

SUPREME COURT COVER LETTER
Edward Earl Young
6330 Vickie Lane
Colorado Springs, CO 80923
youngedward312@gmail.com
(719) 651-9049

Date: September 13, 2025

To: Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States
1 First Street NE
Washington, DC 20543

Subject: Final Submission – Request for Federal Override and Constitutional Adjudication

Dear Clerk of the Court,

I hereby submit my final declaration and evidentiary packet for review by the Supreme Court of the United States. This submission documents six uncontested lawsuits, each denied without lawful ruling, and exposes a pattern of judicial sabotage across federal and state jurisdictions.

The record is sealed. The evidence is uncontested. The denials are procedurally incoherent and constitutionally void. I have exhausted all lawful remedies. The lower courts have failed to adjudicate, failed to respond, and failed to uphold the rule of law.

THIS PACKET INCLUDES:

Verified filings and tracking numbers for all six cases.
Judicial contradictions, unauthorized dismissals, and reversed orders.
Motions for disqualification, fraud on the court, and jurisdictional clarification.
Media briefing and public notice of systemic failure.

I respectfully demand:

- 1.Immediate federal override of all six cases.
- 2.Declaratory judgment confirming systemic denial of due process.
- 3.Referral to public oversight and media transparency.

This is not a request for favor. It is a demand for lawful adjudication. The Constitution does not permit silence in the face of uncontested truth.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward EARL YOUNG
Edward Earl Young
Petitioner Pro Se

MEDIA BRIEFING PACKAGE

Subject: Veteran Litigant Exposes Pattern of Judicial Sabotage Across Six Uncontested Lawsuits
Location: Colorado Springs, CO
Date: September 12, 2025

Headline Summary:

Veteran litigant Edward Earl Young has filed six lawsuits in Colorado courts, each presenting uncontested evidence. In every case, the courts refused to adjudicate, obstructed access, and issued rulings devoid of legal merit. The pattern is timestamped, documented, and now escalated to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Key Exhibits and Evidence

- Federal Complaint (2:SCV346) against Experian, Citibank, and First National Bank of Omaha for violations of the Fair Credit Reporting Act—uncontested and documented.
- Motion for Judicial Disqualification of Judge S. Kato Crews (1:23-cv-01156-SKC), citing bias, refusal to engage evidence, and unlawful rulings.
- Court Filing (25CV315 / 25C335) against 1st Phil Long Autohaus and the VA, entered into record with tracking and timestamped submission.
- Citibank Response Letter (EXHIBIT E) confirming account closure and non-delinquency—contradicting credit reporting and reinforcing claims of data abuse.

Pattern of Judicial Sabotage

Across all six cases:

1. Defendants failed to appear or defend.
 2. Evidence was never ruled on—not once.
 3. No court cited a single statute to justify any ruling.
 4. Judges refused to adjudicate on the merits.
 5. Court access was obstructed for over five months.
- This is not procedural error—it's systemic denial of due process.

Federal Escalation

- Declaration of Systemic Judicial Failure submitted to the Supreme Court of the United States.
- Jurisdictional basis: Denial of Due Process, Equal Protection violations, and breach of judicial oath.
- Spiritual directive: This is not grievance—it is forensic testimony under divine instruction.

Why This Story Matters: This isn't just one man's fight—it's a mirror held to the system. As I go, so goes the world either deeper into the abyss of unchallenged corruption, or forward into the reckoning that begins to end it for what the sake of the needed good for all past, present and future humanity!

Contact for Interview or Documentation Access:

Edward Earl Young
Petitioner Pro Se
6330 Vickie Lane
Colorado Springs, CO 80923

youngedward312@gmail.com
719-651-9049

PLAINTIFF'S FORMAL NOTICE AND EXPECTATION FOR EVIDENCE-BASED ADJUDICATION

PLAINTIFF'S FORMAL NOTICE AND EXPECTATION FOR EVIDENCE-BASED ADJUDICATION

Plaintiff: Edward Earl Young, Pro Se

Case No.: 2025CV315

Filed: September 8, 2025

I. Demand for Correspondence Limited to Merits of Evidence

I hereby place the Court on notice that any future correspondence, orders, or rulings in this matter must be strictly relegated to the merits of the evidence entered into the record.

As a plaintiff, I am lawfully required to substantiate my claims with admissible evidence so that the Court may evaluate the merits of my lawsuit in accordance with all applicable legal requirements.

II. Unlawful Disregard of Evidence

To date, my evidence has never been recognized, addressed, or ruled upon by this Court. This omission is not only irregular—it is pervasive.

My evidence:

- Proves my claims in full
- Is directly relevant to the granting of my pending Motion for Default Judgment
- Has never been contested by either the Court or the Defendants

The continued failure to acknowledge or rule on this evidence constitutes a clear violation of due process under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and Article II, Section 25 of the Colorado Constitution.

III. Source of Delay and Improper Narrative

It is evident that my evidence—because it is irrefutable—has been the true cause of repeated delays and the imposition of irrelevant assertions of procedural defects.

The August 15, 2025 Minute Order issued by Judge S. Kato Crews is defective and void ab initio, serving no purpose other than to delay and distract from the central issue of this lawsuit: my evidence.

This evidence is the staple of the case and the reason it was docketed. Its ongoing disregard, despite facing no lawful contest, has resulted in the imposition of an irrelevant and unlawful narrative designed to preserve obstruction and obfuscation.

IV. Record Preservation and Enforcement

Every other accusation and delay tactic has been proven baseless.

Accordingly, I am compelled to place these critical details into the record so that, if necessary, they may be reviewed to restore the correct narrative and enforce lawful protocol.

V. Immediate Relief Demanded

Given the uncontested, admissible, and dispositive nature of my evidence, and the Defendants' failure to plead, answer, or otherwise defend, I hereby demand that the Court grant my Motion for Default Judgment without further delay in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55(b).

Respectfully submitted,
Edward Earl Young
Plaintiff, Pro Se

TRACKING NUMBERS: 9589 0710 5270 3071 0045 61

Edward Earl Young
Petitioner Pro Se
6330 Vickie Lane
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80923

**NOTE: NEWS STATIONS HAS THIS ENTIRE PACKET
IN THEIR POSSESSIONS AWAITING IN REAL TIME
YOUR DECISION BEFORE IT GOES PUBLIC
WORLDWIDE WITH TRACKING NUMBERS
SHOWING WHEN YOU RECEIVED PACKET
AND MADE YOUR DECISION. WARNING!**

Date: September 12, 2025

To:
Supreme Court of the United States
Office of the Clerk
1 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20543

DECLARATION OF SYSTEMIC JUDICIAL FAILURE AND REQUEST FOR FEDERAL OVERRIDE

Petitioner: Edward Earl Young

Jurisdictional Basis: Denial of Due Process, Procedural Sabotage, Constitutional Breach

Venue: Supreme Court of the United States

I. INTRODUCTION

This declaration is submitted under divine instruction and constitutional authority. Petitioner has filed 6 separate cases in the Colorado State Courts, each presenting uncontested evidence, procedural clarity, and lawful claims. In every instance, the courts have refused to adjudicate, obstructed access, and issued rulings devoid of legal merit. This is not anomaly. This is patterned corruption.

II. FACTUAL RECORD

Across 6 separate cases, the following facts are consistent and documented:

1. Defendants failed to appear or defend in every case.
2. Petitioner's evidence was never ruled on—not once.
3. No court cited a single statute or legal precedent to justify any ruling.
4. Petitioner explicitly requested adjudication on the merits, and no judge responded in kind.
5. The courts obstructed access for over five months, denying Petitioner visibility into case history, filings, or docket activity.

These facts are not speculative. They are timestamped, notarized, and embedded in the record.

III. JUDICIAL COLLAPSE

Petitioner has proven that:

- Judges involved have issued false orders, now under review.
- Rulings were made without findings, without engagement, and without lawful basis.
- The courts have manufactured outcomes against open-and-shut cases, refusing to engage uncontested evidence.
- The pattern is systemic, not isolated.

This is not grievance. This is forensic testimony.

IV. CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS

Petitioner invokes the following constitutional breaches:

- Fourteenth Amendment – Due Process Clause

Denial of fair adjudication, obstruction of access, and refusal to engage uncontested filings.

- Equal Protection Clause

Petitioner's filings were dismissed without merit, while defendants were allowed to default without consequence.

- Judicial Oath and Federal Mandate

State courts failed to uphold their duty to adjudicate lawfully submitted claims.

V. SPIRITUAL DIRECTIVE

Petitioner operates under divine instruction to expose corruption not as coincidence, but as documented rot. The refusal to adjudicate, the issuance of false orders, and the obstruction of access are not random—they

are intentional violations, now sealed in the record.

VI. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

Petitioner respectfully demands:

1. Immediate federal review of all 6 cases.
2. Declaratory judgment confirming systemic denial of due process.
3. Referral to media and public oversight upon ruling, to ensure transparency and accountability.

VII. FINAL DECLARATION

Petitioner has exhausted all lawful remedies at the state level. The record is sealed. The evidence is uncontested. The courts have failed. The only remaining venue is the Supreme Court of the United States, and the only remaining outcome is truth enforced at the highest level.

Respectfully submitted,
Edward Earl Young
Petitioner Pro Se

NOTE: IF THE LOWER COURTS CONTINUE TO SUPPRESS EACH 6 LAWSUITS STATUS & HISTORY I CAN PROVIDE ALL 6 LAWSUITS PROVEN AND UNCONTESTED EVIDENCE, FULLY INTACT, WITH ITS INTERGRITY NOT MARDED BY THE COURTS.

TRACKING NUMBERS: 9589 0710 5270 2617 3279 59
TRACKING NUMBERS: 9589 0710 5270 2617 3276 69

Edward Earl Young
6330 Vickie Lane
Colorado Springs, CO 80923
(719) 651-9049
youngedward312@gmail.com
Plaintiff, Pro Se

Date: August 6, 2025

| LEGAL NOTICE / WARNING |

This document is submitted under penalty of perjury and is part of the official court record in *Edward Earl Young v. United States Department of Veterans Affairs, et al.*, Case No. 1:25-cv-01158-SKC-TPO.

Any challenge to the authenticity or sufficiency of this filing must:

1. Identify the exact recipient allegedly required service beyond those already served.
2. Cite the specific legal authority mandating such service; and
3. Be brought by formal, written, and docketed motion citing controlling law.

All filings in this matter are independently documented, time-tamped, and authenticated through my private recording and tracking system. This system, maintained outside court control, verifies the exact document content, date, time, and delivery. This means:

- Any challenge to my filings must directly address my verified record.
- Any omission, alteration, or misrepresentation by the court will be exposed as tampering; and
- The complete authenticated record remains in my possession as the controlling master record.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Judge S. Kato Crews
U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado
Byron G. Rogers U.S. Courthouse, Courtroom C201
1929 Stout Street Denver, CO 80294

Edward Earl Young,
Plaintiff, Pro Se

TRACKING NUMBERS: 9589 0710 5270 2617 3279 59

v.

[Defendant(s) Name(s)],
U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado

Case No.: 1:25-cv-01158-SKC-TPO

NOTICE TO STAND DOWN OR BE EXPOSED

To all opposing parties, judicial officers, and court personnel connected to this matter:

This Notice serves as a formal challenge and final warning. Stand down now or be exposed — not only as obstructionists before me, but before your peers, your superiors, and the full weight of the public record.

This motion for default will proceed and will pass with or without your participation, because there is no lawful basis for interference. Every attempted procedural barrier has been identified, documented, and met with verified law. Any continued obstruction will not only fail but will be entered into the record as willful misconduct and due process violation.

Now that everything is on the table, I extend forgiveness to each of you for how you have treated me — for expecting a system of law to uphold a higher standard of integrity than common hoodlums. I also apologize for giving you more credit than hoodlums deserve, because at least they operate without pretending to be something they are not. Corruption is corruption — whether it sits in the White House or walks the street.

I live by the truth that I am no respecter of persons, just as God is no respecter of persons. My trust remains in the truth, and the truth has already judged this matter. Your only option now is to either act under the law or stand exposed for openly violating it.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Earl Young
6330 Vickie Lane
Colorado Springs, CO 80923
(719) 651-9049
youngedward312@gmail.com
Plaintiff, Pro Se

Date: August 6, 2025

Motions

1:25-cv-01158-SKC-TPO Young
v. United States Department of
Veterans Affairs et al

ADMAPP,ALLMTN,JD4,NP
ProSe

U.S. District Court - District of Colorado

District of Colorado

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered on 9/3/2025 at 4:39 PM MDT and filed on 9/3/2025

Case Name: Young v. United States Department of Veterans Affairs et al

Case Number: 1:25-cv-01158-SKC-TPO

Filer: Edward Earl Young

Document Number: 50

Docket Text:

MOTION for Judicial Disqualification of Judge S. Kato Crews by Plaintiff Edward Earl Young. (jrobe,)

1:25-cv-01158-SKC-TPO Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Alicia Megan Alvero Koski alicia.alvero.koski@usdoj.gov, , CaseView.ECF@usdoj.gov,
USACO.ECFCivil@usdoj.gov, gage.schlabaugh@usdoj.gov

1:25-cv-01158-SKC-TPO Notice has been mailed by the filer to:

Edward Earl Young
6330 Vickie Lane
Colorado Springs, CO 80923

The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:

Document description:Main Document

Original filename:n/a

Electronic document Stamp:

[STAMP dcecfStamp_ID=1071006659 [Date=9/3/2025] [FileNumber=10444229-0
] [5446a8e0e451ea319ad1c4a7b4abe6d2d6fa5614f1606dca6fbbcefb733e5eadb62
c1c8eab154c0003eed00959f5b45c4123624160deb4a402bb5c61247a63aa]]

DISTRICT COURT, EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO	
Court Address: 270 S. TEJON, COLORADO SPRINGS, CO, 80903	
Plaintiff(s) EDWARD YOUNG v. Defendant(s) MERCEDES OF COLORADO	DATE FILED August 15, 2025 10:47 AM △ COURT USE ONLY △ Case Number: 2025CV315 Division: 21 Courtroom:
Order: Formal Rejection of Improper Dismissal Document	

The motion/proposed order attached hereto: **NO ACTION TAKEN.**

The court takes no action on this request because the court does not know what is being referred to. This court did not issue a dismissal. THIS IS ADMITTED FRAUD UPON THE COURT BY JUDGE MICHAEL P. MCHENRY.

Issue Date: 8/15/2025

Michael P McHenry

MICHAEL P MCHENRY

District Court Judge

El Paso County Court
270 S. Tejon
Colorado Springs CO 80903 United States



EDWARD YOUNG
6330 VICKIE LN
COLORADO SPRINGS CO 80923

1-95-1001

To: Edward Young

Subject: Service of documents in **2025CV315**.

You are being served with documents filed electronically through the Colorado Courts E-Filing system. Please review the following details concerning this service.

- Court Location: El Paso County
- Case Number: **2025CV315**
- Filing ID: N/A
- Filed Document Title(s):
 - Order: Order RE: Defendant's Motion to Strike or for More Definite Statement or in the alternative Motion to Dismiss
- Submitted on Date/Time: Sun Aug 31 17:30:11 MDT 2025
- Submitted by Authorizing Organization:
- Submitted by Authorizing Attorney: El Paso County Court

If you have a question about the above listed case, please contact the court.
Information for all Colorado court locations is listed on the Colorado Judicial Branch website <http://www.courts.state.co.us/Index.cfm>.

THIS COMES JUST 16 DAYS AFTER FRAUD & DISMISSAL BY THE SAME JUDGE MICHAEL P. MCHENRY

DISTRICT COURT, EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO		<p>DATE FILED August 31, 2025</p> <p>THIS COMES JUST 16 DAYS OF AFTER DISMISSAL BY THE SAME JUDGE, JUDGE MCHENRY AGAINST MERCEDES ATTORNEY FOR DOCUMENT ENTERED UNAUTHORIZED BY THE COURT, NOW ITS GRANTED!</p> <p>⚠ COURT USE ONLY ⚠</p> <p>Case Number: 2025CV315 Division: 21 Courtroom:</p>
Court Address: 270 S. TEJON, COLORADO SPRINGS, CO, 80903		
Plaintiff(s) EDWARD YOUNG v.		
Defendant(s) MERCEDES OF COLORADO		
<p>Order:Order RE: Defendant's Motion to Strike or for More Definite Statement or in the alternative Motion to Dismiss</p>		


The motion/proposed order attached hereto: GRANTED.

Rule 3(a), C.R.C.P., states:

"A civil action is commenced (1) by filing a complaint with the court or (2) by service of a summons and complaint. If the action is commenced by service of a summons and complaint, the complaint must be filed within 14 days after service."

Service occurred on July 15, 2025. No separate complaint has been filed or served within said 14 days. Accordingly, the summons shall be deemed ineffective and void without notice. Further, Plaintiff has failed to respond to this motion to dismiss. This action is hereby DISMISSED.

Issue Date: 8/31/2025



MICHAEL P MCHENRY
District Court Judge

THIS IS THE SAME JUDGE WHO JUST 16 DAYS EARLIER REJECTED AN UNAUTHORIZED DOCUMENT BY THE DEFENDANTS ATTORNEY, NOW AFTER COMMITTING FRAUD ON THE COURT JUDGE MCHENRY SHOWS BIAS OVER HIS OWN DOCUMENTED ORDER OF FRAUD AND REJECTED THIS ATTORNEY DOCUMENT AND ENTERED A DISMISSAL, NOW AFTER COMMITTING FRAUD ON THE COURT IS OVER LOOKED AND GRANTED A DECISION OVER MY PRISTINE LEGAL RECORD. w

District Court, El Paso County, Colorado
270 South Tejon Street
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Plaintiff: Edward Earl Young

Defendant: Phil Long Autohaus, LLC dba Mercedes-Benz of
Colorado Springs

Case No.: 25CV315

Div.: 21 Courtroom:

**ORDER RE: DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE OR FOR MORE DEFINITE
STATEMENT OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, MOTION TO DISMISS**

THE COURT having reviewed Defendant's Motion to Strike for More Definite Statement or, in the Alternative, Motion to Dismiss and any response filed thereto, and being fully advised, hereby GRANTS Defendant's Motion. Plaintiff's Complaint is hereby dismissed without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED this day of _____, 2025.

BY THE COURT:

By: _____
District Court Judge

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO VACATE THE COURT'S ORDER OF AUGUST 31, 2025, FOR FRAUD ON THE COURT, JUDICIAL INCONSISTENCY, AND VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO VACATE THE COURT'S ORDER OF AUGUST 31, 2025, FOR FRAUD ON THE COURT, JUDICIAL INCONSISTENCY, AND VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS

District Court, El Paso County, Colorado Court Address: 270 S. Tejon St., Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Plaintiff: Edward Earl Young Defendant: **Phil Long Autohaus, LLC d/b/a Mercedes of Colorado**

Case No.: **2025CV315** (Div. 21)

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO VACATE THE COURT'S ORDER OF AUGUST 31, 2025, FOR FRAUD ON THE COURT, JUDICIAL INCONSISTENCY, AND VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS

Plaintiff Edward Earl Young, pro se, hereby moves the Court, pursuant to C.R.C.P. 60(b)(3) and 60(b)(5), for relief from the Order dated August 31, 2025 ("August 31 Order"), which granted Defendant's Motion to Strike or for More Definite Statement or, in the Alternative, Motion to Dismiss, and dismissed this action without prejudice. This motion is grounded in fraud on the court by Defendant, judicial inconsistency with the Court's prior Order dated August 15, 2025 ("August 15 Order"), and violations of due process under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution and Article II, Section 25 of the Colorado Constitution. In support, Plaintiff states as follows:

Certification Pursuant to C.R.C.P. 121 § 1-15(8): Defendant is represented by counsel who filed the motion leading to the August 31 Order. Plaintiff attempted to confer but received no response. This motion is opposed to the extent Defendant contests it.

Background and Procedural History

- 1. Commencement of Action and Service:** Plaintiff commenced this action by filing the Complaint and obtaining a Summons on July 10, 2025, directing Defendant to respond or appear by July 31, 2025. Service was effectuated on Defendant's registered agent on July 15, 2025, via hand-delivery of the Summons, Complaint, and exhibits, as confirmed by the Affidavit of Service (Exhibit to Plaintiff's Motion for Default Judgment, filed August 31, 2025). This complied with C.R.C.P. 4(e)(4) for service on an LLC. Defendant's response was due by August 5, 2025 (21 days after service), but none was filed.
- 2. Defendant's Improper "Dismissal" Attempt and Court's Rejection:** On or about August 11, 2025, Defendant submitted an unauthorized document purporting to dismiss the case without legal basis, court approval, or Plaintiff's stipulation. This was an extrajudicial tactic to evade litigation. On August 15, 2025, Judge Michael P. McHenry issued the August 15 Order, formally rejecting this "improper dismissal document." The Order stated: "The court takes no action on this request because the court does not know what is being referred to. This court did not issue a dismissal." This Order acknowledged Defendant's filing as fraudulent and without effect, confirming the case remained active and no dismissal had occurred. Plaintiff appreciated this clarification, as it exposed Defendant's fraud on the court.
- 3. Plaintiff's Motion for Default Judgment:** On August 31, 2025, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Default Judgment, supported by affidavits, a memorandum of law, and exhibits, detailing Defendant's failure to appear or defend. Plaintiff attested to Defendant's non-appearance (Exhibit A: Affidavit of Non-Appearance) and emphasized the August 15 Order as evidence that no dismissal existed. The motion was unopposed at filing, as Defendant had not properly appeared.
- 4. The August 31 Order:** On the same day, Judge McHenry issued the August 31 Order, granting Defendant's separate Motion to Dismiss. The Order misapplied C.R.C.P. 3(a), claiming "Service occurred on July 15, 2025. No separate complaint has been filed or served within said 14 days," deeming the Summons ineffective and dismissing the action. This directly contradicts the August 15 Order, issued just 16 days earlier by the same judge, which rejected Defendant's improper tactics and affirmed no dismissal. Moreover, the August 31 Order ignores

Plaintiff's pending Motion for Default Judgment and uncontroverted evidence of proper commencement and service.

Argument

1. **Fraud on the Court Warrants Vacatur Under C.R.C.P. 60(b)(3):** Relief from judgment is warranted where fraud on the court has occurred. Fraud on the court includes any attempt to deceive or mislead the judiciary through fabricated documents, unauthorized filings, or misrepresentations that undermine the integrity of the process (see *Great Western Sugar Co. v. Northern Natural Gas Co.*, 661 P.2d 684 (Colo. App. 1982)). Defendant's August 11 filing was precisely that—a fraudulent "dismissal" document without basis, which Judge McHenry rightly rejected as improper on August 15. This rejection constituted an acknowledgment of fraud, as the filing purported to effect a court action that never occurred.

Yet, just 16 days later, the same judge granted Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, effectively rewarding the prior fraud by terminating the case on a pretextual basis. This is not mere error but a perpetuation of fraud: Defendant, having been caught in an improper tactic, was allowed to file a subsequent motion without consequence, while Plaintiff's evidence of default was ignored. The August 31 Order's claim that "no separate complaint has been filed" is factually false—the Complaint was filed to obtain the Summons on July 10, 2025, before service, commencing the action under C.R.C.P. 3(a)(1) (filing the complaint), not 3(a)(2) (service first). The Affidavit of Service confirms the Complaint was served with the Summons. This misrepresentation in the Order amounts to intrinsic fraud, warranting vacatur to preserve judicial integrity.

2. **Judicial Inconsistency and Abuse of Discretion Violate Due Process:** The August 31 Order is irreconcilably inconsistent with the August 15 Order. On August 15, Judge McHenry explicitly stated the Court "did not issue a dismissal" and took "no action" on Defendant's improper request, affirming the case's active status. This protected Plaintiff's due process rights by rejecting Defendant's fraud. Reversing course on August 31—without addressing the prior Order or Plaintiff's Motion for Default Judgment—constitutes an arbitrary abuse of discretion (see *People v. Montgomery*, 669 P.2d 1387 (Colo. 1983)).

Due process requires notice and an opportunity to be heard before deprivation of property interests, including legal claims (*Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976); Colo. Const. art. II, § 25). Plaintiff received no notice that the Court would disregard its own August 15 Order or misapply C.R.C.P. 3(a). The dismissal without hearing Plaintiff's default motion or evidence denies this right. Furthermore, the inconsistency suggests bias, as documented in Plaintiff's Affidavit of Equivalence (filed August 30, 2025), showing a pattern of mechanical, non-judicial responses to Plaintiff's cases. This violates equal protection by treating pro se litigants unequally (U.S. Const. amend. XIV). Vacatur under C.R.C.P. 60(b)(5) is appropriate for such extraordinary circumstances.

3. **The August 31 Order Misapplies C.R.C.P. 3(a) and Ignores the Record:** The Order errs in assuming commencement by service under C.R.C.P. 3(a)(2), requiring filing within 14 days post-service. The record shows the action commenced under 3(a)(1) by filing the Complaint first on July 10, 2025, with service following. No 14-day filing requirement applies. Even if 3(a)(2) governed, the Complaint was served with the Summons, satisfying the rule. Defendant's default for non-response remains, and the Order fails to address this. Such legal error justifies relief.

Conclusion and Request for Relief

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests the Court:

- Vacate the August 31 Order under C.R.C.P. 60(b)(3) and (5);
- Reinstate the case and grant Plaintiff's Motion for Default Judgment;
- Sanction Defendant for fraud on the court;
- Award costs and such other relief as just.
- Set a hearing if necessary.

Respectfully submitted this 8th day of September, 2025.

/s/ Edward Earl Young Edward Earl Young, Pro Se 6330 Vickie Lane Colorado Springs, CO 80923 719-651-9049
youngedward312@gmail.com

TRACKING NUMBERS: 9589 0710 5270 3071 0045 09

TRACKING NUMBERS: 9589 0710 5270 3071 0044 24
TRACKING NUMBERS 9589 0710 5270 33333071 0044 48

PROPOSED ORDER GRANTING DEFAULT JUDGMENT

[Proposed] Order Granting Default Judgment

District Court, El Paso County, Colorado – Case No. 2025CV315 (Div. 21)

Edward Young v. PHIL LONG, AUTOHAUS, LLC Mercedes of Colorado

ORDER GRANTING DEFAULT JUDGMENT

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Edward Young's **Motion for Default Judgment** (the "Motion") against Defendant Mercedes of Colorado. The Court, having reviewed the Motion, the court file, and being fully advised in the premises, hereby finds and orders as follows:

Findings: The Court finds that Defendant Mercedes of Colorado was properly served with process in this case. Despite being duly served, Defendant failed to file an answer, responsive pleading, or otherwise defend against the Complaint within the time allowed by law. The Defendant has not appeared in this action, and an Entry of Default has been properly entered (or is hereby entered) against Defendant pursuant to C.R.C.P. 55(a). The Court additionally finds that it has jurisdiction over the subject matter and the parties, and that venue in this Court is proper. The Defendant is **not** an infant, incapacitated person, or in military service, and is not entitled to any special protection from default judgment. The Court further notes that it previously issued an order on August 15, 2025, confirming that no dismissal of this case had been ordered by the Court; thus, the case remains active and Defendant is in default.

Order: IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Default Judgment is **GRANTED**. Default Judgment shall enter in favor of Plaintiff Edward Young and against Defendant Mercedes of Colorado on all claims asserted in the Complaint. Plaintiff is awarded judgment as follows:

- **Liability:** Defendant is adjudged to be in default and liable to Plaintiff on each cause of action in the Complaint, by virtue of its failure to respond or defend.
- **Damages:** The Court will conduct a hearing on **[date]** at **[time]** (or will review affidavits submitted by Plaintiff) to determine the amount of damages, including any compensatory damages, statutory or treble damages (if applicable), interest, costs, and reasonable attorney's fees (if applicable) to be awarded. Upon determination of the amount, the Court will enter a final monetary judgment in favor of Plaintiff. *[Alternatively:] Plaintiff is awarded damages in the amount of \$,____, plus applicable pre-judgment interest from [date] to the date of judgment, and court costs. Post-judgment interest shall accrue as provided by law until the judgment is satisfied. (The Court will strike or fill in this damages provision as appropriate based on the evidence.)*
- **Costs and Fees:** Plaintiff is entitled to recover court filing fees and allowable costs of this action. Plaintiff may file a Bill of Costs within the time permitted by C.R.C.P. 54(d) and 121 §1-22. Any request for attorney's fees (if Plaintiff had legal representation and such fees are recoverable) shall be made by separate motion under C.R.C.P. 121 §1-22.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall enter this Default Judgment into the court's registry of judgments. This judgment resolves all claims in the Complaint. **Defendant Mercedes of Colorado, having failed to appear or respond, shall take nothing in this action**, and Plaintiff is entitled to enforce this Default Judgment by all applicable means.

Dated: AUGUST 31, 2025.

BY THE COURT:

Judge Michael P. McHenry
District Court Judge, 4th Judicial District (El Paso County)

TRACKING NUMBERS: 9589 0710 5270 3071 0045 16

LETTER OF CLARIFICATION AND JURISDICTIONAL DISTINCTION

DISTRICT COURT, EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO

270 S. Tejon Street, Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Plaintiff: Edward Earl Young

Defendants: Experian Information Solutions, Inc.; First National Bank of Omaha; Citibank, N.A.

Case Number: **25CV346** CITIBANK'S SECOND CASE NUMBER FOR THE SAME VIOLATION AGAINST THEM FOR THE SAME PLAINTIFF.

Division: 2CV

Courtroom:

LETTER OF CLARIFICATION AND JURISDICTIONAL DISTINCTION

Regarding: Judge Prince's Reference to Federal Filing

To the Clerk and Presiding Judge of El Paso County District Court:

I, Edward Earl Young, Plaintiff in the above-captioned matter, respectfully submit this letter to clarify the jurisdictional basis of my filing and respond to the recent communication referencing federal court.

I acknowledge receipt of the letter signed by Judge David Scott Prince, which suggests that this matter may belong in federal court. However, I must respectfully clarify that none of the named Defendants in this case are federal agencies.

Unlike my prior filings involving the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) and the Social Security Administration (SSA)—which were appropriately filed in federal court due to their federal status—this case involves private entities:

- Experian Information Solutions, Inc. (a private credit reporting bureau)
- First National Bank of Omaha (a private banking institution)
- Citibank, N.A. (a private banking institution)

These parties are all named in the same lawsuit because they are jointly responsible for negative credit reporting that has harmed me. Experian has failed to respond to my formal request for removal of inaccurate information, and the banks have not substantiated the basis for their negative reporting. Furthermore, they have not communicated with Experian to correct or clarify the data they are supplying.

This lawsuit demands that each Defendant appear and substantiate their reporting, not just in isolation, but in coordination—since Experian's reporting is based on the data provided by these banks. It is therefore both logical and legally sound that they were served under the same summons and assigned the same case number in this court.

Additionally, this court's intake center accepted my filing and directed me to serve all parties accordingly. That procedural guidance confirms that El Paso County District Court is the proper venue for this action.

REQUEST FOR COURT CONSIDERATION

I respectfully ask this Court to:

Recognize that the Defendants are not federal agencies, and therefore federal jurisdiction is not required

Acknowledge that the parties are jointly liable under the same factual basis and must be heard together

Confirm that refile in federal court is unnecessary, and that this case may proceed in its current venue

Thank you for your attention to this matter and for your continued consideration of the facts and procedural integrity of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Earl Young

Pro Se Plaintiff

6330 Vickie Lane

Colorado Springs, CO 80923 Phone:

719-651-9049]

Email: youngedward312@gmail.com

Date: September 9, 2025

DISTRICT COURT, EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO

Court Address:

270 S. TEJON, COLORADO SPRINGS, CO, 80903

Plaintiff(s) EDWARD EARL YOUNG

v.

Defendant(s) EXPERIAN INFORMATION SOLUTIONS INC et al.

DATE FILED

September 3, 2025 7:08 AM

△ COURT USE ONLY △

Case Number: 2025CV346

Division: 2CV Courtroom:

Order: Motion for Default Judgment Against All Defendants

The motion/proposed order attached hereto: NO ACTION TAKEN.

The Court takes no action on the attached Motion pursuant to its prior Order. The filing is directed to a case pending in federal court. This is a state court and has no authority to act on a federal court case. The Motion is also substantively invalid. The file does not reflect adequate service of process. While an affidavit of service has been filed, it does not comply with Colorado Rule of Civil Procedure 4. Additionally, the process served appears to be for a federal case and, therefore, would not confer jurisdiction on a state court had service been in compliance with Rule 4.

Issue Date: 9/3/2025



DAVID SCOTT PRINCE

District Court Judge

Judge Prince's Premature Order to File in Federal Court

— This is the smoking gun. If Prince issued that directive before the Supreme Court's denial, it implies foreknowledge or orchestration. It's not guidance—it's a setup to make the denial appear organic.

4. Supreme Court's Delayed Mailing + E-Filing Blackout

— You were told to check E-Filing. You drove to Denver. Clerk says your case doesn't appear. That's not a glitch—it's record suppression. The denial exists, but the system refuses to acknowledge it digitally. That's tampering by omission.

Federal Complaint

25CV346

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

FILED IN THE DISTRICT AND
COUNTY COURTS OF
EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO

Civil Action No.: 25CV346

MO JUL 28 2025

Edward Earl Young, Plaintiff,

vs.

EXPERIAN INFORMATION SOLUTIONS, INC.,
FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF OMAHA,

CITIBANK, N.A.,

Defendants.

**NOTE: CITIBANK, 2ND LAWSUIT INVOLVING FALSE CREDIT REPORTING
AGAINST ME CLAIMING I HAVE AN ONGOING \$10,000 DOLLARS
OPEN CREDIT CARD WITH THEM WITH AN ADDITIONAL PENDING LAWSUIT
AGAINST THEM ALREADY FOR THE SAME FALSE CREDIT REPORTING.**

SHERI KING
CLERK OF COURT

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
(Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq.)

Plaintiff brings this action against the Defendants for willful and negligent violations of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA). Plaintiff asserts:


1. Plaintiff has no open account with Citibank and is already in active litigation against them.
2. Plaintiff disputed the accuracy of this information to Experian, yet Experian retained the data without requiring any rebuttal or legal documentation from Citibank.
3. Plaintiff informed Experian that FNB Omaha refused to provide a final receipt confirming a \$104 payment, failing to close the matter responsibly.
4. Plaintiff lawfully requested Experian conduct a reasonable reinvestigation. Instead, Experian summarily closed the dispute with generic verbiage that the information was "certified as accurate," without any specific or supporting documentation.
5. All Defendants failed to respond specifically and directly as required by 15 U.S.C. §§ 1681i and 1681s-2(b).

Plaintiff demands:

- A direct, documented response from each Defendant.
- Full deletion of unverifiable or unsupported items.
- Statutory, actual, and punitive damages.
- Injunctive relief and any further relief the Court deems proper.

Respectfully submitted,

EXHIBIT E

 UPDATE ON YOUR REQUEST

December 24, 2024

Edward Young
6330 Vickie Ln
Colorado Spgs, CO 80923-4106

My Best Buy® Visa®
Account ending in 1556
Citi Reference Number: 202412111326255627602

CC: Consumer Financial Protection Bureau
Case # 241211-17386201

**THIS IS CITIBANK ACKNOWLEDGING MY FALSE
CREDIT REPORTING CLAIM AGAINST THEM.**

Hello Edward,

You recently reached out to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) regarding your concern about Citi, and we've reviewed your request.

We certainly regret any inconvenience or difficulty you may have experienced with the disputed by consumer note on your credit profile. Our goal is to serve our customers by providing superior service and products. One of the best ways to achieve this goal is to receive feedback, both positive and negative, from our customers. We apologize that this level of service was not met during your contact with us.

We have sent a request to the credit reporting agencies, Experian, Equifax, and TransUnion, to remove the "disputed by the consumer" notes on your My Best Buy® Visa® account from your credit profile. Please allow 30 days for the individual credit bureaus to update their files.

We certainly regret to hear of the recent issues you have experienced at your local Best Buy store. Please know we have forwarded your concerns with that store to Best Buy's Customer Care group. If you would like to follow up with them directly, please call 1-888-237-8289.

Thanks for your inquiry. We'd like you to know that it's important to us and we appreciate the opportunity to respond.

Thank you,
Your Citi Executive Response Team
805-331-1698*
*For TTY: Use 711 or other Relay Service
CitiERU@citi.com

TRACKING NUMBERS: 9589 0710 5270 3071 0045 54

FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT EL PASO COUNTY JUDICIAL COMPLEX
270 TEJON ST.
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80903

1. PHIL LONG AUTOHAUS,LLC CASE NUMBER: 25CV315
2. CITIBANK & BESTBUY CASE NUMBER: 25CV64 (2) LAWSUITS AGAINST THEM, BOTH FOR FALSE CREDIT REPORTING AGAINST ME!
3. FIRST AMERICAN HOME WARRANTY CASE NUMBER: 25C335

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
901 19TH ST, ROOM A105
DENVER, COLORADO 80294-3589
Case Name: Young v. United States Department of Veterans Affairs et al
Case Number: 1 :25-cv-01158-SKC-TPO
Filer: Edward Earl Young

UNITED STATES TENTH CIRCUIT COURT
Byron White United States Building
1823 Stout Street
Denver, Co 80257

Case Name: Young v. United States Department of Veterans Affairs et al
Case Number: 1 :25-cv-01158-SKC-TPO
Filer: Edward Earl Young

SEPTEMBER 10, 2025

TO WHOM CONCERNED:

PLEASE BE ADVISED THE FOLLOWING ATTACHED DOCUMENTS ARE FOR THE SOLE PURPOSE TO BE ENTERED INTO ALL FILES IN THIS COURT UNDER ITS SPECIFIC LAWSUIT DESIGNATIONS WITH THE CASE NUMBERS DISTINCTION FOR EACH ABOVE INDIVIDUAL ONE:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PROFESSIONAL COOPERATION!

Edward EARL YOUNG
EDWARD EARL YOUNG

SEPTEMBER 10, 2025