

1 DENNIS K. BURKE
United States Attorney
District of Arizona

2
3 FRANK T. GALATI
Assistant U.S. Attorney
Arizona State Bar No. 003404
frank.galati@usdoj.gov

4
5 JAMES R. KNAPP
Assistant U.S. Attorney
Arizona State Bar No. 021166
james.knapp2@usdoj.gov
6 Two Renaissance Square
40 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1200
7 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4408
Telephone: (602) 514-7500

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

10 United States of America,
11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 Janice Sue Taylor,
14 Defendant.

No. CR-10-00400-PHX-MHM

**UNITED STATES' RESPONSE TO
DEFENDANT'S EXCEPTION OF
PREVIOUS ORDER, etc.**

15
16 Taylor has filed a pleading which she styles "Exception of Previous Order for
17 Fundamental Violation of Procedural Rights; Notice for Indispensably Necessary Continuance
18 of Court Proceedings, While Challenge of Government's Attorneys for Particular Jurisdiction
19 is Fully Verified According to Law; Notice of Challenge for Constructive Subject Matter
20 Jurisdiction of Court to be Overcome by Adverse Party" (doc. 135). Taylor goes on for 17
21 pages, nearly all of which is unintelligible gibberish. The United States offers the following
22 brief responses to points we believe Taylor attempts to make.

23 1. Taylor's stated "exception to a previous order" appears to refer to the Court's order of
24 September 30, 2010, wherein, among other things, several of Taylor's motions (docs. 90-98) were
25 struck and Taylor was directed that her future filings are to comply with Local Criminal Rule 12.1
26 and Local Civil Rule 7.1 (doc. 107). Taylor's "exception" is either a mere statement of her
27
28

1 disagreement with that order or a quasi-motion for reconsideration. Whichever Taylor's
2 "exception" is, a response by the United States at this time is not appropriate.^{1/}

3 We do note, however, that Taylor has defied the Court's order of September 30, 2010 by
4 once again listing her purported "legal address" on the first page of both her "Exception of
5 Previous Order, etc.," (doc. 135) and another recent "notification" (doc. 139). Because both of
6 these pleadings fail to comply with the Court's order of September 30, 2010 and defendant's non-
7 compliance appears to be entirely willful, we suggest that the Court may, in the exercise of its
8 sound discretion, strike them.

9 2. It also appears that Taylor seeks extension of the deadline for the filing of pretrial
10 motions. Taylor has filed a motion for such an extension (doc. 125) and the United States has
11 responded (doc. 134). We respectfully stand on that response.

12 3. Taylor also offers her thoughts concerning various purported jurisdictional issues.
13 This subject has also been addressed in two of Taylor's previous filings (docs. 117, 119). The
14 United States has responded to each (docs. 132, 133) and we respectfully stand on those
15 responses.

16 Respectfully submitted this 1st day of November, 2010.

17 DENNIS K. BURKE
18 United States Attorney
19 District of Arizona

20 *s/ Frank T. Galati*

21 FRANK T. GALATI
22 JAMES R. KNAPP
23 Assistant U.S. Attorneys
24

25
26

^{1/} See LRCrim 12.1; LRCiv 7.2(g)(2) ("No response to a motion for reconsideration and
27 no reply to the response may be filed unless ordered by the Court...").

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that on 11/1/2010, I mailed copies of the attached document to the following:

Janice Sue Taylor
3341 Arianna Ct.
Gilbert, AZ 85298

s/ Michelle L. Colberg