

# From the desk of Rodney Stich

P.O. Box 5, Alamo, CA 94507; phone: 925-944-1930; FAX 925-295-1203

Author of *Defrauding America*; *Drugging America*; *Unfriendly Skies*;  
*Blowback, 9/11, Iraq, Lies and cover-ups*; *Terrorism Against America*

Member

Association Former Intelligence Officers (AFIO) Association of National Security Alumni

International Society of Air Safety Investigators Lawyers Pilots Bar Association (LPBA)

Web sites: [www.defraudingamerica.com](http://www.defraudingamerica.com) [www.unfriendlyskies.com](http://www.unfriendlyskies.com) [www.druggingamerica.com](http://www.druggingamerica.com)

E-mail: [stich@unfriendlyskies.com](mailto:stich@unfriendlyskies.com)

January 24, 2005

Justice William Rehnquist

U.S. Supreme Court

1 First St., NE

Washington, DC 20543

Certified mailing: 7001 1140 0001 2170 0010

Ref: Latest report of federal judges combining obstruction of justice with major due process violations to block reports of corrupt activities, some of which constituted the primary area of blame for the hijackings of four airliners on September 11, 2001.

To Justice Rehnquist:

This letter to you and the other Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court makes *another* record of serious misconduct perpetrated by federal judges over the Justices of the Supreme Court have supervisory responsibilities. The following are the latest highlights of the misconduct that enabled great harm to be inflicted upon the United States, including national security, and the lives and the deaths of many people. The following are highlights of these serious offenses:

- o I, and a number of other former government agents, have repeatedly tried to report to a federal judge criminal activities that we had initially discovered as part of our official duties. These matters were required to be reported to a federal judge under the clear wording of the federal crime reporting statute, Title 18 U.S.C. § 4.<sup>1</sup> Federal judges had a mandatory requirement under their administrative duties to receive these reports.<sup>2</sup> Other authority exists to seek a court order addressing corrupt activities of federal officials existed under Title 28 U.S.C. § 1361.<sup>3</sup>

### **Initial Attempts to Report Criminal Activities Related to a Series of Airline Disasters**

- o My *initial attempts*<sup>4</sup> to report the corruption in the government's aviation safety offices, which I discovered as part of my official duties, were blocked by federal judges and Justice Department lawyers. Although district and appellate judges admitted the gravity of the charges, the excuse given to block the reports of criminal activities was that I lacked standing. Everyone has standing to report criminal activities, and hundreds of people have been sent to prison for failure to exercise this "standing."
- o In response to the judicial block in those early lawsuits, I filed petitions with the U.S. Supreme Court, which made the Justices fully aware of these serious problems. Their refusal to act enabled the criminal activities to continue, and as expected and forewarned, numerous preventable airline disasters continued to occur—including years of easily preventable airline hijackings.

### **Using my Assets to Circumvent the Judicial Obstruction of Justice**

- o The increasing numbers of easily preventable airline disasters caused by the misconduct I sought to report caused me to use my assets to inform the public, thereby circumventing the blocks in government offices. These actions included publishing informational books and appearing as guest and expert on radio and television shows since 1978, which number over 3,000 at this time.

## **Other Government Insiders Provided Information on Criminal Activities in Other Government Offices**

- o The publicity from these efforts caused other government agents<sup>5</sup> to provide me with information and evidence of corrupt in other government offices.<sup>6</sup> I then sought to report these matters to a federal judge at Sacramento, California. This filing was assigned to U. S. District Judge Milton Schwartz, who initially admitted the gravity of the charges, but then suddenly changed his position a week later. In addition to blocking the reports, he:

- o Issued unlawful and unconstitutional injunction permanently barring me from filing any papers in the federal district and appellate courts—an obviously unlawful and unconstitutional order. That order blocked me from reporting the criminal activities, and blocked me from defending against parallel efforts taken to silence me that involved massive violations of state and federal laws and constitutional protections for which the only defenses were in the federal courts. I was literally converted into a man without a country.

### **Prison for Attempting to Protect Vital U.S. Interests Against Criminal Activities**

- o As information of other criminal activities subverting national interests was provided to me by other government agents, I again attempted to report these federal crimes to a federal judge. Justice Department prosecutors and federal judges then charged me with criminal contempt of court (on the basis that the injunction was violated when I tried to report the criminal activities). I was denied a jury trial, and sentenced to federal prison for six months—of which two months were in solitary confinement. In addition to the felonies arising from obstruction of justice, this misuse of federal courts to harm a former federal agent for attempting to report deadly criminal activities constituted other felonies.<sup>7</sup> Numerous federal judges approved this repeated misconduct, including Judge Anthony Kennedy shortly before he was nominated to the U.S. Supreme Court.

### **Parallel Effort by CIA-Affiliated Law Firm to Block Reports**

- o A number of parallel efforts were made by lawyers—acting with the cooperation of federal judges—to silence me. The *first effort* was by a CIA-front law firm,<sup>8</sup> as it filed a sham lawsuit against me, targeting the \$10 million in assets that funded my exposure activities. That lawsuit was barred by, and violated, dozens of state and federal statutes, rules of court, and constitutional provisions, for which specific federal remedies existed. These violations inflicted great personal and financial harm upon me. Every attempt to exercise federal substantive and procedural due process defenses were denied by federal judges who concurrently protected the CIA-front law firm and its scheme to halt my exposure activities. Federal judges repeatedly combined obstruction of justice tactics with massive violations of civil due process, converting the federal courts into a racketeering enterprise.

### **Seizing and Liquidating my Assets through Massive Due Process Violations**

- o Denied relief by every federal court, I filed Chapter 11 in a desperate attempt to force a federal judge to perform his duty and order a halt to the violations that were inflicting great personal and financial harm upon me. Relief *was initially ordered*, and then mysteriously, without any hearing, without notice of hearing, and without legal cause, orders were rendered seizing and liquidating the assets that funded my exposure activities. After seizing my assets, they were turned over to trustee Charles Duck, who I would later learn had close relationship with the CIA, and who later sentenced to federal prison when media disclosures forced Justice Department prosecutors to prosecute and reach a plea agreement. I was evicted from my home, left without any income, and at the age of 70 suffered severe consequences.

### **Criminal Contempt of Court Charge for Exercising Due Process Defenses Against Seizure of Assets**

- o When I exercised my legal and constitutional rights to file an objection to the seizure and liquidation of the assets, the objection was unlawfully unfiled, and I was charged with criminal contempt of court for having exercised that right. (As with judicial attempts to block reporting the criminal

activities, orders had been rendered denying me the right to file papers in federal court.). The federal judge denied me a jury trial, denied me access to my funds to hire legal counsel, and again sentenced me to federal prison. From 1986 to 1995, I was either in prison or under literal house arrest.

#### **Shortly Prior to 9/11, Federal Judges Continued the Obstruction of Justice**

- o Before the corrupt activities were to play a key role in the events of 9/11, I made a *last attempt* to report the criminal activities to a federal judge. That filing occurred at Sacramento, California.<sup>9</sup> U.S. district judge Edward C. Reed blocked me from reporting the criminal activities. I filed a notice of appeal, and the Ninth Circuit court of appeals panel<sup>10</sup> refused to recognize the appeal, despite payment of fees. By order dated April 12, 2002, the three judge appellate panel ruled that the order rendered ten years earlier by U.S. district judge Marilyn Patel permanently terminated my right to file papers in the federal courts.

#### **Despite the Latest Catastrophic Events, Continued Judicial Obstruction of Justice**

- o After 9/11, I made two more attempts to report the corrupt activities, including those in the government aviation safety offices that constituted the *primary area of blame* for the hijackings of four airliners. I also sought to report the corruption in the FBI and CIA that affected their functions and which would be material factors in understanding why the intelligence failures and failures to act on known intelligence existed.

#### **Obstruction of Justice and Due Process Violations by Federal Judges in the Nation's Capitol**

- o The first attempt to report these matters was by filing papers in the federal courts in Washington, D.C.<sup>11</sup> That attempt was blocked by district and appellate judges, who held that the order rendered in 1991 by former CIA legal counsel and federal judge Stanley Sporkin permanently barred me from filing any papers in the federal courts. The U.S. Court of Appeals<sup>12</sup> in Washington, D.C., refused to conduct their required de novo review of my appeal and supported the obstruction of justice, the violations of due process, and the unlawful and unconstitutional order by Judge Sporkin.

#### **Next Judicial Obstruction of Justice: Federal Judges in New York City**

- o I then attempted to report these matters by filing papers in the federal courts in New York City<sup>13</sup> where most of the 9/11 deaths occurred and where most of the 9/11 related lawsuits were filed. The federal action, which should have been filed upon receipt, was blocked for 13 months. Simultaneous with the 13-month delay in finally filing it, Judge Mukasey issued an order dismissing the filing. Among the statements made in Judge Mukasey's order were (a) that the allegations stated in the action were frivolous; (b) the attempt to report these matters were the act of a vexatious litigant; and (c) that I lacked standing to report criminal activities. (Arguably, the people who suffered so greatly during their final moments on 9/11, or the family members who will suffer for the remainder of their lives, may think otherwise!)

#### **Blocked, Again, by the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court**

- o On January 5, 2005, I submitted to the U.S. Supreme Court a petition for writ of certiorari and writ of mandate, addressing these serious matters. The filing (a) met the requirements specified in Supreme Court rules; (b) met the requirements under 18 U.S.C. § 4; (c) met the Justice's supervisory responsibilities<sup>14</sup> over federal judges; and (d) met the Justice's moral responsibilities to take prompt action against these criminal and due process violations. The Justices, by now, have many years of watching the catastrophic consequences from the criminal activities that I first brought to their attention in the early 1980s.
- o Despite all this, by letter dated January 13, 2005, the Supreme Court returned the material that I submitted, unfiled.

#### **One Supreme Court Justice Responded in a Personal Letter**

- o Only one Supreme Court Justice ever showed any concern to my many letters and petitions. Justice Bryon White wrote a personal letter to me, dated October 28, 1991, implying his recognition of the seriousness of the matters, but that he could not help without the cooperation of the other Justices. The letter, a copy of which is attached, stated: "As a single Justice I can be of no help to you. I am returning

your petition.”

- o Further information on the most recent efforts by federal judges to block the reporting of these corrupt activities can be found at [www.defraudingamerica.com/911\\_lawsuit\\_information.html](http://www.defraudingamerica.com/911_lawsuit_information.html).

### Summary

- o Several points must be recognized: (1) The misconduct by federal judges is well documented, and does not consist of *general allegations*; (2) the corruption and relation to airline disasters are well documented, and I have documents in my possession from my role as a federal aviation safety agent during which I acted as an independent prosecutor; (3) the underlying criminal and subversive activities in other areas would be supported by testimony that I and several other former government agents are willing to provide; and (4) the enormous harm—such as the past events, the events of 9/11—and what will surely follow, does not permit a cavalier response or unlawful cover-ups. If even part of these allegations are true, the United States is being subverted from within, and demands that *anyone* who knows of these allegations act to bring about a thorough public hearing.

At this stage, the enormity of the tragedies made possible by the documented misconduct of federal judges is so severe, that continued cover-up with the escalation of the consequences could be expected. Fortunately for the guilty, many members of Congress have become implicated through cover-ups, insuring that these crimes against the United States will continue.

What is stated here are only the highlights. The entire story is of even worse.

Sincerely,

Rodney Stich

cc:

**Supreme Court Justices** Stephen G. Breyer; Ruth Bader Ginsburg; Clarence Thomas; David H. Souter; Anthony Kennedy; Antonin Scalia; Sandra Day O'Connor; John Paul Stevens.

**Senate judicial committee members:** Orrin G. Hatch; Patrick J. Leahy; Charles E. Grassley; Edward M. Kennedy; Arlen Specter; Joseph R. Biden, Jr; Jon Kyl; Herbert Kohl; Mike DeWine; Dianne Feinstein; Jeff Sessions; Russell D. Feingold; Lindsey Graham; Charles E. Schumer; Larry Craig; Richard J. Durbin; Saxby Chambliss; John Edwards; John Cornyn.

**House judiciary committee members:** Henry Hyde; Howard Coble; Lamar Smith; Elton Gallegly; Bob Goodlatte; Steve Chabot; William Jenkins; Chris Cannon; Spencer Bachus; John Hostettler; Mark Green; Rick Keller; Melissa Hart; Jeff Flake; Mike Pence; J. Randy Forbes; Steve King; John R. Carter; Tom Feeney; Marsha Blackburn; Howard Berman; Rick Boucher; Jerald Nadler; Robert Scott; Melvin Watt; Zoe Lofgren; Sheila Jackson Lee; Maxine Waters; Martin Meehan; William Delahunt; Robert Wexler; Tammy Baldwin; Anthony Weiner; Adam Schiff; Linda Sánchez

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> I elected to report the federal crimes to a federal judge, under 18 U.S.C. § 4, after members of Congress and Justice Department personnel refused to receive the reports.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> *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.

<sup>5</sup> The other insiders included agents of the FBI, CIA, ONI, DEA, Customs, Secret Service, FAA, former drug smugglers working for and with the knowledge of government agents, and former mafia members.

<sup>6</sup> Among the other criminal activities being reported were drug smuggling into the United States by people acting in government positions and covert operations, massive corruption in the bankruptcy courts, among others.

<sup>7</sup> Title 18 U.S.C. § 111. Assaulting, resisting, or impeding certain officers or employees. (a) In general.—Whoever— (1) forcibly assaults, resists, opposes, impedes, intimidates, or interferes with any person designated in section 114 of this title [federal agent] while engaged in or on account of the performance of official duties; or (2) forcibly assaults or intimidates any person who formerly served as a person designated in section 1114 on account of the performance of official duties during such person's term of service, shall, where the acts in violation of this section constitute only simply assault, be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both, and in all other cases, be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

Title 18 U.S.C. § 1512. Tampering with a witness, victim, or an informant—(b) Whoever knowingly uses intimidation or physical force, or threatens another person, or attempts to do so, or engages in misleading conduct toward another person, with intent to — (1) influence, delay or prevent the testimony of any person in an official proceeding; shall be fined ... or imprisoned ... or both. [1988 amended reading]

Title 18 U.S.C. § 1513. Retaliating against a witness, victim, or an informant. (a) 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—(1) the attendance of a witness or party at an official proceeding, or any testimony given or any record, document, or other object produced by a witness in an official proceeding; or (2) any information relating to the commission or possible commission of a Federal offense ...

<sup>8</sup> Friedman, Sloan and Ross, San Francisco.

<sup>9</sup> U.S. District Court, Reno, Nr. CV-N-152-ECR

<sup>10</sup> Ninth Circuit court of appeals judges James Browning, Andrew Kleinfeld, Ronald Gould.

<sup>11</sup> U.S. District Court, Washington, D.C. Nr. 02cv01172. Court of Appeals Nr. 02-5240.

<sup>12</sup> U.S. Court of appeals, Nr. 02-5240.

<sup>13</sup> U.S. District Court, New York, Nr. 03 CV 7405; Court of Appeals Nr. 03-6244-cv.

<sup>14</sup> Supreme Court Justice's responsibility over federal judges, Supreme Court Rule 10.