

**From the desk of Rodney Stich**

P.O. Box 10587  
Reno, NV 89510  
Phone: 775-786-9191; FAX 925-295-1203

January 2, 2001

Justice David Souter  
United States Supreme Court  
1 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC

Certified mail: 7099 3400 0010 8170 2579

Reference: Pattern of judicial misconduct in Ninth Circuit courts with serious national ramifications

To Justice Souter:

The intent of this letter is to put you and the other justices on notice of serious misconduct in the Ninth Circuit courts. This documented misconduct includes a pattern of obstruction of justice combined with a pattern of subverting civil and constitutional rights to block the reporting of corrupt and criminal activities in key government and judicial offices.

The evidence supporting these serious allegations has been accumulated over the years by myself-a former federal investigator-and a group of other former federal agents.<sup>1</sup> These judicial offenses are occurring in your area of supervisory responsibilities.

This misconduct in your area of responsibilities continues to inflict great harm upon the United States and its people, and upon me. The intent of the judicially inflicted civil and constitutional violations is to block my attempts to report and bring to justice the government and judicial corruption that I and my group of other former government agents had discovered. The primary responsibilities that you have, with receipt of this letter, relates to the pattern of judicial misconduct misusing the federal courts as a corrupt arm of government.

Initially, as a federal investigator, I documented<sup>2</sup> these judicial offenses over a period of many years. This documentation includes a systematic obstruction of justice by federal judges as they repeatedly blocked the reporting of criminal activities<sup>3</sup> that I and other federal agents have discovered. I have attempted to report these criminal activities to a federal court in accordance with the federal crime reporting statute, Title 18 U.S.C. § 4<sup>4</sup> and as permitted to be reported under Title 28 U.S.C. § 1361.<sup>5</sup> These judicial obstruction of justice acts were felonies under Title 18 U.S.C. §§ 2,<sup>6</sup> 3,<sup>7</sup> and 4, and caused the continuation of great harm upon the internal security of the United States and upon many people.

**Compounding Obstruction Of Justice With Retaliating Against  
A Former Federal Agent and Witness**

In addition to repeated judicial obstruction of justice, the evidence reveals Ninth Circuit federal judges repeatedly inflicting harm upon me<sup>8</sup> through hard-core civil and constitutional violations in retaliation for attempting to report these criminal activities to a federal court.

It is a federal crime for anyone, including federal judges, to inflict harm upon a former federal agent or witness to prevent him from reporting federal crimes or for having tried to do so. Title 18 U.S.C. §§ 2, 3, 4, 35, 111, 153, 241, 242, 245(b)(1)(B), 246, 371, 1341, 1343, 1505, 1512, 1513(b), and 1515(a). The gravity of the criminal activities that I sought to report makes the felony offenses and national implications more serious.

## **Combining Judicial Obstruction Of Justice and Retaliation With Subversion Of Constitutional Protections**

The pattern of judicial obstruction of justice was accompanied by a pattern misusing the federal courts to render unlawful and unconstitutional orders inflicting great personal and financial harm, while subverting legal and constitutional defenses. The primary goal and effect of these documented acts of judicial misconduct was to block the reporting of criminal and subversive activities that I and my group of other former federal agents sought to report and bring to justice.

The documented criminal activities that the group of former federal agents sought to report under the federal crime reporting statute (18 U.S.C. § 4) included:

- Series of air safety and criminal activities that were associated with a series of fatal airline crashes.<sup>9</sup>
- Pattern of drug smuggling into the United States by people acting under cover of various federal agencies, including the Central Intelligence Agency.
- Pattern of corruption in Ninth Circuit bankruptcy courts involving judges, trustees, and cooperating attorneys and law firms.
- Other criminal activities, as partly described in the third editions of *Defrauding America* and *Unfriendly Skies*, the first editions of *Drugging America* and *Disavow*, the E-book format of these titles, and on various web sites, including [www.defraudingamerica.com/lawsuit\\_progress.html](http://www.defraudingamerica.com/lawsuit_progress.html), and as further described in the lawsuit filed in the U.S. district court at Reno, Nevada, CV-N-00-00152-ECR (PHA). Many of the federal offenses are listed in that lawsuit.

## **Pattern of Judicial Subversion Of Civil and Constitutional Protections Associated With Pattern of Judicial Obstruction Of Justice**

The pattern of civil and constitutional violations, and obstruction of justice, by Ninth Circuit district and appellate judges, commenced with a sham lawsuit filed in the California courts by the San Francisco law firm of Friedman, Sloan and Ross, reportedly a front for the Central Intelligence Agency. That lawsuit targeted the \$10 million in properties that funded my exposure activities. That lawsuit was barred by dozens of state and federal laws and constitutional protections, for which numerous federal defenses existed.

When I exercised these federal remedies, federal judges subverted each of the multiple federal remedies that would have promptly ended the series of civil and constitutional violations occurring in the California courts. This total denial of due process, which made possible the success of the goal to take these assets that funded the exposure of criminal and even subversive activities was judicially accomplished by federal judges:

- Repeatedly subverting and violating the many legal and constitutional defenses specifically intended to halt the sham lawsuit. The primary remedies existed under the Declaratory Judgment Act, FRCivPd 57, and the Civil Rights Act. This same pattern is occurring in the district court at Reno, Nevada, which are already the subject of several notices of appeal as the systematic due process violations continue. These appeals will encounter similar due process denials as documented over the past 20 years.
- Repeatedly rendering unlawful and unconstitutional injunctive orders<sup>10</sup> forever barring me access to the federal courts. These orders voided for me the rights and protections guaranteed by the laws and Constitution of the United States. The orders also barred me from reporting the federal crime to a federal court as required to be reported under Title 18 U.S.C. § 4.
- Unlawfully, unconstitutionally, and corruptly, seizing and liquidating the \$10 million in assets that funded my exposure of these criminal activities against the United States. These assets

were seized without providing the legal and constitutional notice of hearing, a hearing, and legally requirement for such seizure.

- Rendering unlawful and unconstitutional orders barring me from filing objections to the seizure and liquidation of these assets.
- Unlawfully and unconstitutionally removing my legal objections to the corrupt judicial taking of my life's assets after I did file objections.
- In addition, Judge Jellen charged me with criminal contempt of court for exercising this legal and constitutional due process right. Judge Jellen denied me legal counsel, refused to allow me to testify, and then sentenced me to federal prison.
- Continued to render unlawful and unconstitutional injunctive orders barring me, for the remainder of my life, from federal court access. These orders voided for me the rights and protections guaranteed under the laws and Constitution of the United States while California and federal judges were simultaneously rendering unlawful and unconstitutional orders inflicting great and irreparable personal and financial harm upon me. These orders blocked me from defending against the seizure and liquidation of my assets. These orders continue to exist today, and have recently blocked me from access to federal court at Oakland, California.
- After rendering those unlawful injunctive orders voiding for me all legal and constitutional protections, federal judges seized and liquidated my assets, charged me with criminal contempt of court, ordered me held for trial under literal house arrest from 1986 through 1995, and sent me to federal prison for six months, including six weeks in solitary confinement. I was 70 years of age at that time, shortly after undergoing a six-bypass open-heart surgery.
- Ninth Circuit appellate judges refuse to recognize my timely filed notices of appeal, further compounding the widespread contempt for the protections guaranteed by the laws and Constitution of the United States.
- This pattern of arrogant due process violations conflicts with this court's recent professed concern in the Bush versus Gore matter about denial of due process and equal protection to every citizen, putting into question the true motive for its decision in that matter.

#### **A Brief Sequence Of Events Involving Criminal Activities, Judicial Cover-ups, and Judicial Subversion of Due Process Protections**

Briefly, the judicial misconduct and the events leading up to the 20-year documented pattern of total judicial due process denial combined with obstruction of justice followed the following sequence of events:

- Initial obstruction of justice related to a series of fatal airline crashes. As a federal air safety inspector for the Federal Aviation Administration, responsible for air safety at the world's largest airline, I documented a pattern of deeply entrenched air safety and criminal acts associated with a series of fatal airline crashes. These federal offenses prevented the federal government from carrying out its air safety responsibilities, resulting in many crashes and hundreds of deaths. Included in the factors related to the fraud-related crashes were threats, harassment, and intimidation of federal air safety inspectors. I sought to correct the serious offenses by acting as a self-appointed independent counsel, conducting a four-month FAA hearing during which I obtained testimony and additional documentation proving the relationship between numerous specific airline disasters and the federal offenses. This hearing was followed by a cover-up that included top FAA officials, Justice Department personnel, and National Transportation Safety Board officers.
- The combination of evidence and the obstruction of justice caused me to present evidence to a Justice Department-controlled federal grand jury in Denver where the obstruction of justice

continued. Despite the obvious links between the criminal offenses and the tragedy-related crashes, the threats and harassment against me, a federal agent, continued, causing me to leave government service.

- The subsequent escalation of fraud related crashes caused me to exercise federal remedies under the federal crime reporting statute (18 U.S.C. § 4) and the statute allowing any citizen to obtain an order requiring a federal official to comply with the law and halt unlawful conduct. (Title 28 U.S.C. § 1361.11) I filed several federal actions,<sup>12</sup> and each time federal judges refused to perform their duties and promptly dismissed them. This refusal to perform a mandatory duty made possible the continuation of the air safety and criminal offenses, which in turn resulted in many crashes and many deaths.
- In an attempt to circumvent the obstruction of justice, I used my considerable assets to publish books, appear as guest and expert on hundreds of radio and television shows, give speeches, and place notices in various media publications. These activities were funded by my real estate assets, which at that time exceeded \$10 million in value. Other federal agents started to provide me with additional information and documentation of such misconduct, and my “whistleblower” activities covered a wider area. These activities, funded by my assets, threatened to expose people in key government and judicial positions.
- After the second edition of *Unfriendly Skies* was published, which named federal judges who blocked the reporting of these federal offenses, a bizarre lawsuit was filed against me in the California courts<sup>13</sup> that targeted the \$10 million in real estate assets that funded my exposure activities. That lawsuit<sup>14</sup> was barred by several dozen California statutes and rules of court, federal statutes, constitutional protections, and key Supreme Court decisions.<sup>15</sup> Further, state statutes specifically deprived California judges of personal and subject matter jurisdiction for the cause of action that was filed.<sup>16</sup> For that lawsuit to succeed, it needed the cooperation of large numbers of California and federal judges, who had a duty to immediately dismiss it, but who escalated the violations of federally protected rights.
- Despite the absence of jurisdiction and the record setting violations of state and federal laws and constitutional protections, California judges continued to render orders for the next six years that inflicted great personal and financial harm upon me. These repeated violations of not one, but many, civil and constitutional rights caused me to lose valuable properties, including over a quarter million dollar equity in my home.

#### **Exercising Federal Remedies**

- Defenses against these violations existed in the federal courts, and specifically under the Declaratory Judgment Act<sup>17</sup> and the Civil Rights Act.<sup>18</sup> I exercised these federal remedies, which should have promptly resulted in federal judges declaring the validity of prior judgments that adjudicated my personal and property rights, and an order halting the civil and constitutional violations.
- Instead of performing this mandatory duty, every federal district and appellate judge before whom I exercised these federally protected rights refused to perform that duty, thereby aiding and abetting the major violations of federally protected rights.<sup>19</sup>

#### **Fraudulent Judicial Tactics To Violate Due Process**

- The tactic used by federal judges to “support” their refusal to perform these mandatory duties was to reverse the legal definition of frivolous and place a frivolous label on my lawsuits that stated major record-setting violations of federally protected rights. Federal judges then expanded on these fraudulent holdings by labeling me a vexatious litigant for exercising

federal remedies against the great numbers of documented violations of federally protected rights, and for attempting to report the criminal activities that I had sought to report.

#### **Continued Discovery of Serious Criminal Activities**

- While the judicial scheme to silence one was escalating, I had continued to receive reports and documentation from other former federal agents showing the existence of criminal activities in other government and judicial offices. These sources included agents from such agencies as the FBI, DEA, Customs, INS, and the CIA, and included the former heads of secret CIA airlines and secret CIA financial operations that had information of major criminal and even subversive activities. These criminal activities could not be reported to Justice Department personnel, as they were themselves implicated through their obstruction of justice activities, a practice that I initially discovered as a federal investigator.
- I then included in my lawsuits that were exercising federal remedies through a declaratory judgment and for the civil and constitutional violations a demand under the federal crime reporting statute, Title 18 U.S.C. § 4, that the judge receives, as part of his administrative duties, the reports and the evidence of the federal crimes from me and my group of other former federal agents.

#### **Again Seeking To Report Federal Crimes To A Federal Court**

- The federal crime reporting statute requires that any citizen knowing of a federal crime must report it to a federal court or other federal tribunal. (Title 18 U.S.C. § 4) Although federal judges blocked this requirement several years earlier when I sought to report the criminal activities that I discovered as a federal air safety inspector, I again exercised this responsibility in 1986. I included a request to report and produce evidence of criminal activities<sup>20</sup> with the lawsuits filed under the Declaratory Judgment Act and Civil Rights Act for the continuing violations occurring in the California and federal courts.

#### **Credibility Of Allegations**

The credibility of my allegations arose from the evidence of the judicial misconduct in judicial records, my former responsible position as a federal investigator, and the positions held by many of the federal agents who provided me with the information, including the boxes of documentation supporting their explosive information. Included in these sources were former heads of secret CIA airlines and secret CIA financial proprietaries.

#### **Continual Judicial Expansion Of Federal Offenses**

- Federal judges reacted to my attempt to report the criminal activities as they reacted to being confronted with the record setting violations occurring in the California courts. First, they refused to receive the information and evidence of the criminal activities that I was seeking to report under Title 18 U.S.C. § 4 and promptly dismissed the actions at the pleading stage sometimes without notice.

#### **Judicial Dual Obstruction Of Justice and Total Denial Of Due Process**

- Faced with my attempts to report criminal activities implicating people in key government and judicial positions and the documented violations of large numbers of federally protected rights that invoked multiple federal defenses for me, federal judges<sup>21</sup> commenced issuing unlawful and unconstitutional injunctive orders<sup>22</sup> denying to me, for the remainder of my life, the right to federal court access. These orders accomplished several corrupt purposes: they barred me from reporting the criminal activities under the federal crime reporting statute. Second, they blocked the federal defenses against the judicially perpetrated violations of federally protected rights that were devastating my personal and financial life. I was now literally stripped of every right and protection guaranteed under the laws and Constitution of the United States. These acts

revealed the willingness of federal judges to destroy the protections under our form of government and in the process, cover up for criminal activities.

### **Judicial Retaliation For Exercising Due Process and Reporting Criminal Activities**

- The continuing series of judicial actions that consisted of civil and constitutional violations, and the gravity of the criminal activities upon the United States that we sought to report, compounded by the literal judicial anarchy affecting major national interests, caused me to again file a federal action for subsequent federal civil rights violations and to report information about still other areas of corruption in key government and judicial offices. Federal judges<sup>23</sup> then charged me with criminal contempt of court for:
  - Exercising constitutional due process specifically provided by the laws and Constitution against the large numbers of civil and constitutional violations. It is a federal crime under Title 18 U.S.C. § 241<sup>24</sup> for two or more persons to retaliate against a citizen for having exercised constitutional due process rights, and these judges were guilty of that offense numerous times.
  - Reporting criminal activities to a federal court. It is a federal crime for anyone to inflict harm upon a former federal agent or witness to prevent him from reporting federal crimes or for having tried to do so. Title 18 U.S.C. §§ 2, 3, 4, 35, 111, 153, 241, 242, 245(b)(1)(B), 246, 371, 1341, 1343, 1505, 1512, 1513(b), and 1515(a).

\* A combination of Justice Department prosecutors and federal judges then denied me a jury trial (what jury would convict for exercising constitutional defenses and for seeking to report corruption in government and judicial offices!), held me guilty, and then sentenced me to federal prison for six months. The sentence included being shipped repeatedly, in chains, from prison to prison, some of them county jails, and included six weeks in solitary confinement. I was almost 70 years of age at that time, being converted from a multi-millionaire to a state of poverty, stripped of all protections in law and having the power of the courts corruptly used to inflict enormous personal and financial harm upon me. Also, I had recently undergone open-heart surgery requiring six bypasses, and the strain and stress could have had fatal consequences.

### **Judicial Corruption In Ninth Circuit Bankruptcy Courts**

- Several months earlier, I sought to force a federal judge to perform his duty under the Declaratory Judge Act and Civil Rights Act by filing Chapter 11 for my personal and my corporate assets. Although the law provided for this protection, I had not known about the rampant judicial corruption in that segment of the federal courts. I soon learned.
- Instead of providing relief, I discovered another area of judicial corruption in the Ninth Circuit courts. Bankruptcy judges Robert Jones and Edward Jellen escalated and carried out the original intent of taking the assets that funded my exposure activities. (I describe some of these corrupt activities in the three third editions of Defrauding America and Unfriendly Skies, and on various web sites. ([www.defraudingamerica.com/lawsuit\\_progress.html](http://www.defraudingamerica.com/lawsuit_progress.html)))
- Federal judges unlawfully and unconstitutionally ordered the seizure of all my assets, refusing to provide the legal and constitutional requirement of a notice of hearing, a hearing, and legally recognized cause. They just took these life assets, including my home, my businesses, and sole source of income, as if the lives of individual Americans were there to pluck whenever they felt the desire, and knowing that the judicial system was so corrupt that they could get away with these corrupt acts. The Supreme Court Justices, who have supervisory responsibilities over their conduct, refused to exercise their responsibilities.
- Turning the assets over to known embezzler protected by federal judges. These assets were turned over to court-appointed trustee Charles Duck, who had been repeatedly charged with

embezzlement by people whose assets were taken. Several years later, media publicity forced the Justice Department to file charges against Duck and reach a plea agreement providing for a short stay in a federal prison camp. Not bad for a trustee charged with the nation's worst trustee embezzlement. The book, *Defrauding America*, describes Duck's alleged involvement with the CIA. (Even if constitutional due process notice of hearing and hearing had been given, the corruption in the federal courts would probably still have seized my assets.)

- After corruptly seizing my assets, federal judges, including Oakland federal judge Edward Jellen, rendered orders barring me from filing objections to the judicial seizure and liquidation of my assets.
- After I exercised the legal and constitutional right to file objections to the seizure and liquidation of my life's assets, the filings were ordered unfiled.
- Federal judge Edward Jellen then charged me with criminal contempt of court for exercising these legal and constitutional due process remedies. It is a felony, under Title 18 U.S.C. § 241, for two or more people to retaliate against a citizen for exercising constitutional due process. Ninth Circuit district and appellate judges aided and abetted all of these corrupt, unlawful, and unconstitutional pattern of judicial acts perpetrated under color of federal law.
- During the “trial” for criminal contempt of court, I was denied legal counsel, denied the right to testify, and then sentenced to federal prison by Judge Edward Jellen.
- Over the next ten years, all of my assets were liquidated, part of the liquidation going to the parties whose violations of federally protected rights occurred in the California and the federal courts. Before the expiration of the statute of limitations, I filed the lawsuit in the U.S. district court at Reno, and promptly encountered a continuation of the total due process denial that I encountered during the prior 20 years, The Reno lawsuit sought relief under the Declaratory Judgment Act,<sup>25</sup> the Civil Rights Act, Bivens, and RICO, and continued my efforts to report the criminal activities. As in the past, the court systematically blocked each of the federal remedies and the reporting of these inter-related civil and constitutional violations while protecting the California and federal judges, and CIA law firm, that repeatedly subverted large numbers of state and federal laws and constitutional protections.
- The district judge in that lawsuit promptly dismissed the defendant federal judges, holding that they were totally immune from the consequences of the charges that I alleged against them. When I filed a notice of appeal to their dismissal, Ninth Circuit court of appeal judges continue their pattern of refusing to recognize my timely filed notices of appeal. I was totally barred from the protections guaranteed by the laws and Constitution of the United States against the corrupt, criminal, and unconstitutional acts of federal judges in the Ninth Circuit.
- My petitions to the U.S. Supreme Court exposing this pattern of obstruction of justice and subversion of the laws and Constitution were met with refusal to act. In this way, Supreme Court justices aided and abetted the subversive activities.
- The obstruction of justice, made possible great sufferings to me,<sup>26</sup> and great harm upon the United States.<sup>27</sup>

### **Summary**

It is important to realize that this pattern of hard-core documented judicial anarchy is not simply criminal and unconstitutional offenses against a targeted citizen. These are documented acts showing a willingness of large numbers of federal judges to:

- Destroy the legal and constitutional foundation upon which the United States was founded.
- Aid and abet the criminal activities that I and a group of other federal agents have discovered. These criminal activities are inflicting great harm upon the internal security of the United

States, upon its institutions, upon the judicial system, with the results that many deaths have occurred and great harm suffered by people throughout the United States.

- These are not academic possibilities; they are real, and they have already happened. They affect major national concerns and national security. These judicial acts are aiding and abetting the criminal activities that are undermining the internal security of the United States. The documented pattern of repeated subversion of large numbers of legal and constitutional rights and safeguards, the misuse of judicial positions and the courts to inflict such grievous harm upon a former government agent for attempting to perform a moral and legal duty, shows the willingness of federal judges to destroy the legal rights upon which this country has been founded. And if you and the other justices are going to continue to aid and abet this judicial anarchy, then the United States is under an even great threat from within, and particularly from the federal judicial that is controlled by the Supreme Court justices. This cancerous growth will continue to spread through the government and into the private sector. I've performed my duty, now it is time for you to perform yours.

At the age of 78, I expect to have my civil and constitutional rights returned to me before I leave this earth. If this court continues its cover-up of these matters, and if I don't see some concrete reactions from the justices of the Supreme Court, I will promptly take other actions to make the public aware of these judicial subversive activities. Up to this date the only Justice who acknowledged these problems was Justice Bryan White, whose attached October 28, 1999, letter said that by himself he could not be any help. You can get started by acting on the petition for writ of certiorari that was received by your court on November 20, 2000. I did my duty, and paid the price. How about you doing your duty! This letter will appear on an Internet site.

Sincerely,

Rodney Stich

## ENDNOTES

1 The federal agents include former heads of secret CIA airlines and secret CIA financial operations, and agents from the FBI, DEA, and Secret Service.

2 These corrupt and criminal acts, the subversion of constitutional protections, are further detailed in the lawsuit filed in the U.S. district court at Reno, Nevada, number CV-N-00-00152-ECR (PHA), partly shown in the web site location, [www.defraudingamerica.com/lawsuit\\_progress.html](http://www.defraudingamerica.com/lawsuit_progress.html), and in the third editions of *Defrauding America* and *Unfriendly Skies*, with others in progress.

3 From 1987 to this day, federal judges at every level blocked the reporting of corrupt and criminal activities in key government and judicial positions that I, a former federal inspector-investigator, and my group of other former and present government agents sought to report. These agents include former heads of secret CIA airlines and secret CIA financial operations, former FBI and other government agents, who can provide evidence of these crimes against the United States.

4 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.

5 Title 28 U.S.C. § 1361. The district court 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.

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 In retaliation for attempting to report corrupt and criminal activities to a federal court under the federal crime reporting statute, Title 18 U.S.C. § 4, from 1986 to 1995, federal judges repeated charged me with criminal contempt of court, sentenced me to federal prison for six months, subjected me to traveling in chains, over six weeks in solitary confinement, and then used that sentence to seize and liquidate my \$10 million in assets that funded my attempts to expose the criminal activities in key government and judicial offices.

9 I discovered these offenses after being asked to take over the crash-plagued most senior program at United Airlines. My prior aviation experiences commenced during World War II, while I was a Navy pilot, Navy flight instructor, and Navy patrol plane commander in large four-engine patrol planes. After the war I was an international airline pilot and captain. I was also a successful real estate investor, having started up numerous businesses and had over \$10 million in assets.

10 Legal requirements for injunctive orders are (1) they must halt great and irreparable harm; (2) they must halt unlawful acts; (3) they must be in the public's interest; and (4) the judge rendering the orders must issue a finding of facts showing that these requirements had been met. As repeatedly judicially perpetrated, the law was applied in reverse. The orders did not halt the harm, they protected the people inflicting the harm and deprived Stich, who was the recipient of the harm, from defenses and protections in the laws and Constitution of the United States. The orders did not halt the unlawful acts; they provided judicial protection to the continuation and escalating of these violations. Subverting the laws and Constitution of the United States and depriving a citizen of these rights was not in the public's interest. And the findings of facts showing these requirements were met was never rendered by any of the judges.

11 Title 28 U.S.C. § 1361. The district court 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.

12 *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 claimant seeking to expose and correct the powerful and covert air disaster misconduct.

13 The lawsuit was filed by the San Francisco law firm of Friedman, Sloan and Ross, that had been identified to me later by two reliable sources as a front for the Central Intelligence Agency. This would help explain why large numbers of California and federal judges protected that law firm and in the process, repeatedly blocked the reporting of criminal and subversive activities and repeatedly subverted the protections in large numbers of federal laws and the Constitution upon which I relied to defend myself.

14 The sham lawsuit attacked and took the personal and property rights previously adjudicated and established in multiple prior judgments, thereby violating over 36 California statutes and rules of court, federal statutes, constitutional protections, and controlling U.S. Supreme Court decisions. Compounding these civil and constitutional violations, California law specifically deprived the California judges of personal and subject matter jurisdiction for that cause of action.

15 California Civil Codes: §§ 4351, 4554, 5004, 5102, 5103, 5108, 5110.720, 5118, 5164

- Code of Civil Procedures statutes: §§ 1699(b), 1713.1, 1713.3, 1908, 1910, 1913, 915.
- Rules of court barring the attack upon the exercise of jurisdiction and when there is a prior judgment for the same matters under the California Family Law Act and deprive the court of jurisdiction: Rule 1201(c); Rule 1211, Rule 1212 Rule 1215 Rule 1222 Rule 1229(a) Rule 1230(a)(2) Rule 1234, Rule 1239(a)(2) Rule 1281 Rule 1282.
- Absence of personal jurisdiction arising from Rule 1230 Motion to quash, as defined by California Rule of court 1230(a)(2); Rule of Court 1234; Rule of Court 1239(a)(2). Absence of personal and subject matter jurisdiction under the California Family Law Act on the basis of any of the seven prior divorce judgments. Rule 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, providing for full faith and credit recognition of Plaintiff's personal and property rights established in seven judgments, which were taken from Plaintiff).
- Title 28 U.S.C. § 1738, full faith and credit statute.
- Article IV, § 1, in the U.S. Constitution that requires full faith and credit recognition of Plaintiff's personal and property rights.
- Article IV, § 2, the constitutional protection against taking of previously adjudicated and previously acquired personal and property rights upon changing residence to another state. This protection was violated as defendant California judges (assisted by every other defendant) took these personal and property rights after Plaintiff exercised his constitutional right to change residence to California.
- Fourteenth Amendment due process clause, which was repeatedly violated by the defendant California judges.
- Fourteenth Amendment equal protection clause, as Plaintiff's substantive and procedural due process was repeatedly violated by the defendant California judges.

- Fourteenth Amendment privileges and immunities clause was repeatedly violated by denying to Plaintiff the same rights and protections available to other citizens.
- Fourteenth Amendment equal protection, which was repeatedly denied to Plaintiff.
- Fourteenth Amendment property rights, which were repeatedly violated and taken.
- Fourteenth Amendment liberty interests.
- *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).

16 The absence of jurisdiction was clearly stated in California law and rules of court. The bizarre action was filed under the Family Law Act despite the fact there were no family law matters involved following a 1966 divorce judgment that adjudicated all marital matters and I had been divorced for the preceding 20 years.

17 Title 28 U.S.C. § 2201. Creation of remedy. “In a case of actual controversy within its jurisdiction, any court of the United States, upon the filing of an appropriate pleading, may declare the rights and other legal relations of any interested party seeking such declaration, whether or not further relief is or could be sought. Any such declaration shall have the force and effect of a final judgment or decree and shall be reviewable as such.

Title 28 U.S.C. § 2202. Further relief. “Further necessary or proper relief based on a declaratory judgment or decree may be granted, after reasonable notice and hearing, against any adverse party whose rights have been determined by such judgment.”

18 Title 42 U.S.C. § 1983 provides: Every person who, under color or any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage, of any State of Territory, subjects ... any citizen of the United States ... to the deprivation of any rights, privileges or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress; Title 42 U.S.C. § 1985 Conspiracy to interfere with civil rights, (1) Preventing officer from performing duty; (2) Obstructing justice; intimidating party, witness, or juror; (3) Depriving persons of rights or privileges; Title 42 U.S.C. § 1986. Action for neglect to prevent conspiracy.

19 Aiding and abetting and protecting the perpetrators of these violations was accomplished by dismissing every lawsuit that I filed which stated federal causes of action under the Declaratory Judgment Act (Title 28 U.S.C. § 2201), Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 57 relating to declaratory judgments, Civil Rights Act (Title 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983-1986), Title 28 U.S.C. § 1343, and controlling case law that barred dismissal when the facts in the complaint stated federal causes of actions for which federal relief is available. Federal judges sought to “support” their denial of constitutional due process by reversing the legal and common-sense definition of frivolous by placing a frivolous label on the lawsuits that revealed hard-core violations of federally protected rights and then compounded that sham by labeling me a vexatious litigant for exercising constitutional due process specifically provided by federal laws for major violations of federally protected rights.

20 This additional criminal activity included evidence of drug smuggling into the United States by people acting under color of their government positions, including the Central Intelligence Agency, judicial corruption in the bankruptcy courts, the CIA's role in looting the savings and loans, and other federal crimes.

21 Federal judges voiding for me all due process, for the remainder of my life, included Ninth Circuit judges Marilyn Patel, Milton Schwartz, Raul Ramirez, Vaughn Walker, Samuel Conti, and others.

22 Federal judges repeatedly violated the legal and constitutional requirements for injunctive orders. Legal requirements for injunctive orders are (1) they must halt great and irreparable harm; (2) they must halt unlawful acts; (3) they must be in the public's interest; and (4) the judge rendering the orders must issue a finding of facts showing that these requirements had been met. As repeatedly judicially perpetrated, the law was applied in reverse. The orders did not halt the harm, they protected the people inflicting the harm and deprived Stich, who was the recipient of the harm, from defenses and protections in the laws and Constitution of the United States. The orders did not halt the unlawful acts; they provided judicial protection to the continuation and escalating of these violations. Subverting the laws and Constitution of the United States and depriving a citizen of these rights was not in the public's interest. And the findings of facts showing these requirements were met was never rendered by any of the judges.

23 In retaliation for attempting to report corrupt and criminal activities to a federal court under the federal crime reporting statute, Title 18 U.S.C. § 4, from 1986 to 1995, federal judges repeated charged me with criminal contempt of court, sentenced me to federal prison for six months, subjected me to traveling in chains, over six weeks in solitary confinement, and then used that sentence to seize and liquidate my \$10 million in assets that funded my attempts to expose the criminal activities in key government and judicial offices.

24 Title 18 U.S.C. § 241. Conspiracy against rights of citizens. If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; ... They shall be fined ... or imprisoned ... or both;

25 Declaratory judgment is sought to declare the validity of the seven judgments that require recognition of Petitioner's personal and property rights; declaratory judgment declaring as void the orders rendered by Chapter 11 judges seizing and liquidating Petitioner's assets; declaration returning to Petitioner the civil and constitutional rights taken from him by the series of injunctive orders barring him for the remainder of his life from the rights and protections guaranteed by the laws and Constitution of the United States. Petitioner seeks damages under the Civil Rights Act from the California judges and attorneys who repeatedly violated large numbers of state and federal laws, causing Petitioner to suffer extreme personal and financial losses; financial damages under Bivens against the federal judges whose corrupt, unlawful, unconstitutional, and criminal acts were far outside the judicial decision making process for which self-serving judicial immunity has been applied. And damages against the attorneys who aided and abetted the violations of civil and constitutional rights under color of federal law. And finally, a demand that a federal judge receive the evidence of major criminal and subversive acts against the United States.

26 I was made homeless as my home was taken, my businesses were taken, and my sole source of income was taken. At the age of 70, federal judges made me homeless, with horrendous personal consequences.

27 The repeated obstruction of justice made possible the continuation of air safety and criminal activities that I, a former inspector for the Federal Aviation Administration, had discovered and documented, which resulted in a continuation of fatal airline crashes arising from these matters; continuation of the drug smuggling into the United States by people acting under cover of a government agency or operation; continuation of the corrupt judicial activities in Ninth Circuit bankruptcy courts that looted the life assets of many people who exercised the statutory protections of Chapter 11, unaware of the rampant corruption; and much more.