

# Alex Jones' Second Fake Trial

*First published September 17, 2022*

In case you didn't know, there is a *second* Jones trial for defamation against Sandy Hook parents in Connecticut right now. That's weird, right, since we see him in his newsroom every day, doing his show. How can he be in two places at once? Is he twins? Scary thought, eh?

He just lost the first and separate jury trial a couple of weeks ago, with a judgment against him for \$49.5 million. There were also previous Sandy Hook suits he (allegedly) lost in what Wikipedia admits were **default judgments**, which also doesn't make sense because he should have been able to request a jury trial for any defamation case. A jury should have had to find against him, but instead we are told it was a default judgment, which is entered by the judge, not the jury. No jury found against him.

In the second trial, we are told he has *not* defaulted, since the trial is ongoing. We have seen video of that trial as well. Which means he should be there physically in court. And yet we see him everyday on his show. Are we supposed to believe he is flying from Texas to Connecticut and back everyday, or has he set up a duplicate studio adjacent to the courtroom?

I have dismissed both trials as fake, and we were given perfect proof of that today, [when Jones himself reported](#) that the judge declared him guilty during courtroom proceedings—which is of course highly illegal. Here is what she said to his attorney, after interrupting him for the millionth time during questioning of a witness:

**“If it’s not clear – wouldn’t be the first time – and you’ll move for an articulation, and I’ll articulate when I’m directed to by the appellate court. I understand that there will be an appeal, I assume-” Bellis explained before Pattis chimed in.**

Whoops. If this were a real trial, a mistrial would have to be called right there, since the judge has just exhibited extreme prejudice, prejudging the outcome before full testimony. If a real jury had been sitting there, they would have all gasped at once. Jones' attorney Pattis should have demanded a mistrial immediately, but he didn't. None of that happened, because—as I have been telling you—this is not a real trial. It is not a “kangaroo court” either, since a kangaroo court is a real trial that is rigged. This isn't a real trial, it is a fake CIA trial run in some studio.

[**Added October 12:** As more proof of that, we see Jones' attorney Norm Pattis making just as big an ass of himself as Jones, *on purpose*. All part of the planned fail. Back in April Pattis “just happened” to get caught in a televised “comedy routine” with his pants literally at his ankles, saying the word nigger. This was while the first trial was going on. I am just surprised he didn't wear black face and make Nazi salutes at the same time. Now he just needs to get caught groping a small child. But seriously, he was Jones' attorney for the first trial, and they lost by \$50 million. So ask yourself this: if you had just lost \$50 million in a trial, would you keep the same attorney for the second trial? Sure, why not, let's go for a billion! Pattis is also the genius who “accidentally” sent the opposing table all of Jones' private emails. Whoops. He sent the opposing attorney a text admitting he had violated the judge's orders about sharing information. Because, well why not? Why *wouldn't* Jones' attorney be texting the prosecutors, admitting guilt? Happens all the time. Now, after the second trial, Pattis is giving interviews admitting he “got his ass kicked”. Very weird. Except that we know he didn't. He was just reading from the script.

This is a guy who, according to his own website which I just visited, has been pretty much retired since 2012, just writing crap books and doing podcasts and growing a pony tail. In other words, the CIA usual. In his “about” section, his bio ends with his “new” book *Juries and Justice*. That was 2012, so he hasn't updated his bio in ten years.]

Remember, this is being broadcast by CourtTV, which I previously showed you was a CIA front in my [paper on O. J. Simpson](#). They have been faking trials for decades. This should be obvious in the Jones trial, since he is hawking his projects from the witness stand, with the attorneys giving the audience his URL. So he is being promoted even while allegedly being tried. He is also giving press conferences right out in front of the court, calling the judge a tyrant. Does that look real to anyone? The CourtTV guy walks up to him and asks him if he is worried about a mistrial or a gag order. What? Can you have a mistrial of a fake CIA trial? Only if it is in the script.

[**Added October 18, 2022:** I am now padding this out with more information as it reaches my ears. Unknown to me until now, Dan [Solomon](#) of *Texas Monthly* [ran an article](#) on the trials back in June, and he admits many of the anomalies while still selling them as real. Unwittingly he gives me even more ammunition for my thesis here. There we learn that Jones filed for bankruptcy to avoid huge fines he saw coming, but he filed under business entities that were just empty fronts, “none of which held any tangible assets, had any employees, or conducted any discernible business.” He changed the name of one them a week before the filing. That confirms my reading, doesn't it, since otherwise it makes no sense. The judge shouldn't have allowed him to use fictitious business fronts, but she did. The bankruptcy filings were pegged together from mist just like the rest of this.

Solomon also admits that juries found Jones guilty in NONE of the trials. All of them, even the last two televised trials, were decided by default against Jones, [with the jury only there to decide damages after the fact](#). In other words, the jury could not find him not guilty. That is unprecedented. I have never heard of anything like that and neither have any of my lawyer friends. It makes no legal sense, because how can a jury decide damages when it hasn't even decided he was guilty? Think about it: what if you are a juror who thinks Jones was within his Constitutional rights to publish evidence Sandy Hook was fake? And yet here you are, on some sort of newfangled jury that is instructed by the judge that Jones is guilty as soon as they are seated. To start with, if that were the case, why have months of testimony from Jones? Why have cross-examination? Why all the hullabaloo about his emails and his cell phone? As I keep telling you, none of this makes a lick of sense. The trials on CourtTV were simply staged to make the audience *think* the jury was a real jury, deciding guilt or innocence. But the real legal system doesn't work like this.

This bankruptcy hearing was in Victoria, more than two hours south of Austin out in the middle of nowhere. Why there? So fewer people would be able to report it either didn't actually happen or was staged? We are told by Solomon it is because Jones rented an office there the month before, but I don't see what that had to do with anything. In the real world, Jones couldn't determine the venue just by renting an office last minute. Do you think he filed a paper saying, “Hey, I just rented an office in Victoria and demand the bankruptcy of these shell companies be determined there!” and the courts just said “OK, no problemo, Alex”. In Victoria:

**On the video feed, one could find a pair of former federal bankruptcy judges whom Jones's attorneys proposed as trustees to oversee the bankruptcy process; plaintiffs' attorneys representing Sandy Hook families whose cases were filed in Connecticut; a *New York Times* reporter who had recently published a book about Jones and Sandy Hook; and someone**

**appearing under the name “Doom Room,” dressed as a wizard. . .**

So even this was televised, but no one was there except the spooks. Why would former federal bankruptcy judges agree to be trustees for Jones, overseeing shell companies? And if the cases were filed in Connecticut, why was this bankruptcy hearing out in the middle of nowhere in Victoria?

Solomon finds it strange that Jones and his attorneys didn't make a First Amendment argument, but it could be because—as we see in later tape—they were forbidden by the judges of even mentioning the First Amendment. That's right, we are supposed to believe the Constitution is now off-limits in US Courts.

I also discovered Owen Shroyer is a defendant in these suits. But like Jones, he doesn't seem to have suffered much stress from four years of having this hang over his head. You would expect to see these guys looking a little haggard and worried, but I guess the anti-anxieties are working like a miracle. They look like nothing is happening.

This is also strange: According to Solomon, Marcel Fontaine, allegedly misidentified in the fake Parkland shooting, was the first to sue Jones back in 2018. Though I don't know what an accidental misidentification has to do with defamation. People are misidentified all the time by the mainstream, and no one sues. They ask for a retraction and a correction, and get it. But the weirdest thing is that all the Sandy Hook families that decided to sue Jones right after that used the same attorney in Houston, Mark Bankston, that Fontaine from Florida used. Why would they do that? No attorneys in Connecticut or the East Coast?]

Another thing that doesn't make any sense is that we see Jones commenting on his own trial everyday on his site. That is also illegal. Parties in a lawsuit are not allowed to discuss the case outside the courtroom until it is over. Why? Because it might influence the outcome. Jurors might go online and see him making his case. He is supposed to be making his case in the courtroom, not on his site. If this suit were real, the judge would immediately sequester the jury and put a gag order on Jones, to prevent this from happening. That isn't happening why? Because they want this fake trial to be publicized as widely as possible, even by Jones himself, *especially* to Jones' audience. The whole point of these fake trials is to scare people like you and me into silence. **It is a bluff**. They want us to believe we are about to be sued or otherwise prosecuted for talking or writing. We are supposed to believe we will be hit with a \$45 million judgment for giving an opinion. We are supposed to believe the First Amendment no longer exists, I guess.

They did this first with Jim Fetzer, who allegedly had a large judgment against him on the same Sandy Hook event. No word on whether he has actually paid that. I believe he has claimed poverty, forcing Pozner to seize his book copyrights. Fetzer allegedly appealed his case all the way to the Supreme Court. Guffaw. [Problem is, I looked up the Supreme Court case](#), and it also looks fake. The first clue here is that Wikipedia's page on Fetzer has no mention of this entire lawsuit, though you would think it would be a big deal. Although there is a section on his “conspiracy theories”, there is not one word on Sandy Hook, either his book or his trials. As for that document I just linked at [supremecourt.gov](#), it has the form of an appeal to the Supreme Court, but has no case number and publishes only the appendices.

I found [another Supreme Court document dated August 31, 2022 \(about two weeks ago\) that is equally fishy](#), since it isn't written in the expected language. I guess we are supposed to believe Fetzer wrote it himself, with no help from an attorney. That form is addressed to Justice Barrett, but Fetzer refiled it a week later to Justice Gorsuch. He also must have filed a similar appeal on May 16, since that is the

date of the appendices linked above. I finally found it [here](#), and it is not addressed to any specific Justice. So it looks to me like Fetzer is making himself look stupid on purpose, peppering the Supreme Court with multiple and poorly written appeals. He has become an Anti. First he questions the Sandy Hook event, then blackwashes himself. It's textbook. If you will remember, Fetzer tried to rope me into this mess, asking for permission to use my research in his book on Sandy Hook. I said no, not because I was afraid of a lawsuit, but because I didn't want to be tarnished by association with Fetzer. Good call, eh?

Anyway, on page 20 of the Aug. 31 document, we discover Fetzer's outcome in Wisconsin was a **summary judgment without jury**, which again is illegal. This document even admits that, since in such cases the defendant is allowed to request a trial by jury. Fetzer brings up the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, which concerns equal protection, and the fact that Wisconsin's summary judgment method does not match that of Texas, for example. We are supposed to believe no one in a libel case in Wisconsin has ever obtained a trial by jury, I guess.

But the document admits what we already know:

**Even though both Texas and Wisconsin have a right to trial by jury in their state constitutions it is not protected equally in the summary judgment methodologies practiced in the two states.**

**The right to a trial by jury is in the Wisconsin state constitution.**

That being true, there is no possibility Fetzer could have suffered a summary judgment and the failure of two appeals. This whole storyline is impossible from the first word, so this Supreme Court document should not exist.

As for language, I send you to page 21, where at the bottom we find this:

**The Respondent, Mr. Pozner, has asserted that Dr. Fetzer has "zero" chance of obtaining a Writ of Certiorari in this Court and prevailing on the 21 merits. The circuit court judge also said Dr. Fetzer had a one-in-a-million chance: "I will give you this, and I don't mean to be flip, but I think you have maybe a one in a million chance of your certiorari being granted. Not zero. One in a million. But the standard is a substantial likelihood of success on the merits, so one in a million doesn't get you there," (page 19 line 16).**

Do you really think Pozner, after supposedly winning this case and two appeals, is going to piss off the Supreme Court by saying something like that? Pozner and his attorneys were supposedly basing those odds on their belief that "the 7th Amendment right to trial by jury in common law matters does not apply to the states." Really? You see why I am telling you this document is some kind of joke, written by some bozos in the Langley basements who have never been to law school or even read a law book. The 7<sup>th</sup> Amendment doesn't apply to the states? Who does it apply to, the Moon?

You will tell me Fetzer is the bozo and that anyone can appeal to the Supreme Court. All you have to do is enter a document. Yes, but the documents refute themselves, not because they prove Fetzer is a dodo, but because they prove the case could not have proceeded as we are told. Fetzer would never have waived his right to a trial by jury, and we aren't even expected to believe he did. We are expected to believe *he wasn't offered that opportunity*, and that neither appeals court noticed that. Of course the Supreme Court will not hear this case, since I assume they know it isn't even real. So we will be expected to believe Fetzer was thrown into the poor house and his copyrights stolen by Pozner with no

jury ever finding against him. They want you to believe that is the fate awaiting you if you analyze, research, or speak about any major news item. If you disbelieve any mainstream story or call any crisis actor a crisis actor, you are potentially guilty of defamation.

The trouble was, I ignored the Fetzer trial, knowing it was fake, and it passed under the radar of most people. So they had to try again with Jones. They needed a much more high profile fake, to hopefully scare us all silent. But it won't work with me and I suggest you don't fall for it, either. Under the First Amendment, you have a right to question things, including history and the news. You have a right to do research and to state your findings. And you also have a right to state your conclusions based on your findings, even if they appear to be wrong. Yes, under the First Amendment, you have a right to be mistaken. You don't have to be right about everything in order to talk or write. Nobody is right about everything. If you were required to be right about everything, science would screech to a halt, since no one could question current dogma for even a moment. For example, those in charge of Big Bang theory could sue anyone who questioned it, claiming mental distress. All Nobel Prize winners could sue anyone who questioned their theories, saying they were in anxiety of losing their status. All political disagreement could also be squelched, and AOC could sue Tucker Carlson for saying she was a nitwit. Tucker could then sue Jennifer Lawrence for saying he was a denizen of nightmares.

So you see how the Jones lawsuit ties into all that, since they really are pushing for that sort of lockdown. Google, Facebook, and Twitter—at the behest of international government—have created a unilateral version of history and truth, as if everything is now known. If you deviate from that line you are accused of disinformation and censored. And you now see the turn of the screw: while Jones is arguing *against* that sort of censorship on his show, he is taking part in this fake trial that gives it precedent. In one story he is screaming against censorship, in the next he is a clownish victim of it. The railer against crisis actors has become the premier crisis actor.\*

That's why I previously said using Jones in this project, in a pair of televised court cases, was very ill advised. Especially with me lurking to point out all its flaws. It becomes way too easy to blow his cover. Which is precisely why they just released his book, taking it to the top of the Amazon list and so on. They need to create new cover and a diversion, to get eyes off the Sandy Hook failure and move you on. It is hoped the book's sales numbers will reshine Jones' reputation, and get your mind off the fact he just confirmed Sandy Hook as real. I don't think it will work, since he might as well have admitted 911 and the Moon landings were as advertised. He is spitting on his own choir, sort of like Chomsky did after 911. Chomsky destroyed his reputation with that and will never get it back, and Jones has just done the same thing with Sandy Hook. He is claiming to be between a rock and hard place with Trump and the vaccines, but the rock Jones is foundering on right now isn't Trump. It is Sandy Hook.

It occurs to me this all may be planned, with Jones ready to move on to something else after playing the same role for three decades.\* This Sandy Hook fail may be planned to bring Infowars down and allow Jones to retire. It is probably hoped it will leave a big hole in the Truther movement, though I don't think it will. It will just give it more room to breathe. All those herded by Jones for decades will be free to come over to me, where they can roam all they like, going much further down the rabbit hole than Jones ever allowed them. He always made it seem like he was way out in front of everyone, but I have made him look like another brick in the wall from the beginning. Although he sells himself as a history buff and expert, he won't touch 95% of my research, preferring to keep you roped in by partisan politics and daily news. Maybe they hope to replace him by Rogan and others, who are even tamer and bricker, but that won't fly. Every pull on the reins from now on will just infuriate the horses more.

\*Three days ago Jones [admitted in his interview with Del Bigtree at Highwire](#) that his family is stiff with CIA and government agents (see minute 1:51:40). His maternal grandfather developed a secret weapon for the Pentagon, his uncle was involved in Iran Contra and other secret flights, and “many other family members” as well. Jones claims he didn't know that until recently, but that isn't really believable. So the question is, why are we just hearing about it now?

He also admits in that interview that his goal is to semi-retire soon and only appear on air maybe one day a week. So I predict they will soon spin this Sandy Hook after-event into that, while somehow damaging the Truther movement at the same time.

He also admits that State Department bigwig Steve Pieczenik confirmed to him that Sandy Hook was a fake, which of course reminds us that Jones and his attorneys never called any witnesses in any of his Sandy Hook trials. Jones was in the perfect position to enter all the Sandy Hook evidence of a fake into the court record, but didn't even start. That is what you or I would have done, so why didn't Jones and his attorneys? Why didn't they subpoena Pieczenik and hundreds of other researchers, having them read their findings into the court record? Why didn't Jones show the jury the [film of Robbie Parker giving his notorious fake-crying speech](#)? [I just did a search for that, and the first thing that came up was [ABCNews](#), which plays the tape with audio only, no video, and cutting the intro where he gets into character. Proving they are hiding this behind a purple background. Also notice that even on the ones with video, the only ones that have been left up have the first part covered by voice over, to hide Robbie saying “just read from the card? OK!”] Why didn't Jones show the jury the crazy coroner making his speech, telling us the parents wouldn't get to see their dead children? Why didn't Jones enter the story of Gene Rosen into the record, including the stuffed animals, etc? Why didn't Jones mention the admitted use of fake photos in the story, where one lady discovered her living daughter was being included in the pictures of Sandy Hook dead? Why didn't Jones mention the changing story about Lanza's mother working at the school, and of the dead principal giving a press conference, and of Adam Lanza carrying his brother's ID, and of the murder weapon being found in the trunk of the car, though it should have been found with Lanza inside the school, and of Lanza's father just happening to be the VP of GE Financial, and of the cars in the parking lot [all being parked in the same direction](#), and of the [FBI reporting zero murders for Newtown, CT, for 2012 on their own site](#)? Why didn't Jones and his attorneys read into the court record the fake pictures of Emilie Parker, with analysis by photo professionals? Why didn't they tell the jury that no physician assistant by the name of Robert Parker existed at that time in CT? Why didn't they play Kaitlyn Roig's interview with Diane Sawyer, where she claimed there was a bookshelf in the school bathroom? Why didn't they show the jury all the websites about Sandy Hook memorials that went up *before* the event? Why didn't they remind the jury of all the drills going on in Newtown in the months leading up the event, some of them at that firehouse directly in front of the school? Why didn't they remind the juries of the strange actions of judges at the time, who put gag orders on everyone, even putting a gag order on the car's ID? Why didn't they remind the jury that no forensics was done at the school, the crime scene being illegally demolished soon thereafter (much like OKCity and 911). We also have to wonder why Robbie Parker never sued anyone. Surely he suffered the most emotional distress of anyone, since absolutely no one believed him. Why didn't he sue Steve Pieczenik, who stated on-air at Infowars that Sandy Hook was a fake?

---

And in other fake news, [Politico led reporting of numbers](#) from the CDC claiming sexually transmitted diseases are on a steep climb. Well, why not believe the CDC? Their Covid and vaccine numbers were so good, after all.

Syphilis is supposed to be up 26% in 2021. That goes against all expectation, since—due to lockdowns and other restrictions—we may assume far fewer people were hooking up with strangers. But wait, it might be true, but only a misreading of data. We would expect a huge fall in numbers from 2019 to 2020, right. So 2020 was an anomaly, with very low numbers. Say syphilis fell 40% from 2019 to

2020, due to lockdowns. The lockdowns eased in 2021, allowing a 26% increase. But that would mean we were still 14% **down** from 2019 to 2021. You see how that works?

We are told that 26% is the largest increase since 1953, but that doesn't mean anything. The increase is a short term anomaly due to lockdowns, not a long term trend. Which also puts the lie to the title:

## **'Sharing' Economy Continues To Spread: Americans With STDs Jump 26% To Seven-Decade Highs**

Again meaningless, due to population growth. Of course more people have syphilis now than in 1953: the total population of the US is much larger. The population then was about 155 million then; now it is 332 million, so we would expect 2.14 times as many people to have syphilis now, even with the same rate. Due to population growth, we are going to have “record highs” in everything every year. Everything is now at a “seven-decade high”.

As usual, this is just data pushing. The conclusion is actually upside-down to real data, which no doubt shows *falling* rates of STDs, due to falling rates of sex, especially among strangers. So why flip data on you and misreport this, even at Zerohedge? **Population control**. Same reason the government just hit you with a deadly vaccine. Same reason they continue to accelerate the Men-are-Pigs and Woman-are-Pigs programs, the MGTOW movement, and the split-the-sexes project. Same reason they want everyone gay or trans. Same reason they overturned Roe v. Wade and put all the screaming women on the streets with asinine signs like “vasectomies for all men”. Same reason they have put hormone blockers and mimickers in the food, water, and air. Same reason fertility is dropping like a stone. Same reason men are getting breasts. They want you afraid of sex, so they tell you STDs are on the rise when they aren't. They want you wearing masks and condoms at all times, even when driving alone in the car.

The truth is, this is the safest time to have unprotected hetero sex in the history of the world. Why? Many reasons, starting with the fact that fertility rates are so low. Many of you probably couldn't have a baby if you tried. If you are a man your sperm has been rendered worthless, due to what you eat, what you bathe in, what you spray on your lawns, and what you use to polish your car. If you are a woman your uterus is inhospitable, for similar reasons. And if you aren't part of the 5% posting porn videos, you are likely to be semi-frigid, with very few lifetime partners or none, which means your odds of having or getting an STD are almost zero. If you are one of those people, you probably aren't hanging out with dangerous people, you are hanging out with people like yourself: clean as the driven snow. So you can do whatever you like together, within reason. Use the rhythm method if you are in your childbearing years and don't want a child right now, otherwise go crazy. But whatever you choose to do and whomever you choose to do it with, ignore the government and all its fake numbers. The CDC now has zero credibility, along with the FDA and all other government agencies. Listen to them at your own peril. If you follow their advice you will be guaranteed to be miserable, lonely, confused, and unhealthy.

