

1 federal air safety agent, and his group of other government agents, had discovered, and provides
2 meaningful attention to the peripheral issues raised in this filing.

3 2. Plaintiff's repeated attempts to report these criminal activities were followed by repeated
4 cover-ups by judges in the Ninth Circuit courts, who have become complicit in the events of Sep-
5 tember 11, 2001.
6

7 **Jurisdiction and Mandatory Responsibilities Of This Court**

8 3. Jurisdiction for these federal causes of actions arises under:

9 A. Federal crime reporting statute (18 U.S.C. § 4), which requires anyone who knows of
10 a federal crime to report it to a federal judge or other federal officer.
11

12 B. Title 28 U.S.C. § 1361 (right of any citizen to obtain a court order for a federal offi-
13 cial to perform a legal duty and to halt unlawful conduct.

14 C. Declaratory Judgment Act, FRCivP 57, U.S. Supreme Court's void judgment doc-
15 trine,² and related law, to address the (a) permanent taking of Plaintiff's civil and consti-
16 tutional rights and defenses, (b) the illegal, unconstitutional, and corrupt judicial taking of
17 Plaintiff's \$10 million life assets that funded his exposure of criminal activities, and (c)
18 the illegal and unconstitutional taking of Plaintiff's legal rights and legal responsibilities
19 that had been adjudicated and established in five judgments.
20

21 D. Federal Tort Claims Act, Title 28 U.S.C. §§ 2671-80, for financial damages caused by
22 the pattern of massive civil and constitutional violations and torts associated with efforts
23 to block Plaintiff's exposure of criminal and subversive activities implicating people
24

25
26 2 An illegal order is forever void. An order that exceeds the jurisdiction of the court, is void, or voidable, and can be
27 attacked in any proceeding in any court where the validity of the judgment comes into issue. (See *Rose v. Himely*
28 (1808) 4 Cranch 241, 2 L ed 608; *Pennoyer v. Neff* (1877) 95 US 714, 24 L ed 565; *Thompson v. Whitman* (1873) 18
Wall 457, 21 L 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.

1 holding key positions in government.

2 E. Due process rights guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution, Title 28
3 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343, and related law.

4 **Venue**

5
6 4. Venue is proper on the basis that (a) the federal government can be sued in any district
7 court, including the Southern District Of New York, and (b) that all of these matters stated in this
8 court filing have links to the 2800 deaths occurring in New York City on September 11, 2001,
9 and prior tragedies occurring in that city. Further, Plaintiff has been unlawfully and unconstitu-
10 tionally barred from filing any papers in Ninth Circuit courts, preventing the exercise of due
11 process where Plaintiff resides or the reporting of these criminal and subversive activities to a
12 federal courts as required by the federal crime reporting statute.

13 **Statute Of Limitations**

14
15 5. There is no statute of limitations for (a) reporting federal crimes under the federal crime
16 reporting statute, especially when the crimes are ongoing; (b) Obtaining a court order requiring
17 certain federal officials to perform their legal duties and to halt unlawful conduct that would have
18 prevented the events of September 11, 2001; and (c) declaring Plaintiff's previously adjudicated
19 legal rights and obligations that had been subsequently violated as part of a scheme to halt his
20 exposure of criminal activities in certain government offices.

21 **Plaintiff**

22
23 6. Plaintiff is a resident of Nevada and California and considers Nevada his domicile.³
24
25

26
27 ³ Plaintiff's competency to make these determinations is based upon the following: (a) he was a highly trained fed-
28 eral air safety agent who was given the assignment to correct the conditions that were causing the worse series of
airline crashes in the nation's history; (b) he acted as an independent prosecutor to further documented his charges
that a pattern of deep-seated corruption within the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) played key roles in a series
of continuing airline crashes, and which were the primary causes for the success of the September 11, 2001,
terrorist hijackers; (c) he held more aircraft and aviation ratings than most other federal air safety agents; (d) he was

1 **Defendant**

2 7. The defendant for the FTCA cause of action is the United States government, based upon
3 the series of tortious acts by employees of the federal government who misused their government
4 positions to block Plaintiff’s reporting of federal crimes and to inflict great personal and financial
5 harm upon a former federal agent and witness.
6

7 **Preliminary Statement**

8 8. As a federal air safety agent, Plaintiff was asked by the U.S. government to accept the as-
9 signment to correct the conditions resulting in the worst series of fatal airline crashes in the na-
10 tion’s history. One of these crashes⁴ was the world’s worst at that time, and occurred in New
11 York City, approximately one mile from where two airliners would be crashed into the World
12 Trade Center on September 11, 2001. Each of these air disasters was made possible by the same
13 deep-seated misconduct⁵ that Plaintiff and other federal air safety agents had discovered.
14

15 9. When FAA officials refused to halt the corrupt activities that played major roles in sev-
16 eral air disasters in Plaintiff’s area of federal air safety responsibilities, Plaintiff exercised federal
17 remedies existing at that time that permitted him to act as an independent prosecutor. Plaintiff
18 conducted four months of hearings resulting in 4,000 pages of testimony and exhibits. The testi-
19 mony of FAA officials and additional government documents further proved the existence of cor-
20 rupt activities within the FAA that caused or allowed to occur a series of fatal airline crashes, in-
21

22
23 an airline captain in domestic and international operations for over 13 years and one of the first pilots licensed by
24 Japan; (e) he was a Navy patrol plane commander during World War II; (f) he wrote four editions of *Unfriendly*
25 *Skies*, a highly detailed and documented book on corruption related to a series of fatal airline crashes; (g) he has
26 appeared as guest and expert on over 3000 radio and television shows since 1978; and (h) he has filed federal ac-
27 tions under Title 18 U.S.C. § 4 (to report these criminal activities to a federal court under the federal crime reporting
28 statute) and 28 U.S.C. § 1361 (seeking a court order forcing federal officials to perform their legal duty and halt
their unlawful conduct).

4 United Airlines DC-8 crash into New York City on December 16, 1960.

5 The internal FAA corruption prevented the federal government from performing its air safety responsibilities and actually misused FAA offices to protect unlawful and unsafe practices. The misconduct included threats to inspec-
tors not to report unsafe, illegal, or criminal activities; not to make reports of these matters; the destruction of offi-
cial reports of unsafe, illegal, and criminal conduct; retaliating against inspectors who attempt to carry out their fed-
eral air safety responsibilities.

1 cluding the world's worst air disaster occurring in New York City in 1960. That hearing was fol-
2 lowed by multiple cover-ups, causing the conditions to continue, and on September 11, 2001, the
3 number of resulting victims greatly increased.

4
5 10. During the hearing which Plaintiff conducted, several additional fatal airline crashes oc-
6 curred that were due to the very same safety problems, safety violations, criminal falsification of
7 federal air safety records, and cover-ups.

8
9 11. With this additional evidence of the deadly consequences of the documented corruption
10 within the FAA, Plaintiff reported the criminal activities to the FBI, U.S. attorneys, Justice De-
11 partment, the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB),⁶ and members of Congress. Most
12 admitted the gravity of the matters, but refused to act. Some admitted the gravity of the matters
13 but argued that these matters were not in their immediate area of responsibility.

14
15 12. Following the hearing, Plaintiff became the target of retaliation, causing him to leave
16 government service.

17
18 **Exercising Federal Criminal Remedies**
19 **To Report the Criminal Activities To Ninth Circuit Federal Judges**

20
21 13. As the fraud-related airline tragedies continued, Plaintiff sought to force corrective ac-
22 tions. To circumvent the cover-ups and obstruction of justice he exercised the requirements of the
23 federal crime reporting statute (18 U.S.C. § 4)⁷ that required anyone who knew of a federal crime
24 to promptly report it to a federal judge (or other federal officer). Since members of Congress and
25 Justice Department personnel refused to receive the reports, Plaintiff exercised the clearly
26 worded requirement in that statute to circumvent the obstruction of justice, and filed several fed-

27
28

⁶ Including the NTSB predecessor, the Civil Aeronautic Board Bureau of Air Safety.

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

1 eral actions against the FAA and NTSB in Ninth Circuit⁸ courts. The legal *requirement* to report
2 the federal crimes to a federal court were further augmented by the *right* of any citizen to seek a
3 court order forcing federal officials to perform their legal duties and to halt their unlawful con-
4 duct. (Title 28 U.S.C. § 1361⁹)

5
6 14. Ninth Circuit district and appellate judges initially acknowledged on the record that
7 Plaintiff's charges were very serious. But they refused to receive Plaintiff's evidence on the hold-
8 ing that these were matters for Congress to address and not the federal courts. The clear wording
9 of the statutes contradicted those statements. On motion of Justice Department lawyers, the at-
10 tempts to report the criminal activities were refused and Plaintiff's filings were dismissed. Again,
11 the federal crimes continued, accompanied by a long series of airline crashes caused by known
12 unsafe and illegal conditions that required FAA and NTSB actions that were never taken.

13
14 15. During one lawsuit seeking to force the NTSB to receive major evidence relating to the
15 crash of a PSA airliner into San Diego, which Plaintiff had discovered as part of his investiga-
16 tions, assistant U.S. attorney George Stoll, San Francisco, telephoned to Plaintiff and advised that
17 he was recommending to his superiors in Washington that the Justice Department support Plain-
18 tiff's cause of action. Unknown to Stoll, Justice Department personnel had repeatedly covered up
19 for the criminal activities that Plaintiff sought to report and were not required to expand on the
20
21

22
23 8 *Stich v. United States, et al.*, 554 F.2d 1070 (9th Cir.) (table), *cert. denied*, 434 U.S. 920 (1977)(addressed hard-
24 core air safety misconduct, violations of federal air safety laws, threats against government inspectors not to report
25 safety violations and misconduct); *Stich v. National Transportation Safety Board*, 685 F.2d 446 (9th Cir.)(table), *cert.*
26 *denied*, 459 U.S. 861 (1982))(addressed repeated criminal falsification of official airline accident reports, omitting
27 highly sensitive air safety misconduct, making possible repeated crashes from the same sequestered problems);
28 Amicus curiae brief filed on July 17, 1975, in the Paris DC-10 multi-district litigation, *Flanagan v. McDonnell*
Douglas Corporation and United States of America, Civil Action 74-808-PH, MDL 172, Central District Califor-
nia.)(addressing the long standing FAA misconduct, of which the cover-up of the DC-10 cargo door problem was
one of repeated instances of tragedy related misconduct); U.S. v. Department of Justice, District of Columbia, Nos.
86-2523, 87-2214, and other actions filed by Stich seeking to expose and correct the powerful and covert air disaster
misconduct.

9 Title 28 U.S.C. § 1361. Action to compel an officer of the United States to perform his duty. The district courts shall
have original jurisdiction of any action in the nature of mandamus to compel an officer or employee of the United States
or any agency thereof to perform a duty owed to the plaintiff.

1 cover-up and obstruction of justice. Justice Department lawyers then filed a motion to block
2 Plaintiff from obtaining an order to force the NTSB to admit the evidence that was the primary
3 reason why the cause conditions occurred. The lawsuit was then dismissed. This was followed by
4 the NTSB politically appointed board members falsifying the accident report, as it had done sev-
5 eral times for crashes occurring in Plaintiff's area of immediate government air safety responsi-
6 bility. That San Diego crash was the world's worst air disaster at that time, taking the record from
7 the crash of the United Airlines DC-8 into New York City (the occurrence of which precipitated
8 the government's request for Plaintiff to accept the assignment to correct the conditions resulting
9 in the series of airline crashes).

12 **Circumventing the Endemic Cover-Ups and Obstruction Of Justice**

13 16. Seeking to circumvent the obstruction of justice¹⁰ and halt the high death rate in prevent-
14 able air disasters, Plaintiff used his considerable assets¹¹ to fund activities¹² intended to inform
15 the public of these matters, seeking to obtain sufficient public support to force government offi-
16 cials in the three branches of government to perform their duties.

17
18 17. As Plaintiff's activities became more widely known, other former and present govern-
19 ment agents¹³ provided him with information and documentation on federal offenses¹⁴ in other
20 areas which were inflicting great harm upon the United States.

23 10 The obstruction of justice became endemic, including every level of the FAA, the political NTSB board mem-
24 bers, Department of Justice personnel, members of Congress, federal judges, and others.

25 11 After being forced to leave his air safety position with the FAA, plaintiff developed his real estate business which
26 amounted to \$10 million in value in 1987.

27 12 The activities included filing federal papers seeking to report the criminal and subversive activities; publishing
28 books, the first being *Unfriendly Skies*, appearing as guest and expert on over 3,000 radio and television shows since
1978, and giving lectures. Other books included several editions of *Defrauding America*, *Drugging America*, and
Terrorism Against America.

13 Other government agents furnishing Plaintiff with information and evidence on criminal and subversive activities
of government officials and other government employees included agents of the FBI, DEA, Customs, Secret Ser-
vice, CIA, among others.

14 Drug smuggling into United States by people acting under cover of government offices and operations, known to
government officials, and covered up by additional government checks and balances; massive corruption in Ninth
Circuit bankruptcy courts; other criminal activities discovered by federal agents.

1 18. Plaintiff initially sought to report these additional areas of criminal activities to members
2 of Congress and to Justice Department personnel. He encountered the same cover-ups that he
3 encountered while trying to report the criminal activities associated with aviation tragedies. With
4 every cover-up these government officials became more deeply implicated, creating a strong
5 need to prevent the public from learning of these matters.
6

7 **Ninth Circuit Judges Expanding On Earlier Obstruction Of Justice**

8 19. As Plaintiff discovered information and evidence of these other areas of criminal activi-
9 ties Plaintiff sought to report them to Ninth Circuit district and appellate judges, commencing in
10 1986. Instead of receiving the reports and evidence, every federal judge blocked Plaintiff and his
11 group of other government agents from reporting the federal offenses by promptly dismissing
12 Plaintiff's filings, often sua sponte, without a hearing.
13

14 20. In addition, Ninth Circuit district and appellate judges rendered numerous unlawful and
15 unconstitutional orders permanently barring Plaintiff from access to the federal courts.¹⁵ In this
16 way, Plaintiff and his group of other government agents were blocked from reporting the crimi-
17 nal and even subversive activities. Plaintiff was simultaneously stripped of the legal and constitu-
18 tional defenses that would be needed to defend against the misuse of legal process intended to
19 silence him, attacks that continue to this day, despite the fallout of such tactics on the events of
20 September 11, 2001.
21
22

23 **Compounding Judicial Obstruction Of Justice With Felony Retaliation**

24 21. Despite the unlawful and unconstitutional orders barring Plaintiff from access to the fed-
25 eral courts, as Plaintiff discovered evidence of other criminal activities affecting major national
26 interests, including national security, Plaintiff exercised his duty to report these matters to a fed-
27

28 ¹⁵ The standard tactic used was to reverse the legal definition of frivolous and call Plaintiff's filings frivolous. By extrapolation, the attempts to prevent the deaths of 3,000 people on September 11, 2001, would be called frivolous by Ninth Circuit judges!

1 eral court under the federal crime reporting statute.

2 22. Ninth Circuit judges, who had repeatedly blocked Plaintiff and his group from reporting
3 these matters, compounded their obstruction of justice by retaliating against Plaintiff. These acts,
4 which continues to this day, included for example:
5

6 A. Charging Plaintiff with criminal contempt of court after Plaintiff filed federal ac-
7 tions seeking to report the criminal and subversive activities that he and his group had
8 discovered. From 1986 to 1995, Plaintiff was either under house arrest or incarcerated for
9 attempting to report these federal crimes. Justice Department prosecutors and federal
10 judges sought to justify these charges on the unlawful, unconstitutional orders perma-
11 nently barring Plaintiff from federal court—which knowingly violated the federal crime
12 reporting statute and obviously intended to block the reporting of these criminal activi-
13 ties.
14

15 B. Federal judges, acting with the CIA-front law firm of Friedman, Sloan and Ross
16 in San Francisco, seized and eventually liquidated Plaintiff's \$10 million in real estate as-
17 sets, which had funded Plaintiff's exposure activities. Their loss converted Plaintiff from
18 a multi-millionaire to a state of poverty and could be expected to halt Plaintiff's exposure
19 activities. The seizure and liquidation of Plaintiff's assets violated the legal and constitu-
20 tional due process rights of a hearing, notice of hearing, and legally recognized cause. Af-
21 ter seizing Plaintiff's assets, federal judges issued orders barring Plaintiff from filing ob-
22 jections, constituting further violations of due process. When Plaintiff did file objections,
23 they were unlawfully and unconstitutionally unfiled, and Plaintiff was again charged with
24 criminal contempt of court (on the basis that the prior orders terminated his right to file
25 any papers in federal courts). Eventually, the assets that funded Plaintiff's exposure of the
26
27
28

1 criminal and subversive activities—including those that aided and abetted the 19 terrorist
2 hijackers on September 11, 2001, were liquidated.

3 C. Terminated for the remainder of Plaintiff’s life the legal rights, legal protections,
4 and legal defenses guaranteed by the laws and Constitution of the United States. The pur-
5 poses of these judicial acts were (a) to block the reporting of criminal and subversive ac-
6 tivities, and (b) to terminate for Plaintiff each of the many defenses guaranteed by the
7 laws and Constitution of the United States against the continuing misuse of legal proc-
8 ess¹⁶ to halt Plaintiff’s exposure activities.

9 **Consequences Of the Criminal and Subversive Activities and Felony Cover-Ups**

10
11
12 23. The criminal activities that Plaintiff sought to report, which Ninth Circuit federal judges
13 blocked, made possible great harm upon major national interests, upon national security, and
14 matters relating to the aviation environment, most of which are not recognized by the public.

15 These included for instance:

16
17 A. The hijacking of four airliners by 19 terrorist hijackers on September 11, 2001.
18 Their success was due to the refusal of FAA officials to act on the simple and inexpensive
19 preventative measures that Plaintiff and other federal air safety inspectors had reported,
20 which was one of the many consequences of the corruption within the FAA. The refusal
21 to act was a direct result of this corruption that Plaintiff documented.

22
23 B. Forty years of prior fatal hijackings, any one of which could have been prevented
24 if the misconduct within the FAA and NTSB had been acted upon rather than covered up.

25
26
27
28

16 The schemes used to silence Plaintiff have continued without interruption, and include: (a) retaliation against Plaintiff to prevent him from carrying out the government’s air safety responsibilities while Plaintiff was a federal air safety agent; (b) retaliation against Plaintiff to halt his exposure activities by the misuse of the courts by the CIA-front law firm of Friedman, Sloan and Ross (San Francisco), seeking to destroy the assets that funded Plaintiff’s exposure activities, which required violating dozens of state and federal laws and constitutional protections; (c) termination for Plaintiff of all substantive due process defenses against that law firm and those that have since become a part of the continuing attacks upon a former federal agent and witness.

1 Plaintiff and other federal air safety inspectors had reported the simple and inexpensive
2 preventative measures that would have prevented hijackers from taking control of the air-
3 craft. This fact is being covered up by the same federal personnel holding cover-up re-
4 sponsibilities by blaming the success of the 19 hijackers on intelligence failures, which
5 are far inferior to the primary blame.
6

7 C. Over 50 years of airline crashes caused or made possible by unsafe or illegal con-
8 ditions that federal air safety inspectors had discovered and reported, for which no actions
9 were taken because of a corrupt culture aided and abetted by others who covered up for
10 the offenses.
11

12 D. Expansion of FAA corruption into other government entities as efforts were made
13 to cover up for the corruption within the FAA.

14 **Harm To National Interests In Other Areas**

15 E. Harm to national security and the lives of many people arising from the decades
16 of drug smuggling into the United States by people acting in government positions and in
17 covert government operations, including the criminal cover-ups of these crimes.
18

19 F. Harm arising from the endemic corruption in the Ninth Circuit bankruptcy courts,
20 which combined criminal activities with massive violations of legal and constitutional
21 due process to defraud the United States and impoverish millions of people who exercise
22 the statutory protections of Chapter 11.
23

24 G. Conversion of Ninth Circuit courts into criminal and racketeering enterprises,
25 showing a willingness of federal judges to subvert civil rights, human rights, the protec-
26 tions of the laws and the Constitution of the United States, as part of their obstruction of
27 justice activities.
28

1 **Additional Efforts To Block Exposure Of Major Federal Crimes**

2 24. In addition to totally blocking the reporting of these criminal activities that had esca-
3 lated beyond the original aviation environment, other measures misusing the courts were taken to
4 block Plaintiff's exposure activities. These measures required the participation of the same
5 Justice Department and Ninth Circuit federal judges to succeed. These measures constituted
6 major federal offenses, major federal causes of actions for which federal remedies existed. The
7 orders barring Plaintiff from federal courts, that terminated all federal due process defenses,
8 insured the success of these legal actions that were part of the overall obstruction of justice. This
9 court filing addresses several of these federal causes of actions (but not all).
10
11

12 **Federal Remedies Intertwined With Reporting Federal Crimes**

13 25. The federal remedies for the wrongful acts stated in this legal filing primarily arises under
14 the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA), the Declaratory Judgment Act, and the U.S. Supreme
15 Court's void judgment doctrine, including the following:
16

17 A. Return to Plaintiff of his civil and constitutional rights corruptly taken by Ninth
18 Circuit judges as part of their efforts to block the reporting of the criminal activities and
19 to bar Plaintiff from defending against the misuse of legal process that is part of the ob-
20 struction of justice. This federal due process relief arises under the Declaratory Judgment
21 Act and the Supreme Court's void judgment doctrine, and related laws and constitutional
22 protections. These rights were judicially voided through the series of injunctive orders
23 barring Plaintiff from access to the federal courts, which equate with a permanent taking
24 of every legal and constitutional right, protection and defense. Plaintiff, to halt his expo-
25 sure of major crimes against the United States, has been judicially stripped of rights and
26 protections granted to murderers, terrorists, and other criminals, solely to block him from
27
28

1 reporting crimes against the United States.

2 B. Return to Plaintiff the \$10 million in real estate assets that were corruptly taken
3 from Plaintiff through major violations of legal and constitutional due process. Under the
4 Supreme Court's void order doctrine, these orders and orders relying upon them are per-
5 manently void, and the issue can be raised at any time in any court to remedy the taking.
6

7 C. Enter an order declaring Plaintiff's legal rights and legal obligations as previously
8 adjudicated and established in five judgments. The scheme initiated by a CIA-front law
9 firm and aided and abetted by federal judges required taking of personal and property
10 rights established in those judgments. This taking required violating dozens of state and
11 federal laws and constitutional rights and the aiding and abetting by many others in the
12 legal fraternity, including Ninth Circuit federal judges.
13

14 26. Each of these due process defenses have been corruptly denied to Plaintiff by Ninth Circuit
15 federal judges.
16

17 RELIEF SOUGHT BY THIS LAWSUIT

18 COUNT ONE

19 Report Federal Crimes To A Federal Court, 20 Including Those Related To the Aviation Disasters Of September 11, 2001 (Title 18 U.S.C. § 4)

21 27. Plaintiff repeats and realleges all preceding paragraphs by reference, as if stated fully in
22 this Court.

23 28. This court must provide a meaningful forum for Plaintiff to provide information and evi-
24 dence of federal crimes under the court's administrative duties as required by the federal crime
25 reporting statute, Title 18 U.S.C. § 4. This forum must provide for Plaintiff, and his group of
26 other former and present government agents, to report the criminal and subversive activities that
27 they discovered, some of which were primarily responsible for the success of the 19 terrorist hi-
28

1 jackers on September 11, 2001, and those that have yet to occur, made possible by the criminal
2 conditions Plaintiff has sought to report in the past.

3
4 **COUNT TWO**

5 **Declaration Showing Legal Requirement To Report**
6 **Federal Crimes To Federal Court Under the Federal Crime Reporting Statute**
7 **(Federal Crime Reporting Statute, Title 18 U.S.C. § 4)**

8 29. Declaration by this court stating the responsibility of federal judges to receive informa-
9 tion and evidence of federal crimes, as required by the clear wording of the federal crime report-
10 ing statute. This mandatory requirement has been repeatedly blocked by Ninth Circuit district
11 and appellate judges. If this block had not occurred, the corruption that aided and abetted the 19
12 terrorist hijackers on September 11, 2001, could have been corrected. This declaration of right is
13 further required to protect Plaintiff against further retaliation from Ninth Circuit judges.

14 **COUNT THREE**

15 **Court Order Requiring Federal Officials To Perform A Legal Duty**
16 **And Halt Unlawful And Criminal Conduct**
17 **(Title 28 U.S.C. § 1361)**

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

20 31. Issue orders requiring certain federal officials to perform their mandatory duties, to be
21 outlined in further filings by Plaintiff. Failure to provide this order will insure that the déjà vu
22 deaths on September 11, 2001, were simply the latest déjà vu consequences of the documented
23 history of corruption and cover-ups.

24 **COUNT FOUR**

25 **Order Reinstating Plaintiff's Civil and Constitutional Rights**
26 **(28 U.S.C. §§ 2201, 2202, FRCivP 57, Void-Order Doctrine)**

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

1 33. Declare as void the orders issued by Ninth Circuit district and appellate judges that per-
2 manently barred Plaintiff from accessing the federal courts, which terminated Plaintiff's legal
3 rights, legal protections, and legal defenses guaranteed by the laws and Constitution of the
4 United States. The specific authority for this order arises under the Declaratory Judgment Act
5 and the U.S. Supreme Court's void order doctrine.
6

7 34. The effect, and surely the intent, of the permanent injunctions were to (a) block Plaintiff
8 from reporting criminal activities that he and a group of other government agents had discovered;
9 (b) to prevent Plaintiff from exercising the federal remedies to defend against the misuse of the
10 courts to silence Plaintiff's constitutionally protected exposure activities; (c) to protected the par-
11 ticipants in the conspiracy to obstruct justice; and (d) prevent the public from discovering the
12 extent of criminal activities in key government offices, including the federal courts.
13

14 **COUNT FIVE**

15 **Declare the Void Status Of Orders Seizing Plaintiff's Assets In Chapter 11 Courts,** 16 **(Void-Order Doctrine and Declaratory Judgment Act)**

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

19 36. Declare as void the orders issued by Chapter 11 judges that seized and liquidated Plain-
20 tiff's \$10 million in real estate assets on the basis that these were void orders. Under the Supreme
21 Court's void order doctrine¹⁷ orders that violate due process are forever void, and the issue can
22 be raised in any court at any time. Plaintiff filed Chapter 11 for his personal and corporate assets,
23 which were in excellent financial condition, seeking to force a federal judges to do when the dis-
24

25
26
27 17 An illegal order is forever void. An order that exceeds the jurisdiction of the court, is void, or voidable, and can
28 be attacked in any proceeding in any court where the validity of the judgment comes into issue. (See *Rose v. Himely*
(1808) 4 Cranch 241, 2 L ed 608; *Pennoyer v. Neff* (1877) 95 US 714, 24 L ed 565; *Thompson v. Whitman* (1873) 18
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.

1 trict and appellate judges refused to do. Plaintiff sought to obtain his due process right to a decla-
2 ration of rights established in five judgments and to obtain an order halting massive violations of
3 state and federal laws associated with the sham lawsuit filed by a CIA-front law firm. The orders
4 taking Plaintiff's life assets were signed in chambers, after the court signed orders refusing to
5 accept jurisdiction, and rendered without the legal and constitutional requirement of a hearing,
6 notice of hearing, and legal cause. Further due process violations occurred when Ninth Circuit
7 federal judges issuing void orders barring Plaintiff from filing objections to the seizure and liqui-
8 dation. When Plaintiff exercised these basic due process rights, the objections were unfiled and
9 federal judges charged Plaintiff with criminal contempt of court for filing objections to the orders
10 seizing and liquidating his assets.
11

12
13 37. Issue related orders ordering all properties owned by Plaintiff and his corporation, that
14 were seized under these conditions, to be vacated and returned to Plaintiff, and all legal filings
15 affecting those properties after the seizure held to be void. Further, provided for financial dam-
16 ages for judicial and non-judicial parties that were involved in these corrupt acts.
17

18 **COUNT SIX**

19 **Declare Legal Rights and Legal Relations Established In Five Judgments** 20 **(28 U.S.C. §§ 2201, 2202, and FRCivP 57)**

21 38. Plaintiff repeats and realleges all preceding paragraphs by reference, as if stated fully in
22 this Count.

23 39. A declaration declaring Plaintiff's legal rights and responsibilities that were adjudicated
24 and established in five judgments¹⁸ that have been in controversy as a result of a sham lawsuit
25 filed by a CIA-front law firm of Friedman, Sloan and Ross (San Francisco). This right is pro-
26

27
28 ¹⁸ Plaintiff's legal rights and legal relations were established in a final judgment of January 31, 1966, that has been entered as a final judgment in the states of Oklahoma, Texas, and Nevada. These rights are now in controversy and were the basis for sham legal proceedings that stripped Plaintiff of the assets that funded his exposure of corrupt and criminal conditions affecting major national issues, including the aviation matters occurring on September 11, 2001.

1 vided under the Declaratory Judgment Act (Title 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201, 2202), FRCivP 57, and re-
2 lated law. Further, that appropriate relief be provided to return these personal and property rights
3 to Plaintiff, and that the judgments be held to be valid, as provided by the laws of the 50 states
4 and federal statutes, landmark Supreme Court decisions, and constitutional protections.
5

6 **COUNT SEVEN**
7 **FTCA Claim Against U.S. Government**
8 **(Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1346(b), 2671 et seq)**

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

11 41. Relief in the form of financial damages against the United States, as provided by the Fed-
12 eral Tort Claims Act (FTCA). Employees of the United States, including federal judges and Jus-
13 tice Department personnel, as part of efforts to block Plaintiff's reports of criminal and subver-
14 sive activities, repeatedly and deliberately inflicted great personal and financial harm upon Plain-
15 tiff through corrupt misuse of government offices and government power. These acts against
16 Plaintiff were torts under the laws of the states of California and Nevada, while Plaintiff was a
17 resident of both states.
18

19 42. Federal employees deliberately caused Plaintiff to suffer great harm, including (a) loss of
20 his \$10 million in real estate; (b) the loss of investment income; (c) the loss of income from his
21 businesses; (d) the loss of Plaintiff's home; (e) great harm to Plaintiff's quality of life; (f) loss of
22 freedoms through incarceration for reporting federal crimes and exercising federal defenses; (g)
23 Plaintiff's professional and business relations; and (h) infliction of great emotional stress.
24

25 43. The government of the United States also has vicarious liability for the harm inflicted
26 upon Plaintiff during the many years that Plaintiff sought to defend national interests, starting
27 while Plaintiff was a federal air safety agent and continuing to this day.
28

1 44. All federal employees referred to in this Complaint were acting within the scope of their
2 employment with the U.S. government as they committed the wrongful acts against Plaintiff.

3 45. As required by the FTCA act, more than six months before this action was instituted, the
4 claim set forth herein was presented to the Department of Justice and the Federal Courts on
5 March 20, 2000. Neither agency acted on the claim, and such failure to respond constitutes a de-
6 nial of that claim. Further, Plaintiff was unlawfully and unconstitutionally barred from filing any
7 action in his resident location by the misconduct of Ninth Circuit judges, causing a justified de-
8 lay in filing.
9

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

18 47. Although the normal venue for a FTCA claim is in the judicial district where Plaintiff re-
19 sides, the unlawful, unconstitutional, and corrupt acts occurring in the Ninth Circuit district and
20 appellate courts have prevented Plaintiff from filing such action.
21

22
23 **COUNT EIGHT**
24 **Amendment To Include Other Related Causes Of Actions and Defendants**

25 48. Plaintiff repeats and realleges all preceding paragraphs by reference, as if stated fully in
26 this count.

27 49. Plaintiff will request that other causes of actions and other defendants be added to this
28 federal filing. Their wrongful conduct has been intimately intertwined with the events stated

1 here, including the deadly events of September 11, 2001.

2 **Remedies Sought By Plaintiff**

3 **COUNT ONE**

4 50. As to Count One, a meaningful opportunity for Plaintiff, and his group of other govern-
5 ment agents, to report criminal and subversive activities that they discovered to a federal court,
6 including those criminal activities that have links to the events of September 11, 2001, and other
7 areas of major national interests that have not been made known to the people.
8

9 **COUNT TWO**

10 51. As to Count Two, a declaration that federal judges must, as part of their *administrative*
11 duties, receive information and evidence offered to the courts under the federal crime reporting
12 statute, and that any refusal to receive such reports constitute criminal obstruction of justice. This
13 federal statute, if it had not been fraudulently emasculated by Ninth Circuit federal judges, would
14 have permitted long-overdue actions to be taken to have prevented the 19 terrorist hijackers from
15 seizing the four airliners.
16
17

18 **COUNT THREE**

19 52. As to Count Three, a declaration that Plaintiff, or any other citizen, has the right, includ-
20 ing the right provided by Title 28 U.S.C. § 1361, to seek a court order requiring federal officials
21 to perform their legal duties and to halt their hardcore violations of law. Violations of this right
22 by Ninth Circuit federal judges were responsible for the continuation of criminal activities
23 against the United States that Plaintiff and his group of other government agents sought to report.
24

25 **COUNT FOUR**

26 53. As to Count Four, a declaration returning to Plaintiff the legal rights, legal protections,
27 and legal defenses that have been taken from him by a series of injunctive orders that deprived
28

1 plaintiff of access to federal courts and terminated all legal rights, legal protections and legal de-
2 fenses. This block deprived Plaintiff the right, and the requirement, to report criminal activities in
3 government offices to a federal court, and blocked Plaintiff's defenses against massive violations
4 of state and federal laws and constitutional protections that were part of the bizarre scheme to
5 silence the former federal agent and witness. These attacks are continuing at this time, inflicting
6 great personal harm upon plaintiff, with the intent to finally halt Plaintiff's exposure of these
7 criminal and subversive activities. Plaintiff is unable to defend against these ongoing judicial at-
8 tacks because of the orders converting Plaintiff into, as a matter of law, a man without a country.

11 **COUNT FIVE**

12 54. As to Count Five, a court order holding as void the seizure and liquidation of Plaintiff's
13 \$10 million in real estate assets that funded his exposure activities, and provisions insuring the
14 prompt return to Plaintiff of these assets that were seized in gross due process violations.

16 **COUNT SIX**

17 55. As to Count Six, a declaration upholding the validity of legal and personal rights estab-
18 lished in five judgments, including legal relations and legal responsibilities, that have been vio-
19 lated through the scheme initiated by the CIA-front law firm, and which led to the seizure and
20 liquidation of Plaintiff's life assets. Further, an order declaring the validity of those judgments as
21 provided by the laws of all 50 states and federal statutes, Supreme Court Decisions, and constitu-
22 tional provisions.

24 **COUNT SEVEN**

25 56. As to Count Seven, a court forum to litigate the financial liability of the U.S. government
26 for the torts perpetrated against Plaintiff by employees and officials of the federal government, as
27 part of the scheme to halt Plaintiff's exposure of criminal and subversive activities. These activi-
28

1 ties continue to gravely affect national interests.

2 **COUNT EIGHT**

3 57. As to Count Eight, the right to amend this court filing to include causes of actions and de-
4 fendants that are intertwined with the criminal activities and the related harm stated in the filing.

5 **SUMMARY**

6
7 58. Federal law requires that the charges made in a complaint must be accepted as true to
8 prevent dismissal at the pleading stage. This court clearly has a responsibility to provide an hon-
9 est adjudication of these serious charges. If this court continues the unlawful, unconstitutional,
10 and criminal practices of the Ninth Circuit judges that are detailed in this Complaint, it will be
11 aiding and abetting the very same criminal and subversive conduct that played key roles in the
12 deaths occurring in New York City on September 11, 2001.
13

14
15 Dated: August 8, 2002.
16

17
18 RODNEY STICH
19 Plaintiff in pro se
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28