

1 RODNEY STICH
1316 Oakmont Dr
2 Walnut Creek, CA 94595
3 Phone: 776-786-9191

4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

6 RODNEY F. STICH,) Case No: 1:02CV01172
7)
8 Plaintiff,) COMPLAINT, DECLARATORY JUDG-
vs.) MENT ACT (28 U.S.C. §§ 2201,2202); VOID
9) JUDGMENT DOCTRINE; CIVIL RICO (42
10 U.S. GOVERNMENT; NINTH CIRCUIT) U.S.C. §§ 1961-1965); BIVENS; FTCA; 28
COURT OF APPEALS; JAMES R. BROWN-) U.S.C. §§ 2671-80; DEMAND TO REPORT
11 ING; ANDREW J. KLEINFELD; RONALD) CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES UNDER 18 U.S.C.
M. GOULD; CALIFORNIA SUPREME) § 4.
12 COURT; CALIFORNIA COURT OF AP-)
PEAL; RONALD L. GEORGE; MARVIN) JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
13 BAXTER,)
14 Defendants,)

15
16 **PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS**

17 1. The facts stated in this Complaint constitute federal causes of actions for which federal
18 courts have mandatory jurisdiction and the responsibility to provide relief. Several of these fed-
19 eral causes of action relate to documented matters that continue to inflict great harm upon na-
20 tional interests and national security, and played key roles in the success of the four groups of
21 terrorist hijackers on September 11, 2001. The facts address:

- 22
23 A. The successful hijacking of four airliners by four groups of terrorist hijackers on Sep-
24 tember 11, 2001, and can be expected to aid the success of future terrorist attacks.
25
26 B. The documented pattern of criminal and subversive activities that Plaintiff, a former
27 federal air safety inspector, and his group of other government agents, discovered.
28
C. The documented combination of civil, constitutional, and criminal violations pepe-

1 trated against Plaintiff by the defendants, and others not yet named. The intent of these
2 wrongful acts was to block Plaintiff and his group of other former and present govern-
3 ment agents from reporting these federal crimes.

4
5 D. The consequences of these wrongful acts aided and abetted various criminal acts, and
6 play a major role in the continuing great harm upon major national interests, including
7 national security. Deaths repeatedly occurred from these wrongful acts. In the aviation
8 environment, the *latest déjà vu consequences* occurred on September 11, 2001, with the
9 deaths of 3,000 people that far overshadowed prior fraud-related deaths.

10
11 E. Many of the details of these wrongful acts are stated in the third editions of *Un-*
12 *friendly Skies* and *Defrauding America*, the first edition of *Drugging America*, and with
13 additional details in the E-book editions. Plaintiff wrote these books in an attempt to in-
14 form the public of the corrupt, criminal, and subversive activities, and to petition gov-
15 ernment personnel to perform their legal duties relating to halting these crimes.

16
17 F. For the purpose of this lawsuit, the defendants' wrongful acts were combined with
18 massive and repeated violations of state and federal laws and constitutional protections,
19 perpetrated under color of state law and under color of federal law, to block the reporting
20 of criminal and subversive activities affecting national interests. These wrongful acts by
21 the defendants and others constitute federal causes of actions under Civil RICO, Bivens,
22 Civil Rights Act, and the Federal Tort Claims Act. Further federal causes of actions arise
23 under the Declaratory Judgment Act and the U.S. Supreme Court's void judgment doc-
24 trine, to address the violations of other federally protected rights that were part of the tac-
25 tics used by the defendants to block Plaintiff and his group of other government agents
26 from reporting.
27
28

1 G. The criminal acts by the named defendants, and those not yet named, constitute ob-
2 struction of justice, misprision of felonies, becoming accomplices, retaliating against a
3 former federal agent and witness, and various forms of defrauding the United States.

4 These obstruction of justice crimes were repeatedly interspersed with massive civil and
5 constitutional violations by the defendants.
6

7 H. The criminal retaliation against a former federal agent and witness by the named de-
8 fendants and others not yet named or known.

9
10 2. This lawsuit states facts showing federal cause of actions for which relief is provided by fed-
11 eral law and the constitution, including:

12 A. To report criminal and subversive activities to a federal court, as required to be re-
13 ported under the federal crime reporting statute, Title 18 U.S.C. § 4. Federal judges, to
14 avoid being guilty of obstruction of justice, must receive this information and supporting
15 evidence as part of their administrative duties. Plaintiff first discovered these criminal ac-
16 tivities while he held a key federal air safety inspector position. His discoveries of crimi-
17 nal and even subversive activities occurred over a period of years, partly from the felony
18 activities against him seeking to halt his exposure activities, and partly through informa-
19 tion and documentation provided to Plaintiff by a group of other government agents.
20

21 These were agents of the FBI, DEA, Customs, Secret Service, CIA, and included former
22 heads of secret CIA airlines and secret CIA financial operations.
23

24 B. Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201, 2002, and FRCivP 57. A declaration of
25 legal rights and legal relations established in five judgments in five different states that
26 are now in controversy, after exercising the constitutional right to change residence with-
27 out losing previously adjudicated and previously acquired rights. These rights were vio-
28

1 lated by the defendants as they sought to strip Plaintiff of the \$10 million in assets that
2 funded his legal rights and legal requirements to report the criminal and subversive
3 activities.

4 C. Declaratory Judge Act and FRCivP 57. A declaration to declare the void status of in-
5 junctione orders rendered by Ninth Circuit district and appellate judges permanently bar-
6 ring Plaintiff from filing papers in the district and appellate courts, thereby terminating
7 Plaintiff's legal rights, legal protections, and legal defenses. These orders were part of the
8 scheme to block the reporting of crimes against the United States, and played a key role
9 in the conditions making possible the success of the four groups of terrorist hijackers on
10 September 11, 2001. These orders blocked Plaintiff from reporting the criminal and sub-
11 versive activities while simultaneously aiding and abetting the scheme initiated by a CIA-
12 front law firm to strip Plaintiff of the \$10 million in assets that funded his exposure ac-
13 tivities.

14 D. Declaratory Judgment Act and Void Judgment doctrine. A declaration to declare the
15 void status of judicial orders taking Plaintiff's \$10 million in property assets, including
16 his home and sole source of income. The orders seizing and liquidating these assets vio-
17 lated the legal and constitutional requirement of a hearing, a notice of hearing, and legal
18 cause, and were part of the scheme to block the reporting of major crimes against the
19 United States. These corrupt orders were then expanded by rendering orders barring
20 Plaintiff from filing objections to the seizure and liquidation of his assets. When Plaintiff
21 *did* exercise this legal and constitutional right, federal judges unfiled the objection and
22 then charged Plaintiff with criminal contempt of court for exercising constitutional due
23 process, and then sentenced Plaintiff to federal prison.

1 E. Civil Rights Act (42 U.S.C. §§ 1983-1986). Plaintiff seeks financial damages for the
2 repeated violations of record numbers of state and federal laws and constitutional protec-
3 tions, both substantive and procedural, while acting under color of *state law*.

4 F. Bivens doctrine. Financial damages against defendants for the great and irreparable
5 personal and financial harm caused by their repeated violations of state and federal laws
6 and constitutional protections, both substantive and procedural, while acting under color
7 of *federal law*.

8 G. Federal Tort Claims Act Title 28 U.S.C. §§ 2671-80 . Financial damages for offenses
9 perpetrated against Plaintiff by government personnel seeking to block Plaintiff's expo-
10 sure of the criminal and subversive activities. These federal offenses included the pepe-
11 tration of torts and the failure of federal personnel to perform a mandatory duty. Plaintiff
12 had filed an administrative claim with the U.S. Department of Justice on. March 20,
13 2000. He was blocked from filing a subsequent lawsuit due to the unlawful and unconsti-
14 tutional orders terminating Plaintiff's civil and constitutional rights in court.

15 H. Civil RICO, Title 42 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1965. Financial damages from the named de-
16 fendants, under civil RICO, for great and irreparable harm inflicted upon Plaintiff
17 through a series of predicate acts that combined massive violations of substantive and
18 procedural due process rights with felony retaliating against Plaintiff for seeking to report
19 criminal acts against the United States. These multiple predicate acts inflicted great per-
20 sonal and financial harm upon Plaintiff and inflicted great harm upon interstate and inter-
21 national commerce. The most publicized recent examples of the effect upon interstate
22 commerce occurred with the hijackings of four airliners on September 11, 2001.

23
24
25
26
27
28 3. The continued judicial complicity in the combination of obstruction of justice and mas-

1 sive civil and constitutional violations will continue the great harm upon national issues, and will
2 undoubtedly aid and abet the success of future terrorist acts and other harm upon the United
3 States. The gravity of the extensive and Trojan-Horse type of criminal and subversive activities,
4 in which the defendants are involved, threatens the very survival of the United States.
5

6 **Jurisdiction**

7 4. Jurisdiction for these federal causes of actions arises under the:

8 A. Declaratory Judgment Act, FRCivP 57, and related law.

9 B. U.S. Supreme Court's void judgment doctrine.¹

10 C. Bivens doctrine.²

11 D. Civil RICO, Title 42 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1965.

12 E. Federal Tort Claims Act, Title 28 U.S.C. §§ 2671-80.

13 F. Civil Rights Act, Title 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201, 2202, and FRCivP 57.

14 G. Fifth Amendment to the Constitution relating to substantive and procedural due proc-
15 ess rights and equal protection for all citizens.
16

17 H. Title 28 U.S.C. § 1331, which provides that anyone stating facts raising a federal
18 cause of action has the due process right to adjudicate these matters in court and obtain
19 relief.
20

21 I. Title 28 U.S.C. § 1343, which provides a federal court forum in which citizens may
22 seek redress from deprivation of federally protected rights.
23

24
25 1 An illegal order is forever void. An order that exceeds the jurisdiction of the court, is void, or voidable, and can be
26 attacked in any proceeding in any court where the validity of the judgment comes into issue. (See *Rose v. Himely*
27 (1808) 4 Cranch 241, 2 L ed 608; *Pennoyer v. Neff* (1877) 95 US 714, 24 L ed 565; *Thompson v. Whitman* (1873) 18
28 Wall 457, 21 1 ED 897; *Windsor v. McVeigh* (1876) 93 US 274, 23 L ed 914; *McDonald v. Mabee* (1917) 243 US
90, 37 Sct 343, 61 L ed 608. A judgment may not be rendered in violation of constitutional protections. The validity
of a judgment may be affected by a failure to give the constitutionally required due process notice. *Earle v. McVeigh*,
91 US 503, 23 L Ed 398.

2 *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971).

1 J. Title 18 U.S.C. § 4, the federal crime reporting statute, which requires that anyone
2 knowing of a federal crime must promptly report it to a federal judge (or other federal of-
3 ficer), and impliedly makes it a crime for a judge to block such reports.

4 K. Title 28 U.S.C. § 1361, providing for an action to order a federal official to perform a
5 mandatory duty and to halt unlawful conduct.

6 L. Title 42 U.S.C. § 1986.³ This court has the responsibility to correct any major civil
7 rights violations that is brought to its attention.

8
9 5. Venue is proper on the basis that (a) the federal government can be sued in any district
10 court, including the District of Columbia, and (b) Plaintiff has been unlawfully and unconstitu-
11 tionally barred from filing any papers in Ninth Circuit courts, preventing the exercise of due
12 process against the defendant where Plaintiff resides.

13 14 **Statute Of Limitations**

15 6. The latest act by defendants acting under the color of federal law, in a continuing 20-year
16 conspiracy, occurred on April 12, 2002, as Ninth Circuit appellate judges blocked Plaintiff's ap-
17 pellate rights by permanently barring Plaintiff from filing any appeals in the Ninth Circuit courts.

18 7. The effect, and surely the intent, of the permanent injunction is to (a) block Plaintiff from
19 reporting criminal activities that he and a group of other government agents had discovered; (b)
20 to prevent Plaintiff from exercising the federal remedies to defend against the misuse of the
21 courts to silence Plaintiff's constitutionally protected exposure activities; (c) to protected the par-
22
23

24
25
26

³ Title 42 U.S.C. § 1986. Action for neglect to prevent conspiracy

27 Every person who, having knowledge that any of the wrongs conspired to be done, and mentioned in the preceding
28 section [42 U.S.C. § 1985], are about to be committed, and having power to prevent or aid in preventing the com-
mission of the same, neglects or refuses to do so, if such wrongful act be committed, shall be liable to the party in-
jured, or his legal representatives, for all damages caused by such wrongful act, which such person by reasonable
diligence could have prevented; and such damages may be recovered in an action on the case; and any number of
persons guilty of such wrongful neglect or refusal may be joined as defendants in the action, ...

1 participants in the conspiracy to obstruct justice that has left a huge trail of evidence in the federal
2 and California courts; and (d) prevent the public from discovering the extent of criminal activi-
3 ties in key government offices, including the federal courts.

4
5 8. The latest act in the conspiracy by defendants acting under color of state law occurred in
6 May 2002, as defendant California judges continue to block Plaintiff's exercise of state and fed-
7 eral due process defensive remedies. This permanent termination of defense due process is nec-
8 essary to protect their prior documented and massive violations of state and federal laws and
9 constitutional protections, the prevent the existence and intent of the conspiracy to be addressed
10 in court proceedings, and to continue to block the reporting of the underlying criminal and sub-
11 versive misconduct.

12
13 9. Under federal law, there is no time limitation for declaring a person's legal and property
14 rights and legal relations under the Declaratory Judgment Act when such rights have come into
15 conflict and remedies are available under federal law.

16
17 10. Under the Supreme Court's void judgment doctrine, there is no time limitation for raising
18 the issue of void judgments, or for declaring legal rights and legal relations that are in contro-
19 versy, the resolution of which has been repeatedly barred by Ninth Circuit district and appellate
20 judges in a conspiracy that repeatedly blocked the reporting of criminal activities to a federal
21 court.

22
23 **Plaintiff**

24 11. Plaintiff is a resident of Nevada and California and considers Nevada his domicile.

25 **Defendants**

26
27 12. The defendant for the FTCA cause of action is the United States government, based upon
28 the series of tortious acts by employees of the federal personnel that were combined with efforts

1 to halt his reporting criminal acts against the United States implicating people holding key posi-
2 tions in government.

3 13. The defendants for the civil RICO and Bivens causes of actions are judges in the Ninth
4 Circuit courts whose multiple predicate acts, in a conspiracy, inflicted massive personal and fi-
5 nancial harm upon Plaintiff, and upon interstate and international commerce, for the purpose of
6 halting Plaintiff's reporting of criminal activities. Many of their wrongful acts are detailed in
7 Plaintiff's books, *Unfriendly Skies*, *Defrauding America*, and *Drugging America*, and on the
8 Internet sites that can be found at www.defraudingamerica.com and www.unfriendlyskies.com.
9
10

11 **Preliminary Statement**

12 14. Plaintiff is a former federal air safety agent⁴ who was assigned by the Federal Aviation
13 Administration (FAA) to correct the conditions that were causing the worst series of catastrophic
14 air disasters in the nation's history. In this position he discovered and documented deep-seated
15 misconduct, corrupt and criminal activities⁵ that caused or permitted to occur a series of air dis-
16 asters, including years of fatal hijackings. These conditions prevented the federal government
17 from meeting its air safety responsibilities, which continues to this day. The arrogance and cover-
18 ups that protected the misconduct and the perpetrated, and the great numbers of crashes and
19 deaths caused Plaintiff to take the role of an independent prosecutor. In this role he conducted a
20 four-month hearing within the FAA under standard trial procedures, causing additional evidence
21
22
23

24 ⁴ Plaintiff was an airline captain for many years in domestic and international flying, and during World War II he
25 was a Navy Patrol Plane commander and pilot instructor. In addition, he has written numerous highly detailed and
26 documented books, including the third editions of *Unfriendly Skies* and *Defrauding America* and the latest edition of
Drugging America. He has appeared as guest and expert on over 3,000 radio and television shows since 1978.

27 ⁵ The corrupt and criminal activities within the FAA included (a) barring federal air safety inspectors from reporting
28 unsafe or illegal matters that continued to play key roles in prior airline crashes; (b) felony destruction of official
reports of these safety matters; (c) retaliating against inspectors who make the reports required by law; (d) protecting
favored and politically powerful airlines who federal inspectors found violating major federal air safety require-
ments, who criminally falsified the records, who protected airline personnel who threatened federal air safety inspec-
tors, and much more.

1 to be placed in government records.

2 15. Despite the documented relationship between the major federal offenses and a continuing
3 series of fatal airline crashes, every government check and balance engaged in a cover-up, insur-
4 ing the continuation of the federal crimes and the fatal consequences.
5

6 16. Over the years, many fatal air disasters were linked to these deep-seated federal offenses.
7 The most recent consequences of these deeply entrenched matters affecting aviation were the
8 successful hijackings of four airliners on September 11, 2001.

9 17. Plaintiff had previously reported these federal offenses to higher officials within the FAA,
10 to NTSB board officials, to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and to members of Congress.
11 Each refused to receive Plaintiff's evidence and engaged in further cover-ups, which continued
12 the misconduct, the crashes, and the deaths.
13

14 **Plaintiff Used His Assets To Inform the Public and Petition Government**

15 18. Plaintiff refused to work under these corrupt and deadly conditions and left the FAA. As
16 the resulting crashes increased in severity, Plaintiff sought to inform the public of these matters
17 and to petition government to act on these major federal crimes. He used his considerable real
18 estate assets to fund his exposure activities, which included publishing books,⁶ appearing as
19 guest and expert on hundreds of radio and television shows, giving speeches, and placing infor-
20 mational ads in mainstream publications on a regular basis.
21
22

23 **Using Additional Creative Remedies Due To Increasing Air Disasters**

24 19. As major fatal air disasters continued to occur from the deep-seated corruption within the
25 FAA, Plaintiff exercised the responsibilities under the federal crime reporting statute, Title 18
26

27
28 ⁶ The books include three editions of *Unfriendly Skies* and *Defrauding America* and one edition of *Drugging Amer-
ica*. Also, funding Internet sites, including www.defraudingamerica.com; www.unfriendlyskies.com; and
www.druggingamerica.com.

1 U.S.C. § 4,⁷ to report the criminal activities to a federal court; and his rights under Title 28
2 U.S.C. § 1361 to seek a court order forcing a government official to perform a duty and to halt
3 the unlawful conduct. He filed several federal actions⁸ in the late 1970s and early 1980s seeking
4 to report the criminal activities under the federal crime reporting statute and also to obtain a court
5 order for FAA and NTSB officials to perform their legal duty and to halt their unlawful conduct.
6

7 **Repeated Obstruction Of Justice By Justice Department Personnel**

8 20. In every instance, Justice Department personnel filed motions to block the reporting of
9 these criminal activities. Federal district and appellate judges admitted the gravity of Plaintiff's
10 charges, but stated that these were responsibilities of Congress. Plaintiff responded that this is
11 correct, but that the two statutes cited by Plaintiff provided dual responsibilities to federal judges.
12

13 21. Despite the clear wording of Title 18 U.S.C. § 4 that federal judges have a mandatory
14 duty to receive information and evidence of a federal crime as part of their administrative duties,
15 Ninth Circuit district and appellate judges blocked Plaintiff from making these reports. Each of
16 Plaintiff's actions was dismissed shortly after being filed, in clear violation of federal law.
17

18 **Initiation Of Sham Legal Processes To Block Plaintiff's Reports**

19 22. As Plaintiff exercised his constitutional right to make the public aware of these criminal
20

21
22 7 Title 18 U.S.C. § 4. Misprision of felony. Whoever, having knowledge of the actual commission of a felony cog-
23 nizable by a court of the United States, conceals and does not as soon as possible make known the same to some
24 judge or other person in civil or military authority under the United States, shall be fined under this title or impris-
25 oned not more than three years, or both.

26 8 *Stich v. United States, et al.*, 554 F.2d 1070 (9th Cir.) (table), *cert. denied*, 434 U.S. 920 (1977)(addressed hard-
27 core air safety misconduct, violations of federal air safety laws, threats against government inspectors not to report
28 safety violations and misconduct); *Stich v. National Transportation Safety Board*, 685 F.2d 446 (9th Cir.)(table), *cert.*
29 *denied*, 459 U.S. 861 (1982))(addressed repeated criminal falsification of official airline accident reports, omitting
30 highly sensitive air safety misconduct, making possible repeated crashes from the same sequestered problems);
31 Amicus curiae brief filed on July 17, 1975, in the Paris DC-10 multi-district litigation, *Flanagan v. McDonnell*
32 *Douglas Corporation and United States of America*, Civil Action 74-808-PH, MDL 172, Central District Califor-
33 nia.)(addressing the long standing FAA misconduct, of which the cover-up of the DC-10 cargo door problem was
34 one of repeated instances of tragedy related misconduct); U.S. v. Department of Justice, District of Columbia, Nos.
35 86-2523, 87-2214, and other actions filed by Stich seeking to expose and correct the powerful and covert air disaster
36 misconduct.

1 activities involving people in key government offices, and to petition government, efforts were
2 commenced to destroy the assets that funded Plaintiff's exposure activities, using legal process
3 and the courts. The first such scheme commenced with the filing of a sham lawsuit against Plain-
4 tiff in the California courts⁹ by a CIA-front law firm in San Francisco,¹⁰ that sought to take the
5 \$10 million in real estate assets that funded Plaintiff's exposure of the federal crimes. That law-
6 suit was barred by dozens of state and federal laws and constitutional provisions.¹¹

8 23. That lawsuit targeting Plaintiff's assets was fraudulently disguised as a "divorce" action,
9 falsely claiming that Plaintiff was married to a Texas resident, that she wanted a divorce, and half
10 of Plaintiff's personal and corporate assets.

12 24. The parties had been legally divorced for nearly 20 years, as established by a January 31,
13 1966, divorce judgment that had been entered as a local judgment in the states of Oklahoma,
14 Texas, Nevada, and California. Both parties had been declaring themselves divorced in real es-
15 tate transactions throughout this period. The parties' divorced status was recognized in over 100
16 title insurance policies. In addition, the Texas resident continued to declare herself divorced
17 while the California "divorce" action was going through the California courts.

19 25. California judges repeatedly rendered orders inflicting great personal and financial harm

21 ⁹ At Fairfield, California.

22 ¹⁰ San Francisco law firm of Friedman, Sloan, and Ross.

23 ¹¹ California CC §§ 4351, 4554, 5004, 5102, 5103, 5108, 5110.720, 5118, 5164; California CCP §§1699(b), 1713.1,
24 1713.3, 1908, 1910, 1913, 915; California Rules of court Rules 1201(c); 1211, 1212, 1215, 1222, 1229(a),
25 1230(a)(2), 1234, 1239(a)(2), 1281, and Rule 1282; absence of personal jurisdiction arising from Rule 1230 Motion
26 to quash, 1230(a)(2), 1234, and 1239(a)(2); absence of personal and subject matter jurisdiction under the California
27 Family Law Act: Rules 1201(c), 1211, 1212, 1281, 1282, 1215, 1222, 1229, 1230(a)(2), 1234, 1239(a)(2); Civil
28 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; Four-
teenth Amendment equal protection; Fourteenth Amendment property rights; Fourteenth Amendment liberty inter-
ests; 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).

1 upon Plaintiff. They *granted* every motion requested by the CIA-front law firm while simultane-
2 ously *denying* every single motion requested by Plaintiff. These record-setting civil and constitu-
3 tional violations against Plaintiff continued for six years inflicted great personal and financial
4 harm upon Plaintiff while acting without personal jurisdiction and violating unprecedented num-
5 bers of state and federal laws and constitutional provisions. These gross civil and constitutional
6 violations diverted Plaintiff's attention from exposing the continuing criminal activities.
7

8 26. Every exercise of legal and constitutional due process defenses Plaintiff brought to the
9 California court of appeal judges¹² and the California Supreme Court was rejected, as they aided
10 and abetted the gross violations of state and federal laws and constitutional protections. In addi-
11 tion, California court of appeal judges imposed heavy financial sanctions on Plaintiff for exercis-
12 ing the constitutional due process defenses. Federal law¹³ define these as felonies.
13

14 27. California judges commenced the practice, that continues to this date, by reversing the
15 legal and common-sense definition of frivolous and placing that label on Plaintiff exercise of de-
16 fense remedies that were specifically provided by law for any one of the dozens of state and fed-
17 eral laws and constitutional protections that were violated. They then enlarged on this judicial
18 sham by reversing the legal definition of vexatious litigant and define his attempts to halt the
19 great and irreparable personal and financial harm as the acts of a vexatious litigant. In this man-
20 ner, anyone who exercises legal and constitutional defense due process is a vexatious litigant,
21 constituting an ingenious way to desecrate large numbers of due process rights.
22
23

24 **Exercising Federal Defenses Against Violations Of Federally Protected Rights**

25 28. Suffering great and irreparable harm from the repeated violations of civil and constitu-
26

27 ¹² King, Low, Haning.

28 ¹³ Title 18 U.S.C. § 241. Conspiracy against rights of citizens. If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his so exercised the same, ... they shall be fined ... or imprisoned ...

1 tional due process, Plaintiff sought relief in Ninth Circuit courts under (a) the Declaratory Judg-
2 ment Act¹⁴ (to declare plaintiff's personal and property rights established in five prior judg-
3 ments), and (b) the Civil Rights Act¹⁵ (to halt the continuing record-setting violations of state and
4 federal laws and constitutional protections).

5
6 **Violating Crime Reporting Statutes Concurrent With Wholesale**
7 **Violations Of Legal and Constitutional Due Process Rights**

8 29. Despite the bar against dismissing lawsuits when the facts state a federal cause of action
9 for which relief can be obtained, Ninth Circuit federal judges promptly dismissed every action,
10 clearly violating multiple due process rights against such dismissal. These dismissal violated,
11 inter alia, the right to discovery, the right to a jury trial on the factual issues, to findings of facts
12 and conclusions of law, and due process remedies under the Civil Rights Act and Declaratory
13 Judgment Act.

14
15 **Seeking To Report Criminal and Subversive Activities To Ninth Circuit Courts**

16 30. Over a period of years, as Plaintiff's activities became widely known throughout the
17 United States, numerous government agents¹⁶ provided him with information and evidence of
18 criminal activities involving corrupt government personnel in other areas. Plaintiff also person-
19 ally discovered criminal activities in Ninth Circuit courts as a result of the misuse of the courts to
20 silence his exposure activities. Commencing in 1986, plaintiff again sought to report these major
21 criminal activities to Ninth Circuit federal courts under the mandatory requirements of the fed-
22 eral crime reporting statute, Title 18 U.S.C. § 4. Ninth Circuit district and appellate judges again
23
24

25
26
27

14 Title 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202.

15 Title 28 U.S.C. §§ 1983-1986.

16 The other sources of information and evidence were agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Drug En-
28 forcement Administration, Secret Service, and Central Intelligence Agency, including former heads of secret CIA
airlines and secret CIA financial operations who provided Plaintiff with information on drug smuggling into the
United States and various forms of financial fraud perpetrated against the United States.

1 blocked the reports of criminal and even subversive activities, constituting worst crimes¹⁷ than
2 when they blocked Plaintiff's earlier reports.

3 **Combining Cover-Ups With Permanently Terminating**
4 **Plaintiff's Legal Rights, Legal Protections, and Legal Defenses**

5 31. Ninth Circuit judges put into writing what they had done de facto. They started issuing
6 unlawful and unconstitutional injunctions permanently barring Plaintiff from filing any papers in
7 the federal courts.¹⁸

8
9 32. The injunctive orders were void on the basis that they (a) blocked the reporting of crimi-
10 nal acts to a federal court, and (b) terminated Plaintiff's due process rights to the protection of
11 federal laws to defend against the violations of federally protected rights. The series of perma-
12 nent injunctions were also void on the basis that they violated every legal requirement¹⁹ for such
13 order.
14

15 **Expanding Obstruction Of Justice With Expanding Termination Of**
16 **Every Relevant Substantive and Procedural Due Process**

17 33. After Plaintiff sought to report the additional criminal activities to a federal court, and
18 again sought to exercise federal defenses against the escalating harm from the civil and constitu-
19 tional violations occurring in both the California and federal courts, Ninth Circuit district judges
20 and Justice Department personnel charged Plaintiff with criminal contempt of court.
21

22 34. Federal judges denied to Plaintiff the right to a jury trial and he was held guilty of crimi-

23 ¹⁷ Violated criminal statutes included Title 18 U.S.C. §§ 2, 3, and 4.

24 ¹⁸ The orders required Plaintiff to first submit any filing to the courts to determine whether they would be filed. But
25 this qualification was a sham; every attempted filing was barred, despite the record numbers of federally causes of
actions stated in the complaint.

26 ¹⁹ Legal requirements for injunctive orders include (1) they must halt great and irreparable harm; (2) they must halt
27 unlawful acts; (3) they must be in the public's interest; and (4) the judge rendering the orders must issue a finding of
28 facts showing that these requirements had been met. As repeatedly judicially perpetrated, the law was applied in
reverse. The orders did not halt the harm; they protected the people inflicting the harm and deprived Stich, who was
the recipient of the harm, from defenses and protections in the laws and Constitution of the United States. The orders
did not halt the unlawful acts; they provided judicial protection to the continuation and escalating of these violations.
Subverting the laws and Constitution of the United States and depriving a citizen of these rights was not in the pub-
lic's interest. The findings of facts showing these requirements were met were never made by any of the judges.

1 nal contempt of court by federal judges (who were themselves criminally involved in crimes
2 against the United States through their obstruction of justice acts). Plaintiff was transported from
3 prison to prison in chains, spending eight weeks in solitary confinement. Plaintiff was 68 years
4 of age at that time and had recently undergone surgery for six coronary bypasses. A fatal reaction
5 would not have been unexpected.
6

7 **Earlier Attempts Seeking To Force A Federal Judge To Perform A Mandatory Duty**

8 35. Earlier, because of the great personal and financial harm Plaintiff was suffering, and the
9 total deprivation of all substantive and procedural due process by Ninth Circuit district and ap-
10 pellate judges, Plaintiff filed two Chapter 11 cases in Las Vegas for his financially healthy assets.
11 He sought to *force* a federal judge to perform his mandatory duty under the civil rights act and
12 declaratory judgment act.
13

14 36. It was here that Plaintiff discovered another area of criminal activities in the Ninth Circuit
15 bankruptcy courts, which he details, and documents in the third editions of his books, *Unfriendly*
16 *Skies* and *Defrauding America*.
17

18 **Continuation Of Judicial Corruption In Ninth Circuit Courts**

19 37. Instead of performing his duty, Chapter 11 judge Robert Jones continued the practice of
20 denying federal relief, aiding and abetting those perpetrating the violations, including the CIA
21 front law firm, and also blocked the reporting of the criminal activities.
22

23 38. Jones signed orders in chambers ordering the seizure and liquidation of Plaintiff's \$10
24 million life assets, violating the legal and constitutional due process requirement of a hearing,
25 notice of hearing, and legal cause, and under conditions showing fraud. Plaintiff's assets were
26 turned over to trustee Charles Duck, who was subsequently exposed by the media as responsible
27 for the nation's worst trustee embezzlement. Evidence also indicates that Duck was a CIA asset.
28

1 39. The years of legal and constitutional due process violations continued. Chapter 11 Judge
2 Edward Jellen,²⁰ issued an unlawful and unconstitutional order barring Plaintiff from filing any
3 objections to the seizure and liquidation of Plaintiff's assets.

4 40. When Plaintiff did file an objection, as guaranteed by legal and constitutional due proc-
5 ess, Jellen ordered the objection unfiled and then charged Plaintiff with criminal contempt of
6 court for exercising this constitutional due process. It is a felony to inflict harm upon anyone ex-
7 exercising constitutional due process.²¹

8 41. Jellen denied Plaintiff access to Plaintiff's seized funds²² to hire legal counsel, refused to
9 appoint legal counsel, and issued an order holding Plaintiff in criminal contempt of court. Jellen
10 then sentenced Plaintiff to federal prison for having exercised federal defenses against the
11 fraudulent, unlawful, and unconstitutional seize of Plaintiff's assets. Plaintiff was eventually
12 converted from a multi-millionaire to a state of poverty, stripped of all sources of income.

13 42. From 1986 to 1995, Plaintiff was continually under either house arrest or in prison, as
14 Ninth Circuit judges and Justice Department personnel retaliated against him for attempting to
15 report the criminal activities and for exercising federal defenses.

16
17
18
19 **Liquidating the Last Of Plaintiff's \$10 Million Life Assets**

20 43. In 1999, chapter 11 judge Edward Jellen liquidated the last of Plaintiff's \$10 million in
21 assets, leaving Plaintiff homeless, and without any source of income (except for a modest social
22 security payment each month). The scheme initiated by the CIA-front law firm, assisted by Cali-
23 fornia and federal judges, succeeded in stripping Plaintiff of the assets that funded his exposure
24 activities and his constitutional right to inform the public and to petition government related to
25

26 _____
27 20 Oakland, California.

28 21 It is a felony under Title 18 U.S.C. § 241 to inflict harm upon anyone exercising constitutional due process. Jel-
len was aided in this offense by Ninth Circuit district and appellate judges.

22 Plaintiff's funds, which were denied to Plaintiff for legal counsel, were repeatedly provided to legal counsel for
Plaintiff's adversaries.

1 the pattern of criminal activities that had infiltrated numerous government entities.

2 **Continuing Decades Of Judicial Due Process Denial**

3 44. Before the statute of limitations expired on the multiple federal causes of actions occur-
4 ring without interruption for the prior 20-years, Plaintiff sought to exercise his due process right
5 to file a federal lawsuit in the U.S. district court at Oakland, California. District judge Claudia
6 Wilkins refused to allow the complaint to be filed, seeking support in an injunction issued by
7 U.S. district court judges in 1986—13 years earlier, that permanently terminated Plaintiff’s due
8 process rights to petition government to redress massive violations of federally protected rights.
9

10 45. Her March 27, 2000, order stated:
11

12 In one such order, dated June 6, 1986, Senior Judge Samuel Conti enjoined Plaintiff from fil-
13 ing any further civil actions in federal court ...

14 Although the injunctions provided a *theoretical right* to seek approval for filing a lawsuit, the
15 record of grotesque violations of state and federal laws and constitutional violations by Ninth
16 Circuit judicial records show that Plaintiff could never pass that threshold. Further, terrorists,
17 murders, and rapists, for instance, were not denied their civil rights as have been denied to Plain-
18 tiff in combination with felony obstruction of justice. The harm suffered by Plaintiff from these
19 corrupt judicial acts was accompanied by the harm inflicted upon major national interest, which
20 included monumental harm inflicted upon the people of the United States. This harm is described
21 in Plaintiff’s third editions of *Unfriendly Skies* and *Defrauding America* and the first edition of
22 *Drugging America*.²³ Her March 27, 2000, order stated:
23

24 In one such order, dated June 6, 1986, Senior Judge Samuel Conti enjoined Plaintiff from fil-
25 ing any further civil actions in federal court ...

26 46. The injunctions provided a *theoretical right* to seek approval for filing a lawsuit, but the
27

28

23 Later editions that reflect the September 11, 2001, events are available in E-book format.

1 record of total violations of state and federal substantive and procedural due process laws and
2 constitutional violations by Ninth Circuit judicial records show that Plaintiff *could never* obtain
3 approval to exercise his legal and constitutional due process defenses.. Further, terrorists, mur-
4 ders, and rapists, for instance, were not denied their civil rights as have been denied to Plaintiff
5 in combination with felony obstruction of justice.
6

7 47. The harm suffered by Plaintiff from these corrupt judicial acts was accompanied by the
8 harm inflicted upon major national interest, which included monumental harm inflicted upon the
9 people of the United States. This harm is described in Plaintiff's third editions of *Unfriendly*
10 *Skies* and *Defrauding America* and the first edition of *Drugging America*.²⁴ The September 11,
11 2001, terrorist acts resulting in 3,000 deaths were only the latest in a long series of tragedies
12 made possible by the criminal and subversive activities that Plaintiff and his group of govern-
13 ment agents sought to report, which were repeatedly the subject of criminal obstruction of justice
14 by the named defendants and others not named.
15
16

17 **Extension Of Sham Frivolous and Vexatious Litigant Label To Disguise**
18 **Obstruction Of Justice and Total Denial Of Due Process By Defendants**

19 48. Exercise of federal remedies that were specific for the federal causes of actions stated in
20 this complaint was repeatedly mislabeled as "frivolous," fraudulently reversing the legal and
21 common sense criteria for that term. The *one-time violation of any one* of the repeated violations
22 of any of the dozens of state and federal laws and constitutional protections provided the legal
23 and constitutional due process right to invoke a federal court forum and obtain relief.. These two
24 sham labels were used to block the reporting of tragedy-related criminal and subversive activities
25 and to deprive Plaintiff the protections in state and federal laws against the bizarre scheme to
26 strip him of the \$10 million in assets used to fund the exposure of major crimes against the
27
28

24 Later editions that reflect the September 11, 2001, events are available in E-book format.

1 United States.

2 49. Since Plaintiff has periodically resided in Reno, Nevada, which he considers to be his
3 domicile state, and where some of the harm and violations of federally protected rights had oc-
4 curred, Plaintiff filed a federal lawsuit in the U.S. district court at Reno, Nevada. The facts stated
5 in that complaint stated multiple federal causes of actions for which federal judges must provide
6 a federal court forum and relief. The jurisdiction seeking relief arose under (a) the Civil Rights
7 Act (for the multitude of state and federal violations occurring under color of state law); (b)
8 *Bivens* (for the repeated violations of multitude of state and federal substantive and procedural
9 due process laws and constitutional rights); (c) civil RICO (for the predicate acts involving a
10 conspiracy that affected interstate travel—which would include the effects upon the events of
11 September 11, 2001); (d) Supreme Court’s void order doctrine to declare as void the orders per-
12 manently terminating Plaintiff’s civil and constitutional rights; (e) void order doctrine to declare
13 the orders seizing Plaintiff’s life assets as void; (f) Declaratory Judgment Act to declare the legal
14 and property rights and legal relations in five judgments that were violated by both California
15 and federal judges and which continue in controversy to this date; (g) the Fifth Amendment right
16 to due process and equal protection of the law; and (h) to report to a federal court the criminal
17 and subversive acts that Plaintiff and several dozen other former government agents had discov-
18 ered.
19
20
21
22

23 **Repeat Of 20 Years Of Judicial Obstruction Of Justice Combined With Massive**
24 **Violations of Legal and Constitutional Substantive and Procedural Due Process**

25 50. Before Plaintiff could obtain any discovery from the defendants, district court judge Ed-
26 ward C. Reed, Jr. unlawfully and unconstitutionally dismissed every defendant and every federal
27 cause of action. He continued the judicial practice of misstating the facts and the law and to pro-
28 tect each party involved in massive violations of federally protected rights. He retaliated against

1 Plaintiff for exercising due process rights under the Civil Rights Act violations by ordering him
2 to pay thousands of dollars to the defendant California judges who violated dozens of state and
3 federal laws. He also refused to receive the evidence of the criminal activities, continuing the 20
4 years of judicial obstruction of justice.
5

6 51. The dismissals violated numerous legal and constitutional due process rights including
7 (a) the bar against dismissal when facts are stated showing a federal cause of action for which
8 relief is available; (b) violated the due process right to a jury trial on factual matters; (c) violated
9 the right to discovery;(d) refused to address the Declaratory Judgment Act causes of actions that
10 were independent of the defendants; (e) refused to address the void order causes of actions that
11 were also independent of the defendants; and (c) continued the judicial practice of blocking the
12 reports of criminal and subversive activities.
13

14 **Continuing Complicity By Ninth Circuit Appellate Judges**

15 52. For each of the final orders that were rendered, including the final dismissal, Plaintiff
16 filed timely notices of appeal and paid the filing fee. In clear violation of legal and constitutional
17 due process, Ninth Circuit appellate judges refused to provide appellate due processThe first no-
18 tice of appeal was denied recognition on the basis of a 1994 court of appeal order that perma-
19 nently barred Plaintiff from filing any papers in the Ninth Circuit appellate courts. All but the last
20 notice of appeal of final orders were refused recognition on the sham excuse that they were not
21 final orders for that particular defendant or federal cause of action. The final notice of appeal ad-
22 dressing the dismissal of the entire lawsuit was refused recognition by appellate court notice
23 dated April 12, 2002, on the holding that Ninth Circuit appellate court orders had permanently
24 barred Plaintiff from filing any notices of appeal or appeal briefs in the Ninth Circuit appellate
25 court.
26
27
28

1 **Extension Of Total Due Process Denial and Obstruction Of Justice**
2 **To Ninth Circuit Appellate Court Judges**

3 53. In 1994, as the number of due process violations against Plaintiff escalated in Ninth Cir-
4 cuit courts, combined with Plaintiff's attempts to report the increasing numbers of criminal ac-
5 tivities in key government positions, which generated additional legal rights to seek relief in the
6 appellate courts, Ninth Circuit appellate judges issued orders putting in writing what they had
7 previously done de facto. The injunctive orders permanently terminated Plaintiff's legal rights,
8 legal protections, and legal defenses in Ninth Circuit courts by refusing to recognize any of his
9 appeal briefs that were timely filed and for which filing fees were paid.

11 54. The latest such order was issued by Ninth Circuit appellate judges²⁵ on April 12, 2002. It
12 again refused to allow Plaintiff to file any appeal brief for any of the eight notices of appeals that
13 were filed, even though nearly \$1000 in filing fees had been paid. The appellate court closed the
14 case, terminating all of Plaintiff's federal causes of actions, and simultaneously blocking him
15 from reporting the criminal activities that were blocked by district and appellate judges and leav-
16 ing Plaintiff in a legal state where matters affecting his legal rights and legal relations were in a
17 state of controversy, for which federal remedies existed.

19 The Ninth Circuit court of appeal order read:

21 No. 94-80208 D.C. No. CV-00-151-ECR Nevada (Reno
22 Before: BROWNING, KLEINFELD and GOULD, Circuit Judges
23 This court has reviewed the notice of appeal and accompanying documents filed March 1,
24 2002 in the above-referenced district court docket. Because the appeal lacks merit, it shall not
25 be permitted to proceed. No motions for reconsideration, rehearing, clarification, stay of the
26 mandate, or any other submissions shall be filed or entertained in this closed docket.

27 55. Major errors of facts and law were stated in that order, and failed to address the many
28 violations of law barring dismissal. Plaintiff's notice of appeal did not, of course, provide factual

25 Ninth Circuit appellate judges James R. Browning, Andrew J. Kleinfeld, and Ronald M. Gould.

1 and legal information upon which an appeal could be decided, and the appellate judges did not
2 have Plaintiff's Complaint, exhibit,²⁶ and other filings entered into the district court that were
3 needed for due process appellate review. There was no way that the appellate court could deter-
4 mine the merits of the appeal. The appellate judges did have, however, sufficient information to
5 know that massive violations of federally protected rights had occurred, including the judicial
6 acts blocking the reports of criminal activities, in which the appellate judges were directly impli-
7 cated. By their actions, they also blocked the reporting of the criminal activities, and the criminal
8 cover-ups perpetrated by a line of federal judges.
9

10
11 56. Ninth Circuit appellate judges fraudulently placed a "lacks merit" label on massive viola-
12 tions of federally protected rights as they combined their obstruction of justice with massive vio-
13 lations of procedural due process. Their "lacks merit" mislabeling of the basis for the appeal con-
14 sidered the following as lacking merit:

15 A. Obstruction of justice. Plaintiff's attempts to report criminal and subversive activities
16 to a federal court, even after learning of the relationship between 3,000 deaths on Sep-
17 tember 11, 2001, with the byproduct of corruption within the FAA that Plaintiff had
18 documented as part of his official duties.
19

20 B. Civil Rights Act. The massive misconduct by defendant California judges who for
21 five years inflicted great and irreparable harm upon Plaintiff while repeatedly acting
22 without personal jurisdiction and violating dozens of California statutes and rules of court
23 and violating landmark U.S. Supreme Court decisions, federal statutes, and constitutional
24 provisions. The Civil Rights Act expects federal judges to act on these violations rather
25 than aiding and abetting their violations and the violators. The violations included law-
26
27

28

²⁶ An exhibit was included with the filing of the Complaint, Plaintiff's third edition of Defrauding America, which provided considerable details and documentation concerning the criminal and subversive activities.

1 yers and law firms who also acted under color of state law, raising multiple federal causes
2 of actions under the Civil Rights Act.

3 C. Void order doctrine. Orders corruptly taking and liquidating Plaintiff's \$10 million in
4 assets, his home, his sole source of income, which shockingly violated numerous due
5 process protections and which, under the Supreme Court's void order doctrine, are void
6 orders.
7

8 D. Void order doctrine. Orders permanently terminating Plaintiff's legal rights, legal pro-
9 tectations, and legal defenses, constituting void orders, which, in addition, violated every
10 legal requirement for an injunction.
11

12 E. Dismissing all defendants and each federal cause of action in clear violation of fed-
13 eral law, compounded by denying Plaintiff discovery, a jury trial, findings of facts and
14 conclusions of law, and much more.
15

16 **Contents Of the Appeal Brief Draft Reveals Shocking Judicial Corruption**

17 57. The draft of that appeal brief that appellate judges blocked from being filed is on the fol-
18 lowing Internet sites: http://www.defraudingamerica.com/appeal_brief_final.doc, and with high-
19 lights at http://www.defraudingamerica.com/appeal_brief_significance.html. In addition, the
20 Amended Complaint that was filed in the U.S. district court at Reno, Nevada, can be viewed at
21 the following Internet site: http://www.defraudingamerica.com/lawsuit_reno.html.
22

23 **Ninth Circuit Judges Subverted Government Institutions, the Constitution, 24 Obstructed Justice, and Perpetrated Massive Civil and Constitutional Violations**

25 58. For 20 continuing years, Ninth Circuit district and appellate judges protected the CIA-
26 front law firm, blocked the reporting of major criminal and subversive activities that Plaintiff and
27 a group of other government agents sought to report. They combined the criminal acts with mis-
28 use of the federal courts to aid and abet criminal and subversive activities and inflict upon a for-

1 mer federal agent great personal and financial who sought to expose these Trojan horse-like sub-
2 versive activities.

3 59. The documented facts indicate that a powerful source somewhere in government is or-
4 chestrating these criminal and corrupt acts in the Ninth Circuit courts. If the evidence is correct,
5 it indicates that a secret government exists within the United States that is bringing about a Tro-
6 jan Horse destruction of the United States.
7

8 **Ninth Circuit District and Appellate Judges Acted In A Racketeering Conspiracy**

9 60. The facts revealed in Ninth Circuit judicial filings exceed the legal criteria to establish
10 Ninth Circuit federal courts as a racketeering enterprise.²⁷
11

12 61. The claim in this Complaint for financial damages arises under the *Bivens* doctrine,²⁸
13 civil RICO, and the Federal Tort Claims Act.

14 **RELIEF SOUGHT BY THIS LAWSUIT**

15 **COUNT ONE**

16 **Declaration Of Legal Rights and Legal Relations Established In the Five Judgments** 17 **(Declaratory Judgment Act and FRCivP 57)**

18 62. Plaintiff repeats and realleges all preceding paragraphs by reference, as if stated fully in
19 this Count.

20 63. As provided by the Declaratory Judgment Act, FRCivP 57 and specifically by Title 28
21 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, Plaintiff requests that this court issue an order, upon presenting facts
22 and evidence, declaring Plaintiff's legal rights and legal relations established in a final judgment
23 of January 31, 1966, that has been entered as a final judgment in the states of Oklahoma, Texas,
24 Nevada, and California. Also, to declare as void orders rendered for the same cause of action for
25 the same parties, 20 years later. These rights were violated to strip Plaintiff of the \$10 million in
26
27

28 ²⁷ A court system as a racketeering enterprise was defined in *United States v. Stratton*, 649 F.2d 1066 (1981).
²⁸ *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971).

1 assets that funded his attempts to expose and halt the major criminal violations against the
2 United States.

3 64. That all legal filings against such properties that sought support in the orders of the Cali-
4 fornia courts that violated the rights established in the January 31, 1966, judgment be declared
5 null and void, including loans or liens of any type, and that the properties be returned to Plaintiff
6 in the condition that existed when they were corruptly seized.
7

8 65. That the matters arising under the Declaratory Judgment Act be given priority on the
9 court calendar as required by FRCivP 57.
10

11 **COUNT TWO**
12 **Declare As Void Orders Permanently Terminating**
13 **Plaintiff's Legal Rights, Legal Protections and Legal Defenses**
14 **(Void-Order Doctrine and Declaratory Judgment Act)**

15 66. Plaintiff repeats and realleges all preceding paragraphs by reference, as if stated fully in
16 this Count.

17 67. Declare as void the orders issued by Ninth Circuit district and appellate judges that per-
18 manently terminated Plaintiff's legal rights, legal protections, and legal defenses guaranteed by
19 the laws and Constitution of the United States. The authority for this order arises under the De-
20 claratory Judgment Act and the U.S. Supreme Court's void order doctrine. The gravity of these
21 federally protected rights that have been violated dictates priority on the court's calendar. Plain-
22 tiff is 79 years of age and has a limited time remaining to recognize long-overdue relief.
23

24 **COUNT THREE**
25 **Declare the Void Status Of Orders Seizing Plaintiff's Assets In Chapter 11 Courts,**
26 **(Void-Order Doctrine and Declaratory Judgment Act)**

27 68. Plaintiff repeats and realleges all preceding paragraphs by reference, as if stated fully in
28 this Count.

69. Declare as void the orders issued by Chapter 11 judges that seized and liquidated Plain-

1 tiff's \$10 million life assets on the basis that these were void orders and under Supreme Court
2 void order doctrine they are forever void and the issue can be raised in any court at any time.
3 These orders were signed in chambers after the court signed orders refusing to accept jurisdic-
4 tion. Additional due process violations arose by violating the legal and constitutional due process
5 requirement of a hearing, notice of hearing, legally required cause, and absence of personal ju-
6 risdiction arising from prior orders refusing to accept jurisdiction. Further due process violations
7 arose from orders barring Plaintiff from filing objections to the seizure and liquidation of Plain-
8 tiff's assets and the unfiled orders that were submitted, compounded by charging Plaintiff
9 with criminal contempt of court for exercising this legal and constitutional due process right.
10
11

12 70. Issue an order holding that the orders subsequently rendered that sought jurisdiction on
13 the basis of those void orders also be declared void, and provide financial compensation to Plain-
14 tiff for these losses.
15

16 **COUNT FOUR**
17 **Violations Of Legal and Constitutional Due Process**
18 **(*BIVENS* Doctrine)**

19 71. Plaintiff repeats and realleges all preceding paragraphs by reference, as if stated fully in
20 this count.

21 72. Defendants Browning, Kleinfeld, and Gould, along with other employees of the United
22 States government, inflicted, and aided and abetted the infliction by others, of great harm upon
23 Plaintiff through violations of state and federal substantive and procedural due process law, while
24 they acted under color of federal law. Their conduct was of such grave nature, and of such grave
25 consequences, that they were obviously outside the parameters of self-serving judicial immunity
26 case law. The gravity of the defendants misconduct, the pattern of criminal obstruction of justice,
27 the fraudulent misuse of the courts to block the reporting of criminal and subversive conduct, is
28

1 conduct far outside the limits of self-serving judicial immunity case law.

2 **COUNT FIVE**
3 **Multiple Predicate Acts Against Plaintiff By All Defendants**
4 **(Civil RICO--18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1965)**

5 73. Plaintiff repeats and realleges all preceding paragraphs by reference, as if stated fully in
6 this count.

7 74. Defendant judges of the California and federal courts engaged in a racketeering enter-
8 prise, perpetrating massive civil and constitutional violations in a conspiracy to block the report-
9 ing of criminal and subversive activities. This conspiracy commenced in 1982 and continues to
10 this date. This conspiracy and multiple predicate acts inflicted great and irreparable harm upon
11 Plaintiff, upon the United States and its institutions, and causing the inflicting of great harm, in-
12 cluding death, upon the people of the United States.

13 75. The acts of the defendants continue to conduct and participate in, directly and indirectly,
14 the affairs of a continuing criminal enterprise, which affects interstate commerce under 18 U.S.C.
15 § 1961, through a pattern of racketeering activities as alleged and described within this Com-
16 plaint, using telephone communications and the U.S. postal service.

17 76. The acts of the defendants show repeated violations of state and federal law, constituting
18 a further component of a pattern of racketeering activity within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1961
19 and State Corruption Activities Act.

20 77. Each defendant named in this action is a "person" within the meaning of Title 18 U.S.C.
21 § 1961(3).

22 78. The defendants are an enterprise within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1961(4), which is en-
23 gaged in, or he activities of which affect interest and foreign commerce by virtue of the positions
24 held whereby they blocked the exposure of corrupt, criminal, and subversive activities. The acts
25
26
27
28

1 of the defendants provided a benefit to themselves.

2 79. Each defendant engaged in a pattern of racketeering activities affecting interstate and for-
3 eign commerce, as defined in the RICO statutes, Title 18 U.S.C. § 1961(1)(5), and as stated in
4 this complaint. The latest consequences of the criminal activities that Plaintiff initially discov-
5 ered in the FAA and Ninth Circuit judges blocked from being reported were the 3,000 deaths on
6 September 11, 2001, resulting from the successful hijackings of four airliners.
7

8 80. Each defendant, persons within the meaning of RICO, in violation of Title 18 U.S.C. §
9 1962(a) and §1962(b), through their predicate racketeering activities, acquired and maintained an
10 interest in the enterprise, continuing their acts in the conspiracy, and furthering the enterprise.
11

12 81. Each defendant participated directly and indirectly in the conduct of the enterprise, and
13 violated Title 18 U.S.C. § 1962(c), which provides that “it shall be unlawful for any person em-
14 ployed by or associated with any enterprise engaged in, or the activities of which affect interstate
15 or foreign commerce, to conduct or participate, directly or indirectly, in the conduct of such en-
16 terprise’s affairs through a pattern of racketeering activity”
17

18 82. The acts of the individual defendants described in this Complaint constitute repeated and
19 continuing conduct that was neither isolated nor sporadic.

20 83. The acts of the defendants involved a callous disregard for the law and constitution of
21 various states and of the United States, for the lives of those adversely affected by their pattern of
22 corrupt acts, for national security, and the lives that were lost or destroyed, that was made possi-
23 ble by their misconduct.
24

25 84. Each defendant, by their words and their actions, showed that they had agreed to partici-
26 pate, directly or indirectly, in the affairs of the enterprise through the perpetration of multiple
27 predicate acts.
28

1 85. Each defendant acted within the scope of the enterprise. Defendants combined to form an
2 “association-in-fact” enterprise under RICO for the common purpose of engaging in a course of
3 conduct that defrauded plaintiff, which affected interstate commerce, and defrauded the United
4 States.

5
6 86. These predicate acts adversely affecting interstate and international commerce include (a)
7 blocking the reporting of corrupt and criminal activities in the federal air safety agencies, which
8 resulted in a series of fatal airline crashes, for which Plaintiff is prepared to present evidence; (b)
9 blocking the reports of corrupt and criminal activities by government personnel that protected
10 terrorists, including those that subsequently bombed the World Trade Center in 1993, and those
11 that flew airliners into the World Trade Center and Pentagon on September 11, 2001; (c) block-
12 ing the reports of drug smuggling into the United States by people acting under cover of their
13 government positions; (d) blocking the reporting of massive Chapter 11 corruption affecting in-
14 terstate commerce; and (e) the corrupt activities detailed in plaintiff’s third editions of *Defraud-*
15 *ing America* and *Unfriendly Skies* and the first edition of *Drugging America*.

16
17
18 87. The defendants’ predicate acts inflicted great personal and financial harm upon Plaintiff,
19 and were part of a racketeering enterprise enriching the participants.

20 **COUNT SIX**
21 **Violations Of State and Federal Laws By California Judicial Defendants**
22 **(Civil Rights Act—42 U.S.C. §§ 1983-1986)**

23 88. Plaintiff repeats and realleges all preceding paragraphs by reference, as if fully stated in
24 this count.

25 89. Defendant federal judges and the California courts engaged in a 20-year uninterrupted
26 conspiracy to violated every one of the multiple legal and constitutional due process rights, sub-
27 stantive and procedural, without a single exception. They engaged in a pattern of racketeering
28

1 activities that combined total due process violations with a scheme to block the reporting of
2 crimes against the United States. Among the consequences of their acts were the conditions that
3 insured the success of the September 11, 2001, terrorist hijackers and many unpublicized harms
4 inflicted upon major national interests and upon the people of the United States. Their actions
5 adversely, and tragically, affected interstate and international commerce.
6

7 **COUNT SEVEN**
8 **Tortious Acts Against Plaintiff By Employees Of U.S. Government**
9 **(Federal Tort Claims Act--28 U.S.C. §§ 1346(b), 2671 et seq)**

10 90. Plaintiff repeats and realleges all preceding paragraphs by reference, as if stated fully in
11 this count.

12 91. Employees of the United States, consisting of federal judges and Justice Department per-
13 sonnel, as part of their scheme to block Plaintiff's reports of criminal and subversive activities,
14 while in their government positions, repeatedly and deliberately inflicted acts against Plaintiff,
15 which are tortious under the laws of the states of California and Nevada, while Plaintiff was a
16 resident of both states. These wrongful acts caused to be inflicted, and allowed to be inflicted,
17 great personal and financial harm upon Plaintiff.
18

19 92. Federal employees negligently interfered with Plaintiff's prospective economic advan-
20 tage.
21

22 93. Federal employees intentionally inflicted great emotional stress upon Plaintiff.

23 94. Federal employees destroyed the quality of Plaintiff's life.

24 95. Federal employees interfered with and destroyed Plaintiff's professional and business re-
25 lations.

26 96. Federal employees fraudulently and in violation of state and federal laws and constitu-
27 tional protections, seized Plaintiff's \$10 million in real estate, including his home and sole source
28

1 of income.

2 97. Federal employees inflicted great personal and financial harm upon Plaintiff, seeking to
3 block him from reporting criminal and subversive activities against the United States.
4

5 98. Federal employees retaliated against Plaintiff and inflicted great personal and financial
6 harm for exercising constitutional due process against massive violations of state and federal
7 laws and constitutional provisions.

8 99. Federal employees invaded Plaintiff's privacy, and aided and abetted this invasion by a
9 CIA-front law firm, for the purpose of blocking Plaintiff's exposure of federal crimes.
10

11 100. The violations of state and federal laws and constitutional provisions continued from
12 1982 to the present date.

13 101. Federal employees who had a duty to prevent these violations refused to do so. From
14 1986 to 1999, they against violated state law by taking Plaintiff's properties on the basis of void
15 California orders that violated five prior judgments previously determining Plaintiff's personal
16 and property rights.
17

18 102. The government of the United States has a vicarious liability for the harm inflicted
19 upon Plaintiff during the past 20 years, and even the harm inflicted upon Plaintiff while he was a
20 federal air safety agent, causing him to terminate his employment with the federal government;
21

22 103. California Evidence Code § 669 allows a plaintiff to prove tort liability based on a
23 defendant's violations of a substantive statute, which would apply to any of over a dozen
24 California statutes that were repeatedly violated, with the help, aid, comfort, and omission of the
25 defendant federal employees.

26 104. The circumstances of the wrongful conduct by the federal employees were such that
27 if perpetrated by a private person, financial liability would be imposed under the law of the state
28

1 of California and Nevada.

2 105. All federal employees referred to in this Complaint were acting within the scope of
3 their employment with the U.S. government as they committed the wrongful acts against Plain-
4 tiff.
5

6 106. More than six months before this action was instituted, the claim set forth herein was
7 presented to the Department of Justice and the Federal Courts on March 20, 2000. Neither
8 agency acted on the claim, and Plaintiff deems that such failure is a denial. Further, Plaintiff was
9 unlawfully and unconstitutionally barred from filing any action by Ninth Circuit judges, causing
10 a justified delay in filing.
11

12 107. The district courts shall have exclusive jurisdiction of civil actions on claims against
13 the United States, for money damages ... for injury or loss of property, or personal injury
14 ...caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission ... if a private person would be liable to
15 the claimant in accordance with the law of the place.” 28 U.S.C. §§ 1346(b), 2674. *Brady v.*
16 *United States*, 211 F.3d 499, 502 (9th Cir.) The United States is liable in the same manner and to
17 the same extent as a private individual would be liable under like circumstances for violations of
18 state statutory or case law where the victim resides.
19

20 108. Although the normal venue for a FTCA claim is in the judicial district where Plaintiff
21 resides, the unlawful, unconstitutional, and corrupt acts occurring in the Ninth Circuit district and
22 appellate courts have prevented Plaintiff from filing such action.
23

24 109. Caused and unlawfully, unconstitutionally, and corruptly, took Plaintiff’s property,
25 whose value was \$10 million in 1986 and estimated to be in excess of \$15 as of the filing of this
26 lawsuit.
27
28

1 **Financial Damages Demanded By Plaintiff**

2 110. As to Count One, a declaration of legal rights and legal relations established in five
3 judgments entered into five different states establishing the date of these rights as of January 31,
4 1966.

5
6 111. As to Count Two, a declaration reinstating Plaintiff's civil rights, his legal rights, le-
7 gal protections, and legal defenses that have been taken by corrupt Ninth Circuit judges.

8 112. As to Count Three, a declaration showing the void nature of orders seizing and
9 liquidating Plaintiff's \$10 million life assets and related orders returning to Plaintiff these assets.

10 113. As to Count Four, Bivens, against defendants Browning, Kleinfeld, and Gould, Plain-
11 tiff seeks the sum of \$20 million in damages.

12 114. As to Count Five, Civil RICO, against defendants Browning, Kleinfeld and Gould,
13 Plaintiff seeks the sum of \$20 million in damages.

14 115. As to Count Six, against defendant California judges, Plaintiff seeks the sum of \$10
15 million in damages.

16 116. As to Count Seven, FTCA, Plaintiff seeks damages based upon the 1986 taking of his
17 \$10 million in real estate assets, plus the added value of these assets as of today, \$ 5 million; plus
18 the loss of income from the real estate investments, \$10 million; and \$10 million compensation
19 for the years of personal grief inflicted upon Plaintiff.

20 117. Plaintiff demands a jury trial on all claims for which a jury trial is a right.

21 118. Plaintiff requests that other defendants be added to this complaint before trial.

22 119. Plaintiff requests that priority be given on the court calendar for the causes of actions
23 arising under the Declaratory Judgment Act and void judgment doctrine. Plaintiff will file a mo-
24 tion with the facts, the law, and related documents to support these federal causes of actions.
25
26
27
28

