

COPY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

GARY R. WALL  
Plaintiff

CASE NO. 3:09CV1066(DJS)


v.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE U. S. ATTORNEYS  
OFFICE NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT  
DISTRICT JUDGE JANET C. HALL  
Unknown District Law Clerks in the Meaning of Bivens  
CIRCUIT JUDGE SONIA SOTOMAYOR  
Unknown District Law Clerks in the Meaning of Bivens  
42 U.S.C. 1985(3) Defendants 28 U.S.C. 1361 "Action in the Nature of Mandamus"  
CONGRESSMAN JOHN LARSON  
"FEDERAL QUESTION" 28 U.S.C. 1331 Defendant

2010 JAN 26 AM 11:18  
FILED

**PLAINTIFFS RED FLAG F.R.C.P. 65(a)(2) BIVENS INJUNCTION**

SUBMITTED BY:

  
GARY R. WALL, Civil Rights Petitioner  
60 Carriage Hill Drive  
Wethersfield, CT. 06109  
(860) 529-2651

DATED: 1/26/10

## REQUIREMENTS

### (1) "Irreparable injury if the injunction is not issued"

The irreparable injury for this plaintiff if injunction is not issued is usurpation of LMRDA Rights and Due Process (5<sup>th</sup> Amendment) Rights criminally influenced by former and present day D.O.J. officials in order to hide a conspiracy against the Lawful Functions of the United States (18 U.S.C. 371(a)(b)) that involve money streams off 30 billion in pension assets.

In addition regarding irreparable harm is this plaintiff's physical condition which is very poor. I was hospitalized (3) times in November and (once) in December (critical condition). Also, this petitioner has had to overcome (12) years of usurpation and obstruction of Statutory Rights and Constitutional Rights within that (12) year period ending with the 18 U.S.C. 1961(4) Enterprise in collusion with the D.O.J and Judicial Branch to obstruct and usurp pleadings that expose the "Operating Agreement" as a fraud. In addition to flagrant and bold judicial frauds, the tactic of hold and hide was used multiple times. This Civil Rights petitioner hopes this Court is not employing the hold, hide and hope he dies tactic, and instead grants the Rule 65(a)(2) Injunction before the plaintiff dies.

### (2) "A likelihood of Success on the Merits"

The likelihood of success on the merits concerning this injunction is that all the averments of judicial fraud; Separation of Power D.O.J. criminal influence; and Congressional facilitation are documented, the findings are from the work product of a (5) year 11(b)(3) Inquires plus from two years of discovery (24 testimonies taken) Discovery off the Remand of Wall, Cooksey v. Local 230 224 Fed 3d 168.

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION IN SUPPORT OF RULE 65(a)(2)**

### **INJUNCTION**

On or about May 15, 1997, this plaintiff with co plaintiff William Cooksey Sr. filed with an attorney an LMRDA Complaint. The LMRDA Complaint was assigned to the Honorable Arrington, New Haven, CT on or about August 21, 1997 a Transfer Order from then Chief Judge of the district (Alan Nevas) was issued taking the complaint from the New Haven Division to the Bridgeport Division where defendant Hall also sits (Nevas Sub Rosa corrupts whatever he wants in the Bridgeport Division). At the time the Transfer Order seemed normal procedure, meaning a brand new Judge (Hall) being assigned cases. After about five (5) years of F.R.C.P. 11(b)(3) Inquiries and multiple flagrant Judicial criminal acts, the Transfer Order started to appear for what it was; That being, a transfer of an LMRDA Complaint to the Bridgeport Division for the express purpose of hiding the LMRDA Complaint from being exposed while there was D.O.J. Oversight of the union (LIUNA and its Locals) said Oversight was called the "Operating Agreement".

This plaintiff and prior co-plaintiff Cooksey (LMRDA Complaint) had a very capable attorney at the time Marc Mercier, Esq.<sup>1</sup> This Coia 18 U.S.C. 1961(4) Enterprise

---

<sup>1</sup> Attorney Mercier became concerned for his safety when one of our affiants was assaulted (on tape), and the other affiant was threaten to be "shot six times in the head" and the Title 18 crimes were hidden and protected by the Luskin/Coia "Operating Agreement". Both affiants had to leave the union for fear of economic and/or physical harm after 20 and 30 year careers. Quote now Attorney Mercier talking to Cooksey and Wall in his office, after the assault on our affiants was protected by the "Operating Agreement." Quote: "*I am not afraid for my physical safety but I am concerned*" (Judge Hall is aware of why Attorney Mercier relieved himself from the case). Attorney Mercier is a well mannered gentleman who would not be comfortable dealing with some of the representatives and officers of Local 230 (especially when he realized they were being protected by the D.O.J. / Federal Judges who were former D.O.J. officials). For example, these following positions over a twelve year period were held by officers and representatives of Local 230; a convicted rapist, a convicted bookmaker and lottery fixer, a convicted weight heroin trafficker and a convicted pension thief. All these people were appointed by Coia and his "associates-in-fact".

has been protected by former Judge Nevas since the transfer to the Bridgeport Division and protected also prior as Chief U. S. Attorney District of Connecticut.<sup>2</sup>

**F.R.C.P. 65(a)(2)**

***“F.R.C.P. 65(a)(2) “Consolidation of Hearing with trial on Merits”  
Before or after the commencement of the hearing of an application for a preliminary injunction, the Court may order the trial of the action on its merits to be advanced and consolidated with the hearing of the application. Even when this consolidation is not ordered, any evidence received upon an application for a preliminary injunction which would be admissible upon the trial on its merit, becomes part of the record on the trial and need not repeated upon the trial. This sub-division (a)(2) shall be so construed and applied as to save the parties any rights they may have to trial by jury.” (In bold by plaintiff)”***

The undersigned plaintiff has not only a Statutory Right to a trial but also Due Process Rights (5<sup>th</sup> Amendment, 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment).

**REASON FOR RIGHT**

On or about November 3, 2005, Robert D. Luskin General Counsel/In House Prosecutor testified in a jury trial committing material perjury multiple times. Luskin did so identifying himself as former General Counsel (D.O.J.) Department of Justice (Clinton Administration); he also stated he was put in charge of LIUNA by the D.O.J. in order to rid it of Organized Crime. Luskin also committed these testimony schemes in collusion

---

<sup>2</sup> In directly related cases, U. S. v. Lopreato 95-1485 83 F3d 571 (2dCir. May 8, 1976) see also U. S. v Sisti 91 F3d 305, Judge Nevas intentionally and in an insidious criminal act (Sub Rosa) directed the U. S. Attorneys Office to give false information concerning Nevas protected criminal defendant Coia “associates-in fact” Ronald LeConche AKA Ronald Welch. The U. S. Attorneys Office being insidiously directed by former Chief U. S. Attorney now Federal Judge (Alan Nevas) to instruct the U. S. Attorneys Office to tell the trial judge Honorable Judge Daly that Mr. LeConche AKA Welch had no idea that he was committing a crime, he just thought he was delivering a package, keeping a secret from the trial Judge, Honorable Judge Daly that six months prior Mr. LeConche AKA Welch was involved with a three hundred thousand dollar pension embezzlement scheme concerning the Teamsters pension funds. The main concern for Judge Nevas and the Department of Justice to tell that lie to Judge Daly was not for the concern for Ronald LeConche AKA Ronald Welch, the concern was that a RICO Enterprise would be exposed and the “Operating Agreement” would be seen for what it was and what it is; an 18 U.S.C. 1962(a)(b)(c)(d) Conspiracy the effect being a conspiracy against the Lawful Functions (Rules and Justice System) of the United States 18 U.S.C. 371(a)(b). That is Obstruction of Justice on the Department of Justice side and from the Judicial side Usurpation of Rights. Injunctive relief is a Citizen’s Right with such banana republic police state acts.

with Dominick Lopreato (Convicted pension thief convicted perjury) and Vere O. Haynes, First V.P.; Haynes who was a target on the face of the politically and monetarily bought-out 212-page RICO/OCCA Complaint. A hearing will show Defendant Hall facilitated and abetted the perjury collusion by including but not limited to the fact fraud bifurcation of the LMRDA Case to a membership issue only (29 U.S.C. 402(o)); the fact fraud being in a totally different case and circumstances (not even pleaded by defendants Sua Sponti Judicial Criminal Act). In said unrelated and inapplicable case the plaintiff Maddalone v. Local 17 152 F3d 178 (2d Cir.) tells the judge this is a personal vendetta. This plaintiff never pleaded or thought this matter is personal vendetta. The Judge Hall or her criminal puppeteer (Nevan) thought that fact fraud obstruction scheme up in order to usurp 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights. Please keep in mind said Sua Sponti fact fraud came after remand 224 Fed 3d 168 Supra.

#### POWER OF PERJURY

The following statements of facts are the consequences of the Department of Justice being in criminal collusion with 18 U.S.C. 1961(4) OCCA/RICO ENTERPRISE said Coia Enterprise 18 U.S.C. 1961(4) was identified as an OCCA/RICO ENTERPRISE by President Nixon and President Reagan's Crime Commission.

Please read Wall, Cooksey v. Local 230 224 Fed 168 after reading 224 Supra the Court will see that eleven day NLRB trial found that Plaintiff Wall was removed as steward then as worker on the job site for refusing to "shake down" laborers with fraudulent collections. Mr. Lopreato testified in perjury collusion with Robert D. Luskin, Vere O. Haynes and other officers facilitated by Defendant Janet C. Hall (who read the NLRB case a day before and I am sure read her own remand 224 Fed 3d 168 Supra

finding that Plaintiff (Wall) was fired by Lopreato for not “shaking down” laborers. This Separation of Power corruption harmed this Due Process plaintiff. This plaintiff does not blame the jury for that corruption manipulated trial; We were only two blue collar heavy demolition construction workers. It was our word against that of the General Counsel Department of Justice. The jury had no idea they were part of a scheme (victims) against the Lawful Functions of the United States involving the D.O.J., Federal Judges and convicted pension thieves 29 U.S.C. 501(c), 18 U.S.C. 664, 18 U.S.C. 1962(a)(b)(c)(d).

Judge Hall also would not allow expert witness (Mr. Ron Fino) to testify in front of Jury Ruling stating his testimony would not be relevant to the membership issue. Just the opposite would have happened. The jury would have realized that membership issue is how the union punishes workers, who ask questions about union expenditures (prior to the trial Mr. Fino entered an affidavit see copy attached as Exhibit (A)).

Judge Hall would also not allow Mr. Eugene Methvin former editor Readers Digest and last living member of President Regan’s Crime Commission to testify at the membership trial.<sup>3</sup>

## EXAMPLE OF OBSTRUCTION OF THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES

---

<sup>3</sup> At the first hearing in the LMRDA case (1997), Mr. Eugene Methvin came from Virginia to Bridgeport to watch with a Reporter from the Washington News Bureau, Mr. John Mullagan. After the hearing Mr. Methvin warned me about just how powerfully corrupt LIUNA is and just how deep and wide their corrupt influence is. I don’t think he thought it was as bad as it is now exposed through (12) years of Federal Litigation. The same governance structure that was identified by President Nixon and President Regan’s Crime Commissions has not changed (Crime Commission identified sons replaced passed away fathers same National Pension Scheme (29 U.S.C. 501(c)) until Clinton. President Clinton’s Crime Commission was much difference from President Nixon and President Regan. President Clinton’s Crime Commission in reality became President Clinton’s Crime Concession Committee; meaning, if you have enough political power or monetary power, you could corruptly influence the Lawful Functions of the United States (millions in concessions were and are still being paid to the 18 U.S.C. 1961(4) Enterprise by shovel and jackhammer men) a banana republic (30 billion has made the National Pension Crime now Bi-partisan).

This example is being used because it is the outcome of collusion perjury. It involves the same witness. The perjury induced finding by the jury is part of the scheme. This part involves co-plaintiff Cooksey. Please pay extra attention because it will not make sense to Your Honor but it is the ridiculous outcome of perjury exposing itself. On or about November 2005, a Federal Jury ruled that a labor union has the right to not allow admission after one years time. Said jury finding based on the perjury collusion scheme, overturned our own NLRB case and the Finding of the LMRDA trial Wall, Cooksey v. Local 230 224 Fed 3d 168 (Judge Hall's case back on remand). Judge Hall now re-overturns her own 2d Circuit Remand by facilitating and allowing collusion fraud/perjury with member "associates-in-fact" of an OCCA/RICO Enterprise. Take notice not one judge defends their Honor. They can't by reason of the fact they would only expose their "High Crimes" of judicial fraud and usurpation. It makes no difference if you catch them, all criminals are the same in one way you can't insult them. Also two letters from the Officers of Local 230 were sent April 9, 1996 and March 2, 1998 sent to the Inspector General Office for the "Operating Agreement" and then turned over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation accusing this petitioner and his co-plaintiff at the time of violent crimes and other racketeering crimes. Depositions taken proved all the allegations to be fraudulent. One of the reasons that Judge Hall blocked discovery by her fraudulent bifurcation Ruling and is still holding, (hide and hold style), F.O.I.A. \$4,200.00 5 USC 552(a)(4)(B) Fee Waiver Complaint almost one year. The information request on the F.O.I.A. is the F.B.I. investigation report which would also exonerate the plaintiff. Those two letters are what caused the F.B.I. to come to Connecticut and question both Wall and Cooksey. In addition, the officers of Local 230 illegally came into possession of Mr.

Cooksey's medical records from the pension fund. read the psychiatric report out to the membership at a meeting and diagnosed them to the membership finding Mr. Cooksey to be a danger and violent<sup>4</sup>.

Please take special notice of the "associates-in-fact" that Judge Hall's abetting their perjury scheme. Dominick Lopreato convicted perjurer and convicted pension thief; Vere O. Haynes, First V. P. and target on the face of the 212 page OCCA/RICO Complaint; and Robert D. Luskin criminal author of the "Operating Agreement" which time and facts have proven was and is a conspiracy against the Lawful Functions of the United States.

A Federal Judge that committed such bold, flagrant and degrading judicial crimes should not be on the Judiciary. The harm to LMRDA Title 18 and ERISA Statutes are meaningless to defendant Hall.

For the protection of the Lawful Functions of the United States, please contemplate what defendant Hall has done by being part of (18 U.S.C. 1951) extortion of Worker Labor Rights. It is a bad situation where a federal judge and judges compensate and reward known (D.O.J.) protected Organized Crime Pension Thieves for any reason, political or monetary. Someone has to be held accountable here either this Civil Rights Petitioner or the Federal Judges cited in the 28 U.S.C. 351 Complaints and 455 Applications (which can be read at [www.unitedstatesproselaw.com](http://www.unitedstatesproselaw.com)) otherwise the truth hidden here means we are all ready in a banana Republic.

DEFENDANT SOTOMAYOR

---

<sup>4</sup> One of the people subpoenaed to the deposition was Mr. Cooksey's psychiatrist who stated clearly Mr. Cooksey was and is not a threat to anyone. By reason of the economic harm directed at plaintiff Cooksey he was divorced, could not get a job, and went to work on city work fair. Any judge that protects those acts is a criminal and cruel person.

A Rule 65(a)(2) hearing concerning defendant Sotomayor will reveal (documented) she committed multiple judicial frauds in Rulings concerning 28 U.S.C. 351 Complaints and 28 U.S.C. 455 Application for Disqualification to fact fraud Summary Orders and Set Up Panels.<sup>5</sup> In order to condense and clarify grounds for the Rule 65(a)(2) Hearing, this Civil Rights Petitioner will enter under Exhibit B a letter dated July 14, 2009 to Hon. John Roberts in his capacity as Chief of the Judicial Conference. Please take notice that this petitioner brought defendant Sotomayor judicial criminal acts to the attention of Chief Roberts January 7, 2009 way before she was nominated to the Supreme Court (also entered in Exhibit C cover letter to Justice Breyer 28 U.S.C. 351 Conduct Committee).

DEFENDANT NORA R. DANNEHY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A Rule 65(a)(2) Hearing concerning Chief Nora R. Dannehy will show that her U.S. Attorneys Office by relinquishing jurisdiction for Title 18 crimes (inter alia) to the U. S. Attorneys of the Northern District of Illinois knowingly facilitated the Title 18 crimes (inter alia). Also, a Sub Rosa Press Shield in Connecticut was employed. The 65(a)(2) Hearing will also reveal that the criminal intent jurisdiction transfer allowed the 18 U.S.C. 1961(4) Coia Enterprises to openly commit a 29 U.S.C. 501(c) Embezzlement in millions in Laborers membership money. Quote: signed agreement “Operating Agreement” and the D.O.J.

---

<sup>5</sup> By reason of experience over a (12) year period including litigating in front of multiple circuit panels, a pattern style of corruption began to reveal itself. That style being set-up panels where one judge (and his or her clerks) falsely briefs the other two judges or does not brief them at all (because it is in their mind only a pro se filing the D.O.J. wants to stop). What is really happening is D.O.J. corruption influence is using a legitimate practice of one Judge and law clerks on pro se filings in order (to handles work case load) using it in a Sub Rosa insidious way to obstruct pleadings and usurp Rights. Besides the fact that the documented judicial fact frauds speak for themselves on many circuit panels, in this matter, a judge from S.D.N.Y sat and everyone of their judges had former ties to the D.O.J. Ricci et al v. DeStefano et al 07-1428 was no mistake. It is defendant Sotomayor’s style i.e. fact fraud Summary Orders.

D.O.J.

-----“LIUNA Ethics and Disciplinary Procedure” revised 4/01 in its relevant part:

*---“in order to accomplish more fully the purpose of the LIUNA Ethical Practices Code, and the LIUNA Ethics and Disciplinary Procedure, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the General Executive Board that union funds not be used for the payment of the legal fees or expenses for the representation of any officer, member, or employee at any stage of a criminal matter or at any stage of a civil action claiming a breach of fiduciary duties prior to the resolution of the allegation or charge”*

See now Bankers Trust v. Rhoades 859 Fed. Rep. 2d 1096 (2d Cir.) at 1104 referencing RICO and the Clayton Acts:

*“that both statutes bring to bear the pressure of ‘Private Attorney General’ on a serious national problem for which public prosecutorial resources are deemed inadequate”*

A Rule 65(a)(2) Hearing will show that “public prosecutorial resources are deemed inadequate” by an 18 U.S.C. 371 Conspiracy Against the Lawful Functions of the United States. See United States v. Turkish 458 Fed. Supp. 874 S.D.N.Y. citing Supreme Courts Hammerschmidt Id 884:

*“to interfere with or obstruct one of its [the United States] Lawful Government Functions by deceit, craft or Trickery, or at least by means that are dishonest”*

See Also U. S. v. Kraig 99 F3d 1361 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996) Finding #2

*“Conspiracy to commit an offense against the United States under the Federal Conspiracy Statute are two separate crimes.”*

See Also Kraig Supra:

*“Lawyers are not held to a different standard from non lawyers when their participation in a conspiracy is evaluated 18 U.S.C. 371”*

In this instant complaint both sections of 18 U.S.C. 371(a)(b) were violated by Robert D. Luskin and Coia. A Rule 65(a)(2) Hearing will clearly show that. This Civil Rights Petitioner realizes he does not have Standing under 18 U.S.C. 371(a)(b) but he

does have Standing to protect himself as a proximate harm citizen from the Title 18 and Title 29 and ERISA violations and Due Process Rights allowing access to all Rights.

#### DEFENDANT LARSON

A Rule 65(a)(2) Hearing will reveal that defendant Larson over a 2 year period of submitted documents to him intentionally allowed judicial self policing statutes 28 U.S.C. 351 and 28 U.S.C. 455 to be corruptly controlled by the Judicial Branch itself knowing there would be no oversight by Congress in this matter. This Civil Rights Petitioner filed (7) 28 U.S.C. 351 Complaints (3) 28 U.S.C. 455 Applications, everyone avoiding their Oath and Obligation to protect the Laws of the United States not doing so for political and monetary reasons (monetary reasons D.N.C. influenced fund kick backs. Also, defendant Larson was made aware through documentation of Mr. Luskin's committing perjury in testimony given by him to congressman McCollum Subcommittee on Crime July 25, 1996, plus other perjuries right down to trial perjury.

#### CONCLUSION

This Civil Rights Petitioner has shown this Court flagrant and bold abuses and harm to his Civil Rights and Liberties caused by Separation of Power corruption. This petitioner has also made a clear facial showing of the abuses and harm to Federal Statutes, LMRDA Title 18, Title 29 and ERISA committed by Judicial frauds committed to protect the exposure of a National Pension Crime where an OCCA/RICO Enterprise policing itself. See Quote: "Summary of LIUNA Agreement 1995 (open ended):

*"This Agreement is a **first-of-its-kind** in history of union --government partnering – it is completely different from the International Brotherhood of Teamsters situation, which was an example of government takeover and control of a union"*

The “**first of its kind**” was and is a sophisticated criminal scheme devised by the former General Counsel of the D.O.J. now in private practice, who’s criminal influence network effects important Federal Judges and D.O.J. officials, who in some cases, are part of it and other Federal Judges, who are in fear of their colleagues opinions of them and will not speak out. Canon 3A applies: “Adjudicated responsibility” “(1) a “judge should be faithful to and maintain professional competence in the Law, and should not be swayed by partisan intent public clamor or fear of criticism”

The “**first of its kind**” “Operating Agreement” was and is a carefully crafted criminal scheme against the Lawful Functions of the United States 18 U.S.C. 371(a)(b). From the knowledge coming from proximate harm under 18 U.S.C. 1962(a)(b)(c)(d) 18 U.S.C. 1961 Title 28 and Title 29 ERISA and last but not least 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment Due Process Rights where all Rights to Rights come from. This “**first of its kind**” must be stopped before it becomes the banana republic kind like the PLR (Mexican Union) in Mexico where federal police control the union.<sup>6</sup>

The “Operating Agreement” was also carefully crafted where the only law enforcement organization that could have the power under the agreement to investigate Coia’s / 18 U.S.C. 1961(4) Enterprise was Luskin’s private inspectors; in this matter, two former D.O.J. inspectors, one former F.B.I. Agent and one former Treasury Agent (OC Division), who became inspectors under the powers of the signed agreement (“Operating

---

<sup>6</sup> The draft 212 OCCA/RICO Complaint was served in close proximity to LIUNA Election in 1998; see Washington Post Article by line Stephanie Mencimer Page 6 second to the last paragraph, quote for convenience and clarity “Coia was considered a shoe-in. Most members gathering from across the country and never seen the Justice Department’s draft RICO Complaint because Viara barred dissidents from distributing it” Viara is Peter Viara former U. S. Attorney, Philadelphia O. C. Division now known as “Independent Hearing Officer” for Luskin/Coia’s “Operating Agreement.” Everyone should be concerned when former Federal police are shown to be in collusion with targets of a 212 OCCA/RICO Complaint to extort and suppress LMRDA Rights and other Rights of Liberties of an eight hundred thousand (800,000) member trade union.

Agreement”) with the Justice Department. The former agents were two of twenty four (24) depositions taken by this petitioner over approximately a two-year period. See now the relevant quote giving the power over any “Law Enforcement Organization” including the F.B.I. “Operating Agreement” relative quote for convenience and clarity:

*“Anyone including a union officer, representative, member, contractor or vendor, or law enforcement organization may refer a complaint against a union official or member by filing it with the G.E.B. Attorney. The G.E.B. Attorney or the Inspector General will investigate it and decide whether charges should be brought.”*

Two short examples of facilitating and abetting the affairs of an OCCA/RICO Enterprise 18 U.S.C. 1961(4), Charles LeConche deposition testimony December 17, 2001, quote first:

*“Wall: “Did you or anybody do an investigation of Colonial financial scheme.”*

*“LeConche: “not to my knowledge”*

*“Wall: “Did you ever make a report to the membership about the 5 million dollars”*

*“LeConche: “not to my knowledge”*

Next Example, July 1997 Executive Board Assault (Manos has tape recorder on his person so he has proof of how he voted on some union expenditures:

*“CL= Charles LeConche*

*SM= Steve Manos*

*“CL: Why’d you call Ted Grabowski and try to solicit a vote against John Silva”*

*“SM: Because I am a member and I have a right to lobby”*

*“CL: You don’t have a right”*

*“CL: Steve you’re about that fuckin close for me ripping your throat out personally”*

*“CL: fuck you it ain’t a threat it’s a fucking promise”*

Manos then is blind sided attacked by LeConche, Sergeant-At-Arms, throw on the floor and then out the fire exit. He is pursued all the way to his car (tape still running) when Coia “associates-in-fact” makes the following statement “Do yourself a favor. Don’t show up for a while! We own you fucker!” No charges were brought and the 29 U.S.C. 530 assault came after the F.B.I. and U. S. Attorney’s Office Chicago gave their word

they would protect Manos. They instead abandoned affiant Manos per the direction of the D.O.J.'s "Operating Agreement."

"We own you" is the criminal phrase the Hobbs Act was written fore. Think what is going to happen if D.O.J. protected criminals of this nature get "card check."

The depositions of Attorney Cullina and Trustees of the Pension Funds revealed Local 230 and LIUNA knowingly purchased a five million dollars sold out Third Mortgage position for the financial kick back that they would receive costing laborers millions so they can steal hundreds of thousands. They don't care because their pensions are held in a separate fund. Defendant Hall's intentional fact fraud Ruling enforces an OCCA/RICO Enterprise to blanket Hobbs Act its members. Defendant Hall by her intentional fact fraud Ruling silenced an already "Captive Labor Organization." If it looks like a banana republic and acts like a banana republic someone with authority who honors their Oath should stop this. All this corruption locally was started by one man, Alan Nevas. Nevas can not give me Equitable Relief because he took retirement over Senior Status and my reliefs are Equitable Rights, which he no longer has jurisdiction. I personally wonder if he was talked into retiring, by reason of the bold and flagrant criminal violations of his Oath and it is being hide from the public because no one of sound mind would commit the degrading level of judicial crimes he did Sub Rosa in the Bridgeport Division.

Every Statutory Right has been either obstructed or usurped LMRDA RIGHT, NLRB RIGHTS, ERISA RIGHTS, Title 18, 28, 29 Rights of Protection plus the Right to All Rights, 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment Due Process Rights obstructed by D.O.J. and usurped by Federal Judges.

See BIVENS SUPRA id 394, 295 citing Amos v. United States 225 U. S. 313, 317 and BOYD SUPRA, (Finding the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment are in pari material.) This is a 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment Bivens Complaint.

RELIEF

The relief requested in this instant Bivens Complaint is the warning itself cited in BIVENS.

*i.e. "in such cases there is no safety for the citizen except in the protection of Judicial Tribunals for rights which have been **invaded by officers of the government professing to act in its name**"*

A F.R.C.P. rule 65(a)(2) hearing will show clearly that a citizen of the United States "**Rights have been invaded by officers of the government professing to act in its name.**" Also (12) years ago, this petitioner stated to co-plaintiff at the time they (union) can not do this if Judge Nations Orders them to make us whole will get a lawyer (Attorney Mercier) and it will be over in three months. That was (12) years ago. A citizen should not have to go this long in order to protect what Rights and Liberties are his. In additional physical health; this petitioner's physical health is very poor, quoting one of the specialist "It is highly improbable you will not live another year." A Rule 65(a)(2) hearing is a Right in this case at bar for the protection of a citizen "**Rights invaded by officers of the government professing to act in its name.**"

Please give extra contemplation to what "Rights Invaded" means in this matter. Any citizen of the United States has a Right to Relief when his or her own case Wall, Cooksey v. Local 230 224 F3d 168 is overturned by intentional material perjury by an officer of the government 18 U.S.C. 1961(7). Luskin abetted by a Federal Judge (Hall) professing to act in its name. See Wall Supra 224 Fed 3d 170:

*“The NLRB found that the union removed Wall as shop steward in November 1985 in retaliation for refusing to follow directions involving the ‘shake down’ of laborers for money. The NLRB also found that the union had discriminated against both Wall and Cooksey in the union’s hiring hall system in retaliation for their opposition to union management. The NLRB ordered the union to make appellants whole for lost, whole for lost earnings suffered as a result of its ‘discriminatory conduct.’”*

Not only were we not made whole, we lost our membership 28 U.S.C. 402(o) and our pension was embezzled 18 U.S.C. 664. Cooksey and Wall lived the harm cited in 224 Supra. This Court in good conscious let trial perjury committed such a criminal act against the Judicial System of the United States causing severe proximate harm to trade union citizen of the United States.”

See again 224 Fed Id 177


*“There is more than sufficient undisputed evidence in this record, as recounted above, to demonstrate that the union intended to prevent appellants’ from ever being readmitted to membership and sought to conceal that intent by equivocal temporizing, and misleading denials based on lack of referral. Until late 1995 the union clearly told appellants that readmission would be granted upon referral later showed this to have been a misrepresentation”*

Any Justice minded person should be concerned when an officer of the government 18 U.S.C. 1961(7) (Luskin) professing to act in its name, commits trial collusion perjury with a convicted pension thief, a convicted perjurer (Lopreato) and one of the targets of the 212-page OCCA/RICO Complaint (Vere O. Haynes), abetted by a Federal Judge (Hall) in act in the district and abetted in the Second Circuit (Sotomayor) by fraudulent ‘Set-Up-Panels.’ And, any Congressman that is shown ten Judicial Complaints over a five year period should make a serious case for Oversight of 28 U.S.C. 351 concerning the exposure of Due Process 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights from being usurped.

Therefore, this plaintiff respectfully requests F.R.C.P. 65(a)(2) Bivens Injunction be granted. All of the means have been exhausted giving more meaning to Bivens statement quote:

*"In such cases there is no safety for the citizen except in the protection of the Judicial Tribunals."*

Submitted By:

  
GARY R. WALL, Civil Rights Petitioner  
60 Carriage Hill Drive  
Wethersfield, CT. 06109  
860-529-2651

**CERTIFICATION**

This is to certify that a copy of the Bivens Injunction plus three affidavits with exhibits have been sent first class postage pre-paid this 25<sup>th</sup> Day of January 2010 to:

Department of Justice  
New Haven U. S. Attorneys Office  
District of Connecticut  
157 Church Street  
New Haven, CT. 06510

Hon. Janet C. Hall  
United States Courthouse  
915 Lafayette Boulevard  
Bridgeport, CT. 06604

Hon. Sonia Sotomayor  
Supreme Court  
First Street, N. E.  
Washington, D. C. 20548

Office of the General Counsel  
U. S. House of Representatives  
219 Cannon House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515  
Attn: Kerry Kircher  
Representative for Defendant John Larson

SUBMITTED BY:

  
GARY R. WALL, Civil Rights Petitioner

## **EXHIBIT A**

- 1.) Affidavit of Ron Fino `Expert Witness
- 2.) Affidavit of Judith Dobrich
- 3.) Affidavit of Stephen Manos

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

GARY R. WALL,  
WILLIAM COOKSEY SR.  
Plaintiffs

CASE NO: 02:MS-354(TPJ)

v.

CONSTRUCTION & GENERAL  
LABORERS' LOCAL 230, JOHN  
PEZZENTI, DOMINICK LOPREATO,  
AND CHARLES LECONCHE

DATED: MARCH 5, 2004

**AFFIDAVIT OF MR. RONALD FINO**

1. I am over the age of eighteen and understand and believe in the obligation of an oath.
2. My name is Ron Fino I reside at [for reasons of my personal safety as a result of my testimony against a number of organized crime members. I can reached care of Roger Simmons, Esq., 131 West Patrick Street, P. O. Box 430, Fredrick, Maryland 21705.
3. For more than 30 years [the majority of time as a LIUNA official], I provided the Federal Bureau of Investigation with accurate information relating to Organized Crime and Labor Racketeering.
4. I have testified in seven or more federal cases for the United States all ending in convictions.
5. I was classified as an expert on organized crime by the United States Justice Department in United States District Court District of Ohio Sixth Circuit, during the trial of Anthony Libatore.
6. From 1991 to 1994 with U. S. Attorney Kenneth Lawrie and numerous F.B.I. agents. My investigation and testimony contributed to the 212-page RICO Complaint against Arthur Coia Jr., et al.
7. Sworn Statement No. 7 is an exact copy of a letter I sent on February 17, 2004 to United States Attorney Patrick J. Fitzgerald, Federal Building, 219 South Dearborn Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

February 17, 2004  
United States Attorney Patrick J. Fitzgerald  
Federal Building  
219 South Dearborn Street  
5th Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Dear United States Attorney Patrick J. Fitzgerald,

I am writing you regarding the failure of the Laborers International Union Internal reform endeavor and the misuse of Department of Justice sources and information.

Starting in 1969, I provided the Department of Justice and the FBI with information relating to the control of the Laborers International Union (LIUNA) and many of its Locals by Organized Crime (LCN). In 1991 together with United States Attorney Kenneth Lowrie and numerous FBI agents, we commenced in preparing the 1994 Draft Complaint. The sole purpose of the complaint was to remove all LCN control of LIUNA and its affiliates and not limited to those in Chicago and Buffalo and opponents of Arthur Coia Jr.

When I first learned that an agreement was reached by LIUNA and the DOJ, I was opposed and openly expressed my feelings. It was only after I was assured by LIUNA GEB Attorney Robert Luskin and Inspector General Douglas Gow that New England, New York and New Jersey LCN Control would also be targeted. In addition I would be an active paid investigator and allowed reasonable unfettered ability to follow through on investigative leads. At first everything seemed to be in order and I believed that the process would be a success. It was only after I started developing sources (May 1996) that were close to Arthur Coia Jr., Armand Sabitoni, Philip Schwab and Raymond Patriarca that my investigative activity was called into question and I was ordered to cease because it was not authorized. Immediately after I testified before Congress regarding LIUNA, I learned that an article appeared in the Village Voice News that reflected that I named former Congressman Jack Kemp as "mobbed up". Outside of the FBI, I never discussed Jack Kemp with anyone nor have I ever said that he was mobbed up. I did state that Jack Kemp did certain business favors for a mob associate and eventually I was asked by Kemp if this associate was connected to the LCN. I also stated that an assistant to Jack Kemp was heavily connected to the LCN and continued to be. I was somewhat perplexed as to how the Village Voice obtained this previously unknown information but suspected Robert Luskin who had

access to all my 302's. I then received a phone call at my residence from Newsweek reporter Michael Isikoff who left a recording asking me to call him back regarding the Kemp Story. I immediately contacted the Justice Department as well as the FBI to report what I considered a very disturbing practice of someone giving out my unlisted number and a breach of security. As many know, my remarks and testimony has not created many friends in the LCN and my whereabouts could have lead to physical harm for me and/or my family.

I confronted Attorney Luskin him over the Isikoff issue, because I firmly believed that he or someone in his firm initiated the publicity of my telephone number. Luskin answered by stating that he was a dyed in the wool democrat and that this information is vital and that the public has a right to know. He never answered my questioning about who gave out my number. I explained to him that my previous comments do not hurt Jack Kemp. He asked me to let Isikoff decide and that he could be at Luskin's office in minutes. I told him I would meet with him but this will be the last of it. After meeting with Isikoff, he agreed with me that my information did not affect Jack Kemp.

Mr. Fitzgerald, I wish to point out that this episode clearly shows that Robert Luskin has used his position as well as privileged FBI and DOJ information for his own personal gain as well as the utilization of his offices in the promotion of a agenda non beneficial to the matter they were intended for.. I also wish to have known that during this time and since 1994, I was in contact with high level LIUNA officials who provided me with critical information which included Arthur Coia's role in the Luskin-Gow appointments.

Just prior to my testimony in Buffalo and Local 210, I learned from the FBI that LIUNA had conducted an intensive investigation of me in an effort to discredit my credibility. I explained that I was puzzled on why Luskin or his associates have kept this from me nor questioned me about it. I then requested from Robert Luskin and Daniel Braun that they supply me with a copy because I was informed by the FBI that information contained in the investigation documents showed that my rights may have been violated by LIUNA as well as a probable breach of lawyer-client privilege. I was assured I could have them but that I would have to wait until my testimony was done. I was also assured that assistance would be given to help me with employment and my lost wages and pension credits owed me. Even though I repeated asked for the investigation documents to date I have never received them.

During the period that I worked for LIUNA and Inspector Generals

Office I have been asked to reveal my sources which I have done. In 1998 when I realized that that the true purposes of the investigations were not against Coia or his supporters, did I start to refuse to reveal them. I was ordered to name them or I would not be paid. I decided that I no longer desired to be part of a scam and quit. Outside of my complaints to the DOJ and FBI, I have remained silent in the hope that a miracle would happen. It is 2004 and I no longer expect miracles. All I can do is ask that an investigation of the investigators take place and that the United States Department of Justice exercise its rights and place this union under Federal Trusteeship.

There is no question in my mind that all of us have been the victims of a game that has allowed certain privileged LCN members and associates as well as political figures to avail this process to put on a show so that their power remains in place. Substantial replacement of LCN control has taken place in Chicago, Buffalo a few New York City and New Jersey (certain family) locals and district councils. If you take a closer look at these you will see that without them (need to show something) the internal reform program would have been placed in the garbage. Many LCN locals and International Union representatives have remained unscathed and where success has been achieved the positions and posts have been filled with Coia lackeys. I could go on and on about the lack of investigations with Coia controlled locals and benefit funds which include many that I have personal and direct knowledge about.

Even though Coia has been removed in name? His presence remains via his law partners, cohorts and appointed overseers. Anyone familiar with the LIUNA investigation will tell you that I stated prior to its happening that Armand Sabitoni will be placed in a high LIUNA position. I also stated that Coia Sr. was close to Terry O'Sullivan Sr. and that his son or another close non-Italian will be named as General President or General Secretary Treasurer. I was at the funeral of Peter Fosco Sr., and present at the discussions to remove O'Sullivan Sr. as Secretary Treasurer because he wanted to be the next LIUNA president (which had Coia seniors blessing). Ask anyone in the know about Coia Sr., and Coia Jr's role in the Hauser – O'Sullivan Insurance swindle and who brought it to the attention of the Chicago LCN?.

Most of us know the truth about who investigated the New York City Mason Tenders as well as the Concrete Workers. Why does Luskin take credit for this or Local 91 in Niagara Falls. The bare truth is: this whole consent decree program has been a sham. A vehicle to remove Coia opponents and replace them with Coia loyalists, a vehicle where

certain Genovese family controlled officials have been allowed to escape prosecution and allowed to strengthen their position. As we know the LCN has mutated and has been restructured. The children of the made are well educated. They know that to pull a Gotti is to find a cold jail. If anything we have smartened them up. Money remains the key and since the consent decree was issued little has been done to recover and protect the pensions and health benefits of the membership. I am still aware of crimes that continue and I have pointed them out to Coia appointed Investigators. Arthur Coia Jr. stated and I quote: "There is no goal more important in our Union than eliminating all traces of improper influences and past corruption and thereby restoring true autonomy and democracy to our hardworking members." On this we both agree. Bob Luskin has alluded that the millions of dollars that the taxpayers have saved is profound and should be considered in any judgment of the process. Many of us should have known better!!! How could we allow a Coia appointed cleanup team to remove questionable elements from this infested union. We praised, including yours truly, the process even though we had every reason to be skeptical. When I stated to Luskin's office as well as to Peter Vaira that I do not like testifying over the telephone (almost impossible for me) and that I would rather face my detractors. I was told we are trying to save money and in 1 known instance (Pittsburgh) my testimony was not critical to the case.

I know I have substantial unused or explored information that can reveal the truth. I am sure and I point it out that the Doctors of Spin will find someway of painting me as bad and influenced by events not relative to the honesty, sincerity, worthiness and pious efforts of those appointed by Coia. I have testified in numerous cases involving LCN control of LIUNA, The Teamsters and Hotel Restaurant Employees Unions. I have done so at great risk to myself both physically and financially. I am no saint but I believe in the little guy who needs a voice and needs to live just like the rest of us. I have tried and I tried to work with Robert Luskin and Doug Gow. I know now that I should have followed my convictions and been more vocal earlier. I didn't but I am now.

We still have time to curtail this cancer and we still have time to help good decent workers who are mostly unaware of their losses. I know that any effort will be difficult to initiate especially since our main priority is to combat terrorism. I am confident that I can prove my case and I am sure that there are others that will participate in exposing this scam for what it is.


Sincerely,  
Ronald M. Fino

V

Cc:

Thomas J. Kneir, Special Agent in Charge, Chicago Office  
AUSA Craig Oswald  
AUSA David Buvinger  
Special Attorney J. Kenneth Lowrie


8. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ronald Fino

State of Florida

County of Duval

Subscribed and sworn to before me on this 5 day of March 2004.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public



Steven A Tice  
My Commission DD019520  
Expires April 22, 2005

**United States District Court  
District of Connecticut**

Gary R. Wall  
William Cooksey Sr.  
Stephen Manos  
Plaintiffs

Case # 397 CV 02502 JCH

v.

Robert Luskin et al.  
Defendants

Date : August 30, 1999

**Affidavit of Judith Dobrich  
In Support of Second Amended Complaint**

1. I am over the age of 18 & understand & believe in the obligation of an oath.
2. My name is Judith Dobrich & I reside at 77 Hale Road in Glastonbury, Ct.
3. I am a member of the Laborers' International Union of North America.
4. I have been a member of Local 230 since 1994.
5. I was present during a meeting of Stephen Manos & Assistant U.S. Attorney Craig Oswald & FBI special agent Ernest Luera.
6. This Spring of 1997 meeting was held at the FBI offices located in Meriden Ct.
7. I expressed concern for the safety of Mr. Manos regarding his association with the union bosses of Local 230.

8. I specifically stated:

*"I am afraid that they are going to kill Steve & nobody will know why, because they're all going to lie."*


9. U.S. Attorney Oswald stated:

*"If anyone so much as mussed a hair on his [Manos's] head, we will swoop down."*

10. After Mr. Manos was brutally assaulted on July 30, 1997, & while he was still in the hospital, I immediately contacted the Chicago office of the Department of Justice.

11. Soon thereafter, that same office cut off all communication with me with no explanation.

By:




Judith Dobrich

State of Connecticut

County of Hartford

Subscribed & sworn to before me this 27 day of August, 1999

  
FRANCINE E. AUSTIN  
NOTARY PUBLIC  
COMM. EXPIRES 10/20/2002

**United States District Court  
District Of Connecticut**

Gary R. Wall  
William Cooksey Sr.  
Stephen Manos  
Plaintiffs

Case # 397 CV 02502 JCH

v.


Robert Luskin et al.  
Defendants

Date: August 30, 1999

**Affidavit of Stephen Manos  
In Support Of Second Amended Complaint**

1. I am over the Age of 18 & understand & believe in the obligation of an oath.
2. My name is Stephen Manos & I reside at 77 Hale Road in Glastonbury Ct.
3. I am a retired member of the Laborers' International Union of North America.
4. I was Vice-President of Hartford Local 230 from June, 1995 to June 1998.
5. In March of 1997, I personally met with Assistant U.S. Attorney Craig Oswald & FBI Special Agent Ernest Luera in the FBI offices in Meriden Connecticut.
6. Oswald & Luera work out of the Department of Justice in Chicago Illinois.
7. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss racketeering activity occurring inside of Local 230.

- 8. I personally told Oswald & Luera that I was concerned about my physical safety because of my providing information to them.
- 9. Assistant U. S. Attorney Oswald responded with the following statement:  
*"If anyone musses a hair on your head, we will swoop down."*
- 10. I was physically assaulted by union officials at a local 230 Executive Board meeting held on July 30, 1997.
- 11. I reported this assault to Oswald & Luera, & was subsequently abandoned by their department with all communication cut off & never an explanation.


By:  


Stephen Manos

State of Connecticut

County Of Hartford

Subscribed & sworn to before me this 27 Day of August, 1999

  
 Comm Ex 10/30/2002  
 FRANCINE E. AUSTIN  
 NOTARY PUBLIC  
 COMM. EXPIRES \_\_\_\_\_

**EXHIBIT B**

Letter to Hon. John Roberts

Dated July 14, 2009

In his capacity as

Chief of the Judicial Conference

Plus Letter to Breyer 28 U.S.C. 351

Conduct Committee

January 26, 2010


The Honorable Justice Breyer  
Capacity Chairperson 28 U.S.C. 351 Conduct Committee  
United States Supreme Court  
First Street, N. E.  
Washington, D. C. 20548

RE: Defendant Sotomayor 3:09cv1066(DJS)

Dear Honorable Justice Breyer:

For reasons of convenience, money and time, this letter is meant to direct Your Honor to the consequences of white-washing Judicial crimes by requesting Your Honor go to this website [www.unitedstatesproselaw.com](http://www.unitedstatesproselaw.com) and read the Bivens Injunction dated the same day of this letter 1/26/10. Also in Exhibit B is a copy of a letter this petitioner sent to Chief Roberts identifying defendant Sotomayor's judicial criminal scheme as far back as January 7, 2008. A copy of this letter and the Chief Roberts letter is also being sent to Your Honor's Conduct Committee. Everyone involved should know the consequences of your 'white-washing.'

Submitted By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary R. Wall, Due Process 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment Petitioner  
60 Carriage Hill Drive  
Wethersfield, CT. 06109  
860-529-2651

July 14, 2009

The Honorable Chief Justice of the United States John Roberts  
Capacity Chief Judicial Conference  
United States Supreme Court  
First Street, N. E.  
Washington, D.C. 20548

RE: CIRCUIT JUDGE SOTOMAYOR

Dear Hon. Chief of the Judicial Conference and Justice Robert's Conduct Committee Members:

This letter is being sent to Your Honor pursuant to the 28 U.S.C. 351 Conduct Committee instructions that I have followed since July 2005. I have shown the Conduct Committee since that time, D.O.J. corruption politics corruptly influencing the Judicial Branch by letter dated January 7, 2008 exposing one of multiple fact fraud committed by Circuit Judge Sotomayor; See Page 2 of letter dated January 7, 2008 quoted:

*"Multiple complaints and pleadings in the Second Circuit obstructed by judicial fraud have exposed at an 11(b)(3) Level the corrupt use of law clerks, who insidiously through other judges on a panel, falsely brief unknowing Federal Judges. On this panel experience teaches the most likely corruption scenario is Circuit Judge Sotomayor, who is interchangeably used in an insidious manner by Judge Jacobs and Walker is most likely using shared law clerks or a shared law clerk to obstruct Pro se filings that expose the D.O.J. LIUNA "Operating Agreement" as an 18 USC 371(a,b) conspiracy to defraud the Lawful Functions of the United States. The other two judges are most likely being falsely briefed by the shared law clerk(s) (supported by evidence in related filings)."*

Time, facts and circumstances have proven Circuit Judge Sotomayor's obstructions to be factual.

See also as an example Rule 40 Petition for a Panel Rehearing Case No. 06-1264cv dated February 12, 2009 showing Circuit Judge Sotomayor "Set-Up Panels" in the Second Circuit. Quote relative part:

*"Circuit Judge Sotomayor is familiar with the subject matter of this case and related cases in the Second Circuit. She has sat on multiple panels in this case and the companion case. Circuit Judge Sotomayor has already committed multiple fact fraud Rulings that abetted Circuit Judge Walker and Circuit Judge Jacobs extra judicial documented acts of fraud in addition to fact fraud decision concerning District Judge Hall. Five (5) Years of 11(b)(3) Inquiries, Nine (9)*

*years of multiple circuit obstructions in twelve (12) years of cases has given this petitioner a good idea how the set-up panel functions."*

This 28 U.S.C. 351 Petitioner thinks Your Honor's Conduct Committee did an insufficient job in the 351 investigation and because of that fact, Your Honor has a federal judge who facilitated Judicial Council fraud to the Judicial Conference and a Federal Judge who also abetted post dating docket fraud, one step away from degrading Your Honor's Court.

Canon 3A applies:

*"Adjudicate responsibly" "(1)A "Judge should be faithful to and maintain professional competence in the Law, and should not be swayed by partisan intent. public clamor or fear of criticism."*

Therefore, this (4) year 28 U.S.C. 351 Petitioner respectfully request Your Honor set a precedent and reject Circuit Judge's Sotomayor's confirmation until a 28 U.S.C.351 Investigation is made, take notice Judge Sotomayor hides from averments and accountability, making her both an Article II criminal and a coward. Do not let bi-partisan D.O.J. corruption degrade Your Honor's Court with one of its puppets.

Copy of this letter has been sent to Justice Breyer and his 351 Conduct Committee.

CHAMBERS

Honorable Chief Justice Stephen G. Breyer  
Capacity Judicial Conference 28 USC 351 Conduct Committee  
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT  
First Street, N. E.  
Washington, D. C. 20543


CHAMBERS, Honorable Sarah Evans Barker  
U. S. Courthouse  
46 East Ohio Street  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

CHAMBERS, Honorable Sally M. Rider  
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT  
First Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS, Hon. D. Brook Hornby  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
73 Hammond Street  
Bangor, Maine 04401

CHAMBERS, Honorable J. Harvie Wilkinson  
UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE  
1100 East Main Street  
Richmond, Virginia 23219

CHAMBERS, Honorable Pasco M. Bowman  
UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE  
111 South 10<sup>th</sup> Street  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102

SUBMITTED BY:   
GARY R. WALL (860) 529-2631  
60 Carriage Hill Drive  
Wethersfield, CT. 06109