

April 16, 2013

Appellate Case No. D062764
Superior Court Case No. 37-2010-00061530-CU-DF-NC
Appellate Case No. D054496
Appellate Court anti-SLAPP No. D047758
Superior Court Case No. GIN044539

STATEMENT OF REASON FOR EMERGENCY PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS
FILED UNDER DURESS & CORRECTION OF TWO PROCEDURAL ERRORS

1. On April 11, 2013, United States citizen ,(“Petitioner”) Under Duress, Sharon Noonan Kramer, timely mailed an EMERGENCY (“PETITION”) FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS FILED UNDER DURESS in lawful accordance with Rules of the Court 8.486(b)(2), C.C.P.170.3(d) and C.C.P.1013(a) and C.C.P.1209(b).
2. Real Party in Interest is Judith (“McConnell”), Administrative Presiding Justice of the Fourth District Division One Court of Appeals. (“Respondent”). She refused to be disqualified on March 26, 2013 with no explanation given. Within the same ruling, she dismissed the appeal and thus the case while refusing to prove Respondent had subject matter jurisdiction for her to issue any such ruling. Petitioner filed the PETITION as a result of these two acts by McConnell. (See Doc 1 for McConnell's unexplained denial to be disqualified while simultaneously dismissing the appeal/case). (See Petition pgs 14-15 “HISTORY OF APPELLATE COURT (2012-2013) AFTER LOWER COURT HARASSMENT (2010-2013)” for how many times and in how many ways, Petitioner has shown McConnell the direct evidence that her court has no subject matter jurisdiction and first requested, then demanded that McConnell prove jurisdiction before issuing any rulings)
3. On April 15, 2013, Petitioner received a telephone call from Mr. Robert Toy of the California Supreme Court. Mr. Toy informed Petitioner that she had made some procedural errors in her filing.
4. Toy stated that Petitioner needed to clarify why this is an emergency under duress.

A. CORRECTION OF PROCEDURAL ERRORS

1. Petitioner submitted ten copies. An original signature is submitted today.
2. As this matter has been in the courts for now eight years, it has taken many twists and turns. The PETITION covered much ground.
3. Petitioner inserted a document inside the front cover "To Whom It May Concern" to clarify that the courts, Plaintiffs and their attorney, Keith ("Scheuer") have been harassing a United States citizen, Petitioner, without subject matter jurisdiction. The harassment is founded upon a falsified, ante-dated 2008 Void Judgment from the Predicate Case, *Kelman & GlobalTox v. Kramer*. She stapled the Void Judgment and attached the direct evidence of its ante-dating and falsification to the insert. (See PETITION pg. 2-6 for description and misuse of the Void Judgment)(See Appendix Doc 3 pgs. 133-140 for proof the courts know it is void, including McConnell.)(See Doc 10 pg 213 for additional evidence that officers of Respondent, were aware it was ante-dated and void when the Predicate Case was on appeal in 2009-2010)
4. Petitioner, who fully acknowledges her briefs are not of professional or of legally trained quality, was attempting to make it clear she needs the California Supreme Court to MANDATE that McConnell prove Respondent has subject matter jurisdiction; and even if she could prove it (which she cannot) then be disqualified for having personal interest in this matter in violation of Rules of the Court 10.1004(b) – or - Undo this mess she caused when she framed Petitioner for libel in the 2006 anti-SLAPP Opinion, concealed parties on appeal, concealed Plaintiff Kelman committed perjury to establish reason for malice and stop using the courts to harass and United States citizen, Petitioner. (See Petition pg 17-25)(See Doc 2 pg 81-89)
5. Mr. Toy informs Petitioner that one cannot put inserts into a PETITION. As such, Petitioner requests that the insert be removed from copies submitted on April 11, 2013.

B. REASON FOR EMERGENCY UNDER DURESS

1. **Petitioner needs Administrative Presiding Justice McConnell to be immediately stopped from issuing the Remittitur and from giving feigned jurisdiction back to the lower court. Petitioner fears for her physical safety should the lower court again regain feigned jurisdiction of this case.**
2. On December 28, 2012, Petitioner was threatened by Scheuer of more collusive retaliation for her refusal of silence of the court falsified documents aiding the courts to act without subject matter jurisdiction; and for her refusal of silence of the massive amount of scientific fraud that continues in some policies and U.S. courts directly because of these cases – as Petitioner seeks to stop the ever mounting damage. (See Petition pgs.11-12 under **G. “All legal remedies have been more than exhausted for Petitioner. It is so bad, that Petitioner is unable to seek redress of grievance for the damage to her from the fraud upon the court; without threat of more unlawful incarceration, more bodily harm, more emotional distress, sanctions, liens and cost/attorney fee awards to Plaintiffs”**).
3. The promise that more retaliation will occur once McConnell issues the Remittitur back to the lower court, was made by Scheuer on December 28, 2012 via a motion.
4. In December of 2012, Scheuer submitted an unsuccessful motion in the lower court for Petitioner to deemed, vexatious. (See Petition pg. 6 No.18)(See Doc 6 pgs 150-152). The lower court denied the Motion without prejudice on March 29, 2013 upon receipt of notice of McConnell's appeal dismissal. There is threat in the vexatious litigant motion denial that should Petitioner keep trying to get *someone, anyone*, to vacate the December 2008 Void Judgment from the Predicate Case that is being used as the foundational document to harass her by courts with no jurisdiction – she could be deemed vexatious in the future, upon further motion by Scheuer.
5. **A more concerning threat of imminent physical danger to Petitioner should McConnell issue feigned jurisdiction issue back to the lower court;** Scheuer made the terrifying promise of more contempt charges against Petitioner for seeking redress of

grievance. Petitioner knows that it is an intentional threat of more harassment, unlawful incarceration, bodily harm, emotional distress, sanctions and liens on her property.

Scheuer wrote,

“Once her pending appeal is resolved, Plaintiff will apply again for an Order to Show Cause why she should not be held in contempt, yet again.” (See Doc 6 pg. 150)

6. Without Supreme Court intervention to stop falsified documents being used to harass a United States citizen via fraud upon the court; this Remittitur issuance could occur at any time. (See Petition pg.9, “C. McConnell and Benke are now working in concert for McConnell to feign subject matter jurisdiction based on known fraudulent court documents”).(See Doc 5 pgs 146-149) Benke will not recall and rescind the court falsified 2010 Remittitur and vacate the 2008 Void Judgment from the Predicate Case. McConnell and lower court judiciaries are using them to feign their courts have subject matter jurisdiction in this case.

C. PETITIONER FEARS FOR HER PHYSICAL SAFETY IF NO IMMEDIATE INTERVENTION BY THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT

1. Instigated by Scheuer, the lower court has already issued two contempt of court orders, coram non judge, that Petitioner must publish a false confession on the Internet of being guilty of libel for a sentence she never even wrote. (See Doc 2 pg 74 for the sentence not in Petitioner’s writing that she was court ordered to state she retracts on the Internet under threat of incarceration)(See Doc 2 pg 35 for Petitioner’s actual sentence used in her accurate March 2005 writing.)(See Appendix Index pg. iv. No. 11 for the dishonorable motivation behind the difference in the two sentences involving McConnell, Benke and four additional judicial officers of Respondent -- Huffman, Aaron, McDonald and Irion.)

2. Petitioner was jailed in March of 2012, coram non judge, for refusing to sign a false confession under penalty of perjury that was crafted by Scheuer “Retraction of Sharon Kramer” which also contains the sentence, “I do not believe Dr. Kelman committed

perjury". (See Doc 2 pg 52-53). This occurred when she could not adhere to the unlawful January 19, 2012 Civil Contempt Order. (See Doc 3 pgs 63-67)(See Petition pg 26-27)

3. The July 2, 2012, "JUDGMENT AND ORDER FOR CIVIL CONTEMPT AND PERMANENT INJUNCTION" states more threat of incarceration if Petitioner does not publish an impossible false confession on the Internet. (See Doc 2 pg 74:8-13; 75:1-2, 22 - 25; 76:1-2)

4. The Court, Plaintiffs and Scheuer know that Petitioner became painfully ill from the prior incarceration. She acquired shingles. (Attached hereto as Exhibit 1 pgs 1-12, is Petitioner's April 27, 2012 "NOTICE TO COURT, ADMINISTRATION OF COURT AND PRESIDING JUDGE THAT SHARON KRAMER REQUIRES MEDICAL TREATMENT RESULTANT FROM UNLAWFUL INCARCERATION, HARASSMENT AND LIBELING BY THIS COURT WITH NO PROVEN JURISDICTION" and two of its exhibits: a physician assistant report, pg 11, and a picture of the shingles, pg 12, -- what this relentless terrorizing and illegal incarceration is doing to Petitioner) No help or even response was received.

5. (Attached hereto as Exhibit 2, pg 13, is a psychological evaluation of Petitioner by Dr. Lorna Schwarz, January 2012.) The Schwarz evaluation was submitted to the court by Petitioner on February 10, 2012 in her NOTICE TO COURT, INABILITY TO COMPLY WITH UNLAWFUL ORDER & JUDGMENT OF JANUARY 19, 2012; & DECLARATION OF SHARON KRAMER.(See Doc 2 pg 55)

6. What caused Petitioner to have herself psychologically evaluated was her becoming aware that at the January 6, 2012 Civil Contempt hearing, which she did not attend, the Court was plotting with Scheuer and a public defender, Tracey Sang, to have Petitioner deemed a mentally incompetent criminal in need of Sang to become her (silenced) legal voice. (Attached hereto as Exhibit 3, pg 14-19, are the relevant parts of the January 6, 2012 Civil Contempt hearing.)

7. On January 6, 2012, the Court stated “She’s [Petitioner] got to be charged with a misdemeanor” to get her to the “psychiatric unit downtown” under “Penal Code 1368”. (See Exhibit 3 pg 16:16-21; 17:10-23; 18:15-24; 19:16-21) They wanted a criminal public defender (double entendre), Tracey Sang, who the Court was trying to force on Petitioner in a civil matter, to become Petitioner’s (silenced) legal voice. Judge Nugent did not even bother swearing Sang in as a witness and ignored that Petitioner submitted a declaration stating Sang was not to testify in the unlawful, Civil Contempt hearing. (See Exhibit 3 pg 14:8-10, 19-28)

8. The January 21, 2012 Schwarz evaluation of Petitioner states she holding up well all things considered “GAF 60”; but is experiencing Generalized Anxiety Disorder from “a hostile environment by being aligned and subject to libel”. (See Exhibit 2 pg 13). This evaluation was prior to Petitioner acquiring painful shingles from the relentless harassment and terrorizing by the willful participants of the hostile environment.

CONCLUSION

D. PLEASE INTERCEDE QUICKLY

Petitioner’s PETITION to mandate that McConnell prove Respondent’s jurisdiction – which she cannot do – is an emergency under duress because of the documented threat by Scheuer of more harassment and Petitioner’s justified fear of more retaliation at the hands of the courts, Plaintiffs and Scheuer, including more physical harm – should McConnell issue the Remittitur and release feigned jurisdiction back to the lower court.

Plus, Petitioner is financially ruined and cannot get back to work as a reputable real estate agent in Rancho Santa Fe, CA, until the false stigma of being a legally deemed, malicious liar is removed. The situation has reached a critical point. (See Petition pg. 12, No. 2, 3) Petitioner’s May house payment is going to be missed because of the necessary costs of printing and mailing these documents to the California Supreme Court.


McConnell's Remittitur issuance could happen at anytime. Knowing this and what it will cause to Petitioner because of it, makes Petitioner fear for her physical safety and emotional well being – to the point of possibly becoming painfully ill again. To say that they want a piece of Petitioner for her refusal of silence of massive fraud upon the court and the continued massive damage to the public because of it; would be a gross understatement.

The fact that there is no judicial immunity because a void judgment cannot be used for any purpose; including feigning jurisdiction, conspiring to defraud, illegally incarcerating, falsification of public and court records, causation of bodily harm and emotional distress -- makes McConnell, other judiciaries, clerks, Scheuer and Plaintiffs an even greater threat to Petitioner.

If the California Supreme Court does not intercede immediately to make McConnell prove what she cannot, jurisdiction; or reverse all of her malicious orders, rulings and opinions beginning in November of 2006; and vacate all void judgments, liens and sanctions in both this and the Predicate Case -- Petitioner will undoubtedly soon be subjected to more collusive harassment and terrorizing, as was promised by Scheuer on December 28, 2012.

All of this unbridled wrath is for a United States citizen with a marketing degree, Petitioner, daring to expose in March of 2005 for the good of the public, how Plaintiffs' scientific fraud was mass marketed into public health policies for the purpose of misleading U.S. courts to deny liability for causation of illness over the mold issue. (See Petitioner's March 2005 writing Doc 2 pg 35)(See the mass marketing Plaintiffs' scientific fraud to mislead courts, Doc 2 pg 90-97)

April 16, 2013


Sharon Noonan Kramer, Petitioner Under Duress

EXHIBIT

1

1 Sharon Noonan Kramer
2 2031 Arborwood Place
3 Escondido, CA 92029
4 (760) 746-8026

F I L E D
Clerk of the Superior Court

APR 27 2012

BY: A. LUM

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

7 SHARON KRAMER,

8 Petitioner

9 v.

10 BRUCE J. KELMAN,

11 Respondent

CASE NO. 37-2010-00061530-CU-DF-NC

NOTICE TO COURT, ADMINISTRATION OF
COURT & SUPERIOR COURT PRESIDING
JUDGE THAT SHARON KRAMER REQUIRES
MEDICAL TREATMENT RESULTANT FROM
UNLAWFULLY INCARCERATION, HARASSMENT
& LIBELING BY THIS COURT WITH NO PROVEN
JURISDICTION

Submitted to Court, Mr. Roddy & Judge Enright:
April 27, 2012

Thomas P. Nugent Presiding
Department 30:

12
13
14
15
16
17 1. COMES NOW, Sharon Noonan Kramer, a woman, a natural -born citizen, herself, *in forma*
18 *pauperis*, neither corporation nor business entity, as a member of the People proclaimed in the United
19 States Constitution, afforded all rights and defense therein, having waived none of them, acting as
20 [h]er own agent (hereinafter "Kramer"), and files this Continuing Notice of Special Appearance in
21 response to improper hearings illegally scheduled at North San Diego County Superior Court.

22
23 2. Kramer presents this notice, only under special visitation on the grounds that she has a security
24 interest in the subject matter of the above-styled cause that supersedes the unsupported and
25 fraudulent claims of the other party.

26 3. Kramer **DOES NOT** submit to this court's jurisdiction, in the above-styled cause, nor to **ANY**
27 reference thereto, in other cases relating/pending to the relevant issues of this case, where there are
28 facts (in equity) that remain in controversy.

NOTICE TO COURT, ADMINISTRATION OF COURT & SUPERIOR COURT PRESIDING JUDGE THAT
SHARON KRAMER REQUIRES MEDICAL TREATMENT RESULTANT FROM UNLAWFULLY
INCARCERATION, HARASSMENT & LIBELING BY THIS COURT WITH NO PROVEN JURISDICTION

1 4. Any assertion to the contrary is patently false and specifically denied as Kramer DEMANDS
2 through statutory mandates that this court arrange payment for required medical diagnostics and
3 treatments for injury brought about by deliberate indifference of this Court - with no proven jurisdiction
4 - who has been harassing her for refusing silence of prior courts libeling her to conceal they have
5 conspired to defraud the public as they framed Kramer for libel and suppressed the evidence the
6 plaintiff, Bruce "Kelman", committed perjury to establish a manufactured theme for malice.
7 Additionally attempting to conceal that many court documents and computer entries have been
8 falsified, altered and anti-dated, including the three page judgment document from the prior case that
9 is the sole foundation document for this case.

10 5. This court - with no established jurisdiction to do anything to Kramer - is aware that Kramer is
11 suffering from Generalized Anxiety Disorder from being subject to libel and aliened by the courts for
12 now seven years, with it costing her and her family all she owns for daring to speak the truth for the
13 public good. (Attached hereto as Exhibit 1, is the mental status evaluation of Kramer January 21,
14 2012, stating she is more than competent & under extreme stress).

15 6. On March 9, 2012, under the pretense that Kramer violated the Civil Contempt of Court Order of
16 January 19, 2012, CCP1218(a), this Court sentenced Kramer to the Las Colinas Women's Detention
17 Center beginning on March 12, 2012 for refusing to sign a fraudulent document under penalty of
18 perjury that had not even been presented to this Court with the contempt order was issued. The
19 document was crafted by Kelman's attorney, Keith "Scheuer" and presented to the court on February
20 10, 2012.

21 7. Kramer has been physically ill, fearful of this Court and experiencing pain/discomfort ever since
22 her unlawful incarceration among a segment of the population known to be at high risk for bacterial,
23 fungal, viral and infectious diseases. i.e. tweakers, prostitutes and heroine addicts.

24 8. On March 9, 2012, with a sheriff threateningly positioned behind her as she spoke, this Court
25 demanded Kramer sign the document crafted by Scheuer or go to jail. In relevant part, it states,
26
27
28

1 "It was not my intention in writing the press release to state or imply that Dr. Kelman had
2 committed perjury."

3 9. This Court is aware that Kramer did not accuse Kelman of committing perjury in her writing.
4 The Appellate Court, with the aid of Scheuer, made her accurate writing appear that she had falsely
5 accused Kelman of lying about being paid by a think-tank to author the ACOEM Mold Statement and
6 was therefore guilty of libeling Kelman. This Court knows Kramer's writing made no such accusation.

7 10. The fraudulent document Kramer was being coerced by this court to sign to avoid
8 incarceration goes on to state,

9 "I do not believe that Dr. Kelman committed perjury. I apologize to Dr. Kelman and this
10 colleagues at Veritox, Inc. for all statements that I have made that stated or implied
11 otherwise. I sincerely regret any harm or damage that I may have caused. I declare under
12 penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and
13 correct."

14 10. (Attached hereto collectively as Exhibit 2 is the fraudulent retraction crafted by Scheuer, the
15 transcript of March 9th ordering Kramer to sign it, the Minute Order of March 9, 2012 stating she was
16 incarcerated for refusing to sign it, and Kramer's appearance at the January 6, 2012 contempt of
17 court hearing by declaration because of fear for her physical safety from this Court - with no
18 jurisdiction.)

19 11. The March 9, 2012, Minute Order states,

20 Court addresses Ms. Kramer re: proposed retraction order. Ms. Kramer indicates that she
21 will not sign the proposed retraction. Court finds Ms. Kramer in contempt and sentences her
22 to five consecutive days in custody and directs her to report to the Las Colinas Detention
23 Facility at 9:00 am, March 12, 2012. Court denies Atty Scheuer's request that Ms. Kramer
24 be remanded to the custody of the Sheriff forthwith.

25 12. Kramer's appearance by declaration at the January 6, 2012 Contempt of Court hearing states in
26 relevant part:

27 1. I am not physically appearing before any judge with unbridled Contempt of Court and
28 incarceration power, who is i.) suppressing the uncontroverted evidence in his case file that
all prior courts suppressed the evidence the plaintiff committed perjury in a prior case to
establish needed reason for malice, ii.) is suppressing the evidence that the plaintiff's
attorney repeatedly suborned the perjury, and iii.) is suppressing the evidence that the prior
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

1 Order (TIRO), is precluding me from writing and evidencing the corruption of prior courts
2 by stopping me from writing the exact words for which I was framed for libel in the prior
3 case, "altered his under oath statements".

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

12 This testimony supports a conclusion Kelman did not deny he had been paid by the
13 Manhattan Institute to write a paper, but only denied being paid by the Manhattan Institute
14 to make revisions in the paper issued by ACOEM. He admitted being paid by the Manhattan
15 Institute to write a lay translation. The fact that Kelman did not clarify that he received
16 payment from the Manhattan Institute until after being confronted with the Kilian
17 deposition testimony could be viewed by a reasonable jury as resulting from the poor
18 phrasing of the question rather from an attempt to deny payment. In sum, Kelman and
19 GlobalTox presented sufficient evidence to satisfy a prima facie showing that the statement
20 in the press release was false."

21 From my writing of March 2005 accurately stating the Manhattan Institute think-tank
22 money was for the US Chamber's mold position statement -- not ACOEM's.

23 "Upon viewing documents presented by the Hayne's attorney of Kelman's prior testimony
24 from a case in Arizona, Dr. Kelman altered his under oath statements on the witness
25 stand. He admitted the Manhattan Institute, a national political think-tank, paid GlobalTox
26 \$40,000 to write a position paper regarding the potential health risks of toxic mold
27 exposure.....In 2003, with the involvement of the US Chamber of Commerce and ex-
28 developer, US Congressman Gary Miller (R-CA), the GlobalTox paper was disseminated to
the real estate, mortgage and building industries' associations. A version of the Manhattan
Institute commissioned piece may also be found as a position statement on the website of a
United States medical policy-writing body, the American College of Occupational and
Environmental Medicine."

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

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

3. Should the Honorable Thomas Nugent proceed with a Contempt of Court hearing on
January 6, 2012, with no proof of a lawful Temporary Injunctive Relief Order, no proven
jurisdiction to hold a contempt hearing, no proof of a properly served OSC or affidavit; and

1 while continuing to suppress my uncontroverted evidence in his case file that the Appellate
2 Court framed me for libel and suppressed the evidence that Bruce Kelman committed
3 perjury to establish malice in KELMAN & GLOBALTOX v. KRAMER. I am fearful for
4 my physical safety that this court will unlawfully incarcerate me, indefinitely, for
5 contempt of court. This, under the false pretense that I violated a lawful court order by
6 republishing the words for which I am evidenced by uncontroverted evidence, public record
7 and this court's case file to have been framed for libel by the Appellate Court in KELMAN
8 & GLOBALTOX v. KRAMER, "*altered his under oath statements*".

9 13. On April 5, 2012, this court libeled Kramer on her Sheriff Department record to conceal what it
10 had done to unlawfully incarcerate her for refusing coercion into perjury. While directing the Sheriff
11 Department to remove the false misdemeanor that was place on her record on March 12, 2012; this
12 Court deceptively wrote that Kramer was lawfully incarcerated under CCP1218(a) for violating the
13 January 19, 2012 Contempt of Court Order and attached the Order sent to the Sheriff Department,
14 inferring Kramer violated it. (Attached hereto as **Exhibit 3**, is this Court, with no proven jurisdiction,
15 libeling Kramer on April 5, 2012) In relevant part the libel states,

16 The judgment of contempt entered here under Cal. Code of Civil Procedure § 1218(a) constitutes neither
17 a misdemeanor nor a felony conviction and Defendant's record should be corrected forthwith.

18 Dated: April 5, 2012

19 
20 THOMAS P. NUGENT
21 Judge of the Superior Court

22 14. The Sheriff Department has yet to remove the false misdemeanor from Kramer's record and
23 her state justice department record. The false and libelous civil contempt remains with this Court
24 refusing to remove it. (Attached hereto as **Exhibit 4**, is the transcript of April 12, 2012)

25 15. Before unlawfully incarcerating Kramer for refusing to commit perjury and libeling her yet
26 again; this court with no proven jurisdiction, was aware Kramer could not comply with the January 19,
27 2012 Contempt of Court Order and of the stress it was placing on Kramer and the fear it was instilling
28 in her by continuing to harass her to conceal prior courts framed her for libel, suppressed the
evidence Kelman committed perjury - while adversely impacting her, her family and public health.
(Attached hereto as **Exhibit 5**, is Kramer's February 10, 2012, Notice of Inability to Comply with

1 Unlawful Court Order & its exhibits of Declarations of Dr. Lorna Schwarz, Kevin Carstens and Crystal
2 Stuckey).

3 16. This Court was aware under CCP1219(a), CCP 664, CCP664.5(b) and GC 6200 it was
4 unlawfully incarcerating Kramer in retaliation for refusal of silence of the courts colluding to defraud
5 and that she could not comply with the Contempt of Court Order of January 19, 2012.

6
7 17. On March 9, 2012, Scheuer requested and this Court assured that incarcerating Kramer would
8 have a "prophylactic effect". (See exhibit 2c page 11). From the transcript of March 9, 2012:

9 MR. SCHEUER: I'M REALLY, I'M SYMPATHETIC TO HOW SYMPATHETIC YOU
10 ARE TO MS. KRAMER. I'M A LOT LESS SYMPATHETIC. I HAVE A LOT MORE
11 HISTORY THAN YOU DO WITH HER. SHE REPUBLISHED THIS LIBEL
12 YESTERDAY MANY TIMES. SHE REPUBLISHED THIS LIBEL TWO DAYS AGO
13 MANY TIMES. SHE'S GETTING AWAY WITH IT AGAIN. BETWEEN NOW AND
14 MONDAY, I WILL BET YOU, WHATEVER I'M PERMITTED TO BET YOU, THAT
15 THAT LIBEL GETS REPUBLISHED AGAIN.

16 THE COURT: AND IT MAY, BUT WHAT HAPPENS IN FIVE DAYS IF IT WERE
17 TO START TODAY AND MS. KRAMER IS RELEASED, WHICH SHE WILL BE,
18 AND SHE REPUBLISHES THEN?

19 MR. SCHEUER: THEN WE WILL BE BACK HERE AGAIN, BUT THE
20 DIFFERENCE IS, I AM HOPEFUL, I AM HOPEFUL THAT A JAIL EXPERIENCE
21 WILL HAVE SOME SORT OF PROPHYLACTIC EFFECT.

22 THE COURT: WHY DO YOU THINK I'M DOING THIS BECAUSE I LIKE IT?
23 THAT'S OF COURSE NOT MY REASON. [sic, by definition "prophylactic effect"¹]

24 MR. SCHEUER: UNDERSTOOD. BUT MY THINKING IS THE EARLIER SHE
25 GOES, THE SOONER THE PROPHYLACTIC SETS IN.

26 18. From March 12th to March 14, Kramer was incarcerated in a dorm setting with approximately 40
27 tweakers, prostitutes, shop lifters and heroine addicts. As she was unlawfully incarcerated for refusing
28 coercion into perjury, she was also unlawfully strip searched. She was forced to wear underwear worn
by prior prisoners and sleep in a non-disinfected bed. On the evening of March 13, 2012, she was
made to clean the bathroom that is used by approximately 80 women in two joined dorm settings -
many of whom are among a high risk population for bacteria, viral, fungal conditions and infectious

¹ a preventive

1 diseases. On the morning of March 14, 2012, Kramer was shackled to a drug addict for one hour in the
2 dark for the bus ride from Las Colinas to the Vista Courthouse. There she was made to appear before
3 the court in handcuffs, chains, prison garb, no make up and unbrushed hair. Scheuer was invited by
4 this Court to view the continued prophylactic experience as a courtesy. Self professed public defender,
5 Tracey Sang, who Kramer expressly terminated as a legal advisor who was forced upon Kramer by this
6 Court and never Kramer's counsel of record was also invited to view the continued prophylactic
7 experience of Kramer.

8 19. Kramer has been sick, fearful and in pain ever since the failed "prophylactic" efforts of
9 this Court – with no proven jurisdiction - to silence her of the courts conspiring to defraud the
10 public by unlawful means and of its actions more closely akin to gang rapers and Mafiosos than
11 a court of law. (Attached hereto as Exhibit 6 is a picture of the painful skin condition Kramer
12 acquired, unexplained bruising and a report from her doctor's office that this is shingles².)

13 20. The report notes Kramer has been nowhere to acquire a rash, other than Las Colinas. The
14 report does not explain the bruising from the inside out where Kramer's kidneys are located, with that
15 area being swollen along with the area where her liver is located.

16 21. Shingles is known to be a physical manifestation of stress from situations such as being "aligned
17 and subject to libel" for seven years, financially ruined, unlawfully incarcerated, unlawfully strip
18 searched, demeaned and denigrated, made to clean the bathroom of drug addicts & prostitutes while
19 being given a frightening, filthy and "prophylactic" experience for refusing coercion into perjury to aid
20 the courts to continue to defraud the public – at the hand of a court with no proven jurisdiction.
21
22
23

24
25 ² Shingles occurs when the virus that causes chickenpox starts up again in your body. After you get better
26 from chickenpox, the virus "sleeps" (is dormant) in your nerve roots. In some people, it stays dormant
27 forever. In others, the virus "wakes up" when disease, stress, or aging weakens the immune system. Some
28 medicines may trigger the virus to wake up and cause a shingles rash. It is not clear why this happens. But
after the virus becomes active again, it can only cause shingles, not chickenpox.

1 22. Kramer needs medical attention to determine if she acquired a bacterial, viral and/or fungal
2 condition that is causing her organs to swell, while unlawfully incarcerated by this court. Kramer needs
3 continued counseling by Dr. Schwarz for her General Anxiety Disorder which is without doubt caused
4 by being "aligned and subject to libel" by this and prior courts for now seven years to point this court
5 even chose to unlawfully jeopardized her physical safety.

6 23. In case this court is viewing this as yet another opportunity to harass Kramer, she refuses a
7 mental evaluation by the "psych unit downtown" who would surely deem her mentally incompetent in
8 need of Sang to then become her legal voice. (Attached hereto as Exhibit 7 is the except of the
9 Contempt of Court hearing in which this Court was conspiring with Sang to give Kramer a false criminal
10 record to be able to then order a PC 1368³ evaluation at the "psych unit downtown".) On April 23,
11 2012, Kramer asked Sang if she was directed to bring up the PC 1368 in the Contempt hearing. Sang
12 refused to answer the yes or no question.

13 24. On April 12, 2012, this Court stated it "understood" that it has no jurisdiction. On April 24,
14 2012, this court refused to answer the direct "yes" or "no" question if it has jurisdiction. (Attached hereto
15 as Exhibit 8 are the transcript of April 12, 2012 & April 24, 2012)

16 25. On April 24, 2012, this Court, who could not even answer whether it has jurisdiction, scheduled
17 a new contempt of court hearing and trial for June 2012. (See April 24, 2012 transcript). Attached as
18 exhibit to the new complaint filed by Scheuer, is Kramer's public record court pleadings and the
19 evidence that this court unlawfully incarcerated Kramer for refusing to be coerced into perjury; along
20 with the evidence that this court knew Kramer could not comply with the January 19, 2012 Contempt of
21

22
23 ³ a) If, during the pendency of an action and prior to judgment, a doubt arises in the mind of the judge as to
24 the mental competence of the defendant, he or she shall state that doubt in the record and inquire of the
25 attorney for the defendant whether, in the opinion of the attorney, the defendant is mentally competent. If the
26 defendant is not represented by counsel, the court shall appoint counsel. At the request of the defendant or
27 his or her counsel or upon its own motion, the court shall recess the proceedings for as long as may be
28 reasonably necessary to permit counsel to confer with the defendant and to form an opinion as to the mental
competence of the defendant at that point in time.(b) If counsel informs the court that he or she believes the
defendant is or may be mentally incompetent, the court shall order that the question of the defendant's
mental competence is to be determined in a hearing which is held pursuant to Sections 1368.1 and 1369. If
counsel informs the court that he or she believes the defendant is mentally competent, the court may
nevertheless order a hearing. Any hearing shall be held in the superior court.

1 Court order at the time of its coercive, unlawful and prophylactic incarceration of her. (Attached hereto
2 as Exhibit 9 is Scheuer's newest complaint with the evidence attached as exhibit of this court
3 harassing Kramer by unlawful means to the point it has jeopardized her physical well being.)

4 **DECLARATION OF SHARON KRAMER**

5 I am sick. I will deliver Exhibits 1-5 and 7-9 on Monday, which the Court already possesses.

6 Attached is Exhibit 6 of the evidence of physical manifestation of illness at the hand of this Court.
7

8 I need medical attention directly because of the unlawful incarceration in a filthy communal
9 setting with a high risk segment of the population and the continued threat and libeling by this Court.
10

11 My organs are swollen; I am fearful of a powerful court who has no problem bending the law and
12 I am in pain & discomfort and have been for over one month. I need to understand if this physical
13 manifestation of serious symptoms is caused by exposure to bacterial, fungal or viral while unlawfully
14 incarcerated by this Court; or if it is a result of the shingles from stress of being subject to libel by this
15 Court and all its predecessors for now seven years.
16

17 I no longer have insurance and cannot afford medical diagnostics/treatment directly because of
18 what the courts have been doing to me for now seven years to conceal they framed me for libel, and
19 suppressed the evidence that Kelman committed perjury while willfully defrauding the public.
20

21 I do not want this Court to abuse my need for medical care and view it as opportunity to subject
22 me to physicians of its choosing to the benefit of the courts. I need to see physicians of my own
23 choosing with the court paying for the treatments and diagnostics.
24
25
26
27
28

1 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing is
2 true and correct, and as to matters stated on information and belief, I believe those matters to be true
3 with the evidence found extensively in this Court's case file and repeatedly suppressed by this Court,
4 and that this document was executed this 27th day of April, at Escondido, California.

5 
6 Sharon Noonan Kramer

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

Graybill
Medical Group

225 East Second Avenue
Escondido CA 920254249
(866)228-2236

PATIENT: Sharon Kramer
DATE OF BIRTH: 10/28/1955
DATE: 04/25/2012 10:15 AM
VISIT TYPE: Acute Office Visit
AGE: 56 Years
PROVIDER ID: Thao Dinh PAC
ACCOUNT ID: 64514

Nursing Comments

Pt here c/o rash on lower back x1mo

Time	Bp	Pulse	Pattern	Resp	Temp F	O2 Sat	Wt Lb	Wt Oz	Wt Kg	Ht Ft	Ht In	BMI
10:18 AM	104/60	88		16			193	00				

Measured By

Esmeralda Estrada, MA

Allergies:

Description

Penicillins

Reaction

Unknown

Comments

Penicillin

Meds, allergies reviewed by Esmeralda Estrada, MA

Subjective

56 y/o female patient here concerned about a rash on right lower back X1 month. She noticed the rash shortly after she was in a woman's detention center for 2 days. No URI's sxs. No change in soap, detergent, lotion. Pt. denies being out in the woods. She used OTC anti-fungal cream for 1 week without much improvement. Rash doesn't itch and isn't painful. Pt. reports pain around the rash in the lower back, hip area and RLQ prior to noticing the rash in lower back. Pain improving now.

Objective

Well developed, well nourished 56 y/o female patient. VS noted. No distress.

Skin: patch of erythematous papular lesions in right lower back. Some of the lesions are drying out. No discharge. No surrounding erythema.

Assessment/ Plan

Shingles rash (ICD-9 Code: 0539)

1. Reassurance given that it will take some time to completely resolve
2. FU w/PCP if sxs don't resolve or worsens

Thao Dinh PAC

Pt. seen under supervision of Loan Dao MD



EXHIBIT

2

LORNA SWARTZ MD
3252 HOLIDAY COURT STE 108
LA JOLLA CA 92037
PHONE 858 254 3749

January 12, 2012

DATE OF REPORT : 1/15/2012

NAME : Sharon Kramer Age 56 Date of Birth 10/28/ 1955

REASON FOR REFERRAL : Mental Status examination.

MENTAL STATUS EXAMINATION:

Health is good. No known allergies. Has smoked for past 35 years. She uses no illegal substances. The patient arrived on time for her appointment. She was groomed, friendly and cooperative. She was alert and oriented. Her gait was normal and coordinated. She was attentive and responsive. Her vocabulary was good as were her social interactive skills.

Previous testing had revealed her to have extremely well developed problem solving skills and it appears that this ability continues. Her thinking was organized. Her judgment was intact.

There was no atypical behavior, no impulsive acting out. Her memory appeared to be intact for both recent and past memories. Her speech is articulate, coherent and direct, good rhythm, no apraxia. Patient denies hallucinations visual and auditory and denies delusions. No suicidal or homicidal ideations. No abnormal thought process or content. No neuro-vegetative signs of depression. No mood swings. By report the patient is anxious and under enormous stress. She appears to be above average in intelligence and competence.

PAST PSYCHIATRIC HISTORY:

In the past she has been evaluated with extensive neuropsychological testing. The ultimate results revealed her to be smart, intelligent and competent.

REVIEW OF RECORDS:

Records of Dr Thomas Wegman from September 25, 2003.

DIAGNOSIS:

- Axis 1 Generalized Anxiety Disorder
- Axis 2 Deferred.
- Axis 3 None
- Axis 4 Hostile environment by being aligned and subject to libel -- 6
- Axis 5 GAF 60.

Signed
LORNA SWARTZ MD

Date

Lorna Swartz

1-21-12

EXHIBIT

3

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

VISTA, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, 1-6-2012; 1:30 P.M.

-000-

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT.)

THE COURT: KELMAN VERSUS KRAMER.

MR. SCHEUER: GOOD AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR. KEITH SCHEUER FOR PLAINTIFF.

THE COURT: YES, SIR.

MS. SANG: GOOD AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR. TRACEY SANG APPOINTED BY THE COURT TO REPRESENT MS. KRAMER. SHE HAS NOT ACCEPTED MY REPRESENTATION UP UNTIL NOW. 01:52PM

THE COURT: WELL, SHE HASN'T ACCEPTED IT NOW UNLESS YOU GOT A PHONE CALL.

MS. SANG: I DID GET A PHONE CALL FROM HER.

THE COURT: WHEN?

MS. SANG: I HAVE SPOKEN TO HER TODAY.

THE COURT: GOOD. AND?

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

THE COURT: WELL, THAT'S NOT REPRESENTING. I'M LOOKING AT A DECLARATION IF YOU HAVEN'T SEEN IT. 01:53PM

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

THE COURT: IT SAYS -- YOU CAN SAY WHAT YOU WISH AND I'M NOT GOING TO STOP YOU FROM THAT. I WANT YOU TO KNOW THAT.

BUT SHE VERY EXPLICITLY SAYS THAT "I DO NOT AUTHORIZE HER TO SPEAK ON MY BEHALF AT A CONTEMPT-OF-COURT HEARING SHOULD THIS COURT CHOOSE

1 TO PROCEED." AND THIS COURT WOULD CHOOSE TO
2 PROCEED.

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

6 THE COURT: SHE WAS SERVED WITH THE PAPERS AND,
7 MORE IMPORTANTLY, SHE FILED HER OWN APPEARANCE,
8 WHICH IS THE EQUIVALENT OF A GENERAL APPEARANCE. I
9 THINK IT WAS DECEMBER 23RD WHEN WE GOT THE FIRST OF
10 THE STACK THAT WE HAD. I'M GOING TO ASK YOU A 01:54PM
11 QUESTION IN A MINUTE THAT WILL TELL YOU WHERE I'M
12 REALLY COMING FROM AND WHY YOU'RE HERE.

13 MR. SCHEUER: EXCUSE ME, YOUR HONOR. MAY I BE
14 SEATED?

15 THE COURT: OF COURSE. BOTH OF YOU CAN. BE
16 COMFORTABLE.

17 BUT ALL OF THESE DOCUMENTS SAY THE SAME
18 THING, SOME OF THEM SAY YOU DON'T HAVE JURISDICTION,
19 AND I'M SAYING IT'S NOT MY UNDERSTANDING OF THE LAW.
20 ONCE YOU PARTICIPATE IN A PROCEEDING BY WAY OF 01:54PM
21 APPEARANCE, AS INDICATED BY THIS ENORMOUS SET OF
22 DOCUMENTS FILED DECEMBER 23RD, YOU'RE IN. AND NO
23 FURTHER ACTIVITY IS REQUIRED BY THE COURT AND
24 CERTAINLY NO ARRAIGNMENT.

25 BUT IN ANY EVENT, SHE HASN'T AUTHORIZED YOU
26 TO ACT FOR HER IN THE CONTEMPT PROCEEDING, SO I
27 DON'T SEE HOW I CAN DEAL WITH IT.

28 HERE'S WHAT I DID AND HERE'S WHY. SHE'S

1 NOT A BAD LADY; NOT IN MY JUDGMENT. BUT SHE'S
2 TERRIBLY CONFUSED, IF NOT ILL. I MEAN, IF IT WERE
3 ME, OR YOU, I SUSPECT, AND SOMEONE SAID, "LOOK, STOP
4 DOING THAT, THE JURY HAS DECIDED IT WAS WRONG, THE
5 APPELLATE COURT AGREED WITH THEM, ANOTHER, A NEW
6 JUDGE LOOKED AND SAID, LOOK, I'VE GOT TO UPHOLD THE
7 FINALITY OF THE RULING IN ANOTHER COURT, SO DON'T DO
8 IT," ALL SHE HAS TO DO IS STOP DOING IT.

9 I KNOW THAT'S NOT SOMETHING SHE'S PREPARED
10 TO DO. AND YET SHE CAME HERE, I THINK IT WAS 01:55PM
11 YESTERDAY, AND TRIED TO CONVINC ME NOT TO GO
12 FORWARD TODAY. NO BASIS FOR ME TO NOT GO FORWARD
13 TODAY. I MUST.

14 I HAVE SEEN AND HEARD FROM THE VERY
15 BEGINNING, IF THIS WERE A TRUE CRIMINAL CASE, PEOPLE
16 VERSUS, I WOULD BE ORDERING HER DOWN TO THE
17 PSYCHIATRIC UNIT FOR AN EXAMINATION, NOT THAT SHE
18 NEEDS INSTITUTIONALIZATION OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT,
19 BUT IF SHE'S NOT COMPETENT TO GO FORWARD IN THESE
20 PROCEEDINGS, SHE HAS A RIGHT TO SAY THAT AND HAVE 01:56PM
21 SOMEONE SAY IT FOR HER.

22 IT'S VERY TROUBLING, THE WHOLE THING IS
23 VERY TROUBLING. SHE'S RIGHT. I READ PART OF HER
24 PAPERS WHERE SHE SAID JUDGE NUGENT DOESN'T SEEM TO
25 WANT TO GO FORWARD. WELL, ON A PERSONAL LEVEL, I
26 THINK SHE'S RIGHT. ON A PROFESSIONAL LEVEL, I HAVE
27 A CHOICE AND I WILL GO FORWARD AND I WILL REACH
28 WHATEVER CONCLUSIONS THE RECORD THAT WE CREATE HERE

1 THIS AFTERNOON REQUIRES.

2 I'M TELLING YOU IF YOU HAVE ANY INFLUENCE
3 WITH HER, I WOULD DO ANYTHING I COULD TO GET HER
4 EXAMINED, IF I CAN, BY THE PSYCHIATRIC UNIT
5 DOWNTOWN. I WAS PREPARED TO SEE IF I COULD GET THAT
6 DONE TODAY. AND, YOU KNOW, PEOPLE AREN'T SUPPOSED
7 TO PARTICIPATE IN CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS IF THEY'RE
8 INCOMPETENT, AND HER COMPETENCE, IN MY MIND, IS A
9 SERIOUS QUESTION.

10 MS. SANG: I, TOO, HAVE GIVEN THOUGHT TO THIS 01:57PM
11 VERY ISSUE, YOUR HONOR. AND COUNSEL AND I WERE
12 DISCUSSING IT BEFORE THIS HEARING.

13 WHAT I AM -- AS A CRIMINAL ATTORNEY, THE
14 MECHANISMS THAT I USUALLY USE IN SITUATIONS LIKE
15 THIS IS A 1368.

16 THE COURT: 1368. I KNOW IT WELL.

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

19 THE COURT: SHE'S GOT TO BE CHARGED WITH A
20 MISDEMEANOR. I JUST READ THE SECTION. BUT I'M NOT 01:57PM
21 SO SURE THAT WE COULDN'T AT LEAST ATTEMPT TO GET HER
22 EXAMINED. I'VE GOT THE PAPERS. YOU KNOW, IF WE
23 COULD DOCTOR UP AN ORDER AND IF SHE WOULD GO, I'M
24 NOT GOING TO DO THAT IF SHE SAYS YOU PEOPLE ARE THE
25 ONES THAT HAVE THE COMPETENCE ISSUE, AND I'VE HAD A
26 PRO PER CLIENT TELL ME THAT ONCE. AND I CAN'T DO
27 ANYTHING ABOUT THAT.

28 I RESPECT HER AND I RESPECT HER RIGHTS IN

1 EVERY WAY. I JUST HATE TO SEE HER GOING IN THE
2 DIRECTION SHE'S GOING IN WHEN THERE'S SUCH AN EASY
3 ANSWER FOR HER. YOU KNOW, MIGHT BE A LOT OF WAYS TO
4 VOICE HER OPINIONS ABOUT A LOT OF THINGS WITHOUT
5 REPEATING THE DEFAMATORY LANGUAGE THAT HAS BEEN
6 ORDERED WRONG, DON'T DO IT ANYMORE. IT WOULD BE SO
7 EASY, BUT YOU KNOW, YOU KNOW YOU'VE DEALT WITH IT
8 ENOUGH TO KNOW THE PROBLEM.

9 BUT YOU TELL ME. DO YOU THINK SHE WOULD BE
10 WILLING TO BE EXAMINED? 01:58PM

11 MS. SANG: I CERTAINLY COULDN'T GIVE AN OPINION.
12 MY GUESS WOULD BE NO.

13 THE COURT: THAT'S MY GUESS, TOO. OKAY. WELL,
14 IT'S OUT THERE.

15 * MS. SANG: NONETHELESS, IT IS CERTAINLY WITHIN *
16 THE COURT'S POWER TO ORDER IT. AND --

17 THE COURT: I DON'T KNOW THAT. 1368 IS A
18 DIFFERENT BIRD. THIS ISN'T A 1368 MATTER, IT SEEMS
19 TO ME.

20 MS. SANG: WELL, MY OTHER MISGIVING ABOUT IT IS 01:58PM
21 * THAT THE STANDARD FOR 1368 IS SO LOW, I'M NOT -- *
22 ALMOST ANYONE CAN PASS IT, AS YOU KNOW. SO I'M NOT
23 SURE IT WOULD EVEN BE A SATISFACTORY MECHANISM IN
24 THE END.

25 THE COURT: WHAT -- DOES SHE HAVE ANY, I GATHER
26 SHE DOESN'T, HAVE ANY PSYCHIATRIST, TREATING
27 PSYCHIATRIST OR SOMEONE WHO COULD FURNISH US WITH AN
28 OPINION?

1 WHICH DOESN'T HELP THESE POOR FOLKS AND ALL
2 THEY WANT TO DO IS HAVE THE LAW APPLIED. I'M
3 TREMENDOUSLY EMPATHETIC TO THEIR POSITION. I'M
4 RIGHT IN THE MIDDLE OF A VERY DIFFICULT ONE. I
5 DON'T LIKE THAT. I LIKE TO THINK I CAN GET
6 SOMETHING DONE TO RESOLVE THE CASE THE WAY IT SHOULD
7 BE.

8 I'VE TRIED WITH HER. I REMEMBER THE OTHER
9 CASE WAS WHEN A FELLOW WAS OFF HIS MEDICATION AND I
10 TOLD HIM I WANTED NO PART OF MAKING LIFE MORE 01:59PM
11 MISERABLE FOR HIM THAN IT ALREADY WAS. ALL HE HAD
12 TO DO WAS TAKE HIS MEDICATION. LIKE TALKING TO A
13 WALL. HE WASN'T LISTENING TO THAT. NEVER DID
14 LISTEN. THEY HAD TO FIND HIM GUILTY. HE DID TIME.
15 ANYWAY. TOUGH STUFF.

16 IF YOU CAN THINK OF A WAY TO CREATE THAT
17 DEFENSE, I THINK THAT WOULD BE SOMETHING THAT MIGHT
18 BE INTERESTING. SHORT OF THAT, AND SHORT OF YOUR
19 AUTHORITY TO REALLY PARTICIPATE IN THE PROCEEDINGS
20 AS I GET IT, THEN I THINK WHAT WE'LL DO IS GO 02:00PM
21 FORWARD WITH THE PLAINTIFF.

22 MR. SCHEUER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

23 I HAVE TO ADMIT I'M A LITTLE BIT AT SEA
24 HERE, PROCEDURALLY. I WAS AT SEA HERE BEFORE I GOT
25 HERE THINKING THAT MS. KRAMER WOULD BE HERE. AND
26 THAT'S DOUBLE DOWN NOW.

27 WITH RESPECT TO WHAT YOU WERE JUST SAYING,
28 TRACEY WAS KIND ENOUGH TO CALL ME EARLIER AND WE'VE