Filed 11/16/06 Kelman v. Kramer CA4/1 NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

BRUCE J. KELMAN et al.,

D047758

Plaintiffs and Respondents,

V.

(Super. Ct. No. GIN044539)

SHARON KRAMER,

Defendant and Appellant.

(Page 10 of the November 16, 2006 anti-SLAPP Opinion below)

This testimony supports a conclusion Kelman did not deny he had been paid by the Manhattan Institute to write a paper, but only denied being paid by the Manhattan Institute to make revisions in the paper issued by ACOEM. He admitted being paid by the Manhattan Institute to write a lay translation. The fact that Kelman did not clarify that he received payment from the Manhattan Institute until after being confronted with the *Kilian* deposition testimony could be viewed by a reasonable jury as resulting from the poor phrasing of the question rather than from an attempt to deny payment.

In sum, Kelman and GlobalTox presented sufficient evidence to satisfy a prima facie showing the statement in the press release was false.

(Page 19 & 20)

The order is affirmed. Kelman is awarded costs on appeal.

MCCONNELL, P. J.

WE CONCUR:

MCDONALD, J.

AARON, J.

Initially, we note this lawsuit is not about a conspiracy. This lawsuit was filed by

Kelman and GlobalTox alleging one statement in a press release was libelous. Thus,

conspiracy issues are not relevant.

In 2006, the Fourth District Division One Appellate Court deemed Kramer a liar while agreeing with her purportedly libelous writing that Kelman admitted being paid by the Manhattan Institute think-tank to write a lay translation of the ACOEM mold statement (on behalf of the affiliates of the US Chamber of Commerce).

"He admitted the Manhattan Institute, a national political think-tank, paid GlobalTox \$40,000 to write a position paper regarding the potential health risks of toxic mold exposure.....In 2003, with the involvement of the US Chamber of Commerce and exdeveloper, US Congressman Gary Miller (R-CA), the GlobalTox paper was disseminated to the real estate, mortgage and building industries' associations. A version of the Manhattan Institute commissioned piece may also be found as a position statement on the web site of a United States medical policy-writing body, the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine."

"Truth is a complete defense to liability for defamation. (Philidelphia Newspaper, Inc. v. Hepps (1986) 475 U.S. 767, 768-769; Gantry Constru. Co v. Americna Pipe & Constu. Co. (1975) 49.CalApp.3d 186, 191-192). *The truth defense requires only a showing that the substance, gist or sting of the communication or statement is true*. (Gantry Constu.Co v American Pipe & Constr. Co., at p. 194) Unpublished anti-SLAPP Opinion, (2006) D047758 Bruce J. Kelman & GlobalTox v. Sharon Kramer, Cal.App 4th.

Not in this case. In 2010, the Fourth District Division One Appellate Court deemed Kramer a liar again while ignoring the evidence that Kramer's writing is correct about who paid whom for what...and many other facts ignored in this case that have aided an insurance fraud to continue in US and CA policies. From Kramer's Reply To Court's Query, January 30, 2010:

THE SIX KEY FACTS OF THIS STRATEGIC LITIGATION

Much like a Santa Ana wind blowing into the San Diego Appellate court. When the static, immovable airs and visibility blocking smut are purged from this strategic litigation; six facts remain in evidence, clear as day, for this Reviewing Court's opened eyes.

After five years of litigation:

<u>A.</u> <u>Kelman cannot even state how Kramer's phrase "altered his under oath statements"</u> <u>translates into a false accusation of perjury – the sole claim of the case.</u> <u>B.</u> <u>Kelman cannot direct any court's eyes to one piece of evidence of Kramer ever being</u> <u>impeached as to her belief of her validity and logic</u> of her use of her March 2005 phrase "altered his under oath statements" when describing Kelman's testimony given in a legal proceeding in Oregon, February, 2005.

<u>C.</u> <u>Kelman cannot direct this court's eyes to a single piece of evidence of Kramer even</u> <u>uttering a harsh word of him, personally,</u> before she wrote in March of 2005. To speak out of the "positions" of many entities involved in mass marketing a scientific fraud to US courts (scientifically proven the toxins of mold are not toxic) is not evidence of personal malice for one of the many entities and individuals involved. It is a First Amendment right guaranteed to all US citizens to freely speak truthful words that are for the public good.

<u>D.</u> This Court has been provided with uncontroverted and irrefutable evidence that since September of 2005, Kramer has provided all judges and justices to oversee this litigation with <u>uncontroverted and irrefutable evidence that Kelman has committed criminal perjury</u> <u>in this libel action to establish a fictional theme of Kramer having malice</u> for him, personally. She has provided all courts with uncontroverted and <u>irrefutable evidence that Scheuer has</u> <u>willfully suborned Kelman's perjury.</u> "Uncontradicted and unimpeached evidence is generally accepted as true." <u>Garza v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd.</u> (1970) 3 Cal.3rd 312 317-318

E. Kelman cannot state a reason for this Reviewing Court that Kramer would harbor malice for him, personally. Now that the "Foaming At The Mouth, Vindictive Ninny of a Litigant Out To Get an Esteemed Scientific Expert Witness From Her Personal Mold Litigation of Long Ago" theme for Kramer's malice is gone with the Santa Ana winds by the exposing of the criminal perjury and suborning of criminal perjury (Perjury by Kelman: "I testified that the types and amounts of mold in the Kramer house could not have caused the life threatening illnesses she claimed" & Suborning Perjury by Scheuer: "Apparently furious that the science conflicted with her dreams of a remodeled home, Kramer launched into an obsessive campaign to destroy the reputations of Dr. Kelman and GlobalTox"); the replacement absurd and character assassinating theme for Kramer's purported malice is "An Unquenchable Desire To Be Known as 'Queen of the Chatboards". "A state of mind, like malice, "can seldom be proved by direct evidence. It must be inferred from objective or external circumstantial evidence." (Drum v. Bleau, Fox & Associates (2003) 107 Cal.App.4 1009, 1021.

<u>F.</u> Kelman and undisclosed party to this litigation, VeriTox owner Hardin, are the authors of the US mold policy paper "Adverse Human Health Effects Of Molds In An Indoor Environment", <u>ACOEM</u> (2002). They are also the authors of the legal mold policy paper, "A Scientific View Of The Health Effects Of Mold" <u>US Chamber of Commerce</u> Institute For Legal Reform & Manhattan Institute Center For Legal Policy (2003).

<u>This means an author of influential US medical and legal mold policy papers has been</u> proven by uncontroverted and irrefutable evidence to have been committing criminal perjury before the San Diego courts, in a libel action against the first person to publicly write of how these two "questionable" policy papers were closely connected and how they are used in litigation; while the other author did not disclose he was a party to the strategic litigation.

The anti-SLAPP Appellate Panel ignored the evidence of both of these facts when ruling over a strategic litigation impacting US public health policy as they deemed Kramer had falsely accused Kelman of perjury about taking money to make edits in a medical association paper without apparently reading Kramer's writing to see it is 100% correct about who paid whom for what."

1 SCHEUER & GILLETT, a professional corporation Cal. Bar No. 82797 Keith Scheuer, Esq. 2 4640 Admiralty Way, Suite 402 Marina Del Rey, CA 90292 3 (310) 577-1170 Attorney for Plaintiff 4 BRUCE J. KELMAN 5 6 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 7 FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, NORTH DISTRICT 8 CASE NO.: BRUCE J. KELMAN,) 37-2010-00061530-CU-DF-NC 9 Plaintiff, 10 Assigned for All Purposes to: HON. THOMAS P. NUGENT v. 11 DEPARTMENT: N-30 SHARON KRAMER, and DOES 1 12 UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE through 20, inclusive,) 13 [PROPOSED] PRELIMINARY Defendants.) 14 INJUNCTION 15 Hearing Date: March 25, 2011 Time: 1:30 p.m. 16 Department: N-30 17 On proof made to the Court's satisfaction, and good 18 19 cause appearing: 20 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, during the pendency of 21 this action, the above-named Defendants, and each of them, 22 and all persons acting under their instructions or in 23 any of them, are enjoined and concert with them or 24 repeating, publishing or restrained from stating, 25 paraphrasing, by any means whatsoever, any statement that 26 27 1 28 [PROPOSED] PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

1 was determined to be libelous in an action titled Kelman v. 2 Kramer, San Diego Superior Court case no. GIN 044539. The 3 libelous passage of the press release states: 4 "Dr. Bruce Kelman of GlobalTox, Inc., a Washington 5 based environmental risk management company, testified as an expert witness for the defense, as he does in 6 cases throughout the country. Upon viewing mold documents presented by the Hayne's [sic] attorney of 7 Kelman's prior testimony from a case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness 8 stand. He admitted the Manhattan Institute, a national 9 political think-tank, paid GlobalTox \$40,000 to write a position paper regarding the potential health risks of 10 toxic mold exposure." 11 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, before this order may take 12 effect, Plaintiff must file a written undertaking in the sum 13 of \$_____, as required by C.C.P. § 529, for the 14 purpose of indemnifying Defendants for the damages they may 15 the issuance of this preliminary sustain by reason of 16 injunction if the Court finally decides that Plaintiff is 17 not entitled to it. The preliminary injunction shall issue 18 19 on Plaintiff's filing of such written undertaking. 20 Court reserves jurisdiction to modify this The 21 injunction as the ends of justice may require. 22 23 24 Judge of the Superior Court 25 26 27 2 28 [PROPOSED] PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

Barri k

1 LAW OFFICES OF KEITH SCHEUER Keith Scheuer, Esq. Cal. Bar No. 82797 2 4640 Admiralty Way, Suite 402 Marina Del Rey, CA 90292 3 (310) 577-1170 Attorney for Plaintiffs 4 BRUCE J. KELMAN and GLOBALTOX, INC. 5 6 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 7 FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, NORTH DISTRICT 8 BRUCE J. KELMAN, 9 CASE NO. BC GLOBALTOX, INC., Assigned for All Purposes to: 10 HON. Plaintiffs, DEPARTMENT) 11 v. 12 UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE 13 SHARON KRAMER, and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive,) COMPLAINT FOR LIBEL 14 Defendants. 15 16 Plaintiffs BRUCE J. KELMAN (hereafter "KELMAN") 17 and GLOBALTOX, INC. (hereafter "GLOBALTOX") complain against 18 19 Defendants as follows: 20 FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Libel Against All Defendants) 21 22 Plaintiff BRUCE J. KELMAN (hereafter "KELMAN") is 1. 23 an individual who resides in the State of Washington. 24 2. Plaintiff GLOBALTOX, INC. (hereafter "GLOBALTOX") 25 is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the 26 State of Washington, with its principal place of business in 27 28 1 COMPLAINT FOR LIBEL

0000000

1 8. Commencing on or about March 9, 2005, Defendants 2 published and distributed written press releases that falsely 3 KELMAN and GLOBALTOX provided perjurious implied that 4 testimony in lawsuits and stated that KELMAN, while working 5 for GLOBALTOX, "altered his under oath statements" while 6 testifying on the witness stand in an Oregon lawsuit. 7 Defendants posted these statements on various online message 8 9 boards and internet sites, including ToxLaw.com and 10 ArriveNet.com.

9. Such statements are false, and are libelous on 12 their face. They expose Plaintiffs to hatred, contempt, 13 ridicule, and obloquy, and tend to injure Plaintiffs in their 14 business, in that such statements accuse Plaintiffs of 15 providing false testimony under oath, and engaging 16 in 17 dishonest and criminal conduct.

11

19

20

21

25

28

18 These defamatory statements were seen and read by 10. persons across the United States and elsewhere who visited the above-referenced message boards and internet sites.

11. As a proximate result of Defendants' wrongful 22 publication, Plaintiffs have suffered loss 23 to their reputation, shame and mortification, all to their general 24 damage in an amount to be proved at trial.

26 12. In addition, as a further proximate result of the 27 above-described publication, Plaintiffs have suffered special