

The Perjury, The Court, and The Free Speech I The Lie That Killed A Business

Disclaimer & Methodology

This report details an independent analysis based solely on the official public record of **Lueders v. Thompson, Case 254900948, Second Judicial District Court, Weber County, Ogden, Utah.**

The conclusions regarding **Fraud Upon the Court** and **Systemic Due Process Violation** were derived from a review of:

- Official Transcripts from the June 23, 2025 (Commissioner's) and July 28, 2025 (Judge's) Hearings.
- Petitioner's initial filings and subsequent Oppositions.
- Respondent's Motions (Rule 60(b) and Motion to Vacate) and Exhibits (GPS Data, Call Logs, and Text Messages).
- Official Court Docket Entries (Case History).

Court Location: Second Judicial District Court, Weber County, Ogden, Utah.

Note: This report details the case of **Lueders v. Thompson** (Case No. 254900948), an extraordinary instance of judicial failure where a final Protective Order was issued based on demonstrably false allegations, resulting in the censorship of creative speech and the destruction of a citizen's livelihood. Subsequent attempts to correct these errors were actively obstructed by layers of documented procedural sabotage. The consequence of the judicial system's failure is the citizen's complete economic and professional paralysis.

PART I: THE FOUNDATION OF FRAUD AND CENSORSHIP

The final Protective Order rests on findings that were factually contradicted by objective evidence and distorted by rhetorical exaggeration, leading to a severe violation of Mr. Thompson's constitutional rights.

1. The "Five Houses Down" Perjury (Fraud Upon the Court)

The Judge's critical finding against Mr. Thompson's credibility relied heavily on a sworn allegation of stalking presented by the Petitioner's attorney, **Ron W. Haycock, Jr., of the Strong & Hanni Law Firm**. By presenting this provably false claim (the "five houses down" lie), **Ron W. Haycock, Jr.**, engaged in a serious breach of professional conduct, as attorneys cannot ethically present known falsehoods to the court.

- **Objective GPS Data:** Mr. Thompson has **unrefuted GPS records** proving he **remained at his own residence** during the exact time of the alleged stalking.
- **Intentional Deception:** The "five houses down" comment was a deliberate **private ruse** concocted with the paramour to deter the Petitioner from causing drama. The Petitioner weaponized this private fiction as a stalking allegation in court, leading directly to the Judge finding Mr. Thompson "not credible."
- **Contradictory Witnesses:** The alleged victim (the paramour) confirmed in texts that he came to Mr. Thompson's house and **had never been to her house**, destroying the factual basis of the lie.

2. Censorship and the Attack on Creative Expression (First Amendment Violation)

Ron W. Haycock, Jr., successfully framed Mr. Thompson's artistic work and metaphorical language as physical threats, resulting in a judicial order that censored his speech.

- **Metaphorical vs. Literal Threat:** The court treated common **metaphorical expressions** as literal threats. For instance, the attorney convinced the court to treat the phrase "**You have blood on your hands**" (an **accusation of culpability**) as a physical threat, while the Judge failed to distinguish this from an actual criminal threat.
- **Exaggerated Metaphor (The Song):** The actual lyric in the song, "**Exposed**," stated, "**The truth is like a bullet**" (singular), a metaphor for the devastating impact of disclosure. The Judge failed to recognize this distinction, allowing the court to censor Mr. Thompson's commentary.
- **Private Context Ignored:** The song was **never publicly released**; it was part of a private agreement that the Petitioner violated. Furthermore, Mr. Thompson testified the song had **no names in it until the Petitioner explicitly told him to put names in it**, highlighting her participation, not her fear.

PART II: SYSTEMIC FAILURE AND JUDICIAL SABOTAGE

The substantive fraud was enabled by severe, documented procedural errors made by newly appointed judicial officers and their staff, with **Ron W. Haycock, Jr.** exploiting every misstep.

3. Denial of Due Process (The 30-Minute Trap)

Despite having foreknowledge of the flawed case, the District Judge failed to cure the error and actively restricted the defense.

- **Judicial Foreknowledge:** The Judge affirmed he **listened to the entire prior Commissioner's hearing**, placing him on explicit notice that the original Petition was built on weak claims and that Mr. Thompson's evidence had been ignored.
- **Time Theft:** The Judge imposed a limiting **30-minute time slot** for Mr. Thompson's defense. He then consumed over **6 minutes of that time** with his own questions, guaranteeing Mr. Thompson could not fully present his decisive evidence before time expired.
- **The Blackmail Backpedal:** When facing judicial scrutiny over the explicit physical threats, **Ron W. Haycock, Jr.**, immediately backpedaled, abandoning the high standard for threats and successfully pivoting the argument to the lower, vague standard of "**reasonable fear of her safety**," which the Judge accepted.

4. Procedural Weaponization and Hostage Motion

Mr. Thompson's attempt to obtain post-judgment relief was met with direct obstruction, blocking his path to the Appellate Court.

- **Attorney's Collusion:** The filing history reveals that **Ron W. Haycock, Jr., of the Strong & Hanni Law Firm**, filed his Notice of Appearance on the same day as the first hearing, despite being threatened with the law firm prior. This indicates the legal action was coordinated by the family's business attorneys, exploiting procedural technicalities to gain an advantage.
- **Clerk's Unlawful Rejection:** Mr. Thompson's **Rule 60(b) Motion was unlawfully rejected by the Commissioner's clerk**—an administrative staff member with **no judicial authority** to rule on a motion.
- **Procedural Sabotage:** The rejection occurred only **hours after Ron W. Haycock, Jr. intervened** and improperly argued the motion should be rejected under the Commissioner's rules (Rule 101), proving the rejection was not a clerical mistake but a deliberate act of sabotage orchestrated by the opposing counsel.

THE DEVASTATING RESULT: LIVELIHOOD DESTROYED

The sum total of these substantive lies and procedural errors culminated in the destruction of Mr. Thompson's livelihood.

The final court order imposed an overexpanded, ill-defined "**all weapons**" **ban** on Mr. Thompson. This ban, imposed despite the Petitioner's own admission of speculative fear and the lack of a crime, directly targeted and destroyed his legitimate business, **Spartan Tactical (Titan LLC)**.

The Ultimate Irony of Justice: The system's illegal actions stripped Mr. Thompson of his income, preventing him from hiring the necessary counsel to fight the fraud. He is now forced to spend all his time and energy **learning complex procedural law just to teach the courts and opposing counsel the rules they violated**, resulting in complete economic and professional paralysis. This systemic failure creates a self-perpetuating cycle of injustice.