

August 29, 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

cc: Eric A. Johnson
DOJ - Investigations Division
1425 New York Avenue NW, Suite 7100
Washington, D.C. 20530

Re DOJ OIG – Investigations Division re **US v. Jeffrey Clemens, #10-cr- 10124 - TAKE NOTICE**

Your Honor,

I recently received a letter, dated August 12, 2011, relevant to the reference criminal case, addressed to “Dear Mr. Clemens”, from an agent at the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Justice:

“The Purpose of this letter is to acknowledge receipt of your correspondence dated June 15, 2011, and your previous correspondence which you submitted on June 9, 2010. After careful review of your allegations the Department of Justice, Office of Inspector General (OIG) determined the issues you raised do not fall under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice, OIG and we therefore consider this matter closed.”

The DOJ OIG agent Eric A. Johnson took a play out of the BBO/OBC playbook, suggesting that some other organization or agency is responsible (i.e., has jurisdiction) to investigate allegations of official misconduct, despite the specific mission of the OIG to investigate misconduct claims against employees in the DOJ, which includes the FBI, which includes agent BOISSELLE. On June 9, 2010, the undersigned submitted a complaint against BOISSELLE and cc’d AUSA TOBIN (of which the court has been previously informed) and have not had a straight answer or honest response since.

FBI agent BOISSELLE sought the arrest warrant herein. The DOJ OIG deferred the matter of her false statements in pursuit of such arrest warrant (and in testimony at a subsequent grand jury) to others. The BBO/OBC mission is to investigate and discipline attorney misconduct, which they deferred to others, specifically to the courts in the case of attorneys PFAFF and TOBIN, players in this case. What did the courts (you) do? Defer the matter right back (to another “forum”), after back peddling on a petition to hold AUSA TOBIN accountable.

The DOJ OIG agent Eric A. Johnson took a play out of the Massachusetts Attorney General Office (MAGO) playbook, too. MAGO belatedly stated that it did not have jurisdiction to investigate criminal

conduct (of Police Officer OHARA and attorney Stephen C. PFAFF) within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, implying that some other entity has jurisdiction to investigate allegations of official misconduct constituting criminal conduct. The MAGO, like the DOJ OIG, failed to timely inform the complainant just who had the jurisdiction. These organizations failed to inform because it was indeed MAGO and the DOJ OIG who had the jurisdiction.

Mr. Johnson continued to write:

“OIG advised previously that the matters you raised are more appropriate for review by another office or Agency. Therefore, the complaint was forwarded to the following agencies for whatever action they deemed appropriate: Federal Bureau of Investigation Inspection Division... Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts...Department of Justice Office of Professional Responsibility...Any further correspondence regarding this matter should be directed to those offices. I hope this answers any questions you have relative to this matter. Sincerely, Eric A. Johnson, Special Agent in Charge Special Operations Investigations Division.” [end]

The so-called “advised previously” is presumably the only previous correspondence I had from the DOJ OIG, a letter dated October 13, 2010 from Eric A. Johnson, whose content is stated in its entirety:

“Dear Mr. Clemens: The Purpose of this letter is to acknowledge receipt of your correspondence. After careful review of your allegations the Department of Justice, Office of Inspector General (OIG) determined the issues you raised do not fall under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice, OIG and this matter will be closed. I hope this answers any questions you have relative to this matter. Sincerely, Eric A. Johnson, Special Agent in Charge Special Operations Investigations Division”

What Mr. Johnson FAILS to do is properly recollect previous instructions to the undersigned complainant...he incorrectly referred to previous advisement about other “more appropriate” offices or agencies – no such referral ever occurred, as his own words in 2010 attest, which CONTRADICT his words in 2011. Mr. Johnson improperly forwarded my complaint to the Administrative Office of the US Courts, as the AO later wrote in 2010 (of which a copy of the letter was previously submitted to this court on June 23, 2011) that they (the AO) did NOT have jurisdiction. Why in 2011 does Mr. Johnson think that the Administrative Office of the Courts investigate crimes? The undersigned – an educated and experienced engineer – believes that this DOJ OIG agent did something derelict and that he is not the only one. Mr. Johnson had an opportunity last fall to tell me, the undersigned, about their lack of jurisdiction in the matter when I personally visited his office on New York Avenue in Washington, D.C., where I was told to call later and make an appointment. I had always thought that investigators welcomed contact from complainants and witnesses. Perhaps, my expectations of public servants are too high. No, their derelictions are too high.

What Mr. Johnson also FAILS to do is to acknowledge what the June 9, 2010 correspondence actually was...it was a letter to DOJ Inspector General Glenn Fine requesting that his office assure that the webmail complaint against FBI Agent Rachel BOISSELLE be handled properly, while referencing the total

dereliction in handling my complaint (comprising 3 separate webmail submittals to the OIG) against FBI agent Ingerd SOTELO in 2005, also relevant to the matters concerning Defendant herein Jeffrey Clemens.

What Mr. Johnson also FAILS to do is be honest about the DOJ OIG jurisdiction over a complaint against FBI agent Rachel BOISSELLE (accused by me of making multiple false statements of material fact in her Complaint to obtain an arrest of Jeffrey Clemens in the case herein), as he himself investigated the materially false statements of FBI special agent Erik B. Blowers in 2005, which later led to Blowers' resignation from the FBI and guilty plea in a criminal proceeding. A news release stated that Eric A. Johnson of the DOJ OIG investigated Blowers for "knowingly making and submitting to the FBI a materially false statement..."

So, if the DOJ OIG can investigate FBI agent Blowers for making false statements, why can the DOJ OIG not have the jurisdiction to investigate FBI agent BOISSELLE for making false statements?

The striking resemblance of the OIG handling of my June 9, 2010 complaint against BOISSELLE to the MAGO handling of my October 8, 2010 complaint against OHARA and implicitly PFAFF cannot be ignored. NO ONE from the agencies with whom I corresponded answered my actual written requests...I asked MAGO for the jurisdiction to take my complaint to *(and was initially ignored, but later told – after being threatened by an MSP officer co-situated with MAGO of a possible **Criminal Harassment** charge – that MAGO did not have jurisdiction over my complaint, but no mention of the proper jurisdiction!)*...the DOJ OIG also ignored my request to assure that the OIG properly handle my June 9, 2010 complaint. OIG never acknowledged THE COMPLAINT (June 9, 2010 webmail), AND they never told me they did not have jurisdiction, AND they never told me to go somewhere else, AND they never stated where to go.

THE DERELICTS

Police Officer OHARA (remember the lawsuits - defended by PFAFF - filed by Jeffrey Clemens?)
Attorney Stephen PFAFF (remember the RPCs? – the BBO complaints? – the lawsuit against PFAFF?)
BBO/OBC (remember the complaints against PFAFF? – and against TOBIN? - never even investigated!)
FBI Agent BOISSELLE (remember the April 2010 court pleading outlining false statements? – the June 9?)
AUSA David TOBIN (remember Document 52?)
DOJ OIG (remember the letters restated herein?)
MAGO (remember my declaration concerning MAGO et al in March 2011 to this court?)

Who is the next derelict to be added to this list? Can we not stop the list from growing?

It is my firm belief that these derelictions are the natural result of derelictions within the judiciary. Case in point, the US Marshals you sent to visit me last June work in the Seattle/Tacoma region, home to US District Judge Martinez. Martinez was the Washington State Superior Court judge in 1995 who, when confronted with a speeding ticket appeal proving the perjury of Bellevue Police Officer Dennis L. Richards in misconduct against Jeffrey L. Clemens (the defendant herein), said to the effect "I'm not very

good at math” and affirmed the lower court finding of speeding. The math and physics I used to prove the perjury of Officer Richards (included in the 1994-1995 appeal) was high school level.

Just where did Bellevue police detective Bob Thompson learn that by “arresting” Jeffrey L. Clemens for **Criminal Harassment** – to stop his inquiries into the complaint he submitted against the aforementioned officer Richards – that PREJUDICE would follow Mr. Clemens the rest of his life? Hint/answer: the judiciary, who condone the misconduct of police and attorneys. Have you condoned the misconduct of any attorneys lately? Not a direct condoning, just one masked in an appearance of propriety, like suggesting another “forum”. Of course, you know more than anybody else that you had a duty to address the attorney misconduct.

Just where did MSP officer Michael Cashman, co-located with the Massachusetts Attorney General Office, get the idea in January 2011 to threaten a complainant (actually, the undersigned) with a Criminal Harassment charge? Hint/answer: the judiciary, who in my case would have overlooked the lack of probable cause and probably allowed a prosecution to proceed, and if they could, force a derelict public defender to represent me, to ensure that the credibility of the MSP witness is maintained and prejudice against me maintained, as well.

Do I have the scenario identified accurately? I get to this conclusion because you have allowed prejudice and false statements (in a grand jury) to maintain probable cause against Jeffrey L. Clemens, forced an intentionally derelict public defender upon Jeffrey, and proceeded to a trial – for anything but justice.

Your honor, you need to get your US Marshals to look into the Bellevue Matter a little deeper. They will find that when I reported the assault by Bellevue Officer Dennis L. Richards on my brother Jeffrey in 1994, I was charged with a crime, brought to trial, and found not guilty. The crime? Harassment! What was the ultimate result of the police, attorney, and court shenanigans? A good number of officers were demoted and fired. You see, their derelictions eventually caught up with them. Matters are more involved and complicated now, but the long arm of concerned citizens is at work. I am seeing way too many derelictions at the US District Court and Hingham District Court to ignore.

And please, no more visits by your US Marshals. I like and trust US Marshals, but I do not like to see them used for improper reasons and for investigating false pretexts so the courts can spy on me.

Pre-USDC federal judge/ Washington State judge Martinez (*relying on a sworn statement of Officer Richards, because the District Court Judge Linda Jacke insisted in November 1994 that it would take almost two months to reschedule a hearing with the officer present, despite they having just put Jeffrey’s speeding contested hearing on the docket within literally minutes, after Jeffrey had been told verbally to appear on such a date and for which the witness subpoena instructions had been withheld from Jeffrey, thus assuring Jeffrey’s inability to timely subpoena the lying bastard*) would be second derelict behind Linda Jacke on the D-List, lawyers who have enjoyed financial support from the taxpayers amounting to millions of dollars.

The Bellevue Matter is a clear example of police-attorney-judge intermingling and dereliction – a cover-up. Oh, to have such a simple case to recite to legislators, prosecuting attorneys, city council members, activists groups, and others...such disclosure actually led to retirements and firings.

Today, the legal affairs for Jeffrey Clemens, that the Bellevue Matter spawned long ago, involves people like the US Congress, DOJ, MAGO, Board of Selectmen, and others – proven derelicts, leaving the US Citizens with only limited courses of action. Can you guess any of them?

Welcome to the Scituate Matter. A lot like the Bellevue Matter, but unfortunately involving a bunch of federal public servants who think they can get away with dereliction of duty. No, they can't get away with dereliction.

Sincerely,

Jonathan A. Clemens