

Emergency 2023 Omnibus Judiciary Bill Amending AB 1756 by:(1) Amending SBX 2 11 and related Government Code Sections; (2) Establishing Permanent State of California Commission on Judicial Oversight and Victims Compensation for Judicial Misconduct and Judicial Abuse of Power; (3) Amending AB 2960 Establishing Judicial Term Limits; and (4) Amending AB 2960 Requiring Retention Elections for Unopposed Superior Court Judges Seeking Re-Election

BILL NUMBER:
BILL TEXT

CHAPTER
FILED WITH SECRETARY OF STATE
APPROVED BY GOVERNOR
PASSED THE SENATE
PASSED THE ASSEMBLY

INTRODUCED BY [to be inserted]

**THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT
EMERGENCY LEGISLATION AS FOLLOWS:**

SECTION 1: The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:
This legislation addresses and responds:

- (1) to the systemic judicial crisis in California existing since approximately 1985 when individual counties and courts commenced paying State Superior Court judges sitting on State Superior Courts for their counties “supplemental or local judicial benefits” in addition to the State compensation (salary and benefits) paid to the judges by the State causing disparity in judges judicial salary and benefits, double taxation for citizens and residents in the “paying counties”, “unconstitutional (unlawful) ‘supplemental local judicial benefit payments’ ” to the judges resulting in 90% of California’s Superior Court judges receiving “bribes” under California and federal criminal laws;
- (2) to President Biden’s June 3, 2021, Memorandum declaring Corruption to be a National Security Issue stating in relevant part:
“My Administration will lead efforts **to promote good governance**; bring transparency to the United States and global financial systems; **prevent and combat corruption at home** and abroad; and **make it increasingly difficult for corrupt actors to shield their activities.**” (Emphasis added.); and

- (3) to the problem of judicial misconduct and judicial abuse of power in the judicial system by:
- (a) equalizing judicial compensation to all California Superior Court judges;
 - (b) establishing a “compensation of victims of judicial misconduct and judicial abuse of power in the Judicial system” procedure outside the California Judicial system with predetermined dollar amounts to be paid directly to the individual “victims” by the State Controller; and
 - (c) establishing an administrative procedure outside the California Judicial system with direct access to the Governor and the Legislature to recommend actions and legislation to rectify judicial misconduct and judicial abuse of power and institute oversight to prevent it from continuing or is reduced;
- (4) to the failure of SBX 2 11 to establish any means of compensation to the individual victims of judicial misconduct and judicial abuse of power in the California Judicial system:
- (a) while giving the perpetrators of unconstitutional payments to judges and the judges who received such payments in SBX 2 11, Section 5 retroactive immunity from civil liability, criminal prosecution and disciplinary action for all acts occurring prior to July 1, 2008;
 - (b) to the failure of SBX 2 11 to establish any means of compensation to the individual victims of judicial misconduct and abuse of power while allowing the “illegal payments” in Section 2;
 - (c) to the failure of SBX 2 11 to establish any means of compensation to the individual victims of “judicial officers” (including but not limited to Temporary Judges, Referees, Commissioners, Superior Court Judges, Court of Appeal Justices and/or Supreme Court Justices:
 - (i) who entered orders and judgments after deemed to have consented to their disqualification under CCP Section 170.3(c)(4);
 - (ii) who were disqualified under CCP Section 170.1 or 170.6; or
 - (iii) who failed to disclose information required under Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3E(2) and failed to disqualify themselves under Canon 3E(1);

(d) to the unlawful acts as exemplified by the egregious, examples of judicial misconduct and judicial abuse of power upon the following individuals:

- (i) Richard Lee Abrams;
- (ii) Stanley Atkinson;
- (iii) Stephan Brooks;
- (iv) Ryan Clifford;
- (v) Ione Daniels;
- (vi) Richard Isaac Fine;
- (vii) Gertrude Gettinger;
- (viii) Robert George Kincaid;
- (ix) Georges Marciano;
- (x) Carol Pulliam; and
- (xi) Felice Reyes;

- (5) The actions taken by the California Judiciary against victims of judicial misconduct and judicial abuse of power (as exemplified herein by actions taken against Richard Isaac Fine) violated Article 1, Sections 1, 2, 3, 7, 17 and 26 of the California Constitution;
- (6) The actions taken by the California Judiciary against victims of judicial misconduct and judicial abuse of power (as exemplified herein by actions taken against Richard Isaac Fine) violated:
 - (a) United States Constitution, Fourteenth Amendment, denial of due process and equal protection; *Cooper v. Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1, 18 (1958)-“No state legislator or executive or **judicial officer can war against the Constitution without violating his undertaking to support it.**” (Emphasis added.);
 - (b) California Constitution, Article 4, Section 18 (b) “misconduct in office” by engaging in conduct which punished lawyers for following their oath to uphold the Constitution and laws of the United States and the State of California; and
 - (c) California Constitution, Article 6, Section 14 – “Decisions of the Supreme Court and courts of appeal that determine causes shall be in writing with reasons stated.” by deciding motions affecting the jurisdiction of the court without reasons stated;
- (7) The individual victims of judicial misconduct and judicial abuse of power cannot obtain relief from the actions taken against them by the California Judiciary as no relief is available under either California or federal law due to either:
 - (a) lack of jurisdiction;
 - (b) absolute judicial immunity;

- (c) the Eleventh Amendment; and/or
- (d) bias of the judiciary;
- (8) The only relief available to the individual victims of judicial misconduct and judicial abuse of power is through action of the Legislature and the Governor by emergency legislation amending AB 1756 through amending SBX 2 11 and AB 2960;
- (9) The emergency nature of this problem requiring immediate passage of this legislation; and
- (10) It is imperative the Legislature and the Governor uphold the United States and California Constitutions, the integrity of the judicial system and underscore the commitment to never allow those who pursue the goals of such ever be punished for such pursuit.

SECTION 2. The following EMERGENCY AMENDMET TO AB 1756 is added to the laws of the State of California:

- (1) amending SBX 2 11 by repealing Section 2 (which added Section 68220 to the Government Code), Section 3 (which added Section 68221 to the Government Code), and Section 4 (which added Section 68222 to the Government Code) to create a uniform pay schedule for California Superior Court judges;
- (2) repealing Sections 68220, 68221 and 68222 of the Government Code;
- (3) amending SBX 2 11 by adding Section 8 establishing payments to the individual victims of the unlawful payments to State Superior Court judges by counties and courts, Court of Appeal Justices, and California Supreme Court Justices who received such while they were State Superior Court judges to be made by the State Controller from the annual funds budgeted to the State Court System;
- (4) amending SBX 2 11 by adding Section 9 establishing payments to individual victims of judicial officers (Referees, Commissioners, Temporary Judges, Superior Court Judges, Court of Appeal Justices State Supreme Court Justices):
 - (a) who entered orders and judgments after deemed to have consented to their disqualification under CCP Section 170.3(c)(4);
 - (b) who were disqualified under CCP Sections 170.1 and/or 170.6; or
 - (c) who failed to disclose information required under Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3E(2) and failed to disqualify themselves under Canon 3E(1);
- (5) amending SBX 2 11 by adding Section 10 which establishes payments to be made to the individuals claiming from January 1, 1985 onwards as victims of judicial misconduct and judicial abuse of power in Sections 8 and

9 by the California State Controller commencing from the effective date of this legislation from monies annually allocated to the Judicial Branch of the California State Government with a minimum of \$100 million per year annually diverted to the California State Controller to establish and pay for an independent State of California Permanent Commission on Judicial Oversight and Victim Compensation for Judicial Misconduct and Judicial Abuse of Power (Commission) with direct access to the Governor and the Legislature to recommend actions and legislation:

(a) composed of twelve (12) voting members (four (4) current elected officials or their designees while current, seven (7) citizen advocates and a chairperson):

(i) who are not, or were not members of, or employed by, the Judicial Branch of the California State Government;

(ii) to be individually paid under the State of California system at the rate of compensation equal to the compensation for the Governor of the State of California;

(iii) serving up to four-year terms, but no greater than eight (8) years total, being:

(aa) the then current Governor of California (serving without extra compensation) or his/her designee (serving with compensation), representing the Executive Branch of the California State Government;

(bb) the then current State Controller of California (serving without extra compensation) or his/her designee (serving with compensation), representing the Executive Branch of the California State Government;

(cc) the then current President Pro Tempore of the California State Senate (serving without extra compensation) or his/her designee (serving with compensation), representing the Legislative Branch of the California State Government;

(dd) the then current Speaker of the California State Assembly (serving without extra compensation) or his/her designee (serving with compensation); representing the Legislative Branch of the California State Government;

(ee) to be determined, and successor citizen advocates for civil court reform, representing the citizens of California, for initial term of up to four (4) years;

(ff) to be determined, and successor citizen advocates for criminal court reform, representing the citizens of California for an initial term of up to four (4) years;

(gg) to be determined, and successor citizen advocates for family court reform, representing the citizens of California for an initial term of up to four (4) years;

(hh) to be determined, and successor citizen advocates for juvenile court reform, representing the citizens of California for an initial term of up to four (4) years;

(ii) Robert Gettinger, and successor citizen advocates for probate court reform, representing the citizens of California for an initial term of up to four (4) years;

(jj) to be determined, and successor citizen advocates for appellate court and/or supreme court reform, representing the citizens of California for an initial term of up to four (4) years;

(kk) to be determined, and successor citizen advocates for civil, elder, human, individual, property, taxpayer, tenants, veteran's rights and/or other rights reform, representing the citizens of California for an initial term of up to four (4) years; and

(ll) Richard Isaac Fine, Doctor of Law, Ph.D. (the California lawyer who first exposed and brought the first lawsuit against the unlawful "county payments to Superior Court judges", the creator of this legislation, and the author of the Daily Kos article recognized in *Sturgeon v. County of Los Angeles*, supra, 242 Cal.App.4th at 1450 FN. 12 recognizing "groups as diverse as Judicial Watch and the Daily Kos continue to inveigh against county payments to judges.") as Chair Person and his successor citizen advocates for judicial integrity and judicial ethical reform, for an initial and a successive term, each of four (4) years; appointing initial and successor citizen advocates for the following categories:

- (1) civil court reform;
- (2) criminal court reform;
- (3) family court reform;
- (4) juvenile court reform;
- (5) probate court reform;

- (6) appellate and/or supreme court reform; and
 - (7) civil, human, individual, property, taxpayer, tenants, veterans' and/or other rights reform;
- (b) with the Commission's employees paid under the State of California compensation system;
- (c) with the following duties are amongst others:
 - (i) to oversee the Judicial Branch of the State of California Government;
 - (ii) to directly compensate the victims of judicial misconduct and judicial abuse of power through the State Controller;
 - (iii) to ensure the State Controller completes the requirement to report the offending Judicial Officers to the Commission on Judicial Performance on a monthly and annual basis;
 - (iv) to ensure the Commission on Judicial Performance completes the requirement to complete each investigation reported to it by the State Controller and/or other source including individual complainants, within six months after receipt of such Report/source/complaint:(aa) with a written decision containing reasons stated for such decision signed by the Commissioners within six months after receipt of such Report/source/complaint; (bb) in the event any such investigation is not completed with a signed written Report within the six month time period, the Commissioners of the Commission on Judicial Performance shall be deprived of all State Compensation and benefits until the date such Report is filed with the Commission on Judicial Performance and served upon the Controller/source/ complainant; and (cc) convey semi-annual Reports of the results of such investigations to the California State Auditor;
 - (v) to ensure the California State Auditor:
 - (aa) continuously audits the Commission on Judicial Performance to ensure the Commission on Judicial Performance is fully investigating, reviewing and making determinations as required under law on each Judicial Officer's individual and historical misconduct as reported both by the California State Controller and independently from other sources;
 - (bb) makes annual reports to the State Senate and State Assembly as to the conduct of the Commission on Judicial Performance in conducting its duties including

but not limited to its successes, failures, and operational deficiencies regarding the misconduct of the Judicial Officers; and

(cc) makes recommendations for legislation to improve the operation of the Commission on Judicial Performance to reduce the misconduct and abuse of power of the judiciary, including but not limited to the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar of California and the State Bar Court;

(vi) to enforce the twenty-four (24) year individual judicial term limit; and

(vii) to perform such other acts as necessary to administer and enforce this legislation commencing upon the effective date of this legislation; under funding of \$100 million annually or more provided each year through the Annual State Budget or an amendment thereto through a trailer bill for the 2023-2024 Annual State Budget and within the consecutive Annual Budgets thereafter; from monies annually allocated to the Judicial Branch of the California State Government as follows:

(aa) \$1 million tax free per year for each year from January 1, 1985, onwards for defamation (including libel) caused by judicial misconduct or judicial abuse of power which existed or continues to exist;

(bb) \$10 million tax free per year for each year from January 1, 1985, onwards for unlawful incarceration caused by judicial misconduct or judicial abuse of power which existed or continues to exist;

(cc) \$10 million tax free for fraud upon the court caused by judicial misconduct or judicial abuse of power from January 1, 1985, onwards;

(dd) \$10 million tax free for fraud caused by judicial misconduct or judicial abuse of power from January 1, 1985, onwards;

(ee) \$10 million tax free for intentional interference with contract caused by judicial misconduct or judicial abuse of power from January 1, 1985, onwards;

(ff) \$10 million tax free for negligent interference with contract caused by judicial misconduct or judicial abuse of power from January 1, 1985, onwards;

- (gg) \$10 million tax free for intentional interference with prospective business advantage caused by judicial misconduct or judicial abuse of power from January 1, 1985, onwards;
- (hh) \$10 million tax free for negligent interference with prospective business advantage caused by judicial misconduct or judicial abuse of power from January 1, 1985, onwards;
- (ii) \$10 million tax free for intentional infliction of emotional distress caused by judicial misconduct or judicial abuse of power from January 1, 1985, onwards;
- (jj) \$10 million tax free for negligent infliction of emotional distress caused by judicial misconduct or judicial abuse of power from January 1, 1985, onwards;
- (kk) \$10 million tax free for bias against self-represented litigants from January 1, 1985, onwards;
- (ll) \$10 million tax free for bias against litigants with physical or mental disabilities from January 1, 1985, onwards;
- (mm) \$10 million tax free for abuse against litigants over 65 years old (elder abuse) from January 1, 1985, onwards;
- (nn) \$10 million tax free for any other cause of action not mentioned above caused by judicial misconduct or judicial abuse of power from January 1, 1985, onwards;
- (oo) \$10 million tax free for any other unmentioned misconduct or abuse of power by the “Judicial Officer” (Referees, Commissioners, Temporary Judges, Superior Court Judges, Court of Appeal Justices and/or State Supreme Court Justices) from January 1, 1985 onwards;
- and
- (pp) additionally for attorneys who brought cases against counties or the courts of the State of California from January 1, 1985, onwards:
- (1) one third (33.33%) of damages alleged or shown in any case prior to trial dismissed by a Superior Court judge who received “supplemental or local judicial benefits” or other unlawful payment;

- (2) forty percent (40%) for any case settled or dismissed prior to trial; and
- (3) one half (50%) of damages awarded at trial and/or then denied or overturned by the California Supreme Court, any panel of a State Court of Appeal or Appellate Division of a Superior Court upon which a justice or judge who violated or is violating paragraph (2)(a)-(c) above was or is a member; and

(6) amending SBX 2 11 by adding Sections 11-25 to directly compensate the following individual victims as egregious examples and representatives of the various categories of judicial misconduct and abuse of power upon which the Commission and California State Controller may rely as precedents for his/her awards:

- (a) Stanley Atkinson, Richard Lee Abrams, Stephan Brooks, Ione Daniels, Richard Isaac Fine, Gertrude Gettinger, Robert George Kincaid and Carol Pulliam for the category allowing County or court payments to judges to negatively control judicial decisions;
- (b) Richard Lee Abrams, Georges Marciano and Carol Pulliam for the category of antisemitism and bias against religion, race, gender or sexuality to negatively control judicial decisions;
- (c) Stanley Atkinson, Stephan Brooks, Ryan Clifford, Ione Daniels, Robert George Kincaid and Felice Reyes for the category allowing status of representation, such as self- representation before the court to negatively control judicial decisions;
- (d) Ryan Clifford for the category allowing the litigant's physical or mental disability to negatively control judicial decisions;
- (e) Stanley Atkinson, Richard Isaac Fine and Gertrude Gettinger for the category allowing the age of the litigant being 65 years or older (Elder Abuse) to negatively control judicial decisions;
- (f) Richard Isaac Fine, Doctor of Law; Ph.D. Law (International Law) for the category of judicial and/or political retaliation by "Judicial Officers" and their "Associates and Affiliates in the Judicial Branch" (such as the State Bar of California or California State Bar, of which five of its thirteen of its Board of Governors is selected by the California Supreme Court and seven of its thirteen members are members of the State Bar of California, the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar of California and the State Bar Court) against lawyers and others who expose and/or challenge judicial misconduct and abuse of power, in particular:

(i) the retaliation of the Los Angeles Superior Court judges and court commissioners who filed false charges against Richard Isaac Fine State Bar Number 055259 on two occasions and admitted to the Public Information Officer of the Los Angeles Superior Court:

- (aa) a “visceral hatred against Fine”;
- (bb) a “seeking of revenge against Fine”;
- (cc) a “want to silence Fine”; and
- (dd) a “want to take Fine out of communication” amongst other things “for his keeping the issue of county payments to the judges before the courts and the legislature”;

(ii) the errors of the California Supreme Court which institutionalized such retaliation;

(iii) the unlawful acts of the California Supreme Court which included:

- (aa) the refusal to overturn the October 17, 2007, Involuntary Enrollment of Richard Isaac Fine by the State Bar Court;
- (bb) unlawfully disbarring Richard Isaac Fine State Bar Number 055259 effective March 13, 2009, while knowing such disbarment was a sham and a “fraud upon the court”; and
- (cc) denying without reason stated, six motions to Set Aside as Null and Void Ab Initio the October 17, 2007 State Bar Court Order of Involuntary Inactive and March 13, 2009 Disbarment by the California Supreme Court of Richard Isaac Fine which were not opposed by the State Bar of California and “may be deemed a consent to the granting of the motion” under California Rule of Court 8.54(c) [Denials were: 3/25/2009, 1/18/2012, 2/13/2013, 6/19/2013, 6/14/2017 and the last denial being October 11, 2018]; and

(iv) the January 13, 2022, Cease and Desist Notice issued by Kerri Riley of the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar of California (Notice) which violated:

- (aa) the public position of the State Bar of California that the October 17, 2007 State Bar Court Order of Involuntary Enrollment and the March 13, 2009 Disbarment by the California Supreme Court of Richard

Isaac Fine were Frauds Upon the Court as shown by its public opposition to the order to show cause in the case of *Richard I. Fine v. State Bar of California Et Al.* in which it stated Richard I. Fine was disbarred because of his opposition to SBX 2 11 and the California State Bar's public non-opposition to Richard I. Fine's six motions to set aside the October 17, 2007 State Bar Court Order of Involuntary Enrollment and March 13, 2009 California Supreme Court Disbarment for Fraud Upon the Court; (bb) 42 U.S.C. Section 1985, Section 2 (a federal civil rights statute) and 42 U.S.C. Section 1503 (a criminal obstruction of a federal trial statute). The Notice was meant to, and does, threaten and impede Richard Isaac Fine's ability to be a witness for Russell Randall in the case of *Xeriant, Inc. v. Russell Randall; and Russell Randall v. Xeriant, Inc.* currently pending in the U.S. District Court in the Southern District of Florida.

The Notice referenced as a first basis for the Notice, a complaint by William Igbokwe, a New York attorney not qualified in California, attorney for Xeriant, Inc., a public corporation, incorporated in Nevada, with its principal place of business in Florida, not qualified to do business in California.

Xeriant's attorney William Igbokwe alleged that Richard Isaac Fine was practicing law in the State of California without a California Bar license when engaging in long distance four person phone conversations and emails with Xeriant's attorney William Igbokwe in New York, an Xeriant Board of Director member in Texas and Russell Randall in Florida, discussing when Xeriant was going to issue the preferred shares of Xeriant, Inc. Russell Randall had assigned to Richard Isaac Fine, for Strategic Consulting relating to Xeriant's business decisions to reduce Russell Randall's share of the company and not pay him for his patent of a vertical takeoff and landing electrical aircraft patent design he contributed to the company in exchange for such shares and Xeriant's alternative suggestions to such issuance.

Igbokwe's "Linked In" page states he was the "President and General Counsel of Covenant Group Beverly Hills,

Aug 2017-Jan 2019 1yr 6mos”. A California Bar search of lawyers showed William Igbokwe is not, and never was, qualified to practice law in California. As General Counsel of Covenant Group Beverly Hills William Igbokwe was practicing law in California without a license.

William Igbokwe’s complaint implied that he was practicing law without a license in California by claiming that the phone call was under California’s jurisdiction, as he was the only person who did not have a personal financial interest in the subject matter of the phone call. During such conversations and emails, Xeriant Inc.’s attorney William Igbokwe and a Director concealed that Xeriant’s Directors had unlawfully cancelled Russell Randall’s preferred shares in Xeriant, Inc., and refused to re-assign the patent and intellectual property for the vertical takeoff and landing aircraft and drone known as the “Halo” which was the subject for which the preferred shares in Xeriant, Inc., were issued to Russell Randall who assigned a portion to Richard Isaac Fine as his Strategic Consultant.

On January 13, 2022 when Kerri Riley of the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar of California issued its Cease and Desist Notice, the lawsuit was public for over five months, a counterclaim by Russell Randall was public over two months and Kerri Riley and the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar of California were aware that she and it were conspiring, and/or acting in concert, with Xeriant, Inc., its attorney William Ogbokwe and its Director to violate 42 U.S.C. Section 1985, Section 2, and 42 U.S.C. Section 1503; (cc) the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel gave a second reason for the Notice which was the reference in Dr. Richard I. Fine’s personal biography on the website for Richard I. Fine & Associates Strategic Consulting & Mediation that “He [Richard I. Fine] is the principal of Richard I. Fine & Associates which was established in 1974 as an international law firm.”, which the website did not reference such law firm as being currently active under California law; did not state Fine was practicing

California law or currently qualified to practice California law, and was only mentioned in the personal historic biography of Richard Isaac Fine; and

(dd) The Notice did not provide any statute or California Rule of Court mandating, permitting or allowing the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar of California to issue a Cease and Desist Notice nor does such exist rendering the Notice an abuse of judicial power and unlawful;

(g) Richard Lee Abrams, Stanley Atkinson, Stephan Brooks, Richard Isaac Fine, Gertrude Gettinger, Robert George Kincaid, Georges Marciano, Carol Pulliam and Felice Reyes for the category of judges who were disqualified under law and did not leave the case to negatively control judicial decisions; and

(h) Richard Lee Abrams, Stanley Atkinson, Stephan Brooks, Ryan Clifford, Ione Daniels, Richard Isaac Fine, Gertrude Gettinger, Robert George Kincaid, Georges Marciano, Carol Pulliam and Felice Reyes for the category of a combination of any of the above or other unlawful factors to negatively control judicial decisions;

(7) amending SBX 2 11 by adding Section 11 to SBX 2 11 awarding Richard Isaac Fine as a representative of the various categories to be immediately paid by the California State Controller tax free from funds allocated to the State Courts, State Judiciary and counties (where a county was a defendant in a particular case from which the award is being made):

(a) Defamation: \$21 million tax free for the publication of *Fine v. Superior Court*, 97 Cal.App.4th 651 (2002) from 2002 through 2022;

(b) Defamation: \$15 million tax free for the publication of Involuntary Enrollment October 17, 2007, through 2022, California State Bar Case No:04-O-14366; \$13 million tax free for the publication of Disbarment March 13, 2009, through 2022; California State Bar Case No:04-O-14366; \$1 million tax free for the Cease and Desist Notice, January 13, 2022, State Bar Investigation;

(c) Unlawful Incarceration: \$18 million tax free for the Unlawful Solitary, Coercive, Confinement in the Los Angeles County Jail from March 9, 2009-September 17, 2010 (18 months) by Los Angeles Superior Court Judge David P. Yaffe who consented to his Disqualification in the case of *Marina Strand Colony II Homeowners Association v. County of Los Angeles et al.*, under CCP Section 170.3(c)(4); Judge Yaffe was receiving \$827,612.55 in illegal payments from Los Angeles County which he did not disclose;

- (d) Elder Abuse: \$10 million tax free representing actions by Judge Yaffe for his unlawful actions including but not limited to contempt, solitary coercive incarceration for eighteen months against Fine who was 69-70 years old in the case of *Marina Strand Colony II Homeowners Association v. County of Los Angeles et al.*;
- (e) Elder Abuse: \$10 million tax free representing the illegal October 17, 2007, California State Bar Court and subsequent California Supreme Court Involuntary Enrollment; \$10 million representing the illegal March 13, 2009 California Supreme Court Disbarment; and \$10 million representing the January 13, 2022 illegal and unsupported California State Bar Cease and Desist Notice, State Bar Case No.:21-U-08649, actions commencing in 2006 when Fine was 66 through the present when Fine is 82;
- (f) Fraud Upon the Court: \$10 million tax free representing the illegal October 17, 2007, California State Bar Court and subsequent California Supreme Court Involuntary Enrollment; \$10 million representing the illegal March 13, 2009, California Supreme Court Disbarment; and \$10 million representing the January 13, 2022, illegal and unsupported California State Bar Cease and Desist Notice, State Bar Case No.:21-U-08649;
- (g) Intentional/Negligent Interference with Contract: \$10 million tax free representing the illegal October 17, 2007, California State Bar Court and subsequent California Supreme Court Involuntary Enrollment; \$10 million representing the illegal March 13, 2009, California Supreme Court Disbarment; and \$10 million representing the January 13, 2022, illegal and unsupported California State Bar Cease and Desist Notice, State Bar Case No.:21-U-08649;
- (h) Intentional/Negligent Interference with Prospective Business Advantage: \$10 million tax free representing the illegal October 17, 2007, California State Bar Court and subsequent California Supreme Court Involuntary Enrollment; \$10 million representing the illegal March 13, 2009, California Supreme Court Disbarment; and \$10 million representing the January 13, 2022, illegal and unsupported California State Bar Cease and Desist Notice, State Bar Case No.:21-U-08649;
- (i) Intentional/Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress: \$100 million tax free for each of ten cases in which the judge or justice did not disqualify himself or herself as required by CCP Section 170.1(a)(6)(A)(i-111) and or Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3E(1) and (2);

(j) Fraud Upon the Court: \$100 million tax free collectively representing the total for each of ten cases in which the judge or justice did not disqualify himself or herself as required by CCP Section 170.1(a)(6)(A)(i-111) and or Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3E(1) and (2);

(k) Attorney's fees: 50% of awards on cases won at trial and overturned on appeal by disqualified judges or justices
\$179,500,000.00:

(i) \$22,500,000.00 of the 1999 trial judgment of \$45 million taken from Environmental Fund and put into Los Angeles County General Fund annually: enjoined by trial verdict with remaining money returned to Environmental Fund; Judgment now worth \$1 billion; Case *Amjadi and LACAOEHS v. County of Los Angeles*;

(ii) \$150 million of the 1999 trial judgment of \$300 million taken by Los Angeles County in cash (\$150 million) and loan (\$150 million) from the Transportation Fund and put into the General Fund: Judgment returned to the Transportation Fund; Case *Veltman v. County of Los Angeles et al*; and

(iii) \$7 million of the \$14 million admitted at trial in 1999 to be held illegally by the office of Defendant Los Angeles District Attorney Gil Garcetti: Case *Silva v. Los Angeles County District Attorney Gil Garcetti*;

(l) Attorney's fees: 33.33% of damages alleged or shown in any case prior to trial:

(i) \$214,500,000.00 of the \$650 million in damages shown in a series of cases *Coalition to Save the Marina and Marina Tenants Association v. County of Los Angeles et al.* brought from 2001-2004 alleging in the previous tenyears the County of Los Angeles was receiving approximately \$35 million per year from lessees on County owned land while the lessees were earning approximately \$350 million per year. Expert reports showed that the County should be receiving approximately \$100 million per year, resulting in a loss of \$65 million per year over ten years or \$650 million. The Superior Court Judge Soussan G. Bruguera was receiving illegal payments of \$547,232.80 from Los Angeles County and refused to recuse herself Writs of mandate were summarily denied by appellate justices and California Supreme Court justices who also had

received illegal payments from LA County and other counties;
and

(ii) \$2,500,000.00 as a 33.33% fee of an estimated \$7,500,000.00 damage for usurping state law on unfit vessels and for evicting live in boaters from slips in the case of *Coalition to Save the Marina et al. v. County of Los Angeles, Marina Pacific Associates and Bellport Corp.* where the Superior Court Judge Elihu Berle took illegal payments from LA County in the amount of \$637,206.88;

(8) amending SBX 2 11 by adding Section 12 to rectify the retaliation imposed upon Richard Isaac Fine State Bar Number 055259 by the California judiciary and State Bar of California as being the first attorney to expose and challenge, and only attorney to seek to redress, the problem of unlawful payments to California Superior Court judges by Los Angeles County and other counties in the California Courts as follows:

(a) The October 17, 2007, Involuntary Enrollment by the State Bar Court, the March 13, 2009, Effective Disbarment of Richard Isaac Fine State Bar Number 055259 by the California Supreme Court and the January 13, 2022, Cease and Desist Notice by Kerri Riley of the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar of California each is Null and Void Ab Initio;

(b) All State Bar records are ordered immediately corrected to reflect the Voiding and Annulment of the October 17, 2007 Involuntary Enrollment by the State Bar Court, the March 13, 2009 Effective Disbarment of Richard Isaac Fine State Bar Number 055259 by the California Supreme Court and the January 13, 2022 Cease and Desist Notice by Kerri Riley of the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar of California to reflect: (1) no such actions against Richard Isaac Fine; and (2) Richard Isaac Fine being an Active Member of the State Bar of California at all times from October 17, 2007 without any back dues owed or CLE Requirements unfulfilled;

(c) The State Bar of California and the California Supreme Court are ordered to immediately notify all federal and state Courts and other entities which were notified of the October 17, 2007 Involuntary Enrollment, and/or the March 13, 2009 Effective Disbarment of Richard Isaac Fine State Bar Number 055259 by the California Supreme Court, and/or the January 13, 2022 Cease and Desist Notice by Kerri Riley of the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar of California and/or the State Bar of California of the

Voiding and Annuling Ab Initio of the October 17, 2007 Involuntary Enrollment by the State Bar Court, the March 13, 2009 Effective Disbarment of Richard Isaac Fine State Bar Number 055259 by the California Supreme Court and the January 13, 2022 Cease and Desist Notice by Kerri Riley of the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar of California, and are further ordered to request such court or entity adjust its records to reflect such and take any and all action to reverse any action taken against Richard Isaac Fine because of such October 17, 2007 Involuntary Enrollment and/or March 13, 2009 Effective Disbarment and/or the January 13, 2022 Cease and Desist Notice by Kerri Riley of the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar of California including but not limited to:

- (i) the State Bar of Illinois;
 - (ii) the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia;
 - (iii) the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit;
 - (iv) the United States District Court for the Central District of California;
 - (v) the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California; and
 - (vi) the United States Supreme Court (in the event of any unknown action was taken in such court); at the present time, Richard Isaac Fine is qualified to practice in the United States Supreme Court;
- (d) Richard Isaac Fine is ordered immediately enrolled as an Active Member of the State Bar of California for Life with a Waiver of all Past and Future Dues and a Waiver of all Past and Future CLE Requirements effective as of October 17, 2007;
- (e) The immediate Voiding, Annuling and De Publication is ordered of the decision of *Fine v. Superior Court*, (2002) 97 Cal.App.4th 651, which was voided and annulled by the Superior Court Voiding and Annuling its underlying Order and Judgment of Contempt on September 24, 2001 in Response to the U.S. District Court’s August 12, 2002 “Stay of Execution; Order to Show Cause Re Immediately Granting Habeas Corpus Relief” in the Case of *Fine v. Superior Court*, USDC Case No. CV-02-4647 GLT (SLG)(2002); and
- (f) The March 9, 2009 Contempt order and all other orders and judgments entered by Judge David P. Yaffe against Richard Isaac

Fine in the case of *Marina Strand Colony II Homeowners Association v. County of Los Angeles et al.* are legislatively made null and void as Judge Yaffe did not disclose he was taking money from Los Angeles County until he admitted such on March 20, 2008 under questioning by Richard Isaac Fine, did not respond within ten days after being disqualified by Richard Isaac Fine and was deemed to have consented to such disqualification on the eleventh day after service upon him under CCP Section 170.3(c)(4) thereby voiding and annulling any order or judgment of his or any successor, from the outset of the case;

- (9) amending SBX 2 11 by adding Section 13 to SBX 2 11 awarding Richard Lee Abrams, J.D., State Bar Number 77258 as a representative of the various categories to be immediately paid by the California State Controller tax free from funds allocated to the State Courts, State Judiciary and counties (where a county was a defendant in a particular case from which the award is being made:
- (a) Defamation \$3 million from the entry Involuntary Enrollment on July 17, 2020, and Disbarment on December 21, 2020, through 2022;
 - (b) Fraud Upon the Court: \$10 million tax free representing the case of in the case of *Save Hollywood v. City of Los Angeles* also filed as *Hollywoodians Encouraging Logical Planning (HELP) v. City of Los Angeles* in which Judge John A. Torribio made anti-semitic statements about Richard Lee Abrams and did not disqualify himself as required by CCP Section 170.1(a)(6)(A)(i-111) and or Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3E(1)and(2); and
 - (c) Intentional/Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress: \$10 million tax free representing the case of in the case of *Save Hollywood v. City of Los Angeles* also filed as *Hollywoodians Encouraging Logical Planning (HELP) v. City of Los Angeles* in which Judge John A. Torribio made anti-semitic statements about Richard Lee Abrams and did not disqualify himself as required by CCP Section 170.1(a)(6)(A)(i-111) and or Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3E(1)and(2);
- (11) amending SBX 2 11 by adding Section 14 to rectify the antisemitism imposed upon Richard Lee Abrams, J.D., State Bar Number 77258 by the California judiciary by:
- (a) The July 17, 2020, Involuntary Enrollment by the State Bar Court and the December 21, 2020, Effective Disbarment of

- Richard Lee Abrams State Bar Number 77258 by the California Supreme Court each is Null and Void Ab Initio;
- (b) All State Bar records are ordered immediately corrected to reflect the Voiding and Annuling of the July 17, 2020 Involuntary Enrollment by the State Bar Court and the December 21, 2020 Effective Disbarment of Richard Lee Abrams State Bar Number 77258 by the California Supreme Court to reflect no such actions against Richard Lee Abrams and Richard Lee Abrams being an Active Member of the State Bar at all times from July 17, 2020 without any back dues owed or CLE Requirements unfulfilled;
 - (c) The State Bar and the California Supreme Court are ordered to immediately notify all federal and state Courts and other entities which were notified of the July 17, 2020 Involuntary Enrollment and/or the December 21, 2020 Effective Disbarment of Richard Lee Abrams State Bar Number 77258 by the California Supreme Court of the Voiding and Annuling Ab Initio of the July 17, 2020 Involuntary Enrollment by the State Bar Court and the December 21, 2020 Effective Disbarment of Richard Lee Abrams State Bar Number 77258 by the California Supreme Court and ordered to request such court or entity adjust its records to reflect such and take any and all action to reverse any action taken against Richard Lee Abrams because of such July 17, 2020 Involuntary Enrollment and/or December 21, 2020 Effective Disbarment;
 - (d) Richard Lee Abrams is ordered immediately enrolled as an Active Member of the State Bar of California for Life with a Waiver of all Past and Future Dues and a Waiver of all Past and Future CLE Requirements effective as of July 17, 2020;
- (12) amending SBX 2 11 by adding Section 15 to SBX 2 11 awarding Georges Marciano as a representative of the various categories to be immediately paid by the California State Controller tax free from funds allocated to the State Courts, State Judiciary and counties (where a county was a defendant or had an interest in a particular case from which the award is being made, in particular a county employee testifying in the case) based upon Judge Elizabeth White's not disqualifying herself as required by CCP Section 170.1(a)(6)(A)(iii) and/or Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3E(1) and (2) at the outset of the cases of *Marciano v. Fahs et al.* and *Marciano v. Iskowitz et al.*:

- (a) Defamation \$26 million from 2009 through 2022 in 2009 State Superior Court Judge Elizabeth White:
 - (i) made antisemitic and other defamatory statements against Georges Marciano in the case of *Marciano v. Fahs et al.*:
 - (aa) referring to him as an “eel”, an antisemitic reference going back to the serpent statements in the French Dreyfus case referring to Jews as snakes and allowing counsel to refer to him as a “rattlesnake”;
 - (bb) referring to him as “paranoid”;
 - (cc) referring to him as having “other emotional issues”;
 - (dd) then: (1) dismissing his complaint; (2) striking his Answer to defendants’ counter claims; (3) entering defaults to the counter claims; and (4) entering default judgements of hundreds of millions of dollars which were later reduced to \$260.3 million;
 - (ii) made defamatory statements against George Marciano in the case of *Marciano v. Iskowitz et al.*;
 - (iii) additionally on separate grounds she was not allowed to be the trial judge on each of the cases remanded by the respective state Courts of Appeal for retrial on the damage portions of each of the cases;
- (b) Fraud Upon the Court: \$20 million tax free representing the cases of *Marciano v. Fahs et al.* and *Marciano v. Iskowitz et al.* in which Judge White made antisemitic and other defamatory statements about Georges Marciano and complained about his exercising his First Amendment Right to “picket the courthouse”;
- (c) Intentional/or Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress: \$20 million tax free representing the cases of *Marciano v. Fahs et al.* and *Marciano v. Iskowitz et al.* in which Judge White made antisemitic and other defamatory statements about Georges Marciano and complained about his exercising his First Amendment Right to “picket the courthouse”;
- (d) Marciano’s Lost Monies due to actions of Judge Elizabeth White \$260.3 million:
 - (i) The California Court of Appeal reduced the damage judgement in the *Marciano v. Fahs et al.* cross complaint against Georges Marciano to \$50 million if accepted by the five cross complainants, if not the case would be retried before a judge other than Judge White;

- (ii) The California Court of Appeal remanded the \$55 million damage award to be retried before a judge other than Judge White in the *Marciano v. Iskowitz et al.* cross complaint; and
- (iii) The United States 9th Circuit Court of Appeals disregarded each of these decisions in the involuntary bankruptcy instituted against George Marciano by the “Fahs Creditors” leaving the \$260.3 million damage awards in place;

(12) amending SBX 2 11 by adding Section 16 to SBX 2 11 awarding Stephan Brooks as a representative of the various categories to be immediately paid by the California State Controller tax free from funds allocated to the State Courts, State Judiciary and counties (where a county was a defendant or had an interest in a particular case from which the award is being made) based upon California Superior Court Judges Mitchell L. Beckloff, Maria E. Stratton (now Associate Justice California Second District Court of Appeal), Michael C. Small and others not disqualifying themselves as required by CCP Section 170.1(a)(6)(A)(iii) and/or Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3E(1) and (2) at the outset of the cases of:

(a) *Estate of Sherrell Atwood, Deceased* filed January 17, 2007, a probate case which:

- (i) was not mandatorily dismissed for failure to timely file an initial accounting;
- (ii) did not qualify for probate as it was below the minimum dollar requirement; and
- (iii) never claimed the property located at 8708 12th Avenue, Inglewood, CA 90305 as part of the Estate);

(b) *In re Trust of Sireaner Townsend*, filed October 24, 2008, a probate case filed by Maurice Smith and Clifford Townsend challenging Stephan Brooks as the sole heir as the trust of Sireaner Townsend in which the property located at 8708 12th Avenue, Inglewood, CA 90305 was the asset of the Trust of Sireaner Townsend; the case was settled but the settlement never approved by Judge Beckloff, the case has never been dismissed;

(c) *In re Sireaner Townsend Decedent*, filed September 10, 2009, a probate case filed by Maurice Smith and Clifford Townsend challenging Stephan Brooks as the sole beneficiary of the Pour Over Will of Sireaner Townsend never prosecuted by Maurice Smith and Clifford Townsend and never dismissed by Judge Beckloff; and

(d) *Paco Michelle Atwood, Administrator of the Estate of Sherrell Atwood v. Stephan Brooks* filed April 12, 2013, a partition case in

which the Estate of Sherrell Atwood did not own part of the subject property located at 8708 12th Avenue, Inglewood, CA 90305:

(i) Fraud Upon the Court/Fraud: \$40 million tax free representing the cases of *Estate of Sherrell Atwood, Deceased, Trust of Sireaner Townsend, Sireaner Townsend Decedent and Estate of Sherrell Atwood v. Stephan Brooks* in which Judges Beckloff and Stratton received “supplemental local judicial benefits” from Los Angeles County prior to and after July 1, 2008 and Judge Small received “supplemental local judicial benefits” from Los Angeles County from 2015 and each judge was biased against Stephan Brooks and in favor of Paco Michelle Atwood, Maurice Smith and Clifford Townsend based upon such payments;

(ii) Intentional/Negligent Interference with Contract: \$20 million by allowing the Administer of the Estate of Sherrell Atwood Paco Michelle Atwood in the case of *Estate of Sherrell Atwood, Deceased* and the Receiver Charles “Butch” Grimes in the case of *Estate of Sherrell Atwood, Deceased v. Stephan Brooks* to refuse to pay property taxes and the mortgage on the property to which each made a claim allowing such to go into default and foreclosure over the objection of Stephan Brooks;

(iii) Intentional/Negligent Interference with Prospective Business Advantage: \$20 million by allowing the Administer of the Estate of Sherrell Atwood Paco Michelle Atwood in the case of *Estate of Sherrell Atwood, Deceased* and the Receiver Charles “Butch” Grimes in the case of *Estate of Sherrell Atwood, Deceased v. Stephan Brooks* to refuse to pay property taxes and the mortgage on the property to which each made a claim allowing such to go into default and foreclosure over the objection of Stephan Brooks; and

(iv) Intentional/Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress: \$40 million tax free representing the cases of *Estate of Sherrell Atwood, Deceased, Trust of Sireaner Townsend, Sireaner Townsend Decedent and Estate of Sherrell Atwood v. Stephan Brooks* in which Judges Beckloff, Stratton and Small committed the abovementioned acts;

(13) amending SBX 2 11 by adding Section 17 to rectify the bias against Stephan Brooks as a self-represented litigant by:

(a) Self-Represented Litigant: \$40 million tax free representing the cases of *Estate of Sherrell Atwood, Deceased, Trust of Sireaner Townsend, Sireaner Townsend Decedent, Estate of Sherrell Atwood v.*

Stephan Brooks including the trial of the assignment by Rozzell Sykes of her assignment of her share of the estate to Stephan Brooks in which Judges Beckloff, Stratton and Small were biased against Stephan Brooks because he was a self-represented litigant; and (a) voiding and annulling all decisions of the Superior Court judges in the cases of:

(i) *Estate of Sherrell Atwood, Deceased*, other than the closing of the case for failure to file an accounting in July 2007 and by order in October 2018;

(ii) *Trust of Sireaner Townsend* with the result of dismissing the case and leaving the Trust as the sole owner of the property located at 8708 12th Avenue, Inglewood, CA 90305 and dismissing the case;

(iii) *Sireaner Townsend Decedent* with the result of dismissing the case and leaving Stephan Brooks as the sole beneficiary of the Sireaner Townsend Pour Over Will; and

(iv) *Paco Michelle Atwood, Administrator of the Estate of Sherrell Atwood v. Stephan Brooks* other than the April 13, 2015 Stipulation Re: Validity of Budget Finance Company's Deed of Trust showing Joint Tenancy between Sireaner Townsend and Sherrell Atwood, the failure to mandatorily dismiss case on April 17, 2018 and dismissing the case for failure to bring to trial within five years including the motion of Rozzell Sykes to void her assignment of her portion of the estate to Stephan Brooks with the result of Stephan Brooks receiving Rozzell Sykes portion of the Estate of Sherrell Atwood, Deceased as an assignment from Rozzell Sykes;

(b) ordering null and void the sale of the property located at 8708 12th Avenue, Inglewood, CA 90305 (the Property) ordered by the Superior Court on July 15, 2021 along with any payments to be made by Stephan Brooks related thereto both prior and subsequently in the partition case of *Paco Michelle Atwood, Administrator of the Estate of Sherrell Atwood v. Stephan Brooks*; (i) ordering the buyer to immediately vacate the Property; (ii) ordering the Estate of attorney Chrisangela Walston, attorney L'Tanya M. Butler, Referee Charles "Butch" Grimes, Betty Betts Escrow Company and Paco Michelle Atwood, Administrator of the Estate of Sherrell Atwood, and any entities employed by each of them including but not limited to realtors Ted Brass, jointly and severally: (aa) immediately pay all monies paid to each of them (including Chrisangela Walston while living) and

actually paid by them to Rozzell Sykes, Stephan Brooks (none paid), and third persons or entities from the sale proceeds of the Property: (1) to immediately be paid to the Court to be returned to the Buyer along with the Buyer's deposit presently held in the Court; and (2) to make an accounting of all monies related to the property be filed with the Court with service upon the parties within sixty days after the enactment of this legislation;

(14) amending SBX 2 11 by adding Section 18 to rectify the bias against Ryan Clifford as a representative of the various categories to be immediately paid by the California State Controller tax free from funds allocated to the State Courts and State Judiciary to rectify the bias against Ryan Clifford in the case of *Clifford v. Alpha Epsilon Pi, Inc. and Chi Delta, et. al.* by:

(a) Bias Against a Disabled Person: \$10 million for the judicial bias against Ryan Clifford being a physically disabled person which occurred when Judge J. Kent O'Mara ordered Ryan Clifford out of the courtroom because Ryan Clifford was sitting in a wheelchair despite his being the plaintiff in the case;

(b) Bias Against a Self-Represented Litigant: \$10 million for the judicial bias against Ryan Clifford being a self-represented litigant by Judge Daniel P. Maguire dismissing the case and entering a \$2,500.00 sanction against Ryan Clifford originally ordered against his attorney to continue the trial because the attorney was withdrawing from the case and refused to pay the sanction which she incurred leaving Ryan Clifford as pro se (the Court of Appeal reversed Judge Maguire's decision reinstating the case and removing the sanction);

(c) Not disqualifying himself as required by CCP Section 170.1(a)(6)(A)(iii) and/or Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3E (1) for taking greater than \$1,500.00 from an alumnus of Defendant AEPi: \$10 million; and

(d) voiding and annulling all orders and judgments of the California Superior Court against Ryan Clifford;

(15) amending SBX 2 11 by adding Section 19 to rectify the bias against Robert George Kincaid as a representative of the various categories to be immediately paid by the California State Controller tax free from funds allocated to the State Courts, State Judiciary and counties (where a county was a plaintiff or had an interest in a particular case from which the award is being made) based upon California Superior Court Judge Thomas Trent Lewis not disqualifying himself as required by CCP Section 170.1(a)(6)(A)(iii) and/or Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3E(1) and (2) at

the outset of the case of *County of Los Angeles v. Robert George Kincaid*, a paternity and child support case:

(a) Fraud Upon the Court/or Fraud: \$10 million for fraud upon the court or fraud as the case was not mandatorily dismissed for the County's failure to present any documents of paternity at the hearing, timely file such and never file such;

(b) Judicial Bias Because Judge Thomas Trent Lewis was Receiving Money from the Plaintiff: \$10 million for the judicial bias because Los Angeles County was the Plaintiff and would monetarily benefit from bonus money from the U.S. Government if Robert George Kincaid would be declared the father of the minor child and be required to pay child support;

(c) Judicial Bias against a Self-Represented Litigant: \$10 million for the judicial bias against a self-represented litigant which occurred when all the judicial officers ruled against Robert George Kincaid even though no evidence was presented to any of them that he was the father of the minor in question; and

(d) voiding and annulling all orders and judgments against Robert George Kincaid.

(16) amending SBX 2 11 by adding Section 20 to rectify the bias against Stanley Atkinson as a representative of the various categories to be immediately paid by the California State Controller tax free from funds allocated to the State Courts, State Judiciary and counties (where a county was a plaintiff or had an interest in a particular case from which the award is being made) based upon California Superior Court Judges Vanessa W. Vallarta (Trial Judge), Pamela L. Butler, Robert A. Burlison and Andrew G. Liu (Appellate Division Judges) and California Court of Appeal Sixth District Justices Mary J. Greenwood, Allison M. Danner and Charles E. Wilson, II not disqualifying themselves as required by CCP Section 170.1(a)(6)(A)(iii) and/or Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3E(1) and (2) at the outset of the case of *U4ric Investments, LLC v. Petra Martinez, Stanley Atkinson*, an unlawful detainer case:

(a) Fraud Upon the Court: \$30 million tax free as the trial court judge, Appellate Division judges and Court of Appeal justices were mandatorily disqualified for having taken payments from Monterey County which had an interest in the increased collection of property taxes from the sale of the property from which Stanley Atkinson and Petra Martinez were unlawfully evicted;

(b) Bias against a self-represented litigant: \$30 million tax free for the judicial bias against a self-represented litigant which occurred when

all the judicial officers ruled against him while they were collaterally estopped from doing such do to a precedent precluding the plaintiff from instituting a case after stipulating to a dismissal with prejudice with the same parties over the same property on the same issue;

(c) Elder Abuse: \$30 million tax free as during the trial, Appellate Division and Court of Appeal cases Stanley Atkinson was over the age of 65 years old demonstrating the bias of the judges and justices against elder litigants; and

(c) voiding and annulling all orders and judgments against Stanley Atkinson.

(17) amending SBX 2 11 by adding Section 21 to rectify the bias against Carol Pulliam as a representative of the various categories to be immediately paid by the California State Controller tax free from funds allocated to the State Courts, State Judiciary and counties (where a county was a plaintiff or had an interest in a particular case from which the award is being made) based upon: then California Superior Court Judge (now California Court of Appeal Justice Maria Stratton not disqualifying herself as required by CCP Section 170.1(a)(6)(A)(iii) and/or Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3E(1) and (2) at the outset of the case of *Carol Walton(Pulliam) v. HF Family Properties*, an unlawful detainer case in which Judge Stratton received “supplemental and local judicial benefits” from the County of Los Angeles which had an interest in the higher property taxes obtained from the sale of the property to Frank Pearlstein, the new owner of the property who imposed a condition that Carol Pulliam, the only black person in the building be evicted before he would close the escrow on the purchase of the property and a personal friend of H. F. Pearlstein (Harold Pearlstein).

The actions of California Superior Court Judge Maria Stratton of refusing to recuse herself despite her knowing the owner of defendant entity in the case resulting in her adopting his racial bias against “blacks” and obstructing the form of a cash judgment obtained by Carol Pulliam to look like she lost supports:

(a) Fraud Upon the Court: \$10 million tax free as Judge Stratton was mandatorily disqualified for having taken payments from the County of Los Angeles which had an interest in the increased collection of property taxes from the sale of the property from which H.F. Pearlstein demanded Carol Pulliam be evicted before he would close escrow;

(b) Racial Bias: \$10 million tax free for Judge Stratton’s racial bias against “black people” and complicity with racial bias of her friend H.F. Perlstein and his scheme to deny Carol Pulliam her constitutional

right to a free choice of a place to live by enforcing “housing discrimination against Carol Pulliam;

(c) Libel: \$10 million tax free for Judge Stratton’s libeling Carol Pulliam by changing a judgment in the case in which Carol Pulliam prevailed and was awarded \$2,300.00 to appear as if Carol Pulliam lost the case; and

(d) voiding and annulling the judgment in the case signed by Judge Stratton making it appear as if Carol Pulliam lost the case;

(18) amending SBX 2 11 by adding Section 22 to rectify the bias against Carol Pulliam as a representative of the various categories to be immediately paid by the California State Controller tax free from funds allocated to the State Courts and State Judiciary based upon California Superior Court Judge Elaine Lu (Judge Lu) not disqualifying herself as required by CCP Section 170.1(a)(6)(A)(iii) and/or Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3E(1 and (2) during the case of *Carol Pulliam v. USC Verdugo Hills Hospital*, when Judge Lu became aware that her friend Beong-Soo Kim had applied for, was being considered, and would likely receive the position of General Counsel of USC prior to the beginning of the trial.

Beong-Soo Kim obtained the position two months after the trial ended but during the time of post-trial motions. Judge Lu did not recuse herself until two months after Beong-Soo Kim and USC announced had obtained the position. Judge Lu was ruling on the case during the time that she was aware of Beong-Soo Kim’s “relationship” with defendant USC.

The case was rife with racial overtones as USC terminated Carol Pulliam, the only black nurse at the USC Verdugo Hospital for her refusal to sign a “blank incident report” as a “black nurse” to be used against a Chinese/Japanese nurse who USC Verdugo Hospital wanted to terminate due to her Complaints about racial discrimination by the “Filipino” nurses who control the nursing staff at USC Verdugo Hospital and are a majority of the nurses there.

USC Verdugo Hospital was promoting racial tensions between the various races in the nursing staff by “pitting one race against another” so that USC Verdugo Hospital could claim any racial tensions occurred within the races of the nursing staff and not due to USC Verdugo Hospital’s policies of controlling the nursing staff through “racial dissention”, thereby relieving USC Verdugo Hospital of any blame for the firing.

When Carol Pulliam refused to be a part of USC Verdugo Hospital’s scheme, USC Verdugo Hospital terminated and “blacklisted” her in retaliation supporting:

- (a) Racial Bias: \$10 million tax free for Judge Lu adopting and advocating for racial bias;
 - (b) Libel: \$6 million tax free for Judge Lu adopting and advocating for libel at \$1 million per year from 2016-2022;
 - (c) Fraud upon the Court/or Fraud: \$10 million tax free for Judge Lu adopting and advocating for fraud upon the court;
 - (d) Intentional/or Negligent Interference with Contract: \$10 million tax free for Judge Lu adopting and advocating for intentional interference with contract;
 - (e) Intentional/or Negligent Interference with prospective business advantage: \$10 million tax free for Judge Lu adopting and advocating for intentional interference with prospective business advantage; and
 - (f) Intentional/or Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress: \$10 million tax free for Judge Lu adopting and advocating for intentional infliction of emotional distress; and
 - (g) voiding and annulling the judgment in the case signed by Judge Lu;
 - (h) voiding and annulling the actions of Judge Martin who replaced Judge Lu and cancelled a hearing on post-trial motions on the day of the hearing, precluded Carol Pulliam from adding Defendant MSS to the Notice of Appeal and denied Carol Pulliam's motion to require the Court Reporter to produce the second part of the trial's last day for the appeal;
- (19) amending SBX 2 11 by adding Section 23 to rectify the bias against Felice Reyes as a representative of the various categories to be immediately paid by the California State Controller tax free from funds allocated to the State Courts and State Judiciary based upon California Superior Court Judge Lawrence P. Riff not disqualifying himself as required by CCP Section 170.1(a)(6)(A)(iii) and/or Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3E(1) and (2) during the divorce case of *David Reyes v. Felice Reyes*, in which David Reyes originally stated an investment was community property, later stated it was his separate property, but could not produce the front and back of the check to prove it was his separate property in an investment which rose from \$500.00 to approximately \$1 billion at the time Judge Riff was assigned to the case.

A settlement had been made for \$20 million before a private judge who was later disqualified for not disclosing a case with opposing counsel. Felice Reyes, who was Self Represented moved to set aside the Settlement based upon Fraud upon the Court.

Judge Riff, who was recently assigned to the case immediately demonstrated bias against Felice Reyes, who then filed and properly served a Disqualification against Judge Riff on his Clerk in his open courtroom as allowed by statute.

Judge Riff did not respond within the ten-day mandatory response period to the Disqualification and was deemed to have consented to the Disqualification under California Code of Civil Procedure Section 170.3(c)(4).

Judge Riff did not remove himself from the case and sanctioned Felice approximately \$400,000.00 by granting a motion by David's attorney.

Approximately a month after being served, Judge Riff claimed he was not in the courthouse when the Disqualification was properly served on his Clerk, and "ordered the Disqualification stricken". Judge Riff argued in filed documents he was not in the Courthouse at the time the Disqualification was served in his open courtroom.

A public request for Judge Riff's attendance documents and payroll warrants showed he did not have any vacation, sick leave or other reason for absence registered for the day of service, had not requested or been granted such and had been paid for attendance on such day supporting:

- (a) Self-Represented Litigant: \$10 million tax free representing the case of *Reyes v. Reyes* in which Judge Riff was biased against Felice Reyes because she was a self-represented litigant;
- (b) Fraud Upon the Court: \$10 million tax free representing the case of *Reyes v. Reyes* in which Judge Riff did not withdraw from the case after he consented to the Disqualification pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 170.3(c)(4) and still remained on the case falsely claiming he was not in the courthouse when the court documents showed he was;
- (c) Fraud: \$10 million tax free for Judge Riff adopting and advocating for fraud by falsely claiming he was not in the courthouse when the Disqualification was served on his Clerk in "open court"; and
- (d) Intentional/or Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress: \$10 million tax free for Judge Riff causing intentional/or negligent infliction of emotional distress by his false statements; and
- (e) voiding and annulling all orders and judgments in the case signed by Judge Riff;

(20) amending SBX 2 11 by adding Section 24 to rectify the bias against Gertrude Gettinger as a representative of the various categories to be immediately paid to her son and Objector in the case Robert Gettinger by the California State Controller tax free from funds allocated to the State Courts

and State Judiciary based upon California Superior Court Judges Coleman Swart, Candace J. Beason, Mary Thornton House, Lesley C. Green, Yolanda Orozco, Elizabeth A. Lippit and Lee R. Bogdanoff not disqualifying themselves as required by CCP Section 170.1(a)(6)(A)(iii) and/or Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3E(1) and (2) during the case of *Gettinger, Gertrude-Conservatorship* in which her daughter Sylvia Schmidt who had not seen her for many years became her Temporary Conservator in an uncontested trial by not serving her brother Robert Gettinger (later to enter the case as an “objector” to represent the interests of Gertrude Gettinger (Gertrude) which were not being represented by her later court appointed counsel). Sylvia Schmidt was subsequently also appointed Guardian of Gertrude. Sylvia Schmidt proceeded to: (1) sell an apartment building which was the main income of Gertrude; (2) sell Gertrude’s condo which was in the process of a 1031 exchange thereby causing a huge tax liability; (3) take over Gertrude’s bank accounts and not report missing accounts worth hundreds of thousands of dollars; (4) move Gertrude out of her home and forcing her into a forced locked Dementia facility with Dementia medications, despite doctor’s claims Gertrude did not have Dementia; and (5) leaving Gertrude destitute and under Sylvia Schmidt’s total control while draining Gertrude’s assets with attorney’s fees, conservator fees, rental and other fees for Gertrude’s new living quarters, County sale transfer fees on the property sold for over \$1.5 million, for over fifteen years from the time of the commencement of the conservatorship on 12/08/2006 until the end on 3/02/2022, approximately two years after the death of Gertrude on 3/15/2020 supporting:

- (a) Fraud Upon the Court: \$10 million tax free as all the judges were mandatorily disqualified for having taken payments from the County of Los Angeles which had an interest in the increased collection of property taxes from the sale of the property;
- (b) Elder Abuse: \$10 million for the judges installing a conservatorship and guardianship without an examination of Gertrude and/or initially hearing an objector;
- (c) Intentional Interference with Contract/Negligent Interference with Contract: \$10 million for the judges interfering with the leases on the building which was sold;
- (d) Intentional Interference with Prospective Business Advantage /Negligent Interference with Prospective Business Advantage: \$10 million for the judges interfering with the investments of Gertrude’s Bank Accounts;

(e) Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress/Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress: \$10 million for the judges allowing Gertrude's life and wellbeing to be destroyed and her being relegated to a life of poverty, without a home or income;

(f) Any other cause of action not mentioned above caused by judicial misconduct or judicial abuse of power: \$10 million; and

(f) voiding and annulling all orders against Gertrude;

(21) amending SBX 2 11 by adding Section 25 to rectify the bias against Ione Daniels as a representative of the various categories to be immediately paid to her in the case of *Daniels, Ione v. Daniels, Joel* by the California State Controller tax free from funds allocated to the State Courts and State Judiciary based upon:

(a) California Superior Court Judge Cynthia Freeland not disclosing and self-recusing as she was receiving "supplemental or local judicial benefits from the San Diego Superior Court" in violation of CCP Section 170.1(a)(6)(A)(iii) and California Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3E(1) and (2);

(b) California Superior Court Judge Cynthia Freeland demonstrating bias in violation of CCP Section 170.1(a)(6)(A)(iii) and California Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3E(1) and (2) in favor of the attorneys for Joel Daniels who were not filing subsequent financial disclosures and withholding lien information on the marital home making it impossible for Ione Daniels to refinance, in addition to other actions;

(c) California Superior Court Judge Cynthia Freeland showing bias in violation of CCP Section 170.1(a)(6)(A)(iii) and California Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3E(1) and (2) for Ione Daniels' former attorneys who were impairing her ability to proceed with her case by not filing documents and memoranda for which they had been paid; and

(d) California Superior Court Judge Cynthia Freeland demonstrating bias in violation of CCP Section 170.1(a)(6)(A)(iii) and California Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3E(1) and (2) against Ione Daniels, at such times when she was self-represented in denying her a continuance for trial to obtain counsel and sanctioning her stating: "You are capable of litigating the case by yourself."

(22) Such actions support:

(a) Fraud Upon the Court: \$10 million tax free caused by judicial misconduct or judicial abuse of power by California Superior Court

Judge Cynthia Freeland not disclosing and self-recusing for receiving “supplemental or local judicial benefit” payments from the San Diego Superior Court in violation of CCP Section 170.1(a)(6)(A)(iii) and California Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3E (1) and (2);

(b) Fraud Upon the Court, Bias and Interference with Intentional/Negligent Prospective Business Advantage: \$10 million tax free for fraud upon the court; \$10 million tax free for bias; and \$10 million tax free for interference with intentional/negligent prospective business advantage caused by judicial misconduct or judicial abuse of power by California Superior Court Judge Cynthia Freeland not disclosing and self-recusing due to a bias in favor of the attorneys for Joel Daniels who were not filing subsequent financial disclosures and withholding lien information on the marital home making it impossible for Ione Daniels to refinance, in addition to other actions in violation of CCP Section 170.1(a)(6)(A)(iii) and California Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3E(1) and (2);

(c) Fraud Upon the Court and Bias: \$10 million tax free for fraud upon the court; \$10 million tax free for bias; caused by judicial misconduct or judicial abuse of power by California Superior Court Judge Cynthia Freeland not disclosing and self-recusing due to a bias in favor of Ione Daniels’ former attorneys who were impairing her ability to proceed with her case by not filing documents and memoranda for which they had been paid in violation of CCP Section 170.1(a)(6)(A)(iii) and California Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3E(1) and (2);

(d) Bias Against Self-Represented Litigants; \$10 million tax free for bias against self-represented litigants caused by California Superior Court Judge Cynthia Freeland denying Ione Daniels a continuance for trial to obtain counsel and sanctioning her stating: “You are capable of litigating the case by yourself.”;

(e) Intentional/Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress: \$10 million tax free for intentional/negligent infliction of emotional distress caused by judicial misconduct or judicial abuse of power by California Superior Court Judge Cynthia Freeland’s actions; and

(h) \$10 million tax free for any other unmentioned misconduct or abuse of power by California Superior Court Judge Cynthia Freeland’s actions;

(23) establishing an administrative procedure outside the court system to ensure judicial misconduct and abuse of power does not continue or is reduced as follows:

- (a) amending SBX 2 11 by adding Section 25 requiring the California Controller to report all Judicial Officers who were reported by victims of judicial misconduct or abuse of power to the Commission on Judicial Performance on a monthly and annual basis, annually funded under this legislation;
- (b) amending SBX 2 11 by adding Section 26 requiring:
 - (i) the Commission on Judicial Performance to complete each investigation reported to it by the California State Controller, and/or other source including individual complainants, within six months after receipt of such Report/source/complaint:
 - (aa) with a written decision containing reasons stated for such decision signed by the Commissioners within six months after receipt of such Report/source/complaint; and
 - (bb) in the event any such investigation is not completed with a signed written Report within the six-month time period, the Commissioners of the Commission on Judicial Performance shall be deprived of all State Compensation and benefits until the date such Report is filed with the Commission on Judicial Performance and served upon the Controller/source/complainant; and
 - (ii) convey semi-annual Reports the results of such investigations to the California State Auditor;
- (c) amending SBX 2 11 by adding Section 27 requiring the California State Auditor:
 - (i) to continuously audit the Commission on Judicial Performance to ensure the Commission on Judicial Performance is fully investigating, reviewing and making determinations as required under law on each Judicial Officer's individual and historical misconduct as reported both by the California State Controller and independently from other sources; and
 - (ii) make annual reports to the State Senate and State Assembly as to the conduct of the Commission on Judicial Performance in conducting its duties including but not limited to its successes, failures, and operational deficiencies regarding the misconduct of the Judicial Officers and recommendations for legislation to improve the operation of the Commission on Judicial Performance

to reduce the misconduct and abuse of power of the judiciary, including but not limited to the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar of California and the State Bar Court;

- (d) amending AB 2960 by adding a Section to establish a twenty four (24) year term limit on all Judicial Officers, in particular, the members of the judiciary who received retroactive immunity from civil liability, criminal prosecution and disciplinary action under SBX 2 11, Section 5, thereby allowing any criminal action under 18 U.S.C. Section 1346 to continue unabated with those judicial officers and allowing both state and federal criminal actions to be brought against any subsequently appointed or elected judicial officers receiving “supplemental or local judicial benefits” from counties or courts;
- (e) amending AB 2960 by adding a Section precluding any Judicial Officer who received or is currently receiving “supplemental or local judicial benefits from a county or court” from holding a State elective or appointed office; and
- (f) amending AB 2960 by adding a Section requiring any State Superior Court Judge seeking re-election in an unopposed general election, be required to be on the General Election Ballot in a Retention Election requiring 50 plus percent of the votes cast be to retain him/her to retain the State Superior Court Judge position.

