

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".

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 Manhanntan 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*
3 *Plaintiff in this action in the amount of \$19, 343.95*"

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

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

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

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

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
that are the sole cause of action of the case; the courts are essentially taking a case that is a
matter of public record and deceptively making it a sealed case where we cannot write of
how the courts framed a US citizen for libel while aiding a multi-billion dollar fraud to
continue in public health and workers' comp policies. We cannot publicly evidence what
the courts did to frame a US citizen for libel and are now harassing and threatening to block
the citizen's movement (incarceration for Contempt of Court) to keep their misdeeds from
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

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

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

CRYSTAL STUCKEY

SCHEUER & GILLETT
a law corporation
4640 Admiralty Way, Suite 402
Marina Del Rey, California 90292
Tel.: (310) 577-1170
Fax: (310) 301-0035
email: Kscheuer@aol.com

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:

This firm represents Dr. Bruce Kelman in the above-referenced lawsuit. As I suspect you are aware, Dr. Kelman obtained a judgment for libel against Sharon Kramer after a trial in 2008, and recently obtained a preliminary injunction against her in the above referenced action. Copies of the judgment and preliminary injunction are attached for your reference.

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.

They should at least spell names right on legal notices, well - illegal that is. 'Ha'

Crystal Stuckey

Katy's Exposure

MAY 02 2011

BY: A. LUM

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 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9 FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, NORTH DISTRICT

10 BRUCE J. KELMAN,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 SHARON KRAMER, and DOES 1
14 through 20, inclusive,

15 Defendants.

) CASE NO.:

) 37-2010-00061530-CU-DF-NC

) Assigned for All Purposes to:

) HON. THOMAS P. NUGENT

) DEPARTMENT: N-30

) UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE

) [APRIL 27, 2011 REVISED

) ~~PROPOSED~~ PRELIMINARY

) INJUNCTION

Hearing Dates: April 1 and 14,
2011

Department: N-30

18 This matter came on regularly for hearing on April 1,
19 2011, in Department N-30 of the above Court, the Honorable
20 Thomas P. Nugent, Judge presiding. Keith Scheuer, Esq. of
21 Scheuer & Gillett appeared on behalf of Plaintiff Bruce J.
22 Kelman. Defendant Sharon Kramer appeared on her own behalf.
23 On April 14, 2011, the Court heard plaintiff Bruce J.
24 Kelman's ex parte application to correct a clerical error in
25 the minute order and took the matter under submission.
26
27

1 The Court, having taken the matter under submission and
2 having fully considered the arguments of all parties, both
3 written and oral, as well as the evidence presented, rules
4 as follows:

5 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, during the pendency of this
6 action, defendant Sharon Kramer is enjoined and restrained
7 from stating, repeating or publishing, by any means
8 whatsoever, the following statement:
9

10 "Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the
11 witness stand" while he testified as a witness in an
Oregon lawsuit.

12 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, before this order may take
13 effect, plaintiff Bruce J. Kelman must file a written
14 undertaking in the sum of \$5,000 as required by California
15 Code of Civil Procedure section 529, for the purpose of
16 indemnifying the defendant for the damages she may sustain
17 by reason of the issuance of this preliminary injunction if
18 the Court finally decides that the plaintiff is not entitled
19 to it. The preliminary injunction shall issue on plaintiff's
20 filing of such written undertaking.
21

22 The Court reserves jurisdiction to modify this
23 injunction as the ends of justice may require.
24

25 MAY 0 22011

26 THOMAS A. BERGENT
Judge of the Superior Court

MAY 02 2011

PROOF OF SERVICE

BY: A. LUM

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 4640 Admiralty Way, Suite 402, Marina Del Rey, California 90292. On April 27, 2011, I served the foregoing [APRIL 27, 2011 REVISED PROPOSED] PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION on the interested parties in this action by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed as follows:

Sharon Kramer
2031 Arborwood Place
Escondido, CA 92029

[X] BY MAIL -- I caused each such envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid to be placed in the United States mail at Marina Del Rey, California. I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice, it would be deposited in the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Marina Del Rey, California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

[] BY FACSIMILE—I sent such document from facsimile machine (310) 301-0035 on April 27, 2011. I certify that said transmission was completed and that all pages were received and that a report was generated by said facsimile machine that confirms the transmission and receipt. I thereafter mailed a copy to the interested party by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed to the party listed above.

EXECUTED on April 27, 2011 at Marina Del Rey, California.

[X] (STATE) - I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Keith Scheuer

F I L E D
Clerk of the Superior Court

SEP 24 2008

By: M. GARLAND, Deputy

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

BRUCE J. KELMAN,)	CASE NO. GIN044539
GLOBALTOX, INC.,)	Assigned for All Purposes to:
)	HON. LISA C. SCHALL
Plaintiffs,)	DEPARTMENT 31
)	UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE
v.)	Case filed: May 16, 2005
)	
SHARON KRAMER, and DOES 1)	^{ing} [PROPOSED] JUDGMENT
through 20, inclusive,)	
)	Trial Date: August 18, 2008
Defendants.)	Department: N-31
)	

This action came on regularly for trial by jury on August 18, 2008, with Plaintiffs appearing in person and by Keith Scheuer, Esq. of Scheuer & Gillett, and Defendant appearing in person and by Lincoln Bandlow, Esq. of Spillane Shaeffer Aronoff Bandlow. A jury of 12 persons was duly impaneled and sworn, witnesses testified, and after being duly instructed by the Court, the jury deliberated and thereon duly returned the following special verdicts:

1 1. That Defendant Sharon Kramer acted wrongly by
2 making the following statement: "Dr. Kelman altered his under
3 oath statements on the witness stand" while he testified as a
4 witness in an Oregon lawsuit; that Kramer made the above
5 statement to persons other than Kelman; that the persons to
6 whom the statement was made reasonably understood that the
7 statement was about Bruce Kelman; that persons who read the
8 statement reasonably could have understood it to mean that
9 Kelman had committed the crime of perjury or testified
10 falsely while on the witness stand; that the statement was
11 false; that Kelman proved, by clear and convincing evidence,
12 that Kramer knew the statement was false, or had serious
13 doubts about the truth of the statement; and that Kelman be
14 awarded a monetary sum of nominal damages in the amount of
15 \$1.00 (one dollar and no cents).
16
17

18 2. That Kramer made the statement to persons other
19 than GlobalTox, Inc., and that the persons to whom the
20 statement was made did not reasonably understand that the
21 statement was about GlobalTox.
22

23 NOW THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that
24 Plaintiff Bruce Kelman recover the sum of \$1.00 (one dollar
25 and no cents) as nominal damages from Defendant Sharon
26
27
28

1 Kramer, and costs in the amount of \$ 7,252.65 ^{mganand 12/18/08.}, and that
2 Plaintiff GlobalTox, Inc. recover nothing in this action.

3
4 Dated: 9/24/08


Judge of the Superior Court

LISA C. SCHALL

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.*