

June 23, 2011

Jonathan A. Clemens
907 – 19th Street
Port Townsend, WA 98368
(360) 301-5133

Hon. Douglas P. Woodlock
United States District Court
One Courthouse Way
Boston, MA 02210

Re **Administrative Office of the US Courts Involvement in US v. Clemens, 1:10-cr-10124-DPW**

Your Honor,

The independence of the US Courts is in serious question, as the Department of Justice Office of Inspector General saw fit to forward by letter on September 1, 2010 a misconduct complaint (against FBI Special Agent Rachel BOISSELLE – the originating complainant in the reference US v. Clemens case) to the Administrative Office of the US Courts. The AO obviously has no jurisdiction to look into the misconduct – possibly criminal – of a law enforcement officer, but it was the subsequent AO letter to the undersigned that is also a cause for concern.

The AO of the US Courts informed the undersigned (complainant on June 9, 2010 to the DOJ OIG against BOISSELLE, which as cc'd to AUSA Tobin) via a letter signed by Robin G. Trevillian and dated September 24, 2010. [SEE ATTACHED Letter] The AO informs the undersigned, but provides no indication that the DOJ was informed of the impropriety of forwarding a complaint to the Court. The DOJ OIG failed to acknowledge the June 9, 2010 complaint AND failed to inform the undersigned complainant about the transmittal to the Court.

The (attached) AO letter of September 24, 2010 is very misleading and deficient in handling the apparent impropriety on the part of the DOJ. Do the Courts and DOJ have some kind of special relationship, such a mutual back scratchers? The AO mischaracterized the complaint, shifting the focus from the FBI agent (false statements) to a federal judge (prejudice). The AO mentioned the name of the judge (YOUNG), but did not mention the agent (BOISSELLE). The complaint has more to do with the Probation (and Pre-Trial Services) Department (a part of the Courts) than it does about Judge Young. So, why was the mental disorder seeking Probation Department not mentioned? Even if the complaint had involved Judge Young, then the DOJ had absolutely no business forwarding it to the Courts, as the related case was still pending. Still pending! By still pending is meant that the criminal defendant was waiting on belated discovery, including grand jury transcripts containing in part a repeat of the Boisselle false statements first identified from her March 16, 2010 complaint for an arrest warrant.

Maybe we should look a little into the background of the signatory to the September 24 letter from the AO, Robin G. Trevillian. Robin G. Trevillian worked for 9 years for the Department of Justice and has involved herself in efforts to expand information sharing amongst law enforcement agencies, especially as consultant with the Center for Strategic Management. Information sharing just so happens to be at the heart of issues Jeffrey L. Clemens, defendant herein, had (and still has, thanks to Tobin's associates at the Plymouth County DA Office) in the Hingham District Court proceedings and in related US District Court civil proceedings, and is a subject of the March 8, 2010 email involved in this criminal proceeding.

Did Ms. Trevillian's efforts at policy making result in policies that allow sharing of presumably confidential DOJ complaints with the US Courts? Can we possibly get to know the custody of such information within the US Courts, as perhaps it was shared with US District Court judges or clerks, or with Court of Appeals people (who may already be working on related complaints against judges)? The independence of the courts is certainly not assured here! This is no small matter, as even First Circuit Judge Lynch acknowledged that there had been ex parte communication between the victim-attorney PFAFF and the US District Court in March 2010, (leading to the start of the current prosecution).

Apparently, the policies that AO's Robin G. Trevillian helped to establish are the same ones that allowed an unchallenged, perjured OHara Report to be transmitted from a Town of Scituate police department to the FBI and to the US Secret Service, to be floated around Pre-Trial Services and in their reports in attempting and achieving prolonged pre-trial detention of Jeffrey Clemens in the federal system in 2005 and 2006, and even later in 2007, and somewhat again in 2010 and 2011. Ironically, policies placed to ostensibly improve crime fighting and antiterrorism efforts do more to help grind the lives of innocent people into dirt, and in the process make the Court and legal system in general appear corrupt.

Please take judicial notice of these improprieties involving the DOJ and AO of the US Courts.

Sincerely,

Jonathan A. Clemens