

Richard William Hoffmann, Sr., Pro Se  
318 Whitman Street South  
Monmouth, Oregon 97361  
(775) 455-7341 Direct/Cell  
Rich@HFTFire.com

**IN THE IOWA DISTRICT COURT IN AND FOR POLK COUNTY**

UPON THE PETITION OF	)	<b>CASE NO. DRCV37370</b>
	)	
DEEANN RAE JOHNSON,	)	<b><u>NOTICE OF ADDRESS CHANGE AND</u></b>
	)	<b><u>APPLICATION FOR FEE WAIVER</u></b>
Petitioner,	)	<b>UPON EVIDENCED CONTEMPT OF</b>
	)	<b>COURT – PERJURY COMMITTED BY</b>
AND CONCERNING	)	<b>DEEANN RAE JOHNSON - EVIDENCE</b>
	)	<b>OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND</b>
RICHARD WILLIAM HOFFMANN, SR.	)	<b>OBSTRUCTION OF COMMERCE</b>
	)	<b>COMMITTED BY THIS COURT UPON</b>
Respondent	)	<b>RENDERING RESPONDENT AS</b>
	)	<b>UNEMPLOYABLE TO REMIT SAME.</b>

COMES NOW, Respondent, Richard William Hoffmann, Sr. of 318 Whitman Street South, Monmouth, Oregon 97361 hereby applies to the Court to apply for said **FEE WAIVER** upon clear evidence of CONTEMPT OF COURT - PERJURY committed by Petitioner, DeeAnn Rae Johnson, that has been fully exonerated by this Court in its evidenced commitment of OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE upon DENIAL to hear attached Court ENTRY of February 19, 2015 [**Exhibit 1**] and the resulting ACT OF TERRORISM of OBSTRUCTION OF COMMERCE committed by this Court rendering the Respondent, Richard William Hoffmann, Sr., thereby UNEMPLOYABLE upon said PERJURIES to be UNLAWFULLY DECLARED as a TERRORIST THREAT to women and children to remit said fees accordingly.

1 OBSTRUCITON OF JUSTICE committed by this Court is further evidenced  
2 upon ZERO response and thus UNLAWFUL DENIAL to Respondent's LAWFUL "APPEAL"  
3 of June 15, 2015 within the mandatory thirty (30) day time limit [Exhibit 2] regarding same to  
4 be heard by the Appellate Court of Iowa accordingly that clearly evidences more than a dozen  
5 CRIMINAL ACTS TERRORISM as identified therein.  
6

7 Also attached is a copy of the FEE WAIVER that was recently granted by the  
8 Third District Appellate Court of California [Exhibit 3] to further evidence the EXTREME  
9 FINANCIAL HARDSHIP purposely caused by this Iowa District Court In and For Polk County  
10 as additional evidence of OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND THE RESULTING ACT OF  
11 TERRORISM of OBSTRUCTION OF COMMERCE as evidenced in the attached January 13,  
12 2015 Court Entry [Exhibit 4].  
13

14 Please note every effort will be made to make those accountable for said  
15 identified EVIDENCES of OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE and the RESULTING  
16 OBSTRUCTION OF COMMERCE that cause EXTREME FINANCIAL HARDSHIP and  
17 EXTREME MENTAL ANGUISH upon the EVIDENCED FELONY KIDNAPPING, FELONY  
18 IMPRISONMENT, FELONY TRANSPORTION OVER STATE LINES, and now exonerated  
19 FELONY CHILD CUSTODY FILING AND EXECUTED COURT PROCEDURES involving  
20 two (2) minor children with NAMES ENTERED IN EACH COURT ENTRY FILED IN THE  
21 STATE OF OREGON IN TOTAL CONFLICT TO THEIR ACTUAL GIVEN NAMES AS  
22 EVIDENCED ON SAID BIRTH CERTIFICATES.  
23  
24

25 Respondent will not cease and desist said LAWFUL Court proceedings to find all  
26 GUILTY parties and ALL Does one (1) through fifty (50) CONVICTED OF SAME accordingly.  
27

1                   **AFFIDAVIT CONCERNING APPLICATION FOR FEE WAIVER UPON**  
2 **EVIDENCED CONTEMPT OF COURT – PERJURY AND EVIDENCE OF**  
3 **OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND RESULTING OBSTRUCTION OF COMMERCE**  
4 **COMMITTED BY THIS COURT UPON DENIAL OF APPEAL OF JUNE 15, 2015**  
5 **RENDERING RESPONDENT AS UNEMPLOYABLE TO REMIT SAME IN THE IOWA**  
6 **DISTRICT COURT IN AND FOR POLK COUNTY.**

8  
9                   Being first duly sworn, Richard William Hoffmann, Sr., do dispose and state  
10 under penalty of perjury, that I am the Respondent herein, and know the contents thereof and that  
11 the statements and allegations contained therein are true and correct as I verily believe.  
12

13  
14   
15 \_\_\_\_\_  
Richard William Hoffmann, Sr., Pro Se

16  
17 Witnessed herein on this 9<sup>th</sup> day of June in the year of our Lord two-thousand and sixteen.  
18

19   
20 \_\_\_\_\_  
Rebecca Ann Follis

**Subject:** Re: Final Final Version - Child Support Paid since Sept 2007  
**From:** deeann johnson (drjohnson0704@yahoo.com)  
**To:** hoseroller007@yahoo.com;  
**Date:** Thursday, March 31, 2011 10:37 AM

Rich,  
 They only way I will agree to his is if I get something out of all the crap I've been through with you.

I will settle for 10k. Better call your mom ( you don't need an inheritance anyway), otherwise I'm going to let the judge decide.

All my love,

**DeeAnn Johnson**  
**(515) 664-5959**

OK, LET'S SEE THEN!

$$\begin{array}{r}
 \$10,000.00 \\
 - 7,405.29 \\
 \hline
 \$2,594.71
 \end{array}$$

DAMN! ALMOST! JONATHAN  
 YOUR CLIENT NEARLY MET  
 HER GOAL BUT SHORT ONLY  
 \$2,594.71 DID SHE SHARE?

IN THE IOWA DISTRICT COURT IN AND FOR POLK COUNTY

---

UPON THE PETITION OF )

DEEANN RAE JOHNSON, )

Petitioner, )

AND CONCERNING )

RICHARD WILLIAM HOFFMANN, SR. )

Respondent )

CASE NO. DRCV37370

**SWORN AFFIDAVIT OF WITNESS  
KENNETH STORNER**

---

**DECLARATION OF TRUTH**

of  
Kenneth Stoner

- 1) That I, Kenneth Stoner, of the age of maturity, have first-hand personal knowledge of the events described herein, and know them to be true and complete to the best of "My" personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein and if called to witness, could and would testify competently to the truth of this matter.
- 2) That I herein, knowing these facts, hereby depose and say the following TRUTH of this matter:
  - a) That I have personally known DeeAnn Rae Johnson, Petitioner, for approximately 12 years.
  - b) I have known Anika Leigh Blum, Age 35, of 413 NW Winterberry Street, Ankeny, Iowa 50023 for approximately 12 years.
  - c) I have known Deborah L. Eastwood of 4232 65<sup>th</sup> Street, Urbandale, Iowa 50322 for approximately 7 years.

- 3) That I was providing APPROVED childcare for both Morgan Elizabeth Johnson-Hoffmann and Noah Christian Johnson-Hoffmann for Respondent, Richard W. Hoffmann, Sr., for the period of Monday, June 9, 2014 at approximately 3:30 PM through Saturday, June 14, 2014 at approximately 9:30 AM per the APPROVED arrangements with Respondent until his return from Las Vegas, Nevada and Kansas City, Missouri while attending business matters.
- 4) Signed and witnessed Emergency Medical and Dental healthcare endorsements for both said minor children Morgan and Noah were provided to me by Respondent.
- 5) That I received a text on my cell phone from DeeAnn Rae Johnson, Petitioner, at 10:12 AM on June 9, 2014 that states, **“Kenny I had 3 calls from softball parents last night that are very concerned for Morgan & Noah. Will you please let my friend [PRESSUMED DEBROAH L. EASTWOOD] have the kids. She will put them on a plane and I will meet them in Denver. Please. They aren’t ok with rich.”**
- 6) That DeeAnn Rae Johnson called my cell phone at approximately 7:20 PM to commence a conversation lasting approximately ten minutes in which she demanded I release both said children to her sister, Anika L. Blum, and friend, Deborah L. Eastwood, indicating they would arrive soon.
- 7) That as DeeAnn Rae Johnson was completing this call demanding nothing less will be tolerated, Anika L. Blum arrived in her personal vehicle with Deborah L. Eastwood, parked in my driveway, stepped out of said vehicle, and stated, **“I am taking the children now! Get them!”** as she exercised her alleged AUTHORITY as blood relative and **“Aunt,”** and with sheer intimidation and mental intention subjected upon all parties including myself, forcing me to tears, demanded said minor children into her personal vehicle as they **SCREAMED and CRIED with each and every step from the SAFETY and**

**comfort of my home, demanded they enter said vehicle, fasten their seatbelts, she then threw both of their packed luggage into the rear, and ABSOLUTELY NO DESTINATION GIVEN WHATSOEVER, sped off down the street in a westerly direction.**

- 8) That Deborah L. Eastwood stood by and left with both children as an assistant/accomplice to ensure each step listed above was executed exactly as described.
- 9) That I immediately called Respondent from my cell phone to inform him of the details.
- 10) That we talked just a few minutes in which we both decided he would be the party to place to the EMERGENCY call(s) to summons appropriate law enforcement personnel for their assistance.
- 11) That the experience of said child abduction incident was psychologically traumatic for all parties.
- 12) That if I need to clarify any further information of details regarding said incident regarding this matter, I will testify in open court under penalty of perjury, and shall affirm to the verity of TRUTH contained in this document.

All Right Reserved and Retained

DATED: August 16, 2014



Kenneth Stoner  
1212 Southlawn Drive  
Des Moines, Iowa 50315  
(515) 991-6525 Cell  
(515) 256-1760 Home



**IOWA INCIDENT REPORT**  
**ANKENY POLICE DEPARTMENT**  
 411 SW ORDNANCE RD  
 (515) 289-5240

Case Number <b>14-002671</b>
Date of Report <b>6/19/2014</b>
Status <b>01 - ACTIVE</b>

<b>SUMMARY</b>	County <b>POLK - 77</b>	Report Type <b>0 - INITIAL INCIDENT</b>	Day of week Incident Occurred		
	Dispatched Location <b>413 NW WINTERBERRY ST</b>		Dispatched Time <b>21:22</b>	Arrival Time <b>21:30</b>	In Service Time <b>14:00</b>
	Is Incident Date / Time Known? <b>NO</b>	Incident Date or Lower Date Range <b>06/17/2014</b>	Upper Date Range <b>06/19/2014</b>	Incident Time or Lower Time Range <b>00:01</b>	Upper Time Range <b>23:59</b>
	<b>INCIDENT REPORTED BY</b>				
	Incident Reported by/Victim? <b>YES</b>	Reporting Victim's Sequence No. <b>001</b>	Name - Last <b>BLUM</b>	First <b>ANIKA</b>	Middle <b>LEIGH</b>
Business Name (if Incident was Reported by a Business)		Address			
City <b>ANKENY</b>	State <b>IA</b>	Zip Code <b>50023</b>	Home/Cell Phone	Work Phone	

<b>OFFENSE</b>	Seq. No. <b>001</b>	Code Section <b>708.7(1)(A)(1)</b>	Charges/Offense <b>HARASSMENT BY COMMUNICATION - SIMPLE MISD</b>	UCR Offense Code <b>INTIMIDATION - 13C</b>	
	Attempted/Completed <b>C - COMPLETED</b>		Type of Criminal Activity (up to 3)		
	Type of Weapon/Force Involved (up to 3) <b>99 - NONE</b>			Gang Information (up to 2) <b>N - NONE/UNKNOWN</b>	
	Method of Entry <b>N - NO FORCE</b>	Point of Entry	No. of Premises Entered	Offender Suspected of Using <b>N - NOT APPLICABLE</b>	
	<b>LOCATION OF OFFENSE</b>				
Location Type <b>20 - RESIDENCE/HOME</b>	X Coordinate <b>00446198</b>		Y Coordinate <b>04620518</b>		
Literal Description <b>413 NW WINTERBERRY ST</b>					

<b>OFFENDER</b>	Type of Offender <b>01 - OFFENDER</b>	Sequence No. <b>01</b>	Name - Last <b>HOFFMAN</b>	First <b>RICHARD</b>	Middle <b>WILLIAM</b>	Suffix	
	Alias(es)				Offender Sobriety <b>0 - UNKNOWN</b>		
	Address		City <b>WEST DES MOINES</b>	State <b>IA</b>	Zip Code <b>50265</b>	Home/Cell Phone	
	DOB Known? <b>YES</b>	DOB	Age or Lower Age Range <b>53</b>	Upper Age Range	SSN	Resident Status <b>N - NONRESIDENT</b>	
	Driver's License - Number	State <b>IA</b>	Gender <b>M</b>	Height <b>6' 04"</b>	Weight <b>250 LBS</b>	Eye Color <b>BLUE - BLU</b>	Hair Color <b>BLONDE OR STRAWBERRY - BLN</b>
Skin Tone <b>LIGHT - LGT</b>		Race <b>3 - CAUCASIAN</b>		Ethnicity <b>N - NOT OF HISPANIC ORIGIN</b>			
Scars/Marks/Tattoos				Was offender present when officer arrived? <b>NO</b>			
Type of Injury <b>N - NONE</b>		Hospital Taken to		Transported By			

<b>EMPLOYMENT OR SCHOOL INFO</b>						
Employer or School			Occupation		Hours of Employment	
Address		City	State	Zip Code	Work Phone	

<b>ARREST INFO</b>						
Offender Arrested? <b>NO</b>	Arrestee Seq. No.	Type of Arrest		Arrest Date	Arrest Time Hrs.	
Miranda By		Miranda Date	Miranda Time Hrs.	Arrestee Condition		
Arrestee Armed With (up to 2)			Place of Birth	Additional Incidents Cleared		

<b>JUVENILE INFO</b>						
Parent/Guard. Contacted?	Name - Last		First	Middle	Suffix	
Address		City	State	Zip Code		
Home/Cell Phone		Work Phone	Juvenile Arrestee Disposition			

*EXHIBIT 14*



VICTIM	Type of Victim <b>I - INDIVIDUAL</b>	Sequence No. <b>1</b>	Name - Last <b>BLUM</b>	First <b>ANIKA</b>	Middle <b>LEIGH</b>	Suffix		
	Business/Organization/Municipality Name		Address		City <b>ANKENY</b>	State <b>IA</b>	Zip Code <b>50023</b>	
	Home/Cell Phone		Alias(es)			Victim Sobriety <b>0 - UNKNOWN</b>		
	DOB Known? <b>YES</b>	DOB	Age or Lower Age Range <b>35</b>	Upper Age Range	SSN	Resident Status <b>R - RESIDENT</b>		
	Driver's License - Number		State <b>IA</b>	Gender <b>F - FEMALE</b>	Height <b>5' 07"</b>	Weight <b>180 LB</b>	Eye Color <b>BLUE - BLU</b>	Hair Color <b>BLONDE OR STRAWBERRY - BLN</b>
	Skin Tone <b>FAIR - FAR</b>		Race <b>3 - CAUCASIAN</b>	Ethnicity <b>N - NOT OF HISPANIC</b>		Scars/Marks/Tattoos		
	Type of Injury			Hospital Taken To		Transported By		
	<b>EMPLOYMENT OR SCHOOL INFO</b>							
	Employer or School			Occupation		Hours of Employment		
	Address			City	State	Zip Code	Work Phone	
<b>VICTIM CONNECTED TO UCR OFFENSE CODES</b>								
UCR Offense Code 1 <b>INTIMIDATION - 13C</b>			UCR Offense Code 2					
UCR Offense Code 3			UCR Offense Code 4					
<b>ADDITIONAL OFFENSE CIRCUMSTANCE INFO</b>								
Aggravated Assault/Homicide Circumstances (up to 2)								
Additional Justifiable Homicide Circumstances								
<b>VICTIM'S RELATIONSHIP TO OFFENDER(S)</b>								
First Offender Seq. No.	Victim's Relationship to First Offender			Second Offender Seq. No.	Victim's Relationship to Second Offender			
Third Offender Seq. No.	Victim's Relationship to Third Offender			Fourth Offender Seq. No.	Victim's Relationship to Fourth Offender			
<b>SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES</b>								
Not Applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bias Crime <input type="checkbox"/>		Domestic Abuse <input type="checkbox"/>		LEOKA <input type="checkbox"/>			
<b>BIAS CRIME</b>								
Bias Motivation			Target Code					
Bias Group Affiliations								
<b>DOMESTIC ABUSE</b>								
Children Present?	Seq. No. of Domestic Abuse Offender	Does the victim have a current No Contact Order? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO		Has the subject been charged with domestic abuse assault on the victim or others in the past? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO				
Was the Abused Persons Rights given? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO		Does the Victim request a No Contact Order? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO						
Domestic Abuse Referrals (up to 6)								
<b>LEOKA</b>								
Officer Killed			Type of Assignment					
Body Armor			Call Type					

**NARRATIVE**

On June 19, 2014 at approximately 2122 hours, I was dispatched to 413 NW Winterberry St. on a harassment report.

Upon arrival, I spoke with Anika Blum DOB [REDACTED]. Anika said she recently picked up her sister's children, took them to the airport, and had them fly to Oregon to be with their mother. Anika said the children's father, identified as Richard (Rich) Hoffman DOB [REDACTED] was very upset with this.

Ankeny Police have dealt with Rich regarding the incident with his children.

Anika continued by saying that since Tuesday, June 17, Rich has texted her approximately six to ten times. These texts talked about what Rich thinks is going to happen to them, and that he is upset about his kids being in Oregon. Anika said the texts have been annoying to her. Anika stated she was not too concerned, until she received the following text from Rich at approximately 1730 hours:

"So when do you think I'm gonna pull the trigger on your 'change' of life from what you enjoy today"

**NARRATIVE**

Anika said she believed this was a threat from Rich, and did not want to be contacted by Rich. Anika said she wanted the incident documented, and Rich advised not to contact her. Anika said if Rich continues to contact her, she will pursue charges for harassment.


Anika stated most of the texts from Rich have been in a group thread with her husband, her sister, and her friend [REDACTED]. Anika said [REDACTED] reported this incident to Urbandale PD earlier in the day.

I explained to Anika how she can apply for a civil no contact order, and advised her to look into this option.

I called and spoke with Rich by phone. I told Rich he should not contact Anika again. I explained to Rich that if he did contact Anika, she would pursue harassment charges. Rich stated he understood, and did not have any questions for me.

At this time, there is not charges regarding this case.

No further information is known.

<b>O F F I C E R</b>	Complainant/Reporting Party Signature				
					
	Reporting Officer <b>VANDER WAL JAKE</b>	Badge Numbe <b>JCV110</b>	Video Taken?	Evidence Seized? <b>NO</b>	Photos Taken? <b>NO</b>
	Supervisor	Badge Numbe	Incident Assigned To		
	Cleared Exceptionally			Date Cleared Exceptionally	
	Notifications Investigators <input type="checkbox"/> Identification Unit <input type="checkbox"/> Officer Case Investigative Photos <input type="checkbox"/>				

**Subject:** RE: Intended filing in District Court in and for Polk County  
**From:** <DeeAnn.Johnson@wellsfargo.com>(Add as Preferred Sender)  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 16, 2014 4:34 pm  
**To:** <dad@iowaoregonabduction.com>

From

[Subject \(Thread Messages\)](#)

Date

Size

Bottom line I have primary physical care of Morgan and Noah. I'm filing a restraining order. You might get to see Morgan and Noah a year from now.

**DeeAnn Johnson**  
**Underwriter**  
**Pacific Division Retail Investor/Agency NDS**  
**MAC P6184-040**  
**Fax # 866-931-0365**

If this email was sent to you as an unsecured message, it is not intended for confidential or sensitive information. If you cannot respond to this e-mail securely, please do not include your social security number, account number, or any other personal or financial information in the content of the email. This may be a promotional email. To discontinue receiving promotional emails from Wells Fargo Bank N.A., including Wells Fargo Home Mortgage, click here [NoEmailRequest@wellsfargo.com](mailto:NoEmailRequest@wellsfargo.com). Wells Fargo Home Mortgage is a division of Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. All rights reserved. Equal Housing Lender. Wells Fargo Home Mortgage-2701 Wells Fargo Way-Minneapolis, MN 55467-8000

**From:** dad@iowaoregonabduction.com [mailto:dad@iowaoregonabduction.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 16, 2014 4:20 PM  
**To:** Johnson, DeeAnn  
**Cc:** daddy@ioworegonabduction.com  
**Subject:** Intended filing in District Court in and for Polk County

Please see the attached.

I have had every intention of filing this prepared and notarized Motion to Petition for Modification of Custody, Child Support, and Child Visitation Rights PLUS a Writ of Assistance to be executed by the Marion County Sheriff's Department in the State of Oregon [just as I explained to Officer Mark Seyfried of the Salem Police Department this morning yet he ERRONEOUSLY included verbiage in his report the AFFIRMATION that it was "I" who was in fact was planning to allegedly abduct Noah and Morgan as false entries from the exchange of information provided him] This will be executed online with [www.iowacourts.gov](http://www.iowacourts.gov) by twelve noon tomorrow, Tuesday, June 16, 2014 IF you do not respond at that time to confirm you will in fact:

Fully cooperate to, unlike your purposeful misinformation to Officer Seyfried that you moved to Oregon three (3) weeks ago WITH BOTH CHILDREN ON THE SAME PLANE OR IN THE SAME VEHICLE YOU ALLEGEDLY DRIVEN when the EVIDENCE on your

---

credit card and the evidence of the police "Event" reports created by both Des Moines Police Department and Ankeny Police Departments confirms the children were in FACT taken from Kenneth Stoner's residence by alleged abductor Anika L. Blum and her accomplice Doug M. Blum of 413 Winterberry Street, Ankeny, Iowa 50023, held against their will, and then transported over State lines to Denver to meet with you to be later flown to Portland International Airport arriving ten minutes after its scheduled time of 6:32 PM to arrive at 6:42 PM as the flight logs clearly verify:

You SHALL first allow me to speak to BOTH Morgan and Noah this evening as court ordered under the current custodial agreement. Please do not violate same as you continuously do.

Second, you provide both your work phone and work address without further delay

And lastly, you deliver both Morgan and Noah to the Salem Police Department by 7:00 PM

Or I will publish a website as [www.iowaoregonabduction.com](http://www.iowaoregonabduction.com) with all the true events WITH CONVICTING VIDEO of all said events that will further destroy your credibility with local law enforcement agencies including here in Oregon as well.

You have until noon tomorrow to express your decision or the attached SHALL be filed as promised above.

Your anticipated cooperation and is both expected and greatly appreciated.

Have a great day! Look forward to hearing from you my 12:00 PM noon tomorrow.

Daddy

---

IN THE IOWA DISTRICT COURT IN AND FOR POLK COUNTY

---

UPON THE PETITION OF	)	
	)	
DEEANN RAE JOHNSON,	)	CASE NO. DRCV37370
	)	
Petitioner (Plaintiff),	)	<b>MOTION TO CONTINUE OR ENTRY</b>
	)	<b>OF CRIMINAL COMPLAINT/PERJURY/</b>
AND CONCERNING	)	<b>EVIDENCE TO RETAIN/MAINTAIN</b>
	)	<b>VENUE WITHIN THE STATE OF IOWA</b>
RICHARD WILLIAM HOFFMANN, SR.	)	<b>AND DEMAND RE/INSTATEMENT</b>
	)	<b>OF ARREST WARRANTS FOR</b>
Respondent (Defendant)	)	<b>DEEANN RAE JOHNSON. ET AL.</b>
	)	

---

COMES NOW the Respondent, Richard William Hoffmann, Sr. of 4846 Timberline Drive, West Des Moines, Iowa 50265, with further evidence and LESS THAN 98 MINUTES to meet the minimum two (2) day notice, hereby prays this Court ALLOW the ENTRY of this CRIMINAL COMPLAINT -PERJURY as legal justification against Petitioner, DeeAnn Rae Johnson, of 1191 Winter Street NE, Salem, Oregon, 97301 to REINSTATE/ ISSUE ARREST WARRANT(S) for the criminal abduction of Morgan Elizabeth Johnson-Hoffmann and Noah Christian Johnson-Hoffmann that occurred at 7:35 PM CDT on June 9, 2014 from 1212 Southlawn Drive, Des Moines, Iowa 50315 from the involved SUSPECTs, DeeAnn Rae Johnson, et al. including but not limited to Anika L. Blum and Doug M. Blum of 413 Wintergreen Street NW, Ankeny, Iowa 50023; Deborah L. Eastwood of 4232 65<sup>th</sup> Street, Urbandale, Iowa 50322.

The above DEFENDANTS are accused of the crime of CHILD KIGNAPPING, in violation of Iowa Code Sections 710.1, *et seq.*, 710.4, 710.5 (Child Stealing)[two counts], and 710.6 (violation of a known State of Iowa Court Order),; as well as Child Endangerment 726.6(1)(a), 726()(d), 726.6(1)(f), and 726.6(7) of the Iowa Code, as well as knowingly KIDNAPPING and

CHILD STEALING and taking said children ACROSS STATE LINES in overt violation of your Respondent's substantive natural born, common law and constitutional rights in this matter; as that all DEFENDANTS on June 9, 2014 did in fact commit the acts and/or omissions against Respondent Richard William Hoffmann, Sr. and his unemancipated and incompetent minor children: "Morgan Elizabeth Rae Johnson-Hoffmann" and "Noah Christian Johnson-Hoffmann," who are the favored daughter and son of the State of Iowa.

NOTICE: That on a date certain of June 9, 2014, and at a time certain of approximately 7:35 PM CDT and at a place certain of the residence of KENNETH STONER (the Babysitter), located at: 1212 Southlawn Drive, Des Moines, Iowa, that one DEFENDANT ANIKA L. BLUM at the assistance of DEFENDANT DEBORAH L. EASTWOOD at the direction of DEFENDANT, DEEANN RAE JOHNSON, illegally kidnapped, carried away, and inveighed my minor children Morgan Elizabeth Rae Johnson-Hoffmann and Noah Christian Johnson-Hoffmann IN OVERT AND WILLFUL VIOLATION OF A KNOWN COURT ORDER ISSUING FROM THE IN THE IOWA DISTRICT COURT IN AND FOR POLK COUNTY, and in open and willful VIOLATIONS of Respondent, Richard William Hoffmann Sr. lawful authority, and in direct violation of his commands and over his continued objections. This crime was done with collusion of several other DEFENDANTS, whom carried away and willfully concealed the children, including DEFENDANT DOUG M. BLUM, and did not inform/obstructed any contact whatsoever by me, the Respondent of this matter of either the purpose or reason of the CHILD KIDNAPPING; of which aforesaid DEFENDANTS, in open, intentional, premeditated and willful collusions, violated your Respondent, Richard William Hoffmann Sr. natural born, common law and constitutional rights in this matter, and made aforesaid named DEFENDANTS **a law unto themselves**, in violation to both my secured rights, as well as my children's' rights, and in open violation of a KNOWN COURT ORDER.

Your Respondent, the greatly damaged and aggrieved party in this matter, incorporates by reference of the soon to be entered completed POLICE REPORT, in its entirety, along with its ancillary documents: its concomitant AFFIDAVIT OF TRUTH BY COMPLAINANT; DECLARATION OF PROBABLE CAUSE; BODY OF ATTACHMENT AND WARRANT FOR ARREST AGAINST DEFENDANTS: DEEANN RAE JOHNSON, Et Al., including DEBORAH L. EASTWOOD; ANIKA LEE BLUM, and DOUG M. BLUM. Your Respondent Richard William Hoffmann Sr. also incorporates by reference, the *supporting* DECLARATION OF TRUTH OF KENNETH STONER.

Your Respondent also incorporates by reference, and gives NOTICE OF RELATED CASES: within in THE IOWA DISTRICT COURT IN AND FOR POLK COUNTY, Case No.: DRCV37370; as well as the CIRCUIT COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON, FOR THE THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT, Case No.: 14C31598 and Case No.: 14C320321.

Please judicially note and place on the record that within the aforesaid CIRCUIT COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON, FOR THE THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT, Case No.: 14C31598 and Case No.: 14C320321 that Petitioner, Deeann Rae Johnson entered in that Court and placed overt and with fraudulent and willful PERJURY after-the-fact, after committing her crime of ILLEGALLY KIDNAPPING the children from their home, within the STATE OF IOWA, and sending them without PLAINTIFF'S KNOWLEDGE, and over and above-his continued objections and against his authority, sent them to the STATE OF OREGON, and with UNCLEAN HANDS, then knowingly entered PERJURED TESTIMONY (falsely giving illegal names of each unemancipated child from: Morgan Elizabeth Rae Johnson-Hoffmann, to MORGAN ELIZABETH JOHNSON, from Noah Christian Johnson-Hoffmann, to NOAH CHRISTIAN JOHNSON, and entering them before the OREGON Court, so that Court could unlawfully attempt to gain illegal jurisdiction from Petitioner Deeann Rae Johnson's crimes to illegally attempt to transfer

CUSTODY into her possession, in direct violation of law. [**See: EXHIBIT 1**] (Morgan Elizabeth Rae Johnson-**Hoffmann**) and **EXHIBIT 2** (Noah Christian Johnson-**Hoffmann**)] BIRTH CERTIFICATES (attached).

FACT: That the aforesaid CIRCUIT COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON, FOR THE THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT, case no.: 14C31598 and 14C320321 are factually without *in personam*, nor SUSPECT-matter jurisdiction, and any findings, recommendations, or Court orders, issuing from that Court; are in fact, NULL and VOID, upon the crimes and willful PERJURIES of all a forenamed DEFENDANTS and their surrogate Courts. Aforesaid findings, recommendations or Court orders of the Oregon Court are in fact, not just VOIDABLE, but VOID JUDGMENTS at law.

It is a FACT: that this above-entitled THE IOWA DISTRICT COURT IN AND FOR POLK COUNTY, is in fact, **the proper, and controlling venue and jurisdiction of this matter, as the crimes occurred within the County of Polk and City of Des Moines and City of West Des Moines, State of Iowa, concerning each child and their Father, who are State Citizens of the State of Iowa and no other.**

**THEREFORE**, for good and substantive cause shown, Complainant requests (upon change of purpose of said Hearing) entry of verification of VOID JUDGEMENTS and require DEFENDANTS' be SUSPECT to ARREST and BAIL CONDITIONS of release where applicable,

(1) That the ARREST WARRANT for DEFENDANT, Deeann Rae Johnson, [Let this record state evidence that the IOWA ARREST WARRANT appeared "Recalled" WITHOUT proper PROCESS and NOTICE] be REINSTATED WITHOUT DELAY for the immediate ARREST within the State of Iowa and/or the State of Oregon with the NO-BAIL



WARRANT, and/or that other lawful steps be taken to obtain Petitioner's appearances by way of extradition before the above-entitled Court by any means or conveyance; and,

(2) That immediately and UNCONDITIONALLY that the State of Iowa, compel any other harboring state, (most probably the State of Oregon) to formally, and immediately RETURN the state Citizens of the State of Iowa, the unemancipated children Morgan Elizabeth Rae Johnson-Hoffmann and Noah Christian Johnson-Hoffmann belonging to their Father Richard William Hoffmann Sr., **to be immediately RECOUPED and immediately RETURNED back to the State of Iowa, which is aforesaid children's home State and where they reside;** and,

(3) That each DEFENDANT in this matter be lawfully arrested and detained, upon the issue/re-instatement of ARREST WARRANT(S) and which will be supported by the entry of PROBABLE CAUSE against each co-Conspirator and DEFENDANT upon the supporting Declarations thereof, if already in custody, pending further CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS of this matter, and that aforesaid SUSPECTS' otherwise be properly dealt with in accordance with the concise rule of law.

(4) That this Court give your Respondent Richard William Hoffmann Sr. any other further remedy and/or relief that this Court deems fair, necessary and/or just.

Your Respondent Richard William Hoffmann Sr. wants it judicially noted and on the record, that each Defendant not only violated known STATE OF IOWA, but also FEDERAL LAWS, to wit:

- (1) Uniform Child-Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (1997), 9(1A) U.L.A. 657 (1999). The text is accessible online at [www.nccusl.org](http://www.nccusl.org).
- (2) Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction Act, 9(1A) U.L.A. 271 (1999).
- (3) Parental Kidnapping Prevention Act of 1980, 28 U.S.C. § 1738A.

(4) ASDF

(5) SADF

(6) Reference: The Hague Convention can be found at 51 Fed. Reg. 10,494 *et seq.* (1986) or online via the U.S. Department of State's Web site at [www.travel.state.gov](http://www.travel.state.gov), under "International Parental Child Abduction."

a.) International Child Abduction Remedies Act, 42 U.S.C. § 11601 *et seq.*

b.) As to OREGON'S ability to obey this state's law, and Plaintiff's fundamental rights, see: Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction Act, Prefatory Note. The Full Faith and Credit clause requires that full faith and credit "be given in each state to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other state" (U.S. Constitution,

c.) Please also judicially note and place on the record: 28 U.S.C. § 1738A, "Full Faith and Credit Given to Child Custody Determinations."

(7) 28 U.S.C. § 1738A(d). This section establishes the principle of "exclusive, continuing jurisdiction. (*i.e.* The State of Oregon cannot assume jurisdiction as original jurisdiction of the case, as well as the venue and jurisdiction of the crime is controlling throughout the State of Iowa).

That for good cause shown, that the PETTIONER, who is of CLEAN HANDS, and who had been NON-COMPLIANT with a known Court order, must invoke this Courts CRIMINAL JURISDICTION upon the CLAIMS made upon this CRIMINAL COMPLAINT and verification of VOID JUDGEMENTS in other Court(s) to justify the retention and maintenance of these Court proceedings within the "In Rem" jurisdiction of IN THE IOWA DISTRICT COURT IN AND FOR POLK COUNTY.

**AFFIDAVIT**

STATE OF IOWA

COUNTY OF POLK

} *Affirmed*

I, the undersigned, being duly sworn, state that following facts known to me as I have first-hand personal knowledge of the facts, evidence and events form the basis for my belief that the referenced DEFENDANTS/SUSPECTS' committed these crimes:

That on a date certain of June 9, 2014, and at a time certain of approximately 7:35 PM CDT and at a place certain of the residence of KENNETH STONER (the Babysitter), located at: 1212 Southlawn Drive, Des Moines, Iowa, that one Defendant ANIKA LEAH BLUM at the assistance of one Defendant DEBORAH L. EASTWOOD at the direction of Defendant DEEANN RAE JOHNSON, illegally kidnapped, carried away, and inveighed my minor children Morgan Elizabeth Rae Johnson-Hoffmann and Noah Christian Johnson-Hoffmann IN OVERT AND WILLFUL VIOLATION OF A KNOWN COURT ORDER ISSUING FROM THE IN THE IOWA DISTRICT COURT IN AND FOR POLK COUNTY, and in open and willful VIOLATIONS of Plaintiff Richard William Hoffmann Sr. lawful authority, and in direct violation of his commands and over his continued objections. This crime was done with collusion of several other DEFENDANTS, whom carried away and willfully concealed the children, and did not inform me, the Plaintiff of this matter of either the purpose or reason of the CHILD KIDNAPPING; of which aforesaid Defendants' in open, intentional, premeditated and willful collusions, violated your Plaintiff Richard William Hoffmann Sr. natural born, common law and constitutional rights in this matter, and made aforesaid named DEFENDANTS' a law unto themselves, in violation to both my secured rights, as well as my children's' rights, and in open violation of a KNOWN COURT ORDER.

That Defendant DEEANN RAE JOHNSON had aid and assistance from these other known Defendants:

- (1) DEEANN RAE JOHNSON; 1191 Winter Street NE, Salem, OR 97301  
Tel. 515-664-5959
- (2) DEBORAH L. EASTWOOD; 4232 65<sup>th</sup> St., Urbandale, IA 50322  
Tel. 309-269-3089
- (3) ANIKA LEE BLUM; located at: 413 NW Wintergreen St., Ankeny, IA 50023  
Tel. 515-371-4055
- (4) DOUG M. BLUM; located at: (same as above)  
Tel. 309-269-3089/515-963-8568

Dated: February 19, 2015

Richard William Hoffmann  
4846 Timberline Drive  
West Des Moines, IA 50265

**VERIFICATION**

County of Polk

}

.SS

State of Iowa

I, Richard William Hoffmann Sr., being the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury as follows:

That the afore-going Document(s), Affidavit(s), Declaration(s), and/or Materials, Id., including referenced and/or attached documents, and/or duplicates of such documents are exacting copies of the originals in my/or my counsel's (specifically not American Bar Association, or professional "Attorney's") possession. That I have read the foregoing document(s) and attachments, and know and understand their contents, and having personal knowledge, know them to be true. As to those matters submitted therein upon information and/or belief, as to those matters, I also believe them true.

Executed this February 19, 2015 in the Year of Our Lord and Savior, Jesus the Christ, year Two-Thousand-Fifteen.

DATED: February 19, 2015

Richard William Hoffmann  
4846 Timberline Drive  
West Des Moines, IA 50265  
Tel. 515-441-9569

**SUBSCRIPTION**

Subscribed this February 19, 2015, under exigent circumstances, before Almighty God, in the Year of Our Lord and Savior, Jesus the Christ, year Two-Thousand-Fifteen.

DATED: February 19, 2015

SEAL:

Richard William Hoffmann, At Law  
Reserving All Rights, Giving Up None

From: Richard W. Hoffmann, Sr.  
5941 Vista Drive, Suite #436  
West Des Moines, Iowa 50266  
(515) 441-9569 Cell/Text  
(563) 594-5233 Facsimile

Date: September 22, 2014

To: CalPERS  
Attn: 2014 Open Enrollment – Medical, Dental, and Vision ADDITIONS  
800.959.6545 Facsimile

Re: Request to ADD My Two (2) Children: **Morgan Elizabeth Johnson-Hoffmann (9)**  
**Noah Christian Johnson-Hoffmann (7)**

Dear 2014 Open-Enrollment Personnel,

Please find included in this facsimile the following:

- A copy of my Iowa Commercial Driver License #291AE8386 w/ D.O.B. of April 4, 1961
- My Social Security Number: 545-08-5033
- A copy of my BlueCross/BlueShield Insurance Card
- Copy of both children's Birth Certificates
- Morgan Elizabeth Johnson-Hoffmann born 9/13/2005      **SSN: 602-57-3713**
- Noah Christian Johnson-Hoffmann born 10/05/2006      **SSN: 621-59-2531**

Please both children ASAP as I am getting full custody of both in the weeks ahead. I need this done effective November 1, 2014.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard William Hoffmann, Sr.

RWH  
Attachments (3)



BlueCross  
BlueShield



PERS  
Choice  
Basic


**RICHARD W HOFFMANN**  
Identification Number  
CPRR251A23489

Group No: CB040A  
Plan Code: 040  
Coverage(s): Medical

PPO Otc Visit Copay \$20  
RxBIN 004336  
RxPCN ADV  
RxGroup RX5707  
See EOC for Benefit Specifics




Rev 07/25/2011  
CLASS: B-Veh w/28001 GCHR or more towed unit is less than 10001  
GVWR  
ENDORSEMENTS: N-Tank Vehicle, P-Passenger, S-School Bus  
RESTRICTIONS:



04/04/1981

**IOWA**  
COMMERCIAL DRIVER LICENSE  
USA IA



**RICHARD WILLIAM HOFFMANN**  
5941 VISTA DR APT 436  
WEST DES MOINES, IA 50266

DL No. 291AE8386  
ISS 04/02/2014  
Class B  
Restrictions NONE  
EXP 04/04/2019  
Sex M  
Hgt 5'04"  
Eyes BLU  
DONOR Y

DOB 04/04/1961  
DD 679446661HR1555M040419R

CERTIFICATION OF VITAL RECORD

OFFICE OF THE CLERK-RECORDER  
COUNTY OF PLACER  
AUBURN, CALIFORNIA

CERTIFICATE OF LIVE BIRTH  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

1200531002197

STATE FILE NUMBER

USE BLACK INK ONLY

LOCAL REGISTRATION DISTRICT AND CERTIFICATE NUMBER

THIS CHILD	1A. NAME OF CHILD -- FIRST (GIVEN) <b>MORGAN</b>		1B. MIDDLE <b>ELIZABETH RAE</b>		1C. LAST (FAMILY) <b>JOHNSON-HOFFMANN</b>	
	2. SEX <b>FEMALE</b>	3A. THIS BIRTH, SINGLE, TWIN, ETC. <b>SINGLE</b>	3B. IF MULTIPLE, THIS CHILD -- 1ST, 2ND, ETC.	4A. DATE OF BIRTH -- MM/DD/CCYY <b>09/13/2005</b>		4B. HOUR -- (24 HOUR CLOCK TIME) <b>0916</b>
PLACE OF BIRTH	5A. PLACE OF BIRTH -- NAME OF HOSPITAL OR FACILITY <b>SUTTER ROSEVILLE MEDICAL CTR</b>			5B. STREET ADDRESS -- STREET, NUMBER, OR LOCATION <b>ONE MEDICAL PLAZA</b>		
	5C. CITY <b>ROSEVILLE</b>			5D. COUNTY <b>PLACER</b>		5E. PLANNED PLACE OF BIRTH <b>HOSPITAL</b>
FATHER OF CHILD	6A. NAME OF FATHER -- FIRST (GIVEN) <b>RICHARD</b>		6B. MIDDLE <b>WILLIAM</b>	6C. LAST (FAMILY) <b>HOFFMANN</b>		7. STATE OF BIRTH <b>CA</b>
MOTHER OF CHILD	9A. NAME OF MOTHER -- FIRST (GIVEN) <b>DEEANN</b>		9B. MIDDLE <b>RAE</b>	9C. LAST (MAIDEN) <b>JOHNSON</b>		10. STATE OF BIRTH <b>ND</b>
INFORMANT CERTIFICATION	I CERTIFY THAT I HAVE REVIEWED THE STATED INFORMATION AND THAT IT IS TRUE AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE.		12A. PARENT OR OTHER INFORMANT -- SIGNATURE <i>[Signature]</i>		12B. RELATIONSHIP TO CHILD <b>MOTHER</b>	
	12C. DATE SIGNED <b>09/14/2005</b>		13A. ATTENDANT OR CERTIFIER -- SIGNATURE -- DEGREE OR TITLE <i>Dalia Morales</i>		13B. LICENSE NUMBER <b>A80039</b>	
CERTIFICATION OF BIRTH	I CERTIFY THAT THE CHILD WAS BORN ALIVE AT THE DATE, HOUR AND PLACE STATED.		13C. DATE SIGNED <b>09/14/2005</b>		14. TYPED NAME AND TITLE OF CERTIFIER IF OTHER THAN ATTENDANT <b>DALIA MORALES, B.C. CLERK</b>	
	13D. TYPED NAME, TITLE AND MAILING ADDRESS OF ATTENDANT <b>JACQUELINE HO, MD, 2 MEDICAL PLAZA, ROSEVILLE</b>					
LOCAL REGISTRAR	15A. DATE OF DEATH		15B. STATE FILE NO. (STATE USE ONLY)		16. LOCAL REGISTRAR -- SIGNATURE <i>[Signature]</i>	
	17. DATE ACCEPTED FOR REGISTRATION <b>09/23/2005</b>					

CERTIFIED COPY OF VITAL RECORDS  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF PLACER



This is a true and exact reproduction of the document officially registered and placed on file in the office of the Placer County Clerk-Recorder.


DATE ISSUED

09/02/2014

*Jim McCauley*  
JIM McCAULEY  
PLACER COUNTY CLERK-RECORDER

This copy is not valid unless prepared on an engraved border displaying the date, seal and signature of the Clerk-Recorder.

ANY ALTERATION OR ERASURE VOIDS THIS CERTIFICATE



CERTIFICATION OF VITAL RECORD

OFFICE OF THE CLERK-RECORDER  
COUNTY OF PLACER  
AUBURN, CALIFORNIA

CERTIFICATE OF LIVE BIRTH 1200631002595  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

STATE FILE NUMBER		USE BLACK INK ONLY				LOCAL REGISTRATION DISTRICT AND CERTIFICATE NUMBER	
THIS CHILD	1A. NAME OF CHILD — FIRST (GIVEN) NOAH		1B. MIDDLE CHRISTIAN		1C. LAST (FAMILY) JOHNSON-HOFFMANN		
	2. SEX MALE	3A. THIS BIRTH, SINGLE TWIN, ETC. SINGLE	3B. IF MULTIPLE, THIS CHILD 1ST, 2ND, ETC. -	4A. DATE OF BIRTH — MM/DD/CCYY 10/05/2006		4B. HOUR — (24 HOUR CLOCK TIME) 1517	
PLACE OF BIRTH	5A. PLACE OF BIRTH — NAME OF HOSPITAL OR FACILITY SUTTER ROSEVILLE MEDICAL CTR			5B. STREET ADDRESS — STREET, NUMBER, OR LOCATION ONE MEDICAL PLAZA			
	5C. CITY ROSEVILLE			5D. COUNTY PLACER		5E. PLANNED PLACE OF BIRTH HOSPITAL	
FATHER OF CHILD	6A. NAME OF FATHER — FIRST (GIVEN) RICHARD		6B. MIDDLE WILLIAM		6C. LAST (FAMILY) HOFFMANN		7. STATE OF BIRTH CA
MOTHER OF CHILD	9A. NAME OF MOTHER — FIRST (GIVEN) DEEANN		9B. MIDDLE RAE		9C. LAST (MAIDEN) JOHNSON		10. STATE OF BIRTH ND 11. DATE OF BIRTH 07/04/1969
INFORMANT CERTIFICATION	1. I CERTIFY THAT I HAVE REVIEWED THE STATED INFORMATION AND THAT IT IS TRUE AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE		12A. PARENT OR OTHER INFORMANT — SIGNATURE <i>Richard Hoffmann</i>			12B. RELATIONSHIP TO CHILD MOTHER	
	12C. DATE SIGNED 10/06/2006		1. I CERTIFY THAT THE CHILD WAS BORN ALIVE AT THE DATE, HOUR AND PLACE STATED			13A. ATTENDANT OR CERTIFIER — SIGNATURE, DEGREE, OR TITLE <i>Jan Fleischmann, B.C. Clerk</i>	
CERTIFICATION OF BIRTH	13B. LICENSE NUMBER A80039			13C. DATE SIGNED 10/06/2006		14. TYPED NAME AND TITLE OF CERTIFIER IF OTHER THAN ATTENDANT JAN FLEISCHMANN, B.C. CLERK	
	13D. TYPED NAME, TITLE AND MAILING ADDRESS OF ATTENDANT JACQUELINE HO, MD, 2 MEDICAL PLAZA, ROSEVILLE			15A. DATE OF DEATH			
LOCAL REGISTRAR	15B. STATE FILE NO. (STATE USE ONLY)		16. LOCAL REGISTRAR — SIGNATURE RICHARD J. BURTON, M.D.			17. DATE ACCEPTED FOR REGISTRATION 10/18/2006	

CERTIFIED COPY OF VITAL RECORDS  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF PLACER



This is a true and exact reproduction of the document officially registered and placed on file in the office of the Placer County Clerk-Recorder.


DATE ISSUED

09/02/2014

*Jim McCauley*  
JIM MCCAULEY  
PLACER COUNTY CLERK-RECORDER

This copy is not valid unless prepared on an engraved border displaying the date, seal and signature of the Clerk-Recorder.

ANY ALTERATION OR ERASURE VOIDS THIS CERTIFICATE





**RECORD IMPOUNDED**

NOT FOR PUBLICATION WITHOUT THE  
APPROVAL OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY  
APPELLATE DIVISION  
DOCKET NO. A-5349-12T4

I.O.,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

M.C.,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

Argued May 21, 2014 – Decided September 2, 2014

Before Judges Grall, Waugh, and Accurso.

On appeal from the Superior Court of New Jersey, Chancery Division, Family Part, Union County, Docket No. FD-20-1488-05.

Theodore Sliwinski argued the cause for appellant.

Steven M. Resnick argued the cause for respondent (Budd Larner, P.C., attorneys; Mr. Resnick, on the brief).

PER CURIAM

Defendant M.C. (Mary)<sup>1</sup> appeals the Family Part's June 28, 2013 order transferring legal and residential custody of the parties' son, M.J.C.O. (Mark), to his father, plaintiff I.O.

---

<sup>1</sup> We use pseudonyms for the purposes of confidentiality and clarity.

(Ian), and temporarily restricting her to one hour of supervised parenting time per week. Following oral argument in this case, we entered an order of partial remand to allow the Family Part the opportunity to manage the issue of parenting time in light of Mary's pending evaluation by a psychologist.<sup>2</sup> We now affirm.

I.

We discern the following facts and procedural history from the record on appeal.

After his parents had been dating for a few years, Mark was born in December 2003. According to Ian, from the time of Mark's birth, he and Mary had regular disagreements with respect to his role in Mark's life. He asserts that she took the position that he should not participate in Mark's life, as a result of which Mary sought to control all decisions regarding Mark without consulting him.

In February 2005, Ian made an application to determine custody and child support, in part because Mary would not allow him to have parenting time with Mark. In April, Ian and Mary entered into a consent order that included a parenting schedule and an agreement to attend family counseling. According to Ian, Mary began to disregard the agreed-upon schedule shortly after

---

<sup>2</sup> We have requested and received copies of orders entered following the remand, along with emails from counsel, but have not considered them substantively in deciding this appeal.

she consented to it. As a result, the first Family Part judge assigned to this case entered an August 16 order appointing Marcy Pasternak, Psy. D., as parenting coordinator.

Ian then alleged that Mary failed to cooperate with Pasternak, and "wouldn't answer [her] questions." He described Mary's demeanor at their meetings as "indignant" and claimed that Mary would scream and, on one occasion, became so violent that Pasternak had to restrain her. During that period, Mary enrolled Mark in preschools without Ian's knowledge. Ian also learned that Mary had done so using her surname instead of Mark's full legal name. Mark's surname, C.O., which was on his birth certificate, included the surnames of both parents.

In July 2006, Ian filed a motion seeking enforcement of the previously ordered parenting time and the requirement that Mary attend the parenting sessions with Pasternak. In September, Ian and Mary entered into a consent order in which they agreed that Mathias R. Hagovsky, Ph.D., would conduct a best interests evaluation. Mary also agreed to appear at appointments with Pasternak.

Ian filed another motion on September 26. Ian's primary request was for an order requiring Mary to comply with previous court orders related to parenting time and parenting coordination. The judge entered an order on December 28,

reiterating the requirement that Mary attend sessions with Pasternak and comply with her recommendations. The order also warned Mary that if she failed to cooperate with Ian, the judge might appoint a guardian ad litem to resolve the parties' differences.

Hagovsky completed his best interests evaluation and issued a report in March 2007. He described Mary's "commitment to Mark" as "very proprietary." He opined that Mary "espouses a child-focused philosophy, she appears to express her understanding of the application of this approach in terms only of her best judgment as to what is in the child's best interests, minimizing [Ian's] involvement as a result." Hagovsky concluded that "the key to unlocking this terrible contentiousness lies with [Mary] who . . . would greatly benefit from a priority shift in her understanding of the importance of [Mark's] father in his life." Hagovsky recommended that the parties continue to seek Pasternak's help as a parent coordinator.

In May and June,<sup>3</sup> the judge held an evidentiary hearing during which he observed that he had "serious problems" with Mary's credibility. He also noted her "misguided" belief that

---

<sup>3</sup> A subsequent judge's decision states that the 2007 hearing occurred over at least two days in May and June. Mary supplied only one transcript, from June 7, 2007.

she was the only person who took Mark's best interests into account, which he concluded contributed to her refusal to listen to recommendations from Pasternak and Hagovsky. The judge cautioned Mary to use Mark's full legal name, stating that it "clearly reflects a lack of concern for the child's interest, that if acts like that continue you very well could lose custody of your child." The judge entered an order on June 28, providing, among other things, that Pasternak remain parenting coordinator, that the parties confer to select a preschool for Mark, and that they use Mark's full legal name.

An August 13 report completed by Pasternack notes that Ian and Mary could not agree on the preschool. Although Ian consented to Mary's second choice, Mary nevertheless raised objections to enrolling Mark in that school. Pasternak recommended that the parties enroll Mark there because it was the only school on which Ian and Mary could reach some level of agreement. On August 21, Ian sought an order to show cause because Mary refused to enroll Mark in the preschool. In an order dated January 2, 2008, the judge required Mary to pay a portion of Ian's counsel fees as a sanction. Mark was eventually enrolled at the preschool.

Following a conference in October 2008, the second Family Part judge assigned to handle the case entered a consent order

in January 2009. The parties agreed to a parenting time schedule proposed by Hagovsky and to continue to seek assistance from Pasternak. On May 13, however, Pasternak resigned as parenting coordinator. She explained that, "[b]ased upon [Mary]'s statement that she will not speak to [Ian] and my observations that confirm her statement, I have concluded that Parenting Coordination is not a useful process for them."

Ian filed a motion in July 2010 seeking enforcement of the prior orders, including attendance at meetings with a parenting coordinator and use of Mark's full name. Following a hearing, the judge entered a consent order on September 28. The parties agreed to the appointment of Ann Ordway, a member of the New Jersey bar, as the new parenting coordinator. They also agreed to use Mark's full legal name on "all official school records and other formal documents." In a separate order entered the same day, Ian and Mary stipulated that Ian would be responsible for two-thirds of Ordway's fees and that Mary would pay the other one-third. The fees were to be paid within fourteen days of Ian and Mary's receipt of Ordway's retainer agreement. However, Mary delayed payment of her portion of Ordway's fee. She then informed Ian that their meeting with Ordway would have to be postponed unless Ian paid her share of the fees.

As a result, Ian filed a motion to enforce the order requiring Mary to pay her share of the cost of parent coordination. Oral argument was held on January 31, 2011. Mary claimed that she could not afford to pay the fee. The judge disagreed. He found that, because Mary's income was over \$100,000 a year, she could afford to pay Ordway. The judge described Mary as "combative" and "disrespectful" to him. He noted that Mary demonstrated "bad faith" in claiming to lack the funds to pay Ordway. He also expressed concern that she would not comply with his order that she pay her portion of Ordway's fee. The judge entered an order the same day determining that Mary was in violation of the September 28, 2010 order. Mary was ordered to pay her share of Ordway's retainer within fourteen days. The judge further ordered that Mary pay a sanction of \$100 for each day she failed to comply.

Mary filed a motion for reconsideration. The judge held oral argument in March 2011, and denied the motion. In assessing whether to order Mary to pay Ian's attorneys' fees, the judge observed that she "manifested significant bad faith through the parties' litigation to date by intentional non-compliance with court orders [and] voluntary agreements." The judge entered an order denying reconsideration and reiterated Mary's obligation to submit her portion of Ordway's fees. When

Mary continued her refusal to pay Ordway's retainer, Ian paid her share "to facilitate the process."

On July 21, Ordway sent a letter to the judge, outlining the difficulties she faced in scheduling an appointment with the parties. She specified that Ian "has been cooperative and flexible with regard to scheduling appointment dates. It has been very difficult to secure a return call from [Mary,] and when she does return the call, the dates proposed have not been good for her." Ordway also provided the judge with recommendations concerning parenting problems, which she suggested that the judge order the parties to follow.

The parties appeared in court again on October 31. The judge adopted Ordway's suggestions and included them in the resulting order, filed the same day. In reaching his decision, the judge observed that Mary "has been uncooperative in the parent coordination process, with respect to scheduling and attending parenting coordination sessions, and in failing to cooperate with Ms. Ordway's recommendation, [with which] she does not agree." The judge found that Mary's "lack of flexibility continues to have a substantial effect on [Ian's] parenting time and the best interest of the child." He also noted Mary's continuing belief that "she is the one who knows what is in the best interest of [Mark]."



In December, Ian sought an order changing custody, based on allegations that one of Mary's relatives choked Mark during the Thanksgiving holiday. In a December 7 order, the judge denied Ian's request for an immediate change. The order provided that the parties were to complete custody evaluations and attend scheduled parenting coordination sessions with Ordway. The judge scheduled a plenary hearing, to be preceded by discovery.

While on vacation with Mark, Ian learned for the first time that he had received his first holy communion in April 2012 and that only Mary's surname was used at that time. According to Ian, Mark informed him that Mary had instructed him not to tell his father he had received first communion. Ian later discovered that Mary had enrolled Mark in religious classes without his knowledge and using only her surname.

The plenary hearing was held on August 23. At the hearing, when discussing Mary's unilateral decision to have Mark receive first communion without involving Ian, the judge characterized Mary's actions as

a clear example of her willful exclusion of [Ian] from significant milestones in [Mark's] life, an event that [Ian], as a practicing Catholic, has certified is extremely significant to him and cannot be recreated. And it's also a clear example of her repeated violation of court orders, which she blatantly disregards.

In an order entered the same day, the judge denied Ian's request for an immediate transfer of custody, but ordered that the parties were to share joint legal and residential custody of Mark on a pendente lite basis, pending another plenary hearing.

The second plenary hearing was held before a third Family Part judge over eleven days from January 18 to May 23, 2013.<sup>4</sup> Ian and Mary each testified on their own behalf. William Campagna, Ph.D, who conducted a parenting evaluation prior to the hearing, provided testimony on behalf of Ian. Ian also called Ordway to testify. Lisa Tomasini, Ph.D., testified on behalf of Mary. Mary called six additional witnesses, including Mark's second and third grade teachers. The judge interviewed Mark in camera.<sup>5</sup> Mark expressed no preference with respect to residential custody.

On June 28, the trial judge placed a brief oral decision on the record, with both Ian and Mary present. The judge "ordered that [Ian] shall have sole legal and residential custody of [Mark]," and that "[Mary] shall have court supervised parenting time with the child to start on July 13th, 2013 at 9:30 a.m. at

---

<sup>4</sup> Mary represented herself at the hearing.

<sup>5</sup> The transcript of the interview was not submitted as part of the appeal.

Cooperative Counseling." The same day, the judge issued a written decision.

The trial judge found that Ian had proven changed circumstances that were detrimental to Mark's best interests, warranting a transfer of custody. Those circumstances included Mary's consistent non-compliance with court orders regarding parenting time, parenting coordination, and matters related to the use of Mark's full legal name in official documents.

The judge analyzed the applicable factors in N.J.S.A. 9:2-4 prior to arriving at his decision to transfer custody. Based on the expert testimony, he determined that Mary's continued non-compliance with court orders demonstrated a refusal to co-parent and agree on matters related to Mark. He found that Mary's insistence on not using Mark's full legal name created a stressor and an internal identity conflict that caused mental and emotional harm to the child.

This appeal followed. We denied Mary's several emergent applications for a stay and other interim relief.

## II.

On appeal, Mary argues that the trial judge erred in transferring sole custody to Ian because he failed to apply the appropriate legal considerations and abused his discretion by effectuating a complete change of custody and strictly limiting

her parenting time based on the record developed at the plenary hearing. She also contends that the judge's findings of fact are erroneous.

A.

We ordinarily accord great deference to the discretionary decisions of Family Part judges. Donnelly v. Donnelly, 405 N.J. Super. 117, 127 (App. Div. 2009) (citing Larbig v. Larbig, 384 N.J. Super. 17, 21 (App. Div. 2006)). Similar deference is accorded to the factual findings of those judges following an evidentiary hearing. Cesare v. Cesare, 154 N.J. 394, 411-12 (1998). Finally, a judge's purely legal decisions are subject to our plenary review. Crespo v. Crespo, 395 N.J. Super. 190, 194 (App. Div. 2007) (quoting Manalapan Realty, L.P. v. Twp. Comm. of Manalapan, 140 N.J. 366, 378 (1995)); Lobiondo v. O'Callaghan, 357 N.J. Super. 488, 495 (App. Div.), certif. denied, 177 N.J. 224 (2003).

A party who seeks modification of a judgment or order regarding custody or visitation "must meet the burden of showing changed circumstances and that the agreement is [no longer] in the best interests of the child." Abouzahr v. Matera-Abouzahr, 361 N.J. Super. 135, 152 (App. Div.), certif. denied, 178 N.J. 34 (2003); see also Finamore v. Aronson, 382 N.J. Super. 514, 522-23 (App. Div. 2006). The issue is "two-fold and

sequential." Faucett v. Vasquez, 411 N.J. Super. 108, 127 (App. Div. 2009), certif. denied, 203 N.J. 435 (2010). The party seeking the modification "must first make a prima facie showing . . . that a genuine issue of fact exists bearing upon a critical question such as the best interests of the child[] . . . . Once a prima facie showing is made, [the party] is entitled to a plenary hearing to resolve the disputed facts." Id. at 127-28 (first three alterations in original) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted).

The Legislature has found and declared that it is "the public policy of this State to assure minor children of frequent and continuing contact with both parents . . . . and that it is in the public interest to encourage parents to share the rights and responsibilities of child rearing in order to effect this policy." N.J.S.A. 9:2-4. Both parents have a fundamental right to "the custody, care and nurturing of their child[]." Watkins v. Nelson, 163 N.J. 235, 245 (2000) (quoting In re D.T., 200 N.J. Super. 171, 176 (App. Div. 1985)). Because neither has a right that is superior to the other, "the sole benchmark" to a determination of their parenting arrangements "is the best interests of the child," Sacharow v. Sacharow, 177 N.J. 62, 79-80 (2003), that is, what will protect the "safety, happiness, physical, mental and moral welfare of the child," Beck v. Beck,

86 N.J. 480, 497 (1981) (quoting Fantony v. Fantony, 21 N.J. 525, 536 (1956)) (internal quotation marks omitted). The child's best interests are controlling "no matter what the parties have agreed to." P.T. v. M.S., 325 N.J. Super. 193, 215 (App. Div. 1999) (quoting Giangeruso v. Giangeruso, 310 N.J. Super. 476, 479 (Ch. Div. 1997)) (internal quotation mark omitted).

Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 9:2-4, a judge determining custody shall consider the following factors:

the parents' ability to agree, communicate and cooperate in matters relating to the child; the parents' willingness to accept custody and any history of unwillingness to allow parenting time not based on substantiated abuse; the interaction and relationship of the child with its parents and siblings; the history of domestic violence, if any; the safety of the child and the safety of either parent from physical abuse by the other parent; the preference of the child when of sufficient age and capacity to reason so as to form an intelligent decision; the needs of the child; the stability of the home environment offered; the quality and continuity of the child's education; the fitness of the parents; the geographical proximity of the parents' homes; the extent and quality of the time spent with the child prior to or subsequent to the separation; the parents' employment responsibilities; and the age and number of the children. A parent shall not be deemed unfit unless the parents' conduct has a substantial adverse effect on the child.

"The age of the child certainly affects the quantum of weight that his or her preference should be accorded." Lavene v. Lavene, 148 N.J. Super. 267, 272 (App. Div.), certif. denied, 75 N.J. 28 (1977). However,

"[a] trial judge is not bound by a young child's preference to live with one parent over the other." The judge is only required to give "due weight to the child's preference;" the preference is a factor which the judge should consider along with all of the other relevant factors. Thus, stated preferences are not conclusive but must be considered in applications for modification.

[Ali v. Ali, 279 N.J. Super. 154, 169 (Ch. Div. 1994) (quoting W.W. v. I.M., 231 N.J. Super. 495, 511 (App. Div. 1989), appeal dismissed, 121 N.J. 630 (1990))].

See also Sheehan v. Sheehan, 51 N.J. Super. 276, 291 (App. Div.), certif. denied, 28 N.J. 147 (1958); Boerger v. Boerger, 26 N.J. Super. 90, 103 (Ch. Div. 1953). Courts should also evaluate the "'character, condition, habits and other surroundings' of the parents in considering their fitness and the welfare of the children." Sheehan, supra, 51 N.J. Super. at 291 (quoting Clemens v. Clemens, 20 N.J. Super. 383, 392 (App. Div. 1952)).

B.

The trial judge determined that Ian was "a very credible witness" and "sincere" in "hop[ing] that the parenting

coordination process would help facilitate the ability of the parties to co-parent." He found Campagna's expert testimony to be "very credible" and also characterized Ordway as "credible." In contrast, the judge found Mary's "testimony to lack credibility." He also determined that Tomasini's "findings appear to be based on flawed facts," including her understanding that any "past transgressions by [Mary] with respect to parenting issues . . . were 'overwhelmingly corrected.'"

The judge provided a careful explanation of his reasons in determining credibility, which finds ample support in the record. His findings of fact based on his view of the credibility of the witnesses also find ample support in the record. The Supreme Court has held that

The general rule is that findings by the trial court are binding on appeal when supported by adequate, substantial, credible evidence. Rova Farms Resort, Inc. v. Investors Ins. Co., 65 N.J. 474, 484 (1974). Deference is especially appropriate "when the evidence is largely testimonial and involves questions of credibility." In re Return of Weapons to J.W.D., 149 N.J. 108, 117 (1997). Because a trial court "'hears the case, sees and observes the witnesses, [and] hears them testify,' it has a better perspective than a reviewing court in evaluating the veracity of witnesses." Pascale v. Pascale, 113 N.J. 20, 33 (1988) (quoting Gallo v. Gallo, 66 N.J. Super. 1, 5 (App. Div. 1961)) (alterations in original). Therefore, an appellate court should not disturb the "factual findings and legal conclusions of the trial judge unless [it



is] convinced that they are so manifestly unsupported by or inconsistent with the competent, relevant and reasonably credible evidence as to offend the interests of justice." Rova Farms, supra, 65 N.J. at 484. The appellate court should "exercise its original fact finding jurisdiction sparingly and in none but a clear case where there is no doubt about the matter." Ibid.

[Cesare, supra, 154 N.J. at 411-12 (alterations in original).]

Because the judge's credibility determinations and findings of fact are well supported in the record, we will not disturb them on appeal.

Having carefully reviewed the facts found by the trial judge in the light of the record and applicable law, we affirm the June 28, 2013 order transferring sole custody to Ian essentially for the reasons expressed by Judge Mark P. Ciarrocca in his thorough and thoughtful written opinion. We add only the following.

The trial judge provided detailed, fact-based reasons for the exercise of his discretion to change custody. It is clear from the record and the judge's findings that, as of the time of the 2013 plenary hearing, Mary was unwilling, and perhaps psychologically incapable, of engaging in co-parenting in any meaningful fashion. She was given many opportunities to comply with the numerous orders entered in this case, beginning in 2005. We note that many of them were consent orders, with which

she failed to comply not long after they were entered. Mary consistently refused to cooperate with the professionals appointed to help resolve parenting issues and regularly acted as if there were no court orders. Mary's conduct and her belief that only she should be involved in parenting Mark, in addition to being contemptuous of numerous court orders, is inconsistent with New Jersey's strong policy "to assure minor children of frequent and continuing contact with both parents" and "to encourage parents to share the rights and responsibilities of child rearing in order to effect this policy." N.J.S.A. 9:2-4.

The change in custody at issue here followed years of concerted, but unsuccessful efforts by two prior judges to maintain residential custody with Mary, as long as Mark's and Ian's individual rights to meaningful co-parenting were respected. We find it significant that Judge Ciarrocca's views of Mary's conduct and credibility were consistent with those of his predecessors. Mary was advised of the potential for such a change as early as 2007, but her subsequent conduct showed little, if any, signs of real improvement.

A change in custody, of course, is not an appropriate sanction merely for a parent's failure to comply with court orders. See Nehra v. Uhlar, 168 N.J. Super. 187, 194 (App.

Div.), certif. denied, 81 N.J. 413 (1979). It must be based on the best interests of the child. Sacharow, supra, 177 N.J. at 80; Beck, supra, 86 N.J. at 497; Abouzahr, supra, 361 N.J. Super. at 152. In that regard, the trial judge focused on Mary's behavior in depriving Mark of parenting time with his father, which New Jersey law seeks to foster.

Relying on Campagna's testimony, the judge pointed to (1) the risk caused by Mary's inability to allow "separation and individuation" between herself and Mark, (2) Mary's inability to set boundaries for Mark, such as allowing him to play age-inappropriate video games in contrast to Ian willingness to establish and enforce appropriate rules, (3) Mary's actions, such as her insistence that Mark not use his father's surname and enrolling him in religious education classes resulting in the first communion, without notifying or involving Ian, which the judge determined was "an incredible stressor" for Mark, and (4) Mary's focus on joint activities revolving around her and her limitation of activities in which Mark was involved with others.

The judge determined that, in contrast to Mary's efforts to exclude Ian from Mark's life, Ian would "make genuine efforts to include [Mary] in [Mark's] life so that he can continue to have a close relationship with his mother." The judge thus

determined that the change in custody was "the only way to allow decisions for the child to be made in a manner which is least stressful and the best interest of this child." We are satisfied that the record and applicable law support that conclusion and the judge's exercise of discretion in making the change.

With respect to Mary's restricted parenting time, we observe that the judge ordered a psychological evaluation, after which he anticipated further proceedings to evaluate the report and establish "a comprehensive parenting time plan." That aspect of the June 28, 2013 order was clearly interlocutory and not appealable as of right. Because it was an interim exercise of discretion, we will not interfere, especially because the judge was clearly hoping to expand Mary's parenting time in the future. Doing so should be done on a priority basis, assuming of course, appropriate cooperation from Mary.

For too long, Mary promised cooperation by agreeing to consent orders, but those promises proved to be hollow. Mary has the opportunity to cooperate with the court and the professionals to establish a parenting plan that will allow her significant parenting time with Mark. She must demonstrate that real cooperation will be forthcoming.

The goal is "to assure [Mark] frequent and continuing contact with both parents." N.J.S.A. 9:2-4. However, that goal can only be achieved if both parents, but especially Mary, understand that "both parents have a fundamental right to the care and nurturing of their children . . . . and neither has a preeminent right over the other." Sacharow, supra, 177 N.J. at 79. The overarching responsibility of the Family Part is to do what will protect the "safety, happiness, physical, mental and moral welfare of the child." Beck, supra, 86 N.J. at 497 (citation and internal quotation marks omitted).

Affirmed.

I hereby certify that the foregoing  
is a true copy of the original on  
file in my office.



CLERK OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION

IN THE IOWA DISTRICT COURT IN AND FOR POLK COUNTY

UPON THE PETITION OF	)	CASE NO. DRCV37370
	)	
DEEANN RAE JOHNSON,	)	<b>APPEAL/OBJECTION TO DECISION</b>
	)	<b>AND DENIED ENTRANCE OF SAID</b>
Petitioner,	)	<b>EVIDENCE OF FELONY EXTORTION,</b>
	)	<b>FELONY DISTRIBUTION AND</b>
AND CONCERNING	)	<b>ACCEPTANCE OF BRIBES, FELONY</b>
	)	<b>KIDNAPPING AND IMPRISONMENT,</b>
RICHARD WILLIAM HOFFMANN, SR.	)	<b>FELONY TRANSPORTATION OF</b>
	)	<b>CHILDREN OVER STATE LINES,</b>
Respondent	)	<b>AND FELONY CONSPIRACY AND</b>
	)	<b>DEATH THREATS TO RESPONDENT</b>

COMES NOW the Respondent, Richard William Hoffmann, Sr. of 1404 Lincoln Avenue, Harlan, Iowa 51537, hereby enters this NOTICE OF APPEAL to the charades (alleged Court hearings) in both Oregon and now Iowa.

Let it hereby be known that had I appeared, either personally or telephonically, the end result, IF I WASN'T EXECUTED "EXECUTION STYLE" TO SAVE THE PRECIOUS CAREERS OF THE CONNECTED JUDGES and CONNECTED alleged attorneys, Et Al., referred herein, that most certainly, upon our Lord GOD as my CREATOR's witness and clear message to the Respondent, that the following most certainly have occurred (PAST-TENSE)!

1. As I learned from Kenneth Stoner, Tyler James Johnson, the Petitioner's biological son who she ABANDONED in Iowa with Mr. Stoner so she could have HER LIFE, most certainly would have COMMITTED SUICIDE as he threatened in the days that followed the REALITY the Petitioner was going to be arrested for the FELONY PERJURIES, FELONY KIDNAPPING, FELONY

IMPRISONMENT, FELONY TRANSPORTION OVER STATE LINES, AND  
FELONY CONSPIRACY to accomplish same. I SAVED HIS LIFE BY NOT  
APPEARING!!!

2. Since the Restraining Order in Oregon was still being ENFORCED based on  
countless FELONY PERJURIES committed by the Petitioner, and now the  
CONNECTED NEED to secure the career of an up-and-coming wannabe  
'JUDGE JUDY' Pro Tem Judge Audrey Broyles, that upon the Respondent's  
CIVIL RIGHT in his (alleged) COURT OF RECORD RIGHT to a Court  
Reporter was DENIED, and literally ALL efforts since July 3, 2014 have been to  
accomplish same, that it is a FACT, that since the only blood relatives to the  
Respondent's minor children, ANIKA L. BLUM and DOUGLAS M. BLUM,  
would have ALSO been incarcerated, that Respondent's minor children, Morgan  
Elizabeth johnson-HOFFMANN and Noah Christian johnson-HOFFMANN,  
would have MOST CERTAINLY been placed in Child Protective Services and  
therefore SUBJECTED THAT TERRORIST ACT upon two (2) innocent children  
in a HORRIFIC FUTURE purposely CREATED by this alleged Court as well!
3. That upon ANIKA L. BLUM and DOUGLAS M. BLUM being incarcerated, and  
DEBORAH L. EASTWOOD as the accomplice to the FELONY KIDNAPPING  
of said minor children, that as Respondent is not aware of any other appropriate  
relatives that would be available, that these three (3) DEFENDANTS' children  
would ALSO be SUBJECTED TO THE IDENTICAL TERRORIST ACT  
COMMITTED by these alleged Courts as identified in Item 2 above!

That in the COMMITMENT to SAVE LIVES and MAINTAIN the well-being thereof of others has been the CORE of the LIFE OF THE RESPONDENT since he first RISKED his life for strangers as both a Volunteer but especially as a PROFESSIONAL Fire Fighter, that the Respondent was NOT going to live another moment of HIS PRECIOUS LIFE with said results identified above EVER ON HIS SHIFT EVER!!! ...as an expression of BEING RIGHT just to be RIGHT so he could "Have my WAY!!!" [Sound familiar?!]

This now brings the question as to **WHAT INVOLVEMENT did YOU**, the READER, have regarding the Respondent's little visitor and PLACEMENT OF SAID "GPS" TRACKING DEVICE at 0227 Hours, June 13, 2015 where Respondent has been in hiding/seclusion TO SAVE RESPONDENT'S LIFE FROM (YOU PERHAPS!?) so his minor **CHILDREN HAVE THEIR DADDY BACK** from an alleged RANDOM vehicle **ACCIDENT** in which an alleged "DRUNK" driver who is driving perhaps the EXACT SAME LATE MODEL BLACK FORD EXCURSION slams into the Respondent's driver door at a RANDOM intersection thousands of miles from Respondent's home as ATTEMPTED to be arranged at 1337 hrs., August 27, 2014:

1. Given the **EVIDENCE** the Iowa State Supreme Court Attorney Disciplinary Board **FELONY ACCEPTED A BRIBE OF AN UNKNOWN AMOUNT** to save JONATHAN ALAN COY's little BAR that his Daddy PAID FOR to BURY the ENTRANCE OF FALSE SWORN TESTIMONY to create \$92,245.00...
2. Given the **FACT** Kimberly Stamatelos, Court Appointed Mediator, is **GUILTY** of six (6) FELONY COUNTS of EXTORTION upon the MANIPULATED COERCION and subsequent "KICK-BACKS" she needed to supplement her "session income" for alleged child support arrearages as JUDGE AND JURY



based on Jonathan Alan Coy's ENTERED testimony that upon the ENTRANCE of said COERCED EXTORTION WAIVER, the Respondent earned 500% his income as "Self-Employed" though he was MEDICALLY RETIRED as a Fire Captain/Acting Fire CHIEF/Peace Officer for the State of California to...

3. Respondent's REQUIREMENT he SELF-DECLARE as a psychological TERRORIST THREAT to his children though ZERO EVIDENCE was presented from literally ANY psychology intervention/therapy facility and/or professional thereof that Respondent suffered literally ANY condition except, AS EVIDENCED BY THE FACT KIMBERLY STAMATELOS RECEIVED by DIRECT EMAIL at 1100 Hours, April 18, 2011, a copy of the Petitioner's FELONY EXTORTION email to Respondent DEMANDING \$10,000.00 cash from his late mother in which Petitioner stated, "You don't need an inheritance!" to imply if Respondent COMPLIED to said EXTORTION, "It would all go away!" ...and this little STRESS of losing HALF HIS DISABILITY goes away!
4. That now Gerald Moore, Police Chief of the City of Salem, is now GUILTY of OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE in two (2) separate State Courts for his DIRECT INVOLVEMENT to prevent his alleged Internal Affairs Division to CORRECT said police reports within the mandated FEDERAL LAW 45-day period.
5. That Jamise Rhoades, Presiding Judge of Marion County District Court is now GUILTY of OBSTRUCTION of JUSTICE by NOT hearing three (3) separate LEGAL ENTRIES in the Oregon Court regarding PERJURY and CONSPIRACY TO PERJURE in her little regime, charade, house-of-cards to now ENFORCE the TEMPORARY Protective Order of June 20, 2014 that prevented ALL [ZERO!]

CONTACT with said minor children now SUPERCEDES the July 3, 2014 hearing that [ONCE] allowS [EMPHASIS ADDED!!!] both 'Supervised' and ESPECIALLY UNsupervised Visitation [Which was NEVER clarified on any after hearing ORDER but espccially NOT included in any TRANSCRIPT AS NONE EXISTS DUE TO RESPONDENT'S DENIAL OF HIS UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONAL CIVIL RIGHT!] is ALSO GUILTY of OBSTRUCTION of COMMERCE, A TERRORIST ACT by FEDERAL LAW, for causing both the Printer and the Courier service, who had LEGAL commerce with Respondent, to CEASE AND DESIST upon the THREATS to same by the Marion County Courthouse STAFF who are under HER threat to COOPERATE!

6. And lastly the DIRECT INVOLVEMENT of alleged Judge Robert Hutchinson who ENSURED this has all gone away WITH PREJUDICE! Good Job!

Rest assured, you will NOT KILL the Respondent's minor children's DADDY! You instead will live by the consequences of your POLITICALLY CORRECT choices to make this ALL GO YOUR WAY! And now I've been ELECTRONICALLY BLOCKED from accessing my profile to FILE THIS IN A TIMELY MANNER! May God's WILL prevail as this is escalated to the level HE chooses to EXPOSE YOU ALL FOR WHO YOU TRULY ARE!

Respectfully submitted by:

  
Richard William Hoffmann, Sr., Pro Se,  
Respondent  
(401) 439-3569 Direct

Signed this 15<sup>th</sup> day of June in the year of our Lord Two-Thousand Fifteen.

~ã þ9üΔ éð]éþ9Çz··ü;eür<äd Çl∞∞é≤ ||é¥♦é|||én}é√ éÑeéä ünmoöÿ|é L-éþYé¥\$é-ºéw~véää



**\*\*\*\*\* IMPORTANT NOTICE - READ THIS INFORMATION \*\*\*\*\***  
**NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING OR PRESENTATION [NEF]**

A filing has been submitted to the court RE: DRCV037370

Judge: FAMILY LAW #1

Official File Stamp: 06-15-2015:22:37:22

Court: TRIAL COURT

Polk

Case Title: DEANNE JOHNSON VS RICHARD HOFFMANN

Document(s) Submitted: OBJECTION APPEAL/OBJECTION TO DENIED DECISION & DENIED  
 ENTRANCE OF EVIDENCE OF FELONY EXTORTION, DISTRIBUTION &  
 BRIBERY

Filed by or in behalf of: Richard William Hoffmann, Sr.

You may review this filing by clicking on the following link to take you to your [cases](#).

This notice was automatically generated by the courts auto-notification system.

The following people were served electronically:

RICHARD WILLIAM HOFFMANN SR

DEEANN RAE JOHNSON

**PARTIES NOT SERVED BY EDMS**

The Iowa Electronic Document Management System will not serve the following parties because they are not registered filers. Per rule 16.317(1)(b), the filing party must serve a paper copy of the filed document(s) on the following parties in the manner required by Iowa Court Rules. \*

**Note:** The rules define the clerk of court as responsible for service of court-generated documents. Additionally on small claims cases that by statute can be served by certified mail, when the filer has selected and paid for certified mail in the electronic filing system or at the clerk of court office, the clerk of court is responsible for service of the original notice and answer and appearance by certified mail in accordance with the Code of Iowa.

\*The moving party or the individual who filed it is responsible for service of a document if it was not served by the electronic filing system. That includes, but is not limited to, service of all petitions and original notices [rule 16.316(3)], service of documents on all parties seeking to intervene in confidential cases [16.321(1)(c)], and service of all documents on non-registered parties [16.317(1)(b)].

FW-001

Request to Waive Court Fees

CONFIDENTIAL

Clerk stamps date here when form is filed.

If you are getting public benefits, are a low-income person, or do not have enough income to pay for your household's basic needs and your court fees, you may use this form to ask the court to waive your court fees. The court may order you to answer questions about your finances. If the court waives the fees, you may still have to pay later if:

- You cannot give the court proof of your eligibility,
Your financial situation improves during this case, or
You settle your civil case for \$10,000 or more. The trial court that waives your fees will have a lien on any such settlement in the amount of the waived fees and costs. The court may also charge you any collection costs.

Fill in court name and street address:

Superior Court of California, County of State of California COURT OF APPEAL Third Appellate District 914 Capitol Mall Sacramento, CA 95814-4814

Fill in case number and name:

Case Number: C081933

Case Name: Bennett v. Hoffmann

1 Your Information (person asking the court to waive the fees):

Name: RICHARD WILLIAM HOFFMANN SR
Street or mailing address: 318 WHITMAN ST SOUTH
City: MONMOUTH State: CA Zip: 97361
Phone number: 775-455-7391 (RETIRED)

2 Your Job, if you have one (job title): FIRECAPT./PEACE OFFICER

Name of employer: CAL PERS
Employer's address: P.O. Box 942716, SAL, CA 94229-2716

3 Your Lawyer, if you have one (name, firm or affiliation, address, phone number, and State Bar number):

NA

a. The lawyer has agreed to advance all or a portion of your fees or costs (check one): Yes [ ] No [X]

b. (If yes, your lawyer must sign here) Lawyer's signature:
If your lawyer is not providing legal-aid type services based on your low income, you may have to go to a hearing to explain why you are asking the court to waive the fees.

4 What court's fees or costs are you asking to be waived?

- [ ] Superior Court (See Information Sheet on Waiver of Superior Court Fees and Costs (form FW-001-INFO).)
[X] Supreme Court, Court of Appeal, or Appellate Division of Superior Court (See Information Sheet on Waiver of Appellate Court Fees (form APP-015/FW-015-INFO).)

5 Why are you asking the court to waive your court fees?

- a. [ ] I receive (check all that apply; see form FW-001-INFO for definitions): [ ] Food Stamps [ ] Supp. Sec. Inc. [ ] SSP [ ] Medi-Cal [ ] County Relief/Gen. Assist. [ ] IHSS [ ] CalWORKS or Tribal TANF [ ] CAPI
b. [ ] My gross monthly household income (before deductions for taxes) is not more than the amount listed below. (If you check 5b, you must fill out 7, 8, and 9 on page 2 of this form.)

Table with 6 columns: Family Size, Family Income, Family Size, Family Income, Family Size, Family Income. Rows show income thresholds for 1-6 family sizes.

c. [X] I do not have enough income to pay for my household's basic needs and the court fees. I ask the court to: (check one and you must fill out page 2):

- [X] waive all court fees and costs
[X] let me make payments over time
[X] waive some of the court fees

6 Check here if you asked the court to waive your court fees for this case in the last six months. (If your previous request is reasonably available, please attach it to this form and check here:) [ ] BUT NOTHING ORDERED EITHER WAY?

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the information I have provided on this form and all attachments is true and correct.

Date: 5/13/16
Richard William Hoffmann Sr
Print your name here

Signature area with handwritten notes and a large scribble.

Sign here



Case Number:

C081933

Your name: \_\_\_\_\_

If you checked 5a on page 1, do not fill out below. If you checked 5b, fill out questions 7, 8, and 9 only. If you checked 5c, you **must** fill out this entire page. If you need more space, attach form MC-025 or attach a sheet of paper and write Financial Information and your name and case number at the top.

7  Check here if your income changes a lot from month to month. If it does, complete the form based on your average income for the past 12 months.

8 Your Gross Monthly Income

a. List the source and amount of any income you get each month, including: wages or other income from work before deductions, spousal/child support, retirement, social security, disability, unemployment, military basic allowance for quarters (BAQ), veterans payments, dividends, interest, trust income, annuities, net business or rental income, reimbursement for job-related expenses, gambling or lottery winnings, etc.

- (1) CALPERS RETIREMENT \$ 2995.85
- (2) (DISABILITY) \$
- (3) \$
- (4) \$

b. Your total monthly income: \$ 2995.85

9 Household Income

a. List the income of all other persons living in your home who depend in whole or in part on you for support, or on whom you depend in whole or in part for support.

Name	Age	Relationship	Gross Monthly Income
(1) MORLAN	10	DAUGHTER	\$ CHILD SUPPORT
(2) NOAH	9	SON	\$
(3)			\$
(4)			\$

b. Total monthly income of persons above: \$ 679.00 20%.

Total monthly income and household income (8b plus 9b): \$ \_\_\_\_\_

10 Your Money and Property

- a. Cash \$ 20.00
- b. All financial accounts (List bank name and amount):
  - (1) BOFA CHECKING \$ 200.00
  - (2) \$
  - (3) \$
- c. Cars, boats, and other vehicles
 

Make / Year	Fair Market Value	How Much You Still Owe
(1) 99 CHRYSLER PT CRUISER	\$ 500.00	\$ 0
(2)	\$	\$
(3)	\$	\$
- d. Real estate
 

Address	Fair Market Value	How Much You Still Owe
(1)	\$	\$
(2)	\$	\$
- e. Other personal property (jewelry, furniture, furs, stocks, bonds, etc.):
 

Describe	Fair Market Value	How Much You Still Owe
(1) ASSORTED JEWELRY	\$ 700.00	\$ 395.00
(2) FURNITURE	\$ 200.00	\$ 0

11 Your Monthly Deductions and Expenses

- a. List any payroll deductions and the monthly amount below:
  - (1) INSURANCE \$ 150.00
  - (2) CHILD SUPPORT (WOMAN) \$ 619.00
  - (3) \$
  - (4) \$
- b. Rent or house payment & maintenance \$ 450.00
- c. Food and household supplies \$ 300.00
- d. Utilities and telephone \$ 60.00
- e. Clothing \$ 90.00
- f. Laundry and cleaning \$ 30.00
- g. Medical and dental expenses \$ 40.00
- h. Insurance (life, health, accident, etc.) \$ 107.00
- i. School, child care \$
- j. Child, spousal support (another marriage) \$ 619.00 ✓
- k. Transportation, gas, auto repair and insurance \$ 200.00
- l. Installment payments (list each below):
 

Paid to:

  - (1) REPLOL DEBT CONSOLIDATION \$ 329.00
  - (2) DEBT FREE OVER TIME \$ 195.00
  - (3) \$
- m. Wages/earnings withheld by court order \$
- n. Any other monthly expenses (list each below):
 

Paid to:

  - (1) OTHER CREDIT CARDS \$ 80.00
  - (2) \$
  - (3) \$

Total monthly expenses (add 11a - 11n above): \$ 2630.00

To list any other facts you want the court to know, such as unusual medical expenses, etc., attach form MC-025 or attach a sheet of paper and write Financial Information and your name and case number at the top.

Check here if you attach another page.

**Important!** If your financial situation or ability to pay court fees improves, you must notify the court within five days on form FW-010.

IN THE IOWA DISTRICT COURT IN AND FOR POLK COUNTY

---

UPON THE PETITION OF	)	
	)	
DEEANN RAE JOHNSON,	)	CASE NO. DRCV37370
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
AND CONCERNING	)	<b>SUPPLEMENTAL EVIDENCE</b>
	)	<b>IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR</b>
	)	<b>CONTEMPT TO ENFORCE WRIT OF</b>
RICHARD WILLIAM HOFFMANN, SR.	)	<b>ASSISTANCE WITH REQUEST FOR</b>
	)	<b>ARREST WARRANTS FOR ANIKA L.</b>
Respondent	)	<b>BLUM, DOUG M. BLUM, AND</b>
	)	<b>DEBORAH L. EASTWOOD</b>

---

COMES NOW the Respondent, Richard William Hoffmann, Sr. of 4846 Timberline Drive, West Des Moines, Iowa 50265, with further evidence to entered against Petitioner, DeeAnn Rae Johnson, of 1191 Winter Street NE, Salem, Oregon, 97301 to include request to issue Arrest Warrants for the criminal abduction of Morgan Elizabeth Johnson-Hoffmann and Noah Christian Johnson-Hoffmann that occurred at 1212 Southlawn Drive, Des Moines, Iowa 50315 from the involved subjects, DeeAnn Rae Johnson; Anika L. Blum and Doug M. Blum of 413 Wintergreen Street NW, Ankeny, Iowa 50023; Deborah L. Eastwood of 4232 65<sup>th</sup> Street, Urbandale, Iowa 50322. Please verify the following:

- 1) Petitioner entered FALSE SWORN TESTIMONY she brought both children to Iowa with her in November 2007 when in fact she abandoned both children, Noah at six (6) weeks of age, and Morgan at 14 months of age, for over three (3) months as evidenced in the video taken by Respondent in his Sacramento, California home. Please see <http://tinyurl.com/kidsabandoned> that ends in “We Miss You Mom and Tyler” at 2:19.
- 2) Respondent flew both children to Iowa by himself in late February 2007 in which an airline ticket was purchased in Morgan’s name on Frontier Airlines.

- 3) Respondent was served legal papers in June 2007 generated by Petitioner to establish Paternity, Child Support and Visitation while he was 1,800 miles away in Sacramento, California that included three items:
  - a) That although Respondent was on Non-Industrial Disability Retirement from the State of California at \$2,380.00 per month, included was a fully completed Child Support Calculation Sheet generated by Jonathan Alan Coy, Attorney that was entered as admissible evidence showing Respondent earned exactly \$127,200.00 SELF EMPLOYED INCOME annually, that after income tax deductions and other standard deductions resulted in exactly \$6,660.40 per month to create, against Petitioner's income of \$2,045.00 per month an obligation of exactly the desired \$1,598.00 child support that was rounded up to exactly \$1,600.00 of mandatory desired child support as Petitioner DEMANDED her attorney FABRICATE.
  - b) The finished Paternity, Child Support, and Child Visitation Decree DRCV-037370 that included the mandated \$1,600.00 Child Support obligation to be paid directly to the Iowa Child Support Recovery Unit.
  - c) The printed Waiver To Verify Financial Records awaiting Respondents signature to cause the Court to NOT review any and all financial documents to verify or deny the fabricated self-declared Self-Employed income of exactly \$127,200.00 per year as listed above though Respondent has worked only part-time at best after being medically retired (non-industrial) as a Fire Captain/Peace Officer for the State of California from June 1979 through May 2000.
- 4) The fact Jonathan Alan Coy refused to review or accept Respondent's verifiable financial records including his last three pay stubs and last three Federal Income Tax returns that clearly verify Respondent did not earn 400% more (over \$100,000.00) than he did that he faxed verification thereof to J. A. Coy's law office upon Respondent declaring he represented himself as he had inadequate resources to hire an attorney and as such, shall have full access to Petitioner's hired counsel to work out any and all details.
- 5) The fact Jonathan Alan Coy, who upon receiving Respondent's accurate financial records, Jonathan Alan Coy threatened Respondent that any further attempt to contact his office in any manner whatsoever would result in formal criminal harassment charges.

- 6) The fact Petitioner demanded Respondent sign both the Waiver and the finished Decree to verify full acceptance without any opportunity to contest any false sworn written testimony entered in your court or, as she was 100% convinced, given her ability to articulate her unquestioned expertise as an underwriter, she could easily deceive any small financial firm into believing there would never be a need to do a full background check to verify any detail in a successful attempt to leverage Respondent's undying love for his children as she stated, "I live 1,800 miles away. I can have the kids packed in less than 20 minutes. It'll take you 30 hours to get here. My family hates you. They will tell you nothing! I will change my name, my social security number, and the children's last name and I will move to either New York, Los Angeles, Miami, or Seattle or someplace in between and you will NEVER EVER SEE YOUR CHILDREN EVER AGAIN! Even a private investigator will be unable to find me with a false social security number that I will FABRICATE each and every year when I "relocate" and secure yet another position at yet another small firm who will never do a background check. But even if I could be traced, after spending thousands to find me to get to your children, you'd have to start all over again in a new court some place and I'll again slam you for \$1,600.00 child support when you finally do catch me. Now sign all the documents and have them overnighted to arrive by noon on August 17, 2007 to be entered in court at 1:30 PM OR ELSE YOU'LL NEVER SEE YOUR CHILDREN EVER AGAIN!!!"
- 7) The fact that, after Respondent was felony extorted to sign said documents under severe duress, Petitioner demanded Respondent pay cash directly to her of whatever amount he could from his \$2,380.00 disability retirement check on the first day of each month to eliminate any record whatsoever that could be created by a cancelled check or Petitioner threatened again she would "pack-up" the children in less than 25 minutes and move to any one of four corners of the nation without any notice whatsoever.
- 8) The fact, that after Respondent spent every other nickel to travel every four (4) to five (5) weeks from Sacramento to Iowa to maintain his loving relationship with his daughter and establish the same with his son yet adhered to Petitioner's threat to use any and all resources available to her to eliminate Respondent from their children's lives altogether as she was successful when her older son, Tyler James Johnson, at age 16 has ZERO contact with his father. Petitioner's son now resides with Kenneth Stoner at 1212 Southlawn Drive, Des Moines, Iowa which she has also since ABANDONED him.



- 9) The fact that 39 months after said August 17, 2007 Decree was enforced to demand said falsified sworn written testimony Child Support obligation had been fabricated, Petitioner reported to Iowa Child Support Recovery Unit and declared under penalty of perjury Respondent had paid ZERO (\$0.00). Iowa Child Support Recovery invoiced Respondent for \$59,200.00 in child support arrearages.
- 10) The fact Petitioner refused any responsibility for her or Jonathan Alan Coy's assistance to create and submit said extorted sworn written false testimony of said financial documentation stating, "If it wasn't true, why did you ever sign it!?!"
- 11) The fact Respondent experienced:
  - a) An immediate loss of 50% of his disability retirement then \$2,530.00 monthly income reduced to \$1,215.00;
  - b) Half his disability retirement was still \$385.00 less than the minimum payment due PLUS an additional \$320.00 per month was obligated to begin to pay back said \$59,200.00 that was increasing at a rate of \$705.00 per month to a total of \$1,920.00 leveraged;
  - c) Fact it would be impossible for Respondent to ever resolve said felony extorted falsified obligation at the current rate that at the age of 70, he would owe over \$219,600.00;
  - d) Fact all three (3) credit bureaus immediately reported \$59,200.00 in child support arrearages that increased exponentially each month as one of Iowa's worst "Dead-Beat-Dad's" ever CAUGHT that upon any background check of any reputable agency or entity resulted in the successful purposeful attempt to further destroy Respondent's credibility;
  - e) The immediate revocation of Respondent's Commercial Driver's License even though Respondent was a driving instructor for 13 years at his assigned fire departments to cause great harm for his ability to provide for his young family;
  - f) The immediate confiscation all federal and state income tax refunds until paid in full;
  - g) The lien of all real property;
  - h) AND the incredible SITUATIONAL stress that resulted upon him in which Respondent's significant other had to violate the integrity of her 401k retirement fund just to help make ends meet or face eviction as a homeless couple.
- 12) The fact Respondent immediately reported to Iowa Child Support Recovery Unit to begin to resolve said "issue" who's personnel did all they could to expedite Respondent's case file to

be completed in three (3) months instead of the normal, expected six (6) or more before final amount due reached an obligation of \$63,245.00 by April 2011.

- 13) The fact Respondent's child support obligation was reduced \$981.00 per month (\$11,772.00 per year) to \$619.00 per month as determined with now ACCURATE financial data.
- 14) The fact that Respondent filed a complaint against Jonathan Alan Coy's to the Iowa State Supreme Court Attorney Disciplinary Board for his direct involvement to present felony extorted false sworn written testimony into your court of law that Respondent earned over 400% (over \$100,000.00) more income than he did as "self-declared" self-employed income to arrive at the exact desired figures that was insulated/protected by said endorsed waiver to review any and all financial documents upon the threat said children would never be provided any opportunity to establish nor maintain any relationship with Respondent unless endorsed by Respondent upon the purposeful obstruction thereof or face imminent Criminal Harassment charges.
- 15) That in mediation scheduled April 18, 2011 with court appointed mediator attorney Kimberly Stamestelos:
  - a) Petitioner violated Court Ordered Subpoena to produce any and all financial records to prove child support payments were in fact deposited by cash deposit into her personal checking account as demanded or never ever see the children ever again.
  - b) Petitioner demanded Respondent sign off on paragraph that he self-declare, with absolutely ZERO psychological exam and/or medical reports or any documentation whatsoever to justify same, that Respondent SHALL BE CONSIDERED EXTREMELY psychologically unstable and therefore an EXTREME DANGER to his children.
  - c) When Respondent presented EXTORTION email from Petitioner dated 3/31/2011 to Stamestelos as verified at 11:00 AM April 18, 2011 as sent directly to Kimberly Stamestelos that Petitioner DEMANDED \$10,000.00 paid by his mother PLUS the attached spreadsheet that evidenced Petitioner in fact owed Respondent \$3,405.29 in EXTORTED child support in which the Iowa State Child Support Recovery Unit was utilized as the FELONY instrument to FELONY extort same, Kimberly Stamestelos declared she would recover said extorted falsified child support arrearages of \$3,405.29 if Respondent signed off that he was a psychological DANGER to his children who required medication and psychological counseling regiment OR BE DENIED ALL

VISITATION UNTIL COMPLIANCE WAS EVIDENCED UPON SIGNED MEDICAL CONFIDENTIALITY RELEASE.

- d) Respondent signed-off on said paragraph UNDER EXTREME DURESS or face never seeing his children EVER as a psychologically UNSTABLE, DANGEROUS father with ZERO evidence to justify same by any psychologist or psychiatrist in which Kimberly Stamestelos warned she would instead write a letter to the Judge stating Respondent as extremely belligerent and would then therefore ensure Respondent's \$29,003.29 paid child support would be considered a GIFT and he would instead owe the full \$63,245.00 to be paid off at \$320.00 per month over the next 16.5 years thus arriving at a totally child support obligation of \$92,248.29 in only 42 months.
- e) Upon signing said paragraph, Mediator Stamestelos then returned with DEMAND Respondent agree to pay Petitioner an ADDITIONAL \$15,000.00 in child support arrearages that were calculated and court ordered upon FALSE sworn written testimony. Respondent adamantly refused and declared to Mediator Stamestelos she had committed felony extortion of same [At a SAVINGS OF \$77,248.29 that Respondent should have been excited to receive!] to cause Respondent to self-declare as a psychological DANGER to his children. Respondent again demanded Petitioner reimburse the full \$3,405.29 to him instead in exchange for the then now self-declaration of himself as a psychological danger to his children.
- f) Mediator Stamestelos reported to Petitioner and her attorney Espnola Cartmill but then returned with DEMAND Respondent agree to pay Petitioner \$10,000.00 in FALSIFIED child support arrearages [At a SAVINGS OF \$82,248.29 that Respondent should have been excited to receive!] as indicated in Petitioner's original extortion email dated March 31, 2011. Respondent again demanded Petitioner reimburse the full \$3,405.29 to him instead in exchange for self-declaring himself as a psychological danger to his children. Respondent again refused adamantly as he stated this was FELONY EXTORTION.
- g) Mediator Stamestelos then returned with DEMAND Respondent agree to pay Petitioner \$7,000.00 in FALSIFIED child support arrearages [At a SAVINGS OF \$85,248.29 that Respondent should have been excited to receive!]. Respondent again demanded Petitioner reimburse the full \$3,405.29 to him instead in exchange for self-declaring

himself as a psychological danger to his children. Respondent again refused adamantly as he stated this was FELONY EXTORTION.

- h) Mediator Stamestelos then returned with DEMAND Respondent agree to pay Petitioner \$5,000.00 in FALSIFIED child support arrearages. [At a SAVINGS OF \$87,248.29 that Respondent should have been excited to receive!] Respondent again demanded Petitioner reimburse the full \$3,405.29 to him instead in exchange for self-declaring himself as a psychological danger to his children. Respondent again refused adamantly as he stated this was FELONY EXTORTION.
  - i) Mediator Stamestelos DEMANDED Respondent agree to pay Petitioner \$5,000.00 in FALSIFIED child support arrearages and that Petitioner was NOT going to accept anything less. Respondent then showed and demanded full credit of \$1,403.81 spent on September 11, 2008 to move all Petitioner's belongings from Sacramento California to Ankeny, Iowa. Petitioner would only agree to accept \$1,000.00 credit in which it was ordered that Respondent owe \$4,000.00 in FALSIFIED child support arrearages to Petitioner thus netting, upon adding the \$3,405.29 Petitioner OWED Respondent, \$7,405.29 in FALSIFIED FELONY EXTORTED child support arrearages paid at \$124.00 per month until paid in full in addition to the \$981.00 reduced monthly child support then set to the ACCURATE \$619.00. Yet now Respondent had then also now been SELF-declared as a psychologically UNSTABLE DANGER to his children.
- 16) That on February 28, 2012 Petitioner petitioned for a Temporary Restraining Order in which no statutory basis was found. Please compare entries/non-entries alleged in June 20, 2014 Restraining Order filed in Oregon District Court In and For Marion County. ZERO ENTRY OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE whatsoever! End result: DISMISSED but the mere fact Respondent now had a record of Restraining Order filed, regardless if it was dismissed or not, lost INCREDIBLE CREDIBILITY with others but especially higher class women he was trying to date who would ask for his birthday and thus find record of same and would subsequently REFUSE any and all further contact from Respondent or they too would file an identical Restraining Order against him.
- 17) That, as evidenced by written itinerary in which Respondent had primary physical custody of said minor children from May 30, 2014 through July 12, 2014, that on May 30, 2014, Respondent drove Petitioner to Des Moines International Airport to fly to Portland, Oregon

in which the plan was for Respondent to also relocate to Oregon in mid-July 2014 upon Petitioner returning to Van Meter, Iowa to recover her vehicle from Respondent's ex-girlfriend's home and Petitioner and Respondent would then drive both children with them as all parties were to then officially relocate to Salem, Oregon area.

- 18) That on June 9, 2014 Respondent made all proper arrangements including signed emergency medical and dental treatment release forms for Kenneth Stoner (the same individual who is caring for Petitioner's 16 year old son) to babysit said minor children from June 9, 2014 through June 14, 2014 upon Respondent's two (2) days business trip at the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) convention in Las Vegas on June 9, 2014 and June 10, 2014 to meet with the NFPA Title 14 Engineers who will write all the specifications/legal code to be passed by congress to mandate nation-wide Respondent's patented fire protection equipment as well as personally meet with Underwriter's Laboratory personnel who will test said fire protection equipment as certify same as SAFE.
- 19) That, at 10:12 AM CDT on June 9, 2014, Kenneth Stoner received a two (2) part text from Petitioner that alleged, "Kenny, I had three calls from softball parents last night that are very concerned for Morgan and Noah. Will you please let my friend have the kids – she will put them on a plane and I will meet them in Denver. Please! They aren't ok with rich."
- a) **Respondent hereby REQUIRES the court to produce ADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE verification by video record, audio record, or sworn written testimony or written evidence (i.e. text, etc.) of said allegations or CONVICT OF PERJURY IMMEDIATELY AND EXONERATE RESPONDENT OF ALL ACTIONS AGAINST HIM AS PETITIONER HAS UNCLEAN HANDS AND IS THEREFOR DISQUALIFIED FROM FILING ANY AND ALL ACTIONS IN ANY COURT OF LAW WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.**
- 20) That upon Respondent's arrival in Las Vegas, he received a pending text from Petitioner and engaged in text conversation in which Petitioner threatened "I'm going to get them this week then." that ended as Respondent confirmed he would return, "Friday night." June 13, 2014.
- 21) That no other communication was received from Petitioner regarding her intentions yet with only three (3) hours "written notice" and therefore in violation of said Decree by a full 69 hours short of the minimum 72 hours required to make proper changes to said agreement, she had her sister Anika L. Blum of Ankeny and friend Deborah L. Eastwood of Urbandale

FELONY KIDNAP both children from Kenneth Stoner's residence by force and intimidation as both children screaming, "NO!!! NO!!! NO!!!" every step of the way in an extremely violent manner and resulting psychological TERROR to a vehicle driven by Anika L. Blum that sped away in westerly direction with no destination given.

- 22) That upon Kenneth Stoner notifying Respondent of said TERROR event subjected to all parties, that it was determined that Respondent would be the notifying party from his hotel in Las Vegas to Polk County Sheriff's to report said FELONY KIDNAPPING .
- 23) That upon notifying Polk County Sheriff's dispatch, that Respondent's TWO (2) phone requests for help for his felony kidnapped children was terminated by said dispatchers twice in which they implied they had previously heard about him from the Petitioner who had notified Polk County Sheriff dispatch earlier that day and in which Respondent was thus treated as if he was an alleged convicted Spousal and Child Abuser, drug addict, drug dealing, Pimp from the gutters of Des Moines who was fornicating with his favorite prostitutes in his Las Vegas hotel suite funded by illegal drug and prostitution activities.
- 24) That Respondent was forced to call Des Moines Police Department NON-Emergency line long distance to request an officer respond to the scene of the felony kidnapping.
- 25) That Respondent contacted Polk County Sheriff dispatch a third time to request a "Welfare Check" from Ankeny Police to respond to the Anika L. and Doug M. Blum residence to check the safety and security of Respondent's kidnapped children assumed to be then FELONY IMPRISONED at said location at 413 NW Winterberry Street in Ankeny, Iowa.
- 26) That the Des Moines Police Department officer was so concerned for the emotional well-being/welfare of Respondent's severely emotionally disturbed and threatened felony kidnapped and then now imprisoned and detained children, that he then contacted his dispatch of the Des Moines Police Department to request a then second "Welfare Check" for both said minor children at the Blum residence in Ankeny.
- 27) That Respondent called Polk County Sheriff dispatch for a return call from the on-duty Sargent regarding the welfare of said children as no calls, return calls, or texts permitted or completed literally any communication of both said children with their loving father the Respondent.
- 28) That upon the Ankeny Police Officer response, that the written report regarding the investigation at the scene of felony imprisonment of both children, that the responding officer

recorded, "In regards to father wanting to file kidnapping charges. Father has not been following custody agreement."

a) **Respondent hereby REQUIRES the court to produce ADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE verification by video record, audio record, or sworn written testimony or written evidence or Court convictions of said allegations declared by this Peace Officer at the SCENE OF THE FELONY IMPRISONMENT AND DETENTION OF SAID CHILDREN in the presence of the FELONY ABDUCTOR Anika L. Blum and her FELONY ACCOMPLICE Doug M. Blum.**

29) That Ankeny Police Department Sgt. Figueroa left a voice mail for Respondent that indicated he had heard he had some "issues" and IF AND ONLY "IF" Respondent felt he still needed to talk he would return Respondent's call but to otherwise just have a nice night partying in Las Vegas.

30) That upon Respondent's requested return call from Sgt. Figueroa, that Sgt. Figueroa indicated he would do NOTHING to help facilitate speaking to his children, but rather stated they were fine and not worry about a thing and simply party while he had his time there and went so far as to say when he, Sgt. Figueroa recently visited Las Vegas, he had to call a friend (fellow inebriated peace officer?) he was partying with to come find him on the wrong floor as he was so inebriated, that he was unable to safely return to his hotel room. He then hung-up on Respondent upon stating, "Your kids are fine! Shit! ...you're down there! Just PARTY! I did!"

31) That upon Respondent's request for a second "Welfare Check" that next morning on June 10, 2014 at approximately 6:00 AM PDT/ 8:00 AM CDT, that the on-duty Sargent stated nearly an hour after his call that the children were fine, she would do NOTHING to accommodate court ordered communication with either child, and regardless of Respondent's concern two (2) felony counts would be committed if the children had airline tickets over state-lines, that she in fact verified they did have tickets to Portland, Oregon but that since this involved minor children, that no details would ever be disclosed regarding said children EVER as she could not verify the relationship of the reporting Respondent as father of said children. SHE REFUSED TO ACCOMMODATE ANY COMMUNICATION whatsoever between the two (2) felony kidnapped and imprisoned children and their loving father the Respondent.

- 32) That Respondent then changed all business plans the remainder of the week including cancelling his participation in mandatory training scheduled June 11 through June 13, 2014 in Kansas City for Durham School Services to maintain his position as a School Bus Driving Instructor in the Waukee School District to instead fly to Portland later that morning departing at approximately 10:30 AM PDT.
- 33) That Respondent then attempted to contact Doug M. Blum on his cell phone but no communication resulted except by voicemail. All attempts to text communicate were also unanswered at that time.
- 34) That Respondent called Anika L Blum to her cell phone at approximately 10:00 AM PDT in which Anika L, Blum answered, exchanged greetings as an unknown caller, but upon her realizing the caller was the Respondent when he asked her, "Can I speak to my daughter?" that Anika L. Blum immediately terminated the call and refused to respond to his voice mail that immediately followed outlining her felony kidnapping, felony imprisonment, and her direct involvement of felony transportation of both children over state-lines per Ankeny Police Department as well as her direct violation to the current order/decreed by preventing said children any telephone access to their loving father so he could reassure them that the emotionally horrific traumatic experience the night before to present time was just a life experience they will never forget, but with Daddy's, love and support, will eventually get over these horrific events.
- 35) That Respondent arrived in Portland at approximately 1:00 PM PDT in which he received a pending text communication from felon accomplice Doug M. Blum as recorded and entered into evidence in this Court, that Respondent immediately called Doug M. Blum who, and from absolutely no reference whatsoever, declared that if Petitioner were to expire (die) at any time, that it would be he who would receive full custody of both children and not the Respondent. That when Respondent asked why such verbiage was not included in any custody agreement that he was aware of in any Court whatsoever, that he, Doug M. Blum, believed adamantly that he was very clear, "... 'cuz my wife (Anika) says its true! That's why!" When Respondent demanded felon accomplice Doug M. Blum to produce same, Blum became silent and Respondent terminated call in total disbelief this felon accomplice could believe such a ludicrous allegation.



- 36) That Respondent upon taking adequate time to calm his nerves over such lunacy, that he again called felon accomplice Doug M. Blum to ask when might be a good time to contact Petitioner so Respondent could speak to his extremely distraught and confused children. Blum stated they were put on a Frontier Airlines flight to Denver at approximately 1:30 PM CDT to meet with Petitioner who flew from Portland to Denver earlier in the day so Petitioner could fly back with both children from Denver to Portland and upon Respondent reviewing the posted flight schedule in the terminal, he saw they were to arrive in Portland at 6:32 PM PDT.
- 37) That Respondent then reported said felony transportation of children over state-lines to the Port of Authority Police assigned to the Portland International Airport who informed Respondent that with no “Writ of Assistance” entered in any court, that they could do nothing but observe. Respondent then exited the secured area and remained in the waiting area outside the TSA Exit Gate.
- 38) That at approximately 6:20 PM PDT, Respondent contacted Portland Airport Security in which video surveillance commenced but was terminated at 6:59 PM PDT merely six (6) minutes prior to the Petitioner and both felony kidnapped children exited said gate to the unsecured area in which the Respondent rushed to greet, hug, console, and profusely reassure his children that no matter what happens to them, that Daddy is never too far away. Said children are still unaware how far they have been removed from the protective cover of their loving Daddy who waits patiently in Iowa as now the arrest warrant has been reinstated.
- 39) That upon reassuring both children, that Respondent then informed Petitioner to smile because they were all on video surveillance as all four (4) walked to the parking garage in which the Respondent took both still photography and videography to document place, date, and time to verify when felony kidnapping and imprisonment/detention and transportation of minor children occurred. Please see video evidence of Petitioner with no luggage and both children with only the bags Respondent had sent them with the previous Monday morning: <http://www.tinyurl.com/portlandairport01>
- 40) Respondent saw the children the following morning, spoke a few them a few times by phone and then e-filed Petition to Modify Custody, Child Visitation, and Custody AND “Writ of Assistance” in the Iowa court on Friday, June 13, 2014.

41) Respondent spent 30 minutes with both minor children on Father's Day at Dairy Queen in Silverton, Oregon in which Noah recorded the following statement:

<http://www.tinyurl.com/noahstatement>

42) For the record, Morgan refused to participate as Respondent did Not force her because Petitioner has been reported for Corporal Punishment as Respondent has witnessed when Petitioner took a full swing back and then full swing forward to with her right hand striking the right side of Morgan's head in the ear area just weeks after Petitioner's CONVICTION of Deprivation of Critical Care. The information was allegedly forwarded by DHS of Iowa to the County Attorney but NO action was taken. Morgan did NOT want to risk being videotaped in which she could again be subjected to such PHYSICAL ABUSE with no consequences upon Petitioner as demonstrated then.

43) On Monday morning, June 16, 2014, Respondent then tried to add his name to the contact list to pick-up said children from the Kaiser-Salem Education Foundation Camp day-care facility at 725 NE Market Street, Salem, Oregon in which Respondent videotaped the interaction and resulting response of the said staff upon Petitioner's allegations Respondent was a TERRORIST THREAT to all children at said facility causing a staff member to call "911 Emergency" to alleged "Disturbance" in which incident report #14022717 written by Mark Seyfried, S137 and approved by Sgt. Albert Gordon, S245. See published video at: <http://www.tinyurl.com/salemdaycare01>, <http://www.tinyurl.com/salemdaycare02>, <http://www.tinyurl.com/salemdaycare03> for the accurate details of alleged said "DISTURBANCE" in which Salem Police Department has violated its own policy to correct fourteen (14) FALSIFIED entries within their 45 day maximum period to correct same. ZERO RESPONSE HAS BEEN NOTICED TO DATE in which most importantly the following items in which Detective Corporal (?) Mark Seyfried stated and was approved by Sgt. Gordon Albert as FACT:

- a) Inaccurately recorded Respondent's apartment address from data clearly published on Iowa government-issue Commercial Driver's License 291AE8386.
- b) Recorded one (1) phone number as the business line, and then the home line, and then the business line of yet a third and different subject. Yet it was assigned as the Cell Phone that was used to dial 911 but was indicated as the home line of subject number two (2).

- c) That on page 2 of 3, paragraph 2, line 5, “He told me that his ex-wife, Deeann Johnson, moved from Iowa three weeks ago, taking their two children, Morgan and Noah.”
- i) Anika L. Blum admits in her Ankeny Police Department report #14-002671 that, “...she recently picked up her sister’s (Petitioner’s) children, took them to the airport, and had them fly to Oregon to be with their mother.”
- ii) Respondent clearly stated both children had been felony kidnapped by Petitioner’s sister Anika L. Blum that previous Monday evening in Des Moines, Iowa and flown to Denver that following Tuesday in which Respondent met all three (3) at the Portland International Airport at 7:05 PM PDT. For the record, Sgt. Gordon Albert stated to Respondent, “You may have broken the law when you flew from Las Vegas to Portland last Tuesday!”
- iii) Respondent asks the court why would said Detective Corporal state and Sgt. Albert Gordon verify that Respondent stated Petitioner moved out from Iowa with both children three weeks ago if Sgt. Albert Gordon referred to breaking some alleged “law” when he met his children at the Portland International Airport after being felony kidnapped, imprisoned, and then flown over state lines that previous Tuesday, June 10, 2014?
- d) Per page 2 of 3, paragraph 3, line 3 and 4, Respondent showed Detective Corporal M. Seyfried and Sgt. Gordon Albert exact copy of original custody agreement (unsigned) in which Det. Corporal M. Seyfried wrote, “...Deeann would have to notify him of any changes of visitation with **IN** 72 hours.”
- i) Detective Corporal M. Seyfried therefore “felt” there was no violation to said custody agreement as three (3) hours the previous Monday, June 9, 2014 from 2:35 PM PDT to 5:35 PM PDT was more than permissible and acceptable as it was clearly with **IN** the 72 hour window to FELONY KIDNAP BOTH CHILDREN!
- e) Per page 2 of 3, paragraph 4, line 1 and 2, Respondent was purposely NOT placed on the contact list as a direct violation to the current decree and therefore prevented from court ordered visitation.

- f) Per page 2 of 3, paragraph 5, line 1 and 2, Petitioner perjures herself to purposely manipulate a sworn peace officer by stating, "...who said she moved from Iowa to Salem about three weeks ago with her children..."
- i) Anika L. Blum admits in her Ankeny Police Department report #14-002671 that, "...she recently picked up her sister's (Petitioner's) children, took them to the airport, and had them fly to Oregon to be with their mother."
- g) Per page 2 of 3, paragraph 5, line 4 and 5, Petitioner perjures herself again by stating, "...Richard made comments to a Dairy Queen employee that there WOULD BE a child abduction soon." when in fact Respondent mentioned there HAD BEEN on June 9, 2014.
- i) Anika L. Blum admits in her Ankeny Police Department report #14-002671 that, "...she recently picked up her sister's (Petitioner's) children, took them to the airport, and had them fly to Oregon to be with their mother."
- h) Per page 3 of 3, paragraph 1, line 1 and 2, Petitioner's ace in the hole stated, "...Richard had not provided proof of psychiatric treatment and had thus broken the custody agreement." Please see proposed exhibit(s) that verifying otherwise as Petitioner has used this "self-declared psychological terrorist threat to children" FELONY EXTORTION to reduce \$92,248.29 alleged child support obligation in only 42 months down to FELONY EXTORTED \$7,405.29 of the April 18, 2011 charade as manipulated and orchestrated by Court appointed Mediator Kimberly Stamestelos.
- i) Per page 3 of 3, paragraph 1, line 6, Petitioner, "...was upset that we would not take preemptive action upon Richard... ..get a restraining order if need be, and have a safety plan." Respondent asks the court to consider all evidence of felony perjury to manipulate and felony extort etc. and consider who needs preemptive action taken against which party?
- j) Per page 3 of 3, paragraph 2, line 1 and 2, Det. Corp. M. Seyfried, as verified by the severely incompetent approving Sgt. Gordon Albert, in which Respondent showed both of whom his e-filed Petition for Change of Custody... and 'WRIT OF ASSISTANCE' which Respondent further revealed page 9 thereof that clearly stated that Marion County Sheriff's department would recover said minor children for Respondent, yet severely incompetent M. Seyfried, as severely incompetent "Reviewing/Approving" Sgt. G.

Albert read same, stated, "I contacted Richard and he AGAIN (?) alluded to the fact that he would ABDUCT "rescue" his children."

- i) This statement made and approved by these two (2) SEVERELY INCOMPETENT sworn peace officers provided Petitioner full latitude to further manipulate both the Oregon, but now as entered here, the Iowa court to mislead any and all entities that Respondent is A SEVERELY UNSTABLE PSYCHOLOGICALLY UNPREDICTABLE individual who needs significant psychological intervention and should be prevented from having any contact with his children whatsoever! Respondent further asks, if Respondent is so DANGEROUS to the welfare and safety and security of his children, why would the incompetent Detective Corporal and his Sargent allow Respondent to ESCAPE THEIR CUSTODY!?! Respondent would like to suggest because he has never expressed DANGER in his persona at any time ever. He has instead been subjected to severely incompetent personnel of said affecting entities in regards to the custody and safety and security of his minor children.
- k) May it be emphasized that at approximately 3:35 PM PDT on June 16, 2014 later that same day Respondent made contact with M. Seyfried, S137 requesting him to make said corrections but he stated, "I've been doing SHIT for over 20 years! I recorded it as I heard it! I ain't changing SHIT!" and then abruptly hung up on Respondent.
- l) Respondent then spoke with Sgt. Weidemann, S503 of Salem Police Department Internal Affairs immediately following his "conversation" with M. Seyfried, S137 who denied any and all responsibility to these horrendous errors. Sgt. Weidemann, S503 then went line by line through 14 critical errors as identified above.
- m) June 26, 2014, Sgt. Aguillar, Acting IA, Internal Affairs, confirmed NO CORRECTIVE ACTION WAS EVER TAKEN OR RECORDED AT ALL BY SGT WEIDEMANN EVER! Respondent reported to the Salem Police Department Main Lobby to confront this purposeful denial and dedicated ZERO responsibility/accountability of the Salem Police Department that then now involves the Internal Affairs Division thereof.
- n) To the date of this filing, there has been ZERO response from the Salem Police Department whatsoever. COMPLETE AVOIDANCE AND DENIAL as said report was used against Respondent in his Objection Hearing to his Restraining Order of July 3, 2014, is now GUILTY OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE.

- 44) Respondent then emailed Petitioner at approximately 4:00 PM PDT June 16, 2014 (upon assuming the corrections to said incident report would be corrected and therefore resolved soon, requesting Petitioner deliver both said minor children at the Salem Police Department at an agreed location under complete surveillance for her safety and security at 7:00 PM June 17, 2014. Attached to said email was a PDF copy of the e-filed June 13, 2014 Petition for change... and WRIT OF ASSISTANCE.
- 45) Petitioner then responded with said email that further verified she, “had soul physical custody, she would file a Restraining Order, and that Respondent would be lucky if he see his children a year from then. She is now nearly seven (7) months to completion of her goal in which her goal is to simply file for yet another one at the expiration of the current.
- 46) Hence the current Restraining Order in Oregon that includes the following felonious perjuries found in the E-filed entries of December 29, 2014 as:
- a) Page #3, Item #3, DESCRIBE INCIDENT(S) OF ABUSE THAT HAPPENED IN THE LAST 180 DAYS:
- i) Petitioner claims on June 16, 2014, June 18, 2014, and June 19, 2014 AFTER charade of “Disturbance – Child Custody Dispute” Salem Police Department Incident #14022717 in which Petitioner claims Respondent “Threatens to KILL me and ABDUCT my children (per M. Seyfried FALSE testimony of a sworn peace officer). Threatened to kill both of my sister’s children.
- (1) Petitioner only has one (1) half-sister Anika L. Blum who admits in her Ankeny Police Department report #14-002671 that, “...she recently picked up her sister’s (Petitioner’s) children, took them to the airport, and had them fly to Oregon to be with their mother.”
- (2) The Petitioner’s OTHER alleged sister is her girlfriend Deborah L. Eastwood of Urbandale, Iowa in which Respondent texted
- ii) Respondent’s last contact with children was the evening of June 17, 2014. Only voicemails were attempted until it was demanded that ONLY Morgan’s cell phone that was left in Respondent’s minivan in West Des Moines would be acceptable for children to communicate with their loving father in attempt to get Respondent to leave the west coast and “go away.”

iii) Respondent hereby **REQUIRES** the court to produce **ADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE** verification by video record, audio record, or sworn written testimony or written evidence (i.e. text, etc.) of said allegations or **CONVICT OF PERJURY IMMEDIATELY AND EXONERATE RESPONDENT OF ALL ACTIONS AGAINST HIM AS PETITIONER HAS UNCLEAN HANDS AND IS THEREFOR DISQUALIFIED FROM FILING ANY COURT OF LAW WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.**

b) Page 4, Item #4 Incidents in which Respondent has hurt or threatened to hurt Petitioner BEFORE 180 days period above.

i) First entry:

(1) Date is left blank. Not even a year referenced unless first two entries refer to the same time frame as "...while I was pregnant"

**(a) ...which would mean 2005 or 2006. Yet for the record, SHE DID NOT EVER LIVE IN POLK COUNTY IN THE STATE OF IOWA AT ANY TIME SHE WAS PREGNANT! SHE LIVED IN ROSEVILLE AND SACRAMENTO CALIFORNIA!**

(2) County/State: Petitioner swears "Polk" and Iowa but scratches out Marion and Oregon in which she states, "Restraining me, spitting on me; threatening my life if I don't do as he says."

(3) Respondent hereby **REQUIRES** the court to produce **ADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE** verification by video record, audio record, or sworn written testimony or written evidence (i.e. text, etc.) of said allegations or **CONVICT OF PERJURY IMMEDIATELY AND EXONERATE RESPONDENT OF ALL ACTIONS AGAINST HIM AS PETITIONER HAS UNCLEAN HANDS AND IS THEREFOR DISQUALIFIED FROM FILING ANY AND ALL ACTIONS IN ANY COURT OF LAW WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.**

ii) Second entry:

(1) Date is left blank but refers to when Petitioner was pregnant (2005 or 2006?)

(2) County/State: Petitioner swears “Polk” and “Iowa” but scratches out Marion and Oregon in which she states, “Pushing me down and holding me down against my will while I was pregnant.”

(a) ...**which would mean 2005 or 2006. Yet for the record, SHE DID NOT EVER LIVE IN POLK COUNTY IN THE STATE OF IOWA AT ANY TIME SHE WAS PREGNANT! SHE LIVED IN ROSEVILLE AND SACRAMENTO CALIFORNIA!**

(3) **Respondent hereby REQUIRES the court to produce ADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE verification by video record, audio record, or sworn written testimony or written evidence (i.e. text, etc.) of said allegations or CONVICT OF PERJURY IMMEDIATELY AND EXONERATE RESPONDENT OF ALL ACTIONS AGAINST HIM AS PETITIONER HAS UNCLEAR HANDS AND IS THEREFOR DISQUALIFIED FROM FILING ANY AND ALL ACTIONS IN ANY COURT OF LAW WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.**

iii) Third entry:

(1) Date: 6/16

(a) Respondent REQUIRES court to produce and verify year of these allegations as the year 2014 cannot apply as this is specifically prior to 180 days.

(2) County/State: Petitioner swears “Polk” and “Iowa” but scratches out Marion and Oregon in which she states, “Hold my arms so tight that he left bruises; threatening me with physical, emotional, mental anguish if I didn’t comply with his demand.”

(3) **Respondent hereby REQUIRES the court to produce ADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE verification by video record, audio record, or sworn written testimony or written evidence (i.e. text, etc.) of said allegations or CONVICT OF PERJURY IMMEDIATELY AND EXONERATE RESPONDENT OF ALL ACTIONS AGAINST HIM AS PETITIONER HAS UNCLEAR HANDS AND IS THEREFOR DISQUALIFIED FROM FILING ANY AND ALL ACTIONS IN ANY COURT OF LAW WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.**



- c) Page 4, Item #5: Refers to imminent danger of further abuse by Respondent AND the Respondent is a threat to my physical safety or the physical safety of my children because: “He has threatened to abduction my children.”
- i) Per the incompetent AND grossly negligent M. Seyfried, S137 and Sgt. Gordon Albert, S245 for disregarding e-file of June 13, 2014 presented as evidence on scene of the Incident #14022717 which said filing specifically states “WRIT OF ASSISTANCE” for Marion County Sheriff’s Department to perform the deed.
- ii) **Respondent hereby REQUIRES the court to produce ADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE verification by video record, audio record, or sworn written testimony or written evidence (i.e. text, etc.) of said allegations or CONVICT OF PERJURY IMMEDIATELY AND EXONERATE RESPONDENT OF ALL ACTIONS AGAINST HIM AS PETITIONER HAS UNCLEAN HANDS AND IS THEREFOR DISQUALIFIED FROM FILING ANY AND ALL ACTIONS IN ANY COURT OF LAW WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.**
- d) Page 4, Item #7: Firearms possession.
- i) Petitioner claims, “My safety and the safety of my children.”
- ii) **Respondent hereby REQUIRES the court to produce ADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE verification by video record, audio record, or sworn written testimony or written evidence (i.e. text, etc.) of said allegations or CONVICT OF PERJURY IMMEDIATELY AND EXONERATE RESPONDENT OF ALL ACTIONS AGAINST HIM AS PETITIONER HAS UNCLEAN HANDS AND IS THEREFOR DISQUALIFIED FROM FILING ANY AND ALL ACTIONS IN ANY COURT OF LAW WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.**
- e) Page 6, Item #15: Refers to Request for Court to award custody because of an EMERGENCY as:
- i) “Father is continuously threatening to abduct Morgan and Noah. Continues to threaten my children’s place of daycare.”
- (1) Respondent was TRESSPASSED in a legally successful attempt to prevent children access to their father due to FABRICATED UNJUSTIFIED THREAT TO CHILDREN’S SAFETY CREATED BY PETITIONER. Respondent

NEVER returned to children's home or childcare facility after trespass was enforced by Salem Police Department on June 16, 2014.

- f) Page 14: Refers to OFFICIAL address of Respondent as 213 Oak Street, Silverton, Oregon as Respondent's residence.
  - i) Respondent's official address has been written clearly in the first two lines of every court document entered in the Oregon Court yet ALL correspondence has been sent to this INCORRECT address as not only is Petitioner severely incompetent, but the clerks at the Oregon Court have only sent all official mail to this address as evidence not even the first two (2) lines of Respondent's correspondence has EVER been read or acknowledged as 138 pages of evidence in Respondent's defense at his Objection Hearing was 100% disregarded as was his legally required COURT REPORTER flagrantly and adamantly DENIED.
- g) Page 14: Refers to party's character:
  - i) Petitioner states, "History of mental illness."
  - ii) **Respondent hereby REQUIRES the court to produce ADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE verification by video record, audio record, or sworn written testimony or medical report written evidence of said allegations or CONVICT OF PERJURY IMMEDIATELY AND EXONERATE RESPONDENT OF ALL ACTIONS AGAINST HIM AS PETITIONER HAS UNCLEAN HANDS AND IS THEREFOR DISQUALIFIED FROM FILING ANY AND ALL ACTIONS IN ANY COURT OF LAW WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.**
- h) Page 17: Refers to COURT HAS ORDERED AN "EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES" HEARING to include:
  - i) The order restraining Respondent from contacting, threatening, or attempting to contact the Petitioner.
  - ii) The order granting temporary child/ren custody to the Petitioner.
  - iii) **Respondent hereby REQUIRES the court to produce ADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE verification by video record, audio record, or sworn written testimony or written evidence (i.e. text, etc.) of said allegations or CONVICT OF PERJURY IMMEDIATELY AND EXONERATE RESPONDENT OF ALL ACTIONS AGAINST HIM AS PETITIONER HAS UNCLEAN HANDS AND**

**IS THEREFOR DISQUALIFIED FROM FILING ANY AND ALL ACTIONS  
IN ANY COURT OF LAW WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.**

- i) Page 22: Refers to Supervised Visitation that has been DENIED in all cases.
- i) At first it was requested to be ordered on weekends only. NOT EVEN PROVIDED during those hours yet Judge Broyles CANCELED ALL UNTIL Objection Hearing of July 3, 2014 in which upon proof of psychological evaluation (see entered exhibits that PROVE FULL COMPLIANCE):
- (1) Un-Supervised if compliant to MANIPULATED and COERCED psychological regiment requirement.
  - (2) Supervised if NON-Compliant.
    - (a) Yet Judge Audrey Broyles, Pro Tem REFUSED to accept any entries that proved Respondent was compliant to allow unsupervised and yet provided ZERO method to exercise Court Ordered visitation within any hours before walking out her charade of July 3, 2014 with demand Respondent REMAIN SILENT or face a six (6) month jail sentence and \$500.00 fine for, “NOT ONE MORE UTTERANCE!” as witnessed by attending Bailiff and “referee.” who did nothing to ensure equity in any amount for Respondent let alone his Civil Rights to a court reporter, who if present, may have prevented such corruption from occurring.
    - (b) As the Thanksgiving Holiday approached in November 2014, Respondent flew to California to prepare to drive north to Oregon and requested Presiding Judge Rhoades of the Oregon Court to clarify Non-supervised vs, Supervised as referenced in the chicken scratch Order After Hearing which had no clear definition of either, yet she stated ALL PARENTING TIME SHALL BE INDEFINITELY DENIED as found on Page 17 of 31 of original restraining order in which she interpreted Judge Broyles Order of June 20, 2014 to supersede Judge Broyles Order of July 3, 2014 which stated by line as:
      - (i) “Respondent to psych eval and to provide to Court w/
      - (ii) proof of ability/safety to visit w/ children (which he did) – supervised
      - (iii) To include prescribed meds and compliance – unsupervised
      - (iv) w/ regimen.

1. What does this indicate to Respondent to interpret? Judge Broyles denied a court reporter to allow Respondent to effectively review any notes but especially upon Presiding Judge who DENIED ALL in her letter November 25, 2014 regardless of EVIDENCE submitted in each court entry of August 14, 2104 and September 4, 2014, September 5, 2104 and September 9, 2014 that strict compliance was in fact met!

(c) For the record, InFocus has the company policy that unless the Petitioner ALSO signs said application for supervised visitation, which Petitioner was mailed YET REFUSED TO COMPLETE, there SHALL BE NO VISITATION whatsoever. Upper Circle has the same policy in place. Ultimate power is therefore granted and provided the Petitioner to DENY any and all Court Ordered visitation at her choice if she chooses to exercise her ULTIMATE RIGHT TO REFUSE TO SIGN until court ordered to sign.

j) Page 23: Narrative of Petitioner:

- i) Petitioner exaggerated that there would be an abduction instead that there HAD BEEN one on June 9, 2014 as committed by Anika L. Blum, accomplices Deborah L. Eastwood, and Doug M. Blum. Silverton Police contacted Respondent who cleared up all confusion regarding same.
  - ii) Petitioner claims, "Since this time Richard has continuously threatened to kill me, abduct Morgan and Noah, and threatened to kill both of my sister's (she only has her one (1) half-sister Anika L. Blum) children in Iowa.
  - iii) Petitioner states, "Richard was present at Morgan and Noah's 1<sup>st</sup> day of summer school (as he is PROVIDED by court order!) Camp at Grant Elementary. He was threatening the staff there and demanding to see Morgan and Noah." Please see video evidence contrary to dialog presented as FALSE SWORN WRITTEN TESTIMONY found : <http://www.tinyurl.com/salemdaycare01>, <http://www.tinyurl.com/salemdaycare02>, <http://www.tinyurl.com/salemdaycare03>
- (1) Respondent waited and visited with staff for nearly an hour and a half before children walked across the street at nearly 7:30 AM PDT June 16, 2014. Respondent simply tried to add his name to the contact list at the daycare facility to establish and maintain COURT ORDERED visitation that the Petitioner

adamantly refused did all she could to OBSTRUCT against the current order to and then made repeated FALSE CLAIMS THAT RESPONDENT WAS DANGEROUS TO ALL CHILDREN at said childcare facility to cause the staff to call 911 Emergency as a fabricated FALSE “disturbance” yet the video evidence proves Respondent left his driver’s license to add his name before leaving peacefully as video evidenced.

iv) Petitioner’s presented FALSE SWORN WRITTEN TESTIMONY by entering , “The summer camp called the police because of his behavior & because they are concerned for Morgan’s and Noah’s safety. The Salem Police trespassed Richard from the school and my home. ”

(1) Why didn’t the staff call 911 Emergency until after Petitioner arrived? Because Petitioner had not yet had the opportunity to FRIGHTEN said staff with allegations included in every other entry in either court! This is further evidence Petitioner exhibits extremely unstable mental behavior to purposely manipulate any situation to secure ZERO visitation and destroy Respondent’s credibility at every opportunity.

v) Petitioner further states, “Richard has (Petitioner’s ace in the hole!) history of mental illness and appears very unstable right now. Our custody agreement states he MUST provide evidence from his treating psychiatrist that he is taking his medication & is in counseling.”

(1) And how was that established with absolutely ZERO evidence produced by any psychologist or psychiatric exam, evaluation, or report of any kind!?! Choice! Be considered a “Belligerent” with a letter to the Iowa Court from an EXTREMELY CORRUPT Court appointed mediator Kimberly Stamestelos by not signing off on a DEMANDED paragraph that Respondent is a SELF DECLARED PSYCHOLOGICALLY UNSTABLE TERRORIST THREAT TO HIS CHILDREN by requesting his \$3,405.29 of Felony EXTORTED child support RIGHTFULLY reimbursed him, or pay \$7,405.29 instead of the GIFTED \$29,003.29 and owe an additional \$63,245.00 that won’t be paid off for nearly 17 years at an additional \$320.00 per month above his ACCURATELY calculated fair and equitable \$619.00 per month stripped from his DISABILITY

RETIREMENT as a Correctional Fire Captain after nearly 30 years combined experience of putting his life on the line for others both professionally and volunteer for a grand total of \$92,248.29 of alleged child support arrearages in only 42 months based solely on FALSE SWORN WRITTEN TESTIMONY fabricated by a now Law Firm Partner Attorney Jonathan Alan Coy of Thornton, Coy and Hess in Ankeny, Iowa.

vi) Petitioner further states, "He has not provided that for over 1 year."

(1) Respondent requests and invites the Court do it's due diligence to verify his alleged falsified evidence of counseling and medication regimen evidenced in said entered exhibits as Petitioner will stop at NOTHING TO ENTER FALSE SWORN WRITTEN AND VERBAL TESTIMONY TO MISLEAD.SAID COURT(S) to obtain any and all FELONIOUS PERSONAL GOALS to live a life separate from any father of her children as she effectively achieved with her oldest son's father. HE HAS BEEN ELIMINATED!

k) Page 24: Narrative of Petitioner's (cont.):

i) Petitioner states, "I am very afraid of him. He has a history of being very mean, mentally, verbally, and physically abusive."

(1) Respondent has NEVER had any documented history of violence in his alleged history. In fact, Petitioner is a CONVICTED CHILD ABUSER in the DHS registry for DEPRIVATION OF CRITICAL CARE.

(2) Respondent requires the Court to produce any and all evidence alleged by mentally unstable Petitioner that he has ever met this description at any time in his life ever.

ii) Petitioner states, "I feel like Morgan and Noah and I have to constantly look over our shoulder. He shows up at my house uninvited regularly. My fiancé' Chris found him my yard last Friday. Richard thought no one was home. We aren't sure why he was there."

(1) Respondent declares Petitioner has presented pure distortion of TRUTH. He has always contacted Petitioner regarding any Court Ordered DAILY visitation or attempted visitation until the enforcement of said restraining order. Petitioner was contacted each and every time Respondent was anywhere near her residence. Her

fiance Chris Garner has never once indicated he ever felt threatened by Respondent ever.

iii) Petitioner states, "The summer camp Morgan and Noah go to are very concerned about their safety. The contact from Richard keeps escalating."

(1) Respondent declares any and all FEAR experienced by summer camp staff has been created by Petitioner commencing June 16, 2014 when Petitioner put all of them on FULL ALERT regarding a FALSE TERRORIST THREAT description yelling at the top of her lungs in their presence of Respondent's alleged personal history and mental status to frighten her "audience" to coerce law enforcement to be summoned by third parties to discredit Respondent. Respondent attempted to contact his children per court ordered contact at summer camp until restraining order was ordered by Oregon Court. 100% compliance always.

iv) Petitioner states, "Richard has threatened to follow me to work and cause trouble for me there."

(1) Respondent has NO purpose in harassing Petitioner at her work place nor has he EVER.

v) Petitioner states, "I have the text messages of him threatening my life."

(1) Respondent affirms he has NEVER sent any such messages to threaten anyone's life let alone the mother of his children! **Respondent hereby REQUIRES the court to produce ADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE verification by video record, audio record, or sworn written testimony or written evidence (i.e. text, etc.) of said allegations or CONVICT OF PERJURY IMMEDIATELY AND EXONERATE RESPONDENT OF ALL ACTIONS AGAINST HIM AS PETITIONER HAS UNCLEAN HANDS AND IS THEREFOR DISQUALIFIED FROM FILING ANY AND ALL ACTIONS IN ANY COURT OF LAW WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.**

vi) Petitioner states, "Salem Police are urging me to obtain a Restraining Order so they can protect me, Morgan, and Noah. I have the Salem Police support with me, along with my custody agreement evidencing I have primary physical care of my children."

(1) All of which that have been obtained and maintained on pure exaggerations and out right FALSE WRITTEN AND VERBAL TESTIMONY as evidenced above

vii) Petitioner states, "I mentally and emotionally exhausted from being scared all the time. Please assist me in this matter."

(1) Petitioner is exaggerating her concerns and fears hoping for empathy as an alleged terrorized mother of two (2) when in fact she is guilty of countless perjuries and has no choice but to keep stacking more FALSE SWORN WRITTEN AND VERBAL TESTIMONIES one after another hoping that Respondent will give up and go away like the father of her oldest child who has ZERO contact with his father since she mortgaged her mother's home to rid him by drowning him in Court costs until he finally gave up loving his son enough to stay in the fight. Respondent maintains his integrity and will never quit no matter how exaggerated the FALSE written and verbal testimonies continue.

viii) Petitioner claims, "Morgan and Noah are afraid of his anger and don't want to have to be with him."

(1) This is an outright FALSIFICATION OF FACT! Morgan and Noah have stated their desire to be with their loving father. Respondent swears under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Iowa that on June 8, 2014, Morgan personally stated, "Daddy, it's so much fun and relaxed to just be 'home' with you, that I don't care if I don't see mom for another year from now!"

(2) Petitioner will stop at nothing to leverage Respondent's love to punish Respondent at all costs for Petitioner's deranged interpretation of integrity and how she applies it in life as she has demonstrated in every identified felony count of perjury both in this Court and the Oregon Court.

47) Did not answer Petition for Change of Custody, Child Support and Visitation filed 6/13/14

48) Did not answer Contempt of Court filed 7/7/14

49) Did not attend Child in the Middle Class by 8/16/14 per Petition to Change of Custody

50) Did not attend Contempt of Court Hearing – Failure to Appear 8/28/14

51) Did not attend Petition to Change of Custody Hearing 9/5/14

52) Did not complete required Affidavit of Financial Status Petition to Change of Custody

53) Did not complete Child Support Guidelines worksheet for current Petition to Change of Custody.



Respondent hereby requires the Court to produce any and all admissible evidence by verification of video record, audio record, or sworn written testimony or written evidence (i.e. email, cell phone text, SMS, etc.) of said allegations and/or any verifiable conviction in any Court of law or therefore immediately CONVICT Petitioner of Felony Perjury immediately and exonerate Respondent of any and all actions against him as Petitioner shall therefore be deemed as having “unclean hands” and is therefore disqualified from filing literally any and all actions or cases filed or about to be filed in any Court of law within the United States including but not limited to IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON FOR THE COUNTY OF MARION.

**AFFIDAVIT CONCERNING SUPPLEMENTAL EVIDENCE AND ARREST WARRANTS TO BE PRESENTED IN THE RULE TO SHOW CAUSE AND ORDER SETTING CONTEMPT HEARING THAT WAS SCHEDULED AUGUST 28, 2014 AT 10:30 AM AND AGAIN HEARD AT THE MOTION TO DISMISS SAME ON DECEMBER 17, 2014 AT THE POLK COUNTY COURTHOUSE, COURT ROOM 412/413, 500 MULBERRY STREET, DES MOINES, IOWA**

Being first duly sworn, Richard William Hoffmann, Sr., do depose and state under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Iowa, that I am the Respondent herein, know the contents thereof and that the statements allegations contained therein are true and correct as I verily believe.

---

Richard William Hoffmann, Sr.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 13<sup>th</sup> day of January in the year of our Lord two thousand and fifteen.

---

Notary Public