Office of the Circuit Executive, Chief Justice Professor Dave White United State Court for the 9th Circuit cctruth.org
James R. Browning United States Courthouse
thelawisyourattorney.com
95 seventh Street salmonprotectiondevice.com
San Francisco, CA 94119-3939

Circuit Executive, Susan Soong
Chief Justice, Mary H. Murguia

March 14th, 2024

Petition for Judicial Council Review

Dear Ms. Soong and Honorable Chief Justice, Mary H. Murguia

Thank you for your response to my mail. Appellant hereby requests to Petition the Judicial Counsel for review of dockets 25-90001, 25-90002 and 25-90003. In each of the illegal dismissals, Appellant filed judicial complaints against the Federal Judges who illegally dismissed the cases because of bias and illegal administrative law.

The complaint forms filed are attached to this letter. As clear and concise evidence in 3:24-cv-00755-JR, Docket 24-5275, Appellant said, the Judges relied soley on untruthful nonsense of KRRC's attorneys, per the case docket report below. The final ruling was so completely one-sided that it was most likely written by the KRRC attorneys.

The federal judge's complaint form for the two most recent illegal dismissals of 24-6787 and 24-6799 is also attached. The form for 24-6799 is included in the Writ of Certiorari Appellant is filing in the Supreme Court. Two of the five forms involve judge McShane. His abuse of Administrative Law resulted in the same travesty of justice in both the OSU and FERC Complaints filed in federal court. He deserves to be fired and dis-barred for ignoring confession of guilt that is irrefutable grounds for conviction under federal law. Is federal law a take-it-or-leave-it proposition in the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals? How is this any different from anarchy or "law of the jungle?"

Under the new administration, any criticism of Israel or disregard of Israel's law is now considered as illegal, antisemitic discrimination with penalties to include defunding of the individual or agency involved and/or deportation from the United States. Under Israel's Mosaic law, the term "frivolous" in a

court of law is defined as follows: The pro-semitic definition of “frivolous” is found in two passages of Israeli law, known as the Pentateuch.

“If a malicious witness rises up against a man to accuse him of wrong doing...and the judges shall investigate thoroughly; and if the witness is a false witness and he has accused his brother falsely, then you shall do to him just as he had intended to do to his brother. Thus, you shall purge the evil from among you” (Deut. 19:15,19,20).

Another of Israel’s laws requires, “Now if a person sins, after he hears a public adjuration to testify, when he is a witness, whether he has seen or otherwise known, if he does not tell it, then he will bear his guilt” (Lev. 5:1).

The latter passage is what U.S. federal law calls Misprision of Felony and is precisely what all of these judges are guilty of. In other words, all of these judges are misusing their freedom of speech to flaunt the laws of Israel by both:

1. Failing to “investigate thoroughly” all of the evidence, and
2. Having “seen or otherwise known” of the guilt and refusing to “tell it,” then they themselves “will bear his guilt.”

So you be the judge. Are your subordinates judging by an antisemitic or a pro-semitic standard when 1) they fail to investigate thoroughly and 2) they turn a blind eye to the federal crimes being committed? And more importantly, what are you going to do about it?

The other complaint forms are also attached.

Question: since Appellant filed well-documented Judicial Complaints, 1) why weren’t the Judges aware of this and 2) why didn’t they realize that they could not therefore dismiss these dockets as “frivolous?”

Appellant leads a volunteer team consisting of a retired Federal Attorney, well acquainted with federal case law, and an investigative journalist. The latter serves as Legal Editor and helps publicize our findings in the context of actual Court rulings. Appellant learned the law from our retired attorney and with web searching. However, like Pagtalunan, Appellant has lack of legal training. An inside look at what’s really going on in the American Court system, if you will. This has emerged not because we have a preconceived axe to grind, but because we reached a point in life where we personally

experienced the frustration of justice denied under the current system of Administrative Law, having disposed of Administrative Law.

Summary

Every one of these dockets involves a Complaint against the Federal Judge. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the Court to re-open and re-adjudicate each case without bias and without illegal abuse of Administrative Law. Bias and illegal abuse of Administrative Law are no long permitted by 1), 2), 3), 4), 5),6), 7). Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 7), is an Appeals Court ruling that a Pro Se litigant must be given allowance for Pagtalunan's lack of legal training.

24-6787	White v. Ashford, et al.	Decided	Medford, Oregon	IFP Pending in COA	2/28/2025 2:03 PM
24-6799	White v. White, et al.	Decided	Portland, Oregon	Due in District Court	2/27/2025 1:04 PM
24-5811	White v. Phillips, et al.	Closed	Medford, Oregon	IFP Pending in COA	12/12/2024 2:37 PM
24-6015	White v. Dietrich, et al.	Decided	Medford, Oregon	IFP Pending in COA	11/28/2024 8:49 PM
24-5275	White v. Coffman, et al.	Decided	Medford, Oregon	IFP Pending in COA	11/25/2024 10:58 AM

Table of Authorities

Loper Bright Enterprises

US Supreme court June 28th 2024.

1) 22–451 June 28th, 2024 Federal Case number 22–451 in Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo and Relentless, Inc. v. Department of Commerce that all courts shall no longer function as administrative law courts. https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/23pdf/22-451_7m58.pdf

By a six to three decision, abuse of Administrative law is henceforth illegal and ALL courts must convene under Article 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

The Chevron doctrine is invalid. Federal and state agencies can no longer cherry pick data for any preferred political agenda.

Stare decisis must be vertical to the Constitution, not horizontal. This is because any other case can't be guaranteed to have enough similarities to warrant use unless the Judge and counsel on both sides have read case transcripts, exhibits and final ruling.

Four cases as of March 1st 2025 have been sent from the US Supreme Court back to Circuit Court because of use of illegal administrative law.

22-863 DIAZ-RODRIGUEZ, RAFAEL V. GARLAND, ATT'Y GEN.

The petition for a writ of certiorari is granted. The judgment is vacated, and the case is remanded to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit for further consideration in light of Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo, 603 U. S. ___ (2024).

22-868

BASTIAS, ARIEL M. V. GARLAND, ATT'Y GEN.

The petition for a writ of certiorari is granted. The judgment is vacated, and the case is remanded to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit for further consideration in light of Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo, 603 U. S. ___ (2024).

22-1246

EDISON ELEC. INST., ET AL. V. FERC, ET AL.

The petition for a writ of certiorari is granted. The judgment is vacated, and the case is remanded to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit for further consideration in light of Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo, 603 U. S. ___ (2024).

24–5006. Jason Steven Kokinda, Petitioner v. United States. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. Motion of petitioner for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and petition for writ of certiorari granted. Judgment vacated,

and case remanded to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit for further consideration in light of Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo, 603 U. S. —— (2024).

24–92. Kwok Sum Wong, Petitioner v. Merrick B. Garland, Attorney General. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. Petition for writ of certiorari granted. Judgment vacated, and case remanded to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit for further consideration in light of Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo, 603 U. S. —— (2024).

The 22–451 June 28, 2024 U.S. Supreme Court Loper Bright ruling now forbids this abuse and reverts back to the U.S. Constitution. Administrative law is illegal and ALL courts convene as Article three of the US Constitution. The Chevron doctrine is invalid. Federal and state agencies can no longer cherry pick data for their false agenda. Stare decisis must be vertical to the constitution not lower or sideways. This is because any other case can't be guaranteed to have enough similarities to warrant use unless the Judge and each counsel have read those case transcripts, exhibits and final ruling in a Six to Three decision.

Because this is an inferior Court to the U.S. Supreme Court it must limit itself to stare decisis of case law precedent extending vertically back up to the U.S. Constitution. Stare decisis is, of course, a doctrine or policy of following rules or principles laid down in previous judicial decisions

unless they contravene the ordinary principles of justice.

Horizontal stare decisis is unreliable because it can never be guaranteed to be the exact same case with the same history without studying the transcripts and exhibits of the previous case. This is like comparing Apples to Oranges; they are both fruit, but different. This court is therefore, obligated to convene as a Court under Article III of the US Constitution.

2) Also Article 6 Clause 2 of US constitution. This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.
3) Judges Code of Conduct, Canons 2 and 3; https://www.uscourts.gov/judges-judgeships/code-conduct-united-states-judges
4) 18 U.S.C. 4 says, "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) 28 U.S. Code § 455 (b), (1)- Disqualification of justice, judge, or magistrate judge. In this case obstruction of justice by unnecessary delay of Proceedings in Forma Pauperis.
6) 28 U.S. Code § 144 which says Where he (The Judge) has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party, or personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding.
7) Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002): Pagtalunan was Pro Se and made numerous mistakes in filing his complaint resulting in the case being dismissed. However, upon appeal, the higher Court ruled that the lower Court was in error because they did not give allowance for Pagtalunan's lack of legal training.

Conclusion

Appellant

3. David C. White 03/12/2025

APPENDIX