

Judge Flapdoodle Strikes Again

Back in 2009, Judicial Watch filed a lawsuit to remove Hildebeast Clinton as Secretary of State under the Emoluments Clause in the U.S. Constitution. Naturally this was of great interest to me. However, after reading the lawsuit I wondered why Judicial Watch didn't file a Quo Warranto to remove her Highness?

By that time, I was very well versed on this 'Quo Warranto' process in the massive efforts to remove the criminal imposter, Barry Soetoro aka Barack Obama, from the White House. He usurped the office of president through fraud and deceit. I wrote about the *Rodearmel vs Clinton* case with my prediction [it would not succeed and it didn't](#).

"As a matter of fact, there is another lawsuit that has run its course, meaning denied for hearing by the U.S. Supreme Court, you might find of interest: *Rodearmel v. Clinton*. [That lawsuit was filed in January 2009](#) on behalf of a 19-year veteran of the Foreign Service Officer under the State Department, David Rodearmel, a retired Lt. Col. in the U.S. Army Reserve Judge Advocate General Corp. While I support and respect Judicial Watch in their pursuit of making sure no one is above the law, I simply did not understand why they didn't use the Quo Warranto for Rodearmel's case.

"The defendants (mother government) moved to dismiss and [in their filing](#), there is an important footnote; number 6 at the bottom of page 25:

"6 "The D.C. Court of Appeals has observed that a plaintiff who seeks to directly attack the appointment of an official (as opposed to attacking an action of that official) will rarely if ever have standing. See *Andrade v. Lauer*, 729 F.2d

1475, 1496-97 (D.C. Cir. 1984). In the same case, the court suggested that the only proper way to assert such a direct attack is through an action for a writ of quo warranto. See *id.* at 1497 (citing cases). A quo warranto action may only be brought by the Attorney General of the United States or the United States Attorney or, if these Executive Branch officials decline a request, by a private party who has obtained leave of court. See D.C. Stat. §§ 16-3502-3503; see also *Rae v. Johnson*, 1993 WL 544295, at *1”

“Footnotes found in legal filings are very important. What the one above says is quite plain and easy enough for even me to understand; let’s apply it to Rodearmel. He is attacking the appointment of an official (Hillary Clinton) which the court says “will rarely if ever have standing.” Pretty straight forward.

[Exactly why the U.S. Supreme Court denied the writ of certiorari](#): (emphasis below is mine) “ON CONSIDERATION WHEREOF, it is ordered and adjudged by this Court that the District Court dismissed for lack of standing...” And:

“The appeal is therefore dismissed for want of jurisdiction.”

“Does that mean the Supreme Court is saying jurisdiction belongs to the District Court in Washington, DC, under a Quo Warranto? It seems to me that is the case if you read Footnote 6 above: “observed that a plaintiff who seeks to directly attack the appointment of an official...the court suggested that the only proper way to assert such a direct attack is through an action for a writ of quo warranto...” Going back to *Newman v US ex Rel. Frizzell*: ” Rest at link above.

Last week it came to my attention there is another Emoluments Clause case and predictably, it’s against President Trump. Before I get to it, what exactly does the Emoluments Clause in the U.S. Constitution say? [Art. 1, Section. 6, Clause 2](#): “No Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he

was elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased during such time: and no person holding any office under the United States, shall be a member of either House during his continuance in office.”

And, as cited below, Art, 1, Section 9. This from Cornell Law: [Emoluments Clause](#)

“Also known as the Title of Nobility Clause, [Article I, Section 9](#), Clause 8 of the [U.S. Constitution](#) prohibits any person holding a government office from accepting any present, emolument, or title from any “King, Prince, or foreign State,” without congressional consent. This clause is meant to prevent external influence and corruption of American officers by foreign States. A similar provision was included in the Articles of Confederation, applicable to both federal and state officers. The language of the modern clause, however, suggests that only federal government officials are prohibited from accepting any emoluments.

“That the phrase “Offices of Profit or Trust under the United States” applies to all *appointed* officials is undisputed, however there is much debate as to whether it extends to *elected* officials.

“History does not provide a clear answer: When he served as Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton produced a list of persons holding such offices at the request of the Senate; the list did not include any elected positions. Further, during their presidencies, while George Washington did not seek or obtain congressional consent for foreign gifts, Andrew Jackson did.

“The [Foreign Gifts and Decorations Act](#) of 1966, on the other hand, enumerates several elected positions in its definition of “employees” who may not accept any gift of more than

minimal value without congressional approval. Such “employees” include the President and the Vice President, a Member of Congress, and the spouses and dependents of the same.

“A [constitutional amendment](#) was introduced in 1810 to modify the Emoluments Clause. The effect would have been to strip the citizenship of any U.S. citizen who accepted, claimed, received, or retained any title of nobility from a foreign government. However, this amendment was never ratified, though it is technically still pending before the states.

“The interpretation of the Emoluments Clause has never been litigated before the U.S. Supreme Court.” Several footnotes at the bottom if one would like further history on that clause.

While I am not a lawyer and have no legal training, I would make the argument that the Clinton Foundation is the quintessential example of accepting gifts while career criminal, Hillary, was playing Secretary of State. **Pay to Play should have been prominently featured at the top of the Clinton Foundation letterhead.**

A dear friend of mine with a brilliant legal mind who practiced law for many decades refers to a federal judge as Judge Flapdoodle. He holds them in utter contempt as I do. The first time he said Judge Flapdoodle in one of our phone conversations I wanted to laugh but kept listening to what he was saying. Judge Flapdoodle perfectly describes the sorry state of our judicial system in this country herded over by ignorant and/or agenda driven judges.

Judge Flapdoodle strikes again:

[Emoluments case, questions of ethics and constitutional intent](#)

“Lawsuits have been filed in federal court in New York, Maryland, and the District of Columbia seeking a declaration that President Trump is violating the US Constitution because his hotels and other companies continue to do business with

foreign governments and foreign officials.”

One legal scholar said this:

“If I went to the Trump Hotel right now, and I reserved that [Ivanka] suite and I paid \$1,600, stayed there for a night, had dinner, and left, nobody would say I had made a gift to the Trump Organization. I just paid what it cost,” says Andy Grewal, a professor at the University of Iowa College of Law.

“If, the very next day, a foreign ambassador stayed there and paid the exact same amount that I did, it seems strange to me to all of a sudden call it a gift or an emolument,” Professor Grewal says. “You could reasonably say that maybe if the president knows about it, he may favor a particular country in negotiations if they are always holding receptions and functions at the hotel. But that doesn’t make it a gift,” Grewal says.”

By all accounts President Trump, relying on his in-house counsel, has bent over backwards to avoid breaking the law:

“Administration lawyers maintain there is no conflict of interest between Trump’s work as president and the Trump hotel business. Trump’s sons have pledged not to pursue new business deals during their father’s presidency. And prior to becoming president, Trump pledged to donate to the US Treasury all proceeds from foreign officials staying at his hotels. Trump Organization officials announced last month that they turned over \$151,000 to the Treasury for business with foreign officials conducted between Jan. 20 and Dec. 31, 2017.”

Of course, that will never be enough for those out to kill Trump’s presidency. Bog him down with a new lawsuit every week. Not to mention out-of-control fishing expeditions wasting tens of millions of dollars for nothing but political agendas.

[Alan Dershowitz Warns: Criminalizing Political Differences](#)

"Very Dangerous"

Turley: Sessions' Appointing Utah Federal Prosecutor Much Better for Trump than 2nd Special Counsel

But, what about the judges who continue to rule against President Trump on various issues where he **has absolute presidential authority**? Keeping those who hate America out of this country for one and now these absurd emoluments cases.

Individuals who stay at hotels owned by his corporation and pay for a room are conducting a commercial transaction as my dear friend who coined 'Judge Flapdoodle' stated in an email to me the other day. Now, in my mind, *a commercial transaction is not a gift*. President Trump did not let Ambassador Ireland stay free at his hotel and if the ambassador said his paid stay was nice, that's now considered a violation of the emoluments clause? Ambassador Ireland decided to stay at a world class hotel closest to the White House where that individual might be visiting for any number of reasons. Big deal. Judge Flapdoodle in each of those lawsuits should have thrown them out.

From the Ninth (Silly) Circuit to the U.S. Supreme Court this country is drowning in Judge Flapdoodles. Not to mention crooks who end up on the bench. Supreme Court Justice Sonya Sotomayer is a prime example. She should be in a federal prison not presiding over what are referred to as "same sex marriage" ceremonies. No such thing. Another reason I voted for Trump was judicial appointments for federal judges as well as the U.S. 'Supreme' Court.

Dr. Richard Cordero has been on a crusade for many years trying to expose abuse in the federal judiciary and getting someone to listen. I can tell you this honorable man has received ZERO help from Congress. Oh, forget the ethically BANKRUPT members of the Democratic/Communist Party USA. Their rank disregard for enforcing our immigration laws to get illegals signed up in their party and voting is beyond

detestable and continues to wreak major destruction on our republic.

[Proposal to PBS Newshour to investigate unaccountable judges' riskless abuse of power](#), which harms scores of millions of men and women, more than sexual abuse by Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq., Ph.D., University of Cambridge, England, M.B.A., University of Michigan Business School, D.E.A., La Sorbonne, Paris, Judicial Discipline Reform, New York City. Please do go to the link above.

I ask this before in a column several years ago: Where are all the attorneys in this country who represent innocent individuals slain in federal court rooms or attorneys fighting government corruption only to be shot down by some crook or biased judge on the bench with an agenda? Seems to me they would be very interested in Dr. Cordero's efforts as well should the American people.

As I wrote in my column last week, one of the greatest failures of Congress is their refusal to remove corrupt judges who wouldn't know what the U.S. Constitution says or means if James Madison stood in front of them and read it word for word.

But, the American people, sadly just like here in Texas last month, I'm afraid will continue to reelect the same incumbents back to Congress in the upcoming primaries and for that we will all suffer. Why? Because they are distracted by dirty political games that dominate talk radio and cable network talk shows **who never talk about things like this column**. Ignorance is killing us. **That's why it's up to you to get columns like this out there on social media and email lists to reach as many Americans as we can.**

In closing, I want to mention a movie I watched the other night that sickened me to my soul. I don't watch many movies as I simply don't have time or today's offerings are cultural

poison, sex romps or nothing but special effects. I hope you will take the time to watch this one, U.S.S. Indianapolis: Men of Courage starring Nicholas Gage.

I had no idea the history of that ship until a friend recommended the movie. [The Worst Naval Disaster in US History](#) is another SHAMEFUL event in our nation's history. If anyone thinks corruption and cover-ups are something new in the past few decades, the story of what OUR government did to the men aboard that ship and its captain will enrage you.

It's not for anyone with a weak stomach. It is a gut-wrenching true story. Watch it. You won't be sorry although it will break your heart. **However, we must not turn our backs on history and ignore such grotesque actions by our government.** U.S.S. Indianapolis: Men of Courage is available on [Netflix](#) and probably retail outlets.

© 2018 NWV – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Devvy: devvyk@nvn.net

Links:

[1 – GOP Senators Ignore Sotomayor's Criminal Activities](#)
7-20-09 (Jeff Sessions)

[2 – Sotomayor's confirmation vote rescheduled](#) – here's why
7-22-09

[3 – Justice Sotomayor: tax evasion, perjury – what did Obama know and when?](#) 4-23-12