

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.