

July 17, 2010

R. Wayne Johnson
P.O. Box 75162
Colorado Springs, CO 80970

Policy Studies, Inc.
Director Robert Williams
1899 Wynkoop St., Suite 300
Denver, CO 80202

RE: Professional Services Contract 06-004, El Paso County Department of Human Services and Policy Studies, Inc.

Dear Mr. Williams:

Please find attached certain pages from the addendum to the document yet to be claimed by Mr. Jon C. Bourne from June 25th. The format is however slightly different.

Sincerely,

R. Wayne Johnson

Enclosure: Signature page of stamped court order

OVERLOOKED ORDER

Mr. Johnson did not realize he was in possession of the court’s answers to all of his pleadings until sometime after June 15, 2010. As a result, repeated claims were made by Mr. Johnson that the court did not give answer to his initial request for a hearing on March 2, 2010 in the Objection to Proposed Amended Order or the second pleading filed on March 15th as the Continued Objection to Proposed Amended Order.

Therefore, all filings and communications after March 26, 2010 were reviewed for the purposes of correcting this mistake and notifying anyone that may have relied upon his claims for any reason. This review produced the following results and corrections of fact:

Filings	Communications
<p><u>Affidavit</u>, Page 31, ¶ 136, 138: Mr. Johnson received <u>three</u> Orders and the Amended Order in the mail. The Magistrate entered an order denying his request for a hearing and granted the motion to approve the Amended Order. The Amended Order bears the stamped name in this format: JAYNE CANDEA-RAMSEY; the order bears the same date as the other orders that each bear the Magistrate’s personal signature. Parties: Dolbow and CSEU through counsel. SEE DSC Appendix D <u>Index, Judicial Branch</u>: Final Orders and Amended Order, March 26, 2010.</p>	<p><u>Copy of Affidavit</u>: Chief Judge Kirk Samelson and <i>The Gazette</i> managing editor Jeff Thomas (Larry Ryckman was not with the newspaper on March 29, 2010)</p>
<p><u>Petition For Review, April 5th</u>, Pg. 3, Last ¶: An Order was issued denying the hearing request. Parties: Dolbow and CSEU through counsel.</p>	<p><u>Copy of Petition For Review, April 5th</u>: Governor Ritter, Attorney General Suthers, and Judge Thomas Kane</p>
<p><u>Petition For Review, April 8th</u>, Pg. 6, Continuation of Last ¶ from Pg. 5. The Magistrate acknowledged both pleadings for a hearing and issued a third Order denying it, stating in number 6: “Respondent has the right to a review of the District Court Magistrate’s decision within 15 days that the Order is signed and dated by the District Court Magistrate pursuant to Rule 7(a) of the Colorado Rules for Magistrates.” “THEREFORE based on the foregoing reasons, the Court Grants the Motion and</p>	

<p>the Order shall be signed by the Court.” (“Motion” refers to Motion to Approve Amended Order; “Order” refers to the Amended Order.) Parties: Dolbow and CSEU through counsel.</p> <p><u>Petition For Review, April 9th</u>, Pg. 2, First ¶. The Magistrate reviewed the Continued Objection and Ms. Eigel’s response. Parties: Dolbow and CSEU through Counsel.</p>	
	<p><u>April 6th Letters</u>: CDHS Executive Director Beye, CDHS CSE Evaluation Specialist Mardi Houston, CSE Unit IV-D Administrator Laura Davidson, CSE Unit Legal Technician Jonica Brunner, CSE Unit Fiscal Specialist Melissa Balquin. (Copied to Governor Ritter and Attorney General Suthers.)</p> <p><u>April 19th OARC Letter to Continue Oral Complaint</u> filed April 6th, Cynthia Mares: <u>Obstruction of Justice/Conspiracy to Obstruct Justice/Violation of Right to Due Process/Fraud</u>, Pg. 19, <u>Excerpt from Affidavit</u> ¶ 136, 138; <u>I. Facts</u>, Pg. 24, ¶ 1. (Copied to Attorney General Suthers, April 19th; Colorado Commission on Judicial Discipline, April 19th)</p> <p><u>OARC Letter May 3rd</u>, Amy DeVan: <u>Selective Response Points</u>, Pg. 4, Last Sentence. (Also update for OARC Letter May 3rd, Amy DeVan, <u>Tracy Rumans</u>, <u>Compromised Independence</u>, Pg. 2)</p>

The letters that follow have been mailed to each party to the action as well as the recipients of the communications. A copy of the signed order was enclosed.

ORDER DENYING A HEARING OF OBJECTION TO PROPOSED AMENDED ORDER

Mr. Johnson received four court orders by mail on March 27, 2010. Each order was dated March 26, 2010. Three of the orders were personally signed by Magistrate Jayne-Candea Ramsey and gave answer to all of the pleadings and motions filed by Mr. Johnson beginning March 2, 2010, while the order modifying child support was stamped using a nondescript facsimile of the Magistrate’s printed name in all capital letters. Mr. Johnson raised questions about the use of the stamp to members of the judiciary, regulating bodies, the state attorney general and governor, also an attorney by profession. Mr. Johnson held the opinion the stamp was used for corrupt purposes, i.e. to protect the Magistrate from future allegations that: (1) she knowingly signed an order that was obtained through corruption of the judicial process and (2) contained errors of fact and law.

Mr. Johnson now understands, through the wording of the order and the use of the facsimile stamp, the magistrate made an appeal of the Amended Order conditioned upon the actual signing of it as well as denied a hearing of the objection.

Therefore, all filings and communications after March 26, 2010 were reviewed for the purpose of notifying anyone that was advised of the stamped order. This review produced the following results:

Filings	Communications
<p><u>Affidavit</u>, Page 31-32, ¶ 136-139: Mr. Johnson received <u>three</u> Orders and the Amended Order in the mail. The Magistrate entered an order denying a hearing and made the review of the order modifying child support conditioned upon the “signing” of the Amended Order. This order bears the stamped name in this format: JAYNE CANDEA-RAMSEY; the order bears the same date as the other orders that each bear the Magistrate’s personal signature. Parties: Dolbow and CSEU through counsel. SEE DSC Appendix D <u>Index, Judicial Branch</u>: Final Orders and Amended Order, March 26, 2010.</p>	<p><u>Copy of Affidavit</u>: Chief Judge Kirk Samelson and <i>The Gazette</i> managing editor Jeff Thomas (Larry Ryckman was not with the newspaper on March 29, 2010)</p>
<p><u>Petition For Review, April 5th</u>, Pg. 3-4, Last ¶: (C/R) An order was issued in answer to the pleadings for a hearing. The other Orders bear her personal signature, while the Amended Order bears her stamped name. Parties: Dolbow and CSEU through counsel.</p>	<p><u>Copy of Petition For Review, April 5th</u>: Governor Ritter, Attorney General Suthers, and Judge Thomas Kane</p>
<p><u>Petition For Review, April 8th</u>, Pg. 6, Continuation of Last ¶ from Pg. 5: The Magistrate issued the Order denying a hearing, which also acknowledged</p>	

reviewing Ms. Eigel’s responsive pleading. The Order states in number 6: “Respondent has the right to a review of the District Court Magistrate’s decision within 15 days that the Order is signed and dated by the District Court Magistrate pursuant to Rule 7(a) of the Colorado Rules for Magistrates.” “THEREFORE based on the foregoing reasons, the Court Grants the Motion and the Order shall be signed by the Court.” Parties: Dolbow and CSEU through counsel.

Petition For Review, April 9th, Pg. 2, First ¶: The Magistrate reviewed Ms. Eigel’s responsive pleading and acknowledged reviewing the Continued Objection to Proposed Amended Order. Additionally, the Affidavit was filed with this petition and the aforementioned correction is restated. Parties: Dolbow and CSEU through Counsel.

April 6th Letters: CDHS Executive Director Beye, CDHS CSE Evaluation Specialist Mardi Houston, CSE Unit IV-D Administrator Laura Davidson, CSE Unit Legal Technician Jonica Brunner, CSE Unit Fiscal Specialist Melissa Balquin. (Copied to Governor Ritter and Attorney General Suthers.)

April 19th OARC Letter to Continue Oral Complaint filed April 6th, Cynthia Mares: Obstruction of Justice/Conspiracy to Obstruct Justice/Violation of Right to Due Process/Fraud, Pg. 19, Excerpt from Affidavit ¶¶ 136-139. (Copied to Attorney General Suthers, April 19th; Colorado Commission on Judicial Discipline, April 19th)

OARC Letter May 3rd, Amy DeVan: Selective Response Points, Pg. 4, Second Bullet Point.

The letters that follow have been mailed to each party to the action as well as the recipients of the communications. A copy of the signed order was provided in a separately addressed envelope with the accompanying letter that explained it. Both letters were mailed at the same time on the same date.

MISSING CONTINUED OBJECTION TO PROPOSED AMENDED ORDER

Mr. Johnson received three responses from Ms. Eigel by mail with the service date of March 11, 2010. One of them challenged Mr. Johnson’s request for a hearing filed March 2nd. This response ignored the request for a hearing and moved a second time to have the proposed amended order approved. Therefore on March 15th, Mr. Johnson filed the Continued Objection to Proposed Amended Order (Continued Objection).

On March 23rd, Mr. Johnson obtained an ICON report and confirmed the Continued Objection was not listed. On March 26th, Mr. Johnson raised this issue in writing through the Notice of Appeal he attempted to file.¹ Then on April 12th, being concerned the petitions filed by him beginning April 5th and/or the original transcript and personal affidavit filed on the 9th would go missing as well, Mr. Johnson presented the first of five letters to the clerk’s office complaining of record irregularities. The clerk assisting him verified the Continued Objection was not entered into the register of actions and agreed to enter it using his personal copy.

The ICON system now reports: “DOCUMENT MISPLACED IN FILE; NOT ENTERED IN ECLIPSE UNTIL 4-13-10.” However, the April 12th letter sworn by Mr. Johnson specifically states the Continued Objection was not in the case file on March 23rd or April 9th when he physically inspected it.

After June 15th, Mr. Johnson located the third other order issued on March 26th which indicates Magistrate Candea-Ramsey reviewed the Continued Objection sometime prior to signing the order.

Therefore, all filings and communications after March 23, 2010 were reviewed for the purpose of notifying anyone that was advised of the missing filed document. This review produced the following results:

Filings	Communications
<u>Affidavit</u> , Page 29, ¶ 127, 128, 130; Page 30, ¶ 134; Page 31, ¶ 138. Parties: Dolbow and CSEU through Counsel.	<u>Copy of Affidavit</u> : Chief Judge Kirk Samelson and <i>The Gazette</i> managing editor Jeff Thomas (Larry Ryckman was not with the newspaper on March 29, 2010)
<u>Notice of Appeal</u> Parties: Dolbow and CSEU through Counsel.	<u>Copy of Notice of Appeal</u> : Governor Ritter, Attorney General Suthers, Judge Thomas Kane <u>Copy of Petition For Review, April 5th</u> : Governor Ritter, Attorney General Suthers, and Judge Thomas Kane
<u>Petition For Review, April 8th</u> , Pg. 5, ¶ 3. Parties: Dolbow and CSEU through Counsel.	<u>April 19th OARC Letter</u> to Continue Oral

¹ The Notice of Appeal was procedurally incorrect. The clerk kept one copy for the case file.

	<p>Complaint filed April 6th, Cynthia Mares (Text copied to Attorney General Suthers and the Colorado Commission on Judicial Discipline)</p> <p><u>OARC Letter Amy DeVan April 28th Re Christina Eigel, Page 2; Amy DeVan's Letter April 28th Re Jayne Candea-Ramsey, Page 2</u></p> <p><u>Johnson Letter May 3rd to Amy DeVan Re Christina Eigel, Page 19; May 3rd Letter to Amy DeVan Re Jayne Candea-Ramsey, Pages 4-5</u></p>
--	--

The letters that follow have been mailed to each party to the action as well as the recipients of the communications. The applicable pages from the July 7, 2010 ICON report are attached. A copy of the signed Order was provided in a separate mailing also on this date.

ORDER RE: RESPONDENT’S PETITION FOR REVIEW (MOTION TO MODIFY CHILD SUPPORT)

The text of the JUDGE’S order adopting the MAGISTRATE’S order denying the new motion to modify child support draws from the text of the magistrate Order that denied the hearing and approved the Amended Order; said magistrate Order being overlooked by Mr. Johnson until after June 15th. Both the Judge’s and Magistrate’s orders take up the language of C.R.M. Rule 7(a)(4) which states, “A final order or judgment is not reviewable until it is written, dated, and signed by the magistrate...” This language was not made part of the Magistrate’s Orders that were effective and appealable only after they too were reduced to writing, dated and signed by the magistrate. Relevant text is compared below.

Judge’s Order, June 15, 2010	Magistrate’s Order, March 26, 2010
<p>“...The magistrate’s Order of January 13, 2010 was reduced to writing and signed by a magistrate on March 26, 2010. After the January 13, 2010 hearing, but before the written order was entered, Respondent filed a motion to modify child support dated March 10, 2010....”</p> <p>[The MAGISTRATE Order being reviewed by the judge had no such language.]</p>	<p>(This is the Order denying the hearing that Mr. Johnson overlooked and therefore did not appeal. Mr. Johnson appealed the related Amended Order that was stamped and dated March 26th.)</p> <p>6. ...Respondent has the right to a review of the District Court Magistrate’s decision within 15 days that the Order is signed and dated by the District Court Magistrate pursuant to Rule 7(a) of the Colorado Rules for Magistrates.</p> <p>THEREFORE, based on the foregoing reasons, the Court GRANTS the Motion and the Order shall be signed by the Court.</p>

The Judge’s Order adopting the Amended Order that Mr. Johnson did appeal states in full:

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Respondent’s Petition for Review of a magistrate’s order from a hearing held on 1-13-10. The Court has reviewed the pleadings and has reviewed a transcript of the hearing. The Court finds that the findings of fact made by the magistrate was not erroneous. The Order entered by the magistrate nunc pro tunc to 1-13-10 is consistent with the magistrate’s findings at the hearing. This Court adopts the magistrate’s Order as the Order of the Court.

SO ORDERED this 15th day of June, 2010.

BY THE COURT: Deborah J. Grohs (Image of Signature)
District Court Judge

This MAGISTRATE Order was the order most appropriate to “reducing to writing, dating, and signing” language than the JUDGE’s Order selected to include it.

Each recipient of the letter about the overlooked order received a copy of this part of the Addendum.

Introduction

My name is Robert Wayne Johnson. I elected to represent myself in a domestic action filed by me on September 21, 2009 and heard in the El Paso County District Court on January 13, 2010. In the course of acting as my own defense and having full confidence I would receive fair treatment in accordance with the law, I was denied my right to due process and equal treatment and treated with disrespect and animus during the proceeding. Since that time, I have been subjected to continued disrespect unbefitting employees of the El Paso County courthouse who also represent the institution of justice to ordinary citizens. And I have been ignored by State officials that have been belabored with my allegations of corruption as they pertain to Policy Studies, Inc. and the Fourth Judicial District. On May 27, 2010, I officially extended this allegation against the State of Colorado by giving notice of intent to file suit for violating my federally protected rights. Yet, the abuse is allowed to continue, assets continued to be seized, and I remain unable to move about freely.

Recent Events

On July 13, 2010, I visited the courthouse to obtain copies of the original signed documents electronically filed by CSE Unit attorney Tracy Rumans on June 4, 2010 and District Court Judge Deborah Grohs on June 15, 2010. I was told by clerks they did not have signed copies, and I had already verified the case file copies looked the same as mine. I understand the CSE Unit was not required to file a paper copy with an original signature, as stated in court rules and indicated by the notice stamped on the copy mailed to me, i.e. "An original printed or printable copy of the signed document containing the original or scanned signatures is maintained at the El Paso/Teller County Child Support Enforcement Office and is available for inspection pursuant to C.R.C.P. 121, 1-26." However, the Orders mailed by the Court display the image of Judge Grohs' signature and each states, "This Order has been served electronically in accordance with C.R.C.P. 121, section 1-26. A copy of this Order containing an original signature is on file in the Clerk's Office. Counsel are Ordered to serve a copy of this Order on any unrepresented party."

I then asked to have an ROA form completed. The purpose of the form was to obtain the ROA index numbers of each document filed in my case. But once again, I was provided with ICON event ID numbers that did not meet my request. I have been told on more than one occasion the ICON report is not admissible as evidence, and on more than one occasion clerks have refused to sign or stamp them when asked.

Because clerk office procedures are a recurring problem with the clerk's assisting me, I asked once again to speak with Clerk of Court Mary Perry, and once again she was in a closed door meeting and inaccessible to me. Instead, I was provided with screen prints of events recorded on the ICON system using Eclipse. Once again, I was unable to obtain ROA information using the ROA tab next to the Events tab and was then offered the Nexis case history of my case. I was also told by Sheri it was unusual to see e-filed orders from Division 18.

Dissatisfied with the responses concerning the lack of signed e-filed documents, I then visited Division 18 and asked Diane for a copy of the Orders bearing Judge Grohs' personal signature, to which she declined and threatened to call deputies if I did not leave. I then returned to the Clerk's Office as suggested by Diane and was told I could verify the Judge's signature for \$20.

Robert Wayne Johnson, July 16, 2010, Swearing to the Truth of the Statements Made

Copies of the ROA form initialed by Rachel and the screen prints and Nexis report obtained from Sheri (with one page missing) follow and are followed by the ROA form obtained by Sheila on April 16, 2010 after the difficult week trying to protect the petitions, transcript, and affidavit from being recorded late or disappearing as had happened once before.

These are the authorities applicable to Mr. Johnson's statements:

C.R.C.P. Rule 121 Section 1-26 – Electronic Filing and Service System

(Ms. Ruman's filing) **7. Filing Party to Maintain the Signed Copy /- Paper Document Not to Be Filed /- Duration of Maintaining of Document:** A printed or printable copy of an E-Filed or E-Served document with original or scanned signatures shall be maintained by the filing party and made available for inspection by other parties or the court upon request, but shall not be filed with the court. When these rules require a party to maintain a document, the filer is required to maintain the document for a period of two years after the final resolution of the action, including the final resolution of all appeals.

(Judge Grohs filing) **8. Documents Requiring E-Filed Signatures:** For domestic relations decrees, separation agreements and parenting plans, original signature pages bearing the attorneys', parties', and notaries' signatures must be scanned and E-Filed. For all other E-Filed and E-Served documents, signatures of attorneys, parties, witnesses, notaries and notary stamps may be in S/ Name typed form to satisfy signature requirements, once the necessary signatures have been obtained on a paper form of the document. For probate of a will, the original must be lodged with the court.

13-1-101. Clerks shall keep record books.

The clerks of the courts of record in this state shall keep in their respective offices suitable books for indexing the records of their said offices, one to be known as the direct index and one as the inverse index.

13-1-119. Judgment record and register of actions open for inspection.

The judgment record and register of actions shall be open at all times during office hours for the inspection of the public without charge, and it is the duty of the clerk to arrange the several records kept by him in such manner as to facilitate their inspection. In addition to paper records, such information may also be presented on microfilm or computer terminal

A copy of this section of the Addendum was added to the envelopes for the 16 recipients of the letter regarding the language of the Order Re: Respondent's Petition for Review (Motion to Modify Child Support). Exhibited items were not enclosed.