

Synopsis VAWA Complaint

The Violence Against Women Act—which I refer to as the Female Fraud Act because it gives alien females free reign to commit fraud on their husbands and the U.S., or the Female Violence Act because it allows girls to do violence to the rights of guys—gives alien females who married American guys a fraudulent track to permanent residency and U.S. citizenship. All the alien girl has to do is claim her husband or ex-husband “battered” her or subjected her to “extreme cruelty” or an “overall pattern of violence.”

The Government¹ then finds the American husband or ex-husband guilty of “battery,” “extreme cruelty,” or “overall pattern of abuse” in secret proceedings for which he has no notice and no opportunity to refute the charges against him. The so-called evidence used for finding him guilty will come from his wife or ex-wife’s statements, feminist counselors, and her immigration lawyer. If by chance, the American man somehow gets evidence to the Government that shows the alien girl is lying, the evidence ends up in the garbage. It doesn’t matter how reliable the evidence, even an affidavit from the President or next President, gets trashed solely because the American guy handed it over to the Government.

The conduct for which an American guy can be found responsible for “battery,” “extreme cruelty,” or “overall pattern of violence” can range from insulting the alien girl to driving over her in a Mercedes Benz—it’s up to Government officials to decide what is and is not abuse.

The feminist establishment was responsible for getting VAWA enacted into law. The feminists’ purpose was to intimidate American men into looking for wives at home—not overseas. It does that by creating the risk of the Government punishing a citizen man by violating his rights, invading his privacy, and ruining his reputation without any of the usual Constitutional recourses that protect against secret, arbitrary decisions by the Government.

The VAWA provisions challenged in this federal case violate an American man’s:

- freedom of speech by preventing him from standing up and speaking on his own behalf and in his own defense;

- freedom of choice in marital affairs by telling him to either support his alien wife’s application for permanent residency or be found guilty of “battery,” “extreme cruelty,” or an “overall pattern of violence” *in absentia*;

- procedural due process by failing to provide notice, an opportunity to be heard, and non-biased decision makers;

- equal protection as to national origin by discriminating against Americans on the face of the statutes and sex as the statutes are applied by biased Government officials and as intended by the feminist establishment.

Take an example:

The Acting Manager of Kroll Associates’s Russian operation marries a Russian girl and brings her to the U.S. He discovers she’s a Russian mafia prostitute, former mistress to a Chechen warlord, and that she secretly fed him drugs in order to wheedle him into marriage. He

¹ Government means the US Citizenship and Immigration Services and the Executive Office of Immigration Review.

tells the tramp to get lost, but she and her immigration lawyer refuse because they want him to commit perjury by sponsoring her for permanent residency. The guy refuses, so they apparently win or are winning her permanent residency by falsely claiming the guy “battered” her and subjected her to “extreme cruelty” or an “overall pattern of violence.”

The American citizen man, however, can't even find out exactly what the ex-wife and her lawyer did or are doing to win her permanent residency because the Government refuses to tell him. They and anyone else could have said anything about him, submitted any type of phony evidence for any type of crime, civil wrong or “offensive” behavior for which the Government found or will find him guilty of abuse. It's all a secret to the American citizen, but not his ex-wife and her lawyer or others who have access to the Government's findings and will use it for who knows what purpose. If any of it ever becomes known to the plaintiff or the general public, he will have no cause of action to recover for any harm done by its publication.