

“Equal Justice Under The Law”
“Collusion Between An MDA SES And DIA Is Wrong And Unlawful
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
2023-1212

- A May 17, 2023 CAFC Decision for 2023-1212 Adams v. Defense
- B Original MSPB Administrative Appeal DC-3443-22-0385-I-1 against DIA for **Collusion** between Mr. Washull and His Former Employer DIA
- C Things That Don’t Make Sense Unless You Take Collusion Into Consideration!
- D Adverse Actions Chart – a mountain of evidence that proves DIA’s Collusion 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
- 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

“Equal Justice Under The Law”
“Collusion Between An MDA SES And DIA Is Wrong And Unlawful
And MDA’s Adverse Actions Are All A Pretense For Employer Discrimination”

- 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”
“Collusion Between An MDA SES And DIA Is Wrong And Unlawful
And MDA’s Adverse Actions Are All A Pretense For Employer Discrimination”**



APPENDIX A

May 17, 2023 CAFC Decision for 2023-1212 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NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.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.

O R D E R

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

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 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”
“Collusion Between An MDA SES And DIA Is Wrong And Unlawful
And MDA’s Adverse Actions Are All A Pretense For Employer Discrimination”



APPENDIX B

Original MSPB Administrative Appeal DC-3443-22-0385-I-1 against DIA for **Collusion**
between Mr. Waschull and His Former Employer DIA



MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD

Appeal Form--Appellant and Agency Information

Please type or print legibly.

OMB No. 3124-0009

1. Name (last, first, middle initial)

Adams, Charles, D.

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

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:

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.)

Yes

No

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: Defense Intelligence Agency

Address: Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling

City, State, Zip code: Washington, District of Columbia, 20340, United States of America

Agency Phone:

6. Your Federal employment status at the time of the decision or action you are appealing:

- Temporary
- Permanent
- Applicant
- Term
- Retired
- Seasonal
- None

7. Type of appointment (if applicable):

- Competitive
- SES
- Excepted
- Postal Service
- Other

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:

Grade or Pay Band: 15

Duty Station:

9. Are you entitled to veteran's preference? See 5 U.S.C. 2108.

Yes

No

10. Length of Government Service (if applicable):

33 Years 0 Months

11. Were you serving a probationary, trial, or initial service period at the time of the action or decision you are appealing?

Yes

No

Appeal Number: 202201849

Submission Date: 4/30/2022 2:21:31 PM

Confirmation Number: 215057



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: 202201849

Submission Date: 4/30/2022 2:21:31 PM

Confirmation Number: 215057

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

e-Appeal Attachment Transmittal

Appeal Number: 202201849
Appellant Name: Charles Dereck Adams
Agency Name: Department of Defense

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	Name of Attachment	Attachment Processing Status	File Name/Delivery Method
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Drafted Appeal File	Upload with e-Appeal	You Need To Docket This Legitimate Complaint (202201761) As A New Complaint Because It Is A Totally Different Complaint-Issue And It Is Against A Totally Different DoD Agency!.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

You Need To Docket This Legitimate Complaint As A New Complaint Because It Is A Totally Different Complaint/Issue And It Is Against A Totally Different DoD Agency (DIA, Not MDA)!

Dear MSPB:


This is not the same as the MSPB appeal you referenced (DC-0752-21-0372-I-1). It is different. The one you referenced is about revoking my security clearances, not about Collusion between Mr. Washull, MDA and DIA, like this one is about! It's a totally different complaint/issue. **And against a totally different DoD Agency too!** The one you referenced is against MDA while this one is against DIA! Please docket and adjudicate it as a new complaint.

Let me put it another way. Hey someone in your office messed up (looks like a paralegal)! You cannot Reject this Mon Apr 25 Appeal, like you did! It is a legitimate DIA appeal based on a different issue (Collusion between Mr. Washull, MDA and DIA) than the previous MDA Appeal your referenced (DC-0752-21-0372-I-1) and much different than any of the previous DIA appeals! You have never done this before (rejected a legitimate complaint/appeal out of hand before without docketing and adjudicating it). Each of my appeals should be handled separately as initial appeals, and not rejected simply because they are NOT the same complaint/issue (otherwise I wouldn't have spent hours writing and submitting it), and because all the appeals involved completely different actions/transgressions by the agency which were wrong and resulted in an administrative complaint/appeal. Exactly like this one. Please check your Charter and Precedential Rulings and you'll see **"rejecting a complaint before docketing and adjudicating it" or not treating all legitimate complaints as new initial appeals is forbidden and contradicts your policies and procedures and previous precedents.** Furthermore, **falsely stating/alleging that it's the same as a previous complaint to justify your actions is disingenuous and insincere and even ludicrous! And flat out immoral and wrong!** And so does "rejecting an initial appeal without docketing and reviewing it and issuing an acknowledgment order. Doing any of these things is a violation of your own rules and precedents. Need I remind you that my previous MDA appeals were not treated in this manner! And neither should this DIA appeal. Again it is an appeal of different actions and adverse behavior by DIA to a permanent competitive 33 year civil servant and like the MDA appeals clearly fall within your jurisdiction. **If you didn't think so you should have responded with a show cause, not a pleading rejection!** I'm sure if I sent this to your judicial superior, CAFC, they would agree with me (I remember them ordering you to correct a previous violation just like this one). Please don't force me to do that. Please fix this error and enter my new DIA appeal as the initial appeal it is. This is your opportunity to fix your mistake on your own rather than having CAFC fix it for you.

With all due respect, let me reiterate for emphasis and clarity the wrongful unfair and immoral things you have done recently. **First you said my initial appeal is not an initial appeal at all,**

but “an already appealed action” which it clearly is not! Then you said “you’re not going to make it a part of the appeal record” when it clearly should be! With all due respect, that’s not true and blatantly wrong. I did not e-appeal it as a pleading but as a new initial appeal because it is a new initial appeal. And I did so because, like all the previous appeals before it, **it involved a new distinct action perpetrated by a US Government Agency upon a career permanent competitive 33 year civil servant which is what your charter says you are supposed to docket and adjudicate.** You didn’t do an acknowledgement letter as you should have. Nor did you do a show cause for jurisdiction if you believed it didn’t fall within your charter. You simply dismissed it out of hand and wrongfully so. Please fix this oversight/mistake immediately. It would be better if you fixed your mistake yourself and of your own accord. Thank you for your time and consideration and help in this matter.

Respectfully,



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

Attachments:

1. Your Apr 27 Rejection Email And Letter Of A Legitimate Complaint That Should Have Been Docketed And Adjudicated
2. My Apr 25 MSPB Administrative Appeal Against DIA For Wrongful Collusion Between Mr. Waschull And His Former Employer DIA

4/30/22, 8:36 AM

AOL Mail - Message View

< Results for mspb

Fw: Appeal Filed in Adams, Charles Dereck - Initial Appeal -- REJECTED

From: WASHINGTON REGIONAL OFFICE <WASHINGTONREGIONALOFFICE@mspb.gov>

To: melindaeadams@verizon.net <melindaeadams@verizon.net>

Date: Wed, Apr 27, 2022 6:54 am



Adams, Charles D_in docx (41 KB)

DOCSPROD-1919190-01 docx (41 KB)

Good morning,

Please find your rejection letter and initial decision attached.

Thank you,
MSPB/ic

From: e-appeal@mspb.gov <e-appeal@mspb.gov>

Sent: Monday, April 25, 2022 7:19 PM

To: WASHINGTON REGIONAL OFFICE <WASHINGTONREGIONALOFFICE@mspb.gov>

Subject: Appeal Filed in Adams, Charles Dereck - Initial Appeal

A new appeal has been submitted in the case Adams, Charles Dereck - Initial Appeal.
Information on the submitted appeal follows.

Case Title: Adams, Charles Dereck - Initial Appeal
Appeal Title: Agency Personnel Action or Decision
Appeal Number: 202201761
Appellant Name: Charles Dereck Adams
Agency Name: Department of Defense
DMS ID : 1919190

Please click on the link below to View/Download the initial appeal.

<http://AHV-BAS64-PROD2/viewsecuredocs/viewsecuredocs.aspx?docnumber=1919190&version=1925591&application=ACROBAT>



U.S. MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD

Washington Regional Office
1901 South Bell Street, Suite 950
Arlington, VA 22202

Phone: (703) 756-6250; Fax: (703) 756-7112

May 24, 2021

Charles Dereck Adams
12994 Park Crescent Circle
Herndon, VA 20171

Dear Mr. Adams:

We have received your appeal filed on May 24, 2021. We are returning it to you for the following reason(s):

- Based on a review of our records, it appears that you have already appealed this action to the Merit Systems Protection Board docket no. DC-0752-21-0372-I-1. On April 26, 2021, you appealed the Department of Defense decision to revoke your security clearance. In an initial decision issued on May 5, 2021, a Merit Systems Protection Board Administrative Judge dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.*

If the rejected document was served on the Board electronically, it has been deleted from the MSPB Repository and will not be made a part of the appeal record in this matter.

Sincerely,

_____/S/_____
Tempress Coppet
Paralegal Specialist

Enclosure

* A copy of that initial decision is enclosed.

People will always take the path of least resistance when given the choice.” That’s why lawyers are always trying to get cases/appeals dismissed. Let’s make this case/appeal about justice!
You can help undo discrimination with the stroke of a pen!

MSPB Administrative Appeal Against DIA 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)!

Dear Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB):

Hey I just found out that I can appeal DIA’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)! Although DIA 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 losing my health insurance and that of my family in the process, and is still prevented me from getting any future Civil Service jobs/resuming my career). Instead, they chose to collude with Mr. Waschull and MDA and discriminatorily 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). Consequently, **I would like to file a formal complaint with the MSPB against the DIA for 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)! And I would like you to compel MDA to produce the harddrive containing all the discrimination evidence (emails, word documents, etc.) that MDA is hiding, and revisit your decision in light of the new evidence!**

In other words DIA made a mistake when they wrongfully/discriminatorily revoked 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)! And the Solution is to fix your mistake by investigating the collusion that was ignored when revoking my clearances and restore my clearances so that you are not responsible for preventing me from getting another DoD job or continue my career. Also I have attached a FOIA Request asking for records regarding the discrimination I brought to your

People will always take the path of least resistance when given the choice.” That’s why lawyers are always trying to get cases/appeals dismissed. Let’s make this case/appeal about justice!
You can help undo discrimination with the stroke of a pen!

attention before you revoked my clearances during the 3 years I worked at MDA for Mr. Waschull before I was put on administrative leave and the years after when I was on administrative leave for the reasoning for the DIA revoking of my clearances despite it being a first security incident where no damage was done! Also, even though all my previous MSPB complaints have been against MDA, DIA was an early player too. So I was told to file this complaint against them.

Let me put it another way. DIA wrongfully/discriminatorily revoked 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)! And for charging a dead cellphone in my office in Mr. Waschull’s SCIF (so MDA could fire me for not being able to do my job, **which was nothing more than a pretense for discrimination**). And they didn’t do the same thing when other people under similar circumstances (they’re clearances weren’t revoked, only the black guy’s clearances)! And it was discriminatory because there is no question that if I were white, my wrongful/discriminatory discrimination complaint would not have been dismissed/ignored and the discrimination that I brought to DIA’s attention before revocation of my clearances (like all the other nonblack employees who brought the real underlying motives of their agency to the attention of DIA), collusion notwithstanding! That’s employer discrimination (and DIA had a hand in it). Furthermore, it should not have even happened (clearances revocation and termination) since I was the Chief of Information Systems Security and it was within my authority to bend a rule to get the job done (what they FBI said during their investigation).

Resolution/Remedy: Resolution/Remedy: I know you can’t give me my MDA job back but you can give me my clearances back (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 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 you and MDA. 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 Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) for being unlawful and unethical Accomplices After the Fact with regard to MDA’s

People will always take the path of least resistance when given the choice." That's why lawyers are always trying to get cases/appeals dismissed. Let's make this case/appeal about justice!
You can help undo discrimination with the stroke of a pen!

Discrimination and for wrongfully revoking my clearances when other people in the SCIF did what I did but they're clearances weren't revoked (only the black guy's clearances), and for their withholding Vital Evidence, to this day.

2. **Effective Date: Apr 25, 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. Things that don't made sense unless you take Collusion into consideration
2. FOIA Request asking for DIA records (and related MDA records) regarding collusion between Mr. Washull 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).

People will always take the path of least resistance when given the choice.” That’s why lawyers are always trying to get cases/appeals dismissed. Let’s make this case/appeal about justice!
You can help undo discrimination with the stroke of a pen!

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: 4/25/22

Agency
Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) HQ
Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling
200 MacDill Blvd SE,
Washington DC 20340

People will always take the path of least resistance when given the choice.” That’s why lawyers are always trying to get cases/appeals dismissed. Let’s make this case/appeal about justice!
You can help undo discrimination with the stroke of a pen!

Things That Don’t Make Sense
Unless You Take Collusion Into Consideration

1. How could Mr. Wschull get all of my clearances revoked for charging my cell phone in my office in his SCIF instead of denial of SCIF access for a minor security incident where no damage destruction or disclosure of classified info occurred without collusion with DIA (Mr. Washcull’s immediate former employer)?
2. How could Mr. Waschull use clearances to wrongfully terminate a permanent competitive 33 year civil servant in a critical shortage position (cybersecurity) without collusion with DIA (Mr. Washcull’s immediate former employer)?
3. How could Mr. Waschull get away with bigoted behavior with no accountability without collusion with DIA (Mr. Washcull’s immediate former employer)?
4. How could they throw me out of the SCIF without resolving their concerns at the lowest level and with the least amount of resources (a stalwart DoD principle) without collusion with DIA (Mr. Washcull’s immediate former employer)?
5. How could they get away with pulling me back from the Pentagon Comptroller Job after they formally outprocessed me and after I had started working my new job without collusion with DIA (Mr. Washcull’s immediate former employer)?
6. How could they take such extreme measures (revoking all clearances) for a 1st offense (security violation) where no damage was done (the punishment doesn’t fit the “crime”) without collusion with DIA (Mr. Washcull’s immediate former employer)?
7. How can they get rid of a dedicated highly decorated and qualified civil servant because of a single cell phone-charging incident that was a first offense and didn’t result in any damage without collusion with DIA (Mr. Washcull’s immediate former employer)?
8. Three supposedly "random" drug tests in one year (12 months)? That doesn't make sense without collusion with DIA (Mr. Washcull’s immediate former employer)!
9. Why didn’t anyone (DIA, MSPB, OSC) take into account MDA’s discriminatory motives when it was their turn to adjudicate my case?
10. Why didn't they reinstate me after they determined I wasn't a spy and that no damage was done?

People will always take the path of least resistance when given the choice.” That’s why lawyers are always trying to get cases/appeals dismissed. Let’s make this case/appeal about justice!
You can help undo discrimination with the stroke of a pen!

11. Why does MDA’s Counterintelligence folks have more weight than the FBI (who found nothing worth pursuing in their investigation)?
12. Why didn't they give me my unclassified profile of emails between me and management if they didn't have anything to hide?
13. How can they persecute me for bending rules when they bend more rules and more significant rules (they didn’t classify or wipe the nano, they ignored the DIAP’s direction to perform site audits, ST&Es, before issuing ATOs, etc.)?
14. Why didn’t they use the cell phone-charging incident as a teachable moment (retrain me) instead of persecuting me?
15. Why did they let my benefits lapse rather than letting me retire?
16. Why did they withhold my 30 year pin and certificate for 12 months (How come it took them over a year to arrange an awards ceremony for me)?
17. Why were they looking the other way when they clearly overreacted and hypocritically bent more rules and more significant rules than I did?
18. Why hide the Unclassified Profile or H: Drive and Witnesses if the evidence they have to provide helps you? MDA's Behavior only makes sense if the evidence they have to provide hurt them! [It doesn't make sense, unless you consider it was because I personally documented discrimination, retaliation and disparate treatment on the H:drive, and it clearly shows how management (the discriminators) ignored my requests for my 30 year pin for over 12 months! Which is one of the reasons they abruptly sent me home without access to my harddrive and never provided a true copy to anyone!]
19. Why did they seek Employment Termination by cancelling ALL clearances and not just the SCI for a "minor security incident" (their own words), especially since they didn't do that with other white similarly situated employees? [it doesn't make sense unless you consider it was because they wanted to bring in their own team to turn a minor security incident into a major security incident so they could revoke all clearances which is the only way to get rid of me - revoking only the SCI would have resulted in me being transferred to another job in MDA or DoD]
20. Whenever there is a pattern of things that don't make sense, there is always something wrong. In this case, it is with the behavior and explanations used to conceal the discrimination that occurred and the collusion with DIA to revoke clearances needed to wrongfully terminate a permanent competitive 33 year civil servant in a critical shortage position (cybersecurity)!

People will always take the path of least resistance when given the choice.” That’s why lawyers are always trying to get cases/appeals dismissed. Let’s make this case/appeal about justice!
You can help undo discrimination with the stroke of a pen!

FOIA Request Asking For DIA Records (And Related MDA Records) Regarding 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)

Apr 25, 2022

Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) HQ FOIA Officer/Administrator
Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling
200 MacDill Blvd SE,
Washington DC 20340

Dear DIA 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 DIA 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 DIA’s DIA’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. DIA records and communications with MDA (and related MDA records and communications with DIA) 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

People will always take the path of least resistance when given the choice." That's why lawyers are always trying to get cases/appeals dismissed. Let's make this case/appeal about justice!
You can help undo discrimination with the stroke of a pen!

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
FERS ID:
Last 4 SSN: 6880

Attachments:

1. Addresses Charles Dereck Adams Has Lived

People will always take the path of least resistance when given the choice.” That’s why lawyers are always trying to get cases/appeals dismissed. Let’s make this case/appeal about justice!
You can help undo discrimination with the stroke of a pen!

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



U.S. MSPB Merit Systems Protection Board e-Appeal Online

April 25, 2022

Start Interview Attach Files Submit Print Delete **My Account** Tech Support **Save & Exit**

Once you exit this confirmation page, you will not have access to view your submitted appeal in e-Appeal until the appropriate MSPB office assigns a docket number to your appeal. If you wish to save or print a copy of your submitted appeal for your own records, you MUST select the option "Save or Print Submitted Appeal" before exiting this page.

If you do not receive correspondence from MSPB within 10 days of submitting your appeal, you may wish to contact the MSPB office to which you submitted your appeal. Contact information for MSPB's offices is available at <https://www.mspb.gov/about/contact.html>.

The file displayed for printing will be a pdf file, in order to view and print, you need a application viewer, which can read pdf files, such as Adobe Acrobat Reader installed on your computer.

Confirmation of On-line Appeal Submission
Appellant Name: Charles Dereck Adams
Submitted By: CHARLESADAMS
Appeal Number: 202201761
Submission Date: 4/25/2022 7:16:27 PM EST
Confirmation Number: 214998
Submitted To: Washington DC Regional Office

Thank you for using MSPB e-Appeal. Save/print the confirmation details for your records.

The office to which you submitted your appeal will review your appeal and docket it. Once it is docketed, you will be sent an acknowledgement order which will contain your docket number. You must have a docket number to file subsequent pleadings in your case via the e-appeal system.

[Print Confirmation Details](#)

Please take a moment to View and Save a copy of the submitted appeal.

[Save or Print Submitted Appeal](#)

If you would like to provide feedback to MSPB on your experience with e-Appeal use the comment button below.

[Comments on e-Appeal](#)

[Exit e-Appeal](#)

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**