

[REDACTED] Appellant

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, 1 Judge Richard Haaz, Individually and in Official Capacity, Kelly Wall, Individually and in Official Capacity, Gail Weilheimer, Individually and in Official Capacity Thomas Branca, Individually and in Official Capacity Robert Graci, Individually and in Official Capacity, Mary Jane Bowes, Individually and in Official Capacity Kate Ford Elliott, Individually and in Official Capacity,
Appellee

[REDACTED]

ADDENDUM TO
NOTICE OF APPEAL
eFiled January 22, 2019

Re: # [REDACTED]

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

I. On January 14, 2019 the Commonwealth Court entered a Memorandum Opinion

Commonwealth Court Docket [REDACTED]

II. Jurisdiction is proper pursuant to Title 42 - § 761. Original jurisdiction of the Commonwealth Court, and PaRAP Rule 1101. Appeals as of Right from the Commonwealth Court at (a)(1):

(1) Any matter which was originally commenced in the Commonwealth Court and which does not constitute an appeal to the Commonwealth Court from another court, a district justice or another government unit.

III. The Text of the Order is ATTACHED as an APPENDIX due to the entire Opinion and Memorandum being in dispute.

IV. Questions Presented

1. Does the Commonwealth Court Opinion conflict with the intent of Congress regarding judicial immunity, which expressly bars judges acting "**in excess of jurisdiction**" (not "in absence of") in the 1996 Public Law 104-317 104th Congress amending 42 USC §1983?

2. Did the Commonwealth Court in bad faith fail to address the allegation that the Pennsylvania Constitution expressly bars the Judiciary and all branches of government from jurisdiction over the right to civil jury trial under PA Const Article 1 § 6 and §25, and therefore all the judicial defendants are deprived of immunity?

3. Did the Commonwealth Court act in bad faith by deliberately failing to address the allegations that the Pennsylvania Supreme Court has exceeded their

limited general rulemaking power, damaging thousands of citizens, including the Appellant, by concocting rules that abrogate substantive rights, as expressly prohibited by **Article V 10(c)** of the PA Constitution?

4. Are victims such as the Appellant, of judicial criminality, gross negligence caused by unconstitutional policies and public corruption, due remedies under **U.S. Supreme Court** decisions and federal law regardless of whether or not immunity applies?

5. Did the Commonwealth Court act in bad faith by falsely claiming no contract, express or implied, exists for court services and a duty to perform in accordance with **Title 23 and the PA Constitution?**

6. Did the Appellant prove via material evidence that Defendant Montgomery County had **unconstitutional policies**, to facilitate profitable asset-stripping in family court, in violation of **PA Constitution Article 1 § 11 and § 25 and the Fifth, Eight and Fourteenth Amendments**, being a proximate cause of the Appellant's catastrophic damages? (**SEE Appellant's Brief and Response of August 20th, 2018, Page 6 and Exhibit C**)

7. Did the Commonwealth Court use self-concocted, deprecated law to deny the Appellant's right to a waiver of sovereign immunity in their 1990 **Sugalski** Commonwealth Court Opinion, which was declared illogical by the U.S. Federal Court (**Marsh v. Ladd, No. 03- 5977, 2004 WL 2441088 (E.D. Pa. Oct. 27, 2004)**)?

8. Are the self-regulatory, subversive policies of the Judiciary and its Judicial Conduct Board grossly negligent and unconstitutional being geared towards protecting judicial criminality instead of protecting the civil rights of citizens

against abusive public servants, that being the proximate cause of the immense damages to the Appellant and her children?

9. Did the Commonwealth Court abuse its discretion by dismissing the Appellant's Complaint with prejudice when she had the right to Amend; and speciously use *res judicata* when there was by default of the foregoing transgressions, no due process i.e.no adjudication provided in any of the Appellant's cases?

10. Did the Commonwealth Court act in bad faith when they denied the request for disclosures of conflict of interest with the Defendants, when in fact there are repugnant monetary and other benefits exchanged between them including undue influence over the Attorney General Defendant- who refused to investigate the Appellant's criminal complaint?

11. Is it possible for the Pennsylvania Supreme Court to provide an impartial tribunal in judgment of allegations of its own misconduct?

V. CONCISE STATEMENT

Over the course of a decade, FIVE TIMES ([REDACTED])
[REDACTED] the Appellant came to the jurisdiction of the PA Supreme Court **for help before the damage was done;** SIX TIMES valid complaints to the Judicial Conduct Board were dismissed. The Commonwealth Court adds to the abuse by ignoring the 30-page Comprehensive Brief that supported the complaint, containing evidence of a decade of horrendous abuse and financial devastation. Their response is consistent with this culture of

cover-ups and criminality, omitting those arguments they could not win, and perverting others to suit their agenda. All the Defendants are clamoring for self-granted, illegitimate immunity, for the rampant public corruption and gross negligence, that they either knowingly participated in or supported by failing to intervene. Instead the cabal continues with its repugnant public policies focused on "procedural rules," that have resulted in murders, suicides, homelessness, poverty and descent into substance abuse, all at the hands of a racketeering family court industry.

No jury trials, no *de novo* appellate reviews, no impartial tribunals, no expediency...tens years and an entire marital estate was swindled that represented the Appellant's children's college education, retirement and the ability to have housing or any semblance of a humane standard of living. The Commonwealth Court insinuation that civil rights violations under the Pennsylvania law, do not apply by default to the U.S. Constitution- is repulsive, as they refused to answer conflict of interest disclosure requests. This Court and all Defendants acted in unlawfully; therefore, **by default there is no judicial immunity, there has been NO DUE PROCESS and all the orders are VOID** in Montco [REDACTED]

There is no way to preserve the ten years of issues here in only 1000 words. Therefore the following is incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein in addition to all of those named above: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The fact is that judicial corruption is a rampant problem in Pennsylvania Courts- the extent of which is unsurpassed in any other state in the nation.

Submitted by:

[REDACTED]

WORD VERIFICATION: THIS STATEMENT CONTAINS 988 WORDS EXCLUSIVE OF THE CAPTION.