

Notification to Court of Intention to File Injunction

In its 7-1-20 Order, the court states:

“In fact, by asserting in his motion that the report “wholly rebuts the very basis for” the district court’s underlying action” (emphasis added by Respondent)

A reading of Feathers’ recent motion (by any party other than this court, apparently) shows that it states that the Stalker Report rebut SEC’s basis for a sealed, *ex parte*, *prima facie* seizure request. Feathers’ motion does not reference “the district court”. Such word twisting is to be expected by SEC Enforcement. It is disappointing to see this court continue to do same.

And, Feathers in his motion asks the Court to accept the Stalker Report now, not after summary disposition rulings. On that basis, the Court has twisted this matter into putting words into Respondent’s mouth that the Stalker Report is irrelevant. Nothing is further from the truth from a disinterested party’s reading of Feathers’ several motions on this matter.

In his OIP from 2014, Respondent described these proceedings under Hon. Judge Foelak as a “Kangaroo Court”. He now offers this same description for the proceedings of Hon. Judge Grimes.

Respondent hereby informs this court of his intention to file an injunction on further proceedings.

Additionally, Feathers, at that time, does not anticipate filing a motion for summary disposition nor a response to Enforcement filing of same, while challenging the due process failures of this court with the U.S. 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals.

Respectfully,



Mark Feathers, *pro se*, Respondent

Dated: 7-01-20