BOYCOTT NEW YORK STATE UNTIL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS ARE PROTECTED & ENFORCED

Let's start with what is the jurisdiction of the federal court?

FEDERAL COURT JURISDICTION

Where are the federal courts' priorities? Are they willing to protect Constitutional andC rights? As will be documented, the answer is, NO! Both my mother and I went into federal court seeking to protect our Constitutional rights, only find the federal judges are there to protect the corrupt state court judges. This has happened to many others that I have attempted to help with their illegal imprisonments as they were denied their Constitutional Right to a public trial, a jury trial, a court of proper jurisdiction and other illegal actions that the state court judges had taken against them.

The following are the statutes and case law that I relied upon in filing for help in the federal courts to protect my constitutional rights and to seek damages by those acting under color of state law. As will be documented, these statutes and case law mean nothing to the corrupt federal judiciary in New York State. The federal judges are there to protect the illegal actions of the state court judges instead of protecting the constitutional rights of the citizens of this state.

28 U.S.C.A. Section 1343. Civil rights and elective franchise:

The district court shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action authorized by law to be commenced by any person:

(3) To redress the deprivation, under color of State law, statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage, of any right, privilege or immunity secured by the Constitution of the United States or by any Act of Congress providing for the equal rights of citizens or of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States.

Title 42 U.S.C. Section 1983:

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.

Title 42 U.S.C. Section 1985 - Conspiracy to interfere with Civil Rights:

(2) If two or more persons in any State or Territory conspire to deter by force, intimidation, or threat, any party or witness in any court of the United States from attending such court, or from testifying to any matter pending therein, freely, fully, and truthfully, or to injure such party or witness in his person or property on account of having so attended or testified, or to influence the verdict, presentment, or indictment of any grand jury or petit juror in any such court, or to injure such juror in his person or property on account of any verdict, presentment, or indictment lawfully assented to by him, or of his being or having been such juror; or if two or more persons conspire for the purpose of impeding, hindering, obstructing, or defeating in any manor, the due course of justice in any State or Territory, with intent to deny to any citizen the equal protection of laws, or to injure him or his property for lawfully enforcing or attempting to enforce, the right of any person, or class of persons, to equal protection of the laws;

Dinwiddie v. Brown, 230 F.2d 465 (C.A.Tex. 1956)cert. denied 351 U.S. 971, 76 S.Ct. 1041 held where state officers conspire with private individuals to defeat or prejudice litigant's right in state court, litigant is

thereby denied equal protection of the laws by persons acting under color of state law and cause of action is created cognizable by federal courts under this section.

Schorle v. City of Greenhills, 524 F.Supp. 821, 826, 828 (1981) clearly states Appellant's argument:

[4] . . . It is asserted that any individual charged with a criminal offense has a right to be fairly appraised of his constitutional protections and has a right to have the matter heard in a court of proper jurisdiction. The only relief available to such an individual arises under the Civil Rights Act.

. . . The thrust of plaintiff's complaint is that he was repeatedly deprived of certain fundamental rights by the concerted actions of the officials and employees of the city of Greenhills and by a judge of a court that had no jurisdiction to hear the matter. The continuum of incidents inextricably entwined, which culminated in the plaintiff's conviction in the Greenhills' Mayor's Court, demonstrates not that he was falsely accused or that he was falsely arrested and imprisoned but rather that he suffered injury to rights guaranteed under the constitution, - his right to counsel, to be advised of his right to a jury trial, to have the matter heard in a court of proper jurisdiction, and not to be sentenced in excess of the permitted penalty. It is not for this court to break plaintiff's complaint down into isolated instances, which would, if taken separately, bear some token resemblance to various state common law torts. This is because it is the series of events, the totality of acts done under color of state law, which have allegedly deprived plaintiff of his rights under the constitution. And, it is this continuum of events, for which there is no adequate state relief, that comprises a cause of action under § 1983 that is broader than a common law tort. Indeed, Title 42 U.S.C. § 1983 is only one example of sweeping legislation enacted by Congress to provide relief to citizens for whom the state cannot or will not provide adequate relief.

The deterrence of future abuses of power by persons acting under color of state law is an important purpose of this section. City of Newport v. Fact Concerts, Inc., 101 S.Ct. 2748 and that this section was enacted particularly to vindicate federal rights against deprivation by state action. Kerr v. U.S. Dist. Court for Northern Dist. of California, 511 F.2d 192, 1975.

Gibralter v. City of New York, 612 F.Supp. 125 (D.C.N.Y. 1985):

. . . Government officials may be held liable under § 1983 either for overt acts that are illegal and harmful or for a failure to carry out their duties. Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97.

Pro se litigant is not held to same technical pleadings as an attorney

My complaints, my mother's complaints and complaints of others concerning the denial of their constitutional rights to a public trial, jury trial and a court of proper jurisdiction were summarily dismissed. Even when it was shown the judges lacked personal or subject matter jurisdiction or both. The complaints were also summarily dismissed in violation of the following case law.

Raitport v. Chemical Bank, 74 F.R.D. 128 (S.D.N.Y. 1977)

It is unquestionably the law in this Circuit that pro-se litigants' complaints are to be given solicitous and generous consideration. (Citation omitted), and the summary disposition should rarely be granted, no matter how clear the facts may be or how frivolous the complaint. (Citations omitted).

Hughes v. Rowe, 101 S.Ct. 173 (1980)

Petitioner's complaint, like most prisoner complaints filed in the Northern District of Illinois, was not prepared by counsel. It is settled law that the allegations of such a complaint, "however inartfully pleaded"

are held "to less stringent standards than a formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. . . ." (Citations omitted). Such a complaint should not be dismissed for failure to state a claim unless it appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief (Citation omitted). And, of course, the allegations of the complaint are generally taken as true for purposes of a motion to dismiss (Citation omitted).

Heyman v. Commerce and Industry Insurance Co., 524 F.2d 1317 (2d Cir. 1975)

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provide several tools to aid in ascertaining the facts before the curtain ascends on a trial, see E. Warren, 38 Conn.B.J. 3 (1964). One such "tool" is the Rule 56 summary judgment procedure which enables the court to determine whether the "curtain" should rise at all. (Citation omitted). Although for a period of time this Circuit was reluctant to approve summary judgment in any but the most extraordinary circumstances, (Citation omitted), that trend has long since been jettisoned in favor of an approach more keeping with the spirit of Rule 56, (Citations omitted). But, the "fundamental maxim" remains that on a motion for summary judgment the court cannot try issues of fact; it can only determine whether there are issues to be tried. (Citations omitted). Moreover, when the court considers a motion for summary judgment, it must resolve all ambiguities and draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the party against whom summary judgment is sought, (Citation omitted), with the burden on the moving party to demonstrate the absence of any material factual issue genuinely in dispute, (Citation omitted). This rule is clearly appropriate, given the nature of summary judgment. This procedural weapon is a drastic device since its prophylactic function, when exercised, cuts off a party's right to present his case to a jury (Citation omitted).

Caruth v. Pinkney, 683 F.2d 1044 (1982)

. . . As this Court made clear in Madyun v. Thompson, 657 F.2d 868 (7th Cir. 1981), the role of the district court should be to insure that the claims of a pro se litigant are given "fair and meaningful consideration."

As you will see, Judge Thomas J. McAvoy, Judge Lawrence Kahn, Judge Con G. Cholakis, Judge Neal McCurn and other federal judges named herein, do not follow the case law which define the procedures that the Second Circuit Court of Appeals has established in granting summary judgment in dismissing pro se complaints. They do not address the issues that are raised in the complaints. Instead, they cover up the illegal actions of state court judges.

Federal courts should not abstain under the Younger Doctrine

One of the arguments used by the federal court judges, in dismissing pro se complaints, is the Younger Doctrine. That for Federal Court to refuse to assume jurisdiction under the Younger depends upon a finding that (1) there is an ongoing state proceeding, (2) and important state interest is implicated, (3) the plaintiff has an avenue open for review of his or her constitutional claims in the state courts. The federal judges refuse to address these three issues.

The District Court held that the state has a vital interest in family law and domestic relations matters. It will also note that federal courts do not adjudicate family law matters, such as, visitation rights and the custody of minor children. The issues of custody and visitation are not one of the aspects of the cases. The issues before the federal court deal with support, the illegal taking of non-marital real property, and the depravation of constitutional rights as previously documented. All cases referred to by the District Court in their decisions refer to custody and visitation issues. In the cases being presented to the district court we have contempt of court where imprisonment plus other sanctions are a distinct possibility and defendants are being deprived of public trials. There is no important state interest implicated in fathers being

sentenced to jail in secret trials, unless you consider the state covering up the illegal actions of its judges in depriving litigants of their constitutional rights as an important state interest.

As previously documented in this book, the New York State Judiciary has been and continues to violate constitutional rights by denying litigants of due process and equal protection of the law. The district courts are refusing to look at the exceptions to the Younger Doctrine.

Moore v. Sims, 422 U.S. 415, 423, 99 S.Ct. 2371, 2377 (1979)

In Huffman, we noted these well established circumstances where the federal court need not stay its hand in the face of pending state proceedings.

"Younger, and its civil counterpart which we apply today, do of course allow intervention in those cases where the District Court properly finds that the state proceeding is motivated by a desire to harass or is conducted in bad faith, or where the challenged statute is '"flagrantly and patently violative of express constitutional prohibitions in every clause, sentence and paragraph, and in whatever manner and against whomever an effort might be made to apply it."' 420 U.S., at 611, 95 S.Ct., at 1212.

Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37, 91 S.Ct. 760 (1971)

Dombrowski represents an exception to the general rule that federal courts should not interfere with state criminal prosecutions. The exception does not arise merely because prosecutions are threatened to which the First Amendment will be the proffered defense. Dombrowski governs statutes which are a blunderbuss by themselves or when used en masse---those that have an "over broad" sweep. "If the rule were otherwise, the contours of regulation would have to be hammered out case by case---and tested only by those hardy enough to risk criminal prosecution to determine the proper scope of regulation." Id. at 487, 85 S.Ct., at 1121. . . .

The special circumstances when federal intervention in a state criminal proceeding is permissible are not restricted to bad faith on the part of state officials or the threat of multiple prosecutions. They also exist where for any reason the state statute being enforced is unconstitutional on its face. As Mr. Justice Butler, writing for the Court, said in Terrace v. Thompson, 263 U.S. 197, 214, 44 S.Ct. 15, 17, 68 L.Ed. 255;

"Equity jurisdiction will be exercised to enjoin the threatened enforcement of a state law which contravenes the federal Constitution wherever it is essential in order effectually to protect property rights and rights of persons against injuries otherwise irremediable; and in such a case a person, who as an officer of the state is clothed with the duty of enforcing its laws and who threatens and is about to commence proceedings, whether civil or criminal, to enforce such a law against parties affected, may be enjoined from such action by a Federal court of equity."

A State law enforcement officer is someone acting under "color of law" even though he may be misusing his authority. (Citation omitted). And prosecution under a patently unconstitutional statute is a "deprivation of * * * rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution," "Suit[s] in equity" obviously includes injunctions.

Zwickler v. Koota, 389 U.S. 241, 88 S.Ct. 301, 399 (1967)

[11] This conclusion was error. Dombrowski teaches that the questions of abstention and of injunctive relief are not the same. The question of the propriety of the action of the District court in abstaining was discussed as an independent issue governed by different considerations. We squarely held that "the abstention doctrine is inappropriate for cases such as the present one where * * * statutes are justifiably

attacked on their face as abridging free expression * * *." (Citation omitted). This view was reaffirmed in (Citation omitted), when a statute was attacked as unconstitutional on its face and we said, citing Dombrowski, and Baggett v. Bullitt, supra, '[t]his is not a case where abstention pending state court interpretation would be appropriate * *."

[12] It follows that the District Court's views on the question of injunctive relief are irrelevant to the question of abstention here. For a request for a declaratory judgment that a state statute is over broad on its face must be considered independently of any request for injunctive relief against the enforcement of that statute. We hold that a federal district court has the duty to decide the appropriateness and the merits of its conclusion as to the propriety of the issuance of the injunction.

In my complaints to the federal courts, I argued that the Family Court statutes violated my constitutional rights to a public trial, jury trial and court of proper jurisdiction. I also argued that the family court judges lacked personal and/or subject matter jurisdiction, and therefore did not have judicial immunity for their actions. As such, my complaints should have been heard.

Bartholomew v. Port, 309 F.Supp. 1340 (E.D.Wis. 1970)

The plaintiffs invoke the jurisdiction of this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1343(3), 1343(4), 2201, 2202, and 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The defendants contend that "there is no substantial federal question sufficient to invoke the jurisdiction of this court" and they argue that the court should decline to exercise jurisdiction over the case since the plaintiffs have an adequate remedy under state law.

Title 28 U.S.C. § 1343 provides in relevant part: (Cites § 1343, and subds. (3) and (4).

Title 42 U.S.C. § 1983 provides in relevant part:

These sections and 28 U.S.C. § 2201 and 2202 provide this court with jurisdiction to hear a claim that ordinances or state statutes are unconstitutional on their face or as applied. (Citation omitted).

I reject the defendants' contention that the court should decline to exercise its jurisdiction because the plaintiffs have an adequate state remedy. A district court should not, for reasons of comity, abstain or decline jurisdiction to grant declaratory relief under the circumstances set forth in the present case. (Citation omitted).

Furthermore, although the plaintiffs seek to enjoin prosecutions in state court which are currently pending against them, the circumstances of this case make it inappropriate, not withstanding 28 U.S.C. § 2283, to abstain from considering the merits of the plaintiff's case. In Dombrowski v. Pfister, 380 U.S. 479, 489-490, 85 S.Ct. 1116, 1122 (1965). The Supreme Court said:

"We hold the abstention doctrine is inappropriate for cases such as the present one where, unlike (Citation omitted), statutes are justifiably attacked on their face as abridging free expression or as applied for the purpose of discouraging protected activities." (emphasis added)

In Ex parte Young, (Citation omitted) the fountainhead of federal injunctions against state prosecutions, the Court characterized the power and its proper exercise in broad terms: it would be justified where state officers * * * threaten and are about to commence proceedings, either of a civil or criminal nature, to enforce against parties affected an unconstitutional act, violating the Federal Constitution * * * ." (Citation omitted).

But the allegations in this complaint depict a situation in which defense of the State's criminal prosecution will not assure adequate vindication of constitutional rights. They suggest that a substantial loss or impairment of freedoms of expression will occur if appellants must await the state court's disposition and ultimate review in this Court of any adverse determination. These allegations, if true, clearly show irreparable injury.

. . . . When the statutes also have an over broad sweep, as is here alleged, the hazard of loss or substantial impairment of those precious rights may be critical. For in such cases, the statues lend themselves too readily to denial of those rights. The assumption that defense of a criminal prosecution will generally assure ample vindication of constitutional rights is unfounded in such cases. (Citation omitted).

It follows that the District Court erred in holding that the complaint fails to allege sufficient irreparable injury to justify equitable relief.

The District court also erred in holding that it should abstain pending authoritative interpretation of the statutes in the state courts, which might hold that they did not apply to SCEF, or that they were unconstitutional as applied to SCEF. We hold the abstention doctrine is inappropriate for cases such as the present one where, unlike Douglas v. City of Jeannette, statutes are justifiably attacked on their face as abridging free expression, or as applied for the purpose of discouraging protected activities.

...

. . . In these circumstances, to abstain is to subject those affected to the uncertainties and vagaries of criminal prosecution, whereas the reasons for the vagueness doctrine in the area of expression demand no less than freedom from prosecution prior to a construction adequate to save the statute. In such cases abstention is at war with the purposes of the vagueness doctrine, which demands appropriate federal relief regardless of the prospects for expeditious determinations of state criminal prosecutions.

We conclude that on the allegations of the complaint, if true, abstention and the denial of injunctive relief may well result in the denial of any effective safeguards against the loss of protected freedoms of expression, and cannot be justified.

There is more case law that expressly states that injunctive relief should not be denied when there is a deprivation of a constitutionally guaranteed right and would also be an exception to the Younger Doctrine.

Right to Injunctive Relief

In my federal court filings, I also sought injunctive relief to prevent family court judge John Austin from violating my constitutional rights to a public trial, a jury trial, and a court of proper jurisdiction based upon the following. Of course, the federal court judges ignored the following case law and dismissed my complaints.

Where there is clear and imminent threat of irreparable injury amounting to manifest oppression, it is duty of court to protect against loss of asserted right by temporary restraining order. Woods v. Wright, 334 F.2d 369 (5th Cir. 1964).

Injunctive relief against higher public officials is available in situations where they have found to supervise and authorize unconstitutional activities. Farber v. Rochford, 407 F.Supp. 529 (N.D.Ill 1975).

Suits may be brought against public officials to enjoin them from invading constitutional rights. Buffier v. Frank, 389 F.Supp. 502 (D.C.N.Y. 1975)

Javits v. Stevens, 382 F.Supp. 131, 136 (S.D..N.Y. 1974):

[5] . . . Our Court of Appeals (2nd Circuit) has held that: "[N]o sound reason exists for holding that federal courts should not have the power to issue injunctive relief against commission of acts in violation of plaintiff's civil rights by state judges acting in their official capacity."

Mootness Doctrine was not applicable

After the family court proceeding before Judge Austin ended, I argued in my next federal complaint that the mootness doctrine was not applicable as to the above issues of public trials, jury trials and courts of proper jurisdiction as I would most likely be in court again and again facing contempt charges. I also argued issues I raised were certainly capable of repetition as fathers are being brought back to court time after time for violation of support orders.

National Iranian Oil Co. v. Mapco Intern., Inc., 983 F.2d 485, 490 (3rd Cir. 1992) held that a case is not moot if there is a likelihood that the parties will relitigate the same issues in the future. (Citation omitted).

National Iranian Oil Co. v. Mapco Intern., Inc., 983 F.2d 485, 489, 490 (3rd Cir. 1992) held:

[4, 5] A case is saved from mootness if a viable claim for damages exists. (Citations omitted). "Damages should be denied on the merits, not on grounds of mootness." 13A C. Wright, A. Miller & E. Cooper, Federal Practice and Procedure § 3533.3, at 262 (1984). Even where the amount of damages at issue is minute, a case is not moot so long as the parties have a concrete interest, however small in the outcome of the litigation. (Citation omitted).

Hunt V. Murphy, 455 U.S. 478, 102 S.Ct. 1181 (1982) held if that a controversy the between the parties is capable of repetition the matter was not moot under the standard stated in Weinstein v. Bradford, 423 U.S. 147, 96 S.Ct. 347 (1975).

Capital News Div. of Hearst Corp. v. Lee, 139 A.D.2d 31, 530 N.Y.S.2d 872:

At the outset, we address the issues presented on this appeal despite the fact that the trial of Gates has been concluded. The issues involved are issues of public importance and the controversy is capable of repetition, yet evading review (Citation omitted).

Cerniglia v. Ambach, 227 A.D.2d __, 536 N.Y.S.2d 228, 230 (3rd Dept. 1988)
[5] That brings us to the exceptions to the mootness doctrine. A matter will be entertained by the courts, despite its mootness, where significant combination of the following factors are present: it is 1) of public importance, (2) recurring, (3) likely to escape review, (4) novel in terms of judicial review (Citations omitted).

I argued that the issues raised in the appeals are of public importance. There are thousands of litigants in New York State who are being tried, convicted and sentenced to jail in secret family court proceedings for failing to pay child support. These fathers are being deprived of their constitutional rights to a public trial, a jury trial and/or court of proper jurisdiction. Furthermore, they are being deprived of their right to a judge to hear the matter as required by the state constitution.

I also argued the issues concerning the constitutionality of the state statutes were novel in terms of judicial review. There is no case law that addresses the issues of a litigant's constitutional right to a public trial for failure to pay support where imprisonment is a possibility, right to have a judge determine quilt or

innocence as to the charge of contempt, the right to a jury trial when charged with contempt where the potential sentence exceeds six months in jail or a $5,000.00 fine or both. This was especially true since the state was claiming this was a "civil" contempt proceeding and litigants are not entitled to their constitutional rights. As judge Kaye has stated, these are not “substantial constitutional questions”.

Conspiracy of attorney with judges

I argued that the attorneys had joined, cooperated with an/or conspired with the judges and hearing examiners as well as with each other to deprive me of my constitutional right and others rights that I was entitled to. As such, they did not have immunity for their actions and were liable for their actions.

A civil conspiracy has been defined as 'an agreement between two or more individuals to do an unlawful act or to do a lawful act in an unlawful way’. (Citations omitted).

Arment v. Commonwealth Nat. Bank, 505 F.Supp. 911 (E.D.Pa. 1981) holds that where it is alleged that the attorney "joined" or "cooperated with" or "conspired with" state officers who acted under color of state law, state action will exist. (Citation omitted).

Rankin v. Howard, 633 F.2d 844, 850 (9th Cir 1980):

[13] The Supreme Court resolved the issue in Dennis v. Sparks, --U.S. --, 101 S.Ct. 183 (1980). The court held that immune judge's private coconspirators do not enjoy derivative immunity.

[14] It follows that "[p]rivate parties who corruptly conspire with a judge in connection with such conduct are . . . acting under color of state law within the meaning of § 1983. Id. at S.Ct. at 187.

Hostrop v. Board of Jr. College, District 515, 523 F.2d 569 (7th Cir. 1975):

The doctrine of civil conspiracy extends liability for a tort, here the deprivation of constitutional rights, to persons other than the actual wrongdoer. W. Presser, The Law of Torts § 46 at 293 (4th Ed. 1971), but it is the acts causing damage to the plaintiff that give rise to liability for damages, not the conspiracy itself.

"The damage for recovery may be had in a civil action is not the conspiracy itself by the injury to the plaintiff produced by specific overt acts. [Citations omitted.] The charge of conspiracy in a civil action is merely the string whereby the plaintiff seeks to tie together those who, acting in concert may be responsible for any overt act or acts." (Citation omitted).

Rankin v. Howard, 633 F.2d 844 (1980)

But when a judge knows that he lacks jurisdiction, or acts on the face of clearly valid state statutes or case law expressly depriving him of jurisdiction, judicial immunity is lost.

****

FOOT NOTES

You need to know your rights and how to address these issues in court.
Justice4NY - Exposing Judicial Corruption & the Violation of Constitutional Rights

NYS Judiciary is a Racketeering Enterprise accourding to the law. Read Scoop 50 and watch my videos on corruption. All at www.justice4ny.com

All of the family court's illegally imprisoned fathers, mothers and children need to be immeidately released and those who put them illegally in jail need to be prosecuted in order to give the judiciary any credibility. (See, Scoops 01, 02, 05 and 06 www.justice4ny.com) **How many more thousands of men, women and children are going to be illegally imprisoned by the corrupt family court judges and support magistrates before something is done?** Tens of thousands of men, women and children have already been illegally inprisoned since I started raising the issues of these illegal family court proceedings.

How many litigants in criminal court are going to have their cases fixed by the prosecutors and judges? You keep hearing NO one is above the law. The democrats control NYS and Federal Judiciaries in NYS and have placed the judges, attorneys and prosecutors above the law by covering-up their illegal actions. Further, they use the FBI and state and city police that are controlled by the democrats to threaten and intimidate anyone who would try to expose judicial corruption! (Scoop 11 FBI - protecting the democrats and illegal imprisonments and Scoop 23 FBI, state & Albany county officials in attempted murder plot. https://justice4ny.com/scoops/.

Make no mistake about it, the NYS Court of Appeals judges, Appellate Court judges, family court judges, and support magistrates and other state court judges are TERRORISTS and are committing TREASON against both the NYS and Federal Constitutions. These family court judges and support magistrates are DESTROYING thousands of families each year in the illegal family court proceedings and are also abusing children as documented in my scoops and videos. They deprive fathers of their children by refusing to enforce the father's parenting time, they are illegally imprisoning fathers, mothers, our military personal and/or their family members and especially children in their closed court proceedings and by illegally depriving them of their Federal Constitutional right to a jury trial. Further, make no mistake about it, the judges get their jollies out of violating a litigant's rights, and go home every night laughing their asses off about how they are able to destroy litigants and their families because they believe they live on Mount Olympus and no one is going to do anything about their illegal actions.

The democrats pit one group against another and make out that if you disagree with them, you have the problem. Make no mistake about it, the democrats are using Hitler's play book as they are facists or socialists and Hitler wannbe's. The democrats are out to destroy our freedoms and want to finish destroying our Military that Obama started doing. They want to make the United States a third world country.

NYS U.S. liberal democrat Senators Chuck Schumer and KIrsten Gillibrand are more than willing to shut down the US government for children who came to this country illegally than protect the children of NYS. They will NOT negotiate with President Trump bcause they do NOT want this issue off the table. They want to use this issue of the children for the 2018 elections. Go to the following to see Schumers response to DACA before our President Trump was elected. Hint: You would think that Schumer was Trump. Schumer Then VS Now / DACA - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hO79uvBwz48

Senators, do you remember the last election in 2016 and what you made the big issue about?
You are right! Stripping tens of millions of women in the United States of their Constitutional Right to Privacy.

Remember you argued that transgender males should be able to use womens bathrooms or locker rooms even if women are showering in them.

Transsgender males have the same body part as other males. Questions that were NEVER asked of the Senators:

Senator Schumer why would you want your wife or daughters to share a women's bathroom, locker room or shower with a transgender male or any male? Don't your wife and daughter's have a right to privacy? Also,

Senator Schumer why would your wife and your daughters want to share a bathroom, locker room or shower with a transgender male or any unknown male? Obviously, they would have no problem with this as they didn't speak up about it.

Senator Gillibrand can you tell me why you would want to share a women's bathroom, locker room or shower with a transgender male or any male that is not your husband? Also, your husband has no problem with you sharing a bathroom, locker room or shower with a transgender male or any other male than him?

What about my 90 year old mother's, my girlfriend's or my daughter's or grand daughter's and the tens of millions of other women out their constitutional right to privacy? Why should they or any other women be placed in such a situation? Why do you two Senators want to take the constitutional right to privacy away from tens millions of women in NYS and in this country?

Senators Chuck Schumer and KIrsten Gillibrand please explain why are you willing to protect illegal immigrants by shuting down our government over them but you are NOT willing to protect the Constitutional and Statutory Rights of the citizens of NYS and the illegal imprisonments as documtented in my Scoops and Viodeos at www.justice4ny.com?

The democrats will fight to have illegal aliens stay in this country so that they can vote for the democrats even though they are NOT citizens of the United States, yet they will NOT fight to protect our constitutional rights.

Why don't you both (Schumer and Gillibrand) call for a BOYCOTT of New York State until NYS protects our State and Federal Constitutional and Statutory Rights and arrests and tries the corrupt State and Federal Judges and attorneys who have conspired to deprive the citizens of NYS of their State and Federal Constitutional Rights? That's right, they are mostly liberal democrats.

All states and professional teams need to BOYCOTT NEW YORK STATE!!

I am sure that as liberal democarts you both are thilled and that your fellow democrats are envious that NYS illegally imprisons our former and current military personal and/or their family members in illegally closed court proceedings and where they are illegally deprived of a relationship with their children and their constitutional rights to a public trial, jury trial and court of proper jurisdiction just to start with. **The military have put their lives on the line for this Country and this is how NYS repays them by stripping them and their families of their State and Federal Constitutional and Statutory Rights and of their children?**

Further, you both shut down our government to protect illegal mirgrant children. Yet, you both allow the children brought into family court and put into jail and/or detention to be deprived of their constitutional right to a jury trial and the children are in most cases probably given incompetent assistance of counsel. Why are childrren allowed to be abused and threatened by the judges, attorneys, law guardians and social workers? **Why are you Schumer and Gillibrand refusing to proect these abused children?**

Video - A Child's Constitutional Right to a Jury Trial in Family Court (4:30) https://youtu.be/6cHRXJatzD4
14-year-old girl's essay on brutal abuse and threats by judge, social workers and law guardian (8:53) https://youtu.be/3hflopc_qWA
Psychologist's response to 14-year old - slams court (6:53) https://youtu.be/ZwE8cnwvnsA
Court extortion reason - 14-year old girl (11:52) https://youtu.be/Qf6fRs5DeI8
Other Custody and abuse by judges (48:40) https://youtu.be/etQTsLxHNxM
Child Not learning - alternative school (4:12) https://youtu.be/5R1MaSdAyoc
Child on over 20 pills she didn't need (4:16) https://youtu.be/ShIMVtV7-6s

I have emailed both Senators Schumer's and Gillibrand's offices with my Scoops documenting the illegal actions of the NYS Judiciary. I just get a reply that they received it. These Senators and their followers could care less about our constitutional and statutory rights. They could care less about our national security or our borders where millions of dollars of drugs pass over on a daily basis. They could care less about the defense of our country as all they want to spend money on social issues where the money is spent on dulopicate agencies doing the same work and does not solve the problems of poverty as the democrats do not want to solve this problem. Yet, the two of you with Obama were almost able to destroy our military rediness except President Trump got elected and is defending our military. The military fought and continues to fight for our constitutional rights only to have you liberal democrats take their and/or family members rights away.

The democrats, such as Senator Chuck Schumer and Senator Kirsten Gillibrand, go after President Trump claiming he is un-American and compare him to Hitler while covering up the illegal actions of the NYS democrat-controlled judiciary. Make no mistake about it, it is the DEMOCRATS who are the socialists and want to emulate Hitler. In my opinion and others, Kaye, a fem-a-Nazis, wanted everyone to stand up and salute her and yell Sieg Heil Kaye, Seig Heil Kaye. (Sieg Heil meaning was 'Hail Victory" was used to call Nazis to attention to honor Adolf Hitler). Kaye wanted it to honor herself and the CORRUPT Court of Appeals judges for their **opposition** to the NYS and U.S. Constitutions and their victory in the oppression of constitutional and statutory rights of public trials and jury trials and other actions by the corrupt NYS Judiciary in having litigants illegally deprived of their children and/or illegally imprisoned in NYS.

Governor Cuomo is more interested in helping people living in Puerto Rico and the illegal immigrants in NYS than the citizens of NYS. Why is Cuomo allowing the Judiciary and his prosecutors to violate the rights of the citizens of NYS? Cuomo complains about President Trump, but NYS would not be in the position it is financially if it wasn't for the tax and spend liberal democrats and NY being a high tax state. Why is it that all of the high tax states are controlled by the democrats?

Where is NYS Attorney General Sneiderman? Again another liberal democrat fighting for the illegal immigrants while allowing the judges to violate State and Federal Constitutional and Statutory Rights of the citizens of NYS who elected him to office. He is their to protect the corrupt judges, prosecutors and social workers and cover-up their illegal actions.

Tell these corrupt judges and support magistrates that they are NOT above the law and you are going to exercise every constitutional right you have to have them pay for their crimes. EXERCISE YOUR RIGHT TO FREE SPEECH after reading the below cases law in full at the links provided for the full text.

REMEMBER NO VIOLENCE.

Call the judges who participate in these illegal family court and criminal proceedings. What about the attorneys who do nothing but sell out their clients to the corrupt NYS judiciary. Let them know what you think of them. Colorful language is NOT illegal! Remember, they have no problem destroying other people's families including yours. I have documented how the judges abuse children.

Call Judge Kaye's daughter, Luisa M. Kaye, who is an attorney with Wrobel Markham Schatz Kaye & Fox Law Firm, 360 Lexington Avenue, 15th Floor, New York, NY 100170 and Tel.: (212) 421-8100. Look her up on her law firm's website at: http://wmlawny.com/lawyers/luisa-kaye/ The law firm states she has amassed extensive experience in all aspects of commercial litigation, across a broad spectrum of subjects, in all types of forums: state and federal trial courts; appellate courts; and arbitral tribunals. While she is thoroughly comfortable litigating any commercial matter, and an even broader range of subjects on appeal (including criminal law). How many of her cases and/or her father's cases did her mother rule on or fix for them? Ask her under what authority, as a criminal lawyer, did her mother have to strip the citizens of this state of their Federal Constitutional Rights to a public trial, a jury trial, court of proper jurisdiction

before then are illegally imprisoned and other illegal actions by her mother as documented within my "Scoops"? Ask her how many more fathers, mothers and children are going to be illegally imprisoned in this state because of her two-bit lying arrogant liberal democrat fem-a-Nazi whore of a mother who refused to follow the law that she took an oath of office to support and knowingly destroying thousands of men, women and children and their families! (Kaye sounds like a Hitler wannabe to me!!) The article by her law firm goes on to state that she is a member of the New York Women's Bar Association, where she is a co-chair of the Litigation Committee. Luisa should be able to explain her mother's actions holding that the right to a public trial, a jury trial, a court of proper jurisdiction are NOT substantial rights when one is facing imprisonment and I am sure that she supports her mother's rulings. (See Scoop 32 Judge Kaye - Public & jury trials in NY are NOT substantial rights)

Comments on Kaye, my response (13:40) https://youtu.be/tOQQ2Qy1F8Q

Further, the social workers and the law guardians are there to make sure the children are with the mother, even though they know in many cases the mother is unfit. Go into family court, oh, I forgot it is illegally closed to the public. If you could go into family court, you would see in the vast majority of the cases the law guardian sits with the mother and her attorney, Also, in a lot of cases they refuse to even meet with the father and only want to hear the mother's side. I have never heard of a law guardian sitting with the father. I have also been told many times after a father gets custody, they tell the mother what to do so she can get her children back. I have never heard of a father being told this.

Over the years I have seen many fathers like myself trying to have a relationship with our children only to be denied by the mothers. The father's file violation petitions and their time with their children is reduced and NO action is taken against the mother that empowers her even more to interfere with the father's parenting time. The court wants to blame the fathers. I have one ex-military father who hasn't seen his son in a couple of years because the judge refuses to enforce his time with his son. In fact, the judge dismissed his petition well over a year ago and last December 2017, the father won his appeal and the matter was sent back to the family court judge for further hearings. It is now February, 2018 over a year later and he has been unable to get a court date and continues to be deprived of his son. He did drive here for a court date, only to be told after he got here it was cancelled.

NO VIOLENCE, but litigants and their familes need to stand up and exercise their Constitutional Right to Free Speech. In particular read the full ruling in People v. Dietze, 75 N.Y.2d 47 by the NYS Court of Appeals (https://www.leagle.com/decision/198912275ny2d471118) that states in part:

Defendant's words do not, however, fall within the scope of constitutionally proscribable expression, which is considerably narrower than that of the statute. Speech is often "abusive" — even vulgar, derisive, and provocative — and yet it is still protected under the State and Federal constitutional guarantees of free expression unless it is much more than that (see, Lewis v City of New Orleans, 415 U.S. 130, 133-134; cf., Steinhilber v Alphonse, 68 N.Y.2d 283). Casual conversation may well be "abusive" and intended to "annoy"; so, too, may be light-hearted banter or the earnest expression of personal opinion or emotion. **But unless speech presents a clear and present danger of some serious substantive evil, it may neither be forbidden nor penalized** (Terminiello v Chicago, 337 U.S. 1, 4-5; see, City of Houston v Hill, 482 U.S. 451, 461-462; People v Feiner, 300 N.Y. 391, 402).

People v. Hogan, 172 Misc.2d 279 at: https://www.leagle.com/decision/1997451172misc2d2791409

These two cases are part of a growing trend of charging "domestic violence" defendants with harassment for "verbal abuse". If there is an extant order of protection, a count of criminal contempt is thrown in. … They do not involve any threats of physical violence or harm. The defendants are not charged with ... threatening to subject another to physical contact. While People v. Dietze, 75 N.Y.2d 47 (1989) characterizes a statement

by the defendant that she would "beat the crap out of [complainant] some day or night in the street" as not a threat, but merely a protected "crude outburst", ..., virtually any threat of physical violence after the issuance of an order of protection must be taken seriously. But there are no such threats in either of these cases, either express or implied.

The accusatory instruments in the instant cases also fail to allege facts showing that the verbal disputes in these cases had no legitimate purpose. While at first blush it is difficult to ascribe any legitimate purpose to the use of a swear word, the phrase "no legitimate purpose" cannot be so broadly construed. The registering of displeasure with another person is legitimate, protected speech. Indeed, many people seem hardly able to speak an English sentence without the use of at least one four letter word. .... a defendant was prosecuted for calling her ex-husband about his remitting a support payment check in less than the full amount and for using various choice swear words to describe what she thought of the situation. In dismissing the accusatory instrument, the court said "The mere fact the defendant in anger or frustration uses colorful language in registering her displeasure with actions of the complainant does not render the communication criminal within the ambit of the Penal Law."

Yet, everyday fathers are punished for their language by orders of protection. The court keeps postponing the matter with the order of protection in place until the father agrees. The judges do not want a trial! This is a denial of due process and equal protection of the law.

They do not involve any threats of physical violence or harm. The defendants are not charged with ... threatening to subject another to physical contact. While People v. Dietze, 75 N.Y.2d 47 (1989) characterizes a statement by the defendant that she would "beat the crap out of [complainant] some day or night in the street" as not a threat, but merely a protected "crude outburst", ..., virtually any threat of physical violence after the issuance of an order of protection must be taken seriously.

It is the democrats who are leading the charge to deprive us of our constitutional rights to public trials, jury trials, courts of proper jurisdictdion, illegally fixing cases to have people illegally imprisoned for demanding that their Constitutional and Statutory Rights be enforced and fixing criminal cases for the District Attorneys especially in Albany County.

The democarts forced the US giovernment to shut down for illegal immigrants, why don't Schumer and Gillibrand fight for the Constitutional and Statutory Rghts of the citizens who elected them. Because democrats are the new Fourth Reich with the FBI as the new Gestapo. Just look at how the FBI protects the corrupt democrats like Hillary Clinton who sold out the US uranium to Russia. Obama, Hillary and the FBI and the intelligence communities illegally spying on our President Trump before, during and after the election based upon a FAKE dossier paid for by Hillary and the democrats and Hillary conveniently destroying over 30,000 emails to cover up her illegal actions.

Should the US Government take over control of the NYS Judiciary away from the liberal democrats by appointing someone OUTSIDE of the NYS Judiciary to clean it up? The violation of Constitutional Rights has to end. NO one should be tried, convicted and sentenced to jail in a closed court proceeding and deprived of their constitutional right to a jury trial as well as their other constitutional and statutory rights. (I know, Cuomo, Schumer, Gillibrand and Sneiderman will oppose this take over as they SUPPORT the violation of Constitution Rights to a public trial, a jury trial and a court of proper jurisdiction and we must NOT forget, the oppression of rights forf minors and their illegal imprisonments. Also, Cuomo, Schumer, Gillibrabd and Sneiderman will protect illegal aliens in NYS, but will NOT protect the citizens of NY and the stripping of their constitutional rights as they believe we have NO rights!)

New York State should be boycotted by all states and professional organizations!!

Justice4NY – Exposing Judicial Corruption & the Violation of Constitutional Rights
Please donate at my website www.justice4ny.com

Read my searchable book, that ducuments judicial corruption using the NYS and Federal Constritutions, statutes and case law for corrup state and Federal courts. Judicial Terrorism an Indictment of the New York State and Federal Judiciaries at: https://justice4ny.com/ just scroll down.

Charles E. Collins, III - available for lectures
(518) 274-0380
justice4ny@aol.com
www.justice4ny.com
Check out my other scoops! This is scoop #30
Read my book, Judicial Terrorism at:
Like me on face book. (Charles Collins – American Flag waiving)