

We the People

Judge Freda L. Wolfson
United States District Court
District of New Jersey
402 East State Street Room 2020
Trenton, NJ 08608

December 2, 2010

To be made part of the official record
Case No. 3:10-cv-04814 (D.N.J.)

Dear Judge Wolfson,

We are in receipt of your November 23, 2010 correspondence, and would like to clarify what could be considered some misunderstanding of fact and law pertaining to the issue at bar. And, Petitioners request that her Honor recuse herself without further embarrassment for all concerned or unnecessary motion practices.

- (1) There were two formal pleadings before Her Honor, (i) a request for a TRO, and re-argument which the Court refused to properly sign, yet adjudicated the matter in a questionable manner to say the least. Especially given Her Honors reasoning for denial, which the Court ignored facts, law, and evidence, and based its decisions on two (2) vacuous letters; [not proper reply briefs from the Defendants]. See letters dated October 30, and November 18, 2010. No need to elaborate further, the pleadings and letters speak for themselves.
- (2) Clearly, 28 U.S.C.A. 455 (a) states: “Any justice, judge, or magistrate of the United States shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which impartiality might reasonably be question.”

While it is true, Plaintiffs did not file a complaint with the Judicial Conduct Committee, which would surely require Her Honor to formally recuse herself, one could rightfully conclude Her Honor displayed blatant partiality.

Your Honor seems to take issue that the Petition filed before the Court is referred to as “*We the Peoples*” Petition and mistakenly claims “the action was commenced by two individual Plaintiffs, Mr. Purpura and Mr. Laster. Thus the Court has no idea who or what entity the Plaintiffs continue to refer to in their letters.”

- (1) Webster defines “people” (b) a group of persons with a common tradition, historical, or ... [For the purpose of this action “*We the people*” are those who are Petitioning their government based upon our Amendment 1 Right. We are still a Constitutional Republic, are we not]?

(2) Plaintiffs respectfully requests the Court see the caption on the original petition which clearly states: “et al. (Names separately on separate page)”, also we ask the Court to refer to page 1-1 following page 42 of action that lists names of groups and individuals.

Please Take Judicial Notice: If those listed in our first pleading are not enough “*People*” for this Court, “*We the People*” amend the list with the following 4 pages of names of United States Citizens from New Jersey. Please amend and attach this list to Civil Action, No. 3:10-04814 (D.N.J.)

Clarification: again, all letters are forwarded to the Clerk of the Court, Rm. 2020, so surely they should have been filed as part of the record. It appears the Court is now trying to institute procedural ploys to harass or ignore “*The Peoples*” request to have all documents made part of the official record.

Yet, this Court’s letter dated November 23, 2010, that was electronically mailed to the DOJ, surely creates questions upon what you are referring to. That is if our prior correspondence is/was not part of the official record why was the DOJ electronically notified? Clearly, your reply mandates that all prior correspondence now be made prior to the official record.

Clearly, there has been thus far a substantial amount of acrimony generated by this Court with respect to this matter, while we informally raised with you the issue of your recusal, we must confirm this request to you in writing again based upon conduct which we believe has been substantially beyond the norm in terms of required objectivity by a sitting judge.

Under all circumstances, we must respectfully request that you disqualify yourself from proceeding and permit the assignment of another Judge to this case.

Clearly we must reserve our rights herein. We are still waiting for our TRO to properly signed and adjudicated. Once again, “*We the people*” Plaintiffs anxiously await your reply.

Respectfully submitted,

Plaintiffs: Nicholas E. Purpura, 1802 Rue De La Port. Wall, NJ 07719 732-449-0856	Donald R. Laster Jr, pro-se (s) 25 Heidl Ave West Long Branch, NJ 07764 732-263-9235
--	---

cc: Chief Judge Garrett E. Brown, Jr.
Ethan P. Davis, et el

CLERK OF THE COURT Please file all papers submitted, plus those in Judge Wolfson’s possession.

Attachment, Amended list of Plaintiffs, to be attached to main brief following page 42.