

Docket Nr:

IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT
OF THE UNITED STATES

October 2002 Term

In re RODNEY F. STICH

Petitioner

To Chief Justice William Rehnquist

PETITION FOR EXTRAORDINARY--EMERGENCY WRIT

TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

U.S. District Court, District Of Columbia, # 1-02-001172-HHK

Petition for Emergency Writ

Rodney F. Stich

P.O. Box 5

Alamo, CA 94507

Phone: 925-944-1930

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Can a federal judge block a citizen from reporting federal crimes to a federal court that were being reported under the mandatory requirements of the federal crime reporting statute (18 U.S.C. § 4),¹ especially when he is a former federal air safety agent and witness to criminal activities? Included in these criminal activities were those that caused the conditions to exist that enabled 19 hijackers to seize four separate airliners on September 11, 2001, resulting in 3,000 deaths and massive collateral consequences.

2. Can federal judges terminate a whistleblower's federal due process defenses against record-setting violations of state and federal laws and constitutional protections as part of a process to block his reporting of these federal crimes? This tactic has been repeatedly perpetrated by federal judges through unlawful and unconstitutional injunctions that act to permanently bar him from reporting the federal crimes, and prevent him from defending against the misuse of the courts to silence him.

3. Can the justices of this Supreme Court continue to refuse to address these major issues occurring in their areas of supervisory responsibilities that are converting the federal courts into a racketeering enterprise?

4. Can the justices of this Supreme Court continue to refuse to receive information and evidence of criminal and subversive activities that are brought to their attention under the federal crime reporting statute (18 U.S.C. § 4)?

5. Can federal judges deprive Petitioner the right to federal court access and the protections and defenses guaranteed by the laws and Constitution of the United States?

¹ Title 18 U.S.C. § 4. Misprision of felony. Whoever, having knowledge of the actual commission of a felony cognizable by a court of the United States, conceals and does not as soon as possible make known the same to some judge or other person in civil or military authority under the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

Primary Parties To These Matters

The primary parties to the questions presented here are Judge Henry H. Kennedy, Jr., the United States, and the public, and the long list of federal judges in the Ninth Circuit whose obstruction of justice and related civil and constitutional due process violations continue to inflict great harm upon national interests, including national security, and the lives of its people, as shown by the events of September 11, 2001.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Questions presented	i
List of parties	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Index of Appendices	iv
Table of Authorities	v
Citations of district and appellate court decisions	ix
Basis for jurisdiction	x
Statement of the case	1
Summary	11

Index Of Appendices

Orders of U.S. district judge Henry H. Kennedy, Jr. on July 1, 2002. (Exhibit “A”)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics,
403 U.S. 388 (1971) 7

Stich v. National Transportation Safety Board,
685 F.2d 446 (9th Cir.) (table), cert. Denied, 459 U.S. 861 (1982) 2

Stich v. United States,
554 F.2d 1070 (9th Cir.) (table), cert denied, 434 U.S. (1977) 2

Constitutional Provisions

Fifth Amendment due process clause of U.S. Constitution 4

Fifth Amendment equal protection clause 4

Article IV § 1 full faith and credit clause 4

Article IV § 2 right to unabridged interstate travel clause 4

Federal Statutes

Title 18 U.S.C. § 2 7,8

Title 18 U.S.C. § 3 7,8

Title 18 U.S.C. § 4 2

Title 18 U.S.C. § 35 8

Title 18 U.S.C. § 111 8

Title 18 U.S.C. § 153 8

Title 18 U.S.C. § 241 8, 9

Title 18 U.S.C. § 242 8

Title 18 U.S.C. § 245 8

Title 18 U.S.C. § 246 8

Title 18 U.S.C. § 371 8

Title 18 U.S.C. § 1341 8

Title 18 U.S.C. § 1343 8

Title 18 U.S.C. § 1505 8

Title 18 U.S.C. § 1510 8

Title 18 U.S.C. § 1512 8

Title 18 U.S.C. § 1513 (b) 8

Title 18 U.S.C. § 1515(a) 8

Title 28 U.S.C. § 1331 8

Title 28 U.S.C. § 1343 8

Title 28 U.S.C. § 2201 4,5

Title 28 U.S.C. § 2202 4,5

Title 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983-19886

Federal Rules of Civil Procedures:

FRCivP 576

Citations Of District Order

Sua sponte order of U.S. District Judge Henry H. Kennedy, Jr., dated July 1, 2002, refusing to receive Petitioner's reports of criminal activities involving national issues, including national security, and to provide federal relief for major federal causes of actions.

Basis For Jurisdiction In Supreme Court

This court's jurisdiction arises under its supervisory responsibilities over federal judges (Supreme Court Rule); under ; and under this court's responsibilities to receive evidence of federal crimes as provided by the clear wording of the federal crime reporting statute (18 U.S.C. § 4).

The order by district court Henry J. Kennedy, Jr., for which review is sought, was filed on July 1, 2001, which was a sua sponte dismissal of a lawsuit stating major federal causes of actions, which violated a combination of constitutional and criminal matters.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner filed a lawsuit in the U.S. district court in the District of Columbia on June 17, 2002, raising multiple federal causes of actions for which federal remedies exist. These include:

- Attempt to report criminal and subversive activities to a federal court under the mandatory requirements of the federal crime reporting statute, Title 18 U.S.C. § 4. The prior refusal to receive that information continues to inflict great harm upon major national interests and the lives and the deaths of many people. The success of 19 hijackers on September 11, 2001, were simply the latest déjà vu consequences of the federal crimes that Petitioner, a former federal air safety agent, and his group of several dozen other former and present government agents had discovered and sought to report.
- Earlier attempts² were made, starting in the late 1970s, to report and provide evidence to federal courts concerning these crimes under Title 18 U.S.C. § 4. Many deaths were made possible by the repeated refusal by federal judges (including this Supreme Court) to receive this information and evidence.
- The 3,000 deaths on 9-11 were made possible by the conditions associated with the criminal misconduct that Petitioner initially discovered as a federal air safety agent who was assigned the responsibility for correcting the conditions that resulted in the worst series of airline crashes in the nation's history. Further blame goes to the federal judges who repeatedly blocked these

² *Stich v. United States, et al.*, 554 F.2d 1070 (9th Cir.) (table), *cert. denied*, 434 U.S. 920 (1977)(addressed hard-core air safety misconduct, violations of federal air safety laws, threats against government inspectors not to report safety violations and misconduct); *Stich v. National Transportation Safety Board*, 685 F.2d 446 (9th Cir.)(table), *cert. denied*, 459 U.S. 861 (1982))(addressed repeated criminal falsification of official airline accident reports, omitting highly sensitive air safety misconduct, making possible repeated crashes from the same sequestered problems); 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 California.)(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.

reports, which then aided and abetted the escalation of the criminal activities into other areas of government. These matters are detailed and documented in the latest editions of the books that Petitioner wrote: *Unfriendly Skies*, *Defrauding America*, *Drugging America*, *Disavow*, *Terrorism Against America*, and *Legal and Judicial Trojan Horses*.

- Declaratory judgment remedies to address violations of federally protected rights for the following federal causes of actions:
 - To declare the void nature of injunctive orders permanently terminating Petitioner's rights to federal court access and the protections guaranteed by the laws and Constitution of the United States. In this way, the protections and defenses provided by the Civil Rights Act, *Bivens*, civil RICO, Fifth Amendment to the Constitution, and related case law and rules of court, have been permanently denied to Petitioner, causing him to suffer great and irreparable personal and financial harm. These injunctive orders were rendered under unlawful, unconstitutional, and fraudulent conditions, with unlawful, unconstitutional, and criminal consequences, as part of a judicial scheme to block Petitioner and his group of other government agents from reporting criminal and subversive activities implicating people in key government positions in the three branches of government.
 - To declare Petitioner's legal rights and obligations established in five judgments that have been repeatedly violated by California and federal judges as part of the scheme to halt Petitioner's exposure activities, and which continue to constitute matters of legal controversy.
 - Under the Supreme Court's void order doctrine, to declare the void status of orders rendered by federal judges taking Petitioner's \$10 million in life assets. These orders were issued while violating legal and constitutional due process requirement of a hearing, notice of hearing, and legally recognized cause. The assets were simply taken by a sham order signed in chambers,

followed by other unlawful and unconstitutional orders barring Petitioner from filing objections to the seizure and liquidation of his life assets that converted him from a multi-millionaire to a state of poverty. These funds had been used to fund Petitioner's exposure of corruption in government, including the federal courts.

- Financial damages under the Civil Rights Act (against those violating Petitioner's civil and constitutional rights while acting under color of state law); under *Bivens* (against those violating Petitioner's civil and constitutional rights while acting under color of federal law); and under civil RICO (for those acting in a racketeering enterprise consisting of a combination of criminal activities and civil rights violations).

Latest Example Of Judicial Due Process Violations Combined With Obstruction Of Justice

On July 1, 2002, without notice to Petitioner, before Petitioner could serve the defendants, and before discovery, Judge Kennedy issued a sua sponte order dismissing the federal court filing. This unlawful and unconstitutional dismissal violated multiple due process rights and protections, and continued the judicial practice of blocking the reporting of criminal and subversive activities to a federal judge under the federal crime reporting statute (18 U.S.C. § 4).. In this way Kennedy insured the continuation of the corrupt activities that created the conditions making possible the brutal deaths of 3,000 people on September 11, 2001, which will continue the documented misconduct that has left a trail of tragedies within the United States.

Using Unlawful and Unconstitutional Injunctive Orders To Block Reporting Of Criminal and Subversive Activities and Terminate All Federal Defenses

U.S. district judge Henry Kennedy sought to support his violations of due process, and his obstruction of justice, by citing an order rendered by Judge Samuel Sporkin³ on September 23,

³ Sporkin was formerly legal counsel for the Central Intelligence Agency, and blocked the reporting of CIA criminal and subversive activities that Petitioner and his group of other federal agents had discovered. These criminal activities are detailed and documented in Petitioner's books, *Defrauding America*, *Drugging America*, and *Disavow*.

1991, over ten years ago. That order permanently denied to Petitioner the same due process rights available to murders and terrorists and acted to prevent Petitioner and other government agents from reporting criminal activities implicating people acting in government positions.

That injunctive order duplicated those issued in Ninth circuit courts to block the reporting of the criminal and subversive activities and terminate the federal defenses against the onslaught of violations of federally protected rights that were involved in a sham lawsuit filed by the CIA-front law firm of Friedman, Sloan, and Ross.

Judge Sporkin's injunctive order blatantly stripped Petitioner of the most basic rights under the form of government in the United States, while feloniously blocking the reports of crimes that continue to inflict great harm upon America, the latest being the 3,000 deaths on September 11, 2001, and the massive collateral damage arising from the events on that day.

REASONS WHY THIS EMERGENCY WRIT SHOULD BE GRANTED

The writ should be granted for the same reasons that Petitioner has been bringing to this court for the past 20 years and longer:

- Major national security matters are implicated that have already showed the consequences on September 11, 2001. For over 20 years Petitioner has sought to report to federal courts, including this Supreme Court, the criminal activities that he and a several dozen other government agents had discovered. These efforts commenced with the filing of federal lawsuits in the late 1970s. Initially, federal judges admitted the gravity of Petitioner's charges but refused to receive his evidence, claiming this was a responsibility for Congress to address. The truth was that it was also a responsibility of federal judges under the mandatory

language of the federal crime reporting statute (18 U.S.C. § 4) and Title 28 U.S.C. § 1361.⁴

The judicial refusal to perform this mandatory duty encouraged the escalation of the criminal activities, with even worse aviation and other tragedies. The most publicized recent consequence of the criminal misconduct that Petitioner discovered as a federal agent and sought to report to a federal judge were the successful hijackings of four aircraft by 19 hijackers. (Among Petitioner's earlier reports as a federal air safety agent was the report on the urgent need for simple and inexpensive preventative measures to halt 40 years of fatal hijackings, including those of September 11, 2001. Deeply entrenched culture and corruption explains why these and many other preventative measures were not ordered.)

- As the consequences from the criminal activities and the judicial obstruction of justice continued to inflict great harm upon U.S. interests, and Petitioner used his considerable assets to make this information known to the people, the CIA-front law firm of Friedman, Sloan and Ross and federal judges misused the legal process to halt Petitioner's exposure activities. Eventually, these judicial tactics included the fraudulent misuse of the unlawful and unconstitutional injunctions to block Petitioner's access to the courts, thereby preventing him from reporting the criminal activities.⁵
- The combination of corrupt acts by federal judges over whom all Supreme Court justices have supervisory responsibilities, the enormous harm and many deaths associated with these wrongdoings, and the arrogant and enormous personal and financial harm inflicted upon Petitioner, calls for the justices to *finally* exercise their supervisory responsibilities over the

⁴ 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.

⁵ Petitioner had been blocked by personnel in key positions within the executive branch of government from reporting these criminal activities, and members of Congress repeatedly refused to receive the evidence. The only other remedy under law to report these crimes against the United States was to report them to federal courts under the federal crime reporting statute, Title 18 U.S.C. § 4 and under Title 28 U.S.C. § 1361.

federal courts, as required by their oath of office, and as required by the clear wording of criminal statutes.

ARGUMENT

I. Felony Obstruction Of Justice

The sua sponte dismissal of the federal filing continues the pattern of federal judges blocking the reporting of the criminal and subversive activities. Each of these judicial acts constitute crimes under Title 2,⁶ 3,⁷ and 4,⁸ and made the judges, as a matter of criminal law, accomplices in the criminal acts—and the consequences. The latest consequence resulted in 3,000 deaths on September 11, 2001, and the massive fallouts arising from these tragedies.

Other judicial felonies⁹ were perpetrated as federal judges who were blocking the reporting

⁶ Title 18 U.S.C. § 2. Principals. (a) Whoever commits an offense against the United States or aids, abets, counsels, commands, induces or procures its commission, is punishable as a principal. (b) Whoever willfully causes an act to be done which if directly performed by him or another would be an offense against the United States, is punishable as a principal.

⁷ Title 18 U.S.C. § 3. Accessory after the fact. Whoever, knowing that an offense against the United States had been committed, receives, relieves, comforts or assists the offender in order to hinder or prevent his apprehension, trial or punishment, is an accessory after the fact.

⁸ Title 18 U.S.C. § 4. Misprision of felony. Whoever, having knowledge of the actual commission of a felony cognizable by a court of the United States, conceals and does not as soon as possible make known the same to some judge or other person in civil or military authority under the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

⁹ Title 18 U.S.C. §1510. (a) Whoever willfully endeavors by means of bribery, misrepresentation, intimidation, or force or threats thereof to obstruct, delay, or prevent the communication of information relation to a violation of any criminal statute of the United States by any person to a criminal investigator; or Whoever injures any person in his person or property on account of giving by such person or by any other person of any such information to any criminal investigator—Shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.”

18 U.S.C. § 1512. Tampering with a witness, victim, or an informant.

(b) Whoever knowingly uses intimidation or physical force, threatens, or corrupt persuades another person, or attempts to do so, or engages in misleading conduct toward another person, with intent to—

(3) hinder, delay, or prevent the communication to a law enforcement officer or judge of the United States of information relating to the commission or possible commission of a Federal offense ... shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.

of these crimes inflicted great harm upon Petitioner, including charging him with criminal contempt of court¹⁰ for filing papers in federal courts seeking to report the crimes and for exercising federal defenses against the judicial taking of the assets that funded these exposure activities.

II. Sua sponte dismissal violated the law and due process

Judge Kennedy's sua sponte dismissal of Petitioner's filing violated numerous due process rights and protections and was the latest judicial tactic to block the reporting of the criminal activities and their involvement in the 3,000 deaths of September 11, 2001. Of the multitude of federal law barring sua sponte dismissals are the following:

“It is error to dismiss a claim on the merits without notice, a hearing, and an opportunity to respond.” *Anderson National Bank v. Lueck* (1944) 321 U.S. 233, 246. (“We held in *Harmon v. Superior Court*, 307 F.2d 796, 796 (9th Cir. 1962) that the right to a hearing on the merits of a claim over which the court has jurisdiction is of the essence of our judicial system, and the judge's feeling that the case is probably frivolous does not justify by-passing that right. Appellant is entitled to have process issued and served, and to be heard.”

“The fundamental requirements of due process is an opportunity to be heard upon such notice and proceedings as are adequate to safeguard the right for which the constitutional protection is invoked.” *California Diversified Promotions, Inc., v. Musick*, 505 F.2d 278 (9th Cir. 1974). The court held in *Wong v. Bell*, 642 F.2d 359 (9th Cir. 1981) that a trial court may not make a *sua sponte* dismissal, and must give its intention to do so, affording plaintiff an opportunity to at least submit a written memorandum in opposition to such motion, as required by Fed.Rules Civ.Proc. Rule 12(b)(6). It was stated “the court must give notice of its sua sponte intention to invoke Rule 12(b)(6), and afford plaintiffs 'an opportunity to at least submit a

(c) Whoever intentionally harasses another person and thereby hinders, delays, prevents, or dissuades any person from—(2) reporting to a law enforcement officer or judge of the United States the commission or possible commission of a Federal offense

18 U.S.C. § 1513. Retaliating against a witness, victim, or an informant.

(b) Whoever knowingly engages in any conduct and thereby causes bodily injury to another person or damages the tangible property of another person, or threatens to do so, with intent to retaliate against any person for –

(2) any information relating to the commission or possible commission of a Federal offense ...

¹⁰ The criminal contempt of court sought support on unlawful and unconstitutional injunctive orders permanently terminating Petitioner's right to federal court access, which had the dual effect of blocking his reporting of the criminal activities—including those in which they were themselves implicated through felony cover-ups, and blocked the exercising of federal due process defenses against the multitude of violated federally protected rights, including the seizure and liquidation of Petitioner's \$10 million life assets.

written memorandum in opposition to such motion,” *Crawford v. Bell*, 599 F.2d 890, 893 (9th Cir. 1979), quoting *Potter v. McCall*, 433 F.2d 1087, 1088 (9th Cir. 1970).

III. Dismissal Of Lawsuit Is Barred When Federal Causes Of Actions Are Stated In Complaint

Petitioner stated multiple federal causes of actions in the filing, including the demand to report to a federal court the federal crimes that he and other former government agents had discovered.

The complaint:

- Sought to report to a federal court federal crimes that federal judges must receive under the federal crime reporting statute, Title 18 U.S.C. § 4, as part of their administrative (not decision-making) responsibilities.
- Exercised rights under the Declaratory Judgment Act and related federal law to reinstate the same due process rights available to murderers and terrorists.
- Exercised rights under the Declaratory Judgment Act to declare his legal rights and obligations that are in controversy and as established in five judgments exercised before exercising the constitutional right to change residence.
- Exercised rights under the void judgment doctrine to declare as void the corrupt and unconstitutional seizure of Petitioner’s \$10 million life assets that were seized and disposed of without the legal and constitutional right to a hearing, to notice of hearing, and legal cause.
- Rights to financial damages under the Civil Rights Act, under Bivens and under civil RICO.

The law is clear that every citizen has a right to justice.

The fundamental requirements of due process is an opportunity to be heard upon such notice and proceedings as are adequate to safeguard the right for which the constitutional protection is invoked.” *Anderson National Bank v. Lockett* (1944) 321 U.S. 233, 246. The Court held that, when jurisdiction is present, it is error to dismiss a claim on the merits without notice, a hearing, and an opportunity to respond, unless the complaint could not be corrected by amendment. *Worley v. California Department of Corrections*, 432 F.2d 769 (9th Cir. 1970). ... we held in *Harmon v. Superior Court*, 307 F.2d 796, 796 (9th Cir. 1962) that the right to a hearing on the merits of a claim over which the court has jurisdiction is of

the essence of our judicial system, and the judge's feeling that the case is probably frivolous does not justify by-passing that right. Appellant is entitled to have process issued and served, and to be heard.

IV. Allegations Must Be Accepted As True

As a matter of law, the allegations stated in a complaint must be accepted as true and prevents dismissal when one or more federal causes of actions are stated for which remedies are available. This legal requirement establishes that the federal judges dismissing Petitioner's lawsuits that make charges of criminal misconduct associated with a series of continuing national disasters, including the 3,000 deaths on September 11, 2001, must be accepted as true. Continuing with that premises, Judge Kennedy, by dismissing the lawsuit, knew that he was protecting the criminal activities that insured the success of the 19 hijackers on September 11, the many prior aviation tragedies arising from this misconduct, and the other areas of criminal activities that Petitioner and his group of government agents sought to report.

Dennis v. Sparks 449 U.S. 24 (1980) (“a section 1983 complaint should not be dismissed unless it appears that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts which would entitle him to relief ... For the purposes of testing sufficiency of the complaint, the allegations of the complaint must be accepted as true.”).

V. Sporkin's Injunctive Order Was Unlawful and Unconstitutional In Its Issuance and In Its Purpose

Judge Sporkin's sua sponte order dismissing Petitioner's lawsuit claimed that Petitioner did not comply with Judge J. Sporkin's order of September 23, 1991, that permanently deprived Petitioner of the same rights to federal court access that murderers and terrorists enjoy. Judge Sporkin rendered an order forever barring Petitioner from filing papers in federal court without obtaining prior court permission. That (and every other injunction issued) violated every legal requirement for the issuance of an injunction, including:

- The injunction must halt great and irreparable harm. [But it was Petitioner who was suffering

the great and irreparable harm, and the injunctive order protected the parties inflicting the great harm!]

- The injunction must halt unlawful acts. [Petitioner was the victim of the unlawful acts; the injunctions insured the continuation and expansion of the massive violations of state and federal laws and constitutional protections. He was attempting to report criminal and subversive conduct, and he was exercising federal defenses against documented massive violations of state and federal laws.]
- The injunction must be in the public's interest. [There is no public interest being served by a federal judge aiding and abetting hardcore violations of state and federal laws while terminating a victim's rights to federal defenses, and blocking a former federal agent and witness from reporting crimes against the United States that had already inflicted massive harm upon national interests, and many deaths.]
- The judge rendering the orders must issue a finding of facts showing that these requirements had been met. [Never has this requirement be met.]
- Further, a former government agent or witness cannot be barred from reporting federal crimes through sham injunctive orders intended to obstruct justice and protect those perpetrating criminal and subversive acts.

Sham Frivolous Label Fraudulently Used To “Support” Injunctions

The sham argument raised to “support” the injunctive order was that Petitioner’s exercise of federal defenses¹¹ against the massive numbers of state and federal laws¹² being violated, which

¹¹ The federal due process defense remedies arose under the Declaratory Judgment Act (28 U.S.C. §§ 2201, 2202), FRCivP 57, and related law; the Civil Rights Act for massive violations of state and federal laws and constitutional protections while acting under color of state law; under Bivens, for massive violations of state and federal laws while acting under color of federal law.

¹² Six years of violations in California courts of the following (while acting without personal jurisdiction): California CC §§ 4351, 4554, 5004, 5102, 5103, 5108, 5110.720, 5118, 5164; California CCP §§1699(b), 1713.1,

inflicted great personal and financial harm¹³ upon Petitioner, were frivolous acts. In that way, federal judges from coast to coast have established that they have already established the right to corruptly misuse the federal courts to strip a citizen of every protection provided by the laws and Constitution of the United States when that person is targeted, such as when he exposes criminal and subversive activities that involved people holding key positions in any of the three branches of government. If they are willing to do that to Petitioner, they are willing to do that to every other citizen of the United States.

The “clever” wording of the injunctions sought to imply that due process had not been terminated and that Petitioner had to submit any filing to the court for approval. But the massive numbers of hardcore violations for which federal defenses existed that were denied to Petitioner, and the

1713.3, 1908, 1910, 1913, 915; California Rules of court Rules 1201(c); 1211, 1212, 1215, 1222, 1229(a), 1230(a)(2), 1234, 1239(a)(2), 1281, and Rule 1282; absence of personal jurisdiction arising from Rule 1230 Motion to quash, 1230(a)(2), 1234, and 1239(a)(2); absence of personal and subject matter jurisdiction under the California Family Law Act: Rules 1201(c), 1211, 1212, 1281, 1282, 1215, 1222, 1229, 1230(a)(2), 1234, 1239(a)(2); Civil Code §§ 4351, 4503; California Supreme Court Decisions, including *Rediker v. Rediker* (1950) 35 Cal.2d 796.; *Scott v. Scott* (1958) 51 C.2d 249]; *Spellens v. Spellens* (1957) 498 C.2d 210; *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; Fourteenth Amendment equal_protection; Fourteenth Amendment_property rights; Fourteenth Amendment liberty interests; landmark U.S. Supreme Court decisions: *Williams v. North Carolina* (1945) 325 US 226, 65 S Ct 1092, 89 L ed 1577; *Coe v. Coe* (1948) 334 U.S. 378; *Sherrer v. Sherrer* (1948) 334 U.S. 43; *Vanderbilt v. Vanderbilt* (1957) 354 U.S. 416; *Estin v. Estin* (1948) 334 U.S. 541; *Perrin v. Perrin*, 408 F.2d 107 (3rd Cir. 1969). These violations then carried over into the federal courts.

Twenty years of violations in the federal courts:

The above substantive due process protections were then compounded with total violations of every procedural due process right including: (a) Declaratory Judgment Act (28 U.S.C. §§ 2201, 2202) FRCiivP 57 and related law; (b) Civil Rights Act (42 U.S.C. §§ 1983-1986) and 28 U.S.C. § 1343; (c) Bivens (for violations of civil rights occurring in federal courts); (d) civil RICO; (e) void judgment doctrine. Tactics used included denying the right to court access; the right to an adjudication of federal causes of actions; the right to a jury trial; the right to discovery; the right to file appeals; the right to discovery; constant lying by federal judges in their orders.

¹³ The repeated massive violations of substantive and procedural due process stripped Petitioner of the \$10 million in properties (that funded his exposure activities), converting him from a multi-millionaire to a state of poverty, made homeless, and stripped of his sole means of income (as he approached the age of 70). Included in the violations for which he was denied due process defenses were the orders taking and liquidating his life assets that were rendered without the legal and constitutional requirement of a hearing, notice of hearing, legally required cause, and then was followed by orders barring him from filing objections. When he did file objections, they were unfiled and Petitioner charged with criminal contempt of court for filing the objections. Further, court of appeal judges refused to accept his appeals on the basis that he had been permanently barred from the district and appellate courts.

exercise of federal remedies that were given frivolous labels, showed that federal district and appellate judges were determined to permanently terminate Petitioner's right to federal court access and federal defenses.

By calling the exercise of these federal rights for the massive numbers of due process violations to be frivolous acts, federal judges were blatantly subverting the federal courts, subverting the rights and protections guaranteed by the laws and Constitution of the United States, and openly engaging in obstruction of justice. Based upon the sheer number of violations and harm inflicted upon Petitioner which federal judges used to support their injunctions, it would be a literal impossibility to obtain approval to exercise the legal and constitutional right to federal court access and federal remedies.

In this corrupt judicial manner, any citizen posing a threat of exposing corruption in government, including the federal courts, could have the courts used to destroy them and the protections guaranteed under our form of government denied to them.

Judge Sporkin's Injunction, Supported By Judge Kennedy, Was A Blatant Attempt To Block Reporting Of Crimes Against the United States, and Constituted a Criminal Act

Judge Sporkin's injunction was blatantly unlawful and unconstitutional as it destroyed the many laws and constitutional rights and protections guaranteed to all citizens. In addition, it was patently criminal as it obviously blocked the reporting of criminal and subversive activities that Petitioner and his group of other government agents and witnesses sought to report. Among these criminal and subversive activities were those committed by agents and officials of the Central Intelligence Agency, of which Sporkin obviously had knowledge while he was chief counsel for the CIA.

The effects of the injunctive order issued by former CIA legal counsel and then U.S. Superior Court Judge Samuel Sporkin knowingly acted to (a) block Petitioner's reporting of the criminal and subversive activities to a federal court, and (b) terminated Petitioner's multiple

defenses against the record-setting numbers of state and federal laws and constitutional protections, substantive and procedural due process, violated by state and federal judges. These massive civil rights violations were an integral part of the obstruction of justice tactics, thereby constituting criminal acts under federal criminal statutes, including Title 18 U.S.C. §§ 1510, 1512, 1513.

Ironically, and arrogantly, and showing contempt for the 3,000 deaths on September 11, 2001, the same judicial culture is in effect that played key roles in the horrible happenings of that day.

V. Prior Conduct Of Supreme Court Justices

Commencing in 1978, and continuing thereafter to the present day, Petitioner has made this court aware of the criminal and subversive activities that had and would continue to inflict great harm upon national interests, and which continued to result in hundreds of deaths in aviation disasters that resulted and were made possible by the documented corruption that Petitioner sought to report. In the aviation environment, the latest *déjà vu* consequences were the successful hijackings of four aircraft by 19 hijackers that resulted primarily from the corrupt conditions within the government's air safety agencies and the criminal cover-ups by people in government positions. Despite this brutal loss of life, the judicial corruption continues, constituting one of the greatest Trojan horse dangers to America and its people.

When Petitioner first informed Supreme Court justices of the corruption, it consisted of corruption in the Federal Aviation Administration and the felony cover-ups by the political appointees in the National Transportation Safety Board, within the Department of Justice, by members of Congress. By aiding and abetting these crimes, federal judges and Supreme Court justices encouraged the escalation of the endemic corruption in government and its insidious spread throughout society, which in 2001 and 2002 is seen in the worst aviation tragedies in the world's history, corruption throughout government, corruption throughout the corporate world,

and cover-ups throughout the media. It can be said that the Supreme Court justices are at the center of events bring about the corruption and collapse of major national interests today.

Commencing in 1990, the tactics by the U.S. Supreme Court included refusing to file Petitioner's submissions by such chicanery as alleging that the booklet forms of submissions were unacceptable because the spacing in the double lines were some miniscule amount not accordance to Supreme Court rules; that the filings were too late (where they were obviously not too late), and simply refusing to acknowledge the receipt of the submissions.

Never before in the known history of the United States has such documented corrupt acts by such a large number of federal judges existed, all of which were made known to the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court through petitions and through letters.

There is now in the United States a constitutional and criminal crisis emanating from the judicial branch of government, for which the justices of this court hold a primary responsibility. Because of the endemic nature of the criminal and subversive activities in other government entities, it is obvious that this court will continue to expand on these crimes against the American people and the United States itself.

National security matters are implicated when federal judges engage in a documented pattern of criminal activities, including obstruction of justice.

RELIEF THAT SHOULD BE PROVIDED

The necessary response of every justice of the Supreme Court is obvious. The response should include:

- Reinstatement of the lawsuit that Judge Kennedy dismissed, with adequate safeguards that the obstruction of justice and due process violations do not take some other devious form.

- That the relief under the Declaratory Judgment Act and void judgment doctrine be ordered and expedited.
- That the causes of actions for this and prior lawsuits for damages that were subjected to the same judicial misconduct be ordered reinstated.
- Arrangements made for Petitioner and his group of other government agents be allowed, and assisted in presenting the information and evidence of the criminal and subversive activities that continue to harm major national interests.
- Public investigation into the corruption in the federal courts that Petitioner had uncovered and which is documented in his numerous federal filings and detailed in each of his books.

SUMMARY

Based upon the history of the conduct of Supreme Court justices, this petition will be denied filing on some fabricated excuse. The record will show that this continuation of misconduct will continue the corrupt conditions that were responsible for the 3,000 deaths on September 11 and the other areas of harm affecting the United States that are not being publicized but detailed and documented in Petitioners' books and in prior court filings.

Petitioner will continue to use whatever means are available, as a concerned citizen, to expose the corruption that he and his group of other government agents have discovered, and to show how the endemic corruption in the federal courts, and in this Supreme Court, are destroying in a Trojan horse manner vital interests in the United States.

The statements made in this petition sent directly to Justice Rehnquist with copies to every other justice are fully documented.

July 17, 2002.

Rodney Stich