

FW: From Sharon Kramer

---

From: Laura Stuber (laura.stuber@doj.ca.gov)

To: SNK1955@aol.com

Date: Friday, May 26, 2017 at 11:43 AM PDT

---

Dear Ms. Kramer,

I am on the Executive staff of the Attorney General and am writing to you about your allegations concerning the judicial system and the Commission on Judicial Performance. I understand that both Supervising Deputy Attorney General Gonzalez and Deputy Attorney General Zall have previously communicated with you, spent significant time meeting with you, and have reviewed your materials and information, specifically Deputy Attorney General Zall who met with you personally. We appreciate any person bringing allegations of potential wrongdoing to our attention, but, at this time, the office has found nothing to substantiate your claims and will not be pursuing this matter. In addition, as Supervising Deputy Attorney General Gonzalez and Deputy Attorney General Zall have informed you, you may wish to consider communicating with the Commission on Judicial Performance (CJP) concerning your allegations. Should you have additional information, please let us know.

Thanks.

Laura Stuber

---

**From:** Alberto L. Gonzalez

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 09, 2017 5:02 PM

**To:** [SNK1955@aol.com](mailto:SNK1955@aol.com)

**Subject:** RE: From Sharon Kramer

Dear Ms. Kramer,

I am forwarding your concerns to AG executive staff as per your request. It notes your request for a face to face meeting with executive policy staff. I previously shared your concerns that you expressed in the meeting with DAG Zall. These introductions will complete my involvement in this matter.

Sincerely,

Alberto

**Alberto L. González**

***Supervising Deputy Attorney General***

**Department of Justice**

**Office of the Attorney General**

**Tort & Condemnation Section**

**Sacramento, California 95819**

**(916) 324-5369**

**Fax (916) 322-8288**



---

**From:** [SNK1955@aol.com](mailto:SNK1955@aol.com) [<mailto:SNK1955@aol.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 09, 2017 7:32 AM  
**To:** Alberto L. Gonzalez <[Alberto.Gonzalez@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Alberto.Gonzalez@doj.ca.gov)>; [snk1955@aol.com](mailto:snk1955@aol.com)  
**Subject:** From Sharon Kramer

Dear Alberto,

Uh oh! It sounds like I have frustrated you. I understand and agree that this is not your job.

Unfortunately, you apparently got assigned to be my point-man b/c of the Justice Dato matter and no one taking my direct evidence seriously that he's involved in a massive, continuing crime with Justice McConnell and other 4th/1st justices.

I am frustrated, too. It's been exactly three months today since Attorney General Becerra stated on public record that he would investigate my allegation of "CJP unpunished judicial crime".

I've made one trip to Sacramento to meet with public crimes prosecutor, Mr. Zall. He grasped that I have fake-dated interest accruing liens on my property and that McConnell has "compounded" the problem by refusing to recall remittiturs. .

I spoke to Mr. Zall about two weeks ago to set a second, more detailed appointment. He tells me he can't (won't?) meet with me again unless his superiors direct him too.

Again, this is not something that comes under your job description to address. I understand that.

But, I've been in this cat and mouse game with the courts and those who are suppose to police the courts, for twelve years. I've seen many others run through the same gauntlet when people say "It's not my job".

This suggestion does not help: you are welcome to forward your inquiry to the Attorney General by sending it to: [attorneygeneral@doj.ca.gov](mailto:attorneygeneral@doj.ca.gov)

That's like telling us to go back and start at square one with some anonymous being who has no clue of what I'm talking about; and who would most likely send me a "Thank you for sharing" letter in response. (I already have enough of those from public officials that I could wall paper a room!)

I have been working my tail off since that meeting with Mr. Zall to put the evidence in order detailing what a massive crime is being covered by McConnell's refusal to recall remittiturs.

The fake-dated liens remaining on my property is a miniscule fraud upon the court compared to what else is continuing by her obstruction of justice. What the fraudulent liens are, are the direct evidence of her unrepentant and unpunished case-fixing to the false finding of libel on behalf of toxic-tort expert defense witnesses of the USDOJ.

People are literally dying from McConnell's unrecalled remittiturs. So this matter alone, is no small matter. Yet, it's not the only case suffering the same deceptive fate b/c of unpunished crime in CA's courts.

The CJP is currently redoing their practices re: how to admonish judges -- with no mention of needed prosecutions for judicial crimes in legal proceedings.

The Bar is currently redoing their rules re: how to admonish attorneys -- with no mention of needed prosecutions for attorney crimes in legal proceedings.

No one is going to stop the court-officer crimes that I and others report without some policy/practice changes in the Attorney General's office which dovetail w/the changes of the CJP and Bar.

Those policy changes are not going to come w/o someone asking the AG and his senior staff to make them -- and explaining why they are necessary.

Can you make an introduction to AG Becerra's Chief of Staff for me? We want a face to face meeting with the Executive Policy Staff. That's all we really need from you -- an intro.

I really am sorry if I've frustrated you. I'm working to get from point A to point B to cause the correction of a problem/flawed mindset that has been allowed to continue for far too long in California's courts/policing agencies. It is wreaking sheer Hell out here in the real world and needs to change.

Thank you for your help,  
Sharon

P.S. Only if you are interested. Below is a recent article re: the massive amount of problems in many areas that are being caused by never-prosecuted court-officer crime in CA courts.

### California Supreme Court: An Epidemic of Misconduct?

#### **California's Epidemic of Misconduct**

The Federal courts have been trying for decades to force the California courts to rectify their unconstitutional behavior. In January 2015, three federal judges complained that the California courts display an "epidemic of misconduct" and placed the blame on state court

judges and, in particular, on California Supreme Court Chief Justice, Tani Cantil-Sakauye (albeit the problem predates her tenure.)

The January 2015 case involved both a lying jailhouse informant and the prosecutor who committed perjury in order to convict the defendant. When the State Court of Appeals learned about the lying jailhouse informant and the prosecutor's perjury, they said it was "harmless error." A prosecutor solicits perjured testimony and then himself falsely testifies in the front of the jury that the lying jailhouse informant is credible. Yet, the California judges find committing two felonies to be harmless error. As the three federal judges knew from their experience, this type of misconduct was not rare, but rather California was suffering from an epidemic.

In a message dated 5/8/2017 7:03:34 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, [Alberto.Gonzalez@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Alberto.Gonzalez@doj.ca.gov) writes:

Dear Ms. Kramer,

I am sorry I have been unavailable. I was out on vacation and spent last week catching up. In order to have this matter further addressed, you are welcome to forward your inquiry to the Attorney General by sending it to: [attorneygeneral@doj.ca.gov](mailto:attorneygeneral@doj.ca.gov)

My work for the Attorney General does not include any policy areas and, outside the civil litigation defense work that I am assigned to, does not extend beyond preparing the background reports on appellate nominations by the Governor. Hence, there is nothing I can address or respond to as to the CJP. For that reason, you may reach the Attorney General's staff through the email above. Thank you for your understanding of my limited role in the office.

Alberto

**Alberto L. González**  
***Supervising Deputy Attorney General***  
**Department of Justice**  
**Office of the Attorney General**  
**Tort & Condemnation Section**  
**Sacramento, California 95819**  
**(916) 324-5369**  
**Fax (916) 322-8288**



---

**From:** [SNK1955@aol.com](mailto:SNK1955@aol.com) [<mailto:SNK1955@aol.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, May 08, 2017 6:36 AM

**To:** Alberto L. Gonzalez <[Alberto.Gonzalez@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Alberto.Gonzalez@doj.ca.gov)>; [snk1955@aol.com](mailto:snk1955@aol.com)

**Subject:** Please share this with AG Becerra's Executive Policy Committee

Dear Mr. Gonzalez,

Will you call me? There are a few things that are better discussed rather than sent in a long email re: the problem of "CJP unpunished judicial crime" and what needs to be done about it for the good of the public. 760-822-8026

Also, see below. AG Becerra has an opportunity to help reshape CJP practices. They are redoing their rules right now and are open to suggestions. I believe his words would carry much weight.

Thank you,  
Sharon Kramer

The California Commission on Judicial Performance (CJP) is updating their rules governing why and how the state's judges and justices are admonished for acts that are reported to be unethical, "of unsound mind", not-lawful, and/or criminal.

YOU have until May 31, 2017 to help reshape their policies and practices. According to their website:

**[http://cjp.ca.gov/legal\\_authority/](http://cjp.ca.gov/legal_authority/) CJP INVITES  
RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON PROPOSED RULE  
CHANGES**

As part of the commission's 2016 rules review, the commission has determined to seek public comment on amendments to rules 116.5 (Negotiated Settlement During Preliminary Investigation), 120(b) (Disqualification upon notice of formal proceedings), 122(g)(2)(a) (Discovery Depositions), 126(d) (Appointment of Conservator), 110 (Advisory Letter After Staff Inquiry), 111(d) (Advisory Letter After Preliminary Investigation), 111.4 (Legal Error), 111.5 (Correction of Advisory Letter), 114(b)(2) (Advisory Letter After Appearance Before the Commission to Object to Notice of Intended Private Admonishment); 116(b)(2) (Advisory Letter After Appearance Before the Commission to Object to Notice of Intended Public Admonishment), and the proposed adoption of a new rule for reconsideration of closed complaints. The public comment period ended May 1, 2017.

Copies of comments submitted during the public comment period are available to the public upon request. Responses to comments may be submitted no later than May 31, 2017.

There are twelve recommendations that have been received by the CJP. Anyone may comment no later than May 31, 2017 in support or opposition to them by sending a letter or fax to:

California Commission on Judicial Performance  
Janice M. Brickley, Legal Advisor to Commissioners  
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 14400  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660  
Fax: (415) 557-1266

Six are from private citizens/groups. Four are from branch employees/groups. One is from a CJP employee. And one is from an assistant DA.

A brief overview of each, as I understand it, is below. Please do not rely on my understanding to form your opinions. Please read their actual recommendations in the links below.

#### FROM PRIVATE CITIZENS/GROUPS

A. Center for Modern Courts (Joseph Sweeney) in opposition to designating legal staff or private attorneys to negotiate settlements when jurists have been found to have violated the rules of conduct; in support of clarifying the language when it is appropriate to reconsider denials to admonish based on new evidence; in support of eliminating private advisory letters to cause greater transparency and accountability. <http://freepdfhosting.com/28013c2a57.pdf>

B. Center for Judicial Excellence and Court Reform LLC (Kathleen Russell and Joe Sweeney) Ten suggested rule changes/clarification of the process to strengthen oversight of judicial ethics, increase transparency and accountability. [www.centerforjudicialexcellence.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Proposed-Changes-to-Rules-of-Commission-on-Judicial-Performance](http://www.centerforjudicialexcellence.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Proposed-Changes-to-Rules-of-Commission-on-Judicial-Performance)

C. Private Citizen (Professor Tamir Sukkary) in support of eliminating confidential advisory letters; in support of a stipulated method for reconsideration of refusals to admonish with suggested clarification to the rule. <http://freepdfhosting.com/6cffbbf05f.pdf>

D. Private Citizen (Sharon Kramer) in support of addendum to Rule 111.4 due to a pattern of unprosecuted judicial crime in legal proceedings. <http://freepdfhosting.com/8ba5f8e380.pdf>

E. Private Citizen (Thomas Portue) in support of the need for greater transparency within the CJP and to halt "rubber stamping" refusals to admonish. <http://freepdfhosting.com/afed034480.pdf>

F. Private Citizen (Mari-Lynn Earls) in support of elimination of confidential advisory letters to increase transparency and accountability.

<http://freepdfhosting.com/51dd0434f8.pdf>

#### FROM BRANCH EMPLOYEES/GROUPS

G. Chair of Executive Committee of the Trial Courts Advisory Committee of Presiding Judges (San Diego County Presiding Judge Jeffrey Barton) on behalf of the Executive Committee of the TCACPJ, in opposition to the elimination of confidential advisory letters. <http://freepdfhosting.com/1a30eb5862.pdf>

H. Legislative Director of the CA Judges Association (Lexi Howard) on behalf of the CJA re: a.) settlement procedures for admonishments/possible proposed language change to Rule 116.5 to allow a judge's legal counsel greater access to negotiate with CJP staff: b.) in opposition to the elimination of private advisory letters. <http://freepdfhosting.com/5d2a5bfda3.pdf>

I. San Jaquin Superior Court Judge (Barbara Kronland) in opposition to rule change re: closed complaints and alternative for reconsideration if needed; in opposition to elimination of private advisory letters, suggestions for judicial ethics education. <http://freepdfhosting.com/99bb84d2b3.pdf> & <http://freepdfhosting.com/bff41f81f2.pdf>

J. Los Angeles Superior Court Management Research Unit (Sandra Pigari-Pizano) in support of amendment to Rule 116.5 re: attorneys' role in negotiated settlements; in opposition to proposed amendment to Rule 120(b) re: disqualification of judges during formal proceedings; in support of changing AOC's name to "Judicial Council"; in support of change of the word "insane" to "to be of unsound mind"; suggestions of how to address reconsideration of closed complaints; in opposition to elimination of confidential advisory letters. <http://freepdfhosting.com/ecf9d6d404.pdf>

#### FROM CJP EMPLOYEE & ASSISTANT DA

K. Assistant Trial Council, Commission on Judicial Performance (Brad Battson) re: suggestions of how to address prior closed complaints should the need arise.

<http://freepdfhosting.com/1a2bd05801.pdf>

L. Special Assistant District Attorney, Ventura County (Michael Schwartz) in opposition to the elimination of confidential advisory letters.

<http://freepdfhosting.com/0a2b4c6a1d.pdf>

All twelve recommendations may be read in one link here.

<http://freepdfhosting.com/1f7d0f60c0.pdf>

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.