3.11.19

Commission’s Secretary

Marlene H. Dortch

Office of the Secretary

Federal Communications Commission

445 12th Street, SW

Room TW-A325

Washington, DC 20554

Deena Shetler: deena.shetler@fcc.gov

Pam Arluk: Pamela.Arluk@fcc.gov

FCC Contractor: [fcc@bcpiweb.com](mailto:fcc@bcpiweb.com)

**ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE**

**AT&T Business Deals**

**with State Bar Ethics Disciplinary Offices**

**&**

**New Jersey Federal District Court Judges Families**

On July 23, 2018 petitioners filed comments entitled:

AT&T's Business Deals \_ AT&T Comments requested. AT&T did not comment on the various business deals with NJFDC Judges families and State Bar Ethics Councils. AT&T understood it had engaged in case fixing.

Petitioner, FCC, and DC Court for years believed that the NJFDC was simply lazy or incompetent. It was hard to believe that the NJFDC did not understand the Third Circuit Courts 1996 referral was finalized in 2005 when the DC Court’s “PETITION FOR REVIEW GRANTED” corrected the FCC that 2.1.8 did allow traffic only transfers. The FCC January 12, 2007 Order explicitly advised the NJFDC that the 2006 moot referral obtained through an intentional fraud upon the NJFDC Judge Bassler was moot.

**FCC 2007 ORDER:**

**SCOPE OF CASE:**

“Specifically, the Commission was asked to determine '''whether section 2.1.8 [of AT&T's Tariff FCC No.2] permits an aggregator to transfer traffic under a [tariffed] plan without transferring the plan itself in the same transaction.",6 In its *Order* 011 *Primary Jurisdiction Referral****,* the FCC initially concluded that section 2.1.8 did not apply to transfers oftraffic alone.'** The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, however, **found that conclusion to be incorrect.**

**THE 2006 REFERRAL WAS MOOT:**  
As discussed in the 2003 Order on Primary Jurisdiction Referral, the Commission has broad discretion under the **Administrative Procedure Act and Commission rules to decide whether a declaratory ruling is necessary to terminate a controversy or remove uncertainty**. When, as here, a petition for declaratory ruling derives from a primary jurisdiction referral, the Commission also will seek to assist the referring court by resolving issues arising under the Act. That is our goal here. **The district court's June 2006 order does not expand the scope of the issue previously presented.** Rather, we have been asked to interpret the scope of section 2.1.8 of AT&T's Tariff No.2, a matter already **extensively briefed by the parties**."

**AT&T HAS A MOLE IN IN ITS HOLE**

After years of believing NJFDC was simply incompetent Petitioners did not just suddenly wake up one day ---- and out of the clear blue ---- decide that not only did AT&T corrupt the NJFDC but it also corrupted two State Bar Counsels.

**Petitioners Were Tipped Off!!!**

AT&T was bragging that the case at the NJFDC was going to go nowhere because AT&T bought the NJFDC Judges. The tip off led to the discovery of the case fixing AT&T engaged in. As the evidence began to pile up against AT&T through the years AT&T knew it didn’t have to settle because it bought the NJFDC.

The following is additional information to add to petitioners July 23,2018 FCC comments.

Petitioners have been advised Aaron Chesler **is the son** of Judge Stanley Chesler. **Aaron Chesler is married to Jacklene Chesler** the realtor. That is why Judge Chesler within 1 day of taking over the case from the recused Judge Wigenton evaded the FCC 2007 Order.

In fact Judge Chesler lied during June 2018 oral argument to cover for recused Judge Wigenton.

Judge Chesler Oral page 24:

4 THE COURT Now, when Judge Wigenton rules, Judge Wigenton 5 **doesn't know about the FCC 2007 order.** She **never refers to** 6 **it.**

Judge Wigenton DID KNOW ABOUT THE FCC 2007 ORDER!!! Judge Wigenton did have the FCC 2007 Order presented to her Court in 2014/2015. In 2015 Judge Wigenton suggested plaintiffs file a writ of mandamus to force the FCC to rule on the moot 2006 referral.

Her Court also had the FCC 2007 Order in 2018 when she scheduled Oral Argument on an issue the FCC said was moot! Judge Chesler lied that Judge Wigenton “doesn’t know about” the FCC Order when **he took over the same case file!**

Judge Chesler used as a ridiculous excuse for Judge Wigenton “**She never refers to it**!” Is it normal that a federal Judge that was waiting for a primary jurisdictional referral from the FCC **to decide the merits of a case** **NOT REFER TO an FCC Order**?

An FCC Order that explicitly states the DC Court corrected the FCC in 2005 on the 1996 Third Circuit Court referral and the 2006 NJFDC referral is moot!

Which is worse here: (A) Judge Wigenton intentionally ignoring the FCC Order or (B) Judge Chesler lying that Judge Wigenton “doesn’t know about it” and trying to cover-up for Judge Wigenton by taking the position that it was proper for Judge Wigenton not to refer to an FCC ORDER saying the 2006 referral was moot!

Judge Wigenton had that 2007 FCC Order in 2018–yet Judge Wigenton schedule Oral Argument. What was the argument? **The merits were decided by the DC Court in 2005!** The FCC Commissioners removed the referral after a very long review (November 2016- January 2017). Judge Wigenton when learning of this should have simply ---in accordance with Supreme Court Law –lifted the stay. Judge Wigenton played dumb again because AT&T continues to benefit Judge Wigenton and husband Kevin Wigenton.

If Judge Wigenton was unbiased there would not have been an oral argument scheduled. Judge Wigenton not only had the FCC 2007 Order, her Court knew in 2018 that the FCC Commissioners removed the moot referral from Circulation in January 2017!!!

Judge Chesler lied to try and cover for Judge Wigenton but his coverup only proved that HE ALSO HAD KNOWLEDGE OF THE FCC 2007 ORDER and his Court ignored it! Massive AT&T cash caused their Courts to ignore the explicit FCC 2007 Order.

AT&T cash also caused ignoring the FCC Commissioners properly removed the 2006 Moot referral from Commissioner circulation back in January 2017! On top of that the tariffed answer to the moot 2006 referral wasn’t even refuted by AT&T in 2018! There was so much transactional evidence and explicit tariff law evidence (Tr8179 and Tr9229) that answered the moot 2006 Judge Bassler question that AT&T never refuted what obligations transfer. AT&T knew it bought Judge Wigenton and she would ignore all evidence as long as AT&T kept funneling hundreds of thousands into her husband Kevin’s Organization. Remember Kevin was an AT&T ATTORNEY for 12 years during the 1995 tariff violation. Also, AT&T keeps hiring hundreds of students from poorly ranked Norfolk State University—the alma mater of the Wigentons. AT&T hired an incredibly disproportional number of students from this poorly ranked college to make the Wigentons look good.

Judge Chesler even came up with some nonsense that maybe the FCC during FCC Circulation (November 2016 to Jan 2017) could not come up with a quorum! It appears Judge Chesler has so much AT&T cash flowing in that his Court is asserting nonsensical excuses why the FCC Commissioners removed the case back in January 2017!!! Judge Chesler position is amazing--- I don’t give a blank that the FCC Commissioners decided the 2006 referral was moot in January 2017 --I know more about telecom law than they do!

**Amazing what a multi-million-dollar AT&T real-estate deal given to your son’s family will do to sway the scales of justice.**

Jacklene Chesler is the realtor that **falsified** her last name to Joshua Burd the writer of the NJ Biz article----- when Jacklene Chesler landed the gift AT&T real estate listing that served to corrupt Jacklene Chesler’s **father-in-law** Judge Stanley Chesler.

Jacklene Chesler obviously read Joshua Burd’s article after it came out! If it was an error of the editor to have the wrong last name, there is little doubt Jacklene Chesler would have requested a correction. It’s an online article. It would be nothing for Jackie Chesler to ask NJ BIZ for a correction. Did you see the July 23, 2018 FCC Comments with the tremendous number of **ALIASES** used by Jacklene Chesler? The hiding of the Chesler last name appears to be standard operating procedure.

Since when does a realtor not want to be found? Jackie Chesler created many aliases to EVADE that she is related to Judge Stanley Chesler and to intentionally disassociate from connecting to Judge Chesler.

Here is a photo of Stanley Chesler—Age Mid 70’s




**Below are many Facebook Photos of husband and wife -----Aaron & Jacklene Chesler.**

**Aaron is --- “A Chip Off the Block.” Looks just like his Dad!**

**If I didn’t already confirm Aaron is Judge Chesler’s son, I could have picked them out just from their photos.**

**Judge Chesler is mid 70’s and Aaron Chesler is early 50’s.**




**Jackie Chesler Facebook with husband Aaron.**

****

**Now Notice below that Jackie Chesler in 2019 posts** **she WORKED AT Coldwell Banker Real-estate! Jackie, joined Colliers in 2013 as detailed in her Bio:**


[**https://www2.colliers.com/en/Experts/Jacklene-Chesler**](https://www2.colliers.com/en/Experts/Jacklene-Chesler)

****

Jackie has been working for Colliers since 2013 and got the AT&T listing in 2016 still today in 2019 Jackie evaded that she works Colliers Real-estate Brokerage! What realtor does not want to say where she is working unless that information is tied to a Facebook account in which her husband Aaron Chesler is in many photos. Jackie deletes any comments that mentions Aaron’s name. On Facebook Jackie refers to Aaron as my husband---not Aaron.

See Jackie’s Facebook bio upper left…only mentions she “Worked at Coldwell Banker” and see: She has “Posts from 2017”—**so the account was active** but No Colliers Employment despite being there since 2013.


The house on the right is their home in Normandy Beach, NJ. They also have huge home in Denville NJ and investment property in Hoboken, NJ. Many millions in property. It pays to have your Dad be a case fixing Judge!!!

****


**All Jackie’s Facebook photos with husband Aaron but intentionally never mentions his name—and husband Aaron is not a Facebook “friend.”**

**Aaron has a STRIPPED ALL INFORMATION OFF HIS FACEBOOK Account….**


Aaron Chesler has deleted his photo off Facebook and all friend connections and Bio information are now completely empty.




Below we see that Aaron has wiped all “About” information so as not to connect to his wife Jacklene Chesler and Judge Chesler.



All friends gone….





Aaron’s wife Jackie Chesler has tons of friends but not husband Aaron. Aaron’s intention is to make sure the public can’t tie Aaron Chesler to his Dad Judge Stanley Chesler nor his wife Jackie Chesler and not tie **Jackie to Colliers**---all this charade including falsifying her own last name because Jackie knew she was gifted the AT&T property listing to corrupt father-in-law Judge Stanley Chesler.

This is obviously why Jackie Chesler falsified her name to NJ Biz and why she has so many aliases as documented in petitioners July 23, 2018 FCC filing. This is why Jackie left Colliers in 2019 does not mention her employment at Colliers in her Facebook bio that is associated with Aaron. Any Facebook comments that include Aaron’s name are all deleted.

Obviously, this is a conflict of interest and highly unethical for any Judge to accept an AT&T case in which family received a multi-million dollar pay day from defendant AT&T.

Judge Chesler intentionally lied to try and cover up for Judge Wigenton---falsely stating Judge Wigenton not having the FCC 2007 Order when Judge Chesler had it in the same case file.

These Judges forgot ENGLISH because they were trying to fix the case---

Judge Chesler, Wigenton evaded referencing the FCC January 12, 2007 Order that explicitly stated the DC Court Corrected the FCC in 2005:

**In its *Order* 011 *Primary Jurisdiction Referral,* the FCC initially concluded that section 2.1.8 did not apply to transfers oftraffic alone.' The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, however, found that conclusion to be incorrect.**

And the 2006 NJFDC Referral was moot:

“**The district court's June 2006 order “does not expand the scope of the issue previously presented.”**

Because Judge Chesler was corrupted by AT&T’s cash he put on a theatrical performance in his June 2018 Oral Argument that revised history.

Incredibly Judge Chesler said the reason why Judge Politan’s’ first decision found that AT&T could not hold up the plan transfer on grounds that a security deposit was required was because the security deposit when becoming a new AT&T customer was not tariffed into 2.1.8. Yet under that same logic Judge Chesler intentionally EVADED the fact that all AT&T’s 3 defenses raised under substantial cause pleading Tr8179 were withdrawn by AT&T in June 1995! Therefore none of AT&T’s defenses were tariffed and thus any use of a non-tariffed defense –as the FCC 2003 Order stated--is a clear violation of 203(c).

Judge Chesler also evaded the fact that the FCC 2007 Order also explicitly stated that petitioners 201 and 202 claims were FACT BASED ----NOT TARIFF INTERPRETATIONS ----and needed to be decided by the NJFDC. Judge Chesler simply said no he will not entertain such a motion.

Petitioners counsel has advised that if a NJFDC Judge engages in conduct prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts. It is a clear violation of 28 U.S.C. § 351(a).

Given the fact that Judge Chelser took the case when he knew is son’s family was gifted the AT&T real estate deal means Judge Chesler will need to recuse his Court. A recusal filing will be done next week after AT&T gets the opportunity to address the AT&T business deals and the incredible cover-up by Aaron and Jackie Chesler to dissociate with Judge Chesler.

When Judge Wigenton was recused Judge Chesler the NEXT DAY had Oral Argument and put on his theatrical performance because of the AT&T cash. Imagine a Judge taking over a case in **one day** in which the case went back to **1995** and had tens of thousands of pages filed and 10 ORDERS and **within a day** Judge Chesler knew the case well enough?

Judge Chesler was brought in by assignment Judge Jose Linares to “**TEACH PLAINTIFFS A LESSON**” for exposing Judge Wigenton and forcing her Courts recusal.

A smart case fixing Judge would have delayed the Oral argument claiming his Court needed time to study the extensive case history. Judge Chesler was on a mission to earn that AT&T cash. Incredibly Judge Chesler when addressing why the FCC removed the moot 2006 referral from FCC Circulation in January 2017---incredibly asserted the FCC Commissioner’s may not have had a quorum for 13 months while the moot referral was on FCC Circulation! Judge Chesler was flinging his Courts **total bullshit** up against the wall instead of simply adhering to the actions of the FCC Commissioners. Can you imagine the AT&T cash that you have to have coming in to make up such nonsense!!!

The FCC staff saw the June 2018 theatrical performance of Judge Chesler and saw AT&T’s business deals and understand the NJFDC is engaged in case fixing. AT&T filed FCC comments that included Judge Chesler’s June 2018 theatrical performance and demanded the FCC interpret the already FCC determined moot 2006 referral. Obviously, the FCC since AT&T’s July 2018 filing is still ignoring the AT&T fraud.

**These NJFDC Judges are NOT THAT DUMB!!! THEY TRIED TO FIX A CASE THAT WAS NOT FIXABLE!!!**

**THE TARIFF AND TRASACTIONAL EVIDENCE AND FCC and DC ORDERS ARE OVERWHELMINGLY EXPLICT AND THE FCC COMMISISONERS REMOVED THE MOOT REFERRAL in JANUARY 2017!**

Imagine NJFDC Judges Wigenton and Judge Chesler taking the incredible position that the FCC staff are all **no good lazy bastards** for refusing to interpret the 2006 moot referral that AT&T scammed Judge Bassler to obtain! Instead of the reality explicitly stated by the FCC 207 Order: “**The district court's June 2006 order “does not expand the scope of the issue previously presented.”**

Imagine NJFDC Judges Wigenton and Judge Chesler don’t know what the DC COURT concluding statement means: PETITION FOR REVIEW GRANTED IS AS THE FCC 2007 ORDER STATES A CORRECTION OF THE FCC ----IT ODES NOT MEAN IT’S A REMAND!!!

It appears the NJFDC Judge have so much AT&T cash flow coming into their families that IT DIDNT MAKE A DIFFERENCE WHAT THE DC COURT AND FCC ORDER STATED. The case needed to be fixed to keep the AT&T cash flowing in.

NJFDC Judges Wigenton and Judge Chesler had EXPLICT TARIFF EVIDENCE that answered the moot 2006 moot referral regarding which obligations transfer on a traffic only transfer. NJFDC Judges Wigenton and Judge Chesler had multitudes of **transactional evidence** all showing that the non-transferred plan must keep its term commitment and revenue commitment. AT&T claimed it did thousands of “traffic only transfers” and YET AT&T COULD NOT PRODUCE ONE PIECE OF EVIDENCE to support its fraud. Of course, not---no evidence exits –it was all an intentional fraud on Judge Bassler in 2006 to obtain the moot referral that AT&T believed it could also pull on the FCC. The FCC’s Deena Shetler who wrote the FCC 2007 Order was not about to let AT&T argue defenses that were withdrawn in June 1995. Deena Shetler understood the very premise of AT&T’s 1995 Tr8179 Substantial Cause Pleading was that both Petitioners and AT&T understood that the revenue and term commitments do not transfer on a traffic only transfer. There was no uncertainty between the parties as per the Administrative Procedures Act to interpret as the parties agreed on obligation allocation.

Tr8179 was filed in February 1995 in hope that the FCC would agree with AT&T that AT&T could mandate that instead of a TRAFFIC ONLY transfer be effectuated A PLAN TRANSFER be effectuated based upon HOW MUCH TRAFFIC WAS BEING TRANSFERRED---where AT&T decided how much it would allow.

AT&T withdrew the 3 defenses under Tr8179 and settled for Tr9229 on a prospective basis in November 1995. The AT&T customer that was transferring traffic away had to post a security deposit against potential shortfall of the non-transferred plans revenue commitment. The NJFDC Judges were given explicit tariff evidence and yet that AT&T massive cash flow caused the Judge to totally disregard explicit tariff evidence that answered the MOOT 2006 referral.

The NJFDC Judges simply allowed AT&T to violate Rule 11B for failure to provide any evidentiary support. Imagine NJFDC Judges Wigenton and Judge Chesler taking the position that the FCC doesn’t know what they are doing by removing the moot referral from FCC Circulation 26 MONTHS AGO!!!

No Judges are this incompetent. Massive AT&T cash that benefitted their families. Petitioners suspected AT&T was in their pockets or benefitting the NJFDC Judges somehow. But not until we were tipped off that the evidence showed how AT&T bought the NJFDC. It goes without saying neither Judge Wigenton nor Judge Chesler should have ever taken the case when both knew AT&T was massively financially benefitting their families. The assignment NJFDC Judge Jose Linares job was to know the backgrounds of the Judges assigned. Judge Jose Linares chose Judge Chesler because Judge Linares knew Judge Chesler documented history as detailed in the July 2018 petitioner filing was to fix cases for AT&T.

If AT&T was smart it should have just settled the case many years ago to ensure its case fixing Judges remained on the bench, to be used in other cases that were not so overwhelmingly obvious. **AT&T wasted them on a case that was not fixable!!!** AT&T has not only lost the case but it appears is now going to waste its case fixing Judges. The Third Circuit should decide that any AT&T cases these NJFDC Judges have been involved in may be ordered re-heard. The huge AT&T pension fund case with Judge Chesler needs to be re-heard. I’m sure Verizon as well as all other parties versus AT&T would be interested in knowing which NJFDC Judges have been bought.

We are going to allow AT&T to comment this week. We want AT&T to file FCC comments and provide all documentation as to who at AT&T gave Jackie Chesler the AT&T listing. Did Jackie Chesler solicit AT&T? How did she hear about the property? Did AT&T go to Jackie and say we want you of all brokers in NJ to list our AT&T property?

Then next week we will file recusal of Judge Chesler. If Judge Chesler refuses to recuse his Court we will file with the Third Circuit a writ of mandamus forcing Judge Chesler to vacate the case. Just the fact that NJFDC refused to address fact-based claims under 201 (unreasonable practices) and 202 (discrimination) evidences the NJFDC engaged in “conduct prejudicial to the **effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts under 28 U.S.C. § 351(a).”**

Group Discounts, Inc.

3.11.19