

From:

Aug 13 2019

Walter Tuvell, PhD
836 Main St.
Reading, MA 01867
781-475-7254 (c)
walt.tuvell@gmail.com
<http://JudicialMisconduct.US>

To:

EOUSA; OIG

Cc:

OPR; FBI; PIN

Subject:

EOUSA Is Lying, Joins Conspiracy

THE LETTER EOUSA SENT ME

This letter responds to the letter that EOUSA has written to me, dated Aug 7 2019¹ (which responds to my letter to OIG dated Jul 23²). Briefly/summarily stated: EOUSA is lying, and has now joined the conspiracy³ I have complained-of — and all-in-all this *proves* I am now being given a bum's-rush royal run-around slowwalk/nowalk whitewash/doubletalk/gaslight by the DOJ-as-a-whole.

EOUSA IS LYING, HAS JOINED CONSPIRACY

Since EOUSA's Aug 7 letter purports to respond to my Jul 23 letter, it must be assumed that (i) EOUSA actually *read/comprehended* my Jul 23 letter. Since my Jul 23 letter stated right up-front (in its

1 • For what seems like the 1,000th time, I repeat: my whole case is fully documented on my website, at <https://JudicialMisconduct.US/CaseStudies/WETvIBM>, and **you are assumed to be familiar with that website**. The cited EOUSA letter is at <https://JudicialMisconduct.US/sites/default/files/2019-08/EOUSALetter.pdf>.

2 • <https://JudicialMisconduct.US/sites/default/files/2019-07/OIGReply2.pdf>.

3 • That conspiracy was first raised on ¶3 of my Jul 15 letter, <https://JudicialMisconduct.US/sites/default/files/2019-07/OPRLetter.pdf>. And as mentioned there, EOUSA's new conspiratorial "overt act" by EOUSA now **extends the statute of limitations** for this case yet again, to **five years from the present**.

¶1f1) an advertisement for my website (similar to ¶1f1 of this instant letter), it must further be assumed that (ii) EOUSA did indeed familiarize itself with my website.⁴ Given these assumptions (i-ii), and given that (iii) EOUSA's Aug 7 letter provides me with nothing but lies/doubletalk/gaslight (as detailed/proved *infra*), we are inexorably forced to conclude that (iv) EOUSA has now joined the conspiracy against me mentioned *supra*.

FORM LETTER

The entire substantive content of EOUSA's Aug 7 letter is comprised of (three clauses of) a two-page "**Form Letter**," entitled *Executive Office for United States Attorneys, Common Requests for Assistance*. Thereby, EOUSA has characterized/pigeon-holed my case into a "common request for assistance." But such a characterization cannot be further from the truth (i.e., EOUSA **lied**)! For, indeed, my case is so uncommon that it is (undoubtedly) *unique*.⁵

Then, having falsely characterized my case as "common," EOUSA proceeds to highlight ("manually," i.e., by PDF Annotations) the Form Letter's **three clauses** regarding Allegations of Misconduct. The following three sections of this instant letter address those three clauses.

4 • Otherwise, astounding/mind-boggling incompetence would have to be presumed (responding to a complaint without even attempting to understand it) — but that certainly cannot possibly be the case, because EOUSA is run by highly intelligent/proficient/competent/professional lawyers, right?

5 • If my case is not unique, then I hereby challenge you to exhibit another case which is similar to mine, in some reasonable degree. (You cannot do so.) See ¶5f12 of my Jun 21 letter, <https://JudicialMisconduct.US/sites/default/files/2019-06/LellingContinuesLying.pdf>.

1: ALLEGATIONS OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT

This clause of the Form Letter advises me to **file a complaint** with my **District Court's Clerk's Office** (presumably, what's really meant here is the **Judicial Council**), and/or **Judicial Conference** (though EOUSA doesn't mention this title). But **I have already done that,**⁶ and received only *lies/cover-up* from the Judicial Council and Conference. Indeed, those judges are guilty of, and I have accused them of, criminal wrongdoing.⁷

EOUSA knows this, because this information is contained in the stream of letters that I've recently (since May 15) communicated with the DOJ, and posted on my website — which we have assumed EOUSA has reviewed. By pretending this is not so, **EOUSA is lying** to me.

2: ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT BY U.S. ATTORNEY⁸

This clause of the Form Letter advises me to **contact the OPR**. But **I have already done that**, and received *no response* from OPR.

EOUSA knows this, because this information is contained in the stream of letters that I've recently communicated with the DOJ, and posted on my website (see the *To:* and *Cc:* lists of those letters) — which we have assumed EOUSA has reviewed. By pretending this is not so, **EOUSA is lying** to me.

6 • It's documented in *very great detail* on my website (which EOUSA has familiarized itself with, by our assumptions).

7 • For anyone who has perused my website (such as EOUSA), or read the stream of letters I've recently communicated with DOJ (such as EOUSA), this is *obvious*.

8 • Actually, the Form Letter speaks of "Assistant" U.S. Attorneys, whereas I allege misconduct by the U.S. Attorney himself, Andrew Lelling.

3: ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT BY FBI AGENTS OR OTHER FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS

This clause of the Form Letter advises me to **contact the OIG**. But **I have already done that**, and received *no response* from OIG.

EOUSA knows this, not only because (i) this information is contained in the stream of letters that I've recently communicated with the DOJ, and posted to my website (which we have assumed EOUSA has reviewed), but also because (ii) OIG itself "punted"/"passed the buck" to EOUSA to review my complaints.⁹ By pretending this is not so, **EOUSA is lying** to me.

OIG KNEW THIS WOULD HAPPEN (SURELY)

Thus we see from the above that EOUSA has completely abrogated its responsibility to address my concerns, and indeed gone so far as to lie/conspire against me.

But what's even more amazing is that the "presumptively incorruptible" OIG surely knew this would happen. For, the most modest research into EOUSA (its website <https://www.justice.gov/usao/eousa> and elsewhere¹⁰) reveals that EOUSA is *by design/intent* nothing more than a biased/fawning groupie/sycophant/flunkie organization *for* (not *against*) U.S. Attorneys. I.e., the U.S. Attorneys are the real constituency for EOUSA, and not real citizens with real complaints like me.

9 • See especially ¶2(iii) of my Jul 23 letter <https://JudicialMisconduct.US/sites/default/files/2019-07/OIGReply2.pdf>, where I explicitly **complain about OIG ignoring my complaints about FBI/PIN**, and *EOUSA knows this* (by our assumptions).

10 • Such as <https://www.grassley.senate.gov/sites/default/files/judiciary/upload/U.S.%20Attorneys%2C%2009-17-14%2C%20Letter%20to%20EOUSA%2C%20AUSA%20Misconduct%20Cases.pdf>.

WHAT SHOULD REALLY NOW HAPPEN INSTEAD

Let's face it: what OIG has tried to do¹¹ (falsely) is (i) pretend my *second-level* complaints about Andrew Lelling are the *only* actionable thing about my case (ignoring my *first-level* complaints about Obstruction of Justice, or Fraud Upon the Courts, by Judges), and so (ii) pawn me off onto EOUSA, hoping/knowing EOUSA would "blow me off" (lie/conspire/gaslight/etc.), as it has indeed done.

But that's absurd: my complaints about Lelling (and now EOUSA) are obviously *minor/secondary*. What's *major/primary* is my complaints about the Judges (Obstruction of Justice via Falsification of Facts, Cover-Up, Conspiracy). According to my understanding,¹² the only entities with the power to investigate that are FBI/PIN.¹³ And since FBI/PIN have refused to respond to my complaints, it is my understanding that **OIG (if honest) must prod them to do so.**

I previously pointed this (prodding FBI/PIN) out in my letter to OIG dated Jul 23,¹⁴ but **OIG continues refusing to respond.**

11 • By OIG's letters of Jul 15 (<https://JudicialMisconduct.US/sites/default/files/2019-07/OIGLetter2.pdf>) and Jul 31 (<https://JudicialMisconduct.US/sites/default/files/2019-08/OIGLetter%3D2019-07-31.pdf>).

12 • Please inform me if any of my understandings expressed in this letter are incorrect. (I'm open to the truth. Why aren't you?)

13 • And/or Special/Independent Counsel/Prosecutor (?), and/or Congressional Judiciary (Impeachment) Committees (?), given the "cosmic" nature of this case. Comparatively speaking, the Jeffrey Epstein case (which shows all cover-ups eventually/ultimately become exposed/vindicated) is *trivial*, because it doesn't involve widespread institutional corruption of a whole Branch of Government (the Judiciary).

14 • *Addendum to my Jul 23 letter at ¶3f4, regarding element (iii), "intent:"* The leading case defining "intent to obstruct justice" is *U.S. v. Neiswender* (590 F. 2d 1269, 4th Cir., 1979, emphasis added): "[A] defendant who *intentionally* undertakes an act or attempts to effectuate an arrangement, the *reasonably foreseeable consequence* of which is to obstruct justice, violates §1503 even if his hope is that the judicial machinery will not be seriously impaired."

CONCLUSION

I keep repeating this, and you (all sworn/"trusted" government agencies/authorities) keep ignoring it: if anyone really wants to "solve" this case once-and-for-all (absent taking serious action on my complaints), he/she can do so very easily, merely by concisely explaining — *truthfully* — why my Complaint of judges' criminality lacks merit. **If I'm wrong: simply state/prove why! Stop stonewalling/gaslighting/doubletalking/obfuscating/covering-up/lying!!¹⁵**

VERIFICATION; SIGNATURE

Signed under the pains and penalties of perjury:



Walter Tuvell

¹⁵ • I have repeated this so many times now, and you (all) have refused to respond to it, that it's very clear at this point that you are unable to do so. That is, I am 100% right about my claims/arguments, and your silence proves that you know it. But, to date, you haven't shown the decency to do anything about it.