

Kathleen: You can add a picture of Pomeroy Dam if space permits.

Judicial Bias Against Litigants in Dam-Removal Cases

By Oliver Woods and Dave White

According to the Cornell Law School Legal Information Institute, “Pro se is [Law Latin](#) that means ‘*for oneself*.’ A [litigant](#) proceeds pro se when they choose to represent themselves in court, as opposed to litigating through a [lawyer](#).”

We’ve filed five cases on a *pro se* basis over the past year, three of them challenging illegal removal of hydroelectric dams in Oregon. Another suit has been filed against Oregon State University (OSU) for illegal use of Affirmative Action and DEI in selection of Ph.D. candidates in their Environmental Engineering Department. That’s the department that addresses man’s interaction with the environment, with special emphasis on the climate change issue.

That’s five unique lawsuits with legally sound arguments and five different judges presiding. What’s amazing is that a common strategy of corruption has emerged to thwart justice in every case.

Each lawsuit starts when we file our complaint with the court and serve the defendant with the paperwork. The defendants make no response at all within the 21 days allotted. Under federal law and rules of procedure, the defendant has agreed to our allegations by failing to make an appearance, thereby admitting their guilt. We then file for a default judgment, which federal law requires the court clerk to review and sign before submitting to the judge for his signature.

Here’s where the corruption kicks in. As if on cue, a silent signal has been transmitted from defendant to the judge. Instead of acting as a neutral referee, the judge in effect argues for the defendant and dismisses the case, using local administrative rules to nullify the federal law. Typically, the judge ignores the evidence of crimes committed, making him guilty of Misprision of Felony, which occurs when one is aware of a crime and fail to report or stop it.

This strategy has always been illegal under a strict construction of Article III and Article VI of the U.S Constitution, but courts have been letting administrative law creep in for years. However, the Loper Bright Supreme Court decision on June 28 this year made it explicitly illegal. As if Article VI, Section 2, weren’t clear enough already:

“This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof ... 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.”

Currently, all five cases are on appeal at the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals for bias against pro se litigant and Misprision of Felony. Here’s a brief case summary. Details of Cases 1-3 are at salmonprotectiondevice.com. Case 4 is on cctruth.org.

Case 1: Klamath River Renewal Corp (“KRRC”) was sued for illegally removing four Klamath Basin dams, killing all aquatic life for 120 river miles. Docket #24-5275.

Case 2: Federal Energy Regulation Commissioners sued for issuing KRRC illegal license to remove dams on 21 counts of inadequate mitigation. Docket #24-5275.

Case 3: Water Watch sued for removing Pomeroy Dam without proper permits, leaving Cave Junction under 2-4 feet of water 3 months every year. Docket #24-6015h.

Kathleen: You can add a picture of Pomeroy Dam if space permits.

Case 4: OSU sued for illegal affirmative action and textbook misrepresentation of course content. Docket #24-6787. https://cctruth.org/Docket_24-6787_default_judgement.pdf

The simple solution to fix dams is an inexpensive 1-2-3 procedure:

1. Dredge behind the dam every 25 years to remove silt.
2. Heat scrub the silt on-site to remove toxicity.
3. Clean or install fish ladders for migrating fish and gradual drainage of any pollution in the reservoir.

The 9th Circuit Court of Appeals is currently reviewing these complaints filed by the pro se team. Conviction could lead to the removal of seven judges.

Cases 1 2 and 3 were illegally dismissed by three 9th Circuit court of appeals justices within three days. These are the three Justices who dismissed three cases in three days Sidney R. THOMAS, Jay S. BYBEE, Daniel P. COLLINS. The Justices are supposed to be chosen at random. Plaintiff has graduate statistics and calculated the probability of three Justices on three cases in three days happening is 198,359,290,368 to 1. Also Plaintiff was informed the same justices who illegally dismissed with be ruling on the Petitions.

Case 5 is against my x-wife who committed class C felonies. Her dissolution filing was over 80% felony perjury.

Oliver Woods is Headmaster at Kings Way Classical Academy, an online school for grades 7-12. kingswayschool.us. Get a free copy of Keys to the Classics – A History of the Decline and Fall of Western Civilization at GreatBibleReset.com. Dave White teaches science at the academy and leads a team of 35 Ph.D. scientists fighting the U.N. climate change agenda at cctruth.org.