

9/11 Review

Web Site:

[Home Page](#)
[Search](#)
[Summary](#)
[Site Navigation](#)
[Sign Up](#)
[Donations](#)
[Essays](#)
[Viewpoints](#)
[Submit](#)
[Translate](#)
[What's New](#)
[About](#)
[Posters](#)
[911Review.Com](#)

Top Topics:

[FrontPage](#)
[911ReviewPosters](#)
[ConspiracyOfSilence](#)
[PoliticalArt](#)
[AnthraxAttacks](#)
[InsideJob](#)
[LeahyVsAshcroft200406](#)
[McMedia](#)
[PatriotAct](#)
[Building7Collapse](#)
[Guardian](#)
[MuslimsSuspendPhysics](#)
[LatestHeadlines](#)
[OngoingCoverup](#)
[AirForceStanddown](#)
[CoverupByWhiteHouse](#)
[Flight77BlackBoxes](#)
[Flights](#)
[InHisOwnWords](#)
[InsiderTrading](#)
[OpenAndFairTrials](#)
[PentagonAttackCctvVideo](#)
[PriorKnowledge](#)
[OsamaBinAsset](#)
[BinLaden](#)
[BinLadenConfession](#)
[CiaVisasForPatsies](#)
[ExperiencedSkeptics](#)
[HijackersAliveAndWell](#)
[HijackersPatsies](#)
[PentagonAttack](#)
[Flight77](#)
[Flight77Sites](#)
[PentagonAttackDamage](#)
[PentagonAttackDebris](#)
[PentagonAttackFire](#)
[PentagonAttackLegend](#)
[PentagonMascal](#)
[PentagonPlaneRotor](#)

StanleyHiltonLawsuit



Stanley G. Hilton has filed a class action lawsuit in Federal court in Northern California against high officials in the current Bush administration (including the federal government, Bush, Cheney, Rice, Mueller, Tenet, Rumsfeld, Ashcroft), for complicity in aiding and abetting and facilitating the Sep. 11, 2001 attacks.

His suit contends, and we strongly concur, that the defendants did so in order to launch unconstitutional aggressive war against the sovereign states of Afghanistan and Iraq, declare political opponents "enemy combatants," suspend the Constitution indefinitely, etc., all for sordid political ends which subvert the very system of laws and Constitution the defendants have sworn to uphold in their offices.

The suit alleges that Bush, as President, violated the US Constitution by deliberately lying to - and defrauding - the US Congress into passing an "Enabling Act" resolution in October 2002, authorizing Bush to wage aggressive war on Iraq. The war is unconstitutional and an illegal drain on the US taxpayers' funds in the treasury. The suit alleges the Iraq war is unconstitutional and that declaratory and injunctive relief should be ordered. It is unconstitutional and illegal because the president violated the Separation of Powers provisions of the Constitution by deliberately lying to the Congress by falsely assuring them that Bush had evidence of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) in Iraq, and that Iraq was involved in plotting and carrying out the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the World Trade center [Twin Towers](#) and the [Pentagon Attack](#) - attacks actually orchestrated by defendants. The suit also alleges that the USA [Patriot Acts](#) I and II are unconstitutional and must be struck down as such, because they violate the fourth, fifth, ninth and first amendments to the US Constitution, by permitting the government to spy on Americans and violate their rights to privacy, and because the Patriot Acts, like the war in Iraq, were passed under false and fraudulent circumstances presented by defendants to the Congress.

The suit argues that to the extent that the US Constitution is legally analogous to a "contract" between the government and the plaintiffs (taxpayers), it seems that deliberate fraud by defendants should nullify any unconstitutional acts by them, such as the aggressive war and occupation of Iraq and the Patriot Acts.

- [Sept11WebSites](#)
- [Grable.Rosalee](#)
- [Meyssan.Thierry](#)
- [Mirrors](#)
- [MultimediaCollections](#)
- [Sept11Physics](#)
- [Sept11Researchers](#)
- [Sept11Videos](#)
- [TrustedWebSites](#)
- [TrustedNewsSites](#)
- [TwinTowers](#)
- [WhatsNext](#)

[More topics...](#)

News:

- [Maher Arar !\[\]\(cf5be311f7b2821912d8009884508fa2_img.jpg\)](#)
- [Canada Patriot Act 3 !\[\]\(9804e70d96ff9fe9899b264c06a33cd7_img.jpg\)](#)
- [StanleyHiltonLawsuit](#)
- [TrustedNewsSites](#)

Essays:

- [BogusWarOnTerrorism](#)
- [FemaTheSecretGovernment](#)
- [TruthLiesLegendof911](#)
- [RogueUSOwnGoal](#)

Viewpoints:

- [ConspiracyOfSilence](#)
- [FraudulentLegislation !\[\]\(97faa0168e491544be255cfcab218e9b_img.jpg\)](#)
- [WhatsNext](#)
- [WhenDemocracyFailed](#)

Mirrors:

- geocities.com/killtown
- elitewatch.net/firms.com
- lightscion.com
- baltech.org/lederman
- angieon911.com

The Plaintiffs believe they have the right to bring this suit as American citizens and that they face an imminent threat to their freedom from defendants, arising out of the entire orchestrated scenario of 9/11, the PA laws that were passed as a proximate result of 9/11, and the actions of defendants in infringing on their constitutionally guaranteed freedoms.

 [911review.org](#) strongly supports Stanley Hilton's courageous actions to hold the officials responsible for the 9/11 massacres liable to punishment, and to repeal the [FraudulentLegislation](#) such as the [PatriotAct](#).

Hilton is presisting in this legal action despite threats to his life and we call on all our readers to support his actions by all means necessary.

This is the Plaintiffs' Status Conference Statement II;

- For the full text of the lawsuit, see [StanleyHiltonComplaint](#).
- For an excellent interview with Stanley Hilton by Alex Jones: [StanleyHiltonInterview](#).

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PLAINTIFFS' STATUS CONFERENCE STATEMENT II

Date AUGUST 13, 2004

Time 2 pm

TAXPAYERS OF UNITED STATES OF CASE NO. CV-03-03927-SI
AMERICA; STANLEY G HILTON;
SCOTT MUNSUN,
ABEL ASHES,

PLAINTIFFS,

V.

GEORGE W. BUSH, ET AL. ,

Defendants.

FACTS: All defendants have been served.

PLEADINGS: Plaintiffs desire to file a 2nd amended complaint to narrow down the case considerably. We wish to dismiss many of the original defendants, in fact we wish to dismiss from the case all original defendants except UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (the federal government), BUSH, CHENEY, RICE, MUELLER, TENET, RUMSFELD, ASHCROFT. These defendants have been served in DC and local US Attorney. They were served in June 2004. The proposed 2nd Amended Complaint will more narrowly focus the case and clarify the issues at hand.

FACTS OF THE CASE:



Secret
Evidence

Contribute
HELP TAKE BACK
OUR COUNTRY

This is a taxpayer class action suit against high officials in the current Bush administration, for complicity in aiding and abetting and facilitating the Sep. 11, 2001 attacks as a contrived and stylized "New Pearl Harbor" and for doing so in order to launch unconstitutional aggressive war against the sovereign states of Afghanistan and Iraq, declare political opponents "enemy combatants," suspend the Constitution indefinitely, etc., all for sordid political ends which subvert the very system of laws and Constitution the defendants have sworn to uphold in their offices.

The suit alleges two theories, which are not mutually exclusive: (1) LIHOP: that defendants Bush et al LET IT (911) HAPPEN ON PURPOSE, i. e., that they had received adequate warning from FBI agents, NSA intercepts, spy satellites and other sources, of imminent air attacks against the WTC by "Al Qaeda" but deliberately chose to look the other way and to allow these attacks to take place; and (2) that Bush et al actively participated in planning executing and orchestrating the 911 events in order to manufacture a contrived and stylized sensational event aimed at frightening the taxpayers and Congress into passing unconstitutional laws, the PATRIOT ACTS, and in authorizing Bush via resolution to wage an unjustified war of aggression against Iraq. The suit seeks to obtain damages against defendants, an injunction ordering them to reimburse the US treasury for moneys unconstitutionally finagled to prosecute an illegal aggressive war in Iraq, and other damages. Each of the plaintiffs is a victim in some significant way, of the Bush-911 phenomenon and aggressive war and costly perpetual occupation in Iraq. The suit alleges that Bush, as President, violated the US Constitution by deliberately lying to - and defrauding - the US Congress into passing an "Enabling Act" resolution in October 2002, authorizing Bush to wage aggressive war on Iraq. The war is unconstitutional and an illegal drain on the US taxpayers' funds in the treasury. The suit alleges the Iraq war is unconstitutional and that declaratory and injunctive relief should be ordered. It is unconstitutional and illegal because the president violated the Separation of Powers provisions of the Constitution by deliberately lying to the Congress by falsely assuring them that Bush had evidence of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) in Iraq, and that Iraq was involved in plotting and carrying out the 9/11/01 terrorists attacks on the World Trade center and Pentagon - attacks actually orchestrated by defendants. The suit also alleges that the USA Patriot Acts I and II are unconstitutional and must be struck down as such, because they violate the fourth, fifth, ninth and first amendments to the US Constitution o by permitting the government to spy on Americans and violate their rights to privacy, and because the Patriot Acts, like the war in Iraq, were passed under false and fraudulent circumstances presented by defendants to the Congress.

To the extent that the US Constitution is legally analogous to a "contract" between the government and the plaintiffs (taxpayers), it seems that deliberate fraud by defendants should nullify any unconstitutional acts by

them, such as the aggressive war and occupation of Iraq and the Patriot Acts.

While this case presents many issues of first impression (such as whether individual citizens have recognized voices in court to challenge unconstitutional and illegal acts by a sitting president and his administration), there is precedent for such a suit: in 1996, the courts permitted a suit to go forward, whereby President Clinton's line item veto power was declared an unconstitutional delegating of power by Congress to the President.

While defendants will assert "political case," to urge the court to decline jurisdiction, this is not so. This is a legal case with political overtones. The courts cannot escape their responsibilities by branding this a "political controversy." Defendants' campaigns to spy on plaintiffs' records and activities, threats to deprive plaintiffs of freedom and citizenship - these are not "political" questions but rather real legal ones. Defendants Bush et al pose an imminent and immediate threat to the health, safety and well being of plaintiffs, and the case is real and not theoretical.

This case presents many issues of first impression which are important public issues, to wit: whether a president can deliberately lie and defraud and deceive the Congress into delegating war making powers and unconstitutional search and seizure powers to the government, under the false pretext that "terrorists" have to be rooted out everywhere even though it means tearing up the constitution; whether a self-proclaimed and totally fraudulent state of "perpetual national emergency and perpetual war on terror," as defined- by Bush etc, can justify "suspending" and vitiating the Constitution; and whether taxpayers have standing to challenge the government in this fraudulent exercise of power.

Another reason why the suit must be allowed to proceed is that defendants continue to pose a clear and present danger to plaintiffs as taxpayers, because defendants have announced their intent to invade other countries, such as Iran, North Korea etc, in pursuit of their political goals, and these anticipated military misadventures all stem from the 911 events.

DISCOVERY: Plaintiffs intend to take the depositions of defendants Bush, Rice, Cheney, Rumsfeld, Tenet, Mueller and Ashcroft, and also seek requests for production of documents, i. e., all air communications between the planes hijacked on 9/11/01 and ground control, all USAF and NORAD communications records of 911, all stand down orders to USAF that day, the entire Phoenix memorandum of July 2001 (warning of 911) and the August 6 2001 briefing records of Rice to Bush, All records of all persons and entities who bought put options on United Airlines (UAL) and American Airlines (AMR) stock just before 9/11/01, at the Pacific Stock Exchange etc. the suit also seeks documents relating to defendants; ties to the Saudi Arabia government and that governments involvement in 911.

ANTICIPATED LEGAL ISSUES

Of course, defendants will maintain that they are immune from suit, that

plaintiffs lack standing, and that "national security" should impose a cloak of secrecy and lock the doors of justice. We disagree and maintain that there is sound legal precedent for (1) taxpayer suits against the US government and defendants (where unconstitutional acts are being perpetrated in the taxpayers' name), and (2) suing a sitting president and taking his deposition (Paula Jones vs Bill Clinton), even on a civil case not even remotely connected to the president's function as head of the federal government. We maintain that we have a right to vindicate our rights as US citizens and that we have standing to sue.

Standing derives not only from plaintiffs' being taxpayers whose tax dollars have been wasted and misappropriated on an illegal war to benefit the defendants and their allies, but also because the USA Patriots Acts I and II (these Acts are herein referred to as "PA") have seriously infringed on all of the plaintiffs' rights to privacy and freedom of association and speech and 4th amendment rights to be free from unwarranted government snooping. The PATRIOT ACTS ("PA") have been used against plaintiffs by defendants, to spy on what books they check out of libraries, what e mail they receive and send, what books they buy from bookstores, what phone calls they make, what banks they have accounts at, etc. Also, because these deplorable, un-American and unconstitutional statutes give defendants the right to pick up any US citizen off the streets, declare him or her an "enemy combatant," and deprive him or her of citizenship and liberty and even of the rights to a lawyer. This poses an imminent threat to every taxpayer in the country, to allow defendants to suppress political dissent by arbitrarily declaring any citizen an "enemy combatant," because they oppose George Bush II's political policies. These serious infringements on constitutional rights of plaintiffs warrant judicial action and inquiry. We maintain that the PA are unconstitutional and were directly related to the 911 incidents which defendants aided and abetted.

Under the precedent of Marbury vs Madison, and a plethora of progeny, judicial precedent has long maintained that the federal courts have a right, a duty and indeed an obligation to examine and review the federal acts and actions of Congress and of the president - such as the PATRIOT ACTS and the unconstitutional war in Iraq - because of the separation of powers doctrine. This court has jurisdiction to review and declare unconstitutional the actions and acts of defendants.

There is precedent for permitting depositions of sitting president and their top aides: In Paula Jones vs Clinton the high court ruled that a sitting president can be sued and deposed whilst in office.

VENUE: Why is this case brought in US District Court for the Northern District of California? Plaintiffs live here and their rights have been violated here in the San Francisco area. Also, venue is right here because plaintiffs have been victimized here, one of the 4 skyjacked airliners on 9-11-01 was heading to San Francisco from Newark, NJ, and most of the put options on UAL and AMR stock were bought and sold and traded on the Pacific Stock Exchange in San Francisco. Plaintiffs allege that the massive sales of put options on 9/10/01 reveals complicity by certain purchasers of the options, i.e., foreknowledge of 911, a theme prevalent as a motif throughout this case. The vast and pervasive evidence of foreknowledge by

defendants of 911, and defendants' deliberately allowing of the 911 attacks to take place, is a motif of the case.

CONCLUSION

Plaintiffs believe they have the right to bring this suit as American citizens and that they face an imminent threat to their freedom from defendants, arising out of the entire orchestrated scenario of 911, the PA laws that were passed as a proximate result of 911, and the actions of defendants in infringing on their constitutionally guaranteed freedoms.

DATE: 8/1/04

 See our pages: [StanleyHiltonInterview](#) and [StanleyHiltonComplaint](#).

Links:

-  [Sue The Terrorists](#)