

Fed Judge Blasts DOJ Lawyers for Lying in Court to Defend Obama Amnesty

MAY 23, 2016

Email PrintText Size

It's been repeatedly proven that government officials lie regularly to cover up wrongdoing and now a scathing federal court order blasting the Department of Justice (DOJ) and its army of lawyers offers details seldom seen by the public. In fact, the judge in this case appears to go out of his way to write something for the masses, not just the parties involved in the litigation.

The case involves a lawsuit filed by 26 states against the federal government challenging President Obama's immigration amnesty measures. It was originally filed in the Southern District of Texas and the judge hearing the case, Andrew S. Hanen, issued a 28-page [order](#) last week slamming DOJ attorneys representing the administration for intentionally lying to the court, thus violating a multitude of ethics and court rules. Among other things Hanen admonishes DOJ lawyers for lying by claiming in court that the president's amnesty plan featuring three-year deferrals wasn't being implemented when in fact it was for more than 100,000 illegal aliens. The measure is officially known as Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is the agency charged with implementing it.

In the order Hanen writes: "The Government admits that the lawyer making these statements knew at the time of this hearing that the DHS was already granting these three year extensions (which it also admits are only authorized by the 2014 DHS Directive) instead of the two-year renewals authorized in 2012. Not only did counsel fail to tell the Court that the DHS was already granting relief using the 2014 DHS Directive, she told the Court that nothing would happen with regard to revised DACA until mid-February of 2015." The

lashing continues. “Apparently, lawyers, somewhere in the halls of the Justice Department whose identities are unknown to this Court, decided unilaterally that the conduct of the DHS in granting three-year DACA renewals . . . was immaterial and irrelevant to this lawsuit and that the DOJ could therefore just ignore it. Then, for whatever reason, the Justice Department trial lawyers appearing in this Court chose not to tell the truth about this DHS activity. The first decision was certainly unsupportable, but the subsequent decision to hide it from the Court was unethical.”

Texas initiated the lawsuit in December 2014 challenging the president’s amnesty order and the other states eventually joined in. Judge Hanen ruled in favor of the states, essentially blocking the amnesty, and later discovered that the administration disregarded the order and government attorneys repeatedly lied about it in court. After Hanen’s reprimand became public, Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton **said this**: “Throughout this case, the administration has struggled to provide accurate, reliable information regarding the scope of the President’s plan or even when it would be implemented. From the start, our lawsuit has been about asserting that one person cannot unilaterally change the law, and part of that is ensuring everyone abides by the rule of law.

This kind of public scolding, especially from a federal court, is seldom seen while a president is still in office. The DOJ is supposed to defend the public’s best interest, not lie to cover up the president’s wrongdoing. An **editorial** in a mainstream newspaper points out that the misconduct unmasked by Judge Hanen should trouble Americans of all political persuasions. “Prosecutors often abuse their powers in run-of-the-mill cases,” the editorial states. “But this is a constitutional challenge with major consequences for the separation of powers, and the deceit must have required the participation and coordination of dozens of political appointees and career lawyers. That suggests a serious institutional failure, not mere rogue actors.” The piece refers to the DOJ’s systematic deception in court about the administration’s conduct an “ethics rot.”

1. An estimated 5 million foreign immigrants who are in the country illegally are expected to qualify for the executive amnesty. Obama and Representative Luis Gutierrez (D-IL) have said it is incumbent upon immigrant organizations and community advocates to identify the illegal

immigrants and have them apply for formal temporary amnesty next year. Another 7 million illegal immigrants will not qualify for this executive amnesty; however, President Obama has promised the changes of their being deported will be greatly increased, except in the case of violent criminals.

2. Twenty states have filed lawsuits aimed at blocking the Obama executive action, which is designed to benefit illegals who have been in the country more than five years or have children born here, as well as some who entered the country as children.

<http://townhall.com/tipsheet/conncarroll/2014/11/21/everything-you-need-to-know-about-obamas-executive-amnesty-n1922199>

Everything You Need To Know About Obama's Executive Amnesty



[Conn Carroll](#)

|

Posted: Nov 21, 2014 1:45 PM

Share (618) Tweet



In a primetime address on November 20, President Obama made his sales pitch to the American people for a series of immigration executive actions he will sign on November 21 in Las Vegas, Nevada. Here is what you need to know:

What actions is Obama taking specifically?

The key to Obama's [new immigration policy](#) is the creation of one new amnesty program and the expansion of another.

Specifically, Obama's new amnesty program will give illegal immigrants who have been in the United States for at least five years, and who are parents of U.S. citizens or legal residents, a three year work permit. This permit will also allow them to obtain a Social Security number and get a driver's license. [Pew estimates that 3.5 million current illegal immigrants will qualify for this program.](#)

Obama is also expanding the existing Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals amnesty program. Previously only those illegal immigrants who were born before 1981 and entered the U.S. as a minor before 2007 were eligible for benefits. Now all illegal immigrants who entered the U.S. as a minor before 2010 will be eligible for amnesty. Like the parents above, DACA recipients will also get work permits, Social Security numbers, and driver's licenses. [Pew estimates that 235,000 illegal immigrants will gain eligibility for benefits through this program expansion.](#)

Is this legal?

Obama didn't think so. As recently as this spring, and on [more than 20 other occasions](#), Obama said he could not rewrite immigration law by executive action.

Specifically, this March Obama [told Univision](#), "But what I've said in the past remains true, which is until Congress passes a new law, then I am constrained in terms of what I am able to do. ... t at a certain point the reason that these deportations are taking place is, Congress said, 'you have to enforce these laws.' They fund the hiring of officials at the department that's charged with enforcing. And I cannot ignore those laws any more than I could ignore, you know, any of the other laws that are on the books.

More damning, in 2011, Obama [told the National Council of La Raza](#), "Believe me, the idea of doing things on my own is very tempting. I promise you. Not just on immigration reform. But that's not how our system works. That's not how our democracy functions. That's not how our Constitution is written."

How is Obama justifying this amnesty?

The [Office of Legal Counsel memo](#) released before Obama's speech cites Obama's Article II Section 3 constitutional duty to "take care that the Laws be faithfully executed" as the source of his power to grant this amnesty.

The memo reasons that since there are 11.3 million illegal immigrants in the country today, and DHS only has the resources to remove 400,000 illegal immigrants every year, Obama must choose which immigrants to deport and which to ignore. This "prosecutorial discretion" power, the memo claims, allows Obama to choose which illegal immigrants get work permits, which illegal immigrants will continue to be ignored, and which illegal immigrants will be deported.

Under this legal theory, Obama could give all current 11.3 million illegal immigrants work permits and driver's licenses, as long as he kept deporting at least 400,000 illegal border crossers every year.

Will courts let Obama get away with this?

They already have. In 2012, after Obama announced his DACA program, Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents sued the Department of Homeland Security challenging the legality of Obama's first executive amnesty program.

But while the [court found](#) that the border agents "were *likely to succeed on the merits of their claim* that the Department of Homeland Security has *implemented a program contrary to congressional mandate*," the court also ultimately determined that the plaintiffs did not have standing to sue DHS since the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 already established an administrative process for resolving disputes between federal employees and their employer.

The harms from Obama's illegal amnesty programs are just too diffuse for any one litigant to establish [standing](#) in federal court.

If courts can't stop Obama in time, who can?

Only Congress can stop Obama's amnesty program by defunding it.

Now it is true that since the federal agency that issues work permits, the United States Citizen and Immigration Services office, is self-funded through fees it would keep issuing permits in the event of a federal government shutdown.

But that does not mean Congress does not have any power over the agency. Congress could still attach a rider to any appropriations bill forbidding USCIS from using any federal funds, including those collected through fees, for the purpose of carrying out Obama's amnesty programs.

Will Congress stop Obama?

Some in Congress, like Rep. Matt Salmon (R-AZ) and Sen. Mike Lee (R-UT), have said they will use the power over the purse to defund Obama's amnesty.

Others like House Appropriations Committee Chairman Hal Rogers (R-KY) and Sen. Jeff Flake (R-AZ) have said they want to pass a long-term government funding bill which would essentially rubber stamp Obama's amnesty.

How would Obama's amnesty effect legal immigrants?

After Obama enacted DACA, wait times for visas for legal immigrants tripled from 5 months to 15. Obama essentially allowed illegal immigrants to jump in line in front of law-abiding legal immigrants. Since Obama has requested no new funding from Congress to pay for his new amnesty, and since his new amnesty is three times larger than his last amnesty, legal immigrants should not only expect to head to the back of the line again, but they should also expect much longer delays.

Obama claims all these amnestied immigrants will get background checks, Is that true?

If history is any guide, no. Background checks are expensive and time consuming and USCIS does not have the resources to process additional amnesty programs on top of their normal duties. Judicial Watch uncovered documents in June 2013 showing that instead of full background checks normally used by the agency, DACA recipients got cheaper and less comprehensive "lean and lite" checks.

Obama said illegal immigrants will be held accountable by paying taxes. Is that true?

It is true that the IRS already allows illegal immigrants to pay income taxes by obtaining a tax identification number. Most illegal immigrants also already pay state and local taxes. Obama's amnesty program changes none of this. In fact, Obama's new amnesty lets illegal immigrants off the hook but not paying any fines or penalties for breaking the law.

How will Obama pay for this new amnesty program?

The White House has not explained that yet.

What about Democrats who claim Reagan and Bush also acted unilaterally on immigration?

President Reagan did pass an amnesty program through Congress in 1986, but it failed to accomplish its goals. At the time there were just 3 million illegal immigrants in the country and today there are more than 11 million. This is why most Americans do not support amnesty today.

Reagan also used an executive action to ease immigration standards for 200,000 Nicaraguans who feared persecution from the communist Sandinista regime. President Bush used similar powers to grant deportation relief to hundreds of Kuwaiti nationals who had been evacuated to the United States during the first Gulf War.

But both of these executive actions were perfectly in line with the true scope of a president's prosecutorial discretion powers. They were limited in nature, applied to specific smaller groups of immigrants, and were not designed to thwart congressional intent on immigration policy.

Obama's amnesty is the exact opposite. It is a broad-based program in response to no crisis other than Congress isn't doing what Obama wants it to do. As Obama once said, "That's not how our system works. That's not how our democracy functions. That's not how our Constitution is written."

<http://aclj.org/immigration/a-significant-victory-for-constitution-federal-court-halts-president-obamas-illegal-executive-action>

<http://www.redstate.com/matthewclark/2015/07/08/federal-judge-drops-hammer-obama-administration-immigration-defiance/>

http://www.nytimes.com/2015/02/18/us/obama-immigration-policy-halted-by-federal-judge-in-texas.html?_r=0

<https://www.numbersusa.com/news/reports-obama%E2%80%99s-amnesty-spending-may-defy-judge%E2%80%99s-injunction-federal-antideficiency-act>

<http://conservativetribune.com/obama-defies-federal-judge-2/>

A Significant Victory for the Constitution as a Federal Court Halts President Obama's illegal Executive Action

Court Halts Obama's Executive Action

By Jay Sekulow

Just before midnight last night, a [federal court issued an order temporarily halting](#) President Obama's illegal Executive action on immigration.

The federal court agreed with our [amicus brief](#) – on behalf of [68 Members of Congress](#) and over [70,000 Americans](#) – that President Obama’s actions violated the constitution by creating new law. The trial court correctly noted that the Obama Administration “is not just rewriting the laws, he is creating them from scratch.”

This decision represents a significant victory against the unconstitutional overreach by President Obama.

We are extremely pleased the court concluded what we have argued from the start: the President overstepped his authority by changing the law and setting new immigration policy. The manner in which the President acted is unconstitutional, unlawful, and a violation of the separation of powers.

As I [testified before the Congress](#) in December: Impatient presidents don’t get to change the law.

The federal trial court granted a preliminary injunction to 26 states challenging President Obama’s executive action, which temporarily blocks implementation of the President’s actions. In a memorandum opinion accompanying the order, the federal court ruled that the lawsuit should go forward and that without a preliminary injunction the states will “suffer irreparable harm in this case.”

“The genie would be impossible to put back into the bottle,” the trial court held, adding that unilaterally legalizing the presence of millions of people is a “virtually irreversible” action.

The court’s ruling accused Obama Administration officials of being “disingenuous” when they said that President Obama’s initiatives did not significantly alter existing policies. In the words of the federal court, the programs were “a massive change in immigration practice” that would affect “the nation’s entire immigration scheme and the states who must bear the lion’s share of its consequences.” Further, the court stated that the Executive actions had violated laws that the federal government must follow in issuing new rules. The court also determined that “the states have clearly proven a likelihood of success on the merits.”

In our [amicus brief](#) representing 68 Members of Congress, including three Senators, and tens of thousands of concerned Americans, we argued this exact position to the court, stating, “Plaintiffs are likely to succeed on the merits because the DHS (Dept. of Homeland Security) directive violates the Constitution, disrupts the separation of powers, and amounts to an abdication of their constitutional and statutory duty.”

President Obama has [vowed to appeal](#) the trial court's ruling. If he does, we will continue to support these 26 states and defend the Constitution from the abuse of an imperial presidency.

Add your name to our brief below as we continue to take direct action in court to stop President Obama's illegal Executive action.

Federal Judge Drops the Hammer on Obama Administration Immigration Defiance

Posted at 8:48 pm on July 8, 2015 by [Matthew Clark](#)

Share on Facebook

Share on Twitter



A federal judge in the case against President Obama's illegal Executive action on immigration has leveled some serious accusations against not only the Administration and its DOJ attorneys but senior level officials for "violating" a federal court order.

The court has ordered a "[show cause](#)" hearing for August 19th at which "Each individual Defendant," not just their DOJ attorneys, "must attend and be prepared to show why he or she should not be held in contempt of Court."

Here's what happened. A federal lawsuit was brought by Texas and 25 other states against President Obama's Executive action on immigration, where he "[change\[d\] the law](#)" without congressional approval. A federal judge issued a [temporary injunction](#), ordering the Administration to stop providing these new, illegal benefits as the case continued.

However, the government didn't comply with the court's order. He's how the [court](#), without mincing words, described what happened:

[A]pproximately 2,000 individuals . . . were given various benefits in violation of this Court's order after the injunction was issued. . . .

The Government has conceded that it has directly violated this Court's Order in its May 7, 2015 Advisory, yet, as of today, two months have passed since the Advisory and it has not remediated its own violative behavior. That is unacceptable and, as far as the Government's attorneys are concerned, completely unprofessional. To be clear, this Court expects the Government to be in full compliance with this Court's injunction.

These are serious allegations, and equally so are the serious remedies at this federal judge's disposal. The court noted that "it is shocked and surprised at the [Obama Administration's] cavalier attitude" toward its lawful order and refusal to "remedy the violations of the injunction . . . some six weeks after" promising to take "immediate steps" to do so.

If there is one thing federal judges don't take to kindly to, it is being directly defied. This judge expressed that he has given the government ample time and leniency to rectify the situation. Yet the judge concluded:

[A]t some point, when a non-compliant party refuses to bring its conduct into compliance, one must conclude that the conduct is not accidental, but deliberate. If these violations have not been corrected by the end of this month, absent very compelling evidence, which this Court will be glad to consider, the only logical conclusion is that the Government needs a stronger motivation to comply with lawful court orders.

It is clear that the court is ready to hold the named Obama Administration officials in this case – Jeh Charles Johnson, Secretary of Homeland Security; R. Gil Kerlinkowske, Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection; Ronald D. Vitiello, Deputy Chief of U.S. Border Patrol, U.S. Customs and Border of Protection; Sarah R. Saldana, Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and Leon Rodriguez, Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services – "in contempt of Court" if the Administration continues to violate its order.

President Obama already was willing to circumvent Congress, ignore the Constitution, and thus far violate a federal judge's order to uphold his Executive action on immigration, but he may have met his match. If senior level Administration officials start going to jail, it might just change things. Only time will tell what the Administration will do.

The underlying merits of this case continue on appeal with an oral argument scheduled for Friday in the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. At the ACLJ, we've filed [four amicus briefs](#) in this case already on behalf of key Members of Congress and thousands of Americans. President Obama is not a king, and this week he just got reminded of that by a co-equal branch of the U.S. government.

[Follow @ MatthewClark](#)

Matthew Clark is Senior Counsel for Digital Advocacy with the [ACLJ](#). A lifelong citizen of the Commonwealth of Virginia, he lives with his wife and four children in Northern Virginia. Follow Matthew Clark: [@ MatthewClark](#).

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
BROWNSVILLE DIVISION

STATE OF TEXAS, ET AL.,	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	
	§	
V.	§	CIVIL NO. B-14-254
	§	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET AL.,	§	
Defendants.	§	

ORDER

This Court held a hearing on June 23, 2015, at which time both parties indicated that they are making progress toward a resolution of discovery requests made by the Plaintiffs with regard to the Government's belated revelation that it had implemented portions of the November 20, 2014 DHS Memorandum prior to the February 18, 2015 start date provided to Plaintiffs and the Court by defense counsel. Given the fact that counsel for both sides indicated that progress has been made and have requested more time to reach an agreement, this Court granted the parties additional time to seek a resolution of these pending issues. The parties are to file a status report with the Court describing any agreement reached on Plaintiffs' discovery requests and any resolution with regard to the approximately 108,800 individuals who were granted benefits pursuant to the 2014 DHS Memorandum between the date of that Memorandum and this Court's injunction. The parties have until July 31, 2015, to file that status report. The Court will resolve any and all questions regarding future discovery and/or sanctions once it reviews the parties' report.

This, however, does not resolve the issue as to the approximately 2,000 individuals that were given various benefits in violation of this Court’s order after the injunction was issued. The Court was first apprised by the Government of the violations of its injunction on May 7, 2015. It admitted that it violated this Court’s injunction on at least 2,000 occasions—violations which have not yet been fixed. This Court has expressed its willingness to believe that these actions were accidental and not done purposefully to violate this Court’s order. Nevertheless, it is shocked and surprised at the cavalier attitude the Government has taken with regard to its “efforts” to rectify this situation. The Government promised this Court on May 7, 2015, that “immediate steps” were being taken to remedy the violations of the injunction. [See Doc. No. 247]. Yet, as of June 23, 2015—some six weeks after making that representation—the situation had not been rectified. With that in mind, the Court hereby sets a hearing for August 19, 2015, at 10:00 a.m. Each individual Defendant must attend and be prepared to show why he or she should not be held in contempt of Court. In addition to the individual Defendants, the Government shall bring all relevant witnesses on this topic as the Court will not continue this matter to a later date. The Government has conceded that it has directly violated this Court’s Order in its May 7, 2015 Advisory, yet, as of today, two months have passed since the Advisory and it has not remediated its own violative behavior. That is unacceptable and, as far as the Government’s attorneys are concerned, completely unprofessional. To be clear, this Court expects the Government to be in full compliance with this Court’s injunction. Compliance as to just those aliens living in the Plaintiff States is not full compliance.

If the Government remedies this situation and comes into compliance with this Court’s injunction by July 31, 2015, it shall include a summary of that situation in the July 31, 2015 report to the Court. If the Court is satisfied with the Government’s representations, it will cancel the August 19, 2015 hearing. Otherwise, the Court intends to utilize all available powers to compel compliance.

This Court began its last hearing by explaining its reluctance to sanction any party or attorney. If nothing else, sanctions bog both the parties and the Court down on side issues that detract their attention from the real focus: the merits and resolution of the case. Nevertheless, no reasonable person could possibly consider a direct violation of an injunction a side issue. Furthermore, at some point, when a non-compliant party refuses to bring its conduct into compliance, one must conclude that the conduct is not accidental, but deliberate. If these violations have not been corrected by the end of this month, absent very compelling evidence, which this Court will be glad to consider, the only logical conclusion is that the Government needs a stronger motivation to comply with lawful court orders. Neither side should interpret this Court's personal preference to not sanction lawyers or parties as an indication that it will merely acquiesce to a party's unlawful conduct.

Signed this 7th day of July, 2015.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Andrew S. Hanen".

Andrew S.
Hanen
United States District Judge

RELATED CASES:

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS BROWNSVILLE
DIVISION

STATE OF TEXAS, ET AL PLAINTIFFS VS. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET AL DEFENDANTS

CIVIL NO. B-14-254

[Bridgewater Vs State Of Georgia](#)

Case Number: 07-A-03192-7

Filing Date: Tuesday, April 10, 2007

Case Type: Superior Court Quasi Criminal

Disposition: Order

Category: Habeas Corpus-quasi Criminal

Disposition Date: Thursday, August 02, 2007

Courts: Superior Court Civil

Disposition Manner:

Filing Type: Complaint

Official: Judge Melodie Snell Conne

[Bridgewater Vs State Of Georgia](#)

Case Number: 11-A-10155-7

Filing Date: Thursday, September 22, 2011

Case Type: Superior Court General Civil

Disposition: Order

Category: General Civil-other

Disposition Date: Thursday, December 08, 2011

Courts: Superior Court Civil

Disposition Manner:

Filing Type: Motion

[State Vs Bridgewater](#)

[\[Collapse All\]](#)

Case Information

Case Number: 06-D-03943-S2

Filing Date: Monday, July 10, 2006

Case Type: State Court Accusation

Disposition: Sentenced

Category:

Disposition Date: Wednesday, September 19, 2006

Courts: State Court Criminal

Disposition Manner:

Filing Type: Motor Vehicle Violation

Official: Judge Shawn F. Bratton

Scheduled Events

Date	Time	Location	Event	Party	Status
06	8:30AM	3H	Arraignment	Sharon Bridgewater	Bench Warrant Issued
06	9:00AM	J	Jail Calendar	Sharon Bridgewater	Plea Entered
07	10:00AM	3H	Rule Nisi	Sharon Bridgewater	Completed
07	8:30AM	3H	Jury Trial	Sharon Bridgewater	Continued
07	8:30AM	3H	Jury Trial	Sharon Bridgewater	Plea Entered
07	7:00PM		Alcohol Awareness	Sharon Bridgewater	Completed

Party Information

- Carl Jackson Spence (**Former Attorney For Defendant**)
Bar #: 671095, Tel: (404) 236-6060
- Sharon Bridgewater (**Defendant**)
2581 Treehouse Lane, Lawrenceville, GA 30044. DOB Year: 1962, Race: Black, Gender: Female
- Lucas O Harsh (**Attorney For Defendant**)
Bar #: 005415, Tel: (770) 513-4020

Charge/Sentence



Sharon Bridgewater

COUNT 1

D.U.I./Alcohol on 11/20/2005. Code 40-6-391(A)(1), Driving Under The Influence Of Alcohol. Nolle Prosequi (Nol Pros) on 09/19/2007.
Sentenced on 10/16/2006: Probated-Time To Serve. Fines and surcharges of \$501.00. Probation of 12 Months. Confinement of Time Served. CFTS.
Sentenced on 05/25/2007: Sentence Vacated.

COUNT 2

DUI - Controlled Substance on 11/20/2005. Code 40-6-391(A)(6), Dui - Controlled Substance In Blood/urine. Nolle Prosequi (Nol Pros) on 09/19/2007.

COUNT 3

Failure to Maintain Insurance on 11/20/2005. Code 40-6-10, Failure To Maintain Insurance.
Sentenced on Guilty Plea on 09/19/2007.
Sentenced on 10/16/2006: Probated-No Time to Serve. Fines and surcharges of \$280.00. Probation of 12 Months. CONC TO CT 1.
Sentenced on 05/25/2007: Sentence Vacated.
Sentenced on 09/19/2007: Fine Only. Fines and surcharges of \$280.00.

COUNT 4

Failure to Maintain Insurance on 11/20/2005. Code 40-6-10, Failure To Maintain Insurance. Nolle Prosequi (Nol Pros) on 09/19/2007.

COUNT 5

Traffic Offenses on 11/20/2005. Code 40-6-48, Improper/erratic Lane Change. Nolle Prosequi (Nol Pros) on 09/19/2007.

COUNT 6

Reckless Driving on 11/20/2005. Code 40-6-390, Reckless Driving. Sentenced on Guilty Plea on 09/19/2007.
Sentenced on 09/19/2007: Probated-No Time to Serve. Fines and surcharges of \$1090.00. Probation of 12 Months.

The Fifth Amendment states that "no person... [shall] be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb." This means that no defendant can be prosecuted twice for the same alleged offense. However, there are also limitations to this rule, and it's important to understand what the Fifth Amendment does and does not protect against.

The **Fifth Amendment** of the U.S. Constitution provides, "No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor ...

Documents

Document images may be obtained at the courthouse.



Sharon Bridgewater

- 2006-07-10 - Jury Demand - Defendant's Req BIND OVER FROM CITY OF LVILLE Attorney For Defendant
- 2006-09-07 - Bench Warrant JURY TRIAL 9.5.06 Judge
- 2006-09-07 - Motion for Bond Forfeiture Judge
- 2006-09-07 - Order NISI 1.12.07 @9AM 3H Judge
- 2006-10-16 - Order/Notice of License Suspension Solicitor
- 2006-10-16 - Appointment of Counsel J SPENCE Judge
- 2006-10-16 - Plead of Defendant Solicitor
- 2006-10-16 - Defendants Plea Statement Judge
- 2006-10-17 - Sentence Special Alternative Order WAP 5 DAYS Judge
- 2006-10-17 - Sentence A&D Eval/Dom Viol Screen Judge
- 2006-10-19 - Sheriffs Notice Bondsman Off Bond Surety
- 2006-10-24 - Defendants Notice of Appeal Defendant
- 2007-04-10 - Motion for New Trial Defendant
- 2007-04-10 - Motion/Demand Other NOTICE OF MOTION Defendant
- 2007-04-20 - Order NISI MOTION FOR NT/ WITHDRAWL PLEA/ HABEAS PETITN 5.4.07 @10AM 3H Judge
- 2007-05-09 - Transcript GUILTY PLEA 5.9.07
- 2007-05-25 - Order ALLOWING DEF TO WITHDRAW PLEA/ MTN FOR NT 7.12.07 @9AM 3H Judge
- 2007-06-26 - Order Allowing Counsel to Withdrw Attorney For Defendant
- 2007-06-28 - Affidavit of Indigence Defendant

- 2007-06-29 - Order on Indigent Status IS Judge
- 2007-06-29 - Appointment of Counsel L HARSH Judge
- 2007-07-02 - Omnibus Defense Motion Attorney For Defendant
- 2007-07-06 - States Certificate of Service & STATES RESONSE TO DISCOVERY Solicitor
- 2007-07-10 - Order Granting Motion TO FILE ADD'L MOTIONS BY ATTY ONLY Judge
- 2007-07-17 - Counsel Notice of Leave of Absenc Attorney For Defendant
- 2007-09-06 - Counsel Conflict Notice Attorney For Defendant
- 2007-09-14 - Counsel Conflict Notice Attorney For Defendant
- 2007-09-19 - Order REQUIREMENT FOR ATTENDANCE AT ALCOHOL AWARENESS Judge
- 2007-09-19 - Amended Accusation Solicitor
- 2007-09-19 - Plead of Defendant Solicitor
- 2007-09-19 - Order/findings as to Restitution \$150 ATT FEES Judge
- 2007-09-19 - Sentence Special Alternative Order Judge
- 2007-09-19 - Order/Notice of License Suspension Solicitor
- 2007-09-19 - Defendants Plea Statement Judge
- 2007-11-30 - Tolling Order EFFEC 11.30.07 Judge
- 2008-09-24 - Motion/Demand Other MOTION TO VACATE JUDGMENT & ARREST WARRANT Defendant
- 2008-09-24 - Order Denying Motion Judge
- 2009-10-19 - Motion/Demand Other TO MODIFY PROBATION Defendant

†Last updated on Jun 14 2016 9:05AM. ††The official court records are maintained by the Clerk of Court for Superior, State and Magistrate Courts and are available only from the office Monday thru Friday 8:00AM to 5:00PM.

<http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/>