

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
6714 MAIL SERVICE CENTER
RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA
27699-6714

People of North Carolina,
Rodney-Dale; Class,
Private Attorney General
P.O. Box 435
High Shoals, North Carolina 28077
PHONE NUMBER REDACTED

CASE # 12 REV 05184

Date Filed 6/14/2012

Petitioner(s) / Plaintiff(s)

Vs

Administrative Law Judge

Beecher R. Gray

LINDA MILLSAPS, CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER
N.C. DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
PO Box 871
Raleigh, NC 27602

LUKE SISK
TAX COLLECTOR
GASTON COUNTY
TAX DEPARTMENT
128 West Main Avenue
P.O. Box 1578
Gastonia, N.C. 28053

**TAKE JUDICIAL NOTICE OF THE
PETITIONER'S CONGRESSIONAL
AUTHORITY AND OBJECTION TO
DAVID D. LENNON'S MOTION FOR
DISMISSAL**

STATEMENTS OF FACT IN LAW

NOW COMES Rodney-Dale; Class, as a Private Attorney General (hereafter PAG) by and through Congressional Mandate as a Petitioner / Plaintiff, Natural Citizen of North Carolina State and of the United States of America, on behalf of the injuries of People of North Carolina and for his own injuries, and files with this Court a Statement of Facts of this case and a Declaration of Congressional Status for this court to TAKE JUDICIAL NOTICE OF THE PETITIONER'S CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY AND OBJECTION TO DAVID D. LENNON'S MOTION FOR DISMISSAL.

DECLARATION OF CONGRESSIONAL STATUS OF AUTHORITIES

DEFINITION OF PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL

A private citizen who commences a lawsuit to enforce a legal right that benefits the community as a whole.

From West's Encyclopedia of American Law, edition 2. Copyright 2008, The Gale Group, Inc. All rights reserved. *And, used out of necessity.* (as quoted by (<http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/Private+Attorney+General>)

Private Attorney General is an informal term usually used today in the [United States](#) to refer to a private party who brings a [lawsuit](#) considered to be in the [public interest](#), i.e., benefiting the general public and not just the [plaintiff](#). The person considered "private attorney general" is entitled to recover [attorney's fees](#) if he or she prevails. The rationale behind this principle is to provide extra incentive to private citizens to pursue suits that may be of benefit to society at large.

CONGRESSIONAL STATUS OF
WHO CAN PRACTICE LAW IN THE COURTS

This PAG will first start out with Congressional mandate(s) concerning who has been given authority to address any issue before the courts. This Party, Rodney-Dale; Class, PAG, points out that Congressional mandates have only authorized three Acts / laws as to who can address a court.

The **first** of these Acts / laws being the **Judiciary Act of 1789** as currently found in the United States Attorney's Manual at **3-2.110**. This Act created the inferior courts below the united States supreme Court. This Act also created the Attorney General's Office, **BUT** I remind this Court (OAH) that Congress never filled these offices. Congress can only create an office , **BUT** it takes the People to fill an office.

The **second** of these Acts / laws being the **Civil Rights Act of 1866**, 14 Stat. 27, enacted April 9, 1866, (and sometimes referred to as The Private Attorney General Act) 39th Congress, Sess 1, Ch 31 (1866), CHAP. XXXL, (*Formally titled*): **An Act to protect all Person in the United States in their Civil Rights, and furnish the Means of their Vindication**, April 9, 1866; Public Law 104-317, Oct 19, 1996, 110 Stat 3853; 93 stat 1284; Public Law 96-170, 96th Congress, Dec 9th 1979. Congress created the position of Private Attorney General and passed it into Public Law to give the People like this PAG the same right as the Federal or State Attorneys General to bring suit in the name of the People when those who hold Public Office as Federal or State Attorneys General or County Prosecutors fail or refuse to protect the People rights because it conflicts with their BAR Oaths.

This PAG has come before this OAH court on Four case to have this Court and the Attorney General Office to declare that their no such thing as public officials "**just private entity, private contractors, and now privates individuals**" who work for North Carolina/ NORTH CAROLINA "But" yet these people claim public office status for enforcement with wages and benefits. As this PAG has pointed out these facts, can you, Judge Gray, deny that there is a conflict in the BAR rules which creates a conflict in the LAW opposing the people use of the Private Attorney General .

The **third** of these Acts / laws being the **Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 (APA)**, under S.7, 60 stat 237 and under United States Code, Title 5, **GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION AND EMPLOYEES**. Pursuant to the APA of 1946, 60 stat 237, under S. 7, per Congressional decision, a private Citizen, non-lawyer / non-attorney has the right to act as counsel on behalf of a private Citizen in Court without having a law degree. This APA did come about because of the New Deal. This was to give the People remedy against public agencies / departments that bring all allegations / claims against the People. It is a well stated fact, **and a provable fact, that lawyers / attorneys are forbidden to uphold "the People's rights" pursuant to BAR Rule 11 and risk disbarment by doing so. (See local Bar Rules). As this PAG has now pointed out these facts, can you, Judge Gray, deny that there is "NOT" a conflict in the BAR rules which creates a conflict in the LAW regarding "due process" ?**

Now, this PAG sets the proper Status of who has a Congressional mandate to come before a Court. Acting as you are, Beecher R. Gray, in this Courtroom (OAH) at this Hearing / arrangement / communication, you are doing business as and "operating as a skilled expert in law as a professional in the law." Now, as a Judge with such

knowledge and skills, can you dispute or deny that these Congressional Acts / laws (mandates) under Congressional Authorization did not create the Attorney General's Office or the Private Attorney General position ? And, further, as a judge, who is required to be an expert in law, can "you" show this party where any Congressional Act, Congressional Mandate, or public law and / or statutes, of either Federal or State origin, created any lawful authority of the Bar Association or created the specific position of attorney / lawyer to operate before this court or any other court ? If this Court, or you, can not provide such authority under Congressional Acts / laws or Congressional Mandate of the Bar Association's allowance of members to practice in the courts, then you and this court (OAH) are required to come into compliance with the three previously mentioned Congressional Acts / laws (mandates) as to who can enter before this court or any other court !

Now, as Assistant Attorney General David D. Lennon, who is required to be a professional in the law and expert in law with such knowledge and skills, can You dispute or deny that these Congressional Acts / laws (mandates) under Congressional Authorization did not create the Attorney General's Office or the Private Attorney General position ? And, further, as an Assistant Attorney General, who is required to be an expert in law and made the issue of "Practicing Law" , can You show this party on the record and the OAH Court on the Record where any Congressional Act, Congressional Mandate, or public law and / or statutes, of either Federal or State origin, created any lawful authority of the Bar Association or created the specific position of attorney / lawyer to operate before this court or any other court ? As Assistant Attorney General, "IF" you can not provide such authority under Congressional Acts / laws or

Congressional Mandate of the Bar Association's allowance of members to practice in the courts, then you and this court (OAH) are required to come into compliance with the three previously mentioned Congressional Acts / laws (mandates) as to who can enter before this court or any other court !

I, Rodney-Dale; Class, as a PAG will remind this Court (OAH), Judge Gray and the Attorney General's Office that no Court can use its judicial position to create a private, exclusive Association to practice law when there no Congressional authority to do so and no Congressional Authority to back it. To do so is a violation of the TAFT-HARTLEY ACT and the SMITH ACT (54 *Statutes at Large* 670-671 (1940) 18 *U.S. Code* § 2385) . The United States supreme Court has rule many time that the practice of law can not be licensed or restricted.

The Alien Registration Act of 1940, usually called the Smith Act because the antis edition section was authored by Representative Howard W. Smith of Virginia, was adopted at 54 *Statutes at Large* 670-671 (1940). The Act has been amended several times and can now be found at 18 *U.S. Code* § 2385 (2000).

§ 2385. Advocating Overthrow of Government.

Whoever knowingly or willfully advocates, abets, advises, or teaches the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing or destroying the government of the United States or the government of any State, Territory, District or Possession thereof, or the government of any political subdivision therein, by force or violence, or by the assassination of any officer of any such government; or

Whoever, with intent to cause the overthrow or destruction of any such government, prints, publishes, edits, issues, circulates, sells, distributes, or publicly displays any written or printed matter advocating, advising, or teaching the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing or destroying any government in the United States by force or violence, or attempts to do so; or

Whoever organizes or helps or attempts to organize any society, group, or assembly of persons who teach, advocate, or encourage the overthrow or

destruction of any such government by force or violence; or becomes or is a member of, or affiliates with, any such society, group, or assembly of persons, knowing the purposes thereof--

Shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both, and shall be ineligible for employment by the United States or any department or agency thereof, for the five years next following his conviction.

If two or more persons conspire to commit any offense named in this section, each shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both, and shall be ineligible for employment by the United States or any department or agency thereof, for the five years next following his conviction.

As used in this section, the terms "organizes" and "organize", with respect to any society, group, or assembly of persons, include the recruiting of new members, the forming of new units, and the regrouping or expansion of existing clubs, classes, and other units of such society, group, or assembly of persons.

FIRST ISSUE: WHO CAN PRACTICE LAW

1. This PAG will also point out that David D. Lennon has made a claim that I, Rodney-Dale; Class lack standing to represent the People of North Carolina in the capacity of a licensed Attorney or any other capacity.
2. David D. Lennon is now required to provide such Congressional mandates and proof by Federal or State Legislation that Congress did create the Bar Association and Attorneys / lawyers and that they have any lawful authority.
3. David D. Lennon is now required to provide such Congressional mandate and proof by Federal or State Legislation that Congress did create law that allows the Bar Association,

and attorneys / lawyers, the exclusive rights to be the sole practitioners in the arena of Law.

4. If David D. Lennon can not provide such proof he has now violated his Bar Oath to Not Mislead, Misrepresent the Law or Place False statements before the Court. His failure to comply is now perjury of oath.

a). David D. Lennon must now explain to this administrative Court. and to this PAG, as an employee under the Governor's office, why he has violated the Taft-Hartley Act and why he expects this OAH to assist in such a violation, and why he, David D. Lennon, should not be held in "contempt, sanction ,and disbarred" for fraud upon this honorable court.

**SECOND ISSUE: THE STATE HAS NO IMMUNITY UNDER THE ELEVENTH
AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION FOR THE UNITED STATES**

Title 42 2000 d-7

42 USC § 2000D–7 - CIVIL RIGHTS REMEDIES EQUALIZATION

(a) General provision

(1)A State shall not be immune under the Eleventh Amendment of the Constitution of the United States from suit in Federal court for a violation of section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 [29 U.S.C. 794], title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 [20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.], the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 [42 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.], title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 [42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.], or **the provisions of any other Federal statute prohibiting discrimination by recipients of Federal financial assistance.**

(2)In a suit against a State for a violation of a statute referred to in paragraph (1), remedies (including remedies both at law and in equity) are available for such a

violation to the same extent as such remedies are available for such a violation in the suit against any public or private entity other than a State.

(b) Effective date

The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall take effect with respect to violations that occur in whole or in part after October 21, 1986.

5. This PAG has now pointed to the Federal Regulation of federal funding to the State under Title 42, section 2000d-7 above.

6. David D. Lennon, being the expert in law and is operating as professional expert, must have been aware of his committing perjury when he claimed the Eleventh Amendment protection.

7. David D. Lennon being the expert in law and is operating as professional expert must be aware of this State's Constitution. **Article 1, Sec. 2. Sovereignty of the people.** “All political power is vested in and derived from the people; all government of right originates from the people, is founded upon their will only, and is instituted solely for the good of the whole.”

8. David D. Lennon, being the expert in law and operating as professional expert, must have been aware of his cite of Eleventh Amendment immunity as being misleading and did knowingly misquote it with intent to defraud this Party and this Court. David D. Lennon did perjure his oath to the Bar by Misleading, Misrepresenting the Law or placing false statements before the Court.

9. This PAG will point out that this Court is Administrative and under David D. Lennon's purview as Assistant Attorney General of North Carolina, and as the Attorney General's Manual Administrative Procedures of 1947, Rule 4 allows the public or this PAG to address administrative policy violations.

10. This PAG will further make the issue that the Eleventh Amendment protection applies to the People as the People under this State Constitution are the named sovereigns. (See above quote, paragraph 7, from the North Carolina Constitution.) Therefore, David D. Lennon did perjure his oath to the Bar by Misleading, Misrepresenting the Law and Placing False Statements before this Court.

Status as Trustee

63C Am.Jur.2d, Public Officers and Employees, §247* “As expressed otherwise, the powers delegated to a public officer are held in trust for the people and are to be exercised in behalf of the government or of all citizens who may need the intervention of the officer. Furthermore, the view has been expressed that all public officers, within whatever branch and whatever level of government, and whatever be their private vocations, are trustees of the people, and accordingly labor under every disability and prohibition imposed by law upon trustees relative to the making of personal financial gain from a discharge of their trusts. That is, a public officer occupies a fiduciary relationship to the political entity on whose behalf he or she serves. and owes a fiduciary duty to the public. It has been said that the fiduciary responsibilities of a public officer cannot be less than those of a private individual. Furthermore, it has been stated that any enterprise undertaken by the public official who tends to weaken public confidence and undermine the sense of security for individual rights is against public policy. Fraud in its elementary common law sense of deceit-and this is one of the meanings that fraud bears 483 U.S. 372 in the statute. See *United States v. Dial*, 757 F.2d 163, 168 (7th Cir1985) includes the deliberate concealment of material information in a setting of fiduciary obligation. A public official is a fiduciary toward the public, including, in the case of a judge, the litigants who appear before him and if he deliberately conceals material information from them, he is guilty of fraud. *McNally v United States* 483 U.S. 350 (1987)

11. This PAG has pointed to Am. Jur. 2d that clearly shows that those who hold a public office are defined as “**Trustees,**” and, further, to the case law below.

***Monroe v. Pape*, 365 U.S. 167 (1961)**

There can be no doubt at least since *Ex parte Virginia*, 100 U.S. 339, 346-347, that Congress has the power to enforce provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment against those who carry a badge of authority of a State and represent it in some capacity, whether they act in accordance with their authority or misuse it. See *Home Tel. & Tel. Co. v. Los Angeles*, 227 U.S. 278, 287-296. The question with which we now deal is the narrower one of whether Congress, in enacting § 1979, meant to give a remedy to parties deprived of constitutional rights, privileges and immunities by an official's abuse of his position. Cf. *Williams v. United States*, 341 U.S. 97; *Screws v. United States*, 325 U.S. 91; *United States v. Classic*, 313 U.S. 299. We conclude that it did so intend. ***Mr. Justice Douglas delivered the opinion of the Court.***

12. David D. Lennon, being the expert in law and is operating as a professional expert, was aware of his quote being misleading and did knowingly misquote, with intent to defraud this Party and this Court, when he has claimed that LINDA MILLSAPS and LUKE SISK are just run of the mill individuals (**private**) who are **Not** employed as employees of this North Carolina State.

13. Can David D. Lennon, perhaps, explain why both of these individuals (LUKE SISK and LINDA MILLSAPS) hold Public Office and are on the payroll if they are not employed by this North Carolina state ? This would, now, be Fraud as they are collecting State and county **benefits** such as wages, would it not ? Which begs the question: Are they, **or are they not** "Public Officials" of this North Carolina state ? That is one of the main issues of contention by this PAG.

14. David D. Lennon, as did the other Assistant Attorney General, in the other case before this Court lay claim that there are such things as North Carolina State public employees. Has this now become a Tax fraud issue as all of these individuals are all

collecting wages / income and State benefits or County Benefits under the pretense of holding a “public office” ?

a) David D. Lennon, being the expert in law and operating as a professional expert and being Assistant Attorney General, is aware that the Attorney General's office, as Public Policy, will not represent the General Public, such as Rodney-Dale; Class, or any other person in North Carolina State, **HOWEVER** we, **again**, find the Attorney General's Office representing, purportedly, Non-Public Officials / Non-Public Employees and Non-Public Police Officers at the expense of the People.

b) David D. Lennon, being the expert in law and being an Assistant Attorney General, should be required to explain to this Court why, if the Defendants are "private individuals" and non-employees of NORTH CAROLINA / North Carolina State, is the Attorney General Office representing the defendants instead of a private law firm. David D. Lennon, being the expert in law and being an Assistant Attorney General, has now intentionally committed perjury before this OAH Court by calling the Defendants "private individuals" when, in reality, they are Public Officials (or, at least they are sold to the People as such at election time !), and is committing Fraud against the North Carolina State Tax Payer, and at the People's expense, by allowing the Attorney General's Office to represent “Non-State-Employees” in a State Administrative Hearing Court.

THE REAL ISSUES BEFORE THIS COURT

15. One of this PAG's main issues was, and seems to still be, Tax Fraud, and David D. Lennon, being the expert in law, should have full knowledge of the 1913 Federal Reserve

Act, the true intent, meaning and result of Federal Reserve Notes, and the 1933 State of Emergency clause.

16. David D. Lennon, being the expert in law also known as he (or one of the other individuals), has placed into the record of both this PAG's cases a ruling that the defendants in these cases are "Private Contractors" and are **Not** employees of North Carolina.

16. David D. Lennon, being the expert in law, knows taxes can not be collected by individuals who fail to hold a public office when this State benefits from such collection.

17. The issue goes back to who holds the Title to the property in question: the tags and who is the actual "owner" of the registered vehicle.

18. The STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, by and through the 1913 Federal Reserve Act, the true meaning, definition and intent of Federal Reserve Notes, and the 1933 State of Emergency clause, is the "owner."

19. David D. Lennon, being the expert and being Assistant Attorney General by law, has failed to rebut or dispute this fact in law, but instead has allowed the Defendants, under his professional capacity as the Assistant Attorney General, to embezzle the public debt by David D. Lennon claiming they are **Not** employed, **but** are just some run of the mill individuals.

20. These "run of the mill individuals" are collecting wages and income from this State or its Counties. This is Fraud and now becomes an administrative issue of abuse and violation of "honest service" and evidence of yet another perjured oath by David D. Lennon.

21. Shouldn't David D. Lennon, being the expert and being Assistant Attorney General, now be required to define what a Federal Reserve Note is and what actually backs such a note. His failure to define this note in its lawful meaning will place him in dishonor. This would now make the STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA responsible for the public debt that the defendants are trying to collect.

22. David D. Lennon, being the expert and being Assistant Attorney General, has full knowledge that any tax on motor vehicles comes under the Governor's Highway Safety Program per the Highway Safety Act of 1966 under USC 23, section 402, and CFR 23, section 1250, and of the 40% share of funds to all political subdivisions.

23. David D. Lennon, being Assistant Attorney General, **is required** to know that this a Federal Financial Assistance Program and that the Eleventh Amendment of the U.S. Constitution is a frivolous argument and unintelligent for him to make such a statement before this court for an argument.

24. The Governor's Highway Safety Program under the Highway Safety Act of 1966 requires all political subdivisions their fair share of that 40%. The Defendants are collecting tax under this program and denying the political subdivisions their fair share !

25. David D. Lennon, being Assistant Attorney General, has covered up this federal funds embezzlement and fraud of the all the political subdivisions by making a claim that the Defendants are **"private" individuals** and Not Employees. This becomes yet another instance of perjury and of Mr. Lennon's failure to honor his oath and a theft of honest service.

CONCLUSIONS AND RELIEF SOUGHT

This PAG has point out the Congressional mandates which Congress created, who can come before any court and address issues in law, and address civil, criminal or administrative actions.

This PAG has pointed out that North Carolina State / NORTH CAROLINA has waived all immunities under Title 42, section 2000d-7.

This PAG has pointed out, in his first complaint, that all the Defendants agencies / offices are listed on your (OAH) web site as employee of the State or County under this court jurisdiction and subject to administrative action.

This PAG has also pointed out the fraud in paragraphs 15 thru 25 in the above statements. David D. Lennon, being Assistant Attorney General, has perjured his oath to deliver honest service to the People of this State as well as to this PAG and this Court.

This PAG will remind this Court of the 14th Amendment, section 4, as David D. Lennon tried to misuse the 11th Amendment. The public debt can not be questioned or violated !

Fourteenth Amendment, Section 4

The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, **shall not be questioned.** But neither the United States nor any state shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

I, Rodney-Dale; Class, as a PAG will remind this Court and the Attorney General's Office that every argument that David D. Lennon, and the other Assistant

Attorneys General that issued out of the Attorney General's Office made before this never dealt with the “issues” placed before this Court (OAH) by this PAG. In this Court, as a Judge, Mr. Gray, you are aware that the People themselves have made these same claims of **immunity** in their own defense. However, the Court has walked right over these arguments and the People were prosecuted and convicted 100% of the time.

David D. Lennon claims 11th Amendment immunities because of "sovereignty," however that “sovereignty” actually resides in the People (as proven above in paragraph 7), yet 100% of the People get convicted daily by the Courts in this State. This PAG reminds this Court of equal protection under the law and reminds David D. Lennon that he is in an administrative court that has the "Sole" power to hear this PAG's issues because of the public interest and the public concern of abuse by those Defendants which hold these offices under NORTH CAROLINA / North Carolina and are supposed to be doing business as Experts and Educated Tax Collectors for this State.

By the Attorney General's Office making declarations and arguments before this OAH Court that there are no such things as “public officials,” is the proof that those who hold these positions are operating and are doing business as a “Corporation” and not as a “Public” Office under contract to the Constitutions (North Carolina State / STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA or of the united States of America) nor upholding their contract created by their Oaths of Office.

This continuing contention / admission by the Attorney General's Office that there are no such things as “public officials” holding and running North Carolina State agencies or departments is an admission of a “Foreign State Corporation” takeover of the

People's State and government. Such a takeover now requires this “Foreign State Corporation” to come into compliance with the Lieber Code (1863) and Title 10 of the UCMJ as the Federal Reserve Note is a “Foreign currency” and not lawful United States of America dollars. This “Foreign” Corporation has now become liable for the TAXES and the Public Debt under the bankruptcy (of 1933, et al.) of the UNITED STATES.

The People Can Not be held accountable as the People are not employed by such a “Corporation” nor does any of the Corporation's “policy” effect the People. If David D. Lennon, being an Assistant Attorney General and a expert in law, knows full well that in order to force the People of this State to come into compliance under Administrative Law, color of law, or statutory law, then David D. Lennon and this Court is required to come into compliances with the 1913 Federal Reserve Act, the usage of Federal Reverse Note as stated in the law under P.L. 1 48, stat C 1 (State of Emergency of 1933 clause). David D. Lennon, being an Assistant Attorney General, has failed to address these problems and hold these “private individuals” accountable for the Public Debt that has been created by them and their embezzling of Federal funds under the Governor's Highway Safety Program which means that David D. Lennon must be held accountable as this is an administrative issue of abuse of his office among the other violations pointed out.

Wherefore, for the reasons set forth herein, this PAG respectfully requests the Administrative Law Judge grant the Petitioner's demand for Mr. Lennon's Motion For Dismissal to be denied, and for a swift and timely hearing before this court to require the Defendants to rebut the allegations and violations of this PAG and the People.

Private Attorney General Seal

Rodney-Dale; Class
Private Attorney General
C/o P.O. Box 435
High Shoals, North Carolina
PHONE NUMBER REDACTED

Bounty Hunter Seal

PROOF OF SERVICE

NOW COMES Rodney–Dale; Class, as one of the people of North Carolina and on behalf of the People of North Carolina, with this TAKE JUDICIAL NOTICE OF THE PETITIONER'S CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY AND OBJECTION TO DAVID D. LENNON'S MOTION FOR DISMISSAL to be filed into the Clerk of Courts, and certifies that copies of the same were sent via U.S. Mail, etc., to the parties listed below, to be addressed before the STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS under the Administrative Procedure Act (1946) and under the Attorney General's Manual of 1947, Rule 4 on this _____ day of _____ in the year of our Lord, 2012 AD.

Rodney-Dale; Class
Private Attorney General
C/o P.O. Box 435
High Shoals, North Carolina
PHONE NUMBER REDACTED

Cc:

LUKE SISK
TAX COLLECTOR
GASTON COUNTY
TAX DEPARTMENT
128 West Main Avenue
P.O. Box 1578
Gastonia, N.C. 28053

LINDA MILLSAPS, CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER
N.C. Department of Revenue
PO Box 871
Raleigh, NC 27602

David D. Lennon
Assistant Attorney General
Attorney for Respondent N.C. Dept. Of Revenue
North Carolina Department of Justice
Post Office Box 629
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602-0629

ROY COOPER
Attorney General
North Carolina Department of Justice
Post Office Box 629
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602-0629

Also Cc to the following parties:

Timothy Geithner
The Fiduciary by the Appointment as
US Secretary of the Treasury
1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20220

Douglas Shulman, or Designee
Office of the Commissioner
Internal Revenue Service
1111 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20224

Department of the Treasury
Financial Management Service Officer
P.O. Box 1686
Birmingham, AL 35201-1686

Examinations – IRS
Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service
P.O. Box 48-389, Stop 54A
Doraville, GA 30362

J. Russell George
Inspector General
US Treasury Office
1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20220

Assistant Director in Charge

Federal Bureau of Investigation
James W. McJunkin
601 4th Street NW
Washington, DC 20535