

May 3, 2010

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

Colorado Supreme Court-
Office of Attorney Regulation
Attorney Amy C. DeVan
1560 Broadway, Suite 1800
Denver, CO 80202

RE: Request for Investigation of Tracy Rumans 10- 01149

Dear Ms. DeVan:

I had expected a response from Ms. Mares, but thank you for yours of April 28, 2010. (Please note the header of the second page reflects the date of April 23, 2010. I used that date inadvertently as the date of your letter for Ms. Eigel.)

I certainly can appreciate the Counsel's reluctance to accept the information I have provided on face value. I understand the presumption of innocence and recognize its necessity in a society such as ours. I also respect the controls that are in place to keep us all free and safe and the special role the justice system and, those that represent it, contribute to our well being as a nation. From my experience, your jobs are both challenging and demanding.

I entered the courtroom on January 13, 2010 with full confidence that truth would prevail. I expected to be treated fairly and to be presumed to be telling the truth under oath. However, I experienced the same mistreatment and disrespect that I had been forced to endure the previous 16 months at the hands of the same company's legal representative. To say, I was dissatisfied with the outcome of the modification hearing I requested would be an incomprehensible understatement of how I felt when I left the courtroom where I thought justice would be served.

The information that follows is from the District Record ("Dist. Rec.") as transcribed by B.M. Legal Transcriptions, LLP at my request. The original transcript was filed with the Petition for Review on April 9, 2010. I am submitting selected parts of a working document near completion to support my continued claim of gross judicial and professional misconduct in the conspiracy that obstructed justice and denied my rights to due process and equal treatment. I am not attempting to make the parts transition together due to time constraints.

Following the excerpts, there are several points relative to your selected responses.

Please consider it as you will.

Sincerely,

R. Wayne Johnson

Conflict of Interest

¹ The Amended Order title page indicates the relationship of the Law Office to CSEU and identifies CSEU as the Third Party Intervenor. The Law Office has one location at the same physical address as CSEU in Colorado Springs. CSEU is the trade name registered by Policy Studies, Inc. (PSI), a privately-traded company headquartered in Denver. El Paso County has a current contract with PSI to administer the Colorado Department of Human Services (CDHS) Child Support Enforcement Program. The base five-year contract and renewals for 2007-2009 were obtained under the Colorado Open Records Act from the Office of the El Paso County Attorney. The contract was approved by the CDHS.

Selected Response Point

Compromised Independence

Ms. Rumans has had very limited involvement in the mishandling of my child support modification case. I have previously acknowledged that her location at the other Belveal Eigel Rumans & Fredrickson office address limited her access to the facts known to CSEU and Ms. Eigel. Therefore, based on her understanding of the case or what Ms. Eigel told her, her statement may have been true to the best of her knowledge and belief.

ONCE AGAIN, MY ISSUE IS NOT WITH MS. DOLBOW, THE MOTHER OF MY ONLY SON. OUR ONCE GOOD PARENTING RELATIONSHIP HAS BEEN COMPLETELY DESTROYED BECAUSE OF THE MALICIOUS PROSECUTION OF BOTH THE CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT CASE AND THE CHILD SUPPORT MODIFICATION CASE. A SIMPLE AND JUST SOLUTION WAS READILY AVAILABLE ON OCTOBER 10, 2008. INSTEAD, PSI DECIDED TO USE ME TO BUILD UP THEIR COLLECTION RATE AND PROTECT FEDERAL TANF FUNDING TO COLORADO. AS A TAXPAYER – AND RESPONSIBLE FATHER – I EXPECT FATHERS TO PROVIDE FOR THEIR CHILDREN TO THE BEST OF THEIR ABILITY - BUT IN AN OPEN AND FAIR WAY THAT RESPECTS THEIR RIGHTS AND NEEDS, TOO.