

Scott William Fanel
Reg. No. 04564-059
Federal Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 1000
Milan, MI 48160



04564-059

Rudy Davis
PO BOX 2088
Forney, TX 75126
United States

Scott William Faul
Reg. No. 04564-059
F.C.I. Milan
P.O. Box 1000
Milan, MI 48160

August 13, 2026

Rudy Davis
P.O. Box 2088
Forney, TX 75126

Dear Rudy,

I was waiting for some emails from you about information that Heather had discussed, and then it finally dawned on me that your email correspondence here was one time blocked. I looked at my list of approved contacts, and sure enough it lists your email access as "permanently blocked." However, Erin is not blocked, so perhaps she will be so kind to drop me a line or so.

I am enclosing 32 pages of my March 31, 2026 parole APPEAL which includes my DECLARATION OF SCOTT WILLIAM FAUL. That is now all out in the public, and so can be used however you please.

Thank you Rudy and Erin for your continuing support and prayers. Christ's enemies are already defeated as our Father promises. Bless you all.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Scott William Faul".

Scott William Faul

enc: 32 pages



APPEAL

U.S. Department of Justice
United States Parole Commission

Name Scott William Faul

Register No. 04564-059 Institution FCI Milan

I received a Notice of Action dated See below. and appeal that decision.

Scott William Faul
(Signature)

March 31, 2026
(Date)

INSTRUCTIONS:

Procedures. The appeal must be mailed to the Commission within 30 days from the date on the Notice of Action. The permissible grounds for appeal are described below. On page two of this form you must provide a brief summary of all the grounds for your appeal. On page three of this form you must provide a statement of the facts and reasons in support of each ground identified in your summary. Continuation pages are permitted for longer appeals. You may provide any additional information in an addendum to your appeal. The Commission may refuse to consider any appeal which does not follow this format. The appeal will be decided on the record, and you will be notified of the Commission's decision through a Notice of Action. Do not submit multiple copies of your appeal, and do not submit documents which are in the Commission's file.

Mailing address. You should mail the appeal to U.S. Parole Commission, Appeals Unit, 90 K Street, N.E., 3rd Floor, Washington, D.C. 20530.

Permissible grounds for appeal.

Regarding the January 23, 2025 "hearing" at FCI Milan, the Commission, as of March 31, 2026, has not yet furnished to me, Scott William Faul, copies of an audio recording, a hearing summary, or any signed Notice of Action generated from said hearing. Therefore, I will submit this Commission-abolishing "Appeal" document with the reserved right and duty to supplement or amend it if needed when I do receive said recording, summary, and Notice of Action. The Commission's recalcitrance in this matter is further evidence that the Commission must cease to exist. The Commission has no moral compass, and is confused about their station as servants rather than masters. As such, the Commission has become a danger to themselves and to the rest of us who are adversely affected by their obnoxiously unlawful behavior.

With the foregoing caveat, the following attached 28-page "DECLARATION OF SCOTT WILLIAM FAUL, Justice for the Wronged or Retribution against the Corrupt" is hereby submitted with the 4-page APPEAL Parole Form I-22 as my appeal of the Commission's partial compliance with their appointed duties as of March 31, 2026.

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR APPEAL

Instructions: Briefly describe the error which you believe to have occurred, or the specific reason for the Commission to give you a different decision. You do not need to repeat the "ground for appeal" (from Page 1) which applies. Try to list your most important grounds for appeal first.

Ground One: _____

For all Grounds, Facts, and Reasons, see the Declaration of Scott William Faul which is incorporated into this March 31, 2026 Parole Appeal as constituting the full Appeal itself.

Ground Two: _____

Ground Three: _____

Ground Four: _____

Note: You may present as many grounds for appeal as you believe necessary. If you have more grounds for appeal than you can summarize in the space provided, you may complete your summary on a continuation page.

An electronic version of this form can be down-loaded from the Commission's website, www.usdoj.gov/uspc.

STATEMENT OF FACTS AND REASONS IN SUPPORT OF EACH GROUND FOR APPEAL

Instructions: Please present your grounds for appeal in the order in which they appear in your summary. For each ground of appeal, use the following format, first stating the facts that are relevant to deciding the ground you have identified, and then the reasons why you believe the Commission erred and/or should make a different decision. Use continuation pages in the same format.

Ground One: (Circle the applicable ground for appeal from Page 1: a b c d e f g).

Facts: _____

For all Grounds, Facts, and Reasons, see the Declaration of Scott William Faul which is incorporated into this March 31, 2026 Parole Appeal as constituting the full Appeal itself.

Reasons: _____

Ground Two: (Circle the applicable ground for appeal from Page 1: a b c d e f g).

Facts: _____

Reasons: _____

Ground Three: (Circle the applicable ground for appeal from Page 1: a b c d e f g).

Facts: _____

For all Grounds, Facts, and Reasons, see the Declaration of Scott William Faul which is incorporated into this March 31, 2026 Parole Appeal as constituting the full Appeal itself.

Reasons: _____

Ground Four: (Circle the applicable ground for appeal from Page 1: a b c d e f g).

Facts: _____

Reasons: _____

DECLARATION OF SCOTT WILLIAM FAUL

Justice for the Wronged
or
Retribution against the Corrupt

Scott William Faul
Political Prisoner
Declarant

On this 31st day of March
Year 2026 of our Savior,
Yeshua the Messiah

I. INTRODUCTION

"Our legal system is CORRUPT, our Judges (and Justices!) are highly partisan, compromised or just plain scared." Donald J. Trump. A public survey asking whether a judge is allowed to sit in a criminal case after promising favoritism to the prosecution in that case would tally up a total agreement that such behavior by the judiciary can NEVER be tolerated. No reasonable person would dispute that universally accepted truism.

"I am your warrior, I am your justice, and for those who have been wronged and betrayed, I am your retribution. I am your retribution." Donald J. Trump. Scott William Faul ("Mr. Faul" or "Faul") has been wronged and betrayed. The judge in the case against Mr. Faul promised favoritism to the prosecution. The Government does not deny that fact, nor can they. Said favoritism has been established in multiple legal proceedings in which the Government did not deny those facts, even after being urged by Faul to deny them if they were able to do so. The Courts have all avoided the favoritism issue by pretending it is beyond their purview. All prior administrations have ignored this unlawful betrayal causing Mr. Faul's unlawful imprisonment.

"I was innocent on all counts. If I am elected, they will be brought to JUSTICE, something the Republicans have always been afraid to do." Donald J. Trump. Mr. Faul is also innocent. Not only is Mr. Faul innocent, but additionally and more undeniably established by the record, he has not been found guilty of the offense of aiding and abetting second degree murder that keeps him unlawfully imprisoned. To be guilty of that offense, Mr. Faul would have to have had knowledge of the actual killer's intent to kill another person. The jury did not make that finding, since no jury instruction asked them to do so. To prove for yourself that Faul is unlawfully imprisoned, simply make one phone call to the United States Attorney for the District of North Dakota. Verify that in order to be guilty of aiding and abetting second degree murder, one would have to have had knowledge of the actual killer's intent to kill another person. The attorney will have to agree, as that was firmly established by the Supreme Court and all circuits. Then, ask that U.S. Attorney to furnish you with a citation to the trial transcript where the jury was so instructed in C3-83-16, UNITED STATES v. SCOTT FAUL. He will not be able to furnish a citation because said instruction to the jury did not occur, and you will then know beyond any doubt that Mr. Faul is still unlawfully imprisoned after 43 years.

"Those people that CHEATED will be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the Law, which will include long term prison sentences so that this Depravity of Justice does not happen again." Donald J. Trump. In 2002, the United States Parole Commission ("Commission") unveiled its ugly bias and predisposition against Mr. Faul in the case revolving around events at Medina, North Dakota on February 13, 1983 ("this case"). The Hearing Examiner, Samuel Robertson ("Robertson"), showed the true intentions of their entire Department of Justice ("DOJ") against Mr. Faul when commenting on "the individuals involved, and the memory of this, and, ah, you know clearly it has become an institutional thing." A short while later, again revealing that they of the DOJ had already capriciously decided against Mr. Faul, Robertson went on to describe that the "opposition out there to paroling anyone involved in this" comes from "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources and law enforcement and those kinds of people."

With the Commission having set the stage so resolutely against Mr. Faul from the very start, and then having built even further on that over the years, a number of concerns regarding the posture of this case must be addressed, so that the false accusers of the innocent "will be brought to JUSTICE." The most meaningful aspect that is possible for justice to occur is repentance of the officials who created the injustice, accompanied by the full and apologetic correction of the injustice that has been bestowed upon the wrongfully imprisoned. That is our Father's grace. In that spirit, Mr. Faul thusly proceeds with this declaration.

A. Format

As a preliminary matter, due to the Commission having been infested with unscrupulous and unethical creatures for at least the last few decades, the Commission's supplied form for the appeal by Mr. Faul to the National Appeals Board ("NAB") does not accommodate proper presentation of the issues and problems that have been caused by Commission operatives. Thus, Mr. Faul will somewhat follow the Commission's appeal format in the spirit of clarity, but will do so utilizing a more understandable configuration. That is so, because this appeal is not intended for the benefit of the derelicts that the Commission has become, nor for the benefit of Mr. Faul. Rather, the appeal is brought for the purpose of causing permanent elimination of the Parole Commission, as Mr. Faul stated during his brief meeting with Hearing Examiner Erick Helenihi, aka Frederick Helenihi ("Helenihi") on January 23, 2025, that his goal was to exterminate the Commission off the face of the earth. Mr. Faul's goal to abolish this agency is fueled by the Commission operatives' invidious arrogance, and their inability to bridle their blatant bias and insatiable appetite for revenge to accommodate their "institutional thing" which, in the words of the Commission itself, was developed at the urging of "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources and law enforcement and those kinds of people."

B. Deadline

Regarding any Appeal "deadline," Mr. Faul has not yet received from the Commission his requested audio recording and hearing summary of the January 23, 2025 "hearing." The time that lapsed between said "hearing" and receipt of its Notice of Action ("NOA") by Mr. Faul was over nine months. Likewise, in the spirit of fairness and equity, Mr. Faul may take up to nine months to perfect his appeal. Because the Commission is once again unlawfully refusing disclosure, Faul will appeal now AND again when he receives the above referenced items.

C. Factual Predicates and Legal Principles

Law can only have meaning as it is applied to facts. Without an agreed factual predicate, the firmness and clarity of a "legal dispute" disappears. In Mr. Faul's entire case history, no agreed factual predicate exists because the Government refuses to abide by established legal principles in factual pleading. The Government in all branches in this case continues to give mealy-mouthed responses to all of Mr. Faul's sworn facts, allowing them to worm their way around any lawful resolution of their arbitrary and capricious behavior. Thus, to really understand what is going on with the Commission in their shoddy handling of Mr. Faul's statutorily mandated release, and to avoid being misled by the Commission's stories and pretended procedures, it will be beneficial for the reader to have an upfront briefing on a number of important factual predicates and legal principles.

i. Factual Predicates

"Two witnesses, a husband and wife who drove through Medina on February 13, 1983, testified that a police officer pulled them over and told them 'there was going to be a shootout and this time the police were in the wrong.'" UNITED STATES v. SCOTT FAUL, 748 F. 2d 1204 (8th Cir. 1984) (Lay, Chief Judge, dissenting).

a. DOJ's Fake Presentations

The DOJ in this case has continually misstated facts to manufacture their own story of what they needed to have happened to lay blame for their unlawful attack upon those of us who they attacked without warrant or cause. Their fake presentations continue by way of the Commission to this very day.

1. Blame for Unlawful Attack

Blame for the DOJ's unlawful attack upon Mr. Faul actually lies at their own depraved feet. In a March 29, 1995 lawmen's report titled "Affidavit Of Criminal Justice Professionals (The Gordon W. Kahl Case)," seasoned investigators within the law enforcement community concluded that the marshals instigated a confrontation and were at fault for the mayhem of February 13, 1983 and the subsequent murders of Gordon Kahl and Sheriff Gene Matthews, who was likely trying to prevent the DOJ's premeditated murder of Mr. Kahl.

2. Premeditated Murder of Gordon Kahl

Medina, North Dakota Chief of Police Darrell Graf stated on radio interviews that FBI agents and United States Marshals, in his office, argued over which one of their agencies (FBI or Marshals) was going to get to murder Gordon Kahl when they caught up with him. Thereafter, they jointly murdered Mr. Kahl. Immediately, all branches of the Government (judiciary included) colluded together in a coverup and perpetuated their continued revenge against those of us surviving their attacks. The Commission, BOP, and judiciary continue that revenge to this very day.

3. Attack Preplanned by Deep State

"The North Dakota incident was a premeditated assault upon Gordon Kahl and his party, with the intent to ensure violence and injury upon them." Former Phoenix, Arizona Police Officer Gerald "Jack" McLamb and an association of law enforcement investigators made that conclusion after years of investigation into the incident. The DOJ's unlawful attack most certainly was not precipitated by Mr. Faul in any way nor to any degree. It was put into motion by at least February 9, 1983 when the deep state plotters converged at a meeting in Salina, Kansas to perpetuate their Domestic (False Flag) Terrorism operation against patriots such as Gordon Kahl. There is ample evidence from DOJ and North Dakota BCI documents that false APB's were generated days before the DOJ's planned criminal assault on February 13, 1983. While some question the lawfulness of the marshals' onslaught against Gordon Kahl, what cannot be debated is the unlawfulness of their criminal assault against Mr. Faul. It is not denied by the DOJ, nor can it be denied, that to the point in time when marshals assaulted with dangerous weapons an unarmed Mr. Faul, there was no warrant for his arrest and he had done nothing unlawful in their presence. To put it into proper perspective, the events of February 13, 1983 did NOT begin as claimed by the DOJ. A false flag domestic terrorism operation was unleashed at least by February 9, 1983 involving the Salina, Kansas convergence of like minded cohorts on a mission to silence dissent. Without considering those purposefully ignored facts, a wrong picture is painted to obscure their own criminality.

4. "Antigovernmental Group" Fake News

The DOJ, the Commission, the BOP, the judiciary, all of them, consistently spew that Mr. Faul was "part of a violent antigovernmental group." There is no evidence, none, in existence anywhere of that totally invented diatribe, and they never ever identify what "group" they speak of. That false claim is simply repeated over and over because they need it to be so to fulfill their whims to keep Mr. Faul unlawfully imprisoned to satisfy their demented appetite for revenge. While identification of said "group" is never revealed by the Commission since it is invented rhetoric, it can be assumed that they are referring to the same "group" as that which the late Chief Judge Donald Lay identified as the Posse Comitatus. The false innuendo that Faul was "part of" some violent group was shown by Judge Lay to be false information that was actually rooted in the fake news media, which got it from deep state operatives working behind the scenes before, during, and after the events at Medina, North Dakota on February 13, 1983. The rhetoric that Mr. Faul was "part of a violent antigovernmental group" was not accepted as fact by the late Chief Judge Donald Lay. He said, "Many news articles focused on Gordon Kahl's association with the radical Posse Comitatus, and left an impression that all the defendants were involved with the Posse Comitatus." The Commission's vitriolic lie has no basis in the record. It is entirely invented by the mean-spirited creatures of the deep state.

b. Relevant Evidence Ignored

Title 18 U.S.C. Section 4207 and the Commission's Manual at Section 2.19(b)(1) both mandate that "the Commission shall consider ... relevant information concerning the prisoner (including information submitted by the prisoner) as may be reasonably available."

1. Prior Pleadings and Documents

There is a vast amount of information, favorable to Mr. Faul, that is being purposefully ignored by the Commission. An easily verified example of such information is the fifteen-page January 13, 2022 letter they

received from Mr. Faul. The information provided by Faul in that document is sworn to under penalty of perjury, and is not disputed by the Commission nor anyone else in the Government. Nevertheless, said information is simply ignored by them because the facts therein do not assist the Commission with their false scenario. When asked by Mr. Faul at the January 23, 2025 sham hearing why he did not read what Faul had submitted to the Commission, Helenihi, contrary to law, arrogantly stated that he did not have to.

2. People Who Knew Mr. Faul

Also being ignored by the Commission is the valuable insight that has been provided about Mr. Faul's lack of recidivism risk. Letters from numerous people who knew Mr. Faul are in the Commission's possession and were considered for his initial parole hearing in 2002. The Commission decided at that time that Faul was not a risk for committing any crime if released. Instead, to deny release, they used "accountability" as an excuse for five more years before release. Fifteen years later, after the "five more years" was no longer applicable, the Commission did an about face. Because their biased predisposition of revenge against Faul had not abated from the "institutional thing," the Commission needed Faul to be a recidivism risk. Thus, the Commission ignored all of the letters that helped establish in 2002 that Faul was not a risk, and simply without any evidence declared him to be a huge risk for recidivism. The dregs of the Commission just say whatever it takes to satisfy "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources and law enforcement and those kinds of people."

ii. Legal Principles

Generally speaking, maintaining morality involves the correct interpretation and application of sound legal principles to guide future conduct or to assess past conduct.

a. False Presumptions

Embarking on an adjudicatory mission while infected with false presumptions necessarily leads to incorrect conclusions. There are many false presumptions that sound reasonable and even lofty at first blush but fail upon closer examination, two of which are particularly relevant to this case.

1. Honesty and Integrity

There is a laughable notion floating around amongst the judiciary types that they are "presumed to act with honesty and integrity." Our Father said otherwise. The Scriptures teach that men's hearts are deceitfully wicked, and it appears that those who strive for adjudicative positions are the worst of the worst. That ridiculous presumption, bestowing unwarranted honesty and integrity, is a self-serving fabrication, hatched by those who benefit from its blind acquiescence by keeping the people under a shroud of mysticism. The thought that they should be presumed to act with honesty and integrity is absurd, if not criminal.

2. Support the Men in Blue

To support the men in blue, no matter what they do, is a dangerous and foolhardy proposition. As such, it often leads to instances where people who are wronged by police become criminalized and wrongly imprisoned. While it sounds noble and laudable, worship of police is a reversal of good order. It should not be forgotten that law enforcement officers are servants of the sovereign people. They should not be elevated to a greater status with greater protection. Giving carte blanche to the men in blue is a very dangerous and wrong attitude that will lead to an endless loop of more and more police brutality and misbehavior as was perpetrated by the DOJ during the Reagan era when they murdered Gordon Kahl.

b. General Principles of Law

Some legal principles are widely enough applicable to be relevant in all situations of life, and are rarely disputed by reasonable minds. However, some of the principles are nevertheless worthy of attention for purposes of refreshing concepts of fairness and duty.

1. Duty to Criticize

The Supreme Court in 1964 held that New York Times had "an absolute, unconditional privilege to publish their criticism of official conduct." The Court went on to assure that the First Amendment guarantees "that debate on public issues should be uninhibited, robust, and wide open, and that it may well include vehement, caustic, and sometimes unpleasantly sharp attacks on government and public officials." Speaking to the privilege for the citizen critic of government, the Court said that "it is as much his duty to criticize as it is the official's duty to administer," and that "the censorial power is in the people over the Government, and not the Government over the people." Thus, the Commission's incessant whining that Mr. Faul says nasty things about their operatives is not only out of place, but it is just plainly wrong and without authority. The Commission, in the spirit of honesty and integrity, should encourage criticism. If Mr. Faul is accurate in his criticism, it should correct errors that it has made. Alternatively, if Faul is not accurate, the Commission should simply produce reliable evidence to dispute Faul's facts as his correspondence suggested to them that they do.

2. Evidence and Indicia of Reliability

The Commission repeatedly spews their invective and baseless rhetoric as if it were factual or reliable. Mr. Faul has repeatedly contested their rhetoric and has stated under penalty of perjury the actual facts to correct the Commission's errors. The Commission ignored Faul's objections, and further, ignored Faul's sworn facts that he supplied. The Commission cannot simply rely on what the Government provided. When a parolee objects to allegations of fact, additional evidence is required to establish the disputed fact. The Government must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the disputed facts are accurate. To be evidence, the offeror must provide information for the basis of the statements. Statements of counsel are not evidence. Unsworn assertions of the Government's attorney do not provide, by themselves, a sufficiently reliable basis to convert the allegations into evidence. Patently incorrect statements necessarily lack sufficient indicia of reliability, and, thus, cannot form a basis for decisions regardless of whether objected to.

c. Parole Law Principles

Specifically, a proper decision from the Commission involves the correct interpretation and application of legal principles that are specific to the various situations arising within the realm of parole considerations. To guide against arbitrary and capricious action by the Commission, various laws and regulations provide guidance for proper consideration of evidentiary matters, and specific laws have been enacted to define Commission procedures.

1. PSI not Evidence

It is well recognized, and established by the courts, that the Commission's main source of information, the Presentence Investigation Report ("PSI" or "PSR"), is not evidence and is not a legally sufficient basis for making findings on contested issues of material fact. The Commission may rely upon a PSI for findings that are relevant to parole only if the facts in the PSI are not disputed by the parolee. Mr. Faul disputed factual assertions lifted from the PSI by the Commission. A PSI cannot just include statements, in hope of converting such statements into reliable evidence, without providing any information for the basis of the statements. Bald, conclusory statements do not acquire the patina of reliability by mere inclusion in the PSI. Further, unless a defendant has admitted the facts alleged in a presentence report, "the report is not evidence and is not a legally sufficient basis for making findings on contested issues of material fact." Finally, the Commission itself in its Parole Manual at Section 2.19-04(a) of Notes and Procedures establishes use of the preponderance of evidence standard for deciding contested issues of material fact. "To say that the description of the offense in the presentence report will be deemed to be controlling unless first modified by the court is contrary to the Commission's duty to make its own independent factual findings." Section 2.19-06 states that, "An allegation that is vague, unsupported, or comes from an unreliable source should not be considered." Regardless of these precepts, the Commission instead takes all of the PSI's fallacies and pretends them to be factual. Thus, one must be wary of anything the Commission pushes as factual. The Commission operatives along with the other DOJ cohorts are inherently untrustworthy.

2. Rational Basis

All administrative agencies' findings of fact are subject to some particular standard of review regarding their conclusions. The Parole Commission abuses its discretion where there is no "rational basis in the record for the Commission's conclusions embodied in its statement of reasons." The term "rational" includes reason and legitimacy, which demands impartiality applied to a foundation of evidence. To be "rational," a finding must be based on the evidence presented. A finding without evidence has no legitimate reason; rather, it is arbitrary and baseless. To refuse to consider evidence, or to make an essential finding without supporting evidence, is arbitrary action. The Government's diatribe is NOT evidence and thus forms no "rational basis."

3. Elements First then Backfill Facts

The Commission, as well as all other adjudicative type entities, are supposed to make their decisions by seeing whether the established facts fill in the blanks of the law under scrutiny. Instead, the Commission in this case decides what elements of the law need to be satisfied to achieve their goal of refusing Mr. Faul's release, and then dredges up "facts" they claim to satisfy whatever elements they have decided to need. In Mr. Faul's case, the Commission clearly decided their wanted outcome and then manufactured "facts" to backfill the slots. This they did unabashedly to satisfy their "institutional thing" for "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources and law enforcement and those kinds of people," which really is a self-critique of their "honesty and integrity."

4. NOA and Appeal NOA is Autocratic Farce

In 1976, Congress clearly formed the Commission with nine Commissioners, for decisions to be made by one and confirmed by at least one or two more depending on the circumstances, that any appeal of their decision would go before three members of the Commission sitting as a "National Appeals Board," and that none of those three could be one of those who made the decision granting or denying the parole. Now, one person sits as the lone Commissioner, and then, with arrogant effrontery, sits as the sole National Appeals Board member. Talk about CORRUPT! Only someone with a black heart filled with total contempt for even the appearance of decency could be so damned depraved as to sanction such untoward behavior against the concept of appellate review of wrongful decisions. There is now a quorum of "one." That, regarding Mr. Faul, is an ex post facto violation, because he is entitled to the parole laws as they existed in 1983 which included a National Appeals Board with three members with none being a Commissioner who made his parole decision.

iii. "Supposed To" versus "Actually Do"

How factual predicates and legal principles are supposed to be applied by the Commission, versus how they are actually applied, are two different things. For Mr. Faul's case, because the DOJ feels secure with their compliant judiciary of compromised cohorts, the Commission need only satisfy "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources and law enforcement and those kinds of people." Thus: instead of honoring Mr. Faul's waiver of a particular hearing as is his lawful choice, they forged ahead with one anyway because they needed its results to fix Faul's pending litigation against him; instead of accepting the words of a statute, "term or terms," to be a phrase meaning "sentence" as legislative history and contemporary use dictate, they use those three words as if they are supposed to be used separately because as such it achieves their predetermined decision to never release Mr. Faul from prison no matter the facts; instead of deciding whether facts have an indicia of reliability before they are used as a basis for a parole determination, they use only "facts" that support their compromised decision to deny release; instead of considering the information presented including that from the prisoner as the law provides, they openly state that they do not have to; and, instead of crediting their own Salient Factor Score showing Faul to not be a recidivism risk, and the Risk Assessment calculation done by the BOP likewise showing Faul to not be a recidivism risk even without any programming, they simply make up a conclusion that Faul is at great risk to commit some unspecified crime if he were released from prison. The bottom line in all of this is that operatives of the Commission, with assistance from their cohorts in the rest of the DOJ and the judiciary, simply say and do whatever they feel their needed whim to be for achieving their predetermined result of keeping Faul in prison for their "institutional thing" in service to "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources and law enforcement and those kinds of people." How pathetically small and undeserving of respect.

II. COMMISSION'S MAIN PROBLEM

A. Commission's Deliberate Confusion

Although not specifically identified as such by the Commission, having "respect" for them seems at first blush to be the overarching theme and cause of the Commission operatives' invective against Mr. Faul. What is really obvious is that they are filled with some sort of maniacal hatred for anyone they peg as having ever "gone against" the fidelity of their fiefdom or any of their cohorts in "law enforcement," no matter the circumstances or who was at fault. Upon closer examination, however, a clearer picture emerges to show that their hyped issue regarding "respect," while part of their ego trip, is actually a red herring. First, "respect" for people, whether or not it is deserved, is not a factor for any type of parole consideration. Rather, it is an invented "issue" that the Commission latched onto because they had no evidence against Mr. Faul to establish any legitimate factor to prevent his release. Thus, they created a factor which they could fill in with their already ascertainable "facts." They needed their invented criteria of "respect" to backfill their result-oriented decision to deny Faul's release, falsely claiming that his lack of respect for them will cause him to commit some future crime. Second, the Commission makes no showing that they deserve any respect, nor could they. This is an agency that has no concern for facts, principles of law, or how their misapplication of both wrongfully affects the lives of others. In 1984, Congress itself abolished this ill-conceived Commission, which was the mistaken result of their prior attempt in 1976 to correct the Commission's predecessor Board of Parole, which itself was a prior Congress's colossal mistake. Finally, with the facts placed in their proper perspective, the Commission makes no showing that Faul's lack of "respect" for them is not correct or even laudable. Faul is open and bold in his condemnation of rogues who wormed their way into positions they should not be in. The Commission's own placement of themselves into that category is on them, not on Faul. Commission operatives, wanting to be emperors of their fiefdoms, stand naked in their false pretenses and scream loudly against Mr. Faul when he proclaims that the emperor has no clothes. It is undisputed by the Commission, and it is undisputable, that Mr. Faul was attacked by their DOJ cohorts without cause in 1983, and that rogue operatives in all branches of their Government thereafter joined ranks to exact retribution against him regardless of his lack of culpability.

For the Commission to base their "decision" on spurious factors amidst their deep-seated inability to rise above such malevolent retribution against Mr. Faul, after him having been attacked without cause in February of 1983, is pretty damning of the Commission operatives' phony presumption that its officials act with honesty and integrity. That is really quite pathetic of them. To show how pathetic they are, before stating the grounds against this Commission or against its rogues (whichever the case may be), Mr. Faul recognizes that a fuller explanation is in order to show how grossly misplaced is their egocentric notion that Mr. Faul is unjustifiably against them or their esteemed Government. Such explanation about the Commission's "deliberate confusion" is not for them, who with their savior complex would be unable to grasp its significance. Rather, it is for the sake of posterity to know for a certainty what manner of low-grade creatures this United States has allowed to infest its agencies. The fact that the emperor has no clothes should be shown at every available occasion. Thus, before addressing the present Notice of Action which is dated February 4, 2025, a bit of an examination of the Commission's deliberate confusion about "respect" is in order. To show some of the operatives' many instances of their behavior that might diminish an outpouring of respect, and to answer the question of whether they deserve any respect in the first place, some examples follow below.

B. Explanation of Commission's Deliberate Confusion

The record shows that for all the years prior to February 13, 1983, Mr. Faul thought quite highly of the United States of America.

On February 13, 1983, Mr. Faul was criminally assaulted by agents of that United States. Their attack against him was without question unlawful. After that unlawful attack, perhaps Faul could have thought less highly of the United States of America. If his attackers were actual DOJ agents, and not merely rogue agents, it could be argued that Mr. Faul perhaps SHOULD have thought less highly of the United States of America.

On June 3, 1983, swarms of DOJ agents murdered Faul's friend, Mr. Gordon Kahl, along with Sheriff Gene Matthews. Their murder of Mr. Kahl was without question premeditated. If the murderers were actual DOJ agents, and not merely rogue agents, it could be argued that Mr. Faul perhaps could have thought still less highly of the United States of America.

At Mr. Faul's "trial," judge Paul Benson ("Benson") had promised favoritism, in writing, to the prosecutors in the case. That made it a sham proceeding. If that is what the United States judicial system is all about, it could be argued that perhaps Mr. Faul could have thought even still less highly of the United States that was acting as if it were some unsupervised, irresponsible, and unaccountable corporation.

Mr. Faul checked Supreme Court holdings for the answer. The Supreme Court said that the United States is a corporation. Perhaps Mr. Faul could have thought still less highly of the UNITED STATES Corporation ("Corporation") that had been deceitfully passing itself off as a grand creation. There must be some limit as to how much less highly Mr. Faul could think of this, this Corporation, unless of course it is just those nasty old "rogues" who are doing all these horrid things.

The entire jury in the sham trial was biased to the hilt. One juror, for example, during jury selection, stated that he only "knew of" the prosecutor. Some months after the sham trial's phony convictions, that juror bragged about how he "liked it to been on that jury" for his prosecutor friend. Talk about crass! Another juror, during jury selection, promised to base her verdict on the evidence presented at trial, and not on what she saw, heard, or read from the media. Some months later, that juror boldly stated that she knew there was not enough evidence presented at trial to convict Mr. Faul, but she had seen it on TV as soon as it happened. If that is what the Corporation is all about, it could be argued that perhaps Mr. Faul could think even still less highly of it. He certainly could not be blamed for thinking less highly of a Corporation so steeped in fraud.

The sham trial's outcome was appealed to the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals. Their opinion in affirming the district court's sham trial leaves one of average intellect with the overwhelming impression that the opinion was written by the Corporation. Well, in a sense, it was. The judges and DOJ agents, real or rogue, all get their paychecks from the same Corporation. And they act like it. It is all complete and disgusting collusion. It could be argued that perhaps Mr. Faul could think even less highly of these creatures than he already could have less highly thought of them.

The Supreme Court of the UNITED STATES Corporation, on June 24, 1985, refused to address the fact that Mr. Faul did not have an impartial judge or jury at his sham trial. Perhaps Faul deserved, at that point, to not only think less highly of his once highly vaunted United States of America, but to think derogatorily about it. But wait, surely they must merely be rogues; the murderous DOJ agents, the sham trial judge, the corrupted jurors, the colluding Eighth Circuit judges, and the Supreme Court justices who choose to ignore their cohorts' perfidy must just all be rogues. Certainly no corporation could be so inept or evil. Yes, it must be just rogues.

Mr. Faul, knowing in his heart that somewhere within the Corporation there must be some with at least a speck of honor who still see themselves as with the "United States of America," on December 1, 2000 filed a "Motion to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct Sentence" under 28 U.S.C. Section 2255 ("2255") dated October 4, 2000 which was filed on December 1, 2000. That 2255 was before Judge Jones sitting by designation since all judges for the District of North Dakota were recused due to conflicts of interest. Judge Jones had by Order combined various 2255 pleadings into one all-encompassing 2255. Somehow, the Corporation succeeded in replacing a presumably fair Judge Jones with their own partisan Eighth Circuit Judge Kermit Bye ("Bye") to sit by designation on this case. Bye dismissed most of Mr. Faul's claims outright, and scheduled an evidentiary hearing on the issue of jury bias. Bye refused to recuse himself, manipulated the evidentiary hearing to the Corporation's advantage, and denied all claims. Juror bias is apparently okay with the colluding DOJ and judiciary of the Corporation. Mr. Faul perhaps at this point might have considered thinking derogatorily of the Corporation, but it has to be just the rogues.

Mr. Faul concluded that for relief from this now seemingly compromised United States of America, it must be time to go through their parole system. Surely, he thought, the rogues could not have infested it too. That wistful presumption of Faul's was ended by Hearing Examiner Samuel Robertson at Faul's December 30, 2002 initial parole hearing. Amidst a plethora of other partisan rantings, Robertson unabashedly blurted that Faul's release was going to be forever blocked by "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources and law enforcement and those kinds of people" because, as declared in the Commission's rants, this is "an institutional thing." Talk about blatant bias and vitriol. Clearly, Mr. Faul should not have much respect left after that for the Corporation which employs and protects such vitriolic and biased creatures. They are beginning to appear more and more disgusting, as Mr. Faul would certainly be justified for also noticing. The Commission, however, claims that Faul's perception is unfair to them. In addition to their openly stated admission that they were going to forever block Mr. Faul's release to please "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources and law enforcement and those kinds of people" who are involved in their "institutional thing" of bias and revenge, the Commission had some additional ruse in mind. The Commission, in 2002, said that recidivism was not an issue, just "accountability,"

so do another five years or so. Fifteen years later, when a five-year "accountability" need could no longer be claimed, the Commission reversed their spiel to then claim that it was recidivism that was the issue. Perhaps Mr. Faul could have derogatory thoughts toward the Corporation whose rogues cannot be trusted in the least.

In 2005, Mr. Faul filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus in the United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin which was given Case No. 05-C-385 and assigned to Judge John Shabaz. Faul stated therein, and in his accompanying affidavit, that judge Paul Benson promised favoritism to Rodney Webb and Lynn Crooks, the United States Attorney and prosecutor respectively. Judge Shabaz ignored those claims and falsely claimed that Mr. Faul's habeas corpus was a 2255. Faul's facts in that habeas corpus and affidavit were not disputed by the United States. They, the rogues, simply have no intention to follow the law. Perhaps some derogatory thoughts toward the Corporation are in order?

Also in 2005, Mr. Faul raised the same favoritism claims in the United States District Court for the District of North Dakota. The facts therein were likewise not disputed, and again the court pretended that it was all fair and brimming with honesty and integrity presumed upon the judges. The bottom line was that the Corporation showed no concern about biased judges sitting on cases involving their enemies. Perhaps Mr. Faul could have derogatory thoughts toward the Corporation which unlawfully imprisons him.

In other motions and petitions in 2005, Mr. Faul claimed that his prior pleadings were "Unheard" due to the fraud of Paul Benson and Kermit Bye remaining as "judges" in his case even though they had both promised favoritism to the prosecution, that Benson and Bye were both biased because of their promises of favoritism, and that the facts underlying those claims have never been disputed. Also, Mr. Faul, on March 14, 2006, submitted another 2255 that was filed on May 17, 2006, with claims including Benson's and Bye's favoritism to the prosecution. Again the Government did not dispute Mr. Faul's facts. Nevertheless, Mr. Faul's claims were all dismissed by the Court as if admittedly biased judges were acceptable. This pathetic judge, Ralph Erickson, took Faul's very cogent claim of Bye's promise of favoritism, twisted it into Bye's unrelated legal matters, and dismissed it. "Judge" Erickson, eagerly colluding for his DOJ cohorts, became a slight bit overzealous when he made up all that. It was quite an ingenious tale, but it was spun out of whole cloth. Perhaps Mr. Faul, if he has not yet done so, could think much, much more lowly of the entire Corporation system than anyone could ever imagine. But wait, there is even more with this United States of America thing against Mr. Faul.

In 2015, Mr. Faul filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota, which was given Case No. 15-cv-1541 and assigned to Judge Patrick Schiltz. In that petition, Faul claimed that he has not been found guilty of the offense purporting to imprison him, because the jury was not instructed on the essential element for aiding and abetting second degree murder: i.e., that to be guilty, he would have to have had knowledge of the actual killer's intent to kill another person. It is beyond dispute that such is the correct legal analysis of aiding and abetting second degree murder, as that has been firmly established by the Supreme Court. It is also beyond dispute that the jury in Faul's sham trial was NOT given that instruction. Thus, it is beyond dispute that Mr. Faul has not been found guilty of aiding and abetting second degree murder, nor, for all that goes, of any other aiding and abetting offense either. None of that makes any difference to the creatures of the Corporation who have become so crass as to pretend to see nothing wrong with their "system" regardless of its indecency. Oh, I guess they must just be rogues -- certainly REAL Corporation people are presumed to have honesty and integrity -- is that beginning to appear suspect? In the Corporation's spirit of deliberate obfuscation and connivance, the magistrate made up a spurious report and recommendation for the judge to reject Mr. Faul's correct claims and to keep him unlawfully imprisoned. The judicial criminals slithered out of giving a correct ruling by claiming that the Supreme Court's holding in the ROSEMOND case did not activate the savings clause of Section 2255 "in this instance, thereby depriving it of subject matter jurisdiction," and so the Court "declines to address further these arguments." Mr. Faul finds it strange that these judicial creatures seemingly never lack jurisdiction to unlawfully imprison people but seem always to lack jurisdiction to correct any unlawful imprisonment. Surely, it is just them dog gone rogues again. The judge, outdoing even the magistrate's drivel, put forth a convoluted twist to Mr. Faul's actual claims for the sole purpose of pleasing the "institutional thing" of his cohorts to prolong the unlawful imprisonment. It was an ingenious "Opinion," but it was just plainly bogus. The Supreme Court had held that "aiding and abetting requires intent extending to the whole crime ... with full knowledge of the circumstances constituting the charged offense." In this case, the "circumstances constituting the charged offense" include that Mr. Faul would have to have had knowledge of the actual killer's intent to kill another person for him to be guilty of aiding and abetting second degree murder. The courts in Mr. Faul's case continuously pretend the law to be otherwise. Rogues or not, should Mr. Faul perhaps develop a lack of respect for all this?

On April 16, 2018, the Commission held a 15-year reconsideration hearing for Mr. Faul. Having run out of other excuses to deny parole, the Commission reversed their 2002 conclusion that Faul was not a recidivism risk. Now, since their five more years for accountability excuse was overdue by ten additional years, Mr. Faul, while showing no recidivism risk by their own Salient Factor Score, had to be declared a big risk for recidivism. The "institutional thing" was alive and well. Faul was once again denied discretionary parole by "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources and law enforcement and those kinds of people." Of course the Commission wrote up a bogus NOA, mentioning none of that, because they are so full of honesty and integrity. When Mr. Faul appealed to the NAB, they dutifully stuck with their script to please their "institutional thing" for their "prosecutor kinds of sources." And the Commission pretends to be incensed that someone would not respect them? Wow!

In 2020, in the United States District Court for the District of North Dakota, Mr. Faul filed a compassionate release motion pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 3582 ("3582"). The claims he raised, among others, were: the Commission and Bureau of Prisons ("BOP") colluded to unlawfully extend Mr. Faul's release date; he has not been found guilty of aiding and abetting second degree murder (the charge causing his imprisonment) because the jury was never asked to find that he had to have had knowledge of the actual killer's intent to kill another person; and, that sham judges Benson and Bye had promised favoritism to the prosecution in this case. The Government did not dispute that the jury in Mr. Faul's case was not instructed that in order to be guilty of aiding and abetting second degree murder, Mr. Faul would have to have had knowledge of the actual killer's intent to kill someone. Further, the Government did not dispute that Faul has never been found guilty of that necessary element of aiding and abetting second degree murder. The Government likewise did not dispute that sham judges Benson and Bye both promised favoritism to the other side in Faul's case, and stated that Faul was still suffering under an infringement or denial of legal rights. Peter J. Welte, one of the Corporation's paid cohorts acting as a judge, in keeping with their promises, pretended to have no authority to correct a void judgment, stating: "Faul's motion to reduce sentence is DISMISSED for lack of jurisdiction." Being shown, again, that his unlawful imprisonment at the hands of their Corporation is not concerning to them, perhaps Mr. Faul could be justified in holding all of them in not such high regard.

On January 27, 2022, beginning the BOP's administrative remedy process, Mr. Faul challenged their calculation of his unlawful sentence. Faul stated that he was being held in violation of the laws that govern mandatory release pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 4206(d) ("4206(d)") and the Commission's regulations. In their final response dated July 19, 2022, the BOP remained recalcitrant in their miscalculation, and continued to keep Faul unlawfully imprisoned. Perhaps Mr. Faul's regard for the BOP's many cohorts could diminish.

Regarding the sentence miscalculation, on November 28, 2022, Mr. Faul mailed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus to the United States District Court for the district of Minnesota, which was filed on November 30, 2022 and assigned to Judge Michael Davis as Case No. 22-cv-2993 ("22-cv-2993"). The Government did not respond within the statutorily allowed time. They needed extra time beyond that allowed by law in which to manipulate their system in order to put up an argument against Mr. Faul's pending habeas corpus petition. To defeat Mr. Faul's habeas corpus, they needed to have had a 30-year mandatory release hearing that had been adverse to him. The judge, one of their cohorts, obliged the DOJ in their scheme of collusion between the United States Attorney's office, the BOP, and the Commission. With that habeas corpus petition thus pending, without yet being answered within the lawfully allowed timeframe, the Commission stepped up to carry out their part of the scheme by scheduling a "two-thirds/thirty-year" mandatory parole hearing. Perhaps Mr. Faul's regard for their "presumed to act with honesty and integrity" canard could diminish yet further.

Getting back to the Commission's lies and underhanded behavior that they have consistently exhibited in all of their outcome-oriented "decisions" pertaining to Mr. Faul, while the 22-cv-2993 habeas corpus was still pending without the Government even yet responding, the Commission once again raised its ugly head. The Corporation needed, with collusion between the BOP and the Corporation's attorney's office and the judiciary, to manipulate some "facts" for their response to the writ. They forged ahead for that purpose by insisting on a "two-thirds" parole hearing, which Faul was waiving due to the pending habeas corpus. Thus, their January 25, 2023 bogus procedure, which they claimed to be a mandatory release parole hearing, was nothing more than a choreographed performance with Corporation-paid stooges filled with hatred and venom spewing out a diatribe of rhetoric and innuendo; and with "victims" forcing vengeance from their hearts: forcing, because they are deluded by the lies and coverup being orchestrated by the Corporation which is still ongoing to the present time. Rather than fomenting vengeance, the Corporation should have presented the unvarnished facts to allow honest retrospection for those "victims." For example, the record is clear that there was no warrant for Faul and that he had done nothing unlawful in their presence when they attacked him with dangerous assault-style

weapons. Mr. Faul shoulders no blame for the DOJ's unlawful assault against him by their agents, rogue or not. These "victims" have been and are yet being lied to by the Corporation, and truly are victims of the Corporation. The Commission's NOA for that farce of a hearing was a pack of unsupported rhetoric and irrational diatribe without any supporting evidence. Should that have endeared Mr. Faul to the Corporation?

On March 2, 2023, Mr. Faul appealed the January 25, 2023 hearing and subsequent January 31, 2023 NOA to the NAB which in its April 18, 2023 Appeal Notice of Action spewed more irrational venom and baseless diatribe against Mr. Faul than had been spewed in the "decision" Notice of Action. That spiel will be covered later with the identical paragraph in the 2025 NOA and so deserves no further attention at this time other than to state that Mr. Faul perhaps could feel all the more justified to hold them all in utter derogation. Their disgusting, irrational pretense of a "decision" and then an "appeal" is laughable, and would fit better in a fantasy novel. It was the same person sitting on the NAB (the same ONE person) as the person sitting as the lone Commissioner who denied release (the same ONE person). Is that a sham, or what? And that creature has the gall to claim that they act with honesty and integrity. The Commission, doing its part in the collusion, contrary to the actual EVIDENCE, gave the BOP and the United States Attorney their needed "facts" to respond to the habeas corpus in 22-cv-2993. Perhaps Mr. Faul should not be expected to think really highly of them all, and their whole system, after getting a whiff of that.

On February 10, 2023, then having the needed "facts" from the Commission, the Government responded to Mr. Faul's habeas corpus petition in 22-cv-2993. They claimed that, due to the recent Commission hearing, the BOP's calculation of Mr. Faul's sentence was correct. To reach that conclusion, the Government put forth many false notions and skirted the issues. That, perhaps, should not have been very endearing either.

After enduring the Commission's abusive behavior regarding their January 25, 2023 "hearing," its January 31, 2023 NOA, and their April 18, 2023 Appeal Notice of Action, Mr. Faul filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus, in addition to the already pending writ in 22-cv-2993. This second petition was dated and sent on May 10, 2023 and was filed on May 12, 2023 with the assigned Case No. 23-cv-1337 ("23-cv-1337"). Grounds raised by Mr. Faul included First Amendment violations for "using Faul's dislike for government as a material factor denying Faul's parole," and that the parole statute's "recidivism clause violates the First Amendment as applied to Faul"; and Fifth Amendment lack of a rational basis for their "likelihood of recidivism" determination violating the right to due process, and that the parole statute's recidivism clause is void for vagueness. That case, 23-cv-1337, was at an early stage reassigned to be heard by the same magistrate and judge as the still pending 22-cv-2993 habeas action. After the responses and replies, the magistrate and judge did everything in their power, and some things that were not in their power, to justify all of the BOP's and the Commission's coordinated, unlawful actions against Faul in this sordid affair. By this point in time, there was neither surprise nor shock visited upon Mr. Faul. Perhaps Mr. Faul at this point could be more than justified to think whatever he may about creatures who collude so blatantly and arrogantly.

C. Summation of Commission's Deliberate Confusion

In summation of addressing the Commission's egocentric "concern" that Mr. Faul does not have adequate respect for them or their cohorts in their Corporation, it is important to remember the backdrop against which that needed "conclusion" was generated. Take note that the numerous instances of Corporation skulduggery which are noted above are only a partial listing of the total. Myriad other instances are enmeshed within each of those that have been noted. Nevertheless, no dispassionate observer, after cataloging the foregoing details of collusion amidst the Corporation's BOP, Commission, and judiciary, could conclude that Faul should have any respect for or feelings of endearment toward the United States of America. Regardless of whether the Corporation is that corrupt, or that only rogues are to blame, it is of no moment. It must be fairly concluded that if so corrupted, then it is outrightly a shameful creature. On the other hand, if it is just so inept that it allows for rogues to be that corrupt in its stead, then it is still a shameful creature. Thus, whether it is corrupt, or it is woefully inept, it is a shameful creature. Nevertheless, there is no EVIDENCE that Mr. Faul has adopted any such a derogatory attitude toward the United States of America. There is, on the other hand, a plethora of evidence that Mr. Faul perhaps COULD have a loathing for that Corporation which has furnished what could be interpreted as the proof of their own loathsomeness. Be that as it may, the obvious unarguable fact is that the Commission has no right to criticize Faul for what they too must recognize as good cause for him to perhaps be unendeared to their colluding apparatus. The Veronza Bowers case proves conclusively the Commission's perfidy. One need only listen to Hearing Examiner Samuel Robertson at the Commission's December 30, 2002

initial parole hearing against Mr. Faul. He justified the blockage of Faul's parole as "an institutional thing," and that the people behind said blockage were "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources and law enforcement and those kinds of people." Spewing such overt bias, are these people serious? They should look in a mirror and wonder what they have become. If they are not downright evil, they surely are working on it. Furthermore, Mr. Faul's identification and verbalization of the Corporation's most damning shortcomings have been proven true by the Commission's behavior. Most importantly, though, Faul's words of criticism against "officials" are First Amendment protected activity that is strongly encouraged by the Supreme Court. The Commission, along with its cohorts, have earned no kudos here. Their whining about Faul having no respect for them is misplaced. If Mr. Faul actually does have no respect for them, is it not well earned? Can the Corporation or its rogues have any standing to criticize Mr. Faul, after all they have done, if he actually does have no respect for them? Have they not just stooped too low? If they suffer a lack of respectability, is it not a self-induced affliction?

To recap the instances giving rise to why any normal person might develop a healthy lack of respect for any department of the Government, they, by their own words and actions, if not providing the actual reasons themselves, certainly provided for at least the perception that it cared little about the "rule of law" throughout this entire case. The Government's words and actions that are candidates for causing a loss of respect for them include the following instances that specifically affect Mr. Faul: on February 13, 1983, DOJ agents assaulted him; on June 3, 1983, rogue DOJ agents murdered his friend, Mr. Gordon Kahl, and Sheriff Gene Matthews; during his 1983 "trial," a sham judge promised favoritism to the prosecution; he was informed of the Supreme Court's holdings that the United States is a corporation; the 1983 jury's blatant bias was kept secret by the Government's operatives; the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals in 1984 rubber-stamped the operatives' criminality; in 2000, his 2255 claims were all dismissed by another favor-promising "judge" with outrageous collusion; in 2002, the Commission made clear at his initial hearing that they were biased; in 2005, his habeas corpus petition was sleazed into a 2255 and dismissed; in 2005, his favoritism claims were dismissed as if it was okay for a judge to promise favoritism; in 2006, some more favoritism claims were dismissed with an okay for favoritism; in 2015, his habeas corpus, stating that he was not found guilty because an essential element was not given for the jury to find, was dismissed contrary to the Supreme Court's recent holdings; in 2018, the Commission held a bogus 15-year reconsideration hearing where, to deny parole once again, the Commission made a complete about-face from their 2002 finding that Faul has no recidivism risk; in 2020, his motion for compassionate release was rejected amidst a whole string of lies and obfuscation; in 2022, his Administrative Remedy Request for the BOP to correct his wrongly calculated sentence was rejected amidst a string of bald lies and nonsense; in 2022, his 22-cv-2993 habeas corpus against the BOP for his wrongly calculated sentence was stalled by unlawful tactics for the benefit of the Government; in 2023, the Commission forged ahead with a "two-thirds" parole hearing in collusion with the BOP against Faul's 22-cv-2993 habeas corpus action; in 2023, his appeal of their "two-thirds" hearing was heard and rubber-stamped by the same person who made the decision to deny release in the first place; on February 10, 2023, after getting the facts they needed from the Commission's sham hearing, the Government finally responded in 22-cv-2993; in May of 2023, regarding the 2023 "two-thirds" hearing and NOA, Faul filed a habeas corpus (23-cv-1337) which was subsequently decided in every way possible against Mr. Faul.

From any reasonable person's perspective, the foregoing instances of Government wrongdoing are more than sufficient in number and seriousness, without more, to justify a total lack of respect for that organization. Regardless of whether it was direct wrongdoing or a failure to correct wrongdoing of rogues, the perpetration and continued perpetuation of such admitted behavior is astounding. Yet, without disavowing its objectionable behavior, the Commission seems to be incensed with a notion that Mr. Faul has a low opinion of their UNITED STATES Corporation, but offers no evidence that Faul is in error or even too critical. Thus, of his own volition, Faul checked deeper into the definitions and etymology of some of his "words" that were claimed by Cushwa to have so ruffled their feathers. One such "word," for a representative example, is that Faul referred to the Corporation's behavior as shameful. Faul quickly found that his description of the Government's behavior, as shameful, was indeed inaccurate: their behavior is vastly worse than shameful. "Shameful" can be merely a feeling of being ashamed, and may be minor. It does not have to be outright criminal to be shameful. The Corporation's behavior against Faul in this case, on the other hand, is highly criminal. Assaulting without cause is a felony. Keeping one in prison, when such one has not been found guilty by a jury, is kidnapping; which, at common law, was not merely a felony, but was a capital offense. So, yes, Faul's description of "shameful" is incorrect: it is far too lenient and kind. All of Faul's other "words," when applied in context to the facts of this case, bring the same result: Mr. Faul was indeed kinder and gentler in his word usage than he could have been.

III. GROUNDS, FACTS, AND REASONS

Returning back to the Notice of Action for the latest parole "hearing" of January 23, 2025, something is amiss. Mr. Faul had never received a NOA regarding that "hearing" from the Commission. Rather, only by happenstance nine months later, Faul discovered from BOP staff that the Commission had "responded." During the first week in November of 2025, a copy of the NOA dated "February 04, 2025" was furnished by the BOP to Faul. Strangely, except for a date change, the main paragraph in the body of that NOA is verbatim to the earlier bogus January 31, 2023 NOA generated from the January 25, 2023 farce of a hearing. Rather than strange, perhaps it is bogusly colluded. After all, how much change could be expected from one biased autocrat?

In that latest NOA, the entire Commission, Patricia K. Cushwa ("Cushwa"), makes her self-serving remark that there is no change, -- "None" -- in its prior decision to deny release. That egoistic comment saddles it to the fact that all prior Constitutional claims that Mr. Faul raised in 2023 will at some point be addressed before, hopefully, a Court with actual honesty and integrity. That is so, because said claims have not been ruled on due to the Corporation's unlawful denial of the required 28 U.S.C. Section 2243 ("2243") hearing, and undoubtedly will not be corrected by this lawless Commission flying solo. Mr. Faul will address both NOA's together, because they are still together by the Commission's own statement in their latest NOA: "No change in previous decision to deny parole. None." That "Cushwaian" remark was followed by a paragraph that is word for word the same as her rhetoric spewed out in her January 31, 2023 NOA. Thus, the same Constitutional violations are in common to both NOA's, and as such have not yet been adjudicated.

Regarding the statements made by Cushwa in this latest 2025 NOA, they are all baseless rhetoric of diatribe, innuendo, vitriol, invective, or merely boilerplate. As such, her statements are all either false, lacking an evidentiary basis, irrelevant, or without any indicia of reliability. Therefore, the Commission's purported "decision" flowing from said baseless rhetoric is arbitrary and/or capricious. In this Commission's depraved orbit, the Commission is Cushwa, Cushwa is the Commission, the NAB is Cushwa, and Cushwa is the NAB. All of that autocracy leaves the entire NOA to be a bogus pile of false or spurious statements. As such, we will now analyze that rhetoric line by line, with each Ground having a separate paragraph that will also include the Facts and Reasons for that Ground, as follows.

GROUND ONE, with FACTS and REASONS: Cushwa, beginning her February 04, 2025 NOA, stated, "After consideration of all the factors and information presented, at this time, the Commission is denying your release under the standards at ... 4206(d) for the following reasons:" That statement is false, and Mr. Faul is suggesting that criminal charges be pursued against Cushwa and/or Helenihi regarding that statement for violation of 18 U.S.C. Section 1001 ("1001"). Helenihi stated in front of witnesses, on the record, that he did NOT even read the documents that Mr. Faul submitted to the Commission. It is a given, then, that he did not consider it. Having not considered the evidence presented, any subsequent findings made by the Commission are without a reliable evidentiary basis, with all further decisions amounting to arbitrary action on their part.

GROUND TWO, with FACTS and REASONS: Presumably as a reason to justify denial of mandatory release, Cushwa stated, "The Commission has determined that there is a reasonable likelihood that you will commit any Federal, State or local crime." Besides being merely disingenuously misstated boilerplate, that statement is false, and Mr. Faul is suggesting that criminal charges be pursued regarding that statement for violation of 1001. The Commission did not cite to any evidence to substantiate that rhetorical boilerplate. Thus, there is no rational basis in the record for that conclusion.

GROUND THREE, with FACTS and REASONS: Presumably as a reason to justify denial of mandatory release, Cushwa continued, "You were part of a violent antigovernmental group responsible for the murder and serious injury of several law enforcement officers." That statement is false, and Mr. Faul is suggesting that criminal charges be pursued regarding that statement for violation of 1001. The Commission did not cite to any evidence to substantiate that rhetoric. Thus, there is no rational basis in the record for that conclusion. Nowhere in the record, transcript, PSI, or anywhere else is there any EVIDENCE that Mr. Faul "was part of a violent antigovernmental group" of anything at all, much less one responsible for any sort of unlawful activity. It is simply concocted by a DOJ dreg without any evidence. However, there is ample evidence that Faul was NOT part of the violent antigovernmental group of rogue DOJ thugs who were responsible for the mayhem on February 13, 1983, and June 3, 1983. Of that the record is clear.

GROUND FOUR, with FACTS and REASONS: Presumably as a reason to justify denial of mandatory release, Cushwa then stated, "You continue to deny your crimes...." That statement is false, and Mr. Faul is suggesting that criminal charges be pursued regarding that statement for violation of 1001. The Commission did not cite to any evidence to substantiate that rhetoric. Thus, there is no rational basis in the record for that conclusion. Ironically, that is the only statement by the Commission that would be correct were it not for the fact that Mr. Faul has not been found guilty of the offense which the criminally motivated DOJ keeps him falsely imprisoned for. In all of his legal pleadings, and in all of his Commission actions, not once did any creature of the DOJ or of the judiciary deny that sham judges Paul Benson and Kermit Bye promised favoritism to the United States' prosecuting attorneys in Mr. Faul's 1983 "trial." Likewise, they have not denied the fact that, since the jury was not asked to find that to be guilty he would have to have had knowledge of the actual killer's intent to kill another person, Faul was not convicted of the offense for which he is now unlawfully imprisoned. Yet, they persist in continuing Mr. Faul's unlawful imprisonment. Mr. Faul's adamancy that there is no lawful conviction should not cause alarm to Cushwa or anyone else in the Commission except for the fact that they are lacking honesty and integrity. The Commission's consternation that Mr. Faul would "deny" a crime that he was not convicted of is not rational. That fact, presented to the Commission in sworn documentation that remains unrefuted, instead of causing great alarm to them, should have alerted them to the fact that there is something terribly wrong with their methodology of spewing baseless rhetoric.

GROUND FIVE, with FACTS and REASONS: Presumably as a reason to justify denial of mandatory release, Cushwa continued, "You ... claim yourself and your conspirators are the victims," That statement is false, and Mr. Faul is suggesting that criminal charges be pursued regarding that statement for violation of 1001. The Commission did not cite to any evidence to substantiate that rhetoric. Thus, there is no rational basis in the record for that conclusion. It is the whining cohorts at the Commission who need "victims." Victim status, or lack thereof, changes nothing of the fact that it was criminally motivated or rogue DOJ thugs who attacked and assaulted Faul on February 13, 1983 and then brutally murdered Gordon Kahl and Sheriff Gene Matthews on June 3, 1983. Those facts are sworn to, are undenied by the DOJ cohorts, and are irrefutable. Those people of the DOJ are childishly pathetic with their "victim" obsession, but they refuse to face the facts of that obsession. We will now do so. First, a victim is defined as one who is harmed in some way, often by another's actions. For example, when the DOJ thugs purposefully murdered Gordon Kahl and Sheriff Gene Matthews, both Mr. Kahl and Mr. Matthews were victims. What causes the status of "victim" is not the facts that Faul stated for his claims, neither is it Cushwa's mischaracterization of those facts, nor her whims. Rather, it is the entirety of what happened that creates a victim. The facts of this case are amply available in sworn declarations in the Commission's file. The best source is Mr. Faul's January 13, 2022 document addressed to Patricia K. Cushwa, Chair, containing fifteen pages of facts that are sworn to "under penalty of perjury," and are unrefuted. From page 8, some of the facts are: "After a few more shots were fired from the now attacking assailants, and after hearing bullets strike metal nearby, Scott Faul returned fire only in the direction of the Ram Charger in defense of his own life." The undenied facts that are available in Mr. Faul's file in the Commission's possession show, without question, that Mr. Faul was unarmed when he was assaulted by DOJ operatives on February 13, 1983, that Faul thereafter armed himself in self defense, and that after he was shot at numerous times he returned fire in self defense. Those facts have never been denied by anybody in the DOJ, because they cannot be denied. You, Cushwa, should act honestly, FOR A CHANGE, and declare that Mr. Faul has indeed been harmed in some way by another's actions. Pretending that the facts of this case are something else does not endow "honesty and integrity" upon anyone in the Commission. Instead, it makes them all look foolish, like biased fools. So much for Cushwa's false "victimhood" spiel -- a fool's mantra.

GROUND SIX, with FACTS and REASONS: Presumably as a reason to justify denial of mandatory release, Cushwa continued her ranting spiel, stating, "You ... deny the legitimacy of the U.S. Government, law enforcement, and the judiciary." That statement is false, and Mr. Faul is suggesting that criminal charges be pursued regarding that statement for violation of 1001. The Commission did not cite to any evidence to substantiate that rhetorical innuendo. Thus, there is no rational basis in the record for that conclusion. At any rate, how can one measure the "legitimacy" of a corporation? "Legitimate" in comparison to what? Apple pie? Hot dogs? Or unethical agents such as what some of you at the Commission have proven yourselves to be? Are the judges legitimate for promising favoritism to their handlers in the Corporation's prosecutors' offices? Are they legitimate for getting their paychecks from the same Corporation as the one from where the DOJ's

prosecutors get their paychecks? And are the "law enforcement" legitimate for arguing in the Medina, North Dakota Chief of Police's office about who was going to get to murder Gordon Kahl when they found him? Are such deranged thought processes legitimate? Is the Commission itself legitimate for harboring the delusion that it can consist of one person to be the Chair, the sole Commissioner, and the National Appeals Board all at the same time and for that same purpose for the "institutional thing" in service to "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources and law enforcement and those kinds of people?"

GROUND SEVEN, with FACTS and REASONS: Presumably as a reason to justify denial of mandatory release, Cushwa next stated, "Your own words show that you would not obey the requirements of your release." That statement is false, and Mr. Faul is suggesting that criminal charges be pursued regarding that statement for violation of 1001. The Commission did not cite to any evidence to substantiate that wild imagination. Thus, there is no rational basis in the record for that conclusion. The Commission does not even indicate to which requirements they are referring, nor does it identify which words cause disobedience of which requirements, because it is entirely invented. Mr. Faul's words of total disdain, to people who have wormed their way into positions they have no right to fill, have no relationship to any requirements of release, and the Commission's rhetoric fails to identify any such relationship. Following requirements of parole is not a 4206(d) factor. Rather, it is a factor which might cause one's parole to be revoked.

GROUND EIGHT, with FACTS and REASONS: Presumably as a reason to justify denial of mandatory release, Cushwa continued, "You have not completed any programming to address your rehabilitation such as victim impact or criminal thinking and have shown no interest in completing such programming." That statement is false, and Mr. Faul is suggesting that criminal charges be pursued regarding that statement for violation of 1001. The Commission did not cite to any evidence to substantiate that rhetorical innuendo. Thus, there is no rational basis in the record for that conclusion. Furthermore, the only evidence in the record pertaining to programming is contrary to Cushwa's drivel. The need for "criminal thinking" and "victim impact" was either completed during the early years of Faul's imprisonment and/or contraindicated as stated by Case Manager Moore and shown in the documents generated by the BOP, and is stated by the Commission itself in 2002 that recidivism is not an issue for Mr. Faul. As for showing no interest, that is a bald lie. Even though he knew that no need existed, Mr. Faul signed up for the Life Connections Program anyway, just to stifle the biased dregs of the Commission. After submitting his application, he was informed by Mr. Bird that he could not take the program because his projected release date of February 14, 2023 was altered by the Commission. It is you saviors at the Commission who have permanently prevented the very "programming" that you pretend as an excuse for denying mandatory release. Around and around you creatures go. You can save your stupid rhetoric for another time. Mr. Faul has been cleared by case management and by psychology staff and by the Commission itself to not need any type of programming whatsoever. Said staff often agree that it is those of the Commission who need help. Conclusively, Faul did not engage in heavy programming of the type Cushwa is ignorantly limiting her brain to consider because he was told not to by the Commission in 2002 when he was assured that recidivism was not an issue with him; and how could it have been -- Mr. Faul was a farmer, not a bank robber or rogue DOJ thug. The Commission at the present time just keeps inventing excuses to satisfy the bias of their "institutional thing." It is all carefully plotted falsehood. There is no recidivism issue, just like the Commission said in 2002; there is no need for programming. There never was any need for any type of programming with Mr. Faul. It is just the Commission's last ditch available excuse. It is a purposeful fallacy.

GROUND NINE, with FACTS and REASONS: Presumably as a reason to justify denial of mandatory release, Cushwa, ending her paragraph of boilerplate rhetoric, stated, "... you see no issues with your history of violence and have no intention of improving your thoughts and behaviors." That statement is false, and Mr. Faul is suggesting that criminal charges be pursued regarding that statement for violation of 1001. The Commission did not cite to any evidence to substantiate that rhetorical innuendo. Thus, there is no rational basis in the record for that conclusion. Faul, having never been convicted, has no "history of violence." The Corporation, on the other hand, has a HUGE history of violence. The swarm of DOJ agents carrying out their premeditated murder of Gordon Kahl on June 3, 1983 is one segment of their "history of violence." There have been many others. Shame on the Commission creatures to try to impute their guilty consciences of violence unto Faul. He does not share their proclivity for violence, nor their guilt complex. Mr. Faul is at one with his Father, Yahweh. The Commission fools are at one with their god, Lucifer. And contrary to Cushwa's baseless,

split-tongue lie, Mr. Faul HAS improved his thoughts and behaviors. From the BOP's programming and from the Commission's many examples of exhibiting low to no honesty or integrity, Mr. Faul learned that one should not practice delusional thinking such as the Commission uses. Thinking without delusion, therefor, Faul knows that Cushwa, along with everybody else at the Commission, can have no idea whatsoever of what Faul thought in the past, what he is thinking now, or of what he will think in the future. A certainty, then, Cushwa and her cohorts know not one whit about Faul's intentions or thoughts. Her baseless and fanciful rhetoric, colloquially, is pure horseshit. Faul keenly recognizes that fact. Thus, even though Cushwa's coterie of dregs can have no way to say yea or nay in this matter, Faul can do so because his thoughts and intentions are within his own orbit. Faul's aversion to such delusional pretense as practiced by the Commission has arisen from his observations over the years of the Corporation operatives' bad behavior in that regard. So, contrary to Cushwa's delusional needs, the BOP's programming, along with the Commission's manifestations of their own bad behavior and the judiciary's collusion therewith, has indeed caused Faul to improve his "thoughts and behaviors." Cushwa lied, Cushwa is irrational, and Mr. Faul has learned from her sleazy ways to not be like her or the rest of her cohorts.

GROUND TEN, with FACTS and REASONS: Addressing the findings in the Notice of Action, in addition to being void, the Commission's findings are arbitrary and capricious, are unsupported by evidence, do not consider dispositive conflicting evidence, and are vague and conclusory. The Commission capriciously put on a pretense that they concluded that there is a reasonable likelihood that Faul will commit a future federal, state or local crime. Yet the Commission's own Salient Factor Score system places Faul's prognosis for successful parole release to be "Very Good." Likewise calculating recidivism risk, the Attorney General, pursuant to the PATTERN assessment tool developed under the First Step Act, has concluded that Mr. Faul's probability of recidivism is minimum -- and has done so every one of the numerous times Faul has been assessed. Faul's recidivism assessments are part of Faul's central file, and the NOA is silent on what the Commission believes their own Salient Factor Score calculation missed or why the Commission is departing from their own accepted method for assessing Faul's "very good" successful parole prognosis. Likewise, the NOA is silent on what the Commission believes the Attorney General missed or why the Commission is departing from the Attorney General's accepted tool for assessing probability of recidivism. Indeed, the Commission did not even make the finding required by 4206(d) of a "reasonable probability" of recidivism. Further, the NOA does not address the evidence in Faul's sworn communications to the Commission, in which Faul asserted objections to the facts relied on at the January 25, 2023 hearing. The findings in the NOA are so vague as to mandate the conclusion that there is no rational basis in the record for the Commission's conclusions embodied in the statement of reasons. For example, the NOA states that Faul's "words" show he will not obey the parole requirements, but does not identify those words, nor the requirements which they claim are in jeopardy of not being obeyed by him. This is material because certain words -- no matter how obnoxious -- are First Amendment speech, petitioning activity, and associational activity. Finally, the NOA ignores Faul's record over his 43 years in the BOP. Faul has been a model inmate, has taken programming recommended by his case manager, and has done everything asked of him. Mr. Faul's conduct over the past 43 years, if not dispositive evidence that he will follow the law upon release, is certainly not any indication that he will commit any crimes.

GROUND ELEVEN, with FACTS and REASONS: This Ground, although the most dispositive, was left for last because Mr. Faul wanted each reader of this document to get the bigger picture of why the Commission must be forever abolished. Although raised last, the correct decision of this Ground, made first, will mandate that all other Grounds raised need not be considered because they become moot. In 4206(d), the three words, "term or terms," are a phrase meaning "sentence." Without waiving his mandatory release that had already occurred by operation of law on February 14, 2013, Mr. Faul properly waived hearings scheduled for January 25, 2023 and January 23, 2025 by stating in his January 24, 2023 Notice of Hearing-Parole Application Representative and Disclosure Request ("I-24") and its two-page attachment, that he wished "to waive parole consideration" at that time "subject to the conditions set forth ... and for the reasons stated therein." Faul made it abundantly clear that he was not relinquishing his claim that he had already been released on February 14, 2013 by operation of law, by stating, "I do not waive the mandatory release that has already been mandated by operation of law, and I request that the parole certificate be issued." Leaving the Commission without excuse, Faul further clarified, "Without waiving any release consideration, I hereby waive any further parole consideration." Faul's valid hearing waiver could not be tolerated by the Commission. With their prior commitment to their "institutional thing" for "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources and law enforcement

and those kinds of people," and presently in collusion with other rogues in the DOJ and judiciary to thwart Faul's habeas corpus petition, the Commission stooges needed that hearing to deliver some legal factors to the Corporation's operatives. While an explanation of the issue regarding "term or terms" equaling "sentence" could be quite lengthy, Mr. Faul will instead place this purposefully before the Commission with instructions to place it likewise before its Attorney General, who, if truly concerned with their precious "rule of law," will once and for all stop pretending for the Commission that they did not purposefully choose to violate 4206(d)'s mandatory release provisions of calculating two-thirds or thirty-years for each total SENTENCE instead of for each TERM of a sentence. Because the Commission and its cohorts pretend for their "prosecutor kinds of sources" to not understand Mr. Faul's words as intended by Congress, Faul will supply for them a sort of roadmap, if you will, to guide them around their "institutional thing." First, Mr. Faul asks for those at the Commission to pretend for a moment to have at least a modicum of honesty and integrity. Second, with that measure tenuously in place, lay to one side that insidious "institutional thing" of collusion by "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources and law enforcement and those kinds of people," who are nothing more than degenerates if they collude thusly. Third, with that insidious and degenerate "institutional thing" laid aside, inspect and supply to Faul a copy of the very first Manual that was generated by the Commission after the 1976 passage of the Parole Commission and Reorganization Act ("PCRA"), and concomitantly also inspect and supply to Faul a copy of the first BOP Program Statement generated after the PCRA's passage that deals with 4206(d). Fourth, be honorable enough, unlike most in the Corporation, to come to grips with the fact that your Corporation operatives sometimes make mistakes, even criminal mistakes. Fifth, with that background, research the early 4206(d) releases to show its correct application. Finally, with that newly acquired information, mentally chastise the "institutional thing," tell "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources and law enforcement and those kinds of people" to feign honor, and present your findings to the Attorney General, showing that the phrase "term or terms" means "sentence."

IV. CONCLUSION

A. Previous Appeal Notice of Action

Due to the Commission's refusal to rationally consider the evidence within its files, Cushwa's previous diatribe in her April 18, 2023 Appeal Notice of Action against Mr. Faul must be addressed.

i. Waiver of Hearing

Beginning her Appeal Notice of Action, Cushwa rambled on for an entire page with some crazy theory about why Mr. Faul did not really waive the January 25, 2023 hearing. With no basis, Cushwa argued that Mr. Faul could not waive only the hearing, but rather, would have to have waived complete parole consideration, "and do so unequivocally." Cushwa was just too ridiculous. The Commission's own Manual makes clear that those types of hearings can be waived without waiving complete parole consideration. Cushwa was simply lying about it all because she was in collusion with the rest of the DOJ and their compliant judiciary to fix Faul's 22-cv-2993 habeas corpus petition against him. Of course that was their plan all along, that being their easiest way to defeat said habeas corpus petition; that is, if Faul waived complete parole consideration, then he could no longer claim that he was released from the life term in 2013 by parole statutes, consequently invalidating his miscalculated sentence claim. That is precisely what the BOP, the Commission, and the judiciary were colluding about in their ongoing effort to keep Faul unlawfully imprisoned. However, because Faul would not fall for their scheme of getting him to waive complete parole consideration, the Corporation's rogue operatives, to carry out their plot, needed for that hearing to occur. Cushwa knew that Faul's main legal contention was that he had already earned his thirty year mandatory release pursuant to the parole statutes. She knew that if Faul were to "provide an unequivocal waiver of parole," it would negate his legal claim by removing him from the mandatory release provision, due to his waiver of that very parole consideration. Cushwa, to satisfy her cohorts, was attempting to cover for the Commission's holding of a hearing that had been lawfully waived.

ii. Recidivism Assessment

Cushwa went on from her waiver spiel to misstate the recidivism issue. She stated that Mr. Faul argued that recidivism risk "assessment tools utilized by the Attorney General's Office and the Bureau of Prisons have

already determined" his recidivism risk and that "as such, the Commission is bound to accept this." That was an ingenious story, Cushwa, but it was your own story, and it is hogwash. What Mr. Faul actually said was that "the Attorney General, pursuant to the PATTERN assessment tool developed under the First Step Act, has concluded that Faul's probability of recidivism is minimum" and asked "why the Commission is departing from the Attorney General's accepted tool for assessing probability of recidivism." Faul did not even hint that the Commission is "bound" to accept that assessment. Rather, Mr. Faul was pointing to the fact that it is not RATIONAL to go from a minimum to a maximum without explanation of that journey. Furthermore, if Cushwa were not a cohort colluder for the "institutional thing" with "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources and law enforcement and those kinds of people," she perhaps would have factored into this equation the fact that the Commission's very own Salient Factor Score for evaluating recidivism risk likewise placed Mr. Faul at a near zero risk for recidivism. Rather than acknowledging that very obvious fact that was absolutely without question staring her right in the face (because it is one of their main deciding factors) Cushwa dishonestly and without integrity made up some horseshit story to accommodate her bias-filled, arbitrary and capricious nonsense to appease her cohorts' "institutional thing." Cushwa is ugly-spirited, and she will want to use Faul's expression of his truthful observation in some future horseshit story that his "words" show that he will blah, blah, blah. All horseshit. Cushwa, in her condescending drivel, insisted to Mr. Faul that his recidivism argument was all wrong, and then ended that paragraph by stating that Mr. Faul's failure to argue that point at his hearing "is another reason you should have participated as it would have afforded you an opportunity to argue these relevant facts." First Cushwa claims the argument is all wrong, and then, to jab at Faul's refusal to endure their sham "hearing," tries to place blame on him for their totally irrational conclusion about recidivism but stupidly says his ALL WRONG argument is relevant. The Commission, Cushwa, in this case, is totally devoid of moral behavior, and, as such, is certainly unfit to determine Mr. Faul's risk of recidivism.

iii. Egocentric Respect Criteria

Cushwa rambled on in the next paragraph with multiple manipulated scenarios, all orchestrated to fill in whatever is needed to satisfy their result-oriented goal of preventing Mr. Faul's presumptively mandatory thirty year release. One segment of note is where she claimed that Faul's "failure to respect" them "is concerning and provides sufficient reason to deny parole." That is a fiction, and a risible one at that. While it may be true that Cushwa suffers from some sort of egoistic whim that others should be punished if they do not "respect" her, falling for her respect spiel to mean that the Commission properly adopted such to be a legitimate factor for 4206(d)'s application would be a red herring. "Respect" for some Government employee is NOT a criteria for parole, and it is not a valid consideration within the ambit of 4206(d) to prevent its mandatory release provision. Besides being hurtful to Cushwa's ego, the false notion that Faul without cause has no respect for honorable servants is an invented pseudo-factor that is needed by the Commission to backfill their result-oriented conclusion to deny Faul's release. However, even if some quantum of "respect" were a deciding factor under 4206(d) analysis (it is not), the Commission's showing is lacking "honesty and integrity." The Commission's pseudo-factual recitals of Mr. Faul's "words" are calculated falsehoods bearing the quality of reckless untruth, purposefully and disingenuously put forth to produce the effect they were seeking; that is, to place Faul into bad enough light to disorient people enough to cause them to overlook the fact that the Commission has no legitimate factors to invoke against Faul's mandatory thirty year release that 4206(d) provides.

For the sake of showing just how absurd their invented non-factor is, let us assume that an acceptable "respect" requirement is necessary for 4206(d)'s satisfaction. The Commission claims that some of Mr. Faul's "words" (not identified in the NOA) provide for them a finding that he will commit some unspecified crime. That claim is irrational for a number of reasons. For starters, in every example cited by the Commission, Faul's words of "concern" were written in documents that unquestionably show him expressing disdain against those who were, or were thought by Faul to be, operating contrary to law. The Commission, in all of its documents that Faul has seen, refers to a couple dozen or so phrases of "words" of concern, always out of context and never providing a full accounting of their use. An in-context and complete rendering shows conclusively, without any inference to the contrary, that Faul's "words" are in every instance words of disdain for criminal activity, perceived criminal activity, or such activity's perpetrators. That is so, whether those perpetrators are of the DOJ or of the judiciary, without discrimination or preference to either. Rather than unfair, Mr. Faul has oftentimes been too lenient and timid in his condemnation of the miscreants.

Some representative samples from the Commission's 12-page, two-part Pre-Hearing Assessment and

Hearing Summary document, dated April 21, 2022 and January 25, 2023 respectively, will clearly establish such a conclusion. In that document, authored by Hearing Examiner Oscar Vela ("Vela") on the Pre-Hearing segment, and Hearing Examiner Erick Helenihi on the Hearing Summary segment, Vela and Helenihi penned not only a sampling of Faul's "words," but additionally transcribed what a number of other Corporation agents falsely claimed those words meant. Said agents include U.S. Attorney Drew Wrigley, Assistant U.S. Attorney Matt Schneider, and a marshal named Dallas Carlson. It must be noted that an attorney's unsworn statements, as well as a marshal's unsworn statements, are not evidence, but Vela and Helenihi placed those three's words on a Government document as if they were facts. As such, Vela, Helenihi, Wrigley, Schneider, and Carlson, all five ("the tag team"), quite likely committed felonies under 1001. Schneider's contribution of Faul's "words" was mainly (if not entirely) extracted from Faul's documents submitted by him in his 2020 motion for compassionate release. Vela, Helenihi, Wrigley, Schneider, and Carlson are all agents of the same Corporation and are thus equally culpable in matters they collude in. We will now compare what the tag team claimed that Faul's "words" expressed, with what Faul's words ACTUALLY expressed. Some examples of the tag team's efforts follow.

In the Pre-Hearing Assessment segment, Vela stated: (1) that Faul "refers to the 'dregs in the Parole Commission and in the Records Department of the BOP' whom he claims have, 'unjustifiably and unlawfully extended my release date to 2023.'" And they have certainly done so, with use of their invented factors to boot. Nevertheless, Vela's rendition of Faul's "words" leaves an impression that he is referring to everyone in both the Commission and BOP as being dregs, but the fact that Faul's intention is against criminality is made clear from reading, in context, what he actually stated in his document. Two full paragraphs from that 3582 document are instructive enough regarding proper context that Mr. Faul will reproduce them in their entirety here:

Importantly, if you want to honestly consider this request, I was supposed to have been released by operation of law in 2013. However, dregs in the Parole Commission and in the Records Department(s) of the BOP have unjustifiably and unlawfully extended my release date to 2023. When that date arrives, those biased scum will once again enlist some new lies, whatever they feel the whim to need, to deny release yet once again. They will do that because they are part of the deep state swamp, and have made promises of favoritism to their Lucifer-worshipping cohorts. That has been documented in my legal pleadings, and is undenied by the scum.

On top of all that, one thing, out of a mountain of others, is that if you contact the U.S. Attorney for the District of North Dakota, he will be unable to supply you with proof that the jury in my case was instructed that in order to be guilty of aiding and abetting second degree murder, Scott Faul would have to have had knowledge of the actual killer's intent to kill someone. He will also admit, if he possesses merely a speck of integrity, that "having knowledge of the principal's intent to kill" is a necessary element for a conviction of aiding and abetting second degree murder. Go ahead, call him. From that, if you are not yourself under that same favor-promising thrall of Lucifer as were sham judges Paul Benson and Kermit Bye, you will then clearly notice that I have not been found guilty of the charge for which I am imprisoned -- aiding and abetting second degree murder. That is a separately justifiable circumstance, and extraordinary and compelling reason, justifying compassionate release in and of itself. I.e., it is enough for you to invoke your inherent power in habeas corpus to order release when the Corporation fails to make a return to those specific facts.

Section 3582 motion dated December 3, 2020, pages 2-3. Clearly Faul was limiting his designation of "dregs" to those who acted "unjustifiably and unlawfully," which informs that Faul does not like CRIMINALITY: hardly supporting the Commission's irrationality that Faul will go out and commit CRIMES if he were released. No evidence was offered to substantiate that those words suggest recidivism; (2) that Faul "goes on to state, 'when that date arrives, those biased scum will once again enlist some new lies, whatever they feel the whim to need, to deny release yet once again.'" When 2023 arrived, "those biased scum" did just that. As shown in the above reproduced paragraphs, when Faul is depicting "biased scum," he is referring to those few of the Commission and "Records Department(s) of the BOP" who "unlawfully" changed his release date. It is noteworthy that Faul's allegations are not denied under oath, but are only whined about. No evidence was offered to dispute what Faul stated, or to substantiate that those words suggest recidivism; (3) that Faul, in reference to them enlisting some new lies, stated, "'they will do that because they are part of the deep state swamp, and have made promises of favoritism to their Lucifer-worshipping cohorts.'" Likewise put in context, again as the above reproduced paragraphs also show, Faul's "Lucifer-worshipping cohorts" terminology is properly explained to encompass those like "sham judges Paul Benson and Kermit Bye" who, as Faul stated on page 4 of his 3582 motion without denial from the Government, "both promised favoritism to the other side in my case." None of

this was denied by the Government, nor is it denied by the Government now, nor will it ever be denied by them. Further, no evidence was offered to substantiate that those "words" suggest recidivism; (4) that Faul, referring to the promises of favoritism, stated "that has been documented in my legal pleadings, and is undenied by the scum." No evidence was offered to substantiate that those words suggest recidivism. Such whining by the tag team can only raise the fair question of what is wrong with their honesty and integrity that they pretend to be presumed to have? Faul's facts are documented in his legal pleadings, and those facts ARE "undenied by the scum." It cannot be maintained that someone with honesty and integrity can be made aware of undenied facts of favoritism, refuse to correct the egregious and unarguable illegality, and yet maintain they are anything above the category of "scum." Such acquiescence to impropriety is self-implicating and beyond appalling. Regarding the allegations involving Lucifer-worshipping cohorts, do they not ply their Craft out of the swamp, as President Trump had at that time referred to it? And do they not ply their Craft under the shadow of a giant obelisk that was erected in honor to Lucifer? Do they not do that with their cohorts? And without any indicator that they worship our Father, does it not appear that they must instead be worshipping Lucifer? If they are, then the ones that are "biased scum" (and they know who they are) should repent, ask forgiveness from those they have wrongfully schemed against, and correct the injustices they have inflicted upon them. If Mr. Faul is just wrong about all those perceptions, why do those who feel so "offended" not deny the assertions that he made, rather than just whine about the fact that he made them? The answer seems self-evident: what Faul claims to be, is truly so; and (5) that Faul "voices very specific disdain toward the BOP and USPC, which may reflect a likelihood he would not be particularly cooperative with supervision or abiding by the conditions of his release if granted parole." That baseless rhetoric is entirely invented by Vela to achieve the Commission's desired result of denying Faul's release. It is highly irrational for Vela to maintain that one's disdain for wrongful behavior within the BOP and USPC would "reflect a likelihood" of such person to exhibit the same type of wrongful behavior. Just the opposite would be rationally expected: one who "voices very specific disdain" toward illegality would be expected to NOT engage in wrongful behavior as do those targeted by the disdain. Vela's contention on this matter is fully twisted. It is irrational, and opposite to a logical conclusion. Furthermore, Faul's "disdain toward the BOP and USPC," while seen by Vela as an indicator that "may reflect" a measure of cooperation, more properly "may reflect" that Faul is not fond of bad behavior, leaving his "disdain toward the BOP and USPC" instead to be totally appropriate and, more likely, understated: their continued illegal behavior deserves them much harsher disdain than Faul can even express.

Moving ahead to the Hearing Summary segment, Helenihi furnished additions to Vela's contributions. Helenihi and the tag team stated: (1) that "he is unrepentant." No evidence was offered to substantiate that baseless, nonsensical rhetoric; (2) that "he claims he is the victim." No evidence was offered to substantiate that baseless rhetoric, and Faul has never claimed he was "the victim;" (3) that "he shows a continuing disdain for law enforcement and the judiciary." No evidence was offered to substantiate that baseless rhetoric. Put in context, Faul showed disdain for "rogues" and "sham" officers in ALL branches of the Corporation; (4) that "minimizing his crime means he is more likely to commit a future offense." No evidence was offered that Faul has ever minimized ANY crime, much less "his crime." Setting up the strawman only to knock him down, the rogues get knocked down instead, because Faul has not been found guilty of the imprisoning "offense," and no Corporation agent, rogue or otherwise, has denied that fact, nor can they. The tag team's "conclusion" to their false premise, at any rate, is without legal support, is contrary to empirical evidence, and is irrational; after all, Faul (a farmer) did not plan an assault, the thugs (agents who target practiced at HUMAN silhouettes) planned the assault. Minimize THAT; (5) that "he claims he has not been found guilty and is unlawfully committed." No Corporation agent has ever denied that "knowledge of the actual killer's intent to kill another person" must be found by the jury in order to convict one for aiding and abetting second degree murder. Nor have they denied that the jury in Faul's "trial" was never instructed as such, nor can they. It is a given, then, and undeniable, that Faul is therefore "unlawfully committed." No evidence was offered to refute that truism, as none exists; (6) that "in his own words, he was 'unlawfully attacked by murderous thugs.'" It is not denied by any Government agents that Faul was attacked without any warrant and had done nothing unlawful in the attackers' presence when they attacked him with assault weapons, that men from two agencies argued in the Medina, North Dakota Chief of Police's office over which of them were going to get to murder Gordon Kahl, and that swarms of them thereafter with premeditation did murder Gordon Kahl and Sheriff Gene Matthews. "Murderous thugs" was born out of that: their own deserved epithet. Whine about THAT; (7) that "his refusal to accept responsibility is deeply insulting." But "deeply insulting" to who? The idea is absurd. The tag team are like whores in a church choir: they cannot be insulted, or, if they can be, they have no right to whine about it. That the tag team does

not accept responsibility for being deluded, self-created cohorts of "murderous thugs," that is what is "deeply insulting." Accept responsibility for THAT! Regardless, no evidence was offered to substantiate the tag team's baseless innuendo implying that there is an acceptance of responsibility issue with Mr. Faul. Quite the contrary, Faul's documents establish that he accepts full responsibility for everything that he did, but the tag team thinks that Faul should "accept responsibility" for things he did NOT do. Furthermore, even if Faul had tried to downplay his actions (he did not), the courts have consistently held that when many years have passed since sentencing, acceptance of responsibility is no longer a factor to deny parole consideration; (8) that "he referred to 'sham judges' as under the 'favor-promising thrall of satan.'" No evidence was offered to refute that sham judges exist, or to show that "sham judges" are NOT under "the favor-promising thrall of satan." In context, though, Faul's facts, that the particular judges referred to had promised favoritism to the Corporation's attorneys, were never disputed by anyone from the Corporation. Thus, they became the established facts of the case, and, as to whether they were under satan's thrall, would the tag team prefer to pretend that they were under our Father's grace? Faul doubts it: it was satan's thrall; (9) that "he called the Parole Commission 'biased scum.'" No evidence was offered to substantiate that baseless innuendo. In context, Faul stated that those of the Commission, who were involved in the illegal behavior, were "biased scum." It appears that the tag team must be considering all of the Commission as being involved in illegal behavior, in order to cause Faul's definitive category to encompass them all. Without Faul's sorting of them, either all of those at the Commission are bad people involved in illegality, as the tag team's misquote compels, or, as Faul actually expressed, there are only some there who are bad -- so call them what you will, but Faul cannot be expected to cover for the bad of them by withholding his criticism; (10) that "he referred to the US Attorney's office as 'favor-promising scum.'" No evidence was offered to substantiate that misquote that is out of context at any rate. Faul actually stated that they were favor "accepting" scum, which has never been denied by either the U.S. Attorneys or the judges so accused, nor will they ever deny it because it is correct. However, in context, because they admittedly accepted promises of favoritism from favor "promising" sham judges, if such are not "scum" in their own right for the subsequent kidnapping they commit therefrom, then what are they? So go ahead, tag team, and supply a more accurate term to their impropriety -- maybe unethical, which, according to Webster's, brings us full circle to kind of scummy; (11) that he "refers to the United States as a corporation and as a 'shameful creature.'" No evidence was offered to refute that the United States is a corporation: of course it IS a corporation as was held by the Supreme Court of the UNITED STATES Corporation on numerous occasions. And a "creature"? Of course it is a creature: it was created as a corporation by the people. In Latin, it is *creatus + ure*, for creature. As for being shameful, in context Faul explained very cogently to what degree it exudes shamefulness; e.g., a tag team such as Schneider/Heleni, if allowed as rogue, or allowed as valid, would self-place the creature into shameful designation -- or worse: their behavior is below an acceptable point of morality. It is "shameful." Only one filled with depravity up to the gills would contend that a system with favor-promising judges in collusion with favor-accepting prosecutors is not shameful. It is what it is, they are what they are: shameful, disgraceful, disgusting, and illegal; (12) that his "words ... led to murder in 1983." No evidence was offered to substantiate that totally irrational statement. Mr. Faul's words, first uttered or written in 2020, the tag team would have us believe, reached back in time to cause "murder in 1983." If that is not insanity, what, may the tag team suggest, is? It would be more plausible for the tag team to get right about things, and admit that quite possibly just the opposite is true: i.e., that the 1983 murders committed by Corporation thugs, as the Medina, North Dakota Chief of Police can corroborate, helped to cause Mr. Faul's 2020 words of disgust and disdain -- for good cause; (13) that "he does not believe in the authority of any federal law enforcement." No evidence was offered to substantiate that baseless rhetoric. None exists; (14) that "he plans to 'continue from exactly at the same point' that he was at in 1983 before he was 'unlawfully attacked by murderous thugs of the Ronald Reagan, Edwin Meese squad of terrorists.'" In context, Faul was clearly referring to the "same point" in farming. The tag team twists it to imply a criminal context. The tag team is disingenuously scummy, of their own doing. Faul does not make them twist, they do that for their sickness of egocentrism. No evidence was offered to substantiate that Faul plans to "continue" with anything but farming. It is the rogues and thugs who will likely go back to crimes of assaulting others, as the news will confirm. As for murderous thugs of the Reagan era, Faul's 2018 Parole Appeal covers very well his undeniable documentation against that regime. History records it, and the tag team is incessant on staying joined to it. No evidence was offered to deny Faul's claims against the "murderous thugs of the Ronald Reagan, Edwin Meese squad of terrorists." Faul's claim as such will stand as factually sound; and (15) that "he is not a changed man, he is at exactly the same point he was in 1983 - Dangerous and ready to commit a crime." No evidence was offered to substantiate that pretextual diatribe. However, Faul IS

a changed man: he now knows that the rogue faction of bastards within the Corporation are very bad people. He did not know that in 1983, at least to the extent he now does. If Faul is "dangerous and ready to commit a crime," it would be only if he is considering to sign on with some thuggish DOJ agency, and that is not likely. Thus, the tag team is simply full of horseshit -- and "ready to commit a[nother] crime." And they will: they will put more false information on Government forms in violation of 1001, at the least.

But regardless of all that, those of the Commission, whether dregs, or scum, or angels of light, do not even identify what crimes Mr. Faul's words will cause him to commit. Of course they cannot do so because their whole scenario is all simply invented criteria with invented factors, just like Faul says it is: it is all horseshit. A prisoner's words of condemnation against criminals or perceived criminals, whether the perception is correct or in error, can never pose as a rational basis for invoking 4206(d)'s "reasonable probability" of recidivism. It was simply the Commission's last ditch choice, and it was a lousy, stupidly invoked, lame choice. Being their last chance, they are now stuck with it: stupidly and irredeemably stuck, unless they could abandon or lessen their shamefulness and repent of their "institutional thing." Besides, the Commission is totally disingenuous in criticizing Faul for "words." In a footnote in his 2018 Parole Appeal, Mr. Faul very cogently established what should have served as the definitive foundation for his "words," except that such would not have satisfied the "institutional thing" that was at play for "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources and law enforcement and those kinds of people." That footnote bears repeating in its entirety, and as such is reproduced here:

1. Because of a general misunderstanding of some terms, I feel that a rather lengthy explanation is required at this point. I do not use the term "thug" merely to just be derogatory for that purpose in and of itself, and certainly not toward those, however few or many there may be, who have honorable intentions for devoting their lives to what they sincerely believe to be "law enforcement" efforts. The question of whether the whole "system" is sick and degenerate, because of it being against our Father's will, is a discussion necessarily left for another day. But for those, the majority, who do not even comprehend what honorable intentions might consist of, "thug" is the very correct term for them for a number of very cogent reasons. From a Webster's dictionary, thug comes from the concept of "[... he covers, conceals - more at THATCH] (ca. 1810) : a brutal ruffian or assassin : GANGSTER, KILLER...." The term "assassin" includes, "one who commits murder; esp : one that murders a politically important person either for hire or from fanatical motives." With all of the covert operations sponsored by the UNITED STATES Corporation, both here and abroad, there can be no hesitation that "thug" is the correct term for at least all of those in "law enforcement" who wittingly, and probably even eagerly, carry out the agenda of the New World Order criminals. "Thug" is meant for those of that ilk, and not for any with honorable intentions. I simply have no better term for those types. To refer to them as "marshals" is to tarnish and diminish the honor and respect which is due to the few well-meaning officers who have struggled on in spite of the abuse heaped on them by the "thugs" of their own ranks. Please keep that in mind while proceeding.

Addendum for 07-16-18 Appeal of 04-16-18 Parole Hearing/05-09-18 Notice of Action, page 4 of 14, footnote 1. While this footnote was somewhat narrow in scope, the same applies to other agencies and to Mr. Faul's other "words." When servants misbehave, they may be freely chastised to prevent their self-assigned importance from overwhelming their sovereignly-appointed constraints placed upon them by their sovereign masters. To that end, as our Father admonished, such servants must be continuously monitored, and corrected when in error. Words of praise when they are due, as well as words of disdain when such are due, provide an important and useful function for guiding the behavior of all agencies. Words of disdain toward agents or agencies are fully necessary when such are involved in murder, false imprisonment, kidnapping, or putting false information on government documents for the "institutional thing" of their biased "law enforcement" friends. One need look only glancingly at the history of the Commission's dismal existence, and Congress's futile attempts to legislate some decency into it, for proof that the need for harsh words is apparent and certain.

Regardless, the agencies that harbor those who Mr. Faul claims to be miscreant violators have not denied one single instance of illegality that he has pointed out when he heaps disdain on them. Thus, they can have no gripe. Faul can and should refer to those miscreants as miscreants when they behave as miscreants, as scum when they act like scum, and as whatever when they act like whatever. It is the Commission's self-provided evidence that they are all of what Faul has accused them of. Cushwa, it is time for you to meaningfully deny, specifically, anything that Faul has claimed against you or your cohorts; and, as you authoritatively spewed without authority against Faul, you must do so "unequivocally," or remain silent and abide by the law on mandatory release. Until you do so, as Faul accuses, you are a kidnapper. A lawless kidnapper. A lawless,

shameful kidnapper, making the Corporation you infest a shameful creature. You, Cushwa, cannot refute a single assertion in this paragraph, nor in any of Mr. Faul's documents in existence with the Commission or elsewhere, and you have not produced so much as a scrap of relevant evidence to do so. You have no gripe.

The foregoing should leave no doubt that Faul's "words" are reserved for those who are truly miscreants that deserve reprobation, and not for those who actually act with honesty and integrity. Lest there be any lingering doubt regarding the Corporation rogues' bad intent in their twisting of Faul's intentions, another irrefutable segment of the record should help to settle the matter. From the Commission's own source of their out-of-context "words" that Faul was twistedly accused of (his 3582 compassionate release litigation), Faul pointed out another one of the Government's intentional falsifications. The relevant paragraph from Faul's Reply is revealing enough to be reproduced in its entirety here.

Respondent states, "Faul refers to the BOP and the Parole Commission as 'biased scum' who have 'made promises of favoritism to their Lucifer-worshipping cohorts.' Motion at 2." (Opp. p. 38, ¶ 2) That is not true. I stated, in the very paragraph they cite, that it is the "dregs" in those institutions who are "those biased scum," as Webster's dictionary defines "dregs" to mean "the most undesirable part." I do not refer to everyone in the BOP or in the Parole Commission as scum — only those who lack integrity and become "dregs." (Motion p. 2, ¶ 2)

Movant's Reply to Respondent's Opposition to Movant's Motion for Compassionate Relief, Case No. C3-83-16-PDW, dated nunc pro tunc to March 5, 2021. The Commission was wrong. The Commission, at the least, owes Mr. Faul an apology.

As for Cushwa's problem with "respect," Mr. Faul believes it to be a red herring. Certain that their cohorts in the judiciary will not check them for rationality in any meaningful way, the Commission was free to adopt any circumstance in existence as a factor for preventing mandatory release. Because Mr. Faul had spoken boldly against corrupt agents and judges, the Commission adopted his "words" as the factor for preventing his release. If Faul had been totally quiet in all respects, the Commission would have used his quietude as the factor, stating that Faul just allows all bad behavior without objection, so the Commission finds that his unwillingness to speak out against criminality is concerning enough to deny his release. Whatever Faul had exhibited, the Commission (Cushwa) would have simply adopted it against him, just like she helped her fellow Commissioner, Deborah A. Spagnoli, do against Veronza Bowers in his case. Thus, Mr. Faul believes that Cushwa's "respect" spiel, rather than an innocent blunder, is really a purposefully contrived red herring or strawman scenario employed by the DOJ for their nefariously plotted end result of capriciously extending Faul's unlawful imprisonment.

If not, Cushwa may well be an egocentric narcissist with a savior complex. As such, she could not get any satisfaction from Mr. Faul in this case because he was never a criminal, is not now a criminal, has never needed programming, does not now need programming, and has no need whatsoever for any of her dishonest "help."

Regardless, so what if Mr. Faul does not respect her? She has proven herself to be a lying, scheming, dishonest, dishonorable, unethical, and shameless dreg with no integrity. None. The question of "respect" for Cushwa is redundant. Can she bring herself to correct the Commission's baseless, bias-driven decisions that were made with zero evidence? That, perhaps, would garner some "respect."

iv. Reasonable Probability Boilerplate

Cushwa's statement that Mr. Faul has a probability of committing a future crime is merely the wording of 4206(d). Those are the words of the FINDING that the Commission must make to satisfy their result-oriented predetermination to prevent statutory release. They are NOT the facts which would establish that finding. No such facts exist. Without facts to establish a valid finding, Cushwa is stuck with using only the boilerplate of the statute's wording, in hopes that nobody will notice her shortcoming. We have noticed. Simply stating that "the Commission has determined" does not ESTABLISH that the Commission has any basis for that claim. They must actually have an EVIDENTIARY basis to demonstrate just how it "has determined" whatever it is that they determined. There does not appear to be any evidence in the record that is relevant to the 4206(d) release-preventing factors that the Commission has concocted. Not only is it based on no evidence, worse, it is based on the Commission's unmasked bias and vitriol. If the Commission has anything more than innuendo or other baseless rhetoric, they should identify such as if to show a rational basis for their conclusion. What the evidence in this case does establish is that the Commission has no intention of being fair and impartial toward Mr. Faul. Those of the dreg faction of the Commission are still beholden to their "institutional thing" in loyalty to "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources and law enforcement and those kinds of people."

v. Victim Obsession

For starters, "victim" is a useless designation that is way too broad to be meaningful, because anyone who is harmed in any way can be a victim. Many on February 13, 1983 were victims: to what end? The issue in this case is not whether or not Mr. Faul is a victim, but whether he is wrongfully IMPRISONED because of the fact that 4206(d)'s mandatory release provision of "two-thirds" OR "thirty years" of the total sentence, "whichever is earlier," has not been honored by the Commission. The fact that he is or is not a "victim," of the DOJ thugs' unlawful attack against him, cannot be altered no matter how much Empress Cushwa whines about it. She is a liar in this matter, and, thus, is a victim herself; a victim of her own deceit and treachery, and a victim of the Commission's "institutional thing." Perhaps she is a "victim" of "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources and law enforcement and those kinds of people." Perhaps she is, rather, in collusion with them as she was in the Veronza Bowers debacle.

vi. Programming Lunacy

As explained in Ground Eight above, Mr. Faul followed the Commission's advice in its 2002 finding that he does not have any programming needs to reduce recidivism. Thus, besides always working on his assigned jobs, Faul has busied himself in educational areas rather than in what he was told would be, for him, needless programming. Having been told that recidivism was not an issue for him, Faul did not extensively program with such recidivistic type of subjects, because the Commission clearly established that there was no need for him to do so. With a large amount of relevant evidence before him, Hearing Examiner Robertson left no doubt in his conclusion that the usual programming for recidivism risk reduction was not even remotely an issue in this case. Solidifying his factually based conclusion, Examiner Robertson said to Faul:

So, you could serve another five to ten years in custody before the Commission will act to release you [pause] NOT because probably you are any kind of threat to the community or any of those other kinds of things [pause] be like, um, the chances of you doing anything illegal if you were released today is virtually nil. Um, they would probably never hear a squeak out of you again. I'm sure you are not a risk. That is not the issue with you. It's accountability.

Audio Recording Transcript, Initial Parole Hearing before Hearing Examiner Samuel Robertson, December 30, 2002. Fully aware of his own non-criminal existence, and being told by the Commission that they "will act to release" him after "another five to ten years" for "accountability," Mr. Faul could not be expected to have ever believed that he needed any recidivism reduction programming. Faul, knowing that he does not have a broken demeanor, was more than happy and satisfied that the Commission correctly concluded such fact at the 2002 initial hearing. The Commission's about face, now, delivered by Cushwa with her injudicious suggestion that Mr. Faul needs their "broken-demeanor" type of programming or else he will commit some future crime, is worse than merely incorrect: it is a maliciously concocted lunacy born of a malevolent desire to carry out the deep-seated and unequivocal promises of favoritism that feeds their "institutional thing" for the benefit of "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources and law enforcement and those kinds of people."

However, even regardless of all that, Cushwa, with her spiel, is just plainly wrong and in denial. Rather than not having programmed "sufficiently," Mr. Faul has devoted countless thousands of hours to studying law in the institutions' education departments as instructed to do by Case Manager Cram who assured Faul that such study is itself BOP sanctioned programming as stated in Program Statement 5100.08. When considering those facts, Mr. Faul has overprogrammed and Empress Cushwa is without a programming deficit to place against Faul. But, horror of horrors, that would not backfill the blanks to establish any facts for a basis to her boilerplate, so she consciously ignored it. Cushwa needs Faul to have not programmed "sufficiently" -- a totally arbitrary catchall -- so that she can pretend that it is something more than just the "institutional thing" that prevents Faul's release. To that end, Cushwa simply identified the particular program type that Faul did not needlessly do, and then implicated it as she saw fit to satisfy her result-oriented, arbitrary conclusion. In a nutshell, the Commission's "programming" spiel is nothing more than a lame attempt to manufacture a reason for denying statutory release. Their diatribe of invective against Mr. Faul is entirely spun out of whole cloth. It is totally invented. It is, colloquially, horseshit. When Faul completes said programs, "criminal thinking" and "victim impact," the Commission will just invent some new horseshit to backfill their preordained "decision," just like they did after Faul had fulfilled their "five years" for "accountability" pretense: they just make up some new horseshit story for their "institutional thing."

B. End Notes

i. For the Commission

Cushwa, along with any others in the Commission who are likewise implicated, the undenied facts in this case (along with the guidance that Faul has attempted to urge), prudently encourage that you rehabilitate your errant behavior and biased attitude you have openly displayed against Mr. Faul while knowing next to nothing about him. To achieve such rehabilitation, you must be big enough to admit, and, ideally, to say: that the sworn facts that Faul supplied in his provided documents appear to be reliable, and have not been denied by anyone in the DOJ and are irrefutable; that he was a farmer, and not a criminal; that he was wrongly attacked by DOJ agents who were, at the least, mistaken; that the Commission's Salient Factor Score shows him to have a very good prognosis for successful parole; that the First Step Act's PATTERN risk assessment shows him to have a minimum risk for recidivism; that all of the DOJ's metrics very strongly calculate that he has no recidivism risk; that he has no need for programming, but has nevertheless programmed for multiple thousands of hours by studying law and other topics of his own volition with no coaxing needed; that there were no release-precluding factors in existence in 2013 for the Commission to invoke against his presumptively mandatory release; and, that even if he had actually been found guilty of every element of aiding and abetting second degree murder (he was not), he has been in prison for too many years beyond the average length of imprisonment for second degree murder. Finally, humble yourself enough to say you are sorry for applying bias to this unnecessarily political case, and that you are sorry for agreeing, at least tacitly, to accommodate the "institutional thing" of bad people who are without honesty and integrity. Perhaps you were not properly admonished by the right people. Had you been, perhaps you would not have travelled such a dark path with Lucifer's servants. In the end, which is now, those servants, perfidious to our Father's will, have left you outside of our Father's good grace. In your very own words with which from false premises you hypocritically admonished Faul in your 2023 and 2025 Notices of Action, it is for you to adopt an "intention of improving your thoughts and behaviors." Mr. Faul gives this advice to you, Patricia K. Cushwa, as a parent would to an errant child for whom he cares. An apology, and request for forgiveness, can go a long way. It can bring you renewal. That is more than you can get from Lucifer's cohorts.

To that end, apologies and forgiveness do not operate in a vacuum. Correction, when that is reasonably possible, is a necessary corollary. In this case, while it might require a moderate amount of time and effort on the Commission's part because they have it all so injudiciously mangled, there is a reasonably possible way to correct the Commission's glaringly biased position and its result-oriented and irrational conclusions flowing therefrom. Thus, for achieving an honorable conclusion in this case, a map to follow (with some possible alterations, and with useful suggestions being welcome from the Commission) should look something like the following. First, we should all want these most important matters resolved on the basis of reliable evidence rather than baseless innuendo and outrightly false statements. Such a goal can get no objection from any of us. Second, when either party (the Commission or Faul) challenges an assertion of fact, the matter should be settled as Faul suggested to the Commission in his January 13, 2022 letter to Patricia K. Cushwa, Chair. On page 14 of that letter, Faul suggested that if any of his stated facts are disputed by the Corporation (DOJ, Commission, etc.), then he will supply the "precise source for the particular disputed fact," and, reciprocally, if any Corporation-supplied facts are disputed by Faul, then the Corporation must supply the "precise source for the particular disputed fact." Such a procedure is reliable, reasonably fair, and workable. Third, with the facts firmly established from evidence in that manner, the Commission should do an honest and objective culpability determination on all who were involved in this case; that is, Faul, the marshals, the FBI, the judiciary, the DOJ, and the Commission itself. That is so, because it is the Commission that made this a "political case" with, among other things, the invocation of their "institutional thing" with their proudly touted cohorts whom they referred to as "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources and law enforcement and those kinds of people." We should all want to put this all out on the table so as not to leave it appear, as it now does, as a Veronza Bowers type of injustice. Fourth, the Commission should perform an honest recidivism risk assessment, using the real metrics that are widely accepted instead of their own biased notions as they now use to reach their result-oriented decision. More honestly, the Commission would be correct to conclude that there can be no recidivism risk in the first place because there is no conviction: Faul has not been convicted of any crime. That is material, but wholly ignored by the Commission. Fifth, so they will reach the correct conclusion for obeying 4206(d)'s requirement regarding its thirty year presumptive mandatory release (not a "granting" of parole, as

they arrogantly, deceptively state), the Commission should request an investigation into their own calculatedly deliberate abandonment of the position they previously held during the first many years after passage of the Parole Commission and Reorganization Act, and how they administered all 4206(d) releases during those years. The position which they correctly held was that the phrase "term or terms" as used in 4206(d) is synonymous with the "TOTAL SENTENCE" imposed in a single judgment. That is relevant because it brings clarity to the fact that the 1976 Congress with their passage of the PCRA meant for a thirty year maximum presumptive mandatory release from imprisonment to be applied to the total sentence imposed in any single judgment, no matter its counts or their lengths. And finally, sixth, after all of the foregoing is complete, if the Commission has still not properly concluded that Faul is not now nor has ever been a recidivism risk, then they should become sincere with their presently feigned programming spiel, as follows. In their Appeal Notice of Action, the Commission claims that they want Mr. Faul to achieve the "right" programming so that he can be released. If sincere about that, then the Commission should state the specific EVIDENCE of the purported deficiency that Faul is said by them to have so that he can satisfy them in regard to that SPECIFIC deficiency. Then, if the Commission is not a lying farce, they should place into the record a contractual agreement (like a mandatory release contingency) that when Faul completes the specific program indicated from the specific EVIDENCE, then the Commission will no longer act to prevent 4206(d)'s mandatory release. An example is this. The Commission claims that Faul's "word(s)" show that he will commit a crime. If not merely hogwash, then the Commission must identify what specific "word(s)" will cause what specific crime: for example, Faul's use of the word "dreg," to describe an agency's criminally-motivated agent, will cause Mr. Faul to rob a bank, or will cause him to place false information on Government forms like they do. The Commission should see where this all will likely lead if not corrected and forgiven. Mr. Faul thinks that we all understand it, finally.

ii. For the Monitors

President Trump said that "our legal system is CORRUPT, our Judges (and Justices!) are highly partisan, compromised or just plain scared." Cushwa has in the past been part of that CORRUPT system. Herein, she has been asked to correct herself. Mr. Faul sees nothing yet against corruption in HIS case.

Mr. Trump also said, "I am your warrior, I am your justice, and for those who have been wronged and betrayed, I am your retribution. I am your retribution." Scott Faul has been wronged and betrayed, and he remains so to this very day. Mr. Faul sees no hint yet of retribution in HIS case.

Further, President Trump said, "I was innocent on all counts. If I am elected, they will be brought to JUSTICE, something the Republicans have always been afraid to do." Scott Faul is innocent on all counts; and yet more outrageous, he was not even found guilty of the offense for which he is presently unlawfully imprisoned. Mr. Faul sees nobody being brought to justice yet in HIS case.

With a spirit of resolve, President Trump said, "Those people that CHEATED will be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the Law, which will include long term prison sentences so that this Depravity of Justice does not happen again." Many have cheated against Scott Faul in this case. Mr. Faul sees none of the cheaters being prosecuted yet in HIS case.

Time is rapidly running out for this present administration to do, in THIS case, what was in a general sense promised in the foregoing quotes. That admonition can be fairly announced by Mr. Faul, because large amounts of information clearly and indisputably exposing the Government's egregiously wrongful behavior in this case have been repeatedly provided by him to this present administration without results or response. Thus, there can be only two reasons for this to have happened: (1) this administration has not kept its promises to make corrections against the swamp creatures for their murderous corruption; or (2) this administration has been countermanded to the point that the disturbing information surrounding this case has been kept from the attention of President Trump. Either way, whether there has been purposeful disregard or it is inexcusable pigeonholing, such brokenness must be either fixed by the oppressors or circumvented by the oppressed.

To fix it will be the easiest and the least obtrusive. The methodology for fixing it is covered below in the segment regarding and titled "The Correct Solution."

Circumvention is much more difficult, but, given the posture of this case and many others like it, coupled with such a degree of corruption infecting the Corporation that it has caused a stirring among the sovereign people, it may well be that the time for such decisive action has come. Our Sovereign Father and his sovereign children deserve no less. The answer is shortly left to be decided, not BY Cushwa or Trump; but rather, it will be decided by Scott William Faul and other sovereigns BECAUSE of the actions or inactions taken by Cushwa

and Trump. If the Commission cannot decide, and the rest of the DOJ cannot decide, and the pardoner will not get the opportunity to decide, then the Sovereign People will decide.

Lest there be some sanctimonious inner-sneering within any of the servants who have perhaps ignorantly elevated their own selves into loftiness, it is prudently suggested that such ones give serious heed to the words spoken by various judges from time to time. They have affirmed the sound principle that sovereignty does not reside in the persons who fill the different departments of government; but rather, sovereignty resides "in the people from whom the government emanated, and who may change it at their discretion." Further, it has been made clear that "sovereignty, then, in this country, abides with the constituency and not with the agent;" and that such "is true, both in reference to the federal and state governments." That concept will catch on and will be grasped and cherished when properly presented. Due to the outrageously criminal behavior by "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources" in this case, and the people's new awareness of multitudes of other criminality that is rampant within the DOJ and judiciary, that unarguable concept of sovereignty will flourish.

At the 2002 initial parole hearing, Examiner Robertson said that there was still a lot of interest in this case and that such is not necessarily good for Faul. If nothing continues to happen in this case to correct matters; Mr. Faul says, the interest will thus now be cultivated (like never before), and that will not be particularly good for the Republican DOJ who were responsible for the "Depravity of Justice" that this case personifies.

But to the American people, to the Sovereign American People, much more is owed. The perfidious den of vipers who have in the past infested the DOJ, and now the present group that promised to correct those of the past, owe to the Sovereign People a complete accounting of all their activities: ALL.

C. The Correct Solution

That such "Depravity of Justice does not happen again," Mr. Faul might humbly propose, is an honorably wistful and noble notion without a fair chance, because our Father said that the tares will be with us until the end. However, that does not mean that we are supposed to give free rein to those tares who have CHEATED and who continue to do so. Further, with this particular agency (the Parole Commission), if it has not by this point in time corrected itself, an end more meaningful than prosecution is more appropriate to recompense them for their perfidious treachery against their sovereigns. As retribution, which is right to invoke, the United States Parole Commission, if not yet remorseful in a meaningful way, must cease to exist. President Donald J. Trump, at the present time, is the correct person for that task. To accomplish that end, Faul will devote some time, as if 43 years should not have been enough. The foregoing pages give ample reason why that beastly commission must suffer such retribution. From that information, one example all by itself will suffice: keeping someone imprisoned when that person has not even been found guilty is reason enough, but doing so to fulfill promises of favoritism for their accomplices in "law enforcement" is beyond outrageous. That is what they have become. They are hopelessly biased, and are brazenly arrogant about it.

And all of that baseless rhetoric, red herring diatribe, strawman invective, purposeful misrepresentations, and outright lies from the Commission people, put forth as excuses and reasons; all of the Commission's delusional "requirements" and "conclusions": that Mr. Faul does not respect them, that he questions the actual legitimacy of rouges, and that he needs programming, does not make Mr. Faul a bank robber. It simply makes him honest and fully loaded with integrity, leaving him to be qualified to boldly say, the emperor has no clothes.

An emperor without clothes, who falsely claims to his Sovereigns that he wears the finest, must be finally dethroned. So too, a Commission which claims to act with "honesty and integrity" but has not done so, must be finally abolished. Addressing each of you Sovereigns (or those of you who have been defrauded out of that status and duty) who are concerned with real justice against corruption, and with the unlawful imprisonment of the monitors; when you have heard enough of this "institutional thing" of favoritism for their rogue cohorts, if they have not yet arranged for correction, please join Scott William Faul in this quest to deliver retribution against the United States Parole Commission for its final time. Mr. Faul will furnish to all for the asking, an interesting, forward-looking plan of action for not only fixing the Commission but for likewise fixing the entire Corporation's many tyrant-friendly and purposefully-crafted "shortcomings."

Here is a sampling (the how) of what can be done for correction or retribution. It is only a small example of Mr. Faul's total plans for correcting their hideous perfidy. Faul has made the rather bold assertion that the Commission, even in the face of overwhelming evidence that their position is in error, has boastfully set their biased intentions against him from the very start. To test that bold assertion, there is a very easy way for the Commission to settle the issue: give polygraphs to Helenihi, Cushwa, Vela, and everyone else who has touched

this case to any extent. The specific questions for the lie detector test would revolve around a number of Faul's accusations: for example, the question of their favoritism toward "law enforcement" officers; whether they are aware of any Bowers-type pressures or expectations from "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources and law enforcement and those kinds of people" (or anyone else); and, whether they acted upon those influences, or know of any other Commission personnel who did. Could any objections be heard from the Commission for such quality assurance procedures as self-testing for "honesty and integrity"? Should servants be allowed to refuse from their sovereigns such demands for proof of honesty and integrity in office? Then, in conjunction with the polygraph challenges, a full examination must be made of all Commission files (all of them) to winnow out all suspicious information that hints toward any Veronza Bowers type of activity covering the period from 1983 to the present time regarding any of the defendants or anyone else involved in this case. Again, should the DOJ servants be allowed to refuse from their sovereigns such demands for open files to prevent the servants' unfaithfulness?

Specifically addressing two who are presently in positions with authority to make real corrections, Patricia K. Cushwa or Donald J. Trump, Mr. Faul awaits your attentive action. Rehabilitation of the Commission, or retribution against it, are all that are on the table at the moment.

The major factor in deciding the extent of action that will become necessary for the Sovereign People to implement, is the degree to which the Corporation's outrageous criminality in this particular case becomes corrected. The Sovereigns' remedial actions in this case, and wherever else it may lead, might be referred to in future times as "the final solution" against tyranny. Should the above-addressed officials of the Corporation fail to take appropriate action to correct the prior regimes' unlawful activity in this case, the Sovereigns will be presented with the duty to do so. That may include their Grand Juries with their own investigations and grass roots indictments or whatever other processes the Sovereigns will at Law reinvigorate because of the lack of concern from their present and past servants who will then be known to have failed in their duties. Without any doubt, to be within their own "law," the Commission owes Faul a completely new hearing with a full accounting of his stated facts as he detailed the procedure in his January 13, 2022 letter to Chair Patricia K. Cushwa. Unrefuted facts will no longer be ignored and left for the dustbin of history as has consistently been the case where Corporation operatives have been manipulating events. This will be fixed.

The DOJ committed premeditated murder of a man, with a furious, mad-dog frenzy of maniacal "men in blue" servants of Lucifer. That murder of Mr. Gordon Kahl by many dozens of their murderous thugs, and their continuing unlawful imprisonment of his son and Mr. Faul, will be addressed and fixed. The Corporation can do it the easy way, or the Corporation can have it done the hard way. Whichever it chooses, this shameful depravity will be recompensed. There is rehabilitation for Cushwa, or retribution from Trump, or the final solution by the monitoring Sovereigns. Posterity will judge whether we have chosen prudently.

We thank thee Father for your guidance in matters of forgiveness and retribution, and I thank thee Father that thou hast heard me, to this END.

Date: March 31, 2026

Declarant: Scott William Faul
Scott William Faul

ASSEVERATION

In full acknowledgement of the admonition given by our Father Yahweh and our Savior Yeshua, to let our yeas be yea and our nays be nay, I, the undersigned declarant, state that my yeas are yea and my nays are nay in the foregoing document; and to the temporal satisfaction of inferior tyrants, I, the undersigned affiant, hereby certify under their lesser penalty of perjury on this 31st day of March, 2026 that all the facts and circumstances in the foregoing instrument are true and correct.

Declarant: Scott William Faul
Scott William Faul