

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

JOHN B. THOMPSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 07-21256 (Judge Adalberto Jordan)

THE FLORIDA BAR and
DAVA J. TUNIS, JOHN HARKNESS,
AND FRANK ANTONES,

Defendants.

PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE TO THE COURT

COMES NOW petitioner, John B. Thompson, and provides notice to the court as follows:

With all respect for this court, and because of his respect for the judicial function and office, its order of even date is utter nonsense, and here's why:

Judge Friedman in fact did *not* file a sworn complaint, as required by Florida Bar Rules. He himself called it his "bar complaint," yet it was no such thing. An unsworn Bar complaint is not worth the tissue on which it is written.

Secondly, The Florida Bar repeatedly told this court that it never, ever brought a complaint against Thompson as the complainant. That was a lie. So, The Bar has engaged in two deceptions, two frauds upon this court: It processed as if it were a valid complaint the non-complaint complaint of Friedman, and then it switched gears and said that it was not a complaint after all, in the disciplinary proceeding correspondence that came to light at the recently concluded trial. Yet this Bar told this court, switching gears again, that it—The Bar—was not the complainant. This type of double-talk is precisely

why President Lincoln noted that “no one has a good enough memory to be a consistently good liar.” Thompson’s mother taught him never to lie. The Bar’s various counsel were obviously not raised by Thompson’s mother.

The only one confused here is this court, asserting in this strange order that Thompson’s argument against abstention would have been even “weaker” if it had known then what it knows now. Knows what, that The Bar lied twice instead of just once by saying two different things, both false, in two different venues?

The court’s Houdini-like effort to deny Thompson a federal remedy is remarkable, and it is just more of the same judicial sleight-of-hand first exhibited by this court when it miscited an Alaska case to punish Thompson for violation of pleading rule that did not even exist at the time. The court then, after finding Norm Kent was trafficking in obscenity, backtracked and held that well, maybe the obscenity is protected by the First Amendment. “Obscenity” is never protected by the First Amendment. Further, as this court knows and apparently worries, bad faith defeats abstention.

This court, similarly, has grossly misconstrued the clear holding of the federal court in the *Fieger v. Michigan Supreme Court* case. One cannot read the *Fieger* case and not see that what The Florida Bar seeks to do to Thompson has been utterly prohibited by the federal court in Michigan.

All this court has done, in entering this latest baseless order, is disqualify itself from presiding over the new federal civil rights action that will have to be filed if the fraud of The Florida Bar persists to the point of doing permanent injury to Thompson. Because Thompson has the highest regard for the judicial function, he notes to this court that it took an oath, as an Article III judge, to apply the law fairly to all. This court’s

latest order treats bad faith as if it were inconsequential to the abstention issue, and it does so by suggesting that two lies are better than one. Bizarre.

I hereby certify that the foregoing has been provided to opposing counsel through the court's electronic filing system, this December 11, 2007.

/s/ JOHN B. THOMPSON, Plaintiff
Attorney, Florida Bar #231665
1172 South Dixie Hwy., Suite 111
Coral Gables, Florida 33146
Phone: 305-666-4366
amendmentone@comcast.net