



American Thinker

February 27, 2020

Trump's Impeachment and Steve Stockman's Conviction: Facts Don't Matter

By Patti Stockman

In the February 6 celebration of his acquittal, President Trump [explained](#) that, “right at the beginning, they [his advisors] said, ‘don’t worry sir; all of the facts are on your side.’” But the president told them, “you don’t understand. That doesn’t matter.”

He added, “they made up facts.”

Rep. Adam Schiff who led the inquisition indeed made up the facts. He had honed his deceitful tactics as a Department of Justice (DOJ) prosecutor.

Trump [explained](#) that, “right at the beginning, they said, ‘don’t worry sir; all of the facts are on your side.’” But the president told them, “you don’t understand. That doesn’t matter.”

Other political targets of DOJ corrupt prosecutions completely identify with Trump’s retort to his advisors. My husband, former Congressman Steve Stockman (R-TX) certainly does.

He lost count of the times different attorneys advised him of one thing, later, then after prosecutors made an unexpected move, said, “I’ve never seen them do that before.” Naturally they hadn’t. His was a political prosecution. Like the president’s, Stockman’s first counsel told him he hadn’t done anything wrong; he had nothing to worry about. That was near the beginning of the over four-year pursuit that led to Stockman’s prosecution.

Sidney Powell, author of *Licensed to Lie* and attorney for targeted Gen. Michael Flynn, [says](#), “it doesn’t matter whether you are innocent or not. They will make up crimes against you; they will indict you; they will search your house; they are willing to make up evidence ...”

Powell concluded, “we live in far more of a police state than anybody ever wanted to think we did. Just look at what has happened to Congressman Steve Stockman.”

Indeed. While the Trump inquisition occurred in a Congressional setting, Team Schiff’s devices were hauntingly familiar to Stockman -- who watched proceedings from federal prison.

“Sham.” “Scheme.” Even these emotionally charged pejoratives employed by Schiff to cast aspersion on Trump’s actions were identical to those repeated frequently by Stockman’s prosecutors. Clearly, these guys are well-schooled in these deceptive tactics.

If Schiff’s “case” had been played out in a courtroom with a jury of normal uninformed Americans who believed honest prosecutors really sought justice, President Trump would have also been convicted.

In Stockman’s case, the DOJ spent millions of dollars in four years of investigation, cobbling together a false narrative, until a fourth grand jury they employed finally indicted him.



Steve Stockman in 2013 (Photo credit: [Gage Skidmore](#))

Knowing he was innocent, Stockman believed when he pleaded “not guilty” in 2017, that the jury would completely exonerate him when they heard the facts.

He didn’t know that the government entirely controls what the jury may hear, what they see in exhibits, and even what witnesses may be brought. Sound familiar?

Republicans in the House weren’t allowed to call witnesses to the basement secret hearings Schiff ran

for months. In the three-week Stockman trial, the government paraded a host of witnesses before the jury and led them to recount partial truths or downright falsehoods, while the judge denied all but two witnesses for Stockman.

Powell said prosecutors “are willing to make up evidence; they’re willing to put pressure on witnesses to get them to say whatever they want them to say; anything.”

At the request of the prosecutors, Stockman’s judge issued a gag order that prevented him and his defense team from even mentioning political aspects, supposedly because the charges had nothing to do with politics even though political aspects were integral to all components of the case.

There were 23 counts as prosecutors wove an intricate web of supposed wrongdoing, much as Schiff tried to do from many disparate facts in Trump’s case. Fortunately, there are enough legislators who could see the facts in a truthful context and who weren’t snookered.

But in Stockman’s court case, prosecutors persuaded the jury that he defrauded two seasoned donors to conservative non-profit organizations. They never offered any evidence that Stockman had fraudulent intent when donations were solicited – a required component for a conviction of fraud.

Instead, they claim that Stockman defrauded the donors because the non-profits did not do everything included in the proposals for funding. This, even though the Appeals court last month conceded that the donations were viewed as seed money to get the projects going.

Stockman, who has served nearly two years of a 10-year sentence, appealed to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals which heard his arguments in October. Last month, the three-judge panel that included two Obama-appointed judges ruled against Stockman's every argument.

But the panel's opinion ignored several precedent rulings germane to the case – including from the Fifth Circuit itself, other appeals courts and the Supreme Court. [TownHall](#) reported last month that the appellate ruling sets alarming precedents for all non-profit organizations.

Stockman responded by filing a petition requesting an en banc hearing of his appeal by the full court. Attorney Mark Fitzgibbons, of American Target Advertising that has serviced non-profit organizations for years, was joined by 44 co-signers on an Amicus (friend of the court) [brief](#) he authored in support of Stockman's petition.

Co-amicii were largely key people associated with non-profits across the nation, and former congressmen who understand the threat to campaigns of the appellate panel's new precedents.

The Amicus brief argues that the First Amendment protects the right to engage in charitable solicitation and that under achieving goals is not evidence of fraudulent solicitation.

Fitzgibbons wrote in the brief that “instead of reviewing whether the Government proved fraudulent intent in solicitation communications, the Panel's Opinion relies on the failure or underachievement of programs for which donations were solicited, thereby creating a substitute for evidence of fraud and intent at the time of solicitation.”

Eagle Forum Education & Legal Defense Fund also filed an Amicus brief with the court in support of Stockman's petition for the en banc hearing, citing critical legal errors in the panel's ruling.

Stockman and all amiciis strongly believe that the Fifth Circuit Panel got it wrong legally, and are hopeful that the full court will hear the appeal and overturn what they see as criminalization of Stockman's political differences with the Obama administration and prosecuted by the same corrupt DOJ seen prosecuting men around Trump.

Mr. President, you are right. It doesn't matter. They make up facts.

Patti Stockman has been married to Steve for 31 years, is a conservative activist in her own right, and partnered alongside him in all his political endeavors. She has her own professional career, having worked for NASA 35 years. Visit www.DefendAPatriot.com to read more, lend your name to the petition for a pardon, read both briefs, or donate, if you wish.