

Exhibit M
front pg. 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DEL RIO DIVISION

JASON DANIEL GANDY #73006-274

V.

LEE H. ROSENTHAL, et al.

Case transferred to:
United States District
Court - Houston Division
515 Rusk St. # 5300
Houston, Tx. 77002

Houston Case Number
4:25-CV-1613

ORDER

Before the Court are Plaintiff Jason Daniel Gandy's complaint and motion to proceed in forma pauperis. Plaintiff sues Judge Lee Rosenthal, prosecutors Sherri Zack and Kim Leo, Homeland Security Agent Junae Johnson, and FNU Roscoe from the Houston Police Department. Plaintiff's complaint relates to his federal conviction in the Southern District of Texas in Cause No. 4:12-cr-00503. Plaintiff fails to allege how his complaint has any connection to the Western District of Texas. After reviewing Plaintiff's complaint, the Court finds that this action should be transferred to the Houston Division of the Southern District of Texas.

There is no specific venue provision contained in the Civil Rights Act under which this action was brought. Therefore, venue in civil rights cases is controlled by 28 U.S.C. § 1391. The relevant portions of the statute provide:

A civil action may be brought in –

- (1) a judicial district in which any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the State in which the district is located;
- (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action is situated; or
- (3) if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought as provided in this section, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court's personal jurisdiction with respect to such action.

Exhibit M
pg 2

TRULINCS 73006279 - GANDY, JASON DANIEL - Unit: TRM-J-A

FROM: 73006279
TO: Gandy, Joe
SUBJECT: Chief Judge Randy Crane
DATE: 07/31/2025 10:53:26 AM

In the United States District Court	)	Was case no. 2:25-CV-00021-EG
for the	)	
Southern District of Texas	)	I am told by the Western District of Texas judge
Jason Gandy, Plaintiff	)	Ernest Gonzalez, that the new case number is
v.	)	4:25-CV-1613
Lee H. Rosenthal, Defendant	)	

Dear Chief Judge Randy Crane,

1. Are you aware your prior chief, judge Rosenthal made obvious structural constitutional defects in my case? Please watch my interrogation on July 20, 2012, and take notice of the Grand Jury transcripts to see that my illegally obtained statements were used to indict me.
2. Please see attached response to my judicial misconduct complaint on Rosenthal. Fifth Circuit clerk, Robottom, claims the above case is on Pacer, yet my print does not show your court ever got it. Why?
3. Why hasn't your court acknowledged the above complaint?
4. I believe Rosenthal, who also works in the Appeals court, has such strong connections there and obviously in your court, which should allow you to remove my complaint like you did in the Van Deelen v. Jones, Southern District of Texas 4:23-CV-03729 on 6/6/24.
5. May I, or my mom, Julie Gandy, who has power of attorney, have a copy of the above complaint on Rosenthal? Also, of the request for a magistrate I sent on 6/12/25, which I suspect may be what the sealed document number 308, on 6/20/25 was regarding. Were you at the 6/20/25 sealed event? May I know what it was regarding?

TRULINCS 73006279 - GANDY, JASON DANIEL - Unit: TRM-J-A

Exhibit M
Pg. 3

FROM: 73006279

TO: Gandy, Joe

SUBJECT: RE: 6925 Rule 8(a) Abatement

DATE: 07/31/2025 10:16:55 AM

RE: Rule 8(a) Conflicts with Rule 5 & 11 via complaint number 05-24-9002 from 10-13-23.

Dear Clerk Robottom,

1. Your 6-9-25 Review of Pacer "indicating" overlapping issues due to Gandy v. Rosenthal USDC No. 4:25-CV-1613(S.D. Tex.) is Not a Reason in my very similar situation as Deelen's issue w/ Judge David R. Jones, to wait & see what happen in the above case that I can not find on Pacer(Attached Docket from Pacer).

Why is your Pacer different than mine? May I have a copy of yours?

2. I have written to Chief Judge Randy Crane about the above Civil Action against Rosenthal, So this my official update to you that that action has been canceled so that your court can move forward with my Judicial Misconduct Complaint.

3. The best reason for your Court to finally look at the merits of my complaint and to stop holding it in Abeyance can be found in an attachment I have provided. The prior Chief Judge Priscilla Richman's decision to "...herby identify a complaint against Judge David R. Jones. I conclude that disclosure of the existence of this complaint is necessary and appropriate, particularly because many of the allegations regarding Judge Jones' conduct have been made public in the press and in the filing of a law suit against Judge Jones. This statement makes rule 8(a) not applicable in my circumstance. See also attachment showing when Michael Van Deelen filed his district court complaint, which was before Richman decided to take up his judicial misconduct complaint.

4. Structural constitutional defects are according to justice Black, J., "irrespective of the circumstances, convictions obtained by unconstitutional methods should be subject to challenge at any time."

TRULINCS 73006279 - GANDY, JASON DANIEL - Unit: TRM-J-A

Exhibit M
pg 4

FROM: 73006279
TO: Gandy, Joe
SUBJECT: Mini Judicial Misconduct complaint
DATE: 07/31/2025 01:14:56 PM

Consider this mini Judicial Misconduct complaint, in addition to the one that was "received" 6/5/25.

1. Rosenthal refuses to allow a magistrate to fill in when I am asking for proof of her misconduct that is in the Grand Jury transcripts.
2. After I asked for a magistrate to rule on DE 305 in a letter sent 6/12/25, Rosenthal has another "sealed event" DE 308 on 6/20/25. Please look into this and take notice of ALL the unnecessarily sealed events in my case as part of your investigation into Rosenthal's misconduct.
3. As mentioned in my appeal to the denial of my compassionate release motion, case no: 25-20032 (please mail or email my mom a copy of the appeal I sent your court in March or April of 2025.) pg...2 # 2 to pg... 3 of my copy (attached) shows how Rosenthal mislabeled DE#285 in my docket sheet as "motion for return of property". It's obvious she's ignoring Structural Constitutional Defects when you read the response to DE 285 in DE 286.
4. #3 of my attached appeal to my compassionate release motion explains how Rosenthal misinterpreted DE# 287 in her response to my 60(b) request in DE#289. Her response lies about what I'm asking for. This is proof conflicts happen when a judge rules on her own misconduct.
5. This complaint is simple. Please read my attachment dated 7-24-25 the day i mailed the Southern District court my response to prosecutor Leo's denial of my request to my Grand Jury transcripts (DE 307). Page 2 #1 under "Case Law shows how i should be treated": in Boyd v US decided 9-28-06 "The trial Judge abused her discretion by declining to examine the relevant statements in camera". No judge has ever watched the illegal interrogations (7-20-12) with case law in hand.
6. All your court needs to do is watch my 7/20/12 illegal interrogation, after I asked for my lawyer who was at the Bush airport to pick me up. Then, see how my illegally obtained statements were used to coerce KV's statements on 7/20/12. This is well documented in motions to suppress my statements and their fruits in DE 34 and 46. Rosenthal had over four years to watch the videos and respond to the two suppression motions, yet never did. On 12/5/16 DE 89 Dan Cogdell said "we're still waiting on a ruling to our motions", referring to the two above, which he had filed in 2013.
7. Please read all of page 2 of ^{my Response to,} prosecutor Leo's denial of my Grand Jury transcript request, which ends "... to perpetuate something we all know to be wrong, only because we fear the consequences of being right." This quote describes what your court, and the district court, is currently doing to me. By now, your court should know Rosenthal is "deeply at war with both the text of the constitution and many years of supreme court precedent." This quote by 45 year veteran attorney, John O'Neil, in a 1/15/18 Houston Chronicle article titled "Rosenthal rules federal courts in Houston region with firm hand", helped me realize judge Rosenthal did this on purpose.
8. Structural constitutional defects structurally caused by a trial judge are subject to challenge at any time according to justice Black, J. "irrespective of the circumstances, convictions obtained by unconstitutional methods are subject to challenge at any time." Please stop making rules that protect your fellow judges from being held accountable for their misconduct. It defeats the purpose of the Judicial Improvement Act of 2002.