

BILL FOR IMPEACHMENT

With regard to this petition, Judge Evan S. Roberts has consistently **denied Citizens of Indiana their fundamental rights** by placing himself above the law and making decisions that, in abuse of his position and people's trust, show a callous **disregard for the truth**, as well as wanton and deliberate, and at times, **criminal violations of the said Constitution and laws**. Judge Evan S. Roberts is on record **committing lies(Perjury), falsification of official court records, false imprisonment and conspiracy**, amongst other violations.

Regrettably, **the Judicial Branch of government is answerable and accountable to no entity other than itself, resulting in the judiciary's arbitrary abuse** of the self-proclaimed doctrine of judicial "immunity", which itself is in violation of the Constitution, and leaving the People of Indiana without recourse when their inherent rights are violated by judges.

Fortunately, the Framers of the Constitution foresaw and anticipated this abuse of power and included into the Indiana Constitution provisions, such as **Article 6, §§ 7, 8 and Article 7, §§ 11, 13**, as well as the laws in pursuant thereto, that allow its citizens the authority to remove an officer of the court by "**Impeachment**".

Under Rights and Authority of The People of the State of Indiana, and pursuant to the *Bill of Rights, Article I of The State Of Indiana Constitution*, "We DECLARE, That all people are created equal; that they are endowed by their CREATOR with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that all power is inherent in the people; and that all free governments are, and of right ought to be, founded on their authority, and instituted for their peace, safety, and well-being. For the advancement of these ends, the people have, at all times, an indefeasible right to alter and reform their government."

In order to prevent those, who are vested with authority, from becoming oppressors, the people have a right, at such periods and in such manner as they shall establish by their frame of government, to cause their public officers to return to private life; and to fill up vacant places by certain and regular elections and appointments.

To this end, the said Constitution provides, in its **Article 6** and **Article 7** and the laws in pursuant thereto, means of impeachment to have such oppressors removed from office and replaced with men of honor and integrity who abide by the Constitution and laws pursuant thereto.

The undersigned do hereby demand the immediate removal of Judge Evan S. Roberts, of Elkhart County Superior Court 1, Elkhart, Elkhart County, Indiana, for the following reasons:

1. Violates the judicial Canons and Codes of Conduct for judges.
2. Places himself above the law. Read Title 42 U.S.C. 2000-7.

3. Holds hearings and issues orders without having jurisdiction and authority in violation of the Constitutions.
4. Violates the Indiana Codes and laws as legislated by the Indiana General Assembly in violation of Separation of Powers.
5. Violates the Indiana Child Support guidelines approved by the Indiana Supreme Court.
6. Violates the Indiana Parenting Time guidelines approved by the Indiana Supreme Court.
7. Has committed perjury, and official Misconduct of Office.
8. Conspired with the opposing attorney to hold unlawful (in the absence of jurisdiction) hearings without service of process (in violation of the Constitution), and upon failure of the party to attend.
9. Engages in unauthorized *ex-parte* communications with the Indiana Court of Appeals to cover up his part in fraud and other violations in a case before the said Appellate Court.
10. Issues orders in direct violation of the Indiana Statutes and Constitution.
11. Willful neglect of duty.
12. Defrauds and conspires to defraud the Tax Payers of Indiana and United States government.
13. Gross and deliberate ignorance of official duties.
14. Willful discrimination on the basis of gender, (custodial vs non custodial)
15. Unlawful imprisonment of indigent persons from another State.
16. Gross carelessness in the discharge of official duties.
17. Oppression in office.
18. Breach of trust.
19. Endangering the psychological and physical safety and knowingly aiding and abetting injury and abuse of minor children in violation of Indiana and federal laws and Constitutions.
20. Depriving children of their caring parental home.

21. Violations of parties' human rights as guaranteed by the Constitutions and laws of Indiana and the United States.

22. Violation of Oath of Office.

23. Unlawful destruction, for profit, of livelihood and family life of parties in cases before him.

24. Violations of and disdain for the Constitutions and laws of the United States and Indiana. Direct violations of due process.

25. Obstruction of justice and perverting the course of justice, nepotism and cronyism,

26. Intimidation of parties and failure to release attorneys when they are fired, and said court is notified of such by both the defendant, and the attorney in question.

27. A direct denial of ALL motions filed by the non custodial parent and his attorney.

28. Unlawfully acting as a judge without having bond, nor current oaths of office as required by Indiana Constitution.

This Petition, along with its supporting document and evidence, is respectfully submitted to the Indiana **House of Representatives** and **Senate** and the **Governor of Indiana** for action consistent with the Duty and Authority of the members under their respective Oaths of Office to investigate these Complaints and to proceed as enunciated below.

Article 6, § 7, states, "All State officers shall, for crime, incapacity, or negligence, be liable to be removed from office, either by impeachment by the House of Representatives, to be tried by the Senate, or by a joint resolution of the General Assembly; two-thirds of the members elected to each branch voting, in either case, therefor. "

Article 6, §8, states: "All State, county, township, and town officers, may be impeached, or removed from office, in such manner as may be prescribed by law".

Article 7, § 7, states: "a Judge for each circuit" "shall hold his office for the term of six years, if he so long behaves well.

Article 7, § 13, states: "Removal of Circuit Court Judges and Prosecuting Attorneys. Any Judge of the Circuit Court or Prosecuting Attorney, who shall have been convicted of corruption or other high crime, may, on information in the name of the State, be removed from office by the Supreme Court, or in such other manner as may be prescribed by law."

Indiana State Code, IC 5-8-1-1 Officers; judges; prosecuting attorney; liability to impeachment

“(a) Under Article 6, Sections 7 and 8 of the Constitution of the State of Indiana, all state officers other than justices of the supreme court or judges of the court of appeals of Indiana or the Indiana tax court, **all other judges, prosecuting attorneys, and all county, city, town, and township officers are liable to impeachment for any misdemeanor in office.**”

Indiana State Code, IC 5-8-1-19 Judge or prosecuting attorney; duties of Attorney General: (a) Under **Article 7, Section 13** of the Constitution of the State of Indiana, whenever a circuit, superior, probate, or county court judge or prosecuting attorney has been convicted of corruption or any other high crime (such as by Indiana Senate upon impeachment), the attorney general shall bring proceedings in the supreme court, on information, in the name of the state, for the removal from office of the judge or prosecuting attorney.

The Government of the People of State of Indiana has a DUTY and the authority to review and to correct breaches of “good behavior” of the Judicial branches of the State of Indiana, and where appropriate, to investigate and prosecute individual public officers whose performance of the duties of their office **offends the conscience** of We the People.

Accordingly, all courts ordained and established under gubernatorial authority **shall**, as a duty, exercise judicial powers ONLY in conformance with that Constitution and just Laws of the State of Indiana and the United States and shall perform the duties of office sustaining “good behaviour”.

The Petition, under Articles of State of Indiana Constitution and Constitution for the United States, affirms evidence of multiple constitutional violations by Judge Evan S. Roberts, which inflict irreparable financial, emotional and physical harm upon the Citizens of Indiana, my son and alleged grandsons life.

/s/ Michael Jack Stephens

Michael Jack Stephens
P. O. Box 781
Pooler, Georgia 31322

September 29th, 2008

Support Documentation
Criminal Complaint

From: Michael Jack Stephens
P. O. Box 781
Pooler, Georgia 31322
912-429-3387

Judge Evan S. Roberts

Elkhart Superior Court 1

This complaint is one of many my self already filed but gotten no help or even shown any interest. No one will do their job and hold judge’s accountable.

So therefore we (citizens) are reduced to sub-class of persons, under the rule of tyranny from corrupt judges.

Slavery and involuntary servitude shall not exist, is what the Supreme Law of the Land states. But yet (non-custodial parents) are reduced to slaves everyday by corrupt courts, and their judges acting totally outside of their jurisdiction. It is not a judicial act to break the laws of the State of Indiana.

Case in Question: 20D01-0610-JP-11; Elkhart Superior Court No. 1

- 1) On May 17th, 2007 (father/defendant/non-custodial parent) fired his attorney Mr. Tony Zirkle. He probably would have quit anyway, because defendant could not pay him anymore, and Mr. Zirkle has lose interest in our pursuit of justice and equal rights of non-custodial parents.
- 2) On May 25th, 2007 (father/defendant/non-custodial parent) files notice to court of such actions and his intent to represent himself from here on.
 - (a) Quote from CCS record: "Court declines to take any action on fathers request as father is represented by counsel."
- 3) On June 5th, 2007, Mr. Zirkle files "motion to withdraw."

Now as a matter of law this should have been granted immediately. Judges have to make a decision within 30 days of motion file date.

- (a) LR 20 TR 3.1-NAEA Rule 3- Appearances
 - (B) Withdrawal of appearance:
 - a. *
 - b. *
 - c. The party acquiesces to the withdrawal.
- (b) Acquiesce: To give an implied consent to a transaction.
Black's Law Dictionary, 6th ed. page 24

What should have happened here is: Mr. Zirkle's appearance should have been withdrawn immediately. Both defendant and counsel notified the court of the implied intent under the L.R. 20. Was Mr. Zirkle withdrawn? NO. Judge Roberts choose to committed official misconduct: IC 35-44-1-2, which states:

A public servant who:

- (1) knowingly or intentionally performs an act that the public servant is forbidden by law to perform,...commits official misconduct, a class D felony.
- (c) Under the Indiana Constitution, Article 7, Section 13, which states:
Removal of Circuit judges or prosecuting attorneys.
Any judge of the circuit court or prosecuting attorneys, who shall have been convicted of corruption or other high crime, may, on information in the name of the State of Indiana, be removed from office by the Supreme

Court, or in such other manner as may be prescribed by law.

(d) Rule 25; Judicial Disciplinary Proceedings

III. Grounds for Discipline or involuntary retirement.

A. Any judicial officer may be disciplined for any of the following acts.

(1) **conviction of any felony, or any crime which involves moral turpitude or conduct that adversely affects the ability to perform the duties of judicial officer.**

(2) willful and persistent failure to perform duties;

(3) **willful misconduct in office;**

(4) willful misconduct unrelated to the judicial office that brings such office into disrepute;

(5) habitual intemperance;

(6) **conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice, including the repeated failure to adhere to the rules of procedure; or**

(7) **a violation of the Code of Judicial Conduct, the rules of professional conduct, or other professional rules duly adopted by the Indiana Supreme Court.**

(e) Indiana Rules of Court; Code of Judicial Conduct

Canon 2. A judge shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety to all the judge's activities.

A. **A judge shall respect and comply with the law...**

Canon 3. A judge shall perform the duties of judicial officer impartially and diligently.

B. Adjudicative Responsibilities.

(2) **A judge shall be faithful to the law...**

(f) Indiana Constitution, Article 7, Section 4; The supreme court shall have no original jurisdiction except in admission to the practice of law; **discipline and disbarment of those admitted;** the unauthorized practice of law; **discipline, removal, and retirement of justices and judges...**

(g) Indiana Constitution, Article 7, Section 7; ...and a judge...he shall hold his office for the term of six years, **if he so long behaves well.**

(h) IC: 35-34-2-11; Oath

Sec. 11, Before assuming the duties of a judge, a judge must take an oath to; (1) faithfully perform the duties of the judge's office; and (2) Support and defend to the best of the judge's ability the Constitution and laws of Indiana and the United States.

Now at this point we have clearly with all primary evidence shown why this judge should be removed from his office. Was this judge disciplined, removed? NO. An oath of office is also a contract. As a public servant it is a contract with you (every man, woman, and children) who come before this judge's court. So

therefore in cases like this one and other's his violations are a "breach of contract."

4. On June 25, 2007, Mother (by attorney) files verified showing of NON-compliance.

In this verified showing of non compliance there is no request for a GAL (guardian ad litem) within these signed and filed papers. But let's look at the papers put into the CCS from the clerk of court to see what they say. Also within the papers filed there was NO verified facts at all, and it was NOT signed by the plaintiff (mother), but only signed by the plaintiff's lawyer. This is a violation of the attorney to represent the client, not to become the client.

5. Clerk's office entry in the CCS. you can clearly see that on Number 4 above there is no request for a GAL to be involved. You can also see there is no signature of the plaintiff (mother). This attorney has replaced the mother, and filed these papers on her own accord. The mother has not signed anything, and there is nothing verified. This is fraud upon the court, and again this judge allowed this to stand, when he clearly knows better.

6. Father files "motion for continuance".

Father had child visitation the following Saturday, and requested a change so he could make only one trip instead of two. From Savannah Georgia to Elkhart Indiana is 1900 miles round trip. We spend around 600-800 dollars and 31.6 hours of driving time for each trip up and back home. This father only get 2 hours visitation.

- (a) On June 01, 2007; I quote from CCS record: "the court declines to take any action on father's pro se request for motion of continuance."

7. On June 07, 2007; Cause coming on Status Conference. Please note in this document, and we quote: "Respondent (father / defendant / non-custodial parent) appears by co-counsel Dan Areaux."

Father does not know this man, never meet this man, did not hire this man, did not know Mr. Zirkle had a co-counsel working for him. Furthermore Mr.Zirkle's law office was fired on May 17th, 2007. There was no reason, or authority for this man to claim to represent anyone in this case.

8. June 07, 2007 CCS entry on "motion to withdraw". And I quote: "The court declines to approve counsel's motion to withdraw based upon the hearing held in open court on the record June 07, 2007."

As stated above this is a direct violation of judge Robert's Oath of Office. He has now committed another count of Official Misconduct.

9. Hearing set on non compliance for June 18th, 2007. "Father appears by co-counsel Mr. Roberto Collete."

Father does not know this man, never meet this man, did not hire this man, did not know Mr. Zirkle had a co-counsel working for him. Furthermore Mr.Zirkle's law office was fired on May 17th, 2007. There was no reason, or authority for this man to claim to represent anyone in this case. Also within this document, you can see the following statement. "Who is directed to file an appearance." This judge and court has ordered an attorney to file and appearance without him being known or hired by respondent/defendant/non-custodial parent.

(a) Mr. Collete was ordered to file an appearance> Under IC 33-34-1-5 which states: "unless the written authority of a party is first produced and its execution is satisfactory proved to the court, **a judgment may NOT be rendered against a party.**"

10. June 25th, 2007; Father pro se files; "Emergency Notice and Pleadings" again same answer from court. "the court declines to take any actions on father's pro se pleadings as father is represented by counsel."

11. On July 9th, 2007, Mr. Dan Areaux files an appearance order by court/judge.

Again this person was totally unknown to respondent until that day.

12. From the hearing on June 18th, 2007; Father files "Notice of Appeal from Trial Court." Again we hear the same answer from judge. "Court notes father is represented by counsel and declines to take any action on father's pro se pleadings."

All orders are appealable by right. This appeal is from the order dated June 18th, 2007 where as the court ordered respondent to pay attorney peters 400.00 dollars from way back in Sept. 04. This is in violation of the statute of limitation of 2 years. So respondent appealed this order

(a) IC; 33-29-5-6; Direct appeals to supreme court or court of appeals. Sec. 6. in all cases where a person has the right of appeal from the circuit to the supreme court or court of appeals, an appeal may be taken directly to the supreme court or court of appeals from any order or judgment of the superior court.

13. Gaurdian Ad Litem files correspondence with the Court; (via telefax).

Remember no order or request was properly signed for this to take place, in violation of slavery and involuntary servitude of this corrupt judge, and court.

14. On July 27, 2007; the court, "on it's own motion" orders all parties to appear in open court August 27th, 2007 at 8:15. am.

No one has taken into an account that Mr. Christopher Joe Stephens is indigent and has no vehicle, no way to appear anywhere. No way to travel to Indiana from Georgia, as we stated early was 1900 miles round trip. This court has not once taken into consideration the extreme hardship placed onto this respondent/non-custodial parent.

15. On July 13th, 2007 father files: "indiana open records act request"

This was a request for his records, which the attorney's involved did not provide. So under the Indiana Open Records Act he requested a copy of his own records. This action has nothing to do with the operation of the court/judges. Just the clerk.

16. On July 27, 2007 court answers: "the court declines to take any action on said request as father is represented by counsel."

This respondent/father cannot even get his own records.

17. August 01, 2007; Dan Areaux files "motion to withdraw".

Remember this was a court ordered attorney, never hired by respondent, never meet respondent until ordered by court to intervene. Why? such violations of a person's rights to counsel and/or to self represent.?

(a) IC 33-43-1-7: if a party alleges that an attorney appears on behalf of the party without the party's authority the court may, at any stage of the proceeding relieve the party from the consequences of the attorneys act. The court may also, summary or upon motion compel the attorney to repair the injury consequent upon the attorney's assumption of authority.

Now as a matter of law this should have been granted immediately. Judges have to make a decision within 30 days of motion file date.

(b) LR 20 TR 3.1-NAEA Rule 3- Appearances
(B) Withdrawal of appearance:
a. *
b. *
c. The party acquiesces to the withdrawal.

(c) Acquiesce: To give an implied consent to a transaction.
Black's Law Dictionary, 6th ed. page 24

18. On August 02, 2007; Father pro se files correspondence along with attachments with the court. Again same answer. "The court declines to take any action of said filings as father is represented by counsel in this matter."

19. On August 13th, 2007, father pro se files "immediate motion for recusation." Again same answer. "The court declines to take any action on said filings as father is represented by counsel in this matter."

- (a) This motion is because of IC 33-34-2-12; Bonds.
 Sec. 12, (a) a judge shall
 - (1) furnish a bond in a sum required by the circuit court judge...
 - (2) file the bond with the county recorder.
- (b) and IC 5-4-1-9: Time limitations for bond; failure to comply;
 Sec. 9, An officer required to give an official bond shall give the bond before commencement of his term of office. If the officer fails to give the bond before that time, the officer may not take office.

The judges of Elkhart county has been asked repeatedly for their bonds. No judge has produced a bond as of yet. This along put this judge in violation of the following statute.

- (c) IC 35-44-2-3: impersonation of a public servant;
 Sec. 3, A person who falsely represents that the person is a public servant, with intent to mislead and induce another person to submit to false official authority or otherwise to act to the other person's detriment in reliance on the false representation, commits impersonation of a public servant, a class A Misdemeanor.

*And the counts of misdemeanors, and felonies keep counting up against this judge. Has anyone took action against these allegation from this defendant?
 NO>*

20. August 27th, 2007; being this respondent / father choose to challenge this court, he is now in 'direct contempt of court'. But once again, "father appears by co-counsel Dan Areaux."

This is what happens to anyone who wishes to represent himself and the courts put you in jail to try and silence your voice. The courts know they are doing wrong but yet they continue this due process violation of law. Direct contempt order is filed under case no: 20D01-0708-MI-24, dated 08-27-2007.

21. September 06, 2007; Attorney Roberto Collete files "motion to withdraw."

(a) this court noted on the withdraw motion, i quote: "the court defers entry of the proposed order until on or after September 28th, 2007 pursuant to the Elkhart county local rules.

What rule? This judge has the duty to explain and clearly state any rule he is relying on. But once again we clearly show what should have happened here. But it did not.

Now as a matter of law this should have been granted immediately. Judges have to make a decision within 30 days of motion file date.

(b) LR 20 TR 3.1-NAEA Rule 3- Appearances

(B) Withdrawal of appearance:

- a. *
- b. *
- c. The party acquiesces to the withdrawal.

(c) Acquiesce: To give an implied consent to a transaction.
Black's Law Dictionary, 6th ed. page 24

22. On September 10, 2007; father files "motion for trial by jury", "Notice of Appeal", "motion to vacate order", affidavit in support of motion to proceed on Appeal in forma pauperis".

This is on the contempt charge filed against him on August 27th, 2007 under cause no; 20D01-0708-MI-24. All court appointed/forced attorney's have filed to be withdrawn at this time. But as anyone can clearly read, and knowing this judge is about to violate his oath of office again, and he does. Once again we hear the same: "the court declines to take any action on father's pleadings as father is represented by counsel."

"Court, on it's own motion, orders the attorneys of record and respondent/father to appear in OPEN COURT on October 15th, 2007 at 8:15 a.m.

*Once again no consideration for the fact father owns no vehicles and has no money is indigent and no means or way to court. Does this corrupt judge care?
NO>*

- (a) IC: 31-32-6; Trial in open court, trial by jury.
Sec. 1, All proceedings in the juvenile court involving adults charge with: (1) contempt of court; or (2) criminal charges; shall be tried in open court.
- (b) IC: 31-32-6-7; Bench trials; jury trials for adults charged with crime.
Sec. 7(a), except as provided in subsection (b), all matters in juvenile court shall be tried by the court.
(b) A trial by an adult charged with a crime shall be tried by a jury unless the adult requests a bench trial.

23. On September 13th, 2007; father files "motion to compel" and again; "the court declines to take any action on father's pleadings as father is represented by counsel."

*Why is counsel not doing it's job then? Why does a person have to put up with this corruption and violation of Oaths, by corrupt judges.
This motion of compel is for a copy of the clerk's record and transcripts on NO. 14, 1st notice of appeal. The clerk within 30 days is too have records ready, she has failed to do so. Under appellate rule 10(f) within 15 days after the due day you must file this to get records and again respondent/ appellant has been denied his own records, denied a appeal right, and all proper documents required by all laws, and appellate rules.*

This judge and clerk of court has now is continues to commit “obstruction of justice”.

- (a) IC: 35-44-3-4: Obstruction of justice;
Sec. 4; (a) a person who:
(1) knowingly or intentionally induces, by threat, coercion, or false statement, a witness or informant in an official proceeding or investigation to:
(A) withhold or unreasonably delay in producing any testimony, information, document, or thing;
- 24. On October 03, 2007; “court declines to approve Roberto Collete ‘motion to withdraw’.
- 25. On October 15th, 2007; father files “motion for DNA test”. Again same answer: “the court declines to take any action on father’s request as father is represented by counsel.”
- (a) IC 31-14-6-1: Blood or genetic testing,
Sec. 1, Upon the motion of any party, the court shall order all of the parties to a paternity action to undergo blood or genetic testing. A qualified expert approved by the court shall perform the tests.
- 26. On October 22, 2007; father files motion to compel and certificate of service.

This motion to compel was for the 2nd notice of appeal. This notice is for the first contempt charge filed under 20D01-0708-MI-24. Again this judge and clerk has conspired to commit obstruction of justice, as stated above. Why? Why and how can a judge get away with such actions, when they are clearly outside of his authority, and jurisdiction to act. No one can deny an appeal of right, NO ONE.

- (a) Again: “court declines to take any action on father’s pro se pleadings as father is represented by counsel.”

This is clearly a due process violation of respondents rights under the Indiana Constitution, and the U.S. Constitution.

- 27. On October 26th, 2007; court files another contempt charge against respondent. ordered arrest and 60 days this time in jail. This is under same as other cause no. 20D01-0708-MI-24.
- (a) This violates due process of law. (1) a judge cannot become judge, jury, and executioner, all in one. This judge has violated the canons which states he should recuse himself when his bias is questioned. All case law also clearly shows this judge should recuse himself and the supreme court should appoint a special judge for this action. This respondent is entitled to a trial by jury in both contempt charges.

(b) IC 31-32-6-7: Bench trials, jury trials for adult charged with crime.
Sec. 7 (a) except as provided in subsection (b)...
(b) a trial of an adult charged with a crime shall be tried by a jury unless the adult requests a bench trial.

(c) Indiana Constitution:

Sec. 3; No law shall, in any case, whatever, control the free exercise and enjoyment of religious opinion, or interfere with the rights of conscience.

Sec. 11; The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable search or seizure, shall not be violated.

Sec. 20; In all civil cases, whatever, the jury shall have the right to determine the law and facts.

Sec. 22; The privilege of the debtor to enjoy the necessary comforts of life...and there shall be no imprisonment for debt.

(d) The U.S. Constitution states the same and it is the Supreme Law of the Land.

28. On November 19th, 2007; father files; "notice of appeal", "affidavit in support of motion to proceed on appeal in forma pauperis", "motion to vacate order dated October 26th, 2007.

This is the 3rd appeal and on the contempt charge from second contempt.

29. On Dec. 10th, 2007; father files miscellaneous pleadings with the trial court including a "motion to consolidate appeals", "motion to compel", and "motion to overturn both contempt charges."

30. On Nov. 14th, 2007; Michael Jack Stephens did file a criminal complaint with the Elkhart County commissioners against all these violations and clearly by the court records has established a prima facie record of events, and violations of due process, and other as noted within this paper.

31. On April 8th, 2008, chief justice has denied this respondent any appeals and the Indiana Court of Appeals dismissed his appeals. This court now has conspired with the lower court, and all judges involved have committed conspiracy and obstruction of justice. These court judges have violated their Oath of office, and due process violations. All defendants are entitled to an appeal by right. From the very beginning Jan. 2004, every appeal this defendant has filed has been dismissed. WHY? Why can this defendant not get justice?

32. On April 28th, 2008, defendant has now filed Petition to Transfer to the Indiana Supreme Court. Trying to move these dismissed appeals for a hearing within the Supreme Court. Just have to wait and see. All have been pushed aside

and we can only assume that 1) the Supreme Court is in denial. Judge Shepard, as chief justice has now conspired to deny an indigent person, due process of law. Which he (Judge Shepard) did, the Indiana Supreme Court has denied all Motions to transfer.

This paper clearly and with primary evidence of the CCS filed by the clerks office has shown the corrupt intent of the judges, the conspiracy of the different courts, from the lower to the Supreme Court. The upper courts cover up for all judges in the lower courts, to make sure they don't get sued for the Oath of office violations which amount to Treason against the very Constitutions they all agreed to uphold.

As a personal witness, and father of this man, who has been destroyed by the Indiana Judicial System, I have filed several criminal complaints with the Indiana Attorney Generals office, the Federal U.S. Department of Justice, and other local County commissioners office, only to been unheard. The corruption runs deep and wide within the State of Indiana Judicial System, and all parties from the Governors office to the attorney general of Indiana who is suppose to be the person to protect their local citizens but has help cover up these acts.

The Governors office was informed of the acts by Roberts only to send me a letter that he has NO control over the judge. He appointed this judge to that office but yet he has NO control over the corrupt acts of said judge.

What are the citizens too do? Where is the justice? What are you people going to tell GOD on judgment day?

/s/ Michael Jack Stephens
Michael Jack Stephens

September 29th, 2008

cc. file

Certificate of Service

From: Michael Jack Stephens
P. O. Box 781
Pooler, Georgia 31322
912-429-3387

To: Rep. Linda Lawson
Ind. House of Rep.
Judiciary committee
200 W. Washington St.
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Rep. Matt Pierce
Ind. House of Rep.
Judiciary Committee
200 W. Washington St.
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Senator Tim Lamane
Judiciary Committee
State House
200 W. Washington St.
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Rep. Ralph Foley
Judiciary Committee
Ind. House of Republicans
200 W. Washington St.
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Rep. Patrick Bauer
Speaker of the House
Ind. House of Rep.
200 W. Washington St.
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

U.S. House of Rep.
Mr. Joe Donnelly
Longworth House Off. Bldg. 1218
Washington, D.C. 20515

U.S. House of Rep.
Mr. Mark Souder
2231 Rayburn House off. Bldg.
Washington, D.C. 20515

Ind. House of Republicans
Mrs. Jackie Walorski
200 W. Washington St.
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Indiana State Senate
Senator Marvin Riegsecker
200 W. Washington, Street

Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

To: Any other person whom you deem necessary to make a decision on
said Bill of Impeachment.

Respectfully submitted;

/s/ Michael Jack Stephens
Michael Jack Stephens

September 30th, 2008