UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

MIAMI DIVISION

CASE NO. 07-21256-CIV-JORDAN

JOHN B. THOMPSON,
Plaintiff,
vs.
THE FLORIDA BAR, et al.,
Defendants.

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Mr. Thompson's motion to reconsider my order on his motion for reconsideration[1] [D.E. 448] is DENIED.

Mr. Thompson's argument to the contrary notwithstanding, my order did consider Mr. Thompson's motion under Rule 60(b)(6) and denied that argument [D.E. 446 at 2].

Since Mr. Thompson raises no new issues, his motion for reconsideration is DENIED.

DONE and ORDERED in chambers in Miami, Florida, this 13th day of December, 2010.

Adalberto Jordan
United States District Judge

cc: All counsel of record
John B. Thompson, pro se
5721 Riviera Drive
Coral Gables, FL 33146

[1]Mr. Thompson continues to send letters, motions, and supplements through direct electronic mail to my inbox. This includes recently received "Notice of Additional Legal Authority in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration". I have attached this notice to this order and have considered it in denying Mr. Thompson's motion for reconsideration.

Subject Judge Jordan, Scofflaw
:
From: "Jack Thompson"
To: "Jack Thompson", adalberto_jordan
Date: 12/10/2010 07:46 AM

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,

Defendants.

NOTICE OF ADDITIONAL LEGAL AUTHORITY IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM ORDER DISMISSING THIS ACTION ON THE BASIS OF NEWLY DISCOVERED MISCONDUCT BY JUDGE ADALBERTO J. JORDAN AND MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT THEREOF

COMES NOW plaintiff, John B. Thompson, hereinafter Thompson, on his own behalf, and provides additional legal authority in support of his motion for reconsideration of his motion for relief from its order dismissing this action without prejudice, stating:

1. This court has a disturbing habit of both fabricating legal authority that does not exist for its erroneous rulings as well as ignoring, as if it did not exist, legal authority that prohibits such rulings.

2. For example, the court should recall, but will not because of its selective amnesia, its citing of an Alaska case that supposedly provided justification for this court's referral of plaintiff to its ad hoc disciplinary committee because plaintiff sent this court the best proof of The Florida Bar's a) selective prosecution, and b) protection of obscenity.

3. Similarly, now this court at breakneck speed is found citing cases that have absolutely nothing to do with plaintiff's motion in order to obscure, by this paper blizzard, this court's unethical hiding of its long-running cozy financial relationship, through Bar-funded judicial junket vacations at which Judge Jordan holds forth on his liberal interpretations of the First Amendment and the rights of "the media."

4. Inconveniencing this court, however, is a case presently pending before the Florida Supreme Court, *Leslie, et al v. The St. Joe Company* , Florida Supreme Court Case No. SC1-2243. The Florida Supreme Court in that pending case is being asked whether a judge has a duty to disclose

a financial relationship with one of the parties which relationship was fully known to the judge but unknown to that party, even though that relationship was a matter of public record.

5. This court can read the petition by the party laboring under the court's failure to disclose at on-line http://www.floridasupremecourt.org/pub_info/summaries/briefs/10/10-2243/Filed_11-19-2010_Petition.pdf. Plaintiff is sure that this court's energetic clerks can find it, and plaintiff is happy to help them.

6. Here is what the petitioner says in the above-linked case, commencing on page 18, provided hereat in larger font so this court cannot then claim to have missed it:

"Direct disqualification aside, this Court has also recognized that an appellate judge has an even broader duty to disclose a potential conflict to litigants before deciding their cases. The commentary to Canon 3E(1) of the Code of Judicial Conduct provides, "A judge should disclose on the record information that the judge believes the parties or their lawyers might consider relevant to the question of disqualification, even if the judge believes there is no real basis for disqualification." And this Court has not only held that the standard for disclosure is lower than the standard for disqualification, it has disciplined a well-respected appellate judge for violating the duty to disclose, even in a case where the Judicial Qualifications Commission did not contend that disqualification was required. *In re Frank,* 753 So. 2d 1228, 1239-40 (Fla. 2000). [emphases added]

12. From the very outset of this case, Judge Jordan knew that plaintiff was concerned about his coziness with the very people who were leading the ideology-drive charge at The Bar against him. Read the electronic docket of this case. Early on, plaintiff pointed out, in a motion for disqualification, that Judge Jordan was repeatedly holding forth at the ill-named Center for Ethics and Public Service, The major domo at that Center was leftwingnut Steve Chaykin, who publicly proclaimed that any lawyer opposed to gay adoption should be disbarred on that basis alone. Thompson pointed out in this court's file that Chaykin was Thompson's Bar designated reviewer, and thus the most powerful person in directing his prosecution for his Christian beliefs.

13. *If Thompson had also known* that in addition to Judge Jordan's relationship with the Chaykin-led U of M ideology beehive that he was getting all expenses-paid vacation to five star hotels to hold forth on the very issues that were at the core of Thompson's civil rights case assigned to Judge Jordan, then he would have been able to move to disqualify Jordan on that basis, and if denied, then a petition for a writ of prohibition in the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals would have been pursued by Thompson.

14. What this court has done is intentionally hide its relationship with The Florida Bar that of all people on the planet it was particularly well-placed to be cognizant of. This court, in the person of Judge Adalberto Jordan, has gone out of its way to turn this federal case into a) a disciplinary witch hunt of Thompson, b) a platform for Judge Jordan to ridicule Thompson's "crusade" (which only a leftwing ideologue would call Thompson's efforts to get federal obscenity laws enforced), and c) a training exercise for inventive law clerks to hunt for cases that have absolutely nothing to do with this case.

15. So here we have a federal judge who repeatedly holds forth, it turns out, at Florida

Bar judicial junket sites about "what to do about unethical, unprofessional lawyers who appear before the federal bench" who doesn't possess, it is obvious, its own ethical perspicacity to disclose a financial tie to a party that it KNOWS would have been the basis for a motion to disqualify.

16. By its continuing cover-up of its own unethical conduct (see above-cited legal authority) Judge Jordan has invited what he will now get—a formal sworn ethics complaint to the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals for his serial misconduct in this case, that now includes hiding his paid vacations provided by one of the parties.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that this has been served upon record counsel for The Florida Bar and Dava Tunis by mailing it to the clerk of this court, who will then provide it via the court's CM/ECF electronic system from which plaintiff is banned, this December 10, 2010. Thompson has also provided it, as a courtesy, to the above via e-mail on this date.

JOHN B. THOMPSON,
Plaintiff *pro se*

5721 Riviera Drive
Coral Gables, Florida 33146
Phone: 305-666-4366

amendmentone@comcast.net

Jack Thompson, J.D.
5721 Riviera Drive
Coral Gables, Florida 33146
305-666-4366, cell 305-588-3005

"To say I went looking for God is to say a mouse goes looking for a cat." C. S. Lewis

----- Original Message -----
From: Jack Thompson
To: adalberto_jordan@flsd.uscourts.gov
Sent: Monday, December 06, 2010 3:57 PM
Subject: Let's see how much The Bar paid you

John B. Thompson, J.D.
5721 Riviera Drive
Coral Gables, Florida 33146
305-666-4366
amendmentone@comcast.net

December 6, 2010

Jack Harkness

Executive Director
The Florida Bar
651 E. Jefferson St.
Tallahassee, FL 32399

Re: Formal Public Records Law Request

Dear Mr. Harkness:

The Florida Bar has, over the last decade, reimbursed US District Judge Adalberto Jordan for his expenses incurred while speaking, as a self-styled genius on media, the First Amendment, and other issues at Bar events.

These reimbursed expenses are for food, lodging, and travel, as Jordan's own federal financial disclosure forms show, although the amounts are not shown.

Judge Jordan just entered a remarkable order in which he admits the judicial junkets but that I should have known about them.

Therefore, this is a formal public records request, pursuant to Florida statutes and the Rules of Judicial Administration, for ALL records showing what the reimbursements to Jordan have been, from the year 2000 to present.

Warm personal regards, Jack Thompson

Copy: Judge Jordan, in his Courthouse Cocoon

Jack Thompson, J.D.
5721 Riviera Drive
Coral Gables, Florida 33146
305-666-4366, cell 305-588-3005

"To say I went looking for God is to say a mouse goes looking for a cat." C. S. Lewis