



1 Unite States<sup>2</sup> that are guaranteed to others, including murderers and terrorists. The fact that  
2 Plaintiff is a former federal agent seeking to expose corruption in government offices does  
3 not justify terminating these rights.

- 4 • Upholding patently void orders that permanently terminated Plaintiff’s due process and  
5 equal protection rights guaranteed by the laws and Constitution of the United States. Judge  
6 Hicks cited, as one reason for his order, a series of judicial orders<sup>3</sup> terminating Plaintiff’s  
7 due process rights to federal court access.
  - 8 ○ Those orders, including one rendered in this circuit in 1991 by U.S. district judge  
9 Stanley Sporkin (former CIA legal counsel), permanently terminated Plaintiff’s due  
10 process and equal protection right to federal courts access and the protections  
11 guaranteed by the laws and Constitution of the United States. These outrageous  
12 orders terminated all legal rights, legal protections, and legal defenses. On a national  
13 level adversely affecting national security, the orders blocked Plaintiff and his group  
14 of other government agents from reporting the criminal and subversive activities  
15 that they discovered—including those that enabled 19 hijackers to seize four  
16 airliners on September 11, 2001. The orders were, under Supreme Court holdings,  
17 were void orders.
  - 18 ○ The injunctive orders violated every legal requirement<sup>4</sup> for an injunctive order. By  
19 their clear obstruction of justice effect they had a criminal intent and effect. The  
20 effect—and surely the intent—was to block the reporting of criminal and subversive  
21 activities<sup>5</sup> that Plaintiff and his group of other former government agents had  
22 discovered. In addition, the effect, and the intent, was to block Plaintiff’s exercise of  
23 federal defenses against massive violations of federally protected rights occurring in  
24 parallel legal efforts by CIA-front law firms to halt Plaintiff’s exposure activities.
- 25 • Due process violations rooted in long line of judicial conduct blocking former federal  
26 agents from reporting criminal activities. Prima facie evidence of obstruction-of-justice  
27 effect of the continuing pattern of such violations is found in the judicial records showing  
28 federal judges blocking Plaintiff’s attempts to report the criminal activities that he initially

1 discovered as a key federal agent and subsequently discovered, much of it from other  
2 government agents. Every federal judge, including Judge Hicks, knew that Plaintiff had  
3 insider information and evidence of criminal and even subversive activities and that their  
4 misconduct would block the reporting of these federal crimes.<sup>6</sup> These criminal activities  
5 included those that enabled 19 hijackers to seize four airliners on September 11, 2001.

- 6 • Prima facie evidence of prejudicial misconduct by Judge Hicks, revealed by the large  
7 numbers of violations of federal laws and constitutional protections, the omission of  
8 material facts and law, and the unsupported and contradicted statements made in Judge  
9 Hick's order.
- 10 • The following legal filings, some *required* by law, and others authorized by law, are what  
11 Judge Hicks (and a long line of prior federal judges) fraudulently mislabeled as frivolous  
12 acts of a vexatious litigant:

- 13 ○ Plaintiff's attempts to report criminal and subversive activities to federal courts  
14 under the mandatory requirements of the federal crime reporting statute, 18 U.S.C. §  
15 4; and the statute permitting any citizen to seek a federal court order for a federal  
16 official to perform a legal duty and to halt unlawful conduct, 28 U.S.C. § 1361.  
17 Plaintiff's initial attempts to report criminal activities occurred in the late 1970s and  
18 early 1980s.<sup>7</sup> Many deaths associated with these criminal activities occurred in  
19 Plaintiff's immediate area of federal aviation safety responsibilities. Plaintiff's  
20 government background and credentials<sup>8</sup> qualified him to make these  
21 determinations.
- 22 ○ Plaintiff's exercise of specific federal law to defend against massive and repeated  
23 violations of state and federal laws and constitutional protections.<sup>9</sup> The initial  
24 violations occurred in the California courts with the filing of a sham lawsuit by a  
25 CIA-front law firm.<sup>10</sup> The efforts to aid and abet these violations by California  
26 judges and Plaintiff's exercise of federal defenses for massive violations of federally  
27 protected rights caused the violations to expand into the federal courts, and continue  
28 to this date.

- 1           ○ Exercising federal defenses against the corrupt judicial seizure and liquidation of  
2           Plaintiff's life assets. Violating the legal and constitutional due process right to a  
3           hearing, notice of hearing, and requirement for legal cause, federal judges, in  
4           conjunction with the CIA-front law firm, ordered the seizure and liquidation of  
5           Plaintiff's \$10 million in assets. These massive due process violations were then  
6           compounded by issuing orders barring Plaintiff from exercising the due process  
7           right to file objections to the corrupt seizure and liquidation. When Plaintiff did file  
8           objections, federal judges ordered them unfiled and then charged Plaintiff with  
9           criminal contempt of court for exercising these defenses. As provided by federal  
10          due process, Plaintiff then filed various actions to have the seizure declared void, as  
11          provided by Supreme Court decision,<sup>11</sup> and seeking relief under *Bivens* for the  
12          violations of civil and constitutional rights. For exercising federal defenses against  
13          their massive constitutional outrages, Judge Hicks considered Plaintiff a vexatious  
14          litigant for exercising these federal defenses!
- 15          ○ Lawsuits to regain civil rights that were terminated by a series of unlawful and  
16          unconstitutional injunctive orders terminating Plaintiff's due process and equal  
17          protection rights to federal court defenses.
- 18          ○ Exercising federal defenses against criminal contempt of court. Plaintiff filed  
19          lawsuits to defend against the sham criminal contempt of court charges filed in  
20          retaliation for Plaintiff's attempts to report criminal activities and Plaintiff's attempt  
21          to defend against the sham legal actions. Plaintiff sought to obtain an order holding  
22          these injunctions void and unconstitutional, and for damages under *Bivens* and civil  
23          RICO. Judge Hicks considered the exercise of federal defenses under these  
24          conditions to be the acts of a vexatious litigant.
- 25          ● Requiring prior judicial approval before being permitted to exercise due process and equal  
26          protection rights. Judge Hicks help that the series of injunctive orders, which go back for 15  
27          years, blocked Plaintiff from exercising the same due process and equal protection  
28          guaranteed to everyone else. The orders required that federal judges give prior off-the-

1 record approval of any federal filing by Plaintiff.

- 2 ○ There is no provision in the statutes and the Constitution allowing this form of  
3 judicial chicanery to terminate the rights of any particular person, especially a  
4 former government agent exposing massive criminality in government.
- 5 ○ Further, the massive numbers of state and federal laws that have been violated, and  
6 the decades of judicial obstruction of justice, constitute prima facie evidence that a  
7 scheme exists among federal judges that Plaintiff will never be allowed to file any  
8 papers in any district or appellate court. In that way federal judges continue their  
9 felony obstruction of justice offenses.<sup>12</sup>
- 10 ○ Judge Hicks blames Plaintiff for the numerous attempts to defend when the federal  
11 court actions could have been limited to one if federal judges had not corrupted the  
12 judicial process. Even today, these are valid federal causes of actions for which  
13 federal relief is available. At the age of 80, plaintiff still has been denied his day in  
14 court for the ongoing federal causes of actions.<sup>13</sup>

15 **Long List of Procedural Due Process Violated By Judge Hicks.**

16 Examples of the procedural due process rights violated by Hicks includes the following:

- 17 ● Complaints may not be dismissed if any single federal cause of action is stated. Plaintiff  
18 stated multiple federal causes of actions. Plaintiff's Complaint stated that defendants (a)  
19 violated Plaintiff's civil and constitutional rights, which included filing a SLAPP action  
20 against Plaintiff as part of an effort to halt his exposure of criminal and subversive activities  
21 in government offices and the aiding and abetting of such actions by other government  
22 personnel.
- 23 ● The allegations stated in the Complaint must be accepted as true for opposing dismissal.  
24 The law states that allegations stated in the complaint must be accepted as true for the  
25 purpose of preventing dismissal if any single allegation states a federal cause of action for  
26 which federal remedies are available. *Gardener v. Toilet Goods Assn.*, 387 U.S. 167, 172  
27 (1967). This would include the charges that defendants engaged in a conspiracy to halt  
28 Plaintiff's constitutionally protected right to make the public aware of criminal and

1 subversive activities in certain government positions. It would also require that the Judge  
2 Hicks accept the allegations of criminal activities associated with the 3,000 deaths on  
3 September 11, 2001, as true at that stage of the pleadings.

- 4 • Refusal to render findings of facts and conclusions of law related to the issues and the law  
5 raised by Plaintiff's Complaint. Judge Hicks continued the 20-year-pattern by every  
6 California and federal judge who became implicated in this scheme by refusing to make  
7 findings of facts and conclusions of law addressing Plaintiff's claims. Instead, he devoted  
8 eight pages of ramblings that Plaintiff was a vexatious litigant and that Plaintiff's exercise  
9 of due process in the face of massive violations of state and federal laws, and Plaintiff's  
10 attempts to report criminal activities in government offices, were frivolous and the acts of a  
11 vexatious litigant! Findings are required by law. (FRCivP 52).
- 12 • Denied the right to a jury trial. A jury trial is required under FRCivP 38 and 39. The matter  
13 of a conspiracy by defendants would be one of the jury determinations.
- 14 • Denied the right to discovery, as provided by federal law. FRCivP 26-37. This judicial due  
15 process violation continued from day-one in the 20 years of continuous litigation.
- 16 • Statements in Judge Hick's dismissal order reeked of hatred and was ripe with false and  
17 unsubstantiated statements based upon what prior participants in the criminal cover-ups had  
18 written in earlier judicial orders. Included in these statements were the following:
  - 19 • Plaintiff is notorious for such litigious behavior. (He refers to Plaintiff's attempts to  
20 report the criminal activities and Plaintiff's exercise of specific due process defenses  
21 against the unprecedented numbers of state and federal laws and constitutional  
22 protections violated.
  - 23 • Plaintiff has a long list of frivolous filings and litigious history. Not a single one of  
24 Plaintiff's filings met the legal and common sense definition of litigious.<sup>14</sup> Judge  
25 Hicks includes in his definition of frivolous filings Plaintiff's (a) attempts to report  
26 the criminal activities leading to the 3,000 deaths on 9-11; (b) Plaintiff's post 9-11  
27 attempts to report the causative matters as frivolous; (c) Plaintiff's attempt to regain  
28

1 his civil rights taken by the series of injunctive orders; (d) Plaintiff's attempt to  
2 regain the assets corruptly taken from him; (e) Plaintiff's attempt to halt the massive  
3 civil and constitutional violations inflicted upon him; and (d) matters gravely  
4 affecting the United States.  
5

6 Dated: February 13, 2003.

7  
8 

---

Rodney Stich

9 <sup>1</sup> Due process and equal protection rights to federal court access, to the protections under the Fifth Amendment of  
10 the U.S. Constitution and federal laws, including the Civil Rights Act, civil RICO, conspiracy to halt Plaintiff's  
11 constitutionally protected right to provide the public with information on criminal and subversive activities in  
12 government offices that Plaintiff and his group of other former and present government agents discovered.

<sup>2</sup> Repeated violations of the due process clause and equal protection rights of the fifth and fourth amendments to  
13 the U.S. Constitution. (*Bolling v. Sharpe*, 347 US 497 (1954))

<sup>3</sup> Judicial orders—that blocked Plaintiff from reporting criminal and subversive activities under the federal crime  
14 reporting statute—includes those rendered by former CIA legal counsel, Stanley Sporkin, Samuel Conti, Milton  
15 Schwartz, Marilyn Patel, and others.

<sup>4</sup> Legal requirements for injunctive orders are (1) they must halt great and irreparable harm; (2) they must halt  
16 unlawful acts; (3) they must be in the public's interest; and (4) the judge rendering the orders must issue a finding  
17 of facts showing that these requirements had been met. As repeatedly judicially perpetrated, the law was applied in  
18 reverse. The orders did not halt the harm, they protected the people inflicting the harm and deprived Stich, who  
19 was the recipient of the harm, from defenses and protections in the laws and Constitution of the United States. The  
20 orders did not halt the unlawful acts; they provided judicial protection to the continuation and escalating of these  
21 violations. Subverting the laws and Constitution of the United States and depriving a citizen of these rights was not  
22 in the public's interest. And the findings of facts showing these requirements were met was never rendered by any  
23 of the judges.

<sup>5</sup> Criminal activities included deep-seated corruption in the government's aviation safety offices that enabled many  
24 prior aviation disasters to occur; drug smuggling into the United States by and with the knowledge of federal  
25 personnel; massive judicial, Justice Department and lawyer corruption in bankruptcy courts; secret funding of  
26 bank accounts for key government personnel through CIA proprietaries, and much more.

<sup>6</sup> Plaintiff and his group of other former government agents have sought to report these criminal activities to a  
27 federal judge, as required to be reported by the federal crime reporting statute, Title 18 U.S.C. §4.

<sup>7</sup> *Stich v. United States, et al.*, 554 F.2d 1070 (9th Cir.) (table), *cert. denied*, 434 U.S. 920 (1977)(addressed hard-  
28 core air safety misconduct, violations of federal air safety laws, threats against government inspectors not to report  
safety violations and misconduct); *Stich v. National Transportation Safety Board*, 685 F.2d 446 (9th Cir.)(table),  
*cert. denied*, 459 U.S. 861 (1982))(addressed repeated criminal falsification of official airline accident reports,  
omitting highly sensitive air safety misconduct, making possible repeated crashes from the same sequestered  
problems); Amicus curiae brief filed on July 17, 1975, in the Paris DC-10 multi-district litigation, *Flanagan v.*  
*McDonnell Douglas Corporation and United States of America*, Civil Action 74-808-PH, MDL 172, Central  
District California.(addressing the long standing FAA misconduct, of which the cover-up of the DC-10 cargo door  
problem was one of repeated instances of tragedy related misconduct); U.S. v. Department of Justice, District of  
Columbia, Nos. 86-2523, 87-2214, and other actions filed by Stich seeking to expose and correct the powerful and  
covert air disaster misconduct.

<sup>8</sup> Plaintiff's background: he was a federal aviation safety agent, assigned the task to correct the conditions causing  
the worst series of aviation disasters in the nation's history; he acted as an independent prosecutor to prove the  
relationship from hardcore deep-seated corruption in the government's aviation safety offices; he was a Navy  
Patrol Plane commander in World War II; an international airline captain for many years; he wrote numerous

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

books detailing and documenting corruption in government; he became a focal point for dozens of other former and present government agents reporting criminal activities in other government offices that they had discovered; he has appeared as guest and expert on over 3,000 radio and television shows since 1978.

<sup>9</sup> California CC §§ 4351, 4554, 5004, 5102, 5103, 5108, 5110.720, 5118, 5164; California CCP §§ 1699(b), 1713.1, 1713.3, 1908, 1910, 1913, 915; California Rules of court Rules 1201(c); 1211, 1212, 1215, 1222, 1229(a), 1230(a)(2), 1234, 1239(a)(2), 1281, and Rule 1282; absence of personal jurisdiction arising from Rule 1230 Motion to quash, 1230(a)(2), 1234, and 1239(a)(2); absence of personal and subject matter jurisdiction under the California Family Law Act: Rules 1201(c), 1211, 1212, 1281, 1282, 1215, 1222, 1229, 1230(a)(2), 1234, 1239(a)(2); Civil Code §§ 4351, 4503; California Supreme Court Decisions, including *Rediker v. Rediker* (1950) 35 Cal.2d 796.; *Scott v. Scott* (1958) 51 C.2d 249]; *Spellens v. Spellens* (1957) 498 C.2d 210; *Whealton v. Whealton* (1967) 67 C.2d 656; Res judicata and collateral estoppel doctrines.; Title 28 U.S.C. § 1738, full faith and credit statute; Article IV, § 1, providing for full faith and credit; Article IV, § 2, against taking of previously adjudicated and previously acquired personal and property rights upon changing residence to another state; Fourteenth Amendment due process clause; Fourteenth Amendment equal protection clause; Fourteenth Amendment privileges and immunities clause; Fourteenth Amendment equal protection; Fourteenth Amendment property rights; Fourteenth Amendment liberty interests; landmark U.S. Supreme Court decisions: *Williams v. North Carolina* (1945) 325 US 226, 65 S Ct 1092, 89 L ed 1577; *Coe v. Coe* (1948) 334 U.S. 378; *Sherrer v. Sherrer* (1948) 334 U.S. 43; *Vanderbilt v. Vanderbilt* (1957) 354 U.S. 416; *Estin v. Estin* (1948) 334 U.S. 541; *Perrin v. Perrin*, 408 F.2d 107 (3rd Cir. 1969).

<sup>10</sup> Friedman, Sloan and Ross, San Francisco.

<sup>11</sup> One of many U.S. Supreme Court decisions holding the orders taking Plaintiff’s properties as void orders, to be raised at any time in any court proceed. *Sabariego v Maverick*, 124 US 261,

<sup>12</sup> Title 18 U.S.C. § 2. Principals. (a) Whoever commits an offense against the United States or aids, abets, counsels, commands, induces or procures its commission, is punishable as a principal. (b) Whoever willfully causes an act to be done which if directly performed by him or another would be an offense against the United States, is punishable as a principal. Title 18 U.S.C. § 3. Accessory after the fact. Whoever, knowing that an offense against the United States had been committed, receives, relieves, comforts or assists the offender in order to hinder or prevent his apprehension, trial or punishment, is an accessory after the fact.

Title 18 U.S.C. § 4. Misprision of felony. Whoever, having knowledge of the actual commission of a felony cognizable by a court of the United States, conceals and does not as soon as possible make known the same to some judge or other person in civil or military authority under the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

<sup>13</sup> The ongoing federal remedies include (a) order reinstating Plaintiff’s civil and constitutional rights; (b) order holding void the seizure and liquidation of Plaintiff’s \$10 million in assets; (c) financial damages against every defendant whose documented record-setting violations of state and federal laws and constitutional protections invoked federal court jurisdiction under the Civil Rights Act, Bivens, civil RICO.

<sup>14</sup> An appeal [or complaint] is not frivolous if any of the legal points [are] arguable on their merits ...” *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738.