

October 6, 2026

The President of the United States

The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20500

**RE: FORMAL NOTICE AND REQUEST FOR EXECUTIVE REVIEW — UNADJUDICATED
FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL CLAIMS, POTENTIAL DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS, AND
RELATED PUBLIC-FINANCE RISK.**

Dear Mr. President:

Purpose of this letter. This letter combines my public statement concerning the October 5, 2026 denial of certiorari in Supreme Court No. 26-179 with a formal request that the Executive Branch review the constitutional, civil-rights, and public-finance issues presented by the underlying record. This letter does not assert that a denial of certiorari, standing alone, constitutes treason or proves a constitutional coup. It does assert that repeated non-adjudication of asserted constitutional violations can leave citizens without a merits determination on the protections invoked against government action and, if replicated, can affect constitutional protections nationally.

The central constitutional question is simple: when constitutional rights exist in text, but asserted violations cannot obtain meaningful adjudication, what practical protection remains for the citizen who invokes them?

I. What SCOTUS Did — and Did Not Do

- SCOTUS declined discretionary review in No. 26-179 without providing an explanation or identifying any Justice in the order.
- The denial did not adjudicate the asserted federal constitutional claims on the merits.
- SCOTUS did not rule that the evidence was false.
- SCOTUS did not rule that the challenged conduct was lawful.
- The denial left the constitutional questions unresolved.

My position. In my view, leaving those claims unadjudicated constitutes a profound institutional failure. Constitutional protections cannot function as meaningful protections when asserted violations are never reached on the merits. Government invokes constitutional authority when exercising its own powers; citizens must likewise have a meaningful avenue to invoke constitutional protections when challenging the exercise of those powers. In practical terms, taxation imposed without meaningful access to adjudication of the constitutional objections raised against it presents the same foundational concern historically captured by the phrase “**taxation without representation.**”

II. The Pattern of Non-Adjudication

The concern is not merely one adverse ruling. The concern is the cumulative sequence: asserted constitutional violations are raised; the merits are not reached; relief is denied; and the citizens are left without a merits determination. SCOTX and SCOTUS are separate institutions with different jurisdictions and standards, but the practical result presented here is the same: the federal constitutional claims remain unresolved.

I am therefore asking for investigation, not assumption. If the evidence establishes only lawful exercises of judicial discretion, that should be documented. If the evidence instead establishes willful deprivation of protected rights, coordinated conduct, concealment, or other federal offenses, those conclusions should be reached through evidence and the applicable statutory elements.

III. Potential Federal Civil-Rights Issues

The record raises questions that, in my view, warrant examination under 18 U.S.C. §§ 241 and 242 where the required statutory elements can be established by evidence. Section 241 concerns agreements to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate persons in the free exercise or enjoyment of federal rights. Section 242 concerns willful deprivation of rights under color of law. These statutes should not be invoked as conclusions; they should be tested against the evidence, including intent, agreement, official action, and the specific constitutional rights allegedly deprived. The evidentiary record relevant to this request includes court filings, supporting briefs, amicus materials, exhibits, correspondence, and related public records. Substantial portions of that record have already been delivered to courts and government authorities, and the broader supporting record is available for independent review at www.mockingbirdproperties.com/dcad.

Importantly, much of the evidentiary record is not based upon my characterization of events. It consists of primary-source materials generated, maintained, produced, or spoken by the governmental entities, officials, and witnesses whose conduct is at issue—including official data, public records, agency documents, court filings, depositions, audio recordings, video recordings, and sworn or recorded testimony. In addition, certain matters were deemed admitted under the applicable rules of civil procedure and, to my knowledge, were never withdrawn or amended. To the extent those admissions remained in effect, those matters were conclusively established against the admitting party for purposes of that action. The materials should therefore be examined directly rather than treated as allegations that depend solely upon my credibility. Where the government's own records and statements establish the underlying facts, the appropriate inquiry is not whether those records exist, but what they establish and what legal consequences follow from them.

IV. Treason, Misprision of Treason, and Notice to the Executive

I understand that 18 U.S.C. § 2382 addresses misprision of treason and requires a person who has knowledge of the commission of treason, and who owes allegiance to the United States, not to conceal it and to disclose it to the President or to specified federal or state judicial or executive officers. I also understand that treason itself is constitutionally defined narrowly and is not established merely by an adverse judicial ruling or by a denial of certiorari.

Accordingly, this letter is not a declaration that treason has been proven. It is formal notice that the record, as I understand it, raises grave constitutional and potential criminal questions that I am asking the Executive Branch to examine. If competent federal investigators determine that any conduct satisfies the constitutional and statutory elements of treason, conspiracy against rights, deprivation of rights under color of law, or another federal offense, I request that the matter be handled through the lawful processes applicable to those offenses.

V. The Constitutional and Financial Issues Are Not Separate

My concern is that public debt, taxation, valuation, and guarantees may depend upon assumptions that must be independently verified and mathematically sustainable. The evidentiary record presented in this matter alleges and documents systemic property overvaluation and resulting over-taxation. If those valuation and taxation defects are confirmed, they necessarily call into question the tax base and revenue assumptions supporting substantial amounts of school-district debt, including an estimated \$5.1 trillion in school-district bond obligations identified in our analysis. Continued non-adjudication does not remove that financial risk; it can compound and perpetuate it by leaving the underlying valuation, taxation, and debt-support assumptions unresolved while the financial obligations continue to accumulate. If the underlying property values and resulting taxes were fraudulently produced, then debt issued in reliance upon that tax base cannot simply be presumed valid and fully supportable; it must be independently verified.

In short: **property overvaluation → over-taxation → unreliable tax-base assumptions → questionable debt-support assumptions → estimated \$5.1 trillion of identified school-district bond exposure → independent verification required. Non-adjudication does not resolve any link in this chain.**

The governing constraint is $X \leq Y$. If X represents aggregate claims on future income, tax base, or cash flow, and Y represents the sustainable capacity to support those claims, persistent $X > Y$ cannot continue indefinitely. Adjustment must eventually occur through some combination of higher taxation, spending reductions, restructuring, default, inflation, asset repricing, refinancing, or debt relief.

The question is whether adjustment occurs deliberately through verification, restructuring, reform, and, where necessary, debt relief, or through a disorderly loss of confidence, repricing, default, inflation, and Dynamic Contagion.

VI. Requested Executive Action

- Direct an appropriate independent federal review of the constitutional and civil-rights issues presented by the record, including whether the elements of 18 U.S.C. §§ 241 or 242 are implicated.
- Ensure preservation of material records, communications, data, and audit trails relevant to the asserted constitutional, appraisal, taxation, and public-finance issues.
- Determine whether any matter in the record warrants referral to the Department of Justice, the Solicitor General, the Department of the Treasury, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the FBI, or other competent federal authority.
- Assess the systemic risk created if constitutional claims affecting taxation, valuation, and public finance repeatedly evade merits adjudication.
- Require that conclusions be evidence-based: if the allegations are wrong, identify where the evidence fails; if they are supported, act through lawful constitutional and statutory mechanisms.

VII. Time Is of the Essence

The denial of review did not make the constitutional or financial questions disappear. It left them unanswered. Public obligations do not stop compounding because a court declines review, and constitutional protections do not become self-enforcing merely because they appear in text.

THE CONSTITUTION CANNOT PROTECT CITIZENS IF NO COURT WILL ADJUDICATE THEIR CLAIMS.

Your attention to this matter, and to the lawful executive mechanisms available for independent review, is respectfully requested.

Sincerely,



Mitchell Vexler, President
Mavex Shops of Flower Mound LP
1913 Justin Road, Suite 117
Flower Mound, TX 75028
214-725-9013
mitch@mockingbirdprop.com

Authorities referenced for drafting precision

- U.S. Constitution, Article II (Presidential Oath; Take Care Clause).
- 18 U.S.C. § 2382 (Misprision of treason).
- 18 U.S.C. § 241 (Conspiracy against rights).
- 18 U.S.C. § 242 (Deprivation of rights under color of law).
- Supreme Court No. 26-179 — denial of certiorari, October 5, 2026.