

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

GOLEROS; UNNOTE; LINRCROSS,

Case No. 4:20-2407

Plaintiff,

JUDGEMENT

v.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;
THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
SECURITY; ARNIEVINICK, IN HIS
OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS PRESIDENT
OF THE UNITED STATES; CONSIATI,
IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS
SECRETARY OF HOMELAND
SECURITY.,

Defendant.

DISTRICT JUDGE, KIND_YADA

BACKGROUND

The plaintiffs all joined a voice call of their disagreement with their boss Secretary Consiati. They then discussed possible methods to remove their boss. After such an idea got out such was informed to the Office of the Secretary. Shortly after all plaintiffs were terminated. Plaintiff LinRCross and Goleros attempted to gain more information on their termination and appeal it which was denied by the President. A bit later the President said “He’s eeb’ed” referring to Goleros in his appeal ticket. Plaintiffs then shortly after filed a case against the defendants which was docketed to Ret. Hon. Justice SurpriseParty. Plaintiff Goleros is suing the defendant ArnieVinick in his official capacity as President of the United States for deprivation of rights. Plaintiff Goleros is also suing Secretary Consiati in his official capacity for unlawful termination and arbitrary termination. Plaintiff UnNote is suing Secretary Consiati in his official capacity for unlawful termination. Plaintiff LinRCross is suing Secretary Consiati in his official capacity for unlawful termination and arbitrary termination.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

The Plaintiff's claim their first amendment right was violated. It is very clear on this matter that this is such a case, and the court may also refer to Public Law 81-7(II)(C) which prohibits any officer or employee of the United States to terminate someone for invoking their rights set by the Constitution that does not interfere with their duties or responsibilities. Though the defendant in the termination letter claimed inactivity of their duties (see [here](#)) they have no valid proof backing up such claim. It is clear when the appeal was denied and closed the true reason. Though why even put an appeal system if you won't hear appeals? Though on the count of deprivation of rights I see no proof of an ebb being issued. Secretary Consiati has every right to remove UnNote due to his position as Deputy Secretary though the court does declare his termination was in violation of Public Law 81-7(II)(C). The defense has failed to argue this case by not providing a response. Hence default judgement in favor of the plaintiff is ordered.

JUDGEMENT

Defendant ArnieVinick is found not liable on one count of deprivation of rights.

Defendant Consiati is found liable on the false termination against Goleros.

Defendant Consiati is found liable on the false termination against LinRCross.

Defendant Consiati is found liable on arbitrary termination against Goleros.

Defendant Consiati is found not liable on arbitrary termination against UnNote.

Defendant Consiati is found liable on arbitrary termination against LinRCross.

ORDER OF RELIEF

The court hereby declares the termination of Goleros and LinRCross was in violation of Public Law 81-7(II)(C).

The court hereby declares the termination of Goleros and LinRCross was arbitrary and violated their constitutional rights.

The court hereby orders the defendant to reinstate Goleros back to his position as Head of Operations in the Special Weapons and Tactics Team and not to terminate him for this situation again.

The court hereby orders the defendant to reinstate LinRCross back to his position as Chief of Staff in the Department of Homeland Security and not to terminate him for this situation again.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: May 2nd, 2020

BY THE COURT:
/s/ Kind_Yada
Kind_Yada
District Court Judge