

Police Report Statement – 1

Affidavit of Custody and Direct Support

My former common-law wife Vanessa Ralphita Dolbow committed the crime of perjury by the giving of the exhibited sworn Affidavit of Custody and Direct Support (**Exhibit “A”**) to authorize and assist Policy Studies Inc. (PSI), El Paso County’s former independent contractor for child support enforcement, to collect child support for the three year period I had custody of our teenage son, Marcus Aaron Johnson, at her request. The affidavit was taken and signed at the Colorado Springs office of PSI at 30 East Pikes Peak Avenue, Suite 203 on September 29, 2008.

The false statement conveyed through the affidavit is evidenced by the placing of a check mark in the space next to “Yes” at the end of the statement “[t]he child[ren] have been in my custody and resided with me at all times since the children’s birth.” Ms. Dolbow selected the “yes” option two different times on two different pages. And Ms. Dolbow wrote her name in the space that completed the sentence “Obligee in the above-referenced child support action, [has] completed this document under penalty of perjury to the best of my knowledge and belief” and then signed her name to the affidavit before former PSI employee and Notary Public Luz E. Morales. Her statement was proven false during her testimony on January 13, 2010 in the El Paso County District Court in the modification hearing requested by me to eliminate child support claimed by PSI for the three year period.

Ms. Dolbow’s testimony admitting to the change of custody begins on page 17 at paragraph 1 of the exhibited transcript marked “**B.**” The change of custody was central to PSI’s calculation of unpaid child support, and the affidavit swearing to the change of custody authorized enforcement actions to collect it by seizing financial assets, suspending my driver’s license and, by operation of law, placing liens on real and personal property belonging to me. The change of custody remained an essential element in the determination of child support throughout the proceeding, with the Court eventually ruling the change of custody occurred as recorded on page 35 at paragraphs 14-17. The false statement secured by PSI ultimately authorized the company to collect \$12,460.06 in “wrongful” child support prior to the hearing. The Court’s finding that the voluntary change of custody occurred allowed PSI’s former attorney and the State’s prosecutor, Christina K. Eigel, to modify child support retroactively to January 2005 and to reduce but not eliminate child support for 2006 and 2007 based solely on Ms. Dolbow’s testimony about parenting time. Ms. Eigel did not submit the affidavit to the Court for consideration.

Ms. Eigel then successfully obtained the Court’s consent during the hearing to modify child support a second time beginning the month after I filed my sworn motion on September 21, 2009 (**Exhibit “C”**) through August 2010 when Marcus turned 19. PSI’s in-court modification resulted in stepped-up increases of the original child support order of \$438.80 that doubled to \$958 for October through December 2009 and tripled to \$1,357 for January through August 2010 after Ms. Eigel (1) added monthly income of \$6,567 to my monthly retirement from my testimony about a contract job offer in 2009 and (2) added monthly income of \$5,000 in 2008 and \$7,500 in 2009 to Ms. Dolbow’s wages from employment to inheritance payouts of \$60,000 and \$90,000 in 2008 and 2009, respectively, spread monthly as previously indicated over those years; this income being left undisclosed in the second affidavit signed by Ms. Dolbow and submitted as evidence by Ms. Eigel during the hearing on January 13, 2010 and discussed in the second police statement that follows.

The Amended Order showing the changes in the monthly child support obligations that was mailed to me on March 26, 2010 is exhibited as “**D.**” Under the original order, with my private agreement with Ms. Dolbow intact, I would have paid \$14,041.60 (\$438.80 x 32) in court-ordered child support from January 2005 through August 2010. Instead, PSI collected \$26,171.80 with a balance owing of \$12,865.20 that was forgiven before the child support case was closed on November 30, 2010. The Family Support Registry payment record dated September 8, 2010 is exhibited as “**E.**” The case closing letter is exhibited as “**F.**” These facts and others are disclosed in many documents filed with the El Paso County District Court in case number 96DR001112, Dolbow v. Johnson and the paper titled “Privatization of Human Services in Colorado – A Citizen’s Review” submitted as a public record to the El Paso County Board of County Commissioners on January 4, 2011.

Critical to the act of perjury in this instance, Ms. Dolbow had two choices on the affidavit(s) to make a truthful custody statement. By a conscious act of her own freewill, she chose not to place a check mark in the space next to “No” and provide a written statement about the change in custody in the space provided.

For the purpose of resolving this issue and others, I called Ms. Dolbow days after she sent Marcus with a message and personal check marked “gift” to me. [**Exhibit “G.”**] During that phone call, she informed me she met with Jonica Brunner at PSI’s Colorado Springs office for an interview on September 29, 2008 and completed only one document – the affidavit(s) – in the manner Ms. Brunner instructed her to complete it. She said she told Ms. Brunner she was not trying to collect child support for the three year period and asked her how to mark the months in the payment section. Ms. Brunner told her to put zeroes in each space for every month child support was not paid during those three years. Because of Ms. Dolbow’s admissions, I asked for her help to expose PSI’s bad acts through the letter dated September 22, 2010 and exhibited as “**H.**”

Ms. Brunner, a state-certified paralegal employed by PSI, willfully and knowingly committed the crime of subornation of perjury by instructing Ms. Dolbow to make a material statement known by her to be untrue. Ms. Brunner’s assistance and complicity in the act of perjury caused her bad act to rise to a higher level of culpability because of her legal training, experience, and obligation to a defined code of professional conduct. Ms. Brunner’s awareness of the falsity of the statement she coerced was heightened by her knowledge of Ms. Dolbow’s responses on the application she completed prior to September 18, 2008 and the internal intake decisions reached by her PSI co-workers prior to contacting Ms. Dolbow for the interview on September 29, 2008. Ms. Brunner, acting in good faith, was obligated to instruct Ms. Dolbow to place a check mark in the box “No” and explain the change in custody as she explained it in the interview. By instructing Ms. Dolbow to falsify the affidavit for the purpose of suppressing material information about the change of custody, she willfully and knowingly caused her to commit a crime(s) and exposed her to punishment.

Ms. Brunner’s knowledge of the change in custody was first indiscreetly disclosed in her notice of October 2, 2008 exhibited as “**I.**” This notice was the “other side” of a modification request initiated for Ms. Dolbow by Ms. Brunner following the taking of the affidavit(s). The key word confirming her knowledge of the change of custody is “retroactively.” Under state child support modification law, child support can only be modified from the date a request is made unless there was a mutually agreed upon voluntary change of custody during the time period applicable to the request. When custody has changed in this manner, child support can be retroactively modified.

The purpose of PSI's notice to me was to obtain income and asset information that could be used to initiate income withholding immediately and to locate assets subject to immediate administrative seizure as well as to determine if the original child support order could be increased under state law using the stipulated 10% change in financial circumstances. The act of preparing the notice was the first act by PSI to pursue child support on Ms. Dolbow's behalf for the three year period after she signed the affidavit. According to PSI procedures prescribed by state and federal law, Ms. Dolbow was required to make a written request for modification and to provide the same information the letter of October 2, 2008 requested from me. This included an Income and Expense Affidavit and supporting financial documentation, e.g. pay stubs, tax returns, and receipts. But as Ms. Dolbow told me around October 10, 2008, "they [PSI] took the ball and ran with it." Paragraph 26 of my 32-page affidavit filed with the El Paso County District Court attests to the hearing of this statement.

In PSI's 2005 proposal to El Paso County's Procurement and Contracts Department, modification was a stated tool to increase collections year-over-year to meet federal and state goals. When Ms. Dolbow applied for collection services in the fourth quarter of 2008, collections were in sharp decline due to the economic downturn as reported by PSI Administrator Laura Davidson to the Colorado Springs Gazette on May 6, 2009. The decline hit collections from employment hardest and shifted employer-related collections to unemployment compensation. PSI managers knew collections from me would help them in several measured performance areas because my child support and medical support payment history was excellent, the monthly obligation was above average, my retirement income was sufficient to pay support and my living expenses, and my residency was local and stable.

The 2005 proposal also stated PSI managers and team leaders were required to measure and monitor employee performance and addressed certain ways it was measured, e.g., data entry on the state's automated child support enforcement system (ACSES), but stopped short of saying anything about how employees were rewarded. It also did not address how employee performance goals were established. The proposal is a public record available through the Procurement and Contracts Department for Professional Services Contract 06-004. Contracts Manager Eileen Gonzales and El Paso County Department of Human Services contract manager Ms. Toni Herman are knowledgeable of the proposal and my grievances with PSI as is Richard Bengtsson, the DHS director.

I further assert Ms. Eigel was complicit in the crimes of perjury and subornation of perjury by allowing Ms. Brunner, her legal technician, to knowingly participate in the falsification of evidence. According to the Colorado Bar Association's Guidelines for the Utilization of Paralegals, "All of the duties are assumed to, and must be, under the direction and supervision of a licensed attorney." Ms. Eigel was, in fact, ultimately responsible for Ms. Brunner's work and was, at the same time, privileged to all PSI records maintained in Ms. Dolbow's case, including the application for service that prompted the interview to obtain the signed affidavit from Ms. Dolbow. She therefore knowingly and willingly subjected Ms. Brunner and Ms. Dolbow to prosecution and punishment for the crimes they committed.

The application was required under Colorado's Child Support Enforcement Program and required Ms. Dolbow to state if Marcus had ever lived with me. Because I was denied access to the application by PSI under confidentiality claims, I have no knowledge of how this question was answered. When I attempted to examine Ms. Dolbow's testimony in court about the management of her case by PSI, Ms. Eigel

objected on the grounds of relevance and the Court “with urgency and without reservation” sustained the objection.

Ms. Eigel is also known to have gathered information from at least one other attorney on PSI’s legal team, Tracy Rumans, concerning the change of custody. Ms. Rumans filed the late response dated October 14, 2009 to my motion to modify to request that I set a hearing. Ms. Rumans stated in part, “The CSE Unit has no knowledge regarding the living arrangements of the minor child during the time period in question.” Ms. Rumans had information to the contrary. After repeated motions to the Court and complaints to the Supreme Court Attorney Regulation Counsel that were copied to them, both of them failed to take personal responsibility and hold themselves out as accountable for their bad acts. Ms. Rumans was specifically given an opportunity to step forward. Instead, she filed the responsive pleading to the petition for review of the amended order three months late. Their bad acts caused a complete breakdown of built-in protections that preserve the integrity of the justice system. They violated their oaths, the terms of PSI’s contract with El Paso County, and did an extreme injustice to me as a citizen guaranteed the rights to due process and the equal protection of the law.

Because Ms. Brunner was a PSI employee, she reported directly to PSI’s former onsite Collection Manager/Deputy Administrator Claudia-Smith Swain, who in turn reported directly to former site Administrator Laura Davidson. Ms. Smith-Swain and Ms. Davidson therefore provided additional oversight of Ms. Brunner’s work and had immediate access to all records procured by PSI. My vigorous defense to PSI’s allegation that I owed child support for the three year period began immediately and was well known to each of them. Either manager had the authority and responsibility to stop the bad acts committed by the members of their staff, including members of the legal team. PSI was obligated to adhere to all applicable rules, regulations, and laws during the performance of the contract.

Instead, PSI issued a letter (**Exhibit “J”**) signed by Ms. Smith-Swain to Colorado’s Collection Agency Board on April 1, 2010. PSI is a registered collection agency under the trade name Child Support Services of Colorado. Ms. Smith-Swain is/was certified by the Secretary of State as a collection manager as required by law. The Collection Agency Board is part of the consumer protection section of the Department of Law and has an assigned investigator who investigates complaints about registered collection agencies on behalf of the Administrator of the Board and the collection professionals and private citizens that comprise the governor-appointed Board. The investigator reports to the Administrator and the Administrator reports to the Attorney General. Complaints that do not require disciplinary action are not presented to the Board.

PSI’s statements to the Collection Agency Board investigator relevant to this police report are as follows: “Ms. Dolbow completed an application for services which is state required form (CSE-6) and turned it into our office in September 2008. A sample application is provided as attachment A.” “We obtained a completed Direct Payment Affidavit from Ms. Dolbow on September 29, 2008 so that we could complete a beginning balance calculation of the child support arrears owed by Mr. Johnson. The beginning balance notice, calculation, and supporting documentation ... was mailed to both parties on October 10, 2008, indicating the arrears due was \$16,071.60 as of September 29, 2008. This notice gives Mr. Johnson 30 days to dispute the balance before we add it to the ledger and begin collection activities on the arrears balance. We did not receive any correspondence or direct contact from Mr. Johnson during this 30 day time frame and the arrears balance was added to his ledger on November 20, 2008.”

I assert (1) PSI knew the exact date of the application because it was marked on the application and was required by Colorado's Child Support Enforcement Program to be logged in by date into a central application log; (2) PSI could not disclose the application because Ms. Dolbow's answer to the question about Marcus living with me would have been compared to Ms. Dolbow's false statement about Marcus being in her custody since birth. And PSI purposely did not disclose the actual title of the "Direct Payment Affidavit" as "Affidavit of Custody and Direct Support" to avoid dealing with the issue of custody and disclosing the perjured affidavit; (3) PSI received numerous phone calls from me and never returned them as was stated in the affidavit I filed; the letter of October 10, 2008 exhibited as "M" was required under fair debt collection practices because I denied the debt the same date; and (4) the Collection Agency Board investigator sent the results of the investigation on April 27, 2010 after I contacted the Attorney General and Governor by fax demanding they stop the misconduct in the El Paso County District Court. [Exhibit "K."] Because the complaint was dismissed by the investigator, no disciplinary action was taken. The Attorney General, Governor, and Secretary of State never responded to any letter or fax sent to them. [Exhibit "L" – Secretary of State.]

The beginning balance calculation was provided to me in the letter from Ms. Brunner dated October 10, 2008 exhibited as "M." I do not know if Ms. Brunner or Melissa Balquin prepared this calculation, but I know Ms. Balquin was the Fiscal Specialist that met with me on or about April 3, 2009 to discuss the first PSI administrative review calculation results determined by her on April 1, 2009. I told her about the change of custody and my ongoing efforts to resolve the dispute on the date we met. When I met with Ms. Balquin again on October 22, 2010 for the second PSI administrative review, she had knowledge of PSI's bad acts and had received several mailings from me during the year that discussed the Court's involvement. During this review, she left me several times and returned with either answers or documents. She defended the stamped court order, gave me a blank application instead of allowing me to inspect Ms. Dolbow's application, and showed me the blank Affidavit to Forgive Arrears that PSI's legal team had prepared for Ms. Dolbow's signature, although I was required to request that it be mailed to her. Ms. Dolbow eventually signed this affidavit on November 24, 2010 to forgive the \$12,865.20 PSI alleged I still owed. I assert that former PSI employee Melissa Balquin and now an employee of the new independent contractor had more than sufficient reason to refuse to assist in the deception perpetrated by PSI. Her review results letters are exhibited as "N" and "O." My letter to Ms. Balquin and Ms. Davidson's letter to me after the review are exhibited as "P" and "Q". The signed Affidavit to Forgive Arrears is Exhibit "R."

Police Report Statement – 2

Affidavit with Respect to Child Support

My former common-law wife Vanessa Ralphita Dolbow committed the crime of perjury by the giving of the exhibited Affidavit with Respect to Child Support (Exhibit "S") that failed to disclose all sources of monthly income for the year the affidavit was prepared; the affidavit being submitted to the best of my knowledge and belief to the Court in December 2009 in lieu of (1) a true financial statement listing all assets and (2) income verification documents, including pay stubs and tax returns, as required by the Delay Prevention Order issued by the Court on November 24, 2009. [Exhibit "T."] The applicable page of the online judicial case management report showing the "financial statement" filing date of December 17, 2009 is exhibited as "U." The false statement conveyed through the affidavit is evidenced in the

Income from Other Sources section by the placing of “N/A” in the Monthly Income column and drawing an arrow to the end of the list of income sources that ends in “Other.” According to Colorado’s child support income determination laws, other sources of income include gifts. Ms. Dolbow’s sworn statement was proven false during her testimony on January 13, 2010 in the El Paso County District Court when Ms. Eigel, PSI’s attorney and the State’s prosecutor, introduced evidence through Ms. Dolbow’s testimony that she received \$90,000 in 2009 from an inheritance. Ms. Eigel divided the inheritance in 2009 by 12 to add \$7,500 monthly to Ms. Dolbow’s monthly income from wages. The extension of “N/A” past the Interest, Dividend column also failed to reveal any monthly earnings on the inheritance, if any. (Ms. Dolbow may not have had earnings on her inheritance. I believe she sold the house I paid off for around \$195,000 and then bought another house with the proceeds from the sale and the inheritance.)

Ms. Dolbow’s testimony about the inheritance begins on page 24 at paragraph 12 of the exhibited transcript marked “**B.**” Ms. Eigel did not introduce any documentary evidence of the inheritance in court.

The income from the 2009 inheritance payout was particularly important because it (and the 2008 inheritance payout) gave the appearance of fairness when Ms. Eigel used my testimony to impute income beginning in October 2009. When the inheritance was introduced and then split between 2008 and 2009, Ms. Eigel knew Ms. Dolbow had taken custody of Marcus and child support was required to be determined using the sole custody worksheet and would be paid to her. Therefore, the increase in Ms. Dolbow’s monthly income in 2008 was known to cause an increase in our combined monthly income and insignificantly decrease the monthly child support payment to her using my income from retirement only. (She could not use the 2009 job offer testimony for 2008.) The increase in Ms. Dolbow’s monthly income from the inheritance payout had the same kind of effect until October 2009 when state law allowed Ms. Eigel to modify child support back to the date my motion to modify was filed based on the unexpected testimony about the 2009 job offer. Therefore, there was a sharp increase in my monthly child support obligation the last three months of 2009. Then, because Ms. Dolbow’s monthly income returned to wages from income only in 2010, the imputation of my income had the effect of dramatically increasing my monthly child support payment from January 2010 through August 2010 when Marcus was emancipated by law.

Ms. Eigel ran through all of the calculations in court and the Court accepted them and issued its rulings and orders based on them verbatim before the hearing ended. Yet there is no “record” she submitted the proposed order from the hearing to former Magistrate John Paul Lyle before he suddenly resigned on or about January 11, 2010 under his recently signed six-month contract. **[Exhibit “V” – Contract; Exhibit “W” – Fourth District Letter.]** The first disclosed written proposed order produced by Ms. Eigel to be signed by the incoming magistrate, Jayne Candea-Ramsey, was backdated to the date of the hearing and was mailed to me almost one month after the hearing on February 11, 2010.

My former common-law wife Vanessa Ralphita Dolbow also committed the crime of perjury by giving false testimony in court on January 13, 2010 when she stated she was unemployed in 2005. This testimony being recorded beginning on page 22 at paragraph 23 of **Exhibit B**. The false statement conveyed through the affidavit is evidenced in the section Your Primary Employment when Ms. Dolbow’s wrote “Sept. 2005” as the date her employment began.

I do not know the circumstances surrounding the completion of this affidavit. Therefore, I do not know if Ms. Dolbow was instructed to leave the spaces next to the income verification sources blank in the section

on the first page titled Your Primary Employer. I do know the application completed by Ms. Dolbow required proof of income from source documents. I do not know whether PSI obtained them. But I do know, Ms. Dolbow and I traded off years claiming Marcus for tax purposes. I know I filed head of household in 2005 and 2006 because Marcus was living with me and being supported by me and then filed single in 2007 because Marcus was spending more time at his mother's house although I was still meeting his financial needs; Ms. Dolbow's tax returns should have reflected the opposite in those years. And because of being audited, I know our individual filing status during those years was not a problem.

Ms. Eigel willfully and knowingly accepted the affidavit that omitted certain information useful to her case and filed it with the Court on or about December 17, 2009 to prevent disclosure of Ms. Dolbow's increased assets, and I believe to avoid revealing her income tax returns that would have shown that the custody change from January 2005 to December 2007 was indeed an agreement entered into voluntarily by Ms. Dolbow.

Ms. Eigel introduced the affidavit, referring to it as Ms. Dolbow's "financial affidavit," to provide a baseline for the estimates she and the Court used to determine her contribution to the shared child support obligation dictated by Colorado's Child Support Guidelines. Ms. Eigel had immediate access to all income verification documents required to be collected during the application and modification process (if any). If none were available, Ms. Eigel had an obligation to ensure Ms. Dolbow provided them because she knew income was critical to the equitable determination of child support and income was required to be verified by law.

Ms. Eigel also had access to Ms. Dolbow "at will" and, at one time, Ms. Dolbow and Ms. Eigel were together when her projected testimony at the hearing was discussed. This was revealed when Ms. Dolbow personally objected to my first and only question about PSI's management of my case and former Magistrate Lyle immediately stopped her comment before it could be completed. She said, "Your Honor, I thought we were told this was not allowed.... He said, "Just a minute, just a minute." I then asked her the same question, "How many meetings have you had with, uh, child support enforcement? Ms. Eigel addressed Magistrate Lyle saying, "Objection. Relevance." Magistrate Lyle said, "Objection is sustained. You don't need to answer the question. Other questions?" After a brief exchange between me and Magistrate Lyle, he told her to leave the witness stand. (See Exhibit B page 27 at paragraphs 18-25 through page 28 at paragraphs 1-24.) Then prior to issuing his rulings, Magistrate Lyle – intending not to be heard – paused and said "I (look) forward to this" as I was stepping down from the witness stand (page 31 at paragraph 1). This may or may not have been the comment I swore to in my personal affidavit that was heard by me as something like "you have your work cut out for you on this one." (There were instances of whispering and many times when Ms. Eigel's words could not be heard clearly. She was apparently sick the week of the hearing, and she talked extremely fast at certain times. However, Ms. Eigel is a fast talker as Magistrate Candea-Ramsey told her during a child support hearing I sat in on in March 2010.

Background – Change to Young Williams Child Support Services

PSI lost the contract with El Paso County after the proposals were reviewed by the Contracts Evaluation Team in October 2010. After postponements and an executive session on November 18, 2010, the Board of County Commissioners held the public hearing of the award on November 23, 2010. The hearing was conducted in the second session. Contracts Manager Eileen Gonzales and DHS contract manager Toni

Herman presented testimony to the Board. Pricing and customer service were discussed at length with Commissioner Sallie Clark speaking most of time and more than any commissioner. Near the end of the hearing, former Administrator Laura Davidson introduced PSI founder Robert Williams. Dr. Williams asked the County to allow the Evaluations Team to go back to pricing and allow PSI to submit a revised price. El Paso County Attorney Bill Louis addressed Mr. Williams before the vote was taken and asked him if PSI could have “closed a \$600,000 gap,” despite the fact Young Williams’ original contract price presented by Ms. Herman did not originally create a \$600,000 gap. Commissioner Wayne Williams, now the county Clerk & Recorder, commented on the good service provided by PSI over the years and said Young Williams’ bid just came in lower than PSI’s. During Dr. Williams’ comments, he did not take the opportunity to bring up the fact PSI had cut its contract price hundreds of thousands of dollars from the contract’s base price since the economic downturn began as a result of El Paso County’s budget problems and, then, came in \$10,000 less than its last contract renewal price.

Dr. Williams and the PSI Board of Directors have been mailed documents that were also mailed to PSI’s registered agent Jon C. Bourne to keep them informed of my ongoing complaints against PSI and PSI’s attorney Ms. Eigel. All three mailings to Mr. Bourne were lost by the United States Postal Service with a written apology from the same.

From January 4, 2011 until February 8, 2011, the Clerk & Recorder’s Office refused to correct the Unofficial Results of my comment to the Board on January 4, 2011 when I delivered the finished paper that had been sent as a work-in-process in August 2010. The Unofficial Results originally stated in part, “Rick Bengtsson and Tony [sic] Herman of DHS stated that the standard RFP process was used and evaluated for award of the contract. They further stated that Mr. Johnson’s case had been reviewed judicially and by the County Attorney with no findings of inappropriate handling.” On February 8, 2011, the Clerk & Recorder’s Office submitted the amended results to the Board for approval as minutes. The summary of my comment was changed in its entirety to: “Robert Wayne Johnson stated that he was present to follow up on his comment of October 7, 2010 relating to PSI. Commissioner Clark, and Richard Bengtsson and Toni Herman of DHS addressed his comments. It was stated that Mr. Johnson’s case had been reviewed judicially and by the county attorney.”

After a 4-0 vote on November 23, 2010 with outgoing Commissioner Jim Bensburg excused, the contract was awarded to Young Williams effective January 1, 2011. Young Williams assumed the lease at 30 East Pikes Peak Avenue. The phone number is 719-457-6331.

The new administrator’s name is Jeff Ball. Young Williams retained two PSI employees and perhaps others. Ms. Brunner and Ms. Balquin are now working for Young Williams, presumably in similar job positions.

Dr. Williams told the Board of County Commissioners that Belveal, Eigel, Rumans & Fredrickson’s legal services would be lost if PSI lost the contract. I was told by a Young Williams call center employee that Belveal, Eigel, Rumans & Fredrickson LLC was “out of business.” However, I learned Tracy Rumans was hired to work for Young Williams, PC.

Defendants

Vanessa Ralphita Dolbow (“Rita”)
1836 Brookdale Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80918-3476

Jonica Brunner, Paralegal
30 East Pikes Peak Avenue, 2nd Floor
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
719-457-6331

Melissa Balquin, Fiscal Specialist
30 East Pikes Peak Avenue, 2nd Floor
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
719-457-6331

Claudia Smith-Swain, former Collection Manager and Deputy Administrator
(Left approximately nine months ago.)

Laura Davidson
(Left during the transition and is now employed in “Denver.” Ms. Davidson may be working for PSI’s corporate office at 1899 Wynkoop Street, Suite 300, Denver, Colorado 80202, phone number 303-863-0900 or the Colorado Department of Human Services Child Support Enforcement Division at 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, CO 80203, phone number 303-866-4300.)

Christina K. Eigel
(According to the Colorado Supreme Court website, she works for El Paso County Child Support Services at 30 East Pikes Peak Avenue, Suite 203, Colorado Springs, CO 80923, phone number 719-457-6331. According to the Colorado Bar Association, Donald Belveal’s practice is located at 831 Royal Gorge Blvd., Suite 329, Canon City, CO 81212, phone number 719-275-1209. Mr. Belveal was the managing attorney for PSI’s legal team according to PSI’s 2005 proposal.)

Tracy Rumans
(According to the Colorado Bar Association website, she works for Young Williams, PC at 30 East Pikes Peak Avenue, Suite 203, Colorado Springs, CO 80923, phone number 719-457-6330.)

John Paul Lyle, Esq.
2 N. Cascade Avenue, Suite 730
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
719-473-6909

Magistrate Jayne Candea-Ramsey
270 S. Tejon Street
Colorado Springs, CO 80901
719-448-7700

Judge Deborah J. Grohs
270 S. Tejon Street
Colorado Springs, CO 80901
719-448-7700

(Judge Grohs reviewed all three petitions for review that I filed to appeal Magistrate Candea-Ramsey's amended order and two other orders issued the same day. She knowingly and willfully ignored the stamped order that was invalid under the Colorado Rules for Magistrates and Colorado's Rules of Civil Procedure and all of the evidence available for her decisions that denied each petition and which clearly demonstrated corruption.)

Witnesses

Robert Wayne Johnson
307 W. 26th Street
Colorado Springs, CO 80904
719-640-2155

Marcus Aaron Johnson
307 S. 26th Street
Colorado Springs, CO 80904
719-640-1026

Luz E. Morales
(No information.)

Intake Team Members Employed in September 2008
(No information.)

Intake Team Leader Employed in September 2008
(No information.)

Establishment Team Members Employed in September 2008
(No information.)

Establishment Team Leader Employed in September 2008
(No information.)

El Paso County DHS Director Richard Bengtsson
105 N. Spruce Street and 17 N. Spruce Street
Colorado Springs, CO 80905
719-444-5532

El Paso County DHS Contract Manager, Ms. Toni Herman
719-444-5482

El Paso County Contracts Manager Eileen Gonzales
27 East Vermijo Avenue
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
719-520-6390