

Dr. Orly Taitz, ESQ

29839 Santa Margarita, ste 100

Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688

Ph. 949-683-5411 fax 949-766-7603

Pro se plaintiff

IN THE US DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DR. ORLY TAITZ, ESQ, PLAINTIFF V KATHLEEN SEBELIUS IN HER CAPACITY OF SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, et al. DEFENDANTS) CASE # SACV-12-1092 DMG (JC)) ASSIGNED TO) TRIAL SCHEDULED ON) VIOLATION OF 14TH AMENDMENT) EQUAL PROTECTION RIGHTS,) ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE) ARTICLE 2, SEC 1 OF COSTITUTION) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, STAY) DECLARATORY RELIEF) RICO, PREDECATE CRIMES:) FRAUD, AIDING AND ABETTING) FORGERY AND UTTERING OF FORGED) DOCUMENTS TO COMMIT ELECTIONS) FRAUD) 7TH AMENDMENT JURY DEMANDED
--	--

**REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE FILED IN CONJUNCTION WITH
MOTION FOR STAY/PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Plaintiff Pro Se Dr. Orly Taitz (hereinafter “Taitz”) hereby requests that the Court take judicial notice of the following document attached as Exhibit 1. This request is made pursuant to Rule 201 of the Federal Rules of Evidence. This request is made in connection with Taitz’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction filed by plaintiff.

Exhibit 1 - Order from Senior U.S. District Court Judge John L. Kane in recent case Newland et. al. v Sebelius, case No: 1:12-cv-1123-JLK.

BASIS FOR REQUESTING JUDICIAL NOTICE

Courts may take judicial notice of proceedings in other courts. *U.S. ex rel Robinson Rancheria Citizens Council v. Borneo, Inc.*, 971 F.2d 244, 248 (9th Cir. 1992) (citing *St. Louis Baptist Temple, Inc. v. FDIC*, 605 F.2d 1169 (10th Cir. 1979)) (“[W]e ‘may take notice of proceedings in other courts, both within and without the federal judicial system, if those proceedings have a direct relation to matters at issue.’”). Exhibit 1 is a decision of other federal district court. The content of that decision is a public record that is “not subject to reasonable dispute [and] capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned.” Fed. R. Evid. 201(b)(2). This

exhibit reflects the decision in other federal court, and is appropriate for judicial notice as set forth in *U.S. ex rel Robinson Rancheria Citizens Council*. Taitz requests that this Court take judicial notice of Exhibit1 solely to demonstrate its existence and the similarity of the claims in the cases, and not for the truth of their contents.

This order is a precedent to the case at hand. In Newland v Sebelius, the Plaintiffs sought an injunction from providing coverage for abortifacient drugs, contraception, sterilization and the healthcare plan due to their religions aversion against abortions and birth control. The court found that the provision in PPACA violates the Plaintiff's First Amendment rights of Free Exercise of Religion, Free Speech and RFRA.

Similarly, case at hand Taitz v Sebelius is seeking an injunction against the same affordable care act on the grounds that it violates First Amendment rights of Free Exercise of Religion, violates First Amendment Establishment Clause, Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause and Fourteenth Amendment Equal Protection Clause as PPACA gives preference to citizens of certain religions such as Muslims exempting them from purchase of health insurance and punishing members of other religions such as Christians and Jews through mandating to purchase health insurance or penalizing by penalty tax if they do not purchase such insurance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Orly Taitz', written in a cursive style.

by /s/Dr. Orly Taitz, ESQ

Dr. Orly Taitz ESQ, Plaintiff Pro Se

08.02.2012

Certificate of service

I, Yulia Yun, am over 18 years old, not a party to this case and I attest that I served a true and correct copy of above pleadings on all the parties in this case at their respective addresses by first class mail.

Yulia Yun

July 18, 2012