

A GROUP OF 9/11 RELATED CIVIL CASES ARE PENDING AND THEY REPRESENT AN IMPORTANT OPPORTUNITY TO EXPOSE THE TRUTH ABOUT 9/11

January 25, 2015

By Vincent Gillespie, Secretary Treasurer of the Ellen Mariani Legal Defense Fund¹

Background

Ellen Mariani is a widow who lost her husband, Louis Neil Mariani, due to the terrorist attacks of 9/11/2001 and who sued in court to try to find justice and the truth regarding his death. The Ellen Mariani Legal Defense Fund raised money so that she could appeal her case² to the US Supreme Court. She sought that appeal after the courts took many improper steps to shut down her case and prevent it from ever coming to trial. We succeeded in raising the necessary money and the appeal was filed on 11/21/12. However, unfortunately the US Supreme Court refused to hear it. Ellen finally settled her case in September of 2013. ([The September 7, 2014 update](#) for the Ellen Mariani Legal Defense Fund, which is posted at marianilawsuit.com, contains much more background information about this fund.)

The *Burnett* case and a related group of 9/11 cases

In about March of 2014 I learned that there was actually another 9/11 case involving Wrongful Death claims pursued by plaintiffs who had lost relatives on 9/11/01 (besides Ellen Mariani's case, which was settled in September of 2013) which was active, *Burnett v. Al Baraka Investment & Development Corp* (filed in US District Court for the Southern District of New York; case # 1:03-cv-09849-GBD). That case is still active at the time of this writing. (A copy of the very large docket for that case dated 8/9/14 from the Federal District Court for the Southern District Of New York can be reviewed by clicking [here](#). The case was originally filed

¹ Ellen Mariani settled her (deceased husband's estate's) case in September of 2013 and so she is no longer involved with the Ellen Mariani Legal Defense Fund and the marianilawsuit.com website. Any writings or actions by me, Vincent Gillespie, since that date are not endorsed by her. I presently have no mandate from her nor any legal responsibility to her.

² Technically the case which Ellen was involved with (*John Ransmier vs. United Airlines Corporation, et al. vs. Ellen Mariani, proposed intervener*, Second Circuit Federal Court of Appeals case # 11-175) was not her case but rather that of the estate of her deceased husband, Louis Neil Mariani. Ellen was a beneficiary of the estate (as was her step daughter, Lauren Peters) and attorney John Ransmeier (who was *not* Ellen's nor Lauren's attorney) was (since 2007) the administrator of the estate and he, technically, was the plaintiff and it was he, and not Ellen, who was managing the lawsuit. However, for simplicity in this article that lawsuit will be referred to as Ellen's case.

on 8/15/2002 in US District Court for the District of Columbia. The docket for the case when it was there in Washington, D.C. is [here](#).)

On further investigation I found that actually the Burnett case, which is very large in and of itself, is only one of a number of interrelated, large 9/11 cases (apparently all involving wrongful death claims filed by plaintiffs who lost relatives on 9/11). The lead case of this group of cases is titled In Re: Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001, case # 1:03-md-01570-GBD-FM, which is pending in the US District Court for the Southern District of New York.³ That case is really huge. A PDF file of the docket for that case runs to about 1,700 pages. (Click [here](#) to see the docket for that case, dated 8/4/14.) Furthermore, if you look at the first page of the docket for that case (In Re: Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001) you can see that there are numerous other associated cases.⁴ There are 21 “member cases” and 11 “related cases.” I believe that the total number of parties involved in this massive group of 9/11 cases (the “In Re: Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001 group of cases”) runs easily into the thousands.⁵ These cases are still active as of the time of this writing.⁶

3 The case of In Re: Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001 seems to have been formed when a number of cases from several courts were transferred in and combined into that case in the US District Court for the Southern District of New York. The original court order transferring in and combining several cases to form that case is [here](#). One of those several cases which were combined into the case of In Re: Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001 was Fiona Havlish vs. Bin Laden, et al., which was pending in US District Court for the District of Columbia [case # 1:02-cv-00305-JR]. The docket for that case is [here](#).

4 More information about all of these cases is available through [pacer.gov](#), a website which holds data on federal cases. To use that website you will need to create an account and they charge ten cents for each page you view (to a maximum of \$3.00 per document view). However, if your bill is less than \$15.00 per quarter then your charges are waived and you don't have to pay anything for that quarter.

5 Note: the In Re: Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001 group of cases is very large and I do not purport to be very familiar with any of those cases. There might be important information that I am not providing here because I simply don't know about it. Also, there might be information in these cases which contradicts some of what I have written about them. I have not spent the time to become very familiar with them and I only know a limited amount about them.

6 In some of my earlier posts and other statements I previously stated that Ellen Mariani's case was the last case of its type (involving Wrongful Death claims by plaintiffs who lost family members on 9/11/01 due to the terrorist attacks). In light of the In Re: Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001 group of cases it seems that those statements of mine were incorrect. However, I did not know about these other cases previously and Christopher Bollyn (President of the Ellen Mariani Legal Defense Fund) informed me that he also did not know about them. (As noted above, I first learned of the Burnett case in about March of 2014. I learned about the other, related 9/11 cases, the In Re: Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001 group of cases, several months later, to the best of my recollection.) There does not seem to have been much media coverage at all about them. I can unequivocally state that I did not *knowingly* make false assertions about Ellen's case being the last one of its type (in which wrongful death claims were pursued by plaintiffs who lost one or more relatives on 9/11).

Note that the plaintiffs in the In Re: Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001 group of cases apparently include many of the 9/11 families who accepted the payouts, the “hush money” from the Victims’ Compensation Fund.⁷ As previously stated (in prior posts), such families were required to sign away their rights to sue in court.⁸ However, apparently the agreements they were required to sign stipulated that they would not sue *certain defendants* in exchange for that money, but those defendants apparently did not include the Arabs and Muslims, the entities who the mainstream media has told us were responsible for the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Thus, those plaintiffs were able to proceed with the In Re: Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001 group of cases – which (apparently) name only or mostly Muslim and Arab individuals and entities as defendants – despite having received that money from the Victims’ Compensation Fund and despite having signed an agreement not to litigate (against certain defendants only).

There appears at first glance to be a great discrepancy between the way in which the courts treated on the one hand Ellen Mariani’s case and the other 100 or so cases (involving wrongful death claims pursued by plaintiffs who lost a family member on 9/11) which refused (at least at first) to accept the “hush money” from the Victims’ Compensation Fund and demanded a trial instead (and which I have previously mentioned in my posts) (the “Mariani group of 9/11 cases”); and on the other hand the In Re: Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001 group of cases. Regarding the former group of cases the courts did everything in their power, including taking very improper and illegal steps and dirty tricks, to thwart them and *to force each and every one of them to settle out of court*. (There is a long list of improper actions taken by the courts to kill

⁷ Apparently most or many of the plaintiffs in these cases accepted the money from the Victims’ Compensation Fund. However, there are a variety of types of plaintiffs in these cases, including but not limited to financial institutions which were impacted by the events of 9/11. Thus, probably not all of these plaintiffs accepted such money.

⁸ These people who accepted the Victims’ Compensation Fund money were required to sign non-disclosure agreements which prevented them from talking about many issues relating to their cases (and/or their potential cases if they never filed a case) and/or their agreement with the Victims’ Compensation Fund and/or other 9/11 related issues. (I have never read one of these non-disclosure agreements so I don’t know exactly what they prevented these people from saying.)

Ellen's case.⁹⁾ Regarding the latter group of cases the courts appear to have allowed them to proceed. Why is there this difference in the treatment by the courts of these two groups of cases?

It turns out that there appears to be a specific reason for this difference. The In Re: Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001 group of cases fits within the official "party line" in that the defendants are (all or mostly) Arab and Muslim entities, those who the powers that be have told us were responsible for the 9/11 attacks. The powers that be apparently don't mind if 9/11 plaintiffs go after the Arabs and Muslims, as that does not disturb the official party line. (Furthermore, those defendants, even if they were forced to testify or if evidence was subpoenaed from them, would probably not be able to divulge information incriminating the powers that be, who are not Muslim nor Arab, because these defendants [who are mostly foreigners from foreign cultures] probably don't know much about what really happened on 9/11 nor about the real culprits. [But there may be an opportunity to change that, as discussed below.]) It appears to be only cases which go after or get too close to the real culprits (or entities associated with them) – like Ellen Mariani's case and the Mariani group of 9/11 cases which named defendants such as ICTS, Boeing, Huntleigh USA and/or others who might have had some actual involvement in 9/11 or information about those involved or about what actually happened on 9/11 – that the powers that be felt they needed to stop. So that appears to be why the In Re: Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001 group of cases, unlike the Mariani group of 9/11 cases, was allowed to move forward.

What I think is happening here is that the powers that be have chosen to "channel" or redirect all the anger, pain, frustration and determination to find justice (through the courts) in the minds of the 9/11 plaintiffs *from* being aimed at the correct defendants *to* being directed against straw men, the scapegoats, the patsies, the people who the pathological liars in the media keep telling us were responsible for the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the Arabs and Muslims. Thus they have completely shut down all the 100 or so cases like Ellen Mariani's, the Mariani group of 9/11 cases, and (effectively) redirected the remaining 9/11 related cases (which involved

⁹ I have been meaning for many months to prepare a written list of all the irregularities and improprieties (that I know of) that Ellen and her case endured during the course of that case. I have started writing it up but have not yet finished it. I intend that if and when I do finish writing up that list I will revise this article to include a hyperlink connecting to it (probably at this point in the article, in this footnote). If and when that list does get done the revised version of this article, with a new date included just below the title lines, should be posted at marianilawsuit.com. I do not feel I can make any promises about when I will get that done.

wrongful death claims pursued by plaintiffs who lost a relative on 9/11/01) to go against (to name as defendants) the “evil” Arabs and Muslims; they allowed those cases to go forward.

Notice that this vast conglomeration of 9/11 litigation, the In Re: Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001 group of cases, seems to be proceeding in silence, with no or almost no media coverage so that the entire community of 9/11 truth activists is apparently unaware of this large group of large 9/11 cases. Why is that? The incredible media silence regarding these very large 9/11 cases is being maintained, I believe, because the owners of the media know that if too many Americans knew about this litigation they might start calling for these cases to be steered towards the truth, as I am doing in this article. That is why the mainstream media has not covered these cases (or not covered them very much), in my opinion.

The In Re: Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001 group of cases represent an opportunity for 9/11 truth:

The In Re: Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001 group of cases represent a major opportunity for those interested in exposing 9/11 truth. Generally speaking, a lawsuit includes great power to discover the truth. If some of the defendants in these cases could become sufficiently informed about the reality of what happened on 9/11 (as opposed to the fairy tale pushed by the mainstream media about 19 Arab hijackers and Osama Bin Laden), there would in theory be nothing barring them from bringing all kinds of crucial 9/11 truth information into the case, into the formal record of the case (as part of their defenses), and from subpoenaing all kinds of important documents and from deposing – under oath and with a transcript recorded as a public record – many of the criminals involved in 9/11. (Why not start with Larry Silverstein [the owner of WTC7 and the Comptroller of the entire WTC complex], who infamously publicly admitted to having demolished WTC7 with a controlled demolition?¹⁰) Also, note that while many people are closed to the idea of the official story of 9/11 being false, these defendants (or some of them) might be relatively open minded about hearing new perspectives on 9/11 due to

¹⁰ In a PBS documentary titled America Rebuilds Larry Silverstein was interviewed and he stated the following:

“I remember getting a call from the, er, fire department commander, telling me that they were not sure they were gonna be able to contain the fire, and I said, ‘We’ve had such terrible loss of life, maybe the smartest thing to do is pull it.’ And they made that decision to pull and we watched the building collapse.”

(To “pull” a building is demolition industry lingo for destroying a building through controlled demolition.) Thus, Larry Silverstein admitted to being involved in the controlled demolition of WTC7.

the heavy pressure of the litigation against them. (Some of the plaintiffs might also be able to take these kinds of actions as well, if any of them have not accepted the “hush money” and have not signed an agreement not to sue the real culprits. [See fn 7, above.]

(By the way, if you, the reader, still do not know what happened on 9/11, do not know who was behind the 9/11 terrorist attacks and how it was done, I implore you to get a copy of a book titled Solving 911: The Deception That Changed The World, by Christopher Bollyn, which details the story. [Christopher Bollyn’s website is www.bollyn.com.] Reviews of his book can be read on this webpage: <http://www.bollyn.com/bookstore/>)

I did start to try to contact some of the defendants in the Burnett case a number of months ago. I contacted the lawyer for one of the Defendants and a representative for another Defendant and I sent them each copies of Bollyn’s book. However, I did not feel I had the time to properly pursue and follow up with this matter due to many commitments in my life. Thus, in the end nothing came of that effort.¹¹

A call for members of the public to help

This project – contacting the parties (particularly the defendants) in the In Re: Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001 group of cases to try to inform them about the facts and the lies of 9/11 so that they can steer these cases towards 9/11 truth – is a project which could bring the truth about 9/11 to light. However, while I (Vincent Gillespie) may take some action to try to work on this project I have only very limited time available at this point in my life to pursue this. So, perhaps one or some concerned people out there could take up the task. Ideally, if someone (or a group of people) could do some detective work and find the contact info for most or many of the defendants and plaintiffs in these cases he could then just call these parties and talk to them about 9/11 truth (assuming they speak English) and/or one could provide them with information about the truth of 9/11, such as copies of Christopher Bollyn’s book (and/or the Thermite Report by Dr. Stephen Jones, et al¹²). If many of those then parties read the materials and learned more about what really happened on 9/11 and how we have all been lied to and if they were willing to they could then steer these cases towards revealing the truth about 9/11 to

¹¹ Note that a number of months ago, prior to the above mentioned effort of mine and prior to my learning of the Burnett case but after Ellen had settled her case, I anticipated that there might be additional work for the Ellen Mariani Legal Defense Fund to do (i.e., raising money for the limited appeal that Bruce Leichty was considering for a while after the settlement). But I did not feel I had the time to devote to such work. Therefore, I interviewed two people as possible replacement candidates for me, to carry on the pro bono work I was doing as Secretary-Treasurer of the Fund. However, neither of those candidates panned out.

the public and uncovering many new details about the truth of 9/11 beyond what we presently know.¹³ (For a purpose such as this Christopher Bollyn has informed me that he would be willing to offer a discounted price for copies of his books.)

If this information (about the truth regarding 9/11) were directly given to these defendants then this path (of steering these cases towards 9/11 truth) should be readily open to them. (If the information were given to plaintiffs, on the other hand, it might be a bit more complicated.¹⁴) If many of the parties in this massive conglomeration of litigation began endeavoring to steer their lawsuits towards discovering and exposing the truth about 9/11 I think it could play havoc with – and possibly end – the ability of the powers that be to continue to keep a lid on the truth about 9/11 in these cases.

So perhaps there is (are) one or more readers out there who would be willing to work on this project. I invite and urge people to do so. It would take some time and effort and perhaps some money and probably no one is going to pay you (but you might be able to start a new fundraising effort) but you would be fulfilling a useful and potentially very important role for 9/11 truth. The In Re: Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001 group of cases have been pending for a long time and one should not delay too long, as all these cases will eventually be closed.

One key point to convey to the defendants (as well as the plaintiffs), if someone or some people do take up this project, is that their own lawyers may be working against their interests.

¹² The “[Thermite Report](#)” is a technical report prepared by a team of nine scientists which was peer reviewed and published in a technical publication (Open Chemical Physics Journal, Volume 2, 2009). (The correct and proper title of this report is: Active Thermitic Material Discovered in Dust from the 9/11 World Trade Center Catastrophe.) It proves by establishing in four different scientific ways that nano-thermite, a very powerful explosive, was found in the World Trade Center dust, which strongly implies that the *three* (not two) towers which each collapsed in a few seconds on 9/11 were brought down with controlled demolitions (and not due to heat from fires caused by the *two* airplanes which crashed into *two* of the three towers on 9/11/01).

¹³ Christopher Bollyn’s book, Solving 911: The Deception That Changed The World, reveals important information about what really happened on 9/11 and who was behind the 9/11 terrorist attacks. It is a seminal work regarding the truth about the 9/11 terrorist attacks. However, there is much additional information that we do not presently know that could be discovered and brought to light through a properly managed court case. Additionally, a lawsuit presents the opportunity to place important information about 9/11 truth into the official record of the case where it can be reviewed by the public and brought to the public’s attention.

¹⁴ As discussed above, probably most or many of the plaintiffs have signed agreements not to sue the real defendants so they might be barred from directly bringing some or much of this info into the case but I think that if they wanted to they could nonetheless instruct their lawyers to provide the material to the defendants who could then bring the information into the case as part of their defenses. Or these plaintiffs might be able find ways themselves to put certain revealing information into the official record.

Also, some of the hundreds (or thousands) of plaintiffs probably have not accepted the hush money and thus have not signed away their rights to litigate freely regarding 9/11. So these plaintiffs could, if they chose to, readily proceed to reveal the truth about 9/11 through their cases.

Based on my own experience with lawyers generally and my limited observations of lawyers involved in 9/11 litigation, I think one should be wary that these lawyers may be part of the entire scam and cover up, working with the courts and the powers that be to keep these cases within the official narrative of 9/11. (Remember that Ellen Mariani had to go through at least about eight lawyers before she finally got one, Bruce Leichty, who was actually willing to oppose the system and fight to get to the truth of 9/11.) These defendants should be advised that these lawyers should be tested and their willingness to properly deal with these issues, to go after the real culprits and to steer these cases towards the truth (and with zest and determination) should be carefully evaluated, and if they are unwilling to do these things they must be quickly fired and replaced. (And the replacement lawyers must also be carefully scrutinized and replaced if necessary.)

Furthermore, (it is my experience that) one must continually monitor the work of one's lawyer(s) (both lawyers involved in 9/11 litigation and also lawyers in general) and not just sit back and trust them to take care of everything.

So members of the public are urged to help with this project by contacting defendants, giving them information about the truth regarding 9/11, and then urging them to make a decision to steer these 9/11 cases towards 9/11 truth.
