

Mrs. Sharon Noonan Kramer  
2031 Arborwood Place  
Escondido, California 92029  
(760) 746-8026  
February 24, 2014

Denise M. Visconti, President,  
and the Directors of  
LGBT San Diego County Bar Association  
1010 University Ave. PMB 137  
San Diego, CA 92103

RE: Please reinstate your endorsement of Carla Keehn for superior court judge.

Dear Directors,

I am writing you today to urge the reinstatement of Tom Homann Legal Association (THLA) endorsement of Carla Keehn for San Diego Superior Court judge. I have two daughters getting married in the coming months. Because of efforts of THLA and like-minded civil rights groups, both of my daughters will have equal rights under the law, as will my new son-in-law and new daughter-in-law. I appreciate your efforts to assure equal rights for my children and all children.

Unfortunately, THLA's recent succumbing to intimidation tactics by its judicial members, Judge Rubin and Judge Rosenstein, to withdrawal support for Ms. Keehn, is harming the civil rights along with the health and safety of children in this county and nationwide. If your fellow THLA member, Ms. Keehn is not supported in her run for seat 20, unethical legacy judge, Lisa Schall, will most likely win the election. If Ms. Keehn is intimidated not to run by ostracizing acts of her peers, this "unopposed win" will be automatic for Schall. The voters will have no say.

A legacy judge appointed in 1985, whose father was also a judge; Lisa Schall has one of the well earned, worst reputations in the entire state for violating the rights of litigants and families who come before her court. I am aware that local attorneys used to commonly refer to her as "The Wicked Witch of the North" before she was removed from her civil law courtroom in Vista, and forced upon the families of San Diego in family law court.

In addition to being a "Mother of the Brides", I am also a nationally recognized advocate for the rights of the environmentally injured. My efforts were instrumental in causing a 2006 Federal Government Accountability Office audit of the current understanding of the health effects of mold, by audit order of the late Senator Edward Kennedy.

In 2005, I published an internet writing exposing how it became a scientific fraud in U.S. public health policies that the toxic components of mold could never reach a level to harm anyone in a water damaged building. The scientific fraud was penned by toxic tort expert defense witnesses for the U.S. Department of Justice (USDOJ); and was mass marketed by the U.S. Chamber Institute for Legal Reform, Manhattan Institute Center for Legal Policy, and several "non-profit" medical associations.

The purpose of mass marketing scientific fraud into policy was to cause environmentally injured families and workers to be unable to obtain restitution from those responsible for their injuries. It is discriminatory, fraudulent proof of lack of causation, for the purpose of misleading the courts. It is still able to be used to sell doubt of liability in the courts, nationwide, because of the acts of Ms. Keehn's opponent for seat 20, Judge Lisa Schall.

The USDOJ experts sued me for libel for the words, "altered his under oath statements" in my 2005 writing to make me appear a liar for exposing the fraud. Judge Schall oversaw the 2008 trial in which the plaintiffs'/experts' science was not permitted to be discussed in front of the jury, as the reason that under oath statements were altered by the USDOJ "expert". As a result of this and other questionable acts of trial judge, Lisa Schall, I was found guilty of libel. This has aided the scientific fraud to continue to this very day in doubt selling policies and well paid, expert court testimonies across the country; while continuing to harm the lives of thousands of environmentally injured workers and families.

Former THLA board member, Shelby Stuntz, was a juror in the 2008 trial. Ms. Stuntz submitted an affidavit on my behalf regarding false hearsay emails deeming me a "cyberstalker" -- for something I never even said and not discussed in trial -- somehow getting past Judge Schall's clerk and read aloud in the jury room. This greatly aided to cause a verdict for a plaintiff/USDOJ expert witness while making me appear to be a liar for exposing fraud. (Attached hereto as Exhibit 1, October 2008 declaration of former THLA BOD member Shelby Stuntz, Esq.) Being aware of the false and character assassinating emails causing a plaintiff verdict, Schall refused to even hear oral argument for a new trial. Strikingly similar to the collusive thug-like tactics by THLA jurists members now being used to guarantee that Judge Schall stays on the bench by threatening retaliation of Schall's opposition and her endorsers; the appellate justices circled the wagons in their 2010 appellate opinion to shield Schall from yet another admonishment from the Commission on Judicial Performance. It is common knowledge that Judge Lisa Schall has had many admonishments for unethical conduct in her lack-luster, twenty-nine year career. (Attached hereto as Exhibit 2, page 3 of my 2009 opening Appellate brief re: Schall's refusal to hear argument for new trial and appellate justice concealment of a void judgment).



While attempting to intimidate me into silence of the severe ethics problems in the San Diego courts – again similar to how THLA is now being intimidated to aid it to continue; in 2012, I was incarcerated for two days by a local judge, now supporting Schall's re-election campaign. The jailing under the pretence that I was in contempt of court was for my refusal to be coerced to sign a false confession. My signature on the proposed false confession would have absolved the collusively criminal acts of Judge Lisa Schall and her fellow jurists aiding USDOJ expert witnesses to continue to fleece the public. I am soon to file a federal lawsuit for honest services fraud and civil rights violations. District Attorney Bonnie Dumanis, who THLA is fund-raising to support her re-election campaign is aware that she is also going to be a named defendant. By no coincidence, Dumanis is publicly endorsing Schall's re-election to the bench. (Attached hereto as Exhibit 3, pages 4-6 of the Notice of Intent to sue Chief Justice Cantil-Sakauye for racketeering with Judge Schall, et. al.)

Is this really what a group carrying the name "Tom Homann" stands for? I, like many people in this county concerned with the health, safety and rights of our children, would like to have the opportunity to remove Judge Schall from the bench via voting her out of office. It is an uphill battle to remove a sitting judge. A civil rights organization first giving and then publicly rescinding support for a well qualified, viable contender for Judge Schall's seat, makes this battle much harder.

That jurist campaign thugs would intimidate THLA to withdrawal support for Ms. Keehn, while knowing this would aid Judge Schall to keep her seat no matter what the voters want, is further evidence of the systemic ethics problems and rights violations in the San Diego courts. THLA succumbing to the intimidation under pretense of making strides for civil rights by good relations with the local courts; in reality aids the continuance of multiple and egregious civil rights violations in this county and nationwide.

As such, I respectfully urge the Directors of Tom Homann Legal Association to reinstate your organizations' endorsement for the well qualified, Carla Keehn, for a San Diego Superior Court jurist seat, in furtherance of free choice and civil rights in America.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

  
Mrs. Sharon Noonan Kramer

Attachments: (3)

cc: Board of Directors, Alliance for California Judges  
Board of Directors, National LGBT Bar Association

# **EXHIBIT**

**1**

1 SHARON KRAMER, PRO PER

2 2031 Arborwood Place

3 Escondido, CA 92029

4 (760) 746-8026

5 (760) 746-7540 Fax

6 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

7 FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

8 BRUCE KELMAN, GLOBALTOX, INC., )

Case No.: GIN 044539

9 Plaintiffs, )

DECLARATION OF SHELBY STUNTZ,  
JUROR NUMBER 5

10 v. )

11 SHARON KRAMER, and DOES 1 through )  
12 20, inclusive, )

[Assigned for All Purposes To Hon.  
Lisa C. Schall, Department 31]

13 Defendants. )

Trial Date: August 18, 2008

14  
15  
16 1. My name is Shelby Stuntz. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in the State of  
17 California.

18 2. In August 2008, I served as a juror in the defamation case brought by Bruce Kelman and  
19 Veritox, Inc. against Sharon Kramer (Case No. GIN044539).

20 3. During deliberations Exhibit #53 was included in the evidence. As I recall, Exhibit #53  
21 included the invoices submitted by Dr. Kelman for work on a paper titled "*A Scientific View Of*  
22 *The Health Effects of Mold*" that his company was paid to do for the US Chamber of Commerce  
23 and the Manhattan Institute.  
24

00000562



1 A number of additional pages were attached to the invoices in Exhibit #53 that appeared  
2 to be unrelated to the invoices and as I recall were never discussed in the trial proceedings.

3 Those additional pages were not introduced as evidence during the trial. They included  
4 emails between a physician, Veritox employees, and Dr. Kelman. I recall one of the  
5 communications described Ms. Kramer as a "cyberstalker". These emails were read aloud in the  
6 jury room on the second day of deliberations.

7 It was not until these emails which described Ms. Kramer as a "cyberstalker" were read  
8 aloud that the vote of the jurors changed from 8 to 4 (in favor of Dr. Kelman) to 10 to 2 (in favor  
9 of Dr. Kelman). Up until that point, the jury spent a number of hours discussing whether Ms.  
10 Kramer acted with malice. After the "cyberstalker" email was read, jurors #11 and #1 changed  
11 their votes in favor of Dr. Kelman and Veritox. These two jurors both stated these emails  
12 illustrated Ms. Kramer acted with malice.

13 I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of California that the foregoing  
14 is true and correct and that this Declaration was executed by me on this 25<sup>th</sup> day of October,  
15 2008 in Long Beach, California

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
Shelby Stuntz

00000563

# **EXHIBIT**

**2**



Appellant is not recognized as a prevailing party in the judgment. Nor is there a judgment that reflects she was awarded costs in a post trial ruling. (Vol.V App.1234-1238)

Within the judgment that is entered, Respondent was awarded costs for both himself and the nonprevailing party GlobalTox. (Vol.9 RT.600-601) Appellant had to first motion to be recognized *as* a prevailing party and motion again to receive her costs, with the courts refunding Appellant \$120 for the additional motions required. (Vol.9 RT.605-606)

Although rulings reflect Appellant prevailed over Globaltox and was awarded costs, the judgment still does not reflect this. (Vol.V App.1234-1238)

On December 12, 2008, Judge Schall's last day to preside over Department 31, she made a ruling recognizing Appellant as prevailing party over GlobalTox, but denied Appellant's motion for judgment notwithstanding the verdict. Judge Schall refused to even hear oral arguments on Appellant's motion for new trial and to strike costs of Respondent. The ruling was not mailed as final until December 16, 2008. (Vol.V App.1075-1077) (Vol.9 RT 575)

Appellant filed a motion for reconsideration of the rulings with Judge Pressman on December 22, 2008.(Vol.V App.1102-1120) On January 7, 2009, Judge Pressman declined to review, stating he had lost jurisdiction as a judgment had been entered on 12/18/08. (Vol.V App.1222-1223)

Appellant can find no record of a judgment entered on that date in the North County records files, nor was she ever noticed of this occurring.



# **EXHIBIT**

**3**

See my April 2013 Emergency Petition for Writ of Mandamus.<sup>10</sup> The JC/AOC heads and involved JC/CJP members are proven to have been made aware on September 11, 2011 of the AOC falsified documents in the first SLAPP suit, concealed by JC members and former CJP Chair, when in their courts.<sup>11</sup> Please, no more delaying the inevitable of having to address your subordinates aiding to cause environmental injury of U.S. citizens and mass cost-shifting onto SSDI, via document falsifications and concealment of them by those who work under your supervision of the California legal system. I am not going away until this massive fraud is stopped.

1. The December 2008 Void Judgment in *Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer*, Case No. GIN044539. (Attached as Exhibit) Void on its face, it states a date of cost award not possible to have occurred to conceal it was ante-dated, twice. **California Chief Justice Cantil-Sayauke and Director of the Administrative Offices of the California Courts Judge Jahr, admitting that this one court document is fraudulent and void to be used for any purpose; will cause the fleecing of the public by Veritox, et.al, to immediately cease.**

2. The December 31, 2008 Abstract of Judgment & January 20, 2009 Lien in *Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer*, Case No. GIN044539. (Attached as Exhibit) It states interest accruing costs awarded on its face to Mr. Kelman before costs were even submitted by plaintiffs' counsel, Mr. Scheuer. It is founded on the Void Judgment before it was backdated the second time and is contradictory to the current face of the Void Judgment.

3. The December 20, 2010 Remittitur in *Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer*, Appellate Case No. D054496. It awards costs to undisclosed "Respondents" when only one "Respondent" was a disclosed, Mr. Kelman. It conceals that retired US Asst Surgeon General, Bryan Hardin, is a party, and has been known to the appellate justices to be improperly undisclosed since June of 2006, when he also was not disclosed in the anti-SLAPP.

4. The April 5, 2012 Minute Order in *Kelman v. Kramer* Case No. 37-2010-00061530 CU-DF-NC. It was used to give me a false FBI record to conceal I was incarcerated and first given a false criminal record for refusing to commit criminal perjury, by order of a judge who knew his court had no subject matter jurisdiction.

5. The June 12, 2013 Notice sent by an AOC employee from a non-existent "The Court", used to aid a judge to obfuscate from providing impossible evidence of his prior court having subject matter jurisdiction.

#### **Greater Detail of How the Five Documents Were Falsified and Falsifications Used**

1. The December 2008 Void Judgment in *Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer*, Case No. GIN044539.<sup>12</sup> A legal document that has been signed by a judge cannot be changed by an AOC employee without dating and initialing the change. It becomes a void legal document not able to be used for any purpose should this occur. This Void Judgment states on its face that costs were awarded on a date not possible, "\$7,252.65 12/18/08 mgarland". Falsifications to the document via two back datings by the AOC employee deputy clerk Michael Garland were used by the lower court employees.

First, it was changed to aid Mr. Kelman, the five additional owners of Veritox, and Mr. Scheuer, to record a fraudulent 1/20/09 Lien on my property with interest accruing from a date not possible, 09/24/08. Then back-dated again by Mr. Garland for the lower court presiding judge to falsely claim loss of jurisdiction on 01/07/09. I was not noticed by Mr. Garland or Mr. Scheuer of Judge Schall's signing the document on 9/24/08.

<sup>10</sup> 4/11/13 Link to my Emergency Petition For Writ Of Mandamus in its entirety <http://wp.me/p20mAH-nZ>

<sup>11</sup> 9/11/11 Link to letters I sent to JC Chair, AOC Director, JC members & CJP Chair begging they stop the public defrauding & harassment of me via AOC falsified documents/CCMS entries. <http://wp.me/plYPz-3aV>

<sup>12</sup> 2008 Void Judgment in its current form. Amended 10/28/11, one year after the second harassing litigation began, to acknowledge I was a trial prevailing party. It is still void on its face "\$7,252.65 mgarland 12/18/08", yet numerous court officers have refused to vacate it as they continue to use it, coram non iudice <http://freepdfhosting.com/786b95b2bf.pdf>



The undisputed direct evidence proves that the Lien recorded by Mr. Kelman and Mr. Scheuer is contradictory to the face of the Void Judgment. Concealed as void by the appellate justices in their 9/14/10 Appellate Opinion; on 11/04/10 Mr. Kelman and Mr. Scheuer submitted the Void Judgment as the sole foundational document to a second harassing litigation *Kelman v. Kramer* Case No. 37-2010-00061530 CU-DF-NC. The Lien they recorded states that interest accruing costs were first awarded by judgment on 9/24/08. The Void Judgment, sole foundational document to the second harassing case, states 12/18/08.

Contrary to what is written on the face of the Void Judgment, the sole foundational document to the second harassing case; the electronic case record, Register of Action (ROA), establishes by sequential numbering that nothing occurred in the case of *Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer*, GIN044539 on 12/18/08.<sup>13</sup> (Attached as Exhibit)

What gave Mr. Scheuer and his clients, Mr. Kelman and the five additional owners of Veritox, the ability to record the fraudulent Lien, is that the dollar amount of \$7,252.65 was filled in on the Void Judgment by AOC employee, Mr. Garland, without initialing or dating. This occurred after Mr. Scheuer submitted his clients' costs on 10/14/08, including \$3,626.33 incurred by his trial losing client, Veritox', commingled as being costs of Mr. Kelman's.

Mr. Garland's addition of the dollar amount of \$7,252.65 awarding the costs to Mr. Kelman without initialing or dating, made the Void Judgment appear that the interest accruing costs were awarded on 9/24/08 when Judge Schall signed Mr. Scheuer's proposed judgment, with a blank left for the awarding of costs to Mr. Kelman.

Nowhere on the judgment was there a place for my costs as trial prevailing party over Veritox to be filled in. I was a trial prevailing party, noticed to the court and Mr. Scheuer as being self represented on 9/15/08, nine days before Judge Schall signed the Void Judgement. In violation of C.C.P.664.5(b), AOC employee Mr. Garland failed to notice me that Judge Schall signed the proposed judgment on 9/24/08. I have yet to see any Notice of Entry of Judgment that was sent to Mr. Scheuer from Mr. Garland of Judge Schall's signature, 9/24/08.

The way I became aware that Judge Schall signed it, was by an acquaintance who had seen it posted on Veritox's website. To lawfully record an Abstract of Judgment of that date, there needs to be a Notice of Entry of Judgment of that date. No such document exists and the fact that post trial motions were heard on 12/12/08, more that 60 days later, establishes that 9/24/08 is not the Judgment Date. Mr. Scheuer attached a differing dated Notice several times throughout these litigations. In May of 2011, he mailed the Void Judgment and the differing dated Notice, to a blog owner in Texas to threaten her with litigation should she continue to blog of the matter.

Sometime on or after 12/22/08 when the Void Judgment was submitted back to the court for Abstract recording by Mr. Scheuer; "mgarland 12/18/08" was added by AOC employee Mr. Garland next to the dollar amount that he had filled in earlier in mid October 2008, without initialing or dating to make it appear that costs were awarded on 9/24/08. The on/after 12/22/08 backdated addition of "mgarland 12/18/08" on the Void Judgment was then used for the presiding judge of the lower court, Judge Joel Pressman, to claim loss of jurisdiction to be able to hear my timely filed 12/22/08 motion for reconsideration under the false pretence that an amended judgment had been entered on 12/18/08.

There is additional evidence that you have in your possession corroborating the material AOC employee judgment falsifications concealed by officers of the courts including by JC members. I.e. date of Presiding Justice Judith McConnell's acceptance of appellate court jurisdiction on 1/14/09, etc. Acts of lower court officers relying upon the falsifications of the Void Judgment by acts of AOC employee, Mr. Garland, which forced me to have to file an appeal in January of 2009.

---

<sup>13</sup> 12/18/08 CCMS Register of Action (ROA) <http://freepdfhosting.com/64f7288471.pdf>



This is in the same appellate court where Presiding Justice Judith McConnell went out of her way to frame me for libel for the words, "altered his under oath statements" in her 2006 anti-SLAPP opinion. She suppressed the direct evidence that the plaintiff, Mr. Kelman, committed perjury to manufacture reason for personal malice. She concealed the direct evidence that Mr. Hardin was an undisclosed party. She concealed that Veritox's bogus science had been thrown out of a Sacramento court in April of 2006 by absurd stated reason that the evidence had not been presented in the lower court in 2005. (See fn.8,10,11,16)

2. The December 31, 2008 Abstract of Judgment & January 20, 2009 Lien in *Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer*, Case No. GIN044539 with the interest accruing costs awarded on its face before costs were even submitted by Mr. Scheuer<sup>14</sup>. Recorded in San Diego County by Mr. Kelman and Mr. Scheuer, they award interest accruing costs of \$7,253.65 to Mr. Kelman from the date of 9/24/08. This is three weeks before Mr. Scheuer submitted his clients' commingled costs as being those of Mr. Kelman's on 10/14/08. In order to obtain the Lien, Mr. Scheuer received the Abstract from the court and would have seen that it was fraudulent before he recorded the fraudulent Lien. He already knew the Abstract would be fraudulent. He submitted the Void Judgment to obtain the fraudulent Abstract. This alone proves that Mr. Scheuer knowingly record a fraudulent Lien on my property.

The fraudulent Lien was recorded on 1/20/09. It is based on the false 12/31/08 Abstract of Judgment issued by an AOC employee, based on Mr. Scheuer submitting the known Void Judgment for abstract recording on 12/22/08, based on a dollar amount being added in mid 10/08 to the Void Judgment by AOC employee Mr. Garland without initialing or dating the change to the document signed by Judge Schall on 9/24/08 without legally noticing me under C.C.P.664.5(b). Noted in item #1 above, the Void Judgment with "mgarland 12/18/08 " added next to the dollar amount on/after 12/22/08 when Mr. Scheuer submitted it for abstract recording, was submitted by Mr. Scheuer and Mr. Kelman as the sole foundational document for the second litigation, *Kelman v. Kramer* Case No. 37-2010-0006-1530 CU-DF-NC, 11/04/10. The Void Judgment is contradictory to 1/20/09 Lien. The Lien and ROA both substantiate that "mgarland 12/18/08" is fraudulent and the Judgment is Void.

**Corroborated by the case file, the felony Penal Code 134 violations by Mr. Kelman and Mr. Scheuer, establish by the discrepancy between the known fraudulent Lien they recorded and the face of the Void Judgment proves that Mr. Scheuer and Mr. Kelman knowingly submitted an AOC employee falsified, Void Judgment as the sole foundational document to the second harassing litigation, *Kelman v. Kramer* Case No. 37-2010-00061530; and that they knowingly submitted an AOC employee falsified Abstract of Judgment to record a fraudulent Lien on my property with the San Diego County Recorder.**

You also have the direct evidence that three Appellate Justices of the Fourth District Division One Appellate Court (4<sup>th</sup>1<sup>st</sup>), including Justice Huffman who was Chairman of the Executive Committee of the JC at the time, concealed that the 2008 judgment was void in their 9/13/10 appellate opinion. Chief Justice Ronald George, refused for the California Supreme Court to hear the matter in December of 2010 (for the second time).

You have the direct evidence that officers of the courts, Mr. Kelman and Mr. Scheuer then used the Void Judgment as the sole foundational document to the second case to try to silence me of the frauds upon the court; and the AOC falsified court documents in the first SLAPP suit; and to conceal the harm to me and the public. No court has had subject matter jurisdiction in either case while concealing, yet continuing to use, the Void Judgment since it was change in mid-October 2008 by AOC employee, Mr. Garland, without initialing or dating -- actually as of 9/24/08, when he failed to notice all prevailing parties under C.C.P.664.5(b) of Judge Schall's signature.

---

<sup>14</sup> 12/31/08 Abstract of Judgment & 1/20/09 Lien recorded by Mr. Kelman & Mr. Scheuer. It is contradictory to the 2008 Void Judgment they submitted as sole foundation to 2<sup>nd</sup> harassing case in violation of Penal Code 134 (see Item #1, footnote 12) <http://freepdfhosting.com/65ee1006af.pdf>