

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE SIXTH CIRCUIT
COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT OR DISABILITY**

MAIL THIS FORM TO: CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE OF THE SIXTH CIRCUIT
503 U.S. POST OFFICE & COURTHOUSE
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202

MARK ENVELOPE "JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT COMPLAINT" OR JUDICIAL DISABILITY COMPLAINT. DO NOT PUT THE NAME OF THE JUDGE OR MAGISTRATE ON THE ENVELOPE.

SEE RULE 2 FOR THE NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED.

1. Complainant's Name: David Schied
Address: 20075 Northville Place Dr. North #3120 Northville, MI 48167

Daytime telephone: (248) 924-3129

2. Judge or Magistrate complained about:
Name(s): Denise Page Hood

Court: United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division

3. Does this complaint concern the behavior of the judge or magistrate in a particular lawsuit or lawsuits?

Yes

If "yes" give the following information about each lawsuit (use reverse side if there is more than one):

Court: Washtenaw County Circuit Court: 09-1474-NO *David Schied v. Laura Cleary, et. al*

USDC EDM: *David Schied v. Lynn Cleary, et. al*

Docket number: 10-CV-10105-DT

Other Docket number: 09-1474-NO in Washtenaw County Circuit Court

Are (were) you a party or lawyer in the lawsuit?

Party

If a party, give the following information:

Lawyer's Name: I am a "pro se" and "forma pauperis" litigant

Address: n/a

Telephone: (248) 924-3129

Docket number(s) of any appeals of above case(s) to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals:

4. Have you filed any lawsuits against the judge or magistrate?

No

CONDUCT SUBJECT TO COMPLAINT

(Special treatment of peer group; Conduct prejudicial to litigant and business of the Court;
Criminal conduct)

1. The continual DELAY of civil and/or criminal proceedings serves to *discriminate* against me by **denying proper "service"** to me as Plaintiff David Schied;
2. The continual DELAY of civil and/or criminal proceedings serves to further the perpetuation of reported crimes by **denying proper "service"** to me as Plaintiff David Schied;
3. The continual DELAY of civil and/or criminal proceedings serves to prejudicing this case by continuing the perpetual delay and prevention of an **"effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts"**;
4. The continual DELAY of civil and/or criminal proceedings serves to perpetuate the familiar pattern of the Co-Defendant-Appellees of **denying full faith and credit to Petitioner's Texas clemency documents**; and of obstructing Petitioner's free exercise of Constitutional rights, as otherwise guaranteed by Texas courts and the Texas Governor. It also **reflects and reinforces the pattern of Co-Defendants' "exploitation of a vulnerable victim"**;
5. The continual DELAY of civil and/or criminal proceedings serves to provide favor to the government Defendants as the *"defendants"* by criminally **"aiding and abetting"** them with continued *"cover"* for their wrongful crimes against me as the *"crime victim"* and civil rights *"litigant"*;
6. The continual DELAY of civil and/or criminal proceedings serves to **display a willful cover-up of allegations of criminal felony offenses**, inclusive of an offense of *"conversion"* of government property (i.e., an erroneous 2003 FBI report) to personal use (i.e., by public dissemination under the Freedom of Information Act in *"retaliation"* against a former *"whistleblower"* and employee) which itself constitutes felony offenses by the judge;
7. This judge has **displayed a refusal to execute her duty to take immediate action** under both state and federal statutes governing the rights of crime victims;
8. The continual DELAY of civil and/or criminal proceedings serves to display the familiar patterns of a government cover-up of **preferential treatment for government peers, an obstruction of justice, and a conspiracy against rights**;
9. The continual DELAY of civil and/or criminal proceedings serves to display the familiar pattern of the government Co-Defendants, of **corruptly misleading the public** by continuing to allow their predecessor and colleague judges to set forth *fraudulent* authentication features in what is otherwise the restricted interstate communication of criminal history identification information; *
10. The continual DELAY of civil and/or criminal proceedings serves to display the familiar pattern of the government Co-Defendants, of **continuing to allow their predecessor and colleague judges to corruptly misleading the public by libel, slander, and by trespassing upon Petitioner's personal and professional reputation**;
11. The action of this judge **demonstrates her role in a continuum of government racketeering**, not only by her *"meeting of the minds"* with her "peer group" of other judges who have acted similarly in

disregarding the crimes being committed by government officials, but by her meeting(s) with Judge Paul Borman in review of his case, referencing three other previous State court cases, under light of the Evidence and numerous motions showing that Borman's ruling was grossly in error and in need of correction of his "*gross miscarriage of justice*".

I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read rules 1 and 2 of the Rules of the Sixth Circuit Governing Complaints of Judicial Misconduct or Disability, and the statements made in this complaint are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.



8/6/2010

Attached submissions: (3 copies)

1. Cover Letter inclusive of 39 pages of "interpretation" of the 3-page *Statement of Facts*
2. 3-page Statement of Facts

* Note: Statutory procedure requires agency notification of correction or refusal within 10 days of receipt of this complaint.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

- I. JUDGE DENISE PAGE HOOD FIRST STALLED THE CASE FOR SIX MONTHS, AND UNTIL PLAINTIFF FILED A “*MOTION*” TO HEAR A PREVIOUSLY FILED “*DEMAND FOR REMAND*” THAT JUDGE HOOD HAD STATED SHE WOULD OTHERWISE CONSIDER AS PLAINTIFF’S “*MOTION FOR REMAND*”; AND WHILE REFUSING TO “*HEAR*” PLAINTIFF’S DEMAND FOR AN IMMEDIATE ADDRESS OF A CRIME REPORT AND SWORN, NOTARIZED “*WITNESS*” STATEMENT, BECAUSE THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED IN THE “*DEMAND FOR REMAND*” DOCUMENTS SHOWED A MASSIVE “*CONSPIRACY TO DEPRIVE OF RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF LAW*” THAT INCLUDED A HISTORY OF PARTICIPATION BY MEMBERS OF JUDGE HOOD’S OWN “*PEER GROUP*” OF OTHER JUDGES ON THE BENCH OF THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, AND THE SIXTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS.
- II. JUDGE DENISE PAGE HOOD ALLOWED CASE MANAGER WILLIAM LEWIS TO CONTINUE FACILITATING AND MANAGING THE PAPERWORK IN THE CASE; AND WHILE ALSO CONTINUING TO ALLOW HIM TO INTERCEDE THROUGH “*EX PARTE*” COMMUNICATIONS WITH EACH PARTY TO THE CASE, RELAYING THAT INFORMATION TO JUDGE HOOD AND TAKING EFFECTIVE “*PREJUDICIAL*” ACTION TO CAUSE PLAINTIFF DETRIMENT, BY DENYING PLAINTIFF’S “*REQUEST FOR ORAL HEARING*” ON NUMEROUS MOTIONS AND WHILE CANCELING THE PREVIOUSLY SCHEDULED ORAL HEARINGS *WITH ONLY A FEW HOURS NOTICE*.
- III. JUDGE HOOD ACTUALLY ALLOWED CASE MANAGER TO “*FACILITATE*” THE WRITING OF HER “*SIX SEPARATE ORDERS WRAPPED INTO ONE DOCUMENT DATED 7/29/2010*”.
- IV. JUDGE DENISE PAGE HOOD’S RULING IS PREJUDICIAL “*ON ITS FACE*”. THE RULING *MISSTATED* AND CREATED “*OMISSIONS*” OF THE ACTUAL FACTS TO ESSENTIALLY GENERATE A “*FRAUDULENT OFFICIAL DOCUMENT*” THAT JUSTIFIED THE PREJUDICIAL NATURE OF THE DOCUMENT ITSELF.
- V. JUDGE DENISE HOOD THEN USED HER OWN “*FRAUDULENT*” HISTORY OF THIS CASE TO JUSTIFY HER “*ANALYSIS*” OF THE CASE WITH PREJUDICIAL FAVOR *TOWARD* DEFENDANTS AND THEIR ATTORNEYS AND *AGAINST* PLAINTIFF, BOTH AS A CIVIL LITIGANT AND AS A “*CRIME VICTIM*”.
- VI. JUDGE DENISE PAGE HOOD VIRTUALLY IGNORED PLAINTIFF’S “*DEMAND FOR CRIMINAL GRAND JURY INVESTIGATION*” WHILE ACKNOWLEDGING BUT REFUSING TO ACT UPON PLAINTIFF’S ASSERTIONS – BACKED BY EVIDENCE (FOR WHICH THE COURT HAS REFUSED TO LOOK AT YET) – ABOUT HIS BEING A “*CRIME VICTIM*”. YET JUDGE DENISE HOOD HAS ISSUED A RULING THAT COMMANDS PLAINTIFF (EVEN AS A “*PRO SE*” LITIGANT) TO ENGAGE HIS

CRIMINAL PERPETRATORS IN SUCH WAY THAT OPENS HIM UP TO EVEN FURTHER CRIMINAL OPPRESSION AND HARASSMENT BY THE DEFENDANTS AND THEIR ATTORNEY MICHAEL WEAVER, WITHOUT THE PROTECTION OF A PROSECUTING ATTORNEY.

- VII. THE “ANSWER” OF THIS JUDGE FOR THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN FITS THE CRIMINAL PATTERN DESCRIBED IN PLAINTIFF’S ORIGINAL “COMPLAINT” AS FILED IN THE WASHTENAW COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT, BY JUDGE HOOD “MISREPRESENTING” THE UNDERLYING FACTS AND BASIS FOR THE PLAINTIFF’S PLEADINGS, THROUGH SIGNIFICANT “OMISSIONS” AND “MISSTATEMENTS OF FACTS” RELEVANT TO THE PLAINTIFF’S PLEADINGS.
- VIII. THE “ORDER” DISPLAYS THE FAMILIAR PATTERN OF THE CO-DEFENDANTS “DENYING FULL FAITH AND CREDIT” TO PLAINTIFF’S TEXAS “CLEMENCY” DOCUMENTS; AND OF “OBSTRUCTING” PLAINTIFF’S “FREE EXERCISE OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS”, AS OTHERWISE GUARANTEED BY TEXAS COURTS AND THE TEXAS GOVERNOR. IT ALSO REFLECTS AND REINFORCES THE PATTERN OF CO-DEFENDANTS’ “EXPLOITATION OF A VULNERABLE VICTIM”
- IX. JUDGE HOOD’S “ORDER(S)” DISPLAYS INTENTIONAL “FRAUD” AND A WILLFUL “COVER UP” OF ALLEGATIONS OF CRIMINAL FELONY OFFENSES, WHICH ITSELF CONSTITUTES FELONY OFFENSES BY THE JUDGE
- X. THE JUDGE SHIRKED HER “DUTY” TO TAKE IMMEDIATE ACTION UNDER BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL STATUTES GOVERNING THE RIGHTS OF CRIME VICTIMS
- XI. THE ORDER DISPLAYS THE FAMILIAR PATTERNS OF A GOVERNMENT “COVER-UP” OF PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT FOR GOVERNMENT PEERS, AN “OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE”, AND A “CONSPIRACY AGAINST RIGHTS”
- XII. JUDGE HOOD’S “ORDER” DISPLAYS THE FAMILIAR PATTERN OF GOVERNMENT CO-DEFENDANTS, OF “CORRUPTLY MISLEADING THE PUBLIC” BY SETTING FORTH FRAUDULENT “AUTHENTICATION FEATURES” IN WHAT IS OTHERWISE THE RESTRICTED INTERSTATE COMMUNICATION OF CRIMINAL HISTORY IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION
- XIII. THE ORDER DISPLAYS THE FAMILIAR PATTERN OF THE GOVERNMENT CO-DEFENDANTS, “CORRUPTLY MISLEADING THE PUBLIC” BY LIBEL, SLANDER AND BY TRESPASSING UPON PLAINTIFF’S PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION
- XIV. THE ACTIONS OF JUDGE DENISE HOOD AND HER CASE MANAGER WILLIAM LEWIS DEMONSTRATE THEIR ROLE IN A CONTINUUM OF “GOVERNMENT RACKETEERING AND CORRUPTION”

I declare, under penalty of perjury, that I have read rules 1 and 2 of the Rules of the Sixth Circuit Governing Complaint of the Judicial Misconduct of Disability. The statements made in this complaint, as articulated in the 5 pages designated as a concise "Statement of Fact" as seen above and as provided in the accompanying 25 pages of "Interpretation" of those facts, are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Schied", is written over a horizontal line.

Executed on: 8/6/2010