

ORIGINAL

Dave Palmer
The Watchdawg
Email: Noethics1@aol.com
URL: www.noethics.net

February 12, 2010

Paul Pfeifer
Justice Ohio Supreme Court
65 South Front Street
Columbus, OH 43215

Re: Supreme Court Case No. 2010-0054
Appellant David Palmer's reply to Appellee Pheils' letter

FILED
MAR 02 2010
CLERK OF COURT
SUPREME COURT OHIO

Dear Justice Pfeifer:

I must admit that given Mr. Pheils' rather deplorable reputation among his peers in the Toledo I wasn't surprised that he would respond with the missive he sent to you earlier this date. In fact, it can safely be said that Mr. Pheils has dedicated his career to the "total avoidance of propriety," and he's been highly successful in so acting.

With all due respect, I do take umbrage to Mr. Pheils' continued and sham attacks on my wife in falsely asserting that she "continues to use defamation, veiled and expressed threats ... in an attempt to intimidate you and all Justices..."

The court files clearly demonstrate that my wife is unable to read English and speaks it poorly. Mr. Pheils himself has repeatedly testified to this fact (ca. 1990-1995).

For Mr. Pheils of all people to suggest that I am in "direct contempt" of this Court in regards to my communications to you and/or any other justice/judge in Ohio and elsewhere, doesn't pass the involuntary laugh test. In fact, as we speak there is a pending motion before Judge Jennings in LCCP 88-2089 to find Mr. Pheils in direct contempt for perpetrating an obvious fraud on the court.

As you know, I am, as I suspect you are, a fervent believer in the 1st Amendment, especially as it relates to investigative reporters and/or other media outlets. I can safely say Justice Pfeiffer that I have not and do not play fast and loose with my journalistic responsibilities. In fact, I am a true believer in "due diligence" in reporting the news and I have on many, many occasions refused to write articles based simply on hearsay, innuendo or rumor. I fervently ascribe to what Yogi Berra was wont to say years ago, "Just the facts, ma'am."

It now seems as though Mr. Pheils is attempting to place himself in the position as a de facto defense attorney for all of the justices and judges in Ohio and possibly elsewhere. Suffice it to say Justice Pfeifer, having Mr. Pheils act in such a capacity would be analogous to employing the late Jeffrey Dahmer to defend the efficacy of embarking on a vegetarian diet.

I apologize for droning on; however, for someone of Mr. Pheils' ilk (FYI: Mr. Pheils, Ilk is not a male Elk!) to attack the efficacy of my investigative reporting takes frivolity to new and as yet unseen levels.

Suggesting to you that if you rule against me, you will suffer the same fate as Chief Justice Moyer, et al. is just yet another of Mr. Pheils' lame attempts at levity. A cursory review of my motion seeking Chief Justice Moyer's recusal (filed with the Court) speaks for itself as to "actual bias." It should be noted that Justices O'Donnell, O'Connor, Lanzinger and Stratton did not deny they were biased against me.

If Mr. Pheils' statement of **consequences** if you ruled against me were true, then how does one explain my conduct as to the unfavorable rulings I've received from Judges James Bates, Henry J. Shaw, Jr., Everett Krueger, Ruth Ann Franks, Richard Knepper, et al.? The consequences for these judges can be found on my web site at www.noethics.net under the category "Ethical Judges/Attys."

It is patently clear that Mr. Pheils will do or say anything in an effort to assure that this court dispenses with justice rather than dispense with it. All I have ever asked for is a fair hearing before a fair and unbiased jurist. If that's too much to ask for, then so be it Justice Pfeifer.

As to Mr. Pheils' lament of me vetting replacements on the court, this is exactly what took place when I dealt with 1st Court of Appeals Judge Lee Hildebrandt several years ago as Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals in assembling a panel to investigate a pending ethics complaint I filed v. Chief Justice Moyer. Put simply, there's sufficient precedent for such conduct.

If Mr. Pheils had his way, he would prefer that a panel of seven justices be chosen by the Revolutionary Guard in Tehran to assure that justice is in fact dispensed with!

Thanks for your time and attention to this matter and I look forward to a prompt reply.

David Palmer
The Watchdawg
Folsom, CA

ps: A copy of this letter has been sent to Mr. Pheils via email.