

**CRIMINAL CHARGES AGAINST JUDGE THOMAS WOODROW
THRASH RELATING TO OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE
IN ISSUING A PERMANENT INJUNCTION IN VIOLATION OF
ALL RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS**

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

1. Judge Thomas Woodrow Thrash of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, and others have conspired to obstruct justice and deny 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. Judge Thrash has arranged to be the presiding judge in two lawsuits that I filed in which Judge Thrash is one of the defendants. He then issued a permanent injunction against me that blocks me from ever filing a lawsuit in any court anywhere in the country for the rest of my life.

3. The injunction was issued in violation of just about every right to due process that exists. This is by definition a violation of Obstruction of Justice -- 18 U.S.C. § 1503; and as such, said violation also constitutes a predicate act crime and proves violation of the RICO statute of the State of Georgia, O.C.G.A. 16-14-1 et seq.

4. Judge Thrash issued this outlandish injunction that violates the Constitution and Bill of Rights after denying me the legal right to respond to the motion of the U.S. Attorney that resulted in the so-called hearing. Everyone has a legal right to file a response to a motion filed in a court. It is provided in the Rules of Civil Procedure, and no one can deny anyone this right...but Judge Thrash did.

5. Judge Thrash denied my request for subpoenas so I could compel witnesses. Pro Se parties like me do not have the ability to subpoena as attorneys do, so by denying me subpoenas, I was blocked from calling witnesses, a right that everyone has in court...except me.

6. At the hearing, Judge Thrash denied me the ability to introduce my evidence into the record. He denied my request to testify under oath. Everyone has the right to testify...except me.

7. Judge Thrash denied me the right to cross-examine the U.S. Attorney who made a number of false and deceptive statements at the hearing.

8. The ultimate violation of the law, however, was that Judge Thrash denied me the right to have a decision rendered after hearing from me. (Exhibit 1 is a true and correct copy of the Permanent Injunction Order. Exhibit 2 is a true and correct copy of the order denying me the right to respond to the motion. Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of the order placing restrictions on the hearing. Exhibit 4 is a true and correct copy of the Affidavit of Jeff Goolsby. Exhibit 5 is a

true and correct copy of the Transcript of the Hearing.) Judge Thrash had already decided he was going to issue this permanent injunction order against me, and he had his order written before the hearing began. I asked him at the start of the hearing if an order had already been written, and he snapped at me and said he would not answer any of my questions. Then a few minutes after he heard from me, he leaned to his left and read from the pre-written order. This was obvious to people in the courtroom, and Jeff Goolsby has provided an affidavit in which he explains how totally biased Judge Thrash was and that he had predetermined the outcome and read from a pre-written order.

9. Detailed proof is available in docket print-outs, orders issued, motions to disqualify Judge Thrash, appeals, the affidavit of Jeff Goolsby, the transcript of the hearing, and my affidavit. A separate Affidavit is available with more detail, and relevant documents are provided 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

Exhibit

1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION

WILLIAM M. WINDSOR,

Plaintiff,

v.

JAMES N. HATTEN, et al.,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION FILE
NO. 1:11-CV-1923-TWT

ORDER

This is a pro se civil action against the Clerk of this Court and various judges of this Court and the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals and others. It is before the Court on the Defendant United States' Motion for Modification of Protective Order [Doc. 40]. The Court notes that in a related case where the Plaintiff's appeal was dismissed as frivolous, the Court of Appeals described the Plaintiff's abuse of the judicial system as follows:

[The Plaintiff's] litigious behavior [has] undermined the integrity of the judgments and orders in this case. Although the case is closed, Windsor has repeatedly filed unsubstantiated, duplicative pleadings, many after the district court issued an order denying them. Moreover, his pleadings are long and repetitive, and the volume of his filings poses a burden to clerical and judicial operations and is an impediment to the administration of justice.

The Defendant United States' Motion for Modification of Protective Order [Doc. 40] is GRANTED. It is necessary to issue an injunction in this case because of the Plaintiff's extraordinary abuse of the federal judicial system by repeatedly filing frivolous, malicious and vexatious lawsuits against the judges assigned to his many cases, because of the burden to clerical and judicial operations caused by his voluminous frivolous filings, and because his continuing course of conduct has become an impediment to the administration of justice. The administration of justice will suffer irreparable harm if the Plaintiff is allowed to continue filing frivolous, malicious and vexatious lawsuits against the judges and others involuntarily involved in his litigious campaigns. The balance of the harms and the public interest demands that the Plaintiff be stopped.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Plaintiff, William M. Windsor, and any parties acting in concert with him or at his behest, are PERMANENTLY ENJOINED from filing any complaint or initiating any proceeding, including any new lawsuit or administrative proceeding, in any court (state or federal) or agency in the United States without first obtaining leave of a federal district court in the district in which the new complaint or proceeding is to be filed. In seeking such leave, the Plaintiff must present any such court with a copy of this Order. If the lawsuit or administrative proceeding names federal judges or court employees, the Plaintiff must also tender a

\$50,000.00 cash bond or a \$50,000.00 corporate surety bond sufficient to satisfy an award of Rule 11 sanctions since such actions are presumably frivolous. Failure to obey this Order, including by attempting to avoid or circumvent the intent of this Order, will be grounds for sanctions including contempt.

SO ORDERED, this 15 day of July, 2011.

/s/Thomas W. Thrash
THOMAS W. THRASH, JR.
United States District Judge

Exhibit

2

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION

WILLIAM M. WINDSOR,

Plaintiff,

v.

JAMES N. HATTEN, et al.,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION FILE
NO. 1:11-CV-1923-TWT

ORDER

After review, permission to file the papers received by the Clerk on June 27, 2011, June 29, 2011, July 1, 2011, July 5, 2011, and July 7, 2011 is DENIED. The claims are frivolous and the papers constitute attempted abuse of the judicial system.

SO ORDERED, this 7th day of July, 2011.

/s/Thomas W. Thrash
THOMAS W. THRASH, JR.
United States District Judge

Exhibit

3

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION

WILLIAM M. WINDSOR,

Plaintiff,

v.

JAMES N. HATTEN, et al.,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION FILE
NO. 1:11-CV-1923-TWT

ORDER

This is a pro se civil action against the Clerk of this Court and various Judges of this Court and the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals and others. It is before the Court on the Defendant United States' Motion for Modification of Protective Order [Doc. 40]. A hearing on this matter is scheduled for Friday July 15, 2011 at 2:00 P.M.

In a letter to the Court dated July 11, 2011, the Plaintiff has expressed his intent to bring a "truckload" of documents to the hearing. The Court notes that in a related case where the Plaintiff's appeal was dismissed as frivolous, the Court of Appeals described the Plaintiff's abuse of the judicial system as follows:

[The Plaintiff's] litigious behavior [has] undermined the integrity of the judgments and orders in this case. Although the case is closed, Windsor has repeatedly filed unsubstantiated, duplicative pleadings, many after

the district court issued an order denying them. Moreover, his pleadings are long and repetitive, and the volume of his filings poses a burden to clerical and judicial operations and is an impediment to the administration of justice.

In light of the Plaintiff's past conduct and expressed intent in this instance, the following limitations upon the parties will be enforced: (1) The Plaintiff and all others acting in concert with him will be allowed to bring no more than 100 pages of paper into the courthouse for purposes of the hearing. Those items already filed in the case are a matter of record. The Marshal's Service will enforce this limitation at the doors to the courthouse. (2) The Plaintiff and the Defendants will each have 20 minutes for argument on the motion. (3) No witnesses will be called by either side.

SO ORDERED, this 12 day of July, 2011.

/s/Thomas W. Thrash
THOMAS W. THRASH, JR.
United States District Judge

Exhibit

4

Immediately, he announced his decision and clearly read from a previously prepared document. I was seated on the far right side of the courtroom and it was easy to see what he was doing. It appeared to me that the hearing was for the purpose of damage to Windsor.

5. It was a clear absolute appearance of bias and did commit bias against Mr. Windsor, which follows his usual handling of pro se plaintiff lawsuits based on his reputation of ruling against every pro se plaintiff totaling 138 cases.

6. All of the things that Mr. Windsor recounted that Judge Thrash had done to him appeared typical and indicates that Judge Thrash should be impeached and removed from office for violation of his oath of office and law violations.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAITH NOT.

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

Executed this 15TH day of July 2011.


Jeff Goolsby