

1 SHARON NOONAN KRAMER, PRO PER
2 2031 Arborwood Place
3 Escondido, CA 92029
4 (760) 746-8026

5 **SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
6 **FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, NORTH DISTRICT**

7 BRUCE J. KELMAN

8 v.

9 SHARON KRAMER

10 Defendant.

Case No. 37-2010-00061530-CU-DF-NC

SECOND NOTICE TO COURT &
PLAINTIFF COUNSEL REGARDING
TRACEY SANG, ESQ, STATE BAR
NO.153694 & DECLARATION OF SHARON
KRAMER

The Honorable Thomas Nugent Presiding
Department 30

Contempt of Court hearing date: January 6,
2012 at 1:30 pm

14 1. Tracey ("SANG") is a criminal contempt of court specialist who informed Sharon
15 ("KRAMER") she "works for the courts".

16 2. At no time has SANG been the legal counsel for KRAMER in a civil contempt matter
17 or at any other time.

18 3. On October 21, 2011, the Honorable Thomas Nugent introduced KRAMER to SANG.

19 4. This introduction occurred during oral arguments of 10/21/11, where KRAMER'S
20 Motion to Nullify Void Temporary Injunctive Relief Order ("TIRO") was denied with no
21 explanation given and no Tentative Ruling issued prior to oral argument. The CCMS record
22 falsely states there was a Tentative Ruling issued.

23 5. KRAMER informed the court that she did not accept SANG as legal counsel.

24 6. As a courtesy to the court, KRAMER agreed to speak with SANG.

25 7. On January 6, 2012 a Civil Contempt of Court hearing was held.

1 8. KRAMER appeared in Properia Persona for the civil Contempt of Court hearing by
2 declaration that was submitted to the court on January 6, 2012 before the hearing and as is
3 her legal right to do. *"The accused must appear at the hearing because of the quasi-criminal*
4 *nature of a civil contempt proceeding. The appearance may be in person, by an attorney, or*
5 *by affidavit or declaration."* Farace v Superior Court, (1983) 148 CA3d at 917-918.

6 9. On January 11, 2012, KRAMER received a notice via email of a [PROPOSED]
7 ORDER AND JUDGMENT OF CONTEMPT, penned by Plaintiff Bruce ("KELMAN")s
8 legal counsel, Keith ("SCHEUER").

9 10. Within the KELMAN/SCHEUER proposal of January 11, 2012 and with regard to
10 the role SANG played in the January 6, 2012 Contempt hearing, it is states,

11 "...Plaintiff caused the Order to Show Cause to be personally served on Kramer
12 on November 18, 2011, and served by mail on her counsel on November 28, 2011."

13 "...Contemner in writing authorized Tracey S. Sang, Esq., to speak on
14 contemner's behalf on certain limited issues at the hearing."

15 11. On January 17, 2012, KRAMER received a revised, second notice via email of
16 KELMAN/SCHEUER's [PROPOSED] ORDER AND JUDGMENT OF CONTEMPT
17 Within the second proposal and regarding SANG's role, it is states,

18 "...Plaintiff caused the Order to Show Cause to be personally served on Kramer
19 on November 18, 2011, and served by mail on her counsel on November 28, 2011."

20 "Contemner and her counsel are hereby ordered to appear on February 10, 2012 at
21 1:30 p.m. in Department N-30 of the above-entitled Court for a determination as to
22 whether the retraction described above has been adequately published for further
proceeding consistent with this Order and Judgment.

23 The Court offered contemner (sic KRAMER) the opportunity on January 6, 2012 to
24 present an explanation or excuse at the Order to Show Cause hearing but the
25 contemner declined to appear at that time to do so. By declaration she stated she
26 would not physically appear at the hearing to do so.

27 12. Contrary to the above statements in the KELMAN proposal, KRAMER appeared at
28 the hearing on her own behalf, in Properia Persona via declaration as is her legal right to do.

1 13. At no time has SANG be the legal counsel of KRAMER. SANG has always been an
2 employee of the Court. KRAMER has always represented herself in Properia Persona.

3 14. The following exchange occurred between SANG and the Court at the Contempt of
4 Court hearing, January 6, 2012:

5 **MS. SANG:** GOOD AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR. TRACEY SANG APPOINTED BY
6 THE COURT TO REPRESENT MS. KRAMER. SHE HAS NOT ACCEPTED MY
REPRESENTATION UP UNTIL NOW.

7 **THE COURT:** WELL, SHE HASN'T ACCEPTED IT NOW UNLESS YOU GOT A
8 PHONE CALL.

9 **MS. SANG:** I DID GET A PHONE CALL FROM HER.

10 **THE COURT:** WHEN?

11 **MS. SANG:** I HAVE SPOKEN TO HER TODAY.

12 **THE COURT:** GOOD. AND?

13 **MS. SANG:** AND SHE HAS GIVEN ME VERY LIMITED SCOPE INSTRUCTIONS.

14 **THE COURT:** WELL, THAT'S NOT REPRESENTING. I'M LOOKING AT A
15 DECLARATION IF YOU HAVEN'T SEEN IT.

16 **MS. SANG:** I ONLY JUST SAW IT AS I ENTERED THE COURTROOM.

17 **THE COURT:** IT SAYS -- YOU CAN SAY WHAT YOU WISH AND I'M NOT GOING
18 TO STOP YOU FROM THAT. I WANT YOU TO KNOW THAT. BUT SHE VERY
19 EXPLICITLY SAYS THAT "I DO NOT AUTHORIZE HER TO SPEAK ON MY BEHALF
AT A CONTEMPT-OF-COURT HEARING SHOULD THIS COURT CHOOSE
TO PROCEED." AND THIS COURT WOULD CHOOSE TO PROCEED.

20 **MS. SANG:** THAT IS CORRECT. IT HAS SIMPLY COME TO MY ATTENTION THAT
21 MS. KRAMER WAS NEVER FORMALLY ARRAIGNED ON THIS CONTEMPT
22 CHARGE.

23 15. This was a civil, indirect contempt of court hearing. At no time did KRAMER
24 authorize SANG to speak on her behalf at the hearing, nor did SANG speak on KRAMER's
25 behalf.

26 16. Quite the contrary, without even being sworn in as a witness, SANG spoke on the
27 courts' behalf as an employee of the courts, who KRAMER has provided uncontroverted
28 evidence is Speaking With One Voice to stop KRAMER and others from evidencing on the

1 Internet that the Chief Justice of the California Supreme Court was evidenced, September
2 11, 2011, that her inner circle of the judicial branch has severe ethics problems.

3 17. The relevant uncontroverted evidence in the case file of Kelman v. Kramer, which
4 SANG has in her possession, is that the Appellate Court framed a defendant, KRAMER, for
5 libel as they suppressed the evidence a plaintiff, KELMAN, committed perjury to establish
6 malice, and the Court's TIRO that KRAMER is allegedly unlawfully violating is precluding
7 KRAMER and others from being able to write, publish and evidence the courts' prior &
8 current criminal actions.

9 18. A written in the second paragraph of KRAMER's CAUSE, MEMORANDUM of
10 POINTS & AUTHORITES of December 23, 2012, regarding the evidence of KRAMER's
11 alleged contempt; and reiterated in her appearance by affidavit of January 6, 2012, but
12 never addressed by the Court prior to or during the hearing;

13 "The CAUSE for KRAMER petitioning the Judicial Council for redress of
14 grievance on September 11, 2011 and to stop harassment by THIS COURT
15 is that under false pretense THIS COURT is gagging KRAMER from
16 republishing the phrase, "altered his under oath statements" purportedly
17 because it was legally found to be libelous in the prior case. Why THIS
18 COURT is really gagging KRAMER from republishing the phrase is
19 because it was never legally found to be libelous in the prior case. If
20 KRAMER cannot republish the phrase that was the sole cause of action of
the prior case, she also cannot evidence and explain how and why the courts
framed her for libel with actual malice over the phrase she used in a writing
over public health policy and the courts."

21 19.. Contrary to SCHEUER's proposal with regard to SANG's role at the hearing being
22 as a legal representative of KRAMER, no attorney who was representing a client in a civil
23 proceeding would state to the judge in a civil trial that it is a good idea if the judge would
24 charge their client with a criminal offense so they could get her down to the psych unit for a
25 mental evaluation. To quote SANG, *"Its really the only thing we have at our disposal"*.
26 And additionally state that she had discussed this with the opposing counsel before the
27 hearing. But that the bar is too low and her client would probably pass anyway – as SANG
28 stated to the Court on January 6, 2012.

1 20. To reiterate, at no time did SANG represent KRAMER in the Contempt of Court
2 hearing or at any other time, nor was SANG sworn in as a witness at the Contempt of Court
3 hearing.

4 21. KRAMER is aware that SANG has recently had some very stressful personal issues
5 and has just recently returned to work.

6 22. Upon receipt of SCHEUER's second proposal again misstating that SANG is
7 KRAMER's counsel; KRAMER called SCHEUER and asked that he remove false
8 statements from his proposal that SANG is KRAMER's legal counsel. Specifically,
9 KRAMER stated to SCHEUER on the afternoon of January 17, 2012,

10 *"Let her go, Keith. You are going to ruin her career".*

11 SCHEUER replied, *"Ridiculous"* and hung up the phone.

12 23. Court employed, criminal law trained, SANG, has the uncontroverted evidence in her
13 possession that KRAMER is being unlawfully gagged from writing of what occurred at the
14 hands of the court in the prior case to cause a false finding of libel with actual malice, and is
15 now facing jail time for evidencing on the Internet, September 13, 2011, that the Chief
16 Justice of the California Supreme Court knows all about it as do the justices and court
17 clerks involved.

18 24. As such, KRAMER respectfully requests of the Court that in the interest of justice
19 and in the best interest of recovering SANG, that SANG be removed as the court appointed
20 employee involved in an advisory capacity to "help" KRAMER regarding the civil
21 Contempt of Court charges.

22 25. KRAMER respectfully requests of the Court that SCHEUER be made to stop
23 submitting documents to the Court falsely stating SANG is now or ever was the legal
24 counsel of Pro Per KRAMER.

25 January 18, 2012



26 Sharon Kramer, Pro Per
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DECLARATION OF SHARON KRAMER

1. On January 12, 2012, I was given a Mental Status examination by Dr. Lorna Swartz.

2. The report included review of extensive neuropsychological evaluation I underwent in 2003 when the opposing party in the case of Mercury, et. al, v. Kramer attempted to say that I was mentally ill for being concerned of the safety of our home for our daughter with Cystic Fibrosis and Allergic Broncho-pulmonary Aspergillosis, after a botched remediation.

3. As found in the case file of this case as uncontroverted evidence, the lack of safety of our home after a botched remediation was the sole claim of the Mercury case.

4. As found in the case file of this case as uncontroverted evidence, PhD toxicologist KELMAN was an expert witness for our insurer in the Mercury case.

5. As found in the case file of this case as uncontroverted evidence, we made no claims of illness from toxicity in the Mercury case, the only aspect Kelman portrays himself as an expert when testifying before uncountable US courts.

6. As found in the case file of this case as uncontroverted evidence, Kelman testified in the Mercury case that our home appeared to be an increased risk after the botched remediation and that a *“physician with detailed knowledge of the clinical condition of the child involved, must be consulted for specific determination of the safety of this environment for this patient”*

7. As found in the case file of this case as uncontroverted evidence, Judge Michael Orfield, North San Diego County Superior Court Department 28, oversaw the Mercury case and signed all three settlement agreements in 2003 in which we received approximately \$500,000.

8. As found in the case file of this case as uncontroverted evidence, Judge Orfield also oversaw the anti-SLAPP and MSJ portion of the libel suit, Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer from 2005 to 2008. Judge Orfield retired three weeks before trial in August 2008.

1 9. As found in the case file of this case as uncontroverted evidence, in both his anti-
2 SLAPP ruling (2005) and his MSJ ruling (2008) of the libel case; Judge Orfield suppressed
3 the uncontroverted evidence that KELMAN committed perjury and SCHEUER suborned it
4 to establish a false theme for malice, purportedly stemming from a testimony that Kelman
5 never even gave in the Mercury case.

6 10. As found in the case file of this case as uncontroverted evidence, Kelman falsely
7 stated three times in declarations in the libel case of Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer,
8 regarding is role in Mercury, *"I testified the types and amounts of mold in the Kramer*
9 *house could not have caused the life threatening illnesses she claimed"*.

10 11. As found in the case file of this case as uncontroverted evidence, SCHEUER
11 repeatedly suborned Kelman's perjury in the libel case of Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer,
12 and spun it as a false reason for me to harbor malice for Kelman, based on a testimony
13 Kelman is evidenced to have never even given in the Mercury case. . SCHEUER's
14 suborning of perjury in the libel case of Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer:

15 *"Dr. Kelman testified they types and amounts of mold in the Kramer house could not*
16 *have caused the life threatening illnesses she claimed. Apparently furious that the*
17 *science conflicted with her dreams of a remodeled home, Kramer launched into an*
18 *obsessive campaign to destroy the reputations of Dr. Kelman and GlobalTox."*

19 12. Although he is now retired, I am aware that Judge Orfield's wife is still a judge in
20 the North San Diego Superior Court.

21 13. As found in the case file of this case as uncontroverted evidence and submitted to the
22 Court (again) as evidence in my appearance for the Contempt of Court hearing by affidavit,
23 the Appellate Court not only suppressed the evidence that Kelman committed perjury to
24 establish malice and suppressed the evidence that Scheuer repeatedly suborned it; they
25 crafted their Appellate Opinions of 2006 & 2010 to make my accurate writing in question
26 appear false and libelous. Specifically as found in my January 6, 2012 appearance for
27
28

1 Contempt of Court by affidavit and supported by the irrefutable evidence in this Court's
2 case file:

3 "To quote from the 2006 anti-SLAPP Appellate Opinion.

4 *'This testimony supports a conclusion Kelman did not deny he had been paid by the*
5 *Manhattan Institute to write a paper, but only denied being paid by the Manhattan Institute*
6 *to make revisions in the paper issued by ACOEM. He admitted being paid by the Manhattan*
7 *Institute to write a lay translation. The fact that Kelman did not clarify that he received*
8 *payment from the Manhattan Institute until after being confronted with the Kilian*
9 *deposition testimony could be viewed by a reasonable jury as resulting from the poor*
10 *phrasing of the question rather from an attempt to deny payment. In sum, Kelman and*
11 *GlobalTox presented sufficient evidence to satisfy a prima facie showing that the statement*
12 *in the press release was false.'*

13 From my writing of March 2005 accurately stating the Manhattan Institute think-tank money
14 was for the US Chamber's mold position statement – not ACOEM's.

15 *'Upon viewing documents presented by the Hayne's attorney of Kelman's prior testimony*
16 *from a case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness*
17 *stand. He admitted the Manhattan Institute, a national political think-tank, paid GlobalTox*
18 *\$40,000 to write a position paper regarding the potential health risks of toxic mold*
19 *exposure.....In 2003, with the involvement of the US Chamber of Commerce and ex-*
20 *developer, US Congressman Gary Miller (R-CA), the GlobalTox paper was disseminated to*
21 *the real estate, mortgage and building industries' associations. A version of the Manhattan*
22 *Institute commissioned piece may also be found as a position statement on the website of a*
23 *United States medical policy-writing body, the American College of Occupational and*
24 *Environmental Medicine.'*

25 From the Appellate Opinion of September 2010, suppressing the evidence that they had
26 framed me for libel in their 2006 Appellate Opinion.

27 *'In a prior opinion, a previous panel of this court affirmed an order denying Kramer's*
28 *motion to strike under the anti-SLAPP statute. In doing so, we largely resolved the issues*
Kramer now raises on appeal. In our prior opinion, we found sufficient evidence Kramer's
Internet post was false and defamatory as well as sufficient evidence the post was published
with constitutional malice.'

3. Should the Honorable Thomas Nugent proceed with a Contempt of Court hearing on
January 6, 2012, with no proof of a lawful Temporary Injunctive Relief Order, no proven
jurisdiction to hold a contempt hearing, no proof of a properly served OSC or affidavit; and
while continuing to suppress my uncontroverted evidence in his case file that the Appellate
Court framed me for libel and suppressed the evidence that Bruce Kelman committed perjury to
establish malice in KELMAN & GLOBALTOX v. KRAMER, **I am fearful for my physical**

1 **safety that this court will unlawfully incarcerate me, indefinitely, for contempt of court.**

2 This, under the false pretense that I violated a lawful court order by republishing the words for
3 which I am evidenced by uncontroverted evidence, public record and this court's case file to
4 have been framed for libel by the Appellate Court in KELMAN & GLOBALTOX v. KRAMER,
5 "altered his under oath statements'."

6 14. The mental examination of me by Dr. Lorna Swarts on January 12, 2012 finds that:

7 "Previous testing had revealed her to have extremely well developed
8 problem solving skills and it appears that this ability continues. Her
9 thinking was organized. Her judgment was intact.... By report the patient
10 is anxious and under enormous stress. Diagnosis " **Generalized Anxiety
Disorder**" caused by a "**Hostile environment by being aligned and
subject to libel**" [*sic, for now seven years at the hands of the courts*]

11 15. Judge Nugent, this is not going to go away or get swept under the rug. Until you
12 acknowledge the uncontroverted evidence in your case file that the good justices of the
13 Fourth District Division One Appellate Court framed me for libel and suppressed the
14 evidence that Bruce Kelman committed perjury to establish malice in their 2006 anti-
15 SLAPP Opinion; then concealed what they and had done in their 2010 Opinion with all
16 lower courts following the Appellate lead; and your temporary injunctive relief order is for
17 the sole purpose to preclude me and others from being able to write, evidence and publish
18 what they did and its continued damage; the web of deceit will continue to grow.

19 More people like SANG are going to get sucked in and experience unclean hands in this
20 game of white collars teaming up with white coats and black robes to perpetrate a fraud on
21 the US public and US courts. This, while egregiously violating the courts' oaths to uphold
22 the Constitution of the United States and my right to speak and evidence the truth in
23 America without retaliation from the compromised courts of California.

24 16. In the words of the Honorable Runston Maino of Department 26, North San Diego
25 County Superior Court in a January 10, 2012 Courthouse News article titled, "*Speak With
26 One Voice*",
27
28

“We are loyal to the laws of the United States and to the laws of California and to the public. Our oath of office is not to an individual or to a judicial organization. The failure to understand this basic concept has caused much mischief”.

17. Please stop NOW from using the courts and tax dollars to harass us and threaten us to stop us from publicly exposing on the Internet, the mass corruption in California's judicial branch and its continued harm to us, the public and the Constitution. We are not shutting up.

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this Declaration was executed by me on this 18th day of January 2012, in Escondido, California.

Submitted as respectfully as possible,

Sharon Kramer
Sharon Kramer, In Properia Persona

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address): Sharon Kramer, 2031 Arborwood Place, Escondido, CA 92029 TELEPHONE NO.: 760-746-8026 FAX NO. (Optional): E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): ATTORNEY FOR (Name):	FOR COURT USE ONLY
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF STREET ADDRESS: 328 S. Melrose MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: Vista, CA 92081 BRANCH NAME: North San Diego County Superior Court	CASE NUMBER: 27-2010-00061530-CU-DFNC JUDGE: DEPT.:
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: Bruce Kelman DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: Sharon Kramer	
<p style="text-align: center;">PROOF OF SERVICE—CIVIL</p> <p>Check method of service (only one):</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div><input type="checkbox"/> By Personal Service</div> <div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> By Mail</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> By Overnight Delivery</div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div><input type="checkbox"/> By Messenger Service</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> By Fax</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> By Electronic Service</div> </div>	

(Do not use this proof of service to show service of a Summons and complaint.)

1. At the time of service I was over 18 years of age and **not a party to this action.**
2. My residence or business address is:
2031 Arborwood Place, Escondido, CA 92029
3. ☐ The fax number or electronic service address from which I served the documents is *(complete if service was by fax or electronic service):*
4. On (date): 1/18/12 I served the following **documents** (specify):
 SECOND NOTICE TO COURT & PLAINTIFF COUNSEL REGARDING TRACEY SANG, ESQ,
 STATE BAR NO.153694 *and Declaration of Sharon Kramer*

☐ The documents are listed in the *Attachment to Proof of Service—Civil (Documents Served)* (form POS-040(D)).

5. I served the documents on the **person or persons** below, as follows:

- a. Name of person served: Keith Scheuer
- b. ☒ *(Complete if service was by personal service, mail, overnight delivery, or messenger service.)*
 Business or residential address where person was served:
 4640 Admiralty Way #402, Marina Del Rey, CA 90292
- c. ☐ *(Complete if service was by fax or electronic service.)*
 (1) Fax number or electronic service address where person was served:

(2) Time of service:

☐ The names, addresses, and other applicable information about persons served is on the *Attachment to Proof of Service—Civil (Persons Served)* (form POS-040(P)).

6. The documents were served by the following means (specify):

- a. ☐ **By personal service.** I personally delivered the documents to the persons at the addresses listed in item 5. (1) For a party represented by an attorney, delivery was made to the attorney or at the attorney's office by leaving the documents, in an envelope or package clearly labeled to identify the attorney being served, with a receptionist or an individual in charge of the office, between the hours of nine in the morning and five in the evening. (2) For a party, delivery was made to the party or by leaving the documents at the party's residence with some person not younger than 18 years of age between the hours of eight in the morning and six in the evening.

CASE NAME: Kelman v. Kramer	CASE NUMBER: 27-2010-00061530-CU-DFNC
--------------------------------	--

6. b. ☒ **By United States mail.** I enclosed the documents in a sealed envelope or package addressed to the persons at the addresses in item 5 and (specify one):

(1) ☒ deposited the sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service, with the postage fully prepaid.

(2) ☐ placed the envelope for collection and mailing, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this business's practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid.

I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at (city and state): Escondido, CA

c. ☐ **By overnight delivery.** I enclosed the documents in an envelope or package provided by an overnight delivery carrier and addressed to the persons at the addresses in item 5. I placed the envelope or package for collection and overnight delivery at an office or a regularly utilized drop box of the overnight delivery carrier.

d. ☐ **By messenger service.** I served the documents by placing them in an envelope or package addressed to the persons at the addresses listed in item 5 and providing them to a professional messenger service for service. (A declaration by the messenger must accompany this Proof of Service or be contained in the Declaration of Messenger below.)

e. ☐ **By fax transmission.** Based on an agreement of the parties to accept service by fax transmission, I faxed the documents to the persons at the fax numbers listed in item 5. No error was reported by the fax machine that I used. A copy of the record of the fax transmission, which I printed out, is attached.

f. ☐ **By electronic service.** Based on a court order or an agreement of the parties to accept electronic service, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the electronic service addresses listed in item 5.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF DECLARANT)

(SIGNATURE OF DECLARANT)

(If item 6d above is checked, the declaration below must be completed or a separate declaration from a messenger must be attached.)

DECLARATION OF MESSENGER

☐ **By personal service.** I personally delivered the envelope or package received from the declarant above to the persons at the addresses listed in item 5. (1) For a party represented by an attorney, delivery was made to the attorney or at the attorney's office by leaving the documents in an envelope or package, which was clearly labeled to identify the attorney being served, with a receptionist or an individual in charge of the office, between the hours of nine in the morning and five in the evening. (2) For a party, delivery was made to the party or by leaving the documents at the party's residence with some person not younger than 18 years of age between the hours of eight in the morning and six in the evening.

At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age. I am not a party to the above-referenced legal proceeding.

I served the envelope or package, as stated above, on (date):

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date:

1/18/2012

MICHAEL KRAMER

(NAME OF DECLARANT)

(SIGNATURE OF DECLARANT)