

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

F I L E D
SEP 25 2006
Phil Lombardi, Clerk
U.S. DISTRICT COURT

Eddie Andrews, et al;
Rodney D. Class

Petitioner

Vs

CASE No. 06-CV-460-TCK-PJC

UNITED STATES et al,
LINDA SOPER
DEFENDANTS

**MOTION TO STRIKE AND QUASH LINDA SOPER MOTION BASE ON
FRAUD AND PERJURY WITH AN AFFIDAVIT**

The Petitioner Rod Class comes with a **MOTION TO STRIKE AND QUASH LINDA SOPER MOTION BASE ON FRAUD AND PERJURY**. Below are the federal statutes for all attorney who file an enter of appearance before the court. These statutes was created by Congress therefore they are set in stone. Therefore is required.

TITLE 10 App. > UNITED > ATTORNEYS > Rule 13 Prev | Next
Rule 13. Qualifications to Practice

- (a) No attorney shall practice before this Court unless the attorney has been admitted to the bar of this Court or is appearing pro hac vice by leave of the Court. See Rule 38 (b).
- (b) It shall be a requisite to the admission of attorneys to the Bar of this Court that they be a member of the Bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State, Territory, Commonwealth, or Possession, and that their private and professional character shall appear to be good.
- (c) Each applicant shall file with the Clerk an application for admission on the form prescribed by the Court, together with an application fee in an amount prescribed by Court order and a certificate from the presiding judge, clerk, or other appropriate officer of a court specified in (b) above, or from any other appropriate official from the Bar of such court, that the applicant is a member of the Bar in good standing and that such applicant's private and professional character appear to be good. The certificate of good standing must be an original and must be dated within one year of the date of the application.
- (d) If the documents submitted demonstrate that the applicant possesses the necessary qualifications, the Clerk shall so notify the applicant and he or she may be admitted

without appearing in Court by subscribing a written oath or affirmation. However, if the applicant so elects, the admission may be on oral motion by a member of the Bar of this Court in open court. Upon admission, the Clerk shall issue to the attorney a wallet-size admission card and a large certificate of admission suitable for framing.

(e) Each applicant shall take or subscribe the following oath or affirmation:

"I * * *, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support the Constitution of the United States, and that I will conduct myself, as an attorney and counselor of this Court, uprightly and according to law. So help me God."

(f) Admissions will be granted on motion of the Court or upon oral motion by a person admitted to practice before the Court. Special admissions may be held by order of the Court.

TITLE 10 App. > UNITED > PRACTICE > Rule 38

Rule 38. Signatures

(a) General. Except for documents filed in propria persona and those provided for in subsection (b), all original pleadings or other papers filed in a case will bear the signature of at least one counsel who is a member of this Court's Bar and who is participating in the case. The name, address, telephone number, Court Bar number, and rank, if any, of the person signing, together with the capacity in which such counsel signs the paper, will be included. This signature will constitute a certificate that the statements made in the pleading or paper are true and correct to the best of the counsel's knowledge, information, or belief, and that the pleading or paper is filed in good faith and not for the purpose of unnecessary delay. A counsel who signs a pleading "for" some other counsel whose name is typed under such signature must, in addition, affix their own signature in a separate signature block with their own name, address, telephone number, Court Bar number, and rank, if any, typed thereunder.

(b) Exception. If the counsel signing a pleading or paper presented to the Clerk's office for filing is not a member of the Bar of this Court, the pleading or paper shall nonetheless be received as if such counsel were a member. However, within 30 days of the filing of a pleading, such counsel shall, as a prerequisite to continuing in the case as counsel of record, apply for admission to the Bar of this Court or move to appear pro hac vice under Rule 13.

2200.23(a)

"Entry of appearance" --

2200.23(a)(1)

"General." A representative of a party or intervenor shall enter an appearance by signing the first document filed on behalf of the party or intervenor in accordance with paragraph (a)(2) of this section, or thereafter by filing an entry of appearance in accordance with paragraph (a)(3) of this section.

2200.23(a)(2)

"Appearance in first document or pleading." If the first document filed on behalf of a party or intervenor is signed by a representative, he shall be recognized as representing

that party. No separate entry of appearance by him is necessary, provided the document contains the information required by 2200.6.

2200.23(a)(3)

"Subsequent appearance." Where a representative has not previously appeared on behalf of a party or intervenor, he shall file an entry of appearance with the Executive Secretary, or Judge if the case has been assigned. The entry of appearance shall be signed by the representative and contain the information required by 2200.6.

..2200.23(b)

2200.23(b)

"Withdrawal of counsel." Any counsel or representative or record desiring to withdraw his appearance, or any party desiring to withdraw the appearance of counsel or representative of record for him, must file a motion with the Commission or Judge requesting leave therefor, and showing that prior notice of the motion has been given by him to his client or counsel or representative, as the case may be. The motion of counsel to withdraw may, in the discretion of the Commission or Judge, be denied where it is necessary to avoid undue delay or prejudice to the rights of a party or intervenor

1. Let break this down title 10 rule 13 (a) states that the attorney has been admitted to the bar of this Court . What proof does the petitioner have that Linda Soper has the proper Bar card to practice in this court or has been given leave to defend any one.

(a) No attorney shall practice before this Court unless the attorney has been admitted to the bar of this Court or is appearing pro hac vice by leave of the Court. See Rule 38 (b).

2. (b) states that the attorney has to be a member of the Federal Bar not state Bar where is the proof that Linda Soper holds a Federal Bar card. With the proof of her private and professional character shall appear to be good. We the People have the right to know who is in good standing and has the proper Qualifications to Practice before this court to challenge the tax payer in such an action as this.

(b) It shall be a requisite to the admission of attorneys to the Bar of this Court that they be a member of the Bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State, Territory, Commonwealth, or Possession, and that their private and professional character shall appear to be good.

3. (c) states that a filing fee had to be paid . Where the proof that this was paid and not just passed over as part of the good old boy system. Where the Linda Soper proof

of the applicant is a member as state in (b) of this section and the certificate of good standing. We the People demand such proof before entry.

(c) Each applicant shall file with the Clerk an application for admission on the form prescribed by the Court, together with an application fee in an amount prescribed by Court order and a certificate from the presiding judge, clerk, or other appropriate officer of a court specified in (b) above, or from any other appropriate official from the Bar of such court, that the applicant is a member of the Bar in good standing and that such applicant's private and professional character appear to be good. The certificate of good standing must be an original and must be dated within one year of the date of the application.

4. (d) & (e) Where the proof of the admission card that the attorney has met the proper Qualifications to Practice and (e) requires that the attorney swear an oath to the constitution and that includes the 5th and 14th amendment that cover DUE PROCESS.

We the people demand such proof to prevent fraud upon this court so the defendants can not claim a due process violation.

(d) If the documents submitted demonstrate that the applicant possesses the necessary qualifications, the Clerk shall so notify the applicant and he or she may be admitted without appearing in Court by subscribing a written oath or affirmation. However, if the applicant so elects, the admission may be on oral motion by a member of the Bar of this Court in open court. Upon admission, the Clerk shall issue to the attorney a wallet-size admission card and a large certificate of admission suitable for framing.

(e) Each applicant shall take or subscribe the following oath or affirmation:
"I * * *, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support the Constitution of the United States, and that I will conduct myself, as an attorney and counselor of this Court, uprightly and according to law. So help me God."

5. Rule 38 make the state that all filing well be in good faith and not for the purpose of unnecessary delay. All of which is done after a pleading. Who at this time enter a plead. Found in rule 8 admit or deny.

Rule 38. Signatures

(a) General. Except for documents filed in propria persona and those provided for in subsection (b), all original pleadings or other papers filed in a case will bear the signature of at least one counsel who is a member of this Court's Bar and who is participating in

the case. The name, address, telephone number, Court Bar number, and rank, if any, of the person signing, together with the capacity in which such counsel signs the paper, will be included. This signature will constitute a certificate that the statements made in the pleading or paper are true and correct to the best of the counsel's knowledge, information, or belief, and that the pleading or paper is filed in good faith and not for the purpose of unnecessary delay. A counsel who signs a pleading "for" some other counsel whose name is typed under such signature must, in addition, affix their own signature in a separate signature block with their own name, address, telephone number, Court Bar number, and rank, if any, typed thereunder.

As you can see the statutes are very clear on how those who hold a Bar card are to enter. If Linda Soper did meet all of the above requirement this court has a very serious problem. By Linda Soper being required to swear and oath to the constitution then she is in breach of such a swearing for filing a dismissal on a 12(b)(6) into this court for a DUE PROCESS Class Action suit. By filing such a motion she has violated a 18 USC 1621 Perjury ,18 USC 1622 Subornation of perjury , 18 USC 1016 Acknowledgment of appearance or oath and is in violation of 18 USC 241, 242, 371, 1001 and 1341 all of which is felony.

How can anyone who swear an oath to the constitution , file such a Motion and then turn around and not violate that constitutional oath that was taken before they are allow to place their enter of appearance. The Question now arises did Linda Soper met the proper Qualifications . If she did. She has placed a fraud upon the court in which case she can no longer be take in good faith, if she failed to met the Qualification she still can not be take in good faith and all future filing are to be disregarded as frivolous and in bad faith.

Linda Soper claim 12(b) (6) for the defendant. 12(b)(6) is not a plead rule 8 (b) states that Admit or Deny had to be entered not a 12(b) (6). Linda Soper claim that the defendant has some type of immunity under the 11th amendment. The state give up that

immunity when it took federal funding. Read 42 USC 2000d-7. See; Case Site also

Perez v. Brownell, 356 U.S. 44, 7; 8 S. Ct. 568, 2 L. Ed. 2d 603 (1958)

"...in our country the people are sovereign and the government cannot sever its relationship to them by taking away their citizenship."

Sherar v. Cullen, 481 F. 2d 946 (1973)

"There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of his exercise of constitutional rights."

Simmons v. United States, 390 U.S. 377 (1968)

"The claim and exercise of a Constitution right cannot be converted into a crime"... "a denial of them would be a denial of due process of law".

Warnock v. Pecos County, Texas., 88 F3d 341 (5th Cir. 1996)

Eleventh Amendment does not protect state officials from claims for prospective relief when it is alleged that state officials acted in violation of federal law.

**Gonzalez v. Commission on Judicial Performance*, (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 359, 371, 374

Acts in excess of judicial authority constitutes misconduct, particularly where a judge

deliberately disregards the requirements of fairness and due process.

Ryan v. Commission on Judicial Performance, (1988) 45 Cal. 3d 518, 533

Before sending a person to jail for contempt or imposing a fine, judges are required to provide due process of law, including strict adherence to the procedural requirements contained in the Code of Civil Procedure. Ignorance of these procedures is not a mitigating but an aggravating **factor**.

The Petitioner is demand due process for the defendants unlike Linda Soper who is depriving the defendant of his rights to have due process. Let a jury decide of his guilty or innocents so that due process can be serviced. Linda Soper is also a ware of the constitutional mandate that forbids any judge to give such a relief under this section of the F. R. Civ P. She knows if a judge does they can face federal prison time for violating 18 USC 241, 371 and 1001 which hold 5 years each. So can this court trust anyone who swear an false oath and who fail to believe in due process and is willing to place the judge in federal prison for violating they oath of office and their oath to the constitution which

guarantee due process to all.

This court has no choice but to Strike and Quash Linda Soper filing and fine that she has perjury herself be for this court .

_____[LS]
Rodney Class
P.O. Box 435
High Shoals, NC
28077

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

We the People Plaintiff's , do hereby certify, that I have cause to be delivered to the Clerk of Courts of the **UNITED STATES NORTHTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA** a True, Correct, Certain and Not Misleading Document to be serviced upon this court with a **MOTION TO STRIKE AND QUASH LINDA SOPER MOTION BASE ON FRAUD AND PERJURY WITH AN AFFIDAVIT** and to be serviced upon all named parties. By mail. All of the Plaintiff's Electronic mailed to On this _____ day of _____ 2006 A. D.

_____[LS]
Rodney D. Class
P.O. Box 435
High Shoals, NC
28077

CC. DEFENDANT ATTORNEY LINDA SOPER

Assistant Attorney General
Oklahoma Attorney General's Office
Litigation Division
4545 N. Lincoln Blvd
Suite 260
Oklahoma. OK 73015

AFFIDAVIT

Rodney Class, a Private Party and being of sound mind and a reasonable citizen of the united States of America has cause to state and make statement of fact to the best of his knowledge that misfeasance, malfeasance and of a Substantive Due Process violation within the Elements of Jurisdiction of a proper court of competent jurisdiction.

The Class Action suite of DUE PROCESS was file into this court to ensure that all party involved would receive the constitutional 5th and 14th amendment protect of due process. It is and was the intend of the plaintiff that the defendant receive their 5th and 14th amendment rights. In ever court case that the Plaintiff's has had, has been deny there due process rights and has deny been the equal protect of the law under 42 USC 1981 to claim the famous 12(b)(6) escape clause.

The Petitioner is filing into this to have UNITED STATES restore all of the Plaintiff's back to their original position before their due process was violated by the defendants. The Petitioner is also making the claim that all of the defendants are to receive their 5th and 14th amendment rights be up held and not allow Linda Soper deprive them of this guarantee protect constitutional right.

Linda Soper well have to produce document to where violating due process for the defendant/s is in the best interest of the defendant/s and is in the best interest of this nation as a whole. Linda Soper well be required to provide or prove that a trial by jury would not be in the best interest of due process and that this would, violate the due process clause of the constitution. Linda Soper also need to provide and prove that it would be in the best interest of this court to violate the due process in this Class Action claim.

Below is documents that show the limit power of the federal court and if any violation or bad behaviour could cause the court to lose favor for any misuse of power. By Linda Soper conning the court with a fraud document of 12(b)(6) claims and 11th amendment immunity claims this could cause this court to be placed in bad behaviour as these other 12 (b)(6) and 11th amendment person who though they also were above the laws of this nation.

Dr. Eduardo M. Rivera

IMPEACHING A UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

The United States district courts have always been other than judicial courts. Congress created these courts without the judicial power granted by the third article of the Constitution and, as such, they cannot exercise the judicial power of the United States. Chief Justice William Howard Taft confirmed them to be mere Article IV territorial

courts in *Balzac v. People of Porto Rico*, 258 U.S. 298 (1922). That should have settled the matter, but the erroneous belief that these courts have the judicial power of the United States will not die.

The federal government itself nurtures the false belief that the federal courts administer justice and are, therefore, judicial courts. The impeachment of John Pickering district judge from Mass the first federal judge in March 1804 was as a cynical strategy to strengthen the unwarranted assumption that federal judges were of the judicial branch of the government. The impeachment of the first federal judge in the past was nothing more than a ploy by Congress to reinforce the false belief that federal judges and Justices are civil Officers of the United States appointed to their offices during good Behavior.

The false belief that the federal courts exercise the judicial power of the United States legitimates what has become a fascist American government. The federal courts, which include the U.S. Supreme Court, are mere appendages of the legislative branch. The judges and Justices of these courts have exercised the legislative power granted to Congress in Article IV of the Congress.

Today impeachment of United States district court judges is necessary because Congress in 1948 enacted legislation making it possible for them to hold their offices during good behavior. The same legislation continued the requirement that all district judges reside within their districts. Currently, only the district judges in Washington, D. C. and Manhattan, New York are exempt from that residency requirement.

United States district court judges outside of the Manhattan and Washington, D. C. districts cannot possibly satisfy the residency requirements of their offices, because the remaining districts are comprised exclusively of the federal territory within the 50 states. At one time federal territory was an immense expanse of America, today it is military bases, national parks and forests and buildings scattered over the states. Federal territory does not provide an attractive residential area for the federal judges, jurors and other court personnel of the district courts.

Laws enacted by Congress during the Cold War make it necessary that federal judges be impeached so that the last vestiges of that era's restrictions on freedom can be eliminated. When the true nature of the federal courts as non-judicial tribunals is widely known, why will anyone bother to make the effort to impeach even an obviously corrupt federal judge like the Las Vegas federal judge the Los Angeles Times exposed on June 9, 2006, James C. Mahan? In only a short time in office, Mahan has managed to throw a considerable amount of business to his friends to the considerable financial loss of innocent bystanders.

The Times has also reported on July 18, 2006 that an impeachment inquiry of Los Angeles federal judge, Manuel L. Real, is pending before the House Judiciary Committee. Federal judges like Mahan and Real are able to inflict unnecessary financial losses on innocent parties only because of confusion over their "judicial" authority

and the territorial jurisdiction of the district court where they sit. Mahan's and Real's impeachments will send a message to the Congress and the remaining federal district judges that the People want the public officials who have questioned their authority and now understand their limitations.

No United States district court judge is an Article III judge and that fact is easily proven by reference to the current oath taken by all federal judicial employees. The very first federal courts created by Congress were created without judicial power so that the judges of those courts could be subject to the complete control of the legislative branch. The general acceptance of these federal courts as both judicial and administrative allows Congress to exercise power beyond that granted to it in the Congress.

Before the considerable effort is made to impeach one of these non-judicial employees, an attempt should be made to establish the obvious limited authority of these federal employees who act like they are Article III judges. Limiting United States district court judges to the territorial jurisdiction of the district court will effectively confine them to whatever federal territory may be found within the district or division of the court.

None of the federal judges pretending to hold court in the 50 states are any part of the judicial branch of the government established by the Constitution. The federal government reports that there are more than 90 district courts and positions for more than 660 judges, it is, therefore, simpler to prove that the U.S. Supreme Court is not an Article III than it is to prove that all the district courts act without the judicial power of the United States.

To prove that the U.S. Supreme Court is not an Article III court, we need only examine the credentials of William H. Rehnquist, the late Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. When Associate Justice Rehnquist took the following oath:

"I, WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST, do solemnly swear that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent on me as Chief Justice of the United States according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to the constitution, and laws of the United States. So help me God."

The last sentence of the oath clearly makes it a religious test for both the Justices and the district court judges. The Judiciary Act of 1789, the source of the oaths Rehnquist took as Associate and Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, provides different oaths for the judges and Justices incompatible with the oath or affirmation required in the Sixth Article of the Constitution for the Justices of the Supreme Court and the district judges.

"I, WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST, do solemnly swear, that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent on me as associate Justice, according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to the constitution, and

laws of the United States. So help me God."

Rehnquist voluntarily took the judicial oath and there is no evidence that he took the oath required by Article VI of the Constitution. He had taken the same oath as an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. There is no record that he or any other federal judge or Justice had ever taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States without also taking the religious test "So help me God." Neither Rehnquist nor any other Chief Justice or Associate Justice has qualified as an Article VI officer of the United States qualified to hold an "Office or public Trust under the United States."

The oaths Rehnquist had taken first as Associate Justice and later as Chief Justice did nothing to qualify him or any other member of the U.S. Supreme Court as a judicial officer of the United States. The root word "Justice" used to identify the officers of the U.S. Supreme Court serves, also, to distinguish them from the "Judges" in Article III of the Constitution. The word "Justice" is used in the fourth article of the Constitution in a very narrow sense to mean the determination of the guilt or innocence of a person charged in a criminal proceeding in any State. That part of the judicial oath to "administer justice without respect to persons," properly places the federal judges and Justices in Article IV of the Constitution, where Congress is to "have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States."

It is apparent that the original intention of the Constitution was to impose a duty on the governors of the states to deliver up fugitives from Justice and the Article VI oath to be taken by "Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States" was to bind them to that duty.

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States. Constitution Article VI, Clause 3

The first legislative act of the very First Congress was to create an oath that would satisfy Article VI. It will be found on page 23 of volume 1 of the Statutes at Large. If Statute I is read and understood, the reader will be able to explain to anyone why the federal courts are not part of the judicial branch of the federal government.

And be it further enacted, That all officers appointed, or hereafter to be appointed under the authority of the United States, shall, before they act in their respective offices, take the same oath or affirmation, which shall be administered by the person or persons who shall be authorized by law to administer to such officers their respective oaths of office; and such officers shall incur the same penalties in case of failure, as shall be imposed by law in case of failure in taking their respective oaths of office. 1 Statutes at Large 23, Section 4

The Preamble to the Constitution cites the establishment of Justice as one of the primary goals of that document and Article IV, Section 2, Clause 2 clarifies how that will be accomplished where 13 sovereign states have joined together to form a perpetual Union. The Article VI oath creates the duty to remove a fugitive back to the State from he fled. A Person charged in any State with Treason, Felony, or other Crime, who shall flee from Justice, and be found in another State, shall on Demand of the executive Authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having Jurisdiction of the Crime. Constitution Article IV, Section 2, Clause 2.

CONCLUSION

The justices and judges oath set out in Section 8 of the Judiciary Act of 1789 has not changed in 216 years for the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court, but the oath for district judges has been augmented. United States district court judges now take the oath administered to other federal employees. The entire federal judiciary is dedicated by oath and statutory law to carry out the constitutional grant of power to Congress found in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

No further evidence is needed to prove that federal district judges are outside Article III of the Constitution. There is, in fact, no constitutional or statutory evidence that the U.S. Supreme Court or any United States district court has ever been granted the judicial power of the United States.

Impeachments of Federal Judges

John Pickering, U.S. District Court for the District of New Hampshire.

Impeached by the U.S. House of Representatives on March 2, 1803, on charges of mental instability and intoxication on the bench; Trial in the U.S. Senate, March 3, 1803, to March 12, 1803; Convicted and removed from office on March 12, 1803.

Samuel Chase, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States.

Impeached by the U.S. House of Representatives on March 12, 1804, on charges of arbitrary and oppressive conduct of trials; Trial in the U.S. Senate, November 30, 1804, to March 1, 1805; Acquitted on March 1, 1805.

James H. Peck, U.S. District Court for the District of Missouri.

Impeached by the U.S. House of Representatives on April 24, 1830, on charges of abuse of the contempt power; Trial in the U.S. Senate, April 26, 1830, to January 31, 1831; Acquitted on January 31, 1831.

West H. Humphreys, U.S. District Court for the Middle, Eastern, and Western Districts of Tennessee.

Impeached by the U.S. House of Representatives, May 6, 1862, on charges of refusing to hold court and waging war against the U.S. government; Trial in the U.S. Senate, May 7, 1862, to June 26, 1862; Convicted and removed from office, June 26, 1862.

Mark W. Delahay, U.S. District Court for the District of Kansas.

Impeached by the U.S. House of Representatives, February 28, 1873, on charges of intoxication on the bench; Resigned from office, December 12, 1873, before opening of trial in the U.S. Senate.

Charles Swayne, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Florida.

Impeached by the U.S. House of Representatives, December 13, 1904, on charges of abuse of contempt power and other misuses of office; Trial in the U.S. Senate, December 14, 1904, to February 27, 1905; Acquitted February 27, 1905.

Robert W. Archbald, U.S. Commerce Court.

Impeached by the U.S. House of Representatives, July 11, 1912, on charges of improper business relationship with litigants; Trial in the U.S. Senate, July 13, 1912, to January 13, 1913; Convicted and removed from office, January 13, 1913.

George W. English, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Illinois.

Impeached by the U.S. House of Representatives, April 1, 1926, on charges of abuse of power; resigned office November 4, 1926; Senate Court of Impeachment adjourned to December 13, 1926, when, on request of the House manager, impeachment proceedings were dismissed.

Harold Louderback, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California.

Impeached by the U.S. House of Representatives, February 24, 1933, on charges of favoritism in the appointment of bankruptcy receivers; Trial in the U.S. Senate, May 15, 1933, to May 24, 1933; Acquitted, May 24, 1933.

Halsted L. Ritter, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida.

Impeached by the U.S. House of Representatives, March 2, 1936, on charges of favoritism in the appointment of bankruptcy receivers and practicing law while sitting as a judge; Trial in the U.S. Senate, April 6, 1936, to April 17, 1936; Convicted and removed from office, April 17, 1936.

Harry E. Claiborne, U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada.

Impeached by the U.S. House of Representatives, October 9, 1986, on charges of income tax evasion and of remaining on the bench following criminal conviction; Trial in the U.S. Senate, October 7, 1986, to October 9, 1986; Convicted and removed from office, October 9, 1986.

Alcee L. Hastings, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida.

Impeached by the U.S. House of Representatives, August 3, 1988, on charges of perjury and conspiring to solicit a bribe; Trial in the U.S. Senate, October 18, 1989, to October 20, 1989; Convicted and removed from office, October 20, 1989.

Walter L. Nixon, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi. Impeached by the U.S. House of Representatives, May 10, 1989, on charges of perjury before a federal grand jury; Trial in the U.S. Senate, November 1, 1989, to November 3, 1989; Convicted and removed from office, November 3, 1989.

Petition for Impeachment of The Honorable William H. Rehnquist, US. Chief Justice. Petition for Impeachment of The Honorable William H. Rehnquist, US Chief Justice was filed January 19, 1999 in the US. House of Representatives. R.I.C.O Complaint against The Honorable William H. Rehnquist, et als. was filed January 19, 1999. This action substantiates the specific allegations of the Petition for Impeachment. The complete document can be downloaded from Part 1, Part 2, Part 3, and Part 4, or from the public documents of the courts published according to the September 19, 2001 determination of the Judicial Conference of the United States. Interrogatories and Requests for Admissions were propounded on The Honorable William K. Suter under the R.I.C.O Complaint. Here are linked the letters submitting the above documents to the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives. Processing and actions taking place on this R.I.C.O. Complaint during the years 1999 to 2002 can be found in

<http://members.aol.com/DNA519/rico.htm>, in

<http://members.aol.com/DNA519/2000.htm>, and in

<http://members.aol.com/Docket519/WebpageMarch2002.htm>. Plaintiff Maria L.

Costell Gaydos would be grateful to receive legal input, advise, or comments in the matters submitted, from public officials, Law Schools, Bar Associations, newspapers, organizations, or private individuals.

Sworn to under the penalty of perjury



[LS]

Rodney Class
P.O. Boox 435
High Shoals, NC 28077

Notary Public

Wendy D Brown

County of Gaston

State of North Carolina

