

Part 1: Judge Emmet Sullivan wears no clothes

Posted: May 30, 2020

I might be the only accredited (juris doctorate) legal professional who will not sugar coat Judge Emmet Sullivan’s over-the-top abuse of power in his issuance of his May 13, 2020 order in the General Michael Flynn case entitled: “Order Appointing Amicus Curiae”.

In this debut article, I’ll delve into how and why Judge Sullivan’s conduct is literally judicial thuggery. As indicated, this is Part 1 of an unlimited series of articles dedicated to empowering We The People in combatting judicial abuse of power. The irrefutable fact is that the judicial thuggery displayed in the General Flynn case is far from an aberration; that, in actuality, the General Flynn case is the poster child for systemic judicial thuggery that occurs day-in and day-out throughout the courts nationwide—all courts (civil, criminal, bankruptcy, land, probate, divorce, etc.).

As an actively licensed Massachusetts attorney of 24 years, admitted to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court, I have personally and professionally battled—and continue to do so—in the guerilla warfare of judicial tyranny. I’m here to inform everyday citizens what the reality is: Judge Emmet Sullivan’s conduct in the General Flynn case is business as usual and long-embedded for more than three (3) decades.

The very purpose for my writing this article is to have everyday Americans fully grasp the systemic, devastating prevalence of judicial abuse of power—and to fully understand that judicial abuse most certainly can happen to them.

From the very first day of admittance to the Massachusetts Bar, my legal career has been focused on protecting the average citizen’s constitutional rights; and, particularly, for the past nine (9) years, my focus has been exposing judicial lawlessness as an attorney whistleblower—with the past three (3) years, the Massachusetts Board of Bar Overseers (BBO) lawlessly and maliciously persecuting me. (Details of the BBO Witch Trial are viewable at: <http://www.destination2justice.com/retaliation-by-ma-board-of-bar-overseers>).

My knowledge and experience in the subject matter of systemic judicial lawlessness has reached global audiences since the recent March 11, 2020 release of my featured narrative role in Alex Gibney’s one-hour documentary called: Guardian Inc (Episode of Dirty Money Season 2). <https://youtu.be/vZm6WuAfjiw>

Why all Americans should care about Judge Sullivan’s abuse of power:

Prevalent judicial lawlessness affects us all—it happens to the rich, the poor, all socioeconomic groups; it makes no difference the color of one’s skin, religion, age, gender or political party.

Nationwide documented court records overwhelmingly establish that systemic judicial abuse of power has irreparably devastated countless citizens and their loved ones; public officials having no lawful basis ripping families apart, hastening death of loved ones, deliberately causing

financially ruin—decades of endless inhumane acts and it still continues.

<https://stopguardianabuse.org> <https://www.destination2justice.com/free-marvin/federal-civil-action-2015>

The harsh reality is that many people don't realize it until they personally end up in the court system, whether it be of a civil and/or criminal nature. By the time the average person wakes up to the reality of being trapped in a rigged system, it's often too late.

Visualize this reality: you suddenly trip into quicksand, your own lawyer is standing there on solid ground, looking at you straight in the eye, hands in their pockets, not even offering to throw you a rope.

The General Flynn case: a wake-up call for America


Attorney Sidney Powell's bravery is not just a blessing for General Flynn and his family, but also for America.

As a whistleblower exposing judicial corruption, I am forever grateful that Attorney Powell stepped in as counsel for General Flynn when she did; that in so doing, she courageously and with fortitude, single-handedly exposed the heinous government frame-up of General Flynn and the sabotage by his former attorneys.

There are no adequate words to express the extraordinary significance of Attorney Powell's actions as true legal counsel—actions by legal counsel that is essentially nonexistent in the "legal profession"; such absence being the core reason for absolute thriving judicial tyranny.

It is my sincere hope that after people read this article, it will have a lasting impact that motivates citizens to become civically engaged; speaking up, demanding justice for all (even if he/she hasn't yet personally suffered at the hands of judicial abuse).

Best explaining the sorely needed collective voice of We The People in demanding real oversight and accountability for judicial misconduct is the below meme:



To that effect, it is equally important to highlight the exceptional efforts of Pasquale Scopelliti and Tamara Leigh with <https://www.pardonflynnnow.com>. Together they have spearheaded the most powerful force for bringing forth justice through, as what I have coined: The Court of Public Accountability.

The events that led to the DOJ filing a motion to dismiss the criminal matter against General Flynn is what every citizen should recognize as a true testament to the well-known adage: sunlight is the best disinfectant and that We The People, indeed, do have the power to restore law and order in this country.

Judge Sullivan’s Order: Literal Judicial Thuggery

**“Some will rob you with a six-gun, and some with a fountain pen”
– Woodie Guthrie**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. MICHAEL T. FLYNN, Defendant.	Crim. Action No. 17-232 (EGS)
ORDER APPOINTING AMICUS CURIAE	
Upon consideration of the entire record in this case, it is hereby	
ORDERED that the Court exercises its inherent authority to appoint The Honorable John Gleeson (Ret.) as <i>amicus curiae</i> to present arguments in opposition to the government’s Motion to Dismiss, ECF No. 198, <i>see, e.g., United States v. Fokker Servs. B.V.</i> , 818 F.3d 733, 740 (D.C. Cir. 2016); <i>Jin v. Ministry of State Sec.</i> , 557 F. Supp. 2d 131, 136 (D.D.C. 2008); it is further	
ORDERED that <i>amicus curiae</i> shall address whether the Court should issue an Order to Show Cause why Mr. Flynn should not be held in criminal contempt for perjury pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 401, Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 42, the Court’s inherent authority, and any other applicable statutes, rules, or controlling law.	

Here’s the real skinny behind Judge Sullivan’s court order

As shown above, in Judge Sullivan’s own words, he stated that the specific purpose of appointing an “amicus curiae” is to “present arguments in opposition to the government’s motion to dismiss.”

In no uncertain terms, Judge Sullivan, himself, blatantly and flagrantly expressed that he already determined that he vehemently rejects the DOJ’s motion to dismiss. Therefore, in reality, such expressed definitive position would compel any “reasonable and ordinary” judge to formalize such conclusion in an official denial of the DOJ’s motion. What is so astounding is Judge Sullivan’s outright admission to his predisposition!

Red Flag of “Amicus Curiae” Appointment by Its Own Definition

As specifically defined in the federal statute 50 U.S.C. Sec. 1803(4), the “duties of an “amicus curiae” is set forth as:

- (2)(A), the amicus curiae shall provide to the court, as appropriate—
- (A) legal arguments that advance the protection of individual privacy and civil liberties;
 - (B) information related to intelligence collection or communications technology; or
 - (C) legal arguments or information regarding any other area relevant to the issue presented to the court.

As laid out by the above statutory definition of amicus curiae, a person does not need to have a law degree to understand that, in plain English, Judge Sullivan had no legitimate intention of having retired Judge John Gleeson act in the true capacity as an “amicus curiae”.

By stating the “appointment” was specifically “to present arguments in opposition of the government’s Motion to Dismiss” is unethically and intellectually dishonest. The above statutory definition unambiguously and completely contradicts Judge Sullivan’s stated purpose for “appointing” retired Judge John Gleeson .

Judge Sullivan makes no bones about his intention for retired Judge John Gleeson to play the role as a “special prosecutor”. Obviously, Judge Sullivan couldn’t come right out and call the appointment what it really is because he full well knows how absurd (even to a nonlawyer) that would look for a special prosecutor to be appointed to derail the prosecuting party (the DOJ)!

Red Flag by DOJ’s well-founded and substantiated grounds for dismissal

Without even needing to go through the history of what has happened in the General Flynn case, all one has to do to see the over-the-top judicial lawlessness is to examine Judge Sullivan’s “Order Appointing Amicus Curiae” (image above) in relation to the Department of Justice’s (DOJ) Motion to Dismiss

With the link provided, you all can read the DOJ’s motion to dismiss with your own eyes

<https://sidneypowell.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Doc.198-Flynn-Governments-Motion-to-DISMISS-against-Michael-T.-Flynn.pdf>

On page 2 of the DOJ’s Motion to Dismiss, it states:

After a considered review of all the facts and circumstances of this case, including newly discovered and disclosed information appended to the defendant’s supplemental pleadings, ECF Nos. 181, 188-190,¹ **the Government has concluded that the interview of Mr. Flynn was untethered to, and unjustified by, the FBI’s counterintelligence investigation into Mr. Flynn—a no longer justifiably predicated investigation that the FBI had,** in the Bureau’s own words, prepared to close because it had yielded an “absence of any derogatory information.” Ex. 1 at 4, FBI FD-1057 “Closing Communication” Jan. 4, 2017 (emphases added). **The**

Government is not persuaded that the January 24, 2017 interview was conducted with a legitimate investigative basis and therefore does not believe Mr. Flynn’s statements were material even if untrue. Moreover, we [do] not believe that the Government can prove either the relevant false statements or their materiality beyond a reasonable doubt.

As shown by the above direct quote from the DOJ’s motion, it sums up the crux of the irrefutable justified grounds necessitating a judge’s required allowance of the DOJ’s motion to dismiss. Specifically, the above quote—substantiated by the facts laid out in the rest of the DOJ’s motion—says in non-legalese:

- The prosecution does not have sufficient evidence to charge General Michael Flynn for the original charges brought (lying to the FBI); and
- That the investigation of General Flynn was not only baseless, but was, in fact, unlawful FBI conduct.

And that, my fellow Americans, is in the **DOJ’s own words!** (As a side note: usually, when a prosecutor does not have sufficient evidence to prove its case, the caption of the motion is usually: a nolle prosequi—a formal notice of abandonment by the prosecutor its action).

The REAL rationale for Judge Sullivan not denying the DOJ’s Motion to Dismiss

It is very evident from a professional legal examination that Judge Sullivan deliberately chose to not deny the DOJ’s motion—and that was because his intention was to specifically evade personal accountability.

Denying the DOJ’s motion would have meant that it would have been directly appealable as a matter of right by General Flynn and the DOJ.

Keeping in mind the who-knows-what is going on behind the scenes with Judge Sullivan and the DOJ—remember previously, the DOJ was adamant in its reluctance to end this charade in the first instance.

It would have been far too apparent for the DOJ to not directly appeal an outright denial of its motion to dismiss; which speaks volumes since the DOJ has yet to file its position regarding the writ of mandamus filed by Attorney Powell on behalf of General Flynn—and I’d bet that the DOJ doesn’t file anything given the irony of the Court of Appeals having expressed in its Order that the DOJ was not required to file any pleading; that a filing is at the DOJ’s pleasure.

<https://sidneypowell.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/DC-CIR-FULL-ORDER.png>

Furthermore, it is a well-known “little fact” in the legal arena that a writ of mandamus is a procedural avenue having slim odds of being granted—then add into the equation Judge Sullivan’s own written bio published on the Judicial Nominating Commission’s website <https://jnc.dc.gov/biography/honorable-emmet-g-sullivan>

Is it really any wonder that Judge Sullivan decided to play the odds and use diversionary tactics rather than the normal course of denying the motion?

Where legal analysis can get a bit dry and boring, I'll spare you (for now) a detailed blow-by-blow of the unconstitutional nature of Judge Sullivan's own admission of trying to indirectly play prosecutor in a black robe through a retired judge henchman.

The next blog installment: how Judge Sullivan intended to use the "amicus curiae" as an attempt to lawlessly punish General Flynn for the government filing its motion to dismiss—Judge's Sullivan's second prong of his order for the "amicus curiae" to help him "decide" whether there needs to be an Order for Show Cause of "criminal contempt for perjury".