<table>
<tr><td>District Court, El Paso County, Colorado
Court Address: 270 S. Tejon St.
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Robert Wayne Johnson,
Plaintiff

v.

Vanessa Ralphita Dolbow,
Defendant AND
Jonica Brunner, Melissa Balquin, Leslie McGrew, Larry Desbien, Toni Herman and Richard Bengtsson,
Co-Defendants</td><td>▲ COURT USE ONLY ▲</td></tr>
<tr><td>Attorney or Party Without Attorney:

Robert Wayne Johnson
307 S. 26th St.
Colorado Springs, CO 80904

Phone Number: 719-640-2155</td><td>Case Number: 2011CV229

Division: 13 Courtroom: S404</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">STATUS CONFERENCE STATEMENT</td></tr>
</table>

COMES NOW Plaintiff, ROBERT WAYNE JOHNSON, on his own behalf, to issue the statement shown below in preparation for the status conference set for 30 minutes on September 19, 2011 at 8:30 a.m. in Division 13, Courtroom S404 before El Paso County District Court Judge Barbara L. Hughes.

STATUS CONFERENCE STATEMENT

Plaintiff filed the original complaint against Defendant, Vanessa Ralphita Dolbow, on July 8, 2011. Service was perfected on Defendant July 13, 2011 with the summons and complaint delivered together at her El Paso County residence. The responsive pleading, whose manner of construction and purpose are established by Chapter 2 of the Colorado Rules of Civil Procedure, was due 20 days after the service date pursuant to C.R.C.P. 12(a) on August 2, 2011.

On August 3, 2011, Plaintiff moved for a default judgment against Defendant under C.R.C.P. 55(a) based on the incorrect copy of the letter to the court he received from Defendant by mail dated July 27, 2011 that did not comply with the form or purpose of pleadings in civil actions. On the same date, Plaintiff filed a notice to set a hearing of the default motion.

Five days later, Plaintiff moved for a change of venue pursuant to C.R.C.P. 98(g), having established the lawsuit in the county where the Defendant and Plaintiff live and where all of the events that gave rise to the action occurred. Plaintiff then filed a change to the reason for

the hearing being set to include the hearing of the motion to change venue. Plaintiff's motion identified "the court" as the feared adverse party and requested the case be removed to another judicial district.

On the same date, August 8, 2011, Defendant moved for reinstatement of the 1996 permanent restraining order that appeared planned in her July 27, 2011 letter. In her second letter to the "courts" Defendant wrote: "Upon receiving and reading the Affidavit to Support Motion for Change of Venue, I became over and beyond suspicious and knew there was more to this than I was understanding."

On August 12, 2011, Plaintiff gave notice of his need to set a case management conference to develop a modified case management order because of Defendant's allegations of harassment and his inability to engage in constructive communications with Defendant to move the case to trial in the manner set forth in C.R.C.P. 16. And he filed the second change to the reason for the hearing to be set to include resolution of the communications problem that was certain to prohibit him from moving the case to a speedy trial in the manner prescribed by the Rule.

On the same date, August 12, 2011, Magistrate Jami Vigil issued the order to set a hearing of the reinstatement of the permanent restraining order in the County Court. On August 15, the court mailed to Plaintiff the Notice of Appearance demanding he appear on September 6, 2011 at 8:30 a.m. in Division N. Magistrate Vigil's case management note on the Integrated Colorado Online Network said "[a]ctivate."

On August 15, 2011, Plaintiff received the hearing date of September 19, 2011 for the 30-minute "status conference" in the lawsuit.

On August 19, 2011, Plaintiff left his residence to avoid Defendant's arrival to take their son to lunch. He then filed the Motion to Compel Answer and the notice of hearing and the hearing briefs in the lawsuit that were written for Defendant's benefit. The hearing briefs continued the self-help effort he began with his July 28, 2011 letter to Defendant. The motion requested the court demand an answer from Defendant that met the Rules of Civil Procedure or enter a default judgment pursuant to C.R.C.P. 55(b).

On August 22, 2011, the court issued its orders denying a default judgment under C.R.C.P. 55(a) and denying change of venue. The court's change of venue order clearly took an adversarial and defensive position against Plaintiff, leaving him to believe the cover given to the Fourth District magistrates in the Child Support Division's racketeering scheme would continue into the lawsuit under Judge Hughes, the former Probate Division magistrate who granted Defendant's motion to dismiss her 2003 child support modification action after Plaintiff hired an attorney to defend against it. Plaintiff understood that Chief Judge Kirk Samelson supervised all of the magistrates in the Fourth Judicial District and knew he had immediately refused to investigate Plaintiff's ethics complaints related to former Magistrate John Paul Lyle's and Ms. Eigel's illegal handling of Plaintiff's 2010 child support modification case and then later refused to investigate complaints against Magistrate Jayne-Candea Ramsey and the clerk's office for mishandling of filings in his case. Plaintiff also understood that former Magistrate Hughes was

subject to Chief Judge Samelson's supervision during the last years of her 10-year tenure as a probate magistrate.

On August 23, 2011, Plaintiff filed the Consent to Magistrate form with the County Court refusing to have a magistrate rule on any motion or to preside over any hearing, including the September 6, 2011 hearing of the reinstatement of the permanent restraining order. The same date that it was filed, the clerk's office entered a note on ICON stating the consent form could not be uploaded and that it was routed to records for entry into Papervision.

Also on August 23, 2011, Plaintiff called Leslie McGrew, an intended witness in his defense against the planned activation of the 1996 permanent restraining order, at her place of employment and was forced to leave a message for the return of the court transcript in the child support modification case heard by Magistrate Lyle on January 13, 2010 that was left by him for delivery to her on April 29, 2011.

On August 25, 2011, Plaintiff filed the Pre-Hearing Brief in the permanent restraining order case. The brief clearly identified his defense against reinstatement based on the same facts known to him when he filed the lawsuit on July 8, 2011.

On August 26, 2011, Plaintiff called Ms. McGrew's place of employment again and left a very detailed message about the return of the transcript. Later in the day, Plaintiff presented subpoenas to the clerk's office for issuance to Ms. McGrew, and five other witnesses needed in his defense of the reinstatement of the permanent restraining order. Ms. McGrew's subpoena included an order to produce the hearing transcript. Plaintiff immediately delivered the local subpoenas to the El Paso County Sheriff's Office for Jonica Brunner, Melissa Balquin, Toni Herman, and Richard Bengtsson. Then he contacted the Denver County Sheriff's Office for instructions to mail two subpoenas for further personal service upon Ms. McGrew and Larry Desbien, her superior.

On August 29, 2011, Plaintiff, having only attached money orders for mileage on August 26, paid an additional $60 each for delivery of the local subpoenas and then mailed the Denver subpoenas with their fees enclosed.

On August 30, 2011, the court received Defendant's second letter dated August 25 but signed August 29. The letter begins: "As was instructed, I am filing this response to the El Paso County Courts in regards to the above mentioned case [11CV229]. From this point on my part in this is over. Also I will no longer accept any further mailings from the Plaintiff, Robert Wayne Johnson." However, Plaintiff received the first "refused mail of August 23" by certified mail piece 7010 0780 001 8263 4005. Looking back at Judge Hughes' two e-filed orders on August 22, she did not mail copies of her orders to Defendant, which left Plaintiff to suspect that Judge Hughes: (1) advised Defendant not to accept anymore mail from Plaintiff and (2) instructed Defendant to put her decision not to participate in the lawsuit in writing, knowing Plaintiff filed the Motion to Compel Answer.

On August 30, 2011, Plaintiff moved for a change of judge. Since the court also had Defendant's August 29-signed letter, Judge Hughes denied the motion the same day. In her

order, she commented only on the fact she was not a federal judge and chose to ignore the facts that proved she understood orders, like Magistrate Candea-Ramsey's March 26, 2010 order, were stamped for corrupt purposes. Like the other two e-filed orders, Judge Hughes did not provide a copy to Defendant.

On August 31, 2011, the subpoenas to Ms. Brunner, Ms. Balquin, Ms. Herman and Mr. Bengtsson were served. (The court's record shows Ms. Herman's was served August 30.)

On September 1, 2011, Chief Deputy County Attorney John A. Thirkell contacted Plaintiff but had to leave a voice message.

On September 2, 2011, Plaintiff called Mr. Thirkell and had to leave a voice message. Later that day, Mr. Thirkell returned the call and gave notice he had filed a motion to quash the subpoenas to Ms. Herman and Mr. Bengtsson, including the child support enforcement case file compelled from Mr. Bengtsson, the custodian of the record. Mr. Thirkell asked for Plaintiff's email address to send him a copy of the motion, but Plaintiff went to the courthouse instead. There he learned the State had also moved to quash the subpoenas to Ms. McGrew and Mr. Desbien. He was then ran back and forth from the filing area to records trying to locate the State's motion. The records room subsequently called the filing area and told the supervisor to look in the outgoing mail. There the supervisor, with two witnesses, pulled the Fed Ex envelope with the State's motion in it and copied it for Plaintiff. Plaintiff asked that she sign the ICON printout he obtained and acknowledge the problem he encountered. She refused.

Unknown to Plaintiff on September 2, 2011, Christina K. Eigel, the attorney for El Paso County's delegate for child support enforcement and the County's special deputy district attorney for child support enforcement, filed a motion to quash the appearance of witnesses Brunner and Balquin and to quash or protect the subpoena to produce the child support enforcement case file subpoenaed from County employee Bengtsson. Plaintiff received his copy of the motion by mail on September 9 after delivery was delayed by the time taken by the post office to forward it from the old address used by Ms. Eigel to his new address.

In preparation for the permanent restraining order hearing, Plaintiff visited the courthouse and inquired about the status of the assignment of a judge as well as looked closely at the filings in the divorce case. He was told a judge had not been assigned but that he would be notified by mail when the assignment was made. And he learned that the verified motion for the contempt citation in the divorce case proved he paid all temporary spousal and child support.

Since Monday was a holiday, Plaintiff had an additional day to prepare for the permanent restraining order hearing. Consequently, prior to the hearing, he filed his prepared responses to the State and County's motions to quash subpoenas and the supporting exhibit lists and exhibits. He then sat outside the courtroom preparing to make his case without the witnesses. When he saw Chief Deputy County Attorney John Thirkell and Mr. Bengtsson, he handed Mr. Thirkell a copy of his response to the County's motion. Mr. Thirkell immediately handed it to Mr. Bengtsson. He then watched as the State's attorney, Assistant Attorney General Jeremy Hill and Tracy Rumans, the attorney working with Ms. Eigel, arrived. He also saw Ms. Brunner and Ms. Balquin sitting together. As the group went into the courtroom, Plaintiff was immediately

struck by seeing Magistrate Vigil sitting on the bench. She began the hearing by taking the introductions of the attorneys for third parties and allowing Plaintiff to identify himself. Then she dismissed the motion filed by Defendant for failure to appear.

As the group was leaving the courtroom, Mr. Bengtsson told Mr. Thirkell "that was easier than I thought." Outside the courthouse, Plaintiff noticed Mr. Hill and handed him a copy of his response to the State's motion to quash.

Before leaving the courthouse, Plaintiff filed his motion to dismiss the 1996 permanent restraining order; to purge the 1996 contempt citation; and to decide a question of law regarding the mailing of copies of court documents to Defendant. He also filed a settlement offer he had intended to ask for the court's permission to hand-deliver to Defendant at the start of the hearing to avoid her further embarrassment.

Because Plaintiff had not received notice that Defendant had dismissed her motion to reinstate the restraining order and had not received a notice of continuation, he fully expected to be able to present his case and deliver filings to parties with the court's permission during the hearing. The certificates of service were left as "either or." Therefore, he filed corrected certificates of service/mailing as necessary to reflect actual service of motions on parties and used the corrections to memorialize, among other things, Defendant's statement that she notified the court she would not be present at the hearing.

On September 9, 2011, Plaintiff obtained an ICON printout for the permanent restraining order case and identified problems similar to those encountered during the child support modification case. Of immediate interest was the out of sequence numbering that placed transaction #000018 (the County's motion to quash) on September 1 before transaction #000017 (the State's motion to quash) on September 2 which is followed by the note " NO PROP ORD ORIG AND COPY SENT TO DIV N UNABLE TO SCAN AND UPLOAD MUST GO TO RECORDS FOR SCANNING." Then transaction #17 is followed by the return of service on the subpoenas for Ms. Herman (transaction #000021), Ms. Brunner (transaction #000022), Ms. Balquin (transaction #000023), and Mr. Bengtsson (transaction #24). Transaction #000025 (Ms. Eigel's motion to quash) follows. All of which are recorded for September 2. Transaction #000025 is followed by Transaction #000019, which is the Minute Order dated September 6 noting: "PTF FTA; DEF PPS; MOTION FILED BY THE PTF IS DISMISSED FOR HER FTA; COURT FINDS ALL SUBPOENAS WERE SATISFIED AND THE DEF WOULD HAVE TO REFILE." Transaction #000020 follows which is described as "Closed after post jdg activity." Plaintiff's filings made before the hearing are shown after transaction #000020 beginning as transaction number #000026 which is described as "Filing Other: EXHIBIT LIST FOR DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO STATE'S MOTION TO QUASH AND PRODUCE FILED ON SEPTEMBER 2, 2011." Transaction #000027 follows and is described as "Filing Other: EXHIBIT LIST FOR DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO COUNTY'S MOTION TO QUASH AND PROTECT FILED ON SEPTEMBER 2, 2011. Then the other two parts of the pre-hearing filings are entered as transaction #000030 and #000031 as "Responses" to the County's and State's motions to quash respectively. The pre-hearing filings are entered for September 6, except for transaction #000031 which is entered for September 7. The post-hearing filings are shown as transaction #000028 (the motion to dismiss the 1996 restraining order) and transaction

#000029 (the Declarations and Interrogatories to Vanessa R. Dolbow). Unlike the exhibit list and exhibits filed in the lawsuit, the restraining order ICON report does not state the exhibits were filed with the exhibit list.

As a result of the new evidence that proved all temporary support was paid and knowing all defendants knew or should have known Defendant's statement claiming it was not paid was false, Plaintiff amended the complaint on September 12, 2011 to join Ms. Brunner, Ms. Balquin, Ms. McGrew, Mr. Desbien, Ms. Herman, and Mr. Bengtsson, severally and jointly, as co-defendants and added fraud, unjust enrichment, and defamation as Counts III, IV, and V.

On September 12, 2011, Plaintiff also moved to consolidate the County record of the permanent restraining order case into the District record of the lawsuit for efficiency purposes. The $3.00 settlement offer still stands for Defendant Dolbow as stipulated in the Declarations and Interrogatories filed on September 6, 2011.

FACTS ACCEPTED BY PLAINTIFF

1. Plaintiff is guaranteed the right to due process by Section 25 of Article II of the Constitution of the State of Colorado and that right has and continues to be denied to him by the County and District Courts in the Fourth Judicial District.

2. Plaintiff is guaranteed the right to equality of justice by Section 6 of Article II of the Constitution of the State of Colorado and that right has and continues to be denied to him by the County and District Courts in the Fourth Judicial District.

3. Plaintiff is guaranteed the right as a U.S. citizen to due process and the equal protection of the laws by Section 1 of Amendment XIV of the Constitution of the United States of America that further declares no state shall deny to its citizens due process and the equal protection of the laws.

4. Plaintiff paid the requisite jury fee to have a fair and impartial resolution of issues of facts before a jury of his peers as provided by C.R.C.P. 38.

5. Plaintiff exercised his right to object to the venue of the trial based on his fears that he would not receive a fair trial in the Fourth Judicial District. "If a community is prejudiced against a citizen or if *other circumstances* [emphasis added] are likely to deny him a fair and impartial jury trial, then a change of venue must be granted. Brisbin v. Schauer, 176 Colo. 550, 492 P. 2d 835 (1971). The adverse party, the court, is and has been controlled by influential leaders in county, state, and federal government as shown in the affidavit submitted by him to support his motion for change of venue; said affidavit referencing 40 exhibits. Defendant cannot get a fair trial in the Fourth Judicial District where everything was and continues to be orchestrated to prevent public disclosure of the racketeering scheme exposed by Defendant's application for child support enforcement services.

6. Plaintiff exercised his right to object to a magistrate presiding over a full-evidentiary hearing of the Defendant's motion for reinstatement of the permanent restraining order by not waiving the assignment of a judge as provided by Rule 2(A) of the Colorado Rules for Magistrates.

7. Plaintiff exercised his right to object to the assignment of Judge Hughes, who was known to be conflicted in that assignment, pursuant to C.R.C.P. 97. Specifically, Plaintiff's motion conveyed: "Upon reasonable inference of a 'bent of mind' that will prevent judge from dealing fairly with party seeking recusal, it is incumbent on trial judge to recuse himself. Wright v. District Court, 731 P.2d 661 (Colo. 1987)."

8. Plaintiff exercised his right to request the court to issue subpoenas to compel witnesses to appear and to produce certain documents needed to defend against the reinstatement of the civil protection order certain to have serious consequences in his personal life, as permitted by C.R.C.P. 45.

9. The attorneys for the third parties acted to quash all subpoenas for sundry reasons when, in fact, the attorneys for the County, State, and Young Williams Child Support Services could not allow the truthful testimony of the subpoenaed witnesses to disclose the facts related to the racketeering scheme or to raise questions about the County's 2010 procurement process for the 2011 child support enforcement contract.

10. The Affidavit of Custody and Direct Support was falsified at the instruction of Defendant Jonica Brunner on September 29, 2008. Ms. Brunner is a registered/certified paralegal whose conduct is held to professional standards set by the Colorado Bar Association. Defendant Brunner's work product and practices are also required to be supervised by licensed attorneys. Defendant Brunner listened to Plaintiff's explanation of the change of custody on October 10, 2008 and ignored it, only to hand him a copy of the Affidavit of Custody and Direct Support.

11. Defendant Melissa Balquin had access to the child support enforcement case file located onsite and knew Defendant Brunner's action to modify child support retroactively, as conveyed in Defendant Brunner's letter-like notice dated October 2, 2008, was based on the three year change of custody first identified on the application. Defendant Balquin listened to Plaintiff's explanation of the change of custody during the 2009 local review in which she told him he was being "uncooperative" and then told him the child support arrears were being increased $15,000 for alleged unpaid temporary spousal and child support. At the time, Colorado's Child Support Enforcement Program required her to obtain an affidavit of direct payment of all court-ordered child support, which she did not do. Then in the 2010 administrative review, Defendant Balquin again refused to allow Plaintiff to see Defendant Dolbow's application and when Plaintiff attempted to discuss the stamped order, Defendant Balquin said orders were

stamped all the time. She then left the room and returned with the Affidavit to Forgive Arrears prepared for Defendant Dolbow's signature.

12. Defendant McGrew and/or Defendant Desbien conducted the 2009 State administrative review requested by Plaintiff to appeal the results of Defendant. Balquin's review. Like before, the notice of the review said only payments would be reviewed. Unlike before, Defendant Dolbow traveled to Denver to participate in the review. As a result of her appearance, the State reduced Defendant. Balquin's calculation by $7,500 for a credit granted by Defendant Dolbow. Two weeks after the review, Defendant Dolbow went back to the El Paso County child support office and signed a written statement that explained the credit and verified that no temporary child support had been paid.

13. Defendant Desbien and/or Defendant McGrew conducted the 2009 State administrative review. Defendant McGrew signed the State's administrative review results letter "for Larry Desbien, Section Chief." Defendant Dolbow stated that she told the State she did not go to the El Paso County child support enforcement office to collect child support for the three year period.

14. Defendant Herman issued public statements at the January 4, 2011 Board of Commissioner's meeting to the effect that she had reviewed the handling of the child support enforcement case and found nothing wrong in the way that it was handled and then concluded by stating that Plaintiff was released from child support "he did still owe." She also defended the evaluation process that led to the award of the new child support enforcement contract to Young Williams.

15. Defendant Bengtsson issued public statements at the same Board meeting to the effect that he, County Attorney William H. Louis, and "PSI" had taken a very professional and objective view of the handling of the case and found nothing wrong in the way the case was handled. Mr. Bengtsson is El Paso County's DHS Director and the custodian of the child support enforcement case file.

16. Paragraphs 3-37 of the original complaint were used primarily to show that if Defendant Dolbow was indeed owed $15,000 she had access to the court to collect it much sooner than September 2008. Subsequent paragraphs were used to show Defendant's financial hardships to demonstrate that, if Defendant was owed temporary support from years before, Defendant would have been forced to go to the court to collect it. The 1996 verified motion for contempt citation eliminated the need for Plaintiff to use events to prove he paid all temporary support.

17. Defendant's admission in the July 27, 2011 letter confirms that the El Paso County child support enforcement office received all of the income verification documents, tax returns, and affidavits required at the time of application for service. This admission forces questions about why Ms. Eigel used estimates to determine child support during the hearing. Plaintiff knows that Defendant

Dolbow did not claim their son in 2005 or 2006 as a dependent because she was not supporting him during those years. Plaintiff knows that he did not claim their son in 2007 because he was admittedly spending more time at Defendant's residence and returned to her custody at the end of the year.

18. Plaintiff has fully disclosed all facts known to him to Defendant Dolbow, who states "thousands" of pages have been sent to her. Defendant Dolbow wants to be rid of them, perhaps she will volunteer them to the attorneys for her co-defendants. If not, the El Paso Board of County Commissioners has more than 800 pages in their possession. Additionally, the white paper submitted to the Board is a matter of public record and can be obtained from the County. Otherwise, the attorneys for the co-defendants may make discovery requests from Plaintiff of relevant documents that they need.

19. Plaintiff needs unrestricted access to the child support enforcement case file, which contains more information about him than it does Defendant Dolbow. Plaintiff has no objection to redacting the Defendant's social security number. Her address and phone number are already known to Plaintiff because he takes their son to her house for visits at his request.

20. Plaintiff knows that actual damages include $2,500 for the proceeds from the unauthorized and hidden sale of the ATVs and $12,130.20 in fraudulently obtained child support; costs include $424 for the filing of the complaint and payment of the jury fee and more than $310 for the subpoenas to defend against the unfounded and malicious attempt to activate the permanent restraining order. Plaintiff is seeking damages of an unspecified amount for the impact of Defendants' outrageous conduct that has caused loss of enjoyment of life and for defamation.

Submitted this ______ day of September 2011.

____

Robert Wayne Johnson, Pro Se

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing CASE STATUS STATEMENT was placed in the United States mail, postage prepaid as certified mail, on September ____, 2011 and addressed to:

Eigel & Rumans,
Counsel for Jonica Brunner and Melissa Balquin
C/O Young Williams Child Support Services
30 East Pikes Peak Ave., Suite 203
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

The El Paso County Attorneys Office
Counsel for Toni Herman and Richard Bengtsson
John A. Thirkell, Chief Deputy County Attorney
105 East Vermijo Ave.
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

The Colorado Attorney General's Office
Counsel for Leslie McGrew and Larry Desbien
Assistant Attorney General Jeremy R. Hill
1525 Sherman St, 7th Floor
Denver, CO 80203

____
Robert Wayne Johnson

CERTIFICATE OF NO MAILING

Robert Wayne Johnson was put on NOTICE by Vanessa Ralphita Dolbow's letter to the court dated August 25, 2011 and signed August 29, 2011 in case number 2011CV229 that she would no longer accept any future mailings from him in the case. Ms. Dolbow's letter was received by him on August 30, 2011 and after another motion in that case and copies of subpoenas were mailed to her in the restraining order case. Any mailing from Mr. Johnson to Ms. Dolbow may be viewed by her as harassment and subject him to possible criminal charges. Therefore should the court, as a legal question answered, decide a mailing must be made to Ms. Dolbow, her address is shown below and the copy cost and postage for regular delivery by U.S. mail may be taxed to Mr. Johnson; Ms. Dolbow will not return mail from the court.

Vanessa R. Dolbow
1836 Brookdale Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80918-3476

____
Robert Wayne Johnson