

# Judge James Robart's Ridiculous Travel Ban Obstruction Was a Dangerous Political Stunt, says D.C. Law Professor

*Robart's Ridiculous Ruling Highlights the Need for Trump to Fill the 100 Lower Court Judgeships Now Vacant with Nominees as Stellar as Neil Gorsuch for SCOTUS.*

BETHESDA, MD, USA, February 5, 2017 /EINPresswire.com/ -- Victor Williams, head of "[Lawyers and Law Professors for Trump](#)," issued the following statement after U.S. District Judge James L. Robart blocked President Trump's alien travel restriction. Judge Robart issued the order as being immediately effective nationwide, and he then refused to stay the order pending the Solicitor General's appeal to a panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals (9th Circuit).



“

Judge Robart knew that the Ninth Circuit would not review his order until Monday. Robart purposely opened a 72-hour weekend window to allow aliens to flood in. It was a dangerous political stunt.”

*Prof. Victor Williams, Chair of  
Law Professors and Lawyers  
for Trump*

Donald Trump was elected President, in part, because he has the unparalleled ability to communicate -- in 140 characters -- about the Republic's most fundamental problems.

Consider President Trump's tweets Saturday (2/4/17) regarding Judge James Robart's ridiculous ruling:

“What is our country coming to when a judge can halt a Homeland Security travel ban and anyone, even with bad intentions, can come into U.S.?”

Of course, Judge Robart's decision will be overruled. A hearing before a Court of Appeals Ninth Circuit panel is now scheduled for Monday afternoon. It may be on a fast track to

the Supreme Court.

But Judge Robart knew that the Ninth Circuit would not review his order until Monday. Robart purposely opened a 72-hour weekend window to allow aliens from the 7 nations to flood in. It was a shocking and dangerous political stunt.

A camera in the courtroom recorded Judge Robart's hearing on the matter. It exposes the jurist's ideological bias and pre-judgment regarding President Trump's travel restriction. Below is a roughly

transcribed snippet from the [full recording](#):

Judge Robart asks Justice Department counsel Michelle Bennett how many terrorism-related arrests have been made of individuals from the 7 restricted countries since the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

DOJ's Bennett responds that she does not know.

Judge Robart quickly retorts: "None as I can tell".

Judge Robart then states:

"You're here arguing on behalf of someone who says we have to protect the US from these individuals coming from these countries, and there's no support for that."

DOJ's Bennett asserts that it is the President who is charged with making such decisions, and that the court should not "look behind those determinations".

Judge Robart responds that he is deciding if the restriction is "rationally based," and the judge then sarcastically states:

"I have to find facts as opposed to fiction."

The "someone" in Robart's reference to "someone who says we have to protect the US" is none other than the Chief Executive and Commander in Chief of the United States who is vested by Article II of the Constitution with all executive authority.

Donald John Trump has the constitutional authority and responsibility to protect the American people. President Trump's Executive Order was a prudent and measured action.

As with most smart law enforcement actions, the Trump Executive Order was implemented without warning those who would break the law and without any advance notice to those Barack Obama holdover bureaucrats still running the government who might naively aid and abet such law breakers.

Judge James Robart has a pattern of ideological bias. Robart is the same federal judge who early this year defamed Seattle police for alleged abuse of African Americans and [emotionally declared from the bench that "Black Lives Matter."](#)

Judge Robart then threatened future punitive action against the police, and the jurist intimated that civil disobedience might be needed to enforce his will. Judge Robart actually said from the bench:

"I'm sure the people of Seattle will march behind me."

Is there nothing that can be done about such biased lawyers on the federal bench? Frustrated, some suggest impeaching Judge Robart. But impeachment removal will not happen.

It is true that Alexander Hamilton, in *The Federalist*, promised that the new Constitution's federal judiciary posed no danger of political usurpation or ideological bias because Congress would quickly use its impeachment removal power:

"[Impeachment removal] is alone a complete security. There never can be danger while ... [the legislature] was possessed of the means of punishing their presumption by degrading them from their

stations."

But former Attorney General John Ashcroft quite accurately stated:

"The courts have made liars of Hamilton and Madison, confirming our forefathers' worst fears -- for what the Framers intended to be the weakest branch of government has become the most powerful."

Our un-elected federal judges claim life tenure of both office and salary to insure "judicial independence."

This is meant to insulate judges from political pressures. Some say it now facilitates their political usurpation.

And no federal judge should be subject to impeachment removal for a wrong ruling. Otherwise, there would be too few judges left on the federal benches.

Sadly, our indolent Congress has proven reluctant to impeach federal judges even after they have been arrested for actual criminal activity. There was a recent example in Alabama but the judge eventually resigned.

Congress is even slow to impeach judges who have been convicted of a federal crime and sit in federal prison.

Consider the case of the felony-convicted U.S. District Judge Walter Nixon of Mississippi. Nixon continued to receive his federal judicial paycheck through the federal prison bars. With early release to a halfway house, Nixon began interviewing law clerks planning to return to the bench. Only then did the U.S. House begin impeachment proceedings and the Senate prepare to conduct an impeachment trial.

When a judge demonstrates a pattern of bias, shouldn't the jurist at least be subjected to a public shaming.

President Trump's tweets were thus both appropriate and effective.

Ironically, U.S. District Judge James L. Robart has performed something of a service in reminding American citizens how grateful we should all be that it is Donald Trump who will be exercising Article II, Section 2 authority to fill the over 100 empty judgeships existing on lower federal court benches.

---

Longtime Washington, D.C. attorney and law professor Victor Williams was an early primary supporter of Donald Trump (and conducted a disruptive legal action against Ted Cruz). Williams launched "Lawyers and Law Professors for Trump" during the general election. The campaign group is now being transformed into, and re-branded as, an advocacy platform to support the Trump/Pence "America First" administration.

Victor Williams  
Law Professors & Lawyers for Trump  
301-951-9045  
email us here

---

This press release can be viewed online at: <http://www.einpresswire.com>

Disclaimer: If you have any questions regarding information in this press release please contact the company listed in the press release. Please do not contact EIN Presswire. We will be unable to assist you with your inquiry. EIN Presswire disclaims any content contained in these releases.  
© 1995-2017 IPD Group, Inc. All Right Reserved.