

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA

Scott William Faul,

Petitioner,

Case No. C3-16-83

v.

Bureau of Prisons,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR COMPASSIONATE RELIEF
PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. § 3582

Comes now petitioner, Scott William Faul (Faul, I, or Me), pursuant to Title 18 U.S.C. § 3582.

I submitted an "INMATE REQUEST TO STAFF" (IRTS) on August 10, 2020 requesting a reduction in sentence and an early release from prison under the Compassionate Release Program pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582. That request was denied by Sandstone's acting warden on August 24, 2020.

Normal Reasons For Relief

I am 67 years old, and have been incarcerated since February 14, 1983. I have received very little medical treatment over all those years, because little has been requested. I do have trouble breathing at times, I assume from a type of bronchitis, likely stemming from my farming years. This condition has never been treated, as I am able to deal with it under normal conditions. Bouts of labored breathing are usually not severe, and are almost always caused by someone misusing some sort of contraband that should not have been available to them in the

first place. I will not insist that my bronchial condition, whatever it is, puts me in greater danger, because I do not possess the necessary facts to fairly make that assertion with calculated accuracy. I simply have no access to information regarding what may be correlative between those conditions. However, while my bronchial condition could be another factor for concern, it is not a requisite factor for relief because, according to the CDC, the risk of complications from COVID-19 for anyone who is 67 years old is a given in and of itself, even without any other health conditions.

Extraordinary Reasons For Relief

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.

Further, the Parole Commission's guidelines show that, even if I had been lawfully convicted, I should serve 100+ months, and that anything more than 48 months beyond the 100 months must be justified by some extenuating circumstances. None existed in this case. The biased scum of the swamp sitting on the Commission simply proceed with a mindless parroting of the statute itself. They cannot help themselves -- they promised favoritism to their fellow swamp creatures. That is what scumbags do when their fellow craft beckon.

When I am released, I am going to retire to my farm near Harvey, North Dakota, to continue exactly from the same point which I was at in 1983 before I was unlawfully attacked by murderous thugs of the Ronald Reagan, William French Smith, Edwin

Meese squad of terrorists. (See, Scott William Faul's July 16, 2018 50-page parole "APPEAL" for numerous details regarding those criminals).

Because of my age and the plandemic of COVID-19, the fact that I have been unlawfully imprisoned because no jury has found me guilty of the necessary elements of aiding and abetting second degree murder, the fact that favoritism was promised to the other side, and the fact that my already unlawful imprisonment has been further unlawfully extended by the Parole Commission scum to 480 months instead of the 100 months, or 148 months, which their own guidelines call for, I request "early" [compared to the kidnapers' plan of never] release under the Compassionate Release Program.

Inherent Duties And Powers

I hereby state, as a sworn fact, that the UNITED STATES Corporation has already admitted that sham judges Paul Benson and Kermit Bye both promised favoritism to the other side in my case. This is adjudicated fact.

You, falling upon such information as I have sworn to herein, and which has not been and cannot be denied by the UNITED STATES Corporation, may have a duty to correct wrongdoing even without any urging from a litigant. So, go ahead -- do what is right.

For example, if you were to learn that a case was heard by a man who had promised his favoritism to one of the parties in a case, I am certain that you would agree that the said man was not an impartial judge in that case. Correct? Well of course that

is correct -- he was a sham judge -- so mote it be. And then, unquestionably, it would come to your mind that you have a duty to inform your chief district judge, if you be not him, because the chief judge has a "continuing obligation to supervise the members of its Bar, as well as its responsibility to exercise that degree of control required by the facts and circumstances of each case to assure the litigants of a fair trial" in general, and an impartial judge in particular.

And then there just might be a question of having an independent duty to inform the ethics board of the state supreme court, and any other little duties you might think of. Oh, and what about the Code of Judicial Conduct for United States Judges, and oath of office? Oh heck, you are the judge; surely you must know.

In Faul v. United States, 99-cv-41, at doc. ## 113 et seq., and in my May 14, 2006 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion, all in the District of North Dakota, plus in all other pleadings referenced in that § 2255, you can read for yourself the detailed admissions made by the favoritism-accepting scum of the UNITED STATES Attorney's Office. If you are thinking that I have little respect for that group, you are wrong. I have none. And I have less than none for Paul Benson and Kermit Bye. I have good reason.

You certainly know, because you are a judge, that it sounds pretty much like I have been unlawfully imprisoned for 37 plus years. No, that is too kind. It does not sound pretty much like, it sounds absolutely like I have been unlawfully imprisoned

for 37 plus years. You have inherent powers to correct felonious behavior by prior sham judges and their handlers in the UNITED STATES Attorney's Office. I advise, put aside any notion that you should favor the scumbags.

If you are unable to come to a ruling favorable to me because you have promised favoritism to the other side or to the sham judges in any of my previous litigation, then you must recuse yourself. If you are able to come to a ruling favorable to me even though you have promised favoritism to the other side or to the sham judges in any of my previous litigation, then I am inclined to say that you may do so. That may sound strange -- almost self-serving -- but it is not at all unfair. That is so, because ruling against a despised party is certainly not equal to ruling for a despised party. If you can come to a favorable correct ruling for one party in spite of favoritism to the other party, who can complain?

In other words, as far as I am concerned, you may say, "The undersigned, despite having promised favoritism to the UNITED STATES Corporation, finds from the undenied facts in this case as applied to the correct law that Scott Faul is entitled to release because he has not had a 'trial' as that term is constitutionally understood and defined by the courts."

Can you imagine the UNITED STATED Corporation raising the issue of recusal: "You promised your favoritism to us but you ruled in favor of Scott Faul, that is not fair." Yeah, right. That is why I would not challenge you to sit, despite any favoritism you may possess, if your ruling is favorable; but do

challenge you to sit, should you possess any favoritism, if you will rule against me.

Summed up, if you can rule in favor of a party, despite being biased against that party, then that party must have a pretty compelling case. However, regardless of any "approval" from me, you may have to recuse yourself under either scenario for some separate and very compelling reason. That is so, because a promise of favoritism to one side, by one who is supposed to be a judge, creates a "structural defect" which cannot be waived -- worse than there being no judge, there is a partisan for one side who is pretending to be a judge. Under such a disqualifying cloud, the office of judge does not exist.

So, while I may have authority to accept a favorable ruling from an admittedly biased "judge," it does not follow that said "judge" has authority to allow an opposing party to accept it, for there being no office created or maintained, there is no authority whatsoever. I doubt that the people would authorize a mere "judge" to pretend such a sham as, e.g., cosigning the imprisonment of a person by a shameful creature such as the UNITED STATES Corporation without even the pretense of a "fair trial" with an "impartial judge." The people demand at least the pretense -- it soothes their consciences.

If you can overcome that hurdle, i.e., if you are not one who has promised favoritism, there is still the fact that you get paid by the same Corporation as do the scum, which in and of itself reeks of being a farce and sham. Yes, it reeks a malodorous stench. But try to lay that horrible scam aside for

just a moment. Try to at least apply correct law to all the facts which they have admitted in all those prior pleadings, i.e., that those sham judges Benson and Bye had promised their favoritism to one side in this case. Try to determine, instead of deferring to that UNITED STATES Corporation, what facts my above-cited pleadings state and are admitted by that Corporation. That determination will settle absolutely that my imprisonment is unlawful, and that relief is not only warranted, but compelled.

So, I repeat, go ahead -- do what is right.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 3, 2020

Scott Faul

Scott Faul


Affidavit And Certificate

I, the undersigned affiant, certify under the penalty of perjury that all the facts and circumstances in the foregoing instrument are true and correct. I further certify that I served one copy of this instrument on the Clerk of this Court, to be served through the ECF system, on this 3rd day of December, 2020.

Affiant Scott Faul

Scott Faul
Reg. No. 04564-059
F.C.I. Sandstone
P.O. Box 1000
Sandstone, MN 55072

Scott William Faul
Reg. No. 04564-059 K3 Unit
Federal Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 1000
Sandstone, MN 55072



ST PAUL MN 551
DEC 04 2020 AM

RECEIVED

DEC -7 2020

ROBERT ANSLEY, CLERK
U.S. DISTRICT COURT-NORTH DAKOTA

*** LEGAL MAIL ***

Quentin N. Burdick U.S. Courthouse
655 1st Avenue North, Room 130
Fargo, ND 58102