Dear Senator,

Here is the additional detail I promised you regarding our 4 pro se lawsuits and request for one or both of the Senators to Present the Sample Petition Letter below for Reconsideration to Chief Justice Roberts.

Thank you again for your kind consideration,

Dennis Oliver Woods (Legal Editor) & Dave White (litigant)

Table of Contents

1. Abstract

Over the past 2 years, I've prosecuted 4 lawsuits in the jurisdiction of the Ninth Circuit on a pro se basis, from initial complaint all the way to the U.S.A Supreme Court. There are 2 others on my team, including a retired federal attorney. We've appeared before a total of about 25 judges & in every case the Defendant failed to Appear/Respond within the 21+1 days allotted, we filed for default judgment and at that point the Judge steps in to dismiss the case as “frivolous.”. This is obviously Conspiracy to Obstruct Justice because why else would the Defendant fail to Appear in every

single case? In other words 100% of the judges in the 9th Circuit Court are still operating under illegal Administrative Law in spite of the Supreme Court's Loper Bright Enterprises ruling on June 28, 2024. These are NOT frivolous cases and I'm a disabled Army Vet with an ADA-level Siatic Nerve injury. It all started when my wife filed for divorce 4 years ago and the judge was so biased he refused to grant me remote access to a show-cause hearing in which I was declared guilty without due process of law because I couldn't appear. There is also another lawsuit against Oregon State for refusing to let me finish my final 22 credits for a PhD (Taking Chinese students instead) & another important one I filed against FERC for issuing the permits to destroy the 4 dams on the Klamath River in violation of the Clean Water Act. In every case the judge stepped in to declare me "frivolous" and dismiss the case

As a last desperate resort I called the U.S. Supreme Court and asked the Head Intake Clerk what to do. Rashonda Gardner told me to file a formal complaint / Writ of Prohibition with at least one Legal Question and the Justices might decide to discuss it in a Table Conference. I made it through all the initial screening and Rashonda told me I was the first Pro Se litigant ever to make it into the U.S. Supreme Court in U.S History. I actually won all 4 cases by default, but then on January 8, my 4 "victories" were lumped in with about 300+ other pleadings that were dismissed in a 4-hour hearing with obviously no time for meaningful consideration. The Court is clearly overwhelmed by the dearth of justice being dispensed by the lower courts, but my cases would have been the perfect opportunity to approve my Legal Question about denying Judicial Immunity to all these contumacious Courts who refuse to comply with Loper Bright. I've prepared a Petition Letter below as the only and ideal way to enforce discipline on the lower courts, as outlined in the Harvard Legal Review article summary below

2. Summary of the Legal Questions Pro Se Litigant Presented in Four Oregon Lawsuits

I'm writing you concerning the urgent need for Congressional oversight and discipline of certain judges within the jurisdiction of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Over the past 3 years I've had the unusual (but educational) experience of working my way through the court system as a pro se litigant in four unique cases. All four were convened under

Administrative Law -- now illegal under Loper Bright -- resulting in dismissal as "frivolous" at every level up through the Oregon Supreme Court.

At that point, I asked the Lead Intake Clerk at the U.S. Supreme Court, what we could do, since these rogue judges were flaunting Supreme Court authority at every level. She said I should file a formal complaint - a Writ of Prohibition - for each case, presenting at least one legal question relating the complaint to some violation of the U.S. Constitution. All four of our cases were selected for review in a table conference, making this the first time in U.S. history a pro se litigant has ever made it into the U.S. Supreme Court. I was elated when all four of my cases were "won" by default under the 21-day rule, but then thoroughly discouraged when my four "victories" were lumped together and dismissed with all 300+ other pleadings during the second week of January in a 4-hour Table Conference with obviously no time for meaningful consideration. These four dockets 25-5660, 25-5725, 25-5726 and 25-5808. It seems that contumacy of judges in the lower courts is creating a massive number of complaints due to the widespread perception that justice is not being served. This is ironic because the legal questions we posed for review in our Writs of Prohibition were designed to quash this contumacy in the lower courts, notably the removal of judicial immunity from courts that refuse to convene as Article III Courts under the U.S. Constitution. I believe that three of the four are of special interest to your judiciary committee:

1) The case against FERC for issuing a permit to remove the 4 dams on the Klamath River without Congressional approval sets a precedent for further "legalized" vandalism of public property. The Solicitor General of the United States entered a plea of "no contest," which was of course erased by the blanket dismissal, leaving the banks of the Klamath for 120 river miles contaminated with arsenic levels up to 40 times the EPA safe level. This is an environmental catastrophe of Biblical proportions for both man and animal. Can you please exercise your authority under Article III, Section 2 "Exceptions Clause" to recommend that the Supreme Court reopen this case?·

2) The two cases involving my divorce ruling may seem trivial at first blush, but they strike at the very heart of the corruption in the judicial system. That is the systemic tendency of many lower courts to convene as Administrative Law courts which allow local procedural rules to nullify the

U.S. Constitution and federal laws "made in pursuance thereof." In particular, they ignore the 21-day rule and dismiss the case instead of granting the victory by default to plaintiff under Federal Rule 55 In my case, the Dissolution judge proved to be so incompetent and insensitive to my ADA injury that I sued him in his personal capacity. He refused to Appear in court within the 21 days allotted, but the presiding judge dismissed the ADA violations as frivolous in accord with local Administrative Law. This is a blatant violation of Loper Bright Enterprises and would have made an ideal example case for the Supreme Court had they taken the time to examine it with due process of law. Dismissing two justices for "bad behavior" would have sent shock waves throughout the jurisdiction of the Ninth Circuit. By Article III of the U.S. Constitution, the Supreme Court and Congress have the joint right and responsibility to remove such rogue judges as a much needed example for misbehavior. I am willing to testify, but will need some travel allowance from Oregon.

USA Supreme Court Dockets:
25-5726, 25-5660, 25-5725 and 25-5808 need adjudication.
Cordially,

Dave White (503-608-7611) Director of CCTruth.org / SalmonProtectionDevice.com / TheLawIsYourAttorney.com

3. Demand Justice in New York Case: We're Not Alone -- It's Coast to Coast.

Judge Catapano-Fox falsely claimed DEFENDANT Democleia P. Gottesman filed an answer on October 23, 2023, despite no response until March 18, 2024,related cases (Exhibit 11: NYSCEF Doc. 159), show a pattern of bias that protects DEFENDANTS and undermines justice. I filed a criminal complaint alleging judicial misconduct and collusion,the DA has ignored my plea, raising concerns of further collusion. exporting these violations to the FBI and DOJ,deprivation of rights stay the lower court's order,share this petition to demand Judge Kerrigan's removal
Remove Judge Kevin Kerrigan for Misconduct and Collusion. Posted on April 28, 2025 Dear Supporters, Thank you for standing with me in my fight for justice against judicial misconduct in Queens, New York. I'm Lidia Orrego, a battling a miscarriage of justice in my case (Orrego v. Morgovsky et al., Index No. 702511/2023). Judge Kevin J. Kerrigan's actions and

Judge Tracy Catapano-Fox violated my CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS to DUE PROCESS and EQUAL PROTECTION. I need your continued support to hold them accountable. Since my last update, I've uncovered further evidence of misconduct filed in the Appeal. after filing the THIRD DEFAULT, as proven by court documents (Exhibit 2: NYSCEF Doc. 39; Exhibit 3: NYSCEF Doc. 161). As owner of Star Medical Offices P.C., Gottesman knew of the lawsuit since February 2023, yet colluded with lawyers like Charles Kutner to evade accountability. Judge Kerrigan's rulings, including those in See NYSCEF doc. [10] Appeal Docket Help 2024-07753 - Appellate Division - 2nd Dept. On February 23, 2025, with the Queens DA, Melinda Katz, and refiled today. Email to DA Melinda Katz supported by Exhibits. Despite follow-up letters, This inaction shields corrupt practices and denies me EQUAL PROTECTION under the law. I've escalated my fight to federal authorities, r alleging federal crimes like (18 U.S.C. § 242). My appeal in the Appellate Division (Docket No. 2024-07753) continues, with motions to waive fees, submit new evidence, and all to protect my CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. We need your help now more than ever! Please: Sign and an investigation into judicial misconduct in Queens. Call the New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct (646-386-4800) to report Judge Kerrigan's and Judge Catapano-Fox's bias. Contact the Queens DA (718-286-6000) to urge action on my February 26, 2025, complaint. Together, we can stop judicial corruption and ensure justice for all. Follow me in X for updates: Thank you for your support! Lidia Orrego, PRO SE Rego Park, NY[Contact: lidia.orrego@justiceforlidia] **PRO SE litigant**https://x.com/LidiaOrrego1

WE'RE NOT ALONE: Here, we introduce the pleas of a pro se woman who got cheated in New York by the same subjective Administrative process that we did in our 4 cases at all levels up to the Oregon Supreme Court. The judges are using local, variable, Administrative Law to override the default judgments under Federal Rule 55. This proves that abuse of judicial immunity has devolved to a system of injustice in a vast number of courtrooms coast-to-coast, in spite of relief promised by the Loper, Bright, Enterprise ruling of June 28, 2024. There is also an independent petition to recall judge Charles Bailey circulating in Washington County, Oregon, spearheaded by 30 women who were cheated of justice in the Marriage Dissolution Court of Judge Bailey.

Question: Answer:

Why is it such a "federal case" to get rid of a corrupt judge at any level? Because of a pervasive system of Judicial Immunity that has devolved into a corrupt judge protection racket.

4. Possibilities for Judge Removal Short of Cumbersome Impeachment Process, Including Congressional Petition to the Court.

Federal judges hold their offices during "good behavior," and to remove them through impeachment (House) and conviction (Senate) is quite literally a "federal case."

Under Article III of the Constitution only Congress has the authority

However, some legal scholars and historic articles explore the possibility that statutory actions or the “Good Behavior Clause" is a distinct standard from "High Crimes and Misdemeanors .” Congress could potentially pass a statute allowing the judiciary—or even the Supreme Court—to determine if a judge has forfeited their office through misbehavior,

Legal scholars Saikrishna Prakash and Steven D. Smith argued in an article titled *“How to Remove A Federal Judge"* for **removal through alternative legal theories.** They suggest though, this remains a controversial minority view. **Statutory Removal for "Misbehavior":** 2006 Yale Law Journal article

That's what we were arguing in our Oregon cases - Lack of "good behavior" being habitual flaunting of Loper Bright Enterprises, which is a category of lawlessness in addition to the subjective high crimes and misdemeanors.

- **Good Behavior:** This phrase in Article III is distinct from "treason, bribery, and other high crimes and misdemeanors." Why isn't that obvious?
- **The "Quo Warranto" Action:** Ku Klux Klan Act **Writ of quo warranto** is a writ used to challenge an individual's right to hold a public or corporate office, or to exercise a specific power. Why does the Court refuse to address this?
- **14th Amendment:** We were also arguing the lack of equal protection when comparing the stark contrast between the Ninth and Tenth Circuits, with the Tenth Circuit committed to functioning as Article III courts and the

Ninth Circuit *statistically* 100% committed to variations of local administrative law.

 Official Petition: The Harvard Legal Review calls for Supreme Court refinement of this broken system to introduce equity to the system. It traces the legal history behind the current manifestation of a concept created by judges for judges. .This suggests that a petition from the Senate Judiciary committee to the Supreme Court is in order to remove officials who were disqualified from office under the 14th Amendment.

Congressional Threats as Control: Texas Journal on Civil Liberties & Civil Rights . Congress often uses **threat of impeachment** this is a "readily usable instrument of control" over judges they deem "unqualified" or "rogue."

Harvard Legal Review: In some instances, the Chair of the Senate Judiciary Committee may consult the Chief Justice on broader issues affecting the federal court system, such as the creation of new judgeships or changes to court procedure. https://onedrive.live.com/:w:/g/personal/d172f747c79ee46a/IQA0kREzeT9PTYhs2cLCni6BARyQxtNafy6GLREV9HhypW4?rtime=G78fXDNj3kg&redeem=aHR0cHM6Ly8xZHJ2Lm1zL3cvYy9kMTcyZjc0N2M3OWVlNDZhL0lRQTBrUkV6ZVQ5UFRZaHMyY0xDbmk2QkFSeVF4dE5hZnk2R0xSRVY5SGh5cFc0P2U9TzlvOUo1

An article in the Harvard Legal Review calls for Supreme Court "refinement" of Judicial Immunity and concludes:

CONCLUSION TO HARVARD LEGAL REVIEW ARTICLE ON JUDICIAL IMMUNITY

Judicial immunity has landed in a place far from where it began. It provides an incredibly broad shield for judges who perform judicial acts that are not clearly beyond their jurisdiction. But, as a close examination of history shows, judicial immunity in its current form prevents judges from being held accountable, as measures for accountability outside of civil liability are often ineffectual at best or nonexistent at worst.

If the Supreme Court were to revisit the existence of judicial immunity, it should consider this history. Doing so would be a good first step in allowing for greater accountability for judges who misbehave. It would also help to provide relief to litigants who may not otherwise be able to receive it. And eliminating judicial immunity in this way would also provide much-needed deterrence for bad behavior, which is not adequately covered by current judicial oversight organizations. As Congress reevaluates other kinds of immunity doctrines such as qualified immunity, and as American society discusses and evaluates other kinds of immunity doctrines for officials ranging from the President to prosecutors to police officers, those conversations should also include a doctrine that was created by judges for the benefit of judges, which has veered from its historical and policy-objective roots, and which, in combination with ineffectual oversight mechanisms, provides little to no meaningful deterrence for officials entrusted with dispute resolution.

https://harvardlawreview.org/print/vol-136/judicial-immunity-at-the-second-founding-a-new-perspective-on-%C2%A7-1983/

5. Sample Petition Letter from Senators Grassley & Kennedy to Chief Justice Roberts & Associates

Greetings Chief Justice Roberts and Associates,

I trust this petition finds you in good health and cheerful spirits in spite of the daunting challenges facing America today that you are called upon to resolve . I'm aware of your frustration with some of the lower courts refusing to . comply with several of your recent rulings . I'm guessing this is a major factor contributing to the docketing logjam as litigants struggle to cope with the injustice that ensues and appeal to a higher power for relief.

In particular, we've noticed an uptick in complaints about local administrative law being used to nullify the Constitution and federal laws . I realize you are no stranger to the issue given your Loper Bright decision two summers . And who can blame you for the blanket dismissals of the flood of pleas for certiorari or prohibition that have poured in over the past

few months. The danger, of course, is overlooking opportunity for a decision that just might provide the desired relief.

The challenge is enforcement. An article in Harvard Legal Review drew attention to the tendency for gradual accumulation of power in "the system" itself at the expense of individual liberty. It is the age-old philosophical problem of "the one and the many," balancing the singular power of the state with the freedom of the many individuals in the state. The article indicted a tilt toward judicial immunity as the fulcrum and challenged the Supreme Court to refine the concept of Judicial Immunity to balance the scale.

I was particularly intrigued by this legal Question Presented in the attached Writ: "Shall Judicial Immunity be reserved exclusively for Courts convened under Article III of the U.S. Constitution and denied to illegal Administrative Law courts convened in defiance of Loper Bright." Might not this be the enforcement mechanism you are looking for regardless of political affiliation? On page two are several other supporting Questions to clarify terms like "frivolous," "Misprision," and the extreme "Circuit Split" from unequal enforcement of 14 th Amendment "equal justice under the law." Witness the dramatic difference in the Ninth and Tenth Circuits, revealed on the home page of the Tenth.

So my petition is a humble request to reopen docket numbers #25-5660, #25-5725, #25-5726, #25-5808, giving special attention to the Bailey-Baggio case in which these legal dynamics are playing out (attached), with the "wild-card" of an ADA qualified Plaintiff who was denied remote access to a hearing and thereby due process of law in his absence. In addition, confession of the Solicitor General in the case against FERC for the environmental disaster created by illegal removal of the Klamath dams is a matter of grave national concern that was simply swept under the judicial rug with no due process of law.

Yours sincerely,

(We're asking Senators Charles Grassley & John Kennedy to use this letter as a template and ultimately sign it)

6. Attached Extraordinary Writ of Prohibition Against Rogue Oregon

Judges Bailey & Baggio, with the Legal Questions We Presented to Supreme Court

RECEIVED IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SEP 16 2025

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Q(x)
1. Shall U.S. Courts at all levels persist in extreme bias against pro se or any litigant, contrary to Judicial Code of Conduct and Loper Bright, especially in use of Administrative Law to nullify federal law for Summary Judgment, by dismissing a case when defense fails to Appear? This unjust procedure is systemic throughout the Ninth Circuit Court System, suggesting collusion in obstruction of justice.

2. Shall a judge who dismisses a case when defense fails to Appear be guilty of Misprision of Felony, having reviewed the felonies admitted by abandonment of the defense, then does nothing to adjudicate them, thus denying due process of law in defiance of Loper Bright?

3. Shall a ruling of "frivolous" be rendered only after a thorough investigation of case facts and law, rather than subjective Judicial Discretion under Administrative Law?

4. Shall judges in the Ninth Circuit persist in violation of Loper Bright, thus denying citizens 14th Amendment equal protection under the law, compared to citizens in other jurisdictions such as the Tenth Circuit, which complies with Loper Bright, per their home page?

5. Shall judicial immunity be reserved exclusively for Courts convened
under Article III of the U.S. Constitution and denied to illegal Administrative Law courts convened in defiance of Loper Bright and Article III of the U.S. Constitution? Shall any Judge or Justice have Absolute judicial immunity for violation of federal laws or the U.S. Constitution,

thus denying citizen rights to due process of law?

6. Shall any court under cover of judicial immunity, dismiss a case of ADA violation as “frivolous” without thorough investigation -- potentially pending by ADA investigative Authority -- thus denying due process and equal protection of law to our most vulnerable citizens?

7. Shall any Court illegally dismiss a Complaint as frivolous by Abuse of Process when Defendants are in default but the judge fails to enforce the 21-day FRCP rule? This unjust abuse of judicial discretion is systemic throughout the Ninth Circuit Court System.

7. Extraordinary Writ of Prohibition, Mandamus by Rule 20

There is no question that the criteria for an extra ordinary Writ of Prohibition has been met by these 4 lawsuits originating in the state of Oregon. Taken together Plaintiff faced an Administrative Law wall consisting of between 20 and 25 corrupt judges. That's 4 cases, each passing through an average of at least 4 case appeal levels, up to and including the Oregon Supreme Court, some with 3 judge panels. Without exception they all dismissed his case the filed for summary judgment when the Defense had not appeared in the case. Here is proof that the writ abundantly satisfies the dozen reasons the writ is overwhelmingly qualified for reconsideration as for the contumacy and corruption that is rampant in the U.S. Court system. This is proven by the fact that about 234 judges were recently removed for drug cartel influence. All these judges had been hiding under the cover of a flawed system of Judicial Immunity. There are at least 12 solid reasons why the writ is overwhelmingly qualified for reconsideration as for the contumacy and corruption that is rampant in the U.S. Court system.

1. Without question, all options for relief were exhausted
2. Without question, all these judges exceeded their lawful jurisdiction and judicial discretion by convening as Administrative law courts, in violation of Loper Bright.
3. Without question it acts as a preventative remedy to halt these illegal actions from continuing into the future, rather than undoing past decisions,
4. Without question this is a "drastic remedy" to be used because no other legal remedy exists to prevent this illegal denial of due process (5th Amendment) and equal protection under the law (14th

Amendment), especially as related to 3 of our local lawsuits in which ADA-injury was filed and accepted, but ignored.

5. Without question this remedy blocks lower Administrative Law courts from perpetuating their sordid history of usurping natural justice and the U.S. Constitution by what amounts to "the Divine Right of Kings," dressed up in modern legal trade jargon.
6. Without question It is being used to stop ongoing or threatened proceedings that have frustrated litigants for decades, even though it cannot undo these actions that have already been finalized.
7. Without question (by Rule 20) the petitioner has shown through the course of some 20-25 lower court actions show that the lower courts are acting without jurisdiction and that no other adequate, speedy, or ordinary remedy (like an appeal) is available.
8. Without question (by rule 20) issuance is at the discretion of the higher court and is not a matter of right, although it is hoped that the Court will do the right thing in the spirit of the principle of mandamus, which requires that there is a clear legal obligation to act, and no other adequate remedy exists.
9. Without question (by rule 20) -- while it is recognized that it is completely discretionary at the Supreme Court level -- the Writ carries a strong moral compunction for the Supreme Court tribunal, which exercises judicial or ministerial functions, to stop proceedings that are without or in excess of jurisdiction, or that involve grave abuse of discretion.
10. Without question, by (Rule 20): The petitioner has demonstrated the writ is justified to aid the Court's appellate jurisdiction by enforcing its landmark rulings, under the exceptional circumstance of rampant lower court contumacy, when no other adequate remedy exists. This is demonstrated by the Harvard Law Review Article on the history of abuse of Judicial Immunity in the United States.
11. Without question Procedural rules and briefs have been Rules and Briefs by (Rule 20) have been filed for the Petition and briefs have been filed, often including an appendix. If issued, the writ acts as an order to show cause, which may stay proceedings in the lower court.
12. Without question the writ follows the format of a writ of certiorari, evidenced by frequent reference to the term throughout the pleadings.

A Writ of Prohibition is an extraordinary, discretionary judicial order issued by a higher court to a lower court, tribunal, or public body, commanding it to cease proceedings that exceed its lawful jurisdiction or authority. It acts as a preventative remedy to halt actions before they are completed, rather than to undo past decisions, often referred to as a "drastic remedy" used when no other adequate legal remedy exists. Key Aspects of a Writ of Prohibition:

Purpose: To restrain inferior courts from usurping jurisdiction, exceeding their authorized power, or violating principles of natural justice.

Preventive Nature: It is used to stop ongoing or threatened proceedings, not to undo actions that have already been finalized.Requirements: The petitioner must show that the lower court is acting without jurisdiction and that no other adequate, speedy, or ordinary remedy (like an appeal) is available.

Discretionary: Issuance is at the discretion of the higher court and is not a matter of right.Usage: It is frequently employed by appellate courts to prevent lower courts from handling matters outside their scope, such as cases pending appeal or matters violating constitutional rights.

Examples of Situations for Issuance: A court acts in a case where it lacks subject-matter jurisdiction. A lower court acts in contravention of a higher court's decision. Proceedings are conducted in violation of procedural due process. The writ of prohibition is distinct from a writ of certiorari, which is used to review and quash already completed actions, whereas prohibition stops them from happening.

AI Overview: Supreme Court Rule 20 governs the procedure for extraordinary writs (prohibition and mandamus) in the US Supreme Court, which are discretionary, not of right, and require showing that no other adequate relief exists and that the writ aids the Court's jurisdiction. These writs are generally used to compel or prevent action by lower courts or officials. Mandamus (Rule 20): Compels a person, tribunal, corporation, board, or officer to perform a ministerial duty that they have failed or refused to do. It is used when there is a clear legal obligation to act, and no other adequate remedy exists. Prohibition (Rule 20): Commands a tribunal, corporation, board, or person exercising judicial or ministerial functions to

stop proceedings that are without or in excess of jurisdiction, or that involve grave abuse of discretion. Requirements (Rule 20): The petitioner must demonstrate that the writ will aid the Court's appellate jurisdiction, exceptional circumstances justify the request, and no other adequate remedy exists. Procedure (Rule 20): A petition and brief are filed, often including an appendix. If issued, the writ acts as an order to show cause, which may stay proceedings in the lower court. Hierarchy of Courts: In many jurisdictions, including the Philippines, these petitions must follow the hierarchy of courts—first to the Regional Trial Court, then Court of Appeals, before the Supreme Court. Limitations: Mandamus cannot compel the exercise of discretion, only ministerial acts. They are not substitutes for appeal.

Signed by Senator Grassley and Kennedy.

_____ Dated:_____

_____ Dated:_____