

Violence Against Women's Act Press Releases (Chronological order)

February 14, 2008

Federal lawsuit charges parts of the Violence Against Women Act are unconstitutional.

The unconstitutional sections of the Violence Against Women's Act create a fraudulent track to permanent U.S. residency and citizenship for alien wives or ex-wives of American husbands whenever the alien female alleges abuse. Once she mentions the magic words "battery," "extreme cruelty," or "overall pattern of violence," the Government institutes secret, "Star Chamber" immigration proceedings to determine whether the citizen husband abused her.

The Government almost always finds the man guilty and promptly grants the alien female permanent U.S. residency. The American husband or ex-husband receives no notice of the proceedings, has no opportunity to defend his name, cannot prevent the invasion of his privacy, and the Government's findings of abuse are based almost exclusively on what the alien female says. Not only is the husband presumed guilty, but he's not even allowed to prove differently. **The Government has taken the "he said" out of the proverbial "he said, she said."**

The feminist lobby created the VAWA sections in order to deter American men from looking overseas for wives—Sen. Joe Biden got it passed. The feminists didn't create VAWA out of bleeding hearts for alien wives but to intimidate American men into shopping at home for wives. If an American wife accuses her husband of abuse, he at least gets his day in court and the abuse should fit specific legal definitions. But under VAWA, a husband can be found guilty of "battery," "extreme cruelty," or an "overall pattern of violence" for anything from an "offensive" remark to felony assault.

Even terrorists have more rights than American men accused of abuse by their alien wives.

December 4, 2008

Men just don't count in the Federal District Court of New York.

In a December 3, 2008 decision, Federal Judge William Pauley III approved the U.S. Government's use of secret proceedings to find U.S. citizen husbands of alien wives guilty of battery. The proceedings are kept secret from only the husband, not the alien wives, various government officials or various Feminist groups.

In a slipshod opinion that reflects Judge Pauley III's effort to give men's rights the bum rush out of his court, he ignored the law and invented facts because of the ever present bureaucratic zeal to curry favor with the Feminists.

The case challenged the constitutionality of certain provisions of the Violence Against Women Act ("VAWA") that allow alien females to fraudulently gain U.S. citizenship by falsely accusing their U.S. husbands of battery. Under VAWA, the husband has no notice nor opportunity to refute the charges against him, the so-called evidence used for finding him guilty comes from his ex-wife, her immigration lawyer and feminist counselors. If by chance, the American man somehow gets evidence to the Government that shows his alien wife is lying, the evidence ends up in the garbage.

Judge Pauley III disdainfully brushed aside any concern for the rights of the husbands, which is common in the misandrist court of the Southern District of New York, to rule that such Nazi-like proceedings don't injure the husband. Think a minute—would you want the U.S. Government, listening only to your ex-wife, her lawyer and various feminists, to decide whether you committed felonies and misdemeanors against her. You know they are going to find you guilty because you're not there. The Government then promises that no harm will come to you because all its findings will be kept secret, except from your ex-wife, her lawyer, various

feminists, and local, state and federal law enforcement agencies. Oh, and by the way, if any of the Government's decisions about you committing crimes leaks to the general public, there is not a damn thing you can do—legally. There are no lawsuits or administrative proceedings you can bring to correct the false record or keep it from being published. To judges like William Pauley III, such are not injuries because they are injuries to males not females.

But there's something more important than Judge Pauley III's spinning of the law to favor feminists—ask yourself, does this Government process seem fair to you. “The heart of the matter is that democracy implies respect for the elementary rights of men, however suspect or unworthy those men may be; a democratic government must therefore practice fairness; and fairness can rarely be obtained by secret, one-sided determination of facts decisive of rights.” Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. McGrath, 341 U.S. 123, 170 (Frankfurter J., concurring)(1951).

Where's Felix Frankfurter when justice needs him?

February 13, 2009

Federal Court of Appeals trying to coerce lawyer into giving up on anti-feminist lawsuits.

Staff Counsel for the U.S. Second Circuit Court of Appeals, Stanley Bass, is using his power as a gatekeeper to the Court to prevent the appeal of two anti-feminist cases. The two cases challenge the denial of equal protection and other constitutional rights to men.

The Ladies' Nights case challenged as unconstitutional charging guys more for admission than ladies in NYC nightclubs. The Violence Against Women Act (“VAWA”) case charged violations of due process and equal protection by secret Federal Government proceedings in which American men are found to have committed felonies and misdemeanors against their alien wives so the wives can become permanent residents and citizens. The proceedings are kept

secret from only the husbands, not the alien wives, various government officials or various Feminist groups.

Mr. Bass, acting on behalf of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, (1) threatened that possible “sanctions” would be brought against attorney Roy Den Hollander if he pursued the appeals and “you [Den Hollander] may be subject to ... other disadvantageous action”; (2) tried to have a defendant in the Ladies’ Nights case pay Den Hollander monetary damages in return for dropping the case; (3) initially gave both appeals the same briefing schedule, which may end up as the final briefing schedule so as to assure Den Hollander, a sole-practitioner, doesn’t have enough time to adequately appeal both cases; and (4) engaged in the usual personal insults by saying Den Hollander was “remiss” in not suing in state court. Mr. Bass also called the cases “absurd” and “offensive”—I’ve heard that word before.

In addition, Mr. Bass says as to the VAWA case that the plaintiffs should not be allowed to “inject [themselves] into a proceeding where neither the claimant [alien wives] nor the agency [Immigration] welcomes [them].” Of course the American husbands aren’t welcome, since then it would be much harder for the Federal Government to find them responsible for felonies and misdemeanors against their alien wives.

The Second Circuit Court of Appeals, once the court of renown judges such as Learned Hand and Henry Friendly, has forgotten on this Valentine’s Day weekend: “The heart of the matter is that democracy implies respect for the elementary rights of men, however suspect or unworthy those men may be; a democratic government must therefore practice fairness; and fairness can rarely be obtained by secret, one-sided determination of facts decisive of rights.” Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. McGrath, 341 U.S. 123, 170 (Frankfurter J., concurring)(1951).