

June 9, 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 USMS Visit on 6/8/11 regarding Document 105 on the Docket of 1:10-cr-10124-DPW

Your Honor,

The undersigned Document 52 petitioner is quite grateful that you and your US Marshals arranged a visit by Seattle agents to discuss Docket Document 105. Perhaps, if the agents had read Document 52 and 103 (which they admit they had not read), then the meeting would not have gone so long. As US Marshal A. Knight said he was to write a report, I am also writing a report of sorts, addressing only matters discussed with the US Marshals on June 8, 2011.

Though the Marshals were not wholly circumspect about why they were visiting with me, I summarize what (answers) I believe they were seeking:

- 1) When the “frequent writer” [undersigned] was going to end his writing, as one Marshal expressly believed that the May 16 letter [Document 105] was “consuming”.
- 2) When the “frequent writer” [undersigned] was going to get on with his life, that is, stop his involvement with the matters involving Defendant Jeffrey Clemens.
- 3) What the “frequent writer” [undersigned] was planning to do next, with regard to the US v. Jeffrey Clemens case.

Answers provided to the US Marshals:

A1) The undersigned has no plans to end his writing, as there is nothing relatively “consuming” about the May 16 letter [Document 105] or any other necessary response to appearances of misconduct by public servants in our legal system. Since when are survival and the pursuit of justice a mere consumer choice?

A2) The undersigned has not put his life on hold with this current matter before the Court, so there is nothing to “move on” from. As long as errant authorities impinge upon my life, there will be appropriate legal and rightful responses, which do require time and effort – my life.

A3) What the undersigned plans to do is not the business of our US Marshals, as the undersigned has only communicated and acted with the Courts lawfully and in good faith. The undersigned stated to the US Marshals that he plans to act within the law and within his rights. May I suggest that you do NOT use MOSAIC, the threat assessment tool of Gavin Debecker & Associates, due to their tie to this case.

As the recent meet up with the US Marshals afforded an opportunity for the undersigned to detail and clarify what he is seeking (perhaps the unstated intent of the visit), a few important points will be noted herein (in case they are missed in A. Knight’s Report), as the points were made to the US Marshals:

- a) **Passing the buck on Attorney Misconduct** - The BBO points to the Court and the Court points to another “forum”. Why do we need a BBO? More specifically, why do we need an Office of Bar Counsel? The undersigned had thought to maintain the integrity of the profession and protect the public. Actually, the BBO is protecting the impression of integrity, and doing a bad job at it.
- b) **The disingenuous nature of Assistant US Attorney Eric Christofferson**, in his response to Document 59/52, **in referring to false statements made in Court [as outlined in Document 52] as “immaterial”**. Such immateriality involves statements that wrongly imply the Defendant Clemens was a vexatious litigant repeatedly seeking civil redress for the same cause. Defendant Clemens had actually had separate causes resulting from the fact that attorney David G. Tobin’s former associate, Plymouth County ADA Richard Linehan, had separately prosecuted three related charges originating from the same incident and same police report facts in Scituate, Massachusetts, facts directly relevant to the email communication noted in this prosecution. Therefore, the “immaterial” statements actually served to disguise misconduct.
- c) **The role (and rights) of Pro Se litigants**. Respecting the rights of Pro Se litigants preserves the fundamental constitutional right to access to the courts for redress. Pro Se litigants do not necessarily take cases to court that are frivolous or unmerited, but often take on matters of corruption and official misconduct that licensed attorneys refuse to get involved with for reasons NOT related to merit. So many public servants have harmed Jeffrey L. Clemens, and so many have helped cover up that harm, that attorneys stay away from it for personal or political reasons, not for lack of merit. What does this court really know of the years-long litigation of Jeffrey Clemens? [The US Marshals know more now, due to the recent meet up.]

This report of the June 8 visit by US Marshals is concluded. At a minimum, the Court is respectfully requested to take notice, as this report relates to the US Marshals report forthcoming.

Sincerely,

Jonathan A. Clemens