

From the desk of Rodney Stich

P.O. Box 5, Alamo, CA 94507;

Phone: 510-944-1930; FAX 510-295-1203

August 23, 1997

William K. Sutter, Clerk
U.S. Supreme Court
1 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20543

Ref: Response to your rejection of the highly sensitive petition for writ of certiorari on fabricated grounds (i.e., obstruction of justice)

Dear Sir:

As I expected, you and your Justices have again blocked the reporting of criminal and subversive activities, as your court has repeatedly done in the past with tragic consequences.

Your August 20, 1997, letter rejecting the filing of my petition for writ of certiorari is as usual, based upon misreading of the authorities. You wrote that the petition was not timely filed by being received on August 19, 1997, referring to Supreme Court Rule 13.1, 29.2 and 30.1. Let me read the pertinent wording and rule for you, and for the record:

- Rule 13.1 A petition for a writ of certiorari to review a judgment in any case, civil or criminal, ... shall be deemed in time when it is filed with the Clerk of this Court within 90 days after the entry of judgment. (The Court of Appeals denial of a petition for rehearing was on June 5, 1997, as shown by the attached order, and not on April 14, 1997 as you misstated in your August 20, 1997 letter. The April 14, 1997 order was the initial decision by the Court of Appeals upholding the decision of the district court judge.
- Supreme Court Rule 13.4 says:
- The time for filing a petition for a writ of certiorari runs from the date the judgment or decree sought to be reviewed is rendered. ... If a petition for rehearing is timely filed in the lower court [the lower court in this case is the last order of the Court of Appeals that is being reviewed by petition for writ of certiorari] by any party in the case, the time for filing the petition for a writ of certiorari runs from the date of the denial of the petition for rehearing or the entry of a subsequent judgment. [That rehearing was denied on June 5, 1997, allowing under federal statutes and rules of court for the filing with the Supreme Court of the Petition for writ of certiorari until September 5, 1997.]

I personally telephoned to the clerk's office about two weeks *prior* to submitting the petition, and that clerk said, after looking at the record, that I had until September 5, 1997, for file the petition.

In your latest attempt to block the filing of papers relating to a series of criminal and subversive activities against the United States, you wrote, "A suggestion for rehearing en banc is not a petition for rehearing within the meaning of Rule 13." But the petition that I filed was clearly stated to be a petition for rehearing, as shown by the attached front page of that rehearing petition.

Rules of Court provide for also filing a suggestion for an en banc rehearing, either as a separate or an add-on to the petition for rehearing. That en banc rehearing was never granted, and did not come into effect in my clearly worded and titled petition for rehearing to the Court of Appeals.

Pattern Of Supreme Court Lying, Deception, Obstruction of Justice

Your outright lying and deception, seeking to block the filing of the petition that would put on record the criminal and subversive activities that my large group of former government agents seeks to report, and the pattern of judicial obstruction of justice, retaliation, aiding and abetting, provides prima facie evidence of criminal acts far more serious than those for which many people have been subjected to long prison terms.

Your reference to Supreme Court Rule 29.2 is not relevant, in that it pertains to the date of mailing, with proof of mailing, and that was included with the petition for writ of certiorari. Your reference to Supreme Court rule 30.1 is likewise not applicable, as it relates to the consideration of holidays for computing the time for filing a petition for writ of certiorari. These references are additional smoke screens.

If I were still a federal investigator, I would charge you with criminal obstruction of justice based upon this latest obstruction of justice tactic.

Never in my many years of attempting to bring to justice the criminal activities that I uncovered have I obtained such an abundance of evidence supporting my charges of high-level corruption in government that are clearly criminal and subversive, undermining the national security, government offices, and criminality in the courts. The Supreme Court has set the acceptable conduct for the federal judges over whom the Justices have supervisory responsibilities.

As I said before, this is not the end of this matter.

Sincerely,

Rodney Stich

cc: Justices William Rehnquist; John Paul Stevens; Sandra Day O'Connor; Antonin Scalia; Anthony Kennedy; David Souter; Clarence Thomas; Ruth Ginsburg; Stephen Breyer.