

***TOPSY-TURVY CHIEF JUDGES:
Draw the Curtain the Fraud is Over***

*Manuel P. Asensio
Rightabigwrong.org*

American citizens live under two constitutions, the Constitution of the United States and their state constitutions. This article is about a law that is embedded into all of our state constitutions that grants chief judges certain powers to administrate their state courts. This power must be strictly limited. It can only be used to manage budgets, buildings, archives, equipment, personnel etc. It cannot be used to affect evidence, rights, decisions or judgments. But it does. The Power to manage personnel includes the power to regulate the behavior of our judges and the police that patrol in our courts. This power over judicial conduct sets the tone of how the judges in the state's various courts, its civil, criminal and family courts, preform their job, how they treat citizens and their right to be heard.

RightABigWrong.Org has conducted an investigation on how state judges use this power in family court and discovered it is used to abuse parents and violate their constitutional rights. Specifically RightABigWrong.Org has unearthed the mechanics through which the chief judges' power is used to illegally promulgate undefined unpublished ideological policies as an excuse to illegally use administrative power to silence and punish parents to manufacture spectacularly false evidence and charges and to take discretion with Americans' our most protected, precious and supposedly most secure legal rights: our right to due process,¹ our private property rights and our natural and legal right to rear our children free of government oppression and interference.² RightABigWrong.org's purpose is to research how and why this system has quietly flourished on American soil and how it affects all American lives.

This article uses on a study of New York State law and uses the New York Constitutional as an example.

LIBERTY AND BEING A FREE AMERICAN

The Declaration of Independence warns us that we "are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to

¹ See Annex IV: Substantive Due Process in Parental Rights for 10 Rules for Conducting Fair Trial by: Friendly, Henry J. "Some Kind of Hearing", 123 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1267 (1975).

² See Annex I: Legal Authorities on Parental Power and Rights.

TOPSY-TURVY CHIEF JUDGES

Manuel P. Asensio
Rightabigwrong.org

which [we] are accustomed.” The “evils” of which our Founding Fathers warned us are violations of our “inalienable” natural rights. Our natural rights that are not dependent on law. These American or natural rights are given to us by our Creator and not by government. It is how Americans govern their government. There are no more powerful, supposedly more legally secure and protected natural right than the right to a fair and impartial judge and the right to a fair trial. This right is compiled into 10 rules for conducting a fair trial.³ It is this right that is violated by a chief judge when they allow judicial misconduct.

Violations of civil and due process rights in family court is one such case and there is no valid legal excuse for why it has come into existence or why it is allowed to continue exist.

The plain fact is that the acts of allowing false melodrama into family law is dishonest and illegal. There are no statutes that allows the Chief Judges to use their power in such a matter. It requires systemic collusion with a vast number of judges and the denial of collusion. It is unimaginable that state chief judges charged with protecting our rights, have betrayed us, our nation, our families and our children. The chief judges allow our family court judges to use the *administrative power* given to them by our state constitutions to wantonly deny our due process rights to parents in order to take control of their parental rights. Obviously, the use of administrative power to fabricate evidence or take rights and affect a judgement destroys the purpose of a justice system and is thereafter illegal. Yet it goes on in every state. This would be the case in all areas of law but it is only in family law that lawless judicial conduct is an established practice operated by the Chief Judge.⁴ It is important to note that it is our nation’s family courts where our educational and religious freedoms and our freedom of speech rights and our political freedoms are most directly affected.

THE USE OF STATE EXECUTIVE POWER AGAINST BASIC FREEDOMS

The most fundamental principle of any court of law is that *no administrative rule or policy can affect a citizen’s rights or a judgment*. The first canon of jurisprudence is the separation of *administrative acts* from *judicial acts*. This is the

³ Annex IV: Substantive Due Process in Parental Rights

⁴ In New York common law under Varkonyi and Grisi has dealt with unfair consideration of evidence and unfair use of administrative power. In New York the People lack a private right of action against judges not only due to the principle of judicial immunity but through a rule that denies actions against judges under the state’s judicial conduct rules.

TOPSY-TURVY CHIEF JUDGES

Manuel P. Asensio
Rightabigwrong.org

bedrock ideal of the separation of powers applied to our justice systems. This canon determines if a judicial act is legal or illegal. However, every state's constitution allows their chief judge to delegate their *administrative power* and in every state in the land those that receive this delegated *administrative power* use it to take *administrative* actions against parents' most basic rights and liberties.

In every state, family court judges are allowed to suspend parental rights *administratively*. Then, the chief judge is allowed to use their *administrative power* to protect the offending judges from liability and criminal prosecution. A reading of U.S. Supreme Court decisions shows that citizens are protected from government interference with their natural parenting rights. Yet state chief judges in every state use constitution power to *administer* the state's courts to allow family court judges to deny parents due process rights through the use of court officers and manufactured orders in order to take their parental rights. This is the same system creating laws that appear to guarantee freedoms and then allow private *administrative* acts that deny those rights through the use of executive power. If we calmly think about this we can draw comparisons with the methods of government used by Fidel Castro in the author's homeland or even Stalin that led to the Great Purge.⁵

STATE CHIEF JUDGE'S ARE TAKING PARENTAL POWER

This paper demonstrates how the chief judge delegates their *administrative power* and how this power is used to purge due process and parental rights from normal, caring good citizen parents.

The fact is that chief judges delegate their *administrative power* to state bureaucrats, non-judicial employees. Working unnoticed inside state court systems, these bureaucrats use the chief judge's *administrative power* to allow family court judges to violate the very laws that protect parents and their rights. These laws include rules governing judicial conduct that are essential to freedom and justice.⁶ These are laws of common sense, reason, and civility. Family court judges routinely violate these rules and all civil human interaction and communication. They use their court officers and the complacency of the divorce bar to deliberately and maliciously destroy parents' sense of security, stability, and power. If any parent files a

⁵ "The civil rights, personal freedoms, and democratic forms promised in the Stalin constitution were trampled almost immediately and remained dead letters until long after Stalin's death." J. Arch Getty, "State and Society Under Stalin: Constitutions and Elections in the 1930s," *Slavic Review* 50#1 (1991), pp. 18-35.

⁶ See Annex III: NY State Judiciary Laws and Rules Governing Judicial Conduct. New York Rules of the Chief Administrator, Part 100 titled "Judicial Conduct."

TOPSY-TURVY CHIEF JUDGES

Manuel P. Asensio
Rightabigwrong.org

complaint against the family court judge these bureaucrats then use the Chief Judges authority to retain the state's prosecutors to protect these family court judges or actually step into the state's own courts to defend the offending judges themselves.

The chief judges and their state bureaucrats allow family court judges to use *administrative power* to manufacture unreviewable and unappealable judgments. Using private parties, the chief judges grants authority to family court judges to take due process and protected parental rights from citizens through surreptitious use of chief judges' *administrative power* and then provides the family court judges with protection from state and federal actions against them.

In other words, non-judicial employees of state court systems (bureaucrats) use the *administrative powers* of state chief judges to operate a fraudulent system that involuntarily emancipates children from their parents without any legal authority or due process. It is a deliberate scheme that turns a state constitutional power granted to the chief judge upside down, topsy-turvy. It lawlessly and wrongfully puts the power of a state's chief judge into the hands of family court judges, their appointees, and the lawyers that appear before them every day. More importantly, and no less repugnant, it places "state interest" over parents' federally protected due process U.S. constitutional rights under the fourteenth amendment and parental rights. Presto. Chief Judges, lawyers and family judges without legal authority without notice to the people, their elected governors and elected state representatives have taken power from parents unto themselves.

FRAUD ON THE COURT

Fraud statutes apply to judges and their judgements. Fraud upon the court is a fraud perpetrated by officers of the court so that the judicial machinery cannot perform in an impartial manner while adjudging cases.⁷

Family court judges routinely use *administrative/ministerial* or executive, power to take rights away from normal fit parents.⁸ Family court judges are protected from parental complaints by constitutional power granted solely to state chief judges

⁷ *Appling v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 340 F.3d 769, 781 (9th Cir. 2003). Annex II

⁸ Family courts have limited legal authority to take wide discretion and are given wide powers only if and when certain special circumstances are found in abuse, neglect, abandonment, and juvenile delinquency related cases or cases involving a crime and a minor, but not in normal parental custody disputes. Yet in practice the Chief Judges allow this courts to take these types of discretions illegally with normal fit parents.

TOPSY-TURVY CHIEF JUDGES

Manuel P. Asensio
Rightabigwrong.org

for *administrative* purposes. Family Court judges are granted judicial immunity even when they act in clear absence of jurisdiction and without legal authority. They take wide discretion with parental rights without legal authority based on the chief judge's *administrative power*. This is the genesis of the nation's systematic family court judicial fraud—the chief judge and a trial judge joining forces to commit fraud on the citizens of their state by usurping their federal due process rights in order to take discretions with their parental power.

Every act a family court judge takes after wrongfully assuming jurisdiction over parental rights is a fraud under the color of law. However, internally within the state, the chief judges' power is used to protect this judicial fraud. If the chief judge allows fraud and the chief judge retains the state's prosecutors to claim the offending judge had legal power then the parent has no remedy in the state. This protects the state from liability by claiming the judge is entitled to judicial immunity because the judge had jurisdiction. Further, it allows the chief judge to argue the principle of state sovereignty in our federal system to prevent the parent from seeking a redress in federal court.

The frauds committed by family court judges are serious. They include first and foremost dishonest acts, the use of court officers to deny due process right and fabricating suspensions and fees and appointing private parties as agents of the state to interfere with parental rights and delay the proceedings. They also include gross judicial misconduct such as screaming, yelling, and ignoring law and parents. If a parent attempts to speak out and stop the judge from making a fraudulent finding that the judge is making the judge will order court guards to silence the parent and even to handcuff the parent in a manner that inflicts “compliance” pain on nonconforming parents. In doing so, the judges are violating explicit rules that govern their conduct and protect citizens but that are not enforced in family court.⁹ Further, parents have no private right of action under these rules.

JUDICIAL ABUSE OF BLAMELESS CHILDREN

This dishonest state judicial practice is far more than an embarrassment to our civilized society. This is an illegal judicial conduct to commit fraud on the American people. This paper is the product of a study of New York law. However, similar judicial conduct occurs in every state.

In New York State alone, such judicial family court fraud affects over a

⁹ See Annex III: NY State Judiciary Laws and Rules Governing Judicial Conduct. New York Rules of the Chief Administrator, Part 100 titled “Judicial Conduct.”

TOPSY-TURVY CHIEF JUDGES

Manuel P. Asensio
Rightabigwrong.org

million victims a year.¹⁰ The victims of this judicial fraud are our children, who cannot identify the fraud and evil. They cannot comprehend that the judges wearing black robes are accountable for the fraud that only their parents are accountable and responsible for their well-being and that the judge has illegally removed a parent from their lives. The child cannot identify the state or the judge as the villain. The state is responsible but not accountable for the harm it causes the child by avoiding real issues and creating agitation and taking discretion with parental power without legal authority.

It is important that you know why the author became involved and discovered how in New York the Chief Judge's power under Constitution Article 6 §28¹¹ is used to allow illegal and fraudulent family court judicial misconduct.

RIGHT A BIG WRONG

I am a private citizen and not a lawyer or politician. I have experience with totalitarian governments and the investigation of fraud. My family fled communism and struggled not to leave any members behind. My childhood memories of the evils of exalted governments make it utterly intolerable for me to allow my own child to come under the control of an exalted judicial system much less an *administrative* system governed by undefined ideological policies that are directly the opposite of my own moral and ethical beliefs.

This matter should not be an issue between liberal and conservative Americans. RightABigWrong.Org is a research and educational nonpartisan nonprofit that focuses on judicial conduct in the nation's normal custody cases in its state family courts. This paper is the product of an investigation of the New York State Unified Court System's child custody laws and *administrative* procedures.

RightABigWrong.org's research focuses exclusively on state laws and procedures involving normal American families—normal American moms, dads, and their beloved children—and places where government has no jurisdiction

¹⁰ See: The New York State Unified Court System: 2016 Annual Report. Page 26.

¹¹ New York Constitution Article 6 §28 (c), entitled "Administrative Supervision of the Courts" states, "The chief judge, after consultation with the administrative board, shall establish standards and administrative policies for general application throughout the state, which shall be submitted by the chief judge to the court of appeals, together with the recommendations, if any, of the administrative board. Such standards and administrative policies shall be promulgated after approval by the court of appeals."

TOPSY-TURVY CHIEF JUDGES

Manuel P. Asensio
Rightabigwrong.org

whatsoever but takes jurisdiction through the unnoticed and unauthorized use of organized *administrative power* to intervene in private American lives without any legal authority.

There can be no justification to allow governments to use *administrative powers* to fabricate evidence and fake crimes based on undefined ideological policies against untouchable and undeniable parental rights or to generate agitation. There must be no debate about the gravity of this systemic judicial fraud when it takes such an undeniable important and unalienable right as parental rights under state control.

It must be acknowledged that a fish rots from the head because the head allows the gut to rot. The guts of our nation's family justice system are its non-judicial employees that wheel and deal within the chief judge and the state's constitutional high court and legislatures and leading members of the bar. This is where political power overwhelms parents' legal rights.

Coincidentally, the facts, factors and circumstances of my life experience with communism and New York City *administration* of family law have direct parallels.

Communists promote agitation in society. Totalitarian use ideology to justify taking rights through *administrative* powers.¹² They claim to believe in an ideology and justify the creation of a government powerful enough to take rights to reach a goal. They take control by ignoring law and creating *administrative* power systems to govern.

State law governs family court but New York's controversial mayor, Bill De Blasio, appoints all of New York City's family court judges.¹³ Mayor De Blasio has proudly earned the title of "America's Un-American Marxist Mayor."¹⁴

¹² "Stalinism promoted the escalation of class conflict, utilizing state violence to forcibly purge society of claimed supporters of the bourgeoisie, regarding them as threats to the pursuit of the communist revolution. This policy resulted in substantial political violence and persecution of such people." Stephen Kotkin. *Magnetic Mountain: Stalinism As a Civilization*. First Paperback Edition. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California, USA: University of California Press, 1997 Pp. 71, 307, 81.

¹³ See article published on April 27, 2015, on NYC.gov for 26 new judicial appointments made by Mayor De Blasio: <http://www1.nyc.gov/office-of-the-mayor/news/266-15/mayor-de-blasio-swears-28-judges-recently-appointed-family-court-criminal-court-civil>

¹⁴ <https://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/bill-de-blasio-americas-marxist-mayor>

TOPSY-TURVY CHIEF JUDGES

*Manuel P. Asensio
Rightabigwrong.org*

I am a father who was sued for custody of my daughter. For the same reasons that defined my professional career, I refused to conform to the political prejudices and corruption. As life would have it, the case went before one of Mayor De Blasio's more politically radical, controversial, and inexperienced family court judges. Jointly, these two men represent extreme ideological and political government beliefs that are for most citizens opposite from American ideals. Their religious, educational, and moral views are contemptuous of those that are central to my life.

I was born in La Habana, Cuba, in 1954. My family and I fled Cuba after communism took over. My parents arranged a spot for me on a merchant ship to Spain with a plan to disembark in Venezuela. The ship had a few passenger cabins. They did this so that I could leave Cuba ahead of their own escape to avoid the Communist indoctrination that had already begun. My aunt and uncle adopted me so that I could leave with them first. It was a dramatic time, not quite like the Fall of Saigon but bloodier and more severe than the downfall of Venezuela's democracy and takeover by a Marxist dictator, which I also personally experienced later in life.

My family and our friends came to New York and established an enclave of Cuban Bay of Pigs refugees in Brooklyn. I am a product of New York City's Catholic parochial school system, St. Frances de Chantal and Bishop Ford High School. I worked as a bag boy and a newspaper delivery boy and in a Carvel ice-cream shop at a very early age. I worked my way through the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School of Finance parking cars at a dinner theater as a bus boy and by buying and repairing used cars. After Penn, I returned to Venezuela to work. I came back to the United States to attend and graduate from Harvard University's Graduate School of Business.

In 1996, fourteen years after graduating from Harvard, during the birth of the internet, I came up with the idea of using the internet to expose stock fraud for a profit. I discovered over fifty frauds in a row in short order. I am recognized by the National Bureau of Economic Research, the nation's leading nonprofit economic research organization, as the "pioneer" of "information producers as arbitrageurs rather than as short-sellers, to distinguish them from uninformed short-sellers in the market."

De Blasio has questioned the concepts of economic freedom and private property, basic constitutional American rights that are fundamental to our free

TOPSY-TURVY CHIEF JUDGES

Manuel P. Asensio
Rightabigwrong.org

society.¹⁵ He was an ardent supporter of Nicaragua's Marxist Sandinista government and of Castro in the 1980s, and he has praised Hugo Chavez. As mayor, he has said that most New Yorkers would "love" a "very, very powerful government...involved in directly addressing their day-to-day reality."¹⁵

Contrast De Blasio with Rudolph W. Giuliani who is also product of New York City's parochial school system, Bishop Loughlin High School in Brooklyn. As the corruption-fighting prosecutor and no-nonsense former Mayor of New York, Mr. Giuliani acted as the city's tough chief executive and earned the title of "America's Mayor"¹⁶ after the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

My love for the American values of self-rule independence and freedom from government oppression and deep concerns about my daughter's future and how she was being taught to feel about what's right and wrong left me no alternative than to oppose the radical Mayor De Blasio judicial appointee that was assigned to my case. I learned how the judicial system works to enlighten others including the blameless victims like my own daughter and to defend myself from the effects of fraudulent judicial misconduct. New York State's UCS lacks the availability of plainly adequate remedy for due process claims against judicial fraud. There is no adequate path to federal protection. This is the purpose of RightABigWrong.Org to investigate how in this day and age and in such a personal private area of law dealing with individual rights and powers that have found protection under the 14th amendment of the U.S. Constitution¹⁷ such judicial corruption can exist and survive in the United States.

PROMULGATED GRAFT

New York Constitution Article 6 §28 grants the state's chief judge sole and individual power to device and promulgate *administrative* rules and policies that govern the internal workings of its state justice department. This is an enormous responsibility in a system of justice but it is unregulated and unsupervised by the state's elected official or any other state agency.

New York Constitution Article 6 §28 requires that the chief judge consult the four members of the *administrative* board of the courts. These are the leaders of

¹⁵ "In Conversation: Bill de Blasio," September 4, 2017, New York Magazine.

¹⁶ Mott, Gordon. "Rudy Giuliani: America's Mayor". *Cigar Aficionado*. Retrieved October 26, 2007

¹⁷ See Annex I: Legal Authorities on Parental Power and Rights.

TOPSY-TURVY CHIEF JUDGES

Manuel P. Asensio
Rightabigwrong.org

each one of its appellate divisions. The members are the four Appellate Division presiding judges. Then the Chief Judge is supposed to obtain the approval of the six other judges of the Court of Appeals. There are 7 judges on the Court of Appeals. The Chief Judge is one of them. The Chief Judge is support to obtain approval before promulgating rules throughout the UCS.¹⁸ This type of organization exists in each state. This is how an incredibly small group of judges can delegate power to state bureaucrats that affect parents federally protected due process and parental rights and authority.

This system exists in every state. It is private and it is used to create operate lawless unauthorized internal family law system that take categorical constitutionally protected due process and parenting rights from parents and then protects family court judges from discovery and liability regardless of the level of their misconduct.

Using *administrative power* to affect rights and judgment is illegal; *administration* is not a judicial act. Judges have no right to interfere with parental rights without due process and legal authority. They must comply with laws that clearly prohibit government from deprive parents of their rights. States ignore the law and interfere with the knowledge that parents cannot afford the burden of defending themselves.

After taking all sorts of acts including suspending a parent, State's allows these judges to sit in judgment and claim to be impartial and unbiased. This is a part of the policy that is promulgated by the chief judge's *administrative power* and is direct violation of federal law.¹⁹

The State act this way because it knows that even if a parent can afford the burden of suing a judge that is can deny the parent adequate remedy for dealing with malicious prosecution, manufactured crimes²⁰ and criminal indifference of their civil rights²¹ and defend the state action in federal court under principle of state

¹⁸ The New York Unified Court System or "UCS" is the name of New York State's judicial department. The UCS encompasses all of the state's judges and courts from the lowest level limited jurisdiction magistrate sitting in a village court to the chief judge of the state's highest court, the Court of Appeals, which hears constitutional claims.

¹⁹ In re Murchison, 349 U.S. 133, 136–37, 75 S. Ct. 623, 625–26, 99 L. Ed. 942 (1955). Annex II

²⁰ Chambers v. State of Florida, 60 S.Ct. 472, 479, 309 U.S. 227, 240–41 (U.S. 1940). Annex II

²¹ Smith v. Wade, 103 S.Ct. 1625, 1632, 461 U.S. 30, 41 (U.S., 1983). Annex II

sovereignty in our federal system.

As a result, a court of laws are governed by backroom wheeling and dealing conducted without oversight under some private undefined ideological policies using private unpublished *administrative* rule. Family Court becomes a private playground for lawyers and judicial appointees.

UNREVIEWABLE AND UNAPPEALABLE EVIL ACTS

Allowing bureaucrats to use of the chief judge’s constitutional power, intended for *administrative* purposes, to perform individual unauthorized acts against parents is illegal but it happens, exists and there is no available state remedy. Americans are torn over law and legislation dealing gun control and the rights of an unborn child. But these are legal issue being fought over openly. The issue of Chief Judge using constitutional power illegally to allow family court judges to commit fraud against parents is of a different form and nature, independent of the subject matter. Guns, abortion and individual due process and parenting rights are different. But sadly, abortion is legal. The taking of individual due process and parenting rights privately without legal authority by delegated of the Chief Judge is not legal.

These are fraudulent acts. They finagle normal parents into court and keep them there. These acts executed are without cause, codes, or standards and without legal authority, reasoning, evidence, hearing, or factual findings. Because they are devoid of all judicial substance, they are both fundamentally illegal and unjust. They are unreviewable and unappealable orders. This is judicial conscious evil wrongdoing²² at its worst. It is organized by chief judges. The US Supreme Court has called these government acts that has called “evil.”²³

MANUFACTURED CRIME

The US Supreme Court has repeatedly deemed parental rights to be an essential basic civil right of people, a right more precious than property rights.² Our highest court has ruled, “It is cardinal with us that the custody, care and nurture of

²² “Whenever the injury complained of has been inflicted maliciously or wantonly, and with circumstances of contumely or indignation...the tort is aggravated by evil motive.” *Smith v. Wade*, 103 S.Ct. 1625, 1632, 461 U.S. 30, 41 (U.S., 1983). Annex II

²³ “The evil of a decision that applies a standard other than the one it enunciates spreads in both directions, preventing both consistent application of the law by subordinate agency personnel (notably ALJs), and effective review of the law by the courts.” *Allentown Mack Sales and Service, Inc. v. N.L.R.B.*, 118 S.Ct. 818, 827, 522 U.S. 359, 374–75 (U.S., 1998). Annex II

TOPSY-TURVY CHIEF JUDGES

Manuel P. Asensio
Rightabigwrong.org

the child reside first in the parents, whose primary function and freedom include preparation for obligations the state can neither supply nor hinder and that government is powerless to supplant parents.”²⁴ To justify taking such a powerful right, family court judges routinely manufacture undefined, ideological, unwritten, nonexistent, and emotional authority as excuses for their own actions, again using the chief judge’s constitutional *administrative* power.

The US Supreme Court has described persons that become victims of government abuse such parents involved in custody cases in family court as “non-conforming victims of prejudice” who represent “tragic proof that the exalted power of some governments to punish manufactured crime dictatorially is the handmaid of tyranny.”²⁵

THE STATE ATTORNEY’S ROLE

The US Supreme Court has ruled that it would be “very strange if our system of law” permitted such a scheme, noting that “no man can be a judge in his own case and no man is permitted to try cases where he has an interest in the outcome.”²⁶ In the case of family court judges, the UCS metamorphoses into the judge, jury, and prosecutor, defending its own practice of allowing family court judges to act *administratively* against parents. The system does not end here. As noted earlier, the Chief Judge has the constitutional power to retain the State Attorney to defend the judge at the trial and appeal level and to defend the family court judge directly through private attorney directly under the control of the chief judge.

New York Executive Law Article 5 §63(1) states that the state’s attorney general (“AG”) will defend all actions taken against any state office that requires the services of attorney or counsel to protect the interest of the state if, in the AG’s opinion, the interests of the state so warrants.

In practice, the AG indiscriminately appears to defend any judge against any citizen who files a suit against the judge. This includes all cases, even cases involving allegations of serious deliberate and malicious conduct in which the judge has executed criminal or fraudulent actions in the clear absence of jurisdiction.

²⁴ Prince v. Massachusetts, 321 U.S. 158, 166, 64 S.Ct. 438, 442, 88 L.Ed. 645 (1944). Annex I

²⁵ Chambers v. State of Florida, 60 S.Ct. 472, 479, 309 U.S. 227, 240–41 (U.S. 1940). Annex II

²⁶ In re Murchison, 349 U.S. 133, 136–37, 75 S. Ct. 623, 625–26, 99 L. Ed. 942 (1955). Annex II

This is even the case if the judge has acted maliciously against parental rights, a constitutional liberty right. No matter how particular or well documented the parent's evidence, the AG automatically, without review, comes to the judge's defense. This is true even in cases where citizens are challenging the state's scheme of wrongfully using the chief judge's constitutional power to make *administrative rules* against parents. The AG steps in, ignores the facts and constitutional arguments of the parents, and declares with the full power of the Attorney General's Office that the judge is right and the citizen is wrong. No facts allowed. Period.

No less repugnant is the situation in which the AG defends a family court judge against a parent and that parent then sues the Supreme Court judge presiding over the citizen's case of judicial misconduct. In this situation, the UCS automatically allows the same non-judicial bureaucrats of New York's court system, the same non-judicial employees accused of illegally using the chief judge's *administrative powers* against parents and make their appearance to defend the offending judge. Essentially, non-judicial bureaucrats defend the fraudulent system before the judges that allow it. But the judges are not the court. Court rulings have defined this conduct as a fraud on the court.²⁷

EVIL MOTIVE

The US Supreme Court ruled that this type of system “flouts the basic principle that all people must stand on an equality before the bar of justice in every American court.”²⁵ Allowing family court judges to act lawlessly inflicts injury maliciously and wantonly. As stated in the opening, the US Supreme Court has found this practice to be “evil”²⁸ because the act is without standards. It has also found that such acts have an “evil motive”²⁴ because they are executed with “criminal indifference to civil obligations.”²⁹

²⁷ “Fraud upon the court is fraud which is directed to the judicial machinery itself and is not fraud between the parties or fraudulent documents, false statements or perjury. It is where the court or a member is corrupted or influenced or influence is attempted or where the judge has not performed his judicial function—thus where the impartial functions of the court have been directly corrupted.” *Bulloch v. United States*, 763 F.2d 1115, 1121 (10th Cir. 1985). Annex II

²⁸ *Allentown Mack Sales and Service, Inc. v. N.L.R.B.*, 118 S.Ct. 818, 827, 522 U.S. 359, 374–75 (U.S., 1998). Annex II

²⁹ *Smith v. Wade*, 103 S.Ct. 1625, 1632, 461 U.S. 30, 41 (U.S., 1983). Annex II

TOPSY-TURVY CHIEF JUDGES

*Manuel P. Asensio
Rightabigwrong.org*

Judges are authority figures that wear black robes. Judges allow judges to commit illegal acts against parental prima facie rights.³⁰ This idea is morally and emotionally disturbing and difficult to comprehend. The truth is that what goes on in New York State for the most part goes on in every state. In over 82% of custody cases the mother gets custody.³¹ Obviously, no one is stopping the judges for putting a thumb on the Scale of Justice.

The judicial system's victims cannot speak out. The judicial fraud they are witnessing is obviously illegal, but the judges and victim's lawyers themselves control the illegal system. If questioned, the judges simply say, "It's too bad the citizen thinks it is strange; they should have appealed the decision."

CONFLICT BETWEEN PARENTAL AUTHORITY AND JUDICIAL JURISDICTION

The power of a parent to protect his or her children from exalted government intrusion is categorical and undeniable.³² Family court judges simply do not respect the law that gives power to parents to control their children.²

The most important safeguard against exalted government power is rules that limit power over individuals, or "personal jurisdiction" rules. If a justice system lacks codes and standards to control the personal jurisdiction of a judge, then any judge could have power over any American.

The second safeguard Americans rely upon to regulate judicial power is the subjects that a judge can take power over, or "subject matter jurisdiction" rules. The subject of personal family decisions on religion, morals, social and formal education, personal behavior, attitudes toward government and politics, and so on, are fundamental constitutionally protected rights.

CONCLUSION: THE CHIEF JUDGE AND THE WIZARD OF OZ

Parents' prima facie rights to the companionship and guidance over their children is greater than that of governments. In normal custody cases government cannot legally interfere with parental rights.³² The most fundamental truth in

³⁰ See Annex II for New York Jurisprudence 2d Domestic Relations § 330: Parents' Prima Facie Right to Custody in the "Referenced Legal Authorities"

³¹ "Custodial Mothers and Fathers and Their Child Support" by Timothy Grall. U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. Census Bureau (2016).

³² See Annex II: Legal Authorities on Citizen's Rights against Government Intrusion.

TOPSY-TURVY CHIEF JUDGES

Manuel P. Asensio
Rightabigwrong.org

jurisprudence is that no *administrative* rules or policies can affect a right or a judgment. However, in family court, constitutional power given to the state's chief judge to *administer* the state's courts is handed down to family court judges to allow them to manufacture crimes against parents and to create unreviewable unappealable judgments that take categorical constitutionally protected due process and parenting rights.

The chief judges use of *administrative* power is “tragic proof that the exalted power” leads to “tyranny.”²⁵ Using the chief judge's power family court judges terrorize parents with government misconduct. This is not legal. “[T]he Constitution proscribes such lawless means irrespective of the end.”²⁵

The United States Supreme Court has called a justice system without standards “evil.”²⁸ The actions that Family Court judges take against parents are malicious and evil. The United States Supreme Court has called this class of actions “criminal indifference to civil obligations.”²⁹

We are speaking here about the self-determining rights of normal fit parents. It is time to pull back the curtain on topsy-turvy chief judges and hold the chief judges responsible for illegally allowing family courts judges use their *administrative* power take parent due process and parenting rights and the protecting offending family court judges within the state and under the principle of state sovereignty in our federal system. We must restore parents to their rightful place. There is no place like home for parental rights.

Manuel P. Asensio
Founder, RightABigWrong.Org
www.rightabigwrong.org
212-702-8806

RightABigWrong.Org is a nonprofit created to educate Americans on issues in our nation's state justice systems that affect their freedom without their knowledge or consent. He is the founder of Asensio & Company and www.asensio.com.