

## Media Responses

*Response to court decision?*

It's a reversal of Jim Crow. Euro-Americans are now in the balcony, those with darker skin in the orchestra. Regardless of color, the bigots are still in control.

*Are you saying the judge is a bigot?*

I'm saying I suspect that bigotry played a role in the two decisions. Will I ever know for sure—not likely.

It demonstrates that America is now a country like the former Soviet Union where legal decisions should be made based on whether a person subscribes to the popular, trendy ideology of the time.

Those who dissent are not disserving of the rule of law because they are so inferior to the “in crowd,” or the effete, Eastern, intellectual, white-trash elite, that they have no rights for the law to protect.

Today, all that is needed to justify the stripping of a man's rights is to label him an “anti-feminist” or politically incorrect, which I refer to as “evolutionarily correct.” (Ex. A, Order at p. Tres). In the 1950s, the label was “fellow traveler.”

Justice is supposed to be blind, not just to race, creed, color, national origin, age, gender, disability, marital status, partnership status, sexual orientation, alienage or citizenship status, but to a person's beliefs. In this democracy, legal decisions are not supposed to be determined by the popularity of such beliefs.

Hunter seems to think he knows more about the law than the US Supreme Court. If a club refuses to let you in because of age and sex, do you have two causes of action or grievances or one? Two.

*Didn't you first complain about sex discrimination?*

Hey, didn't you ever make a mistake? I have, especially when I married my ex-wife.

The State DHR complaint actually states “I believe I was discriminated against because of my: sex.”

As it turned out, my belief was wrong, which, as I made clear to City HR on October 15, 2010, I did not realize until the State's decision on September 16, 2010, which concluded that age discrimination was probably involved.

If the State Human Rights Division had jurisdiction over age discrimination, I would have amended my complaint rather than approaching City HR.

*Isn't the crowd a result of demographics?*

That's like an all-white country club stating everybody here is white because it's white people who typically play golf and tennis.

Amnesia admitted that it “employs an admission strategy to limit the number of individuals . . . who do not have the appearance [Amnesia] desires to maintain the image of the nightclub.”

*In what manner were you discriminated against?*

Velez discriminated against Den Hollander because of

1. his ancestry-Huguenot,
2. exercising his First Amendment right to file suits against the preferential treatment of females, and to defend the rights that men used to have,
3. his marital status - divorced in which he has nothing good to say about his ex-wife.

Den Hollander based his allegation of Velez's bigotry on Velez's own words:

Complainant is a self-professed advocate for men's rights who identifies himself as an “anti-feminist lawyer” on his website, [www.roydenhollander.com](http://www.roydenhollander.com). He has filed a number of lawsuits against bars and clubs that have “Ladies Nights,” and admits in several online publications that he is “bitter” from an ex-wife who used him for his US citizenship and money. Complainant's description of himself is consistent with his pattern of filing several gender discrimination suits.

When the City HR dismisses a complaint for “no probable cause,” it is required to issue a written order listing the reasons. 47 RCNY § 1-52. Velez included the paragraph describing Den Hollander's anti-feminist activities in his Order and bitterness against his ex-wife; therefore, Den Hollander's beliefs, speech, and lawsuits concerning such are a reason for the dismissal. Otherwise, why include the remarks.

These words of Velez have nothing to do with an age-discrimination complaint against a nightclub, so what possibly could have motivated Velez to include them in an administrative agency order—bigotry toward Den Hollander for exercising his First Amendment rights, which include the right to file lawsuits to fight for the rights he foolishly thought the U.S. Constitution guaranteed him, *N.A.A.C.P. v. Button*, 371 U.S. 415, 429 (1963), to believe as he chooses, and to communicate those beliefs.

Velez also based his dismissal on Den Hollander's “marital status,” which is prohibited under the City's Human Rights Law. Velez wrote, “[Den Hollander] admits in several online publications that he is ‘bitter’ from an ex-wife who used him for his US citizenship and money.” (Ex. A, Order at p. Tres). That's an understatement.

At an initial meeting at City HR, Velez argued there was no discrimination because had Den Hollander and his friend agreed to buy a \$350 bottle, they could have entered. Years ago in Montgomery, Alabama, people with relatively darker skin color could enter a public bus, but

they would have to sit in the back. By Velez's reasoning, such conduct was not discriminatory because those with a different skin complexion were not barred from entering and riding the buses as long as they sat in the back.

So, contrary to the U.S. Supreme Court, since Den Hollander and his friend could enter the club [get on the bus] but once inside, they would have to buy a bottle [sit in the back], there was no discrimination. There is nothing comical about this type of rationalization used by Velez and many residents of the Deep South in another century. It makes clear a mindset driven by prejudices, which in Velez's case are directed toward Den Hollander and people like him.

*Do you think you'll win?*

No, but if I win this one, the Ku Klux Klan will make me an Imperial Wizard. Then I can open up that organization to everybody regardless of color who wants to fight the Establishment. Those guys have a lot of guns and they're nuts. What better group to have on your side when fighting the modern day tyranny of the Feminists and Political Correctionalists.

*I find that offensive.*

Too bad, I don't apologize for subjective sensitivities.

*Why did HR rule against you?*

I'm an obnoxious guy who fights for his rights. Probably also because I'm not a girl, don't have a deeper tan, or talk with an accent. They see me as a Euro-American man, which to Feminists and Political Correctionalists is evil, although in reality I'm African-American, since my ancestors originated in Africa.

*What serious non-economic injuries have you incurred?*

I boil through my days and some of my nights. I could have been out at the beach lusting after the young ladies in their thong bikinis. Instead I was in the law library fighting these bureaucrats who are suppose to defend people's rights—not violate them.

*How old are you?*

You don't want to know and neither do I.

Physically or emotionally?

Old enough to know better but don't.

*Why did you use the term "reasonable man" in the complaint and appeal?*

Have you ever met a reasonable girl? I haven't.

*Are you a bigot?*

No, I'm an equal opportunity insulter of idiot and fools. Also an equal opportunity molester of pretty young ladies.

Bigots come in all colors, shapes, sizes and stupidities.

*Why did you number the pages in Spanish?*

Isn't that America's official language? It is in LA.

I'm just trying to be inclusive of foreign tongues.

HR was so discourteous in not numbering the pages of its Order, I figured I'd repay them the same amount of disrespect by numbering them in Spanish.

*You really insulted the Commission's Executive Director of Law Enforcement?*

And that was intentional. His order is uncivil and disrespectful. Anyone uncivil and disrespectful with me, and I'll do the same to them. Where does he get off justifying the violation of my rights because I choose to fight for my rights against the Feminists and Political Correctionalists and complain about my ex-wife.

What's wrong with these bureaucrats? Don't they realize that if it weren't for the government, they'd be unemployable. You'd think they would at least try to do their duty.

*Some younger guys are required to buy bottles to enter clubs, so where's the age discrimination?*

In those cases, those guys are probably being discriminated against because they're guys. At first, I thought that was why my buddy and I were kept out because we were guys. But the State Human Rights Division indicated it was age.

Amnesia admitted to the State that it "employs an admission strategy to limit the number of individuals . . . who do not have the appearance [Amnesia] desires to maintain the image of the nightclub."

So the question is, what is that image? If it is youth over age—it's illegal discrimination. If it's white over black—it's illegal discrimination. If it's more girls than guys—it's illegal discrimination.

*Can't a club promote the type of image it wants?*

Not when "the patronage . . . of any person belonging to, purporting to be, or perceived to be, of any particular race, creed, color, national origin, age, gender, disability, marital status, partnership status, sexual orientation or alienage or citizenship status is unwelcome, objectionable or not acceptable, desired or solicited." Admin. Code § 8-107(4)(a).

A club cannot create an image based on making older guys unwelcome, objectionable or not acceptable, desired or solicited.

Also, under the law, Amnesia does not have to have a policy or ongoing practice of discrimination. One event is enough. So if the doorman was trying to keep my buddy and me out because of our dirty old man image, then it's illegal discrimination. If on some other night, he lets two older guys in for the usual \$20, that does not mean he did not discriminate against us.

*Are you and your friend dirty old men?*

I can only speak for myself and yes, I've been a dirty old man since I was five. When my mother took me to see *Gentlemen Prefer Blondes*, I wasn't staring at those rocks around Marilyn Monroe's neck when she sung *Diamonds Are a Girl's Best Friend*.

*What if the club was just trying to make some extra money?*

The profit motive is no justification for violating someone's rights.

You're a successful person. How would you feel if the price went up when you tried to buy something? That's not fair and the purpose of anti-discrimination laws is to make society reasonably fair.

*Do anti-discrimination laws apply to the rich and celebrities?*

The way this society works, they don't have to, but whether there's ever been a case concerning such, I do not know.

*What's the big deal?*

Fairness and civil rights. What good is free speech if your expressions of ideas are used against you by self-righteous, hypocritical bigots? Those who believe there is only one true belief system, one true set of ideas, and they're the ones that are popular at a particular place and time. Does it really serve the founding principles of this country to allow such persons into positions of power?

A commission on Human Rights is supposed to protect those rights, not use an individual's fight for his rights as a member of a disfavored group to allow discrimination against him.

Basically, you have a "Hate Order" from the City's HR. A "hate" crime means a crime that shows evidence of prejudice based on race, religion, ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, national origin, age, gender, or alienage or citizenship status. So an Order that shows such prejudice is a "Hate Order."

*Why did you assume a judge might rule “white” as an absence of color?*

I live in one of the few remaining communist territories on the planet—Manhattan. Commies are renown at relying on illogic to enforce their ideology.

(1) In the Ladies’ Nights case the courts ruled that nightclubs could not discriminate at the bar by charging guys more for drinks but could discriminate against guys when they walk into a club by charging them more for admission. That makes no sense, since the entire operation of a nightclub is controlled by the state.

(2) In a case challenging a secrecy provision of the Violence Against Women’s Act, the courts said any allegation of injury was “speculative” because the secrecy law being challenged prevent us plaintiffs from finding out what the government did behind closed doors, even though various private feminist groups and all law enforcement agencies could be using the government’s conclusions against us.

(3) In a case against Witches Studies where I claimed Feminism is a religion, a judge decreed without any evidence that “Feminism is no more a religion than physics.” According to the U.S. Supreme Court secular beliefs of a purely ethical or moral source and content which impose a duty of conscience can function as a religion, *Welsh v. U.S.*, 398 U.S. 333. Buddhism, Taoism, Ethical Culture, Secular Humanism, and other non-theistic belief-systems are religions. *Torasco v. Watkins*, 367 U.S. 488. If you have an ethical and moral belief system that determines someone’s actions the way a traditional religion does, then it’s a religion. The Second Circuit Court of Appeals also threatened that if I involved myself with another case concerning that issue that I would be sanctioned.

*Why did you raise the Huguenot past?*

I’m fed up with all these groups exploiting superficial differences in order to win preferential treatment. If they want to rant about persecution, then so will I.

All these groups hate each other: whites hate blacks, latins and asians, blacks hate whites, latins, asians and lighter skin or darker skin blacks, latins hate whites, blacks and asians and the Nazis hate everybody.

In the recent election: one group of bigots voted for Obama and all the other bigots voted for Romney. Since Obama won, I assume more bigots voted for him

There are only two groups of humans that are fundamentally different—girls and guys. All these other distinctions are meaningless. They’re only used to con people out of money, win political support, and make the ignorant feel superior to others.

There hasn’t been another hominid race on the planet since the Neanderthals died out. Although, sometimes when I’m in court before certain judges, I begin to wonder whether they all died out.

The only meaningful difference between a black guy and me is that he can probably play better basketball.

*What about affirmative action?*

Two wrongs don't make a right. If you're going to give someone a break, do it because they are poor—there's plenty of them across the rainbow spectrum today.

*The Commission found no pattern of discrimination.*

Under the City's Human Rights law, you don't need a pattern—a single instance is enough. Even so, the City's Commission didn't bother to look for a pattern. The Commission claims that Amnesia keeps surveillance tapes, so look at its tapes over a period of time to see whether guys my age get in or not—simple. The Commission could even require Amnesia to keep tapes for a longer period of time than it normally does under Admin. Code §8-105(6).

*Didn't you already file a sex discrimination complaint with the State Division of Human Rights?*

Yes, and they indicated it was age discrimination over which they didn't have jurisdiction, so I went to the City HR which does have jurisdiction.

But according to the City's Human Rights Commission, if, as an example, its Executive Director for Law Enforcement files a complaint with the State because the local Ku Klux Klan club would not let him in because he believed he had too deep a tan, then he could never file a complaint with the City after learning that the real reason he was denied admission was because of his partner status with another guy.

*Where's your evidence of discrimination?*

My friend, me and the doorman—the only eye witnesses. The City HR never talked to my friend and apparently never talked to the doorman.

Velez's own words:

Complainant is a self-professed advocate for men's rights who identifies himself as an "anti-feminist lawyer" on his website, [www.roydenhollander.com](http://www.roydenhollander.com). He has filed a number of lawsuits against bars and clubs that have "Ladies Nights," and admits in several online publications that he is "bitter" from an ex-wife who used him for his US citizenship and money. Complainant's description of himself is consistent with his pattern of filing several gender discrimination suits.

*What do you want?*

A few drinks on the house would be nice.

*What was wrong with the Order mentioning you're an anti-feminist lawyer, isn't that true?*

Yes, it is true, I'm proud to say, want to see the pink "A" on my t-shirt? The exercise of my freedom of speech and the filing of lawsuits is not a reason to decide I wasn't discriminated against. To the Commission, anyone who disagrees with the current majority's beliefs to which it subscribes is not deserving of the rights protected by New York law and the State's Constitution.

When the City's HR dismisses a case after its investigation, as it did in my case, it is required to provide a written order, and that order under the Commission's rules states the reason for the dismissal. 47 RCNY 1-52. Since the City's HR included my men's rights cases and that I'm divorced and bitter toward my ex-wife, those must be among the reasons for dismissal; otherwise, why included them in the Order.

*How bitter?*

I'm still waiting for a Mack truck to run a red light while she's crossing the street.

*Does the City's HR have the power to handle a complaint against one of its employees?*

There's some language in a Court of Appeals decision that indicates it might: *Maloff v. Commsn Human Rights*, 38 NY2d 329, 332 (1975), the City's HR "powers and duties" extend to discrimination "practiced by private persons, associations, corporations and . . . by city officials or agencies."

And the NYC Admin. Code §8-105(4)(iii) indicates it might: "To receive, investigate and pass upon complaints and to initiate its own investigations of: Discrimination against any person or group of persons, provided, however, that with respect to discrimination alleged to be committed by city officials or city agencies; such investigation shall be commenced after consultation with the mayor."

Also, the City's HR law is to be liberally construed with the aim of making it even more protective. *Carlton v. Mystic Transp. Inc.*, 202 F.3d 129 (2<sup>nd</sup> Cir.), *cert. denied*, 530 U.S. 1261 (2000).

But I can't say so for sure.

*Ever watch Person of Interest?*

Used to until they feminized it. I was waiting for someone to catch the HR reference. In the show, HR is a cabal of corrupt city officials out to enrich themselves. In reality, there's an informal cabal of ideologically corrupt city officials united in making decisions based on Feminism and Political Correctionalism rather than the law.

*Are the feminists and PCers really trying to impose totalitarianism?*

I think so. “To exalt as an absolute is the mark of totalitarianism, and it is possible to have an atmosphere of totalitarianism in a society that has many of the attributes of democracy.” Howard Zinn. Believing that a particular political ideology is “correct” is as nuts as believing a particular religion is the “true” religion, and look at the carnage that has caused.

*Are you an Aryan?*

No, I’m a human being. I don’t buy into all those superficial groupings of people that exist just so some moron can feel superior or some two-faced politician—a redundancy in terms—can get elected.

*Do you think you’re superior because you’re an Aryan white guy?*

No, I’m superior because of my intelligence, unless Alan Colmes is interviewing me.

*Why Alan Colmes?*

Because he’s smarter.

*You sound like a whacko?*

And I am. What’s more whacky than a man fighting for his rights in Feminarchy America?

*Aren’t Hispanics discriminated against in America?*

Not the illegal ones, they can violate the law and still get what they want. Look at O’Bama’s executive order that violated the Constitution by unilaterally changing the immigration law to allow children brought here illegally to stay. I’d like to have a President willing to violate the Constitution for my benefit.

Also they’re not discriminated against by me. For my part, I’d rather go out with a hot Latina than a mid-western blonde. But I’ll have to brush up on my salsa.

*You’re not taking this very seriously?*

On the contrary, I’m at my most serious when joking.

*Aren’t you venting your revenge against the Feminists?*

How can I vent revenge, I don’t have any government power with which to grind a personal axe. I simply file lawsuits in a vain attempt to protect my rights against the government’s infringement by giving them preferential treatment.

*Aren’t you just looking for publicity?*

No, when I went to Amnesia I was looking for hot young ladies to fondle.

I'm not the one who decides if something I do is newsworthy—you do.

Yes, I thoroughly enjoy being pilloried in the forum of public opinion, receiving hate emails, and being pink listed.

*Aren't cultures different?*

What is culture, the commodity that sells all the rest.

*Where'd you read that?*

It was on a wall somewhere. Hey, the words of the prophets are written on the subway walls, tenement halls.

Okay, take away the food, music, dress, and handshakes and what do you have? People wanting a decent job, so they can make money to live their lives, raise and educate their children in a safe environment. They want to eliminate the risk of something stupid happening to them and their family.

*What Clintonesque tactic were you referring to in the complaint?*

Common sense implications don't apply when trying to cover up misdoings.

*There have always been temporary restraining orders, so how can the feminists be responsible for such?*

The traditional TRO required an *ex parte* showing by the one seeking such of (1) likelihood of success on the merits; (2) the extent to which the plaintiff is being irreparably harmed by the defendant's conduct; (3) the extent to which the defendant will suffer irreparable harm if the TRO issues; and (4) the public interest.

The Feminists expanded the meaning of domestic violence in state laws so that now TROs are issued based not on irreparable harm, such as physical violence, but subjective sensitivities over humiliation, withholding information from the victim, deliberately doing something to make the victim feel diminished or embarrassed, isolating the victim from friends and family, denying the victim access to enough money, verbal abuse that undermines the victim's self-worth or self-esteem, constant criticism, making statements that damage the victim's self-esteem, neglect, name-calling, blaming, ridicule, disrespect, criticism.

Also, thanks to a culture perverted by the Feminists the judges no longer consider the likelihood of success on the merits or the impact of a TRO on the male defendant, which is the result of VAWA funded Feminist training courses for court personnel and federal money to local governments for doing what the Feminists want.

*The Mayor said....*

What's the petite fuehrer [Bloomberg] chiming in for, I thought he was only concerned with telling people how many calories they can consume.

*Petite Fuhrer?*

Anyone who has the police spy on left-wing groups and ignores the will of the people for two term limits, sounds like a dictator to me.

Hey, plenty of Jews, socialists, commies, and gypsies cooperated with the Nazis.

*Are you a bigot?*

Yes, I'm bigoted against bigots and other ignoramuses—and that's a lot of people in this country.

*Why didn't you sue Commissioner Gatling personally?*

Because I think she's hot.

Facts

### **The Ku Klux Klan Mindset of the N.Y.C. Commission on Human Rights**

Suing in the N.Y. Supreme Court (13-100299) the N.Y.C. Commission on Human Rights and the Commission's Executive Director of Law Enforcement—Carlos Velez for discriminating against me because I'm a Euro-American of protestant ancestry, a divorced husband who has nothing good to say about his ex-wife, and is uppity for expressing ideas of which Velez and the effete eastern white washed elite disapproves.

The Commission has the same type of mindset as the Ku Klux Klan in the Deep South in another century. Just reverse the color and groups it's bigoted against. They cannot act by personal whim no matter what superficially defined group they belong to or what comeuppance they believe members of other groups deserve. Two wrongs don't make a right, or they didn't use to.

The Commission issued an *Order* that dismissed Den Hollander's age discrimination complaint against the nightclub Amnesia.

Amnesia refused to admit Den Hollander and his attorney friend, a former Democratic State Committeeman, unless they bought a \$350 bottle of watered down, brandless vodka. They declined.

Den Hollander went to the Commission to file an age-discrimination complaint. The head of law enforcement at the Commission, Carlos Velez, refused to accept Den Hollander's complaint by claiming there was no discrimination because had Den Hollander and his friend agreed to buy a \$350 bottle, they could have entered. Duh, that can't be right;

otherwise, years ago in the Deep South it would have been okay to require people with relatively darker skin color to enter a public bus so long as they sat in the back. The U.S. Supreme Court kicked that looney-tune reasoning out of the law in *Browder v. Gayle*, 352 U.S. 903 (1956).

The U.S. Supreme Court also said that a discrimination injury can be the existence of a “barrier [read \$350 bottle of watered down brandless vodka] that makes it more difficult for members of one group [read older guys] to obtain a benefit [read chasing young ladies] than it is for members of another group [read younger guys].” *Northeastern Fla. Chapter, Associated Gen. Contractors of America v. Jacksonville*, 508 U.S. 656, 666 (1993).

Municipalities and officials acting under color of law are supposed to be blind, not just to race (true there has not been another hominid race on this planet since the Neanderthals died out, although some apparently still linger in the government), but to ancestry and to a person’s beliefs and speech.

A letter to the Commissioner forced Velez to accept the case but didn’t reign in his prejudice that colored his investigation, reasoning, and *Order*. Among the reasons for dismissing the age discrimination complaint Velez wrote:

“Complainant [Den Hollander] is a self-professed advocate for men’s rights who identifies himself as an ‘anti-feminist lawyer’ on his website, [www.roydenhollander.com](http://www.roydenhollander.com). He has filed a number of lawsuits against bars and clubs that have ‘Ladies Nights,’ and admits in several online publications that he is ‘bitter’ from an ex-wife who used him for his US citizenship and money. Complainant’s description of himself is consistent with his pattern of filing several gender discrimination suits.” *Velez Determination and Order*, Ex A. at p. Tres.

So what’s that got to do with an age-discrimination complaint? Sounds like the typical feminist and PCer tactic of discrediting someone by pegging them as a member of a currently disfavored group. In Den Hollander’s case, a member of the last remaining 200 men in this country willing to fight for their constitutional rights against the feminists and PCers. Although some think that 200 number is too high.

Specifically, City HR and Velez violated Den Hollander’s clearly established constitutional rights under the Fourteenth Amendment’s equal protection and substantive due process:

- a. Not to be discriminated against based on his ancestry, or national origin, which is a suspect classification under equal protection of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, *Graham v. Richardson*, 403 U.S. 365, 372 (1971);
- b. **To speak and write as he chooses provided such does not create an imminent danger of harm, such as yelling “bomb” in Times Square**, or defaming someone. *Terminiello v. Chicago*, 337 U.S. 1 (1949). Freedom of speech is a fundamental right under substantive due process of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment that along with equal protection protects speech from arbitrary municipal action intended to punish it;
- c. **To petition a court for redress of grievances—even against the preferential treatment of females.** *NAACP v. Button*, 371 U.S. 415 (1963). Freedom of speech includes the right to file lawsuits, which is a fundamental right under substantive due

- process of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment that along with equal protection protects litigation from arbitrary municipal action intended to punish it; and
- d. **To marry or divorce as the heart, or stupidity, dictates and to express opinions about such**, which are fundamental rights under substantive due process of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment that along with equal protection protects such from arbitrary municipal action intended to punish it. *Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1 (1967).

### Euro-American.

The name “Den Hollander,” which means “the Dutchman,” and photographs of him on his website, which Velez refers to in his *Order*, at p. Tres, brand Den Hollander as belonging to that currently disfavored group—Euro-American males. (For some reason, Velez failed to put page numbers on his *Order*, so Den Hollander has supplied them for citation purposes in the *de facto* second, soon became the first language of America, *see Ex. A, Order*).

Den Hollander also considered accusing Velez of violating the Fourteenth Amendment by discriminating based on color, since Den Hollander is “white,” when not using the micro-wave tanning salon down the street, and Velez is of a darker complexion, according to his Internet photo, assuming the f-stop was correct. But since Den Hollander lives in one of the few remaining *de facto* communist territories on the planet—Manhattan, and many, but not all, of the judges here are lefties, feminists, and political correctionalists who will use any Orwellian argument to further their ideology, he assumed it not so far-fetch that they would rule “white” not a color but an absence of color, so no illegal discrimination based on the superficial characteristic of color.

### Anti-feminist litigation and speech

Discrimination against my right to file lawsuits to fight for the rights I foolishly thought the U.S. Constitution guaranteed me. *NAACP v. Button*, 371 U.S. 415, 429 (1963).

Velez discriminated against Den Hollander for being an “anti-feminist lawyer”—assuming he’s just referring to the “anti-feminist” part and not the “lawyer” part. Such is prohibited by the Constitution, and is the same tactic so commonly used throughout history by small minded conformists and two-bit totalitarians: justify violating human rights because an individual does not believe, speak, or act as “right minded” people do, or in this case “left minded,” and therefore he belongs to a disfavored group. In Den Hollander’s case, one of the last remaining 200 Euro-American men, or perhaps more accurately African-American men, in this country who are willing to fight the feminists and political correctionalists efforts to impose their own brand of totalitarianism.

Whoa! “Totalitarianism” is a strong term. But according to the late Professor Howard Zinn, “To exalt as an absolute is the mark of totalitarianism, and it is possible to have an atmosphere of totalitarianism in a society that has many of the attributes of democracy.” Believing that a particular political ideology is “correct” is as nuts as believing a particular religion is the “true” religion—look at the carnage that caused throughout history.

Bigotry is evident in Velez ruling that “[Den Hollander’s] description of himself [an anti-feminist] is consistent with his pattern of filing several gender discrimination suits.” Den Hollander pleads guilty, but so what? Is Velez actually saying that any person or organization that sues in court for human rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution can be summarily discriminated against because they brought prior suits? By that reasoning, had Velez been on the U.S. Supreme Court in 1954, he would have ruled against the NAACP in *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483, because the NAACP had a history of fighting in the courts for human rights. Would Velez rule the same way on actions brought by the National Council of LaRaza? Not likely, but consistency rather than arbitrary decision making driven by prejudices would require that LaRaza lose before Judge Velez.

While Velez’s disapproval of Den Hollander’s jihada against the Feminists (that’s jihad with an “a”—wouldn’t want to be accused of gender insensitivity) is irrelevant to the age discrimination complaint filed with the City HR, it makes clear that Velez’s disapproval of Den Hollander exercising his First Amendment rights is also driven by his effort to curry favor with the Feminist Establishment, a.k.a. “Feminarchy America,” by adding to his reasons for ruling against Den Hollander the classification that Den Hollander is an “anti-feminist.”

The Establishment today is a Feminist Establishment—a unitary belief system held by enough influential persons so that it dominates over other beliefs in this society, such as the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Velez and City HR, like so many self-righteous government officials today, believe America is now a country similar to the former Soviet Union where legal decisions should be made based on whether a person subscribes to the popular, trendy ideology of the day. Those who dissent are not disserving of the rule of law because they are so inferior to the “in crowd,” or the effete, Eastern, intellectual, white-washed elite that they have no rights for the law to protect.

Today, all that is needed to justify the stripping of a man’s rights is to label him an “advocate for men’s rights” or “anti-feminist.” In the 1950s, the label was “fellow traveler” or “commie sympathizer.”

### Marriage Right

Velez writes, “[Den Hollander] admits in several online publications that he is ‘bitter’ from an ex-wife who used him for his US citizenship and money.” That’s an understatement! The ex-wife—a Russian mafia prostitute, former mistress to a Chechen warlord, self-proclaimed black-magic witch, and devotee of the anti-Christ—secretly fed Den Hollander drugs so that he would believe the euphoria he experienced in her presence was the delusion of love—that’s as a noun not a verb.

Thanks to the perversion of state domestic relations laws by the Feminists, the Queens Family Court issued an *ex parte* temporary order of protection against Den Hollander based on perjury by his ex-wife, except for the part of Den Hollander bruising her arm by using a little martial arts to disarm her wheedling an oversized steak knife in an effort to slice him into a steak sandwich. Her perjury left out the stuff about the knife—naturally. That protection order still results in U.S.

Customs detaining Den Hollander when he re-enters the country even though the order was dismissed long ago. Perhaps he should resort to entering the land of his birth with the other illegals.

Okay, so Velez got something right, Den Hollander is “bitter” toward his ex-wife and her feminist allies, but what does that have to do with an age-discrimination complaint against a New York City nightclub? Nothing, but it has everything to do with showing that Velez is bigoted toward Den Hollander for who he is, what he believes, and what he says.

### Relief

Den Hollander, therefore, requests that this Court under CPLR 7806 order the City of New York to have its Human Rights Commission implement in its operations anti-discrimination policies that prevent unlawful discriminatory acts by its employees against Euro-Americans of protestant origin, divorced husbands, and any man who chooses to fight for his rights by suing or otherwise petitioning the government for a redress of grievances.

In addition under CPLR 7806, the City require the Executive Director for Law Enforcement of its Human Rights Commission be required to undergo sensitivity training to mitigate or at least enable him to control his prejudice toward Euro-Americans of protestant ancestry, divorced husbands, and men who choose to fight for their rights by suing or petitioning the government for a redress of grievances.

### State Court Decision

The State Court dismissed the Article 78 complaint against City HR saying that

1. Because Den Hollander complained to the State Human Rights Division for sex discrimination, he could not complain to City HR about age discrimination even though the State said it appeared to be age-discrimination and the State does not have jurisdiction over age discrimination by nightclubs.

“Based on observations made during the field visit, the vast majority of the patrons of the nightclub appeared to be under the age of 30 years. Respondent asserts that, when the nightclub is crowded, respondent employs an admissions strategy to limit the number of individuals, male and female, who do not have the appearance respondent desires to maintain the image of the nightclub. A photo on complainant's website suggests that he is significantly older than respondent's patrons, and age discrimination is beyond the jurisdiction of the Division with regard to public accommodation.”

A proper analogy of what really occurred in this case is the following: Let's assume City HR's investigator, Velez, steps into a British telephone booth and ends up in Atlanta, Georgia in front of the Pickrick Restaurant in 1964. Hungary after his time travel, he tries to enter the restaurant but is met by Lester Maddox brandishing an axe handle. Maddox, an avowed bigot toward people with darker skin color and those he thinks are aliens (foreigners) refuses to admit Velez. Does Velez have one cause of action, one grievance, against Maddox or two? There's only one

fact situation, but he has two causes of action because Maddox discriminated against him on the basis of color and alienage.

If Georgia in 1964 had the same laws as New York State in 2010, and Velez filed a complaint for color discrimination with Georgia's division of human rights and it dismissed the complaint but indicated the discrimination was based on alienage instead, over which it had no jurisdiction just like the N.Y. State Division of Human Rights, under Braman and Velez's definition of "grievance" as the fact situation itself, Velez could not file a complaint with Atlanta's human rights commission. He's out of luck and the bigots win. Such, however, is not the law.

2. It was okay for Amnesia to discriminate in order to further the club's younger image and because there was limited space inside the club.

Public lunch counters in the Deep South during the 1960s also admitted only those who furthered their image—white. But in doing so, they violated the rights of others. If Amnesia wanted the right to admit only persons that fit its image, then it should have acquired a membership club liquor license rather than one for a public accommodation.

The "limited space" rationale is contradicted by one of an Internet blog. "Kelly R. Paris France" entered Amnesia minutes before Petitioner and his friend were barred. Inside, she found the place not crowded, which means the Court's argument that I and my friend were required to buy a bottle because the club was crowded is false.

3. The Commission's Director of Law Enforcement Carlos Velez conducted a sufficient investigation even though it was a "desk-chair" or "desktop" investigation.

The Commission instead relies on two Internet blogs as evidence that Amnesia not only required the Petitioner and his friend to buy a \$350 bottle in order to enter but required the younger patrons to buy a bottle as well. The problem with the blogs is that they do not even concern the same date and incident in which I and my friend were discriminated against.

The State Court did not know whether the two bloggers were who they claimed to be, were sober enough that their perceptions and memories were accurate or were even at Amnesia.

The State Court credits City HR for trying to obtain a silent video from the night of the discrimination, but what would it have shown. Young people approach the doorman and are allowed in. We approach the doorman and step aside. There's no audio, so indication what was said.

Also Velez

- did not interview witnesses,
- did not issue interrogatories,
- did not obtain authenticated documents,
- did not make any telephone logs, which indicates he made no telephone calls, except perhaps to Amnesia's attorney,

- did not try to contact a potential witness, attorney Robert M. Ginsberg, who was with Petitioner on the night of the discrimination, which amounted to denying Petitioner a “full and fair opportunity” to present his claims, *Stern v. N.Y.C. Comm’n Human Rights*, 38 A.D.3d 302, 302 (1st Dep’t 2007),
- did no more than send a letter to Amnesia addressed to the doorman ‘David,’ which was returned as undeliverable,
- did not try to contact anyone familiar with Amnesia’s admission policy,
- did not try to contact anyone at Amnesia who witnessed the discrimination even though there were two bouncers standing next to the doorman,

4. That Velez’ failure to follow City HR procedure is not a violation of procedural due process rights--wrong.

“[N]ot properly conducting an investigation in accordance with the [agency’s] procedures would mean [it] did not afford sufficient process . . . .” *Rosu v. The City of New York*, 2012 U.S. Dist. 178875 \*14 (S.D.N.Y. 2012).

### Rights

Look, I’m a lawyer. If I get through the day without someone insulting me or threatening me, then I figure I missed an appointment.

People can call me anything they want. It’ll just make me fight harder for my rights.

The only people who are critical about you fighting for your rights are the ones who are trying to get something by violating those rights.

### Chasing young skirts

I only do what Mother Nature tells me to.

So I’m looking for the daughter I never had.

### Age

I thought it was your attitude and not the number of year.