

**APPENDIX OF WHY MRS. KRAMER CANNOT SIGN MR. KELMAN'S  
PROPOSED "RETRACTION BY MRS. KRAMER" WITHOUT COMMITTING  
PERJURY, DEFRAUDING THE PUBLIC & AIDING TO CONCEAL JUDICIAL  
MISCONDUCT**

This document may be read online at: [ContemptOfCourtFor:ME](#)

No retraction by Sharon Kramer.....	1
Inability to sign retraction by Sharon Kramer without committing perjury & defrauding the public .....	2
Appellate Court crafted opinions to make a writing appear to have made an accusation of perjury that it did not make.....	3

**HOW THE SAN DIEGO COURTS FRAMED A US CITIZEN FOR  
LIBEL OVER A WRITING IMPACTING PUBLIC HEALTH  
& BILLIONS OF INSURANCE INDUSTRY DOLLARS**

The 2006 & 2010 Appellate Opinions omitted fourteen key lines from the middle of Mr. Kelman's testimony in Oregon.....	4
All courts suppressed the evidence of Mrs. Kramer's unimpeached explanation for using the phrase, "altered his under oath statements....."	5
Mrs. Kramer's writing accurately states the think-tank money was for the US Chamber Mold Statement.....	7
The 2006 anti-SLAPP Appellate Opinion falsely made it appear Mrs. Kramer accused Mr. Kelman of lying about being paid for the ACOEM Mold Statement.....	7
The 2010 Appellate Opinion concealed what judicial peers had done in 2006 to frame Mrs. Kramer for libel.....	8
Mr. Kelman's attorney's role in making it falsely appear Mrs. Kramer accused Mr. Kelman of lying about being paid to author the ACOEM Mold Statement.....	8
This Court is aware that Mr. Kelman and Mr. Scheuer want Mrs. Kramer gagged from being able to write of how prior courts and Mr. Scheuer framed her for libel over the words, "altered his under oath statements".....	9
Mr. Kelman <b>DID</b> commit perjury – in <u>Kelman &amp; GlobalTox v. Kramer</u> to establish false theme for malice.....	10

This Court knows Mr. Kelman's testimony as an expert defense witness in mold litigation is not based on accepted science.....	12
Prior to issuing the temporary injunctive relief order, this Court was provided evidence of the continued adverse impact on the public if Mrs. Kramer was stopped from writing of what prior courts had done.....	13
Mrs. Kramer is unable to sign proposed retraction without committing perjury, defrauding the public, concealing judicial misconduct & aiding to defile the Constitution.....	14
Retraction by Justice Judith McConnell, Chair of the California Commission on Judicial Performance.....	14
Declaration of Sharon Noonan Kramer.....	15



1 SCHEUER & GILLETT, a professional corporation  
2 Keith Scheuer, Esq. Cal. Bar No. 82797  
3 4640 Admiralty Way, Suite 402  
4 Marina Del Rey, CA 90292  
5 (310) 577-1170  
6 Attorney for Plaintiff  
7 BRUCE J. KELMAN

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, NORTH DISTRICT

BRUCE J. KELMAN, ) CASE NO.:  
) 37-2010-00061530-CU-DF-NC

I cannot retract the actions of others. I am unable to sign Mr. Kelman's February 10, 2012 (Proposed) RETRACTION BY SHARON KRAMER for what Mr. Kelman's attorney, Mr. Scheuer, and the Courts did to make it appear Mr. Kelman was falsely accused of perjury in my March 2005 writing - without committing perjury myself. Nor can I remain silent of Mr. Scheuer's and the Courts' actions without harming the lives of thousands. They framed me for libel for the words, "altered his under oath statements" in the first public writing of how it became a fraud in US public health policy that it was scientifically proven moldy buildings do not harm - thereby casting doubt on all my truthful words of the fraud by unlawfully deeming me to be a "malicious liar". This was a SLAPP suit from the beginning. Seven years does not change that or the continued damage from the courts' actions.

March 6, 2012

Sharon Neenan Kramer

In May, 2005, Dr. Bruce J. Kelman and Globaltox, Inc. (now known as Veritox, Inc.) filed a defamation action against me relating to a statement that I made in a press release that Dr. Kelman had "altered his under oath statements" while testifying as an expert witness in a civil lawsuit in Oregon. It was not my intention in writing the press release to state or imply that Dr. Kelman had committed perjury. I do not believe that Dr. Kelman committed perjury. I apologize to Dr. Kelman and his colleagues at Veritox, Inc. for all statements that I have



1 made that stated or implied otherwise. I sincerely regret any harm or damage that I  
2 may have caused.

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

5 Executed on February 10, 2012 at Vista, California.

6  
7 \_\_\_\_\_  
SHARON N. KRAMER

8 **INABILITY TO SIGN RETRACTION BY SHARON KRAMER WITHOUT**  
9 **COMMITTING PERJURY & DEFRAUDING THE PUBLIC**

10 All of the following information and corroborating evidence is within the case file of  
11 Kelman v. Kramer, Case No 37-2010-00061530-CU-DF-NC, San Diego North County  
12 Superior Court. Although not by Court Order or Judgment, this Court is verbally directing  
13 Mrs. Kramer as of March 2, 2012, to sign this retraction stating that she did not mean to  
14 accuse Mr. Kelman of committing perjury when testifying as an expert defense witness in a  
15 mold trial in Oregon on February 18, 2005.

16 The threat is that Mrs. Kramer will be indefinitely incarcerated for Civil Contempt of  
17 Court until she is coerced into committing perjury by retracting an allegation she never  
18 made and coerced into silence of justices of the Fourth District Division One "Appellate  
19 Court" crafting opinions to make the false finding of libel; thereby aiding to conceal how  
20 their judicial misconduct has harmed the lives of thousands and has defiled the First  
21 Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

22 In Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer, Superior Court Case No. GIN044539 (2005), the  
23 courts willfully framed Mrs. Kramer for libel over the words, "*altered his under oath*  
24 *statements*". These five words are the only words for which Mrs. Kramer has ever been  
25 sued. These words were found within the first public writing of how a fraudulent concept  
26 mass marketed into public health policy that it was scientifically proven moldy buildings do  
27 not harm. The writing name the names of those involved and explained how they did it.  
28

NO



1 Then in the second case, Kelman v. Kramer (2010), she was gagged from writing the  
2 exact words for which she was framed for libel in the first case, "*altered his under oath*  
3 *statements*". This makes it impossible for Mrs. Kramer to write of the continued adverse  
4 impact on her and the public caused by judicial misconduct of crafting opinions to the false  
5 finding of libel without violating a court order and running the risk of being indefinitely  
6 incarcerated for speaking the truth in America –without ever being charged with a crime  
7 and with no access to a jury trial .. This makes it impossible for her to seek help to stop the  
8 court harassment aiding to conceal judicial misconduct and its continued adverse impact on  
9 her and the public.

10 **APPELLATE COURT CRAFTED OPINIONS TO MAKE A WRITING APPEAR**  
11 **TO HAVE MADE AN ACCUSATION OF PERJURY THAT IT DID NOT MAKE**

12 In seven years time, no one has provided any evidence that Mrs. Kramer does not believe  
13 the truth of her words, "*altered his under oath statements*" are an accurate description of Mr.  
14 Kelman's testimony when serving as an expert defense witness in a mold trial in Oregon on  
15 February 18, 2005. No one can even state how those words translate into a false allegation  
16 that Mr. Kelman committed perjury. [Emphasis added]

17 The artfully crafted and false finding of the courts is that Mrs. Kramer's writing of  
18 March 2005 accused Mr. Kelman of lying about being paid by the Manhattan Institute  
19 think-tank to make revisions to the American College of Occupational and Environmental  
20 Medicine "ACOEM" Mold Position Statement of 2002.

21 Mrs. Kramer's March 2005 writing speaks for itself. It accurately states that Mr.  
22 Kelman admitted he was paid by the Manhattan Institute think-tank to author the US  
23 Chamber's Mold Position Statement of 2003 when forced to discuss the two mold policy  
24 papers together in front of a jury. The writing accurately states that. ACOEM's 2002 Mold  
25 Position Statement was a "*version of the Manhattan Institute commissioned piece*" that Mr.  
26 Kelman and Veritox co-owner Bryan Hardin, authored for the US Chamber of Commerce.  
27  
28



1 The transcript of the Oregon trial provides the evidence that Mr. Kelman was attempting  
2 to say the two medico-legal policy papers were not connected (in setting policy which aids  
3 to provide undue credibility to his opinion when serving as a professional defense witness  
4 in mold litigation). The transcript shows that at the same time, he had to admit their close  
5 connection. This altering and obfuscating testimony transpired after Mr. Kelman attempted  
6 to shut down the line of questioning of the two papers' dubious origins and their close  
7 relationship by shouting "*ridiculous*" when ask about the involvement of think-tank money.

8 Mr. Kelman was forced to discuss the two medico-legal policy papers together only after  
9 a prior testimony of his from Arizona (2004) was permitted into the 2005 Oregon mold trial  
10 over the defense attorney's objection. All courts overseeing the libel case of Kelman &  
11 GlobalTox v. Kramer, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's unimpeached explanation that this is why  
12 she used the phrase, "*altered his under oath statements*" to describe Mr. Kelman's  
13 obfuscating and flip flopping testimony of February 18, 2005. The courts then crafted their  
14 opinions to make Mrs. Kramer's writing in question appear to have made an allegation of  
15 perjury that it did not make.

16  
17 **HOW THE SAN DIEGO COURTS FRAMED A US CITIZEN FOR LIBEL**  
18 **OVER A WRITING IMPACTING PUBLIC HEALTH AND BILLIONS OF**  
19 **INSURANCE INDUSTRY DOLLARS**

20 **THE 2006 & 2010 APPELLATE OPINIONS OMITTED FOURTEEN KEY LINES**  
21 **FROM THE MIDDLE OF MR. KELMAN'S TESTIMONY IN OREGON**

22 In both the 2006 anti-SLAPP Appellate Opinion and the "reviewing" 2010 Appellate  
23 Opinion, fourteen key lines were deleted from the middle of the Oregon case transcript.  
24 This completely changed the color of Mr. Kelman's testimony on February 18, 2005. It  
25 made it appear that Mr. Kelman willingly discussed the connection of the US Chamber  
26 Mold Statement to that of ACOEM's; aiding to make Mrs. Kramer's accurate description of  
27 "*altered his under oath statements*" appear false. From the actual transcript illustrating the  
28 14 key lines the Appellate Court omitted from the transcript in their opinions.



1 MR. VANCE: And, you participated in those revisions?

2 BRUCE J. KELMAN: Well, of course, as one of the authors.

3 MR. VANCE: All right. And, isn't it true that the Manhattan Institute paid GlobalTox  
\$40,000 to make revisions in that statement?"

4 KELMAN: That is one of the most ridiculous statements I have ever heard.

5 MR. VANCE: Well, you admitted it in the Killian deposition [*sic bench trial*], sir.

6 BRUCE J. KELMAN: No. I did not. (Typd.Opn.pp.4)

7 **(Omitted From the 2006 & 2010 Opinions):**

8 MR. VANCE: Your Honor, may I approach. Would you read into the record, please,  
the highlighted parts of pages 905 and 906 of the trial transcript in that case.

9 MR. KECLE: Your Honor, I would ask that Dr. Kelman be provided the rest of the  
transcript under the rule of completeness. He's only been given two pages.

10 JUDGE VANDYKE: Do you have a copy of the transcript?

11 MR. KECLE: I do not.

12 MR. VANCE: Your Honor, I learned about Dr. Kelman just a –

13 JUDGE VANDYKE: How many pages do you have?

14 MR. VANCE: I have the entire transcript from pages –

JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. Hand him the transcript.

MR. VANCE: I'd be happy to give it to him, Your Honor.

JUDGE VANDYKE: All right. (App.Opn.Brf.Erta,pp.26)

15 **(Back In The 2006 & 2010 Opinions)**

16 MR. VANCE: Would you read into the record the highlighted portions of that  
transcript, sir?

17 MR. KELMAN: "And, that new version that you did for the Manhattan Institute, your  
company, GlobalTox got paid \$40,000. Correct. Yes, the company was paid \$40,000  
for it."

18  
19 **ALL COURTS SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE OF MRS. KRAMER'S**  
20 **UNIMPEACHED EXPLANATION FOR USING THE PHRASE,**  
21 **"altered his under oath statements"**

22 All courts in the case of Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer, suppressed Mrs. Kramer's  
23 unimpeached explanation of what she was referring to by the use of the sentence, "*Upon*  
24 *viewing documents presented by the Haynes' attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a*  
25 *case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand.*"  
26 .Since July of 2005, she has provided never impeached evidence that she believes Mr.  
27 Kelman was obfuscating to hide the true connection of ACOEM to the US Chamber in  
28 promoting false science in US public health policy for the purpose of misleading US courts.



1 As evidenced by the transcript of Mr. Kelman's Oregon testimony, once forced to  
2 discuss the two papers together, he was trying to say they were not connected while having  
3 to admit they were.

4 (from Mrs. Kramer's Appellate Brief of 2009)

5 "Declaration of Kramer submitted to the courts, July 2005: He [Kelman] went on to  
6 say GlobalTox was paid for the 'lay translation' of the ACOEM Statement. He  
7 then altered to say 'They're two different papers, two different activities.' He  
8 then flipped back again by saying, 'We would have never been contacted to do a  
9 translation of a document that had already been prepared, if it hadn't already  
10 been prepared.' By this statement he verified they were not two different papers,  
11 merely two versions of the same paper. And that is what this lawsuit is really all  
12 about.

13 The rambling attempted explanation of the two papers' relationship coupled with  
14 the filing of this lawsuit intended to silence me, have merely spotlighted Kelman's  
15 strong desire to have the ACOEM Statement and the Manhattan Institute Version  
16 portrayed as two separate works by esteemed scientists.

17 In reality, they are authored by Kelman and Hardin, the principals of a corporation  
18 called GlobalTox, Inc. – a corporation that generates much income denouncing the  
19 illnesses of families, office workers, teachers and children with the purpose of  
20 limiting the financial liability of others. One paper is an edit of the other and both  
21 are used together to propagate biased thought based on a scant scientific  
22 foundation.

23 Together, these papers are the core of an elaborate sham that has been perpetrated  
24 on our courts, our medical community and the American public. Together, they are  
25 the vehicle used to give financial interests of some indecent precedence over the  
26 lives of others.'(Appellant Appendix Vol.1 Ex.8:157-158) (Response to Court's  
27 Query, pp.10-11)"<sup>1</sup>

28 <sup>1</sup> The evidence in the case file shows that the US Chamber's Mold Position Statement cites false  
authorship of being co-authored by a physician employed by the Regents of the University of  
California, now retired. In reality, the paper was only authored by Bruce Kelman & Bryan Hardin of  
Veritox – two PhD's with no background in mold research. The billing records, canceled checks  
made out only to GlobalTox and under oath testimony of the UCLA physician stating he did not  
author the US Chamber Mold Statement are in the files of this case and the files of the first case; in  
which the Appellate court framed Mrs. Kramer for libel for the words, "*altered his under oath*  
*statements*". The evidence on record also shows the Appellate Court was aware when they rendered  
their crafty 2010 opinion that the US Chamber Mold Statement had recently been submitted by a DC  
PAC via an Amicus to lend credibility to Mr. Kelman's expert defense opinions. It is a mold case in  
AZ involving two deceased newborns & a \$25M Travelers' Insurance policy. They knew that IF they  
acknowledged the subject paper of Mrs. Kramer's writing, the US Chamber Mold Statement cited  
false authorship, Mr. Kelman's expert opinion on behalf of Travelers's would have been discredited.



1                   **MRS. KRAMER'S WRITING ACCURATELY STATES THE THINK-**  
2                   **TANK MONEY WAS FOR THE US CHAMBER MOLD STATEMENT**

3                   Mrs. Kramer's March 2005 writing accurately states Mr. Kelman admitted being paid by  
4                   the Manhattan Institute to author the US Chamber Mold Position Statement and that  
5                   ACOEM's was "*a version of the Manhattan Institute commissioned piece*".

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

16                  **THE 2006 anti-SLAPP APPELLATE OPINION FALSELY MADE IT APPEAR**  
17                  **MRS. KRAMER ACCUSED MR. KELMAN OF LYING ABOUT BEING PAID FOR**  
18                  **THE ACOEM MOLD STATEMENT**

19                  While suppressing the evidence that Mrs. Kramer gave a logical and unimpeached  
20                  explanation of why she used the phrase, "*altered his under oath statements*" and ignoring  
21                  the writing accurately stated Mr. Kelman's company was paid to author the US Chamber's  
22                  Mold Statement, not ACOEM's; in their anti-SLAPP appellate opinion of 2006 the court  
23                  falsely made it appear Mrs. Kramer had accused Mr. Kelman of lying about being paid to  
24                  author the ACOEM Mold Position Statement of 2002. From the 2006 Appellate anti-  
25                  SLAPP Opinion:

26                  "This testimony supports a conclusion Kelman did not deny he had been paid  
27                  by the Manhattan Institute to write a paper, but only denied being paid by the  
28                  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 from an attempt to deny payment. In sum, Kelman and  
                    GlobalTox presented sufficient evidence to satisfy a prima facie showing that  
                    the statement in the press release was false."



1 **THE 2010 APPELLATE OPINION CONCEALED WHAT JUDICIAL PEERS HAD**  
2 **DONE IN 2006 TO FRAME MRS. KRAMER FOR LIBEL**

3 In 2010, again deleting the fourteen key lines of Mr. Kelman's testimony in the Oregon  
4 trial; again suppressing the evidence that Mrs. Kramer gave a logical and unimpeached  
5 explanation for the use of the phrase "*altered his under oath statements*"; and having been  
6 provided the evidence of error by their peers in 2006; the Appellate Court ignored the  
7 evidence Mrs. Kramer had been framed for libel in the 2006 anti-SLAPP Appellate  
8 Opinion. They wrote:

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

14 **MR. KELMAN'S ATTORNEY'S ROLE IN MAKING IT FALSELY APPEAR MRS.**  
15 **KRAMER ACCUSED MR. KELMAN OF LYING ABOUT BEING PAID TO**  
16 **AUTHOR THE ACOEM MOLD STATEMENT**

17 Mr. Kelman's attorney, Mr. Scheuer, deceptively encouraged the above court false  
18 finding of libel in his briefs. He did this by attributing the words of the plaintiff attorney in  
19 the Oregon case, Calvin Vance, to Mrs. Kramer's writing of the case. This is illustrated by  
20 Mr. Scheuer's Respondent Brief, submitted to the Appellate Court in September of 2009:

21 i.) (Respondent' Brief, Page 7) describing the actions of Mr. Vance:

22 "During the Haynes trial, the Haynes's counsel, Calvin Kelly' Vance,  
23 insinuated that Dr. Kelman had accepted money from The Manhattan Institute  
24 and in return had skewed the content of the ACOEM scientific study."

25 ii.) (Respondent' Brief, Page 6) attributing Mr. Vance's words to Mrs. Kramer's writing,  
26 while leaving out the rest of Mrs. Kramer's writing where she accurately stated the  
27 exchange of Manhattan Institute think-tank money was for the US Chamber's Mold  
28 Position Statement. Mr. Scheuer's Respondent brief willfully and falsely inferred that  
Mrs. Kramer's writing accused Mr. Kelman of lying about taking think-tank money for  
the ACOEM Mold Position Statement.



1       *"In her press release, Appellant stated: 'Upon viewing documents presented by*  
2       *the Haynes [sic] attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a case in Arizona,*  
3       *Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand. He admitted*  
4       *The Manhattan Institute, a national political think-tank, paid GlobalTox \$40,000*  
5       *to write a position paper regarding the potential health risks of toxic mold*  
6       *exposure.'"* [sic, omitted, for the position statement of the US Chamber of  
7       Commerce]

8       **THIS COURT IS AWARE THAT MR. KELMAN AND MR SCHEUER WANT**  
9       **MRS. KRAMER GAGGED FROM BEING ABLE TO WRITE OF HOW PRIOR**  
10       **COURTS AND MR. SCHEUER FRAMED HER FOR LIBEL OVER THE WORDS,**  
11       **"altered his under oath statements"**

12       In the original complaint of this case filed in November of 2010, Mr. Kelman wanted  
13       Mrs. Kramer gagged from writing the following as illustrated by the original proposed  
14       Temporary Injunctive Relief Order which states:

15       *"The libelous passage of the press release states: 'Dr. Bruce Kelman of GlobTox, Inc,*  
16       *a Washington based environmental risk management company, testified as an expert*  
17       *witness for the defense, as he does in mold cases through the country. Upon viewing*  
18       *documents presented by the Hayne's [sic] attorney of Kelman's prior testimony from a*  
19       *case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand. He*  
20       *admitted the Manhattan Institute, a national political think tank, paid GlobalTox*  
21       *\$40,000 to write a position paper regarding the potential health risks of toxic mold*  
22       *exposure."*

23       The Court is aware that they wanted Mrs. Kramer gagged from writing absolutely true  
24       statements of how it became a false concept in US public health policy that it was  
25       scientifically proven moldy buildings do not harm, with the prior courts framing her for  
26       libel for the truthful words. This is evidenced by the fact that this Court understood Mrs.  
27       Kramer's writing accurately stated the think-tank money was for the US Chamber Mold  
28       Statement and did not grant Mr. Kelman's request that Mrs. Kramer could be gagged by  
29       temporary injunctive relief order "TIRO" from writing all of the above.

30       Instead, the Court granted a TIRO containing the five words for which Mrs. Kramer was  
31       sued and framed for libel, *"altered his under oath statements"* while gagging her from  
32       writing a sentence that is not even in Mrs. Kramer's writing of March 2005. This Court  
33       ordered by TIRO that Mrs. Kramer' be enjoined from writing,



1       *"Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand' when he*  
2       *testified in a trial in Oregon." [sic, that based solely on his toxicology model, he*  
3       *professed it was proven the Haynes children's illnesses "Could not be" caused by*  
4       *mold toxins]*

5       **MR. KELMAN DID COMMIT PERJURY – IN KELMAN & GLOBALTOX V.**  
6       **KRAMER TO ESTABLISH FALSE THEME FOR MALICE**

7       Within the Retraction proposed by Mr. Kelman, it states that Mrs. Kramer is to sign  
8       under penalty of perjury, *"I do not believe that Dr. Kelman committed perjury. I apologize*  
9       *to Dr. Kelman and is colleagues at VeriTox, Inc. for all the statements that I have made that*  
10       *stated or implied otherwise."* The only words for which Mrs. Kramer has been sued and  
11       deemed by the courts to be a malicious liar are *"altered his under oath statements"*. In libel  
12       law one must establish a reason for malice. The undisputed evidence in both libel cases is  
13       that Mr. Kelman committed perjury to establish a false theme for Mrs. Kramer to harbored  
14       malice for him. He submitted declarations three times which falsely stated that when  
15       retained as an expert defense witness in Mrs. Kramer's mold litigation (2002-03) he had  
16       testified the *"types and amount of mold in the Kramer house could not have caused the life*  
17       *threatening illnesses she claimed."* His attorney then wrote as a false reason of why Mrs.  
18       Kramer was writing of the fraud in US public health policy, *"Apparently furious that the*  
19       *science conflicted with her dreams of a remodeled home, Kramer launched into an*  
20       *obsessive campaign to destroy the reputation of Dr. Kelman and GlobalTox."*

21       All courts suppressed Mrs. Kramer's uncontroverted evidence that Mr. Kelman gave no  
22       such malice causing testimony in Mrs. Kramer's mold litigation, including declarations  
23       submitted by attorneys involved in the case. All courts ignored the fact that there was not a  
24       single piece of evidence presented that Mrs. Kramer was in the least unhappy with Mr.  
25       Kelman's involvement in her own mold litigation. All courts ignored the evidence that  
26       Mrs. Kramer received approximately \$500K in settlement from the case.

27       On July 15, 2011, Mrs. Kramer asked this Court that Mr. Kelman's attorney be made to  
28       corroborate the reason given for malice – as no court in the prior case would make him and  
all suppressed the evidence that he was perjury to establish needed theme for malice.



1 This Court said it was "frivolous" that a plaintiff in a libel litigation be make to  
2 corroborate reason given for malice and threatened to sanction Mrs. Kramer. The evidence  
3 is undeniable in this Court's case file. All courts in the prior case suppressed the evidence  
4 that Mr. Kelman committed perjury to establish needed reason for malice.

5 After being provided no less than 28 pieces of evidence that Mr. Kelman had committed  
6 perjury to establish malice while strategically litigating against public participation and all  
7 courts suppressed the evidence, the Appellate Court wrote in their 2010 Opinion:

8 We recognize that with respect to malice "courts are required to independently  
9 examine the record to determine whether it provides clear and convincing proof  
10 thereof." (McCoy v. Hearst Corp. (1991)227 Cal.App.3d 1657, 1664.) However, in  
11 Kelman v. Kramer I (sic, the 2006 anti-SLAPP Appellate Opinion) we expressly  
12 rejected Kramer's argument that such independent review entitled her to  
13 judgment....Given that disposition, we can only conclude that panel which decided  
14 Kelman v. Kramer I conducted the required independent review of the record and  
15 agreed with the trial court that, as the record stood at that point, there was clear and  
16 convincing evidence of malice.

17 Falsely stated in the 2010 Appellate Opinion, in 2006 the Appellate Justices did no  
18 review of Mrs. Kramer's evidence that Mr. Kelman was committing perjury to establish  
19 needed reason for malice. The Appellate Court even refused to acknowledge the evidence  
20 that Mr. Kelman committed perjury to establish false theme for malice. They refused to  
21 read Mrs. Kramer's exhibits that were attached to briefs that were properly written by an  
22 attorney who has been licensed in California for over thirty years. Specifically, in 2006, the  
23 Appellate Justices wrote:

24 Kramer asked us to take judicial notice of additional documents, including the  
25 complaint and an excerpt from Kelman's deposition in her lawsuit against her  
26 insurance company [sic, the evidence that Kelman submitted false declarations as a  
27 reason for malice claiming to have given a malice causing testimony in Mrs.  
28 Kramer's mold litigation, that he never even gave].

29 As appellant, Kramer has the burden of showing error. (See Howard v. Thrifty Drug  
30 & Discount Stores (1995) 10 Cal.4th 424, 443.) "The reviewing court is not required  
31 to make an independent, unassisted study of the record in search of error or grounds  
32 to support the judgment. It is entitled to the assistance of counsel." (9 Witkin, Cal.  
33 Procedure (4th ed. 1997) Appeal, § 594, p. 627.) We may ignore points that are not  
34 argued or supported by citations to authorities or the record.



1 **THIS COURT KNOWS MR. KELMAN'S TESTIMONY AS AN EXPERT DEFENSE**  
2 **WITNESS IN MOLD LITIGATION IS NOT BASED ON ACCEPTED SCIENCE**

3 On February 10, 2012, this Court sheepishly stated at the prior Contempt of Court  
4 sentencing date that this case has nothing to do with the science. However, this Court is  
5 aware that Mr. Kelman's expert opinion of testifying that he has proven individuals'  
6 illnesses "*Could not be*" caused by mold toxins found in water damaged buildings is based  
7 solely on one single toxicology model of his and his business partner, Bryan Hardin.

8 This Court knows it is not accepted scientific testimony in the courtroom to claim proof  
9 of lack of causation of individual illness based solely on a toxicology model. This Court  
10 knows that is not just Mrs. Kramer's opinion. This is according to the Third Edition of the  
11 National Academy of Sciences Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence (2011) & the  
12 Institute of Medicines, Damp Indoor Spaces & Health Report (2004). Both are in the case  
13 file of this case.

14 What allows this scientific fraud to continue in US courts to be used to sell doubt of  
15 causation and delay restitution for damages in Bad Faith claims handling practices  
16 throughout the US, is the unlawful judicial misconduct of the judiciary and (some of) their  
17 clerks overseeing seven years of Strategic Litigation Against Public Participation against  
18 Mrs. Kramer. By willfully and falsely deeming the wrong party to be the malicious liar and  
19 then gagging the wronged party from being able to write of what the courts have unlawfully  
20 done and continue to do, the science fraud of Mr. Kelman et.al. in all US courts and claims  
21 handling practices, is aided and abetted to continue. Directly stated: the courts involved in  
22 these two cases have been colluding to commit insurance fraud by framing a whistle blower  
23 for libel for the words, "*altered his under oath statements*"; and then gagging the framed  
24 whistle blower from writing of what they have unlawfully done and unlawfully continue to  
25 do.  
26  
27  
28



1 **PRIOR TO ISSUING THE TEMPORARY INJUNCTIVE RELIEF ORDER, THIS**  
2 **COURT WAS PROVIDED EVIDENCE OF THE CONTINUED ADVERSE**  
3 **IMPACT ON THE PUBLIC IF MRS KRAMER WAS STOPPED FROM WRITING**  
4 **OF WHAT PRIOR COURTS HAD DONE**

5 After being provided the evidence that all of the above had occurred in the case of  
6 Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer, this Court still chose to issue an order that precluded Mrs.  
7 Kramer from writing the words for which she was framed for libel with actual malice in the  
8 prior case, "*altered his under oath statements*". On April 27, 2011, Mrs. Kramer informed  
9 this Court as respectfully as possible that she would not be able to adhere to any court order  
10 that precludes her from being able to write of how the courts, Mr. Kelman and Mr. Scheuer  
11 did it while knowing the lives that were continuing to be harmed from their actions. Mrs.  
12 Kramer submitted to this Court on April 27, 2011:

13 This order is making it against the law for the never impeached citizen to write and  
14 speak of errors of the courts in Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer that have aided with  
15 a fraud in US public health policy to continue by the courts ignoring the evidence  
16 that an author of policy for the Chamber and ACOEM used criminal perjury in a  
17 malicious, strategic, libel litigation. It is a matter of court record that the appellate  
18 court was informed and evidenced that "**WHEN**" the acknowledged the plaintiff's  
19 criminal perjury, "**THEN**" the fraud in policy would immediately cease by rightfully  
20 exposing the conflicts of interest and lack of truthfulness in legal proceedings by the  
21 plaintiff, policy author and professional witness, Kelman. Instead, the courts  
22 rewarded the criminal behavior. This order is furthering the abuse of the prior courts  
23 that aids the US Chamber adverse to public interest.

24 As such, Kramer respectfully informs this court that she will not stop writing and  
25 speaking of the fraud in policy and of the courts rewarding criminal perjury in a  
26 malicious, strategic litigation that aids the fraud to continue; regardless of the order  
27 this court may issue. She informs this court of because she will not lie to this court  
28 that she will follow an injunctive relief order based on prior improvidently entered  
orders and false documents submitted to this court. What this court does with this  
information is unknown to Kramer. But public safety and integrity in the courts are  
more important to Kramer than consequences of refusing to be silenced of fraud in  
policy aided to continue by the judiciary to oversee Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer.



1 **MRS KRAMER IS UNABLE TO SIGN PROPOSED RETRACTION WITHOUT**  
2 **COMMITTING PERJURY, DEFRAUDING THE PUBLIC, CONCEALING**  
3 **JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT & AIDING TO DEFILE THE CONSTITUTION**

4 Mrs. Kramer is unable to retract that she accused Mr. Kelman of perjury by her use of  
5 the phrase, "*altered his under oath statements*" because she did not. Mr. Kelman, Mr.  
6 Scheuer, and the Courts falsely made it appear that she had. If this fraudulent and unlawful  
7 retraction is required by the Court to be signed by Mrs. Kramer to avoid coercive  
8 incarceration; that would criminal coercion into perjury of a framed whistleblower - aiding  
9 to conceal judicial misconduct of crafting opinions to the false finding of libel. Then  
10 gagging the framed whistle blower from being able to write of what the courts have done  
11 and its continued adverse impact on public health policy and US courts over the mold issue.  
12 Mrs. Kramer refuses to be coerced by the court into a criminal act, aiding the courts to  
13 continue to defraud the public through their collective judicial misconduct

14 **RETRACTION BY JUSTICE JUDITH MCCONNELL**  
15 **CHAIR OF THE CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE**

16 Mrs. Kramer is not being sent to jail or being held in Contempt of Court for repeating  
17 the words, "*altered his under oath statements*". She is being sent to jail for providing the  
18 direct evidence on the Internet on September 13, 2011 of how Justice Judith McConnell  
19 framed her for libel for these words in the November 2006 anti-SLAPP Opinion she wrote,  
20 while she suppressed the evidence that Mr. Kelman committed perjury to establish a false  
21 theme for Mrs. Kramer to harbor malice for Mr. Kelman.

22 As evidenced above and repeatedly in this Court's case file; Justice McConnell's peers -  
23 Justice Patricia Benke, Justice Richard Huffman and Justice Joan Irrion then concealed  
24 Justice McConnell's unlawful and unethical conduct in their 2010 Appellate Opinion. The  
25 required retraction to undo this fine mess the courts have gotten themselves into of having  
26 to indefinitely incarcerate a framed US citizen to conceal judicial misdeeds; needs to come  
27 from Justice Judith McConnell, the Chair of the California Commission on Judicial  
28 Performance "CJP".




1 The CJP is "independent state agency" that polices ethics in the judicial branch. Justice  
2 McConnell is also the Presiding Justice of the Fourth District Division One Appellate  
3 Court. As evidenced in this Court's case file, Justice McConnell knows what she has done,  
4 the continued adverse impact on the public and that an honest US citizen is about to be sent  
5 to jail to stop her and her judicial peers' unlawful behavior from coming to public light. Yet  
6 Justice McConnell remains silent.

7 The RETRACTION OF JUSTICE JUDITH MCCONNELL needs to come in the form  
8 of recalling and rescinding the Remittitur that was issued for the fraudulent 2006 anti-  
9 SLAPP Appellate Opinion, in which she willfully framed a US citizen for libel over a  
10 writing impacting public health. *"If the remittitur issue by inadvertence or mistake or as a*  
11 *result of fraud or imposition practiced on the appellate court...its significant function is to*  
12 *permit the court to set aside erroneous judgment on appeal obtained by improper means.*  
13 *In practical effect, therefore the motion or petition to recall the remittitur may operate as a*  
14 *belated petition for rehearing on special grounds, without any time limitations."* 9 Witkin,  
15 Cal.Procedure (4<sup>th</sup> ed. 1997) Appeal, 733, pp762-763.


16 There is no other way out for the courts to undo the harm that they have done to  
17 Mrs. Kramer and to the public, other than rescind the anti-SLAPP remittitur.  
18

19 March 6, 2012

20   
21 Sharon Noonan. Kramer

22  
23 DECLARATION OF SHARON NOONAN KRAMER

24 I am unable to sign Mr. Kelman's, Mr. Scheuer's and the Court's proposed  
25 RETRACTION BY SHARON KRAMER for the words, *"altered his under oath*  
26 *statements"* without committing perjury, aiding to defraud the public and aiding to conceal  
27 that the courts have forgotten their oath is to uphold the Constitution of the United States –  
28 not the Constitution of the US Chamber of Commerce and the insurance industry.





1 Even under threat of permanent coercive incarceration, I refuse to be coerced into  
2 becoming a criminal and a party to defrauding the public by aiding to conceal judicial  
3 misconduct that aids false science to continue in US courts over the mold issue and  
4 continues to harm the lives of thousands.

5 If the Court is intending to incarcerate an honest US citizen who dared to speak of a  
6 fraud in US public health policy that benefits the affiliates of the US Chamber of  
7 Commerce and for repeating the truthful and never impeached words while providing the  
8 undeniable I was framed by the courts for libel, "*altered his under oath statements*"; then  
9 may God protect the Constitution of the United States – because this Court and the justices  
10 of the Fourth District Division One Court of Appeals certainly are not.

11 If I am a liar about what the courts have done to me while knowing they are defraud ing  
12 the public; all the courts would have to do to prove it is show two pieces of evidence:

13 1. That I was ever impeached in my belief that Mr. Kelman "*altered his under*  
14 *oath statements*" while obfuscating to hide how the US Chamber's Mold Statement  
15 is closely connected to ACOEM's.

16 2. One piece of evidence that I was even remotely unhappy with Mr. Kelman's  
17 involvement in my mold litigation of long ago, having malice stemming from his  
involvement in the case.

18 This Court and no other can provide that evidence. It does not exist. I am precluded  
19 from filing a writ regarding this Court's irregularities in the Contempt of Court hearing of  
20 January 6, 2012 and subsequent irregular actions. This is because I would be submitting it  
21 to the Presiding Justice of the Appellate Court, Justice Judith McConnell. This Justice; her  
22 Justice peers; and their Clerk of the Court (who falsified court documents and computer  
23 records) benefit from seeing me incarcerated and silenced of their judicial misconduct and  
24 Government Code 6200 violations - which are criminal and punishable by up to four years  
25 in prison.

26 Public sunlight is my only hope to stop this travesty. As such, this legal filing, which is  
27 a matter of public record in a case that is a matter of public record, may be read online at  
28 the blog of ContemptOfCourtFor.ME



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

3 Executed on March 6, 2012 at Escondido, California.

4 Sharon N. Kramer  
5 SHARON N. KRAMER  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

NO







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  
9 Plaintiff  
10 v.  
11

12 SHARON KRAMER,  
13 Defendant

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

NOTICE TO COURT, INABILITY TO COMPLY WITH  
UNLAWFUL ORDER & JUDGMENT OF JANUARY  
19, 2012; & DECLARATION OF SHARON KRAMER

[Assigned for All Purposes To Hon. Thomas  
Nugent]

Contempt of Court Sentencing Date

February 10, 2012, 1:30PM

This Notice to the Court, which is a matter of public record, may be read online at <http://wp.me/plYPz-3iR>

Some pdf links are large and may take several seconds to open.

1. **BACKGROUND**

1. On January 19, 2012, the Honorable Thomas Nugent signed a five page REVISED "ORDER" AND JUDGMENT OF CONTEMPT for alleged contempt of court by Sharon "KRAMER". The ORDER contains an impossible remedy for the alleged contempt for KRAMER to avoid coercive incarceration. The ORDER may be read online at: <http://freepdfhosting.com/a2de403995.pdf>

2. The requirement of the ORDER was that by February 6, 2012, KRAMER was to have retracted posts from Internet sites that KRAMER does not own. This includes a post she did not make and posts that do not exist -- or KRAMER will spend five days in jail.

3. The posts by KRAMER and others are regarding litigations that are a matter of public record of "KELMAN & GLOBALTOX v. KRAMER" No. D054493 and this case, "KELMAN v. KRAMER," and their continued adverse impact on public health policy and all US courts because actions of the courts involved in the two cases.

4. The Internet site owners are refusing to retract all posts regarding the case of "KELMAN & GLOBALTOX v. KRAMER" No. D054493 and this case, "KELMAN v. KRAMER," and their continued adverse impact on public health policy and all US courts because actions of the courts involved in these two cases.

5. The ORDER was originally proposed on January 10, 2012; amended and submitted again on January 17, 2012 by Bruce "KELMAN"s, legal counsel, Keith "SCHEUER".

NOTICE TO COURT, INABILITY TO COMPLY WITH UNLAWFUL ORDER & JUDGMENT OF  
JANUARY 19, 2012; & DECLARATION OF SHARON KRAMER



1 6. Although not found on record in the IT Court Case Management System "CCMS"; on January 18, 2012,  
2 KRAMER submitted an objection to the January 17, 2012 amended ORDER, including objections to omissions  
3 and misstatements of facts on record and procedural errors. KRAMER'S January 18, 2012 Notice to the Court  
4 not found in the CCMS may be read online at: <http://freepdfhosting.com/38b82349b6.pdf> The omission of this  
5 court filing in the CCMS may be viewed at: <http://freepdfhosting.com/196437f8ce.pdf>

6 7. To reiterate a few of the procedural errors and misstatements of facts/omissions in the ORDER:

7 i.) The ORDER fails to state this is Civil Contempt of Court – not criminal contempt. As stated by  
8 the Court on December 7, 2011 and read online at: <http://freepdfhosting.com/ae24c874b.pdf>

9 Defendant's request for a jury trial in the civil contempt matter is denied. There is no constitutional right  
10 to a jury trial in civil contempt proceedings in civil contempt proceedings in which the sentence imposed  
11 does not exceed six months' imprisonment. Codispoti v. Pennsylvania (1974) 418 US 506, 512; Mitchell  
12 v. Superior Court (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 1230, 1244. Defendant has not been charged with a criminal  
13 contempt. See Penal Code §166(a)(4) and Mitchell, supra, at 1240.

14 ii.) The ORDER falsely states Tracy "SANG", Esq., is KRAMER's counsel. SANG has never been  
15 KRAMER's counsel. KRAMER has always represented herself, Pro Per. SANG "works for the courts"  
16 in criminal contempt cases – not civil.

17 iii.) KRAMER lawfully appeared on her own behalf at contempt trial of January 6, 2012 via affidavit.  
18 KRAMER'S appearance stating reason she did not appear in person because of fear for her safety  
19 caused by all the uncontroverted evidence of the case that this Court is suppressing may be read  
20 online at: <http://freepdfhosting.com/d4be0bd127.pdf>

21 iv.) Contrary to what the transcript of the trial shows, KRAMER is not charged with a misdemeanor  
22 or criminal contempt of court and she is not mentally incompetent. The transcript of the January 6,  
23 2012 trial may be read online at: <http://freepdfhosting.com/6bf98fa946.pdf>

24 v.) Contrary to the direction the Court, court employee SANG and plaintiff counsel SCHEUER  
25 appear to attempt to be headed according to the trial transcript, KRAMER is mentally competent.  
26 (Attached Hereto As **EXHIBIT 1**, is the mental status evaluation of KRAMER by Dr. Lorna Swartz,  
27 January 12, 2012) **Kramer was forced to spend \$600 she does not have for the evaluation and**  
28 **the mental status report after statements made by SANG and the Court in the trial inferring**  
**they, SCHEUER and KELMAN would like KRAMER to be found guilty of Criminal Contempt and**  
**deemed mentally incompetent.** Dr. Swartz' January 12, 2012 evaluation of KRAMER may be read  
online at: <http://freepdfhosting.com/54eaa3ce20.pdf>

vi.) Contrary to the ORDER, SANG is not KRAMER's counsel or a mental health professional. She  
did not represent KRAMER in trial and was never sworn in as a witness. Evidence of the Court trying  
to force SANG, who "works for the courts" on KRAMER as her counsel with the assistance of the  
Administration of the Courts "AOC", on October 21, 2012 for alleged indirect civil contempt, made be  
read online at: <http://freepdfhosting.com/d4673d19e7.pdf>

vii.) The ORDER fails to state the reason for the \$19,343.95 awarded to KELMAN, The Court did not  
state why in trial or at anytime put an explanation in writing. Putative damages cannot be awarded  
without stated reason. The court must find several elements to hold an action frivolous or in bad faith:  
(1) The action must be determined to be without merit; (2) the action is prosecuted for an improper  
motive, including harassment or delay; or (3) the action indisputably has no merit, where any



reasonable attorney would agree that the action is totally and completely without merit. *Winick Corp. v County Sanitation Dist. No. 2* (1986) 185 CA3d 1170, 1176, 230 CR 289. **A motion to void an order which aids the Court to unlawfully gag a party from writing of prior courts framing a defendant for libel while suppressing the evidence the plaintiff committed perjury to establish malice, with numerous court documents falsified, is not frivolous by any stretch of the imagination.**

viii.) CCMS was falsified to state that a Tentative Ruling was issued on October 20, 2011 regarding the Motion of KRAMER's for which KELMAN - for some unstated reason -was awarded \$19,343.95 for KRAMER's alleged contempt of court. **There was no such Tentative Ruling ever issued.** The falsification of CCMS regarding the Tentative Ruling that was never issued involving the \$19,343.95 may be read online at: <http://freepdfhosting.com/c8f6cf3647.pdf> The actual non-Tentative issued may be read online at: <http://freepdfhosting.com/43d7b93b80.pdf>

ix.) The Court failed to establish that KRAMER violated a lawful court order – one that **precludes her ability to write five words for which the Court's case file undeniably provide direct evidence KRAMER was framed for libel with actual malice by prior courts**; with numerous court documents and CCMS entries falsified of judgments never entered, lien placed on KRAMER's property, who prevailed in trial, who was awarded costs, etc. in *KELMAN & GLOBALTOX v. KRAMER*. KRAMER's Declaration in support of MOTION TO NULLIFY VOID ORDER may be read online at: <http://freepdfhosting.com/8db56e704d.pdf> Two examples of falsified court documents from the prior case as found and suppressed in this Court's case file may be read online at: <http://freepdfhosting.com/44d413025b.pdf> and <http://freepdfhosting.com/12a0b4f0c3.pdf>

x.) The Court failed to address prior to trial, KRAMER's evidence that she had not violated a lawful court order establishing that the Court had jurisdiction to hold the December 6, 2012 Contempt of Court hearing. KRAMER'S ExParte Motion to stop the trial and oral arguments of December 5, 2012 with this Court stating that this would be addressed the next day before trial, may be read online at: <http://freepdfhosting.com/b8f3113096.pdf> and <http://freepdfhosting.com/78510c742a.pdf>

8. With regard to KRAMER's impending incarceration for inability to perform tasks stipulated in the unlawful REVISED ORDER & JUDGMENT FOR CONTEMPT it states in relevant parts:

**"In the courts of the proceedings in the case of *Kelman v. Kramer*, 37-2010-00061530-CU-DF-NC, this Court issued a preliminary injunction, filed on May 2, 2011, enjoining Defendant and Contemner Sharon Kramer from republishing a statement that had been found to be libelous in an action title *Kelman v. Kramer*, San Diego Superior Court case no. GIN044539. In relevant part, the preliminary injunction provided:**

**IT IS HEREBY ORDER that, during the pendency of this action, defendant Sharon Kramer is enjoined and restrained from stating, repeating or publishing by any means whatsoever, the following statement: 'Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand' while he testified as an [ sic, professional toxic tort defense] witness in a trial in Oregon.'**

**Contemner, with full knowledge of the preliminary injunction, republished the defamatory statement by posting it [sic letters sent to the Chief Justice and Judicial Council Members on September 11, 2011 seeking help to stop court, SCHEUER and KELMAN harassment <http://freepdfhosting.com/65495fd522.pdf>] on the Internet (i) on the *Katy's Exposure* website on September 13, 2011[sic KRAMER's direct evidence that was sent to the Chief Justice of the California Supreme Court, et. al., and placed on the Internet of who, how and why within the CA courts framed a defendant for libel with actual malice for the statement, suppressed the evidence that the plaintiff committed perjury to establish reason for malice; falsified court documents, falsified CCMS**

1 entries along with its continued adverse impact on public health <http://wp.me/pLYPz-3aV> ]; (ii) on the  
2 Yahoo Groups "Sickbuildings" chatroom on November 3, 2011 [sic, not a post made by  
3 KRAMER <http://freepdfhosting.com/db99aa4548.pdf>]; which linked to an article on the Katy's  
4 Exposure website dated November 3, 2011 [sic 11/03 by European time zone and about this  
5 Court's swov suppression of evidence concealing the framing of a defendant for libel with actual  
6 malice by prior courts <http://wp.me/pLYPz-3dY>]; (iii) on Katy's Exposure website on November 4,  
7 2011 [sic again of this Court's suppression of evidence & harassment <http://wp.me/pLYPz-3et> ] and  
8 (iv) on the Yahoo Group "Sickbuildings" chatroom on November 5, 2011, which linked to an  
9 article, also dated November 5, 2011, on the Katy's Exposure\_website.[sic, there was NO POST  
10 made on Katy's 11/05/11 for a 11/05/11 post on Sickbuildings to link  
11 <http://freepdfhosting.com/68d9ce0aaa.pdf>] ...(c) That the contemner is sentenced to spend a total  
12 of five days in the San Diego County jail pursuant to the C.C.P. section 1218(a), which shall be  
13 suspended upon the condition that, prior to February 6, 2012, contemner publish a retraction  
14 on the Katy's Exposure website and on the Yahoo Group "Sickbuildings" chatroom of the  
15 defamatory statement set for in the preliminary injunction...."

16  
17 **II**  
18 **KRAMER DOES NOT OWN KATY'S EXPOSURE BLOG**

19 1. As the Court, KELMAN, SCHEUER and SANG are aware, KRAMER is not the owner of "KATY'S  
20 EXPOSURE". All are aware that Crystal "STUCKEY" is the owner.

21 2. On May 6, 2011, after the Temporary Injunctive Relief Order "TIRO" issued by the COURT on May 2,  
22 2011 which precluded KRAMER from republishing the five words for which she was framed for libel with actual  
23 malice by the Fourth District Division One Appellate Court; SCHEUER mailed a threat to STUCKEY not to  
24 republish the sole cause of action words of the litigation that is a matter of public record, "altered his under oath  
25 statements". [Threat: <http://freepdfhosting.com/5a3c5a16c6.pdf> Sole cause of action words Pg 4, Line 5:  
26 <http://freepdfhosting.com/ec62b54c79.pdf> ] In relevant part the interstate US Postal Service mailed threat to  
27 STUCKEY from SCHEUER on May 6, 2011, states:

28 VIA EMAIL AND US MAIL

May 6, 2011


Ms. Chrystal Stucky  
KATYSEXPOSURE  
6010 Sandy Valley Drive  
Katy, TX 77449-6577

**Re: KELMAN v. KRAMER**  
**San Diego Superior Court case no. 37-2010-00061530-CU-DF-NC**

Dear Ms. Stucky:

Please be advised that if you republish the defamatory matter, we will pursue you  
personally to the fullest extent permitted by law.

Very truly yours,

  
Keith Scheuer  
KS/sel  
Encs.



1 3. STUCKEY refuses to allow the posts of September 13, 2011, November 3, 2011 and November 4, 2011  
2 containing the words, "altered his under oath statements" when discussing litigations that that are a matter of  
3 public record to be retracted from her blog, KATY'S EXPOSURE. There was no post made on KATY'S  
4 EXPOSURE on November 5, 2011 to be retracted.

5 4. (Attached Hereto As **EXHIBIT 2**, is the February 6, 2012 Declaration of Crystal Stuckey) It may be read  
6 online at: <http://freepdfhosting.com/5534e07fdf.pdf>, & <http://wp.me/plYPz-3id> &  
7 <https://www.facebook.com/#!/pages/Justice-for-Sharon-Noonan-Kramer/265403400200156>).

8 5. In relevant parts the STUCKEY Declaration states:

9 I am aware and have the direct evidence posted on Katy's Exposure that the Fourth District  
10 Division One Appellate Court issued a second opinion in September of 2010 in which they concealed  
11 they had crafted their 2006 anti-SLAPP opinion to make the false finding that Sharon Kramer was  
guilty of libel with actual malice and that all lower courts followed their lead, including the trial court  
when framing the scope of the trial and in post trial rulings.

12 I am aware and have the direct evidence posted on Katy's Exposure that numerous court  
13 documents and computer entries were falsified in the case of judgments that were never entered and  
14 concealing who were the actual parties to the litigation, with Bryan Hardin who is a retired Deputy  
Director of NIOSH and co-owner of Veritox being an undisclosed party to the litigation.

15 I am aware that this court is suppressing the uncontroverted evidence in its case file that Bruce  
16 Kelman committed perjury to establish malice and Keith Scheuer repeatedly suborned it. I am aware  
17 and have the evidence on Katy's Exposure that on July 15, 2011, this court deemed it  
18 "frivolous" that all prior courts suppressed the evidence of plaintiff's perjury and threatened to  
19 sanction Sharon Kramer when she asked that the plaintiff attorney be made to corroborate  
20 reason given for malice in a libel litigation.

21 I am aware that if the court would acknowledge Sharon Kramer's uncontroverted evidence in its  
22 case file that the prior courts framed her for libel for the words, "altered his under oath statements",  
23 suppressed the evidence that Bruce Kelman (author of mold policy for ACOEM and the US Chamber)  
24 committed perjury to establish reason for malice, falsified court documents and computer entries; and  
25 then in a second case gagged her from being able to write the exact words for which she was framed;  
26 the deceptive marketing campaign of the US Chamber of Commerce that all claims of illness from  
27 WDB are only being made because of "trial lawyers, media and Junk Science" would immediately  
28 vanish from policy and courtrooms throughout the United States.

23 As the owner of Katy's Exposure I do not give Sharon Kramer permission to retract the  
24 truthful and well evidenced post of September 13, 2011 from Katy's Exposure, "Is The  
25 California Court Case Management System (CCMS) Being Misused For Politics In Policy &  
26 Litigation.....And The Fleecing Of The California Taxpayer Over The Mold Issue?" Based on  
27 the evidence I have posted on Katy's Exposure, the answer appears to be a resounding "Yes".

27 The posts of November 3 & 4 on Katy's Exposure are titled respectively "Texas judge abuses his  
28 child for Net usage. Cal Courts threaten Katy's Bloggers with jail time for exposing by Net, many  
children abused by their actions" and "Texas Judge Won't Be Charged With "Beating Into Submission"

To Stop Internet Use. Will California's Leading Judiciaries Ever Be Charged For Collectively Trying To Do The Same To Whistle Blowing Bloggers?"

As the owner of Katy's Exposure, I do not give Sharon Kramer permission to retract these truthful posts of November 3, 2011 and November 4, 2011 from my blog, Katy's Exposure. There is no post dated November 5, 2011 on Katy's Exposure Blog to be retracted, nor was there ever.

### **III**

#### **KRAMER DOES NOT OWN SICKBUILDINGS SUPPORT GROUP**

1. Kevin "CARSTENS" is the owner of "SICKBUILDINGS" online support group of approximate 2800 members. Most have been injured by biocontaminants that are often found in water damaged buildings.

(Attached Hereto As **EXHIBIT 3** is the Declaration of Kevin Carstens. It may be read online at:

<http://freepdfhosting.com/33b2d76d81.pdf> ,& <http://wp.me/pLYPz-3is> &

<https://www.facebook.com/#!/pages/Justice-for-Sharon-Noonan-Kramer/265403400200156> )

2. CARSTENS refuses to retract the post of November 3, 2011 made by Sickbuildings member Karen Dean, **not by KRAMER**, which states,

repost and repost Lets post these words everywhere, on every facebook and blog site, over and over "In the matter of Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer, Bruce Kelman and GlobalTox, Inc., sued Sharon Kramer for the words, Dr. Kelman `altered his under oath statements on the witness stand"?

3. CARSTENS states that KRAMER does not have the ability to retract her posts or anyone else's from SICKBUILDINGS. In relevant part the CARSTENS Declaration states:

I respectfully decline to retract the reply post made by Karen Dean on November 3, 2011, which accurately states the sole cause of action of Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer is over five words, "altered his under oath statements". This is a matter of public record.

As the owner and moderator of Sickbuildings, I respectfully decline to retract the posts made by Sharon Kramer on November 2 and November 5, 2011.

There is no post made by Sharon Kramer on this subject on November 3, 2011. The November 5, 2011 Sickbuildings post by Sharon Kramer does not link to a November 5, 2011 post on Katy's Exposure because there was no post made on Katy's Exposure on November 5, 2011.

I am aware and have the direct evidence posted on Sickbuildings that on May 2, 2011 in a second case, this case, Sharon Kramer was enjoined by Temporary Injunctive Relief Order from republishing the sole cause of action phrase from the prior case, "altered his under oath statements", the phrase for which the courts had framed her for libel with actual malice in the first case.

I am aware and have the direct evidence posted on Sickbuildings that the California Fourth District Division One Appellate Court issued an anti-SLAPP opinion in November of 2006 in which they falsely made Sharon Kramer's writing appear to be a libelous accusation that Bruce. Kelman lied on a witness stand about being paid by the Manhanttan Institute think-tank to make edits to ACOEM's mold



1 position statement of 2002, "Adverse Human Health Effects Associated With Molds In The Indoor  
2 Environment."

3 I am aware and have the direct evidence posted on Sickbuildings that Sharon Kramer's writing  
4 accurately states the exchange of think-tank money was for the US Chamber of Commerce's mold  
5 position statement, "A Scientific View of the Health Effects of Mold".

6 I am aware and have the direct evidence posted on Sickbuildings that the Fourth District Division  
7 One Appellate Court issued a second opinion in September of 2010 in which they concealed they had  
8 crafted their 2006 anti-SLAPP opinion to make the false finding that Sharon Kramer was guilty of libel  
9 with actual malice.

10 I am aware and have the direct evidence posted on Sickbuildings that numerous court documents  
11 and computer entries were falsified in the case of judgments that were never entered and concealing  
12 who were the actual parties to the litigation, with Bryan Hardin who is a retired Deputy Director of  
13 NIOSH and co-owner of Veritox being the undisclosed party.

14 **If this court would like to post an explanation of why it is sentencing Sharon Kramer to jail**  
15 **for republishing the phrase the prior courts are evidenced in this court's case file to have**  
16 **framed her for libel with actual malice and with one post for which she is to be jailed not even**  
17 **being made by her, I will share the court's post with the 2800 members of Sickbuildings.**

18 **If Bruce. Kelman would like to post the direct evidence corroborating the statements he**  
19 **made under penalty of perjury in declarations of why Sharon Kramer would have reason to**  
20 **harbor malice for him, I will share the post with the 2800 members of Sickbuildings.**

21 If the Fourth District Division One Appellate justices would like to post an explanation to the 2800  
22 members of Sickbuildings of why they crafted their Appellate opinions in 2006 and 2010 to make the  
23 false finding of libel with actual malice and suppressed the evidence that Bruce Kelman committed  
24 perjury to establish needed reason for malice, while knowing they were aiding the marketing  
25 campaign of the US Chamber of Commerce to remain in US policy and US courts, I will share the  
26 post with the 2800 members of Sickbuildings.

27 If the clerks of the court would like to post an explanation to the 2800 members of Sickbuildings of  
28 why they falsified court documents and computer entries of judgments never entered and concealed  
who were the true parties to the litigation of Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer, I will share the post with  
our 2800 members.

If Mr. Kelman's attorney, Keith Scheuer, or the clerks of the court or judiciary would like to post an  
explanation of how and why Sharon Kramer has an interest accruing lien on her property for costs  
incurred by Mr. Scheuer's trial losing client, Veritox, with interest accruing from a date of three weeks  
before he even submitted costs, I will share the post with our 2800 members.

If the Chief Justice of the California Supreme Court, Tani Cantil-Sayauke, would like to post an  
explanation of why Sharon Kramer is to be incarcerated for placing the direct evidence on the  
Internet, September 13, 2011, November 2, 2011 and November 5, 2011 that the Chief Justice is  
aware of the illegalities of these two cases by officers of her courts and its continued adverse impact  
on the 2800 members of Sickbuildings, I will share the post with our members.

**Until the California judicial system, Mr. Kelman and Mr. Scheuer provide an explanation of**  
**why the courts framed a defendant for libel, suppressed the evidence the plaintiff committed**  
**perjury, falsified court documents and computer entries, gagged the defendant from**  
**republishing the words for which she is evidenced to have been framed by the courts, and is**

1 now going to be incarcerate her for refusing silence of how the courts' actions continue to  
2 harm the 2800 members of Sickbuildings; no posts of Sharon Kramer's or any other member  
3 of Sickbuildings regarding this matter will be retracted.

4 **IV**

5 **KRAMER IS UNABLE TO COMPLY WITH UNLAWFUL COURT ORDER & JUDGMENT**

6 1. Again, the ORDER states, *"That the contemner is sentenced to spend a total of five days in the San*  
7 *Diego County jail pursuant to the C.C.P. section 1218(a), which shall be suspended upon the condition that,*  
8 *prior to February 6, 2012, contemner publish a retraction on the Katy's Exposure website and on the Yahoo*  
9 *Group "Sickbuildings" chatroom of the defamatory statement set for in the preliminary injunction...."*

10 2. C.C.P 1209(b)states, *"A speech or publication reflecting upon or concerning a court or an officer thereof*  
11 *shall not be treated or punished as a contempt of the court unless made in the immediate presence of the court*  
12 *while in session and in such a manner as to actually interfere with its proceedings"*

13 3. Without being able to state there is anything untruthful or inaccurate in the posts, the three posts by  
14 KRAMER that the Court want removed from the Internet by Court order are titled:

15 "Is The California Court Case Management System (CCMS) Being Misused For Politics In Policy &  
16 Litigation.....And The Fleecing Of The California Taxpayer Over The Mold Issue?"

17 "Texas judge abuses his child for Net usage. Cal Courts threaten Katy's Bloggers with jail time for  
18 exposing by Net, many children abused by their actions" and

19 "Texas Judge Won't Be Charged With "Beating Into Submission" To Stop Internet Use. Will  
20 California's Leading Judiciaries Ever Be Charged For Collectively Trying To Do The Same To Whistle  
21 Blowing Bloggers?"

22 4. The fourth post the Court wants removed by court order was not made by KRAMER. It was made by  
23 Karen Dean and states states,

24 repost and repost Lets post these words everywhere, on every facebook and blog site, over  
25 and over "In the matter of Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer, Bruce Kelman and GlobalTox,  
26 Inc., sued Sharon Kramer for the words, Dr. Kelman `altered his under oath statements on  
27 the witness stand"?

28 5. As proven by the Declarations of CARTENS, February 5, 2012 and STUCKEY, February 6, 2012,  
**KRAMER does not have the ability to comply with the ORDER to avoid incarceration.** C.C.P 1211.5.  
states, *"At all stages of all proceedings, the affidavit or statement of facts, as the case may be, required by*  
*Section 1211 shall be construed, amended, and reviewed according to the followings rules: (b)...No order or*  
*judgment of conviction of contempt shall be set aside, nor new trial granted, for any error as to any matter of*



pleading in such affidavit or statement, unless, after an examination of the entire cause, including the evidence, the court shall be of the opinion that the error complained of has resulted in a miscarriage of justice.

6. Civil Contempt of Court is the charge. The purpose of indirect civil contempt is to coerce compliance with an order by imprisoning the contemner until performance of an act he or she has the power to perform. CCP §1219(a) states. **"The 'coercive' imprisonment must end when the contemner no longer has the power to comply."**

7. The Court does not have legal authority to incarcerate a *never legally impeached US citizen*, KRAMER, for failure to comply with a court order for which KRAMER cannot comply; and for truthful speech or publication made regarding judicial officers in cases that are a matter of public record. Additionally, one day of the jail sentence is for a post KRAMER did not even make. One is for a nonexistent post on KATY'S EXPOSURE and one is for a post on SICKBUILDINGS supposedly linking to the non-existent post on KATY'S EXPOSURE.

8. An adjudication for indirect contempt requires that the facts show the contemner's willful and contemptuous refusal to obey a valid order of the court. In re Cassil (1995) 37 CA4th 1081, 1087-1088, 44 CR2d 267 (accused does not have burden of proving inability to comply with order).

#### **V.**

#### **SUPPORT LEGISLATION IMPACTING THE COURT'S FINANCES....GO TO JAIL?????**

1. On February 3, 2012, SCHEUER submitted a FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF KEITH SCHEUER IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S APPLICATION FOR HOLDING DEFENDANT IN CONTEMPT. It may be read online at: <http://freepdfhosting.com/b50a2861b8.pdf>

2. Attached as exhibit were new posts made by KRAMER regarding the need for passage of AB1208 to remove control of the California courts' coffers from those judicial branch leaders that KRAMER can and has provided uncontroverted and direct evidence are ethically challenged.

3. Nowhere in the posts of January 29<sup>th</sup> <http://wp.me/pIYPz-3ga> , January 31<sup>st</sup> <http://wp.me/pIYPz-3h0> and February 1<sup>st</sup> <http://wp.me/pIYPz-3hk> were the five words for which KRAMER is gagged by this Court from republishing, *"altered his under oath statements"* written in the posts or in KRAMER'S letters to California Assemblymen, Senators.

4. As illustrated by SCHEUER's exhibits, KRAMER stated in letter to Judicial Council member and Assemblyman Mike Feuer that she was being held in contempt and to be incarcerated already for sending him a letter seeking his help on September 11, 2011; and that she could not republish the sole cause of action

1 words from KELMAN & GLOBALTOX v. KRAMER again without risk of more incarceration and sanctions.  
2 Specifically on page 3 of SCHEUER's newest complaint it quotes KRAMER as writing:

3 "In order to seek your help, I had to violate a  
4 COURT ORDER that precludes me from using words for  
5 which the courts framed me for libel with actual malice  
6 in one case and then gagged me from writing of their  
7 actions in another. I would write the five words here  
8 as I again seek your help. However if I do, that could  
9 be five more days in jail for me and several thousands  
10 of dollars more in sanctions.

11 **VI.**

12 **CONCLUSION**

13 As illustrated by SCHEUER's exhibits; he, KELMAN and this Court know KRAMER does not have the  
14 ability to remove posts from SICKBUILDINGS or KATY'S EXPOSURE to avoid incarceration by this Court  
15 because the Internet site owners control post retractions and are refusing to remove.

16 As illustrated by SCHEUER trying to use this case to silence KRAMER of politics in the courts aiding  
17 himself and his clients, by attaching posts of KRAMER's that do not even contain the five words, "altered his  
18 under oath statements", this harassment by SCHEUER and KELMAN aided by this Court must stop, NOW! .

19 KRAMER respectfully requests that this Court stop aiding to harass her and others for exposing on the  
20 Internet that there are severe ethics problems within the judicial branch of California and that these ethics  
21 problems are egregiously adverse to the public's best interest, health and safety.

22 We will not be silenced. There are thousands of lives that are continuing to be adversely impacted by the  
23 courts' numerous misdeeds in KELMAN & GLOBALTOX v. KRAMER and in KELMAN v. KRAMER. To take it  
24 to the level of incarceration of KRAMER to conceal judicial misdeeds, past and present, is taking the  
25 matter into a whole new realm of criminality by members of the California judicial system.

26 February 10, 2012

27   
28 Sharon Kramer, Pro Per



## DECLARATION OF SHARON KRAMER

Honorable Thomas Nugent, please stop abusing your position of authority as a Constitutional officer of the court. What you are doing is unlawful harassment, intimidation and threat to block my movement to conceal unlawful and criminal actions by leaders of the Judicial Branch of California.


You now have a pony in the race to see me incarcerated and silenced for exposing not only their actions, but your actions. For nearly one year, you have willfully gagged me from writing the exact words for which your case file provides the direct evidence you know the prior courts framed me for libel with actual malice while they falsified court documents and CCMS computer records.

You have suppressed this evidence in this case including the fact that you know the continued adverse impact on public health causing harm to thousands directly because of your current unlawful actions.

You must know by now I am not going to be silenced and neither are others whose numbers and understanding of this case for its impact on thousands, are growing by the day.

With the passage of AB1208 in the Assembly, you must know by now that Speak With One Voice is rapidly leaving the California judicial system for the sake of the preservation of the Constitution you are here to protect and uphold.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California the foregoing is true and correct and executed by me this 10<sup>th</sup> day of February in Escondido, California.



Sharon Kramer in Properia Persona





LORNA SWARTZ MD  
3252 HOLIDAY COURT STE 108  
LA JOLLA CA 92037  
PHONE 858 254 3749

January 12, 2012

DATE OF REPORT : 1/15/2012

NAME : Sharon Kramer Age 56 Date of Birth 10/28/ 1955

REASON FOR REFERRAL : Mental Status examination.

**MENTAL STATUS EXAMINATION:**

Health is good. No known allergies. Has smoked for past 35 years. She uses no illegal substances. The patient arrived on time for her appointment. She was groomed, friendly and cooperative. She was alert and oriented. Her gait was normal and coordinated. She was attentive and responsive. Her vocabulary was good as were her social interactive skills.

Previous testing had revealed her to have extremely well developed problem solving skills and it appears that this ability continues. Her thinking was organized. Her judgment was intact. There was no atypical behavior, no impulsive acting out. Her memory appeared to be intact for both recent and past memories. Her speech is articulate, coherent and direct, good rhythm, no apraxia. Patient denies hallucinations visual and auditory and denies delusions. No suicidal or homicidal ideations. No abnormal thought process or content. No neuro-vegetative signs of depression. No mood swings. By report the patient is anxious and under enormous stress. She appears to be above average in intelligence and competence.

**PAST PSYCHIATRIC HISTORY:**

In the past she has been evaluated with extensive neuropsychological testing. The ultimate results revealed her to be smart , intelligent and competent.

**REVIEW OF RECORDS:**


Records of Dr Thomas Wegman from September 25, 2003.

**DIAGNOSIS:**

Axis 1 Generalized Anxiety Disorder  
Axis 2 Deferred.  
Axis 3 None  
Axis 4 Hostile environment by being aligned and subject to libel -- 6  
Axis 5 GAF 60.

Signed  
LORNA SWARTZ MD

Date



1-21-12

## **CURRICULUM VITAE**

Lorna Swartz, M.D.  
3252 Holiday Court ste 108  
La Jolla CA.92037  
(858 ) 254 -3749

### **EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS:**

These were obtained in South Africa. On the left is the American Equivalent, on the right the degrees obtained.

#### **DEGREES**

1961	M.D.	(Medicine)	M.B.B.Ch. University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
1974			Completed requirements for B.A. Degree. University of South Africa
1975	M.A.	(Psychology)	B.A. (Hon) University of South Africa.
1979	Ph.D.	(Psychology)	M.A. (Psychology) Rand Afrikaans University, Johannesburg Thesis: The effect of a developmental Motor therapy program on children with learning disabilities.

### **AMERICAN EXAMINATIONS PASSED:**

1981	E.C.F.M.G
1982	F.L.E.X. (Illinois)

### **DIPLOMA**

Diploma In Learning Disabilities.  
Glen Haven Center. Attached to University of North Colorado. Greeley, Colorado

### **IN-SERVICE TRAINING:**

1971	Optometry as applied to learning. (Dr. G. Getman)
1972	Speech and Reading of the L.D. Child. (Dr. D. Johnson)
1978	Occupational Therapy applied to the exceptional child. (Dr. J. Ayres)
1978	Bobarth Therapy. (Stellenbosch University South Africa)



**EMPLOYMENT HISTORY:**

**June/1969 – October/1979**

Director of Lorna Swartz Achievement Center, Johannesburg.

*Responsibilities:* The diagnosis and monthly home programming of exceptional children. The clinic served children, adolescents and adults.

**January- December/ 1970**

Public School Consultant

*Responsibilities:* Establish first experimental pilot class for children with learning problems in the public school system in South Africa. Appointed to organize class, choose children, train the teacher and recognize the school curriculum in a developmental orientation to include therapeutic learning. This still forms the basis of work done in the now 100 Aid classed for learning disabled children in South Africa. Instituted teacher curriculum, which now is the basis of the In-Service Teacher training course conducted by the Transvaal College of Education. (This is the largest teacher training college in South Africa.)

**January/1971 – November/ 1979**

Director of Private School- Johannesburg specializing in Attention Deficit Disorder.

Established a private school for exceptional children. The school was registered and recognized by the educational authorities. The school had over 70 pupils and a staff of fourteen teachers. The school population included a wide variety of learning disabilities and handicaps, and had a range of I.Q. from 40 to 160. Handicaps included cerebral palsy, blindness, and hard-of-hearing. Ages from five years to seventeen years. The average turnover of children leaving the school annually to return to "normal" school was approximately 35%.

*Responsibilities*

1. Diagnosis, educational and therapeutic programming
2. Teacher Training.
3. Parent Counseling.
4. Conduct multidisciplinary in-service training and a demonstration unit for medical personnel. Also included were occupational and speech therapists and psychologists.

**LORNA SWARTZ, M.D.**

**PAGE 3**

**July/1972 – November/ 1979**

Executive member of Society for the Education for the Gifted Child.

*Responsibilities:*

1. Conducting courses for teachers in this area.
2. Executive Admissions Officer.

**November/1979**

Professor- Special Education, Chicago State University.

*Responsibilities:* Teaching undergraduate and graduate student teachers in special education courses including diagnosis and methodology for retarded, learning disabled and emotionally disturbed.

**December/ 1979 – July/ 1982**

Adjunct Professor -- National College of Education.

*Responsibilities:* Teaching training courses as before. Elected to introduce special needs of exceptional children to instructors of vocational education.

**July/ 1982 – January /1983**

Medical and Psychiatric Internship. Cook County Hospital and Illinois State Psychiatric Institute.

**January/ 1983 – January/1984**

Psychiatric Residency.  
Illinois State Psychiatric Institute.

**June/ 1985**

Graduated University California San Diego with degree in Adult Psychiatry.  
Adult Psychiatry Training Completed.

**LORNA SWARTZ, M.D.**  
**PAGE FOUR**

**June/ 1987**

Completed Fellowship at University of California San Diego, in Child Psychiatry.

**March /1987 – Present**

Private Practice in San Diego, California.

**September/ 1988 – Present**

Assistant Clinical Professor at University of California San Diego.

**May/ 1992 – May /1993**

Hosted radio program regarding mental health issues. Live call in program weekly.  
KFMB Radio Station, San Diego.

**June/ 1993 – May/ 1993**

Hosted radio program regarding mental health issues. Live call in program- one hour  
duration, weekly KSDO Radio Station, San Diego.

**April/ 1996 – 2000**

Weekly TV Consultant on Psychiatric matters. Morning news; to discuss current relevant  
news items. KUSI San Diego.

**PUBLICATIONS:**

The Role of Kinesthesia in Arousal and Learning Behavior.  
Perceptual and Motor Skills. 1978



**LORNA SWARTZ , M.D.**  
**PAGE 5**

**INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL PRESENTATIONS**

Over 100 seminars, presentations and lectures on Attention Deficit Disorder, Learning Disabilities , Depression , Anxiety, Obsessive Compulsive Disorder, and Bipolar Disorder.

**ARTICLES SUBMITTED FOR PUBLICATION:**

1. Developmental Motor Training improves attention.
2. The Correlation between Alpha wave development and Piagetian stages of cognitive growth.

**ASSOCIATIONS:**

California Medical Association  
Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Association



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

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

8  
9 **BRUCE J. KELMAN,**

10 **Plaintiff**

11 **v.**

12  
13 **SHARON KRAMER,**  
14 **Defendant.**

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

**Declaration of Crystal Stuckey, Owner  
of Katy's Exposure Blog**

**[Assigned for All Purposes To Hon.  
Thomas Nugent]**

**Contempt of Court Sentencing Date**

**February 10, 2012, 1:30PM**

15  
16 **Declaration of Crystal Stuckey**

17 I, Crystal Stuckey, hereby declare as follows:  
18

19 1. I am the owner of Katy's Exposure Blog, Exposing Environmental Health Threats  
20 and Those Responsible. The web address is: <http://katysexposure.wordpress.com/> I reside in Katy,  
21 Texas and have personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein. If sworn as a witness I could and  
22 would testify competently thereto.

23 2. Many of our readers have difficulty obtaining medical treatment for their injuries  
24 caused by exposure to contaminants found in water damaged buildings (WDB) because of a  
25 marketing campaign by the US Chamber of Commerce that began in 2003 and in which it was mass  
26 promoted to US physicians, insurers and the courts that it had been scientifically proven all claims of  
27 illness and death from "toxic mold" were only being made because of "trial lawyers, media and Junk  
28 Science".

Declaration of Crystal Stuckey



1           3.       I am aware and have the direct evidence posted on Katy's Exposure that the plaintiff  
2 in this case, Bruce J. Kelman, along with his business partner in the corporation of Veritox, Inc.,  
3 Bryan Hardin, are the authors of those words that were mass marketed by the US Chamber of  
4 Commerce to US physicians, insurers and to courts. I am aware that Veritox was formerly known as  
5 GlobalTox, Inc.

6           4.       I am aware and have the direct evidence posted on Katy's Exposure that the alleged  
7 contemner in this case, Sharon Kramer, was the first to publicly write in March of 2005, how the US  
8 Chamber of Commerce, Bruce J. Kelman, his company, Veritox, the Manhattan Institute think-tank,  
9 US Congressman Gary Miller and the occupational medical trade association, the American College  
10 of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM) were connected in mass marketing the false  
11 concept that it had been scientifically proven people claiming injury from WDB were only doing so  
12 because of "trial lawyers, media and Junk Science".

13           5.       I am aware and have the direct evidence posted on Katy's Exposure that Bruce  
14 Kelman and Veritox sued Sharon Kramer in May of 2005 for five words within the first public  
15 writing of how it became a false concept in US public health policy and in US courts that it was  
16 scientifically proven all claims of illness from WDB were only being made because of "trial lawyers,  
17 media and Junk Science". Those five words are "*altered his under oath statements.*"

18           6.       I am aware and have the direct evidence posted on Katy's Exposure that the  
19 California Fourth District Division One Appellate Court issued an anti-SLAPP opinion in November  
20 of 2006 in which they falsely made Sharon Kramer's writing appear to be a libelous accusation that  
21 Bruce. Kelman lied on a witness stand about being paid by the Manhanttan Institute think-tank to  
22 make edits to ACOEM's mold position statement of 2002, "*Adverse Human Health Effects*  
23 *Associated With Molds In The Indoor Environment.*"

24           7.       I am aware and have the direct evidence posted on Katy's Exposure that Sharon  
25 Kramer's writing accurately states the exchange of think-tank money to Veritox was for the US  
26 Chamber of Commerce's mold position statement of 2003, "*A Scientific View of the Health Effects*  
27 *of Mold*".  
28

1           8.     I am aware and have the direct evidence posted on Katy's Exposure that in 2006, the  
2 Fourth District Division One Appellate Court suppressed the evidence that Bruce Kelman submitted  
3 a false declaration statement under penalty of perjury in September of 2005 to establish a fictitious  
4 theme of why Sharon Kramer would harbor malice for him. Bruce Kelman falsely claimed under  
5 penalty of perjury to have given an expert defense opinion of a nature in 2003 in Sharon Kramer's  
6 lawsuit with her homeowner insurer, Mercury Casualty, that caused her to be "*apparently furious*  
7 *that the science conflicted with her dreams of a remodeled home. Kramer launch into an obsessive*  
8 *campaign to destroy the reputations of Dr. Kelman and GlobalTox.*"

9           9.     I am aware there is no evidence to corroborate that this testimony in the Mercury case  
10 was ever given by Bruce Kelman or that there is any evidence Sharon Kramer had reason to, or did,  
11 harbor personal ill will for Bruce Kelman stemming from his involvement in the Mercury case.

12           10.    I am aware and have the direct evidence posted on Katy's Exposure that the Fourth  
13 District Division One Appellate Court issued a second opinion in September of 2010 in which they  
14 concealed they had crafted their 2006 anti-SLAPP opinion to make the false finding that Sharon  
15 Kramer was guilty of libel with actual malice and that all lower courts followed their lead, including  
16 the trial court when framing the scope of the trial and in post trial rulings.

17           11.    I am aware and have the direct evidence posted on Katy's Exposure that numerous  
18 court documents and computer entries were falsified in the case of judgments that were never entered  
19 and concealing who were the actual parties to the litigation, with Bryan Hardin who is a retired  
20 Deputy Director of NIOSH and co-owner of Veritox being an undisclosed party to the litigation.

21           12.    I am aware and have the direct evidence posted on Katy's Exposure that on May 2,  
22 2011 in a second case, this case, Sharon Kramer was enjoined by Temporary Injunctive Relief Order  
23 from republishing the sole cause of action phrase from the prior case, "*altered his under oath*  
24 *statements*", the phrase for which the courts had framed her for libel with actual malice in the first  
25 case. Then gagged her from writing of what they had done in the second by gagging her from writing  
26 the exact words for which she was framed by the courts for libel with actual malice.  
27  
28

1        13. On May 6, 2011, I was mailed a threat via the US postal service, interstate, from  
 2 Bruce Kelman's attorney, Keith Scheuer. The threat was that if I republished the sole cause of action  
 3 words of a case that is a matter of public record, "*altered his under oath statements*", Bruce Kelman  
 4 would "*pursue legal action against [me] to the fullest*". (Attached Hereto As Exhibit 1 is the May 6,  
 5 2011 threat from Mr. Scheuer, providing the evidence he and the court know I am the owner of  
 6 Katy's Exposure)

7        14. I am aware that this court is suppressing the uncontroverted evidence in its case file  
 8 that Bruce Kelman committed perjury to establish malice and Keith Scheuer repeatedly suborned it.  
 9 I am aware and have the evidence on Katy's Exposure that on July 15, 2011, this court deemed it  
 10 "frivolous" that all prior courts suppressed the evidence of plaintiff's perjury and threatened to  
 11 sanction Sharon Kramer when she asked that the plaintiff attorney be made to corroborate reason  
 12 given for malice in a libel litigation.

13        15. I am aware that if the court would acknowledge Sharon Kramer's uncontroverted  
 14 evidence in its case file that the prior courts framed her for libel for the words, "*altered his under*  
 15 *oath statements*", suppressed the evidence that Bruce Kelman (author of mold policy for ACOEM  
 16 and the US Chamber) committed perjury to establish reason for malice, falsified court documents  
 17 and computer entries; and then in a second case gagged her from being able to write the exact words  
 18 for which she was framed; the deceptive marketing campaign of the US Chamber of Commerce that  
 19 all claims of illness from WDB are only being made because of "trial lawyers, media and Junk  
 20 Science" would immediately vanish from policy and courtrooms throughout the United States.

21        16. I have read the judgment for Contempt of Court, signed by Judge Thomas Nugent on  
 22 January 19, 2012. It states in relevant part:

23        "Comptemer, with full knowledge of the preliminary injunction, republished the defamatory  
 24 statement [sic, "*altered his under oath statements*"] by posting it on the Internet (i) on the  
 25 Katy's Exposure website on September 13, 2011...(ii)...which linked to an article on  
 26 Katy's Exposure website dated November 3, 2011...(iii) on the Katy's Exposure website  
 27 dated November 4, 2011...(iv.) on the Yahoo Group "Sickbuildings" chatroom on  
 28 November 5, 2011 which linked to an article, also dated November 5, 2011, on the Katy's  
Exposure website (c) That the contemner is sentenced to spend a total of five days in the  
San Diego County jail, pursuant to C.C.P. section 1218(a), which shall be suspended upon  
 the condition that prior to February 6, 2012, contemner publish a retraction on the Katy's  
Exposure website and on the Yahoo Group "Sickbuildings" chatroom of the defamatory



1 statement set forth in the preliminary injunctions. Further, pursuant to C.C.P. section  
 2 1218(a), **contemner is ordered to pay to Plaintiff the attorney's fees and costs incurred by**  
**Plaintiff in this action in the amount of \$19,343.95"**

3 17. I have reviewed the posts made by Sharon Kramer on Katy's Exposure on September  
 4 13, 2011 and the accompanying linked legal documents from the litigation of Kelman & GlobalTox  
 5 v. Kramer, North San Diego Superior Court, Case No. GIN044539; along with the linked letters sent  
 6 to members of California's Judicial Council on September 11, 2011, seeking their help to stop  
 7 harassment by the courts to conceal their past and present misdeeds.

8 18. The September 13, 2011 post is titled, *"Is The California Court Case Management*  
 9 *System (CCMS) Being Misused For Politics In Policy & Litigation.....And The Fleecing Of The*  
 10 *California Taxpayer Over The Mold Issue?"*

11 19. I find nothing inaccurate about this post. It provides the direct evidence that the  
 12 Fourth District Division One Appellate Court crafted their 2006 and 2010 opinions to make the false  
 13 finding of libel with actual malice for the words *"altered his under oath statements"*, falsified court  
 14 documents and computer entries with much the same occurring in the lower courts; and thereby  
 15 aiding continued adverse impact on those injured by WDB, Katy's Exposure blog readers.

16 20. **As the owner of Katy's Exposure I do not give Sharon Kramer permission to**  
 17 **retract the truthful and well evidenced post of September 13, 2011 from Katy's Exposure, "Is**  
 18 **The California Court Case Management System (CCMS) Being Misused For Politics In Policy &**  
 19 **Litigation.....And The Fleecing Of The California Taxpayer Over The Mold Issue?"** Based on  
 20 **the evidence I have posted on Katy's Exposure, the answer appears to be a resounding "Yes".**  
 21

22 21. The November 3, 2011 (November 2, 2011 PST) and November 4, 2011 posts are  
 23 regarding how it continues to be a scientific fraud in public health policy that it is proven WDB do  
 24 not harm because of the California courts' crafting opinions to the false finding of libel with actual  
 25 malice and then gagging Sharon Kramer from writing of what they have done – with the threat of  
 26 litigation for me and incarceration for her.

1       22.    The posts of November 3 & 4 on Katy's Exposure are titled respectively "Texas judge  
2   *abuses his child for Net usage. Cal Courts threaten Katy's Bloggers with jail time for exposing by*  
3   *Net, many children abused by their actions*" and "Texas Judge Won't Be Charged With "Beating  
4   *Into Submission*" To Stop Internet Use. Will California's Leading Judiciaries Ever Be Charged For  
5   *Collectively Trying To Do The Same To Whistle Blowing Bloggers?"*

6       23.    I have reviewed the posts of November 3, 2011 and November 4, 2011 and the  
7    accompanying linked evidence. I find nothing inaccurate or untruthful in the posts. All statements  
8    appear to be well supported by corroborating evidence and discussing litigations that are a matter of  
9    public record, including that the sole cause of action of *Kelman & Globaltox v. Kramer* is the phrase,  
10   *"altered his under oath statements"*.

11       24.    In relevant part, the November 3, 2011 post on my blog states,  
12    The sole claim of the first case was that Sharon Kramer's use of the phrase, "*altered his*  
13    *under oath statements*" in a March 2005 Internet posting was a maliciously false accusation  
14    that Bruce Kelman, author of environmental policy for the US Chamber, committed perjury  
15    on the witness stand in an Oregon trial in February of 2005. The phrase was used by Sharon  
16    in the sentence, "Upon viewing documents presented by the Hayne's attorney of Kelman's  
17    prior testimony from a case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman 'altered his under oath statements' on  
18    the witness stand." The threat to Katy's and to Sharon is that they are not to republish, "*Dr.*  
19    *Kelman altered his under oath statements' when he testified on the witness stand in an*  
20    *Oregon trial*", even when discussing it in the context of a court case that is a matter of  
21    public record. We have never republished the phrase for which Sharon was sued, "*altered*  
22    *his under oath statements*" without discussing it in the context of the case — that is a matter  
23    of public record.

24    Is it just us, or is no one in the United States permitted to write, "*In the matter of Kelman &*  
25    *GlobalTox v. Kramer, Bruce Kelman and GlobalTox, Inc., sued Sharon Kramer for the*  
26    *words, Dr. Kelman 'altered his under oath statements' on the witness stand*"?

27       25.    In relevant part, the November 4, 2011 post on my blog accurately states,  
28    By precluding us from writing the phrase "altered his under oath statements", the words  
29    that are the sole cause of action of the case; the courts are essentially taking a case that is a  
30    matter of public record and deceptively making it a sealed case where we cannot write of  
31    how the courts framed a US citizen for libel while aiding a multi-billion dollar fraud to  
32    continue in public health and workers' comp policies. We cannot publicly evidence what  
33    the courts did to frame a US citizen for libel and are now harassing and threatening to block  
34    the citizen's movement (incarceration for Contempt of Court) to keep their misdeeds from  
35    coming to greater public light.

1       25. As the owner of Katy's Exposure, I do not give Sharon Kramer permission to  
 2 retract these truthful posts of November 3, 2011 and November 4, 2011 from my blog, Katy's  
 3 Exposure. The posts provide direct evidence via linked legal documents of why the California  
 4 courts want Sharon Kramer and I silenced of how they framed a defendant for libel with actual  
 5 malice for a writing impacting public health. Contrary to the courts' attempting to deceptively stop  
 6 public light on what occurred in the cases and continues to occur; these cases are a matter of public  
 7 record as are the linked legal documents from the cases.

8       26. There is no post dated November 5, 2011 on Katy's Exposure Blog to be  
 9 retracted, nor was there ever. The next post made after November 4, 2011, was made on  
 10 December 9, 2012 and is titled, "*MOLD ISSUE: Scientists, Physicians & Citizens Request Joint US*  
 11 *Federal Agency Public Health Advisory*" (Attached Hereto As Exhibit 2, is the November 2011  
 12 Achieve of Katy's Exposure showing no post was made on November 5, 2011)

13       27. On April 30, 2010, I posted a blog on Katy's Exposure titled, "*Truth Out Sharon*  
 14 *Kramer Letter To Andrew Saxon MOLD ISSUE*". An extensive post with many linked documents, it  
 15 may be read online at the short link of <http://wp.me/plYPz-25q>  
 16

17       28. The post details the State of California's involvement in the mass promotion of the  
 18 false concept that it has been scientifically proven moldy buildings do not harm. This would include  
 19 the Regents of the University of California permitting their name to be used on the US Chamber of  
 20 Commerce's, "*A Scientific View of the Health Effects of Mold*", while knowing the paper cites false  
 21 UCLA physician authorship, Dr. Andrew Saxon; and knowing it has been submitted into mold  
 22 litigations in support of Bruce Kelman's (the true author) expert defense witness opinion.

23       29. Beginning in May of 2010, Katy's Exposure began to be visited frequently by several  
 24 from the California judicial branch and the Office of the Regents of the University of California.

25       30. Occurring at the same time, my Blackberry was hacked and my computer invaded to  
 26 the point that I have had difficulty ever since posting to my own blog. I have difficulty getting direct  
 27 Internet access if I try to make connections from my home. My searches are continually re-routed.  
 28



1        31. Sharon Kramer has made posts on Katy's Exposure on my behalf, but only with my  
2 verbal approval. I do not give Sharon Kramer permission to retract any posts that are currently  
3 on Katy's Exposure Blog including but not limited to the posts of September 13, 2011,  
4 November 3, 2011 and November 4, 2011. There is no post ever made on Katy's on November  
5 5, 2011 to be retracted or that was ever linked to a post on Sickbuildings.

6        I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of Texas that the foregoing is true  
7 and correct. This Declaration was executed by me on this 6th day of February, 2012 in Katy, Texas.

8   
9 CRYSTAL STUCKEY  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## Katy's Exposure

Exposing Environmental Health Threats  
& Those Responsible

---

Monthly Archives: November 2011

### Texas Judge Won't Be Charged With "Beating Into Submission" To Stop Internet Use. Will California's Leading Judiciaries Ever Be Charged For Collectively Trying To Do The Same To Whistle Blowing Bloggers?

Posted on November 4, 2011

According to today's Huffington Post, Judge William Adams, a Family Court judge in Texas, will not be charged for abuse that was caught on video tape by his daughter seven years ago, with the video going viral on the ... [Continue reading →](#)

Posted in [Civil Justice](#), [Environmental Health Threats](#), [Health - Medical - Science](#) | Tagged [abuse](#), [Bruce Kolman](#), [California Judicial Council](#), [County Family Courts](#), [Joith McConnell](#), [Keith Schneider](#), [Mold](#), [Richard Hoffman](#), [Sharon Lerner](#), [Texas Judge Abuse](#), [Thomas Robert](#), [US Chamber](#), [Verito](#) | [Leave a comment](#) |

### Texas judge abuses his child for Net usage. Cal Courts threaten Katy's Bloggers with jail time for exposing by Net, many children abused by their actions

Posted on November 4, 2011

This is a VIDEO of a abusive Texas Family Law Judge beating his daughter for using the Internet. So offensively abusive, one must sign into YouTube and be over 18 to view. Our hearts go out to this ... [Continue reading →](#)

Posted in [Civil Justice](#), [Environmental Health Threats](#), [Tamp](#) | Tagged [California Judicial Council](#), [Judge Joith McConnell](#), [Mold](#), [Sharon Lerner](#), [US Chamber](#), [Verito](#) | [1 Comment](#) |

---

Katy's Exposure

Theme: Twenty Ten  
Blog at WordPress.com.





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

5  
6 **SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
7 **FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, NORTH DISTRICT**  
8

9 **BRUCE J. KELMAN,**

10 **Plaintiff**

11 **v.**

12  
13 **SHARON KRAMER,**

14 **Defendant.**

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

**Declaration of Kevin Carstens, Owner & Moderator of Sickbuildings Support Group**

**[Assigned for All Purposes To Hon. Thomas Nugent]**

**Contempt of Court Sentencing Date**

**February 10, 2012, 1:30PM**

15  
16  
17 **Declaration of Kevin Carstens**

18 I, Kevin Carstens, hereby declare as follows:

19 1. I am the owner and moderator of a twenty-eight hundred member online support group  
20 for those injured by biological contaminants found in water damaged buildings (WDB),  
21 Sickbuildings. The web address is: <http://health.groups.yahoo.com/group/sickbuildings/> I reside in  
22 Cornelia, Georgia and have personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein. If sworn as a witness I  
23 could and would testify competently thereto.

24 2. Many of our members have difficulty obtaining medical treatment for their injuries  
25 because of a marketing campaign by the US Chamber of Commerce that began in 2003 and in which  
26 it was mass promoted to US physicians, insurers and the courts that it had been scientifically proven  
27 all claims of illness and death from "toxic mold" were only being made because of "trial lawyers,  
28 media and Junk Science".

Declaration of Kevin Carstens

1           3. I am aware and have the evidence posted on Sickbuildings that the plaintiff in this case,  
2 Bruce J. Kelman, along with his business partner in the corporation of Veritox, Inc., Bryan Hardin,  
3 are the authors of those words that were mass marketed by the US Chamber of Commerce to US  
4 physicians, insurers and to courts. I am aware that Veritox was formerly known as GlobalTox, Inc.

5           4. I am aware and have the evidence posted on Sickbuildings that the defendant in this  
6 case, Sharon Kramer, was the first to publicly write in March of 2005, how the US Chamber of  
7 Commerce, Bruce J. Kelman, his company, Veritox, the Manhattan Institute think-tank, US  
8 Congressman Gary Miller and the occupational medical trade association, the American College of  
9 Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM) were connected in mass marketing the false  
10 concept that it had been scientifically proven people claiming injury from WDB were only doing so  
11 because of "trial lawyers, media and Junk Science".

12           5. I am aware and have the evidence posted on Sickbuilding that Bruce Kelman and  
13 Veritox sued Sharon Kramer in May of 2005 for five words within the first public writing of how it  
14 became a false concept in US public health policy and in US courts that it was scientifically proven  
15 all claims of illness from WDB were only being made because of "trial lawyers, media and Junk  
16 Science". Those five words are *"altered his under oath statements."*

17           6. I am aware and have the direct evidence posted on Sickbuildings that the California  
18 Fourth District Division One Appellate Court issued an anti-SLAPP opinion in November of 2006 in  
19 which they falsely made Sharon Kramer's writing appear to be a libelous accusation that Bruce  
20 Kelman lied on a witness stand about being paid by the Manhatttan Institute think-tank to make edits  
21 to ACOEM's mold position statement of 2002, *"Adverse Human Health Effects Associated With*  
22 *Molds In The Indoor Environment."*

23           7. I am aware and have the direct evidence posted on Sickbuildings that Sharon Kramer's  
24 writing accurately states the exchange of think-tank money to Veritox was for the US Chamber of  
25 Commerce's mold position statement of 2003, *"A Scientific View of the Health Effects of Mold"*.  
26  
27  
28

1           8. I am aware and have the direct evidence posted on Sickbuildings that in 2006, the  
2 Fourth District Division One Appellate Court suppressed the evidence that Bruce Kelman submitted  
3 a false declaration statement under penalty of perjury in September of 2005 to establish a fictitious  
4 theme of why Sharon Kramer would harbor malice for him. Bruce Kelman falsely claimed under  
5 penalty of perjury to have given an expert defense opinion of a nature in 2003 in Sharon Kramer's  
6 lawsuit with her insurer, Mercury Casualty, that caused her to be "*apparently furious that the science*  
7 *conflicted with her dreams of a remodeled home. Kramer launch into an obsessive campaign to*  
8 *destroy the reputations of Dr. Kelman and GlobalTox.*"

9           9. I am aware there is no evidence to corroborate that this testimony in the Mercury case  
10 was ever given by Bruce Kelman or any evidence Sharon Kramer had reason to, or did, harbor  
11 personal ill will for Bruce Kelman stemming from the case.

12           10. I am aware and have the direct evidence posted on Sickbuildings that the Fourth  
13 District Division One Appellate Court issued a second opinion in September of 2010 in which they  
14 concealed they had crafted their 2006 anti-SLAPP opinion to make the false finding that Sharon  
15 Kramer was guilty of libel with actual malice.

16           11. I am aware and have the direct evidence posted on Sickbuildings that numerous court  
17 documents and computer entries were falsified in the case of judgments that were never entered and  
18 concealing who were the actual parties to the litigation, with Bryan Hardin who is a retired Deputy  
19 Director of NIOSH and co-owner of Veritox being an undisclosed party to the litigation.

20           12. I am aware and have the direct evidence posted on Sickbuildings that on May 2, 2011  
21 in a second case, this case, Sharon Kramer was enjoined by Temporary Injunctive Relief Order from  
22 republishing the sole cause of action phrase from the prior case, "*altered his under oath statements*",  
23 the phrase for which the courts had framed her for libel with actual malice in the first case.

24           13. I am aware that if the court would acknowledge Sharon Kramer's uncontroverted  
25 evidence in its case file that the prior courts framed her for libel, suppressed the evidence that Bruce  
26 Kelman (author of mold policy for ACOEM and the US Chamber) committed perjury to establish  
27 reason for malice, falsified court documents and then in a second case gagged her from being able to  
28 write of what they had done; the deceptive marketing campaign of the US Chamber of Commerce

1           13. I have read the judgment for Contempt of Court issued January 19, 2012 which states  
2 in relevant part:

3           “Comptemer, with full knowledge of the preliminary injunction, republished the defamatory  
4 statement [sic, “altered his under oath statements”] by posting it on the Internet....(ii) on the  
5 Yahoo Group “Sickbuildings” chatroom on November 3, 2011 which linked to an article on  
6 the Katy’s Exposure website dated November 3, 2011;...(iv) on the Yahoo Group  
7 “Sickbuildings” chatroom on November 5, 2011, which linked to an article, also dated  
8 November 5, 2011 on the Katy’s Exposure website.... (c) That the contemner is sentenced to  
9 spend a total of five days in the San Diego County jail, pursuant to C.C.P. section 1218(a),  
10 which shall be suspended upon the condition that prior to February 6, 2012, contemner  
11 publish a retraction on the Katy’s Exposure website and on the Yahoo Group  
12 “Sickbuildings” chatroom of the defamatory statement set forth in the preliminary  
13 injunctions. Further, pursuant to C.C.P. section 1218(a), contemner is ordered to pay to  
14 Plaintiff the attorney’s fees and costs incurred by Plaintiff in this action in the amount of  
15 \$19,343.95”

16           14. I have reviewed the posts made by Sharon Kramer on Sickbuildings on November 2,  
17 2011 and November 5, 2011 regarding how it continues to be a scientific fraud in public health  
18 policy that it is proven WDB do not harm because of the California courts’ crafting opinions to the  
19 false finding of libel with actual malice and then gagging Sharon Kramer from writing of what they  
20 have done – with the threat of incarceration by the courts. There is no post made by Sharon Kramer  
21 on this subject on November 3, 2011. The November 5, 2011 Sickbuildings post by Sharon Kramer  
22 does not link to a November 5, 2011 post on Katy’s Exposure because there was no post made on  
23 Katy’s Exposure on that date..

24           15. I have reviewed the post by Sickbuildings member Karen Dean made on November 3,  
25 2011 in reply to Sharon Kramer’s November 2, 2011 post.. **(Attached Hereto Collectively as**  
26 **Exhibit are Sickbuildings November 2, 2011 Message #93617 by Kramer; Reply November 3,**  
27 **2011 by Dean; Message #93706 November 5, 2011 by Kramer, Sickbuildings digest of posts on**  
28 **these days & the November 2011 Achieve of Katy’s Exposure Blog).**

          16. Contrary to the finding that Sharon Kramer is to be incarcerated for one day for a post  
she made on November 3, 2011 for republishing the five words, “altered his under oath statements”,  
my records reflect that Sharon Kramer made no post whatsoever regarding this matter on this date.  
Sickbuildings member, Karen Dean, made a reply post on that date in which she stated,



1 repost and repost Lets post these words everywhere, on every facebook and  
2 blog site, over and over "In the matter of Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer,  
3 Bruce Kelman and GlobalTox, Inc., sued Sharon Kramer for the words, Dr.  
4 Kelman 'altered his under oath statements' on the witness stand"?

5 17. Sharon Kramer does not have the capability to retract posts on Sickbuildings made by  
6 herself or others. As the owner and moderator of Sickbuildings, only I and my assistant, have this  
7 ability.

8 18. **As the owner and moderator of Sickbuildings, I respectfully decline to retract**  
9 **the posts made by Sharon Kramer on November 2 and November 5, 2011.**

10 19. To my extensive knowledge of the issue and the ongoing saga of Kelman v. Kramer,  
11 the posts provide truthful and direct evidence of the California's judicial system illegal and  
12 unconstitutional involvement of why it remains a false concept in US public health policy and in US  
13 courts that it is scientifically proven all claims of illness and death from WDB are only being made  
14 because of "trial lawyers, media and Junk Science". This continues to harm the 2800 members of  
15 Sickbuildings.

16 20. **I respectfully decline to retract the reply post made by Karen Dean on November**  
17 **3, 2011, which accurately states the sole cause of action of Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer is**  
18 **over five words, "altered his under oath statements". This is a matter of public record.**

19 21. If Bruce. Kelman would like to post the direct evidence corroborating the statements  
20 he made under penalty of perjury in declarations of why Sharon Kramer would have reason to harbor  
21 malice for him, I will share the post with the 2800 members of Sickbuildings.

22 22. If the Fourth District Division One Appellate justices would like to post an  
23 explanation to the 2800 members of Sickbuildings of why they crafted their Appellate opinions in  
24 2006 and 2010 to make the false finding of libel with actual malice and suppressed the evidence that  
25 Bruce Kelman committed perjury to establish needed reason for malice, while knowing they were  
26 aiding the marketing campaign of the US Chamber of Commerce to remain in US policy and US  
27 courts, I will share the post with the 2800 members of Sickbuildings.  
28

1           24.    If the clerks of the court would like to post an explanation to the 2800 members of  
2 Sickbuildings of why they falsified court documents and computer entries of judgments never  
3 entered and concealed who were the true parties to the litigation of Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer,  
4 I will share the post with our 2800 members.

5           25.    If Bruce Kelman's attorney, Keith Scheuer, or the clerks of the court or judiciary  
6 would like to post an explanation of how and why Sharon Kramer has an interest accruing lien on her  
7 property for costs incurred by Mr. Scheuer's trial losing client, Veritox, with interest accruing from a  
8 date of three weeks before he even submitted costs, I will share the post with our 2800 members.

9           26.    If this court would like to post an explanation of why it is sentencing Sharon Kramer  
10 to jail for republishing the phrase the prior courts are evidenced in this court's case file to have  
11 framed her for libel with actual malice and with one post for which she is to be jailed not even being  
12 made by her, I will share the court's post with the 2800 members of Sickbuildings.

13           27.    If the Chief Justice of the California Supreme Court, Tani Cantil-Sayauke, would like  
14 to post an explanation of why Sharon Kramer is to be incarcerated for placing the direct evidence on  
15 the Internet, September 13, 2011, November 2, 2011 and November 5, 2011 that the Chief Justice is  
16 aware of the illegalities of these two cases by officers of her courts and its continued adverse impact  
17 on the 2800 members of Sickbuildings, I will share the post with our members.

18           28.    Until the California judicial system, Mr. Kelman and Mr. Scheuer provide an  
19 explanation of why and how the courts found it constitutionally legal to frame a defendant for libel,  
20 suppress the evidence the plaintiff committed perjury, falsify court documents and computer entries,  
21 gag the defendant from republishing the words for which she is evidenced to have been framed by  
22 the courts, and is now going to be incarcerated her for refusing silence of how the courts' actions  
23 continue to harm the 2800 members of Sickbuildings; no posts of Sharon Kramer's or any other  
24 member of Sickbuildings regarding this matter will be retracted.  
25  
26  
27  
28

1           29. I am also aware and have the direct evidence posted on Sickbuildings that in October  
2 of 2005, one month after the first North San Diego County Superior Court judge denied defendant  
3 Sharon Kramer's anti-SLAPP motion in September 2005 while suppressing the evidence that Bruce  
4 Kelman submitted a false declaration statement to establish needed reason for malice; ex-Governor  
5 Arnold Schwarzenegger endorsed the ACOEM mold position statement as written by plaintiff Bruce  
6 Kelman and Bryan Hardin into California's Workers' Compensation "Reform" policy.

7           30. 'I am aware the sole cause of action words of the prior case, "altered his under oath  
8 statements" and the purported reason Sharon Kramer is gagged from writing these words in this case,  
9 is because they were allegedly legally found to be a maliciously false accusation that Bruce Kelman  
10 committed perjury on the witness stand in Oregon. If any judiciary involved in this matter, Mr.  
11 Kelman or Mr. Scheuer would like to post on Sickbuildings what Sharon Kramer falsely and  
12 maliciously accused Bruce Kelman of lying about by her use of that phrase, I will share the post with  
13 our 2800 members who have had a difficult time receiving medical treatment because of  
14 misinformation mass marketed over the mold issue.

15           31. To date, I am *not aware* anyone has been able to state how Sharon Kramer's phrase  
16 "altered his under oath statements" translates into maliciously false accusation of perjury - the sole  
17 cause of action words of the entire seven years worth of litigation and alleged sole words for Sharon  
18 Kramer's impending incarceration.

19           I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of Georgia that the foregoing is true  
20 and correct and that this Declaration was executed by me on this 5th day of February, 2012 in  
21 Cornelia, Georgia.

22   
23 KEVIN CARSTENS  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**Sickbuildings@Yahoogroups.Com Message #93617 November 2, 2011**

Posted by snk1955@aol.com (Sharon Noonan Kramer)

Texas judge abuses his child for Net usage. Cal Courts threaten Katy

Topic  
List  
< Prev  
Topic  
| Next  
Topic >

Reply	Delete	< Prev Message	Next Message >
Texas judge abuses his child for Net usage. Cal Courts threaten Katy's Bloggers with jail time for exposing by Net, many chil. (http://katysexposure.wordpress.com/2011/11/03/texas-judge-abuses-his-child-for-net-usage-cal-courts-threaten-katys-bloggers-with-jail-time-for-exposing-by-net-many-children-abused-by-their-corruption/)			
Sharon Noonan Kramer			

**Sickbuildings@Yahoogroups.Com Reply To Message #93617 November 3, 2011**

Reply	< Prev Message   Next Message >
Posted by "Karen Dean" <kdeanstudios@...>	
repost and repost	
Lets post these words everywhere, on every facebook and blog site, over and over	
"In the matter of Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer, Bruce Kelman and GlobalTox, Inc., sued Sharon Kramer for the words, Dr. Kelman 'altered his under oath statements' on the witness stand"?	
[IN REPLY TO]--- In sickbuildings@yahoogroups.com, snk1955@... wrote:	
>	
> _Texas judge abuses his child for Net usage. Cal Courts threaten Katy's Bloggers with jail time for exposing by Net, many chil. (http://katysexposure.wordpress.com/2011/11/03/texas-judge-abuses-his-child-for-net-usage-cal-courts-threaten-katys-bloggers-with-jail-time-for-exposing-by-net-many-children-abused-by-their-corruption/)	
>	
> Sharon Noonan Kramer	
































Posted by snk1955@aol.com (Sharon Noonan Kramer)

Do U understand? They will put me in jail for using NET 2 show YU ca..

Topic  
List  
< Prev  
Topic  
| Next  
Topic >

<a href="#">Reply</a>   <a href="#">Delete</a>	<a href="#">&lt; Prev Message</a>   <a href="#">Next Message &gt;</a>
<p>Are you all understanding? They are going to put me in jail for evidencing on the internet why YOU can't get medical treatment and have to fight so hard to have your claims properly adjusted. The leadership of the California courts aided to suppress that the ACOEM Mold Statement is BS.</p> <p>We can write all day long of the insurer cost shifting scheme/scientific fraud endorsed into California's workers' comp policy over the mold issue by Governor Schwarzenegger_ (<a href="http://freepdfhosting.com/715a485427.pdf">http://freepdfhosting.com/715a485427.pdf</a>) in 2005 without repeating the phrase, "altered his under oath statements".</p> <p>But what we cannot do without repeating that phrase is evidence how the courts framed an environmental advocate, Sharon Kramer, for libel as they suppressed the evidence that an environmental policy author for the US Chamber of Commerce/ACOEM, Bruce Kelman, committed criminal perjury to establish needed reason for malice while Strategically Litigating Against Public Participation &amp; suppressed the evidence that Kelman's "legal" counsel repeatedly suborned the criminal perjury.</p> <p>We cannot write about and publish what happened in a libel case that is a matter of public record, which this one is, without being able to write what words were claimed to be libelous. That's why the courts, Kelman and his "legal" counsel, are trying to gag us and are threatening us not to "republish" the following sentence, "Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness stand' while he testified as a witness in an Oregon lawsuit."</p> <p>The above is not even a sentence that is found within Sharon Kramer's the purportedly libelous _Internet writing_ (<a href="http://freepdfhosting.com/ff60f5f64b.pdf">http://freepdfhosting.com/ff60f5f64b.pdf</a>) of March 2005, – where she first exposed how it became a fraud in public health policy that it was scientifically proven moldy buildings do not harm.</p> <p>She also named names in this writing of those involved in the mass marketing of the scientific fraud: Bruce Kelman, GlobalTox, Inc., the Manhattan Institute think-tank, US Congressman Gary Miller (R-Ca), the US Chamber of Commerce and the medical policy writing body, the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM). _<a href="http://wp.me/plYPz-3et">http://wp.me/plYPz-3et</a>_ (<a href="http://wp.me/plYPz-3et">http://wp.me/plYPz-3et</a>)</p>	

Messages: Show Message Summaries (Group by Topic)			
	Author	Yahoo! ID	Sort by Date 
93617	<b>Texas judge abuses his child for Net usage. Cal Courts threaten Katy</b>	 snk1955@aol.com	 snk1955 Nov 2, 2011
93618	Re: With the meds the LIVER BURDEN is too great...	Jennifer Pinto	 jbea2011 Nov 2, 2011
93619	Re: With the meds the LIVER BURDEN is too great...	steelroots77	 steelroots77 Nov 2, 2011
93620	Re: ASIC1a Trpa1. - new theory.	osisposis	 osisposis Nov 2, 2011
93621	Re: Avoiding Cross Contamination/killing mold	Carl Grimes	 grimeshh Nov 2, 2011
93622	Re: With the meds the LIVER BURDEN is too great...	Diane	 dianebolton52 Nov 2, 2011
93623	Re: Dr. Mercola How to Recover from Toxic Mold Exposure	em.1002	 em.1002 Nov 2, 2011
93624	Re: With the meds the LIVER BURDEN is too great...	Kristina Townsend	 kmtown2003 Nov 2, 2011
93625	Re: ASIC1a Trpa1. - new theory.	Carl Grimes	 grimeshh Nov 2, 2011
93626	Re: Mold in air ducts?	Gil Vice	 gilvice Nov 2, 2011
93627	Re: ASIC1a Trpa1. - new theory.	Judy Wohlberg	 peedyjudy Nov 3, 2011
93628	Re: Heat	Karen Dean	 carondeen Nov 3, 2011
93629	Re: Mast Cell Degranulation	Jack Dwayne Thrasher,...	 drthrasher12 Nov 3, 2011
93630	Re: Am I overdoing the dehumidifiers?	Carl Grimes	 grimeshh Nov 3, 2011
93631	Re: Dr. Mercola How to Recover from Toxic Mold Exposure	Patilla DaHun	 glypella Nov 3, 2011
93632	Re: Living normal	Linda Bullock	 linda_ed... Nov 3, 2011
93633	Re: ASIC1a Trpa1. - new theory.	urbanpinetrees3	 urbanpinetrees3 Nov 3, 2011
93634	Re: 1992. sorce:neurotoxicity branch, U.S. Army Medical Resea...	snk1955@aol.com	 snk1955 Nov 3, 2011
93635	Re: ERMI/HERTSMI-2 seem to contradict each other	Mystic Tuba	 matilf Nov 3, 2011
93636	Housing	Mystic Tuba	 matilf Nov 3, 2011
93637	repost and repost	Karen Dean	 carondeen Nov 3, 2011
93638	Re: Mold in air ducts?	em.1002	 em.1002 Nov 3, 2011
93639	Re: Mast Cell Degranulation	snk1955@aol.com	 snk1955 Nov 3, 2011
93640	Sisal or jute rugs safe for MCS	jonathanc	 jjcox22 Nov 3, 2011
93641	Re: Living normal	osisposis	 osisposis Nov 3, 2011
93642	Re: 1992. sorce:neurotoxicity branch, U.S. Army Medical Resea...	osisposis	 osisposis Nov 3, 2011
93643	Re: Mast Cell Degranulation	Jack Dwayne Thrasher,...	 drthrasher12 Nov 3, 2011

**Katy's Exposure**

*Exposing Environmental Health Threats  
& Those Responsible*

---

Monthly Archives: *November 2011*

**Texas Judge Won't Be Charged With "Beating Into Submission" To Stop Internet Use. Will California's Leading Judiciaries Ever Be Charged For Collectively Trying To Do The Same To Whistle Blowing Bloggers?**

Posted on [November 4, 2011](#)

According to today's Huffington Post, Judge William Adams, a Family Court judge in Texas, will not be charged for abuse that was caught on video tape by his daughter seven years ago, with the video going viral on the ... [Continue reading →](#)

Posted in [Civil Justice](#), [Environmental Health Threats](#), [Health - Medical - Science](#) | Tagged [acoem](#), [Bruce Kelman](#), [California Judicial Council](#), [Corrupt Family Courts](#), [Judith McConnell](#), [Keith Scheuer](#), [Mold](#), [Richard Huffman](#), [Sharon Kramer](#), [Texas Judge Abuse](#), [Thomas Nugent](#), [US Chamber](#), [Veritox](#) | [Leave a comment](#) |

**Texas judge abuses his child for Net usage. Cal Courts threaten Katy's Bloggers with jail time for exposing by Net, many children abused by their actions**

Posted on [November 3, 2011](#)

This is a VIDEO of a abusive Texas Family Law Judge beating his daughter for using the Internet. So offensively abusive, one must sign into YouTube and be over 18 to view. Our hearts go out to this ... [Continue reading →](#)

Posted in [Civil Justice](#), [Environmental Health Threats](#), [Temp](#) | Tagged [California Judicial Council](#), [Justice Judith McConnell](#), [Mold](#), [Sharon Kramer](#), [US Chamber](#), [Veritox](#) | [1 Comment](#) |

---

Katy's Exposure

*Theme: Twenty Ten  
Blog at WordPress.com.*

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          CASE NUMBER: 37-00061530-CUDFNC  JUDGE: Hon Thomas Nugent DEPT.: 30
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF STREET ADDRESS: 325 S. Melrose Dr. MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: Vista, CA 92081 BRANCH NAME: North San Diego County Superior Court		
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: Bruce Kelman DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: Sharon Kramer		
<b>PROOF OF SERVICE—CIVIL</b> <b>Check method of service (only one):</b> <input type="checkbox"/> By Personal Service <input type="checkbox"/> By Mail <input type="checkbox"/> By Overnight Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> By Messenger Service <input type="checkbox"/> By Fax <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> By Electronic Service		

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

- At the time of service I was over 18 years of age and not a party to this action.
- My residence or business address is:  
2031 Arborwood Place, Escondido, CA 92029
- ☒ The fax number or electronic service address from which I served the documents is (complete if service was by fax or electronic service): MAKramer@aol.com
- On (date): 2/10/12 I served the following documents (specify):  
NOTICE TO COURT, INABILITY TO COMPLY WITH UNLAWFUL ORDER & JUDGMENT OF JANUARY 19, 2012; & 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:

- Name of person served:
- ☐ (Complete if service was by personal service, mail, overnight delivery, or messenger service.)

Business or residential address where person was served:

- ☒ (Complete if service was by fax or electronic service.)

- (1) Fax number or electronic service address where person was served:  
KScheuer@aol.com

- (2) Time of service: Approx 9am

☐ 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):

- ☐ **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: 37-00061530-CUDFNC
--------------------------------	------------------------------------

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*):

- 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: 2/10/12

MICHAEL KRAMER  
(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:

\_\_\_\_\_  
(NAME OF DECLARANT)



\_\_\_\_\_  
(SIGNATURE OF DECLARANT)

Exhibit

2

# CONTEMPT OF COURT

Because the First Amendment, Thousands of Lives  
& Restoring Scruples In California's Judicial Branch  
is WORTH THE FIGHT! Website:  
ContemptOfCourtFor.ME

4		SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	BY: A. LUM
5		FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, NORTH DISTRICT	
6	BRUCE J. KELMAN,		CASE NO. 37-2010-00061530-CU-DF-NC
7			REQUEST FOR EXPARTE RE: COURT'S INTENT
8	Plaintiff		TO REMOVE FALSE CRIMINAL RECORD OF
9	v.		DEFENDANT SHARON KRAMER
10			[Assigned for All Purposes To Hon. Thomas
11	SHARON KRAMER,		Nugent]
			Wrongful Incarceration & False Criminal Record

Search  Search

**Main menu**

**Post navigation**

← Previous

**Bruce Kelman v. Sharon Kramer ~ Request For  
Exparte Re: Court's Intent To Remove False  
Criminal Record Of Defendant Sharon Kramer**

Posted on March 27, 2012

**March 13, 2012 ~ While Mrs. Kramer was  
unlawfully incarcerated and being given  
a false criminal record in the County of  
San Diego, California; Mr. Kelman was  
rendering an "Expert Toxicologist**