

1 Rodney Stich
1316 Oakmont Dr. # 6
2 Walnut Creek, CA 94595
3 925-944-1930
4

5 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
6 **FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA**

7 STEVE GRATZER,) Case No.: No. MSCO1-05094
8 Plaintiff,)
9 vs.) RODNEY STICH'S
10 DIABLO WESTERN PRESS, INC.;) OBJECTION TO THE
11 RODNEY STICH;) REQUESTED ASSIGNMENT
DOES 1 through 100, inclusive.) ORDER; DECLARATION
12 Defendants,) CCP § 708.510
13) Hearing Date: February 15, 2007
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Dept. 30
)

14
15 RODNEY STICH (Stich)¹ makes the following declaration and objection to the request by
16 Gratzner for an assignment order relating to books exposing corruption in certain government of-
17 fices. Because this legal action is a continuation of prior schemes² to prevent Stich and a group
18 of other former federal agents from revealing to the public the corruption that they discovered,
19 and the gravity of the consequences arising from the corruption, justification exists for exceeding
20 the page limitation under local court rules. The enlarged objection also puts the judge of this
21 court on notice of the serious national issues involved with this latest legal filing.

- 22 • The motion for an assignment order by the Guerrini law firm is the latest in a long series

23
24
25

¹ Stich's bio is at www.defraudingamerica.com/stich_bio.html.

² The ongoing scheme is detailed at www.defraudingamerica.com/sequence_legal.html.

1 of legal attempts³ to prevent disclosure to the public of corrupt activities that continues to
2 have major harmful effects upon national issues, including national security. It is also an
3 indirect tactic to obstruct justice.

- 4 • The motion for an assignment is based upon a South Carolina default judgment, where
5 the judge lacked personal jurisdiction over the parties, and was an attempt to obtain a
6 judgment that would halt attempts to make known to the public the corruption that Stich
7 and his group of former federal agents seek to expose.
- 8 • The prior entry of that South Carolina Default judgment as a California judgment in *this*
9 court had its own due process problems. For instance:
 - 10 o The California judge entered the South Carolina default judgment as a California
11 judgment against Diablo Western Press, Inc., a Nevada corporation, when he lacked
12 jurisdiction over a Nevada corporation.
 - 13 o That judge entered the default judgment against Stich as a California judgment know-
14 ing that:
 - 15 ▪ The judgment was intended to halt Stich's exposure of serious criminal activities
16 that in the past were associated with several major airline disasters, among other
17 adverse consequences.
 - 18 ▪ The judgment was retaliation against Stich for defending against corrupt activities
19 undermining national interests, and therefore was barred by California's anti-
20 SLAPP statute on the basis that the publication of a book exposing corruption was
21 a public service.
 - 22 ▪ The judgment was a form of obstruction of justice, the effects of which will con-
23 tinue to result in great harm to national interests, along with fatal consequences.

25 ³ The continuing involvement of lawyers and judges in attempting to block the reporting of the criminal activities is detailed at www.defraudingamerica.com/lawyers_obstructing_justice.html.

1 **Further Details of the Ongoing Scheme to Obstruct Justice**

2 The initial discovery and documentation of corruption in government offices was made by
3 Stich after the Federal Aviation Administration⁴ gave him the assignment to correct the condi-
4 tions that at that time were responsible for the worst series of fatal airline disasters in the nation's
5 history. (Details in *Unfriendly Skies: 20th & 21st Centuries*.)

6 While in that position, Stich acted similar to an independent prosecutor. He ordered and con-
7 ducted hearings before an administrative law judge that lasted approximately four months, in-
8 volving testimony of witnesses called by Stich, and the placement of official documents in the
9 hearing records showing the relationship between specific corrupt acts and fatal airline disasters.
10

11 During those hearings, three *additional* major airline disasters occurred,⁵ two in his immedi-
12 ate area of federal safety responsibility. Each was caused by the identical air safety problems and
13 corruption that Stich had previously reported in writing for which corrective measures were
14 blocked by the existing culture in certain segments of the government's aviation safety offices.
15 In his final closing brief,⁶ Stich warned of the consequences of covering up for the corruption.
16 The standard cover-up did occur, followed by the expected series of resulting airline disasters.
17 Stich left government service after the cover-up.

18 During these hearings, Stich and his wife entered into a bilateral consent divorce proceeding
19 that ended in a final divorce judgment in 1966. That judgment was later entered as a local judg-
20 ment in the states of Oklahoma, Colorado, Nevada, and California. That matter is relevant to un-
21 derstanding the 20-plus years of legal and judicial attacks, that obstructed justice, by halting
22 Stich's attempts to report and expose the corruption that continues to play key roles in major
23

24 ⁴ Stich's aviation experience started in World War II when he was a Navy patrol plane commander, then an in-
25 ternational airline captain, and then a federal aviation safety inspector-investigator.

⁵ During and hearings three more fatal crashes occurred: United Airlines at Salt Lake City; United Airlines into Lake Michigan; and American Airlines at Cincinnati.

⁶ Final closing brief in the FAA is located at www.defraudingamerica.com/faa_closing_brief.html.

1 harm to national interests, including national security.

2 **Judicial Cover-Ups in the Federal Courts**

3 Upon returning to private life in California, the continued occurrence of airline disasters due
4 to the corrupt culture Stich had earlier discovered caused him to file federal actions⁷ under the
5 federal crime reporting statute,⁸ and Title 28 U.S.C. § 1361. The crime reporting statute requires
6 that anyone knowing of a federal crime must report it to a federal judge (or other federal officer),
7 and requires that federal judges receive the information as part of their *administrative* duties.

8 Although federal judges admitted the gravity of the charges, and never questioned Stich's
9 credibility, the judges blocked Stich from presenting the information after Department of Justice
10 attorneys filed a motion to dismiss. Stich then filed appeals. Federal appeal judges stated similar
11 concerns, but supported the obstruction of justice.

12 Stich then filed petitions for writ of certiorari in the U.S. Supreme Court, where Supreme
13 Court Justices refused to hear the cases. In this way they became complicit in the following air-
14 line disasters that were caused or allowed to occur by the corruption that Stich sought to report
15 and that they prevented from being reported.

17 **Stich Circumvented the Cover-Ups Using Funds from Real Estate Investments**

18 Seeking to circumvent the cover-ups, Stich published the first in a series of books in 1978,

19
20 ⁷ *Stich v. United States, et al.*, 554 F.2d 1070 (9th Cir.) (table), *cert. denied*, 434 U.S. 920 (1977)(addressed
21 hard-core air safety misconduct, violations of federal air safety laws, threats against government inspectors not to
22 report safety violations and misconduct); *Stich v. National Transportation Safety Board*, 685 F.2d 446 (9th
23 Cir.)(table), *cert. denied*, 459 U.S. 861 (1982))(addressed repeated criminal falsification of official airline accident
24 reports, omitting highly sensitive air safety misconduct, making possible repeated crashes from the same sequestered
25 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 claimant seeking to expose and correct the powerful and covert air
disaster misconduct.

⁸ 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 impris-
oned not more than three years, or both.

1 which was *Unfriendly Skies*, and which received excellent book reviews. Stich used his assets⁹ to
2 fund the publication of the books and his many travels to appear on hundreds of radio and televi-
3 sion shows¹⁰ throughout the United States. These activities threatened many people, including
4 the judges who blocked the reporting of the corruption.

5 Over a period of many years other present and former government agents contacted Stich
6 with information and documentation on corruption in other areas of government, especially in
7 the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). These confidants included agents of the FBI, DEA, FAA,
8 ONI, CIA, and others. He described these findings in other books, again seeking to circumvent
9 the standard cover-up of especially serious high-level corruption.

10 **The First in a Long Series of Legal Tactics to Halt Exposure Activities**

11 After the publication of the second edition of *Unfriendly Skies*, which named the federal
12 judges who blocked the reports and identified subsequent airline disasters arising from the mis-
13 conduct, the first in a long series of legal and judicial actions were taken to halt Stich's costly
14 exposure activities.

15 The effect—and surely the intent—of each of these legal actions was to halt the exposure of
16 the criminal activities. That first legal action was a lawsuit filed by the CIA-front law firm of
17 Friedman, Sloan and Ross (San Francisco) in the Solano County courts, and was filed in such a
18 way that it would immediately separate Stich from the assets that funded his exposure activities.

19 That first lawsuit was filed under the Family Law Act, using as a “strawman” a Texas resi-
20 dent¹¹ who the lawyers fraudulently claimed was married to Stich, claiming that she wanted a
21 divorce and a division of alleged community properties. Even though there was no marital or
22 other relationship between the parties, that lawsuit continued for six years in the Solano County
23

24
25 ⁹ The assets at that time exceeded \$10 million in real estate.

¹⁰ To this date, Stich has appeared on over 3,000 radio and television shows.

¹¹ Emma Stich of Duncanville, Texas.

1 courts, during which orders were repeatedly rendered that violated large numbers of state and
2 federal laws.¹² These tactics halted Stich’s attempts to expose the corruption that was continuing
3 to have grave consequences on national security matters.

4 **Facts and Law Showed the Lawsuit to Be a Sham,**
5 **And Prohibited by State and Federal Laws**

6 A prior divorce judgment 18 years earlier, in a bilateral consent divorce proceeding, when
7 neither party resided in California, legally and factually terminated the marriage and declared
8 there was no community property. That 1966 divorce judgment, later entered as a local judgment
9 in the states of Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, Nevada, and California, had to be recognized under
10 state and federal law, and under several California statutes. The existence of any of those judg-
11 ments deprived California judges of personal and subject matter jurisdiction under the clear
12 wording in the California Family Law Act. California judges ignored these judgments, as if they
13 did not exist, and repeatedly violated wholesale violations of state and federal substantive and
14 procedural due process protections.

15
16 The Texas resident used as the ‘strawman’ had been buying and selling real estate during the
17 prior 18 years, declaring herself divorced. *After* the California “divorce” action was filed, she
18 *continued* to declare herself divorced in Texas, and even filed for social security benefits on the
19 basis of the 1966 divorce judgment. The Social Security administration recognized that judgment

20
21 ¹² Civil Codes: §§ 4351, 4554, 5004, 5102, 5103, 5108, 5110.720, 5118, 5164; Code of Civil Procedures §§
22 1699(b), 1713.1, 1713.3, 1908, 1910, 1913, 915; Rules of court: Rule 1201(c); Rule 1211, Rule 1212 Rule 1215
23 Rule 1222 Rule 1229(a) Rule 1230(a)(2) Rule 1234 Rule 1239(a)(2) Rule 1281 Rule 1282; Absence of personal ju-
24 risdiction arising from Rule 1230 Motion to quash, as defined by California Rule of court 1230(a)(2); Rule of Court
25 1234; Rule of Court 1239(a)(2); Absence of personal and subject matter jurisdiction under the California Family
Law Act on the basis of any of the seven prior divorce judgments. Rule 1201,1211, 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; Full faith and credit statute clause, Article IV, ' 1; 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. This list of vio-
lations is listed at www.defraudingamerica.com/law_violated_by_california_judges.html.

1 and approved her application. But the California judges¹³ continued to render orders as if she was
2 still married to Stich, thereby assisting in the perjury and deception.

3 Compounding their misconduct, whenever Stich exercised any of the many procedural due
4 process rights clearly stated in state and federal law, California judges labeled the exercise of
5 these defense rights as frivolous acts. This was a novel way to violate due process and the dozens
6 of state and federal judges, and a novel way to obstruct justice. Unfortunately, these tactics
7 would have catastrophic consequences seemingly far remote from the Solano County courts.
8

9 These legal and judicial acts eventually stripped Stich of his life assets, converting him from
10 a multi-millionaire to a state of poverty. However, the gravity of the issues and the consequences
11 motivated Stich to continue in a far more limited manner his David vs. Goliath battle. This de-
12 termination brought forth the present action seeking to halt the distribution of the books exposing
13 the corruption, the tragedies, and the lawyers and judges heavily implicated.

14 **Using a Possible Wife-Murderer as a Plaintiff in a Remote South Carolina Court**

15 After stripping Stich of his life assets, lawyers and judges continued their attempts to block
16 Stich from exposing the corruption; they attempted to seize the books that Stich and his group of
17 other government insiders had previously published. Lawyers filed a sham lawsuit in the distant
18 location of South Carolina, knowing that funds did not exist to hire legal counsel at the opposite
19 end of the United States, where local judges would insure the success of the scheme.

20 **False Claim of Libel in a Remote South Carolina Jurisdiction**

21 The lawsuit claimed that the book, *Drugging America*, libeled Steve Gratzner. But the only
22 reference in the book to Steve Gratzner was reporting the word-by-word statements of a physician
23

24
25 ¹³ California judges in Fairfield, California, included DeRonde, Dennis W. Bunting, Dwight Ely, Michael
McInnis; Harold F. Wolters; William Jensen; J. Clinton Peterson; California Court of Appeals judges Donald King,
Harry Low, Zerme Haning. All justices of California Court of Appeals (except Stanley Mosk, who initially sought to
support Stich's defenses)

1 in Elko, Nevada, who described to Stich the retaliatory actions taken against him by Justice De-
2 partment prosecutors after the Idaho National Guard, in which he was a medical officer, refused
3 to provide a helicopter to attack the Ruby Ridge family.

4 During this description, Dr. Cserna, also a Lt. Colonel in the Idaho National Guard. described
5 statements made to him by a patient, Doris Gratzner, who feared that her husband was going to
6 murder her. She told Dr. Cserna that if she were found dead that it would have been her husband,
7 Steve Gratzner, who did it. A week later, she was found murdered in Elko, Nevada.

8
9 The quotation placed in the book was privileged under law. Further, in no way did the state-
10 ments state that Steve Gratzner murdered his wife (although the information provided by his
11 wife's physician raised a strong probability that Steve Gratzner *did in fact* murder his wife). The
12 reference to Gratzner was strictly peripheral to the main subject being discussed. The following is
13 the statement in *Drugging America*:

14 **Imprisoning A Doctor On Perjured Testimony**

15 In 1997 I started receiving information from a physician who had been tar-
16 geted in a similar gun-charge. Dr. Jed Cserna was an MD with a private practice
17 in Ely, Nevada, and a Lt. Colonel in the Idaho National Guard, with 16 years of
18 military service behind him. His problems started in Ely, Nevada, where he was a
19 physician. Cserna told me how it appeared to start. While he was treating a pa-
20 tient, Doris Gratzner, she told him, "If I'm ever shot, Steve [her husband] did it."
21 Dr. Cserna told this to the hospital staff and they said that she always had prob-
22 lems, and this occasion was no different than others. A week later, she was found
23 dead, killed by a bullet wound to the head.

24 Cserna said her husband, Steve Gratzner, was influential in the town, especially
25 with the sheriff, who was responsible for conducting an investigation into his
26 wife's killing. Cserna was now a danger to Gratzner. According to Cserna, false
27 statements were made by a government informant, seeking to justify his position
28 and pay, that resulted in a raid by ATF agent Doreen on his doctor's office. His
29 home was broken into and possessions disappeared. Participating in the ATF raid
30 was the sheriff who he referred to as Burnie (Ronero), who would soon participate
31 in sham charges filed against the doctor.

32 Cserna said her husband, Steve Gratzner, was influential in the town, especially
33 with the sheriff, who was responsible for conducting an investigation into his
34 wife's killing. Cserna was now a danger to Gratzner. According to Cserna, false
35 statements were made by a government informant, seeking to justify his position

1 and pay, that resulted in a raid by ATF agent Doreen on his doctor's office. His
2 home was broken into and possessions disappeared. Participating in the ATF raid
3 in sham charges filed against the doctor.

4 Government agents arrested Cserna a short time later and charged him with
5 possession of a machine gun and a short-barreled rifle. The guns in question were
6 an AR-15 that was not an automatic, and a Uzi 9mm that had been sold to him
7 with a folding stock and various barrels. He had used both guns two and three
8 times a week at the local police firing range and was never questioned about their
9 legality.

10 **DOJ Retaliation Because of Refusing Ruby Ridge Participation?**

11 Cserna told me about an event that happened in Idaho while he was the physi-
12 cian assigned to the Idaho National Guard air wing. During the Ruby Ridge attack
13 that killed Mrs. Weaver and her son, ATF agents had gone to the Idaho National
14 Guard base and told the Commander of the helicopter division, "We are ordering
15 you to activate your choppers to go north and strafe Ruby Ridge." The colonel re-
16 fused, stating, "This is against the law, the constitution, and finally, Randy Weaver
17 is an Idaho Citizen. Either you get out or I'll have you thrown out."

18 **No Possibility of Money Damages in the Lawsuit: Only Possible Goal Was 19 Halting Distribution of Books Revealing Criminal Activities**

20 Before the South Carolina law firm of David Collins filed their lawsuit against Stich, the law
21 firm knew that neither the Nevada corporation, Diablo Western Press, nor Stich, had any assets
22 that could be seized (other than the books), and that there was no insurance to pay for any legal
23 defense or judgment. The *only goal* could have been to seize the remaining books, which would
24 then be virtually valueless to them. But it would be another obstruction of justice tactic to keep
25 the public from learning about the corruption that had by that time included many lawyers and
judges. Despite this knowledge, several dozen lawyers and half a dozen law firms have put hun-
dreds of hours into this action during the past several years. And incredibly, a possible wife-
murderer as a "strawman!"

26 The South Carolina judge lacked personal jurisdiction over Stich, and Diablo Western Press.
Neither party made a personal appearance in the South Carolina lawsuit. The judge sought juris-

1 diction on the basis that the books¹⁴ Stich wrote were on the Internet (a similar theory would give
2 Osama bin Laden jurisdiction in Afghanistan over President Bush because Bush's statements ap-
3 peared on the Internet!).

4 **Entry of the South Carolina Default Judgment as a California Judgment**

5 The Smith and Collins law firm then hired local attorneys in California to enter that default
6 judgment as a California judgment. California judges in *this* judicial district, who would decide
7 the issue, knew these facts, and knew:

- 8
- 9 (a) The South Carolina judge who rendered the default judgment of \$3 million had no per-
10 sonal jurisdiction over Stich and Diablo Western Press.
- 11 (b) That reporting the statements of Dr. Cserna was not libel and also a protected publication
12 right.
- 13 (c) That the California anti-SLAPP statute prevented such an retaliatory action for activity in
14 the public's interest.
- 15 (d) A California judge had no jurisdiction over a Nevada corporation, and that the corpora-
16 tion had not appeared in California.
- 17 (e) That these actions would, and undoubtedly were intended to, prevent the reporting of cor-
18 rupt activities that were major crimes against the United States, and constituted a thinly
19 veiled obstruction of justice that would continue the catastrophic consequences.
- 20 (f) That the corruption that Stich initially discovered in the government's aviation safety of-
21 fices would be the same type of corruption responsible for the conditions that enabled
22

23
24 ¹⁴ Books include the following print and e-books: *Blowback, 9/11, and Cover-Ups*; *David vs. Goliath: 9/11 and*
25 *Other Tragedies*; *Defrauding America*, two volumes; *Disavow: A CIA Saga of Betrayal*; *Drugging America—a Tro-*
jan Horse; *Explosive Secrets of Covert CIA Companies*; *FBI, CIA, the Mob, and Treachery*; *Lawyers and Judges:*
American Trojan Horses; *Subverting America*, two volumes; *Terrorism Against America: External and Internal*;
Unfriendly Skies: 20th & 21st Centuries.

1 four groups of terrorists to hijack four airliners on September 11, 2001.

2 (g) That aiding the scheme would insure the continuation of the corruption and the deadly
3 consequences.

4 The California judge then *increased* the judgment to over \$4 million.

5 After several other lawyers refused to go along with the scheme, John Guerrini joined the
6 ongoing series of legal and judicial attacks that are now in the 24th year. The only goal: seize the
7 books or the money that enabled the books to remain available to the public. A subtle form of
8 obstruction of justice action, and raises the question, where is this scheme being orchestrated and
9 where is the money coming from!

10 Guerrini claims that Stich “makes a great deal of money from the sale of ... books.” The
11 truth is that Stich *never* received any income from the sale of the books, being why it required
12 his assets to continue his exposure activities.

13 At this stage in Stich’s life, at 84 years of age and with a near-fatal heart condition, he will
14 continue his fight to expose and seek to halt the corruption that continues to inflict catastrophic
15 harm upon the people and the country.

17 SUMMARY

18 *Everyone* involved in the sordid history of these obstruction of justice activities knew that
19 people and the nation had suffered great harm from the corruption, and that these tragedies
20 would continue as a result of their conduct. If the charges by Stich and his group of other former
21 government agents are correct about the corruption, including the related airline disasters, then
22 the lawyers and judges directly and indirectly involved in these legal tactics share blame in the
23 deaths that occurred, which would include the hijackings of four airliners on September 11,
24
25

1 2001.¹⁵ (Details in *Blowback, 9/11, and Cover-Ups*, and *Unfriendly Skies: 20th & 21st Centuries*.)

2 Stich has recently withdrawn a lawsuit filed in this court against the Guerrini law firm and
3 Steve Gratzer, among others, due to Stich's advancing age and near fatal heart condition.

4 I, Rodney Stich, declare that these facts are true, to the best of my knowledge and belief.
5 Executed this 29th day of January 2007 in the City of Walnut Creek, County of Contra Costa,
6 State of California.

7 Dated: January 29, 2007.

8
9
10 _____
Rodney F. Stich, in pro se

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 _____
¹⁵ This relation is detailed in two books Stich authored: *Unfriendly Skies: 20th & 21st Centuries*, and *Blowback, 9/11, and Cover-Ups*.

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

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, Rodney Stich, declare as follows:

I am only the age of 18 years. My mailing address is POB 5, Alamo, CA 94507.

On January 29, 2007, I served the following:

Opposition to the request assignment order.

By placing a true copy in an envelope addressed to

John D. Guerrini,
The Guerrini Law Firm
750 East Green Street
Pasadena, CA 91101

Executed on January 29, 2007, at Walnut Creek, California.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Rodney Stich