The Rotten Peaches Brief

Corruption in Atlanta's Federal Courts

by William M. Windsor

Atlanta's federal courts are filled with corruption. I always knew there were problems with our legal system, but I thought it was just unscrupulous lawyers. I never dreamed that federal judges were corrupt and routinely commit crimes, but they do.

I have charged nine federal judges in Atlanta of corruption and dishonesty. From my personal experience, these judges ignore the law, ignore the facts, and commit criminal acts while hiding behind their judicial robes and the "judicial immunity" that the judges have given themselves over the years. These judges don't make mistakes; they do all of this intentionally.

I hope this is limited to Atlanta, but I fear that it is widespread in the federal judiciary in America. From my experiences here, the federal judges have turned this into a police state where they do whatever the hell they want to do. I do not have any proof that judges have been bribed, but the thought comes to mind. With Atlanta federal District Court Judge Orinda D. Evans, I have learned that she is evil. She has a reputation that she will twist the law and the facts to decide however she wants to decide. I have seen the darkest of her sides. She is truly an evil woman.

After spending the last five years battling corrupt attorneys and judges in Atlanta, I have taken my fight to The United States Supreme Court. This week, The Supreme Court has been presented with three Petitions for Writs of Mandamus. If granted, Judge Orinda D. Evans, Judge William S. Duffey, Jr., and 16 federal appellate court judges at the Eleventh Circuit will be disqualified from being judges in any matters relating to me. More importantly, The Supreme Court has been asked to refer charges against Judge Orinda D. Evans, Judge William S. Duffey, Jr., Judge Joel F. Dubina, Judge Rosemary Barkett, Judge Edward Earl Carnes, Judge James Larry Edmondson, Judge Frank M. Hull, Judge Stanley Marcus, and Judge William H. Pryor, Jr. to a Grand Jury for criminal indictments and to the House and Senate Judiciary Committees for impeachment.

In the history of the United States, only eight federal judges have been impeached. Atlanta could top that in one fell swoop with nine.

These questions have been presented to The Supreme Court:

1. Whether The Supreme Court is prepared to declare that the Constitution and its amendments are void...because this is precisely what the federal judges have done in Atlanta.

2. Whether Judge Orinda D. Evans, Judge William S. Duffey, and federal judges in the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit should be stopped from committing illegal and corrupt acts to obstruct justice and inflict bias on litigants.

3. Whether anyone in the federal judiciary cares about honesty and decency, or perjury, subornation of perjury, fraud upon the courts, and crimes committed by federal judges from the bench.

4. Whether The Supreme Court will be afraid to disclose the corruption in the federal courts.

Should The Supreme Court fail to act on these Petitions, they will be saying it is okay for the lower courts to void the Constitution. This puts The Supreme Court in a very uncomfortable position because they are now faced with the proposition that they will be acknowledging one of the biggest scandals in the history of our country if they blow the whistle on judicial corruption.

The Story of what has happened to William M. Windsor

My story is the discovery that our legal system is broken.

I always knew there were problems, but I thought it was just dishonest lawyers. I never dreamed that federal judges are corrupt and routinely commit crimes because they have the power to do anything they want.

In August 2005, Maid of the Mist Corporation and Maid of the Mist Steamboat Company, Ltd. (jointly "Maid") filed a civil action against Alcatraz Media, LLC, Alcatraz Media, Inc. (jointly "Alcatraz") and William M. Windsor ("Windsor" or the "Petitioner") (Alcatraz and Windsor jointly "A&W.") The action was filed in Gwinnett County Georgia Court. It was removed to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia in March 2006 as Civil Action No. 1:06-CV-0714-ODE ("MIST-1"). The action was originally assigned to Judge Forrester,

but he recused himself, and the case was assigned to Judge Orinda D. Evans ("Judge Evans.") [1] Neither Alcatraz nor I knew Judge Forrester, and neither of us had ever had any dealings of any type with him. It seems he recused himself due to some relationship with Maid of the Mist or their attorneys.

On March 3, 2005, Maid of the Mist had entered into an oral agreement with Alcatraz to allow Alcatraz to purchase tickets for the boat ride at Niagara Falls from Maid at a discounted rate for the entire 2005 season (April to October). The terms of the oral contract were specific. The period for the oral contract was less than a year, so it was a binding oral contract under Georgia law.

Sandra Carlson of Maid of the Mist entered into the contract with Alcatraz. I was visiting Alcatraz's office that day when one of the salespeople needed some tickets for a group to ride the Maid of the Mist. I knew that the business development person handling the dealings with Maid of the Mist was unavailable as mother has just had a stroke. So, while I didn't work for Alcatraz, I'll do anything to help my son, so I picked up the phone and called Sandra Carlson at Maid of the Mist. She entered into the contract with me for Alcatraz to buy tickets for the entire 2005 season. The discussion was very specific because I could see from the file that Carlson had been a flake to deal with. Carlson also made the same agreement with Carolyn Ballard Bazzo ("Bazzo"), who called her while her mother was sleeping in the hospital.

Carlson sent faxes to both Bazzo and me following the telephone conversations of March 3, 2005. Maid agreed to provide Certificates of Insurance naming Alcatraz as additional insured, and Maid did. Maid agreed to provide information for Alcatraz to use on its web sites, and they did. Alcatraz agreed to submit a voucher (E-Ticket) for Maid's approval, and Alcatraz did. Maid approved the voucher. The approval of the voucher was the final obligation agreed to when the contract was entered into on March 3, 2005. It still took a long time and a lot of hassles to get the information needed from Sandra Carlson, but it finally was resolved in early April.

Alcatraz advertised for Maid of the Mist boat tours at Alcatraz's website www.niagarafallstours.net. Alcatraz advertised for various tours in the Niagara Falls area, as well as for tours in Canada, New York and in others cities in the Northeast. This web site did not represent that it was sponsored by Maid. Rather, it expressly represented that it was run by Alcatraz. Alcatraz has also used additional web sites to promote its 74 different Niagara Falls tours and activities and its 17 tours that include a Maid of the Mist ticket.

Alcatraz began generating excellent sales for Maid of the Mist in March 2005.

Alcatraz honored all of the terms of the oral contract with Maid. Maid breached the contract in a number of ways. Maid refused service to some Alcatraz customers who had valid E-Tickets. Initially, this was probably because no one at Maid bothered to advise the ticket takers that Alcatraz was issuing valid E-Tickets. Maid informed some Alcatraz customers that they should purchase their tickets directly from Maid at a lower price and file chargebacks against Alcatraz to get their money back from Alcatraz. Not cool. Maid charged Alcatraz for some customers who did not receive the boat ride. Maid failed to give Alcatraz certain discounts that had been promised.

For reasons unknown at the time, Maid created false stories in an attempt to damage Alcatraz and manufacture a claim with which to breach the contract with Alcatraz. Upon information and belief, this was because Maid was in breach of contract with the Niagara Parks Commission ("NPC") and the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation ("OPRHP").

Carlson and Schul sent letters, faxes, and emails for Maid to Alcatraz that contained false claims. Glynn, Schul, and Carlson made false claims by telephone. Carlson sent letters on June 14 and July 19, 2005 that contained false claims of problems caused by Alcatraz. The July 19, 2005 letter asked for Alcatraz to make changes to its E-Ticket. .Alcatraz made changes to the E-Ticket. Carlson then sent an email claiming the July 19 letter asked for changes to the web site, but the letter said no such thing. Schul then sent a letter and emails that contained false claims of problems caused by Alcatraz. On July 29, 2005, Maid breached the contract with Alcatraz by declaring the contract to be terminated. But the oral contract was for the entire 2005 season, and Maid of the Mist did not have the right to terminate it until it expired in mid-October 2005.

It was all totally bizarre. It made no sense at the time. Alcatraz tried repeatedly for a month to get Maid or Maid's Attorneys to speak with Alcatraz about the problem, but they refused. My son asked me to handle the legal stuff for him, so I am the one who tried to get them to respond.

Despite Maid's written promise to Alcatraz on July 29, 2005 that Maid would honor tickets purchased prior to July 29, 2005, Maid subsequently refused to honor some Alcatraz tickets purchased prior to that date. Not surprising. Maid refused to honor these tickets despite the fact that Alcatraz had provided Maid with over $10,000 in prepayments, a written payment guarantee, and credit card

authorization to charge any tickets purchased for the 2005 season, thus guaranteeing Maid that it would be paid for any Alcatraz customer who showed up with a voucher. It was the first week in August 2005 when Maid of the Mist began refusing service to Alcatraz customers.

Maid of the Mist began defaming Alcatraz and telling Alcatraz's customers that Alcatraz was an Internet Scam. (Alcatraz has been in business for 11 years and is the largest company in the world selling tickets and tours as Maid of the Mist knew quite well.) In August, September, and October 2005, Maid refused to honor vouchers for more than eight hundred (800) Alcatraz customers.

Alcatraz issued refunds to customers who placed orders that it believed would not be honored and to customers who contacted Alcatraz who claimed that Maid of the Mist refused to honor the Alcatraz vouchers. Every customer was refunded by Alcatraz. Maid of the Mist sold tickets to Alcatraz's customers directly and generated a greater income as a result.

I am the father of the 75% owner of Alcatraz. I have never been an officer, director, shareholder, owner, investor, or employee of Alcatraz, but I stepped in to handle the legal problem on behalf of Alcatraz. This is important because Maid of the Mist might have had a basis to sue me if I was involved in the company in one of those manners, but I wasn't. For the first three years of Ryan's company, I was CEO of a large company in Ohio. Ryan started and built Alcatraz all on his own.

I placed five phone calls, sent five faxes, and sent approximately 20 emails from July 28, 2005 until August 28, 2005 in an attempt to get someone from Maid of the Mist or a Maid of the Mist attorney to speak with me about the problem. No one from Maid of the Mist and no Maid attorney ever spoke to Alcatraz or me until after the lawsuit was filed on August 29, 2005.

Since it appeared that Maid of the Mist was hell bent on breaching the contract and screwing my baby boy's company, I called the Niagara Parks Commission ("NPC") to see if we could go into competition with Maid of the Mist. I was turned away, but the NPC told Maid of the Mist about my call. Less than three weeks later, we were sued.

It was August 25, 2005 when Christopher Glynn ("Glynn"), President of Maid of the Mist signed a sworn affidavit to be used with the filing of the lawsuit [MIST-1 Docket #1.] 46 of the 50 paragraphs were false or incorrect. Proof to show that as many as 46 of the statements are false is set out on pages 364 to 553 of Dec #25 (MIST-1 Docket #462).

Glynn swore that his statements were his personal knowledge, but that was false. Personal knowledge means the information is known from direct experience rather than hearing about it from someone else or making it up. Glynn swore that everything in his affidavit was true and correct, but that was false. In deposition testimony, Maid of the Mist Marketing VP Timothy P. Ruddy testified that some of the statements in Glynn's August 25, 2005 affidavit were not true. In his deposition testimony, Controller Robert J. Schul testified that some of the statements in Glynn's August 25, 2005 affidavit were not true. Alcatraz, Bazzo, and I testified in depositions that statements in Glynn's affidavit were not true at all, and we had a lot of proof in emails and letters.

The drafting of this affidavit by Mr. Carl Hugo Anderson, Mr. Marc W. Brown, and Mr. Arthur P. Russ, while under oath as officers of the court as members of the Bar, was improper, and statements in the affidavit were known to be false by the attorneys.

When Maid of the Mist sued, they sued Alcatraz and me personally. The lawsuit falsely and maliciously claimed that I operated my own business and did all types of things including theft and bribery. Maid of the Mist and their attorneys knew this was false. Ruddy testified that I should not have been included in many of the sworn paragraphs in Glynn's affidavit and verification. Maid of the Mist never produced any evidence to prove that Maid of the Mist had any valid legal claim against me for anything.

When I became involved in all of this, I was very naïve. I felt that the judicial system was fair and honest, so I was confident that the courts would vindicate us and put Christopher Glynn in jail for perjury for a long, long time. (Five years later, I know that our federal court system in Atlanta, Georgia is totally corrupt. I am not an attorney, but I have spent over 7,000 hours studying the law, so I know more about the legal issues in this case than most attorneys.)

On behalf of Alcatraz and myself, I filed a sworn response to Maid of the Mist's lawsuit stating under oath under penalty of perjury that everything Glynn had said was false.

Nothing much happened in the fall of 2005, but in March 2006 after we subpoenaed Glynn for a deposition, Maid of the Mist filed a motion with the court seeking a temporary restraining order. That was when Judge Orinda D. Evans was assigned to the case. She read the two affidavits that were totally contradictory

about the facts, and she granted the TRO to Maid of the Mist. Our attorney and I were shocked.

When a party to a lawsuit gets a TRO, they have to post a bond to cover the other party's costs in the lawsuit if they lose. We asked for $250,000. Judge Evans only required $5,000. It should have been over $1.5 million as it turns out. Awarding such a ridiculously low bond was another strong signal of the bias of Judge Evans (something that judges are sworn not to have).

At first, I suspected that Judge Evans had an incompetent young law clerk who was making a mess of this. I thought the judge just wasn't paying attention. It didn't take long for me to discover that Judge Evans was simply a bad judge. Then it didn't take me long after that to begin organizing the proof that she was a dishonest, corrupt judge.

Every order that Judge Evans issued was against us. Out of 40 contested motions, it was 40 for Maid of the Mist and zero for Alcatraz and me. This was all due to the dishonesty of Judge Orinda D. Evans. (Once I started representing myself, that grew to 100 to zero.)

During the discovery period, we took depositions and obtained documents. Our goal in all of this was to prove in THEIR WORDS that the verified complaint was totally false. We succeeded.

In February 2007, Judge Orinda D. Evans gave us a short meeting in her chambers. I informed her that we had documented proof of over 400 counts of perjury and that we had proven that the verified complaint was totally false. She refused to allow it to be discussed.

At this point, I felt for sure that she was corrupt. But then she said a few things that caused our attorney and me to think we had won the case. But as she had done many times before, she reversed herself or "forgot" those things later. Any time we though we prevailed on something, she ignored that and turned whatever it was against us.

Shortly after the February 7, 2007 meeting, Maid of the Mist filed two contracts under seal for an in camera inspection. These were their contracts with the governments of Ontario and New York State. We felt for sure that they would have vital information for our defense. Judge Evans reviewed them and said they would not be provided to us. That is supposed to mean they were not relevant to the case.

All types of dishonesty by Maid of the Mist, their attorneys, and Judge Orinda D. Evans took place from 2005 to now. It would just take way too long to recount it all. But rest assured that I have it all documented.

The next big development was motions for summary judgment. This is a legal procedure where a judge can end a case without a jury if it is so clearly one-sided. If there is a "fact issue," an important issue in the case that is disputed, there cannot be a summary judgment. EVERYTHING was disputed in this case, so a summary judgment was impossible.

But you've already figured out what happened. Judge Evans granted the summary judgment for Maid of the Mist and ordered Alcatraz and me to pay over $400,000 in Maid of the Mist's legal fees. To say that I was shocked was an understatement. I read the order, and it was one false statement and lie after another. The documents filed with the court proved her order was totally false.

Judge Evans granted the summary judgment to Maid on a legal cause of action called "tortious interference" with alleged damages of less than $100, though (1) A&W provided sworn affidavits from the four customers involved who allegedly did not spend $100, and each swore that they did buy tickets from Maid, so there were no damages, and (2) the only sworn testimony before the court was that there was an oral contract breached by Maid, and thus there was no tortious interference by Alcatraz. Damages are a requirement for tortious interference, so the fact that there were no damages was critical. We proved that with affidavits from the people Maid claimed created the damages.

Alcatraz and I swore under oath at all times that Maid made up all of the sworn claims in the Verified Complaint and motion for injunctive relief in MIST-1. Judge Evans refused to even consider A&W's charges of perjury, false sworn pleadings, and Rule 11 violations by Maid and Maid's attorneys. I documented all the lies with citations to the record.

We appealed the summary judgment order to the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals. Naive me thought we would finally get this overtured and headed in the right direction. But three judges rubber-stamped Judge Evans' order. They TOTALLY ignored every error of law and fact raised by our attorneys. I was flabbergasted. I was literally sick for several weeks from it. I worked closely with the attorneys and researched all of the appeal issues, so I knew the Eleventh Circuit had to overturn Judge Evans. When I was able to think straight, I figured they

supported their friend, Judge Evans, to protect her from indictment, conviction, and impeachment.

So, on to The Supreme Court, I thought. Our attorneys then educated me that The Supreme Court is no longer a court of appeals. They don't review actions of the appellate courts. They decide if a case is interesting enough to them. The odds of that in 2009 were 1 out of 100. We were told it could cost us another $250,000 in legal fees if we went on, and we might be held responsible for Maid of the Mist's legal fees since that had happened to us before. That would mean $500,000 or more. So, through clenched teeth, we reached an out-of-court settlement with Maid in December 2008 to stop the outrageous legal expense in MIST-1. Alcatraz and I refused to provide and did not provide general releases to Maid or Maid's Attorneys. We refused to provide releases because I was determined to go after them again.

I tried and tried to find an attorney to represent me, but no attorney was willing to sue a judge. They felt the federal judges would ruin them if they did.

So, in April 2009, I began efforts (representing myself) to reopen the case pursuant to FRCP Rule 60(b) primarily due to fraud upon the courts. A major factor was the discovery of new evidence that had been concealed from us by Maid and Judge Evans.[2] I obtained copies of the two contracts that Maid had been ordered to file under seal with Judge Evans. As soon as I looked at them, I knew that they were vital to our case. After obtaning some additional information through Freedom of Information Act requests, I felt sure that Maid of the Mist had filed bogus documents with Judge Evans. So, my task was simple; get the court to produce those documents, and we would get the case reopened and win. The bad guys would go to prison, and the Windsors would live happily ever after.

Surprise, surprise, Judge Evans refused. She began issuing perjury-filled orders. I knew now that she was as corrupt as a judge could possible be. The only reason to keep the documents hidden was to hide the fact that she had committed perjury and obstruction of justice...and to protect Maid of the Mist from losing the lawsuit and having its key managers all found guilty of hundreds of counts of perjury.

(One of the attorneys who refused to represent me out of fear of the judges gave me some advice. He told me to appeal early and often, so I did. As a result, I now have dozens of orders from Judge Evans, Judge Duffey, and the Eleventh Circuit. This gives me dozens and dozens and dozens of documents that establish the dishonesty and corruption.)

Not to be blocked without a fight after Judge Evans tried to block my efforts, I subpoenaed Judge Evans! This probably doesn't happen very often. Then some truly bizarre things happened. Judge Evans filed a motion in her own court in my case. Judges can't do that, but she did. She hired the United States Attorney's Office (the same people who are supposed to go after corrupt judges). On June 3, 2009, the U.S. Attorney representing Judge Evans filed a motion to quash a subpoena for the deposition in MIST-1. [Pet.App.171 – Mandamus Affidavit #1 -- "M-Aff #1", ¶39.] [3] [Deposition Action Doc. 1.] [4] The motion was referred to Judge William S. Duffey ("Judge Duffey"), and this created Civil Action 1:09-CV-01543-WSD (the "Deposition Action").[5]

Judge Duffey had never had any dealings with me prior to the referral of the motion to quash. I had never heard the name "Judge William S. Duffey" either. There was no conference held, and there was no hearing held, despite my motions requesting both.[6] On June 8, 2009, Judge Duffey stayed the properly subpoenaed deposition.[7] Judge Duffey made a number of incorrect statements in the stay order dated June 8, 2009.[8] The order was totally pro-Judge Evans, and it indicated that Judge Duffey may be biased.[9]

On June 10, 2009, the U.S. Attorney supplemented Judge Evans' motion to quash.[10] On June 18, 2009, I filed a Motion for Reconsideration of the Order Staying Case and the Twenty-Ninth Declaration of William M. Windsor (Dec #29).[11] [12] This was filed to note errors in Judge Duffey's order.[13] On June 30, 2009, an Order to Quash the Deposition of Judge Evans was issued by Judge Duffey.[16] [17] The order described me as "scurrilous and irresponsible." The legal definition of scurrilous is "evil." The legal definition of irresponsible is "mentally or financially incapable." I am neither scurrilous nor irresponsible!

This was written by a man who did not know me, had never even seen me, and who made such a statement and decision based solely on my three uncontroverted sworn affidavits. In 2009, there were zero (0) affidavits filed by Maid in MIST-1, the Deposition Action, or MIST-2. So, my testimony and evidence stood alone as the record before the court.[18]

The only explanation for this slander is that Judge Duffey was predisposed to bias against me because I had the audacity to try to depose Judge Evans to obtain information that was available only from Judge Evans that I desperately needed to reopen the case in MIST-1.[19] There is nothing scurrilous and irresponsible in the three affidavits that Judge Duffey had before him when he entered the June 30, 2009 order – Dec #29, Dec #35, and Dec #34. The statements made therein are no

different than the statements made herein. Judge Evans made as many as 200 false statements in two orders in MIST-1. She knew statements that she made in her orders were false. She obstructed justice by concealing documents from me. These are facts, proven with evidence that I filed in each of the three civil actions.

On July 27, 2009, I filed Civil Action No. 1:09-CV-02027-WSD ("MIST-2"), an independent action in equity for fraud upon the court and RICO.[20] On July 28, 2009, when I was told by the District Court Clerk's Office that Judge Duffey (the judge who called me "scurrilous and irresponsible") would be presiding in MIST-2, I immediately went home and prepared a Motion to Recuse Judge Duffey and a Motion for Change of Venue. I returned later in the day and filed.[21]

On July 30, 2009, a TRO Hearing was held. Judge Duffey denied the motion.[22] Judge Duffey distributed an order on my motions regarding service of process on Canadian defendants, representation, motion to change venue, and motion to recuse. All were denied.[23] Judge Duffey was antagonistic and biased in the hearing. Details of this are provided in the Transcript of the Temporary Restraining Order Hearing.[24] False statements in the July 30, 2009 order are listed in the Affidavit of Prejudice.[25]

On August 4, 2009, I filed an Emergency Motion to Recuse Judge Duffey. I advised Judge Duffey that I would seek a Writ of Mandamus if there was not a prompt response. This motion appears on the MIST-2 Docket as a "Motion for Leave" because Judge Duffey ordered that I must first submit proposed motions to him with a request for approval to file.[26] This motion was pursuant to 28 U.S.C.§144. The filing included an Affidavit of Prejudice[27] and a 28 U.S.C.§144 Certificate of Good Faith.[28]

On August 10, 2009, I filed a Petition for a Writ of Mandamus with the Eleventh Circuit seeking to have Judge Duffey disqualified.[29] The Affidavit of Prejudice[30] and a 28 U.S.C.§144 Certificate of Good Faith[31] were included as exhibits. On September 17, 2009, the Eleventh Circuit denied the Petition for a Writ of Mandamus.[33]

At some point during all this, I took my first petition for writ of certiorari (appeal) to The Supreme Court. The Supreme Court decided it was not "worthy" of their consideration. I spelled out the fraud and corruption for them, but they ignored it.

Like the Energizer Bunny, I just kept going. Every order issued by Judge Evans and Judge Duffey was not valid based upon the facts or the law. They were totally

corrupt. The judges didn't make mistakes. They were intentionally committing crimes to try to stop me.

I reported all of this to the United States Attorney (same one who represents Judge Evans), the FBI, the Justice Department, every member of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, and many others. No one would do anything! They completely ignored me.

So, I sued them. I prepared everything and flew to Washington, DC to file there as I thought I would find honest judges in the shadow of The Capitol and The Supreme Court. I ran right smack dab into Judge Richard J. Leon. He proved to be just as corrupt. He dismissed my case on bogus grounds and did a lot of nasty stuff to me. At this point, I started to realize that the corruption in our federal courts may be everywhere. I don't know that yet, but from the reports I have gotten from people all over the country, I suspect it is true. We have a Constitutional Crisis on our hands. The federal judges have hijacked the Constitution, and they are holding us all hostage.

I continued my efforts in Judge Evans' court and Judge Duffey's court, and they lied and cheated me every step of the way. I appealed just about everything to the Eleventh Circuit, and they lied and cheated me every step of the way. In fact, in 62 pages of orders (perhaps 25 orders) from the Eleventh Circuit, they never ever, even once, addressed ANY of my points or error or law. They ignored the facts and what the law actually provides and ruled against me in one sentence orders much of the time.

The abuse has escalated. Judge Evans found me in contempt of court. She warned me that "You are playing with fire." She threatened to put me in jail. She fined me. She hit me with more legal fees. Lying every step of the way. Violating the law again and again and again. Same for Dishonest Duffey. He's just as bad -- maybe worse -- a real snake. Most of his lies are proven with documents that he pretends do not exist.

Judge Duffey has taken the unbelievable corrupt acts to a new level. He has the Clerk of the Court doing all types of things. My filings magically disappear. I presented a new lawsuit to be filed, and they refuse to file it. There is no legal right whatsoever for them to do this. but there is nowhere to turn. I will try filing in Washington, DC again, but that is probably a waste of time.

At this point, I have two appeals pending in Washington DC, a dozen at the Eleventh Circuit, and one at The Supreme Court. During a conversation with a

clerk at The Supreme Court, I learned by accident that one can file a petition for writ of mandamus with The Supreme Court. This is not an appeal, so it isn't something that they can ignore. They have to render a decision on it. So I filed three. One each to disqualify Judge Orinda D. Evans, Judge William S. Duffey, and one for the seven corrupt judges who I have identified at the Eleventh Circuit. The Supreme Court has given the accused judges until December 15 to file responses.

This will be a landmark decision. I have asked The Supreme Coutrt whether they will stop federal judges from voiding the Constitution. I have asked them whether they will expose the corruption in the federal courts. I have asked them whether federal judges may continue to ignore the facts, ignore the law, and violate the Constitutional rights of the people who appear as parties in their courts. I pray that they have the guts to blow the corruption wide open, but I know that they are all products of the same corrupt system, so I am not holding my breath. My best chance is if this story gets out to enough people that we get public pressure building to have someone somewhere do something.

Judges are supposed to tell the truth at all times, but these judges have made false statements routinely. These were material false statements made under the judges' oath of office in a federal proceeding. These judges knew statements that they made were false.

Judges are supposed to provide due process to the parties in their courts, but I have had just about every form of due process denied. I have not been allowed to present evidence, call witnesses, cross examine witnesses, have an impartial judge, and much more.

These judges routinely ignored the facts and the law and even invented their own facts.[43] These judges have made rulings that are absolutely contrary to the law. Judge Evans even denied us any ability to obtain the names of witnesses that we needed to depose. She granted a summary judgment for Maid on the key issue in the case – an oral agreement for six months in 2005 -- based upon the following: Maid testified that its president was not aware of an agreement with Alcatraz. There was no other testimony from Maid other than this one statement in the Verified Complaint! Alcatraz provided a Verified Answer, multiple sworn affidavits, and extensive deposition testimony detailing the exact terms of the oral agreement from the people who made the oral agreement with Maid. This clearly created at least a fact issue that defeated summary judgment, but Judge Evans invented facts that weren't true and weren't in the record, ignored the truth, and

claimed her facts trumped the A&W's sworn testimony. As there was a contract, there was no tortious interference, but there was breach of contract by Maid, and A&W should have won the case.[44]

Detailed background facts regarding the judicial misconduct of these judges is provided in the three petitions for writ of mandamus:

Judge Evans

Judge Duffey

Judges of the Eleventh Circuit

Katherine Albrecht asked me on her radio show why I have kept going. My friends and relatives will tell you that I am the most tenacious person they have ever known. I will not stop. I will get these judges indicted, convicted, and impeached, or I will die trying. They "stole" from my child. I'll fight back against anyone who messes with me wrongfully, but you mess with one of my children or grandchildren, and you've declared war.

I obviously have a personal stake in all of this. Most people who pursue a cause do, but now, I have met and spoken with so many people who have been cheated by corrupt judges that I feel I have a big responsibility to them as well. I will fight for everyone.

My son said, "Dad, all of this is well and good, but what is your solution to the problems?" I sat down at the keyboard, and did a brain dump. Here are my ideas to correct the problem of judicial corruption.

I have three grandchildren - Madison, Mackenzie, and Katherine. I drive Madison's carpool once a week. She is unbelievably intelligent and worldly for a seven-year-old. As we drove home one day, she told me they were studying Martin Luther King. She asked me to tell her about those times, so I did. She asked me what I did to stop the prejudice and all the problems. I told her that I was never prejudiced, but I didn't really do anything. She asked if I had ever done anything that made a big difference in the world. i said, no, unfortunately not. She quickly assured me that she would make a difference in the world. I absolutely believe that is true. Well, I hope I can do something vitally important to every American with my efforts to expose corruption in the federal courts. We are all in trouble. Madison and I want to help.

[1] MIST-1_Doc.1.

[2] MIST-1_Docs.361 and 362.

[3] The Mandamus Affidavit of William M. Windsor is on pages 161-185 in the Appendix (Pet.App.). "M-Aff #" is the abbreviation used for this affidavit herein. "Doc." is the abbreviation for Docket used herein.

[4] "Pet.App. ###" indicates page number in the Appendix to this Petition for Writ of Mandamus.

[5] Pet.App.171 -- M-Aff #1, ¶40.

[6] Pet.App.171 -- M-Aff #1, ¶41.

[7] Deposition Action_Doc.4; Pet.App.172 -- M-Aff #1, ¶42.

[8] Pet.App.161-170, 190-191, Affidavit of Prejudice ¶¶34-67 and 118-121.

[9] Pet.App.172 -- M-Aff #1, ¶43.

[10] Deposition Action_Doc.8; Pet.App.127 -- M-Aff #1, ¶45.

[11] Declarations and affidavits of William M. Windsor have been numbered. "Dec #__" is used as the abbreviation for each. Dec #5 is the Fifth, Dec #34 is the Thirty-Fourth, etc.

[12] Deposition Action_Doc.15.

[13] Pet.App.172 -- M-Aff #1, ¶47.

[14] Deposition Action_Doc.21; Pet.App.172 -- M-Aff #1, ¶49.

[15] Deposition Action_Doc.24; Pet.App.173 -- M-Aff #1, ¶50.

[16] Deposition Action_Doc.32.

[17] Pet.App.24.

[18] Pet.App.173 -- M-Aff #1, ¶51.

[19] Pet.App.173 – M-Aff#1, ¶51.

[20] Pet.App.173-174, ¶53; MIST-2_Doc.1.

[21] MIST-2_Docs.15 and 17; Pet.App.174 -- M-Aff #1, ¶55.

[22] MIST-2_Doc.31.

[23] Pet.App.19; Pet.App.174 -- M-Aff #1, ¶56; MIST-2_Doc.22.

[24] MIST-2_Doc.48; Pet.App.174, ¶56.

[25] Pet.App.71-77, ¶¶121-141; Pet.App.174 -- M-Aff #1, ¶56.

[26] MIST-2_Doc.36.

[27] Pet.App.161.

[28] Pet.App.114; Pet.App.174-175 -- M-Aff #1, ¶57.

[29] Pet.App.116.

[30] Pet.App.161

[31] Pet.App.114.

[32] Mist-2_Doc.1.

[33] Pet.App.4.

[34] Pet.App.186.

[35] Pet.App.3 and 18.

[36] Pet.App.A.

[37] Pet.App.175 -- M-Aff #1, ¶59-60.

[38] Pet.App.176 -- M-Aff #1, ¶62.

[39] See MIST-1_Doc.474, Pet.App.176 – M-Aff #1, ¶63.

[40] MIST-1_Doc.377, Exhibits 9 and 22; see Pet.App.90-101, ¶¶189-264.

[41] MIST-1_Doc.174, P23: 24-25, P24: 1-7, P34: 4-7, P44: 6-8.

[42] MIST-1_Doc.361.

[43] Pet.App.99, ¶245; Pet.App.178 -- M-Aff #1, ¶78.

[44] MIST-2_Doc.1.

[45] MIST-1_Doc.406.

[46] MIST-1_Doc.462.

[47] MIST-2_Doc.1.

[48] Pet.App.85-104, ¶¶172-276.

Judge Orinda D. Evans

The following has been filed with The United States Supreme Court regarding Judge Orinda D. Evans, a federal district court judge in Atlanta for the last 32 years:

District Court Judge Orinda D. Evans ("Judge Evans"), several attorneys, and five people lied again and again and again and cost Alcatraz Media, LLC and Alcatraz Media, Inc. (jointly "Alcatraz") and me a fortune in legal fees and litigation expenses and much more.

Maid of the Mist Corporation and Maid of the Mist Steamboat Company Limited (jointly "Plaintiffs" or "Maid") filed suit in August 2005 against Alcatraz Media,

LLC, Alcatraz Media, Inc., and William M. Windsor (jointly "Defendants"). [This case is Civil Action No. 1:06-CV-0714-ODE ("MIST-1").]

Four managers of Maid of the Mist committed hundreds of counts of perjury. These managers lied repeatedly under oath and conspired to commit fraud against the Defendants. This lawsuit ("MIST-1") began with a sworn Verified Complaint that consisted of perjured testimony by the President of Maid, Christopher Glynn ("Glynn"). I have detailed under oath that as many as 46 of the 50 paragraphs were false or incorrect and/or not based upon the personal knowledge of Glynn as he swore.

The lawsuit claimed I did a variety of things, none of which were true. In depositions, their managers admitted under oath that none of it was true, but Judge Evans ignored this and found be at fault. It has now cost me $1.5 million in legal fees to fight the injustice. Judge Evans keeps sticking me with the legal fees of Maid, so the number keeps growing.

The lies, false sworn pleadings, false pleadings, and discovery abuse continued throughout MIST-1. This deprived Alcatraz and me of any opportunity for a fair trial. The dishonesty of Maid and their attorneys was compounded by the "mistakes" of Judge Evans, who decided on day one that she was going to find in favor of Maid, withheld documents from us, violated our legal rights by ignoring perjury and a massive fraud upon the court, denying the most basic discovery, and acting without the impartiality required of a judge.

Maid of the Mist's managers and primary attorney, Mr. Carl Hugo Anderson, lied many hundreds of times. (MIST-1 Doc. 377 – Exhibits 1-8, 10-21 lists each false statement and provides citations to the proof of the falsities.)

Maid's attorneys have violated the State Bar of Georgia Rules of Professional Conduct and have committed many violations of their oaths.

Maid of the Mist and their attorneys used a deliberately planned unconscionable scheme to fraudulently subvert the integrity of the judicial process. Proof of the unconscionable scheme, and of its complete success to date, is conclusive in the Docket of Civil Action 1:06-CV-0714-ODE ("MIST-1").

Maid of the Mist's attorneys have filed false sworn pleadings, have filed false pleadings, have filed improper pleadings, have filed allegations and other factual contentions that lack evidentiary support, have obstructed justice, have suborned

perjury, and have violated numerous criminal statutes.

Maid of the Mist's attorneys have knowingly had their client verify false pleadings. Plaintiffs' attorneys have committed perjury. Maid's attorneys have suborned perjury.

Maid of the Mist's attorneys established a pattern and practice of lies, multiple false sworn statements in multiple false sworn affidavits by multiple people, false sworn testimony at the Preliminary Injunction Hearing, in their depositions, and more. These were material false statements.

Maid of the Mist's attorneys concealed documents, altered documents, withheld documents, and more as part of the scheme.

Statements were knowingly and deliberately falsified to serve the improper needs of Maid of the Mist's' attorneys, to inflict pain, suffering, and financial loss on Alcatraz and me.

The many issues of professional misconduct are detailed in MIST-1 Docket #474 and Dec #25 (MIST-1 Docket #462).

All of this should subject Maid of the Mist's attorneys (Carl Hugo Anderson, Hawkins Parnell Thackston Young, Phillips Lytle, Marc W. Brown, and others) to professional discipline for knowingly making false statements of fact; assisting a client in illegal or fraudulent conduct; engaging in conduct involving fraud, dishonesty, deceit, and misrepresentation; and engaging in conduct reflecting adversely on the attorneys' fitness to practice law.

I filed motions for sanctions against Maid of the Mist's attorneys that provide additional details of attorney misconduct. [MIST-1 Docket #363 and 364]. But Judge Evans ignored it all. She never allowed it to be discussed, and she refused repeated motions for hearings and conferences.

Judges are supposed to tell the truth at all times, but Judge Evans has made false statements routinely.

Judge Evans has violated my Constitutional and civil rights under color of law and has denied due process.

Judge Evans has not demonstrated the impartiality required of a judge. Judge

Evans has demonstrated a personal bias in favor of Maid of the Mist and a prejudice against Alcatraz and me.

The improper acts of Judge Evans were motivated by unknown extrajudicial factors. The record shows that Judge Evans was against Alcatraz and me from the minute she became involved in MIST-1.

Judge Evans established a fixed view about substantive pending trial matters. Judge Evans issued a Temporary Restraining Order in March 2006 and required a bond that was less than 1.5% of the amount underestimated by Alcatraz and me. The bond was $5,000, and the loss by Alcatraz and me has been over 100 times that.

Judge Evans spoke at the Preliminary Injunction Hearing in April 2006 with a clearly fixed view about substantive pending trial matters. Judge Evans indicated to me that she maintained a position throughout this proceeding that Alcatraz and I were wrong and that our case did not matter. Judge Evans called it a "simple case" in complete disregard for the facts, the law, and the counterclaim of Alcatraz.

Judge Evans treated Alcatraz and me in a hostile manner.

Denying Alcatraz and me access to important records, evidence, and witnesses, as Judge Evans did, is a violation of Equal Protection.

Judge Evans made as many as 200 false statements in the Preliminary Injunction Order in May 2006 and Summary Judgment Order in August 2007. Proof of the false statements in the orders has been documented in MIST-1 Docket #362 and 377 with citations to Maid's witnesses proving that many statements are false.

These were material false statements made under the Judge's oath of office in a federal proceeding. Judge Evans knew statements that she made were false because she claimed statements were evidence before the Court, and that was clearly not true. Furthermore, Judge Evans was on notice that the Summary Judgment Order statements were false because the Petitioner informed her on February 2, 2007. [MIST-1 Docket #174, P 23: 24-25, P 24: 1-7, P 34: 4-7, P 44: 6-8.]

I began efforts to reopen the case in April 2009. In five years, Judge Evans has never granted me a single conference or hearing. Never.

Pervasive bias continued in 2009 as was shown on May 22, 2009 in an order from Judge Evans wherein she falsely claims "the issues of law and fact in this case ultimately were not difficult." Judge Evans ignored the facts and the law. She issued an injunction to stop Alcatraz and me from a business that we are licensed to operate by the State of Georgia wrongly claiming the business is illegal.

Judge Evans ignored everything in MIST-1 from May until December 22, 2009 when she issued an order denying all pending motions en masse and enjoining me from filing. Several appeals are pending at the Eleventh Circuit, and several petitions are yet to be submitted to the United States Supreme Court.

Alcatraz and I are allegedly entitled under the Fifth Amendment to the "absolute right" to an impartial tribunal. The Fifth Amendment is supposed to act as a limitation upon the exercise of judicial power – to wit, justices may not sit as adjudicators in cases in which they have an interest. But by adjudicating pending motions and a Complaint of Professional Misconduct in MIST-1, Judge Evans violated my right to an impartial tribunal.

Judge Evans ignored my claims of hundreds of counts of perjury, Rule 11 violations, and subornation of perjury by the Plaintiffs and their attorneys. Judge Evans issued orders and the summary judgment based upon testimony that she was told was perjured. Judge Evans refused to give proper consideration to the merits of my sworn statements based upon my personal knowledge and made under penalty of perjury before a notary in MIST-1.

Maid of the Mist has not attempted to dispute the perjury with a single solitary affidavit. This is because Maid of the Mist cannot dispute the uncontroverted facts.

Judge Evans has committed obstruction of justice by withholding material evidence that should have been provided to Alcatraz and me. Judge Evans received two contracts for an in camera inspection in February 2007. Judge Evans claimed the contracts were not relevant to the case, but that was false.

Alcatraz and I finally obtained the contracts through a Freedom of Information request in 2009, so I know that the contracts contained extremely important information. I have reason to believe that Maid of the Mist filed bogus documents with Judge Evans. These documents are referenced in MIST-1 Docket #168, and the production requirement is noted in MIST-1 Docket # 174 - Hearing of February 2, 2007, P 61-62. (See First Declaration of William M. Windsor (Dec #1, ¶¶ 15-

32) and Exhibits 1 and 2 thereto. [MIST-1 Docket #361].) Judge Evans refused to produce these documents from a subpoena, and she denied a motion to lift the seal with no justification whatsoever. These documents will prove that MIST-1 should be reopened. These documents will prove fraud. I have no way to get the documents because Judge Evans is concealing them.

Alcatraz and I were denied the most basic discovery -- never even given the names and contact information for employee witnesses. Judge Evans denied us the ability to take deposition testimony of any of the people directly involved with customers or any customers. Judge Evans denied us the time needed to obtain the depositions of Canadian employees of Maid who were important to our case.

Judge Evans repeatedly denied discovery requests that were essential to our defense and in support of our case. Discovery Abuse is detailed in Exhibit 16 to the Second Declaration of William M. Windsor ("Dec #2") [MIST-1 Docket #361]. Judge Evans denied me, a pro se party, the ability to conduct a 30(b)(6) examination of Maid Corporation. [MIST-1 Docket # 174, P59: 18-21.]

Maid of the Mist's attorneys were either the luckiest attorneys in the world to find such a willing accomplice in Judge Evans...or they had reason to believe that Judge Evans would participate in their scheme. Judge Evans acted as if she was on their payroll.

Judge Evans routinely ignored the facts and the law and even invented her own facts.

Judge Evans committed many violations of the Code of Judicial Conduct and the State Bar of Georgia Code of Professional Conduct.

Judge Evans made rulings in MIST-1 that are contrary to the law. She issued a preliminary injunction based upon an argument presented after the preliminary injunction was long over. She issued a preliminary injunction claiming tortious interference based on approximately $100 in damages that the Defendants proved were bogus with sworn affidavits from the customers involved. She denied the Defendants any ability to obtain the names of witnesses that they needed to depose. She granted a summary judgment for Maid of the Mist on the key issue in the case – an oral agreement for six months in 2005 -- based upon the following: Maid of the Mist testified that its president was not aware of an agreement with Alcatraz. There was no other testimony from Maid of the Mist other than this one statement in the Verified Complaint! Alcatraz provided a Verified Answer,

Alcatraz and I filed multiple sworn affidavits and gave extensive deposition testimony detailing the exact terms of the oral agreement from the people who made the oral agreement with Maid of the Mist. This clearly created a fact issue, but Judge Evans invented facts that weren't true and weren't in the record and claimed her facts trumped our sworn testimony. As there was a contract, there was no tortious interference, and Alcatraz and I should have won the case. This is about as basic as legal issues get.

Detailed background facts regarding the professional misconduct of Judge Evans are provided in Dec #23 -- MIST-1 Docket #406. Dec #23 details what Judge Evans did throughout this case. Other violations are detailed in Dec #25 (MIST-1 Docket #462).

The various actions of Maid of the Mist, their attorneys, and Judge Evans constitute fraud upon the courts.

I naively felt like I had a chance when I was forced to appeal to the Eleventh Circuit. Of course the judges of the Eleventh Circuit have all been friends with Judge Evans during her 32 years as a federal judge. I believe that the judges of the Eleventh Circuit have issued decisions against me for the purpose of covering up for their friend, Judge Evans.

The legal system has been structured so that grave miscarriages of justice, such as the one in this case, should not happen.

Oaths theoretically require honesty. Every witness, attorney, and judge swears an oath to the truth. Attorneys and judges swear to abide by codes of conduct. But when the witnesses for Maid lied and committed perjury hundreds of times; when their attorneys suborned that perjury; when Plaintiffs' attorneys violated their oaths and the law for the purpose of committing fraud upon the courts; when Judge Evans actively participated in supporting the wrongdoing; and when all the lies deceived the U.S.C.A. on appeal, my most basic rights were violated.

The system theoretically provides safeguards and checks and balances. FRCP Rules 11, 34, and 37 and Local Rule 83.1C provide means to call party and attorney dishonesty to the attention of the judge. Rule 60 provides the ability for grave miscarriages of justice to be corrected by reopening cases and setting aside wrongful judgments. 28 U.S.C. 144 and 28 U.S.C. 455 provide the means to seek recusal of a judge. But in this case, Judge Evans ignored the pleas under Rule 11, 34, and 37 claiming there was no proof despite mountains of it. In this case, Judge

Evans improperly denied the Motion to Reopen. In this case, Judge Evans refused to be recused despite pervasive bias. In this case, Judge Evans ignored the reports of massive perjury and refused to even consider that Maid of the Mist and their attorneys should be sanctioned. There is no factual or legal basis for the actions of Judge Evans.

The worst of hardships have resulted from the dishonesty in this case. Alcatraz and I have lost a fortune, have been saddled with an injunction that is a violation of Georgia law, have been defamed, and have lost years of man hours fighting the injustice. Now others are unfairly using the erroneous decision in this case in litigation against Alcatraz in efforts to "void" O.C.G.A.43-4B.

In 2009, I wrote to the Presiding Judges of the Northern District of Georgia and the Eleventh Circuit asking for a conference of some type, and I was ignored. I filed a Motion for Judicial Intervention asking these judges, the Supreme Court, and the House and Senate Judiciary Committees to do something, but only the Supreme Court replied to say that they were unable to consider a letter and motion in a district court.

I sent detailed information to the FBI, the District Attorney, and the United States Attorney. The District Attorney referred me to the FBI. The FBI said $1,000,000 was not a big enough deal for them to get involved. The United States Attorney simply ignored it.

I have now written to every member of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, and only Senator Arlen Specter replied by referring the letter to the two senators from Georgia. The Senators said they couldn't get involved.

After learning that there is no civil lawsuit allowed for perjury, and after none of the authorities responded, I filed an independent action in equity lawsuit against Judge Evans, Maid of the Mist, and their attorneys pursuant in part to FRCP Rule 60(d) for fraud upon the court and RICO. In the Verified Action in N. D. Ga. 1:09-CV-02027-WSD, I detail thousands of false statements, identify hundreds of violations of criminal statutes (predicate acts for RICO), and reference all of the proof about which I have sworn under penalty of perjury before a notary.

I had high hopes that another judge would finally step in and end this nightmare. Instead, Judge Evans' next-door neighbor was assigned the case. Judge William S. Duffey ("Judge Duffey") immediately denied all of my motions and requests based on no evidence other than mine; he ordered the Defendants to submit Motions to

Dismiss; he denied me the ability to submit any motions without his prior approval, and more. Judge Duffey was previously acquainted with facts in MIST-1 because he called me "scurrilous and irresponsible" for taking legal action against his friend, Judge Evans. So much for impartial judges and fair trials!

And the Eleventh Circuit joined the act. A review of the orders in the Eleventh Circuit on my three cases shows 62 pages of orders. Guess how many sentences out of 62 pages addressed the facts or points of law that I raised in my appeals?

Not one single sentence. NOTHING. They have ignored absolutely everything, and they have done it intentionally.

I asked the following questions of the Eleventh Circuit in my appeal, all of which are facts:

1. Should a court allow perjury by a party? How much perjury does it take to become objectionable? What about 450 counts of perjury?

2. Should a court allow attorneys to commit perjury by submitting false statements of fact to the court? How many false statements from attorneys does it take to become objectionable? What about 350 counts of perjury? [

3. Should a court allow attorneys to suborn perjury? How many instances of suborning perjury from an attorney does it take to become objectionable? What about hundreds?

4. Should a court allow attorneys to commit violations of the State Bar of Georgia Code of Professional Conduct? How many violations from an attorney does it take to become objectionable? What about hundreds?

5. Should a court allow attorneys to routinely violate the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure ("FRCP")? How many violations from an attorney does it take to become objectionable? What about dozens?

6. Should a court allow attorneys to routinely violate the laws of the state? How many laws must be violated by an attorney to become objectionable? What about nine laws violated repeatedly over three years?

7. Should a court allow attorneys to routinely violate the laws of the USA? How many laws must be violated by an attorney to become objectionable? What about

eight laws violated repeatedly over three years?

8. Should the judicial system allow judges to commit perjury and obstruction of justice? How much perjury by a judge does it take to become objectionable? What about 250 counts of perjury?

9. Should a judge be allowed to completely and totally ignore the complaints of one party that the other party and their attorneys have committed massive misconduct as described above?

10. What should be done to attorneys and judges who commit such incredible misconduct? Shouldn't these attorneys be disbarred, and shouldn't this judge be impeached?

11. How do you compensate a litigant who had over $1,000,000 stolen from him in the guise of a lawsuit in which this professional misconduct completely and totally perverted the legal system?

12. How in the world can a judge even pretend to stand for truth and justice and decency if he/she allows things like this to happen?

The Eleventh Circuit ignored it all.

I have the evidence if someone will just care.

The dishonest and/or corrupt federal district court judges are: Judge Orinda D. Evans and Judge William S. Duffey. The dishonest and/or corrupt judges with the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit are Judge Joel F. Dubina, Judge J.L. Edmondson, Judge Frank M. Hull, Judge Ed Carnes, Judge Stanley Marcus, Judge Rosemary Barkett, and Judge William H. Pryor.

The judges with the Court of Appeals don't just allow the corruption to take place; they facilitate it.

This is like a horrible nightmare that has consumed five years of my life and a fortune in hard-earned money.

This is a case of legal and judicial abuse on steroids. This is a case that will prove that there is no such thing as justice in America if the Supreme Court declines to act.

And guess what? Thus far, The United States Supreme Court ruled that this case was not worthy of their attention. I did not realize that The Supreme Court is not really an appellate court. You don't get to have your case reviewed by The Supreme Court. THEY decide if a case is worthy of their consideration -- whether they feel it has important value as a precedent. It would be interesting to hear how one or more of the members of The United States Supreme Court decided that such corruption and dishonesty was not worthy.... Additional motions are pending with The Supreme Court -- the only hope for anything to be done in this matter.

Since I filed the above information with The Supreme Court, I have learned a lot more about the corruption in the federal courts in Atlanta, Georgia. I now know the various techniques that the judges use. I have detailed these using examples from orders issued in my cases.

For the Appendix and more information, see
http://www.lawlessamerica.com/index.php/news/blog-of-william-m-windsor/105-petition-for-recusal-of-judge-orinda-d-evans-us-supreme-court

Judge William S. Duffey, Jr.

The following has been filed with The United States Supreme Court regarding Judge William S. Duffey, Jr.:

In April 2009, the Petitioner began efforts to reopen the case pursuant to FRCP Rule 60(b) primarily due to fraud upon the courts. A major factor was the discovery of new evidence that had been concealed from Alcatraz and me by Maid and Judge Evans.

On June 3, 2009, the U.S. Attorney representing Judge Evans filed a motion to quash a subpoena for the deposition of Judge Evans in MIST-1. [Deposition_Action Doc.1.]

The motion was referred to Judge Duffey, and this created Civil Action 1:09-CV-01543-WSD.

Judge Duffey had never had any dealings with me prior to the referral of the motion to quash. I had never heard the name "Judge William S. Duffey" either. There was no conference held, and there was no hearing held, despite my motions requesting both.

On June 8, 2009, Judge Duffey stayed the properly subpoenaed deposition. Judge Duffey made a number of false statements in the stay order. The order was totally pro-Judge Evans, and it first indicated that Judge Duffey was biased.

On June 18, 2009, I filed a Motion for Reconsideration of the Order Staying Case and the Twenty-Ninth Declaration of William M. Windsor. This was filed to note errors in Judge Duffey's order.

On June 30, 2009, an Order to Quash the Deposition of Judge Evans was issued by Judge Duffey. The order described me as "scurrilous and irresponsible."

This was written by a man who did not know me, had never even seen me, and who made such a statement and decision based solely on my three uncontroverted sworn affidavits. In 2009, there were zero (0) affidavits filed by Maid in MIST-1, the Deposition Action, or MIST-2. My testimony and evidence stood alone as the record before the court. There was no evidence before Judge Duffey to allow him to make such a biased slur.

I am not scurrilous and irresponsible.

The only explanation for this slander is that Judge Duffey was predisposed to bias against me because I had the audacity to try to depose Judge Evans to obtain information to prove fraud upon the court that was available only from Judge Evans that I desperately needed to reopen the case in MIST-1.

There is nothing scurrilous and irresponsible in the three affidavits that Judge Duffey had before him when he entered the June 30, 2009 order – Dec #29, Dec #35, and Dec #34. The statements made therein are no different than the statements made herein. Judge Evans had made as many as 200 false statements in two orders in MIST-1. She knew statements that she made in her orders were false. She obstructed justice by concealing documents from me. These are facts, proven with evidence that I have filed in each of the three civil actions.

On July 27, 2009, I filed a complaint to begin MIST-2, an independent action in equity for fraud upon the court and RICO.

On July 28, 2009, when I was told by the District Court Clerk's Office that Judge Duffey would be presiding in MIST-2, I immediately went home and prepared a

Motion to Recuse Judge Duffey and a Motion for Change of Venue. I returned later in the day and filed.

On July 30, 2009, a TRO Hearing was held. Judge Duffey denied the motion. Judge Duffey distributed an order on my motions regarding service of process on Canadian defendants, representation, motion to change venue, and motion to recuse. All were denied.

Judge Duffey was antagonistic and biased in the hearing. Details of this are shown in the Transcript of the Temporary Restraining Order Hearing. False statements in the July 30, 2009 order are listed in the Affidavit of Prejudice that I filed.

On August 4, 2009, I filed an Emergency Motion to Recuse Judge Duffey. I advised Judge Duffey that I would seek a Writ of Mandamus if there was not a prompt response. This motion appears on the MIST-2 Docket as a "Motion for Leave" because Judge Duffey ordered that I must first submit proposed motions to him with a request for approval to file. This motion was pursuant to 28 U.S.C.§144. The filing included an Affidavit of Prejudice and a 28 U.S.C.§144 Certificate of Good Faith.

On August 10, 2009, I filed a Petition for a Writ of Mandamus with the Eleventh Circuit seeking to have Judge Duffey disqualified. The Affidavit of Prejudice and a 28 U.S.C.§144 Certificate of Good Faith were included as exhibits.

On September 17, 2009, the Eleventh Circuit denied the Petition for a Writ of Mandamus.

On November 2, 2009, Judge Duffey granted permission for me to file an appeal to The Supreme Court. The requirement of filing Requests for Approval before anything can be filed was made by Judge Duffey in his order dated July 30, 2009. I filed a Petition for Writ of Certiorari with The Supreme Court within 90 days from the order granting approval by the District Court. The Petition was rejected due to being more than 90 days from the order of the Eleventh Circuit. I called The Supreme Court Clerk's office prior to filing to ask if the time for filing was 90 days from the order granting permission to file. I was advised to include a letter explaining the situation, which I did.

I had also appealed the orders entered by Judge Duffey on September 25, 2009 and October 20, 2009. An order was issued by the Eleventh Circuit dismissing the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. I am filing this Petition for Writ of Mandamus as

Judge Duffey cannot be allowed to preside with demonstrated bias.

Judge Duffey has demonstrated pervasive bias ever since he called me "scurrilous and irresponsible." Judge Duffey has shown pervasive bias through many improper actions. He intentionally made absolute false statements in orders to damage me and protect Judge Evans and others. He used a wide variety of techniques to block my access to the two documents that will prove fraud upon the court and obstruction of justice. He denied me access to the courts by implementing filing restrictions without notice and without the opportunity to be heard. In the Deposition Action, Judge Duffey has ignored five motions filed by me in July and August 2010 including a motion for recusal filed on July 21, 2010 (Deposition_Action Doc. 65).

On September 23, 2010, I had a courier deliver several motions to the Clerk of the Court's office for filing. Though there was no restriction of any type on filing in Civil Action No. 1:09-CV-01543-WSD, the Clerk refused to file them. The Clerk, Miss Anniva Sanders, told me that she had been advised "by Chambers" to refuse to file the motions.

I spoke to Ms. Jessica Birnbaum who advised me that Judge Duffey issued an "oral order" requiring that I first seek request for specific approval before filing anything. The excuse was that I had requested a stay due to medical problems, and the case was closed. As the court Docket shows, the Plaintiffs were allowed to file Docket Nos. 55, 56, 75, 76, 77, 82, 83, and 84 between June 17 and September 3, 2010 after the case was closed, while I was having eye surgeries, and without any requirement to request specific approval to file. The Docket also shows that my motions for stay Docket 63 (July 19, 2010), Docket 79 (August 6, 2010), Docket 80 (August 26, 2010) were ignored by Judge Duffey. This demonstrates the bias of Judge Duffey.

Since September 23, 2010, Judge Duffey has failed to grant his approval for the filing of 10 motions, including two motions for stays due to medical emergency, a motion for a conference, and a motion for a hearing. There is no reason to block the filing of any of these motions.

In MIST-2, Judge Duffey has granted every request for specific approval filed by the Defendants. He has denied nine of my requests for specific approval to file, including a motion to strike false statements made by the attorney for most of the defendants [MIST-2_Doc.57]; a request for a conference [MIST-2_Doc.113]; three requests on stays due to medical emergency [MIST-2_Docs.139-144-157]; a

request to file a Verified Complaint of Professional Misconduct Against the Attorney Defendants [MIST-2_Doc.158]; and a request to file an affidavit that provided complete proof of most of the claims in my Verified Complaint [MIST-2_Doc.159]. Judge Duffey has completely ignored 18 requests for specific approval to file by me, including filing of proofs of service [MIST-2_Docs.54-60]; motion to strike the answer of Defendants [MIST-2_Doc.119]; motion to file brief on judicial immunity [MIST-2_Doc.123]; motion form the Court to take judicial notice of the evidence in related cases [MIST-2_Doc.125]; and a motion to name DOE Defendants [MIST-2_Doc.146].

Orders have been issued by Judge Duffey that have ignored the facts, ignored the law, cited erroneous case law, cited case law that does not support the subject of the citation, and much more. Orders have been issued that contained false statements and perjury.

As justification for denying MIST-2 Doc.144, Motion for Extension of Time; Motion for Discovery; Motion for In Camera Review; and Motion for Hearing and granting motions to dismiss, Judge Duffey claimed I did not submit to him a required report on my medical status on September 1, 2010. This is absolutely false. The report is provided in Appendix 3, p.324, dated August 31, 2010 for delivery on September 1, 2010. In addition to this report, I also reported on June 17; July 21 and 27; September 1, 10, 15, 23, and 30; and October 1, 7, 11, 15, 18, 19, 21. (Appendix 3, pp 326-373.)

Judge Duffey dismissed the case in MIST-2 under absolutely false pretenses. He did it while a stay order was in effect. He did it while ignoring the responses that I timely filed on August 18, and he did it while refusing to file the evidence and legal arguments that I had to submit as "requests for specific approval to file."

Judge Duffey ignored all of the wrongdoing in MIST-1 when it was spelled out for him in precise detail in MIST-2. Details of the earliest wrongs ignored by Judge Duffey are provided in MIST2-Doc.1 and the Affidavit of Prejudice. There has been much more since these were written.

In denying a Motion to Recuse, Judge Duffey stated that extrajudicial bias is required for recusal. On the Petition for Writ of Mandamus, the Eleventh Circuit also ruled: "Windsor has not shown bias stemming from an extra judicial source." But Judge Duffey's bias IS extrajudicial. Judge Duffey, like Judge Evans, will say anything to rule the way he wants to rule.

For the Appendix and more information, see
http://www.lawlessamerica.com/index.php/news/blog-of-william-m-windsor/103-petition-for-recusal-of-judge-william-s-duffey-us-supreme-court

There is a lot more on Judge Duffey, but I will have to add it later.

The United States Court of Appeals for The Eleventh Circuit

The following has been filed with The United States Supreme Court regarding the Judges of the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals:

A reasonable person would question the impartiality of any judge in litigation involving another judge who has been a friend for as long as 32 years. When there is a "reasonable apprehension of bias," judges are supposed to recuse themselves because the law says they may not serve as a judge under the circumstances.

Judge Evans has been a federal judge since 1978. She has been a federal judge in Atlanta longer than all 11 of the active federal judges at the Eleventh Circuit. Judge Edmondson--1986, Judge Dubina--1990, Judge Carnes--1992, Judge Black--1992, Judge Barkett--1994, Judge Hull--1997, Judge Marcus--1997, Judge Wilson--1999, Judge Pryor--2005, and Judge Martin--2010. Only Judge Tjoflat has been a federal judge longer – 1975, but he joined the Eleventh Circuit three years after Judge Evans became an Atlanta federal judge. Two Senior Judges have slightly more seniority: Judge Hill--1976, Judge Fay--1976, Judge Kravitch--1979, Judge Anderson--1981, Judge Cox--1988. The number of years that each of the Eleventh Circuit Judges have been friends with Judge Evans are: 24, 20, 18, 18, 16, 13, 13, 5, 1, 29, 32, 32, 31, 29, and 22.

The federal judges in the Northern District of Georgia and the Eleventh Circuit recently established a precedent regarding recusal in cases involving a friend judge. Every federal judge disqualified himself or herself in Criminal Action No. 1:10-MJ-141S involving federal judge Jack T. Camp, accused of drug and gun violations with a local stripper. Chief Judge Dubina petitioned the Chief Justice of The United States Supreme Court to appoint a judge from another circuit, and he did. I have filed motions in this regard, but they have been ignored.

While the prejudice FOR their fellow judges is bad enough, the judges of the Eleventh Circuit also have a bias against pro se parties. Pro se parties who represent themselves in court are mistreated. There is a presumption of "guilt,"

legal incompetence, and that the judges can get away with whatever they choose to do to a pro se party. There is a presumption that pro se parties will be similarly mistreated at every level of the judicial process. The Eleventh Circuit judges employ a different set of rules for pro se parties. Pro se parties have their legal rights curtailed.

While the prejudice against pro se parties may have come from experience as a judge or as an attorney, this prejudice did not emanate from in-courtroom experience with the pro se party. The bias against pro se parties is clearly extra-judicial. I have had my rights violated by the prejudice these judges have against me as a pro se party. Extra-judicial bias is grounds for disqualification pursuant to 28 U.S.C.455.

I believe Federal Judges Orinda D. Evans ("Judge Evans"), William S. Duffey, Jr. ("Judge Duffey"), Joel F. Dubina ("Judge Dubina"), James Larry Edmondson ("Judge Edmondson"), Rosemary Barkett ("Judge Barkett"), Edward Earl Carnes ("Judge Carnes"), Frank M. Hull ("Judge Hull"), Stanley Marcus ("Judge Marcus"), and William H. Pryor, Jr. ("Judge Pryor") (jointly "Defendant Judges") are corrupt and have conspired to damage me. I have filed a civil action against these judges in the Northern District of Georgia.[1]

The Defendant Judges have ignored my uncontroverted proof of massive dishonesty in MIST-1.

The actions of the Defendant Judges support perjury, subornation of perjury, Rule 11 violations, obstruction of justice, dishonest parties, dishonest attorneys, and corrupt judges.

By failing to follow proper procedure, the Defendant Judges violated my civil rights as they have been acting in the absence of all jurisdiction.

Examples of the wrongdoing by the Judges of the Eleventh Circuit are illustrated in the Appendix to the Petition for Writ of Mandamus ("Pet.App.") as highlighted below. Each of the techniques that the corrupt judges use is shown in boldface type with examples from my cases beneath. With so many examples from just my own dealings, I imagine there are thousands of examples from the cases of others.

---

[1] I am TRYING to get his lawsuit filed. The Clerk of the Court has not assigned a civil action number and has not submitted the case to a judge for the emergency Temporary Restraining Order hearing that I requested weeks ago.

CORRUPT JUDICIAL TECHNIQUE: IGNORE THE FACTS

This is clearly one of the universal techniques used by the corrupt federal judges. If they want to rule against you, they simply ignore the facts. I would have never dreamed that nine federal judges would ignore thousands of documents cases of perjury and subornation of perjury in one lawsuit, but that's what each and every one of them has done for the last five years. They pretend the evidence doesn't exist. They ignore the facts that prove your case, if they want to rule against you for their own corrupt reasons.

Here are examples just from my appeals:

Judges Dubina, Hull, and Fay completely ignored the facts presented by Alcatraz and me – facts absolutely proven by the record before the courts. (Pet.App.6.) The only reason for these judges to rule as they did was to support Judge Evans' order. I suspect that the district court judges have a way to communicate with the appellate court judges when they want them to rubber stamp their corrupt rulings. This doesn't just all happen by accident. Perhaps they get together like the judges did in the movie, ***Star Chamber***, and let each other know how to rule.

Judges Hull, Marcus, and Pryor completely ignored the facts and sanctioned perjury by Maid's Attorneys.(Pet.App.20.)

Judges Edmondson and Birch did not address a single fact in denying a petition for writ of mandamus. In so doing, they took the position that sworn affidavits under penalty of perjury and a mountain of proof of crimes and wrongdoing by Maid, Maid's Attorneys, and Judge Evans was not worthy of their time. Their order sanctions perjury and obstruction of justice.(Pet.App.22.)(Docket in Appeal No.09-15232-D.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull ignored all of the facts and law. Their decision in Pet.App.26 says that if a corporation or LLC is unable to find an attorney who will represent them in a lawsuit against a judge, that corporation loses all legal rights. They ignored this very important issue. (Pet.App.26.)(Dockets in Appeal Nos.09-14735-DD,09-16493, and 09-16494.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull ignored everything and issued two of the most outlandish orders ever in Appeal No. 09-14735-DD. (Pet.App.29_and_40.) They ignored the facts and the law. They dismissed an appeal as frivolous with no

explanation whatsoever. They lied about the basis for the bias that I swore was why the judges of the Eleventh Circuit should be recused in matters involving Judge Evans and Judge Duffey. They granted sanctions against me and to Maid in an appeal that did not even involve Maid, where the district court found nothing frivolous, where the facts and the law and case law indicate that the appeal was totally proper and sanctions were totally improper. And after all that, they violated my Constitutional rights even more severely in Pet.App.40.(Pet.App.29.)(Docket in Appeal No.09-14735-DD.)

I need to add Judges Black and Wilson to my lawsuit after reviewing their order of April 14, 2010. (Pet.App.35.) This is a horrible order in which they demonstrate bias by making absolutely false statements obtained from their fellow judges. They cite erroneous law while ignoring the case law that proves that mandamus is the proper vehicle for recusal. Their order does not discuss a single one of my points in an appeal where the law and the facts are absolutely overwhelming against Judge Evans' order. The only finding in the five page order (padded mercilessly) is "After review, we find that Petitioner has failed to carry his burden both...." This clearly violates ***Corcoran v. Levenhagen***, 558 U. S. ____ (2009). Judges Black and Wilson then trample all over my legal and Constitutional rights by placing filing restrictions on me. This was done in violation of the case law that says such restrictions may not be placed without notice and an opportunity to be heard. The restrictions are totally unfounded because I have filed nothing even remotely frivolous. (Pet.App.35.)(Appeal Nos.10-10698-A,10-10699-A,10-10700-A,10-10701-A.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull ignored everything and issued two of the most outlandish orders ever in Appeal No.09-14735-DD. (Pet.App.29_and_40.) In Pet.App.40, they literally ignored absolutely everything. They illegally and maliciously claimed that I exceeded the page limits that do not exist in FRAP 38. They ignored and never even ruled on motions that pertained to the same issue and preceded this refusal to even allow my response to be filed. After it was file stamped by the Clerk, it was returned over a month later with the file stamp scratched out. Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull granted sanctions against me and to Maid in an appeal that I should have won hands-down. To add insult to injury, they never issued a judgment, and their order gave no direction to the Clerk of the Court to issue a writ of execution, but the Clerk did both. Maid has filed liens on all of my assets and those of my wife, and I am suing the Clerk of the Court over the wrongful actions. To just add a little more violation of my rights to due process, they ordered that I could not file a motion for reconsideration or any motion of any type in this matter ever. Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull need to be high on Congressional list of the

Atlanta federal judges to be impeached.(Pet.App.40.)(Docket in Appeal No.09-14735-DD.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull struck again in Pet.App.43. They lied about the basis for the bias that I swore was why the judges of the Eleventh Circuit should be recused in matters involving Judge Evans and Judge Duffey. They cited erroneous case law and ignored the Supreme Court's order in ***Liteky***. Then the further trampled my rights by ordering that I could not respond to the denial and its perjury.(Pet.App.43.)(Dockets in Appeal Nos.09-16448-A,09-16493-A, and 09-16494-A.)

I have been blocked from seeking reconsideration of orders or petitioning for rehearing en banc. This keeps me from reaching the honest judges at the Eleventh Circuit.(Pet.App.50.)

Judges Carnes, Hull, and Marcus ignored everything in Appeal No.10-12517-A.(Pet.App.55.) They ignored the facts. They ignored the law. They dismissed as frivolous with no explanation whatsoever. There is nothing whatsoever frivolous about the appeal; it covers similar issues to appeals ruled not frivolous. The law is crystal clear that Judge Evans violated the law.(Pet.App.55.)(Docket in Appeal No.10-12517-A.)

Judges Edmondson, Birch, and Wilson ignored everything in Appeal Nos. 10-12450-A. (Pet.App.57.) They ignored the facts. They ignored the law. They dismissed as frivolous with no explanation whatsoever. There is nothing whatsoever frivolous about the appeal; it covers identical issues to appeals ruled not frivolous. The law is crystal clear that Judge Evans violated the law. Significant case law was cited by Windsor. (Pet.App.57.)(Docket in Appeal No.10-12450-A.)

CORRUPT JUDICIAL TECHNIQUE: IGNORE THE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL AND APPELLATE PROCEDURE

Judges Dubina, Hull, and Fay ignored the various rules that were violated by the Plaintiffs. (Pet.App.6.)

Judges Hull, Marcus, and Pryor had no trouble illegally ordering sanctions against me (Pet.App.29_and_40), but they completely ignored the many violations of Maid's Attorneys in MIST-2. On page 19,¶2 of Appellees' Brief, Appellees state: "...he [Windsor] ... testified that he sold consumers worthless vouchers as part of his campaign to injure Maid." I stated in my Motion for Sanctions in Appeal No. 09-

13998-A: "This is false and despicable. The Appellees are all extremely dishonest, and this statement is a whopper of a lie. Appellees know this is false. This statement was made to deceive this Court and damage Windsor. If this Court believes this statement, Windsor will be damaged. This is FRAUD – fraud upon the court. This is PERJURY. There is no factual basis whatsoever for this statement. Exhibit J hereto are pages from the deposition cited by Appellees on Page 19 of their Brief. See Exhibit J, P76:11-15, P91, 92, 93. Exhibit C hereto provides Maid's 30(b)(6) testimony that Windsor did not do what Appellees claim. Seventeen (17) sentences in Appellees' Brief are false." I cited the proof, and my sworn affidavit under penalty of perjury was not controverted.(Pet.App.20.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull ignored FRAP 38 and every provision that requires due process as well as everything to do with fairness and decency in Pet.App.40. They ignored and never even ruled on motions that pertained to the same issue and preceded this refusal to even allow my response to be filed in violation of a wide variety of rules. After it was file stamped by the Clerk, it was returned over a month later with the file stamp scratched out. To add insult to injury, they never issued a judgment as is required by the Rules, and their order gave no direction to the Clerk of the Court to issue a writ of execution, but the Clerk did both. I tried to get the Eleventh Circuit to do something about this, but Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull ordered the Clerk to return anything and everything presented by me.(Pet.App.40 and Docket in Appeal No.09-14735-DD.)

I have been blocked from seeking reconsideration of orders or petitioning for rehearing en banc. This keeps me from reaching the honest judges at the Eleventh Circuit.(Pet.App.50.)

Judges Carnes, Hull, and Marcus ignored everything in Appeal Nos. 10-12517-A.(Pet.App.55.) They ignored the facts. They ignored the law. They dismissed as frivolous with no explanation whatsoever. There is nothing whatsoever frivolous about the appeal; it covers similar issues to appeals ruled not frivolous. The law is crystal clear that Judge Evans violated the law. (Pet.App.55.)(Docket in Appeal No.10-12517-A.)

Judges Edmondson, Birch, and Wilson ignored everything in Appeal Nos. 10-12450-A.(Pet.App.57.) They ignored the facts. They ignored the law. They dismissed as frivolous with no explanation whatsoever. The law is crystal clear that Judge Evans violated the law. Significant case law was cited by me. (Pet.App.57.)(Docket in Appeal No.10-12450-A.)

CORRUPT JUDICIAL TECHNIQUE: IGNORE THE POINTS OF ERROR OF APPELLANTS

Judges Dubina, Hull, and Fay ignored all but one. They did not address 12 significant points of error and gave no justification whatsoever for the decision. (Pet.App.6.)

Judges Edmondson and Birch did not address a single point of the 19 issues Presented by me in denying a petition for writ of mandamus. (Pet.App.22.)(Docket in Appeal No.09-15232-D.)

Judges Black and Wilson completely and totally ignored my absolutely valid issues. (Pet.App.35.) Their order does not discuss a single one of my points in an appeal where the law and the facts are absolutely overwhelming against Judge Evans' order. (Pet.App.35.)(Appeal Nos.10-10698-A,10-10699-A,10-10700-A, and 10-10701-A.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull ignored everything and issued sanctions against me and to Maid in an appeal that I should have won hands-down. My Appellant's Brief cited 35 cases, 18 statutes, 13 Rules, and several Constitutional provisions. They ignored the following: Whether Judge Duffey erred by allowing Judge Evans to file a Motion to Quash Subpoena and create this civil action. Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull completely and totally igniored the following: Whether Judge Duffey erred by demonstrating pervasive bias against Windsor; Whether Judge Duffey erred by making false statements in orders; Whether Judge Duffey erred by encouraging perjury, subornation of perjury, Rule 11 violations, obstruction of justice, dishonest Plaintiffs, dishonest Plaintiffs' Attorneys, and dishonest Judge Evans; Whether Judge Duffey erred by making fact decisions contrary to the facts that were before the court; Whether Judge Duffey erred by commiting perjury; Whether Judge Duffey erred by issuing orders without legal justification; Whether Judge Duffey erred by claiming I did not cite errors of law that would justify reconsideration on the Court's orders; Whether Judge Duffey erred by claiming I did not cite errors of fact that would justify reconsideration on the Court's orders; Whether Judge Duffey erred by violating my Constitutional rights; Whether Judge Duffey erred by failing to report Judge Evans to the appropriate authorities for violations of the Code of Judicial Conduct; Whether Judge Duffey erred by failing to report Maid's Attorneys to the appropriate authorities for violations of the State Bar of Georgia Rules of Professional Conduct; Whether Judge Duffey erred by failing to provide valid legal justification when denying Motion for Change of Venue.(Pet.App.40.)(Docket in Appeal No.09-14735-DD.)

CORRUPT JUDICIAL TECHNIQUE: IGNORE THE LAW

One of the primary techniques used by corrupt judges is to simply ignore the law. One party cites the law and overwhelming case law. The other party doesn't have a leg to stand on. The judge simply ignores the law and rules against the party that was legally right.

In one instance, I presented literally thousands of cases that proved that I was right. In fact, there had never been a case in any court where there was a ruling other than one that would be in my favor. But Judge Orinda D. Evans had one and only one motive, so she ignored the law and ruled against me.

Judges Dubina, Hull, and Fay ignored perhaps the single most clear law there is – that there cannot be summary judgment if there is a key disputed fact issue, which there absolutely was. In MIST-1, the key issue was whether there was an oral contract for six months in 2005. The Defendants provided sworn testimony in multiple affidavits and three depositions stating that there was an oral contract for the entire 2005 season that was provided by Sandra Carlson for the Plaintiffs. The only testimony or evidence for the Plaintiffs was that the President testified he was "not aware of a contract." Sandra Carlson failed to appear for multiple depositions and was not allowed to testify by affidavit. Judge Evans stated in two orders that the Defendants swore there was a contract "for the entire 2005 season," but in her Summary Judgment Order, she claimed the agreement was for "in the 2005 season," a statement that appears nowhere in the record. Judges Dubina, Hull, and Fay ruled that there was no fact issue, and they affirmed summary judgment. This violates thousands upon thousands of cases.(Pet.App.6.)

Judges Tjoflat and Pryor ignored the letter of the law in 28 U.S.C.144. They quoted from ***Liteky v. United States***, but ignored the portion of ***Liteky*** that makes it crystal clear that matters arising out of judicial proceedings can be grounds for recusal, especially if it came from a previous case, as was the situation with Judge Duffey. Judges Tjoflat and Pryor have the ungodly audacity to claim that Judge Evans can call me "scurrilous and irresponsible, and reasonable people would not think that he might not be able to be impartial.(Pet.App.15-17.) (See the Petition for Writ of Mandamus to disqualify Judge William S. Duffey that was filed with this Court the first week in November 2010.)

Judges Hull, Marcus, and Pryor completely ignored the law and sanctioned perjury by Maid's Attorneys.(Pet.App.20.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull regularly ignore the law (just as they ignore the facts). (Pet.App.26.)(Dockets in Appeal Nos.09-14735-DD, 09-16493, and 09-16494.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull ignored everything and issued one of the most outlandish orders ever in Appeal No. 09-14735-DD.(Pet.App.29.) They ignored the facts. They ignored the law. (Pet.App.29.)(Docket in Appeal No.09-14735-DD.)

Judges Black and Wilson completely and totally ignored my absolutely valid issues. (Pet.App.35.) They cite erroneous law while ignoring the case law that proves that mandamus is the proper vehicle for recusal.(Pet.App.35.)(Appeal Nos.10-10698-A,10-10699-A,10-10700-A, and 10-10701-A.)

In Pet.App.40, Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull literally ignored absolutely everything. This has been discussed above. Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull need to be high on Congressional list of the Atlanta federal judges to be impeached. (Pet.App.40.)(Docket in Appeal No.09-14735-DD.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull struck again in Pet.App.43. They lied about the basis for the bias that I swore was why the judges of the Eleventh Circuit should be recused in matters involving Judge Evans and Judge Duffey. They cited erroneous case law and ignored the Supreme Court's order in ***Liteky***. Then the further trampled my rights by ordering that I could not respond to the denial and its perjury.(Pet.App.43.)(Dockets in Appeal Nos.09-16448-A,09-16493-A, and 09-16494-A.)

I have been blocked from seeking reconsideration of orders or petitioning for rehearing en banc. This keeps me from reaching the honest judges at the Eleventh Circuit.(Pet.App.50.)

Judges Carnes, Hull, and Marcus ignored everything in Appeal No.10-12517-A.(Pet.App.55.) They ignored the facts. They ignored the law. They dismissed as frivolous with no explanation whatsoever. There is nothing whatsoever frivolous about the appeal; it covers similar issues to appeals ruled not frivolous. The law is crystal clear that Judge Evans violated the law.(Pet.App.55.)(Docket in Appeal No.10-12517-A.)

Judges Edmondson, Birch, and Wilson ignored everything in Appeal No.10-12450-A.(Pet.App.57.) They ignored the facts. They ignored the law. (Pet.App.57.)(Docket in Appeal No.10-12450-A.)

CORRUPT JUDICIAL TECHNIQUE: IGNORE APPLICABLE CASE LAW

In virtually all of the orders in the Pet.App., the judges ignored extensive case law cited. In not one single order did the judges of the Eleventh Circuit ever indicate that any of my cited case law was in any way incorrect -- thousands of citations.

While I have read many cases that cause me to feel that Judge Tjoflat is honest and an excellent judge, the decision of Judges Tjoflat and Pryor on my effort to recuse Judge Duffey is one of the worst. This has been discussed above.(Pet.App.15-17.) (See the Petition for Writ of Mandamus to disqualify Judge William S. Duffey that was filed with this Court the first week in November 2010.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull ignored the case law that says mandamus is the appropriate appellate action in matters of recusal.(Pet.App.26.) (Dockets in Appeal Nos. 09-14735-DD,09-16493, and 09-16494.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull ignored everything and issued one of the most outlandish orders ever in Appeal No. 09-14735-DD.(Pet.App.29.) They ignored the facts. They ignored the case law. (Pet.App.29.)(Docket in Appeal No.09-14735-DD.)

Judges Tjoflat, Edmondson, and Burch ignored the case law that says mandamus is the appropriate appellate action in matters of recusal.(Pet.App.33.) (Docket in Appeal No.10-10349-A.)

Judges Black and Wilson completely and totally ignored my absolutely valid issues. (Pet.App.35.) They cite erroneous law while ignoring the case law that proves that mandamus is the proper vehicle for recusal. (Pet.App.35.)(Appeal Nos.10-10698-A,10-10699-A,10-10700-A, and 10-10701-A.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull lied about the basis for the bias that I swore was why the judges of the Eleventh Circuit should be recused in matters involving Judge Evans and Judge Duffey. This has been discussed above. (Pet.App.43.) (Dockets in Appeal Nos.09-16448-A,09-16493-A, and 09-16494-A.)

Judges Tjoflat, Edmondson, and Burch ignored the case law that says mandamus is the appropriate appellate action in matters of recusal.(Pet.App.45.) (Docket in Appeal No.10-10349-A.)

CORRUPT JUDICIAL TECHNIQUE: CITE ERRONEOUS CASE LAW

Sometimes a judge will feel like citation of case law is needed to support their ruling. So, they cite a case that is in some way related, but they claim the case applied when it didn't. Judge William S. Duffey has done this a number of times. He cites a case in his orders, and then when I review those cases, I find that they actually proved my position. But he ruled against me because he needed to in order to shield his good friend, Judge Orinda D. Evans, from criminal prosecution and impeachment.

Judges Hull, Marcus, and Pryor quoted erroneous case law to dismiss an appeal sua sponte. This had to be reversed later.(Pet.App.20.) Judges can make honest mistakes, but based upon what happened before and after, I believe they simply cite erroneous case law when they don't want to do what the law provides. (Pet.App.12,¶1.)

Judges Tjoflat and Pryor cited ***Loranger v. Stierheim*** and ***United States v. Chandler***, but those cases do not support their argument.(Pet.App.15-17.) (See the Petition for Writ of Mandamus to disqualify Judge William S. Duffey that was filed with this Court the first week in November 2010.)

Judges Edmondson and Birch ignored the controlling case law on the use of mandamus on recusal. They ignored the fact that I argued pervasive bias.(Pet.App.22.) (Docket in Appeal No.09-15232-D.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull cited erroneous case law so they could ignore the case law that says mandamus is the appropriate appellate action in matters of recusal.(Pet.App.26.)(Dockets in Appeal Nos.09-14735-DD, 09-16493, and 09-16494.)

Judges Tjoflat, Edmondson, and Burch ignored the case law that says mandamus is the appropriate appellate action in matters of recusal.(Pet.App.33.) (Docket in Appeal No.10-10349-A.)

CORRUPT JUDICIAL TECHNIQUE: ISSUE SHORT, INADEQUATE DECISIONS

One of the favorite techniques of the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals is to say nothing. They corruptly call an appeal "frivolous" and dismiss it with no explanation whatsoever. Sometimes they write a page or two simply reciting

history of the case, so it appears it is a real order, and then they write one sentence dismissing the appeal with no valid reason or explanation.

Pet.App.13 merely says "FRIVOLOUS sua sponte." Judges Hull, Marcus, and Pryor made this OUTRAGEOUS ruling without even considering anything from the Appellees. They claim to have made this decision solely from looking at my motions in the district court and my Brief. Based upon this statement in the Order, these judges committed perjury and fraud upon the courts. I proved: Judge Evans erred by claiming there was not any evidence that Plaintiffs acted in bad faith in the course of this litigation, and my massive evidence was uncontroverted. Maid did not file a single, solitary affidavit and had no admissible evidence. Judge Evans erred because there is massive evidence of bad faith. Judge Evans erred because there was no factual support for the Appealed Order. Judge Evans erred in denying Rule 60(b) Motion due to improper interpretation of the law. Judge Evans "interpreted the law" dishonestly in the Appealed Order. I cited 52 cases that proved the law. If Judge Evans is right and a closed case cannot be reopened through a Rule 60(b) motion, I have thousands of cases where every federal court in the country was wrong. Judge Evans improperly defined "proceeding" to exclude a Rule 60(b) motion. Ridiculous. Judge Evans erred in ruling that the 60(b) motion was untimely. She ignored the letter of the law that says a motion to set aside a "Final Order and Judgment." Judge Evans erred by claiming I did not have valid arguments under Rule 60(b). It was a timely, valid argument under each of the six sections of Rule 60(b). Perhaps one or two sections were debatable, but the fraud upon the court was not debatable based upon the evidence. Judge Evans erred by failing to recuse herself. I said she was biased against pro se parties, and I now have massive evidence of this fact. (See Petition for Writ of Mandamus to disqualify Judge Evans that is being filed with this Court.) Judge Evans erred by failing to properly consider the Motion for Recusal. She did not follow the required procedures. Judge Evans erred by claiming I did not enumerate meritorious reasons for a reasonable person to doubt the impartiality of Judge Evans. I had a long list, though I believe the fact that she refused to even allow the perjury of the Plaintiffs and the subornation of the perjury by their attorneys was more than enough. Judge Evans erred by claiming that bias must be extra-judicial. ***Liteky*** does not say that, and besides, bias against a pro se party (because he or she is pro se) is extra-judicial. Judge Evans erred by claiming that recusal and consideration of motions by another judge would ultimately make no difference as to the outcome of the case. She may be right about that one, if the judge is from the Eleventh Circuit where I know that at least nine judges in Atlanta are corrupt. Judge Evans erred because the impartiality of the judge might reasonably be questioned. Judge Evans erred by failing to consider that the cumulative effect of

the facts presented would be grounds for recusal – pervasive bias, clearly grounds under 28 U.S.C.455. Judge Evans erred by improper consideration of recusal under 28 U.S.C.144. Case law proves that she had to accept my certificate of good faith since I am pro se. Judge Evans erred by failing to consider my Constitutional justification for recusal. Judge Evans erred by failing to consider my Motion to Reopen under the Court's Inherent Powers. She didn't even address it. Judge Evans erred by claiming that my Rule 11 Motions for Sanctions were entirely lacking in merit. This is a serious case of perjury that is absolutely proven by the record. Judge Evans erred by failing to give me my legal right to file a Reply to a Response. Judge Evans erred by failing to consider that this case casts doubt on the integrity of the judicial process. And Judges Hull, Marcus, and Pryor committed the same wrongdoing. Calling this motion FRIVOLOUS is about as corrupt as any judicial decision could be.(Pet.App.13.)

Judges Hull, Marcus, and Pryor were given a second chance with a motion for reconsideration, and they said nothing but "frivolous sua sponte" again. (Pet.App.18.) This Frivolous sua sponte is a favorite technique of some of the corrupt federal judges. They give me absolutely nothing to go on, and the claim that the appeal is "frivolous" sets up the pro se party for them to award sanctions, thus scaring many honest people.(Pet.App.18.)

Judges Hull, Marcus, and Pryor gave no explanation of denying a motion for sanctions and thus sanctioned perjury by Maid's Attorneys. (Pet.App.20.)

Some of the judges, such as Judges Edmondson and Birch, Evans, and Duffey know how to pad an order to make it appear that the issues were addressed. Judges Edmondson and Burch took four pages to recite the relief requested by me, discuss erroneous case law to the issues, and deny the relief requested with no facts or case law or discussion to support the decision.(Pet.App.22.) (Docket in Appeal No.09-15232-D.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull are pros in padding an order to make it appear that the issues were addressed. Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull took three pages to recite the relief requested by me in three petitions for writ of mandamus and say "Petitioner has failed to carry his burden.... Therefore, these petitions for writ of mandamus are denied." They gave no facts or case law or discussion to support the decision other than one erroneous citation claiming that mandamus is not appropriate for recusal as Judges Edmondson and Burch did in Pet.App.22. (Pet.App.26.) (Dockets in Appeal Nos.09-14735-DD, 09-16493, and 09-16494.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull ignored everything and issued one of the most outlandish orders ever in Appeal No. 09-14735-DD. (Pet.App.29.) They ignored the facts. They ignored the law. They dismissed an appeal as frivolous with no explanation whatsoever.(Pet.App.29.)(Docket in Appeal No.09-14735-DD.)

Judges Black and Wilson completely and totally ignored my absolutely valid issues. (Pet.App.35.) Their order does not discuss a single one of my points in an appeal where the law and the facts are absolutely overwhelming against Judge Evans' order. The only finding in the five page order (padded mercilessly) is "After review, we find that Petitioner has failed to carry his burden...." This clearly violates ***Corcoran v. Levenhagen***. (Pet.App.35.)(Appeal Nos.10-10698-A,10-10699-A, 10-10700-A, and 10-10701-A.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull said nothing in Pet.App.43 but a lie about the basis for the bias that I swore was why the judges of the Eleventh Circuit should be recused in matters involving Judge Evans and Judge Duffey. My petition stated: "Windsor submits that judges do everything possible to protect fellow judges. As a 30-year veteran of the Northern District of Georgia and as a former Chief Judge, Windsor submits that Judge Evans is a senior judge who is being protected by her fellow judges. Windsor asked that this Appeal and all of his appeals be moved to another District where the judges will not be friends and associates of Judge Evans and Judge Duffey and where the appellate judges are honest and abide by the law." They cited erroneous case law and ignored the Supreme Court's order in ***Liteky***. Then the further trampled my rights by ordering that I could not respond to the denial and its perjury. (Pet.App.43.)(Dockets in Appeal Nos.09-16448-A,09-16493-A, and 09-16494-A.)

Judges Carnes, Hull, and Marcus ignored everything in Appeal Nos. 10-12517-A.(Pet.App.55.) They ignored the facts. They ignored the law. They dismissed as frivolous with no explanation whatsoever. There is nothing whatsoever frivolous about the appeal; it covers similar issues to appeals ruled not frivolous. The law is crystal clear that Judge Evans violated the law. (Pet.App.55.)(Docket in Appeal No.10-12517-A.)

Judges Edmondson, Birch, and Wilson ignored everything in Appeal Nos. 10-12450-A.(Pet.App.57.) They dismissed as frivolous with no explanation whatsoever.(Pet.App.57.)(Docket in Appeal No.10-12450-A.)

A review of all of the orders in the Pet.App. will reveal that 62 pages of orders from the Judges of the Eleventh Circuit yielded not one single sentence that

addressed my facts or citations of law. There was no discussion of factual or legal issues other than to recite boilerplate order language and factual background. (Five sentences about facts raised were in Pet.App.1 handled by Windsor's attorney.)

This Court says judges may not issue these inadequate orders. (***Corcoran v. Leverhagen***, 558 U. S. ____(2009).) But they get away with it because this Court seems to only choose to review cases that will establish new precedents. A tiny fraction of the Petitions for Writ of Certiorari get granted.

CORRUPT JUDICIAL TECHNIQUE: SAY ONE THING AND DO ANOTHER

Judges Dubina, Hull, and Fay said they were reviewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the party opposing the motion, but that actually constitutes perjury because they did no such thing. The record of the court in MIST-1 and in Appeal No.07-14214 will prove this to any honest judge. (Pet.App.p.7,¶2.)

Judge Evans uses this technique all the time. She issues an order claiming one thing, and then she turns around, often in the same order, and she does just exactly the opposite of what she just ordered. For example, she orders that an affidavit is inadmissible, and then she uses it and quotes from it to support her wrongful decisions.

CORRUPT JUDICIAL TECHNIQUE: COMMIT PERJURY

Lying under oath is perjury. Judges are always under oath, and a judge is supposed to never say or write anything that isn't true. So, when a judge knowingly lies in orders for the purpose of ruling against a party for the judge's criminal reasons, it is a criminal violation of perjury. Each such instance is a separate count. In my case, Judge Evans has committed hundreds and hundreds of counts of perjury. The record filed with the Court proves that she lied, but she gets away with it because the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals' judges will lie to protect their fellow judge.

Judges Dubina, Hull, and Fay make various statements that are absolutely proven wrong by the facts and the law. These judges had an obligation to review the record and indeed claimed they did. Therefore, these were false statements made intentionally while under their oath as judges, and that's perjury. All of the Defendant Judges should be tried for perjury just as Judge Mary Waterstone is in Michigan (case citation unknown, but see

http://www.freep.com/article/20101013/NEWS02/101013031/0/ent) (Pet.App.7,¶2-4 and Pet.App.8,¶1.)

Judges Dubina, Pryor, and Anderson emphasize a technique that Eleventh Circuit Judges use to foster their corrupt practices. They don't publish the corrupt opinions. I look forward to determining how many pro se orders are published compared to the percentage of opinions published when there are attorneys on both sides. It will be staggering. Judges Dubina, Pryor, and Anderson refused to allow the order in Pet.App.40 to be published that I moved to have published. Honest lawyers and judges would have instantly seen that the order violates just about everything, so they couldn't allow their dishonesty to be published in a book. (Pet.App.61.)

CORRUPT JUDICIAL TECHNIQUE: DO WHATEVER IT TAKES TO SUPPORT THEIR FRIENDS AT THE DISTRICT COURTS

The entire Pet.App. reflects this, pp.2-62.

Judges Edmondson and Birch did this very specifically in claiming mandamus was not proper for seeking recusal of Judge Evans.(Pet.App.22.)(Docket in Appeal No.09-15232-D.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull also did this very specifically in claiming mandamus was not proper for seeking recusal of Judge Evans. (Pet.App.26.)(Dockets in Appeal Nos.09-14735-DD,09-16493, and 09-16494.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull ignored everything and issued one of the most outlandish orders ever in Appeal No. 09-14735-DD. (Pet.App.29.) They ignored the facts. They ignored the law. They dismissed an appeal as frivolous with no explanation whatsoever.(Pet.App.29.)(Docket in Appeal No.09-14735-DD.)

Judges Tjoflat, Edmondson, and Burch ignored the case law that says mandamus is the appropriate appellate action in matters of recusal.(Pet.App.33.) (Docket in Appeal No.10-10349-A.)

Judges Black and Wilson supported both Judge Evans and Judge Duffey in one order. (Pet.App.35.) This is a horrible order in which they demonstrate bias by making absolutely false statements obtained from their fellow judges. (Pet.App.35.)(Docket in Appeal Nos.10-10698-A,10-10699-A,10-10700-A, and 10-10701-A.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull might as well have been on Judges Evans and Duffey's payroll with Pet.App.40.(Pet.App.40.)(Docket in Appeal No.09-14735-DD.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull said nothing in Pet.App.43 but a lie about the basis for the bias that I swore was why the judges of the Eleventh Circuit should be recused in matters involving Judge Evans and Judge Duffey. This has been discussed above. (Pet.App.43.)(Dockets in Appeal Nos.09-16448-A,09-16493-A, and 09-16494-A.)

Judges Tjoflat, Edmondson, and Burch ignored the case law that says mandamus is the appropriate appellate action in matters of recusal.(Pet.App.45.) (Docket in Appeal No.10-10349-A.)

Even the screening orders that have ALL said that my appeals are not frivolous show bias. They include language that implies that I exceeded pages or words in motions or briefs, and I have NEVER done any such thing. (Pet.App.47,52.)

I have been blocked from seeking reconsideration of orders or petitioning for rehearing en banc. This keeps me from reaching the honest judges at the Eleventh Circuit.(Pet.App.50.)

Judges Carnes, Hull, and Marcus ignored everything in Appeal Nos. 10-12517-A.(Pet.App.55.) They ignored the facts. They ignored the law. They dismissed as frivolous with no explanation whatsoever.(Pet.App.55.)(Docket in Appeal No.10-12517-A.)

Judges Edmondson, Birch, and Wilson ignored everything in Appeal Nos. 10-12450-A.(Pet.App.57.) They ignored the facts. They ignored the law. They dismissed as frivolous with no explanation whatsoever. (Pet.App.57.)(Docket in Appeal No.10-12450-A.)

Proof of this is throughout the Pet.App. pp.2-62.

CORRUPT JUDICIAL TECHNIQUE: TRAMPLE THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF LITIGANTS

Virtually all of these orders trampled my Constitutional rights.(Pet.App.pp.2-70.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull ignored everything and issued one of the most outlandish orders ever in Appeal No. 09-14735-DD.(Pet.App.29.) And after this, they violated my Constitutional rights even more severely in Pet.App.40.(Pet.App.29.)(Docket in Appeal No. 09-14735-DD.)

Judges Black and Wilson completely and totally trampled my Constitutional rights in Pet.App.35. This has been discussed above. (Pet.App.35.)(Docket in Appeal Nos.10-10698-A,10-10699-A,10-10700-A, and 10-10701-A.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull trampled me mercilessly in Pet.App.40. (Pet.App.40.) (Docket in Appeal No.09-14735-DD.)

Judges Carnes, Barkett, and Hull cited erroneous case law and ignored the Supreme Court's order in ***Liteky***. Then they further trampled my rights by ordering that I could not respond to the denial and its perjury.(Pet.App.43.)(Dockets in Appeal Nos.09-16448-A,09-16493-A, and 09-16494-A.)

As discussed above, I have been blocked from seeking reconsideration of orders or petitioning for rehearing en banc. This keeps me from reaching any honest judges at the Eleventh Circuit.(Pet.App.50.)

Judges Carnes, Hull, and Marcus ignored everything in Appeal Nos. 10-12517-A.(Pet.App.55.) (Pet.App.55.)(Docket in Appeal No.10-12517-A.)

Judges Edmondson, Birch, and Wilson ignored everything in Appeal Nos. 10-12450-A. (Pet.App.57.) (Pet.App.57.)(Docket in Appeal No.10-12450-A.)

CORRUPT JUDICIAL TECHNIQUE: DON'T PUBLISH THE DECISIONS

The Eleventh Circuit has NEVER published one of the orders in my appeals. When they are violating the law, they have protection by not publishing the order. That keeps it from the eyes of attorneys and other judges who would identify the wrongdoing. Publishing would also make their erroneous decisions precedents for other cases. The whole legal system would be turned even more upside down if this were to happen.

CORRUPT JUDICIAL TECHNIQUE: CONCEAL EVIDENCE

A really dishonest judge like Judge Evans will simply conceal evidence. In my case, she has two documents that will prove fraud by the other party and their

attorney. She simply conceals that evidence and refuses to allow it to see the light of day so her criminal efforts are not exposed.

CORRUPT JUDICIAL TECHNIQUE: IGNORE ISSUES

Another of Judge Evans' favorite techniques is to simply ignore issues in orders. She does not respond to motions on a timely basis, and then she takes many motions at once and rules on them. This buries the fact that she ignored motions where her ruling could not possible be explained. So, rather than make up an explanation, she just ignores those tough issues.

For the Appendix and more information, see http://www.lawlessamerica.com/index.php/news/blog-of-william-m-windsor/104-petition-for-recusal-of-judges-of-the-eleventh-circuit-court-of-appeals-us-supreme-court

Violation of My Constitutional Rights

First Amendment

The First Amendment Right to petition provides "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Federal judges violate the First Amendment every time they refuse to recuse themselves in cases where they have a bias. A motion for recusal is a petition to redress a grievance, and a judge's refusal to even entertain the motion is clearly a violation. In my case, all of the federal judges that I have named have refused to consider recusal. Judge Evans and Judge Duffey "decided" they would not recuse themselves, but they were not the proper people to decide if I had asserted valid factual and legal grounds to recuse them. This is like letting the fox guard the hen house. There is nothing fair about letting the biased judge rule on whether he or she is biased.

Judge Evans denied access to important records, evidence, and witnesses as did Judge Duffey.

The due process clauses of both the Georgia and the United States Constitutions guarantee a party an impartial and disinterested tribunal in civil cases, but I have had nothing but biased, corrupt judges.

I was entitled to a fair trial, but there was little that was fair from Judge Evans, Judge Duffey, or the judges of the Eleventh Circuit.

Judge Evans denied me the ability to petition for a redress of grievances by an illegal injunction that denies my access to the courts. Judge Duffey then did the same. This has been taken even further as the Clerk of the Federal District Court is now refusing to file lawsuits that I have presented for filing. Rights of citizens to litigate claims against judges are protected by the First and Fourteenth Amendments and by Article III of the Constitution for the United States of America as well. The Clerk of the Court and the judge or judges who told them to take such action are violating the Constitution big-time.

> ***United Mine Workers v. Illinois State Bar Ass'n*** (1967), 389 US 217, 19 L Ed 2d 426, 88 S Ct 353, 42 Ohio Ops 2d 394. Right to petition for redress of grievances is among most precious liberties safeguarded by Bill of Rights and this right is intimately connected, both origin and in purpose, with other First Amendment rights of free speech and free press. (See also ***Brotherhood of R.R. Trainmen v. Virginia State Bar***, 377 U.S. 1 (1964); ***NAACP v. Button***, 371 U.S. 415 (1963); ***Ex Parte Young***, 209 U.S. 123 (1908). See also ***Cotting v. Kansas City Stockyards Co.***, 183 U.S. 79, 10Z (1901); ***Cohens v. Virginia***, 19 U.S. (6 Wheat.) 264 (1821); ***Martin v. Hunter's Lessee***, 14 U.S. (1 Wheat.) 304 (1816).
>
> We note initially that the Supreme Court has recently reaffirmed the principle that petitioning, like "other guarantees of [the first amendment,] * * * is an assurance of a particular freedom of expression." ***McDonald v. Smith***, 472 U.S. 479, 105 S. Ct. 2787, 2789, 86 L. Ed. 2d 384 (1985). This reaffirmation clearly underscores the coequal status of the right to petition with other first amendment rights. ***(In re IBP Confidential Business Documents Litig.*** (1986, CA8 Iowa), 800 F2d 787.)
>
> "When any court violates the clean and unambiguous language of the Constitution, a fraud is perpetrated and no one is bound to obey it." (***State v. Sutton***, 63 Minn. 147 65 NW 262 30 ALR 660. Also see (***Watson v. Memphis***, 375 US 526; 10 L Ed 529; 83 S.Ct. 1314.)

> If a judge does not comply with the Constitution, then his orders are void. (***In re Sawver,*** 124 U.S. 200 (1888). He/she is without jurisdiction, and he/she has engaged in an act or acts of treason.

Due process of law is one of the most deeply rooted principles in American jurisprudence, a legal concept that ensures the government will respect all of a person's legal rights instead of just some or most of those legal rights when the government deprives a person of life, liberty, or property. Due process places limitations on laws and legal proceedings in order to guarantee fundamental fairness, justice, and liberty. The federal judges have not respected my legal rights. The government has all but ignored my rights.

The Constitution states only one command twice. The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments say that no one shall be "deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law." The central promise is that all levels of government must operate within the law and provide fair procedures.

I have been deprived of most rights except the right to pay money and make filings with the District Court and the Eleventh Circuit. I have incurred over a million and a half dollars in legal fees and court costs and have <u>never</u> been granted a hearing.

Due process requires that the government respect all of the legal rights that are owed to a person according to the law. Due process holds the government subservient to the law of the land, protecting individual persons from the state. In the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson set forth the rationale for the establishment of government in a society: to secure the fundamental, inherent, and preexisting rights of the people.

In my experience, the federal courts have shown absolutely no respect for my legal rights. The courts have ignored the law and the facts. I have been denied the most fundamental right to not have my legal rights stolen by dishonest judges.

Judge Evans allowed the guilty Maid of the Mist to prevail, and the innocent Alcatraz and I were punished to the tune of a million and a half dollars and injunctions. I have absolutely undeniable proof, but the judges just ignore it, have pretended it doesn't exist, and have not even given me a hearing. The actions and inactions of these judges are a disgrace to the judicial system. I believe Judge Evans has done this to cover up her criminal acts. Judge Duffey followed her lead and has ignored the facts to protect her. Now Judge Duffey commits perjury, obstruction of justice, and violates the law and the Constitution regularly to protect

himself from indictment and impeachment.

Procedural due process was supposed to guarantee protection to everyone so that statutes, regulations, and enforcement actions ensure that no one is deprived of "life, liberty, or property" without a fair opportunity to affect the judgment or result. This is meaningless to the federal judges in Atlanta. I can list literally hundreds of examples.

> At a basic level, procedural due process is essentially based on the concept of "fundamental fairness." In 1934, the United States Supreme Court held that due process is violated "if a practice or rule offends some principle of justice so rooted in the traditions and conscience of our people as to be ranked as fundamental." (***Snyder v. Massachusetts***, 291 U.S. 97, 105 (1934).) As construed by the courts, it includes an individual's right to be adequately notified of charges or proceedings, the opportunity to be heard at these proceedings, and that the person or panel making the final decision over the proceedings be impartial in regards to the matter before them. (***Goldberg v. Kelly***, 397 U.S. 254, 267 (1970).)

I have been denied the right to be heard, and the judges have been totally biased against me. I have been denied hearings repeatedly, and Judge Evans didn't even pretend to review motions for eight months. There has been no fundamental fairness.

> Courts have viewed the Due Process Clause, and sometimes other clauses of the Constitution, as embracing those fundamental rights that are "implicit in the concept of ordered liberty." (***Palko v. Connecticut***, 302 U.S. 319 (1937).)

My fundamental right to have the courts accept my sworn affidavits as true has been violated. My sworn affidavits under penalty of perjury before a notary have been ignored. This is made even worse because my affidavits have not been controverted in any manner.

> If due process is to be secured, the laws must operate alike upon all and not subject the individual to the arbitrary exercise of governmental power unrestrained by established principles of private rights and distributive justice. (***Marchant v. Pennsylvania R.R.***, 153 U.S. 380, 386 (1894).)

Judge Evans, Judge Duffey, and the judges of the Eleventh Circuit have subjected

me to arbitrary actions unrestrained by the concepts of rights and justice. Maid of the Mist was given partial treatment.

> Just as in criminal and quasi-criminal cases, (***Tumey v. Ohio***, 273 U.S. 510 (1927); ***In re Murchison***, 349 U.S. 133 (1955)), an impartial decision maker" is an "essential" right in civil proceedings as well. (***Goldberg v. Kelly***, 397 U.S. 254, 271 (1970).)

These judges have demonstrated pervasive bias against me. Judge Evans hasn't shown an ounce of impartiality. She has never ruled in favor of me on any contested motion. The record shows that Judge Evans was against me from the minute she became involved. Judge Evans established a fixed view about substantive pending trial matters. Judge Evans issued a Temporary Restraining Order and required a bond that was less than 1.5% of the amount underestimated by A&W. The bond was $5,000, and the loss by the Defendants has been approximately $1,000,000. This demonstrates extrajudicial bias. Judge Evans spoke at the Preliminary Injunction with a clearly fixed view about substantive pending trial matters, so this must raise concerns about the "appearance of impropriety," a standard that must be safeguarded. Judge Evans indicated to Windsor that she maintained a position throughout this proceeding that Alcatraz and I were wrong and that our case did not matter. Judge Evans called it a "simple case" in complete disregard for the facts, the law, and the counterclaim of Alcatraz. Judge Evans treated us in a hostile manner. Judge Evans ignored my reports of over 400 counts of perjury, Rule 11 violations, and subornation of perjury. Judge Evans issued orders and the judgment based upon perjured testimony. There can be little proof of extrajudicial bias that can be any stronger than to demonstrate that Judge Evans welcomed the opportunity to have this civil action perverted by perjury. Maid of the Mist has not attempted to dispute the perjury with a single solitary affidavit. This is because Maid cannot dispute the facts. This pervasive bias continues as was shown on May 22, 2009 in Evans Docket #390 – an order from Judge Evans wherein she falsely claims "the issues of law and fact in this case ultimately were not difficult." Everything that Judge Evans has done has shown bias, and her failure to act on anything in this case for close to six months certainly is an exclamation point on the bias! Then on December 22, 2009, she issued an illegal injunction denying my access to the courts.

Judge Duffey branded me as scurrilous and irresponsible and then pretends he isn't biased. This is outrageous.

Judges are required to be neutral.

> The neutrality requirement helps to guarantee that life, liberty, or property will not be taken on the basis of an erroneous or distorted conception of the facts or the law. . . . At the same time, it preserves both the appearance and reality of fairness . . . by ensuring that no person will be deprived of his interests in the absence of a proceeding in which he may present his case with assurance that the arbiter is not predisposed to find against him." (***Marshall v. Jerrico***, 446 U.S. 238, 242 (1980); ***Schweiker v. McClure***, 456 U.S. 188, 195 (1982).)

In the underlying actions, there was no neutrality.

The rights of confrontation and cross-examination are basic.

> Where the "evidence consists of the testimony of individuals whose memory might be faulty or who, in fact, might be perjurers or persons motivated by malice, vindictiveness, intolerance, prejudice, or jealously," the individual's right to show that it is untrue depends on the rights of confrontation and cross-examination. "This Court has been zealous to protect these rights from erosion. It has spoken out not only in criminal cases, . . . but also in all types of cases where administrative . . . actions were under scrutiny." (***Greene v. McElroy***, 360 U.S. 474, 496 -97 (1959).)

I have reported massive perjury, yet he has been denied the rights to examine the perjurors. The right to present evidence, including the right to call witnesses is a vital right of due process. If the liars show up for a hearing, I will win. The judge will see within 10 minutes that this is a situation that must be fixed.

> Due process of law is violated when the government vindictively attempts to penalize a person for exercising a protected statutory or constitutional right. [***United States v. Conkins***, 9 F.3d 1377, 1382 (9th Cir. 1993).]

The judges have vindictively penalized me. The Northern District of Georgia and the Eleventh Circuit are corrupt. These are strong words, but I know I can present information that a reasonable person will find to be evidence of corruption.

Judge Evans and Judge Duffey have definitely taken vindictive action against me. Attorneys' fees ordered by Judge Evans was a vindictive penalty. All of Judge Duffey's orders have been vindictive penalties.

> In his well-regarded article, "***Some Kind of Hearing***," Judge Henry Friendly says that an important right of due process is "a decision based exclusively on the evidence presented."

The decisions have not been based upon the evidence presented. Judge Evans routinely ignored the facts and the law and even invented her own facts. Judge Evans manufactured false facts upon which she based orders. The record proves this. Judge Duffey is just as bad.

> Due process is "an established course for judicial proceedings or other governmental activities designed to safeguard the legal rights of the individual." A commitment to legality is at the heart of all advanced legal systems. The due process clause promises that before depriving a citizen of life, liberty, or property, government must follow fair procedures. It is not always enough for the government just to act in accordance with whatever law there may happen to be. Citizens are also entitled to have the government offer fair procedures, whether or not those procedures have been provided for in the law on the basis of which it is acting. Action denying the process that is "due" is unconstitutional.

In this civil action, Judge Evans, Judge Duffey, and the Eleventh Circuit have denied the process that is due. The government's actions are unconstitutional.

The rights at issue are fundamental rights, and the government is prohibited from infringing that right unless the infringement is narrowly tailored to serve a compelling interest.

Judge Evans and Judge Duffey have no supportable reason for infringing on my fundamental rights.

> In 1934, the United States Supreme Court held that due process is violated "if a practice or rule offends some principle of justice so rooted in the traditions and conscience of our people as to be ranked as fundamental." (***Snyder v. Massachusetts***, 291 U.S. 97, 105 (1934).)

The practices of Judge Evans and Judge Duffey have been totally offensive. Litigants are supposed to have the right to subpoena witnesses and any documents or other evidence that may support your position or contradict evidence presented against you.

Litigants have the right to protections expressly created in statute and case law precedent. Statutes have been violated and overwhelming case law has been ignored by Judge Evans and Judge Duffey.

Litigants have the right to equal protection of the law regardless of race, creed, color, religion, ethnic origin, age, handicaps, or sex. I am handicapped and a minority, and I have not received equal protection as a pro se party.

Litigants have the right to a remedy, by recourse to the laws, for all injuries or wrongs that you may receive in your person, property, or character.
I have been denied recourse. I spent a year assembling the proof so the courts would reopen the case. The courts have improperly denied the recourse.

Litigants have the right to justice, without being obliged to purchase it; completely, and without any denial; promptly, and without undue delay; in conformance with the laws.

The judges and the N.D.Ga. have denied justice, has not provided prompt response to motions, and has not conformed with the laws.

There is supposed to be a truth finding process:

> Due process tolerates variances in form "appropriate to the nature of the case...." (***Mullane v. Central Hanover Trust Co.***, 339 U.S. 306, 313 (1950).) "[P]rocedural due process rules are shaped by the risk of error inherent in the truth-finding process as applied to the generality of cases." (***Mathews v. Eldridge***, 424 U.S. 319, 344 (1976).) The rules "minimize substantively unfair or mistaken deprivations" by enabling persons to contest the basis upon which a State proposes to deprive them of protected interests. (***Fuentes v. Shevin***, 407 U.S. 67, 81 (1972).) At times, the Court has also stressed the dignitary importance of procedural rights, the worth of being able to defend one's interests even if one cannot change the result. (***Carey v. Piphus***, 435 U.S. 247, 266 -67 (1978); ***Marshall v. Jerrico, Inc.***, 446 U.S. 238, 242 (1980).)

There was an error in the truth-finding process with Judge Evans and Judge Duffey. I haven't asked much. I have prepared all the proof, and it is filed with the courts. All I have asked from the beginning is an evidentiary hearing, and I have promised that the result will be that the orders and judgment will be set aside. Judge Evans, Judge Duffey, and the Eleventh Circuit have totally ignored me.

"Fairness of procedure is "due process in the primary sense." ***Brinkerhoff-Faris Co. v. Hill***, 281 U.S. 673, 681. "It is ingrained in our national traditions and is designed to maintain them. In a variety of situations the Court has enforced this requirement by checking attempts of executives, legislatures, and lower courts to disregard the **deep-rooted demands of fair play enshrined in the Constitution**." [***Anti-Fascist Committee v. McGrath***, 341 U.S. 123, 162] One of these principles is that no person shall be deprived of his liberty without **opportunity, at some time, to be heard** . . . ." ***The Japanese Immigrant Case***, 189 U.S. 86, 100 - 101. "[B]y 'due process' is meant one which, following the forms of law, is appropriate to the case, and **just to the parties to be affected**. It must be pursued in the ordinary mode prescribed by the law; it must be adapted to the end to be attained; and **wherever it is necessary for the protection of the parties, it must give them an opportunity to be heard respecting the justice of the judgment sought**." (***Hagar v. Reclamation District***, 111 U.S. 701, 708.) "Before its property can be taken under the edict of an administrative officer the appellant is **entitled to a fair hearing upon the fundamental facts**." (***Southern R. Co. v. Virginia***, 290 U.S. 190, 199.) "Whether acting through its judiciary or through its legislature, a State may not deprive a person of all existing remedies for the enforcement of a right, which the State has no power to destroy, unless there is, or was, afforded to him some real opportunity to protect it." (***Brinkerhoff-Faris Co. v. Hill***, supra, 281 U.S. at 682.)

"The requirement of "due process" is not a fair-weather or timid assurance. It must be respected in periods of calm and in times of trouble; it protects aliens as well as citizens. But "due process," unlike some legal rules, is not a technical conception with a fixed content unrelated to time, place and circumstances. Expressing as it does in its ultimate analysis respect enforced by law for that feeling of just treatment which has been evolved through centuries of Anglo-American constitutional history and civilization, "due process" cannot be imprisoned within the treacherous limits of any formula. Representing a profound attitude of fairness between man and man, and more particularly between the individual and government, "due process" is compounded of history, [***Anti-Fascist Committee v. McGrath,*** 341 U.S. 123, 163] reason, the past course of decisions, and stout confidence in the strength of the democratic faith which we profess. Due process is not a mechanical instrument. It is not a yardstick. It is a process. It is a delicate

process of adjustment inescapably involving the exercise of judgment by those whom the Constitution entrusted with the unfolding of the process.

"This Court is not alone in recognizing that the right to be heard before being condemned to suffer grievous loss of any kind, even though it may not involve the stigma and hardships of a criminal conviction, is a principle basic to our society. Regard for this principle has guided Congress and the Executive. Congress has often entrusted, as it may, protection of interests which it has created to administrative agencies rather than to the courts. But rarely has it authorized such agencies to act without those essential safeguards for fair judgment which in the course of centuries have come to be associated with due process. (See ***Switchmen's Union v. National Mediation Board***, 320 U.S. 297; ***Tutun v. United States***, 270 U.S. 568, 576 , 577; ***Pennsylvania R. Co. v. Labor Board***, 261 U.S. 72 . 15 And when Congress [***Anti-Fascist Committee v. McGrath*** 341 U.S. 123, 169] has given an administrative agency discretion to determine its own procedure, the agency has rarely chosen to dispose of the rights of individuals without a hearing, however informal. [***Anti-Fascist Committee v. McGrath*** 341 U.S. 123, 170]

"The heart of the matter is that **democracy implies respect for the elementary rights of men**, however suspect or unworthy; a democratic government must therefore practice fairness; and **fairness can rarely be obtained by secret, one-sided determination of facts decisive of rights**.

An opportunity to be heard may not seem vital when an issue relates only to technical questions susceptible [***Anti-Fascist Committee v. McGrath,*** 341 U.S. 123, 171] of demonstrable proof on which evidence is not likely to be overlooked and argument on the meaning and worth of conflicting and cloudy data not apt to be helpful. But in other situations an admonition of Mr. Justice Holmes becomes relevant. "One has to remember that when one's interest is keenly excited evidence gathers from all sides around the magnetic point . . . ." (Mr. Justice Holmes made this remark in a letter to Mr. Arthur Garfield Hays in 1928.) It should be particularly heeded at times of agitation and anxiety, when fear and suspicion impregnate the air we breathe. Compare Brown, ***The French Revolution in English History***. "The plea that evidence of guilt must be secret is abhorrent to free men, because it provides a cloak for the malevolent, the misinformed, the meddlesome, and the corrupt to play the role of informer undetected and uncorrected." (***United States ex rel. Knauff v. Shaughnessy***, 338 U.S. 537, 551 (dissenting).) **Appearances in the dark are apt to look different in the light of day.**

"Man being what he is cannot safely be trusted with complete immunity from outward responsibility in depriving others of their rights. At least such is the conviction underlying our Bill of Rights. That a conclusion satisfies one's private conscience does not attest its reliability. The validity and moral authority of a conclusion largely depend on the mode by which it was reached. Secrecy is not congenial to truth-seeking and self-righteousness gives too slender an assurance of rightness. No better instrument has been devised for arriving at truth than to give a person in jeopardy of serious loss [***Anti-Fascist Committee v. McGrath,*** 341 U.S. 123, 172] notice of the case against him and opportunity to meet it. Nor has a better way been found for generating the feeling, so important to a popular government, that justice has been done. ("**In a government like ours, entirely popular, care should be taken in every part of the system, not only to do right, but to satisfy the community that right is done**." (***The Writings and Speeches of Daniel Webster***, 163.)"_ [emphasis added]

"Due process forbids condemnation without a hearing." (***Pettit v. Penn***, LaApp., 180 So.2d 66, 69.) The notice of hearing and the opportunity to be heard "must be granted at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner." (***Armstrong v. Manzo***, 380 U.S. 545, 552 (1965).) "The constitutional right to be heard is a basic aspect of the duty of government to follow a fair process of decision making when it acts to deprive a person of his possessions. The purpose of this requirement is not only to ensure abstract fair play to the individual. Its purpose, more particularly, is to protect his use and possession of property from arbitrary encroachment. . . ." (***Fuentes v. Shevin***, 407 U.S. 67, 80 -81 (1972).) "While written presentations may be acceptable in some situations, in others the issue of veracity may necessitate oral presentation or oral examination of witnesses, or the petitioner may not have the ability to present his case in writing." (***Goldberg v. Kelly***, 397 U.S. 254, 266 -67 (1970); ***Mathews v. Eldridge***, 424 U.S. 319, 343 -45 (1976). See also ***FCC v. WJR***, 337 U.S. 265, 275 -77 (1949).)

Judge Evans has arbitrarily ignored at least 20 requests for an evidentiary hearing. The opportunity to be heard is the most basic of rights, and Judge Evans has denied that right. Judge Evans has violated Windsor's First Amendment rights.

The term due process refers to the requirement that the actions of government be conducted according to the rule of law. No government can be above the law. Both the lessons of history and the natural rights philosophy declare that each person possesses rights to life, liberty, and property. Government cannot interfere with these rights except according to established procedures of law. The principle of due process of law is one of the most important protections against arbitrary

rule. The Fifth Amendment prevents the federal government from depriving any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. The Fifth Amendment acts as a limitation upon the exercise of judicial power – judges may not sit as adjudicators in cases in which they have an interest.

Windsor filed a professional misconduct complaint against Judge Evans, and he filed a lawsuit against Judge Evans. This means Judge Evans had more than an interest in MIST-1, and she violated the Fifth Amendment by remaining involved.

An inherent right is the honesty of the judge.

Judge Evans has committed perjury. Judge Evans made over 200 statements in the Preliminary Injunction Order and Summary Judgment Order that were false or that Windsor believes to be false. Proof of most of the false statements in the orders has been documented in Evans Docket #362 and 377 with citations to Maid's witnesses proving that many statements are false. These were material false statements made under the Judge's oath of office in a federal proceeding. Judge Evans knew statements that she made were false because she claimed statements were evidence before the Court, and that was clearly not true. Furthermore, Judge Evans was on notice that the Summary Judgment Order statements were false because Windsor informed her at a hearing on February 2, 2007.
Judge Duffey has also been extremely dishonest.

Inherent in the expectation of due process is that the judge will abide by the rules. In this civil action, Judge Evans has violated many canons of the Code of Judicial Procedure as well as rules in the State Bar of Georgia Code of Professional Conduct. Failing to report the dishonesty of Maid's attorneys is a clear violation of the ministerial duties of Judge Evans pursuant to Canon 3B(3) of the Judicial Code of Conduct that states: "A judge should initiate appropriate action when the judge becomes aware of reliable evidence indicating the likelihood of unprofessional conduct by a judge or lawyer." Detailed background facts regarding the professional misconduct of Judge Evans are provided in Dec #23 -- Evans Docket #406; this details what Judge Evans did throughout this case. Other violations are detailed in Dec #25 (Evans Docket #462). Docket 406 and 462 are referenced herein and made a part hereof as if attached hereto. All of this should cause Judge Evans to be found guilty of conduct prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts. All of this should cause this Court to set aside the orders and judgments.

Inherent in due process is the expectation that the judge will not violate criminal

statutes.

Judge Evans has committed perjury and obstruction of justice. Judge Evans withheld material evidence that should have been provided to A&W. Judge Evans received two contracts for an in camera inspection in February 2007. Judge Evans did not respond to A&W's Motion to Compel these contracts until well after discovery had closed. Judge Evans claimed the contracts were not relevant to the case, but that was false. Maid claimed these documents were "irrelevant, immaterial, ill-defined, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence," but that was false. A&W have now obtained the contracts through a FOI request, so Windsor knows that the contracts contained extremely important information. These documents are referenced in Evans Docket #168, and the production requirement is noted in Evans Docket # 174 - Hearing of February 2, 2007, P 61-62. The importance of these documents is addressed in the First Declaration of William M. Windsor (Dec #1, ¶¶ 15-32 and Exhibits 1 and 2 thereto -- Docket #361.) Dockets 168, 174, and 361 are referenced and incorporated herein as if attached hereto.

Fourth Amendment

The Fourth Amendment is a classic repository of constitutional rights. It serves as a bulwark, protecting individual liberty from arbitrary invasions by state actors. See ***Wolf v. People of State of Colorado***, 338 U.S. 25, 27--28, 69 S.Ct. 1359, 1361, 93 L.Ed. 1782 (1949), overruled on other grounds by ***Mapp v. Ohio***, 367 U.S. 643, 81 S.Ct. 1684, 6 L.Ed. 2d 1081 (1961). To that end, the proscriptions found in the Fourth Amendment impose a benchmark of reasonableness upon the exercise of governmental discretion. (***Delaware v. Prouse***, 440 U.S. 648, 653, 99 S.Ct. 1391, 1396, 59 L.Ed. 2d 660 (1979); ***Marshall v. Barlow's, Inc.***, 436 U.S. 307, 312, 98 S.Ct. 1816, 1820, 56 L.Ed. 2d 305 (1978).)

With me, the federal judges have been totally unreasonable. These judges have violated due process and/or the Fourth Amendment.

Judgments and orders rendered in violation of due process are void.

> "A judgment rendered in violation of due process is void." (***World Wide Volkswagen v Woodsen***, 444 US 286, 291 (1980); ***National Bank v Wiley***, 195 US 257 (1904); ***Pennoyer v Neff***, 95 US 714 (1878).)

The summary judgment and the final judgment in MIST-1 should be voided.

Clearly the orders from Judge Evans in 2009 must be considered void as the violations of due process are horrendous.

Judge Evans has repeatedly violated my Constitutional rights.

To punish a person because he has done what the law plainly allows him to do is a due process violation "of the most basic sort." ***(Bordenkircher v. Hayes,*** 434 U.S. 357, 363.) Alcatraz and I were wrongly punished for exercising a protected statutory right due to O.C.G.A. 43-4B, Sherman Act, Clayton Act, and Robinson-Patman Act.

Fifth Amendment

The Fifth Amendment "guarantees" the right to due process. The Fifth Amendment protects against abuse of government authority in a legal procedure. "No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

The Fifth Amendment guarantee of due process is applicable only to actions of the federal government. The Fourteenth Amendment contains virtually the same phrase, but expressly applied to the states. Due process alternatively due process of law or the process that is due, is the principle that the government must respect all of the legal rights that are owed to a person according to the law. Due process holds the government subservient to the law of the land, protecting individual persons from the state. Courts have viewed the Due Process Clause, and sometimes other clauses of the Constitution, as embracing those fundamental rights that are "implicit in the concept of ordered liberty." In case a person is deprived of liberty by a process that conflicts with some provision of the Constitution, then the Due Process Clause normally prescribes the remedy: restoration of that person's liberty. The Due Process Clause has been interpreted by the Supreme Court not only as a remedial requirement when other constitutional rights have been violated, but furthermore as having additional "procedural" and "substantive" components, meaning that the Clause purportedly imposes unenumerated restrictions on legal procedures -- the ways in which laws may operate -- and also on legal substance --

what laws may attempt to do or prohibit. Procedural due process has been broadly construed to protect the individual so that statutes, regulations, and enforcement actions must ensure that no one is deprived of "life, liberty, or property" without a fair opportunity to affect the judgment or result.

At a basic level, procedural due process is essentially based on the concept of "fundamental fairness." For example, in 1934, the United States Supreme Court held that due process is violated "if a practice or rule offends some principle of justice so rooted in the traditions and conscience of our people as to be ranked as fundamental". As construed by the courts, it includes an individual's right to be adequately notified of charges or proceedings, the opportunity to be heard at these proceedings, and that the person or panel making the final decision over the proceedings be impartial in regards to the matter before them.

Or, to put it more simply, where an individual is facing a (1) deprivation of (2) life, liberty, or property, (3) procedural due process mandates that he or she is entitled to adequate notice, a hearing, and a neutral judge. Substantive due process refers to the rights granted in the first eight amendments to the Constitution. The Supreme Court has consistently held that Fifth Amendment due process means substantially the same as Fourteenth Amendment due process.

I filed motions to recuse in MIST-1, and Judge Evans refused to do so.
I filed motions to recuse in MIST-2, and Judge Duffey refused to do so.
Judge Evans and Judge Duffey were not the proper people to decide if I have asserted valid factual and legal grounds to recuse them. This is like letting the fox guard the hen house. There is nothing fair about criticizing at length the actions and bias of the Judge, and then letting the biased judge rule on whether those criticisms were valid.

Alcatraz and I were not even afforded a trial in MIST-1. Judge Evans violated the law in improperly disposing of this case at summary judgment.

An objective observer, lay observer, and/or disinterested observer must entertain significant doubt of the impartiality of Judge Evans and Judge Duffey.

A judge is supposed to disqualify himself or herself in a proceeding in which the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned.

The due process clauses of both the Georgia and the United States Constitutions guarantee a party an impartial and disinterested tribunal in civil cases, but Alcatraz

and I were denied an impartial judge.

I have brought an action against Judge Evans and Judge Duffey, and the Federal Officials, pursuant in part to 28 U.S. C. § 1331, in claims arising from violations of federal constitutional rights guaranteed in the First, Fifth, Sixth, Eighth, Ninth and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution and redressable pursuant to ***Bivens v. Six Unknown Narcotics Agents*** 403 U.S. 388 (1971). Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress. Judge Evans and Judge Duffey have been acting in MIST-1and MIST-2 in the clear absence of all jurisdiction.

I was entitled to a fair trial, and there was little that was fair from Judge Evans, Judge Duffey, or the Eleventh Circuit.

By continuing today to adjudicate motions, Judge Evans and Judge Duffey are violating my right to an impartial tribunal.

The Fifth Amendment acts as a limitation upon the exercise of judicial power – to wit, justices may not sit as adjudicators in cases in which they have an interest. Judge Evans has an interest in MIST-1, yet she continued.

Judge Evans continued in a clear violation of the ministerial duties of Judge Evans pursuant to Canon 3B(3) of the Judicial Code of Conduct that states: "A judge should initiate appropriate action when the judge becomes aware of reliable evidence indicating the likelihood of unprofessional conduct by a judge or lawyer."

Judge Evans has committed obstruction of justice. Judge Evans withheld material evidence that should have been provided to me.

Detailed background facts regarding the professional misconduct of Judge Evans are provided in Dec #23 -- MIST-1 Doc. 406. Dec #23 details what Judge Evans did throughout the case.

All of this should cause Judge Evans to be found guilty of conduct prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts.

All of this should cause this Court to find Fraud Upon the Courts and set aside the orders and judgments in the underlying actions.

The record shows that Judge Evans violated the rules, codes of conduct, and various laws to enable him to rule against me because that was what she was intent on doing from day one.

Judge Evans' actions are not part of a function normally performed by a judge, and thus are non-judicial. Judge Evans does not have immunity for non-judicial acts.

I seek monetary damages against Judge Evans, Judge Duffey, and Federal Officials based upon violations of federal constitutional rights pursuant to ***Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of the Fed. Bureau of Narcotics***.
Jayuee Brand, Inc. v. United States (1983, App DC) 232 US App DC 150,721 F.2d 385. Money damages are available to of victims of official acts that violate Fifth Amendment due process clause.

"When any court violates the clean and unambiguous language of the Constitution, a fraud is perpetrated and no one is bound to obey it." (***State v. Sutton***, 63 Minn. 147 65 NW 262 30 ALR 660. Also see (***Watson v. Memphis***, 375 US 526; 10 L Ed 529; 83 S.Ct. 1314.)

If a judge does not comply with the Constitution, then his orders are void. (***In re Sawyer***, 124 U.S. 200 (1888). He/she is without jurisdiction, and he/she has engaged in an act or acts of treason.

Sixth Amendment

The Sixth Amendment guarantees the right to a fair trial. The Sixth Amendment addresses criminal prosecutions. However, I believe it should apply in this civil action because the threat of sanctions from these judges has been criminal in nature. "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district where in the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence."

The Sixth Amendment guarantees the right of trial by jury, which protects the right

of the accused to be judged by ordinary people in the community rather than by the judge presiding over the case.

I was denied a trial by jury. Judge Evans and Judge Duffey each presided over a case and committed massive fraud and criminal acts to damage me. Judge Evans has never granted a single evidentiary hearing to me in five years. Judge Evans ignored and/or denied repeated requests for hearings.

The Supreme Court has consistently held that some kind of hearing is required at some time before a person is finally deprived of his property [418 U.S. 539, 558] interests. (***Anti-Fascist Committee v. McGrath***, 341 U.S. 123, 168 (1951) (Frankfurter, J., concurring).

Seventh Amendment

The Seventh Amendment provides the right to a trial by jury. "In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law."

Judge Evans and Judge Duffey denied hearings or trials.

Ninth Amendment

The Ninth Amendment addresses rights of the people that are not specifically enumerated in the Constitution. "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." In 2000, the Harvard historian Bernard Bailyn gave a speech at the White House on the subject of the Ninth Amendment. He said that the Ninth Amendment refers to "a universe of rights, possessed by the people — latent rights, still to be evoked and enacted into law....a reservoir of other, unenumerated rights that the people retain, which in time may be enacted into law." The Ninth Amendment requires a presumption of liberty. Others have argued that the Ninth Amendment protects the unenumerated rights that the federal government was never empowered to violate.

The extent of those rights was detailed in ***Griswold v. Connecticut***, 381 U.S. 479, 484 (1965) in Justice Goldberg's concurrence:

> While the Ninth Amendment—and indeed the entire Bill of Rights—

> originally concerned restrictions upon federal power, the subsequently enacted Fourteenth Amendment prohibits the States as well from abridging fundamental personal liberties. And, the Ninth Amendment, in indicating that not all such liberties are specifically mentioned in the first eight amendments, is surely relevant in showing the existence of other fundamental personal rights, now protected from state, as well as federal, infringement. In sum, the Ninth Amendment simply lends strong support to the view that the 'liberty' protected by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments from infringement by the Federal Government or the States is not restricted to rights specifically mentioned in the first eight amendments.

The action and inaction of these federal judges in violating my Constitutional rights under color of law caused damage to me.

Fourteenth Amendment

The Fourteenth Amendment guarantees right to due process. "**Section 1.** All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." The Supreme Court has extended the reach of the Equal Protection Clause to other historically disadvantaged groups.

These federal judges have deprived me of the due process of law, liberty, and property.

Someone somewhere needs to do something. All of these judges should spend the rest of their years behind bars rather than sitting at home drawing fat lifetime pensions at our expense.

About William M. Windsor

I am a 62-year-old husband of 39 years, father of two, grandfather of three. I was a magazine publisher for most of my career. I never worked in any capacity in my entire career other than as owner, President, or senior manager. I served as

President for a Goldman Sachs Company and as CEO for a Bain Capital company. I have never been arrested or accused of a crime. I haven't even had a traffic or parking ticket in over 10 years. We pay our taxes, and I show up for jury duty. The point is that I am a decent, honest, intelligent corporate executive. I know criminals and corruption when they smack me in the face. The federal courts in Atlanta are filled with criminals. The trouble is that the criminals are the ones wearing robes.

A Final Thought...LawlessAmerica.com

We live in Lawless America.

When it comes to civil litigation in a federal court, my experience is that there are no laws. Sure, there are statutes enacted by Congress. There are state laws, too. But the judges routinely ignore the laws to do whatever they want.

And you can't read a law, understand what it means, follow the law to the letter, and expect to win in court. Lawless America has been created by judges everywhere who decide that they have the power to interpret the law. So every judge is out there changing the law every day. This maintains this massive legal infrastructure filled with attorneys who spend a lot of their time reviewing all of these court rulings to find a few that they can try to use to convince the local judge to rule their way.

So good luck to you. Your expectation of abiding by the law and winning in federal court is a mirage. A federal civil lawsuit is merely a way to lose a massive amount of money and get screwed repeatedly by the opposing party and their attorneys as well as by the judges. The judges can and will do whatever the hell they want. If they are friends with the opposing attorney, you well may lose just because of that. If they don't like your suit, you may lose just because of that. Got a beard? You lose. Not rich? You lose.

And there isn't a damn thing you can do about it. It's Lawless America. The laws mean nothing, and the federal judges take the law into their own hands.

I know. I have lived in Lawless America for the past five years.

I NAIVELY thought the part of the legal system that was broken is the dishonest attorneys. Yes, that's a mess, as expected. What I never dreamed is that the judges

are dishonest and criminals! It took me a while to accept this. I made excuses in my own mind for the outrageously incorrect rulings at first. Then I finally came to the obvious conclusion that the judge was a crook. I confirmed that again and again and again.

Please don't take my word for it, and don't sit there thinking I must be wrong. I am documenting every single thing here on this website, so you can see for yourself.

And if you think the United States Attorney, FBI, your Senator or Congressman, or the House and Senate Judiciary Committees are going to do anything to help you, you are wrong again. They all protect the evil-doer federal judges.

As you review information on my website at www.LawlessAmerica.com, you will realize that we do indeed live in Lawless America.

William M. Windsor

PO Box 681236 * Marietta, GA 30068 * 770-578-1094 * Fax: 770-234-4106
Cell: 404-606-1885 * williamwindsor@bellsouth.net