

“Equal Justice Under The Law”
“Mr. Washull Not Recusing Himself For Conflict Of Interest Or Lack Of Impartiality Is
Wrong, And MDA’s Adverse Actions Are All A Pretense For Employer Discrimination”



APPENDIXES
ATTACHED TO THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI IN THE SUPREME
COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR WRONGFUL DIA-MDA COLLUSION CASE
2023-1215

- A May 17, 2023 CAFC Decision for 2023-1215 Adams v. Defense
- B Original MSPB Administrative Appeal DC-3443-22-0388-I-1 against Mr. Washull not recusing himself from the clearance investigation and revocation process in order to avoid the appearance of impropriety and Conflict of Interest or Lack of Impartiality (due to collusion) since Mr. Michael Washull worked for DIA immediately before MDA, and MDA for not directing Mr. Washull to recues himself!
- C Things That Don’t Make Sense Unless You Take Mr. Washull not recusing himself from the clearance investigation and revocation process in order to avoid the appearance of impropriety and Conflict of Interest or Lack of Impartiality (due to collusion) since Mr. Michael Washull worked for DIA immediately before MDA, and MDA for not directing Mr. Washull to recues himself Into Consideration!
- D Adverse Actions Chart – a mountain of evidence that proves Mr. Washull not recusing himself from the clearance investigation and revocation process in order to avoid the appearance of impropriety and Conflict of Interest or Lack of Impartiality (due to collusion) since Mr. Michael Washull worked for DIA immediately before MDA, and MDA for not directing Mr. Washull to recues himself and MDA’s Discrimination
- E Pain and Suffering Caused by MDA’s Discrimination Document – Real injuries and damages to more than one person
- F Before and After the Discrimination - What Their Discrimination Cost Me and My Family
- G The True Impact of Discrimination (MDA’s Discrimination Costs and Damages)
- H Summary and Statement of Facts for the US Supreme Court
- I Why you need to subpoena the 7 missing pieces of evidence not currently in the record - The evidence MDA never provided, even when ordered to by an Administrative Judge

“Equal Justice Under The Law”

“Mr. Washull Not Recusing Himself For Conflict Of Interest Or Lack Of Impartiality Is Wrong, And MDA’s Adverse Actions Are All A Pretense For Employer Discrimination”

- J What’s on the Harddrive - Why we need an uncensored copy of the entire unclassified harddrive
- K Reasons Why We Need An Independent Investigator And Investigation
- L Red Flags of Disparate Treatment, Discrimination and Retaliation
- M I Had Escaped MDA’s Discrimination, But the Bigots at MDA Pulled Me Right Back into It!
- N My Former Employer's Most Blatant Discriminatory Actions
- O MDA has A Pattern of Disparate Treatment (MDA Disparate Treatment Is Not An Isolated Incident)
- P MDA has A Pattern of Misusing the Clearance Revocation System to Discriminate against their Black Employees
- Q Official Outprocessing Paperwork

“Equal Justice Under The Law”
“Mr. Washull Not Recusing Himself For Conflict Of Interest Or Lack Of Impartiality Is
Wrong, And MDA’s Adverse Actions Are All A Pretense For Employer Discrimination”



APPENDIX A

May 17, 2023 CAFC Decision for 2023-1215 Adams v. Defense

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

**United States Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit**

CHARLES DERECK ADAMS,
Petitioner

v.

MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD,
Respondent

2023-1212

Petition for review of the Merit Systems Protection Board in Nos. DC-3443-22-0385-I-1 and DC-3443-22-0387-I-1.

CHARLES DERECK ADAMS,
Petitioner

v.

MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD,
Respondent

2023-1213

2

ADAMS v. MSPB

Petition for review of the Merit Systems Protection Board in No. DC-3443-22-0386-I-1.

CHARLES DERECK ADAMS,
Petitioner

v.

MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD,
Respondent

2023-1214

Petition for review of the Merit Systems Protection Board in Nos. DC-3443-22-0385-I-1 and DC-3443-22-0387-I-1.

CHARLES D. ADAMS,
Petitioner

v.

MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD,
Respondent

2023-1215

Petition for review of the Merit Systems Protection Board in No. DC-3443-22-0388-I-1.

PER CURIAM.

ORDER

Having considered the parties' responses to this court's January 30, 2023, show cause order, we summarily affirm.

Charles Dereck Adams served as an Information Technology Specialist with the Missile Defense Agency of the Department of Defense. His position required him to have and maintain a Top-Secret security clearance. In 2010, Mr. Adams' security clearance was revoked, resulting in his removal from the agency. As relevant here, Mr. Adams appealed his removal to the Merit Systems Protection Board ("Board"). The Board concluded that it lacked jurisdiction to review the merits of the agency's decision to remove Mr. Adams for failure to maintain the required security clearance, which we affirmed. *See Adams v. Dep't of Def.*, 688 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2012).

In April and May 2022, Mr. Adams initiated the four above-captioned Board proceedings challenging the revocation of his security clearance as discriminatory and the result of a biased process.¹ In the two matters underlying Appeal Nos. 2023-1213 and 2023-1215, the Board dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. In the two matters underlying Appeal Nos. 2023-1212 and 2023-1214, the Board dismissed because the appeals raised materially identical claims to the already-pending appeals. Because Mr. Adams raised a discrimination claim before the Board and was interested in seeking judicial review of that claim, we directed the parties to address our jurisdiction.

We have jurisdiction to review a final decision from the Board except in "[c]ases of discrimination subject to the provisions of [5 U.S.C. §] 7702," which are instead brought

¹ Mr. Adams had filed a materially similar appeal with the Board in April 2021, which was recently denied. *See Adams v. Dep't of Def.*, MSPB No. DC-0752-21-0372-I-1.

in district court. 5 U.S.C. § 7703(b)(1)(A), (b)(2); *Perry v. Merit Sys. Prot. Bd.*, 137 S. Ct. 1975, 1984 (2017). For a “case[] of discrimination [to be] subject to the provisions of section 7702,” it must involve both (1) “an action which the employee [] may appeal to the” Board and (2) an “alleg[ation] that a basis for the action was [covered] discrimination,” § 7702(a)(1). Here, Mr. Adams did not bring Board proceedings under § 7702 because he did not raise a non-frivolous basis to invoke the Board’s jurisdiction.

Mr. Adams’ removal action was resolved in 2012, *Adams*, 688 F.3d 1330, and the Board clearly lacks jurisdiction to solely review the manner in which the security clearance revocation proceeding was conducted. It has long been settled that “[a] denial of a security clearance is not . . . an ‘adverse action,’ and by its own force is not subject to Board review,” *Dep’t of Navy v. Egan*, 484 U.S. 518, 530 (1988). See *Hesse v. Dep’t of State*, 217 F.3d 1372, 1376–77 (Fed. Cir. 2000). These petitions also seem to involve the same issue as resolved in our earlier decision, which is collateral estoppel as to the Board’s jurisdiction relating to adjudication of his security clearance. See *Adams*, 688 F.3d at 1334. In any event—and as already explained to Mr. Adams in his prior appeal—“neither this court nor the [Board] has authority to review the charge that retaliation and discrimination were the reasons for revocation of the security clearance.” *Id.*

It follows that Mr. Adams’ petitions are not “[c]ases of discrimination subject to the provisions of [§] 7702,” § 7703(b)(2), but instead fall within this court’s jurisdiction under § 7703(b)(1)(A). See *Perry*, 137 S. Ct. at 1984 (holding that a “nonfrivolous” allegation under § 7702 channels judicial review to district court); cf. *Granado v. Dep’t of Just.*, 721 F.2d 804, 807 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (dismissing petition for review for lack of jurisdiction where the allegation of Board jurisdiction was not found to be frivolous).

ADAMS v. MSPB

5

It further follows that summary affirmance is appropriate because “no substantial question regarding the outcome of the appeal exists.” *Joshua v. United States*, 17 F.3d 378, 380 (Fed. Cir. 1994). The Board was clearly correct in its decisions in Appeal Nos. 2023-1213 and 2023-1215 that it lacked jurisdiction over Mr. Adams’ appeals. Summary affirmance of the dismissal in Appeal Nos. 2023-1212 and 2023-1214 is likewise appropriate because those cases involved materially similar allegations of Board jurisdiction.²

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- (1) The decisions of the Board are summarily affirmed.
- (2) All pending motions are denied as moot.
- (3) Each side shall bear its own costs.

FOR THE COURT

May 17, 2023

Date

/s/ Peter R. Marksteiner

Peter R. Marksteiner
Clerk of Court

² Under the circumstances, even if we were to conclude that we lacked jurisdiction, we would nonetheless decline to transfer these cases because it would not be in the interest of justice under 28 U.S.C. § 1631 for the reasons provided above. *Cf. Campbell v. McCarthy*, 952 F.3d 193, 203 (4th Cir. 2020) (“[W]e have never discerned an unmistakable expression of purpose by Congress in Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to subject security clearance decisions to judicial scrutiny.” (internal quotation marks, brackets, and citation omitted)).

23-1212, 23-1213, 23-1214, 23-1215

Charles D. Adams
12994 Park Crescent Circle
Herndon, VA 20171



NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

**United States Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit**

CHARLES DERECK ADAMS,
Petitioner

v.

MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD,
Respondent

2023-1212

Petition for review of the Merit Systems Protection Board in Nos. DC-3443-22-0385-I-1, DC-3443-22-0387-I-1.

CHARLES DERECK ADAMS,
Petitioner

v.

MERIT SYSTEM PROTECTION BOARD,
Respondent

2023-1213

Petition for review of the Merit Systems Protection Board in No. DC-3443-22-0386-I-1.

CHARLES DERECK ADAMS,
Petitioner

v.

MERIT SYSTEM PROTECTION BOARD,
Respondent

2023-1214

Petition for review of the Merit Systems Protection Board in Nos. DC-3443-22-0385-I-1, DC-3443-22-0387-I-1.

CHARLES D. ADAMS,
Petitioner

v.

MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD,
Respondent

2023-1215

Petition for review of the Merit Systems Protection Board in No. DC-3443-22-0388-I-1.

ADAMS v. MSPB

3

ON PETITION FOR REHEARING AN BANC

Before MOORE, *Chief Judge*, NEWMAN, LOURIE, DYK,
PROST, REYNA, TARANTO, CHEN, HUGHES, STOLL,
CUNNINGHAM, and STARK, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM.

O R D E R

Charles Dereck Adams filed petitions for rehearing en banc in each of the above-captioned appeals. The petitions were first referred as petitions to the panel that issued the order, and thereafter the petitions were referred to the circuit judges who are in regular active service.

Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

The petitions for panel rehearing are denied.

The petitions for rehearing en banc are denied.

The mandate of the court will issue July 28, 2023 in the above-captioned appeals.

FOR THE COURT

July 21, 2023
Date

/s/ Jarrett B. Perlow
Jarrett B. Perlow
Clerk of Court

“Equal Justice Under The Law”

“Mr. Washull Not Recusing Himself For Conflict Of Interest Or Lack Of Impartiality Is Wrong, And MDA’s Adverse Actions Are All A Pretense For Employer Discrimination”



APPENDIX B

Original MSPB Administrative Appeal DC-3443-22-0388-I-1 against Mr. Washull not recusing himself from the clearance investigation and revocation process in order to avoid the appearance of impropriety and Conflict of Interest or Lack of Impartiality (due to collusion) since Mr. Michael Washull worked for DIA immediately before MDA, and MDA for not directing Mr. Washull to recues himself!



MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD

Appeal Form--Appellant and Agency Information

Please type or print legibly.

OMB No. 3124-0009

<p>1. Name (last, first, middle initial) Adams, Charles, D.</p>	
<p>2. Present Address (number and street, city, state, and zip code) Address: 12994 Park Crescent Cr. City, State, Zip Code: Herndon, Virginia, 20171, United States of America</p>	
<p>3. Telephone numbers (include area code) and E-Mail Address You must notify the Board in writing of any change in your telephone number(s) or e-mail address while your appeal is pending. Home: (703) 708-9077 Work: Fax: Cell: E-mail Address: melindaeadams@verizon.net Other Phone Type:</p>	
<p>4. Do you wish to designate an individual or organization to represent you in this proceeding before the Board? (You may designate a representative at any time. However, the processing of your appeal will not normally be delayed because of any difficulty you may have in obtaining a representative.) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
<p>5. Name, address, and telephone number of the agency that took the action or made the decisions you are appealing (include bureau or division, street address, city, State and Zip code) Agency Name: Department of Defense Bureau: MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY Address: James Delduco c/o Missile Defense Agency City, State, Zip code: Washington, DC , District of Columbia, 20301, United States of America Agency Phone:</p>	
<p>6. Your Federal employment status at the time of the decision or action you are appealing: <input type="checkbox"/> Temporary <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Permanent <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Term <input type="checkbox"/> Retired <input type="checkbox"/> Seasonal <input type="checkbox"/> None</p>	<p>7. Type of appointment (if applicable): <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Competitive <input type="checkbox"/> SES <input type="checkbox"/> Excepted <input type="checkbox"/> Postal Service <input type="checkbox"/> Other</p>
<p>8. Your occupational series, position title, grade, and duty station at the time of the decision or action you are appealing (if applicable): Occupational Series GS-2210-15 Position Title: Supervisory IT Specialist or Cluster: Duty Station: Grade or Pay Band: 15</p>	<p>9. Are you entitled to veteran's preference? See 5 U.S.C. 2108. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>10. Length of Government Service (if applicable): 33 Years 0 Months</p>	<p>11. Were you serving a probationary, trial, or initial service period at the time of the action or decision you are appealing? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>

Appeal Number: 202201860

Submission Date: 5/1/2022 8:27:14 PM

Confirmation Number: 215066

MSPB Form 185-1, Page 1 (5/13/2011)
5 CFR Parts 1201, 1208, and 1209



MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD

Appeal Form--Appellant and Agency Information

Please type or print legibly.

HEARING: You may have a right to a hearing before an administrative judge. If you elect not to have a hearing, the administrative judge will make a decision on the basis of the submissions of the parties. Do you want a hearing?

12. Do you want a hearing? Yes No

E-Filing: Registration as an e-filer enables you to file any or all of your pleadings with the Board in electronic form. Registration also means you consent to accept service of all pleadings filed by other registered e-filers and all documents issued by the Board in electronic form. You will receive these as PDF documents at the e-mail address you provided the Board. If registered as an e-filer, you may file any pleading, or portion of a pleading, by non-electronic means. You can withdraw your registration as an e-filer at any time.

13. Do you wish to register as an E-Filer in this appeal?

I elect to E-File I decline to E-File

14. I certify that all of the statements made in this form and all attached forms are true, complete, and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Charles Dereck Adams, Appellant

Date:

Appeal Number: 202201860

Submission Date: 5/1/2022 8:27:14 PM

Confirmation Number: 215066

MSPB Form 185-1, Page 2 (5/13/2011)
5 CFR Parts 1201, 1208, and 1209

e-Appeal Attachment Transmittal

Appeal Number: 202201860
Appellant Name: Charles Dereck Adams
Agency Name: Department of Defense

Please check the box for each document included with this transmittal.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Name of Attachment	Attachment Processing Status	File Name/Delivery Method
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Drafted Appeal File	Upload with e-Appeal	MSPB Administrative Appeal Against MDA for not directing Mr. Waschull to recues himself from the clearance investigation and revocation process.pdf

2 copies must be submitted of all documents submitted in hardcopy.

Send documents to be submitted in paper form to:

Washington DC Regional Office
1901 S. Bell Street, Suite 950
Arlington, Virginia 22202
United States of America

Phone: (703) 756-6250

Fax: (703) 756-7112

This Unfortunate Series Of Events All Happened Because Mr. Waschull Refused To Recues Himself From A Discrimination-Based Clearance Investigation And Revocation Process And Because The MDA "Ostriches" – I Means Leadership - Buried Their Heads In The Sand And Neglected To Do Their Duty And Recues Him When He Refused!

MSPB Administrative Appeal Against MDA For Not Directing Mr. Waschull To Recues Himself When He Refused To Do So From The Clearance Investigation And Revocation Process

Dear Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB):

Hey I just found out that I can appeal MDA's failure for not directing Mr. Waschull to **recues himself** when he refused to do so from the clearance investigation and revocation process and so would like to file a formal complaint with MSPB. Mr. Waschull should have recuesed himself from the discriminatory Clearance Investigation and Revocation Process for two reasons: 1) He worked for DIA immediately prior to working for MDA which created a blatant and obvious conflict of interest and gave the appearance of impropriety (collusion); and 2) He had a history of discrimination as shown in his EEO Records and that of the organizations he worked for (DIA and MDA) and **should never have been involved in the decision-making process of an appeal that involved discrimination of any kind. And since MDA had access to both sets of facts, they knowingly allowed him to become a decision-maker in an appeal that involved discrimination that resulted in my wrongful termination by design** (revoking all clearances instead of just SCIF Access so there was no other choice but termination - took transfer to another position or organization off the table), **instead of directing him to recues himself!** Essentially MDA knowingly and wrongfully allowed Mr. Waschull to be the decision-maker in this discriminatory Clearance Investigation and Revocation Process (from the biased predetermined 2nd investigation using his own people, after the FBI's 1st investigation showed no wrongdoing, to the predetermined and only allow outcome of termination), and whose bigotry adversely affected the outcome from the start. **That failure to direct Mr. Waschull to recues himself, when he refused to do so, in light of the known conflicts of interest and bigotry is MDA's fault and needs to be addressed in this complaint/appeal!** In other words, MDA knew, not suspected but knew Mr. Waschull worked for DIA immediately before MDA and that he had a history of discrimination and still allowed him to be the decision-maker in an investigation and termination that involved DIA and Discrimination! **All because Mr. Waschull refused to recues himself from a discrimination-based clearance investigation and revocation process for conflicts of interest and past history of discrimination and MDA neglecting to do their duty and recues him when he refused!**

In other words, MDA failed to direct Mr. Waschull to recues himself when he refused to do so from the clearance investigation and revocation process, knowing that he worked for DIA immediately prior to working for MDA creating a blatant and obvious conflict of interest and giving the appearance of impropriety (collusion), and knowing that he had a history of

This Unfortunate Series Of Events All Happened Because Mr. Washull Refused To Recue Himself From A Discrimination-Based Clearance Investigation And Revocation Process And Because The MDA "Ostriches" – I Means Leadership - Buried Their Heads In The Sand And Neglected To Do Their Duty And Recues Him When He Refused!

discrimination when the clearance investigation and revocation process involved both DIA and discrimination! And **neglected their duty to insure a fair and impartial investigation and result!** Although MDA has a lot of latitude for addressing security incidents, the typical "punishment" for a first offence where no damage was done (no destruction, disclosure or alteration to classified information or classified information systems) is removal of SCIF access, not revocation of all clearances, which allowed MDA to wrongfully/discriminatorily terminate me, and prevented me from transferring to another DoD job or organization, losing my health insurance and that of my family in the process, and is still preventing me from getting any future Civil Service jobs/resuming my career. **And MDA did nothing about it, and did nothing to correct the situation or even attempt to make the investigation and revocation process fair and equitable, not even directing Mr. Washull to recue himself for conflict of interest and past discrimination history reasons!** All they did was bury their heads in the sand and allow the investigation and result to be tainted with a predetermined unfair and unjust outcome that proved detrimental to a highly decorated 33 year military veteran employee in their organization. In other words **they failed to recue a senior member of their staff in order to stop Employer Discrimination in their midst.** Additionally, Mr. Washull and MDA unfairly convinced DIA to revoke all clearances, in order to prevent a transfer to another DoD Organization (so MDA could not only terminate me but prevent me from transferring to another DoD Organization costing me my career, my TSP retirement savings and my health insurance and that of my family's). **And none of this would have happened if MDA had did their duty and Directed Mr. Washull to recue himself!** Clearly Mr. Washull's failure to recue himself and MDA's mismanagement and lack of leadership in not directing him to do so created a blatant and obvious conflict of interest that produced these adverse results. **MDA had a choice. And they chose to let DIA revoke my clearances, at the behest of Mr. Washull, a person who should have recued himself because of conflicts of interest and past history of discrimination!** And MDA knowingly allowed it to happen by not directing Mr. Washull to recue himself, despite the fact that they knew he had worked for DIA immediately before working for MDA, and despite the fact that they knew he had a history of discrimination. **On top of that they had another choice. And they chose to sit back and allow DIA to revoke all my clearances, not just the SCI or SCIF access, so I had to be terminated and couldn't be transferred somewhere else, again at the behest of Mr. Washull.** So they're just as guilty as Mr. Washull (what they call aiding and abetting a crime, in this case discrimination)! And they didn't do the same thing when other (white) people under similar circumstances (they're clearances weren't revoked; only the black guy's clearances were)! **All because Mr. Washull refused to recue himself from a discrimination-based clearance investigation and revocation process for conflicts of interest and past history of discrimination and MDA neglecting to do their duty and recues him when he refused!**

This Unfortunate Series Of Events All Happened Because Mr. Washull Refused To Recue Himself From A Discrimination-Based Clearance Investigation And Revocation Process And Because The MDA "Ostriches" – I Means Leadership - Buried Their Heads In The Sand And Neglected To Do Their Duty And Recues Him When He Refused!

Consequently, I would like to file a formal complaint with the MSPB against the MDA for ignoring Mr. Washull's blatant and obvious and known conflict of interests (since DIA was his immediate former employer, he should have recused himself, and since DIA got rid of him for discriminatory behavior/passed the problem onto MDA, yet supported his discriminatory behavior in his subsequent organization, which resulted in MDA getting rid of him too) that resulted in the wrongful/discriminatory revocation of my clearances and in my wrongful termination because I couldn't do the job without any of my clearances (**remember suspension of SCIF Access was typical punishment for white employees who did the same thing but without the same result**). And of course all of it was based on race and age discrimination! So I would like you MSPB to **compel MDA to produce the harddrive containing all the discrimination evidence (emails, management communications, word documents, etc.), and the EEO Records of the Organization and Discriminators, that MDA is still hiding 12 years after the wrongful termination, and revisit their decision in light of any new evidence obtained from the hidden harddrive and EEO Records!** Also you have to also ask yourselves, how come it was so easy to get rid of me; a loyal outstanding employee in a critical need position (cybersecurity), when it's so hard to get rid of bad teachers, bad cops, and bad doctors, even bigoted managers! DIA chased Mr Washull away, probably for discrimination. And so did MDA! And he's probably still discriminating in his newest job. They terminated me, the black manager, but not him, the white manager. And then they just passed their problem child on to someone else! **MDA made a mistake when they allowed Mr. Washull who was full of conflicts of Interest to wrongfully collude with DIA and to discriminatorily revoke my clearances based on their bigotry and bias** (and not just SCIF Access but all of my clearances so I could not transfer to another job or organization). And the Solution should have been to fix their mistake by recuesing Mr. Washull and doing another fair impartial objective investigation or just reversing the bad clearance decision (revoking my clearances based on conflicts of interest, bias and bigotry), and reinstating my clearances and me so that you are not responsible for preventing me from getting another DoD job or continuing my career. But that didn't happen! **All because Mr. Washull refused to recues himself from a discrimination-based clearance investigation and revocation process for conflicts of interest and past history of discrimination and MDA neglecting to do their duty and recues him when he refused!** Also I have attached a FOIA Request asking for records regarding the lack of recusal and discrimination I brought to their attention before all my clearances were revoked at Mr. Washull's behest and me wrongfully being terminated because of the complete revocation.

Resolution/Remedy: Give me my MDA job back (after persuading DIA to restore my clearances) so I can get my beloved Cybersecurity Job back (or another DoD job) so I can get my health insurance and other benefits back in retirement, and my Civil Service Career back (both of which were wrongfully taken from me). Reinstatement (I still have my CISSP which makes

This Unfortunate Series Of Events All Happened Because Mr. Washull Refused To Recues Himself From A Discrimination-Based Clearance Investigation And Revocation Process And Because The MDA "Ostriches" – I Means Leadership - Buried Their Heads In The Sand And Neglected To Do Their Duty And Recues Him When He Refused!

reinstatement easy) and unspecified compensatory and non-compensatory, consequential and non-consequential, and other damages (lost wages/income and earning capacity, back pay, future income if not reinstated, mental anguish, pain and suffering for my entire family) caused by their discrimination (actions) and disregard for my civil rights by both MDA and DIA. If Charles and Willa Bruce can get their beach back after 100 years I should be able to get my job back after 10! **It's never too late to do the right thing! To right past wrongs!**

Filing Requirements:

1. **Agency Action I Am Appealing:** The DoD Missile Deense Agency (MDA) for not directing Mr. Washull to recues himself when he refused to do so from the biased and discriminatory clearance investigation and revocation process, and for their withholding Vital Evidence, to this day. **All because Mr. Washull refused to recues himself from a discrimination-based clearance investigation and revocation process for conflicts of interest and past history of discrimination and MDA neglecting to do their duty and recues him when he refused!**
2. **Effective Date:** May 1, 2022.

Thank you for your time and consideration (and help).

Respectfully,



Charles Adams
12994 Park Crescent Circle, Herndon, VA 20171
703-708-9077
melindaEadams@verizon.net

Attachments:

1. FOIA Request asking for MDA records (and related DIA records) regarding Mr. Washull's refusal to recues himself from a discrimination-based clearance investigation and revocation process for conflicts of interest and past history of discrimination and MDA neglecting to do their duty and recues him when he refused!

This Unfortunate Series Of Events All Happened Because Mr. Washull Refused To Recues Himself From A Discrimination-Based Clearance Investigation And Revocation Process And Because The MDA "Ostriches" – I Means Leadership - Buried Their Heads In The Sand And Neglected To Do Their Duty And Recues Him When He Refused!

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I CERTIFY THAT I SERVED A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF THE ATTACHED LETTER TO THE PARTIES IDENTIFIED BELOW BY US MAIL.



Charles Adams
12994 Park Crescent Circle, Herndon, VA 20171
703-708-9077
melindaEadams@verizon.net
Date: 5/1/22

Agency
Missile Defense Agency
ATTN: James Delduco
7100 Defense Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301

This Unfortunate Series Of Events All Happened Because Mr. Waschull Refused To Recues Himself From A Discrimination-Based Clearance Investigation And Revocation Process And Because The MDA "Ostriches" – I Means Leadership - Buried Their Heads In The Sand And Neglected To Do Their Duty And Recues Him When He Refused!

**FOIA Request Asking For MDA Records (And Related DIA Records)
Regarding Mr. Waschull's Refusal To Recues Himself From A
Discrimination-Based Clearance Investigation And Revocation Process
For Conflicts Of Interest And Past History Of Discrimination And MDA
Neglecting To Do Their Duty And Recues Him When He Refused!**

May 1, 2022

Missile Defense Agency
ATTN: James Delduco
7100 Defense Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301

Dear MDA FOIA Officer/Administrator:

This is a request for information filed under the Freedom of Information Act. **I hereby request that you provide me with a copy of my entire MDA file under the Freedom of Information Act (from 1st DoD Clearance in 1979 to present), including any security incidents and especially the following documents:**

1. All documents pertaining to the Revocation of all Clearances of Charles Adams and the reasoning behind the revocation.
2. All instances pertaining to MDA's wrongful/discriminatory revocation of my clearances for collusion between Mr. Waschull and his former employer DIA (DIA got rid of him for discriminatory behavior, yet supported his discriminatory behavior in his subsequent organization) resulting in my wrongful termination based on race and age (which resulted in MDA getting rid of him too).
3. MDA records and communications with DIA (and related MDA records and communications with DIA) MDA's part in DIA's wrongful/discriminatory revocation of my clearances for collusion between Mr. Waschull and his former employer DIA (from 2005 to present),
4. Additionally, **Sometime between June 2008 and Apr 2009 (most likely June or July 2008), The Missile Defense Agency asked the FBI to investigate me for espionage (at least that is what they told me) for charging my cell phone in my office in Mr. Waschull's SCIF. I was told the FBI "found nothing actionable" and that they said "it was just a case of an IT specialist bending the rules to get the job done." Please provide me a copy of that investigation report (DIA and both the FBI and MDA should have copies).**

Please include all material relating to me, including references to me in other people's files. I want all records to include administrative markings and pages. If pages are withheld, or material is

This Unfortunate Series Of Events All Happened Because Mr. Washull Refused To Recues Himself From A Discrimination-Based Clearance Investigation And Revocation Process And Because The MDA "Ostriches" – I Means Leadership - Buried Their Heads In The Sand And Neglected To Do Their Duty And Recues Him When He Refused!

blacked out, please explain why. If you deny any, or all, of this request, please specify the reason, and cite each specific exemption you feel justifies the refusal to release the information, and tell me where I may appeal the decision, and notify me of the appeal procedures available to me under the law. If there are any fees for copying and/or searching for records, kindly let me know. You may call me at 703-708-9077 or email me at melindaEadams@verizon.net if you have any questions. Thank you for considering my request.

Sincerely,



Charles Dereck Adams
12994 Park Crescent Circle, Herndon, VA 20171
melindaEadams@verizon.net
703-708-9077
Last 4 SSN: 6880

Attachments:

1. Addresses Charles Dereck Adams Has Lived

This Unfortunate Series Of Events All Happened Because Mr. Waschull Refused To Recues Himself From A Discrimination-Based Clearance Investigation And Revocation Process And Because The MDA "Ostriches" – I Means Leadership - Buried Their Heads In The Sand And Neglected To Do Their Duty And Recues Him When He Refused!

Addresses Charles Dereck Adams Has Lived

I have lived at the following addresses:

1. Nov 55 - Aug 56: Ramey AFB, Puerto Rico
2. Aug 56 - Jun 57: Roswell, New Mexico
3. Jun 57 - Sep 61: California
4. Sep 61 - Jun 63: Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota
5. Jun 63 - Jun 66: 130 Kurtz Way, Mather AFB, California
6. Jun 66 - Sep 67: Glenview St, Rancho Cordova, California
7. Sep 67 - Jun 68: 819D Idaho St, Ellsworth AFB, South Dakota
8. Jun 68 - Jun 69: Fairfield, California
9. Jun 69 - Aug 72: Edgemont St, Ellsworth AFB, South Dakota
10. Aug 72 - Aug 73: Downtown, Wiesbaden, Germany
11. Aug 73 - Dec 73: USAF Academy Prep Sch, Colorado Springs, Colorado
12. Dec 73 - Jun 75: 98A Washington Strasse, Wiesbaden AFB, Germany
13. Jun 75 - Mar 77: 9169 Trujillo Way, Sacramento, CA 95826
14. Mar 77 - May 77: BMTS, Ft Dix, New Jersey
15. May 77 - Oct 77: Tech Sch, Ft Lee, Virginia
16. Oct 77 - Sep 78: 9169 Trujillo Way, Sacramento, CA 95826
17. Sep 78 - Jan 79: Fulton Ave Apt, Sacramento, California
18. Jan 79 - Feb 79: 3703 BMTS, Lackland AFB, TX 98200
19. Feb 79 - May 79: 3392 Sch Sq, Keesler AFB, MS 39534
20. May 79 - Aug 80: BKS 1503 Rm 330, Hanscom AFB, MA 01731
21. Aug 80 - Jun 83: 901 W. Magnolia #4, Auburn, AL 36830
22. Jun 83 - Sep 83: OTS Sq 6-13, Medina Annex, Lackland AFB, TX 98200
23. Sep 83 - Oct 85: 6104 Eden East Dr #M, Montgomery, AL 36117
24. Oct 85 - Nov 85: 1839 Windsor Downs Ct, Montgomery, AL 36117
25. Nov 85 - May 86: 475 Edgewater Gulf Dr #68, Biloxi, MS 39531
26. May 86 - Sep 86: 1571 London Town Lane, Montgomery, AL 36117
27. Sep 86 - Mar 87: 9169 Trujillo Way, Sacramento, CA 95826
28. Mar 87 - May 87: 7123 Springboro Dr #18, Dayton, OH 45449
29. May 87 - Nov 88: 2223 Chapel Dr #J, Fairborn, OH 45324
30. Nov 88 - Dec 88: 2357 Northrop Ave #G103, Sacramento, CA 95825
31. Dec 88 - Oct 89: 9130 Kiefer Blvd #55, Sacramento, CA 95826
32. Oct 89 - Jun 92: 2749 Winding Lane, Antioch, CA 94509
33. Jun 92 - Aug 92: 1111 James Donlon Blvd #1025, Antioch, CA 94509
34. Aug 92 - Oct 92: Johnson Rd, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania
35. Oct 92 - Apr 99: 466 Mower Rd, Chambersburg, PA 17201
36. Apr 99 - Aug 99: 400 15th South St., Arlington, VA 22202
37. Aug 99 - Present: 12994 Park Crescent Cr., Herndon, VA 20171