

[REDACTED]
Plaintiff

and other similarly situated
v.

Judicial Conduct Board
by and through its agents and
Chief Counsels;

Supreme Court of Pennsylvania
by and through its TBN agents
and employees;

Pennsylvania Superior Court and
Its Prothonotary
by and through its TBN agents
and employees;

Pennsylvania Court of Common
Pleas
by and through its TBN agents;

Montgomery County and its
Sheriff, ;

Office of Attorney General
by and through its TBN agents
and employees.

Josh Shapiro, Individually and in
Official Capacity

Judge Paul Diamond,
Individually and in Official
Capacity,

Judge Richard Haaz, Individually
and in Official Capacity,

In the

COMMONWEALTH COURT OF
PENNSYLVANIA

Demand For Jury Trial

Docket: [REDACTED] MD [REDACTED]

COMPLAINT

<p>Kelly Wall, Individually and in Official Capacity,</p> <p>Gail Weilheimer, Individually and in Official Capacity,</p> <p>Thomas Branca, Individually and in Official Capacity,</p> <p>Robert Graci, Individually and in Official Capacity,</p> <p>Mary Jane Bowes, Individually and in Official Capacity</p> <p>Kate Ford Elliot, Individually and in Official Capacity</p> <p>Defendants</p>	
---	--

NOTICE TO DEFEND You have been sued in court. If you wish to defend against the claims set forth in the following pages, you must take action within 20 days after this Petition and Notice are served by entering a written appearance personally or by attorney and filing in writing with the Court your defenses or objections to the claims set forth against you. You are warned that if you fail to do so, the case may proceed without you and a judgment may be entered against you by the Court without further notice for any claim or relief requested by Plaintiff.



I. Jurisdiction and Venue Statement

This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter pursuant to the following choices pursuant to **Title 42 - JUDICIARY AND JUDICIAL PROCEDURE Chapter 5 - Organization of Appellate Courts:**

§ 562. Powers of Commonwealth Court,

§ 761. Original jurisdiction.

and,

42 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 8522. Exceptions to sovereign immunity

Pursuant to **§ 8523 (a) Venue** is proper as this is an action for claims against Commonwealth parties as subsidiary agencies of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in which the principal offices are located.

Related Cases

Montgomery County

[REDACTED]

U.S. Eastern District

[REDACTED]

Judicial Notice:

Due to the prohibitive costs for the informa pauperis litigant, including copies of every referenced case and motions is impossible. In fact, it has been an ongoing obstruction to the access of justice for the citizens of Pennsylvania. It is axiomatic that these government parties all of have unlimited resources to obtain such copies themselves.

II. Parties

██████████ Plaintiff – Pro Se Informa Pauperis, a resident of Montgomery County, Pennsylvania

Judicial Conduct Board and Chief Counsel Robert Graci
601 Commonwealth Avenue, Suite 3500
PO Box 62525, Harrisburg 17106-2525

Supreme Court of Pennsylvania
601 Commonwealth Ave, Harrisburg, PA 17120

Pennsylvania Superior Court and Its Prothonotary
601 Commonwealth Ave, Harrisburg, PA 17120

Pennsylvania Court of Common Pleas
601 Commonwealth Ave, Harrisburg, PA 17120

Office of Attorney General, Attorney General Josh Shapiro, Strawberry Square, Harrisburg, PA 17120

Judge Paul Diamond, U.S. Eastern District Court, 601 Market Street,
Philadelphia, PA 19106

Judge Richard Haaz, Montgomery County Court House, 2 East Airy St.
Norristown, PA 19401

Judge Kelly C. Wall, Montgomery County Court House, 2 East Airy St.
Norristown, PA 19401

Judge Gail Weilheimer, Montgomery County Court House, 2 East Airy St.
Norristown, PA 19401

Judge Thomas Branca, Montgomery County Court House, 2 East Airy St.
Norristown, PA 19401

Judge Mary Jane Bowes, Superior Court of Pennsylvania, Grant Bldg 310
Grant St, Pittsburgh PA 15219

Judge Kate Ford Elliot, Superior Court of Pennsylvania, Two Chatham Ctr
Pittsburgh PA 15219

III. Preliminary Statement

The Defendants have individually and collectively acted brazenly above the law and in excess of their jurisdiction, causing severe financial and emotional damages to the Plaintiff. They engaged in a continuing course of conduct in the divorce process that resulted in the extortion and conversion of the Plaintiff's assets over a period of ten years, which caused the loss of two homes, her business and savings, traumatized her children and their destruction of her credit perpetuated her unemployment.

The Plaintiff alleges those illegally and unethically obtained proceeds were used to supplement budgets for the county and state, and for an ongoing scheme to launder money to the politicians that protect this "synchronized crime." They have continued upon a course of conduct that deliberately and negligently fails to adequately supervise the Judiciary whose conduct has repeatedly brought shame upon themselves and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It is useless to have a Constitution, statutes or laws if there is no one to enforce them, which is the current conditions in Pennsylvania.

The Legislature codified fundamental rights to circumvent the possibility of judicial abuse of power by undermining the substantive law with their own "opinions," including:

Title 1 § 1504. Statutory remedy preferred over common law:

and

42 Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes § 5101 - Remedy To Exist

For Legal Injury

Every person for a legal injury done him in his lands, goods, person, or reputation shall have remedy by due course of law, and right and justice administered without sale, denial or delay.

In approving **Act 1978, Sept. 28, P.L. 788, No. 152, [42 PA. CONS. STAT. ANN. § 8522] Exceptions to Sovereign Immunity**, the Governor [Milton Shapp] expressly stated:

"Further, it is my intent in approving this act and my understanding of Section 5(c) that the language therein does not

deny the court the power to perpetuate testimony or to take any other action necessary to prevent manifest injustice.”

The Defendants have collectively and individually subverted the Pennsylvania Constitution including but not exclusively at **Article 1 § 25. Reservation of powers in people,** which constructs an impenetrable wall around the rights expressed in that Article, against any form of government manipulation or intrusion. It very clearly removes from the Jurisdiction of the both the Judiciary and the Legislature of any authority over the right to trial by jury:

*To guard against transgressions of the high powers which we have delegated, we declare that **everything in this article is excepted out of the general powers of government** and shall forever remain inviolate.*

Yet every judge named as Defendants in this case decided to dispense with their jurisdictional restrictions and violated one of the most basic rights that we have been given to protect the people specifically against them via:

Article 1 § 6. Trial by jury.

Trial by jury shall be as heretofore, and the right thereof remain inviolate. The General Assembly may provide, however, by law, that a verdict may be rendered by not less than five-sixths of the jury in any civil case. Furthermore, in criminal cases the Commonwealth shall have the same right to trial by jury as does the accused.

Collectively, the entire Pennsylvania Supreme Court, by and through its rules committees, have consistently ignored the boundaries of their powers as expressed in **Article V §10(c)**, which in relevant part states:

(c) The Supreme Court shall have the power to prescribe

general rules governing practice, procedure and the conduct of all courts, justices of the peace and all officers serving process or enforcing orders, judgments or decrees of any court or justice of the peace, **if such rules are consistent with this Constitution and neither abridge, enlarge nor modify the substantive rights of any litigant....**

To the contrary, the appearance of subterfuge by members of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court can be perceived in procedural rules inserted into almost every statute passed by our legislature. They have effectively undermined a large majority of the substantive laws, and put in the extra effort to exempt the Judiciary from the previous checks and balances protection of having the Attorney General's office determine the Constitutionality of all procedural rules (**42 PA 1702**).

In pursuit of revenue, the rules were constructed to maximize "judicial discretion" creating a lawless branch of government, given free reign to facilitate conversion of assets into attorney hourly billing. These law firms then launder funds into the political arena in an unethical, if not illegal, *quid pro quo*. Those with the least resources to protect themselves, families in the Domestic Relations system, have been the main target of this despicable culture of criminality and deception which has visibly engulfed the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

This Complaint is founded in all of the above unbridled, brazen misconduct and negligence pervasive in our current court system. **42**

PA 128, mandates that policies and laws are to benefit the public, and not as currently, work to protect an elite group that appointed itself royalty.

There has been no explanation offered of how a law-abiding citizen, who was forced into a contract with the monopolistic family court for the dissolution of a marriage, could become trapped for ten years. And then by her continuing to pursue justice in every available jurisdiction, "judges" have retaliated, conspired and colluded with attorneys, in thwarting valid claims, including interfering with the Plaintiff's past and future employment.

III. STATEMENT OF FACTS

**COUNT I – Against Pennsylvania Supreme Court and its Subsidiaries
of the Court of Common Pleas and the Superior Court – for
Conversion, Breach of Contract, Negligence, Abuse of Process,
Official Oppression, Discrimination and in violation of PA Title 23,
the U.S & Pennsylvania Constitutions and 42 USC §1983 and §1985**

- 1) Demands for justice to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court have been treated with bias and discrimination against *pro se* and indigent litigants to the point that not one allocator can be found for anyone self-represented. Justice is being served according to the monetary value of the parties to the court system.

- 2) Between 2008 and 2017, the Plaintiff filed two Kings bench Petitions , two Mandamus and an allocator of the Equitable Distribution Opinion and Order, in pursuit of justice, but received the "*per curium*" dismissal that all *pro se* litigants received.
- 3) On June 7, 2007, Plaintiff filed for divorce in Montgomery County, paying a fee in consideration for the mediation for the dissolution of her marriage, constituting a contract under Title 23. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania holds a monopoly on the divorce industry, regulates its fees and procedures.
- 4) During the course of litigation she submitted multiple demands for jury trial (Case #2 [REDACTED]). She has acted *pro se* in all her cases since 2009. All demands for jury trial have been dismissed in excess of jurisdiction in violation of **PA Const Article 1 §6 and §25.**
- 5) There was a very solvent marital estate, excellent credit, no demands for alimony and no custody issues at the inception of the divorce case. The main issue was to obtain an innocuous mortgage modification, which is routine to preserve the family home until the resolution of a case. However, the more Plaintiff followed the rules, the more she was abused.
- 6) In good faith the Plaintiff had cooperated in the sale of a secondary marital property located in Monroe County, Pennsylvania, with the stipulation that the proceeds be used to pay off the couple's bills to

maintain their excellent credit standing, and to be used for the welfare of her children.

- 7) Instead, those escrowed funds came under the control of the courts, and the majority of the funds were delved out to attorneys who protracted the case for that reason, resulting in unpaid marital bills and destruction of the Plaintiff's credit.
- 8) Instead, it was not until all of her assets were dissipated that finally in December 2015, a divorce decree was entered, without the Plaintiff every having a trial in equitable distribution, due to collective judicial misconduct at all levels of the court system, which is rampant against pro se litigants.
- 9) Due to the continual civil rights violations by the Courts in the divorce case the Plaintiff was compelled to seek justice in the federal jurisdiction. However, it is clear, that those courts are nothing but an extention of the state level, due to the constant fraternization and monetary exchanges between them, and collaborative treatment of the courts as their own personal franchises.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff claims monetary damages against the Defendant in an unliquidated amount to be determined at trial, and for any further relief that this Honorable Court determines necessary and appropriate.

**COUNT II – Against Judge Kelly Wall, the Judicial Conduct
Board and Chief Counsel Robert Graci for Breach of Contract,
Negligence, Discrimination and in violation of the U.S &
Pennsylvania Constitutions and and 42 USC §1983 and §1985**

- 10) The Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein all of the foregoing facts and allegations.

- 11) Due to the course of action, Defendants directly caused severe financial and emotional damages to the Plaintiff and her children, in actions repugnant to **Title 23:** (a) Policy.--The family is the basic unit in society and the protection and preservation of the family is of paramount public concern. Therefore, it is the policy of the Commonwealth to (4) Mitigate the harm to the spouses and their children caused by the legal dissolution of the marriage.

- 12) In 2013, a complaint in foreclosure were filed against the Plaintiff's primary residence, the result of judicial misconduct by Judge Kelly C. Wall.

- 13) The actions of Judge Wall included having lied on her "Rule 703" reports to the AOPC over a period of four years, regarding overdue disposition of motions for mortgage modification on the primary

residence. At the time, there were three minor children living in the home.

- 14) The Plaintiff was gainfully employed between February 2008 and October 2014, and able to maintain the home had the Court not created a foreclosure as further detailed herein.
- 15) The Plaintiff had filed multiple complaints between 2008 and 2012, with the Judicial Conduct Board, which were dismissed by former Chief Counsel Joseph Massa, who was then removed for his covering up of the Kids for Cash crimes.
- 16) The new Chief Counsel Robert Graci, removed Judge Wall from the case on or about September 2013, (although it pretentiously remains confidential), after the Plaintiff had met with members of the Board.
- 17) The Conduct Board failed to apply appropriate punishment against Judge Wall; her biased orders were allowed to stand, she was allowed to continue to enjoy her salary and influenced the subsequent judge to drive the Plaintiff's home into default.
- 18) The Plaintiff had been informed by Chief Counsel Graci there was no restitution process available by the Conduct Board for damages.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff claims monetary damages against the Defendant in an unliquidated amount to be determined at trial, and for any further relief that this Honorable Court determines necessary and appropriate.

COUNT III – Against Judges Kelly C. Wall, Gail Weilheimer and Mary Jane Bowes for for Conversion, Breach of Contract, Negligence, Abuse of Process, Official Oppression, Discrimination and in violation of PA Title 23, the U.S & Pennsylvania Constitutions and and 42 USC §1983 and §1985

- 19) The Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein all of the foregoing facts and allegations.
- 20) Due to the course of action, the Defendants directly caused severe financial and emotional damages to the Plaintiff and her children, in actions repugnant to **Title 23:** (a) Policy.--The family is the basic unit in society and the protection and preservation of the family is of paramount public concern. Therefore, it is the policy of the Commonwealth to (4) Mitigate the harm to the spouses and their children caused by the legal dissolution of the marriage.
- 21) Judge Gail Weilheimer, who is a former Montgomery County Solicitor and participated in the election campaigns of Attorney General Josh Shapiro, was then assigned the divorce case.
- 22) Weiheimer acted in proxy for Judge Wall and began to retaliate, ignoring requests for another two years to order the spouse to cooperate with a mortgage modification. This included obstruction of jury trials in excess of their jurisdiction.

- 23) It was glaringly obvious that the spouse and his Counsel Randee Feldman, were deliberately working to drive the home into foreclosure, but could not have accomplished it without the support of the judiciary. They had a duty to remove him from the deed at that point. He has never answered any of the complaints in foreclosure, but remains on the deed.
- 24) In addition to that conspiracy, the spouse was allowed by Judge Wall, a fraudulent transfer of the mutually-owned business in the midst of the divorce litigation, and she then accepted indisputably false income statements. Wall used that income contrary to the Rules on support calculation, cutting the already modest support from \$1200 to \$400 a month for three children, and ordering a refund to him as he continued to operate the business under the "ownership" of friends.
- 25) The transfer of the business met all 12 elements of fraud for the statute in Pennsylvania. A very detailed motion submitted by the Plaintiff as visible in the divorce docket regarding it, but was again delayed and eventually ignored by the court.
- 26) Judge Gail Weilheimer continued the abuse, obstructed a jury trial demand for Equitable Distribution, and lied in her statement to the Appellate court, regarding the Plaintiff not having a car to attend an equitable distribution one-judge trial. The laws and rules only applied

to the Plaintiff and no one else through the decade of harassment by the Courts.

- 27) Appellate Judge Mary Jane Bowes wrote an unfounded, biased Opinion on the Appeal of the Equitable Distribution, and did not provide a *de novo* review. She claimed she could not understand the Plaintiff's brief; however, Bowes comments were nothing but pretext. What she really meant was she did not want to be bothered going through the ten years of a mess that they created, and because it was for an indigent *pro se* litigant.
- 28) Between 2009 and 2013, the Plaintiff had submitted multiple appeals to the Superior Court regarding the time-sensitive motions that were being delayed by the court, and the refusal of Judge Wall to disqualify. As usual, they were all dismissed by the idiocracy as interlocutory, *per curium*.
- 29) All submissions by the Plaintiff to the court were and are very well composed, especially in consideration of the fact that she has been doing the work of an army of attorneys, by herself – and doing it better. But that means nothing to the pettifoggers of the Pennsylvania court system.
- 30) Bowes simply regurgitated Weilheimer's false statements that conflict with the record, because she never looked at the record – even though

they went to the expense of transferring all ten years of it to the Superior Court.

- 31) It was extremely evident that Judge Weilheimer had lied, as her Order not only conflicted with the record, it was in massive conflict with the recommendations of Equitable Distribution Master Gordon Mair (Montco # [REDACTED] - [REDACTED] seq 451) .
- 32) Due to the Plaintiff's indigent status, she was precluded from attending the first day of a two-day protracted equitable distribution hearing, which she explained in a motion filed the day of that hearing – ([REDACTED] [REDACTED] Weilheimer lied, as did Bowes, claiming no such communication was ever made to the court.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff claims monetary damages against the Defendant in an unliquidated amount to be determined at trial, and for any further relief that this Honorable Court determines necessary and appropriate.

COUNT VI – Against Judge Thomas Branca for Conversion, Breach of Contract, Negligence, Abuse of Process, Official Oppression, Discrimination and in violation of PA Title 23, the U.S & Pennsylvania Constitutions, 42 USC §1983 and §1985

- 33) The Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein all of the foregoing facts and allegations.
- 34) Due to the course of action, Defendants directly caused severe financial and emotional damages to the Plaintiff and her children, in actions repugnant to **Title 23:** (a) Policy.--The family is the basic unit in society and the protection and preservation of the family is of paramount public concern. Therefore, it is the policy of the Commonwealth to (4) Mitigate the harm to the spouses and their children caused by the legal dissolution of the marriage.
- 35) The mortgage was modified on or about February 2009, however it was done contrary to the UCC, the banking laws and the restrictions imposed by the federal lawsuit against the mortgage industry that same year. This included discrimination with a high interest rate because the male i.e. spouse on the deed, would not sign.
- 36) Those violations were addressed in the foreclosure action by the Plaintiff in a Counterclaim and brief (Montco # [REDACTED]), but Judge Branca, not only denied a jury trial but would not allow the Plaintiff to submit a Counterclaim to defend herself. He did however, manage to roll his eyes at the Plaintiff in Court and make condescending comments. All in all, his conduct was that of a common thug.
- 37) Judge Branca violated the Plaintiff's right to jury trial acting in excess of his jurisdiction, and did not even follow the Summary Judgment

rule, that prohibited him from granting it if there were outstanding disputed facts. Among those facts were the failure to join indispensable parties in the foreclosure actions, which deprived him of jurisdiction.

38) Plaintiff is now fighting an ejectment (2018-03369), while waiting for the decision of the Superior Court on the foreclosure appeal that had a hearing on May 2, 2018, that will no doubt support all their fellow judges of the cabal, against a moneyless *pro se* litigant.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff claims monetary damages against the Defendant in an unliquidated amount to be determined at trial, and for any further relief that this Honorable Court determines necessary and appropriate.

COUNT VI Against Common Pleas Judges Richard Haaz, Kate Ford Elliot and U.S. District Court Judge Paul Diamond for Conversion, Breach of Contract, Negligence, Abuse of Process, Official Oppression, Discrimination and in violation of PA Title 23, the U.S & Pennsylvania Constitutions and 42 USC §1983 and §1985

39) The Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein all of the foregoing facts and allegations.

- 40) Due to the course of action, they directly caused severe financial and emotional damages to the Plaintiff and her children, in actions repugnant to **Title 23:** (a) Policy.--The family is the basic unit in society and the protection and preservation of the family is of paramount public concern. Therefore, it is the policy of the Commonwealth to (4) Mitigate the harm to the spouses and their children caused by the legal dissolution of the marriage.
- 41) The Plaintiff filed several cases trying to save her home and personal property from this excessive public corruption. One was against Randee Feldman the spouse's lawyer, for abuse of process. After the first judge on the Montgomery County case had sustained the Plaintiff's causes of action, Judge Richard Haaz had been suspiciously put in her place (# [REDACTED]).
- 42) Consistent with the synchronized crime, Haaz dispensed with the law of the case doctrine, proceeded to game the system, obstructed a jury trial in excess of his jurisdiction, and allowed the opposition to intimidate the Plaintiff's witness and then dismissed the case.
- 43) The Superior Court appeal on that case suffered the routine *pro se* dismissal and a feeble Opinion from Superior Court Judge Kate Ford. Unfortunately, Judge Ford-Elliot and other members of the panel, forgot to disclose all the money she received from Judge Haaz, his

former law firm Agins, Seidel and Haaz, LLC, and a current law firm from which he still collects income (Saltz, Mongeluzzi LLC).

- 44) Haaz has been associated with the latter since 1980, of which PA Supreme Court Justice Max Baer's son is "coincidentally" a staff attorney.
- 45) The other member of that Appellate panel included Judge Beck Dubow who also had thousands of dollars in contributions from Haaz and his law firms, with the third panel member being again Mary Jane Bowes. Bowes had a duty to recuse because of her knowledge of facts outside of the case. In a Motion for Reconsideration, these conflicts of interest objections were submitted but as usual, dismissed by the Superior Court. The law and rules simply do not apply in *pro se* cases.
- 46) In further pursuit of due process, a case was filed in the federal jurisdiction for civil rights violations against Judge Richard Haaz, Paul Troy, Esq, and his client, the spouse's attorney, Randee Feldman and certain others that potentially cooperated in manipulating the case of Montco # [REDACTED]
- 47) Judge Paul Diamond was "randomly assigned" to all three of the Plaintiff's federal cases, including that against Haaz, between 2011 and 2016. He was the Campaign Manager, Counsel, and 30-year long time friend of U.S. Senator Arlen Specter, who was responsible for some 40 judges being appointed to the Pennsylvania federal bench, including

Judge Scirica, Supreme Court Judge Samuel Alito, and the Appellate judges on the Plaintiff's cases. (Not surprising Specter's son's law firm – Kline Specter LLC, is now one of the wealthiest in the state with massive suspect insurance awards and settlements).

- 48) Diamond subverted all jury trials in excess of his jurisdiction with pretrial dismissals. His appeals went to a very specific cabal of judges, who also are in control of the disciplinary process in the federal courts, all the way to Washington DC, via Judge Anthony Scirica, who is very conveniently the Chair of the U.S. Judicial Conference Committee on Conduct.
- 49) The Counsel for the Judiciary in this instant case, Andrew Coval, represented Defendants in the Federal case also, however, never disclosed that he recently had been employed by the U.S. Eastern District Court as a law clerk from 2015-2016- more deception.
- 50) Judge Anthony Scirica, a former Montgomery County Common Pleas judge, state representative, and close friend of Arlen Specter, and who had worked with PA Senator Stewart Greenleaf, Chair of the Judiciary committee for three decades in the Pennsylvania Legislature. It is also interesting to note that Judge Branca's father worked for Judge Scirica for a decade. So many coincidences!

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff claims monetary damages against the Defendant in an unliquidated amount to be determined at trial, and for any

further relief that this Honorable Court determines necessary and appropriate.

COUNT VII – Against Montgomery County and Sheriff for Conversion, Official Oppression, Discrimination and in violation of PA Title 23, the U.S & Pennsylvania Constitutions and 42 USC §1983 and §1985

- 51) The Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein all of the foregoing facts and allegations.
- 52) Due to the course of action, they directly caused severe financial and emotional damages to the Plaintiff and her children, in actions repugnant to **Title 23:** (a) Policy.--The family is the basic unit in society and the protection and preservation of the family is of paramount public concern. Therefore, it is the policy of the Commonwealth to (4) Mitigate the harm to the spouses and their children caused by the legal dissolution of the marriage.
- 53) The Plaintiff's home was sold at Sheriff sale on May 31, 2017, inexplicably while the foreclosure was still on appeal, and after the Pennsylvania Supreme Court would not review her request for Mandamus. Obviously this is because \$6000 goes to the general operating account of the county for budgeted unfunded liabilities, and the Plaintiff's home is just one of thousands subjected to this synchronized crime via the family court.

- 54) On October 5, 2015, Montgomery County Court released a self-incriminating announcement in the renowned publication "The Legal Intelligencer." They announced a "back log" of 5000 pending cases, placing the blame on their "attorney-driven" system, with pretext of how it is now being converted to a "court-driven" system.
- 55) This was obviously a response to the mass of allegations of racketeering through individual professional conduct complaints and in social media. It stands to reason, attorneys were never allowed to "drive" the litigation process, as they have an inherent conflict of interest with the hourly billing system.
- 56) To an educated public, the pretextual county declaration in the Legal Intelligencer was just a sugar-coating to conceal their complicity in the destruction of thousands of lives over the course of decades that forced people into bankruptcy and homes into foreclosure, mainly through the family courts via conversion of assets.
- 57) Plaintiff alleges it was no coincidence that Haaz was chosen to supervise the "disposing" of those thousands of mishandled cases and a new program that professes to assist in mortgage foreclosures.. Thanks to him, according to the AOPC department of statistics, the family court was excluded from the audit which precipitated these measures..

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff claims monetary damages against the Defendant in an unliquidated amount to be determined at trial, and for any further relief that this Honorable Court determines necessary and appropriate.

**Count VIII Against the Office of Attorney General and Attorney
General Josh Shapiro for Conversion, Breach of Contract, Negligence,
Abuse of Process, Official Oppression, Discrimination and in violation
of PA Title 23, the U.S & Pennsylvania Constitutions and 42 USC
§1983 and §1985**

- 58) The Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein all of the foregoing facts and allegations.
- 59) Due to the course of action, Defendants directly caused severe financial and emotional damages to the Plaintiff and her children, in actions repugnant to **Title 23:** (a) Policy.--The family is the basic unit in society and the protection and preservation of the family is of paramount public concern. Therefore, it is the policy of the Commonwealth to (4) Mitigate the harm to the spouses and their children caused by the legal dissolution of the marriage.
- 60) Plaintiff filed a criminal complaint with the Attorney General's office, which they prejudicially failed to investigate the allegations against the

Courts and the County, allowing her residence to be sold without the due process of law.

- 61) According to Agent Jeffrey Wright, while he had essentially admitted the Commonwealth has a problem with organized crime in its government, he was ordered to a halt by Deputy Attorney of the Criminal Division - Nicole Forzato. She has a conflict of interest as she also was a Montgomery County solicitor and represented a county court Master against the Plaintiff, in an aspect of the divorce process.
- 62) Conflicts of interest exist whereby the Plaintiff's Criminal Complaint included Judge Gail Weilheimer who had worked with Attorney General Josh Shapiro while he was the Montgomery County Commissioner. Shapiro shows thousands of dollars in campaign contributions from the Counsel for Thomas Jefferson University, the law firm of Klehr Harrison Harvey LLC.
- 63) On or about 2012, the Attorney General's office signed an agreement with the Federal Government in a settlement of \$66 million dollars that resulted from prosecution of members of the banking industry for mortgage fraud.
- 64) Those funds have been misappropriated, never being used to provide relief to the Plaintiff or victims in Pennsylvania. Instead, although the Attorney General's office would not provide the requested information, those funds have been traced predominantly into the pockets of the

legal industry, being used for "pro bono" assistance to file bankruptcies for victims of mortgage fraud.

- 65) Instead of protecting the citizens against public corruption and consumer fraud, Mr. Shapiro is using public funds to sue a President that is trying to rid our government of the types of people that are Defendants in this case. That speaks volumes as to the integrity of Attorney General Shapiro.
- 66) Greenleaf has funneled millions to just about every Pennsylvania Supreme Court judge, on both sides of the aisle, and to Attorney General Josh Shapiro, while simultaneously controlling the Senate Judiciary Committee for decades.
- 67) Plaintiff lives in Senator Greenleaf's District. She went to him for help with judicial corruption on or about 2012, before she realized the above illustrated network culture of collusion. Of course, he did nothing but get angry regarding her accusations. It has since been discovered Greenleaf has been receiving \$50,000 a year to his law firm from contracts awarded by the Pennsylvania Judicial branch. He also maintains a "secret" PAC – the Commonwealth Heritage Fund.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff claims monetary damages against the Defendant in an unliquidated amount to be determined at trial, and for any further relief that this Honorable Court determines necessary and appropriate.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF IN CONCLUSION

Defendants have acted in excess of their jurisdictions and cannot hide behind immunity. A Government is not an inanimate object; it is merely individuals who often operate in their own self-interests rather than according to their oaths of office. And when it decays into a "kleptocracy" it becomes like the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

"It is not uncommon for corrupt public officials to have connections to organized crime...The grand corruption (def. Kleptocracy) depends on a culture of impunity that exists when corrupt leaders control the administration of justice...Corruption is a crime of calculation, when public officials can calculate they would not get caught, they won't be prosecuted or punished, there is nothing to inhibit them from robbing their countries."

(Senior United States District Judge Mark Wolf of Massachusetts, September 18, 2017 speech on "Challenging Corrupt Practices", Academy of Arts and Sciences.)

Who in our Judiciary is going to step up to the plate and by opposing this sinister and diabolical cabal, put an end to the suffering of thousands of families across what is no longer a "commonwealth," but an ATM machine for an elite club that has embedded itself perpetuated through generations of cronyism, malfeasance and greed? As the Plaintiff prepares to move into

her car, she hopes that she has finally reached a corner of the Judiciary that is untouched by all of the foregoing.

Wherefore, in consideration of the foregoing repugnant judicial conduct which includes acting in excess of their jurisdiction, official oppression and crimes committed under color of law against her, in violation of the U.S & Pennsylvania Constitutions, the Plaintiff claims monetary damages against the Defendant in an unliquidated amount to be determined at trial, and for any further relief that this hopefully Honorable Court determines necessary and appropriate.

Submitted on this day – May 9, 2018 by

████████████████████

Pro Se

VERIFICATION: I, ████████████████████ swear that all of the foregoing is true to the best of my knowledge and beliefs.