

THE DRE¹ CASES AGAINST JOHN G. ROBERTS, JR.

With the DRE case (Exhibit 1), Americans can see what violations of separation of powers really mean in their everyday lives, how these violations harm them. They produce a government entirely out of control. Judges use them to coerce the American people being coerced under the protection of armed police in court courts. Can you imagine that your liberty and freedom taken from your family by rogue judges on American soil without any remedy or rights to protect yourself and family? This is the DRE scheme that is being operated by John G. Roberts, Jr. (Roberts). This is how Roberts breeds self-righteous, self-congratulatory judges and prosecutors who impose their radical mindset and worldview on Americans. It is happening to good Americans who are not racists, biased, bigoted, or out of order. Americans that have not violated any law, done no wrong, or caused harm to any other person's rights. This is why I am prosecuting the nation's first criminal indifference conduct case against Roberts in Congress, the White House, at the Judicial Conference, and in US courts.

Former Attorney General William Barr remarked on federal judges who use the law as a “battering ram to break down traditional moral values and to establish moral relativism as a new orthodoxy” and who “take a delight in compelling people to violate their conscience” [Note 1]. Federal judges claim to be on a “holy mission” to excuse their deliberate lawbreaking by purporting to be “virtuous people pursuing a deific end” [Note 2]. Attorney General Barr remarked on how federal judges he identified as “so-called progressives” treat politics as their religion; how they use their judicial position as political offices to coerce Americans to accept their political preferences as if they confer legitimate authority over private liberties, morality, and codes of conduct; and how they have justified official misconduct by believing they are “virtuous people pursuing a deific end” [Note 3]. He further observed that “By and large, the Founding generation's view of human nature was drawn from the classical Christian tradition. These practical statesmen understood that individuals, while having the potential for great good, also had the capacity for great evil. Men are subject to powerful passions and appetites, and, if unrestrained, are capable of ruthlessly riding roughshod over their neighbors and the community at large. No society can exist without some means for restraining individual rapacity. But, if you rely on the coercive power of government to impose restraints, this will inevitably lead to a government that is too controlling, and you will end up with no liberty, just tyranny” [Note 4]. He also noted that “For anyone who has a religious faith, by far the most important part of exercising that faith is the teaching of that religion to our children.

1. The DRE is an abbreviation that refers to a judicially fabricated jurisdictional rule called the domestic relations and domestic violence exception to federal subject matter jurisdiction. The federal judges assert without foundation or authority that the DRE is a legitimate judicial doctrine of deference to federalism in family law. Simply stated, the DRE is a lawless fabrication that is enforced through deliberate and malicious federal judicial corruption as if it were law. The DRE directly contradicts the body of US Supreme Court case law involving child custody. No such doctrine, rule, policy, or law can ever be considered much less passed by Congress and signed into law by the President. The DRE is a nationwide judicial fraud that violates the very canons of truth and reason, and it is diametrically opposed to any notion of democracy, the rule of law, or federalism. Whatever the federal judges call the DRE is irrelevant. It is an act of collusion between federal and state judges to allow crimes to be committed against Americans' unassailable rights. The DRE violates the Constitution's separation of powers and separation of church and state axiom. It is an overt act of tyranny. [See Exhibit 1]

The passing on of the faith. There is no greater gift we can give our children and no greater expression of love. For the government to interfere in that process is a monstrous invasion of religious liberty.” [Note 5]

Yet Barr knowingly failed to act in the DRE case and to bring Americans’ attention to Roberts’s executive positions and the flaws in the Judicial Conduct Act that are allowing Roberts to use executive power directly on the American people. [See Exhibit 2]

Exhibit 2

THE DRE FEDERAL JUDICIAL CONDUCT CASES, DRE CONSIDERATION, AND DRE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The DRE judicial conduct cases against **the Hon. John G. Roberts, Jr.**, chief justice of the United States and presiding justice of the Judicial Conference of the United States (the “Conference”). It is based on Roberts conduct at the Conference to obstruct in proceedings at the Conference under the Judicial Conduct Act of 1980 docket numbers 02-19-90052-jm and 02-19-90053-jm and at the Department of Justice (DOJ) ID numbers 4381283 and 4381289.

The purpose of Roberts’s misconduct is to protect himself and to conspire with the federal judges who are acting fraudulently at the US District Court for the Southern District of New York, the Judicial Council of Second Circuit, and the Conference to protect the DRE and the defendants in the DRE civil rights case. (“DRE Consideration”). These are deliberate and malicious violations 28 U.S. Code 359. The DRE Record inexorably shows Roberts’s violations of The DRE record shows the Roberts violating Title 28 USC Chapter 16 §§§ 354, 355 and 359 (a); §455(b) (iii); and §2072(b); Canon 3(C) (1) (d) (i) and (iii) of the Code of Conduct for United States Judges; and Judicial Conference’s Advisory Opinion No. 103 of its Committee on Codes of Conduct to protect himself.

Manuel P. Asensio and his daughter, Eva Asensio, are the complainants. The respondents beside **Roberts** are the **Hon. Anthony J. Scirica**, a Senior United States Circuit Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and Chair of the Conference Committee on Judicial Conduct; the **Hon. Robert A. Katzmann**, the chief judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and the Judicial Council for the Second Circuit, and member of the Conference’s Executive Committee and Chair of the Judiciary Committee; the Hon. Colleen McMahon, chief judge of the US District Court for the Southern District of New York (SDNY), and the **Hon. Ronnie Abrams** and **Katherine Polk Failla**, SDNY judges in the DRE constitutional rights cases entitled *Asensio et al. v. DiFiore et al.*, 18 CV-10933 (Ronnie Abrams), and *Asensio et al. v. Roberts et al.*, 19 CV-03384 (Katherine Polk Failla). The first case is referred to as the NY State DRE Case, and the second as the US DRE Case.

The parties in the US DRE Case are Manuel P. Asensio, individually and as the parent of Eva Asensio, a minor child, plaintiffs, against the **Hon. John G. Roberts, Jr.**, chief justice of the United States and presiding justice of the Judicial Conference of the United States; the **Hon. Robert A. Katzmann**, the chief judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit; and the **Hon. Ronnie Abrams**, a judge of the US District Court for the Southern District of New York, defendants.

The parties in the NY State DRE Case are Manuel P. Asensio, individually and as the parent of Eva Asensio, a minor child, plaintiffs, against **Janet DiFiore**, chief judge of New York State; **Barbara Underwood [now Letitia Ann “Tish” James]**, attorney general of New York State; **Andrew M. Cuomo**, governor of New York State; **Adetokunbo O. Fasanya**, New York County Family Court magistrate; and **Emilie Marie Bosak**, individually, defendants.

THE MATTER OF THE HON. JOHN G. ROBERTS, JR. AND HON. RONNIE ABRAMS

Judge Abrams is also the respondent on a collaterally related conduct case that accuses her of deliberate misconduct in the Devon Archer criminal case titled *United States of America v. John Galanis, Bevan Cooney, and Devon Archer* 366 f. supp. 3d 477(2018). It concerns evidence of that Judge Abrams fabricated fictitious information in her November 15, 2018 Opinion and Order granting Mr. Archer's motion for a new trial, and in pre-trial orders denying Mr. Archer's co-defendants their right to testify as to their personal knowledge related to certain politically influential persons who were fundamental actors in the case.

Exhibit 2

US ATTORNEY GENERAL WILLIAM P. BARR'S 2019 SPEECHES AT THE FEDERALIST SOCIETY AND NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY'S LAW SCHOOL CATEGORIZED A LITANY OF DELIBERATE LAWBREAKING BY FEDERAL JUDGES.

1. Notre Dame 2019. “A third phenomenon which makes it difficult for the pendulum to swing back is the way law is being used as a battering ram to break down traditional moral values and to establish moral relativism as a new orthodoxy. Law is being used as weapon in a couple of ways. First, either through legislation but more frequently through judicial interpretation, secularists have been continually seeking to eliminate laws that reflect traditional moral norms. At first, this involved rolling back laws that prohibited certain kinds of conduct. Thus, the watershed decision legalizing abortion. And since then, the legalization of euthanasia. The list goes on. More recently, we have seen the law used aggressively to force religious people and entities to subscribe to practices and policies that are antithetical to their faith. The problem is not that religion is being forced on others. The problem is that irreligion and secular values are being forced on people of faith. This reminds me of how some Roman emperors could not leave their loyal Christian subjects in peace but would mandate that they violate their conscience by offering religious sacrifice to the emperor as a god. Similarly, militant secularists today do not have a live and let live spirit - they are not content to leave religious people alone to practice their faith. Instead, they seem to take a delight in compelling people to violate their conscience.”

2. Federalist Society 2019. “In any age, the so-called progressives treat politics as their religion. Their holy mission is to use the coercive power of the State to remake man and society in their own image, according to an abstract ideal of perfection. Whatever means they use are therefore justified because, by definition, they are a virtuous people pursuing a deific end. They are willing to use any means necessary to gain momentary advantage in achieving their end, regardless of collateral consequences and the systemic implications. They never ask whether the actions they take could be justified as a general rule of conduct, equally applicable to all sides.”

3. Federalist Society 2019. “In any age, the so-called progressives treat politics as their religion. Their holy mission is to use the coercive power of the State to remake man and society in their own image, according to an abstract ideal of perfection. Whatever means they use are therefore justified because, by definition, they are a virtuous people pursuing a deific end. They are willing to use any means necessary to gain momentary advantage in achieving their end, regardless of collateral consequences and the systemic implications. They never ask whether the actions they take could be justified as a general rule of conduct, equally applicable to all sides.

Conservatives, on the other hand, do not seek an earthly paradise. We are interested in preserving over the long run the proper balance of freedom and order necessary for healthy development of natural civil society and individual human flourishing. This means that we naturally test the propriety and wisdom of action under a “rule of law” standard. The essence of this standard is to ask what the overall impact on society over the long run if the action we are taking, or principle we are applying, in a given circumstance was universalized – that is, would it be good for society over the long haul if this was done in all like circumstances?

For these reasons, conservatives tend to have more scruple over their political tactics and rarely feel that the ends justify the means. And this is as it should be, but there is no getting around the fact that this puts conservatives at a disadvantage when facing progressive holy war, especially when doing so under the weight of a hyper-partisan media.”

4. Notre Dame 2019. “Men are subject to powerful passions and appetites, and, if unrestrained, are capable of ruthlessly riding roughshod over their neighbors and the community at large. No society can exist without some means for restraining individual rapacity. But, if you rely on the coercive power of government to impose restraints, this will inevitably lead to a government that is too controlling, and you will end up with no liberty, just tyranny. On the other hand, unless you have some effective restraint, you end up with something equally dangerous – licentiousness – the unbridled pursuit of personal appetites at the expense of the common good. This is just another form of tyranny – where the individual is enslaved by his appetites, and the possibility of any healthy community life crumbles. “In

the words of Madison, “We have staked our future on the ability of each of us to govern ourselves...” This is really what was meant by “self-government.” It did not mean primarily the mechanics by which we select a representative legislative body. It referred to the capacity of each individual to restrain and govern themselves.”

The “force, fervor, and comprehensiveness of the assault on religion we are experiencing today. This is not decay; it is organized destruction. Secularists, and their allies among the “progressives,” have marshaled all the force of mass communications, popular culture, the entertainment industry, and academia in an unremitting assault on religion and traditional values. These instruments are used not only to affirmatively promote secular orthodoxy, but also drown out and silence opposing voices, and to attack viciously and hold up to ridicule any dissenters. One of the ironies, as some have observed, is that the secular project has itself become a religion, pursued with religious fervor. It is taking on all the trappings of a religion, including inquisitions and excommunication. Those who defy the creed risk a figurative burning at the stake – social, educational, and professional ostracism and exclusion waged through lawsuits and savage social media campaigns . . . today – in the face of all the increasing pathologies – instead of addressing the underlying cause, we have the State in the role of alleviator of bad consequences. We call on the State to mitigate the social costs of personal misconduct and irresponsibility. So[,] the reaction to growing illegitimacy is not sexual responsibility, but abortion. The reaction to drug addiction is safe injection sites. The solution to the breakdown of the family is for the State to set itself up as the ersatz husband for single mothers and the ersatz father to their children. The call comes for more and more social programs to deal with the wreckage. While we think we are solving problems, we are underwriting them. We start with an untrammelled freedom and we end up as dependents of a coercive state on which we depend. Interestingly, this idea of the State as the alleviator of bad consequences has given rise to a new moral system that goes hand-in-hand with the secularization of society. It can be called the system of “macro-morality.” It is in some ways an inversion of Christian morality. Christianity teaches a micro-morality. We transform the world by focusing on our own personal morality and transformation. The new secular religion teaches macro-morality. One’s morality is not gauged by their private conduct, but rather on their commitment to political causes and collective action to address social problems.”

“It is hard to resist the constant seductions of our contemporary society. This is where we need grace, prayer, and the help of our church. Beyond this, we must place greater emphasis on the moral education of our children. Education is not vocational training. It is leading our children to the recognition that there is truth and helping them develop the faculties to discern and love the truth and the discipline to live by it. We cannot have a moral renaissance unless we succeed in passing to the next generation our faith and values in full vigor. The times are hostile to this. Public agencies, including public schools, are becoming secularized and increasingly are actively promoting moral relativism. If ever there was a need for a resurgence of Catholic education – and more generally religiously-affiliated schools – it is today. I think we should do all we can to promote and support authentic Catholic education at all levels. Finally, as lawyers, we should be particularly active in the struggle that is being waged against religion on the legal plane. We must be vigilant to resist efforts by the forces of secularization to drive religious viewpoints from the public square and to impinge upon the free exercise of our faith. I can assure you that, as long as I am Attorney General, the Department of Justice will be at the forefront of this effort, ready to fight for the most cherished of our liberties: the freedom to live according to our faith.”

5. Federalist Society 2019. “In the 20th century, our form of free society faced a severe test. There had always been the question whether a democracy so solicitous of individual freedom could stand up against a regimented totalitarian state. That question was answered with a resounding “yes” as the United States stood up against and defeated, first fascism, and then communism. But in the 21st century, we face an entirely different kind of challenge. The challenge we face is precisely what the Founding Fathers foresaw would be our supreme test as a free society. They never thought the main danger to the republic came from external foes. The central question was whether, over the long haul, we could handle freedom. The question was whether the citizens in such a free society could maintain the moral discipline and virtue necessary for the survival of free institutions. By and large, the Founding generation’s view of human nature was drawn from the classical Christian tradition. These practical statesmen understood that individuals, while having the potential for great good, also had the capacity for great evil. Men are subject to powerful passions and appetites, and, if unrestrained, are capable of ruthlessly riding roughshod over their neighbors and the community at large. No society can exist without some means for restraining individual rapacity. But, if you rely on the coercive power of government to impose restraints, this will inevitably lead to a government that is too controlling, and you will end up with no liberty, just tyranny”