

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

Case No. 37-2010-00061530-CU-DF-NC

8 v.

NOTICE TO COURT & PLAINTIFF
COUNSEL REGARDING TRACEY SANG,
ESQ, STATE BAR NO.153694

9 SHARON KRAMER

The Honorable Thomas Nugent Presiding
Department 30

10 Defendant.

Contempt of Court hearing date: January 6,
2012 at 1:30 pm

11
12
13 1. Tracey (“SANG”) is a criminal contempt of court specialist who informed Sharon
14 (“KRAMER”) she “works for the courts”.

15
16 2. At no time has SANG been the legal counsel for KRAMER in a civil contempt matter
17 or at any other time.

18 3. On October 21, 2011, the Honorable Thomas Nugent introduced KRAMER to SANG.

19
20 4. This introduction occurred during oral arguments of 10/21/11, where KRAMER’S
21 Motion to Nullify Void Temporary Injunctive Relief Order (“TIRO”) was denied with no
22 explanation given and no Tentative Minute Order issued prior to oral argument.

23 5. KRAMER informed the court that she did not accept SANG as legal counsel.

24 6. As a courtesy to the court, KRAMER agreed to speak with SANG.

25
26 7. On January 6, 2012 a Civil Contempt of Court hearing was held. The Reporter
27 Transcript evidences there was no clear distinction of when pretrial discussion ended and
28 the actual trial began.

1 8. KRAMER appeared Properia Persona for the Contempt of Court hearing by affidavit
2 that was submitted to the court on January 6, 2012 before the hearing.

3 9. Reasons stated in the affidavit by KRAMER of why she did not appear in person are:

4 "I am not physically appearing before any judge with unbridled Contempt of Court and
5 incarceration power, who is i.) suppressing the uncontroverted evidence in his case file that
6 all prior courts suppressed the evidence the plaintiff committed perjury in a prior case to
7 establish needed reason for malice, ii.) is suppressing the evidence that the plaintiff's
8 attorney repeatedly suborned the perjury, and iii.) is suppressing the evidence that the prior
9 courts in the prior case, KELMAN & GLOBALTOX v. KRAMER, framed me for libel
over a writing impacting public health and safety. This court's Temporary Injunctive Relief
Order (TIRO), is precluding me from writing and evidencing the corruption of prior courts
by stopping me from writing the exact words for which I was framed for libel in the prior
case, *'altered his under oath statements'*."

10
11 **"I am fearful for my physical safety that this court will unlawfully incarcerate me,
12 indefinitely, for contempt of court."**

13 10. SANG was given permission to speak only on KRAMER'S behalf before the
14 Contempt of Court trial to the issue of arraignment. As stated in KRAMER's affidavit:

15 "I give Tracey Sang, Attorney at Law, authority to speak on my behalf regarding the
16 lack of this court holding an arraignment hearing, prior to holding an unlawful Contempt
of Court hearing. I have not been advised of my rights by this court, the Honorable
Thomas Nugent."

17 11. The Court was specifically informed SANG was not given permission to speak on
18 KRAMER's behalf for the Contempt of Court hearing. As stated in KRAMER'S affidavit:

19 "I do not give Ms. Sang permission to speak on my behalf at a Contempt of Court
20 hearing should this court choose to proceed."

21 12. The Court chose to proceed with the Contempt hearing. The Court acknowledged
22 SANG was not legal counsel for KRAMER in the hearing. The Court chose to allow SANG
23 to speak on KRAMER'S behalf to issues beyond arraignment without KRAMER'S consent.

24 13. In relevant part, the exchange between SANG and the Court is:

25 MS. SANG: AND SHE HAS GIVEN ME VERY LIMITED SCOPE INSTRUCTIONS.

26 THE COURT: WELL, THAT'S NOT REPRESENTING. I'M LOOKING AT A
27 DECLARATION IF YOU HAVEN'T SEEN IT.

28 MS. SANG: I ONLY JUST SAW IT AS I ENTERED THE COURTROOM.

1 THE COURT: IT SAYS -- YOU CAN SAY WHAT YOU WISH AND **I'M NOT GOING TO**
2 **STOP YOU FROM THAT. I WANT YOU TO KNOW THAT.** BUT SHE VERY
3 EXPLICITLY SAYS THAT "I DO NOT AUTHORIZE HER TO SPEAK ON MY BEHALF AT
4 A CONTEMPT-OF-COURT HEARING SHOULD THIS COURT CHOOSE TO PROCEED."
5 AND THIS COURT WOULD CHOOSE TO PROCEED.

6 MS. SANG: THAT IS CORRECT. IT HAS SIMPLY COME TO MY ATTENTION THAT
7 MS. KRAMER WAS NEVER FORMALLY ARRAIGNED ON THIS CONTEMPT CHARGE.

8 14. SANG then proceeded to state she had discussed with plaintiff counsel of having
9 KRAMER's mental capacity examined (for civil contempt) and this was the Court's only
10 option. Specifically, the exchange between SANG and the Court stated:

11 THE COURT:I'M TELLING YOU IF YOU HAVE ANY INFLUENCE WITH HER, I WOULD
12 DO ANYTHING I COULD TO GET HER EXAMINED, IF I CAN, BY THE PSYCHIATRIC
13 UNIT DOWNTOWN. I WAS PREPARED TO SEE IF I COULD GET THAT DONE TODAY.
14 AND, YOU KNOW, PEOPLE AREN'T SUPPOSED TO PARTICIPATE IN CRIMINAL
15 PROCEEDINGS IF THEY'RE INCOMPETENT, AND HER COMPETENCE, IN MY MIND, IS A
16 SERIOUS QUESTION.

17 MS. SANG: I, TOO, HAVE GIVEN THOUGHT TO THIS VERY ISSUE, YOUR HONOR. AND
18 COUNSEL AND I WERE DISCUSSING IT BEFORE THIS HEARING. WHAT I AM -- AS A
19 CRIMINAL ATTORNEY, THE MECHANISMS THAT I USUALLY USE IN SITUATIONS
20 LIKE THIS IS A 1368.

21 THE COURT: 1368. I KNOW IT WELL.

22 MS. SANG: IT'S REALLY THE ONLY THING THAT I BELIEVE WE HAVE AT OUR
23 DISPOSAL.

24 THE COURT: **SHE'S GOT TO BE CHARGED WITH A MISDEMEANOR.** I JUST READ
25 THE SECTION. BUT I'M NOT SO SURE THAT WE COULDN'T AT LEAST ATTEMPT TO
26 GET HER EXAMINED. **I'VE GOT THE PAPERS.** YOU KNOW, IF WE COULD DOCTOR UP
27 AN ORDER AND IF SHE WOULD GO, I'M NOT GOING TO DO THAT IF SHE SAYS YOU
28 PEOPLE ARE THE ONES THAT HAVE THE COMPETENCE ISSUE. AND I'VE HAD A PRO
PER CLIENT TELL ME THAT ONCE. AND I CAN'T DO ANYTHING ABOUT THAT. (RT
page 4, lines 2-27)

15. Attached hereto, in a SANG email to KRAMER dated November 9, 2011, stating:

"you do nice work, sharon! please let me know if the monday date is continued"

16. With all due respect to the Court, *"you people are the ones that have the competence
issue."* Not mentioned in the Contempt of Court hearing is the direct evidence that this
court's TIRO for which KRAMER is to be incarcerated for violating; is for repeating to the
Chief Justice of California, Justice Richard Huffman, Justice Judith McConnell and

1 members of the Judicial Council the sole cause of action words in the prior case “*altered*
2 *his under oath statements*”. And for placing it on the Internet that they were evidenced what
3 occurred in the prior case that caused the false finding of libel with actual malice at the
4 hand of the courts – that the Court’s TIRO is used to try to stop KRAMER from evidencing.

5 17., With all due respect to the Court, “*you people are the ones that have competence*
6 *issues.*” It is absurd to preclude never legally impeached, **WHISTLEBLOWER**
7 **KRAMER**, from being able to petition her government for redress of grievance for being
8 framed for libel with actual malice by the prior courts, in the prior case of (“KELMAN &
9 GLOBALTOX v. KRAMER”) including by Justice McConnell and Justice Huffman; and
10 then incarcerate her for evidencing it on the Internet of what they have done – by gagging
11 her from republishing the words she was court framed for libel with actual malice.

12 18. With all due respect to the Court, “*you people are the ones that have competence*
13 *issues.*” This is occurring while knowing the Court is aiding a scientific fraud to continue in
14 US courtrooms by aiding with malicious litigation, **I.e., that toxicology risk models can be**
15 **used by themselves to prove lack of causation of individual illness from environmental**
16 **exposures – the mainstay of Plaintiff Bruce (“KELMAN”)s interstate, expert defense**
17 **witnessing enterprise, Veritox, Inc. [EMPHASIS ADDED]**

18
19 19. As specifically stated in KRAMER’S January 6, 2012 affidavit and evidenced
20 many times over by irrefutable, direct evidence in this court’s case file:

21 “The direct evidence in this court’s case file is that the Fourth District Division One
22 Appellate Court framed me for libel in their 2006 anti-SLAPP Appellate Opinion to make
23 my writing appear false. Then in their 2010 Appellate Opinion suppressed the evidence of
24 what they had done in 2006. In their unpublished anti-SLAPP Opinion of November 2006,
25 made it appear that I had accused Kelman of getting caught on the witness stand lying about
26 being paid by the Manhattan Institute think-tank to make edits to a position statement for a
27 medical trade association, the American College of Occupational and Environmental
28 Medicine, ACOEM: To quote from the 2006 anti-SLAPP Appellate Opinion.

*This testimony supports a conclusion Kelman did not deny he had been paid by the
Manhattan Institute to write a paper, but only denied being paid by the 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*

1 *with the Kilian deposition testimony could be viewed by a reasonable jury as resulting*
2 *from the poor phrasing of the question rather from an attempt to deny payment. In*
3 *sum, Kelman and GlobalTox presented sufficient evidence to satisfy a prima facie*
4 *showing that the statement in the press release was false.”*

5 From my writing of March 2005 accurately stating the Manhattan Institute think-tank
6 money was for the US Chamber’s mold position statement – not ACOEM’s.

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

17 From the Appellate Opinion of September 2010, suppressing the evidence that they had
18 framed me for libel in their 2006 Appellate Opinion.

19 *“In a prior opinion, a previous panel of this court affirmed an order denying*
20 *Kramer’s motion to strike under the anti-SLAPP statute. In doing so, we largely*
21 *resolved the issues Kramer now raises on appeal. In our prior opinion, we found*
22 *sufficient evidence Kramer’s Internet post was false and defamatory as well as*
23 *sufficient evidence the post was published with constitutional malice.”*

24 THE COURT: -- ALL OF WHICH CONTAINED LANGUAGE THAT HAS BEEN
25 ENJOINED BY THIS COURT AND **FOUND DEFAMOUS BY ANOTHER COURT**, AND
26 AS A CONCLUSION, THEREFORE, THE COURT IS COMPELLED TO FIND THAT THE
27 DEFENDANT, SHARON KRAMER, IS IN CONTEMPT OF THIS COURT'S ORDER. (RT
28 page 19, lines 8-13)

20. KRAMER is aware that Keith (“SCHEUER”) has submitted a [Proposed] Order and
Judgment of Contempt, which falsely states SANG is KRAMER’S counsel who was authorized to
speak on KRAMER’S behalf in the civil Contempt of Court hearing. It states:

“...Plaintiff caused the Order to Show Cause to be personally served on Kramer on
November 18, 2011, **and served by mail on her counsel on November 28, 2011.**”

**“...Contemner in writing authorized Tracey S. Sang, Esq., to speak on contemner’s
behalf on certain limited issues at the hearing.”**

21. At no time has SANG been the legal counsel for KRAMER. SANG was directed by
KRAMER she was not to speak on KRAMER’S behalf at the Contempt of Court hearing.

1 22. SANG was never given permission to discuss with the court the need to take a civil
2 contempt hearing and charge KRAMER with a misdemeanor for the purpose of giving the
3 court jurisdiction to order a mental examination to the benefit of plaintiff Bruce KELMAN
4 and the courts who are evidenced to have framed KRAMER for libel with actual malice.

5 23. Court employed, criminal law trained attorney, SANG has the evidence in her
6 possession that in the case of KELMAN & GLOBALTOX v. KRAMER, the courts
7 willfully and falsely made KRAMER'S writing appear libelously false. (see no.19 above)

8 24. Court employed criminal law trained attorney SANG has the evidence in her
9 possession that in the prior case, SCHEUER repeatedly suborned his client's perjury to
10 establish malice, all courts suppressed the evidence and KRAMER is being gagged by the
11 Court from writing/evidencing what occurred by being gagged from republishing the sole
12 cause of action words of the case, "*altered his under oath statements*".

13 25. SCHEUER'S Proposed Order stating SANG is KRAMER'S counsel is invalid.

14 26. The court needs to include this Notice in its case file and acknowledge its existence
15 in the CCMS file without KRAMER needing to write (another) letter that her submissions
16 be properly recorded by the Court.

17 27. California Canon of Judicial Ethics, 3D(1) states,

18
19 "*Whenever a judge has reliable information that another judge has violated any*
20 *provision of the Code of Judicial Ethics, the judge shall take appropriate corrective*
21 *action, which may include reporting the violation to the appropriate authority*"

22 28. California Canon of Judicial Ethics, 3D(2) states,

23 "*Whenever a judge has personal knowledge that a lawyer has violated any provision*
24 *of the Rules of Professional Conduct, the judge shall take appropriate corrective*
25 *action*"

26 29. With regard to the continued actions of SCHEUER and SANG both being agents of
27 the Court in attempting to stop KRAMER from evidencing ethics violations in by the courts
28 via the "Nice Lady, But Crazy" defense, including violations by Justice McConnell to

1 whom KRAMER will now have to submit a Writ, “..once the attorney realizes that he or
2 she has misled the court, even innocently, he or she has an affirmative duty to immediately
3 inform the court and to request that it set aside any orders based upon such
4 misrepresentation; also, counsel should not attempt to benefit from such improvidently
5 entered orders.” Datig v. Dove Books, Inc. (1999) 73 Cal.App.4th 964, 981

6 30. Justice Judith McConnell to whom KRAMER will now have to submit a Writ, is the
7 Presiding Justice of the Fourth District Division One Appellate Court. She is the Chair of
8 the California Commission on Judicial Performance, the “independent state agency” whose
9 sole taxpayer paid function is to police ethics within the judicial branch.

10 31. Justice McConnell is also the author of the 2006 anti-SLAPP Opinion that was
11 crafted to make it appear KRAMER had accused KELMAN of lying about being paid to
12 make edits in the American College Of Occupational and Environmental Medicine’s mold
13 position statement of 2002, “*Adverse Human Health Effects From Molds In The Indoor*
14 *Environment*”. KRAMER’S writing accurately states the Manhattan think-tank money was
15 for the US Chamber’s mold position statement of 2003 that was also authored by KELMAN
16 and GlobalTox (aka Veritox) co-owner, Bryan Hardin, “*A Scientific View of the Health*
17 *Effects of Mold*”. (See No. 19 above).

18 January 12, 2012

Submitted as respectfully as possible,

19 Sharon Kramer, Pro Per
20 Sharon Kramer, In Propria Persona

21 Please stop using the courts and taxpayer dollars to harass us for exposing the California
22 courts practicing politics – not law - favorable to the interests of the affiliates of the US
23 Chamber of Commerce and adverse to the interest of the public. We are not shutting up.

24 I declare, under the penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California, that the
25 foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. This declaration is executed on
26 January 12, 2012 in Escondido, California.

27 Sharon Kramer, Pro Per
28 Sharon Kramer, Pro Per

In a message dated 11/9/2011 10:29:20 A.M. Pacific Standard Time, sangmitchell@roadrunner.com writes:

you do nice work, sharon! please let me know if the monday date is continued.

On Nov 9, 2011, at 9:12 AM, SNK1955@aol.com wrote:

Dear Tracey,

For your files. Not sure the email of the fax of the ExParte came through to you.

Sharon Noonan Kramer
<11.11.10 Notice To Scheuer Of Exparte.pdf>

Thursday, January 12, 2012 AOL: SNK 1955

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): Properia Persona	FOR COURT USE ONLY
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF STREET ADDRESS: 325 S. Melrose Drive MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: Vista, CA 92081 BRANCH NAME: North County Superior Court	
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: Bruce Kelman DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: Sharon Kramer	CASE NUMBER: 37-2010-61530-CU-DF-NC
<p style="text-align: center;">PROOF OF SERVICE—CIVIL</p> Check method of service (only one): <input type="checkbox"/> By Personal Service <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> By Mail <input type="checkbox"/> By Overnight Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> By Messenger Service <input type="checkbox"/> By Fax <input type="checkbox"/> By Electronic Service	JUDGE: DEPT.:

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

1. At the time of service I was over 18 years of age and **not a party to this action.**
2. My residence or business address is:
 2031 Arborwood Place, Escondido, CA 92029
3. The fax number or electronic service address from which I served the documents is (complete if service was by fax or electronic service):
4. On (date): 1/12/12 I served the following documents (specify):
 NOTICE TO COURT & PLAINTIFF COUNSEL REGARDING TRACEY SANG, ESQ, STATE BAR NO.153694

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:
 - b. (Complete if service was by personal service, mail, overnight delivery, or messenger service.)
 Business or residential address where person was served:
 Keith Scheuer, 4640 Admiralty Way, Su 402, Marina Del Rey, CA 90292
 - c. (Complete if service was by fax or electronic service.)
 - (1) Fax number or electronic service address where person was served:
 - (2) Time of service:

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 v Kramer	CASE NUMBER: 37-2010-61530-CU-DF-NC
-------------------------------	--

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: 1/12/12

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)