

COPY

R E C E I V E D
MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

OCT 12 2009

FILED _____
DOCKETED _____
DATE _____
INITIAL _____

**MATTHEW ROBERT YOUNG,
Appellant**

9th Cir. No. 09-35790

District Court No. 3:08-cv-1496-BR

Vs.

**INTEL CORPORATION; STEVE JOBS,
Appellees.**

APPELLANTS INFORMAL BRIEF

1. Jurisdiction

a. Timeliness of Appeal:

(I) Date of entry of judgment or order
Of lower court: **July 29th, 2009.**

(ii) Date of service of any motion made after judgment
(other than for fees and costs): _____

(iii) Date of entry of order deciding motion _____

(iv) Date notice of appeal filed **August 27th, 2009.**

**b. IF POSSIBLE, PLEASE ATTACH ONE COPY OF EACH OF THE
FOLLOWING:**

1. The order from which you are appealing
2. The district court's entry of judgment
3. The district court docket sheet

2. **What are the facts of your case?**

1) Intel Corporation built Two (2) commercially valuable Technology products, which Intel Corporation calls [**Core-2, Duo Micro Processor**, and a computer it calls **Virtual Technology**] from Appellant's personal intellectual property, Designs, and Schematics which are patentable inventions and copyrightable works).

2) Appellant is the **ONLY PERSON** in the world Today with the actual proprietary information, the actual Trade Secrets as to how these Two commercially valuable Technology products actually work.

3) Appellant did request in his complaint that the district court hold a simple exemplary test under seal of the district court. Where Appellant could give a factual demonstration and prove for the district court, the facts of his claims, and show the court exactly just how these Two Technology products work. Because although Intel Corporation has in fact built Appellant's inventions, Intel Corporation does not know how too actually make these Technology products work.

4) Appellant can in fact prove ALL of his claims raised in the complaint, with documented evidence and exhibits.

3. **What did you ask the district court to do (example, award damages, give injunctive relief, etc.)?**

Award Five Billion Dollars (\$5,000,000,000.00), and issue a compensatory Award of All Patents, Copyrights, Trademarks, Proceeds, Monies, Stocks, Bonds, Securities, Contracts, and Agreements. Issue an injunction prohibiting Intel Corporation, its subsidiaries, Business Partners, and Associates from manufacturing, building, marketing or selling any products

pertaining to the Technology stated in the complaint.

4. State the claims or claims you raised at the district court.

CLAIM I

10) In March or April of 2003, pro se plaintiff, sent a copy of the Designs and Schematics, of his intellectual property, a patentable invention, and copyrightable work, to wit; a *Hacker proof, Virus proof* Computer, with *Multi phase Microprocessors*, which pro se plaintiff calls [LANCELOT], for its impervious ability to being Hacked into and its ability to fight off Viruses, to **Steve Jobs**, at **Apple Computer**, in California, but did not send **Mr. Jobs**, the *proprietary information*, which is the *Trade Secret*. See Attached Exhibits Marked **PRO SE PL. EX. 1.**

a) Pro se plaintiff requested that **Mr. Jobs**, Help and Assistance him in developing and Marketing, his intellectual property patentable invention, or buy it from pro se plaintiff for **Two Hundred and Fifty Million Dollars** [\$ 250,000,000.00], and that upon receiving a contractual signed agreement, then pro se plaintiff would agree to send to **Mr. Jobs**, the *Proprietary Information*, the *Trade Secrets* on how to make this computer Technology work.

b) **Steve Jobs**, never replied to pro se plaintiff.

CLAIM II

11) In the latter part of that same year, 2003, **Steve Jobs**, took pro se plaintiff's *intellectual property* patentable inventions, to **Intel Corporation**. The exact nature and extent of the Agreement between **Mr. Jobs**, and **Intel Corporation** is not known to pro se plaintiff at this time.

a) It remains however a fact that **Mr. Steve Jobs**, *Defrauded Intel Corporation*, by not

totally Disclosing to, and Informing **Intel Corporation** just where exactly he got it, and from whom he actually did get the *Designs* and *Schematics* for the **Dual-Core/ Core-2 Duo Microprocessor, and Virtual Technology.**

CLAIM III

12) In June of 2006, **Intel Corporation**'s senior vice president **Mr. Pat Gelsinger**, is seen being photographed in the Oregonian News Paper, Holding in his left hand, a computer mother board, which **Intel Corporation** later termed **Virtual Technology**. With the help of **EMC Corporation's VMware Inc.** unit, who **Intel Corporation** paid **Two Hundred Eighteen Million Dollars,[\$ 218,000,000.00]** to **HELP Intel Corporation**, to try figure out pro se plaintiff's *proprietary information, Trade Secrets*, See Attached Exhibit Marked **PRO SE PL. EX. 2 & 6.**

a) Pro se plaintiff can in fact come *Before* this U S District Court, and prove conclusively that the computer mother board, which **Mr. Gelsinger**, is holding in his hand, in the News Paper is in fact a product created and manufactured from pro se plaintiff's *intellectual property Design*, patentable invention, of [LANCELOT] the *Hacker proof, Virus Proof computer*. See Attached Exhibits Marked **PRO SE PL. EX.1.**

b) **Intel corporation** has publicly Announced that **Intel Corporation** rolled out the first dual-core microprocessor in the latter part of 2005, and in that same Public Announcement, stated that **Intel Corporation** is seeking **HELP** from *universities* and *programmers*, to **HELP** **Intel Corporation** [SOLVE the multithreading] problems that **Intel** cooks up. See Attached Exhibit Marked **PRO SE PL. EX. 3.** This is in fact an explicit **PLEA** from **Intel Corporation** *albeit an implicit PLEA* by **Intel Corporation** for any one to **HELP**

Intel Corporation tries to figure out how to make this Technology work.

CLAIM IV

13) after learning that that computer microchips Grossed over **Two Hundred and Forty Six Billion Dollars** [\$ 246,000,000,000.00] world wide in 2006, pro se plaintiff In **February 2007**, sent to **Intel Corporation** a letter of acknowledgment and ownership of the **[Core-2 Duo Processor and Virtual Technology]**, in which pro se plaintiff made certain demands, and placing certain restrictions, and obligations on any *Letters, Response, Reply, Communiqués*, or interacting *Missives*, to which **Intel Corporation** did in fact, in large part complied with, which in turn was an Act by **Intel Corporation** establishing that **Intel Corporation's** does in fact Acknowledge that pro se plaintiff is the Rightful owner of, and original inventor and creator of the **[Dual core / Core-2 Duo Microprocessor, and the Virtual Technology]**.

a) In his Communiqué to **Intel Corporation**, Pro se plaintiff addressed **Intel Corporation** in this manner;

Dear Intel Corporation

Proof, Virus Proof Computer, that I invented, which I Call **[LANCELOT]**. I showed it to **Steve Jobs**, at **Apple Computer**, and asked him for **Two Hundred and Fifty Million Dollars**, he took it to you at **Intel**, and you built it but you do not know how to turn it on.

So here is what you are going to do. You are going to Agree to pay me **Seventy Percent (70 %)** every thing that You Gross Off of it, and then I will tell you how to turn It on and make it do what I Designed it to do. You have **30 days to Respond**, on **Bonded paper, with your Signature written in Blue ink**, or I am going to send copies of my schematics to **AMD (Advance Micro Devices)** and tell them how it works for next to nothing.

b) Intel Corporation responded exactly in the manner DEMANDED by pro se plaintiff, meeting the required conditions, and obligations placed on the Response by pro se plaintiff, See Attached Exhibit Marked PRO SE PL. EX.

c) Pro se plaintiff request that this U. S. District Court pay special Attention to the fact the even though, Intel Corporation did *not* agree to pay pro se plaintiff Seventy Percent (70%) Intel Corporation *Never* once *Denied* nor even tried to *Challenge* pro se plaintiff's position as the Rightful Owner, and Original Creator, and Inventor of the Dual-Core Microprocessor, and the Computer mother board, latter call Virtual Technology, seen being Held in the hand of Intel Corporation's senior vice president Mr. Pat Gelsinger. See Attached Exhibit Marked PRO SE PL. EX. 4 & 7.

d) When Intel Corporation replied within Two and one half weeks, in the manner DEMANDED by pro se plaintiff, pro se plaintiff, wrote to Intel Corporation a second time, and in this *Communiqué* pro se plaintiff did not address Intel Corporation so harshly, and made Intel Corporation, what pro se plaintiff believed to be a *fair* proposition, which was stated to this effect

Dear Intel Corporation:

Thank you for responding in the Manner that I requested,
And since you did it may not have been your fault and that you
may not have known that Steve Jobs lied to you, so here is my
Offer to you, Sign a Contractual Agreement with me where
Intel Corporation will agree to pay me Fifteen Percent (15%)
Of every thing that you make on my Hacker Proof, and Virus
Proof Computer [LANCELOT], and also *sign a Contractual*
Agreement to manufacture build, and Market for me, my
Computer Chip Microprocessor, [TRADWAY].
Please note that the SAME Conditions apply here, 30 days, with
Your signature in Blue ink on Bonded paper.

e) Intel Corporation Responded just as pro se plaintiff Requested, within **Three (3)** weeks, on **Bonded paper**, with the **Signature in Blue ink**. See Attached Exhibit Marked **PRO SE PL. EX. 5,**

f) Again pro se plaintiff Request that this U.S. District Court pay special attention to the fact that *AGAIN* Intel Corporation did not Challenge or Deny that pro se plaintiff is the Rightful owner of this Technology.

CLAIM V

a) According to various News Paper Publications, **Intel Corporation** has Made over **Fifty Billion Dollars** [\$ 50,000,000,000.00] profit off of pro se plaintiff's intellectual property patentable invention, which **Intel Corporation** calls **[Core 2, Duo Processor]** alone, and pro se plaintiff can not even guess how much **Intel Corporation** has made off of pro se plaintiff's intellectual property patentable invention, which **Intel Corporation** calls **[Virtual Technology]**

b) But **HERE IS A FACTUAL CONTENTION, AND ISSUE AT LAW, AT COMMON LAW**, Intel Corporation would **NOT HAVE** this *Money, Profits, Stocks, Bonds*, and position as the *Main supplier*, and *principal provider* of the Worlds *Computer Microchips*, HAD Steve Jobs NOT provided **Intel Corporation**, a copy of pro se plaintiff's Intellectual Property Designs, and Schematics from which **Intel Corporation** then manufactured the Dual Core Multiphase Microchip Processor.

c) Even after pro se plaintiff has **CONCLUSIVELY PROVEN** to **Intel Corporation** that he is in fact the Rightful Owner, and the Original Inventor of this Technology, **Intel Corporation** continues to violate pro se plaintiff's Constitutional, and Common Law Rights to

enjoy the Fruits of his labor, **Intel Corporation** in its unfair trade practice, continues even after becoming aware that pro se plaintiff is the rightful owner, and original inventor of this technology, knowingly conceal, withhold, transfer in interstate commerce, sell on the world commercial market for the sole purpose of illegally profiting from pro se plaintiff's personal intellectual property patentable inventions, and copyrightable works without pro se plaintiff's approval, authorization, consent, and against pro se plaintiff's wants and desires, without being **Grateful** or **showing** any **consideration** to the fact that had it not been for pro se plaintiff's **intellectual property patentable invention designs and schematics**, Intel Corporation would **NOT** be the **World leader** in computer microchips Today, **AMD (Advanced Micro Devices)**, or **Micron Technology** could have just as easily have been the **World Leader** in manufacturing computer microchip processors with pro se plaintiff's intellectual property patentable inventions. See Attached Exhibit Marked **PRO SE PL. EX. 7 & 10.**

5. What issues are you raising on appeal?

- i. That the district court erred when dismissed the civil action without allowing the plaintiff Any form of Evidentiary Hearing to establish and prove the claims raised in the complaint.
- ii. That Plaintiff-Appellant can if fact come before **ANY Court of Law**, and give a demonstration as to how exactly the Computer Technology which **Intel Corporation** calls **[Virtual Technology, and Core 2-Duo Micro processor]** works, which is an Act that will prove that Plaintiff-Appellant is the **[Original Inventor]** of these Technology Commercially valuable products.
- iii. That This United States, Ninth Circuit Court Appeals should reverse the decision of the

district court, and **ORDER** that the district court Hold an Evidentiary Hearing, to allow this Plaintiff-Appellant to develop for the district court, the proof of Plaintiff-Appellant's True ownership of these Commercially valuable Technology products.

6. Did you present all these issues to the district court ?

YES . If not, why?

7. What law supports these issues on appeal? (You may, but need not, refer to cases and statutes.)

1338. Patents, plant variety protection, copyrights, mask works, *designs*, trademarks, and *unfair competition*;

(a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents, plant variety protection, copyrights and trademarks. Such jurisdiction shall be exclusive of the courts of the states in patent, plant variety protection and copyright cases.

(b) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action asserting a claim of unfair competition when joined with a substantial and related claim under the copyright, patent, plant variety protection or trademark laws.

(c) Subsections (a) and (b) apply to exclusive rights in mask works under chapter 9 of title 17 [17 USCS 901 et seq.], and to exclusive rights in designs under chapter 13 of title 17 [17 USCS 1301 et seq.], to the same extent as such subsections apply to copyrights.

REHAN SHEIKH, Plaintiff, v. CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., and DOES 1-20, Defendants.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION

2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 32161

No. C-07-00262 RMW

March 31, 2009, Decided

March 31, 2009, Filed

XCEL DATA SYSTEMS, INC., a California corporation, Plaintiff, v. DEREK BEST, an individual, and DOES 1 through 25, inclusive, Defendants.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 34904; Copy. L. Rep. (CCH) P29,728

1:08-CV-00613-OWW-GSA

March 31, 2009, Decided

Best grew dissatisfied for reasons not relevant here and parted ways with Moreno. *Id.* PP 10, 14. On March 6, 2002, Moreno and Best entered into a Software Purchase Agreement (the "contract") in which Best agreed to resign as co-director, surrender any shares he owned, and transfer to XCEL all rights associated with XPAWN, including intellectual property, among other things, such as the "xpawn.com" domain name and website. Contract 1.01, 1.03(f)-(j). The contract required a third-party to keep the copyright and trademark certificates in escrow until "[XCEL's] satisfactory performance," and, until the certificates' release XCEL agreed not to remove from XPAWN's opening screen the words "Copyright: Derek Best." *Id.* 1.01(b), 3.06. In consideration of the sale, XCEL promised Best \$ 69,154.30 (purchase price), profits or draws due as of March 31, 2002, repayment of \$ 12,500 in loans, a \$ 150 royalty fee for each software sold, rented, or licensed within 48 months of the contract's execution, and \$ 10,000 in fees for servicing Best agreed to render. *Id.* 1.01(a)-(d). XCEL also agreed to assume all notes and leases Best had entered into as co-director. *Id.* 1.01(k). The contract also gave Best an exclusive license to sell, distribute, and use the software in the United Kingdom and retain as security ownership in the software and associated intellectual property. *Id.* 1.04(a), 3.05. The contract closed in Bakersfield, California "or such other location as may be agreed upon," with a provision specifying California law as the choice of law and a provision providing for attorneys' fees. *Id.* 1.07, 5.14-15.

8. **Do you have any other cases pending in this court? IF so, give the name and docket number of each case.**

Young vs. Williams, et al., Case No.

9. Have you filed any previous cases which have been decided by this court? If so, give the name and docket number of each case.

None of my cases where decided, but dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

10. For prisoners, did you exhaust all administrative remedies for each claim prior to filling your complaint in the district court?

Date October 8th, 2009,


Matthew Robert Young
SID No. 6242666
777 Stanton Blvd.
Ontario, OR 97914

FILED 09 JUL 29 15:30 USDCORP

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Matthew Robert Young,

08-CV-1496-BR

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

Intel Corporation, et al.,

Defendant(s).

BROWN, Judge.

On January 13, 2009, the Court issued an Opinion and Order (#5) in which it granted Plaintiff's Application to Proceed In Forma Pauperis, but concluded Plaintiff had failed to state a claim for relief in his Complaint, and, therefore, dismissed Plaintiff's Complaint without prejudice. The Court also granted Plaintiff an opportunity to amend his Complaint to cure the deficiencies noted in the Court's Opinion and Order. The Court also stated failure to cure these deficiencies would result in dismissal of Plaintiff's Complaint with prejudice.

On June 22, 2009, Plaintiff filed his Amended Complaint. Plaintiff's Amended Complaint does not cure the deficiencies as set forth in the Court's January 13, 2009, Opinion and Order. In

fact, other than a new introductory paragraph, Plaintiff's Amended Complaint is virtually identical to Plaintiff's original Complaint.

Accordingly, the Court dismisses Plaintiff's Complaint with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 29th day of July, 2009.

Anna J. Brown
ANNA J. BROWN
United States District Judge

FILED 09 JUL 29 15:30 USDC ORP

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Matthew Robert Young,

08-CV-1496-BR

Plaintiff,

JUDGMENT

v.

Intel Corporation, et al,

Defendant(s).

BROWN, Judge.

Pursuant to the Court's Order (#20),

This action is DISMISSED with prejudice.

DATED this 29th day of July, 2009.


ANNA J. BROWN
United States District Judge

APPEAL, TERMINATED

U.S. District Court
District of Oregon (Portland)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 3:08-cv-01496-BR
Internal Use Only

Young v. Intel Corporation et al
 Assigned to: Judge Anna J. Brown
 Cause: 42:1983 Civil Rights Act

Date Filed: 12/29/2008
 Date Terminated: 07/29/2009
 Jury Demand: Plaintiff
 Nature of Suit: 440 Civil Rights: Other
 Jurisdiction: Federal Question

Plaintiff**Matthew Robert Young**

represented by **Matthew Robert Young**
 6242666 LEGAL MAIL
 SRCI
 777 Stanton Blvd.
 Ontario, OR 97914
 PRO SE

V.

Defendant**Intel Corporation****ThirdParty Defendant****Steve Jobs**

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
12/29/2008	<u>1</u>	Application for Leave to Proceed IFP. Filed by Matthew Robert Young. (ecp) (Entered: 12/31/2008)
12/29/2008	<u>2</u>	Complaint. Jury Trial Requested: Yes. Filed by Matthew Robert Young against Intel Corporation, Steve Jobs. (ecp) (Entered: 12/31/2008)
12/29/2008	<u>3</u>	Declaration and Affidavit of Mailing. Filed by Matthew Robert Young. (ecp) (Entered: 12/31/2008)
12/30/2008	<u>4</u>	Notice of Case Assignment: This case is assigned to Judge Anna J. Brown. (ecp) (Entered: 12/31/2008)
01/13/2009	<u>5</u>	Opinion and Order - The Court GRANTS Plaintiff's Application to Proceed In Forma Pauperis <u>1</u> and DISMISSES Plaintiff's Complaint without

		prejudice. Plaintiff may file an amended complaint to cure the deficiencies noted above no later than February 12, 2009. The Court advises Plaintiff that failure to file an amended complaint by February 12, 2009, shall result in the dismissal of this proceeding with prejudice. Signed on 1/12/2009 by Judge Anna J. Brown. (See formal Opinion and Order, 9-pages) (ecp) (Entered: 01/14/2009)
01/14/2009	<u>6</u>	Motion to Recuse. Filed by Matthew Robert Young. (ecp) (Entered: 01/15/2009)
01/29/2009	<u>7</u>	ORDER: Denying Motion to Recuse <u>6</u> . (see 3 page Order). (copy of order sent to Plaintiff). Signed on 1/29/09 by Judge Aancer L. Haggerty. (ljl) (Entered: 02/02/2009)
02/11/2009	<u>8</u>	Motion for Extension of Time. Filed by Matthew Robert Young. (ljl) (Entered: 02/18/2009)
02/18/2009	<u>9</u>	ORDER by Judge Anna J. Brown. Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time <u>8</u> . Plaintiff's Amended Complaint shall be filed no later than 5/11/2009, or this matter will be dismissed on that date pursuant to the Court's Opinion and Order issued 1/13/2009. (sm) (Entered: 02/18/2009)
02/18/2009	<u>10</u>	Notice of Appeal to the 9th Circuit from Order on motion to recuse <u>7</u> , entered on 2/2/2009 Filing fee in amount of \$ 455 collected. No fee collected. IFP granted on 1/13/2009 <u>5</u> . Filed by Matthew Robert Young. (ecp) (Entered: 02/19/2009)
02/24/2009		Notification of Appeal <u>10</u> sent to USCA for the 9th Circuit and to counsel along with a copy of the docket sheet. (tmg) (Entered: 02/24/2009)
03/04/2009	<u>11</u>	Notification from USCA 9th Circuit of appeal number CA 09-35164 for Notice of Appeal <u>10</u> filed by Matthew Robert Young on 2/18/09, including Time Schedule Order. (tmg) (Entered: 03/18/2009)
04/28/2009	<u>12</u>	Order from USCA for the 9th Circuit dismissing Appeal CA 09-35164 <u>10</u> : A review of the record demonstrates that this court lacks jurisdiction over this appeal because the order challenged in the appeal is not final or appealable. Consequently, this appeal is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. (tmg) (Entered: 05/01/2009)
05/06/2009	<u>13</u>	Scheduling Order by Judge Anna J. Brown. The Court acknowledges receipt of an Order from the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals dismissing Plaintiff's appeal in this matter. This Court previously set a deadline of 5/11/2009 for the filing of an Amended Complaint to cure the deficiencies as set out in the Opinion and Order of 1/12/2009. Because plaintiff may have deferred the filing of such amended complaint due to his appeal, the Court is extending the deadline for the filing of the amended complaint until 6/12/2009. Failure to file the amended complaint as now ordered shall result in the dismissal of this action with prejudice. (sm) (Entered: 05/06/2009)
05/07/2009	<u>14</u>	Motion for Extension of Time. Filed by Matthew Robert Young. (pvh) (Entered: 05/11/2009)

05/07/2009	<u>16</u>	Motion for Extension of Time. Filed by Matthew Robert Young. (ljl) (Entered: 05/12/2009)
05/12/2009	<u>15</u>	ORDER by Judge Anna J. Brown. On 5/6/2009 the Court issued an Order directing Plaintiff to file his amended complaint by 6/12/2009. On 5/7/2009 the Court received Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time <u>14</u> seeking until 6/21/2009 to file his amended complaint. In the exercise of discretion, the Court grants Plaintiff until 6/30/2009 to file his Amended Complaint subject to the same conditions as set forth in the Court's Order of 5/6/2009. (sm) (Entered: 05/12/2009)
05/20/2009	<u>17</u>	MANDATE from USCA for the 9th Circuit re Notice of Appeal CA 09-35164 <u>10</u> . (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Attachment Order) (tmg) (Entered: 05/28/2009)
06/17/2009	<u>18</u>	Amended Complaint. Filed by Matthew Robert Young against Intel Corporation, Steve Jobs. (Plaintiff lists Steve Jobs as a Third Party Defendant on his Amended Complaint.) (ecp) (Entered: 06/17/2009)
06/22/2009	<u>19</u>	Amended Complaint. Filed by Matthew Robert Young against Intel Corporation. (ljl) (Entered: 06/24/2009)
07/29/2009	<u>20</u>	ORDER: The Court dismisses Plaintiff's Complaint with prejudice. IT IS SO ORDERED. Signed on July 29, 2009 by Judge Anna J. Brown. (kt) (Entered: 07/31/2009)
07/29/2009	<u>21</u>	JUDGMENT: Pursuant to the Court's Order # <u>20</u> , This action is DISMISSED with prejudice. Signed on July 29, 2009 by Judge Anna J. Brown. (kt) (Entered: 07/31/2009)
08/27/2009	<u>22</u>	Notice of Appeal to the 9th Circuit from Judgment <u>21</u> . Filed by Matthew Robert Young. (ljl) (Entered: 09/01/2009)
09/01/2009		Court of Appeals notified re: Notice of Appeal <u>22</u> . Copy of notice and docket sheet mailed to appellant. (tmg) (Entered: 09/03/2009)
09/02/2009	<u>23</u>	Notification from USCA 9th Circuit of appeal number CA 09-35790 for Notice of Appeal <u>22</u> filed by Matthew Robert young on 8/27/09, including Time Schedule Order. (tmg) (Entered: 09/03/2009)