

Oct 22, 2012 attempted to file this in
Dept 28 as per direction of Judge Maas
Dept was closed Sharon Kramer

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

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

BRUCE J. KELMAN & GLOBALTOX, INC.,
including Officers of the Court concealed
GLOBALTOX owner, BRYAN D. HARDIN,
who is a retired U.S. Assistant Surgeon General
& Deputy Director of Centers for Disease
Control & Prevention, National Institute for
Occupational Safety and Health "CDC NIOSH"

Plaintiffs,

v.

SHARON KRAMER

Defendant

CASE NO. GIN044539

MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION TO
VACATE VOID JUDGMENT OF
SEPTEMBER 24, 2008; MEMORANDUM
OF POINTS & AUTHORITIES;
DECLARATION OF SHARON KRAMER

[Assigned for All Purposes To Hon. EARL
H. MAAS III, Department 28]

Filed May 2005

Motion Hearing Date: To Be Determined

In lawful accordance with Code of Civil Procedure 1209(b)¹, this Motion for
Reconsideration may be read online at the blog, ContemptOfCourtFor.ME <http://wp.me/p20GZ5-4>

It is supported by the case records of this case and the companion case of Bruce J. Kelman
v. Sharon Kramer, Case No. 37-2010-00061530-CU-DF-NC, North San Diego County Superior
Court Department 30. Both case records are chalked full of direct evidence of collusive fraud on the
court by officers of the court, plaintiffs and clerks. As such, there are two questions of law before
This Court:

**By law, must a trial court vacate a known void judgment after a known
falsified remittitur has issued jurisdiction back from the appellate court and
the appellate court has refused to recall and rescind the known falsified
remittitur? -- which is being used to conceal the judgment is known to officers
of the court, plaintiffs and clerks be fraudulent and while confusing who hold
jurisdiction to vacate the known void judgment.**

¹ C.C.P.1209(b) A speech or publication reflecting upon or concerning a court or an officer thereof shall not
be treated or punished as a contempt of the court unless made in the immediate presence of the court while in
session and in such a manner as to actually interfere with its proceedings."

1 Is This Court accountable to the defendant, to due process of law, to the public
2 and to the sworn oath to uphold the Constitution to vacate the known void
3 judgment when officers of the reviewing court, including the presiding justice
4 and clerk of the appellate court, are established by direct evidence to be
5 operating outside the law, and with other courts attempting to aid to conceal
6 their misconduct?

7 October 22, 2012

8 Sharon Kramer
9 Sharon Kramer, Pro Per

10 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS & AUTHORITIES

11 I.
12 Background

13 The uncontroverted evidence of two cases is that the void judgment and falsified remittitur
14 from this case are being used as the foundational legal documents to a second case that is attempting
15 to permanently enjoin the defendant from exposing fraud on the court by officers of the court,
16 plaintiffs and clerks in both the first and second cases. The void judgment and falsified remittitur are
17 aiding and abetting the continuance of false science in public policy and U.S. courts in financially
18 motivated hate crimes against U.S. environmentally disabled, dying and the defendant.

19 This is because the defendant's writing in question is the first to publicly expose how a
20 false scientific concept was mass marketed into U.S. public health policy that it was scientifically
21 proven contaminants in water damaged buildings do not harm; involving the plaintiffs and for the
22 express purpose to mislead U.S. courts to deny liability for causation of environmental illness.

23 In seven and a half years time, there is no evidence in the case record of either libel case
24 that the defendant Sharon "Kramer" committed libel with actual malice. There is no evidence she
25 does not hold subject belief in the validity of her words "altered his under oath statements" were an
26 accurate description of the plaintiff Bruce "Kelman" weaseling on a witness stand in Oregon in an
27 attempt to conceal the mass marketing of scientific fraud involving a think-tank "Manhattan
28 Institute"; a medical association "ACOEM, a congressman from California "Gary Miller (R-Ca)";
the plaintiffs; and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Yet, by wrongfully deeming Kramer to be a
malicious liar over the words, "altered his under oath statements" in the first public writing exposing

1 the fraud; officers of the courts knowingly cast wrongful doubt that the plaintiffs' science is indeed a
2 fraud on the court as first exposed by defendant Kramer's in the writing in question.

3 There is also no question that the judgment of September 24, 2008 and remittitur of
4 December 20, 2010 are fraudulent and void. This is corroborated by This Court amending the
5 judgment on October 28, 2011 one year after the fraudulent remittitur issued back to This Court. It is
6 also corroborated by the December 31, 2008 Abstract of Judgment which substantiates the judgment
7 was antedated by the clerk of the court, once before the Abstract was recorded and once after. It is
8 also corroborated by the submission of costs of plaintiff Kelman, submitted three weeks after interest
9 begins to accrue by lien and containing costs incurred by trial loser, Veritox.

10 The remittitur is corroborated to be fraudulent again by the judgment being amended by
11 This Court after appeal and by stating "Respondents" on appeal, when only one "Respondent",
12 Kelman, was disclosed on the 2009 Certificate of Interested Persons. The Appellate Opinion of
13 September 2010 is corroborated to be fraudulent as it states a judgment with costs awarded to the
14 defendant that was in reality never entered and known not to have been entered by the appellate
15 officers of the court. Provided in prior briefs, there are other corroborating factors on the record
16 before This Court, corroborating that the void judgment is known to be void and the remittitur is
17 known to be fraudulent by officers of the courts, plaintiffs and clerks.

18 In the second case which is founded on this case, in March of 2012 Kramer was
19 incarcerated for refusing to be coerced to sign a false confession of being guilty of libel with actual
20 malice. As she was unlawfully incarcerated, she was also unlawfully strip searched. She became ill
21 from having to clean the bathrooms of approximately 80 tweakers, heroine addicts and prostitutes.

22 While she was incarcerated, her alleged civil contempt morphed into a criminal
23 misdemeanor. There is evidence of the court's willful intent to give Kramer a false criminal record
24 so the court could "get her downtown to the psychiatric unit" under Penal Code 1368 for the purpose
25 of deeming her a mentally incompetent criminal liar to conceal officer of the court, plaintiff and
26 clerk of the court, fraud on the court.

1 The Sheriff Department record was also falsified by the court to libel Kramer and conceal
2 Kramer was incarcerated for refusing coercion into fraud and perjury – not for alleged violation^{0&} a
3 lawful civil contempt of an alleged civil court order.

4 When she wrote again on the ongoing harassment in April of 2012 in lawful accordance
5 with C.C.P.1209(b), of what has occurred by collusive misconduct by officers of the courts, plaintiffs
6 and clerks; the court held her in contempt of court, threatened to incarcerate her again and sanctioned
7 her \$3000.00. The court also ordered she must publish a false confession on the internet for a
8 sentence she never wrote – while knowing the court lacked subject matter jurisdiction because the
9 judgment from this case is fraudulent and void to be used for any purpose; and the court had lost any
10 jurisdiction it may have had by incarcerating, libeling via false public records and causing bodily
11 harm to a U.S. citizen for refusing to commit perjury to aid to defraud the public.

12 The court also held a trial in June 2012, which Kramer refused to attend because the court
13 failed to establish it held jurisdiction and had already caused her false imprisonment, bodily harm,
14 emotional distress, more libeling and fear for her physical safety for daring to expose fraud in policy
15 and fraud by officers of the court. (Kramer was not informed the court proceeded with trial until
16 three days after the trial.)

17 The judge who oversaw Kelman v. Kramer from November 2010 to October 12, 2012 has
18 since lost his court with a new court now up to bat to do the bait and switch of who has legal subject
19 matter jurisdiction, when officer of the court fraud on the court is rampant and incestuous.

20 On September 20, 2012, Defendant Kramer filed a Motion to Vacate the known Void
21 Judgment of September 24, 2008 from the first case in This Court.²

22 On September 28, 2012, Scheuer filed an Opposition³

23 On October 3, 2012, Kramer filed a Reply to the Scheuer/Kelman/GlobalTox opposition.⁴

24 On October 11, 2012 This Court issued a Tentative Ruling denying Kramer's Motion.⁵

25
26 ² Sept 20, 2012 Kramer's Motion To Vacate Void Judgment
<http://freepdfhosting.com/c88675ba9a.pdf>

27 ³ Sept 28, 2012 Scheuer's Opposition <http://freepdfhosting.com/543fbb3c7f.pdf>

28 ⁴ Oct 3, 2012 Kramer's Reply <http://freepdfhosting.com/6b4b27e292.pdf>

⁵ Oct 11, 2012, Court's Tentative <http://freepdfhosting.com/cfe49aa785.pdf>

1 Oral arguments were held on October 12, 2012, where This Court stated it did not hold
2 jurisdictional authority to vacate the void judgment after appeal; and thus could not stop the
3 relentless harassment of Kramer that she prayed This Court would make stop.

4 Kramer disagreed with This Court's understanding of authority to right wrongs when
5 collusive fraud on the court had been committed by officers of the court, plaintiffs and clerks aiding
6 financially motivated hate crimes to continue throughout the U.S. and against Kramer for exposing
7 fraud.

8 This Court graciously allowed Kramer ten days to submit legal authority and reference
9 showing that by law, This Court does have judicial authority and must vacate the void judgment that
10 is the foundational document for all of this continued fraud on the courts, fraud on the public and
11 continued relentless harassment of Kramer. By the direct and uncontroverted evidence on record,
12 there can be no question in This Court that the judgment is void. The only question in the presiding
13 judge's mind is if This Court, by law, can and must vacate it.

14 II 15 Argument

16 A. A Court may set aside a void order at any time, particularly when a fraud on the court has 17 occurred by officers on the court and litigants, on appeal.

18 The December 2010 remittitur is fraudulent to conceal that the judgment is void and awards
19 costs to Kelman that were incurred by trial losers Veritox, including Hardin, who the Appellate
20 Court concealed was a party to the litigation in the anti-SLAPP opinion of 2006.

21 The following is word-smithing by the Appellate Court in their September 2010 Appellate
22 Opinion, regarding the void judgment and establishing they knew they did not hold jurisdiction
23 because the judgment was void. They were trying to conceal judicial misconduct in the appellate
24 court when rendering the anti-SLAPP opinion of November 2006 and to conceal falsification of the
25 judgment document by the lower court after trial: *"Thus any disagreement we might entertain with*
26 *respect to our prior disposition would be no more than that: a disagreement. Given that*
27 *circumstance and the fact that only nominal damages were awarded against Kramer, the value of*
28 *promoting stability in decision making far outweighs the value of any reevaluation of the merits of*

1 *our prior disposition.* "Stability in decision making" is a euphemism of collusive fraud on the court
2 by officers of the court, plaintiffs and clerks. And *"The jury found that Kramer did not libel*
3 *GlobalTox and judgment against GlobalTox was entered."* FALSE. No such judgment had been
4 entered, providing clear evidence of officer of the court intent to commit fraud on the court by falsely
5 stated the judgment entered.

6 "[A] court may set aside a void order at any time. An appeal will not prevent the court
7 from at any time lopping off what has been termed a dead limb on the judicial tree -- a void order."
8 (*MacMillan Petroleum Corp. v. Griffin* (1950) 99 Cal. App. 2d 523, 533 [222 P.2d 69]; accord:
9 *People v. West Coast Shows, Inc.* (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 462, 467 [89 Cal. Rptr. 290]; *Svistunoff v.*
10 *Svistunoff* (1952) 108 Cal. App. 2d 638, 641-642 [239 P.2d 650]; and see: 6 Witkin, *Cal. Procedure*
11 *(2d ed. 1971) Appeal, § 7, pp. 4024-4025.*)

12 **B. There is no statute of limitations for a court who has always held jurisdiction to prevent**
13 **that court from vacating a known void judgment.**

14 As This Court is aware, Kramer only filed an appeal in January of 2009, because she could
15 not get straight answer of what court held jurisdiction, with three courts overseeing the case in a
16 matter of weeks between mid-December 2008 and beginning of January 2009. There is no rhyme or
17 reason of why this case went from the trial judge (who substituted in shortly after the prior presiding
18 judge of Department 28 retired), to the presiding North County Superior Court judge, (who oversaw
19 the case when the trial judge was transferred), to yet a fourth court; when Department 28, This Court,
20 has always held original jurisdiction of the case. This Court's continued jurisdiction is evidenced by
21 the electronic record of the case and is why This Court is now overseeing the matter.

22 The fourth court issued a ruling in April of 2009 that found Kramer prevailed and was
23 entitled to costs, but refused to amend the judgment – even when plaintiff counsel, Scheuer,
24 submitted a proposed amendment to the void judgment. Proving yet again that plaintiff counsel
25 knows the judgment is void and plaintiffs have been benefiting from improvidently entered orders.

26 The judgment was provably void when the game of "musical courts" was being played in
27 the lower court in 2009 and it is still void today. As such, the Appellate Court acted in excess of
28

1 jurisdiction to render an opinion, let alone a fraudulent one concealed by a fraudulent remittitur
2 concealing the judgment is void.

3 “Uncontradicted and unimpeached evidence is generally accepted as true.” (*Garza v.*
4 *Workmen’s Comp. App. Bd.* (1970) 3 Cal.3d 312 317-318 [90 Cal.Rptr. 355]; *Keulen v. Workers’*
5 *Comp. Appeals Bd.*, *supra*, 66 Cal.App.4th at p. 1099.)

6 **This Court always held jurisdiction and now continues to hold that same jurisdiction.**
7 **It must, by law, vacate the known void judgment that the Appellate Court and musical judges**
8 **have collectively attempted to conceal is void.**

9 “It is true that the statute of limitations does not apply to a suit in equity to vacate a void
10 judgment.” (*Cadenasso v. Bank of Italy*, *supra*, p. 569; *Estate of Pusey*, 180 Cal. 368, 374 [181 P.
11 648].) This rule holds as to all void judgments, in two other cases, *People v. Massengale* and *In re*
12 *Sandel*, the courts hearing the respective appeals confirmed the judicial power and **responsibility** to
13 correct void judgments (in excess of jurisdiction).

14 A further citation on appeal states “A ‘void’ judgment, as we all know, grounds no rights,
15 forms no defense to actions taken there under, and is vulnerable to any manner of collateral attack
16 (thus here, by). No statute of limitations or repose runs on its holdings, the matters thought to be
17 settled thereby are not *res judicata*, and years later, when the memories may have grown dim and
18 rights long been regarded as vested, any disgruntled litigant may reopen old wound and once more
19 probe its depths. And it is then as though trial and adjudication had never been. *Fritts v. Krugh*,
20 *Supreme Court of Michigan*, 92 N.W. 2d 604, 354 Mich. 97 (10/13/58).”

21 **C. Should This Court follow the law and vacate the void judgment, the decision would be a**
22 **final decision.**

23 The Fourth District Division One Appellate Court has forever lost jurisdiction to hear any
24 matters regarding this case and the companion case of *Kelman v. Kramer*, because of appellate
25 officer of the court fraud on the court of rendering an opinion and issuing a remittitur while knowing
26 the judgment was void and thus they had no jurisdiction. “Courts are constituted by authority, and
27 they cannot [act] beyond the power delegated to them. **If they act beyond that authority, and**
28 **certainly in contravention of it, their judgments and orders are regarded as nullities. They are**

1 **not voidable, but simply void, and this even prior to reversal.** *Elliott v. Lessee of Piersol*, 26
2 *U.S. (1 Pet.) 328, 340; Old Wayne Life Assn. v. McDonough*, 204 U.S. 8, 27 S.Ct. 236

3 Kramer has currently filed an appeal in the second case, once again finding herself caught
4 in the game of musical judges of who holds jurisdiction. Department 30, who has overseen the
5 second case with no subject matter jurisdiction is now a dark court.

6 Department 29 is the next court up to bat. Kramer has filed a Motion for Reconsideration
7 of Department 30's down right criminal actions. There is a jurisdictional challenge hearing
8 scheduled for November 2, 2012. She will soon be filing a jurisdictional challenge in the Appellate
9 Court to whom she had to timely file an appeal while the bait and switch jurisdiction games play on.

10 The reality is that no one has jurisdiction to hear motions in the second case, because the
11 judgment from this case is the foundation for that one and is void to be used for any purpose.
12 Officers of the court have been committing fraud on the court in both cases. Once that happens,
13 subject matter jurisdiction is forever lost. U.S. Supreme Court precedents hold that fraud upon the
14 court vitiates the case; that all orders and judgments are regarded as nullities and void. SEE: *U.S. v.*
15 *Throckmorton*, 98 U.S. 61,64,66(1878); *Valley v. Northern Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*, 254 U.S. (1920))

16 Fraud upon the court" has been defined by the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals to "embrace that
17 species of fraud which does, or attempts to, defile the court itself, or is a fraud perpetrated by officers
18 of the court [Judges are officers of the court] so that the judicial machinery can not perform in the
19 usual manner its impartial task of adjudging cases that are presented for adjudication." *Kennerv.*
20 *C.I.R.*, 387 F.3d 689 (1968); 7 *Moore's Federal Practice*, 2d ed., p. 512, 60.23. The 7th Circuit
21 further stated "a decision produced by fraud upon the court is not in essence a decision at all, and
22 never becomes final." "Obviously a judgment, though final and on the merits, has no binding force
23 and is subject to collateral attack if it is wholly void for lack of jurisdiction of the subject matter or
24 person, and perhaps for excess of jurisdiction, or where it is obtained by extrinsic fraud. [Citations.]"
25 7 *Witkin, Cal. Procedure, supra, Judgment*, § 286, p. 828.).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

III
Conclusion

There is no question that judgment is void. There is no question that there has been fraud on the court by officers of the court, plaintiffs and clerks aiding and causing the continued misuse of a known void judgment to conceal additional collusive misconduct. This Court holds subject matter jurisdiction with the Appellate Court having unclean hands and thus the inability to reverse what This Court is bound by law to do, i.e., vacate the known void judgment.

By law, This Court must end the officer of the court reign of terror over a United States citizen for daring to expose a science fraud in public health policy and in U.S. courts that has manifested as financially motivated hate crimes against the environmentally disabled, dying and Kramer herself; and continued by officer of the court, plaintiff and clerk fraud on the court in these two cases.

October 22, 2012


Sharon Kramer

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DECLARATION OF SHARON KRAMER

Judge Maas, this is from the heart. Please make the officer of the court and plaintiff terrorizing of me stop by vacating the known void judgment, of which you have the legal and ethical authority and obligation to do. It is not my fault that Justice McConnell et.al., chose to practice politics from the bench and that they grossly under estimated my tenacity when so many lives are on the line.

I tried to warn Judge Nugent from the beginning of the second case that he was being used and that they would chew him up and spit him out if he did their bidding and he did not stand up to stop the malicious litigations. I see the same happening to you at their hands if you do their unlawful bidding and I refuse to remain silent of the continued adverse impact on the public, my family and me because it, as you know I will. Courts of law are to protect the public, not to try to pummel them into silence of a severely broken judicial system from the top down aiding a massive fraud on all U.S. courts – while people are losing everything, sometimes even their lives, because it.

1 I respectfully request that if you are going to unlawfully deny this Motion, you schedule a
2 hearing date so I may hear it in your own stated words, why.

3 I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is
4 true and correct and executed by me this 22nd day of October, 2012.

5 Submitted as respectfully as possible,

6  _____

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

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address): Sharon Kramer 2031 Arborwood Place Escondido, Ca 92029 TELEPHONE NO.: 76--746-8026 FAX NO. (Optional): E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): snk1955@aol.com ATTORNEY FOR (Name):		FOR COURT USE ONLY CASE NUMBER: GIN044539 JUDGE: Hon Earl Maas III DEPT.: Dept 28
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF San Diego STREET ADDRESS: 325 S. Melrose Drive MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: Vista, CA 92081 BRANCH NAME: North County		
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: Bruce Kelman DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: Sharon Kramer		
PROOF OF SERVICE—CIVIL Check method of service (only one): <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): 10/22/12 I served the following **documents** (specify):
**MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION TO VACATE VOID JUDGMENT OF SEPTEMBER 24, 2008;
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS & AUTHORITIES; 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:

a. Name of person served: **Keith Scheuer**

b. ☐ (Complete if service was by personal service, mail, overnight delivery, or messenger service.)

Business or residential address where person was served:

c. ☒ (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: **before 5PM**

☐ 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):

a. ☐ **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 & GlobalTox v. Kramer	CASE NUMBER: GIN044539
---	----------------------------------

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: October 22, 2012

Michael A. 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)