

00-00-00-human-rights-los-angeles-county

09-06-24 Human Rights in Los Angeles County, California 1985-2009

Human Rights - Los Angeles County, California 1985-2009

From drug trafficking for profit by the CIA in the 1980's, through the Rampart Scandal and the permanently incarcerated Rampart-FIPs, to widespread engagement in sham litigations in both California and U.S. Courts.

[TOC](#)

Los Angeles County, California, with over 10 million residents, is the most populous county in the U.S., and accordingly, the LA Superior¹ Court (LA SUP CT) is the largest of its kind in the U.S., perhaps in the world. Review of the record relative to Human and Civil Rights enforcement in Los Angeles County in the past quarter century (1985-2009), demonstrates widespread, large scale violations of Human Rights and Civil Rights, most of which were intensively investigated and reported. In the 1980s, CIA was involved in drug trafficking into Los Angeles, for profit -as part of the Iran Contra scandal. See Wikipedia - "Iran Contra Affair"² and "CIA Drug Trafficking"³. The issue was extensively investigated, and a special report was issued in 1997 by the U.S. Department of Justice.⁴ The Rampart Scandal (1998-2000) was the defining human rights event of the period under review. See Wikipedia - "Rampart Scandal"⁵ It was considered by scholars in published reviews as the worst abuse of civil rights by police in the history of the U.S.^{6 78} The investigation, which focused on the undercover narcotic officers of the Rampart division of the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD), unveiled large scale false imprisonments based on false evidence - generated through framing, false confessions - extracted through torture, and routine false testimonies by police in criminal courts of the Los Angeles Superior Court. Some of the same police were also involved in significant crime cases in Los Angeles. The scandal was also extensively covered in news broadcasts of the respective years.⁹ The Rampart Scandal investigation, however, ended with no report being issued. The Blue Ribbon Review Panel, Chaired by Att Connie Rice, was therefore commissioned in 2003 by the LAPD, by then under a new chief, to produce such final report as the basis for future policies and corrective actions. The Panel issued its report in June 2006. It is the most detailed and authoritative record on the matter under review - providing detailed analysis of the initial investigation (1998-2000), of several subsequent review panels that preceded the Blue Ribbon Review Panel,

of LAPD efforts to correct underlying conditions that allowed the scandal to take place, of the reasons why the vast majority of the large number of Rampart-FIPs (Falsely Imprisoned Persons) identified in the initial investigation, were never freed, and of the efforts of the Panel itself. It concluded that the initial investigation of 1998-2000, as well as all subsequent review panels, including itself, were failures, and that Los Angeles County authorities were incapable of investigating themselves in a case of such nature and such scope. Accordingly, the panel recommended an "external investigation".^{10 11} Such recommendation was never implemented.

In the years 2007-9, conflicts involving the LA Superior Court have escalated through several court cases related to payments accepted by all LA Superior Court judges for over a decade from the Los Angeles County treasury, on top of their regular income, prescribed by the California Constitution to be paid by the State of California alone. Neither the judges of the LA SUP CT, nor the County had ever disclosed such payments. In October 2008, the California Court of Appeal, 4th District (San Diego) ruled that such payments were "not permitted" pursuant to the California Constitution.¹² Consequently, the judges first attempted to reverse the ruling by appealing to the California Supreme Court. The Supreme Court denied the case a review.¹³ Then, the judges succeeded in bypassing the California Court of Appeal through new legislation - a provision inserted through into the 2009 budget bill, without ever being referred for committee review, as mandated by the standard rules of the of California State Assembly.¹⁴ Such actions generated protests, and opinions were published that doubted the legal validity of the new law, which the ruling of the Court of Appeal had made clear was unconstitutional on its face.^{15 16 17} Such conduct by the Judges of the LA Superior Court could not be perceived any way other than deliberate public display of disregard for the law. The disregard for the law was further displayed in the harsh retaliation against Att Richard Fine, former U.S. prosecutor, one of the individuals who led the efforts to expose the payments by LA County to the judges of the LA SUP CT.¹⁸ In March 2009 Att Richard Fine was indefinitely jailed on charges of "contempt of the court". Conditions of his jailing include, but are not limited to -- long term solitary confinement, and denial of access to pen and paper.¹⁹ Such conditions in themselves are likely to be deemed in violation of human rights and civil rights upon review by respective courts of jurisdiction. Att Fine was denied the First Amendment right to write his own habeas corpus and to file petitions in court.²⁰ Beyond the case of Att Richard Fine, the pertinent question, raised at present,

relative to the judges of the LA Superior Court, is whether current circumstances, where the judges publicly display their disregard for the law, inherently voids any judicial authority that they may have.

All three branches of U.S. government - the U.S. Courts, U.S. Congress, and the U.S. President Obama will have to address these questions sooner or later.

However, the positions taken on such matter by U.S. Courts, and in particular – the U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th District, will have particular significance in this precarious point of the history of the U.S. Constitution.

Contents

[Top of Document](#)

- 1. Iran-Contra Affair and drug trafficking to Los Angeles, for profit, by the CIA (early 1980s-early 1990s)**
- 2. The Rampart Scandal Investigation (1998-2000) and Its Aftermath.**
- 3. The Los Angeles Superior Court Routinely Engages in Real Estate Frauds.**
- 4. Failure Of Government To Institute Fair Tribunals - Violation Of Articles 2,7,8,10,11, & 12 Of The Universal Declaration Of Human Rights**
- 5. Retaliation against Att Richard Fine, Former U.S. Prosecutor - Now Indefinitely Jailed in LA for Contempt**
- 6. Routine Violations of First Amendment, Common Law, and Due Process rights- Commonplace Since Introduction of CMSs**
- 7. Failure to Address the CMS in Rules of Courts Appears to be Universal.**
- 8. Acting in Concert, Both California and U.S. Lower and Appellate Courts Routinely Conduct Sham Litigations, or Sham Court Proceedings, and Then – at Times – Sham Appeals. Is it accessible to the Public to Inspect and to Copy?**
- 9. What is the Register of Actions, Where is It?**
- 10. The U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit Has Already Rendered Rulings that Sustained Conduct that Is Likely to be Deemed Part of Corruption of the Courts in LA**
- 11. The Significance of the U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit Ruling on the Paper - Now “Docketed”, Albeit – With No Evidence of Its Filing and Entry, as a Petition of Indeterminate Type, by Prisoner Attorney Richard Fine, Albeit Without His Signature**
- 12. References**

- 1. Iran-Contra Affair and drug trafficking to Los Angeles, for profit, by the CIA (early 1980s-early 1990s)** [TOC](#)

The Iran Contra affair consisted of several convoluted parts, all of which were deemed with the perspective of time policy failures and violations of the law.

See Wikipedia - "Iran Contra Affair"²¹ and "CIA Drug Trafficking".²² The affair involved sales of missiles to Iran, at time that U.S. Congress had an embargo imposed on such sales. It therefore generated funds that were unaccounted for, and were to be used for supplying weapons to the Contras, at a time that U.S. Congress imposed an embargo on such sales as well. In addition, disputable activity took place, related to the trafficking of cocaine and crack cocaine from Latin America to California, and distribution of such drugs for profit by individuals who were presumed to be CIA patronized. The profits were, at least in part, diverted to the purchase of weapons for the Contras as well. The fact that such drug sales took place is indisputable. The dispute is primarily regarding the scope of the shipments, and whether the importation of drugs by CIA had a significant effect on the crack cocaine epidemic of the respective years. Extensive investigations into the matter were conducted later on. A Special Report by the Inspector General of the U.S. Justice Department, specifically on the issue of drug trafficking by the CIA to Los Angeles was issued in December 1997.²³

It is commonly agreed among criminologists and drug policy experts, that corruption of the justice system is one of the highest cost associated with a failed drug policy. Here- federal agencies were involved in drug sales for profit, while officially the President was endorsing a "War on Drugs". Los Angeles County and California law enforcement agencies, as well as branches of federal agencies in Los Angeles County had to be aware of the matter, and pretend not to see. Such conditions, which continued for about a decade, must have undermined the law enforcement authority of federal agencies in Los Angeles County.

2. The Rampart Scandal Investigation (1998-2000) and Its Aftermath.

[TOC](#)

The Rampart Scandal was the defining event of he period under review.²⁴

a) *The initial investigation (1998-2000), and initial responses (2000) to the facts uncovered in the investigation*

The investigation exposed human rights violations in Los Angeles County, California, including the false imprisonment of thousands of people, almost all of them black and Latinos. The scandal was also characterized by racist undertones. Nevertheless, today, almost a decade later, the perpetrators have largely not been prosecuted, and the victims - the Rampart-FIPs (Falsely Imprisoned Persons) remain incarcerated. By conservative estimates some

10,000 Rampart FIPs are still locked up in Los Angeles California, today. The basic facts were established in the Rampart scandal investigations (1998-2000) - a 2-years, 200-investigator probe, which ended with no report ever being written. However, events of the investigation were extensively reported in the media.²⁵

Legal scholars wrote during the investigation:

“...judges tried and sentenced a staggering number of people for crimes they did not commit. How could so many participants in the criminal justice system have failed either to recognize or to instigate any meaningful scrutiny of such appalling and repeated perversions of justice?” “...we felt a particular obligation to ensure that no aspect of the Los Angeles criminal justice system, including the lawyers and judges, escaped scrutiny.”

Prof David W. Burcham, then Dean, and Prof Catherine L. Fisk, Loyola Law School, Los Angeles, Rampart symposium, 2000

“Any analysis of the Rampart scandal must begin with an appreciation of the heinous nature of what the officers did. This is conduct associated with the most repressive dictators and police states. “...and judges must share responsibility when innocent people are convicted.”

Erwin Chemerinsky, today Dean of Irvine Law School, University of California, 57 Guild Prac. 121 2000

b) *The First Rampart Trial, and reversal of jury verdict(December 2000)*

The First Rampart Trial opened with Judge Jacqueline Connor appearing as the “assigned” judge. Newspapers of the period expressed amazement. Judge Connor had been recognized for some time as a “Rampart judge”. She was particularly close with the police who later turned out to be some of the most corrupt. She wrote a couple of years earlier a recommendation letter for Rafael Perez, emphasizing his effective testimonies in her court room – The same testimonies that later were recanted as part of the framing.²⁶ She also had made an unusual public appearance just a couple of months earlier, where she made comments from the public stage that could be taken as a warning to Rafael Perez not to cooperate with the investigation.²⁷ It appears entirely unlikely that during the lengthy investigation he was subjected to, Rafael Perez never divulged anything about the role of Judge Connor in the Rampart Scandal and the false convictions of the Rampart-FIPs. In fact, one can almost certainly conclude that he did reveal some information to such effect, since he was punished harshly. Yet his punishment was not executed by State Judges and state prosecutors, but by U.S. prosecutors and U.S. judges.²⁸ It was clear to many that she had

possibly as much to lose in this litigation as the police who were named defendants, ended in jury conviction of 3 of the 4 police prosecuted (November 2000). A month later, almost at Christmas, the trial judge, Jacqueline Connor, overturned jury trial in a special ruling from home (December 22, 2000).^{29 30} As newspapers noted since the beginning of the trial, the fact that Judge Connor was allowed to preside in such trial, and the fact that she did not recuse, and the prosecutor did not disqualify her, were all absurd from the start. That signaled the end of prosecutions of police in that matter, and also the end of any release of the victims.

c) *The U.S. v City of LA, the Consent Decree, and appointment of the U.S. Overseer for Civil Rights in LA.(June 2001) .*

Following the episode of the First Rampart Trial, the U.S. Government filed a complaint at the U.S. District Court in LA, (U.S. v City of LA et al 2:2000cv11769) (Ref). the complaint was framed under 42 USC § 14141 which prohibits government officials or authorities from engaging ...

"... in a pattern or practice of conduct by law enforcement officers or by officials or employees of any governmental agency with responsibility for the administration of juvenile justice or the incarceration of juveniles that deprives persons of rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States."

The city, mayor, city council, police chief, police commission, were all among those named defendants, and expectations were that it could cost the city billions, and that there could also be criminal liability to some who were accountable. Therefore, the city opted to yield, and the complaint resulted in the U.S. Government and the City of LA entering the Consent Decree (June 2001), which led to the appointment of an Overseer for civil rights, for a term of 5 years, during which the city and the LAPD had to demonstrate meeting specific goals relative to civil rights protection.

Within a couple of years after the Consent decree was signed, the City of LA and the LAPD were reported as non-cooperative in periodic reports of the Overseer. As a result, the Consent Decree Bureau, and the Overseer, never ended their term as anticipated, in 2006, and today, it appears that the office has become a permanent part of life in LA. Major obstacles that were noted as preventing progress: First - the city and LAPD were required to allow the Overseer access to certain computer systems and databases of complaints, violations, incidents, and it appears to have never happened. Second - pursuant

to the Consent Decree, narcotics officers of the LAPD were required to provide periodic financial disclosures. However, when the Overseer tried to enforce that provision, the narcotics officers refused to comply en masse, and surprisingly - police chief Bratton supported their position that such provision was invasion of privacy. The reason why such provision was included in the Consent Decree is not explicitly stated, however, the City and Police consented. Although no report states it directly, review of the few cases of victims that were released makes it clear that the issues underlying the Rampart scandal were related to drug sales for profit by police, and elimination of any persons who stood in their way. In fact, the scandal, as a whole, started in 1998, when a police officer from the undercover narcotics unit, Rafael Perez, was caught stealing 6 lbs of cocaine from police safe. His investigation, and later plea bargain, opened the way to exposure of police practices that were prevalent for some time. The description from the investigation included numerous cases of framing - planting drugs and weapons on persons, then having them convicted and sentenced to long prison terms, as well as torture to extract confessions. Other instances were reported, of killing, maiming, and robberies by police. In the absence of a final report it is difficult to ascertain the true scope of the abuses. However, the absolute refusal of the narcotics officers to comply with the requirement for financial disclosure raises concerns that even today they engage in drug sales for profit in LA County, as apparently was the situation prior to the scandal.

Of note - the Consent Decree was framed under the code section related to abuse of civil rights of juveniles under the color of law. A parallel section in the code is inclusive of adults, but it was not used. By using the 42 USC §14141, the Consent Decree at once recognized that the scandal involved various types of abuse of juveniles, but also could be seen as limiting the authority of the Overseer. Regardless, there is no evidence to show that even a single juvenile was ever released from jail in LA by the Overseer.

Of interest, the term of the Overseer for Civil Rights in LA almost overlaps the term of another Overseer appointed during President George W Bush administration - for the Guantanamo Bay detention center. With that - the close relationship between abuse of civil rights by U.S. Government off shore and at home is clearly established. In both cases, in review, it may be concluded that the appointment of Overseers was meant a priori as a fig leaf, nothing more. Perhaps the best proof of that was the record of a yet third Overseer - appointed to ascertain that California prisoners receive at least minimal medical care. After the first Overseer appeared to be determined to achieve improvement, and took steps to seize funds from the California government for such purpose, he was

replaced with a more restrained Overseer.

The size of the California prisoner population, the cost of imprisonment, and the existence of a privatized prison industry, combined - create incentives for imprisonment, lawful or false, and minimization of prison expenses to increase profit margins. No report was found of any kick-backs in California relative to the Rampart-scandal. However, a notorious case was exposed in Pennsylvania in early 2009, where two state judges received kick-backs for falsely sentencing juveniles for confinement. In juvenile hall, the cost of imprisonment is much higher than in adult institutions. By law, prison authorities must take responsibility for education of the juveniles, including Special Education, Individualized Educational Programs (IEPs) and other services that are required in public school as part of Americans with Disability Act and other laws governing Special Education.

The victims of the Rampart scandal, both juveniles and adults, are expected to be almost entirely black and Latinos, based on the composition of the victims who were released during the investigation (less than 200 by estimates). Under President Bush's administration, the U.S. Department of Justice in its highest ranks, was molded to support his policies relative to expanding the legal limits on torture, and acknowledging the legal validity of the detentions at Guantanamo Bay. Under such litmus tests for senior political appointees, it was impossible to get any response to requests for action by the U.S. government in regards to Civil Rights disgraces in LA. However, after the election of President Obama, and the appointment of Attorney General Eric Holder, both of whom identify themselves as black, one would expect that action would be forthcoming towards righting of this human rights disgrace, which is of historic proportions.

There are no good estimates of the number of the Rampart FIPs, in part - since there was no report written of the investigation. The estimate of 10,000 is likely to be a conservative one, relative to direct victims of the 70-80 police officers of the Rampart Division who were investigated and documented during the probe of 1998-2000. A PBS report from 2001 provides estimates from 8,000 (by prosecutors) to 15,000 (defense attorneys) and up to 30,000 by some other groups. In comparison, the total number of detainees in Guantanamo was at the most about 750, including those who stayed there for a very short period. In contrast, all of the Rampart-FIPs were sentenced to long prison terms. The only other comparable even in U.S. history is the internment of Japanese American during WW II. But that case, too, does not compare in its scope, severity, and length, to the case of the Rampart-FIPs. In fact, one can safely state that the

Human Rights record of the U.S. government, and also of the American public is questionable at best, when such conditions have been allowed to prevail for that long.

Officially, the blame for such human rights abuses were attributed to police, and police alone. However, as reflected in the opinions quoted above, such claims were not believable. In fact, it was widely believed that prosecutors and certain judges were intimately involved in the scandal, and that the prosecutions were stopped exactly for that reason, and that was also why a report was never issued.

d) The Blue Ribbon Review Panel (2003-2006) and its report (June 2006).

The definitive, most recent official report relative to the Rampart scandal and the FIPs, is the Blue Ribbon Review Panel report, issued in 2006. The panel, chaired by Los Angeles black attorney/civil rights activist Connie Rice, was commissioned by the LAPD in 2003, after the then new police chief, Bratton, realized that there was no report concluding the Rampart investigation, and therefore no guideline for any corrective actions. The report of the Blue Ribbon Review Panel is unique in its approach. On the one hand - it refused to issue the "final report", as charged.

It stated:

"LOS ANGELES INSTITUTIONS FAILED TO RESPOND ADEQUATELY TO THE CRASH CRISIS

The facts that best support this conclusion are that a federal court had to take over Los Angeles police reform and that no public entity conducted an independent investigation with the capacity, authority and resources to properly investigate the extent of the alleged corruption or its causes. In addition, after numerous scandal related criminal trials and pleas, multiple LAPD investigations and over 80 internal Boards of Rights, four major reports and a failed civil grand jury inquiry, the following basic facts about the Rampart CRASH corruption remain unknown or disputed:

- **Whether the scandal was about two officers guilty of isolated criminal misconduct or about policing systems that tolerated routine abuse and criminality by a significant subcult in its ranks.**
- **How many officers committed crimes or serious misconduct.? The scope of misconduct at issue (ranging from unjustified shootings, framings and beatings to falsifying arrest reports and fabricating probable cause).**
- **How many officers committed crimes or serious misconduct.**
- **The scope of misconduct at issue (ranging from unjustified shootings, framings and beatings to falsifying arrest reports and fabricating probable cause).**
- **The extent of Rampart CRASH-like misconduct in the CRASH units of other divisions, other specialized units and LAPD policing**

generally. • **The extent of corrupt acts, if any, by Rampart CRASH alumni who graduated into Metro, Internal Affairs and other coveted and specialized units.**

- **Why CRASH supervisors and others in LAPD silenced whistleblowers who tried to warn about CRASH insubordination and misconduct.**
- **How many of Perez' specific allegations were fully investigated and verified.**
- **Why the DA's declination memos explaining the reasons for not charging Rampart related cases submitted by LAPD did not address a number of cases of alleged misconduct, including several allegedly unjustified shootings.**
- **How many officers were administratively investigated or sent to Boards of Rights as a result of Perez' allegations.**
- **Why an after-action report on LAPD's response to the CRASH crisis could not get written.**
- **Why the Boards of Rights were allowed to fail on such a large scale.**
- **Whether the USCIS (formerly known as the INS) investigated Perez' allegations that its agents helped deport gang members or others who filed complaints against LAPD officers.**

Blue Ribbon Review Panel Report,p47 (2006).

The report went in length into interviews with police, prosecutors, and judges, trying to document how those in charge of the justice system in LA rationalize the continued false imprisonment of thousands of innocent people. Such accounts, mostly claimed that release of the FIPs was impossible, since it would lead to collapse of the justice system... summarized as follows:

"While the criminal justice system could sustain overturning scores of criminal prosecutions tainted by Rampart CRASH corruption, thousands could have meant the collapse of the entire LA County criminal justice apparatus." "Facing a choice between containment or catastrophic failure, the operators of any system-law enforcement, prosecutors and judges-inexorably choose containment. It is not that individuals or entities conspired to cover up corruption; it is that when a window on its true extent opened, they simply closed it."

Blue Ribbon Review Panel Report,p48 (2006).

The report also describes the conditions at the criminal division of the LA Superior Court, as such where criminal defense attorneys may be subject to undue pressure to the detriment of their clients. The report brings some testimonials that such conditions continue today.

e) *The Blue Ribbon report (2006)- scope of the abuses was under estimated in 2000, since the initial investigation (1998-2000)was deliberately limited in scope.*

The Blue Ribbon Review Panel also makes it clear that the official name of the scandal "The Rampart area corruption incident" was entirely false - the conduct documented in the Rampart division was not limited to the Rampart division at all. However, police hierarchy prevented any investigation beyond the boundaries of the Rampart division, even though clear lead pointed to other stations as well, in an attempt to contain the damage. The conduct documented in the investigation was not an "incident", but rather the outcome of prevalent norms for some years prior to the investigation. Therefore, while the number of 10,000 may be consider a conservative estimate for the number of the Rampart-FIPs, such number only refers to those who were documented directly or indirectly relative to the conduct of specific police officers from the Rampart division. It is almost certain that the same or similar conduct to some extent took place in some other stations.

f) *The Blue Ribbon report (2006)- recommendation of "External Investigation"*

As a result of such conclusions, the Blue Ribbon Review Panel refused to provide an estimate of its own, and also refused to provide a "final report". instead, it issued a recommendation - that LA Government is unable to investigate itself, and there is an urgent need for an "external investigation". The LAPD made substantial efforts to address the issues that came to light in the Rampart investigation. The Blue Ribbon Review Panel documents such efforts and the achievement that could be documented. However, the report deems such improvements as not likely to be sustainable without a major change in police culture.

g) *Response of the LAPD Chief to the Blue Ribbon Review Panel report (2006)*

The report was delivered in July 2006, and the response of police chief Bratton was stated as follows:

"Los Angeles Police Chief William J. Bratton appeared at the Police Commission's special public meeting this afternoon on the blue ribbon report, "Rampart Reconsidered: The Search for Real Reform Seven Years Later." Chief Bratton thanked the report's primary author, Ms. Connie Rice for her work. "I'd like to thank Connie Rice and her committee for carrying out the mandate to produce, once and for all, a comprehensive and objective Rampart after-action report." Chief

Bratton also acknowledged the leadership of the current and former Police Commission presidents and Los Angeles mayors.

"My initial reaction is a favorable one, but, as you might expect, I reserve the right to take exception to some of the findings and recommendations," Bratton added.

The LAPD will review the report and work to implement its recommendations within the Department's own "State of the Department" action plan, which was begun in October 2004. The blue ribbon report's most significant finding is the need for more officers, a clarion call Chief Bratton has made since he took office in October 2002. Mayor Villaraigosa and the City Council heard the call and authorized an expansion of 1,000 officers. Their commitment is an important step to bringing about operational and cultural changes called for in the report. "Professor George Kelling's research has shown the best way to reduce the effects of 'stranger policing' is to get the cops out of the police cars and interacting with the people they serve," Bratton said. "Out of necessity, LA has policed from police cars for 50 years, in order to handle a large area and population with half the cops of any other major city."

Bratton added, "One has only to look at the changes in Mac Arthur Park, Hollywood, and Baldwin Village to see the effects of close interaction with the community." "This is not a sprint, but a marathon," the Chief said. "We've made monumental changes in LAPD, but we are still not where we want to be. Our action plan is the road map to get there --- to make Los Angeles the safest big city in America. And we are committed to doing it constitutionally, compassionately, and consistently."

Additional official response of the Police Chief is posted online³¹, as is the official response of the District Attorney Office.³²

h) In the aftermath of the Blue Ribbon Review Panel report - the Mac Arthur Park Melee (May 2007)

Indeed, the speculation by the report authors about difficulties related to police culture, and police chief Bratton focus on Mac Arthur Park as an indicator for progress, converged less than a year later, when police officers from the Metro division engaged in violent attack on a May day parade/picnic in that park. The event was caught on videos, and some television crews were among those harmed. Some of the recordings were permanently posted on YouTube. The incident came to be officially known as the "Mac Arthur Park Melee".

An official investigation was instituted, a report was authored and issued, lawsuits were filed, and the city paid again substantial sums in damages.

i) General Outcomes of the Rampart Scandal.

The long term outcomes of the scandal can be summarized as follows:

1. The City of LA ended up paying substantial sums to the few victims that were released, but nowhere near the sums that could have been paid had the victims been all released.
2. In the course of such litigations, a U.S. Judge in LA permitted claims for damages against the LAPD to be filed pursuant to civil RICO Claims (Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act 18 USC § 1964) - an unprecedented claim.
3. One must count with the losses also the enormous recurring sums that are wasted from the public coffer on false imprisonments of thousands of people for long terms.
4. The underlying corruption in the justice system in LA was not directly addressed, it was instead covered up..
5. One of the most disturbing parts of the case is the evidence that federal agencies were tied to both the scandal and the cover up. The "federal option" was never applied to the police officers who were convicted by jury, then had their sentence voided by a judge. In contrast, Rafael Perez, the police officer who signed a plea bargain, but was openly warned not to speak out, ended up being subjected to a federal prosecution, which both he and his attorney claimed they were led to believe was covered by the plea agreement.

3. The Los Angeles Superior Court Routinely Engages in Real Estate Frauds.

[TOC](#)

- a) Galdjie v Darwish
- b) Samaan v Zernik,
- c) Pasternak's Grant Deeds,
- d) Pasternak's Notary Public
- e) Conditions at the Office of Registrar Recorder.

4. Failure of Government to Institute Fair Tribunals - Violation Of Articles 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, & 12 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

[TOC](#)

Six of the first dozen articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights require that government establish a fair justice system. Conditions prevailing

today in some parts of the U.S. fail to meet such requirements. In Los Angeles County, conditions are approaching extremes.

a) Organized corruption of the judiciary - racketeering - found only in Chicago and California

Review of the enforcement records of the justice Department, Section on Public Integrity (ref) as well as other resources regarding litigations against judges reveals that in only two regions of the U.S. judges have been indicted, prosecuted, and convicted of racketeering pursuant to criminal RICO (Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act 18 USC § 1961–8). Cook County (Chicago) Illinois, and California. In San Jose, California, the Presiding Judge of the U.S. District Court, Robert Aguilar, was convicted of Racketeering (ref), and in San Diego, California, a number of state judges, attorneys, and others were convicted (ref). Similarly, direct evidence for organized widespread corruption of the California judges in LA County is overwhelming (see below), but conspicuously, there is no evidence of any enforcement action in LA County in the past 25 years! Conditions of the justice system that deteriorate to the point that judges engage in racketeering are generally unheard of in western democracies. Therefore, it is likely that such findings reflect a more fundamental deficiency in the justice system in the U.S., perhaps imbalance of authority among the branches of government that allows judges to extend themselves well outside the realm of the law before they get concerned about enforcement. Given the deference to the judiciary in the U.S., which seems misplaced, there is not enough research on the subject, but it is likely that such findings as listed above, which are unique to the U.S. among western democracies, are also correlated with other findings unique to the U.S.- the populist movement of Jail4judges, and the high, or extreme, dependent on perspective, percentage of the adult population that is incarcerated, at enormous cost to society.

b) The opposition of the Los Angeles judges to release of the Rampart-FIPs is inexplicable in any terms that are consistent with the law, integrity, or the furtherance of justice.

Los Angeles County is also unique in that the California State District Attorney office, Los Angeles, keeps an office for Integrity of the Justice System. However, as noted above, there is no record of enforcement action against a judge in LA County by either state or federal agencies. In general, the balance of

power is such that indictment and prosecution of a State Judge by state law enforcement is unlikely. Such enforcement is almost always by FBI or the Public Integrity Unit of the Justice Department.

The anomaly of the position of the California State judges in Los Angeles County is also evidenced in the Blue Ribbon Review Panel (2006) cited above, relative to the Rampart scandal. Such report quotes judges justifying the continued incarceration of the Rampart-FIPs by concern regarding stability of the justice system. And the U.S. Judge Overseer is unable to enforce the terms of the Consent Decree. The overseer was appointed in 2001, but the record fails to show him releasing even a single Rampart-FIP. One must recall that the Code of Conduct of U.S. judges (ref), and likewise, the California Code of judicial Ethics (Ref), prescribe that a judge who is reliably informed of an unethical situation, such as the false imprisonments in LA, must initiate corrective actions. None of the state or federal judges in California has done any of that. In contrast, within a month after two Pennsylvania judges were indicted and arrested for falsely convicting juveniles and sentencing them for prison terms, the Pennsylvania Judiciary, on its own, established a panel to expediently review the judicial acts of these two judges, and void any judgments or convictions that were deemed false or inadequate (Ref). The official blame for the Rampart scandal false convictions and false sentencing was attributed to police alone. However, a reasonable person reviewing the data would surely conclude that prosecutors and judges were involved as well. That sentiment is heard already in the writing from 2000 of the legal scholars quoted above. Regardless, even if one accepted that notion, there is no way to explain the conduct of the LA judges since the Rampart scandal and to this date, and their failure to take action to release the FIPs. Moreover, as described in the Blue Ribbon Review Panel Report (2006), they are most likely some of the staunchest opponents of any attempt to release the Rampart-FIPs.

c) Secret corporations and secret funds held by the los Angeles Superior Court judges (1998-9)

In parallel to the Rampart scandal investigation, a series of three reports were published by the Washington DC "Insight Magazine", describing a series of secretive corporation which held various funds from different sources, and were controlled by the judges of LA County, outside of any funds accountable through a recognizable budgetary process(1). Although the existence of such funds that were unaccounted for should be considered in and of itself evidence

of widespread corruption, there is no record of any action by IRS or FBI in this matter.

d) All Los Angeles Superior Court judges (~500) took payments that were "not permitted", ~\$45,000 per judge per year, and failed to disclose such fact, while routinely judging in favor of the payer - Los Angeles County (1990's-2009)

In the years 2007-2009 other evidence for widespread, organized corruption of the California State judges in LA County emerged through the efforts of a few individual, one of them - a former U.S. prosecutor, anti-trust attorney Richard Fine. It turned out that while the California Constitution allows judges to be paid only by the State Treasury, and while the judges completed on an annual basis disclosure forms declaring any outside income, the judges had been paid about \$45,000 per judge per year by the Los Angeles county, failed to list such outside income in their annual disclosures, failed to disclose such payments to parties before them in cases involving LA County was a party, and according to reports, also routinely judged in favor of LA County. In October 2008, after a series of legal actions, the California Court of Appeal, 4th District, San Diego, published its decision that such payments were "not permitted" (Ref). In lay person's language such payments would be called "bribes". Media quoted comments in public appearance by the California Supreme Court Chief Justice Ronald George, immediately after that ruling, that such conditions in LA County amounted to denial of "access to the courts" and "fair trial" - basic civil and human rights. The ruling by the San Diego court could have major implications - in fact, it could be construed as key ruling that would enable criminal prosecution against such judges, And given the organized nature of the offence, and the pattern and enterprise, it could probably qualify as racketeering. Moreover, it could have meant that the judges had to refund to LA County such funds that were paid but were "not permitted". Moreover, they should have stopped accepting such funds. Finally - any judge, U.S. or California, who was reliably informed of the scandal, was prescribed by the Code of Judicial Ethics (3), to initiate corrective actions, such as voiding the judgments issued by such judges in cases where LA County was party to litigation. However, following the pattern of conduct established relative to the Rampart-FIPs, it soon became clear that none of the above was going to happen.

e) The judges hired a lobbyist to insert a provision that is unconstitutional on its face into the budget bill (2009)

The LA judges tried to overturn the decision of the San Diego Court by appealing to the California Supreme Court. When the California Supreme Court refused to review the case, the judges of LA are reported by media to have retained a lobbyist, at \$60,000, who within the span of a few days they managed to affect the insertion of a little noticed provision into the large budget bill just prior to its final vote and delivery to the Governor for signature. The California State Legislature never debated such provision, and it is questionable whether the members of the legislature even knew about it (4). Such bill theoretically pardoned the judges for any criminality associated with their past conduct, and immunized them for any criminality associated with continued payments that are "not permitted". Needless to say, such law is unconstitutional on its face. Moreover, conditions where judges, as an organized group, hire a lobbyist to alter State Law through unscrupulous methods, with the goal of establishing a law that is unconstitutional on its face; moreover - they do so after the unconstitutionality of such law, as practiced by them for over a decade had already been ruled upon by California court -- is incompatible with any notion of judges who are faithful to the law, or otherwise are complying with the code of ethics.

CALIFORNIA CODE OF JUDICIAL ETHICS:

Canon 1. A judge shall uphold the integrity and independence of the judiciary.

Canon 2. A judge shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all of the judge's activities.

Canon 3. A judge shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially and diligently.

In sum, conditions in Los Angeles County, California, were brought to the brink by the California judges, soon after the election of President Obama. In fact, the judges took a position that is comparable to establishing a renegade court in Los Angeles County. It is evident that the citizens of the county are unable to assert their authority over the judges, neither can the civilian county leaders, or for that matter the State Attorney General. It is such conditions that require that the U.S. Government initiate action to establish "Equal Protection" under the U.S. Constitution for the 10 millions who reside in Los Angeles County. Such action could be directed through the U.S. District Court in LA. After all- it is the U.S. Courts who are supposed to safeguard the civil rights of the people. However, as seen in the case of the Rampart-FIPs and the Overseer, it is not likely to happen that way.



Attorney Richard I Fine

File:Http://inproperinla.com/09-06-23-Richard-Fine-700323.JPG

5. Retaliation against Att Richard Fine, Former U.S. Prosecutor - Now Indefinitely Jailed in Los Angeles

[TOC](#)

Beyond all the above, the Los Angeles Superior Court initiated in the past 2 years a coordinated campaign of harassment, retaliation, and intimidation against Att Richard Fine, who was one of the leaders of the campaign to expose and to ban the impermissible payments. First - he was charged in administrative court of the California State Bar Association with "Moral Turpitude". Such charge is typically reserved to sexual misconduct between counsel and client. In this case, the charge of Moral Turpitude was construed to encompass Att Richard Fine's filing of complaints against Los Angeles County judges in relationship to the impermissible payments. Subsequently, Att Richard Fine's license to practice law was revoked.(5) Along the way, Judge David Yaffe, continued to preside in a case where Att Richard Fine was appearing. Att Richard Fine requested that Judge David Yaffe be disqualified from any involvement in his case, since he was Judge Yaffe was one of the judges who received the impermissible payments. Judge Yaffe refused to disqualify, found Att Richard Fine twice in contempt of the court, and on March 4, 2009, had Attorney Fine jailed indefinitely for contempt (Ref).

a) *U.S. District Court, Los Angeles, so far goes along with the LA Superior Court's treatment of Att Fine.*

The jailing of Att Fine, identified as a civil rights leader in LA County, and even more so - the conditions and events that followed, brought the human rights record in LA County to level of abuse that was difficult to perceive just a few years ago. It also appears that the LA County Judges are determined to establish the fact that the U.S. Government under President Obama is unable to enforce the U.S. Constitution in LA County. Att Fine has been kept for about 3 months in solitary confinement. Most of this time he was never allowed to get outside his cell. Moreover, he was not allowed any access to paper and pen, so that he wouldn't be able to write any papers to file in court. Att Fine nevertheless had from time to time been able to talk by phone, and he dictated a Habeas Corpus petition, which was filed March 20, 2009 in the U.S. District Court in LA (Ref). Circumstances surrounding the review of that petition were far from the role advertised for the U.S. Courts as the guardians of civil rights. The U.S. magistrate, Carla Woehrle, for example, in response to a motion by the LA County Sheriff, rejected the filing of some of Att Fine's papers as deficient - since Att Fine had not signed them in person. Att Richard Fine could not sign them since the LA County Sheriff jailed him under abusive conditions, which did not allow him to practice his First Amendment rights. With such ruling, the U.S. Magistrate, not only sanctioned the abusive practices of the LA Judges and Sheriff relative to the jailing of Att Richard Fine, she also allowed them to benefit a second time from such abuse, by rejecting the filing of his papers. By mid June, 2009, the U.S. Magistrate denied the Habeas Corpus Petition of Att Richard Fine (Ref), and his appeal of that decision is now before the U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit. The papers filed on behalf of Att Richard Fine as a petition with the U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th circuit, are no better than those filed for his habeas corpus petition. Signatures are missing, and it appears that the dictation by phone did not work effectively.(Ref) The U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th District finds itself in a junction that we doubt any court in the U.S. had ever been before. The Court of Appeal, 9th Circuit would have to decide between its duties to uphold the U.S. Constitution, and its loyalty to a renegade group of over 500 California state judges, who so far managed to secure the support of at least some U.S. District Court judges in LA.

b) U.S. government has so far taken no action.

Beyond the extreme abuse of Att Richard Fine, the situation appears to signal entire abandonment of adherence to civil rights in Los Angeles County. Given that none was signed, it was at time unclear which records are authentic. The only record that is certainly authentic, albeit - edited, is a phone call recording of

Att Richard Fine, describing in his own voice his conditions in the Los Angeles Jail. (Ref) Conditions in LA County are already such that are far removed from any semblance of civil rights under the Amendments. If the U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit deny the Att Richard Fine Petition, one can expect that the judges would keep him jailed indefinitely, as a sign of their power, and LA County would be fairly characterized as having fallen into tyranny of the courts. The conflict is likely to reach Washington DC expediently. In fact, it is already there. A complaint filed May 1, 2009 in Washington DC called upon "U.S. Officers to perform their duties" relative to enforcement of the law in LA County(Ref). The U.S. Officers at bar are Director of the U.S. Dept of Justice, and Assistant Director of FBI. Moreover, a special request (ex parte) was filed in early May in that complaint for an order on FBI and US DOJ to secure paper and pen for Att Richard Fine. Had that motion been heard, the current crisis could probably be averted, since Richard Fine could file a petition that would have made it much easier for the 9th Circuit Court of Appeal to accept his position.

c) *Media quotes:*

"Los Angeles County has the best courts that money can buy".
KNBC, Los Angeles (October 16, 2008)

"This extraordinary judicial action of ordering the indefinite incarceration of such a prominent attorney whose long and distinguished career included service in the U. S. Department of Justice in Washington D.C. followed an intensive exchange where attorney Fine objected to Judge Yaffe's failure to disqualify himself. According to Richard Fine, Judge Yaffe along with all of the Los Angeles County judges have each been accepting up to hundreds of thousands of illegal dollars from the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, that is specifically prohibited by the California Constitution and the Canons of Judicial Ethics."

Full Disclosure Network, Los Angeles (March 4, 2009)

"Private party payments to the judiciary would be condemned by the U.S. government in other parts of the world. The U.S. Federal government must uphold the same principle of law here at home. The judges in California did not disclose their "bribes". Evidence shows the 430 judges in Los Angeles county consistently decided cases in favor of Los Angeles County."

"Richard I. Fine is a political prisoner. He is currently being held without a release date, without bail, and in solitary confinement,. He is 69 years old, a former Department of Justice lawyer fighting for his client's rights. The California judiciary has responded by retaliating against him, disbaring him and throwing him in jail for having done so. "

AHRC News (April 16,2009)

6. Routine Violations of First Amendment, Common Law, and Due Process Rights- Commonplace Since Introduction of CMSs [TOC](#)

- a) Test frequencies of 1; 2: 3: 4: 5: 6: 7: 8:
- b) Test live data base.
- c) How many people know?
- d) Link in court of appeal
- e) Language of unsigned, unpublished.
- f) Connor on page 1 of Samaan v Zernik
- g) Connor and others 00/00/00
- h) Register of Actions in Sustain
- i) Book of Judgments in Sustain
- j) Cal Court of Appeals with no numbers on the docket
- k) Cal Court of Appeals with no date of entry of judgment
- l) Pasternak and Prisoner's frivolous petition
- m) Sharon Stone
- n) Linked cases in Pacer.
- o) Docketing of Summons
- p) Chris Sawyer filed false summons.

Human and civil rights in LA County, as we see them today, came into being around 1985 with the introduction of the first computer systems in the courts. The case management systems created a major change in the way the courts do business, and therefore, there was a need for a whole new set of Rules of Court to guide the courts and the public in court operations with computers in place. The law is clear regarding what the courts had to do, the U.S. Rule Making Enabling Act 28 USC §2071-2077, and similar state laws require that all courts rule be published, and that any new rules be published and posted for public comment and challenge before they are adapted as new Rules of Court. However, regardless of the sea change in their practices, most courts that were looked into treated the Rules of Court as if there were no computers, and treated

the computers, as if there were no such things as Rules of Court. The claim is that with that, the public experienced a major loss of human and civil rights – specifically – the right for due process. Due process can be most simply defined as the right for disambiguation of court procedures. Since any time that a court procedure is vague and ambiguous, there is a good chance that it creates room for abuse of rights of the individual.

However, with the switch to the use of computers in the courts, with no Rules of Courts regarding the use of such computer systems, court processes became thoroughly ambiguous and abusive.

a) Abusive nature of Sustain - the CMS introduced in the LA superior Court.

Annual reports of the California commission on judicial performance.

b) Abusive nature of the Pacer CMS as seen in the U.S. District Courts.

afd

c) aaaa

d) Abusive nature of the Pacer CMS as seen in Att Richard Fine's petition to the U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit.

One can demonstrate this phenomenon even in the petition of Att Richard Fine now pending before the U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit (Ref).

The record that appears on line first is now called for the lack of better term docketing sheet. But it was never defined by law or by Rules of Court, and it replaced a similar paper based instrument that was clearly defined by law – the Register of Actions.

e) With the introduction of computerized CMS, the simplest clerk functions - "File" and "Enter" - became unnecessarily vague and ambiguous.

The very basic functions of the clerk of court are “File” and “Enter”, and these functions were clearly defined for generations in paper operations. “File” referred to the transaction when a new record came into possession of the court from whatever source, and such newly possessed record was stamped “Filed” – indicating it became part of the records in the court’s possession. When such record was fixed into the correct place in the public record, it was “Entered”. For example- if it belonged in a particular court file, the clerk would fix it into that

file, and then endorse the record on its face with his/her hand-signature and the date. With that, such record became part of the public record, since all court files and books of the court are public records. And the process was irreversible. For the clerk of the court to remove any record from the public domain, special procedures had to be implemented, such as sealing, since it was recognized that any such removal from the public domain deprives the public at large of its rights.

Furthermore, the significance of any entry into court file was recognized, and Notice and Service, and Proof of Service, simple basic court procedures, became the corner stones of Due Process rights.

f) Review of the "docket" of Att Richard Fine's petition to the U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit demonstrates ambiguity on the basic terms of "FILE" and "ENTER".

.....i. Att Richard Fine mailed his petition for filing with the court. Had it been a paper based process, the record would have been clearly marked with the stamp "Filed" and the date of filing, with the clerks hand signature on it. In addition, when the petition would have been incorporated into a court file, again, a stamp would be impressed, saying "Entered" with date and clerk hand signature. The situation would have been crystal clear – either the paper was filed and entered, or it was not. Instead, the record presented online is ambiguous to the point that it is entirely unclear that the court of appeal deemed it a valid court record and filed it in the first place.

.....ii. At the upper right corner a field was created labeled: "**Docketed**" with the value entered in it: "**6/3/2009**", However, the term "Docketed" was never defined by law or by Rules of Court, and therefore is vague and ambiguous. It surely does not infer any concept that the record is acknowledged by the court as valid court record.

.....iii. At the left column, another field was created, labeled: "**Date Filed**". That is in fact a formal legal term. However, that field was left incomplete in this and many, but not all records found online at the Court of Appeals 9th Circuit. Reading the record plainly – the Att Richard Fine Petition was never accepted as a filing by the court.

.....iv. Below that, at the left column, another field was created, labeled: "**Date Received Court of Appeal**". If we follow the pattern of all other fields in this form, then the value entered in this field would have to be on the right of the label, immediately following the colon. There is nothing there, that

space was left empty. Instead, we find the value of “6/2/2009” on the next line, with no label at all. Had the date value appeared adjacent to the right of the “Date Received”, the result would have been still been an ambiguous record, since “Received” is not a formal term of the courts, in fact it is notoriously controversial. Some courts hold that a record can be “Received”, but not “Filed”, some state laws, such as California, state that anytime a record came into possession of the clerk of court, it is deemed “Filed”, whether it is stamped “Received”, or “Filed”. But here, the date value was deliberately dissociated even from the label “Date Received”. There was plenty of space on the right of the label “Date Received”, but the form was designed so the date value is dissociated even from such ambiguous label.

.....v. At the upper left a label was created: “**Case Type Information**”, and underneath it are three fields, but none of them has a label that would make it clear what the difference among them is, if any. Regardless, if one reads the data plainly, then the Court of Appeal defined the record as follows:

“**Original Proceeding**” – which invalidates the record - since the Court of Appeal does not accept any Original Proceedings, it handles only review of cases from lower courts.

“**Habeas Corpus**” – which again invalidates the record – since the Court of Appeal does not entertain Habeas Corpus petitions, only review of such petitions.

“**Null**” – again, such an attribute for a record may implied anything but validity.

Regardless, none of these term was clear, because the field were not labeled.

.....vi. The first item on the docket says:

“06/03/2009 1 8 pg, 461.56 KB FILED PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS. DOCKETED CAUSE AND ENTERED APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL AND PRO SE PETITIONER. (HC)”

“**06/03/2009**” - The value on the left, for the date of has no label, and therefore is undefined. A court record would clearly define any date appearing in the record for its definition.

“**1**” - Next to it appear the ordinal number of the record, “1”. One must appreciate the ordinal numbers in this system. For example, the comparable

system at the California Court of Appeal, has no ordinal numbers attached to the records. Such system with no numbers must be deemed suspect on its face.

"8p, 461.56kb" - Next appear the values, which you may assume are of the record under the label #1. If one clicks on the icon, one may obtain for pay, today, the 8 pages. However, one must note that the values of "8pg" and "461.56kb" have not been attached to the value of "06/03/2009". On that date the values present online and all the way till June 7, 2009 were "1 page, and 128 kb". Only after a phone call and complaint, the additional 7 pages appeared, but the date value was never corrected, since it is not a valid date of "Filing", neither is it a valid date of "Entry".

In the case of attorney Fine, the public can see now part of the records, for a pay, but one must note that most of the records of other petitions are locked or removed from online viewing in various ways, through the attachment of images of locks, through the removal of the records from the online docket, etc. But none of these procedures denying the public access to these records are defined in any Law or Rule of Court. These are arbitrary actions by the Court. Furthermore, it is never stated that the entire record is posted online, for any of the petitions. In fact, it is very likely that the record posted online today, the 8 pages, are only part of the record.

.....vii. The docketing text says next:

"FILED PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS".

The language is atypical for court language. It fails to state who filed, and on behalf of whom, and what party designation, which is a must in any such court notation. Furthermore, this docketing text again state that the document produced by Att Fine was a Habeas Corpus Petition, again invalidating the record.

.....viii. The docketing text says next:

"DOCKETED CAUSE AND ENTERED APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL AND PRO SE PETITIONER."

The word "Entered", which is the key word in this process, was never applied to the paper sent by Att Richard File to the Court. Instead, we find "Entered appearances", but in fact the statement is incorrect, since on of the conspicuous facts about Att Richard Fine and many others, which appear as deliberately invalid, but "Docketed" records, is the fact that NO

appearances were scheduled, in contrast with the cases that appear as valid records that were indeed filed and entered by the court of appeals.

.....ix. Verification: The docketing text ends with:

“(HC)”. A very similar notation is used in Pacer of the U.S. District Courts to designate digital signatures of the clerks. However, the specific syntax there is as follows:

<u>Date Filed</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Docket Text</u>
09/02/2008	1	COMPLAINT filed by plaintiff John Smith against Defendants The Insurance Company, and the Plan Administrator .(Filing fee \$350)(ad) (ad). (Entered: 09/04/2008)

The U.S. District Court Pacer system does not explicitly say so, and it appears as if all tags that could have indicated digital signature were deliberately stripped. Regardless, the syntax that follows, is the digital signature for each entry by the clerk: “(ad). (Entered: 09/04/2008)”

.....x. A similar notation is used by the U.S. Court of Appeals, as seen in the Att Fine petition, but the notation is NOT a digital signature. Therefore, the process of “docketing” in the case of the U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit is missing the essential element that defines the “Entry” by the clerk – pursuant to the Rules of Court or applicable law in the various courts, the clerk is prescribed to endorse and date the new entry. In short, the system used by the U.S. District court can be deemed a valid entry system, but not so the “docketing”: system of the Court of Appeal, 9th Circuit. Most likely, it was meant exactly that way by the Court of Appeal. However, it is surely presented in a way that is vague and misleading, and there is no simple way for the public to know whether a record was or was not filed and entered – making the court process vague and ambiguous from the very start.

.....xi. **Doc #1-1: Clerk’s letter (1p):**

Notice that the letter like other records of this court, fails to mention the words “File” and “Enter”, instead it uses the informal wording:

“A petition for writ of mandamus and/or prohibition has been received”.

Such language is also invalid since it does not state a date of receipt.

Furthermore, notice that in this record of the court, the Att Fine paper is deemed:

“Writ of Mandamus and/or prohibition”

Such designation would be a valid petition for review by the court, in contrast with the two other designations, previously noted, which referred to the paper as a “Habeas Corpus Petition”.

The next paragraph in the Clerk’s letter (Doc #1-1)states:

“no answer to a petition for writ of mandamus and/or prohibition may be filed unless ordered by the Court”.

In fact, it is the exact opposite of what was stated in the docketing text. No appearance and no answer were scheduled, again indicating that the petition was not going to be reviewed on its merits.

.....xii. Verification: The space was created for the signature, but the letter is unsigned, not even by the questionable “/s/”, which the court of appeal clerk uses in formal letters. In short, this is not a valid court record either.

.....xiii. **Doc #1-2: Att Richard Fine’s (?) Paper**

The language in the paper is confusing, surely not the work product of an attorney like Richard I Fine. It may be the outcome of dictation by phone, which was committed to paper by a lay-person with no understanding of the nature of the paper he/she was producing and its significance. Most likely the form used by such writer was not in front of Att Richard Fine when he was dictating the paper, and the procedure was therefore of the nature of guess work. Such circumstances were not the making of Att Richard Fine, and it remains to be seen how the U.S. Court of Appeals would rule under the circumstances “to do justice”.

7. Where are the Books of Courts? What is the Register of Actions of the U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit? Where is It Physically Stored? Under Whose Possession? Is it accessible to the Public to Inspect and to Copy? Why are there no Rules of Court Related to Docketing? Why are the Digital Signatures Stripped? Why are the URLs at COA Manipulated? Where are the Data Bases? Why is the Dictionary Not Public Record? Why are the Related Transaction falsified. [TOC](#)

- a) Double books as the standard in the courts.
- b) Sustain v Courtnet

- c) Cal Court of Appeals
- d) US Dist Court.

8. Failure to Address the CMS in Rules of Courts Appears to be Universal. [TOC](#)

- a) LA Superior Court – Books of Court, Register of Actions, entering motions, proceedings, adjudication, Book of Judgments
- b) Pacer in U.S. Courts- digital disnatures, dictionary, docketing invalid records, summons. Related cases.
- c) Cal Court of Appeals – date of entry of judgment
- d) U.S. Court of Appeal 9th circuit – docketing false records, not enter, file, no digital signatures.
- e) Added Document 6 Page 18 a document that was not mine into the record.
- f) Removed consistently the URLs. Doc 6, page 4
- g) Documents removed from the docket

US Dist Court

9. Acting in Concert, Both California and U.S. Lower and Appellate Courts Routinely Conduct Sham Litigations, or Sham Court Proceedings, and Then – at Times – Sham Appeals. Is it accessible to the Public to Inspect and to Copy? [TOC](#)

- a) Samaan v Zernik
- b) Samaan v Zernik Appeals
- c) Galdjie v Darwish
- d) Galdjie v Darwish Appeals
- e) Zernik v Connor

- f) Zernik v Woehrle – petition
- g) Fine v Sheriff
- h) Fine v Sheriff – Petition
- i) Other fake related cases
- j) Other cases where the summons was manipulated
- k) Other Petitions with language unsigned.
- l) Other Habeas Corpus where service was denied.
- m) Cases of Schaffer
- n) Case of DC employee

10. The U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit Has Already Rendered Rulings that Sustained Conduct that Is Likely to be Deemed Part of Corruption of the Courts in LA

- a) *Ruling on \$15m for the cop*
- b) *Ruling on my petition.*

11. The Significance of the U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit Ruling on the Paper - Now “Docketed”, Albeit – With No Evidence of Its Filing and Entry, as a Petition of Indeterminate Type, by Prisoner Attorney Richard Fine, Albeit Without His Signature [TOC](#)

- b) *Richard Fine previously filed Habeas Corpus Petitions before the U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit.*

c) *Petition #09-71692, as viewed on the web site of the Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit, is most likely deemed by that court invalid, and as a record that has never been "filed" and "entered".*

Most likely nothing about this petition was deemed valid by the Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit from day it was received. However, the petition was "Docketed" in a manner that is vague and ambiguous, therefore abusive of the rights of the prisoner. Such simple matters- whether the clerk of the court filed and entered a paper or not, should not be left as a matter for speculations. They never were - prior to the introduction of the computerized CMS.

d) *The question whether the petition was or was not "filed" and "entered" is critical for any prisoner, and also for Att Richard Fine..*

Based on review of other cases of the same court, the justices of the Court of Appeal may continue the same system into their ruling. They may issue a vague an ambiguous order, which would appear to the Prisoner as a denial, but in fact would be an invalid order issued in response to an invalid petition.

Prisoners are hardly ever even allowed to file a second habeas corpus. Therefore, the question whether the first petition was or was not "filed" and "entered" is critical for such prisoners. However, as can be seen on the online docket, many of the petitions were not deemed valid, and were in fact not "filed". However, an ambiguous response by the Court of Appeal would deny such prisoners their only chance to regain their freedom. Most of them file the petitions with no legal help, and overcoming difficulties put in their way, as was the case of Att Richard Fine.

e) *Conduct of the Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit in the Case of Att Richard Fine means much more than his individual case – it shows its true colors relative to abuse of civil rights by the renegade Los Angeles Superior Court.*

The U.S. Courts are advertised as guardians of Civil Rights, and also as lenient towards *pro se* filers. The conduct of the U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit, as reflected in its online "docket", does not convey any of that.

Running court procedures that are vague and ambiguous, must be deemed a violation of Due Process rights. However, in the case of Att Richard Fine, there is a bigger significance to the conduct of the U.S. Court of Appeals. As stated

above, in conditions generated at present in Los Angeles County, where the Los Angeles Superior Court judges in fact flaunted their disregard for the law, the response – is expected from all three branches of the U.S. government. And the position taken by the U.S. Courts would be particularly important.

If the conduct of Magistrate Carla Woehrle could be dismissed as only one magistrate, here, the U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit, made itself abundantly clear, through the manner in which it “docketed” the petition of Att Richard Fine. The manner of docketing of the Fine petition provided the straight forward answer to the question –

- **Which way would the U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit rule in questions related to conduct of the Los Angeles Superior Court judges that is in violation of the law?**

The court’s only way to redeem itself from such disgrace is to issue an ruling that would first make it clear and unambiguous:

- **Did the U.S. Court of Appeal, 9th Circuit accept the filing and entry of Att Richard Fine’s petition on June 3, 2009?**
- **If so, what did the Court consider it to be? A habeas corpus ? Or a petition for mandate and/or prohibition?**

Any ruling of the U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit, on Att Richard Fine’s petition, which would not clearly answer these questions, would amount to abuse of the civil rights of all 10 million residents of Los Angeles County.

12. References

[TOC](#)

-
- ¹ Los Angeles Superior Court
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Superior_Court_of_Los_Angeles_County
 - ² Iran Contra Affair
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iran-Contra_affair
 - ³ Drug Trafficking by the CIA
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/CIA_drug_trafficking
 - ⁴ CIA Drug Trafficking, Report of the Inspector General of the U.S. Justice Department, 390p (1997)
http://inproperinla.com/00-00-00-us-doj-oig_special_9712_full-report-cia-drug-sales-in-la.pdf
 - ⁵ The Rampart Scandal
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rampart_Scandal
 - ⁶ The Criminal Justice System of Los Angeles County, by Erwin Chemerinsky (2000)
http://inproperinla.com/00-00-00-rampart-reports-00-09-01-chemerinsky-57_guild_prac_121_2000.pdf

-
- ⁷ David W. Burcham and Catherine L. Fisk, The rampart scandal: policing the criminal justice system, 34:537-53 Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review (2000)
<http://inproperinla.com/00-00-00-rampart-loyola-symposium-2000-burcham-fisk-s.pdf>
- ⁸ Los Angeles Blue - Rampart Report Series by Public Broadcasting Service, 283p (2001, updated)
http://inproperinla.com/00-00-00-rampart-pbs-full-report-series_s.pdf
- ⁹ One in a series of broadcasts by PBS on the Rampart Scandal, which focused on False Imprisonments in Los Angeles, and provided estimates of their scope at 8,000 by the LA District Attorney office, 15,000 by criminal defense attorneys, and 30,000 by others - PBS Frontline (2001, updated 2005)
http://inproperinla.com/01-05-01-pbs-frontline_rampart-false-imprisonments-s.pdf
- ¹⁰ LAPD Blue Ribbon Review Panel Report, 101p (2006)
<http://inproperinla.com/00-00-00-rampart-blue-ribbon-review-panel-2006-report.pdf>
- ¹¹ Appendix to the Blue Ribbon Review Panel Report (2006).
- ¹² Decision of the California Court of Appeals, 4th District, San Diego that LA Judges took payments that were "not permitted" pursuant to the California Constitution.
<http://inproperinla.com/08-10-10-cal-ct-app-4th-dist-la-county-judges-payments-not-permitted.pdf>
- ¹³ December 2008- California Supreme Court denied review of the Court of Appeal decision that payments to the Los Angeles judges were "not permitted".
<http://inproperinla.com/08-12-23-california-supreme-court-denies-review-re-not-permitted-payments-to-los-angeles-judges.pdf>
- ¹⁴ Rules of the California State Assembly:
http://inproperinla.com/00-00-00-law-cal-california-state-assembly-Ch_06_CaLegi06-s.pdf
- ¹⁵ June 20, 2009 - Full Disclosure Network report - LA County will continue its payments to the judges.
<http://inproperinla.com/09-06-20-buget-bill-bypass-court-decision-la-county-will-continue-pay-to-judges-full-disclosure-network-s.pdf>
- ¹⁶ June 1, 2009 - Full Disclosure Network report - LA Superior Court Judges retained a \$60,000 to achieve the speedy legislation to bypass the California Court of Appeal, 4th District (San Diego)
<http://inproperinla.com/09-06-01-la-sup-ct-judges-retained-lobbyist-full-disclosure-network-s.pdf>
- ¹⁷ Petition for impeachment of California judges, detailing the legislative process through which the "not permitted" payments were purportedly made permitted by law.
<http://www.thepetitionsite.com/338/petition-to-recall-six-california-supreme-court-justices-and-ls-superior-court-judger-david-uaffey>
- ¹⁸ Retaliation by the judges of LA Superior Court against Att Richard Fine.
<http://inproperinla.com/08-07-14-richard-fine-chronology-of-retaliation-ahrc.pdf>
- ¹⁹ March 2009 Recording of a phone interview by Att Richard Fine, describing his jailing conditions in Los Angeles, reported by the Full Disclosure Network
<http://inproperinla.com/vid-09-03-10-full-disclosure-network-911-call-from-jailed-att-fine.flv>
- ²⁰ Att Richard Fine's Habeas Corpus petition
<http://inproperinla.com/09-04-08-full-disclosure-network-on-richard-fine-habeas-corpus.pdf>
- ²¹ Iran Contra Affair
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iran-Contra_affair
- ²² Drug Trafficking by the CIA to Los Angeles
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/CIA_drug_trafficking
- ²³ CIA Drug Trafficking, 1997 Report of the Inspector General of the U.S. Justice Department.
http://inproperinla.com/00-00-00-us-doj-oig_special_9712_full-report-cia-drug-sales-in-la.pdf
- ²⁴ Rampart scandal
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rampart_scandal

1) The Criminal Justice System of Los Angeles County, by Erwin Chemerinsky (2000) http://inproperinla.com/00-00-00-rampart-reports-00-09-01-chemerinsky-57_guild_prac_121_2000.pdf

2) LAPD Blue Ribbon Review Panel Report(2006) <http://inproperinla.com/00-00-00-rampart-blue-ribbon-review-panel-2006-report.pdf> ..

3) Frontline broadcast with estimates of the numbers of Rampart-FIPs http://inproperinla.com/01-05-01-pbs-frontline_rampart-false-imprisonments-s.pdf ..

. 4) General record deposit <http://inproperinla.com/> ..

. 5) Two Pennsylvania Judges indicted http://inproperinla.com/09-02-11-two-pennsylvania-judges_indicted.pdf ..

. 6) Pennsylvania judicial panel reviews convictions of indicted judges. <http://inproperinla.com/09-03-26-penn-court-corrective-action-s.pdf> .

. 7) Judge Robert Aguilar, San Jose, California convicted of Racketeering; <http://inproperinla.com/00-00-00-us-app-ct-9th-us-v-aguilar-a-docket.pdf> ..

. 8) Judge Frega, San Diego, U.S. Court conviction for racketeering <http://inproperinla.com/00-00-00-us-dist-ct-la-usa-v-frega-DOCKET.pdf> .

. 9) Public Integrity Section, U.S. Dept of Justice annual reports. <http://inproperinla.com/00-00-00-us-doj-public-integrity-section-reports/> .

. 10) Rampart scandal http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rampart_scandal ..

. 11) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Consent_decree ..

. 12) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Drug_policy ,.

- . 13) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Drug_policy_of_the_United_States ..

- . 14) Failed drug policy corrupts the justice system: <http://inproperinla.com/00-00-00-us-doj-drug-policy-War%20on%20narcotics%20imperils%20justice%20system.pdf> .

- . 15) Secret corporations and secret fund accounts held by the judges of LA Superior Court, Washington, DC Insight Magazine <http://inproperinla.com/00-00-01-99-04-11-la-sup-ct-slush-fund.pdf> ..

- . 16) Decision of the California Court of Appeals, 4th District, San Diego that LA Judges took payments that were "not permitted" pursuant to the California Constitution. <http://inproperinla.com/08-10-10-cal-ct-app-4th-dist-la-county-judges-payments-not-permitted.pdf> ..

- . 17) KNBC ran a short segment on October 16, 2008: <http://inproperinla.com/08-10-16-knbc-los-angeles-county-got-the-best-court-money-can-buy-s.pdf> .

- . 18) California Code of Judicial Ethics http://inproperinla.com/00-00-00-law-ca_code_judicial_ethics-s.pdf ..

- . 19) Passage of California Budget bill with provision allowing impermissible payments to judges.

- .
- 21) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/CIA_and_Contras_cocaine_trafficking_in_the_US ..

- . 22) Petition pending before the 9th Circuit Court of appeal in re: Habeas Corpus denial by US District Court, Los Angeles <https://ecf.ca9.uscourts.gov/cmecf/servlet/TransportRoom?servlet=CaseSummary.jsp?caseNum=09-71692&dktType=dktPublic&incOrigDkt=Y&incDktEntries=Y> . Court of Appeals Docket #: 09-71692 Richard Fine v. Sheriff of Los Angeles County Appeal From: US District Court for Central California, Los Angeles Docketed: 06/03/2009 ..

. 24) Habeas Corpus Petition by jailed Att Richard Fine, denied. https://ecf.cacd.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/DktRpt.pl?156797741033736-L_801_0-1 . Richard I Fine v. David P Yaffe CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:09-cv-03315-JFW-CW Assigned to: Judge John F. Walter Referred to: Magistrate Judge Carla Woehrle UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA Western Division - Los Angeles Date Filed: 05/11/2009 Date Terminated: 05/20/2009 Jury Demand: None Nature of Suit: 530 Habeas Corpus (General) Jurisdiction: U.S. Government Defendant Petitioner Richard I Fine represented by Richard I Fine BK#1824367 Twin Towers Correctional Facility 450 Bauchet Street Los Angeles, CA 90012 310-277-5833 PRO SE ..

. 25) Habeas Corpus Petition by jailed Att Richard Fine, denied. https://ecf.casd.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/DktRpt.pl?100118899381401-L_801_0-1 . U.S. District Court Southern District of California (San Diego) CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 3:09-cv-00639-BEN-PCL Fine v. Yaffe et al Assigned to: Judge Roger T. Benitez Referred to: Magistrate Judge Peter C. Lewis Cause: 28:2254 Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (State) Date Filed: 03/27/2009 Date Terminated: 04/06/2009 Jury Demand: None Nature of Suit: 530 Habeas Corpus (General) Jurisdiction: Federal Question Petitioner Richard I Fine 1824367 Twin Towers Correctional Facility 450 Bauchet Street Los Angeles, CA 90086 PRO SE ..

. 26) Litigation by Att Richard Fine relative to revocation of his license for filing complaint against judges. https://ecf.cacd.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/DktRpt.pl?933722668694662-L_801_0-1 . Richard I Fine v. State of Bar of California et al Assigned to: Judge John F. Walter Referred to: Magistrate Judge Carla Woehrle Cause: 42:1983 Civil Rights Act Date Filed: 05/02/2008 Date Terminated: 04/17/2009 Jury Demand: None Nature of Suit: 950 Constitutional - State Statute Jurisdiction: Federal Question Plaintiff Richard I Fine represented by Richard I Fine 468 North Camden Drive Suite 200 Beverly Hills, CA 90210 310-277-5833 PRO SE ..

. 27) Another action initiated against Att Richard Fine through the California State Board, while he is in

jail https://ecf.cacd.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/DktRpt.pl?102517386671374-L_801_0-1 . UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA Western Division - Los Angeles CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:09-mc-00129-ABC Fine Assigned to: Judge Audrey B. Collins In Re Richard Isaac Fine In the Disciplinary Matter of Date Filed: 05/27/2009 Richard Isaac Fine 468 N Camden Beverly Hills , CA 90210 LEAD ATTORNEY, ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED . .

. 28) The original California State Board action https://ecf.cacd.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/DktRpt.pl?490557605366691-L_801_0-1 . UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA Western Division - Los Angeles CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:07-mc-00189 Fine In Re Richard Isaac Fine In the Disciplinary Matter of Date Filed: 12/11/2007 Date Terminated: 02/01/2008 Richard I Fine Richard I Fine & Associates 468 N Camden Dr, Ste 200 Beverly Hills , CA 90210 310-277-5833 LEAD ATTORNEY, ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED ..

. 29) Habeas Corpus Petition https://ecf.casd.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/DktRpt.pl?103341593185206-L_801_0-1 . U.S. District Court Southern District of California (San Diego) CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 3:09-cv-00819-W-POR Fine v. Yaffe Assigned to: Judge Thomas J. Whelan Referred to: Magistrate Judge Louisa S. Porter Cause: 28:2241 Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (federal) Date Filed: 04/13/2009 Date Terminated: 05/05/2009 Jury Demand: None Nature of Suit: 540 Mandamus & Other Jurisdiction: U.S. Government Defendant Petitioner Richard I Fine PRO SE . .

. 30) Booking record of Att Richard Fine <http://inproperinla.com/09-04-21-richard-fine-inmate-information-center-%20booking-details.pdf> ..

. 31) Full Disclosure Network on the jailing of Att Richard Fine <http://inproperinla.com/09-03-04-full-disclosure-network-att-richard-fine-jailed-in-attempt-to-disqualify-la-judge.pdf> .

. 32) Full Disclosure Network on Fine's Habeas Corpus

Petition <http://inproperinla.com/09-04-08-full-disclosure-network-on-richard-fine-habeas-corpus.pdf> .

. 33) Full Disclosure Network on Habeas Corpus

Petition <http://inproperinla.com/09-04-11-full-disclosure-network-on-fine-jailing-us-court-orders-la-sheriff-to-decide-on-release-of-judicial-critic-attorney-held-in-contempt-by-judge-yaffe.pdf> .

. 34) Consent Decree – The case that is the legal basis for the appointment of the Overseer for Civil Rights in Los Angeles in June 2001 https://ecf.cacd.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/DktRpt.pl?486918992065255-L_801_0-1 . UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA Western Division - Los Angeles CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:00-cv-11769-GAF-RC USA v. Los Angeles City of, et al Assigned to: Judge Gary A. Feess Referred to: Magistrate Judge Rosalyn M. Chapman Demand: \$0 Related Case: 2:08-cv-00784-GAF-RC Cause: 42:1983 Civil Rights Act Date Filed: 11/03/2000 Jury Demand: None Nature of Suit: 440 Civil Rights: Other Jurisdiction: U.S. Government Plaintiff Plaintiff United States of America .

. 35) .

. 36).

. 37) May 2007 Mac Arthur Park Melee <http://inproperinla.com/00-00-00-rampart-consent-decree-07-05-17-may-1-lapd-knbc.pdf>

. 38) June 2006, Los Angeles Police Department Chief Bratton, response to the Blue Ribbon Review Panel report: <http://inproperinla.com/00-00-00-rampart-consent-decree-07-05-17-may-1-lapd-knbc.pdf>

. 40) December 2008- California Supreme Court denied review of the Court of Appeal decision that payments to the Los Angeles judges were "not permitted" .<http://inproperinla.com/08-12-23-california-supreme->

[court-denies-review-re-not-permitted-payments-to-los-angeles-judges.pdf](#)

. 41) California legislature permitted payments that were not permitted pursuant to the California constitution and the California courts. <http://inproperinla.com/09-02-14-california-bill-permitting-payment-not-prmitted-SBX2%2011%20Senate%20Bill.%202nd%20Ext-s.pdf>

. 42) Rules of the California State Assembly: http://inproperinla.com/00-00-00-law-cal-california-state-assembly-Ch_06_CaLegi06-s.pdf

. 43) Petition for impeachment of California judges, detailing the legislative process through which the "not permitted" payments were purportedly made permitted by law. <http://www.thepetitionsite.com/338/petition-to-recall-six-california-supreme-court-justices-and-ls-superior-court-judger-david-uaffey>

. 44) Retaliation by the judges of LA Superior Court against Att Richard Fine. <http://inproperinla.com/08-07-14-richard-fine-chronology-of-retaliation-ahrc.pdf44>) Att Richard Fine's Habeas Corpus petition <http://inproperinla.com/09-04-08-full-disclosure-network-on-richard-fine-habeas-corpus.pdf>

45)Att Richard Fine's Habeas Corpus petition <http://inproperinla.com/09-04-11-full-disclosure-network-on-fine-jailing-us-court-orders-la-sheriff-to-decide-on-release-of-judicial-critic-attorney-held-in-contempt-by-judge-yaffe.pdf>

²⁵ A partial log of media reports of the Rampart corruption scandal 1998-

2000 <http://inproperinla.com/00-00-00-ranmpart-scandal-a-log-media-reports-s.pdf>

²⁶ Jude Connor wrote a recommendation letter for Rafael Perez

²⁷ Public comments by Judge Jacqueline Connor expressing her dismay with Rafael Perez's cooperation with investigators.

²⁸ Rafael Perez was punished for his cooperation with the Rampart Scandal investigation, at the hands of U.S. prosecutors and U.S. judges in Los Angeles.

²⁹ First Rampart Trial Reversed <http://inproperinla.com/00-12-23-rampart-verdicts-voided-los-angeles-times.pdf>

³⁰ First Rampart Trial Reversed <http://inproperinla.com/00-12-24-los-angeles-judge-overturns-convictions-of--police-in-scandal-nyt.pdf>

³¹ Official response of the LAPD Police Chief Bratton (June 2001)

as posted online.

³² Official response of the office of District Attorney to the Blue Ribbon Review Panel Report (June 2001) from online.