



Rules of Practice and Procedure suggestion

Suresh S. to: Rules_Support

Cc: usarmy.pentagon.hqda-tjaglcs.mbx.clamo-tjaglcs

09/28/2016 10:27 PM

History: This message has been forwarded.

Dear Sir/Ma'am.

Concerning use of fear and intimidation, I understand the presence of legal statute (<https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/18/115>) to hold a perpetrator accountable. I am writing to suggest a judicial procedure requiring a judge disclaim fear or intimidation influence the judgment being written (e.g., "This judgment is unaffected by fear or intimidation") to serve as reciprocal check. The rationale for this suggestion, a spoken/written word has a powerful influence on preserving integrity.

Such disclosure is relevant because, though rule of law has been able to place limits on traditional forms of intimidation involving physical presence/action, methods without physical presence/action are not limited. For instance, powerful beam-forming/focused wireless energy has been used for intimidation without physical contact ("Microwaving Embassy Moscow", <http://adst.org/2013/09/microwaving-embassy-moscow/>). Such a method that was privy to a few in the 1970s is ubiquitous and boundless in civil society since anyone can combine a Horn antenna to focus energy from a Magnetron* (microwave energy generator in a microwave oven) and use it for crime in the United States and elsewhere.

Please clarify if the suggested civil procedure is necessary to render justice unaffected by fear or intimidation**.

Faithfully Yours,
Suresh Kalkunte
<http://sskalkunte.info>

[*] "Designing a Horn antenna for 2.45GHz",
http://www.arrl.org/files/file/QEX_Next_Issue/Jan-Feb_2011/QEX_1_11_PASKVAN.pdf

and other sources on the Internet provide step-by-step sheet-metal work instructions to combine a Magnetron (operating at 2.45GHz) with a Horn antenna. Such combinations are published for use in termite control (via Internet search for "horn antenna magnetron termite control"), however, no limits are set by law when it is used against fellow being since such a combination used at close range using a priori information (where one sits at office, place where one sleeps etc.) is capable of physical harm as <http://www.eng-tips.com/viewthread.cfm?qid=172987> describes subject matter experts express injury when working with a microwave oven's Magnetron.

[**] In my case "Kalkunte v. United States Department of Justice et al", https://www.pacermonitor.com/public/case/8540782/Kalkunte_v_United_States_Department_of_Justice_et_al, the judge characterized my complaint as fiction. The outcome would be different if the judge extended the courtesy of checking with:
- A senior law enforcement professional like LTG. Steven H. Blum (ret.), United States Army who responded to my email in June 2015 after this case got dismissed on 23 June 2016 indicating law lags technology. You may verify my communication with LTG. Blum via blumhs@aol.com.

- The FCC who clarified before I filed the above case in June 2015 that its jurisdiction of regulation/enforcement does not cover criminal use of components used in wireless communication infrastructure. The Office of Engineering and Technology at the FCC can be contacted at oetinfo@fcc.gov to verify if FCC has jurisdiction to prevent criminal use of components emitting potent wireless energy.