

1 SHARON NOONAN KRAMER, Pro Per
2 2031 Arborwood Place
3 Escondido, CA 92029
4 Snk1955@aol.com

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

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

CASE NO. GIN044539

7
8 v.

REPLY to PLAINTIFF(S)' OPPOSITION to
KRAMER'S MOTION TO VACATE THE VOID
JUDGMENT RENEWED BY CORRUPTION OF THE
ROA & Declaration of Sharon Noonan Kramer

9 SHARON KRAMER, and DOES 1
10 through 20, inclusive, Defendants.

Assigned for All Purposes to Hon. EARL H. MAAS, III
Department 28

11 William Litvak, Esq. for Plaintiff(s)
12 Dapeer, Rosenblit & Litvak, LLC

13 The Hon. Peter Deddeh,
14 Presiding Judge San Diego Superior Court
15 Michael Roddy, CEO San Diego Superior Court
(parties responsible to correct the corrupted ROA)

Case Origin, May 2005
Motion Hearing Date: October 5, 2018 1:30 PM

16 **I.
INTRODUCTION**

17 Stop framing Sharon KRAMER as libeling the owners of GLOBALTOX, Inc. (now Veritox, Inc.) with
18 a renewed void judgment. There are no legal grounds possible that could ever justify the San Diego
19 Superior Court getting caught backdating fraudulent entries into the electronic record to facilitate the renewal
20 of a void judgment; and not moving to correct the colossal damage from the fraud. Judge Maas, Judge
21 Deddeh, and Mike Roddy know that if the void judgment continues to be obstructed from being vacated, a
22 massive insurer fraud scam based on GLOBALTOX's junk science will also continue in U.S. policies and
23 courts via the ongoing case-fixing of this thirteen-year-long fixed SLAPP suit with an unlawfully renewed void
24 judgment.

25 The OPPOSITION¹ brief dated 9.21.18 fails to even address the title of KRAMER'S MOTION². It
26 does not even attempt to refute the direct evidence that the Void Judgment was renewed on 7.17.18 via a
27 records-clerk's backdating false ROA entry #300 into the record. The corruption of the electronic record
28

¹ Smyth's 9.21.18 OPPOSITION brief. <https://katysexposure.files.wordpress.com/2018/09/18-09-23-litvak-reply-brief.pdf>

1 occurred shortly after Mr. Litvak was retained as counsel and he submitted the application to renew the void
2 judgment which fraudulently does not decree that Sharon KRAMER prevailed over GLOBALTOX in trial.

3 San Diego Superior Court CEO Mike Roddy knows the fraud on the face of the Void Judgment is
4 because one of his deputy clerks, Michael Garland, corrupted it on 12.18.08 to make it falsely appear that
5 KELMAN and GLOBALTOX prevailed in the August 2008 trial – inconsistent with the jury verdict and Judge
6 Lisa Schall's Minute Order of 12.12.08.

7 The OPPOSITION argument is that since the 4th/1st Appellate Court justices will not stop the case-
8 fixing by recalling remittiturs to their correct the legal errors; the presiding officer of this court is bound to
9 keep case-fixing (and can use newly falsified electronic case entries to do it).

10 All involved in this ongoing case-fixing knows that the newly renewed Void Judgment and the
11 facilitating fraudulent ROA entry **do not lawfully decree that the August 2008 jury found KRAMER was**
12 **not guilty of libeling the owners of GLOBALTOX.** In what can only be described as feeling like the victim
13 of a gang rape; the courts, GLOBALTOX owners, and the attorneys they hire have been collusively using
14 the void judgment to frame KRAMER for libel and literally terrorize her, for years. STOP IT!

15 Judge Maas, who has been involved in this matter since September of 2011, knows by not lawfully
16 vacating the renewed Void Judgment, he would be enabling the ongoing framing of a whistleblower of an
17 epic scam for libel and causing the criminal harassment of her by Void Judgment and fraudulent liens to
18 continue for at least another ten years.

19 The country recorder's office shows that on 8.14.18, plaintiff counsel used the 7.17.18 unlawfully-
20 renewed Void Judgment to record a fraudulent interest accruing lien on defrauded-KRAMER'S property in
21 the amount of \$14,294.84. STOP IT!

22 5. Renewal of money judgment

a. Total judgment	\$ 7,253.65
b. Costs after judgment	\$ 0
c. Subtotal (add a and b)	\$ 7,253.65
d. Credits after judgment	\$ 0
e. Subtotal (subtract d from c)	\$ 7,253.65
f. Interest after judgment	\$ 7,011.19
g. Fee for filing renewal application	\$ 30.00
h. Total renewed judgment (add e, f, and g)	\$ 14,294.84

28 ² KRAMER'S 9.12.18 MOTION TO VACATE THE VOID JUDGMENT RENEWED BY CORRUPTION OF THE ROA
<https://katysexposure.files.wordpress.com/2018/09/18-09-12-file-stamped-motion-to-vacate-the-renewed-void-judgment3.pdf>

II

**WHY THE PRESIDING OFFICER OF THIS COURT IS MOST LIKELY GOING TO CONTINUE TO FRAME
KRAMER AS LIBELING GLOBALTOX & AID THE THEFT OF HER WITH A VOID JUDGMENT,
FRAUDULENT LIEN(S) & FRAUDULENT ELECTRONIC RECORD ENTRIES**

1
2
3
4 1. Courts are allegedly autonomous with one presiding officer who is the decision maker. Judge Earl
5 Maas III is the presiding officer of this court. He *could* make this criminal case-fixing stop immediately simply
6 by directing the lawful vacating of the (renewed) Void Judgment – but not without exposing extreme financial
7 liability for the State of California and exposing systemic corruption, cronyism and political prostitution of
8 office in the San Diego Superior and 4th/1st Appellate Courts.

9 2. KRAMER has a degree in marketing. She paid PRWeb close to \$300 to publish a writing on March
10 9, 2005. It exposed how GLOBALTOX owners (who are prolific lying expert defense witnesses in U.S. toxic
11 torts) were able to get a bogus risk assessment model (the Veritox Theory/GlobalTox Paper) mass marketed
12 into U.S. policies.

13 3. KRAMER's writing also exposed how one could defeat the scam in trial by making GLOBALTOX
14 president, Bruce KELMAN, squirm in front of a jury when forced to talk of the exchange of money among the
15 scam-marketers. It was a public service announcement purposed to save lives from well-connected
16 fraudsters, who feed off of litigations, by exposing their scam.³

17 4. The purpose of the mass marketing of GLOBALTOX's scientific fraud via the American College of
18 Occupational & Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), the Manhattan Institute Center for Legal Policy (CLP),
19 the U.S Chamber Institute for Legal Reform (ILR), U.S. Congressman Gary Miller (R-CA), and the University
20 of California (UC) was to profitably cheat environmentally disabled and dying people in U.S. toxic torts.

21 5. GLOBALTOX'S bogus risk assessment model (marketed as legitimate science by respected orgs
22 and individuals) is used by U.S. toxic tort defense attorneys retained by insurers or employed by government
23 agencies as false proof that mycotoxins in water damaged buildings (WDB) can never reach a level to harm
24 anyone. It is projected to prove that all who are claiming severe disabilities indicative of toxicity from
25 exposure in WDB are liars and malingerers.

26
27
28 ³ March 9, 2005 Jury Finds "Toxic Mold" Harmed Oregon Family, Builder's Arbitration Clause Not Binding
<https://www.prweb.com/releases/2005/03/prweb216604.htm>

1 6. It, the relentless SLAPP-fixing in the San Diego courts to conceal it, and the harm it causes to many
2 people are the ugliest most hateful thing KRAMER has ever witnessed in her life. It is an epic insurer fraud
3 scam to avoid liability for causation of disability and death that is profitable for many while harming thousands
4 - based on GLOBALTOX's junk science/bogus risk model.

5 7. The two-primary position-papers that were originally used to promote GLOBALTOX's science fraud
6 (and were the subject papers of KRAMER's March 2005 writing) are:

- 7 a. **"Adverse Human Health Effects Associated with Mold in the Indoor Environment"**, ACOEM
8 2002, authored by Bruce Kelman & Bryan Hardin of Veritox, Inc. and Andrew Saxon of **UCLA**.
9 b. **"A Scientific View of the Health Effects of Mold"** CLP & ILR 2003, stated authorship of Bruce
10 Kelman, Bryan Hardin, Coreen Robbins of Veritox, Inc. and Andrew Saxon of **UCLA**.

11 8. In May of 2005, KELMAN and GLOBALTOX sued KRAMER for the benign and accurate words in
12 her March 2005 writing "*altered his under oath statements*".

13 9. The local courts have been framing KRAMER for libel for those words with rewarded perjury,
14 fraudulent court documents and falsified electronic records ever since. The 2018 renewal of the void
15 judgment by backdated, fraudulent ROA entry is a prime example of extensive case-fixing in the San Diego
16 courts over this matter.

17 10. The first ruling of the case came in September of 2005. Judge Michael Orfield suppressed the
18 evidence that KELMAN was committing perjury to manufacture a false reason for KRAMER to have malice
19 for him while strategically litigating, and GLOBALTOX's attorney Keith SCHEUER was suborning the perjury.

20 11. Why? Not likely to be by sheer coincidence, one month later in October of 2005, Governor
21 Schwarzenegger (who was also president of the UC Regents) endorsed GLOBALTOX'S and UCLA-Saxon's
22 junk science into CA Dept of Industrial Relations Board and CA Dept of Health policy⁴. This was done via a
23 policy paper titled "*Mold In the Indoor Workplaces*". It stated on its fourth page:

24 *Physicians can refer to the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*
25 *(ACOEM) statement "**Adverse Human Health Effects Associated with Mold in the Indoor***
26 ***Environment**" endorsed by Arnold Schwarzenegger Governor of California, Kimberly Belishe*
27 *Secretary Health and Human Services Agency, Sandra Shawny Director of Health Services,*
28 *and John Rea Acting Director of Industrial Relations.*

⁴ The marketing of GLOBALTOX'S junk science by the State of California since October 2005:
<https://katysexposure.wordpress.com/2018/07/25/toxic-mold-ca-dept-of-health-quietly-stops-marketing-litigation-defense-argument/>

1 12. In early 2010, Governor Schwarzenegger, in the capacity as the UC Regents President, was made
2 aware that the UC imprimatur on the second paper, the U.S. Chamber's "**A Scientific View of the Health**
3 **Effects of Mold**" as authored by GLOBALTOX owners, was being used interstate to cheat mold injured
4 people in toxic torts. Multiple scientists, physicians and advocates told him⁵. He did nothing to stop it.

5 13. A few months later, the 4th/1st appellate court justices and clerks framed KRAMER as libeling
6 GLOBALTOX owners with the Void Judgment that they sneakily left in effect; and falsified the remittitur and
7 electronic case file to conceal it. They knew it was created by extrinsic fraud and falsely did not state by
8 decree that the jury found KRAMER did not libel GLOBALTOX.

9 14. A month after that, the second litigation began in Judge Thomas Nugent's court, where he used the
10 Void Judgment to feign court subject matter jurisdiction. The purpose of the collusive fraud was to try to
11 unlawfully permanently enjoin KRAMER from telling of the ongoing case-fixing to defraud the public with
12 GLOBALTOX's junk science in CA policies – used to cheat people all across the U.S.

13 15. In 2016, resultant from the efforts of KRAMER and others, the State of CA's Dept of Health stopped
14 marketing GLOBALTOX'S junk science by policy paper. But they cheated to make it look like they never
15 had. They quietly stopped referring physicians to the litigation defense argument, "*Adverse Human Health*
16 *Effects Associated with Mold in the Indoor Environment*" without dating the change to the policy paper –
17 making it appear that California had never marketed the scam while harming and cheating thousands.

18 16. For thirteen years, San Diego Superior Court judges and 4th/1st justices have been contributing to
19 the obstruction of justice for thousands by obstructing justice for one, KRAMER, by framing her as libeling
20 GLOBALTOX owners and harassing her with the void judgment.

21 17. In reality, KRAMER honestly exposed the epic scam in March of 2005 that should have been shut
22 down by the acknowledgment that this is a SLAPP suit -- before Schwarzenegger even endorsed the scam
23 into California public health and workcomp policies in October of 2005.

24 18. For ten years, the framing of KRAMER for libel to obstruct justice for thousands, has been carried
25 out by use of the unvacated Void Judgment -- which fraudulently does not state by decree that the jury found
26 KRAMER did not libel GLOBALTOX with her 2005 writing.

27
28

⁵ The marketing of GLOBALTOX's junk science in courts interstate via the UC imprimatur. <http://freepdfhosting.com/e88548fd20.pdf>

1 19. Appellate Court Justices Judith McConnell and Patricia Benke have been asked multiple times to
2 recall their remitturs and direct the lower courts to vacate the Void Judgment(s) that they sneakily left in
3 effect in the 2010 appellate opinion and the courts continued to use to try to harass KRAMER into silence.

4 20. The severely compromised appellate justices will not lawfully do it, because they cannot do it
5 without exposing they have been criminally case-fixing with a Void Judgment for many years – and lower
6 court judges viciously tried to permanently enjoin KRAMER from telling of it as they continue to frame her for
7 libel with the void judgment.

8 21. As noted in Ms. Smyth's OPPOSITION, she would like to see KRAMER falsely deemed to be a
9 vexatious litigant for refusing silence of the ongoing case-fixing with the renewed Void Judgment. Ms. Smyth,
10 (a graduate of the Christian school Pepperdine) now has a pony in the race because she is now willingly
11 involved in the ongoing case-fixing with a renewed Void Judgment to fleece the public. Smyth writes:

12 This latest motion by Defendant is patently frivolous. The 2008 Judgment has been ruled
13 valid by the Court of Appeal and this Court ruled as recently as July that it does not have the
14 jurisdiction to reconsider the 2008 Judgment. Plaintiff renews his request pursuant to C.C.P.
15 section 391.7(a) that Defendant be deemed a vexatious litigant and precluded from filing more
16 litigation without leave of the presiding judge. This continued harassment of Plaintiff by
17 Defendant must stop.

18 22. KRAMER is not the one harassing anyone by recording fraudulent interest accruing liens on their
19 property and framing them for libel with a VOID JUDGMENT -- enabled to do so by falsified electronic
20 records and falsified court documents in the San Diego courts. Smyth, Litvak, and the owners of
21 GLOBALTOX are the court enabled harassers. People are losing all they own with some dying because of it.
22 There is nothing Christian about misusing one's law license to cause horrible discrimination of sick and dying
23 people with fraudulent court documents.

24 III.

25 NON-ATTORNEY-OF-RECORD UNTIMELY SERVED REPLY BRIEF


26 1. On Tuesday, September 25, 2018, KRAMER received a "PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO
27 DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO VACATE THE 'VOID JUDGMENT RENEWED BY CORRUPTION OF THE
28 ROA". It was signed by Joan Stephens Smyth, Esq. only.

1 2. There was no declaration of allegedly-represented Plaintiff Bruce KELMAN attached. There is no
2 substitution of counsel which shows that Ms. Smyth is KELMAN'S attorney of record or has authority to file,
3 sign and untimely serve briefs on his behalf.


4 3. C.C.P. 128.7. states (a) *Every pleading, petition, written notice of motion, or other similar paper*
5 *shall be signed by at least one attorney of record in the attorney's individual name.*

6
7
8
9
10

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Print 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: BRUCE J. KELMAN	
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	
COURT/JUDICIAL DISTRICT: North County	
CASE NAME:	
KELMAN V. KRAMER	
SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY—CIVIL (Without Court Order)	

By: 
William Litvak, Esq.
Joan Stevens Smyth, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff/Judgment Creditor,
BRUCE J. KELMAN

11 4. Additionally, Ms. Smyth's "OPPOSITION" was untimely served on KRAMER eight court days before
12 the scheduled October 5, 2018 MOTION hearing – leaving KRAMER only one day to write and mail her
13 response. Below is Ms. Smyth's intentional "two-day" Fed Ex mailing scheduled to be delivered on Tuesday,
14 September 25, 2018 -- assuring that KRAMER would untimely receive the OPPOSITION brief from the
15 apparent non-counsel of record.



18
19

IV. KRAMER'S MOTION WAS TIMELY MADE, FILED & SERVED

20 1. Under C.C.P. 683.170 (b), a judgment debtor has 30 days after receiving the notice of a renewed
21 judgment to "apply" by noticed motion for it to be vacated or modified. KRAMER timely called the court on
22 August 16, 2018 and applied to schedule the motion hearing for the MOTION TO VACATE THE VOID
23 JUDGMENT RENEWED BY CORRUPTION OF THE ROA. There were extenuating circumstances to be
24 addressed by heard-motion because of the court records department's fraudulent backdated electronic
25 records used to facilitate Ms. Smyth's and Mr. Litvak's renewal of GLOBALTOX's Void Judgment.

26 2. October 5, 2018 was the first date that the court had available to hear the MOTION. KRAMER timely
27 applied for a noticed motion within 30 days of receiving the notice of the void judgment's unlawful renewal.

1 3. On September 13, 2018, in lawful accordance with CCP § 1005 KRAMER timely filed the moving
2 papers and lawfully noticed the attorney of record, William Litvak, Esq, that the motion hearing was
3 scheduled for October 5, 2018. Unlike non-attorney-of-record Ms. Smyth, KRAMER made the effort to have
4 the moving papers hand delivered to Los Angeles on September 13, 2018 to assure they were timely served.

5 **VI.**
6 **THERE IS NOTHING “FRIVOLOUS” ABOUT CASE-FIXING SLAPP WITH A VOID JUDGMENT**

7 Contrary to Ms. Smyth’s uncorroborated and over-used tired-word “frivolous”; she provided no
8 evidence in her OPPOSITION to refute KRAMER’S direct evidence that the “Toxic Judgment” was created
9 and used in extrinsic and intrinsic fraud by KELMAN, GLOBALTOX, their prior counsel SCHEUER, and
10 multiple officers of multiple courts for ten years to frame KRAMER as libeling GLOBALTOX (and KELMAN).

11 Plaintiff counsel has had the evidence even before they filed to renew the judgment that it is a void
12 judgment created by a deputy clerk and used extensively by GLOBALTOX’s prior attorney to try to pummel
13 KRAMER into silence of the epic insurer scam based on GLOBALTOX’s junk science. There is no legal
14 justification for California licensed attorneys to knowingly using fraudulent electronic records and falsified
15 court documents to renew a void judgment and record fraudulent liens on people’s property.

16 **V.**
17 **SECOND FRAUDULENT ELECTRONIC RECORD DISCOVERED ON AUGUST 31, 2018**

18 KRAMER did not become aware until August 31, 2018 that not only was the ROA corrupted by the
19 court records department with false, backdated entry #300 to cause the renewal of the Void Judgment in
20 mid-July 2018; the Case History was also fraudulently corrupted with an amended and false backdated entry.

21 The stealth Case History entry falsely states that GLOBALTOX was a prevailing party in the August
22 2008 trial. (No one, including the appellate court, has claimed this). Further evidence that it is no accident
23 that the courts are intentionally framing KRAMER as libeling GLOBALTOX and harassing her by acts of
24 willful extrinsic fraud, KRAMER would have had no way to know of the fraudulent Case History entry if a
25 records clerk had not let it slip. Case History entries are not shown to the public, litigants, attorneys or the
26 media. Most people have no idea how the Case History is used to impact their cases.
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

VI.
ARGUMENT

"Where there exists a relationship of trust and confidence it is the duty of one in whom the confidence is reposed to make full disclosure of all material facts within his knowledge relating to the transaction in question and any concealment of material facts is a fraud." (Estate of Shay (1925) 196 Cal. 355, 365 [237 P. 1079]; Martin v. Martin (1952) 110 Cal. App.2d 228, 233 [242 P.2d 688]; Main v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc. (1977) 67 Cal. App.3d 19, 32 [136 Cal. Rptr. 378].)

The presiding officer of this court is the sole decision maker of whether this ongoing criminal harassment of KRAMER is going to be made to stop. He knows deputy clerk Garland's void amended judgment of 12/18/08 is inconsistent with the jury verdict of August 2008 which found KRAMER was not guilty of libeling GLOBALTOX; is inconsistent with the trial court's Minute Order of 12/12/08 showing KRAMER (not GLOBALTOX) prevailed in trial; is inconsistent with the 9/11/10 appellate opinion that acknowledges KRAMER (not GLOBALTOX) prevailed in trial; and is inconsistent with this court's 10/28/11 amendment to the Void Judgment acknowledging that the appellate court (sneakily) left the void judgment in effect that failed to state KRAMER prevailed in the trial of the ongoing Strategic Lawsuit.

As shown by her MOTION and attached exhibits of September 12, 2018, KRAMER has requested that San Diego Superior Court CEO Michael Roddy and Presiding Judge Peter Deddeh timely and lawfully act to cause the fraudulent electronic records to be removed prior to the hearing date of October 5, 2018.

"Where there is [such] a duty to disclose, the disclosure must be full and complete, and any material concealment or misrepresentation will amount to fraud sufficient to entitle the party injured thereby to an action." (Stafford v. Shultz (1954) 42 Cal.2d 767, 777 [270 P.2d 1]; Main v. Merrill Lynch, supra.)

The lawful removal of the fraudulent electronic records entries is to facilitate the presiding officer of this court to lawfully cease obstructing the vacating of the (renewed) Void Judgment that is used to frame KRAMER for libel. If left unvacated it will be used to harass KRAMER for another ten years for exposing GLOBALTOX's junk science in an epic insurer fraud scam.

The scam was endorsed into California workcomp and DHS policies by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger in October of 2005. It was quietly removed in 2016. KRAMER does not deserve a lifetime sentence of GLOBALTOX'S criminal harassment by the libel-framing Void Judgment, falsified electronic records and fraudulent interest accruing liens, for helping to make that happen.

1 Accordingly, the Legislature directed that a trial court may vacate renewal of a judgment "on any
2 ground that would be a defense to an action on the judgment" (§ 683.170, subd. (a); In re Marriage of
3 Thompson (1996) 41 Cal.App.4th 1049, 1058.)
4


5 **CONCLUSION**

6 The renewed Void Judgment must be lawfully vacated by act of the presiding officer of this court, the
7 Superior Court Presiding Judge and the Superior Court CEO; as it is the criminal lynch-pin which *still* causes
8 the insurer fraud scam (that KRAMER exposed thirteen years ago) to continue to harm thousands. It is the
9 fraudulent legal instrument which enables GLOBALTOX owners and the attorneys they hire to abuse
10 KRAMER under the color of law for telling the truth about their junk science and the case-fixing on their
11 behalves in the San Diego courts.

12 This court knows it is a Void Judgment because this court ordered it to be amended in 2011 to state
13 that KRAMER prevailed over GLOBALTOX – inconsistent with how it was just renewed on July 17, 2018
14 which fails to state the truth of the jury verdict and the trial court's Minute Order of 12.12.08.

15 The presiding officer of this court knows that the lawful (and moral) thing to do is to stop this
16 relentless case-fixing of a SLAPP suit by directing that the Void Judgment -- created by extrinsic fraud on
17 12.18.08 and renewed by corruption of the electronic record in the summer of 2018 -- be vacated. "A void
18 judgment [or order] is, in legal effect, no judgment. By it no rights are divested. From it no rights can be
19 obtained. Being worthless, all proceedings founded upon it are equally worthless. It neither binds nor bars
any one." Bennett v. Wilson (1898) 122 Cal. 509, 513-514, 55 P. 390.

20 Submitted with all respect due,

21 

22 Sharon Noonan Kramer

23 **DECLARATION OF SHARON NOONAN KRAMER**

24 PLEASE STOP HARASSING AND LIBELING ME WITH THE RENEWED VOID JUDGMENT. Order it to be
25 vacated. For God sakes, people are losing everything they own and some are dying from the relentless case-
26 fixing. I declare under penalty of perjury that the above is all true to the best of my knowledge and this
27 document is executed by me on September ~~26~~ 2018 in Escondido, California.

28 

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address): <i>Sharon Kramer</i>	FOR COURT USE ONLY
TELEPHONE NO.: <i>760-822-8004</i> FAX NO. (Optional): E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): ATTORNEY FOR (Name):	
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF <i>San Diego</i> STREET ADDRESS: <i>425 S. Mirrose,</i> MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: <i>Vista, CA 92083</i> BRANCH NAME: <i>North County</i>	
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: <i>Bruce Kulman & Globaltek, Inc</i> DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: <i>Sharon Kramer</i>	CASE NUMBER: <i>61W044539</i>
<p style="text-align: center;">PROOF OF SERVICE—CIVIL</p> Check method of service (only one): <input type="checkbox"/> By Personal Service <input type="checkbox"/> By Mail <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> By Overnight Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> By Messenger Service <input type="checkbox"/> By Fax <input type="checkbox"/> By Electronic Service	JUDGE: <i>Gardmas III</i> DEPT.: <i>28</i>

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

1. At the time of service I was over 18 years of age and **not a party to this action.**
2. My residence or business address is: *2031 Ardenwood Place
Escondido, CA 92029*
3. The fax number or electronic notification address from which I served the documents is (complete if service was by fax or electronic service):
4. On (date): *9/12/13* I served the following **documents** (specify):
*Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Kramer's Motion To Vacate
The Void Judgment Renewed by Corruption of the BOA &
Declaration of Sharon Inouen Kramer*
- The documents are listed in the Attachment to Proof of Service—Civil (Documents Served) (form POS-040(D)).
5. I served the documents on the **person or persons** below, as follows:
 - a. Name of person served: *William Hutvuk, Judge Peter Deddah, and Mike Roddy*
 - b. (Complete if service was by personal service, mail, overnight delivery, or messenger service.)
 Business or residential address where person was served:
*11500 W. Olympic Blvd #500 Los Angeles, CA 90064 1100 Union St 10th floor
San, Diego, CA 92101*
 - c. (Complete if service was by fax or electronic service.)
 - (1) Fax number or electronic notification address where person was served:
 - (2) Time of service:
- The names, addresses, and other applicable information about persons served is on the Attachment to Proof of Service—Civil (Persons Served) (form POS-040(P)).
6. The documents were served by the following means (specify):
 - a. **By personal service.** I personally delivered the documents to the persons at the addresses listed in item 5. (1) For a party represented by an attorney, delivery was made to the attorney or at the attorney's office by leaving the documents, in an envelope or package clearly labeled to identify the attorney being served, with a receptionist or an individual in charge of the office, between the hours of nine in the morning and five in the evening. (2) For a party, delivery was made to the party or by leaving the documents at the party's residence with some person not younger than 18 years of age between the hours of eight in the morning and six in the evening.

(Continued on next page)

CASE NAME

CASE NUMBER:

Kelman & Goldhaber v Kramu

GW044539

6. b. **By United States mail.** I enclosed the documents in a sealed envelope or package addressed to the persons at the addresses in item 5 and (specify one):

- (1) deposited the sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service, with the postage fully prepaid.
- (2) placed the envelope for collection and mailing, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this business's practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid.

I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at (city and state):

c. **By overnight delivery.** I enclosed the documents in an envelope or package provided by an overnight delivery carrier and addressed to the persons at the addresses in item 5. I placed the envelope or package for collection and overnight delivery at an office or a regularly utilized drop box of the overnight delivery carrier.

d. **By messenger service.** I served the documents by placing them in an envelope or package addressed to the persons at the addresses listed in item 5 and providing them to a professional messenger service for service. (A declaration by the messenger must accompany this Proof of Service or be contained in the Declaration of Messenger below.)

e. **By fax transmission.** Based on an agreement of the parties to accept service by fax transmission, I faxed the documents to the persons at the fax numbers listed in item 5. No error was reported by the fax machine that I used. A copy of the record of the fax transmission, which I printed out, is attached.

f. **By electronic service.** Based on a court order or an agreement of the parties to accept service by electronic transmission, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the electronic notification addresses listed in item 5.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF DECLARANT)

(SIGNATURE OF DECLARANT)

(If item 6d above is checked, the declaration below must be completed or a separate declaration from a messenger must be attached.)

DECLARATION OF MESSENGER

By personal service. I personally delivered the envelope or package received from the declarant above to the persons at the addresses listed in item 5. (1) For a party represented by an attorney, delivery was made to the attorney or at the attorney's office by leaving the documents in an envelope or package, which was clearly labeled to identify the attorney being served, with a receptionist or an individual in charge of the office, between the hours of nine in the morning and five in the evening. (2) For a party, delivery was made to the party or by leaving the documents at the party's residence with some person not younger than 18 years of age between the hours of eight in the morning and six in the evening.

At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age. I am not a party to the above-referenced legal proceeding.

I served the envelope or package, as stated above, on (date):

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date:

(NAME OF DECLARANT)

(SIGNATURE OF DECLARANT)