

**From the desk of Rodney Stich**

P.O. Box 5, Alamo, CA 94507

Phone: 925-944-1930; FAX 925-295-1203

October 21, 2003

Justice William Rehnquist

U.S. Supreme Court

1 First Street NE

Washington, DC 20543

Certified mailing: 7002 0860 0003 9592 6443

Ref: This letter is the latest in a series of reports on judicial misconduct in your area of supervisory responsibilities, including judicial misconduct with links to the events of 9/11.

To Justice Rehnquist,

This letter and the attached copy of a notice of appeal continue the series of reports to you and other Supreme Court justices. The issues relate to misconduct by federal judges that continues to adversely affect national security and other national interests. In one area affected by the misconduct and addressing only one-day's consequences, are the catastrophic aviation events of September 11, 2001. This relationship is highlighted in the notice of appeal dated October 11, 2003, that was submitted to the U.S. district court for the southern district of New York. Among the issues raised in that notice are the:

- Actions by Judges Mukasey<sup>1</sup> blocking the reporting of criminal activities to a federal court under the mandatory requirements of the federal crime reporting statute, Title 18 U.S.C. § 4-<sup>2</sup> This obstruction of justice by federal judges has a long history, beginning in the late 1970s as I sought to report criminal activities inflicting great harm upon national security interests.<sup>3</sup>
- The continuing violations of legal and constitutional substantive and procedural due process that have been an integral part of the attempts to block me and other former government agents from reporting the corruption in government offices.
- Effects of this misuse of judicial positions and the federal courts: great harm to national security and other national interests, including the catastrophic aviation disasters of September 11, 2001. These criminal activities have been discovered by me and other government agents as part of our official duties. Their continuation has been made possible by cover-ups, and particularly that by federal judges at every level.
- Exercise of duty under the federal crime reporting statute, and my rights as a citizen, to report these matters to a federal court.
- If federal judges had not blocked me and other former federal agents from reporting these corrupt and criminal conditions, the conditions enabling hijackers to seize four airliners could have been addressed and the 9/11 catastrophic events prevented.

The defendants in the lawsuits relating to 9/11 should be made aware of these charges and given access to the supporting evidence. The evidence would show that the primary blame for the success of the 9/11 terrorists would not, in many cases, be with the defendants, but with the persons responsible for the misconduct that we agents discovered, and the people who blocked the reporting of these matters, and especially federal judges who misused their judicial positions to inflict great personal and financial harm upon those former government agents who came forward seeking to protect U.S. interests.

Sincerely,

Rodney Stich

1 The Complaint, seeking to report corrupt and criminal activities that continue to inflict great harm upon national security, was blocked from being filed for 12 months, and then without notifying me, a *sua sponte* dismissal was made, insuring the criminal activities go unreported, along with the felony cover-up involvement of federal judges and others.

2 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.

3 *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