

ATTACHMENT A

Constitutional violations by the NJ Judiciary against the rule of law, the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses of the 14th Amendment, the First Amendment Free Speech Clause, and separation of powers:

1.NJ Judiciary' Decisions against the rule of law/Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment.

Denial of my disability pension against the law. p.2-3.

Pages 9-17 (denial by ALJ McGill); p. 18-22 (denial by App. Judges Geigner and Susswein)

2. Denial of due process of the law throughout my entire appeal (2013-2023)

outline on p.3-4; Explanation on p. 18-22 and 27-34.

- a. ALJ McGill waited four years to grant me a hearing and ignored my letters informing him that my attorney Samuel Gaylord had intentionally failed to present the most relevant evidence at the hearing (physical evidence of my Traumatic Brain Injury). P.31
- b. Appellate Judges Clarkson Fisher and Lisa Rose denied my right to appeal the ALJ's decision based on a false allegation by the agency which I had proven false. They vacated that decision after I wrote to NJ Supreme Court Chief Justice Rabner asking for an investigation. Although they allowed me to present my Merits Brief, Judges Geigner and Susswein issued a decision failing to address my brief legal points and using half-truths and false statements to support their denial. * p.17-22; p.28.
- c. Appellate Judge Carmen Messano said she would dismiss my appeal if my Merits Brief contained any deficiencies. Page 29.
- d. The NJ Supreme Court denied my request for review and my Motion for Reconsideration after having ignored my earlier requests for investigation of a likely collusion between

*As I wrote in my request for review to the NJ Supreme Court, it is likely that these Appellate Judges did not even write their decision and instead simply signed the decision the agency's attorney gave them already written. This is my opinion based on the fact that they only had about a week to read the entire, very voluminous, record and write their 22-page decision. It seems very unlikely that both these judges were able to do all that in just a few days.

the Appellate Court and the agency involved in my appeal while said appeal was ongoing. Pages 22- 23 and 30-31.

In my letters to Chief Justice Stuart Rabner, I also explained that I had reason to believe the agency had abused its power and obstructed justice throughout my entire appeal, and that such abuse of power likely involved my former attorney Samuel Gaylord, OAL Chief Justice Lisa James Beavers, the IME's employer (IMX) in collusion with the Division of Pensions, and the New Jersey Commission for Investigation's Executive Director Lee Seglem. P.22.

- e. After the NJ Supreme Court shut me down, the NJ Advisory Committee for Judicial Conduct (whose members are appointed by Chief Justice Rabner) denied my request to investigate the matter alleging that Chief Justice Rabner had done nothing wrong. P.32.
- f. . I was shut down every time I attempted to bring wrongdoings to the judges' attention. P.31-32.
- g. I did not get an impartial tribunal.p.33-34.
- h. Denial of due process by the agency (Board of Trustees TPAF.) p.34-36.

3. Violation of the First Amendment right to freedom of speech. pages 23-25; p.38

- a. NJ Judge JoAnn Lasala Candido sealed my appeal record against the law at a hearing closed to the public that I was not asked to attend.
- b. This decision was later affirmed by Appellate Judges Geigner and Susswein.
- c. ALJ Chief Justice Lisa James Beavers shut me down when I tried to inquire about the lawfulness of the sealing of my record. P.32.
- d. This unlawful sealing of my record forbids me from sharing my own record with the public and it denies the public its right to inspect it.

4. Violation against the separation of powers. Pages 33-34.

I did not get an impartial tribunal. The NJ judiciary is not independent, as it is supposed to be and as it claims to be. The judges involved in my appeal had a great conflict of interest because NJ Judges are appointed, given tenured and promoted by the governor.

Under those circumstances, can the public trust that these judges will rule against him or his agencies when the law and the Constitution requires them to do so?