

**Oral Argument to Court of Appeals**  
**Argument Limited to 10 Minutes**  
**(The following oral argument statement will be checked with the tapes)**

- **Good morning**, I am the appellant in this appeal, appearing in pro se, and my name is Rodney Stich.
- **In the ten minutes allotted, Appellant will attempt to show the close relationship between the latest due process and civil violations with the continuing attempts to block Appellant, a former federal agent, from reporting criminal activities that he and a group of other former government agents discovered.** These reports were being made under the mandatory requirements of the federal crime reporting statute, Title 18 USC Section 4.<sup>1</sup> Appellant first discovered certain of these federal crimes after he was given the assignment to correct the conditions responsible for the worst series of airline crashes in the nation's history.
- The **ten minutes allotted to appellant cannot come close to addressing** the many false statements made in the dismissal order or the brief filed by the U.S. attorney.
- **Among the multiple federal causes of actions stated in Appellant's complaint, and the issues brought to this court,** are the following:
  - **Under the federal crime reporting statute, Appellant has attempted to report to a federal judge the criminal activities against the United States,** under the mandatory requirements of the federal crime reporting statute, Title 18 USC Section 4. Every attempt to report these deadly activities had been blocked, and the latest block was done in the lower court.
  - **Two of the federal causes of actions arise under the Supreme Court's void judgment doctrine:**
  - **Federal judges have issued a series of unlawful and unconstitutional orders** forever barring Appellant from filing any papers in the federal district and appellate courts.
  - The **effect and intent of these orders were to block Appellant from reporting the criminal activities** to a federal court, and to block Appellant from exercising the federal defenses needed to halt the ongoing massive violations of state and federal laws that were part of the legal schemes to halt his exposure activities.
  - These **orders violate the due process and equal protection guarantees of the Constitution,** and deprive Appellant the defenses guaranteed by the laws and Constitution of the United States. At this time, anyone can perpetrate any violation upon Appellant through sham legal actions and Appellant cannot exercise the defenses in the laws and Constitution of the United States.
  - **After the first of these unlawful orders were rendered in the Ninth Circuit courts, Appellant discovered additional criminal** activities. As required by the federal crime reporting statute, and granted by federal rights, Appellant sought to report these criminal activities, and also exercised federal defenses seeking to halt the great and irreparable personal and financial harm he was suffering from the violations of federally protected rights.

- **A U.S. attorney and federal judges then retaliated against Appellant for attempting to report these criminal activities** and for exercising defenses guaranteed to all citizens by the laws and Constitution of the United States. Appellant was denied a jury trial and sentenced to six months in federal prison
- **While in prison, federal judges rendered unlawful and unconstitutional orders seizing and liquidating Appellant's \$10 million in assets that Appellant foolishly used to fund his exposure activities.**
- These orders were combined with an **order barring Appellant from filing any objections.** When Appellant exercised his legal and constitutional right to object to the seizure of his life assets, a federal judge charged him with criminal contempt of court for having exercised that legal and constitutional right, denied him a jury trial, and sentenced him again to federal prison.
- **Several tactics were used to block appellant from reporting the criminal activities,** and to block Appellant from exercising federal defenses.
- **Every action was dismissed at the pleading stage,** often sua sponte dismissals, and always during the initial filing stages.
- **Seeking to justify the dismissals, the standard practice was to reverse the legal and common sense definition of frivolous and call Appellant's filings frivolous.** Exercising federal remedies for the most outrageous, and record-setting violations of state and federal laws, a frivolous label was promptly placed.
- barring appellant from having the federal claims adjudicated on their merits. Instead, every action was given a frivolous label and dismissed.
- Judge Mukasey enlarged upon this tactic, falsely stating in his sua sponte dismissal order that each of the claims had been adjudicated on the merits; that they were found to be without merit; that Appellant was a vexatious litigant filing frivolous actions.
- **Included in the relief sought from this appellate court** are the following:
  - **Order that permits appellant and his group of other former government agents to provide information, testimony, and evidence, of the criminal activities that they discovered during their official duties.**
  - **An Order holding the series of permanent injunctions unlawful, unconstitutional, and void,** returning to Appellant the same due process and equal protection rights guaranteed to everyone else.
  - **Order holding that the unlawful and unconstitutional orders seizing and liquidating appellant's life assets are void,** and that the title and possession of the properties be returned to the status that they were in when they were ordered seized.
  - **Simply returning this case to the lower courts would be the equivalent of continuing the same tactics.** The only remedy Appellant knows is for **this court** to provide an adequate federal court forum for Appellant and several other former government agents to provide information, testimony and evidence.

- **Since the massive due process and civil violations were an integral part of the felony obstruction of justice actions,** this court should adjudicate on the merits the causes of actions under the Civil Rights Act, Bivens, RICO, Declaratory Judgment Act, and Federal Tort Claims Act.
-