Indiana Constitution Reforms Proposed by Andrew Straw:
1. http://bivens.andrewstraw.com – *Bivens* expansion act
2. http://amendments.andrewstraw.com – People Power Amendments

HR xxxx

To amend titles 18, 28, and 42 of the U.S. Code to address errors by U.S. District Courts and a U.S. Courts of Appeals and restore disability rights that have been infringed through hostile and erroneous jurisprudence.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Date: _____

Mr./Ms. _____ introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Justice.

A BILL

To amend the U.S. Code at titles 18, 28, and 42 to address illegitimate attacks on a disability rights attorney, Andrew Straw, and reform the law to conform to his efforts to increase disability privacy, increase rights of parents with disabilities to parenting time, force the ABA to collect statistics on disability in law admissions, and prohibit any state ADA coordinator from retaliating against any ADA complaint or other disability-related petition for redress of grievances, including new criminal provisions.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the "Andrew U. D. Straw Disability Rights Reform Act".

SEC. 2 Findings of fact and purpose.

(a) Attorney Andrew U. D. Straw is a disability rights lawyer and advocate and civil rights leader. He has been attacked by his former employer, the Indiana Supreme Court, where a reckless driver hit him head-on as he drove to the Indiana Supreme Court to work in 2001 and broke both of his legs and pelvis, permanently disabling him.

(b) The Indiana Supreme Court discovered Andrew U. D. Straw's bipolar disorder which came from his being born on an EPA Superfund site, Camp LeJeune, North Carolina, in 1969, because the Indiana Supreme Court asked this information on its bar exam application in 2001. Cf. 38 U.S.C. § 1787 ff.; 38 C.F.R. § 17.400(b)(xiv); *Straw v. Wilkie*, 20-2090-ZZ (Fed. Cir. 1/15/2021); *Straw v. North Carolina*, 7:18-cv-74-D (E.D. N.C.) (Dkts. 16, 31, 32, 47); *Straw v. Indiana Supreme Court, et. al.*, 1:15-cv-1015-RLY (S.D. Ind. 2016); *Straw v. Indiana Supreme Court, et. al.*, 1:16-cv-3483-JMS (S.D. Ind. 2017) (Especially **Dkts. 1-11 & 1-13**); *Straw v. Indiana Supreme Court, et. al.*, 17-1338 (7th Cir.).

(c) Andrew U. D. Straw worked at the Indiana Supreme Court from 2000 to 2002.

(d) Andrew U. D. Straw complained about disability rights violations by the Indiana Supreme Court in 2014. This was met with immediate retaliation by the Indiana Supreme Court ADA Coordinator in the form of a disciplinary complaint that attacked Straw's Camp LeJeune disability, his competence, his own petition for redress of over 10 years of alleged discrimination, and at least 4 different ADA lawsuits Straw filed, some of which

were labeled as "frivolous" by federal judges. Despite his best efforts to defend himself and his work, Straw was suspended from the practice of law for 180 days and his pleadings in that case were ignored for 5+ more years, leaving him suspended **72 months** as of **February 2023**. See, *In Re Andrew U. D. Straw*, 68 N.E.3d 1070 (Ind. 2/14/2017). http://InReStraw.andrewstraw.com

(e) The hearing officer appointed by the Chief Justice of Indiana was a candidate for a justice vacancy on the Indiana Supreme Court when he was appointed. Obviously, he had a conflict of interest because the discipline was in retaliation for Andrew U. D. Straw's ADA complaints in 2014, so this disciplinary process was both a defensive measure against Straw's own complaints and an offensive measure to injure Straw and declare him incompetent. The choice the Disciplinary Commission presented Straw was a medical and non-punitive "disability status" or a full-fledged disciplinary attack with suspension the final result. Either way, a permanent suspension was the Commission goal.

(f) This same hearing officer applied for a federal judge appointment by the 7th Circuit Judicial Council while he was sitting on a late hearing officer report for Straw in 2016. That hearing officer, Hon. James R. Ahler, gave his report after an *in-absentia* hearing, to the Indiana Supreme Court in December of 2016. Straw immediately filed a lawsuit to stop the discipline and reject its discrimination. *Straw v. Indiana Supreme Court, et. al.*, 1:16-cv-3483-JMS (S.D. Ind. 2/16/2017).

(g) The trial judge, Hon. Magnus-Stinson, was on the 7th Circuit Judicial Council that was considering Hon. Ahler, the Indiana hearing officer, for that federal judge position. Magnus-Stinson

ruled in Ahler's favor, then withdrew.

(h) On appeal at the 7th Circuit, Hon. Ahler was hired by the 7th Circuit with Magnus-Stinson on the Council on June 15, 2017. On July 6, 2017, the 7th Circuit panel over Straw's appeal against the Indiana Supreme Court and Hon. Ahler, was dismissed with nonsense law. Straw had never sued Ahler before, but he was protected with *res judicata* and nothing else. One of Straw's panel members employed Ahler as a clerk before but did not recuse until ***after*** voting in favor of Ahler. *Straw v. Indiana Supreme Court, et. al.*, 17-1338, 692 F. App'x 291 (7th Cir. 7/6/2017); *Straw v. U.S. District Court, et. al.*, 1:18-cv-278-CMH (E.D. Va.) (**Dkts. 7 & 20**); *Straw v. U.S. District Court, et. al.*, 20-1352 (4th Cir. 2020).

(i) Andrew U. D. Straw lost 5 law licenses, was rejected for another by the 11th Circuit, was expelled by the ABA as a member (inhibiting his reform activities), was attacked by Avvo.com, which cited his Indiana suspension, and was denied insurance to work as a lawyer in Virginia because of the Indiana suspension. He was attacked by legal publishers in the Southern District of New York and the Clerk's office of the U.S. Supreme Court, who refused to allow Straw to make filings.

(j) The snowball effect here caused Andrew U. D. Straw at least as much damage as the suspension itself, which spiraled out of control.

(k) Another state has rejected the Indiana discipline wholly and completely both in 2016 (before its imposition) and in 2017 (after the discipline was imposed with the federal ADA lawsuit to stop it still open. The Virginia State Bar said using an ADA

coordinator to attack Straw in this fashion, "had all the grace and charm of a drive-by shooting." Then, the Virginia State Bar said that Straw demonstrated by **clear and convincing** evidence that he should not be disciplined in Virginia and he was not disciplined there. *In the Matter of Andrew U. D. Straw*, 17-000-108746 (VSB, 6/20/2017). The Virginia State Bar invoked the *Moseley* case to show that Straw's cases and filings were not "totally frivolous" and this is why no discipline was appropriate. The Indiana Supreme Court **cited no authority or precedent** for imposing permanent suspension on Straw.

(l) VSB ORDER: https://www.vsb.org/docs/Straw-062217.pdf

(m) No state or federal agency or court in Indiana or the Midwest or U.S. courts of any kind in the 7th Circuit would assist in protecting Andrew U. D. Straw from what his former employer did to him, and this includes the U.S. Department of Justice, which repeatedly refused to help or intervene, the FBI, and many other agencies Straw approached for help.

(n) Congress finds that the entire purpose of the ADA and especially Title II is to prevent the kinds of attacks that happened to Andrew U. D. Straw.

(o) Congress agrees with the Virginia State Bar, and Title II of the ADA needed to be applied so that Straw's discipline was impossible and the violations and retaliations would be compensated instead of buried under dishonest adjudications that merely served to deny justice as part of a conspiracy. Luckily, this conspiracy is obvious on its face in the federal court records.

(p) Straw had a right under the ADA both to file lawsuits and to complain about disability discrimination by his former employer as a Title II matter. No ADA coordinator has any right or power to do what ADA Coordinator Brenda F. Rodeheffer did in response to Straw's complaints. On its face and *per se*, what she did violated Title II and Title V because it was done in retaliation. No fancy legal theories can excuse immediate retaliation against ADA complaints, even if those complaints are limited by some legal theory such as statute of limitations. There should be no statute of limitations protection when a state abuses its former employee who became so severely disabled while driving there to work. See, *Straw v. Streamwood, et. al.*, 17-1867, 734 F. App'x 344 (7th Cir. 2018) (Appendix with x-rays)

(q) Simple law changes, long overdue, could have reversed every case in which Straw lost and that means his work was law reform, seeking out the weaknesses in the law and weaknesses in the judges who worked against his disability rights and those of others. We make those law changes now.

SEC. 3. Statute of Limitations, ADA Title II

(a) 42 U.S.C. § 12133 shall be amended to include a statute of limitations provision below the current text: "(a) When an employee of a state entity covered by Title II (including all trial and appellate and supreme courts at the state level) becomes disabled while working there or on the way to or from that entity for work, any disability violations thereafter by that state entity may be pursued in federal court without regard to any statute of limitations, because there is no statute of limitations under those circumstances."

(b) 42 U.S.C. § 12133 shall be amended to protect those poisoned on military bases and the following text shall be added: "(b) When a person born on a U.S. military base is found judicially or administratively to have a disability from exposure to poisons on such base, such person shall have a protected status. No state court or federal court shall ever deny such person the protection of the ADA when that person demands it and no such demand or lawsuit or any pleading by that person shall ever be labeled as frivolous. Such person has the right to protect others with mental and physical disabilities and no attempt to do so shall be labeled as frivolous or punished in any way whatsoever. Any discrimination in the form of any negative outcome mentioning in any way or alluding to such base poisoning disability to inflict damage or deny ADA coverage shall be addressed by Title II and compensated with compensatory and punitive damages. This is justified by Congress' plenary power over military matters under Article I of the U.S. Constitution. If a federal judge violates the right to file an ADA lawsuit by using the word frivolous or denying the ability to file, the United States shall be liable for all damages and such 5th Amendment lawsuit may be filed in any other U.S. District Court. There shall be no federal government, federal court, or judicial immunity when federal judges deny ADA rights."

SEC. 4. Standing, Titles II & V

(a) 42 U.S.C. § 12133 shall be amended to address standing below the current text: "(c) All persons aggrieved by disability rights violations under Title II or Title V have the right to sue entities covered by Title II and Title V for compensatory damages, with a minimum damage amount of $20,000 if the plaintiff prevails in any fashion, including obtaining *in forma pauperis*. Private entities that cooperate with or expand the damage of covered entities shall

also be covered by the Act and subject to all relief. This section protects ADA testers and such testers need not be disabled and the damages they obtain must not be reduced simply because a plaintiff is not disabled. It shall also be presumed that any person who files a lawsuit to address violations of this Act has standing and all of the requirements of standing are therefor met simply by filing the lawsuit. The only requirement per standing law is that the plaintiff sought relief against violations of this Act and alleging such violations is all that is necessary."

SEC. 5. ABA and Disability Reporting

(a) The ABA has refused to collect data on disability in law school admissions and regarding faculty. Addressing past violations of the ADA in the LSAT administration and other disability rights violations associated with law school admissions requires such information. Therefore, 42 U.S.C. § 12133 shall be amended to include the following language: "(d)(i) the American Bar Association or any successor to the ABA which regulates law school admissions shall collect and publish statistics in bar admissions that includes both physical and mental disabilities in the same manner it has done for gender and race; (d)(ii) the American Bar Association shall collect and publish statistics on mental and physical disability in law school faculty members and this information shall be collected voluntarily; (d)(iii) any person who finds that the ABA or its successor is not collecting and publishing this required disability statistics information shall have standing to sue, force its collection with injunction relief, and obtain damages in a minimum amount of $20,000, plus attorney fees under 42 U.S.C. § 12205."

SEC. 6. Parenting Time Rights of Disabled Parents

(a) Disabled parents have a right under the ADA Title II to time with their children regardless of the parent's disability. This right is so incredibly important and has been rejected by federal judges in the Northern District of Indiana, who have refused to impose the injunctions needed to enforce the ADA. Therefore, another amendment is needed for Title II, 42 U.S.C. § 12132: "(b)(i) All disabled parents have a right to parenting time and if this is infringed in any manner by a state court, such disabled person has a right to a federal district court injunction and damages against that state court, regardless of the stage of the state proceeding. This is an explicit right to an injunction against any state court or other agency that may infringe this right. No other federal or state statute shall limit the right to an injunction and damages relief, and if a state court violates this right, attorney fees shall be available to the plaintiff under 42 U.S.C. § 12205. The Anti-Injunction Act does NOT apply to any part of the ADA. There is also a right to a declaratory judgment at any time if this right is infringed; (b)(ii) The only exception to this right to parenting time is if there is a clear and convincing evidence finding that the disabled parent is physically dangerous to the child(ren), and this can only be found after a state court hearing reviewable by the federal court with another hearing. Such findings may be challenged in federal district court and overturned if they are found to be unreasonable, factually unsupported, or false, or a violation of 14th Amendment due process; (b)(iii) If a federal judge will not protect these rights, it is a violation of 5th Amendment due process because this is a vested civil right under Title II of this ADA and there shall be an action for all equitable and legal relief available against the United States in any other district court of the United States for

such damages under the 5th Amendment. The United States thus waives its sovereign immunity and judicial immunity for all such actions arising from the ADA and its non-enforcement and there is no statute of limitations or repose on such actions."

SEC. 7. Disability Privacy Protections

(a) When Andrew U. D. Straw sought relief against attacks on his character that were printed in a newspaper because Straw fought for about 150 missing handicap spaces in Streamwood, Illinois, the lawyer for the newspaper sent a threatening letter that requires additional language in Title 18 of the U.S. Code: "18 U.S.C. § 1962 (e)(1). It shall be a racketeering activity to threaten a disabled person with monetary threats of at least $1,000 per day from Medicare or any other source in order to coerce that disabled person into giving up private information such as a Social Security Number, Medicare Number, Date of Birth, or access to any private database of claims such as Medicare provides. Regardless of being in the same demand document, it shall be a separate racketeering activity to ask for each piece of information under such threats. Further, if the person who demanded this private information is a lawyer, this is another racketeering count because lawyers are meant to uphold the law, not engage in racketeering behavior. If that lawyer asked in the demand document(s) that the private information be given to a newspaper on an insurance form, this demonstrates conclusively that the intent is to make the information public. One document can include many different acts of racketeering demonstrating a pattern of racketeering activity and the fact that they happened in just one document does not preclude obtaining civil and criminal justice for those multiple acts of disability privacy violations; 18 U.S.C. §

1964(e)(2). Any person or entity found to violate 18 U.S.C. § 1962(e)(1) shall be considered a racketeer and shall be liable for civil damages and all other relief available at law to the crime victim injured in their person, their property, their reputation, and any other damage done to such crime victim. There shall be no statute of limitations on such restitution actions or any limit on the amount of compensatory and punitive damages."

SEC. 8 ADA coordinators.

(a) Given there is no reference to ADA coordinators in the ADA itself, an amendment is necessary to prohibit any such ADA coordinator from harming in any fashion a person whose complaint that officer received: "42 U.S.C. § 12104. ADA coordinators are individuals who assist a public entity or others under this Act to comply with the ADA and other disability rights laws. Such ADA coordinators often are empowered to receive complaints and address them. ADA coordinators are trusted officers who have no power to retaliate against any disabled person who makes a complaint. They have no power to question the competence of the disabled person, no power to attack in any fashion any ADA complaint, administrative actions, or any lawsuit to enforce this Act. No ADA coordinator shall ever serve both as an ADA coordinator and as legal counsel for the same state or local agency because this creates a conflict of interest. Any ADA coordinator or similar officer shall only provide help and assistance to the disabled people who make complaints and inquiries. Any action done that injures a disabled person is prohibited and compensable. Any ADA coordinator who works for a court has a special obligation not to retaliate against complaints because there is a long history of disability discrimination by state courts. *Tennessee v. Lane*, 541

U.S. 509 (2004). If an ADA coordinator takes any action to injure a complainant, the entity for which that officer works shall pay compensatory and punitive damages, shall be subject to injunction and declaratory judgment relief, and all other relief a court may find appropriate to address the retaliation. Retaliation can happen regardless of the merits or timing of the complaint or any lawsuit. If a complaint is made and a retaliatory measure is implemented by the ADA coordinator, the contents of the complaint are irrelevant so long as disability violations were the *topic* of the complaint. The statute of limitations time period begins to run when the retaliation was initiated by the ADA coordinator and if that damage continues, only begins to run when the damage stops. When a state court retaliates through its ADA coordinator, the statute of limitations is 25 years. Attacking a disability or the competence of a lawyer or his ADA cases is *per se* retaliation that must be addressed by the district court. If the disabled person alleges the federal court legal environment to be hostile to disability rights in the area where the damage happened, that disabled person has the right to file a 5th Amendment lawsuit enforcing this provision in any district court of the United States against the United States and there shall be no statute of limitations or repose. There is a positive obligation on every federal judge to help those injured by state court discrimination given the established discrimination adjudicated in *Tennessee v. Lane*, 541 U.S. 509 (2004). This includes state trial and appellate and supreme courts."

SEC. 9 Malpractice Cases

(a) As a matter of Interstate Commerce, when a lawyer makes a representation agreement to which a client agrees in whole and

that agreement states that the lawyer will only do negotiation and not file any lawsuit, such agreement is ironclad and may not be abused or misrepresented to imply an obligation by that lawyer to file any lawsuit in that matter. Before filing any lawsuit, both attorney and client must agree in writing and there shall be no implied duty to file any lawsuit. Such an act requires written agreement. To punish any lawyer for not filing a lawsuit when there was a written agreement not to file a lawsuit is on its face imposing malpractice law penalties on a lawyer who did not commit malpractice. Filing a lawsuit when the agreement was not to do so would be malpractice. When an ADA coordinator gets involved in such a situation to show the "incompetence" of the disabled lawyer who did not commit malpractice, this is an ADA violation under the above new section, 42 U.S.C. § 12104.

SEC. 10. Judge Dishonesty, Discrimination, and Plenary Justice Reforms

(a) Title 28 and other parts of the U.S. Code need clarity on some very important due process matters.

(b) Courts are always open and there is no dispute about this. 28 U.S.C. § 452. 28 U.S.C. § 751(g) is hereby created and states as follows: "(g) A clerk or deputy clerk of any district or circuit court or the U.S. Supreme Court must always accept documents sent to the Court, regardless of their being in paper or electronic format and regardless of whether they were sent by U.S. Mail or email or some other efiling system. Every clerk shall provide a service email address on the page devoted to the Clerk and on the front page of the Court website. PDF format is the format of court documents. No document need have its signatures as

paper and ink and a stamped signature shall always be allowed as evidence of assent of the "signer." A computerized printed signature on a document shall be considered as an allowed stamped signature. Any document that comes to the Court and identifiable with a case shall be filed regardless of signature type. Any original case filing to initiate a case shall be filed and assigned a case number. Under no circumstances shall any Court or court employee reject any filing sent to the Court in any fashion or method. Emailed documents are specifically included and shall be allowed and filed and shall not be rejected. No clerk may ever refuse to file a document for any reason and no Court shall have the power to direct a clerk to refuse any filing."

(c) *In Forma Pauperis* and service. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(i): "(i) When *in forma pauperis* status is granted in a case, full PACER access shall be granted at no cost to the litigant and e-filing shall also be granted immediately. Further, when a Court grants *in forma pauperis* status, service shall be done by the U.S. Marshal and if there is some problem with service, the Court shall investigate and repair the problem with all necessary orders. No Court may dismiss any case in which it has ordered *in forma pauperis* status on the basis of failure of service or any of the grounds given in 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). The Court is responsible for such service and shall retain jurisdiction as long as it takes to effectuate service. If a Court insists on dismissing in such a circumstance, this is a due process violation under the 5th Amendment and shall be compensated in a separate lawsuit with no statute of limitations, jurisdiction in any U.S. District Court anywhere in the United States, and the damages shall be those found in the original complaint without any question as though default had happened. The United States waives its sovereign immunity

and the immunity of anyone who violated this section."

(d) Perjury. 28 U.S.C. § 365 is hereby created: "It is a serious violation of due process for a court to allow an attorney to make material false statements of fact or law such that the attorney's falsehoods affect the outcome. For instance, when an attorney makes a motion for extension of time after the time for answering has expired and says the time for answering is not yet expired and gives a false statement of the number of days (e.g. 29 days when the true limit is 21 days), this is perjury. When a court suborns and protects perjury in a court ORDER for the benefit of one side only, the disadvantaged side has a right to 5th Amendment damages relief in another district of another circuit. If further injury is inflicted when the non-perjury side objects, this is another instance of due process violation under the 5th Amendment. These due process violations are specifically compensable against the United States in any other district of the United States with no sovereign immunity and no statute of limitations."

(e) Hiring litigants. 28 U.S.C. § 366 is hereby created: "No court may hire any litigant that is before that Court or likely will come before that court because of a case below it. To hire a litigant is to violate 5th Amendment due process and Article III and such behavior is absolutely prohibited in every court of the United States and every state court as an enforcement of the 14th Amendment's due process clause, Section 5. Enforcement of this due process obligation not to hire litigants shall be available in any district court of the United States and there shall be no statute of limitations and no sovereign immunity or any other immunity defense. The damages shall be whatever were in the original complaint against the person hired and all other relief

of an equitable or legal nature.

(f) Law license rescissions. 28 U.S.C. § 367 is hereby created: "There is a right under the Privileges and Immunities Clause to a law license. *Supreme Court of N.H. v. Piper*, 470 U.S. 274 (1985). No Court has the power to interfere with that right unless an attorney commits a crime and such crime shall not include any contempt so that there can be no abuse of that court power. No court shall remove or suspend any lawyer's license based on anything but committing a crime with a sentence of 1 year or more because there is too much potential for political abuse by judges. If any attorney wishes to have a law license rescinded, this is a First Amendment matter and shall be granted without comment. To remove a law license without the consent of a lawyer and with no sufficient (1-year) crime committed by that lawyer or refuse to rescind a license when asked by the lawyer is a 5th Amendment due process violation in each case and shall be compensable in any district court of the United States with no statute of limitations and no sovereign immunity defense or any other immunity defense."

(g) Judges subject to the ADA. 42 U.S.C. § 12215 is hereby created: "This section shall be considered part of Title V of the ADA. Given the unacceptable judge-created immunity from lawsuits against themselves, there must be specific statutory coverage of judges both for their judicial and administrative acts. (a) When a judge issues a decision that restricts or avoids enforcing the ADA, this is a due process violation and shall be compensable in any other district court of the United States with no immunity possible because Congress hereby waives all immunity (including sovereign immunity) and there is no statute of limitations. (b) Title II of this Act has been construed narrowly

by federal courts and when a judge violates such rights, a federal judge shall be considered as a member of the state entity that is being sued and that entity is subject to all of the legal and equitable relief available under 42 U.S.C. §§ 12132 & 12133 when a judge acts as a co-conspirator to allow ADA Title II violations. (c) A federal judge who violates the ADA by refusing to fully enforce it to the greatest extent possible under the Constitution shall be subject to impeachment, *scire facias* relief for removal, and all other relief available to punish that judge. Violating the ADA is a 5th Amendment violation and a district or circuit judge can violate the ADA by making it difficult to use with unwise and irresponsible judgments, including disrespectful statements to disabled lawyers. A judge may be personally sued under (b), but the United States also takes responsibility and waives all immunity (including sovereign immunity) so that relief to all disabled persons is available when judges will not enforce the ADA for whatever reason. Someone needs to take responsibility and Congress believes it should be the United States itself since Congress created all judgeships as well as the ADA and expanded the Act in 2008 to reverse the discrimination of judges, but the 2008 legislation was insufficient. Federal judges continue to be hostile to disability rights, as do state judges. The abuse of Andrew U. D. Straw is a testament to this fact. He was abused in every federal court where he sought relief from what Indiana did to him. The relief above would have helped him if it were available at the time.

(h) Congress hereby declares that all of the punishment doled out to Andrew Straw, including denying his ADA rights, banning him from using the Courts, and refusing to file his papers all violate the First and Fifth Amendments and are acts of corruption by courts. Straw deserved justice and every action he

took was legitimate and authorized by law, NOT frivolous as some of these courts have said with the clear intent to abuse him. Every ORDER by the 7th Circuit or any lower court in that circuit that abused Straw or accused him of doing something wrong shall be compensated with compensatory and punitive damages and the United States shall pay for its abusive judges.

(i) There is no other way to address judges so hostile to the rights of someone like Andrew U. D. Straw. The courts must be dissolved. All of the district courts in the 7th Circuit as of the date of this bill becoming law shall be placed in a dormant state such that all judges become senior judges and shall not be assigned any cases anywhere. A new district court shall be established in each such state and all cases reassigned to these new courts, which shall take special care not to violate the Constitution and instead to reconsider every denial of ADA and constitutional rights. There shall be no *res judicata* coverage of past cases Andrew U. D. Straw has pursued because of the corruption and abuse of Mr. Straw. A litigant who lost due to the bad faith and bad decisions of the former district judges shall have the right to reconsideration of those orders without regard to what the 7th Circuit or its previous vassal courts held.

(j) Similarly, the 7th Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals is here found to violate the ADA and the 1st and 5th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution as well as Article III for defying law, and that circuit is thus repugnant to law. All of the 7th Circuit judges shall be placed in a dormant status with no power to make any order whatsoever in any case. All of the appellate cases deriving from Wisconsin shall be assigned to the 8th Circuit. All appellate cases deriving from Illinois or Indiana shall be assigned to the 6th Circuit. And any future appeals by former 7th Circuit district

courts shall be taken to those circuits. Wisconsin shall be added to the 8th Circuit. Indiana and Illinois shall be added to the 6th Circuit. One district court shall be added to each of Wisconsin, Illinois, and Indiana, and new judges shall be appointed for all districts, which shall have new, statewide boundaries. The new circuits shall have power to review any case of the former 7th Circuit orders without regard to any previous rule. The 8th and 6th Circuits have special instruction from Congress to give full and complete effect to the ADA with tester standing and to reverse any case restricting those disability rights in any manner, however miniscule. The 6th and 8th Circuits shall exonerate Andrew U. D. Straw in an ORDER that revokes every damage done to him in the 7th Circuit and its corrupt lower courts. Every law license taken from Andrew U. D. Straw shall be restored and he shall have total and permanent immunity from any accusation that any filing he makes at any time henceforth is inadequate or frivolous. He shall be immune from discipline by the State and federal courts of the United States no matter his actions or words, like a Member of the House in the U.S. House Chamber. The abuses of his rights as a person poisoned by the U.S. Marine Corps give him a special status that may not be infringed by any judge. He may say whatever comes to his mind to any judge and it shall not be questioned or punished as though he were a member of Congress in the U.S. House of Representatives itself. No officer of the United States shall ever infringe these rights and the U.S. Marshal is directed to protect Andrew U. D. Straw from any judge and to remove a judge from his or her own courtroom when that judge acts in contempt of Andrew U. D. Straw and his rights.

(k) Congress gives Andrew U. D. Straw the special right to recommend removal or punishment of any federal judge and

when he does so, Congress shall promptly hold a hearing in the appropriate committee and vote on the matter. Further, Andrew U. D. Straw is hereby granted bar membership in every state court and every federal court in the United States and **he shall be heard** when he requests it, including amicus briefs. All of his pleadings shall be accepted and entered into any court record. These powers come from his special status as the poisoned child of a U.S. Marine who was stationed at Camp LeJeune, North Carolina. State and federal courts have abused him on this basis and this requires dramatic and plenary response. Because Article I gives Congress full power over military matters, Andrew U. D. Straw's above powers and immunities derive from his military status. His actions shall be deemed to be military actions above review by any judge and all Article III judges shall acquiesce and not question his powers on pain of immediate removal from office pending Congressional review as a *scire facias* matter. These powers would not be necessary if he had been treated with respect and honor for the many sacrifices he has made to the U.S. military and the courts of the United States and 400+ Indiana courts.

(l) As a military Article I matter, the Indiana law license of Andrew U. D. Straw is declared as having never been lawfully disciplined and he shall have all of the privileges and immunities granted above, including the power to **remove any Indiana judge or justice** pending a review for punishment by Congress under the 14th Amendment. Henceforth, Andrew U. D. Straw is immune from discipline by the Indiana Supreme Court and its agencies. He shall have plenary power to remove any state or local officer using authority of the 14th Amendment, including all Indiana judges and justices who discriminated against him for his Camp LeJeune disability and such officer shall be accountable to

Congress and removable by Congress. Nothing restricts Andrew U. D. Straw from bringing such charges more than once if Congress does not agree to punishment the first time.

(m) The certiorari system imposed in 1925 and at other times is hereby abolished. The U.S. Supreme Court shall hear every appeal taken to it and there shall be no fee for doing so. Any *pro se* litigant or lawyer who makes such an appeal shall have the right to use the electronic filing and docketing system of the U.S. Supreme Court without charge and an electronic filing shall be sufficient for a filing and no paper copies shall be required. Any person may apply for an e-filing account at the U.S. Supreme Court and shall be granted this privilege even prior to an appeal being lodged. There shall no longer be discretion in granting appeals. All appeals shall be granted and merits decisions provided in every case. The Chief Justice of the United States may request the assistance of circuit judges to act as temporary Supreme Court justices, but this shall be assigned randomly and without any interference by any justice. No judge from the defunct 7th Circuit or its former districts shall participate.

(n)The PACER.gov system shall henceforth be free of charge to any users. All e-filing systems (CM/ECF) shall be free of charge to use and no charges shall be imposed for any court service. All dockets shall be visible to the public on the Pacer website and every filing and every ORDER in every case shall have a permanent URL link to which anyone may connect. This shall provide accountability and review that is currently absent. Congress shall appropriate adequate funding for the Courts to operate, including all e-filing and electronic document systems (including PACER). PACER shall contain no pay-per-use services or subscriptions henceforth. Nothing PACER does may

involve any fee. All appeals shall rely on the record of the Court(s) below.

(o) Indiana shall pay Andrew U. D. Straw compensatory relief, immediately due upon this bill becoming law for the above violations.

(p) The United States shall pay Andrew U. D. Straw compensatory relief for not protecting him from crimes and civil rights violations upon passage of this bill.

(q) Congress apologizes for the delay in justice and the abusive actions of state and federal judges of the United States against Andrew U. D. Straw, who only ever wanted greater disability and ADA rights for every disabled person and full implementation of the Constitution. Straw was punished for this as though the judicial branch was an arbitrary tyrant, biased and hostile to every disability right and incredibly, the Constitution itself. Congress has power over this tyrant and the state and federal judicial officers ***will*** comply with this law in every respect.