

Sharon Noonan Kramer
2031 Arborwood Place
Escondido, CA 92029
Snk1955@aol.com
July 31, 2018

The Honorable Peter Deddeh
Presiding Judge, San Diego Superior Court
1100 Union St, 10th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101
(hand delivered)

Michael Roddy
Chief Executive Officer, SD Superior Court
1100 Union St, 10th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101
(hand delivered)

Re: URGENT, Court clerk(s) have falsified the Register of Action (ROA) to accommodate the wrongful designation of vexatious litigant in North San Diego County Department 28, **Judge Earl Maas III, presiding**. They have also corrupted the ROA to accommodate the renewal of a void judgment.

Judge Deddeh and Mr. Roddy,

Late on the afternoon of July 3, 2018 I filed my REPLY MADE UNDER DURESS To Vacate/Stop the Renewal of the Void Judgment in the matter of *Bruce J. Kelman and GlobalTox, Inc. v Sharon Kramer*, Case No. GIN044539. Hereafter referred to as "SLAPP".

As you know, Mr. Roddy, I have been begging the courts for years to stop Kelman and GlobalTox from harassing and terrorizing me with the void judgment that fails to state that I prevailed over GlobalTox (Veritox) in an August 2008, trial. The following properly submitted brief should have been entered into the ROA on July 5, 2018:

SHARON NOONAN KRAMER 2031 Arborwood Place Escondido, CA 92029 Snk1955@aol.com		RECEIVED 2018 JUL -3 P 3:20 (14) SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, NORTH DISTRICT
BRUCE J. KELMAN & GLOBALTOX, INC., Plaintiffs,	CASE NO. GIN044539	
Counsel: William Litvak, Esq. (SBN 90533) Joan Stevens Smyth (SBN 118347) DAPEER, ROSENBLIT & LITVAK LLP 11500 W. Olympic Blvd, Suite 550 Los Angeles, CA 90064	REPLY MADE UNDER DURESS in Support of the Need to Vacate/Stop the Renewal of the Void Judgment Filed concomitantly with the Declaration of Sharon Noonan Kramer and Exhibits Volume II	
v.	[Assigned for All Purposes To Hon. EARL H. MAAS III, Department 28]	
SHARON KRAMER, and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, Defendant	Filed May 2005 Motion Hearing Date: July 13, 2018 1:30 PM	

Sharon Noonan KRAMER hereby submits her Reply Made Under Duress in Support of the Need to Vacate/Stop the Renewal of the Void Judgment. It is void because of fraud upon the Fourth District Division One Court of Appeal (4th1st) and repeated refusals to recall and rescind their remittiturs to correct legal errors. As a result, it has been used by Bruce KELMAN to horrifically harass KRAMER when working to conceal the fraud of a fixed strategic lawsuit against public participation that enables his junk science to continue.

The above filing (purposed to stop Kelman and GlobalTox from continuing to harass me in the local courts for blowing the whistle on their junk science in U.S. mold litigations) was not entered into the ROA. Instead, someone entered into the ROA that Kelman and GlobalTox filed a Motion Under Duress on July 5, 2018, to make it falsely appear that they are filing motions to make me stop harassing them. See ROA Entry #309 below.

308	06/29/2018	Request for Judicial Notice filed by KELMAN, BRUCE J. Refers to:	KELMAN, BRUCE J (Plaintiff)
309	07/05/2018	Reply (7/13 MTN MADE UNDER DURESS) filed by KELMAN, BRUCE J; GLOBALTOX INC. Refers to:	KELMAN, BRUCE J (Plaintiff); GLOBALTOX INC (Plaintiff)
310	07/11/2018	Tentative Ruling for Motion Hearing (Civil) published.	

It is not even possible that GlobalTox could have filed a motion in this matter; and they certainly did not file any motion made under duress. The local courts have been case-fixing strategic lawsuits against public participation for them for years. The above fraudulent ROA Entry is just one more example of it.

The reason is not possible that GlobalTox filed anything in this matter, is because they are not even a disclosed party to this matter. When filing the Application to renew the judgment, Kelman was the only party disclosed to be represented by William Litvak, Esq.

See substitution of counsel:

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address): WILLIAM LITVAK, ESQ (SBN 90533) CAROLINE K. CASTILLO (SBN 236987) 11500 W. OLYMPIC BLVD, SUITE 550 LOS ANGELES, CA 90064 TELEPHONE NO.: 310-477-5575 FAX NO. (Optional): E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): ATTORNEY FOR (Name): BRUCE J. KELMAN		FOR COURT USE ONLY
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF San Diego STREET ADDRESS: 325 South Melrose Drive MAILING ADDRESS: 325 South Melrose Drive CITY AND ZIP CODE: Vista, 92081 BRANCH NAME: North County		
CASE NAME: KELMAN V. KRAMER		
SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY—CIVIL (Without Court Order)		CASE NUMBER: GIN044539

THE COURT AND ALL PARTIES ARE NOTIFIED THAT (name): _____ makes the following substitution:

1. Former legal representative ☐ Party represented self ☒ Attorney (name): **KEITH SCHEUER**

2. New legal representative ☐ Party is representing self ☒ Attorney

a. Name: **WILLIAM LITVAK** b. State Bar No. (if applicable): **90533**

c. Address (number, street, city, ZIP, and law firm name, if applicable):
11500 W. OLYMPIC BLVD, SUITE 550
LOS ANGELES, CA 90064

d. Telephone No. (include area code): **310-477-5575**

3. The party making this substitution is a ☒ plaintiff ☐ defendant ☐ petitioner ☐ respondent ☐ other (specify): _____

***NOTICE TO PARTIES APPLYING TO REPRESENT THEMSELVES**

- Guardian
- Conservator
- Trustee
- Personal Representative
- Probate fiduciary
- Corporation
- Guardian ad litem
- Unincorporated association

If you are applying as one of the parties on this list, you may NOT act as your own attorney in most cases. Use this form to substitute one attorney for another attorney. SEEK LEGAL ADVICE BEFORE APPLYING TO REPRESENT YOURSELF.

NOTICE TO PARTIES WITHOUT ATTORNEYS

A party representing himself or herself may wish to seek legal assistance. Failure to take timely and appropriate action in this case may result in serious legal consequences.

4. I consent to this substitution.

Date:
BRUCE J. KELMAN
 (TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

Bruce J. Kelman 4/12/18
 (SIGNATURE OF PARTY)

5. ☒ I consent to this substitution.

Date:
KEITH SCHEUER
 (TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

Keith Scheuer State Bar 082797 (retired)
 (SIGNATURE OF FORMER ATTORNEY)

6. ☒ I consent to this substitution.

Date: **04/02/2018**
WILLIAM LITVAK
 (TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

William Litvak
 (SIGNATURE OF NEW ATTORNEY)

(See reverse for proof of service by mail)

Form Adopted For Mandatory Use
 Judicial Council of California
 MC-698 (Rev. January 1, 2009)

SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY—CIVIL
(Without Court Order)

Page 1 of 2
 Code of Civil Procedure, §§ 284(1), 285;
 Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.1362
 www.courtinfo.ca.gov

ROA Entry #308, "Request for judicial notice" filed on 6/29/18 by Mr. Litvak, was Judge Robert Dahlquist's 3/29/13 thinly veiled threat that the local judges would deem me to be a vexatious litigant, if I did not stop begging them to make Kelman, GlobalTox and their prior

attorney, Keith Scheuer, stop harassing me with the void judgment (that Judge Maas just renewed). See Dahlquist's threat:

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
NORTH COUNTY

MINUTE ORDER

DATE: 03/29/2013

TIME: 09:58:00 AM

DEPT: N-29

JUDICIAL OFFICER PRESIDING: Robert P Dahlquist

CLERK: Lynn Arthur

REPORTER/ERM: Not Applicable

BAILIFF/COURT ATTENDANT:

CASE NO: 37-2010-00061530-CU-DF-NC CASE INIT. DATE: 11/04/2010

CASE TITLE: Kelman vs. Kramer

CASE CATEGORY: Civil - Unlimited CASE TYPE: Defamation

APPEARANCES

The Court, having taken the above-entitled matter under submission on January 25, 2013 and having fully considered the arguments of all parties, both written and oral, as well as the evidence presented, now rules as follows:

On December 31, 2012, plaintiff Bruce J. Kelman ("Kelman") filed his "motion to designate Sharon Kramer as a vexatious litigant and for a prefiling order pursuant to C.C.P. § 391.7." On January 25, 2013, the Court conducted a hearing on the motion. At the end of the hearing, the Court took the matter under submission. After carefully considering the parties' arguments and evidence, the Court will now issue its ruling on the motion.

The Court denies the motion without prejudice.

The current motion is brought under Code of Civil Procedure section 391.7. That section authorizes the Court, in its discretion, to declare a self-represented litigant to be a vexatious litigant and to make a "prefiling order" precluding the vexatious litigant from filing any new litigation as a self-represented litigant without first obtaining leave of the presiding judicial officer of the court where the litigation is proposed to be filed.

Here, the Court does not doubt that it could grant the current motion because defendant Sharon Kramer ("Kramer") has "while acting in propria persona, repeatedly file[d] unmeritorious motions, pleadings, or other papers . . . that are frivolous." Code of Civil Procedure section 391, subdivision (b)(3). In particular, Kramer has repeatedly filed papers and applications in the Superior Court that: (1) assert that the Court of Appeal erred in its handling of a prior appeal in a related case (Superior Court case no. GIN044539; Court of Appeal case no. D054496); and (2) request the Superior Court to correct the supposed errors made by the Court of Appeal. These assertions and requests are frivolous because the Superior Court is entirely without authority to review any action by the Court of Appeal. Any assertion of error by the Court of Appeal must be made to the Court of Appeal or a higher court, not the Superior Court.

Nevertheless, even though Kramer has repeatedly filed frivolous papers in the Superior Court, the Court is not persuaded, on this record, that she should be declared a vexatious litigant and made subject to a prefiling order. The Court is unaware of any litigation commenced by Kramer as a self-represented litigant in the Superior Court. To date, Kramer has only been defending against the claims made against her in two lawsuits filed by Kelman. She appears to have made good faith efforts, as a self-represented litigant, to try to defeat Kelman's claims against her.

On this record, the Court is not persuaded that it should exercise its discretionary powers to declare Kramer to be a vexatious litigant and to make her subject to a prefiling order. However, the Court wishes to advise Kramer that: (1) she is currently eligible to be declared to be a vexatious litigant; (2) as such, the Court would strongly encourage Kramer to obtain legal advice before filing any new papers in the Superior Court, particularly if those papers are not in response to some action taken by Kelman; and (3) if Kramer files any new frivolous papers in the Superior Court, then there is a very high likelihood that the Court will be receptive to a renewed motion to declare Kramer a vexatious litigant and to make Kramer subject to a prefiling order.

The above was attached to Mr. Litvak's Brief in response to my Motion Made Under Duress. It was submitted by Mr. Litvak and Ms. Smyth as representatives of Mr. Kelman (no mention of GlobalTox who I prevailed over in trial, but the void judgment failed to state it).

**PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR
JUDICIAL NOTICE IN SUPPORT
OF OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANT'S MOTION UNDER
DURESS TO VACATE/STOP
RENEWAL OF VOID JUDGMENT**

*[Filed concurrently Plaintiff's
Opposition to Defendant's Motion
Under Duress to Vacate/Stop Renewal
of Void Judgment]*

Hearing Information:

Date: July 13, 2018

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Dept: 28

Dated: June 26, 2018

DAPEER, ROSENBLIT & LITVAK, LLP

By:


William Litvak, Esq.

Joan Stevens Smyth, Esq.

Attorneys for Plaintiff/Judgment Creditor,

BRUCE J. KELMAN

Given that the ROA was corrupted (not for the first time) in support of the false concept that I am a vexatious litigant who is causing duress for Kelman and GlobalTox (nondisclosed, but somehow allegedly filing motions under duress); I highly expect to see my name on the Judicial Council's vexatious litigant list in the coming days.

Yet, the reality is I have not filed a motion in any court for five years – and the vast majority of the ones that I have filed were to try to stop the local courts, Kelman, GlobalTox, and Scheuer from harassing me with this void judgment. I have never initiated litigation in my entire life, with or without an attorney.¹ And under C.C.P 683.170(b), I have a legal right to try to stop the harassing renewal of the void judgment without experiencing more loss of rights by dishonest acts and falsified electronic case-file entries in the local courts.

Mr. Kurt Duecker of the AOC is aware of the fraudulent ROA Entry #309 in support of the false designation of vexatious litigant. I spoke to Mr. Duecker yesterday and sent him a follow up email. In part it states,

¹ Even in our lawsuit of 2001 with our homeowner insurer that brought me into this issue, they sued us for not accepting \$30,000. We counter-sued and received approximately \$500,000. They excluded the insurer broker from the settlement, and a second response-lawsuit was filed by my attorney.

"Attached is the information that causes me to think my name may have been wrongfully submitted to be added to the Vexatious Litigant list. It's a fraudulent entry made in the Register of Action and there is no way it was made by mistake. I'm getting the info to Michael Roddy tomorrow. But that does not mean he will act on it before you update the list on Wed. If at all possible, if there was a submission to add my name to the list it would be greatly appreciated if you could hold off on it until next month, until I have a chance to hear back from Mr. Roddy. The main thing I want you to see in the above attachment is fraudulent ROA Entry #309, falsely entered into the electronic case file as occurring on July 5, 2018."

Mr. Roddy, please tell Mr. Duecker to not add my name to the vexatious litigant list. It would be more harassment to conceal that Fourth District Division One Presiding Justice Judith McConnell committed legal errors in an anti-SLAPP opinion in 2006 that enabled the epic insurer fraud scam to continue in toxic torts all across the United States, based on GlobalTox's junk science; and that her justice-peers concealed the direct evidence of it in their 2010 opinion as they left the void judgment in effect that failed to state I prevailed over GlobalTox in trial; and that the local courts have been participating in horrifically harassing me ever since – while people are still losing all they own and some are dying from the relentless case-fixing of strategic lawsuits against public participation.

Mr. Roddy, I want an in-person meeting with you to discuss the corruption of ROA Entry #309 to make me look like a vexatious litigant. I would like to know who did it and who told them to do it.

There is a second relevant corruption of the ROA, Entry #300, that is very harmful to me, and which I would also like to discuss. On February 20, 2018, Mr. Kelman attempted to renew the void judgment. He could not do it because it was not supported by the ROA. See ROA Entry #294.

294 02/20/2018 Renewal of Judgment - Application for Entry submitted by KELMAN, BRUCE J rejected on 02/20/2018.
Refers to:

KELMAN, BRUCE J (Plaintiff)

Mr. Kelman then hired Mr. Litvak to renew the void judgment. After the renewal application was filed, the court records department backdated the following fraudulent Entry #300 into the ROA in June of 2018, to accommodate the wrongful renewal of the void judgment in its form which failed to state that I prevailed over GlobalTox in trial and was entitled to my costs. See ROA Entry #300.

179 09/24/2008

Judgment on Verdict filed by KELMAN, BRUCE J;
GLOBALTOX, INC..
Refers to:

KELMAN, BRUCE J (Plaintiff);
GLOBALTOX INC (Plaintiff)

300 09/24/2008

Judgment was entered as follows: Judgment entered for KELMAN, BRUCE J and against KRAMER, SHARON for \$ 1.00, punitive damages: \$ 0.00, attorney fees: \$ 0.00, interest: \$ 0.00, prejudgment costs: \$ 7252.65, other costs: \$ 0.00, amount payable to court: \$.00, for a grand total of \$ 7253.65.

180 09/29/2008

Notice - Other (OF UNAVAILABILITY OF PLTF'S COUNSEL) filed by KELMAN, BRUCE J;
GLOBALTOX, INC..
Refers to:

KELMAN, BRUCE J (Plaintiff);
GLOBALTOX INC (Plaintiff)

Judge Maas and Mr. Litvak both knew of the fraudulent ROA Entry #300 that was needed to renew the void judgment. I requested to have an ExParte motion heard on June 13, 2018 that it be removed from the ROA. Judge Maas refused to hear the motion.

BRUCE J. KELMAN & GLOBALTOX, INC.,
Plaintiffs,

CASE NO. GIN044539

v.

SHARON KRAMER, and DOES 1
through 20, inclusive,
Defendant.

EX PARTE APPLICATION
To Remove ROA Entry #300

Declaration of SHARON KRAMER
[Assigned for All Purposes to the Hon. EARL
H. MAAS III, Department 28]

Filed May 2005

Motion Hearing Date: June 13, 2018 8:30am

To ALL PARTIES and their ATTORNEYS OF RECORD Please take notice that on June 13, 2018 at 8:30 am in Department 28 of the North San Diego County Superior Court located at 435 S. Melrose Drive in Vista, California with the Honorable Earl H. Mass III presiding, this EX PARTE APPLICATION TO REMOVE REGISTER OF ACTION (ROA) ENTRY #300 will be heard.

Sharon Kramer

EX PARTE APPLICATION TO REMOVE REGISTER OF ACTION (ROA) ENTRY #300

1. I am aware that in February of 2018, Bruce KELMAN, president of VERITOX, Inc. formerly GlobalTox, Inc.) attempted to renew the void judgment from this case but was unable to do so because it was inconsistent with the electronic case record, the ROA.

2. On June 4, 2018, I became aware that an erred entry was just added to the ROA, entry #300, to make it consistent with the void judgement that KELMAN, via his newest attorney William ITVAK, is again trying to renew.

Contrary to the face of the void judgment as just renewed and the matching backdated ROA Entry #300, there is no question that I prevailed over GlobalTox in trial and that Judge Maas knows he just renewed a void judgment by use of a corrupted ROA, that fails to state it.

On October 28, 2011, Judge Maas ordered that the void judgment be amended to acknowledge I prevailed. This occurred one full year after the 4th/1st left the void judgment in effect in their September 2010 appellate opinion; and Kelman and Scheuer were using it to try to have me permanently enjoined from telling of case-fixing for GlobalTox via the second harassing case, *Bruce Kelman v. Sharon Kramer* Case. No. 37-2010-00061530; hereafter referred to as "RETALIATION" that began in November of 2010.

SLAPP's true ROA states by amendment:


- 281 10/28/2011 Judgment was entered as follows: Judgment entered for KRAMER, SHARON and against GLOBALTOX INC for \$ 0.00, punitive damages: \$ 0.00, attorney fees: \$ 0.00, interest: \$ 0.00, prejudgment costs: \$ 2545.28, other costs: \$ 0.00, amount payable to court: \$.00, for a grand total of \$ 2545.28.
- 278 10/28/2011 Minutes finalized for Motion Hearing (Civil) heard 10/28/2011 01:30:00 PM.

Continuing on with the harassment by the void judgment in its pre-2011 amended form, accommodated to be renewed by corrupted ROA Entry #300; the judgment was again renewed in its form which fails to state that I prevailed over GlobalTox in trial.

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Plaintiff Bruce Kelman recover the sum of \$1.00 (one dollar and no cents) as nominal damages from Defendant Sharon

Kramer, and costs in the amount of \$ 7,254.65 ^{mgardner 12/18/08}, and that Plaintiff GlobalTox, Inc. recover nothing in this action.

Dated: 9/24/08


Judge of the Superior Court
LISA C. SCHALL

No one denies that this judgment was obtained by extrinsic fraud upon the court, which the appellate court covered up by leaving it in effect. No one denies that Judge Schall made a legal error on September 24, 2008 by signing the judgment (crafted by Scheuer) which failed to state I prevailed over GlobalTox in trial. No one denies that she corrected her legal error in the December 12, 2008 minute order --- but her clerk, Michael Garland, reinstated the legal error on 12/18/08. No one denies that, while failing to state that I prevailed over GlobalTox, it was used in RETALIATION to try to harass me into silence of the blatant case-fixing of SLAPP by extrinsic and intrinsic fraud.

Plaintiff counsel's only argument is that it should be renewed (by use of the corrupted ROA Entry #300) because the appellate court left the void judgment in effect while case-fixing for GlobalTox (and its litigation undisclosed co-owner, Bryan Hardin, retired deputy director of CDC NIOSH, et.al.). No one denies that I have repeatedly motioned, begged and pleaded for the 4th/1st to recall and rescind their remittiturs to correct their egregious legal errors, which have greatly harmed me.

From the court transcript of July 13, 2018, verbatim pages 3-6 as transcribed by Court Reporter Julie McKay CSR NO. 9059

THE COURT: Good afternoon. All right. Ms. Kramer, this is your motion. You heard what I said earlier. Go ahead.

MS. KRAMER: I will. Okay. The problem with this, they're trying to renew this judgment that they created ten years ago that only acknowledged their client was a prevailing party to trial. The judge signed it. Didn't acknowledge that I prevailed. It took me through the oral arguments to have it acknowledged that I was a prevailing party on the minute order.

And then after that, within a few days, the clerk signed the amended judgment by just initialing or dating it, which, again, didn't acknowledge that I prevailed. I wasn't noticed of it. Apparently, they were. And they took it and recorded this fraudulent abstract of judgment and lien on my property.

I never would have even known it if I hadn't asked for a motion for reconsideration. And that was denied based on this amended judgment, which wasn't really an amended judgment.

And I think you know the rest from here. It was an extrinsic fraud for the -- for them to be sent this bogus amended judgment and for them to take it and record a fraudulent lien on my property without my notice. And I was denied the opportunity to have the matter heard in motion for reconsideration based on that fraud written on the document that they used to record that.

And you know, Your Honor, how much trouble this little piece of paper has been for me for ten years, and I would greatly appreciate it if you could stop them from being able to harass me with it in the future.

I'm a whistle blower. I've knocked their scientific fraud out of a lot of policies, and that's what this case was really about. It's no longer marketed by the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine. California Department of Health no longer markets it. California Industrial Relations Board no longer markets it. The U.S. Department of Justice no longer uses it.

I've done a great service for the people of the United States. And if you could make them stop harassing me by using these extrinsic but fraudulent court documents, it would be greatly appreciated.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.

And on the phone.

MS. SMYTH: Thank you, Your Honor. Joan Smyth on CourtCall. Your Honor, this judgment was entered in 2008. It was entered ten years ago. It was then confirmed by the Court of Appeal. There is absolutely nothing wrong with this judgment. It is a proper judgment.

Even in Judge Dahlquist's courtroom and in his minute orders, he made clear that all of these attacks on the judgment are frivolous. There is no reason for this court to hold up the renewal of a judgment application. It's an absolutely proper judgment. There's no basis for either a direct attack or a collateral attack on this judgment.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else you want me to know other than what's in your papers?

MS. SMYTH: I have nothing further, Your Honor, unless Ms. Kramer makes further comments that I need to respond to.

THE COURT: Ms. Kramer, final comments.

MS. KRAMER: Yes. This court knows what happened in the appellate court was not an appropriate judgment because this court amended the judgment after appeal to acknowledge that I prevailed.

And additionally, when they went to renew this lien or this judgment, first of all, they couldn't because the Register of Action didn't match to be able to do the automatic renewal. So the court records department backdated this entry into the Register of Action to be able to record it. And what the entry said was what the fraud was to begin with:

That only Kelman prevailed in trial by judgment. Only Kelman was awarded costs. And that is not consistent with what Your Honor had found in this case in 2011. And so that's my argument, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. Do you have any need to follow up after that, Counsel?

MS. SMYTH: No. I'm going to submit, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. As you can imagine, I have a lot still to go through with it just to match up all the dates. But my trial for Monday went away, so it is front on my desk, and I will have your decision by the end of the week.

MS. KRAMER: Thank you, Your Honor. I would like you to understand what I have done to reshape policy and change a lot of lives. So I hope you take that into consideration too.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. Have a good weekend.

MS. KRAMER: You too, Your Honor.

MS. SMYTH: Thank you, Your Honor. Have a good weekend.
(The proceedings adjourned at 1:47 p.m.)

Additionally, it was not denied (or even mentioned) in Mr. Litvak's response that half of the \$7,252.65 awarded to Kelman by void judgment were actually costs incurred by the party I prevailed over in trial, GlobalTox, Inc.

Mr. Scheuer had submitted his client, GlobalTox's costs as being those of Kelman's as he crafted the judgment making it appear that only his clients prevailed by decree (as just renewed). It was also not denied that the appellate court knew this when they left the void judgement in effect that failed to state I prevailed over GlobalTox in trial. No explanation was provided in writing or in oral argument of why the so called "proper judgment" that did not state I prevailed over GlobalTox was able to be used by Scheuer and Kelman to literally try to terrorize me into silence in RETALIATION.

From my Motion Made Under Duress to Vacate/Stop the Renewal of the Void Judgment:

2. In 2010, the Fourth District Division One Court of Appeal (4th/1st) compounded the problem by suppressing the evidence that many legal errors were made in their 4th/1st 2006 anti-SLAPP Opinion [Ex. 9. P.77-96], which caused the 2008 trial to take place. In their 2010 Appellate Opinion [Ex.10 P.97-112] they left the Void Judgment undisturbed which failed to state that KRAMER prevailed over VERITOX in the 2008 trial and was awarded costs – but by ruling only in violation of C.C.P.664.5(b). To quote:

"The trial court with a different trial judge presiding, heard Kramer's cost motion on April 3, 2009, and awarded her a total of \$2,545.28" ...on the record we cannot disturb the trial court's award of costs to Kelman...Judgment affirmed. Respondents to recover their costs on appeal." [Ex.10 P.111-112]

4. Additionally, costs of \$7252.65 that KELMAN and VERITOX's former counsel, Keith Scheuer, submitted to the court on 10/14/08 as being KELMAN's include VERITOX's. Fifty percent of the cost award to KELMAN on the face of the Void Judgment and the RA are trial loser VERITOX's costs. This is proven by the deposition costs. KRAMER was only deposed once and on video. The total cost was assigned by Scheuer as being that of KELMAN's. [Ex.10 P.111]

6. Even if the above noted handwriting by Garland on the 3rd page of the Void Judgment would have occurred on 12/18/08 (which it did not); it is not consistent with the 12/12/08 Minute Order it is supposedly founded upon, making it a falsely amended judgment forever void on its face. [Ex.3 P.8; Ex.18 P.160]

The Record in this case reflects that Plaintiff Bruce J. Kelman is the prevailing party solely as against Defendant Sharon Kramer. Defendant Sharon Kramer is the prevailing party solely as against Defendant Globaltox, Inc.

On October 16, 2008, pursuant to California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1700(a), Notice of Entry of Judgment was properly served on Defendant Sharon Kramer by Counsel for Plaintiff.

As you know, Mr. Roddy, what I was served by plaintiff counsel on October 16, 2008, was the void judgment which failed to state by decree that I prevailed over GlobalTox in trial. It was the first time I'd even seen it. I was not being properly noticed as a prevailing party.

"NOW THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Plaintiff Bruce Kelman recover the sum of \$1.00 (one dollar and no cents) as nominal damages from Defendant Sharon Kramer, and costs in the amount of \$_____ and that Plaintiff GlobalTox, Inc recover nothing in this action."

As you know, Mr. Roddy -- Judge Thomas Nugent, Scheuer and Kelman used the void judgment from SLAPP (that Judge Maas just renewed) to feign that Judge Nugent's court had subject matter jurisdiction in RETALIATION; and that I was physically hurt by the harassment that occurred in that case -- purposed to conceal the 4th/1st justices' case-fixing to frame a whistleblower of GlobalTox's junk science, for libel.

3. In March of 2012 KRAMER was sent to jail for refusing to sign a false confession of being guilty of libel. It was crafted by Scheuer and contained the sentence "*I do not believe Dr. Kelman committed perjury*". [Ex.27 P.229-230; Ex.28 P.231]

4. On 3/14/12 KRAMER was brought before Judge Nugent in shackles and chains. He again attempted to coerce KRAMER into signing the false confession. KRAMER said:


"NO, I DID NOT HEAR THE IMPORTANT THING. I DIDN'T HEAR AN APOLOGY THAT THE COURT'S FRAMED ME FOR LIBEL SEVEN YEARS AGO. I'M SITTING HERE IN HANDCUFFS FOR SPEAKING THE TRUTH ABOUT A FRAUD AND POLICY. IF YOU WANT TO SEND ME BACK TO JAIL, FINE, BUT I'M NOT SIGNING AN APOLOGY FOR THE COURT DOING THAT."
[Ex.29 P.237]

5. KELMAN and VERITOX's "legal" counsel, Scheuer, was there to witness the fruits of his labors as KRAMER was brought in, in shackles and chains, no makeup and no sleep for two nights. So was the attorney that Judge Nugent kept trying to force on KRAMER, Tracey Sang Mitchell (deceased). KRAMER made Sang get up from the defense table and go sit in the audience. (Sang was another aspect to the terrorizing harassment of what they were plotting. Evidence indicates they were going to deem KRAMER criminally and mentally incompetent under PC 1368 and have her "*taken downtown to the psych ward*")

As such, please inform Mr. Duecker to remove my name from a place it does not belong -- the California vexatious litigant list. I would like a meeting with you, Mr. Roddy, to discuss why your deputy clerks are falsifying Register of Action entries to accommodate the renewal of a void judgment obtained by extrinsic fraud; and are falsifying ROA entries in support of the false concept that I should be deemed a vexatious litigant.

No one uses the bogus risk assessment model that Kelman and Hardin concocted in 2002, and that I exposed in 2005 was junk science in mold litigations (other than hard-up insurer defense attorneys who don't have a leg to stand on). Health departments do not market it anymore. The USDOJ does not use it. The thirteen-year harassment on behalf GlobalTox has already cost me practically everything I own to help cause this for the public good; and I would sincerely appreciate it if the local courts would stop helping them to continue to harass me with a renewed void judgment and fraudulent ROA entries.

Sincerely,



Sharon Noonan Kramer

EC: Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakayue via her executive secretary, AhMoi Kim.

Kurt Duecker, AOC Senior Staff – overseer of the Vexatious Litigant list.

CA Attorney General Xavier Becerra via Public Crimes Unit investigator Clifford Zall & Senior Policy Advisor Laura Stuber.