

Just a portion of the case. But this is why we have no recourse in the so called “independent courts”. I don’t call them independent when officers of the corporate United States elects them and the corporate United States pays them because that is control over the courts. Now what oath are they taking if they are not officers of the United States to defend what? As I say, the whole lawyer bar establishment has to be eliminated.

Cromelin V United States 177 F. 2d. 275

277

in his company, and his payment on the minority stock, and forcing him into personal bankruptcy since he was indorser on corporation's debts. Other items of personal damages were also alleged.

The judge designate, in sustaining the to dismiss, said orally: "It is in an effort to recover damages what the complaint charges is malfeasance ,misfeasance, and nonfeasance of federal district judge, an action to recover damages for things that he did or failed do as a judge in a matter pending before him. I hold that neither under the Claims Act nor under any other Act of Congress can a federal district judge be liable for any of his judicial decisions; and that the United is not liable and not suable under Tort Claims Act for the judicial decisions of a federal judge on matters heard determined by him. I hold further a federal district judge is not an employee of the United States, nor is his trustee in bankruptcy".

[1-4] We think the holdings are correct. The trustee, like a receiver, is an officer of court, appointed by the court, directed by the court, and paid by the court from the funds in the court. **He is in no sense an agent or employee or officer of the United States.** The judge is appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate and paid from the United States treasury, but in trying cases he is a member of the independent judiciary and is not under the control of the United States any more than a member of the legislative department is in legislating. Such officers are not within contemplation of the Tort Claims Act, if even gross errors of the judges are to compensable out of the Treasury of the United States, very clear language would required in a law so ordering.

What a sweet deal they set up for themselves. They are strictly the US corporation courts no doubt.

[5, 6] Appellant, in argument, concedes judicial errors are not within the Claims Act, but argues that what is are refusals and neglects to do and constitutional duties and so as to be ministerial in character.

We cannot agree. However wrong the conduct attributed to the judge may have been, and we must on this motion to dismiss view the allegations of fact as true, it was the conduct of a judge acting as such, subject to correction on appeal to this court, but not a tort which the United States has made itself liable in damages to persons claiming to have been injured. Nor does State law afford any standard of liability if the Tort Claims Act were sought to be applied, for judicial error gives rise to no private liability under the law also. Judgement affirmed.

I have 4 mores cases saying the same thing.

Big Al