

GOD'S BOOK, ADVANCING LAW AND LIFE  
(LAW BOOK, 1992..., AUTHOR: GOD)  
1992... DOCTORAL LAW WORK

1(a)

GOD'S COURT  
1993

HONORABLE HOLINESS GOD  
(Judge of God's Court)  
President Joseph Mallon  
Prayer

93:1-15

v.

Dreamers of 93:1-15  
Dreamer

---

JUDGMENT

There has, through the past over 2 years now, been cases coming up to me because of the United States legal system malfunctioning and, thus, not providing its services needed by and supported by the much advanced U.S. society. Two such cases are *Mallon v. United States*, G.Ct. (1991), and *U.S. Citizens v. United States*, G.Ct. (1991). Both cases entailed and provided much authority and, plus, were always within United States law, too, because of the U.S. Constitution's amendments 9 and 10 invoking jurisdiction. Now, I am presented with a slew of these types of cases, 15 in total, of which this instant case is one.

Each case, and this case included, involved and went up to the level of the Supreme Court of the United States. Without proper judicial functioning or results, there was then no further U.S. Court to go to for appropriate, necessary, and right judicial service or action. The correct Court next was this one, God's Court. Therefore, I do take on this job, and my judgment is the following.

There is present a United States Constitution article III valid case with controversy requiring a factual conclusion beyond mere illusory, which provides no tangible relief or balances, *Aetna Life Ins. Co. v. Haworth*, 57 S.Ct. 461 (1937). The evidence is abundant and is admissible because it is legally and factually sufficient, *United States v. Kroop*, 34 M.J. 628 (AFCMR 1992), [Evidence sufficient is admissible]; *United States v. Schneider*, 34 M.J. 639 (ACMR 1992), [Legal and factual sufficiency]; *United States v. Kirks*, 34 M.J. 646 (ACMR 1992), [Legal and factual sufficiency of evidence]; *United States v. Branoff*, 34 M.J. 612 (AFCMR 1992), [Legal and factual sufficiency]; *United States v. Whitcomb*, 34 M.J. 984 (ACMR 1992), [Legal and factual sufficiency of evidence]; *United States v. Whitaker*, 34 M.J. 822 (AFCMR 1992), [Evidence sufficient is admissible]. The prosecutor is of good moral character so has rights to and must get full consideration and favor in all ways, *United States*

*v. Tippy*, 25 M.J. 121 (CMA 1987), [Evidence of good moral character could be sufficient for favorable evidence]; *United States v. Tipton*, 34 M.J. 1153 (ACMR 1992), [Good character is admissible evidence and could be sufficient for favorable decision, and also dealt with legal and factual sufficiency]. All of the prosecution's statements are backed by evidence, *United States v. Yeoman*, 25 M.J. 1 (CMA 1987), [Evidence corroborating statements—testimony].

The prosecutor is proven to be seeking justice legally so has full rights and authority here, and must continue getting in all regards, a prosecutor's, and judge's, rights, privileges, and immunities, *Imbler v. Pachtman*, 424 U.S. 409 (1976). The prosecutor's side of the case is overwhelmingly abundant in positive, legal, factual, and successful ways as compared to the opposite of that, which is the reality of the other side. Therefore, the prosecution has all the merits and, thus, must receive the judgment, *Elrod v. Burns*, 427 U.S. 507, 100 S.Ct. 2673, 49 L.Ed.2d 547 (1976); *Branti v. Finkel*, 445 U.S. 507, 100 S.Ct. 287, 63 L.Ed.2d 574 (1980) [*Elrod* and *Branti*, concerning the doctrine of the successful party being rewarded and this being a constitutionally sound doctrine]. There is an extreme amount of authority supporting the prosecution, *Mallon v. United States*, G.Ct. (1991); *U.S. Citizens v. United States*, G.Ct. (1991); U.S. Constitution amendments 9 and 10, World Constitution; 18 U.S.C. 700, 3 U.S.C. 101-103, 105, 107-110, and 112; Iraq War; Law Books and U.S. Presidential Books; God's Miracle Cross, United States Flag with God's Miracle Cross on it, and God's United States Presidency.

The decision of this Court is, as it must necessarily be, in favor of the prosecutor. Therefore, the judgment is to the prosecution (Prayer).

The prosecuted (Dreamer) is guilty. The prosecuted outrageously and illegally committed the crimes charged against the prosecuted. Such crimes include (1) Freedom of Speech violations, (2) Tyranny, (3) Oppression, (4) Treason, (5) Capricious Disregard, (6) Gross Negligence, (7) Contempt, (8) Malpractice, (9) American Flag desecration, (10) Fraud, (11) Non-performance of Duties, and (12) Violations of the Law of Nations. This Court hereby adopts all the prosecution's work as binding law and authority over all lower Courts of law and their jurisdictions. This law is to be known and dealt with as being law over the Supreme Court of the United States and all of the United States and its government and with all various divisions, offices, and branches included. The prosecution's work, this judgment, and all involved with this law, must always be properly regarded, dealt with right, respected, and honored.

All or anything contrary to this law is invalid. In any discrepancy or controversy concerning this law, the contesting party has the burden of proof. This case's prosecutorial work is to be known as being fact and fully admitted to by the prosecuted. All of the prosecution's work in briefs, memos, reports, petitions, and books, etc. is affirmed by this Court and is to be known and worked with as being positive law that is to be affirmatively stated. The prosecuted (Dreamer) is legally bound within all terms of this law and is hereby **ordered** to immediately and continuing comply with this law, stay in full accord with this law, be fully knowledgeable of this law, and provide the full compensation required by this law.

An appropriate **ORDER** follows.

---

**ORDER**

The prosecuted, Dreamer, is on this day of Saturday, April 3, 1993, ordered to (1) immediately and continuing comply with this case's law; (2) stay in full accord with this law; (3) be fully knowledgeable of this law, and (4) provide the full compensation required by this law.

The prosecuted Dreamer is responsible and fully legally liable in all regards concerning the prosecuted Dreamer working out all aspects of compliance with this law.

\*\*\*\*\*

HONORABLE HOLINESS GOD  
(Judge of God's Court)  
President Joseph Mallon

Dated: Saturday, April 3, 1993

HONORABLE HOLINESS GOD  
(Judge of God's Court)  
President Joseph Mallon  
Prayer

v.

Dreamer(s)

1. United States (G.Ct. 93-1)
2. U.S. Dist. Ct. Judge Bartle (G.Ct. 93-2)
3. U.S. Attorney for the E. Dist. of Pa. (G.Ct. 93-3)
4. U.S. Dist. Ct. Judge Padova (G.Ct. 93-4)
5. Chrissie Hynde-Mallon (G.Ct. 93-5)
6. The Hyndes [Parents of Chrissie Hynde-Mallon] (G.Ct. 93-6)
7. Pretenders [Band] (G.Ct. 93-7)
8. Cheval Music (G.Ct. 93-8)
9. Philadelphia (G.Ct. 93-9)
10. Pennsylvania Real Estate Commission (G.Ct. 93-10)
11. Harvard Law School (G.Ct. 93-11)
12. People of England (G.Ct. 93-12)
13. U.S.A. (G.Ct. 93-13)
14. United States Presidency of George Bush (G.Ct. 93-14)
15. United States Government (G.Ct. 93-15)

Judge: Judge God  
HONORABLE HOLINESS GOD  
(Judge of God's Court)

President Joseph Mallon

## GOD'S BOOK, ADVANCING LAW AND LIFE

1992... DOCTORAL LAW WORK

1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, Eastern Pennsylvania  
 UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS, Third Circuit  
 SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
 GOD'S COURT

GOD  
 President  
 Joseph Mallon  
 Plaintiff/Appellant/Petitioner/Prayer

Action

v.

Dist. Ct. Case Number: 92-3242  
 Apls. Ct., 3rd Cir. Number: 92-1736  
 S.Ct. Number: 93-5183  
 G.Ct. Number: 93-0001

United States  
 Defendant/Appellee/Respondent/Dreamer  
 -----/

## COMPLAINT

I {GOD} (President) Joseph Mallon, the plaintiff, do hereby complain that the United States excessively committed (1) Tyranny, (2) Oppression, and (3) Treason. The defendant committed these injustices against me when because of duties, I had to do a lot of important work involving the United States. I did the work and, thus, fulfilled my duties. Through a substantial amount of time, though, the United States did not regard me, my work, or my communication, committed the stated charges, and hence, caused me extensive financial damage that I must be compensated for.

GOD  
 President  
 Joseph Mallon

Filed in U.S. Dist. Ct. of E.Pa.: June 4, 1992  
 Judged to Plaintiff (Appellant/Petitioner/Prayer)  
 in God's Court in April 1993

# **Mallon v. Padova, 806 F. Supp. 1186 (E.D. Pa. 1992)**

**U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania - 806 F. Supp. 1186  
(E.D. Pa. 1992)  
October 26, 1992**

---

**806 F. Supp. 1186 (1992)  
Joseph MALLON, God  
v.  
Honorable John R. PADOVA.  
Joseph MALLON, God  
v.  
HARVARD LAW SCHOOL.  
Joseph MALLON, God  
v.  
PHILADELPHIA.  
Joseph MALLON, God  
v.  
PENNSYLVANIA REAL ESTATE.  
Joseph MALLON, God  
v.  
PRETENDERS.  
Joseph MALLON, God  
v.  
CHEVAL MUSIC.  
Joseph MALLON, God  
v.  
UNITED STATES PRESIDENCY OF GEORGE BUSH.  
Joseph MALLON, God  
v.  
The HYNDES.  
Joseph MALLON, God  
v.  
The PEOPLE OF ENGLAND.  
Joseph MALLON, God  
v.  
Chrissie (Hynde) MALLON.**

**Joseph MALLON, God  
v.  
UNITED STATES.**

Civ. A. Nos. 92-5825, 92-5885 to 92-5887, 92-5889, 92-5890, 92-5982, 92-5891 to 92-5893 and 92-5981.

**United States District Court, E.D. Pennsylvania.**

October 26, 1992.

\*1187 Herbert G. Keene, Stradley, Ronon, Stevens & Young, Philadelphia, Pa., for U.S. Presidency of God.

Joseph Mallon, pro se.

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

ROBRENO, District Judge.

Joseph Mallon, who purports to be God and the President of the United States ("Mallon"), has filed fourteen lawsuits in this Court, eleven of which are still pending.

# **Mallon v. Padova, 806 F. Supp. 1189 (E.D. Pa. 1992)**

**U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania - 806 F. Supp. 1189  
(E.D. Pa. 1992)  
November 17, 1992**

---

**806 F. Supp. 1189 (1992)  
Joseph MALLON, God,  
v.  
Honorable John R. PADOVA.  
Joseph MALLON, God,  
v.  
HARVARD LAW SCHOOL.  
Joseph MALLON, God,  
v.  
PHILADELPHIA.  
Joseph MALLON, God,  
v.  
PENNSYLVANIA REAL ESTATE COMMISSION.  
Joseph MALLON, God,  
v.  
PRETENDERS.  
Joseph MALLON, God,  
v.  
CHEVAL MUSIC.  
Joseph MALLON, God,  
v.  
UNITED STATES PRESIDENCY of GEORGE BUSH.  
Joseph MALLON, God,  
v.  
The HYNDES.  
Joseph MALLON, God,  
v.  
THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND.  
Joseph MALLON, God,  
v.  
Chrissie (Hynde) MALLON.**

**Joseph MALLON, God,  
v.  
UNITED STATES.**

Civ. A. Nos. 92-5825, 92-5885 to 92-5887, 92-5889, 92-5890, 92-5982, 92-5891 to 92-5893 and 92-5981.

**United States District Court, E.D. Pennsylvania.**

November 17, 1992.

**\*1190** Joseph Mallon, pro se.

Herbert G. Keene, Stradley, Ronon, Stevens & Young, Philadelphia, Pa., for U.S. Presidency of God.

**MEMORANDUM**

ROBRENO, District Judge.

[11] Needless to say, the injunction imposed today will be dissolved in the event that Mr. Mallon, upon application to this Court, can demonstrate, some time in the future, a change in circumstances sufficient to justify such a dissolution.

GOD’S BOOK, ADVANCING LAW AND LIFE

1992... DOCTORAL LAW WORK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, Eastern Pennsylvania  
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS, Third Circuit  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
GOD'S COURT

GOD  
President  
Joseph Mallon  
Plaintiff/Appellant/Petitioner/Prayer

Action

v.

Dist. Ct. Case Number: 92-3242  
Apls. Ct., 3rd Cir. Number: 92-1736  
S.Ct. Number: 93-5183  
G.Ct. Number: 93-0001

United States  
Defendant/Appellee/Respondent/Dreamer  
-----/

## INVOLVEMENT OF PHILADELPHIA RE-EMPHASIS

I, the plaintiff, do hereby re-emphasize that Philadelphia is involved with the *Mallon v. United States* law case and does have to deal with the important matters of the case and does have to produce results. The authority I will use here as even more appropriate binding authority that is applicable concerning Philadelphia is William Penn's prayer (Date stated: 1864) that deals with Philadelphia and that is engraved on a plaque at City Hall in Philadelphia.

## WILLIAM PENN'S PRAYER FOR PHILADELPHIA

...AND THOU \* PHILADELPHIA \* THE VIRGIN  
 SETTLEMENT OF THIS PROVINCE \* NAMED BEFORE  
 THOU WERT BORN \* WHAT LOVE \* WHAT CARE \* WHAT  
 SERVICE \* AND WHAT TRAVAIL HAVE THERE BEEN TO  
 BRING THEE FORTH AND PRESERVE THEE FROM SUCH  
 AS WOULD ABUSE AND DEFILE THEE. O THAT THOU  
 MAYEST BE KEPT FROM THE EVIL THAT WOULD  
 OVERWHELM THEE \* THAT FAITHFUL TO THE GOD OF  
 THY MERCIES \* IN THE LIFE OF RIGHTEOUSNESS \*  
 THOU MAYEST BE PRESERVED TO THE END. MY SOUL  
 PRAYS TO GOD FOR THEE \* THAT THOU MAYEST STAND  
 IN THE DAY OF TRIAL \* THAT THY CHILDREN MAY BE  
 BLEST OF THE LORD \* AND THY PEOPLE SAVED BY  
 HIS POWER \* \* \* \*

Therefore, I re-emphasize that Philadelphia is involved with the *Mallon v. United States* law case and does have to comply with the law, deal with the case, and produce results that are solid and add to progress.

GOD  
President  
Joseph Mallon

Dated: Thursday, August 27, 1992

Type of Work: Visual Material

Registration Number / Date:

VAu000453445 / 1999-02-10

Title: God's miracle cross with heart and angel wings.

Description: Drawing.

Copyright Claimant:

God, President Joseph Mallon, 1961-

Date of Creation: 1998

Copyright Note: C.O. correspondence.

Names: Mallon, God, President Joseph, 1961-

---

# **Mallon v. Padova, 806 F. Supp. 1189 (E.D. Pa. 1992)**

**U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania - 806 F. Supp. 1189  
(E.D. Pa. 1992)  
November 17, 1992**

---

**806 F. Supp. 1189 (1992)  
Joseph MALLON, God,  
v.  
Honorable John R. PADOVA.  
Joseph MALLON, God,  
v.  
HARVARD LAW SCHOOL.  
Joseph MALLON, God,  
v.  
PHILADELPHIA.  
Joseph MALLON, God,  
v.  
PENNSYLVANIA REAL ESTATE COMMISSION.  
Joseph MALLON, God,  
v.  
PRETENDERS.  
Joseph MALLON, God,  
v.  
CHEVAL MUSIC.  
Joseph MALLON, God,  
v.  
UNITED STATES PRESIDENCY of GEORGE BUSH.  
Joseph MALLON, God,  
v.  
The HYNDES.  
Joseph MALLON, God,  
v.  
THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND.  
Joseph MALLON, God,  
v.  
Chrissie (Hynde) MALLON.**

**Joseph MALLON, God,  
v.  
UNITED STATES.**

Civ. A. Nos. 92-5825, 92-5885 to 92-5887, 92-5889, 92-5890, 92-5982, 92-5891 to 92-5893 and 92-5981.

**United States District Court, E.D. Pennsylvania.**

November 17, 1992.

\***1190** Joseph Mallon, pro se.

Herbert G. Keene, Stradley, Ronon, Stevens & Young, Philadelphia, Pa., for U.S. Presidency of God.

## **MEMORANDUM**

ROBRENO, District Judge.

Presently before me are eleven separate complaints filed by Mr. Joseph Mallon.

### **I. BACKGROUND**

Mr. Mallon, acting *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed the eleven complaints now before me during a period from October 8, 1992 to October 16, 1992.<sup>[1]</sup> After reviewing \***1191** the complaints and various other materials submitted to the Court by Mr. Mallon in connection with these lawsuits, I issued a temporary restraining order ("TRO") on October 26, 1992, [806 F. Supp. 1186](#).

That same date, I also scheduled a hearing for November 3, 1992... Finally, on that same date I appointed Mr. Herbert G. Keene, Jr., Esquire, of the law firm of Stradley, Ronon, Stevens & Young, to represent Mr. Mallon's interests on the question.

Mr. Keene and Mr. Mallon appeared at the November 3, 1992 hearing, and the Court heard argument from both. Mr. Mallon also submitted various exhibits for the Court's review.

### **II. DISCUSSION**

#### **A.**

The Court will... each of the eleven complaints now pending. I attach hereto an Appendix describing each of the eleven cases. A review of the case descriptions in the

Appendix demonstrates the clear ... of Mr. Mallon's actions; for purposes of this Memorandum, a summary will suffice.

Summarizing Mr. Mallon's complaints is difficult because there is common factual thread running between them. A few general themes, however, can be detected. Mr. Mallon signs most of his complaints as "Honor Holiness God (Judge of God's Court) President Joseph Mallon." He \*1192 claims to be the "possessor" of "a valid U.S. Presidency" and that various entities have refused to "regard" his presidency. He also states that he owns "God's Holy Cross," and makes frequent references to it throughout his pleadings. Mr. Mallon also claims that God's Holy Cross should be on the American flag, and has attached to several pleadings what appears to be a color photocopy of a picture of an American flag with a cross on it.

Most, if not all, of the complaints involve an entity that has not "dealt with" or "regarded" Mr. Mallon. It appears as if Mr. Mallon has previously sent many of the defendants various communications, and that the defendants have ignored them. Mr. Mallon, for example, has sued Harvard Law School, claiming that various communications that he has written to Harvard were sent back. Mr. Mallon claims that he has performed various other unspecified "law work" that Harvard "has a duty to deal with...."<sup>[3]</sup> In another suit, Mr. Mallon has sued Ms. Chrissie Hynde, a well known rock music performer and leader of the rock band called "The Pretenders." Mr. Mallon alleges that Ms. Hynde is his wife, and he brings claims against her on the grounds that she doesn't "communicate" with him, that she is "too far away," and that she is not "doing her part." Mallon has also sued, in separate actions, The Pretenders and Ms. Hynde's parents, claiming, *inter alia*, that they did not "deal with" communications from Mr. Mallon. Other defendants sued by Mr. Mallon include the President of the United States and "the People of England." In connection with his various complaints, Mr. Mallon has also submitted various "songs" that he has written, as well as assorted essay-type documents such as "President Joseph Mallon's Wednesday, August 7, 1991 Presidential Speech Dealing With Marijuana and Drugs," "President Joseph Mallon's Monday, September 16, 1991 Presidential Speech Dealing With Important Music Matters," "President Joseph Mallon's Wednesday, October 16, 1991 Presidential Speech Dealing With Rock and Roll," and "Some Dreams I, GOD, President Joseph Mallon, Had Involving My Wife, Chrissie (Hynde) Mallon."

Suffice it to say that the complaints are ... merit. A complaint may be...

## B.

Mr. Mallon's appointed counsel<sup>[6]</sup> sets forth three significant arguments...

..... Mr. Mallon has filed fourteen ... lawsuits in this Court in the span of five months. See note 1, *supra*. In connection with one of those suits, Mr. Mallon made approximately sixty separate filings... The eleven cases now before me were filed during an eight day period. Mr. Mallon has filed a multitude of ... pleadings in these eleven cases. Many of these pleadings were submitted even after the entry... Although

these pleadings are technically not in contravention... because they did not purport to initiate new actions, that Mr. Mallon found it necessary to submit so many ... documents leads the Court to conclude...that future... The fact that Mr. Mallon sued Judge Bartle for dismissing his case against the United States, and has now sued Judge Padova for dismissing Mr. Mallon's case against Judge Bartle, further confirms Mr. Mallon's litigious propensities.<sup>[9]</sup>

Dismissal under § 1915(d) is an inadequate solution in situations such as that now presented. As the Third Circuit has stated:

### III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court finds ... the complaints at issue...

### ORDER

AND NOW, TO WIT, this 17th day of November, 1992, IT IS ORDERED that:

### APPENDIX

92-5825 *Mallon v. Judge Padova*. Mr. Mallon alleges that Judge Padova "dismissed [Mallon's] complaint without [Mallon] getting a chance to say anything about it." He claims that Judge Padova was "not regarding my serious and factual statements" and dismissed the complaint without "freedom of speech" and "due process."

92-5885 *Mallon v. Harvard Law School*. Mr. Mallon makes ... references to certain "law work" that he has done, and says that Harvard has a duty to deal with his law work. He claims to have written a law book that Harvard is somehow ignoring. He also states that he attended law school at one point, and that various work needs to be done concerning his "lawyer's license."

92-5886 *Mallon v. Philadelphia*. Mr. Mallon claims that the City has not dealt with his God's Miracle Cross, and that it didn't respond to his February, 1984 communication to the City. He claims that the Mayor did not properly earn his position. He claims that the City caused property in Philadelphia "to be regarded as not belonging to plaintiff." He also claims that the 1991 mayoral election was invalid.

92-5887 *Mallon v. Pennsylvania Real Estate Commission*. Mr. Mallon says that he sent reports of "valuable real estate" to the Commission, but that it has failed to deal with the reports appropriately. He states that in March of 1985, a representative of the Commission visited the property, but didn't grant him the relief he wanted. It's not clear whether Mr. Mallon is or was the owner of the property that he is referring to. Mr. Mallon also says that the Commission is somehow interfering with his valid real estate license.

92-5889 *Mallon v. The Pretenders*. Mr. Mallon claims that the Pretenders did not "deal with" a communication to them. He also claims they injured him by moving to England.

92-5890 *Mallon v. Cheval Music*. Defendant allegedly "misdealt" with important communications. Mr. Mallon states: "The person who the communication was specifically to, a famous celebrity, did not even once communicate back to the plaintiff in regard to any aspect of any of the very important communication sent to the defendant acting as the celebrity's agent and sole source of reasonable communication. ..."

92-5891 *Mallon v. The Hyndes [Parents of Chrissie [Hynde] Mallon]*. Mr. Mallon has sued the parents of Chrissie Hynde, alleging that they "cut off all postal service communication and telephone communication from me to Akron, Ohio," and also England, where Chrissie Hynde was residing. He says that he wrote a book that he sent to "his wife" by way of Akron, but that the book was sent back without "being dealt with."

92-5892 *Mallon v. People of England*. Mr. Mallon says that the people of England "were outrageously unreasonable and caused a very bad situation" and that they "excessively did not deal with anything pertaining to me when there was a lot that had to be and was supposed to be dealt with." He says \*1197 they were involved with terrorism and showed no "reasonableness."

92-5893 *Mallon v. Chrissie (Hynde) Mallon*. Mr. Mallon alleges that Ms. Hynde is his wife, and that she has failed to deal with him. He says that Hynde is "not doing her part," that she is "too far away," and that she "didn't communicate" with him. He states that "I demand all that she is, and has, as a very minimum of at least that, and plus, I demand my children from her, too; in other words, I demand as compensation, all of my wife's and our my children's possessions, life, and even rights, and I have to own and possess all that is of my wife and children."

92-5981 *Mallon v. United States*. Mr. Mallon claims that the United States has failed to deal with him. He states that the recent presidential debates "caused me damage because instead of me being dealt with, I was still left out in the middle of nowhere...." He says he must be dealt with because of, among other things, his United States Presidency, his "law work," and his law cases in this Court.

92-5982 *Mallon v. United States Presidency of George Bush*. Mr. Mallon says that President Bush did not carry out his presidency properly, and that President Bush has not dealt with Mr. Mallon's U.S. presidency. He says the White House has not responded to his communication, and President Bush "has not been properly regarding the reality of my GOD'S MIRACLE CROSS and the fact of me being God." He also seeks to impeach President Bush, citing incidents involving taxes and the war in Kuwait.

## NOTES

[1] Mr. Mallon has filed three actions other than those now before me. The first, an action against the United States of America filed by Mr. Mallon on June 3, 1992 (Civil Action 92-3242), was dismissed by the Honorable Harvey Bartle, III on September 3, 1992 pursuant to the grant of a motion to dismiss the complaint. After that dismissal, Mr. Mallon filed one action against Judge Bartle and the United States District Court (Civil Action 92-5226), and a separate action against the United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania (92-5227). These latter actions were dismissed as frivolous by the Honorable John R. Padova on September 28, 1992. Mr. Mallon has appealed all three dismissals to the United States Third Circuit Court of Appeals. Those appeals are still pending. Additionally, it appears that some of the claims now before me were raised as part of Mr. Mallon's initial lawsuit against the United States. It is also worth noting that the docket reflects that Mr. Mallon made approximately sixty separate filings in connection with that initial lawsuit.

[2] Specifically, ... as follows:

.....

[9] Also relevant is the following colloquy that took place between the Court and Mr. Mallon at the November 3, 1992 hearing:

THE COURT: ... Are you planning to file any additional actions in this Court?

MR. MALLON: In regard to these matters involved?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MALLON: No. Something would have to happen to make that cause be necessary.

THE COURT: Such as what?

MR. MALLON: *Some kind of wrong that would justify a grounds for a law case.*

Transcript from November 3, 1992 Hearing, p. 26 (emphasis added). Given that the stated "grounds" in support of Mr. Mallon's existing actions ..., the Court has no reason to believe that Mr. Mallon will not continue to bring suit over whatever "wrong" he may perceive in the future based on similar... grounds.

.....

[11] Needless to say, the injunction imposed today will be dissolved in the event that Mr. Mallon, upon application to this Court, can demonstrate, some time in the future, a change in circumstances sufficient to justify such a dissolution.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Honorable Joseph Mallon, MBA

Plaintiff,

)Civil Action

)Number: 92-5825

v.

)92-5885, 92-5886,

)92-5887, 92-5889,

Honorable John R. Padova, United States District Court Judge, et al.

)92-5890, 92-5891,

)92-5892, 92-5893,

+ 10 others, including the United States

)92-5981, 92-5982

Defendant(s)

)

)Philadelphia,

)Pennsylvania

) November 3, 1992

) 10:00 a.m.

REVISED TRANSCRIPT OF CIVIL NONJURY TRIAL  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDGE IN THE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## INDEX

EXHIBITS

		Marked	Received
P-1	Paper filed by Mr. Mallon	8	30
P-6	Law research done by Mr. Mallon	10	30
P-7	Statements re: Mr. Mallon's counsel	10	30

I first said that the person named in my filings representing prosecution I made was present in the Court, and that was myself, whom was present in the court on that occasion. The reason I say prosecution here was because these legal issues concerned the United States, and consideration to me is valid in terms of active duty concerning the United States, so my work was the prosecution. I made the law cases. They were my law cases I made, and nothing contrary is valid at all. This view needs comprehension as the appropriate perspective. Understanding the material will then be possible.

I said the following about papers I submitted before this hearing.

\* I submitted the papers. I submitted these papers without the law maxims, but here the law maxims are included, so this was additionally filed.

\* The books I did not file. Upstairs, in the Appeals Court, Third Circuit, I filed the book, called, Advancing Law and Life. That case now in the Appeals Court was the original case. That case actually involved these parties—the defendants—that these other cases were made concerning. I had to appeal. There was only delay caused, so that is why I made the individual cases. Now, I say about this here in this document – do you want me to read it?

\* The document is four pages and...

\* The Court should regard, respect, and honor these law cases I made and each document I filed because these were cases necessary to be worked out. If I make a case, I had a lot of reasons why I made it. These were all matters requiring to be dealt with for years and worked on by me every day for the entire summer of 1992. Because of the delay, I had to keep on working and continued to do so through September 1992; that is the law cases.

\* I was in law school, and I wrote a book. I wanted the book work done.

\* I was in Widener University School of Law.

\* I did a lot of substantial work, and it was necessary for what I was actually involved with to be dealt with, to be actually worked with.

\* I could not continue there at the law school without that work done. I did my work and then made efforts to have that work dealt with.

\* That work dealing with my work was not done yet, and that includes there at the law school. I also substantially dealt with Harvard Law School. That is why one of the cases involves Harvard Law School. I made a judgment myself pertaining to Harvard Law School.

I answered about employment in the times.

\* I do have a job.

\* I just work at a research company, which is like a minimum wage type of job, which is far below my proper quality levels. The company is located in Philadelphia, and that is stated in my original documents I filed.

I said a statement about a paper I had with me.

\* I will give you this copy, because I have a copy of it on my computer.

\* I have a few other papers too.

I then described more.

\* Those papers I filed on the day I saw the order. I came in with those documents.

I questioned if marking the papers was good to do.

\* Do you want me to mark them?

I continued.

\* Exhibit Two and Three are documents that I submitted on the day that I saw the order. The time was before I actually knew that there was going to be this order there.

\* I left them documents on that day. The following day I submitted Exhibit Four, along with the first document I already submitted here, in regard to dealing with the order and the memorandum; no, actually dealing with the statement that there was a memorandum. I did not read the memorandum until a few days later. That was because of taking a while before I received the memorandum. This Exhibit Seven is just statements concerning my counsel. Exhibit Six is law research work I did on this case. Exhibit Five is just a statement saying that I did not file papers one day when it was not appropriate for me to do so. When I do file papers, it is only because it is appropriate and necessary.

I said a statement about not presently having more to say.

\* I have no more to say. Everything is all in my papers.

I made an objection to a negative allegation unfounded.

Later I said more relevant to the law cases I made to stop illegality happening in this jurisdiction and concerning this country.

\* Mainly, all my cases are appropriate. They are requiring to be worked out, and that is why I made them. They were involved with an original case that was delayed. That is why nothing was worked out, so I made individual law cases.

I was asked if I would file additional actions in this Court.

\* Actually, I did not want to. I want the original case worked out. That was the whole purpose.

\* I had important matters that had to be dealt with, such as a discovery, which is God's Miracle Cross. That is a discovery; it was the only one in this country, and I was with it myself. It involved other people and including the defendants of these cases. They would not regard anything, and they would not even communicate to me, but I had to keep on doing the work, including the work that was in their favor and in their best interests. I have rights to be appropriately regarded and dealt with by them, but they did not do that. I wanted the Court to facilitate the relationship – the communication and the business between the parties of my cases, and including myself.

I was questioned about believing the aspects involving my above average identity.

\* It is not a matter of belief. It is a matter of facts that have to be properly regarded and dealt with right. Why is because I am the discoverer of God's Miracle Cross. That was not put here by me. That was an actual miracle. That has to be worked on, and I have rights pertaining to it. That is what was involved with my cases.

I was asked if those cases were dismissed and are now on appeal.

\* The first one is such a case, the original one.

I then was asked about the 11 other cases I filed and said about the parties of those cases.

\* The other 11 cases were involving the parties that were involved with the first case.

I was then asked about this case involving the Federal Court judge.

\* I filed this case for the same reasons, for dismissing the case and not working the matters out.

I was asked about making more cases in this Court following this hearing and my appeals made in the Appeals Court.

\* In regard to these matters involved? No, something more would have to happen to make that cause be necessary, some kind of wrong that would justify a grounds for a law case.

The active Federal Court judge then asked me if I had been involved with litigation previously in the United States Courts.

\* I was in law school; I did law work.

\* That was a long time ago.

My age was questioned.

\* I am over 30 (and under 40).

\* I earned my law degrees and my lawyer's license.

\* I wanted that worked on.

\* I earned my law credentials by my books but no law school...worked on it yet.

\* That is why Harvard Law School...

I was asked about having a lawyer's license from the state (of Pennsylvania).

\* That is right; I do not have one, but I earned one.

\* That is why I wanted the law school to work on that, and that is why Harvard Law School is a party of one of these 11 cases and the original case.

\* That is why I came to the Court. Otherwise, I would not have. I was in law school, so I came to the Court. I was doing law work.

I was asked if I filed cases in any other courts, state courts or courts in any other countries.

\* I have filed cases in the U.S. Supreme Court.

The active Federal judge made a questioning statement about me filing cases in the U.S. Supreme Court, and I said, yeah, that is right.

\* Yeah, I made...

\* I sent a petition for an extraordinary writ. I sent that, but it just recently got there.

\* Also – let me tell you something about my documents. They are documents that are made by a person of proven qualifications. I mean that I write a book; I am proving that I earned my law degrees, for example, and I want the book worked on and dealt with in honoring ways, such as my law degrees being issued to me. There is a lot of money involved too, and I have rights to be paid money.

\* This having right to be paid money is what I am saying too.

\* I made a formal brief upstairs, in the higher Court. That was the first formal brief I ever made, and that was a successful accomplishment in itself and a lot of merits included. I made this petition to the Supreme Court of the United States. That was the first petition I ever made. Again, that is successful work to achieve. I am also proving, and did with my books and all involved with these cases, that I already earned a lot of rewards and honors such as law degrees and my lawyer's license and money.

They were my main points, and I have rights to security in law too, so that I am not detrimented in any way by any criminality or any kind of wrong.

The active federal judge asked me if I had anything additional I wanted to say.

\* No, they are my main points, and everything, including what I said and everything more, is what is on my papers and in my books.

\* Thanks. Oh, I did want to say...that my cross – God’s Miracle Cross, is patented, too; it is the only one in this country, and the design is patented, thus proving that the design is unique and is the only one in this country.

Re-Dated: February 14, 2016

Revised paraphrasing and direct quoting: Tuesday, August 4, 2009

Originally from: November 3, 1992

## References –

Mallon v. Padova (1992). Case opinion from the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. 806 F. Supp. 1189 (E.D. Pa. 1992). Retrieved from <http://law.justia.com/cases/federal/district-courts/FSupp/806/1186/1747649/>

Mallon v. Padova (1992). Case opinion from the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. 806 F. Supp. 1189 (E.D. Pa. 1992). Retrieved from <http://law.justia.com/cases/federal/district-courts/FSupp/806/1189/1747799/>

Mallon (2016). Law Work from the Old Files. *Mallon Law Legacy Archives* (1991-1993). Retrieved from Own Law Legacy Archives.