

Profile of a **POPULAR** Advocate:  
*Eugene A. Wrona, J.D.*



***Introduction and Background***

- Eugene A. Wrona is a 67 years-old attorney in Pennsylvania who has suffered the weight of disbarment by State government disciplinary action in retaliation for reporting the criminal alteration of court audio records and other deprivations of the Constitutional rights of litigants in Lehigh County, Pennsylvania.
- Mr. Wrona exposed a pattern and practice of electronic editing of audio records of court proceedings and the intentional deprivation of rights of fathers in Lehigh County and other courts throughout the state. He brought attention to State-Sanctioned Stealing by domestic relations courts, obtaining the release from prison of an illegally incarcerated non-custodial parent. The first incident of criminal alteration of audio records in court involving Attorney Wrona was Sept. 24, 1997. Subsequent recurrences of these illegal acts took place through October of 2000 in Lehigh County Courtrooms.

***Confirming A Motive For Retaliation***


- Because Attorney Wrona maintains his position regarding the accusations of criminal misconduct by judges and other court officers, including the District Attorney’s office, he became a target for retaliation in the form a disciplinary action. Attorney Wrona reported the crimes first to Judge William E. Ford, who did nothing except LIE about his own custody of the audio tape. The crimes were later reported to the Office of the District Attorney of Lehigh County [James R. Martin, Esq.] and to the Attorney General of Pennsylvania [Michael Fisher]. The Attorney General refused to investigate the charges. Attorney Wrona and his client [Farouk Z. Hamoui] were removed from the D.A.’s office by sheriff’s deputies, one of whom threatened them with his hand on his weapon. The District Attorney would not permit filing of criminal charges against judges William E. Ford and Alan M. Black for the illegal editing of audio tapes of court hearings. These crimes were also reported to Edward D. Reibman (judge) and James Knoll Gardner (Predient judge), neither of whom would act to investigate the legitimacy of the criminal complaint. Judge Reibman expressed a cavalier attitude asking about the residency of Rosemary Woods.
- The court and the state Disciplinary Board conspired to prosecute Attorney Wrona for his vigorous representation of clients under the Laws of Pennsylvania and its Rules of Court and his obstinance in pursuing a criminal investigation of the courts. Attorney Wrona acted at all times for the protection of the rights of his clients and for the integrity of the judicial process, which he contends has been “corrupted”.

## Confirming a Motive for Retaliation

- Attorney Wrona accuses Pennsylvania family courts of having a “pre-determined outcome” for more than 90% of the cases that appear before it. He cites as proof that the courts deviate from the rules in the application of child support guidelines and other Rules of Court. Attorney Wrona believes that the enticement of “federal incentives” is sufficiently strong motivation to induce formerly ‘honorable’ judges to vacate their integrity and their principles in favor of the obscene amount of money available from Washington, D. In every instance, Attorney Wrona’s speech is protected under the First Amendment, as affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Landmark Communications v. Virginia and Gentile v. State of Nevada*. His Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States was Denied. Attorney Wrona maintains that the Supreme Court does not want the exposure of judicial corruption to reach the national stage.
- The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania entered a **void** order of disbarment and the assessment of monetary damages against Attorney Wrona based solely on the recommendation of the State Disciplinary Board. The ORDER was not signed by a justice of the Supreme Court. The Disciplinary Board acted on the recommendation of a hearing panel selected by the Disciplinary Board. The hearing was pretense, where defendant was denied the right to call witnesses. Contrary to settled law, Pennsylvania’s Disciplinary rules **transfer the burden of proof** from the prosecutor to defendant in disciplinary cases. It was then a simple matter for the Disciplinary Board to ignore defendant’s evidence with the suborned perjury of its witnesses such that “forensic evidence” confirming that audio tapes were edited was nullified by false testimony of a **non**-expert witness for the prosecution.
- The Defense argument that disciplinary procedures intrude on his First Amendment rights, and that the disciplinary procedures violate the “presumption of innocence” by transferring the burden of proof to the accused are ignored. The Disciplinary Board failed to argue or to produce any evidence that Attorney Wrona made any false accusations or statements about the court or about the judge who filed the false complaint. Attorney Wrona maintains that Alan M. Black (judge) and Alan J. Davis (prosecutor) conspired to suborn the perjury of witnesses and to present knowingly false charges against him **in retaliation** for Attorney Wrona’s pursuit of judicial integrity. Attorney Wrona does not absolve the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania from complicity in his prosecution. The prosecutorial duty to “search for the truth” has been abandoned in Pennsylvania.
- The disciplinary proceedings were corrupted. Attorney Wrona obtained permission from the Board to record “at his expense” the disciplinary proceedings conducted by the Board. This permission was hastily withdrawn at the beginning of the proceedings when a professional audio/video specialist set up with three cameras and four microphones to “record” the proceedings for the purpose of insuring the integrity of the record. An emergency Motion was raised by the Disciplinary Board to evict the specialist and all his equipment. A plea to permit an audio recording was also denied, denying Attorney Wrona the right to defend himself. Subsequently, the transcribed record of the hearings were illegally edited, presumably by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. Two witnesses to the hearings executed affidavits attesting to specific inaccuracies of the transcribed record.

## *Confirming a Motive for Retaliation*

- Attorney The PA Supreme Court acted contrary to Pennsylvania's Rules for Disciplinary Enforcement (Rule 208) and Constitution which requires that an accused shall have the right of appeal to a "court of record". Rule 208 requires a hearing before the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania before an Order to disbar an attorney may be entered. Pennsylvania's Supreme Court DENIED Attorney Wrona his right to a hearing, violating its own Rules. The assessment of monetary damages violates the due process protections of the Fourteenth Amendment. Attorney Wrona has yet to pay ONE CENT of those corrupt monetary damages, and neither the Supreme Court nor its agent, the Disciplinary Board has or will pursue payment.
- Attorney Wrona also appealed to Governor Edward G. Rendell for protection of another client from the corrupt domestic relations court in Northampton County. The Northampton County court withheld appeals to retain jurisdiction in order to incarcerate the client, a disabled man approved for SSI benefits. The judge entered a bench warrant two days before he left office. The Governor [Edward G. Rendell] and the Attorney General of Pennsylvania refused to act in the matter.
- On February 26, 2008, Mr. Hamoui and Attorney Wrona again delivered a criminal complaint to the U.S. Attorney Office in Allentown, and handed it with exhibits to U.S. Attorney Seth Weber. The next day, Weber returned the documents to Attorney Wrona in a clear and conscious act of violating his duty and oath of office. Attorney Wrona then mailed the documents back to the U.S. Attorney Office, where delivery of the parcel was "Refused" by the Department of Justice.
- Attorney Wrona then notified the Attorney General of the U.S. and President George W. Bush of these transgressions, and requested their assistance. Neither has made any effort to comply. The Office of Attorney General had a paralegal, to whom "no official authority" may be presumed, respond that the complaint was not in the correct department.
- Not one of the public officers cited above perform the duties of their office in conformance with their "Oath of Office" to support and defend the Constitution of the U.S.
- In the interim, two men claiming to be FBI officers visited Attorney Wrona at his residence. Both men refused to provide adequate identification, and one of them threatened the life and liberty of Attorney Wrona. Their mission was to intimidate, harass, and otherwise terrorize Attorney Wrona or induce him into making any kind of threat against U.S. Attorney Weber or other public officers. This is what "justice" in America has become.
- The standards for American justice (jurisprudence) can no be longer the envy of the world.



**See also:**

MOORE v. HARTMAN, No. 03-5241 (D.C. Cir. November 09, 2004)

Government officials are barred from bringing charges they would not have pursued absent retaliatory motive, regardless of whether they had probable cause to do so.

To read the full text of this opinion, go to: [PDF File]

<http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/data2/circs/dc/035241a.pdf>

