

APR 13 2012

BY: *Cham*
A. LUM

1 SHARON NOONAN KRAMER, ~~POOR~~
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
8 SHARON KRAMER,

9 Petitioner

10 v.

11 BRUCE J. KELMAN,

12 Respondent

CASE NO. 37-2010-00061530-CU-DF-NC

NOTICE OF SPECIAL APPEARANCE UNDER
EXERCISED APPLICATION OF GUARANTEED
CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED
UNALIENABLE RIGHTS

Unlawful Status Conference (Civil) & Unlawful
Exparte Hearing Date:

April 13, 2012 10am

Thomas P. Nugent Presiding
Department 30:

17 1. COMES NOW, Sharon Noonan Kramer, a woman, a natural –born citizen, herself, *in forma*
18 *paupeis*., neither corporation nor business entity, as a member of the People proclaimed in the United
19 States Constitution, afforded all rights and defense therein, having waived none of them, acting as
20 [h]er own agent (hereinafter "Kramer"), and files this Continuing Notice of Special Appearance in
21 response to an improper hearing illegally scheduled at North San Diego County Superior Court.

22 2. Kramer is present, only under special visitation on the grounds that [s]he has a security interest
23 in the subject matter of the above-styled cause that supersedes the unsupported and fraudulent
24 claims of the other party.
25
26
27
28

1 3. Kramer **DOES NOT** submit to this court's nor any other foreign jurisdiction, in the above-styled
2 cause, nor to **ANY** reference thereto, in other cases relating/pending to the relevant issues of this
3 case, where there are facts (in equity) that remain in controversy. Any assertion to the contrary is
4 patently false and specifically denied as Kramer hereby submits these contemporaneous challenges
5 to this and **ANY** court, and furthermore **DEMANDS** through statutory mandates and full disclosure
6 **PROOF** as required, of this Court's procurement of jurisdiction.

7 4. Kramer exercises [h]er constitutionally guaranteed unalienable rights/liberties, and statutory or
8 procedural defenses, NOT waiving any of [h]er constitutionally guaranteed unalienable rights to
9 remedy, in the free exercise of [h]er U. S. Constitutional First Amendment right for redress of
10 grievances.

11 5. That Kramer has filed notice of this Court's lack of jurisdiction over this and any cause of action.

12 6. That Kramer is entitled to a **true and correct accounting** as a matter of law.

13 7. Respondent's stated law claims are fatally flawed, even assuming, arguendo, and existence of
14 subject-matter jurisdiction.
15

16
17 At the outset it seems necessary to reiterate the basic principle of
18 government underlying the decision in Johnson: the doctrine of the
19 separation of powers, although enshrined in the Constitution and
20 fundamental to the preservation of our civil liberties, "does not mean
21 that the three departments of our government are not in many respects
22 mutually dependent." (Brydonjack v. State Bar (1929) 208 Cal. 439,
23 442 [281 P. 1018, 66 A.L.R. 1507].) [6] As this court explained more
24 than half a century ago, "the constitutional jurisdiction and powers of
25 the superior court [as defined in article VI of the Constitution] can in no
26 way [19 Cal.3d 192] be trenched upon, lessened or limited by the
27 legislature. While this is undoubtedly true it does not follow that the
28 legislative department of the state government possesses no regulative
power with relation to the jurisdiction of the superior courts of the state
or to the method and procedure in and means of which the
constitutional powers of these courts are to be exercised. On the
contrary, it has been decided by this court in a long and consistent line
of cases that "the procedure by which the jurisdiction of said courts is to
be exercised may be prescribed by the legislature, and that the
statutory regulation thereof will be upheld unless such regulations

1 should be found to substantially impair the constitutional powers of the
2 courts or practically defeat their exercise." (Sacramento etc. D. Dist. v.
3 Superior Court (1925) 196 Cal. 414, 432 [238 P. 687].) To put the
4 matter affirmatively and more simply, the Legislature may regulate the
5 exercise of the jurisdiction of the courts by all reasonable means.
(Solberg v. Superior Court (1977) 19 Cal.3d 182, 189-190 [137
Cal.Rptr. 460, 561 P.2d 1148])


6 8. The entire case of Kelman v. Kramer is founded upon a three page judgment document from
7 the litigation of Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer Case No. GIN044539, North San Diego County
8 Superior Court.
9

10 9. This Court is aware the three page judgment document, sole foundation for this case, that was
11 submitted with Respondent's COMPLAINT of November 4, 2010, is fraudulent and as such this Court
12 is aware it holds no jurisdiction.
13

14 10. WHEREFORE, Kramer submits that Respondent and the above-styled court cannot amend or
15 cure the jurisdictional defect or merits deficiencies in this case, or any subsequent proceedings held
16 thereon, as a matter of law. Therefore, this case before a fake court of law, is dismissed for lack of
17 statutory qualifications for office and lack of personal and subject matter jurisdiction.
18

19 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing is
20 true and correct, and as to matters stated on information and belief, I believe those matters to be true,
21 and that this document was executed this 13th day of April, at Escondido, California.
22

23 Submitted,
24

25 
26 SHARON NOONAN KRAMER,
27 In Forma Pauperis
28

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

STREET ADDRESS: 325 S. Melrose
MAILING ADDRESS: 325 S. Melrose
CITY AND ZIP CODE: Vista, CA 92081
BRANCH NAME: North County
TELEPHONE NUMBER: (760) 201-8030

F I L E D
Clerk of the Superior Court

APR 12 2012

BY: A. LUM

PLAINTIFF(S)/PETITIONER(S)/APPELLANT(S): Bruce J Kelman

DEFENDANT(S)/RESPONDENT(S): Sharon Kramer

Short Title: Kelman vs. Kramer

NOTICE OF RESCHEDULED HEARING

CASE NUMBER:
37-2010-00061530-CU-DF-NC

Notice is given that the hearing in the above-entitled case has been rescheduled from 04/27/2012 10:00 AM to date and time shown below. All inquiries regarding this notice should be referred to the court listed above.

TYPE OF HEARING

Status Conference (Civil)

DATE

04/13/2012

TIME

10:00 am

DEPT

N-30

JUDGE

Thomas P. Nugent

TO SET CASE FOR TRIAL

Appearances at all hearings are mandatory unless specifically excused by the court for good cause shown. Refer to local rules.

**NOTICE TO JUDGE THOMAS NUGENT, NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT,
DEPARTMENT 30**

I, Mrs. Sharon Noonan Kramer, am not obligated and will not be attending the "Status Conference (Civil)" scheduled to take place on April 13, 2012 at 10:00 am in Department 30.

The Court lacks jurisdiction to hold a status conference because the judgment document submitted to this Court on November 4, 2010 by California licensed attorney, Keith Scheuer, from Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer Case No. GIN044539, which is the sole foundation for Kelman v. Kramer Case No. 37-2010-00061530-CU-DF-NC, is known by to this Court to be fraudulent.

I, Mrs. Sharon Noonan Kramer, DEMAND that this Court with no jurisdiction, cease and desist from harassing me further to conceal Judicial, Clerk, Attorney Keith Scheuer, Attorney Tracey Sang and Plaintiff Burce Kelman unlawful misconduct.

April 12, 2012

Mrs. Sharon Noonan Kramer
Mrs. Sharon Noonan Kramer