


Desiree E. Saunders

Appearing Specially, Not Generally

Legal Address. Commencing, in suf. det., at w 1/4 corner of section 26, T.2S.-R.6E., G & SRB & M, thence S. 0° 07' 22" W. to 332.12 ft. to SW corner of section 26, thence bearing 0° S. 7' 22" W. from SW. corner of section 26, 332.12 ft. distant therefrom, thence southerly of N. Section 26 - 858.78 ft to the True Point of the Beginning, continuing thence 164.91 ft. to SE corner, thence 164.91 ft. to SW corner, to True Point of the Beginning; organic city of Gilbert, organic county of Maricopa, organic State of Arizona; —not owned or possessed by the United States of America; —not a post Road; —not on a post Road; —not in a U.S. district.



(response information at certificate of service page)

**IN THE [ALLEGED] UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE [ALLEGED] DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

[The United States of America] /
The Internal Revenue Service
federal agency

ALLEGED AS PLAINTIFF,

v.

Janice Sue Taylor

ALLEGED AS DEFENDANT

cc: Circuit Executive Cathy A. Catterson

**Memorandum In Support Of MOTION
To Require Involuntary Recusal of judge
Mary H. Murguia, or In the Alternative,
refer the matter to Chief Judge John M.
Roll for Involuntary Disqualification;**

Case # CR 10-400-PHX-MHM (ECV)

LIABLE NOTICE: Clerk Of Court

NOTICE: Mary H. Murguia

COMES NOW, by special appearance, Demandant/Petitioner, in the above captioned matter, and hereby submits this Memorandum In Support of MOTION To Require Involuntary Recusal of judge Mary H. Murguia, or In the Alternative, refer the matter to Chief Judge John M. Roll for Involuntary Disqualification, and shows the court alleged, as follows.

FACT And ARGUMENT:

1. On August 12, 2010, this alleged court's judge alleged issued its repeated order denying Demandant certain civil and Constitutional Rights, in order to *make sure* that the Treasonous and Bad Faith Plaintiff, the "IRS federal agency," by and through its errantly and recklessly acting attorneys, would be able to continue their own abuse of process, by demanding of Demandant information that they could have more easily obtained by way of a subpoena ducas tecum served upon known public institutions in which claimed, alleged relevant information is or would be logically contained, and thus, obtainable;
2. There being, therefore, no real or legal reason, whatsoever, for the alleged plaintiff's attorneys from continuing to move either forward or inversely against Demandant and Demandant's Rights, EXCEPT that they have Ulterior Motives, UnLawful = Illegal Motives in doing so;
3. Which UnLawful = Illegal Motives, being perceived to exist on the part of such acclaimed plaintiff and said plaintiff's attorneys, You quickly dismissed without hesitation, with Demandant's own precious civil rights and Constitutional rights along with them, and cared not to stand as any neutral defense of any of Demandant's rights, no matter what such rights may be or may have been;
4. Which "[low] standards of conduct," you, this alleged court's judge, have carried out rather than the requisite "high standards of conduct," which

“standards” you have not “personally observe[d],” in violation of **Cannon 1** of the **Code Of Conduct For United States Judges**, which acts by you further constitute disrespect and compliance to **Cannon 2** of the **Code Of Conduct For United States Judges**, such latter **Cannon** setting forth the minimally requisite Good Behavior term of Conduct as being that “A judge should respect *and* comply with the law,” which “law” is minimally, the proposed Constitution for the United States, all parts and amendments thereof;

5. Inclusive of the Several Amendments thereof, inclusive of the Ninth Amendment and the Fifth Amendment, the Sixth Amendment and the Fourteenth Amendment, and other parts and places within the proposed Constitution too numerous to enter into discussion of herein;
6. Which Fifth Amendment’s own essential protection requirements, you thumbed your nose at and continued on undaunted, in order that you might continue to “help out” the “IRS federal agency,” by which “help” you chose to leave your alleged neutral position in doing so;
7. There being, in Demandant’s earlier appearance of pleading some discussion that may have appeared to be less than legally skillful, but which lack of legal skill you were required – if not thumbing away the U.S. supreme Court’s statement, to wit:

“The Federal Rules (of Civil Procedure) reject the approach that pleading is a *game of skill* in which one misstep by [private citizens as litigants] may be decisive to the outcome and accept the principle that the purpose of pleading is to facilitate a proper decision on the merits.” Conley v. Gibson 355 U.S. 41, 48, 78 S. Ct. 99, 103 (1957).

8. By which denial of Demandant’s merits straightforward (Constitutional Protections are regarded to be such “merits”), you, by acting in the capacity of a “United States judge,” either committed, ipso facto, or would have committed (and so would yet commit) - if carried out, in the future, before an impartial Jury, the obstruction of justice crime known as *Embracery*, which UnLawfulness goes to Bias, or else Prejudice, either way the outcome being an Abuse of Discretion;
9. Not respecting any part of Demandant’s pleadings due to the fact that they did not appear to be the “profession level” pleadings of those of your attorney-in-office profession, inclusive of Demandant’s indication of a perceived necessity of protecting Demandant’s civil and Constitutional Rights by way of entering a pleading for the Fifth Amendment Right to not cooperate with alleged government officials in what appears to be a likely covert investigation of Demandant, for whatever unknown purpose that such governmental officials have opted to do so, which Demandant never should have had to propose any such Fifth Amendment Right *ab initio*, or in the first place, going instead to Demandant’s UnEnumerated Right coming under the Ninth Amendment Power to Protect Demandant’s Rights, equal to other

Citizen's protected Rights, by which you may have been able to retain your trustability on this matter;

10. But it being that by such Exhibited Bias you have not retained or maintained trustability in the case, in violation of both Cannons 1 and 2 of the Code Of Conduct For United States Judges, but have given Demandant not even a shred of hope or reason to trust you neutrality and professional conduct in this case;
11. Therefore, you, the above named judge, are hereby reasonably respectfully petitioned that, Certain Exhibited Bias Appearing, you recuse yourself and withdraw forthwith from this case, or else in the alternative refer the matter to Chief Judge John M. Roll for involuntary disqualification;
12. Request of this Petition for Recusal is not meant to construed or regarded on any personal basis, but recognizes that you, the court's judge, have unwittingly been made an involved party to a corruption that is bigger and more treacherous than what you could possibly be aware of, unless you wittingly are aware of it, which will prove to be for another legal matter for future purposes, if so, the likely cause of your Evident Bias in the case, and not less than that;
13. In order to maintain an appearance of respect for the law, thereby upholding the law as is to be necessarily respected and involuntarily complied with, the above named judge, Mary H. Murguia, should disqualify herself from the case for an appearance of bias;

Dated this 20 day of AUGUST, 2010 A.D.

Desiree E. Saunders

Desiree E. Saunders – Demandant / Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Desiree E. Saunders, hereby declare and state that I have filed a true and correct copy of the above document with the Clerk of the Court for the [Alleged] United States District Court For The [Alleged] District Of Arizona, said [Alleged] Court Appearing And Existing [Supposedly] As A Possession Of Its Own And NOT Lawfully Existing In The Legal or Organic County of Maricopa, Legal or Organic [Proposed] State of Arizona, and have mailed a copy hereof, postage prepaid thereon, to the Alleged U.S. Attorney's Office and the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office, et al, at the following addresses set forth below.

Frank T. Galati,
James Richard Knapp,
Office of the Alleged U.S. Attorney
40 N. Central Ave. # 1200
Phoenix, Arizona near 85004

Joe Arpaio, Sheriff
Maricopa County Sheriff's Department
100 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

Major General Hugo Salazar
Adjunct General, Commanding,
Arizona State Militia

ATTENTION: Provost Marshal

Over All Military Crimes Committed In Arizona:
I.E., Treason, Misprision of Treason,
Seeded Treason / Covert Invasion of "Them"
Trial By Treason, Seeded Insurrection

5636 E. McDowell Rd.
Phoenix, AZ 85008

RESPONSE TO THIS EXHIBITED COMPLAINT IS REQUIRED - *Qui Tacet, Consentire Videtur, Ubi Tractatur De Ejus Commodo* (He[She] who is silent is considered as assenting [to the matter in question] when his[her] interest is as stake.)

Popular Address,
For Use For Postal Service Mailing:
Desiree E. Saunders
3341 Arianna Court
Gilbert, AZ 85298

JUST
CUT >
AND
GLUE >
To Envelope

Legal Address. Commencing, in suf. det., at w 1/4 corner of section 26, T.2S.-R.6E., G & SRB & M, thence S. 0° 07' 22" W. to 332.12 ft. to SW corner of section 26, thence bearing 0° S. 7' 22" W. from SW. corner of section 26, 332.12 ft. distant therefrom, thence southerly of N. Section 26 - 858.78 ft to the True Point of the Beginning, continuing thence 164.91 ft. to SE corner, thence 164.91 ft. to SW corner, to True Point of the Beginning; organic city of Gilbert, organic county of Maricopa, organic State of Arizona; —not owned or possessed by the United States of America; —not a post Road; —not on a post Road; —not in a U.S. district.

Legal Notice. Do not mind the small letters size for the Legal Address that you see. All Articles – Sent By U.S. Mail – Are To be Opened And Read Only When Accompanied By Label Size (small size) "**Legal Address**" From First Page (Shown Above) Displayed On Envelope - **Below Popular Address.** Otherwise, Where Legal Address Is Not Present, Article Sent Will Be Returned Unopened.

No need to waste gasoline and time by not using the U.S. mail, or postal service.

Dated this 20 day of August, 2010 A.D



Desiree E. Saunders