

1 Unite States² 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 orders³ 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 requirement⁴ 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 activities⁵ 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.⁶ 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.⁷ 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 credentials⁸ 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.⁹ The initial
24 violations occurred in the California courts with the filing of a sham lawsuit by a
25 CIA-front law firm.¹⁰ 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,¹¹ 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.¹²

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

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

- 12 • Complaints may not be dismissed if any single federal cause of action is stated. Plaintiff
13 stated multiple federal causes of actions. Plaintiff's Complaint stated that defendants (a)
14 violated Plaintiff's civil and constitutional rights, which included filing a SLAPP action
15 against Plaintiff as part of an effort to halt his exposure of criminal and subversive activities
16 in government offices and the aiding and abetting of such actions by other government
17 personnel.
- 18 • The allegations stated in the Complaint must be accepted as true for opposing dismissal.
19 The law states that allegations stated in the complaint must be accepted as true for the
20 purpose of preventing dismissal if any single allegation states a federal cause of action for
21 which federal remedies are available. *Gardener v. Toilet Goods Assn.*, 387 U.S. 167, 172
22 (1967). This would include the charges that defendants engaged in a conspiracy to halt
23 Plaintiff's constitutionally protected right to make the public aware of criminal and
24 subversive activities in certain government positions. It would also require that the Judge
25 Hicks accept the allegations of criminal activities associated with the 3,000 deaths on
26 September 11, 2001, as true at that stage of the pleadings.
- 27 • Refusal to render findings of facts and conclusions of law related to the issues and the law
28 raised by Plaintiff's Complaint. Judge Hicks continued the 20-year-pattern by every

1 California and federal judge who became implicated in this scheme by refusing to make
2 findings of facts and conclusions of law addressing Plaintiff's claims. Instead, he devoted
3 eight pages of ramblings that Plaintiff was a vexatious litigant and that Plaintiff's exercise
4 of due process in the face of massive violations of state and federal laws, and Plaintiff's
5 attempts to report criminal activities in government offices, were frivolous and the acts of a
6 vexatious litigant! Findings are required by law. (FRCivP 52).

- 7 • Order dismissing Complaint was filled with statements that were obtained from outside of
8 the record and for which Plaintiff was never given the opportunity to defend. This would
9 include such defenses as the orders terminating Plaintiff's due process rights to federal
10 court access and the defenses provided by the laws and Constitution of the United States are
11 patently void and irresponsible orders.
- 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.¹³ 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.

4 Judge knew that the allegations against the defendants clearly showed a continuing
5 attempt to halt Plaintiff's exposure of ongoing criminal activities, including those responsible
6 for the 3,000 deaths on September 11, 2001. His contempt for these victims is matched by his
7 contempt for the integrity of the courts and the rights guaranteed by the laws and Constitution
8 of the United States. His actions continue the conduct that makes the federal courts into a
9 racketeering enterprise. Throughout the 20 years of endless attacks upon Plaintiff, the most
10 prominent highlights of the misconduct by federal judges have been (a) blocking the reporting
11 of criminal and subversive activities; (b) aiding and abetting CIA-front law firms and
12 protecting every participant in their sham attacks upon Plaintiff; (c) violating and depriving
13 plaintiff of every single substantive and procedural due process law and constitutional
14 protection invoked by the ongoing violations. In the process, they are subverting the United
15 States with catastrophic consequences.

16 Dated: February 13, 2003.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Rodney Stich

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

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

1
2 ³ Judicial orders—that blocked Plaintiff from reporting criminal and subversive activities under the federal crime
3 reporting statute—includes those rendered by former CIA legal counsel, Stanley Sporkin, Samuel Conti, Milton
4 Schwartz, Marilyn Patel, and others.

5 ⁴ Legal requirements for injunctive orders are (1) they must halt great and irreparable harm; (2) they must halt
6 unlawful acts; (3) they must be in the public’s interest; and (4) the judge rendering the orders must issue a finding
7 of facts showing that these requirements had been met. As repeatedly judicially perpetrated, the law was applied in
8 reverse. The orders did not halt the harm, they protected the people inflicting the harm and deprived Stich, who
9 was the recipient of the harm, from defenses and protections in the laws and Constitution of the United States. The
10 orders did not halt the unlawful acts; they provided judicial protection to the continuation and escalating of these
11 violations. Subverting the laws and Constitution of the United States and depriving a citizen of these rights was not
12 in the public’s interest. And the findings of facts showing these requirements were met was never rendered by any
13 of the judges.

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

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

20 ⁷ *Stich v. United States, et al.*, 554 F.2d 1070 (9th Cir.) (table), *cert. denied*, 434 U.S. 920 (1977)(addressed hard-
21 core air safety misconduct, violations of federal air safety laws, threats against government inspectors not to report
22 safety violations and misconduct); *Stich v. National Transportation Safety Board*, 685 F.2d 446 (9th Cir.)(table),
23 *cert. denied*, 459 U.S. 861 (1982))(addressed repeated criminal falsification of official airline accident reports,
24 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.*
26 *McDonnell Douglas Corporation and United States of America*, Civil Action 74-808-PH, MDL 172, Central
27 District California.(addressing the long standing FAA misconduct, of which the cover-up of the DC-10 cargo door
28 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.

⁸ 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
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.

⁹ 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; *Wheaton v.*
Wheaton (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).

¹⁰ Friedman, Sloan and Ross, San Francisco.

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

¹¹ 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,

¹² 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.

¹³ 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.