CRIMINAL CHARGES AGAINST JUDGE WILLIAM S. DUFFEY FOR OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND CONSPIRACY

I, William M. Windsor, the undersigned, hereby declare under penalty of perjury:

- 1. Judge William S. Duffey, judge in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, and others have conspired to obstruct justice and deny my wife and me due process rights under the Constitution of Georgia and the United States by intentionally and knowingly committing the crime of obstruction of justice.
- 2. James N. Hatten, Clerk of the Court for the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, and his employees are obligated to file motions, documents, and affidavits that are presented to them for filing. But they have failed to docket and process appeals filed by my wife ("BGW"). The conspired with Judge Duffey to cause these filings to be held in some unknown location at the federal courthouse.
- 3. This is by definition a violation of Obstruction of Justice -- 18 U.S.C. § 1503; and as such, said violations also constitute predicate act crimes and prove violation of the RICO statute of the State of Georgia, O.C.G.A. 16-14-1 et seq.
- 4. Blocking the appeal allows wrongful actions to take place when the case should be stayed so that nothing further takes place until the Court f Appeals

rules on BGW's Appeal. Blocking the appeal may allow the courts to deny any appeal from BGW as being untimely.

- 5. BGW is not now and never has been a party to any civil action in any federal court.
- 6. On June 30, 2009, Civil Action No. 1:09-CV-01543-WSD ("BOGUS ACTION") was closed. (Exhibit 1 is a true and correct copy of the Docket; the Docket entry between #33 and #34 shows that this is a closed case "Civil Case Terminated."
- 7. On September 24, 2010, Judge Duffey entered an oral order as to me and no one else. The full text of the Oral Order is:
 - "ORAL ORDER (by docket entry only) as ordered by Judge William S. Duffey, Jr. on 9/23/10: Mr. Windsor's courier appeared today in the Clerk's Office to file several pleadings, including motions, in the above-styled action. This action was closed and judgment was entered on June 30, 2009. Based on the history and current disposition of this case and Plaintiff's previous request to stay all action in his cases because of issues with his eye, the Court directed the Clerk's Office to not accept the pleadings for filing in their present form. The Court instead ordered Mr. Windsor to first request permission to file the pleadings in this closed case and further ordered any request for permission to file in this case be limited to five pages or less in length. The purpose of this requested procedure is so the Court can evaluate if the pleadings are appropriate to be filed in this closed case and, if so, the proper form in which the pleadings should be submitted if allowed. (jdb) (Entered: 09/24/2010)." [See Exhibit 1, between Docket entries #91 and 92.]
- 8. On October 6, 2010, non-party BGW was served by the Plaintiffs with a subpoena to produce documents on October 18, 2010. [Docket #96.] (Exhibit 2 is

a true and correct copy of the subpoena.) The documents requested were identical to the documents requested in a request for production of documents served on me.

- 9. On October 18, 2010, BGW timely filed a Motion for Protective Order. [Docket #96.] (Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of the Motion.)
- 10. On November 3, 2010, Judge Duffey issued an order denying BGW's Motion for Protective Order claiming BGW was bound by the September 24, 2010 order. [Docket #99.] (Exhibit 4 is a true and correct copy of the November 3, 2010 order.) BGW had no knowledge of the September 24, 2010 Oral Order as to me, and the order placed no restrictions on BGW, as paragraph 7 above clearly shows. Judge Duffey's actions stripped BGW of essential protections. Judge Duffey did this knowingly and intentionally to damage BGW and me.
- 11. On November 5, 2010, BGW presented a notice of appeal to the District Court Clerk with the required filing fee of \$455 cash. The appeal said: "This appeal is necessary due to the violation of ... Constitutional rights by Judge Duffey; claiming filing restrictions on Barbara Windsor when there were none; wrongful dismissal of Barbara's filings; denial of Barbara's access to the Court; and abuse of discretion by Judge Duffey." (Exhibit 6 is a true and correct copy of the Notice of Appeal.)

- 12. The District Court Clerk refused to file BGW's November 5, 2010Notice of Appeal. The U.S. Treasury sent a refund check for \$455 to BGW.Exhibit 12 is a true and correct copy of this denial.
- of Appeal and paid the appeal fee. (Exhibit 24 is a true and correct copy of this Notice, and Exhibit 25 is a file-stamped copy of the cover letter proving receipt by the CLERK.) The Notice of Appeal was returned by the CLERK. Note that this Notice of Appeal was never docketed, and notice that only the cover letter was file stamped.
- 14. On April 21, 2011, Judge Duffey entered an order questioning the signature on the April 11, 2011 Notice of Appeal:

"The Clerk is DIRECTED to return filing for Barbara Windsor dated March 21, 2011. The Clerk is DIRECTED to return to Barbara G. Windsor the Notice of Appeal Certificate of Compliance, and Certificate of Service that were filed in her name on April 11, 2011 for her own original signature."

[Docket # 151.] (Exhibit 27 is a true and correct copy of this order.) BGW was ordered to add her signature over the top of the signature stamp that had been used. (Exhibit 28 is a true and correct copy of the Notice of Appeal with the second signatures.) Note that this April 21, 2011 Order (P.4, ¶2) acknowledges the receipt of the April 11, 2011 Notice of Appeal and says "the Notice of Appeal, Certificate of Compliance, and Certificate of Service that were filed in her name on April 11, 2011," but it is not shown anywhere on the Docket (Exhibit 1).

- 15. On April 28, 2011, BGW filed the Notice of Appeal again and paid the appeal fee with \$455 cash. (Exhibit 32 is a true and correct copy of this Notice.) (Exhibit 33 is a true and correct copy of the Courier Connection delivery documentation to prove receipt by the CLERK.) Note that this Notice of Appeal is not reflected anywhere on the Docket (Exhibit 1).
- appear for a hearing on May 13, 2011. [Docket #158.] (Exhibit 34 is a true and correct copy of this Order.) Note that in this order, Judge Duffey acknowledges that on April 28, 2011, the CLERK received the April 11, 2011 Notice of Appeal with the original signatures. (See paragraph ____ above.) Judge Duffey questioned the signatures, so BGW submitted an Affidavit dated May 10, 2011 attesting to the validity of both the stamp and her signature. (Exhibit 35 is a true and correct copy of this Affidavit.)
- 17. BGW's valid Notices of Appeal were not filed by the CLERK as required by the FRCP and FRAP. This is a violation of the Rules and BGW's rights to due process.
- 18. When this wrongdoing was brought to the attention of Judge Duffey, he intentionally ignored it. Because of the repeated efforts to address this issue and the rejection of these efforts by Judge Duffey, I can further demonstrate this was not error but intentional reckless, criminal, and conspiratorial acts.

19. Detailed proof of this wrongdoing is available in copies of the documents presented for filing, cover letters listing the documents, proof of receipt by the Office of the Clerk of the Court, docket print-outs showing the documents were not docketed, affidavits from the couriers who delivered the documents and obtained signed delivery receipt, my affidavit, and BGW's affidavit. A separate Affidavit is available with more detail, and relevant documents are on CD-ROM.

FURTHER SAITH AFFIANT NOT.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct based upon my personal knowledge.

Executed this 12th day of August 2011.

William M. Windsor