

1 **A. Defendants conspire with their judicial colleagues to alter the constitutions of the**
2 **United States and Washington to deprive plaintiff of all his rights.**

3 The above named defendants are lawyers and judges of both state and federal courts¹.

4 These defendants, by virtue of their government office, are mandated by the constitution to “protect
5 individual rights”, that is to protect Plaintiff’s rights, as Washington’s Article 1, section 1 clearly
6 demands. As in the original complaint, incorporated by reference, Defendants, by law, are to:

- 7
- 8 1. Provide a valid application to plaintiff, per RCW 84.36.379-389, for Plaintiff’s Article 7,
9 section 10 benefits. To the contrary, Defendants aid in the refusal to abide by these statutes
10 by providing a fraudulent application as the method denying Plaintiff’s Article 7 section 10
11 right;
 - 12 2. Assure plaintiff obtains his right to competent counsel per RCW 2.48.210. To the contrary,
13 Defendants deny and sabotage plaintiff’s right to counsel;
 - 14 3. Assure Plaintiff is granted his statutory immunity for his whistle-blowing effort per RCW
15 4.24.510. To the contrary, Defendants join with their government colleagues in the attack
16 and retaliation against plaintiff by imposing an unlawful \$130,000 penalty related to
17 plaintiff’s whistle-blowing effort;
 - 18 4. Assure plaintiff can pursue his constitutionally unabridged and unlimited right to his “civil
19 jury trial” as expressly provided by Article 1, sections 4 and 21 and Article 2, section 28(12).
20

21 To the contrary, Defendants conspire with their government colleagues to limit, abridge and
22

23
24
25 ¹ See *Polk County v. Dodson*, 454 US 312 - Supreme Court 1981. In this case, as *Dodson*
26 holds, lawyers perform a state function because their clients are state officials. They are therefore
27 “officers of the court” and liable under 42 USC 1983 because they act under color of state law.
28 See also RCW 2.48, the Bar Act. Under this act, lawyers are regulated by state law, RCW
2.48.180 through .230, and, under this state law all lawyers owe a duty to the State regardless of
whether their client is a public or private person. See *Nix v. Whiteside*, 475 US 157, 174 -
Supreme Court 1986 “the responsibility of an ethical lawyer, as an officer of the court and a key
component of a system of justice, dedicated to a search for truth, ...”

1 deny plaintiff's "unabridged and inviolate rights" to his civil trial by jury;

2 5. Assure plaintiff appears before an impartial judge as RCW 2.28.030 and 28 USC 455 were
3 enacted to assure. To the contrary, only biased and interested judges presided. Judge Ronald
4 Leighton's wife was doing business with the defendant in the seminal proceeding. Because
5 Judge Leighton refused to disqualify himself under law, plaintiff was forced into a no-win
6 contest between himself and the powers judges claim for themselves and their self imposed
7 scheme in which judges-judge-judges. It is a scheme devised by judges to assure judges
8 decide the scope of their own authority. Such a scheme is loaded with bias and conflicts
9 leaving plaintiff no impartial avenue for redress.

10
11 6. Defendants do not deny the allegations, or controvert the facts that prove the allegations.
12 Rather Defendants claim they have "ABSOLUTE IMMUNITY FROM SUIT" for anything
13 and everything they do. Because they are ABSOLUTELY IMMUNE FROM SUIT they
14 don't need to address their conduct, address the facts, or explain how, in what they do, is
15 just, protects individual rights, or is authorized which are the three essential elements
16 imposed upon them by Article 1, section 1 applicable to every government act.

17
18
19 "All political power is inherent in the people, and governments derive their *just*
20 powers *from the consent of the governed*."

21 To the contrary, these government defendants have claimed the judicial branch, and the
22 People's powers, for themselves as the means to claim privileges and immunities they
23 don't rightfully have. And, further, to escape all accountability through their self-designed
24 schemes under their self-created rules.

1 **B. Defendants intend, by obstructing plaintiff’s civil remedy, plaintiff resort to**
2 **uncivil methods in his self-defense.**

3 Uncivilized methods, as Abraham Lincoln makes known, are the only alternatives available
4 to plaintiff if public officials (defendants and those who aid defendants) unlawfully use their public
5 office to inflict harm and deny all “civil” avenues for redress. President Lincoln said,

6
7 “We the people are the rightful masters of both Congress and the courts, not to overthrow the
8 Constitution but to overthrow the men who pervert the Constitution ... This country, with its
9 institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the
10 existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or exercise
11 their **revolutionary** right to **overthrow** it.”

12 **C. Additional allegation: Defendants have an unlawful monopoly over the judiciary**
13 **depriving Plaintiff of his CIVIL REMEDY.**

14 Fact number 1: It is also crystal clear to any conscious reader that the above identified
15 defendants, both lawyers and judges in state or federal courts, belong to the same association – the
16 Washington State Bar Association. It is political incest at the extreme when associates of the
17 WSBA control both state and federal judicial offices - there is no separation whatever between
18 ‘the government’ and this public association’ – they are Bar Associates plain and simple.

19 Fact #2: And the Bar publically admits that its purpose is to serve its members.² Said
20 another way, members of the Bar serve members of the Bar. The Bar’s stated purpose clearly alters
21 the constitutional mandate expressed by Article 1, section 1, that require its “members” serve
22 citizens. Clearly Plaintiff cannot obtain a fair hearing in any state or federal court because the
23 defendants and the decision-makers who control the courts in Washington state have the same
24 motives and belong to the same association whose stated purpose is to serve themselves – not
25 citizens as the constitution and laws of Washington demand of its WSBA members.
26

27 _____
28 ² <https://www.wsba.org/about-wsba/who-we-are>

1 Fact #3: The WSBA is a monopoly association under the judicial branch of Washington
2 State. The WSBA, exactly like the AFSCME, is an unconstitutional association as noted by the
3 US Supreme Court in *Janus v. AFSCME*³. The WSBA, just like *Janus*, forces membership and
4 forces its members support the Bar's political objectives. It goes without saying the ultimate
5 service the Bar can achieve for its members' is wealth, power, prestige, and unaccountability,
6 which goals are achieved at Plaintiff's expense.
7

8 It also goes without saying, if defendants can force upon plaintiff a fraudulent application,
9 sabotage plaintiff's right to counsel, retaliate and impose an unlawful \$130,000 sanction, have a
10 judge preside whose wife was doing business with the defendants, and then deny plaintiff his civil
11 action and trial by jury to address these injustices, the WSBA has achieved the ultimate "service
12 to its members"- absolute immunity. Washington's constitution PROHIBITS monopolies (Article
13 10, Section 13); PROHIBITS privileges and immunities (Article 1, sections 8, 12, and 28).
14

15 **D. The allegations against the named defendants are self-validating.**

16 The allegations are self-validating.

- 17
- 18 1. Defendants' denial of plaintiff's right to honest government services by forcing plaintiff
19 sign, as true, a fraudulent document is shown by defendants' documents;
 - 20 2. Defendants' denial of plaintiff's statutory immunity is shown by defendants' \$130,000
21 retaliation scheme, designed by and executed by the WSBA, for his whistle-blowing
22 effort;
 - 23 3. Defendants' denial of plaintiff's constitutional right to his civil trial by jury is shown by
24 the absence of a civil trial by jury;
25
- 26

27
28 ³ *Janus v. AFSCME* No. 16–1466. Argued February 26, 2018—Decided June 27, 2018. Source: https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/17pdf/16-1466_2b3j.pdf

1 4. Defendants’ denial of an impartial judge is shown by the judge’s wife doing business
2 with defendants;

3 5. Defendants’ claims of “absolute immunity from suit” is, on its face, unconstitutional as
4 WA’s Article 1, section 8, 12, and 28 PROHIBIT immunities and privileges, and Article
5 3 of the US Constitution clearly states holding judicial office is contingent upon “good
6 behavior”.

7
8 These self-validating allegations are proof defendants have commandeered the judicial
9 branch for themselves -- a consequence in having a monopoly association, the WSBA, occupy
10 judicial positions. They are all liable to plaintiff under 48 USC 1983 and other common law torts.

11
12 **II. ADDING/JOINING DEFENDANTS – OFFICERS OF THE COURT**

13 Joining JESSIE K. LIU, *D.C. Bar #472845* United States Attorney; DANIEL F. VAN
14 HORN, *D.C. Bar #924092*, Chief, Civil Division; FRED E. HAYNES, *D.C. Bar #165654*,
15 Assistant United States Attorney; and, JAMES E BOASBERG, Federal judge, *D.C.Bar*,
16 membership status is in GOOD STANDING.

17
18 Defendants Liu, Van Horn and Haynes are employees of the US DOJ, which is an executive
19 branch agency. But they are also, as is Defendant Boasberg, members of the DC Bar and “officers
20 of the court” who answer, ultimately, to defendant Roberts. These defendants serve two masters
21 – the President and Defendant Roberts.

22
23 The President, Donald Trump, was elected by the whole nation with over 53 million votes,
24 including plaintiff’s vote, based in part for his promises to “drain the swamp” and “return
25 government back to the people”. He says, “It’s time for rule by the people, not special interests as
26 we have now.”

27
28 In contrast, these Defendants, including defendant Roberts, were elected by no one. Nor
do they have any noted popular support. Nevertheless, the DC Bar defendants have chosen to

1 support the policies, customs and practices of John Roberts by betraying the promises of President
2 Trump and thereby extinguishing the votes of 53 million Americans.

3 Furthermore, as noted in docket 7, incorporated by reference, defendants are violating the
4 express will of the US Congress by their unlawful and unethical acts in violation of 28 USC 455(a)
5 and (b), by asking judges to rule on matters in which judges have bias and conflict; in violation of
6 28 USC 1652 and 28 USC 2672, by applying irrelevant case law rather than the laws of
7 Washington state as Congress demands; in violation of 28 USC 2072(b) by using the court rule
8 schemes to ‘abridge, modify or enlarge’ substantive rights. These violations by defendants
9 constitute misrepresentations and ‘half-truths meant to deceive’ in order to preserve the swamp
10 and assure the People remain oppressed by special interests – i.e., the Bar’s political objectives).

11
12
13 Specific allegation concerning James E Boasberg. Defendant Boasberg is a member of the
14 Swamp who uses his public office to further the special interests of the WSBA and D.C. Bar
15 associations, as well as the special interests of Justice Roberts.

16 Defendant Boasberg:

- 17 6. grants “absolute immunity” where no immunity exists;
18 7. denies a “jury demand” without authority; and
19 8. ignores substantive laws in favor of “court rule powers”.

20
21 These are all self-validating acts in belligerent violation of law, 28 USC 2072(b) – which
22 states, court rules *shall not abridge, modify or enlarge any substantive right*.

23 **III. THE ALLEGATION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS (UNITED STATES, JOHN**
24 **ROBERTS, THOSE NAMED AND ADDED ABOVE) REMAINS THE SAME AS**
25 **IN THE ORIGINAL COMPLAINT, INCLUDED BY REFERENCE,**

26 The United States is negligent in holding judicial branch officials (lawyers and judges),
27 particularly the captain of the judiciary ship – Defendant, Chief Justice Roberts, to their duty.
28 Defendant Fred Haynes describes the allegation in docket 4, page 1, “judicial officers failed to

1 perform their duties properly in connection with plaintiff’s litigation, and consequently, plaintiff
2 is entitled to damages.” None of the defendants denied the allegation, nor denied the facts that led
3 to the allegation, nor argued that their conduct complained about was proper, or authorized, or
4 even legal. Rather defendants claim they have “absolute immunity” for anything they choose to
5 do, or not do. Therefore defendants claim it isn’t necessary to justify the ‘fraudulent application’,
6 the ‘retaliation against plaintiff’, ‘the methods used to extort plaintiff’s counsel’, or Judge
7 Leighton’s conflicts given his wife’s association with defendants ..., because anything they do, or
8 not due, is “absolutely immune from suit”. This claim of absolute immunity by these defendants,
9 judges included, is a fraud upon plaintiff, the courts, and America. Article 3, section 1 clearly
10 says, “The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good
11 Behaviour”. Additionally, Washington’s constitution, Article 1, sections 8, 12 and 28, “Prohibit
12 immunities of all kinds, including inherited immunities” unless everyone enjoys the same
13 privileges and immunities. The questions concerning defendants’ “behavior” is for a JURY to
14 decide if it is “good” and “just” and “authorized” as the laws of the United States and Washington
15 require.
16
17
18

19 Notwithstanding the above, the conduct by the United States, particularly Justice Roberts’
20 blind eye to a private monopoly’s takeover of the United State’s judicial branch, is even more
21 egregious. When defendants and decision makers are associates of the same political enterprise
22 operating for the mutual benefit of each other, plaintiff’s petition for redress for the harms inflicted
23 by these union defendants is an act in futility. “[T]he law does not require performance of futile
24 acts”. *Kaplan v. N.W. Mut. Life Ins. Co.*, 115 Wn. App. 791, 65 P.3d 16, 2003 Wash. App. LEXIS
25 270. Bar associates have commandeered the judicial branch of government; they have bestowed
26 upon themselves absolute immunity for anything they do or not do, and there is no limit in what
27 these associates of a ‘for profit’ entity – the WSBA and D.C Bar, can do or harm they can inflict.
28

E. The Facts remain the same: (Ref dkt 1-1 Appendices)

1
2 On 12/14/2012, and on 12/22/2016, and on 2/11/2019, respectively and specifically
3 referring to plaintiff's jury demand, dkt 19, in his civil action #3:12-cv-05996, and plaintiff's jury
4 demand, dkt 10 in his civil action #3:16-cv-06016, and in this case, plaintiff's jury demand, dkt 1,
5 civil action #19-00373 JEB, Plaintiff clearly demanded a civil trial by jury. The purpose for
6 plaintiff's civil trial by jury, which are rights due plaintiff specifically declared by Washington
7 State's constitution Article 1, sections 4, and 21, was to assure plaintiff presented his case – a
8 petition concerning the common good, to an impartial decision-maker – the jury. It is through a
9 jury the People, who have “all political power”, as Article 1, section 1 makes clear, who determine
10 whether or not defendants' are conducting themselves “by their consent and in a just manner” as
11 Article 1, section 1 explicitly imposes upon all defendants.
12
13

14 The documents/evidence plaintiff meant for a jury and only a jury, because “judges shall
15 not charge juries with respect to matters of fact, nor comment thereon” -- Article 4, section 16,
16 include, but are not limited to: (Refer to Dkt 1, attachment 1, Appendices)
17

- 18 1) Exhibit 2: Kitsap County's senior/disabled application and the Department of
19 Revenue's instructions to County officials in which they clearly alter statutes for the
20 purpose of taking plaintiff's property – the documents are part of a fraud. These lies
21 and the theft of plaintiff's property, as Exhibit 2 describes, is self-evident when the law,
22 RCW 84.36.383(5), is compared to the documents provided by Exhibit 2.
23
- 24 2) Exhibit 4: Copies of sworn testimony, letters, court filings which clearly show lawyers
25 (officers of the court) are lying to plaintiff and judges – subornation of perjury. These
26 documents when compared to each other prove the lies/perjury.
27
- 28 3) Exhibit 5: The lies and perjury being told by lawyers to judges resulted in sanctions
against plaintiff in an amount in excess of \$130000.

1 Based upon these documents alone, which plaintiff argued to public officials as
2 ‘unauthorized, unlawful and intended to take private property without due process’, which are all
3 matters concerning the public good, government officials retaliated against plaintiff by having
4 their colleagues in judicial office remove plaintiff’s lawyer and impose \$130,000 in sanctions
5 against plaintiff for his whistle-blowing attempts.
6

7 **IV. MOTION TO TRANSFER JURISDICTION FOR LACK OF A FAIR TRIBUNAL.**

8 Plaintiff, William Scheidler, realleges and incorporates in full, dkt 7, §I, the futility in
9 seeking redress from biased and conflicted decision-makers inherent in the scheme concocted by
10 judges where ‘judges-judge-judges’ with respect to the laws that apply to judicial conduct. “[T]he
11 law does not require performance of futile acts”. *Kaplan v. N.W. Mut. Life Ins. Co.*, 115 Wn. App.
12 791, 65 P.3d 16, 2003 Wash. App. LEXIS 270, 115 Wn. App. 791, 65 P.3d 16, 2003 Wash. App.
13

14 The futility in arguing before conflicted decision-makers is itself proof the ‘judicial branch’
15 has assured itself, unlawfully, the power to determine the scope of its own authority. “To permit
16 branches to measure their own authority would quickly subvert the principle that state
17 governments, while governments of general powers, must govern by the consent of the people as
18 expressed by the constitution”. *Wash. State Labor Council v. Reed* 149 Wn.2d 48 (Apr. 2003).
19

20 In this case judicial employees are using, improperly, court rules to ‘abridge, modify or
21 enlarge’ substantive rights – which is prohibited by law, 28 USC 2072(b). And federal judges are
22 presiding over cases in which they are disqualified by law – 28 USC 455. It is Congress who
23 represents the People, not judicial employees who are not elected. When ‘employees’ of the
24 government – the Defendants – use their office of trust to re-write laws, grant each other “absolute
25 immunity”, and establish themselves as an unelected cabal, Congress must act to restore the rule-
26 of-law. Otherwise, revolt, rebellion, and violence are the only alternates for the People.
27
28

1 This case must be transferred to the jurisdiction of the US House and Senate Judiciary
2 Committees for resolution to the judicial scam in judges-judging-judges and the self-awarding of
3 privileges and immunitie.

4 **V. CONCLUSION AND RELIEF**

5 In addition to the Relief requested in the original complaint, with respect to the added
6 defendants, Liu, Van Horn, Haynes and Boasberg, for their deliberate attack upon plaintiff's rights,
7 an award of \$250,000 against each, individually.
8

9
10 

11 _____
12 William Scheidler, plaintiff pro per.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28