

**Respondent's Follow-on to Motion For Adjusted Reply Date to Enforcement Motion for Summary Disposition re:
Feathers 3-15755**

Respondent some ten calendar days, or more, ago presented to the Commission's in-house tribunal system a request to adjust the response date to Enforcement's Motion for Summary Disposition. Respondent has not received a response from the court on this matter as of this date. During this period of some calendar days, Enforcement presented to the Court a reply on certain of Respondent's motion filings, which is a change from Enforcement's actions in the two months prior to that of not responding to Respondent's motion filings.

This court has now accepted Enforcement's reply, with a response that the court had always "made it optional" (or words to that affect), anyways, and left matters in Enforcement's hands in that way, in an accommodation to Enforcement, on appearance. Why does this court accommodate Enforcement? Why, because they are all receiving their paycheck from the same pay department at the Commission, of course. Simply put, this court and Enforcement are not, and cannot be, arms-length from each other. Many respondents before have argued the same in civil court, all to no avail, however.

This court also instructed that Respondent must file a reply to Enforcement's reply to his motion filings by 8-14-20. This reply is due in addition to a deadline of 8-14-20 to reply to Enforcement's motion for summary disposition. Pro se Respondent respectfully requests a response on his earlier motion request for accommodations to adjust response dates to Enforcement motion filings and reply filings.

Pro se Respondent also asks this Court to make note of the following matter. Within the past two calendar weeks, Respondent asked this Court to consider the manner in which it addresses Respondent in its orders, and to consider modifying same. Specifically, Respondent asked not to be referred to simply as "Feathers" in the court's orders, for he is not a military boot camp enlistee, and for the court to consider that Respondent be referred to as "Respondent", "Mr. Feathers", or "Mark Feathers". Respondent even made reference in his filings that Enforcement typically refers to Respondent as "Respondent" or "Mr. Feathers" in their filings. And yet, in its 8-5-20 filing for these proceedings, Enforcement titles its filing as follows:


"DIVISION OF ENFORCEMENT'S CONSOLIDATED RESPONSE TO FIVE FEATHERS' MOTIONS FILED BETWEEN JULY 29 AND AUGUST 2, 2020"

Clearly, Enforcement goes out of its way to antagonize Respondent. Respondent has pointed these matters out to the court before.

When is this court going to refer the entirety of these matters over to the Attorney General's Office?

By steps big and little, and with planning on their part for more than eight years now with every step, Enforcement has robbed Respondent not only of his private due process rights, his property, and his reputation, it also actively takes steps to antagonize Respondent, strip him of humility, etc. This court should recognize that fact at some point.

Resp.



Mark Feathers, *pro se*, Respondent

8-8-20