

April 22, 2016

Access To The Courts  
c/o Huron Police Department  
417 Main Street  
Huron, OH 44839  
[www.accesstothecourts.org](http://www.accesstothecourts.org)

Thomas J. Ryan  
11 Emerald Street  
Medford, MA 02155

Re Medford Police Report 16004997/1 – Analysis and Background

Mr. Ryan,

The Access To The Courts organization (ATTC) was founded on June 11, 2005, primarily in response to ongoing police prejudicing of innocent citizens bringing forth complaints of police misconduct or other official misconduct. We are in receipt of Medford Police Department Report 16004997/1, written by a Detective Norton.

You are hereby given notice that such a report has been found by ATTC to be highly prejudicial, self-inconsistent, incomplete, and to a large degree blatantly false. As your name is listed as a “Reporting Person”, ATTC is sharing information of interest to you and your family, as Detective Norton has thoughtlessly filed a false report that raises unfounded fears and prejudice that can harm all involved. To be clear, ATTC is alleging misconduct on the part of Detective Norton and you and your family are unwitting witnesses to such misconduct.

You had every right to contact police for an incident on April 13, 2016 involving an encounter by your daughter with two individuals soliciting contact with a former juror and witness to possible juror misconduct, Linda Ryan. What has been lost (in the Report) is the reason for the contact and the manner of such contact. In the interest of civility and justice, ATTC is providing the following information, which will not only explain why contact was made and why at this time, but will establish a pathway to understanding and peace of mind.

ATTC is sympathetic to your concerns, but must forewarn you of the difficulty you may be in – that your local police betrayed you in dishonestly reporting the said incident, forcing you to either conform to their dishonesty or face an uncertain future of police prejudicing, mistrust of police, and fear of retaliation by police.

The decision to make contact at 11 Emerald Street – a likely location in public records for a juror in a May 2011 trial, US v. Jeffrey L. Clemens – was prompted by an encounter of the Clemens Twins with the Hingham Police Department earlier in the day of April 13, 2016.

Scituate Police Department Sergeant Michael O’Hara, on the morning of Wednesday April 13, 2016, phoned in a report that the Clemens Twins were suspected of driving without valid driving licenses; the Clemens Twins were subsequently pulled over and “cleared”. **The problem:** O’Hara and the Town of Scituate are civil defendants in litigation with Jeffrey L. Clemens, stemming from a provably false report from O’Hara on May 12, 2005, and beginning with a lawsuit filed in May 2007 (almost three years before the reference US case – itself stemming from communication during litigation of a 2<sup>nd</sup> lawsuit dismissed upon instigation of the 2010 criminal case, for which Linda Ryan served on the jury). Further, the Scituate Police Chief W. Michael Stewart presented a fraudulent basis for coming up with “Reasonable Suspicion” of the Clemens Twins BOTH not having licenses and admitted that it was he, the chief, who authorized a call to the Hingham Police Department. [Odd, as why would a police officer O’Hara need authorization from the chief to do his job? Answer: He did not, so the situation begs for an explanation, and such is likely nefarious.] The chief also presented in person to the Clemens Twins a letter of No Trespass on town property, barring them from Town Hall and other public places, citing that the Clemens Twins were seen in the Assessor’s Office the day before, but citing no conduct from the visit warranting an order to stay away...

What were the Clemens Twins doing the day before? They were checking property records to ascertain whether or not a witness to a May 12, 2005 incident at 52 Old Oaken Bucket Road (leading to the O’Hara Report) was still available to speak...as there was a possibility that she had moved or sold her house, so the Clemens Twins were trying to avoid contact with a stranger (a possible new owner). Jeffrey Clemens, due to the malicious prosecution for Criminal Harassment, instigated by O’Hara and his superior Lt. John Rooney AFTER submitting the provably false O’Hara Report to federal authorities, for having contact with several witnesses...the effect was to keep Jeffrey from HIS witnesses (due to a stay away order given early on in Hingham District Court) for over 10 years. This is from a police entity that withheld discovery in a multiple charge prosecution for over 3 years, and that ultimately failed to convict on any charge.

**More of the problem:** O’Hara filed a provably false report on April 13, 2016, with Hingham Police, in order to harass the Clemens Twins, thus, demonstrating a Hidden Agent in the local legal system. A confrontation with Hingham police could have gone bad, and there is no reason to believe that good intentions were at work that day.

Three criminal charges stemming from the Scituate Police officer O’Hara in May 2005 – Disorderly Conduct, Unlicensed Private Investigator, and Criminal Harassment - are all now dismissed and all without convictions...the Town of Scituate now faces a new lawsuit, especially now that Hidden Agents (behind police harassment and manipulations and derelictions at Hingham District Court, undermining the defense of Jeffrey Clemens) are emerging.

Though Jeffrey Clemens may have had cause for a couple of years to contact jurors, he has refrained from requesting or making contact. Obviously, Jeffrey does not have subpoena power in and by himself. Jonathan Clemens has also had cause for a couple of years to contact certain jurors. In fact, it was the cause of Jonathan Clemens that gave rise to the cause of Jeffrey Clemens. Prior to discovery of certain information on Juror #12 (Bryan Gothie), and his potential ties to parties averse to Jonathan Clemens, Jeffrey had no necessary cause to initiate contact with any juror, but perhaps Juror #12 – who, as Linda Ryan may recall, was excused in the middle of the trial for apparently having fear of the defendant Jeffrey Clemens. Instead of a mistrial, a highly prejudiced and manipulated trial was allowed to continue. Technically, there was no legal reason for Jeffrey to pursue contact with jurors, as it was the failure of the judge to declare a mistrial that IS the issue.

Recall the trial and the timing of the excusal of Juror #12: There were 3 days of trial. Bryan Gothie asked to be excused at the end of Day 2, after hearing testimony and such, and after having had an overnight in which he had opportunity to look on line or talk with related persons involved in the case. The second night (with Gothie gone) provided an opportunity for the rest of the jury to also look on line or discuss the case or read media, which would be a violation of the instructions to the jury, thus, a rationale for declaring a mistrial. A mistrial would not have prejudiced the ability of the USA to re-try the matter, and would have allowed the defendant to mount the defense that he had a right to have.

Jonathan Clemens is the founder of Access To The Courts ([www.accesstothecourts.org](http://www.accesstothecourts.org)). On April 13, 2016, Jonathan lifted his objection to contacting jurors, prompted by the newly acquired evidence of a Hidden Agent in legal proceedings involving his twin brother Jeffrey Clemens. There is now probable cause to go beyond a mere tainted jury (prejudicial excusal of Juror #12) to a tampered jury. To be clear, Linda Ryan is not suspected of any juror misconduct whatsoever.

Bryan Gothie is a Sudbury, MA close neighbor to Nancy Verser Brumback (formerly of Hinsdale, IL near Chicago, IL) – literally in direct view of each other. Nancy Verser (Brumback) is a sister to attorney and former judge Craddock Verser. Craddock Verser is a former partner with Peggy Ann (Ross) Bierbaum (formerly of Chicago, IL), whose husband Brent Bierbaum's father is a doctor in Boston, MA (with current or past residence in Chestnut Hill and Wellesley Hills, MA...residence of so-called victim Stephen C. Pfaff in the reference case). Craddock and Peggy Ann are long-time residents of Washington State. Jonathan Clemens sued Craddock Verser and Peggy Ann Bierbaum in or about November 2007 for unethical conduct and contrivance of an improper Restraining Order against Jonathan Clemens, an order proposed and initiated by Peggy Ann Bierbaum in August 2007 as an attorney for the wife of Jonathan Clemens. The wife had disclosed the ATTC website to Peggy Ann Bierbaum in or about July 2007...the website focused primarily on the Town of Scituate police and its involvement in promoting a federal prosecution against Jeffrey Clemens in 2005. The perjured O'Hara Report of May 12, 2005 had been faxed to a federal agent on May 17, 2005, prior to any federal prosecution and was used to justify a horrific pre-trial detention of 7 months (Bail was denied, lastly by psychology major and former Chicago, IL resident with ties to a college in Massachusetts US District Judge Andrew Wistrich, a hearing tied to an improper pre-assignment of counsel to Jeffrey Clemens), which forced a Plea Bargain (with the devil and with the secret push of the pre-assigned counsel, whose boyfriend went to college in Massachusetts) to

gain release. Such prior case was improperly disclosed by AUSA David G. Tobin to the Grand Jury in April 2010, and with provably knowingly false statements by FBI Agent Rachel Boisselle (subject of a DOJ OIG complaint by Jonathan Clemens in May/June 2010 regarding her false and prejudicial complaint for an arrest warrant) – whose supervisor is a resident of Scituate, MA and wherein the supervisor’s wife is an attorney. Oddly, a single e-mail addressed to one person – attorney Stephen C. Pfaff (civil defendant) – resulted in two counts.

Of note, FBI Agent (Ms.) Ingerd Sotelo was also a subject of a DOJ OIG complaint (actually 3 separate submittals) in 2005 by Jonathan Clemens, who observed provably false statements in her May 24, 2005 complaint (for an Arrest Warrant), most particularly of an Arrest Mandate – that if he wrote another letter to a judge, then he would be arrested, supposedly given to Jeffrey Clemens in an FBI interview on April 19, 2005...a mandate not included in the written FBI Form 302 report, a mandate never given to Jeffrey Clemens. Upon Jeffrey’s false arrest for disorderly conduct by Sergeant O’Hara (despite being told he was free to go after a pull over), and having drafted another lawsuit for the matters in LA, CA, Jeffrey wrote another letter to a judge involved in a judge assignment scheme in prior litigation in LA, CA. Jeffrey was indicted with a single count in June 2005 for two letters written three months apart – indication of a perjured (false) arrest mandate presented to the grand jury. Jeffrey Clemens to date has been denied access to such grand jury transcripts. Jonathan’s complaints to the DOJ OIG were ignored, and only after a resubmittal did a conclusion of “no serious misconduct” come from the US DOJ! Is perjury in the federal courts a matter of “no serious misconduct”? Is perjury something to be weighed, as in a form of cost/benefit analysis – the benefits outweigh the costs? Indeed, incredible benefits accrue to the perjurer and his associates...but, at what costs?

Continuing...

Judge Craddock Verser, in or about November 2009, despite an Affidavit of Prejudice, took adverse action to Jonathan Clemens and his company (Olympic Energy Systems, Inc.) in a (September 2009 filed) lawsuit against the local newspaper, whose derelictions, errors, and poor journalism (unfairly favoring a competitor with distortions and misrepresentations) in October 2006 harmed the business volume to the extent that the wife sought a divorce. The wife’s second of two reasons for filing for divorce in August 2007 was simply that she did not want to be followed by the FBI the rest of her life.

In response to being informed of the Access To The Courts website, attorney Peggy Ann Bierbaum (through the wife) served a Temporary Restraining Order on Jonathan Clemens – barring Jonathan from his own house and business office site. At a subsequent Show Cause hearing in front of Judge Verser, Peggy Ann hijacked the beginning of the hearing, saying that an order is not needed for protection but would be a good idea during the divorce. What Peggy Ann Bierbaum had not disclosed was her former professional relationship with Judge Verser (former law partner and fellow socialite at the local casino). The Restraining Order was allowed (until the April 4, 2008 Divorce Decree), with devastating consequences. When the wife announced that she was withdrawing her Petition for Divorce in November 2007, the family of Jonathan Clemens came out against it, citing the imposition of a Restraining Order (as basically unforgiveable).

In or about 2009, Jonathan Clemens was asked by private investigator Rose Winqvist of Seattle, WA to provide a sworn statement about his experiences with Verser and Bierbaum. The statement that was provided supported formal complaints against the attorneys, which resulted in an order to disclose the professional relationship with all parties whenever Bierbaum is appearing in Verser's court.

Peggy Ann Bierbaum's husband Brent Bierbaum has a known Bellevue, WA (address) connection. And, Bellevue, WA is where IT ALL BEGAN. The very first criminal allegation against Jeffrey Clemens occurred on September 8, 1995 from Bellevue Police Detective Bob Thompson. Jeffrey was asked to stop in the station to discuss his complaint against a police officer (submitted in October 1994 and also documented in a formal statutory complaint submitted to the City of Bellevue in June 1995 – a precursor to a lawsuit), when he was detained and accused of Criminal Harassment for making repeated phone calls to the Police for status. The "arrest" was reported to the FBI, unbeknownst to Jeffrey...THE start of severe police prejudicing of Jeffrey Clemens.

Jonathan Clemens had a similar experience in his attempt in January 2011 to file a written criminal complaint against Scituate Police Sergeant Michael O'Hara and attorney Stephen C. Pfaff. When the Massachusetts Attorney General Office was not answering Jonathan's phone call inquiries, Jonathan called the Assistant DA assigned to investigate the matter...where did she live? You guessed it, in Scituate, MA. What did she do? The Assistant DA prompted Michael Cashman (MSP officer assigned to MAGO) to call Jonathan Clemens and threaten a Criminal Harassment charge! Woa.

Jeffrey Clemens retained counsel in August 1997 to file a lawsuit against the City of Bellevue. In September 1997 – one month later - Jeffrey was assaulted (thrown down on the floor) and arrested in a public lobby of the Creative Artists Agency (CAA) by a private security guard (*who worked for a threat management and security firm having offices in Bellevue, WA as well as several other locations*), for allegedly trespassing. The municipal judge stopped the in-progress criminal trial and dismissed the case. BUT, the dismissal was never relayed to the FBI, *as discovered in a July 2005 bail hearing, where such status was "unavailable"; no bail was given, because Jeffrey Clemens was considered "dangerous" [despite guidelines that exclude using the alleged facts in charging papers for such consideration of dangerousness, as they are disputable, and despite any other evidence Jeffrey was ever dangerous]... and a possible trespasser...and a possible criminal harasser...or whatever else one can imagine, or the police can allege.* Never a criminal conviction, never an act of violence, multiple college degrees, multiple complaints through proper channels against police, who had already inflicted bludgeoning assaults upon Jeffrey, and Jeffrey is "dangerous"? ATTC suspects it had to do with four pleadings by Jonathan Clemens submitted in June 2005 to the US District Court challenging the veracity of the arrest and charging documents, a timeframe in which FBI Agent Tom Greenawalt (who testified at the May 2011 trial) submitted a supplementary declaration that Jeffrey Clemens had stated he knew of an Arrest Mandate in May 2005; Greenawalt was to also have been alleged by agent Rachel Boisselle at the April 2010 grand jury to have heard Jeffrey tell the agent he knew his email would be taken as a threat. Three FBI agents (Sotelo, Greenawalt, and Boisselle) fabricated statements in order to achieve results against Jeffrey...causing denied bail in the first and prejudicing a grand jury to indict in the second federal

prosecution. Juror Linda Ryan was to observe and hear testimony from two of these FBI agents in May 2011, *agents who had been subjects of prior misconduct complaints, but was to observe no challenge by the incompetent court forced counsel to Jeffrey. Yes, Jeffrey tried for much of the pre-trial period to get another attorney, with cause.*

Years of civil litigation followed the false trespassing arrest of 1997 and charge in LA, CA, but a settlement was reached in December 2002 by multiple parties. It was early 2003 and onward that Jeffrey Clemens began investigating malfeasance in the courts, making inquiries, writing letters, submitting motions, submitting Petitions to the US Congress, contacting the FBI and US Attorneys...only to be arrested on May 25, 2005 on trumped up, prejudiced allegations that were literally laughable.

What should be explained at this point is why the Bellevue Police surveilled (Jeffrey at Jonathan's apartment), pursued, pulled over, gave a provably false speeding ticket, threatened, and assaulted Jeffrey Clemens on or about October 25, 1994....

The complete answer has already been documented on the [www.accesstothecourts.org](http://www.accesstothecourts.org) website. But, simply put, a lawsuit against an attorney necessitated a discovery request to a Washington State Patrol officer, who asked Jonathan Clemens to call him with specifics, only to have the two unanswered phone calls / messages interpreted as harassment, and the officer sought an Anti-Harassment Restraining Order, which was served on Jonathan via the Bellevue Police Department in September 1994...one way not to turn over public information! When reporting the October 25, 1994 BPD assault upon his brother, Jonathan Clemens was arrested for violating an Anti-Harassment Restraining Order...was charged and tried on February 6, 1995...found Not Guilty. Absolutely lawful and constitutional conduct was attempted to be criminalized...so much that one of the jurors contacted Jonathan Clemens' co-worker (at The Boeing Company) to ask – **what was that trial all about?** [*Of note, Jonathan Clemens sued the patrol officer, obtained a sworn statement (attesting to a provably false fact) to settle the matter... the Washington State Patrol experienced a mass demotion and firing period in the months after the horrific, unlawful prosecution for going into a police station and reporting a crime. The said officer ultimately resigned from the Patrol.*]

**Answer:** Considering the decades old misconduct of Detective Thompson and the recent conduct (alleged misconduct amounting to perjury) of Detective Norton, false reports, false arrests, malicious prosecutions, and the like, i.e., the attempts to criminalize decent, civil, and constitutional behavior, are obviously intrinsic to our universal legal system, at the local, state, and federal level. How this “corruption” persists is not apparent to the general public, but it is the ATTC founder's belief that it goes along with a free society – that in a democracy, one needs eternal vigilance of authorities (with special privileges and powers, such as the right to arrest or file criminal complaints and charges), to keep things fair. The “corruption” cover up by attorneys and judges is a subject for another day. [Try following the money....]

Because of pending legal proceedings, a detailed analysis of (and testimonial response to) Detective Norton's Report is not possible (without further police/attorney malfeasance), but ATTC will provide these basic points derivable from Norton's Report:

- 1) No mention of the Clemens Twins stated reason for contact...the subject was another juror's misconduct (not Linda Ryan's) – this reason was stated to the daughter and Detective Norton, yet is missing from the Report. It is an unintelligent and ridiculous notion to say the Clemens Twins were there (according to the Report) to give another version of the case...such would result in nothing gained or changed or fixed. The juror cannot do anything about it! The defendant can do nothing with such alternative version of the case. The Clemens Twins were there to get information – NOT the confidential stuff, but any observations of other juror misconduct (i.e., non-compliance with instructions), which is NOT confidential.
- 2) No mention of the law as applicable to harassment, intimidation, (or even witness tampering), as no instruction on behalf of the police was given to either the reporting witness or to the Clemens Twins.
- 3) An emphasis on Jonathan's supposed "vehement disagreement" with Norton's advisement...without stating his specific advisements AND with relatively little attention on Jeffrey – the defendant. Instead of facts, Norton presented conclusory and implicative statements, problematic for a detective, who should be gathering facts. What did Jonathan "argue" about? [no facts given]
- 4) Etc. More to come, on the ATTC website. Phone records, personal testimonials of Jeffrey and Jonathan Clemens, voice mail recordings, and analysis will tell the truth and refute the Norton Report.

Access to the courts is more important than you may think. The First Amendment declares our right to Free Speech, Free Press, etc....and our right to redress grievances in court.

- A) In March 2010, a 2<sup>nd</sup> lawsuit (Jeffrey L. Clemens v. Town of Scituate re Malicious Prosecution for Unlicensed PI and Criminal Harassment), wherein unethical conduct was alleged of attorney Stephen C. Pfaff, *during the proceedings AND wherein Pfaff was a defendant because of his corrupting role in the Disorderly Conduct charge and withholding witnesses from depositions and trials of witnesses in the other charges*, was pending, when Jeffrey Clemens was prosecuted for allegedly sending a threat in an e-mail (not for sending a threatening e-mail), resulting in an unconventional dismissal of the lawsuit. Pfaff had unethically communicated with the court BEFORE a federal prosecution started, while also passing ex parte info on the FBI to the court BEFORE the FBI had even brought a complaint to court. Of note, Pfaff has years of experience defending FBI agents and police officers in criminal and civil matters.
- B) In September 2008, a 1<sup>st</sup> lawsuit (Jeffrey L. Clemens v. Town of Scituate re False Arrest for Disorderly Conduct, filed in May 2007...a year BEFORE the trial) was dismissed upon a motion by Stephen C. Pfaff after an ill-gotten conviction for Disorderly Conduct...reversed on appeal. The trial of September 18, 2008 – a shock trial without preparation and without defense counsel – was preceded the day before by the unethical conduct of Stephen C. Pfaff – who tampered with

the two (SPD officer) witnesses, conducting a deposition of one, while the other - already previously deposed – was present. Pfaff had denied Jonathan Clemens attendance at such deposition, when he had no cause or authority whatsoever to do so.

- C) On Friday January 13, 2012, two assaults (aka Excessive Use of Force, EUOF) witnessed by Jonathan by US Marshals (deputized, aka CSO's) of a HANDCUFFED Jeffrey Clemens resulted in multiple injuries and **interference with his medical attention to a visible tumor growth, later discovered to have been found malignant BEFORE being sent to prison, yet left undisclosed to Jeffrey, where medical attention was delayed for over a year.** The US Marshal Use of Force Reports – extremely discrepant with video recordings – cited a statement by AUSA David G. Tobin at Sentencing, who stated (as if a fact) erroneously and unethically, that Jeffrey Clemens had assaulted a police officer with a deadly weapon, not mentioning that the incident involved a car and that Jeffrey was never charged, tried, or convicted of AWDW, but instead had been literally bludgeoned (requiring stitches) by MSP police officers upon a pull over (originally for an intermittent headlamp) – for asking why he was being pulled over. *[Multiple charges were levied – to cover up the police assault upon Jeffrey – resulting in no convictions ultimately. Yet, AUSA Tobin speaks as if Jeffrey had done an assault, even when Sally Port video proved otherwise, and no court record exists to support Tobin's prejudicial and inflammatory comments in open court.]* Of note, Tobin and Pfaff are Suffolk Law '88 graduates. Tobin previously worked as Plymouth County Assistant DA, the same agency that prosecuted the false charges by Scituate against Jeffrey Clemens. Tobin was also a subject of the complaint filed by Jonathan Clemens with the DOJ OIG in or about June 2010, long before any trial.

Within our criminal justice system, an allegation (wrongly) means fact, means guilty, to a police officer, attorney, or even judge. Of note, the entire arrest history of Jeffrey Clemens was relayed to Officer O'Hara and Officer Goyette of Scituate BEFORE arresting Jeffrey for supposed Disorderly Conduct...despite no guilty pleas or convictions...an arrest history maliciously crafted by police, all with allegations ORIGINATING with the police, not with private citizens. Allegations get you prejudiced police and maximum sentences. A wish, in Boston's US District Court, with Tobin and Pfaff in tow, means a threat. If you are Jeffrey Clemens, it means 5 years in prison, with derelict attorneys in tow to keep him there.

Hmm. So, if Jeffrey were to wish attorney Stephen C. Pfaff were in heaven (and thus dead), then would he face another 5 years in prison?

In conclusion, Access To The Courts has provided background information on a history of intentional prejudicing against Jeffrey Clemens. Meanwhile, the access to the courts right of Jeffrey Clemens under the US Constitution has been seriously and repeatedly abused. Much more relevant information and evidence resides on the [www.accesstothecourts.org](http://www.accesstothecourts.org) website. As of August 2008, the site documented the innocence of Jeffrey Clemens with hundreds of documents and articles and analysis...but the site was mysteriously expunged from the servers of its provider, just weeks before the first Scituate-related Disorderly Conduct (involving ONLY Officer O'Hara and keenly EXCLUDING Jeffrey's witnesses...perjury is much easier that way) trial of September 18, likely a product of the Pfaff- FBI collusion, as the FBI is the



only entity capable of effecting such an obstruction, which benefited the Scituate police AND FBI to have all that evidence and analysis and proof of innocence go away.

The Clemens Twins are seeking to inquire and document. They wish for the help of jurors, or any other witness to misconduct in the courts. Just as omission of facts can mean lying or perjury (yes, we are meaning Detective Norton, and many others), staying silent about (official) misconduct can mean complicity.

It is never too late to do the right thing. Only by speaking truth to power can we the people diminish the prejudice arising from self-corrupting power. Jeffrey Clemens is a horrified victim of such prejudice. Do good neighbors and citizens just sit and watch?

Many people and players within the legal system had stakes in the outcome of the May 2011 trial of Jeffrey Clemens. Stephen Pfaff and the Town of Scituate had most to gain, and gain they did, as lawsuits were dismissed and justice denied to Mr. Clemens, and pretexts were established to justify the continued obstruction of his constitutionally protected behavior. The Totality of Circumstances defense of Jeffrey was undermined by many unscrupulous attorneys – all bent on winning rather than participating with the basic idea of good sportsmanship and fair play. Stephen Pfaff – the “victim” – essentially lied by omission on the stand in May 2011...sure, no findings of attorney misconduct had not been made by the Board of Bar Overseers, but he failed to tell that complaints by both Jonathan and Jeffrey Clemens in 2009 had been literally ignored by the Office of Bar Council and by the Board of Overseers...presumably because of the discretion of a single attorney initial reviewer...no investigations were ever conducted as to the conduct of Stephen Pfaff. Who’s the real victim?

Juror #12 is a Person of Interest to Jonathan Clemens and, thus, a witness of sorts. Jonathan cannot very well confront the POI without resistance by an obvious adverse party, especially without subpoena power. As Access To The Courts has observed, the police, prosecutors, and courts are no place to take complaints, because the First Amendment apparently slipped off their copies of the US Constitution.

Access To The Courts