

Defendants' intimidation, threats, corrupt persuasion, or attempts to do so, or misleading conduct toward Plaintiffs, was with the intent to influence, delay, or prevent testimony of any person in an official proceeding, or to coerce or induce any person to withhold testimony, from an official proceeding, or to hinder, delay or prevent Plaintiffs from communication with a law enforcement officer or judge of the United States relating to Defendants' commission of possible federal or state criminal offenses, and such acts violated 18 U.S.C. 1512.

Plaintiffs allege that on **16 February 2010**, At 9:12 AM, at 75 Langley Drive, Lawrenceville, GA 30045, in an "unknown" courtroom in State Court Accusation and case # 06-D-03943-S2, State of Georgia vs. Sharon Bridgewater, at trial, Randy Rich acted under the color of Georgia law, knowingly, intentionally abused the Superior Court of Gwinnett County, committed a prosecutorial act, detertermine the charge and plea of reckless driving and driving with no proof of insurance, and suspended the complaintant license, presented the form to himself, issued an order for 7 months time served, 5 month probation, and suspended the complaintant Sharon Bridgewater Georgia Driver license, and knew or should have known it was the basis for unconstitutional conviction and sentence. Plaintiff allege that Szabo, changed the accusation on the day of trial, and despite the Plaintiffs demand for a jury trial, caused to be filed and record an change of amended of the original accusation, citation on the day of trial. Plaintiff allege Randy Rich, conspired with Szabo, Harsh, et al, caused to be file and recorded the disposition, and a suspension of the Plaintiff Georgia Driver license, and/or mailed to the Georgia Driver License Department a notice of supsension of the Plaintiff Drivers license defrauded the Plaintiffs out of \$1,080.00, and subjected the Plaintiff to peonage and slavery and the act was legally done and did overt acts and/or omissions to further of the objective of the conspiracy.

Plaintiff allege that Rosanna Szabo, violated Ocgga 17-7-1 f which states, Prior to trial, the prosecuting attorney may amend the accusation, summons, or any citation to allege or to change the allegations regarding any offense arising out of the same conduct of the defendant which gave rise to any offense alleged or attempted to be alleged in the original accusation, summons, or citation. A copy of any such amendment shall be served upon the defendant or his or her counsel and the original filed with the clerk of the court. Plaintiff allege Rich violated OCGA 17-7-1f which state Rich and/or Harsh, had a duty or obligation to grant the Plaintiffs a continuance which was reasonably necessitated by an amendment, and failed to advise the Plaintiffs of her automatic right for a continuance.

Plaintiff allege the purpose of seven month time credit serve, and five month probation, was to act in joint participation with Caldwell, give the complaintant one year of probation, and subject the complaintant to peonage and slavery without due process of law and did acts or omissions in furtherance of the objective of the conspiracy.

~ 51

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

RICO ARTIFICE AND SCHEME TO DEFRAUD [TITLE 18 U.S.C. § 1964(c)]
RE: INJURY TO BUSINESS AND PROPERTY AND DESTRUCTION OF BUSINESS
and OBTAINING MONIES BY AND THROUGH FALSE MISREPRESENTATIONS or
FRAUD, PEONGAGE Aiding and Abetting a Conspiracy

Plaintiff allege that On or about Oct. 19, 2007 after leaving from the Gwinnett County Detention Center, and after completion of the "free slavery," I was driving her "newly purchased" White Van driving with the regular flow of traffic and driving "normal" (not engaged in any suspicious activity), and had violated no traffic laws and driving with a lawful, "clearly visible" not expired drive out tag.

Plaintiffs allege in furtherance of the unlawful agreement of Officer Hardin a "former" Lawrenceville Police Officer and Defendants JOHN DOE 14 unknown Lawrenceville ,GA On or Oct. 19, 2007, "exactly ONE MONTH"(30 days later)an on the anniversary of the illegal conviction of Rich, Harsh, Szabo, Caldwell, at approx. 3:30 p.m. on Centerville Hwy. in Gwinnett County Georgia, Officer Caldwell of the Gwinnett county police Department, via federal interstate wires, originating within the state of Georgia, and terminating within the state of State of Georgia, transmitted the following "an unknown message" police radio wire, electronic message to "unknown" Gwinnett County Police Department, used, threat, coercion and force, made an unconstitutional traffic stop of the Plaintiff based on race, class, ethnicity, and charged the complainant with a crime that's not in the adopted the acts of Lawrenceville Police Department and/or Rich, "Georgia traffic code of notations and the defendants did acts or omissions in furtherance of the objective of the conspiacy.

Officer Caldwell at all times mentioned had a duty and/or obligation to follow correct police procedures in the traffic stop.

There was no probable cause for Officer Caldwell, to use excessive force, discriminate against the Plaintiffs based on race, class, ethnicity, make an unconstitutional traffic stop and issue the Plaintiffs a ticket that's not in the Georgia code of notations.

Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants were monitoring the Plaintiffs, and closely watching the Plaintiff to see if the Plaintiff would file a appeal of the unlawful conviction. Plaintiff allege when the Plaintiff did not file an appeal, the Defendants used, excessive force, threat coercion and force, was an abuse of US Government Power, and the traffic stop was to subject the

52

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1 Plaintiff to even further peonage and/or slavery and or to defraud the Plaintiff out of money
2 and/or property.

3 Caldwell's actions constitute a violation of my 4th via 5th or 14th US Constitutional amendment
4 due process in the traffic stop, ille

5
6
7 Plaintiff allege the Defendants actions also constitute, a violation of (1) and/or (2) and/or (3)
8 and/or (4) and/or (5) and/or (6) and/or (7) and/or (8) and/or (9) and/or (10) and/or (11) and/or (12)
9 and/or (13) and/or (14) and/or (15) and/or (14) and/or (15) and/or (16) and/or (17) and/or (18)
10 and/or (19) and/or (20) and/or (21) and/or (22) and/or (23) and/or (24) and/or (25) and/or (26)
11 and/or (27) and/or (28) and/or (29) and/or (30) and/or (31) and/or (32) as mentioned in the above
12 pages 42 thru 46 of the above criminal charges (The United States ex rel Sharon Bridgewater vs.
13 the Defendants)

14
15 Officer Caldwell knew or should have known not to breach his duties and/or obligation in the
16 traffic stop, the issuance of a ticket with no Georgia Code notation, and/or arrest, detain the
17 Plaintiffs with due out due process of law, and is liable for damages.

18
19 Plaintiffs allege in furtherance of the unlawful agreement of Officer Hardin a "former"
20 Lawrenceville Police Officer and Defendants, Rich, et al, Officer Caldwell then knowingly,
21 intentionally engaged in activity as mentioned on page paragraph then, through threat, coercion
22 or force, intentionally did illegally, unlawfully put restraints on my freedom through, threat,
23 force and coercion and falsely imprison me again without due process of law. (imprisoned in the
24 Gwinnett County Detention Center). The Defendants then knowingly, intentional charged the
25 complainant Sharon Bridgewater (Specialty Investment Group LLC) with driver with suspended
26 license without due process of law, used threat, coercion or force, intentionally did illegally,
27 arrested me without due process of law, unlawfully put restraints on my freedom through, threat,
28 force and coercion falsely imprisonment me (imprisoned in the Gwinnett County Detention
Center) detained Plaintiffs against their will for hours in the Gwinnett county detention center,
against my will, , towed my Company Van without due process of law and defrauded the
plaintiffs out of money for a void traffic citation, and/or suspended license and the defendants
did acts or omissions in furtherance of the objective of the conspiracy.

29
30 (INCLUDE DAMAGES, TO BUSINESS AND PERSON)

31
32 Plaintiffs allege in furtherance of the unlawful agreement of Officer Hardin a "former"
33 Lawrenceville Police Officer and Defendants, Rich, et al, Officer Caldwell Plaintiffs allege the

-53-

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

Defendants believed or knew that the "Georgia traffic ticket with no Georgia Code of notation would be taken as evidence in connection with a proceeding and/or that an official proceeding was pending before a Federal Judge or about to be instituted, and have altered, destroyed, mutilated, or concealed an the citation issued to the Plaintiff with "no Georgia Code of notation" with the intent to impair the integrity or availability of the object for use in an official proceeding and/or Defendants' intimidation, threats, corrupt persuasion, or attempts to do so, or misleading conduct toward Plaintiffs, was with the intent to influence, delay, or prevent testimony of any person in an official proceeding, or to coerce or induce any person to withhold testimony, from an official proceeding, or to hinder, delay or prevent Plaintiffs from communication with a law enforcement officer or judge of the United States relating to Defendants' commission of possible federal or state criminal offenses, and such acts violated 18 U.S.C. 1512 and the defendants did acts or omissions in furtherance of the objective of the conspiracy.

Plaintiff allege the Defendants actions also constitute, a violation of (1) and/or (2) and/or (3) and/or (4) and/or (5) and/or (6) and/or (7) and/or (8) and/or (9) and/or (10) and/or (11) and/or (12) and/or (13) and/or (14) and/or (15) and/or (14) and/or (15) and/or (16) and/or (17) and/or (18) and/or (19) and/or (20) and/or (21) and/or (22) and/or (23) and/or (24) and/or (25) and/or (26) and/or (27) and/or (28) and/or (29) and/or (30) and/or (31) and/or (32) as mentioned in the above pages 42 thru 46 of the above criminal charges (The United States ex rel Sharon Bridgewater vs. the Defendants)

Defendants JOHN DOE 15 is unknown Lawrenceville, GA Chief of Police in his/her current or "former" capacity as Chief of Police and/or Defendants JOHN DOE 16 unknown Chief of Police of Gwinnett County, GA Police or Sheriff's Department in his/her individual and official or "former" capacity is the final decision maker for any policy and procedure, unconstitutional traffic stops, peonage and slavery, and is responsible.

Defendant JOHN DOE 17 are unknown Executive Directors, Commissioners, Board of Directors, of Gwinnett County, GA individually and official and/or "former" capacities has failed to instruct, supervise, and control officers and/or instructed, supervised, and controlled Gwinnett County to subject African American or Mexican or other minorities, and/or the plaintiff to peonage and Slavery employees and is responsible.

54

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1 Plaintiffs allege that RICO persons, and other persons unknown to plaintiffs, acting in concert
 2 therewith, are employed by and associated with said Georgia RICO enterprise that is engaged in,
 3 or activities of which affect, Georgia State and/or federal interstate and/or foreign commerce,
 and that said Georgia RICO persons, and persons acting in concert therewith, conduct or
 participate, directly or indirectly, in the conduct of such Georgia RICO enterprise's affairs
 through a Georgia RICO pattern of racketeering activity.

6
 7 ***Plaintiffs allege RICO Enterprise No. 1:*** Randy Rich, Individually and in his official
 8 capacity as the Superior Court Judge of Gwinnett County, Lucas O. Harsh, Rosanna Szabo
 9 Individually and in her official and/or "former" capacity as Gwinnett County Solicitor, Officer
 10 Hardin "former" Police Officer of the Lawrenceville Georgia Police Department, Defendants
 11 JOHN DOE 14 is unknown Lawrenceville ,GA Police Officers in their individual and official
 12 and/or "former" capacities, Defendants JOHN DOE 15 is unknown Lawrenceville ,GA Chief of
 13 Police he/she is sued in his/her current or "former" capacity as Chief of Police, Officer Caldwell
 14 Individually and in her official and/or "former" capacity as arresting Officer of the Gwinnett
 15 County, GA Police or Sherriff Department Defendants, JOHN DOE 16 unknown, Chief of
 16 Police of Gwinnett County, GA Police or Sherriff Department in his/her individual and official
 17 or "former" capacity, Defendant JOHN DOE 17 unknown Executive Directors, Commissioners,
 18 Board of Directors, of Gwinnett County, GA individually and official and/or "former" capacities
 19 and Does John Does 18 thru 1000 inclusive constitutes a RICO enterprise as defined in
 20 1964. Plaintiff allege and/or upon information and belief at all times mentioned
 21 the Defendants severally and/or jointly and/or agreed to and/or invested in,
 22 organized and/or controlled and/or maintained by and through a consensual
 23 hierarchy of partners, managers, directors, officers, supervisors, agents, deputies,
 24 and/or representatives of a Gwinnett County Superior Court acted under the under
 25 the color of the State law of Georgia, formulated and implement policies relative
 26 to the promoting, advancing and/or otherwise operating a the United States
 27 Government, State of Georgia business organization for the purpose of the
 28 facilitating, furthering, and promoting the Gwinnett County Detention Center
 and/or Professional Probation Services, "private correctional facility including, but
 not restricted to, the raising of monetary funds by and through the abuse of the
 Superior Court of Gwinnett County, unconstitutional traffic stops, extortion, or
 attempts, or conspiracy to do so, and/or threats of physical violence, under color of
 official right, excessive force upon Hispanic and African Americans and other
 minorities, employing federal mails and/or federal interstate wires, as well as and
 providing documentary materials such as dispositions, traffic citations, warrants of
 arrest, mugshots, resulting in slavery and peonage of US Citizens(minorities).
 Plaintiffs allege that RICO persons defendants, and other persons unknown to
 plaintiffs, acting in concert therewith, are employed by and associated with said

-55-

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

Georgia RICO enterprise that is engaged in, or activities of which affect, Plaintiffs allege that Georgia RICO persons, and other persons unknown to plaintiffs, acting in concert therewith, are employed by and associated with said Georgia RICO enterprise that is engaged in, or activities of which affect and/or violated Georgia RICO and/or federal interstate and/or foreign commerce, and that said Georgia RICO persons, and persons acting in concert therewith, conduct or participate, directly or indirectly, in the conduct of such RICO federal interstate and/or foreign commerce, and that said Georgia Georgia RICO persons, and persons acting in concert therewith, conduct or participate, directly or indirectly, in the conduct of such Georgia RICO enterprise's affairs through a Georgia RICO pattern of racketeering activity, a Georgia RICO pattern of racketeering activity.

Plaintiffs allege that RICO persons, and other persons unknown to plaintiffs, acting in concert therewith, are employed by and associated with said Georgia RICO enterprise that is engaged in, or activities of which affect, Georgia State and/or federal interstate and/or foreign commerce, and that said Georgia RICO persons, and persons acting in concert therewith, conduct or participate, directly or indirectly, in the conduct of such Georgia RICO enterprise's affairs through a Georgia RICO pattern of racketeering activity.

The Plaintiff(s) have been damaged by the above Defendants RICO activities, in that the Defendants actions caused the Plaintiff to go out of business, drove the Plaintiff out of the State of Georgia.

O.C.G.A. 9-3-99" provides that the running of the period of limitations with respect to any cause of action in tort that may be brought by the victim of an alleged crime which arises out of the facts and circumstances relating to the commission of such alleged crime committed in this state shall be tolled from the date of the commission of the alleged crime or the act giving rise to such action in tort until the prosecution of such crime or act has become final or otherwise terminated, provided that such time does not exceed six (6) years, and therefore the statue of limitation is tolled to the Plaintiffs RICO cause of action.

RICO ENTERPRIZE #2

RICO ARTIFICE AND SCHEME TO DEFRAUD [TITLE 18 U.S.C. § 1964(c)]

.56.

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

RE: INJURY TO BUSINESS AND PROPERTY AND DESTRUCTION OF BUSINESS and OBTAINING MONIES BY AND THROUGH FALSE MISREPRESENTATIONS or FRAUD, PEONGAGE or SLAVERY, FALSE IMPRISONMENT, Federal Principal and Aider and Abettor, Title 18 U.S.C.A §2(a)-(b), Federal Principal and Aider and Abettor, Aiding and Abetting A Conspiracy, Federal Principal and Aider and Abettor Conspiracy to Commit Aiding and Abetting

On or about Oct. 30, 2007 while conducting business in Dekalb County, the Plaintiff(a Black female and two Black Male employees of the Specialty Investment Group LLC) was driving her "newly purchased" White Van driving with the regular flow of traffic and driving "normal" (not engaged in any suspicious activity), and had violated no traffic laws and driving with a lawful, "clearly visible" not expired drive out tag. I had the Companies three stainless steel appliances and a dishwasher, in the back of my Company Van.

Plaintiffs allege in furtherance of the unlawful agreement of Rich, Harsh, et al, On Oct 30, 2007, and continuing through present Officer Schriender a "former" and/or current Dekalb County Police Officer adopted the acts of of Officer Hardin a "former" Lawrenceville Police Officer and Defendants JOHN DOE 14 unknown Lawrenceville, GA Police Officers, acted under the color of Georgia law, employed the federal interstate wires via police radio originating in the State of Georgia and terminating in the State of Georgia to Defendants JOHN DOE 13 unknown, DeKalb County GA Police Officers in their individual and official and/or "former" capacities, and Does 18 thru 1000 Defendants used, threat, coercion and/or force made an unconstitutional traffic stop based on race, class or ethnicity and violated the Plaintiffs 4th United States Constitutional Right via the 5th or 14th amendment in the traffic stop. and the defendants did acts or omissions in furtherance of the objective of the conspiracy.

Officer Schriender at all times mentioned had a duty and/or obligation to follow correct police procedures in the traffic stop.

There was no probable cause for Officer Schriender a "former" and/or current Dekalb County Police Officer to stop the Plaintiffs for driving with a drive out tag. There was no probable cause for Officer Schriender to discriminate based on race, class or ethnicity, use, threat, coercion and/or force, make a unconstitutional traffic stop just because the Plaintiffs were driving while "Black."

Plaintiff allege the Defendants actions constitute, a violation of (1) and/or (2) and/or (3) and/or (4) and/or (5) and/or (6) and/or (7) and/or (8) and/or (9) and/or (10) and/or (11) and/or (12) and/or (13) and/or (14) and/or (15) and/or (14) and/or (15) and/or (16) and/or (17) and/or (18) and/or (19) and/or (20) and/or (21) and/or (22) and/or (23) and/or (24) and/or (25) and/or (26) and/or (27) and/or (28) and/or (29) and/or (30) and/or (31) and/or (32) as mentioned in the above pages

-57-

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1 42 thru 46 of the above criminal charges(The United States ex rel Sharon Bridgewater vs. the
2 Defendants)

3
4
5 Plaintiffs allege that excessive force, threat coercion and force traffic stop was to falsely
6 arrest and falsely imprison the complainant without due process of law, issue traffic
7 citations without due process of law, and take the Plaintiffs business and personal
8 possession and/or vehical without due process of law and/or defraud the Plaintiffs out of
9 money and/or property.

10 Plaintiffs allege in furtherance of the unlawful agreement On Oct 30, 2007, Officer
11 Schriender a "former" and/or current Dekalb County Police Officer, Plaintiffs allege On
12 Oct. 30, 2007, Officer Schriender a "former" and/or current Dekalb County Police Officer
13 subsequently used threat, coercion and force, illegally detained the Plaintiffs against the
14 Plaintiffs will, and without the right, unlawfully restrained the Plaintiffs freedom threat,
15 force or coercion, falsely arrested the Plaintiffs without due process, left the scene of the
16 traffic stop, got in their police cars, traveled to the Plaintiff place or resident or business,
17 acted in joint participation with Officer Franklin Individually and in his/her official and/or
18 "former" capacity as a DeKalb County, GA, Police Officer, Detective George Individually
19 and in her official and/or "former" capacity as Detective of the DeKalb County GA Police
20 Department, Lieutenant Hamilton Individually and in his/her official and/or "former"
21 capacity as Lieutenant of the DeKalb GA County Police Department, Defendants JOHN
22 DOE 13 unknown DeKalb County GA Police Officers in their individual and/or official
23 capacities cooperated, agreed, flagrantly, intentionally, broke the complainant Sharon
24 Bridgewater(Specialty Investment Group LLC) residential door down, illegally entered
25 Sharon Bridgewater(Specialty Investment Group LLC) resident, violated the complainant
26 solitude, evaded the Plaintiff personal privacy, made a warrantless search, absent probable
27 cause and/or exigent circumstances and "without consent," criminally trespassed, on
28 lawfully lease or co-owed property without the right and without a search warrant and took
by theft or robbery the Plaintiff's and/or family personal and/or business(es) Specialty
Investment Group LLC, valuable Specialty Investment Contracts, Solar Energy Company
ideals, contracts, intangible property valued at more than \$5,000(of the Specialty Investment
Group LLC), computers and other items and did overt acts and/or omission to further the
objective of the conspiracy.

Plaintiff allege their was no probable cause for Officer Schreidner et al to make an unconstitutional
based on race, class or ethnicity, get in the police cars, travel from the scene of the traffic stop to
the Plaintiff resident and illegally and unlawfully take business and personal possession without
a search warrant and without due process of law.

-58-

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1 The Defendants actions constitute a violation of the complainant Fourth Amendment right to be
 2 free from unreasonable search and seizure, via the 5th or 14th US Constitutional amendment.
 3 Plaintiff allege the Defendants actions also constitute, a violation of (1) and/or (2) and/or (3)
 4 and/or (4) and/or (5) and/or (6) and/or (7) and/or (8) and/or (9) and/or (10) and/or (11) and/or (12)
 5 and/or (13) and/or (14) and/or (15) and/or (14) and/or (15) and/or (16) and/or (17) and/or (18)
 6 and/or (19) and/or (20) and/or (21) and/or (22) and/or (23) and/or (24) and/or (25) and/or (26)
 7 and/or (27) and/or (28) and/or (29) and/or (30) and/or (31) and/or (32) as mentioned in the above
 8 pages 42 thru 46 of the above criminal charges(The United States ex rel Sharon Bridgewater vs.
 9 the Defendants)

10 Plaintiffs allege in furtherance of the unlawful agreement of Dective George of Dekalb County
 11 Police Department, et al Plaintiffs allege the Defendants then through threat, coercion or force,
 12 illegally detained me and against my will, and through threat, coercion or force, intentionally
 13 dillegally, unlawfully put restraints on my freedom for two days, through, threat, coercion or
 14 force, falsely imprisoned me without due process of law. (in the Dekalb County Jail)
 15 knowingly, intentional charged the complainant Sharon Bridgewater(Specialty Investment
 16 Group LLC) with theft by taking(crimes they committed against Sharon Bridgewater-Specialty
 17 Investment Group LLC)and "two" misdemonor traffic for violations of an tag violations and
 18 driving with suspended license without due process of law. The Defendants defrauded the
 19 Plaintiffs out of valuable property valued at more than \$5,000, Real Estate Contracts, and/or
 20 solar energy ideals, blueprints, or and/money for the above mentioned traffic citations.
 21 Plaintiffs allege in an intentional act to "cover-up" their illegal actions the Defendants - from
 22 **Oct. 30, 2007 thru April 2009(ONE YEAR AND A HALF) knowingly, intentionally kept**
 23 **the theft by taking charges(crime they committed against the complainant) open and**
 24 **pending against the Plaintiffs without the initition of criminal proceedings, presentment**
 25 **to a Grand Jury, and/or initition of process any criminal process.** Plaintiffs allege the
 26 Defendants_hindered, delayed, or prevented the communication of the complainant to a law
 27 enforcement officer or judge of the United States of information relating to the commission or
 28 possible commission of a Federal offense, and the defendants did acts or omissions in
 furtherance of the objective of the conspiracy.

1 Plaintiffs allege that Officer Schriender, Officer Franklin Individually and in his/her official
 2 and/or "former" capacity as a DeKalb County, GA, Police Officer, Detective George
 3 Individually and in her official and/or "former" capacity as Detective of the DeKalb County
 4 GA Police Department, Lieutenant Hamilton Individually and in his/her official and/or
 5 "former" capacity as Lieutenant of the DeKalb GA County Police Department, Defendants
 6 JOHN DOE 13 unknown DeKalb County GA Police Officers in their individual and official at
 7 all times had a legal duty and/or obligation to follow correct Police Procedures.

59

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1 Plaintiffs also allege the purpose of and to keep charges pending against the complainant was to
 2 Retailate against the Plaintiffs victim of crime of US Government RICO activites, protect the
 3 RICO enterprise, use the Plaintiffs valuable Real Estate Contracts and/or Solar Energy blueprints
 4 and other items for themselves, acts in joint participation with Obama and/or Eric Holder Jr.
 5 Defendants JOHN DOE 2 are unknown agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation(FBI),
 6 JOHN DOE 3 are unknown Assistant United States Attorney General(s), Defendants JOHN DOE
 7 4 unknown US "State" Attorney (ies) General(s) Defendants JOHN DOE 5 is unknown
 8 employees of the U.S. Department of Justice, use illegally obtained evidence of the Specialty
 9 Investment Group LLC, in a court of law, abuse US Government Power, "twist" draft the truth,
 10 and falsely imprision and convict the complainant without due process of law and defraud
 11 Plaintiffs out of property and/or money.

12 The Defendants actions constitute a violation of the complainant Fourth Amendment right to be
 13 free from unreasonable search and seizure, via the 5th or 14th US Constitutional amendment.
 14 Plaintiff allege the Defendants actions also constitute, a violation of (1) and/or (2) and/or (3)
 15 and/or (4) and/or (5) and/or (6) and/or (7) and/or (8) and/or (9) and/or (10) and/or (11) and/or (12)
 16 and/or (13) and/or (14) and/or (15) and/or (14) and/or (15) and/or (16) and/or (17) and/or (18)
 17 and/or (19) and/or (20) and/or (21) and/or (22) and/or (23) and/or (24) and/or (25) and/or (26)
 18 and/or (27) and/or (28) and/or (29) and/or (30) and/or (31) and/or (32) as mentioned in the above
 19 pages 42 thru 46 of the above criminal charges(The United States ex rel Sharon Bridgewater vs.
 20 the Defendants)

21 Officer Schriender, Officer Franklin Individually and in his/her official and/or "former"
 22 capacity as a DeKalb County, GA, Police Officer, Detective George Individually and in her
 23 official and/or "former" capacity as Detective of the DeKalb County GA Police Department,
 24 Lieutenant Hamilton Individually and in his/her official and/or "former" capacity as
 25 Lieutenant of the DeKalb GA County Police Department, Defendants JOHN DOE 13 unknown
 26 DeKalb County GA Police Officers in their individual and official at all times mentioned knew
 27 or should have known not to take, steal, convert the Plaintiff property to their own use, and
 28 breached their duty and/or obligation, and failed to follow correct Police Procedures, and is
 liable to the Plaintiffs for damages.

29 Plaintiffs allege in furtherance of the unlawful agreement of the above Defendants. On Nov. 30,
 30 2007 and continuing through today of the filing of this complaint present Randy Rich A State
 31 Court Judge, acted under the Color of Georgia State Law employed the federal mails and/or
 32 federal interstate wires and/or foreign international wires to the United States Department of
 33 Justice, and/or and the United States Department of Justice Eric Holder Jr., United States

1 Attorney General, Defendants JOHN DOE 1 unknown employees of the Executive Branch
 2 and other agencies of the U.S. government in their official personal capacity and/or personal
 3 "former "capacities, Defendants JOHN DOE 2 are unknown agents of the Federal Bureau of
 Investigation(FBI)in their official personal capacity and/or "former "capacities, Defendants
 JOHN DOE 3 unknown Assistant United States Attorney General(s), in their official personal
 capacity and/or "former "capacities, Defendants JOHN DOE 4 unknown US "State" Attorney
 (ies) General(s), "put" the Plaintiff name Sharon Bridgewater in the National Crime Data Base
 as "wanted a National Criminal." in their official personal capacity and/or "former "capacities, to
 subject the complainant and the defendants did acts or omissions in furtherance of the objective
 of the conspiracy.

8 Plaintiff allege this tolling order and/or data regarding the Plaintiffs was to capture the Plaintiff
 9 and return the Plaintiff to peonage and/or slavery, fasley imprision the complainant without due
 process of law.

12 The Defendants actions constitute a violation of the complainant Fourth Amendment right to be
 free from unreasonable search and seizure, via the 5th or 14th US Constitutional amendment and;

14 The Defendants actions constitute a violation of the complainant Fourth Amendment right to be
 free from unreasonable search and seizure, via the 5th or 14th US Constitutional amendment.
 Plaintiff allege the Defendants actions also constitute, a violation of (1) and/or (2) and/or (3)
 and/or (4) and/or (5) and/or (6) and/or (7) and/or (8) and/or (9) and/or (10) and/or(11)and/or (12)
 and/or (13) and/or(14) and/or (15) and/or (14) and/or (15) and/or (16) and/or (17) and/or (18)
 and/or (19) and/or (20) and/or (21) and/or (22) and/or (23) and/or (24) and/or (25) and/or (26)
 and/or (27) and/or (28) and/or (29) and/or (30) and/or (31) and/or (32) as mentioned in the above
 pages 42 thru 46 of the above criminal charges(The United States ex rel Sharon Bridgewater vs.
 the Defendants)

21 In furtherance of the unlawful agreement of the defendants, Plaintiffs allege that On or about
 22 Nov. 2, 2007 and continuing through the initiation of these proceedings Plaintiff have
 consistently asked for the return plaintiffs Specialty Investment Group LLC business and/or
 23 personal property from Dective George et al. Plaintiff allege the Defendants have consistently
 failed and refused to return the Plaintiffs possession and defrauded the Plaintiffs out of money or
 24 property valued over \$5,000.00, and did overt acts or omission to further the objective of the
 conspiracy.

28 .61.

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1 Plaintiff and for the purpose to retaliate against a Federal Witness and victim of Crime of US
2 Governrment RICO activities and falsely imprision the Plaintffs and halt the ability of the
3 Plaintiffs to report the crimes.

4
5 In furtherance of the unlawful agreement of the defendants, after the repeated asking of the
6 Plaintiff to return the Plaintffs possesseion, the Defendants knowingly, with the intent to
7 retaliated, took harmful against to the Plaintiff, interfered with the lawful employment of the
8 Plaintiff Sharon Bridgewater or livelihood of the Plaintiff Sharon Bridgewater(Specialty
9 Investment Group LLC), deprive the Plaintiffs of right to honest services in violation of 18 USC
10 1346, and/or deprive the Plaintiff(s) of their property , and prevented the Plaintiffs from
11 conducting business, due to the theft, and robbery of the Specialty Investment Group Property
12 and did overt acts and/or omission to further the objective of the conspiracy.

13
14 Defendants Terrell Bolton "former" Chief of Police of DeKalb County, Georgia
15 his/her individual and official "former "capacity as Chief of Police of Dekalb County
16 is the final decision maker for any policy and procedure, unconstitutional traffic stops, theft,
17 conversion of the Plaintiffs property and is responsible.

18
19 Defendants JOHN DOE 12 unknown Executive Director of Dekalb County, Georgia in his/her
20 individual and official and/or "former" capacity failed to instruct, supervise, and control officers
21 and/or instructed, supervised, and controlled Dekalb County employees and is responsible.

22
23
24 **INTERNET ARTICLE**

25
26 **INTERNET MEDIA ARTICLE OF THE DEKALB COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT**
27 **Friday, February 27, 2009 DeKalb County Police Chief Terrell Bolton Fired**

28 62

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

*Decatur, GA*

In a bold move towards a better community in DeKalb, the county's new CEO Burrell Ellis has fired DeKalb police chief Terrell Bolton. The announcement came on Tuesday, following much controversy, surrounding, Bolton's, conduct, as, police, chief.

A pre-termination notice sent to Bolton last week gave him a deadline of 10:00 a.m. Monday to respond to the charges and explain why he shouldn't be fired. Bolton did send a letter to Ellis on Monday morning, stating numerous reason he should be allowed to remain in his position, however, Ellis, apparently, was, not, swayed.

Among Bolton's major claims is that he can't be fired because he is on medical leave. Bill McKenney, Bolton's lawyer claims the firing may violate federal law. McKenney says the leave falls under the federal Family and Medical Leave Act and cautioned Ellis not to take any action while, the, chief, is, on, leave.

Bolton is accused of various discrepancies, crimes and misconduct including allegations that he has taken over 5 months of "comp" time during his two years on the job despite police department policies against "comp" time for executives and that he personally kept luxury vehicles, seized, in, drug, raids.

This could be a step in the right direction for Ellis in cleaning up the government of DeKalb County. Former CEO Vernon Jones left quite a mess in the county, including a judicial system full of unscrupulous ashkenazis **who rob citizens under color of law on a daily basis, amounting to basically nothing more than an organized crime ring similar to the former judicial system of Cook County, Illinois.**

The Defendants Rico activities, forced Plaintiffs to flee the State of Georgia, forced Plaintiff out of business, and/or prevented Plaintiff from conducting business in Georgia..

63.

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Plaintiffs allege the defendants at all times exhibited conduct constitutes a form of active and/or passive form of concealment of material known facts. Plaintiff allege that the defendants actions constitute a conspiracy under the color of state law, and violation of the Plaintiffs 1st and/or 6th United States Constitutional Right via the 5th or 14th amendment in the traffic stop and/or an intentional. Plaintiff allege Plaintiff allege the Defendants actions also constitute, a violation of (1) and/or (2) and/or (3) and/or (4) and/or (5) and/or (6) and/or (7) and/or (8) and/or (9) and/or (10) and/or (11) and/or (12) and/or (13) and/or (14) and/or (15) and/or (14) and/or (15) and/or (16) and/or (17) and/or (18) and/or (19) and/or (20) and/or (21) and/or (22) and/or (23) and/or (24) and/or (25) and/or (26) and/or (27) and/or (28) and/or (29) and/or (30) and/or (31) and/or (32) as mentioned in the above pages 42 thru 46 of the above criminal charges(The United States ex rel Sharon Bridgewater vs. the Defendants)

, Plaintiffs allege RICO Enterprise No. 2 JOHN DOE 12 unknown Executive Director of Dekalb County, Georgia in his/her individual and official and/or "former" capacity Defendants Terrell Bolton "former" Chief of Police of DeKalb County, Georgia in his/her individual and official "former" capacity as Chief of Police of Dekalb County, Chandra Y. Schreinder #2491, in her official and/or "former" capacity as arresting Officer of the DeKalb County, GA Police Department, Officer Franklin in his/her official and/or "former" capacity as a DeKalb County, GA Police Officer, Detective George in her official and/or "former" capacity as Detective of the DeKalb County GA Police Department, Lieutenant Hamilton in his/her official and/or "former" capacity as Lieutenant of the DeKalb GA County Police Department, Defendants JOHN DOE 13 are unknown DeKalb County GA Police Officers in their individual and official and/or "former" capacities, Does 18 thru 1000 inclusive constitutes a RICO enterprise as defined in 1964. Plaintiff allege at all times mentioned the Defendants severally and/or jointly and/or agreed to and/or invested in organized and/or controlled and/or maintained by and through a consensual hierarchy of partners, managers, directors, officers, supervisors, agents, deputies, and/or representatives of a Dekalb County who " act under the under the color of the State law of Georgia, formulated and implement policies relative to the promoting, advancing and/or otherwise operating a the United States Government, State of Georgia business organization for the purpose of the facilitating, furthering, and promoting the Dekalb County Police Department including, but not restricted to, the raising of monetary funds by and through unconstitutional traffic stops, theft, fraud, robbery, extortion, or attempts, or conspiracy to do so, and/or threats of physical violence, under color of official right, excessive force upon African Americans and other minorities, employing federal mails and/or federal interstate wires, as well as and providing documentary materials such as, traffic citations, warrants of arrest, mugshots, pertaining to the the false arrest, false imprisonments of such individuals who are victims of their RICO activities. Plaintiffs allege that RICO persons defendants, and other persons unknown to plaintiffs, acting in concert therewith, are employed by and associated with said Georgia RICO enterprise that is engaged in, or activities of which affect, Plaintiffs allege that Georgia RICO persons, and other persons unknown to plaintiffs, acting in concert therewith, are

-64-

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

employed by and associated with said Georgia RICO enterprise that is engaged in, or activities of which affect and/or violated Georgia RICO and/or federal interstate and/or foreign commerce, and that said Georgia RICO persons, and persons acting in concert therewith, conduct or participate, directly or indirectly, in the conduct of such RICO federal interstate and/or foreign commerce, and that said Georgia Georgia RICO persons, and persons acting in concert therewith, conduct or participate, directly or indirectly, in the conduct of such Georgia RICO enterprise's affairs through a Georgia RICO pattern of racketeering activity, a Georgia RICO pattern of racketeering activity.

Plaintiffs allege that RICO persons, and other persons unknown to plaintiffs, acting in concert therewith, are employed by and associated with said Georgia RICO enterprise that is engaged in, or activities of which affect, Georgia State and/or federal interstate and/or foreign commerce, and that said Georgia RICO persons, and persons acting in concert therewith, conduct or participate, directly or indirectly, in the conduct of such Georgia RICO enterprise's affairs through a Georgia RICO pattern of racketeering activity.

The Plaintiff(s) have been damaged by the above Defendants RICO activities, in that the Defendants actions caused the Plaintiff to go out of business, drove the Plaintiff out of the State of Georgia.

O.C.G.A. 9-3-99" provides that the running of the period of limitations with respect to any cause of action in tort that may be brought by the victim of an alleged crime which arises out of the facts and circumstances relating to the commission of such alleged crime committed in this state shall be tolled from the date of the commission of the alleged crime or the act giving rise to such action in tort until the prosecution of such crime or act has become final or otherwise terminated, provided that such time does not exceed six (6) years, and therefore the statue of limitation is tolled to the Plaintiffs RICO cause of action.

RICO ENTERPRIZE #3

RICO ARTIFICE AND SCHEME TO DEFRAUD [TITLE 18 U.S.C. § 1964(c)]
RE: INJURY TO BUSINESS AND PROPERTY AND DESTRUCTION OF BUSINESS
and OBTAINING MONIES BY AND THROUGH FALSE MISREPRESENTATIONS or
FRAUD, PEONGAGE or SLAVERY, FALSE IMPRISONMENT, Federal Principal and
Aider and Abettor, Title 18 U.S.C.A §2(a)-(b), Federal Principal and Aider and Abettor, Aiding

1 and Abetting A Conspiracy, Federal Principal and Aider and Abettor Conspiracy to Commit
2 Aiding and Abetting
3

4
5 Upon information and belief in furtherance of the unlawful agreement of Dective George et al,
6 Conspired with HVLP. Upon information and belief HVLP adopted the acts of Officer
7 Schriender of the Dekalb County Police Department, et al a "discriminated against the Plaitniffs
8 based on race, class, or ethnicity and/or because the Plaintiff was a member of a "protected
9 Class" and/or minority owned Real Estate Company and competors of the US Government and
10 did overt acts in furtherance of the objective of the conspiracy.

11
12 The reason why I belief this is:
13

14 I at all times arrived in my apartment in California, on or about Nov. 4, 2007, from Georgia.
15 I at all times mentioned owed, operated my own Real Estate Company, and my son was study to
16 become a Licensed Real Estate Broker. We at all times mentioned were minority owed
17 businesses, and were at all times mentioned competitors with the Hayes Valley Limited
18 Parntership(Public/Private Partnership)had a (on or about Jan. 1, 2005, I Sharon Bridgewater,
19 the San Francisco Housing Authority(SFHA), and HVLP entered into a "three way" legally
20 binding, HUD lease agreement contract for the premise of 427 Page Street, San Franscico, CA
21 94102), a legally binding lease agreement with HVLP and in order to terminate a HUD tenancy
22 it requires a 90 day notice(put law). I at all times was in peaceful, lawful possession of the
23 premise of 427 Page Street, San Francisco, California, Plaintiffs rental payments were current.
24

25 Defendants JOHN DOE 8 is unknown Director of the San Francisco Housing Authority in
26 her/his official or former personal capacity as Director of the San Francisco Housing
27 Authority, Defendants JOHN DOE 9 unknown employees of the San Francisco Housing
28 Authority in their official personal capacity or former capacities, Hayes Valley Limited
Partnership (AKA, Hayes Valley Apartments II L.P.), McCormack Baron Ragan Management
Services Inc, MBA Urban Development Co., The Related Companies of California, Inc.,
Sunamerica Affordable Housing Partnership Inc., Hasinah Rahim,Shawn Bankson, Jane
Creason, Kimball, Tirey & St. John, LLP had a legal obligation and/or duty to as contractor of

-66-

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1 the US Federal Government to comply with Federal and/or State laws, in the termination of
2 tenancy process, agreements with Tenants, and to comply with federal fair housing law, etc. and
3 had duties and/or obligation as Federal and/or State Actors and/or receiptant of US Federal
Government funds, and manager of Federal Public Housing Complexes, across America, in
accordance the the Hud Regulatory and Management agreement.

Plaintiff allege On **Nov. 12, 2007**, at an "unknown" time at 401 Rose Street, San Francisco,
California Hashiah Rashad, property Manager for HVLP(defendants Hayes Valley Limited
Partnership (AKA, Hayes Valley Apartments II L.P.), McCormack Baron Ragan Management
Services Inc.MBA Urban Development Co., The Related Companies of California, Inc.
Sunamerica Affordable Housing Partnership Inc.,) acted under the color of the US Federal
and/or State Government, originating within the state of California, and terminating within the
state of California, caused to placed in a post office, or in an authorized depository for mail,
matter to be sent and delivered by the Postal Service to 427 Page Street the following document,
and did overt acts in furtherance of the objective of the conspiracy.

.b7.

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

Case 4:09-cv-03551-PJH Document 1-4 Filed 08/03/09 Page 20 of 29
 Valley Apartment
 street
 cisco, CA 94102
 5-487-1218
 5-487-1834

NOTICE TO PAY RENT OR QUIT

To: Sharon Bridgewater

AND ALL OTHERS IN POSSESSION:

WITHIN FIVE DAYS, after the service on you of this notice, you are hereby required to pay the delinquent rent of the premises herein after described, of which you now hold possession as follows:

\$78.00	From	November 1, 2007	Through	November 30, 2007
\$78.00	From	October 1, 2007	Through	October 31, 2007
\$78.00	From	September 1, 2007	Through	September 30, 2007
\$78.00	From	August 1, 2007	Through	August 31, 2007
\$78.00	From	July 1, 2007	Through	July 31, 2007

Or you are hereby required to deliver up possession of the hereinafter described premises, with five days after service on you of the notice, to HAYES VALLEY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP ("owner"), who/which is authorized to receive the same, or legal proceedings will be instituted against you to declare the forfeiture of the lease or rental agreement under which you occupy the herein below described property and to recover possession of said premises, to recover all rent past due, to recover court cost, attorney fees as permitted by law, and possible additional statutory damages of up to SIX HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$600.00) in accordance with California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1174(b), as a result of your failure to comply with the terms of this notice.

The premises herein referred to is situated in the City of SAN FRANCISCO, County of SAN FRANCISCO, State of California, designated by the number and street as 656 Fell Street 94102

You are further notified that should you fail to remit the above-demanded rent or surrender possession of the above-described premises, the undersigned does elect to declare the forfeiture of your lease or rental agreement under which you hold possession of the above-described premises.

Payment must be made to the owner/agent at the following address: 401 ROSE STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

Telephone number for the above-address: 41

Payments made in person shall be delivered to or between the hours 9:00 am - 4:00 pm on the following days of the week: Monday through Friday. Payments may also be made by appointment only on Saturday and Sunday.

68
 SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- 69 -

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

.7°.

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

Case4:09-cv-13551-PJH Document1-4 Filed08/03/09 Page21 of 29

You may make such reply as you wish. You have the right to examine Lessor documents directly relevant to the lease termination.

You have a right to a grievance hearing in this matter. You must within five (5) days meet and discuss with the landlord this notice and the proposed termination of tenancy. Advice regarding this notice is available from the San Francisco Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board located at 25 Van Ness Street, Suite 320, San Francisco, CA 94102 on Monday through Friday from 8:00 am 5:00 pm and via telephone at 425-252-4600.

Dated: November 12, 2007

By:

Hasinah Rahim

Hasinah Rahim, General Manager
McCormack Baron Ragan for Hayes Valley
Apartments

71

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1 Plaintiff's allege Hashiah Rashad, property Manager for HVLP(defendants Hayes Valley
2 Limited Partnership (AKA, Hayes Valley Apartments II L.P.), McCormack Baron Ragan
3 Management Services Inc.MBA Urban Development Co., The Related Companies of
California, Inc. Sunamerica Affordable Housing Partnership Inc.,) Plaintiff allege the notice to
pay rent or quit was false, deceptive and an "invalid" or "improper" notice to pay rent or quit
with no "exact" dollar amount due in dollars and cents in violation of California Civil Procedure
1161.

6 Plaintiff's allege Hashiah Rashad, property Manager for HVLP(defendants Hayes Valley
7 Limited Partnership (AKA, Hayes Valley Apartments II L.P.), McCormack Baron Ragan
8 Management Services Inc.MBA Urban Development Co., The Related Companies of
9 California, Inc. Sunamerica Affordable Housing Partnership Inc.,) knew and were aware the
notice to pay rent or quit was false, deceptive and an "invalid" or "improper" notice to pay rent
or quit with no "exact" dollar amount due in dollars and cents and violated of California Civil
10 Procedure 1161. Plaintiff allege the Defendants knew and were aware the Plaintiff was current
11 in rents. Plaintiff allege that the Defendants knew and were aware they needed to provide the
Plaintiffs with a HUD notice of termination of tenancy as provided by federal law.

13 Plaintiff's allege Hashiah Rashad, property Manager for HVLP(defendants Hayes Valley
14 Limited Partnership (AKA, Hayes Valley Apartments II L.P.), McCormack Baron Ragan
15 Management Services Inc.MBA Urban Development Co., The Related Companies of
California, Inc. Sunamerica Affordable Housing Partnership Inc., intended for the Plaintiff to
16 rely on the false, deceptive notice to pay rent or quit.

17 Plaintiffs relied on the notice to pay rent or quit, called Hashiah Rashad, property Manager for
18 HVLP(defendants Hayes Valley Limited Partnership (AKA, Hayes Valley Apartments II L.P.),
19 McCormack Baron Ragan Management Services Inc.MBA Urban Development Co., The
Related Companies of California, Inc. Sunamerica Affordable Housing Partnership Inc.,) to get
20 an the exact dollar amount due and/or a copy of the McCormack Baron Rental ledger to verify
and/or to cure any back rent due.

22 Plaintiff allege Hashiah Rashad, property Manager for HVLP(defendants Hayes Valley Limited
23 Partnership (AKA, Hayes Valley Apartments II L.P.), McCormack Baron Ragan Management
24 Services Inc.MBA Urban Development Co., The Related Companies of California, Inc.
Sunamerica Affordable Housing Partnership Inc.,), knowingly, intentionally concealed a
25 material known facts from the Plaintiffs, failed to return the Plaintiffs phone calls for the Plaintiff
to cure back rents, and failed to give plaintiffs a rental ledger to verify the amount of rent due,
26 just for the purpose to use, threat, force the Plaintiff out of the apartment pending Christmas/New
Years destroy the Plaintiffs holiday season and/or to use coercion and maliciously evict
27 Plaintiffs pending the holiday season and/or defraud the plaintiffs out of money or property.

28 .12.

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1
2
3 Plaintiffs allege the defendant had a duty or obligation to give to Plaintiffs the McCormack baron rental ledger and to communicate to the Plaintiffs an amount of rent due.

4
5 The Plaintiffs would have known, and/or acted differently had the Defendants made known the
6 amount of rent due, or supplied the rental ledger.

7
8 There was no probable cause for the Defendants to conceal the rental ledger, and/or to send a
9 notice to pay rent or quit when the Plaintiffs were current in rent.

10
11 In furtherance of the unlawful agreement of the Defendants Plaintiff allege On Dec.24, 2007,
12 Dec.25, 2007, Dec. 26, 2007, HVLP, Shawn Bankson or Kimball, Tirey & St. John LLP
13 conspired, discriminated against the Plaintiffs based on race, class or ethnicity, "minority
14 business owners" or "protected class tenants" concealed known facts from the Plaintiff, acted in
15 joint participation with the local Sherriff, acted the color of Federal and/or State law, used threat,
16 coercion and/or force, maliciously breached the US HUD contract without due process of law,
17 forcibly evicted the Plaintiff(s) from the apartment without due process of law and without
18 probable cause, and violated the Plaintiffs 5th or 14th amendment due process rights in the
19 termination of tenancy and did overt acts and/or omissions in furtherance of the conspiracy.

20
21 The Rico actions of the Defendants caused horrific, physical trauma, extreme emotional distress,
22 and I broke my foot in the process of moving my items of the apartment on the surprise forcible
23 eviction. Plaintiff at all times mentioned relocated to a "new" apartment in San Francisco(see
24 exh.)

25
26 The Defendants actions constitute a discrimination based on race, class ethnicity, or
27 discrimination against a minority owed business owner, and/or a "protected class individual."
28 The Defendants actions constitute an conspiracy under the act color of Georgia State law, and a
violation of the Plaintiffs 4th United States Constitutional Right via the 5th or 14th amendment in
the traffic stop. Plaintiff allege the Defendants actions also constitute, a violation of (1) and/or
(2) and/or (3) and/or (4) and/or (5) and/or (6) and/or (7) and/or (8) and/or (9) and/or (10)
and/or (11) and/or (12) and/or (13) and/or (14) and/or (15) and/or (14) and/or (15) and/or (16)
and/or (17) and/or (18) and/or (19) and/or (20) and/or (21) and/or (22) and/or (23) and/or (24)
and/or (25) and/or (26) and/or (27) and/or (28) and/or (29) and/or (30) and/or (31) and/or (32) as

- 73 -

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1 mentioned in the above pages 42 thru 46 of the above criminal charges(The United States ex rel
2 Sharon Bridgewater vs. the Defendants)

3
4
5 On or about Jan. 22, the Plaintiff(s) petitioned a Superior court Judge to vacate the illegal
6 eviction, and/or illegal judgment obtained by the Defendants. The Superior Court Judge,
7 Granted the Plaintiffs motion.(see exh.)

8 Plaintiff allege the Defendants obstructed a lawful court order, concealed known facts of the
9 rental ledger from Plaintiffs

10
11 Plaintiffs allege the defendant purposefully concealed known facts of the rental ledger just for
12 the purpose to defraud Plaintiffs out of money or property.

13
14 On or about Feb.19, 2008, at the Superior Court of the State of California, County of San
15 Francisco Court house, 400 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 Shawn Bankson and/or
16 KTJ and/or HVLP with the intent to defraud, use threat, coercion and/or force and obtain money
17 and/or property without due process of law concealed a material known facts from the Plaintiff
18 Sharon Bridgewater(Specialty Investment Group LLC) abused the Superior Court of California,
19 under penalty and perjury, prepared and presented the legal document to the Plaintiffs as follows
20 and the act was legally done as follows:.

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 - 74

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

Case4:09-cv-03551-PJH Document1-5 Filed08/03/09 Page15 of 22

1 KIMBALL, TIREY & ST. JOHN, LLP
 2 Jane L. Creason Bar No. 189094
 3 5994 W. Las Positas Blvd., Suite 210
 4 (800) 525-1690
 5 (800) 281-1911 (fax)
 6 Attorney for Plaintiff
 7 HAYES VALLEY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

FILED
 SUPERIOR COURT
 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
 FEB 19 2008
 GORDON PARK-LI, Clerk
 FY: Property Clerk

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

9 HAYES VALLEY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

Case No.: CUD-06-617995

10 Vs.

Plaintiff,

STIPULATION FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENT
 AND ORDER THEREON

11 SHARON BRIDGEWATER

Defendant

12 DOES 1 TO 10 INCLUSIVE

13 IT IS SO STIPULATED by and between the parties hereto through Plaintiff's counsel,
 14 KIMBALL, TIREY & ST. JOHN; Plaintiff, HAYES VALLEY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP,
 15 and Defendant, SHARON BRIDGEWATER, that judgment in the above-entitled will be entered
 16 as follows should Defendant fail to comply with any of the terms stated herein:

17 1. Plaintiff to receive possession of the premises located at 427 PAGE STREET,
 18 San Francisco, CA, 94102 on ~~March 17~~ ^{April 30}, 2008. A Writ of Possession for said premises may
 19 issue immediately if Defendant has not restored possession to Plaintiff by vacating said
 20 premises on or before ~~March 17~~ ^{April 30}, 2008 by the close of business at 6:00 p.m.

21 2. The parties further agree that in exchange for Defendant moving out by ~~April 30~~ ^{April 30}
 22 ~~2008~~, Plaintiff will waive all of the past due rent in the amount of \$2,124.74.

23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 -B-
 SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

Case4:09-cv-03551-PJH Document1-5 Filed08/03/09 Page16 of 22

3. Plaintiff waives \$450 attorneys' fees and \$405 in costs.

4. The rental agreement/lease under which Defendant holds possession of said property is forfeited on April 30, 2008. *(JLH)*

5. Defendant SHARON BRIDGEWATER expressly waives any and all rights to a noticed motion and/or right to a hearing on the entry of a judgment pursuant to this stipulation.

6. Defendant SHARON BRIDGEWATER expressly agrees to leave the premises in good repair and clean condition according to California law.

7. Plaintiff shall return Defendant's security deposit in the amount of ~~\$666.66~~ accordance with California law. *(JLH) (57)*
~~exchange for keys on March 17, 2008.~~

8. Defendant SHARON BRIDGEWATER and any others in possession will move out April 30, 2008 by 8:00 p.m. *(JLH)*

9. If Defendant fails to comply with any of the terms as herein stated, judgment shall enter for possession and the full amount of past due rent, attorneys' fees and costs. A writ of execution for money and possession shall issue immediately upon Declaration by Plaintiff's counsel if Defendant fails to comply with this stipulation. Judgment for possession shall be entered pursuant to CCP 415.46 as to any and all occupants.

10. In the event of non-compliance, Plaintiff shall give 24-hour telephonic notice to the defendant at the following phone number: 415-401-5573.

11. This stipulation shall be dispositive of all issues raised in Plaintiff's Complaint and all affirmative defenses which could have been raised in Defendant's Answer, and shall be ~~considered as a full and final settlement of all claims and issues raised in the Complaint and Answer.~~ *(JLH) (56)*

12. It is further stipulated that facsimile signatures shall be deemed originals, per California Rules of Court, Rule 2.305 (d) and that this Stipulation may be executed in

76

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

Case 4:09-cv-03551-PJH Document 1-5 Filed 08/03/09 Page 17 of 22

1 counterparts as circumstances require and shall be deemed fully enforceable upon execution
 2 of all parties hereto.

3 13. In the future, Plaintiff will give only a neutral reference as to dates of occupancy
 4 and rental amount.

5 14. Each signatory hereto represents that they have the express authority from the
 6 party they represent to sign for and bind that party to the terms herein.

7 15. Defendant reserve the right to sue in the future and
 8 do not give up all claims pertaining to future lawsuits

9 Dated: 2/19/08

10 Defendant- SHARON BRIDGEWATER

11 Dated: 2/19/08

12 Plaintiff- HAYES VALLEY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

13 By: _____
 14 Authorized Agent for Plaintiff

15 Dated: 2/19/08

16 Jane Creason
 17 KIMBALL, TIREY & ST. JOHN, LLP
 18 Attorneys for Plaintiff
 19 By: Jane Creason

20 ORDER

21 IT IS SO ORDERED:

22 Dated: 2-19-08

23 Alexander Chalik
 24 Judge Pro Tem.
 25 JUDGE/COMMISSIONER OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

1 On or about Feb. 19, 2008 at the San Francisco Superior Court house, 400 McAllister Street,
2 San Francisco, CA at approx. 2:30 p.m. at the mandatory settlement conference in case number
3 CUD- for Attorney Jane Creason agent for HVLP knowing, willingly, intentionally, with
malice fraudulently concealed known facts of the amount of rent due from the Plaintiff and/or
withheld the McCormack Baron Rental ledger from the Plaintiff.

5 On or about Feb. 19, 2008 at the San Francisco Superior Court house, 400 McAllister Street,
6 San Francisco, CA at approx. 2:30 p.m. at the mandatory settlement conference in case number
7 CUD-06-17995; Attorney Jane Creason agent for HVLP knowing, willingly, intentionally,
8 maliciously with the intent to deceive and defraud the Plaintiff(s) Sharon Bridgewater and/or
9 the Specialty Investment Group LLC out of money or property malice fraudulently concealed
from the Plaintiff that she was in legal possession of the premise of 427 Page Street, San
Francisco, CA 94102. The Defendants were under a duty to disclose the known facts.

10
11 On or about Feb. 19, 2008 at the San Francisco Superior Court house, 400 McAllister Street,
12 San Francisco, CA at approx. 2:35 p.m. on the day of trial, at the mandatory settlement
13 conference in case number CUD-06-17995; Attorney Jane Creason agent for HVLP knowing,
14 willingly, intentionally, with malice acted with the state of mind to extort cash from the
15 Plaintiff, and/or violate the Plaintiff(s) Sharon Bridgewater and/or the Specialty Investment
16 Group LLC Plaintiff violate the Plaintiffs civil rights, exerted pressure, intimidated, used force
and/or coerce and/or use threat and/or and used her authority as an Attorney and under the color
of official right, instilled fear in the Plaintiff, made a intentional material misrepresentation to
the Plaintiff Sharon and told the Sharon Bridgewater that she owed \$405.00 in cost, and
\$450.00 in attorney fees.

17 Attorney Jane Creason agent for HVLP knew the material representation was false when she
18 made it.

19
20 Attorney Jane Creason agent for HVLP intended for Sharon Bridgewater to rely on her material
21 representation to coerce and/or induce the Plaintiff to give her cash in the amount of \$955.00
22 without due process of law.

23 Sharon Bridgewater and/or the Specialty Investment Group LLC was ignorant of the material
24 representation made by Attorney Jane Creason agent for HVLP.

25
26 On or about Feb. 19, 2008 at the San Francisco Superior Court house, 400 McAllister Street,
27 San Francisco, CA at approx. 2:36 p.m. on the day of trial, at the mandatory settlement
28 conference Property Manager for HVLP Hashiah Rahim knowing, willingly, intentionally,

-76

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1 with malice acted with the state of mind to extort cash, exerted pressure, intimidade, use force
2 and/or coerce and/or use threat and/or and used her authority as Property Manager, and/or under
3 the official right to instill fear in the Plaintiff Sharon Bridgewater and/or the Specialty
Investment Group LLC that \$2,124.74 owed and past due for rent. Property Manager Hashiah
Rahim knew the material representation was false when she made it.

4
5 Property Manager Hashiah Rahim intended for the Sharon Bridgewater and/or the Specialty
6 Investment Group LLC to rely on her material representation to intended for Sharon Bridgewater
7 to rely on her material representation to coerce and/or induce the Plaintiff to give her cash in the
amount of \$2,124.74 without due process of law.

8
9 The Plaintiffs Sharon Bridgewater and/or the Specialty Investment Group LLC was ignorant of
10 the material representation made by Hashiah Rashad Property Manager for HVLP.

11 At approx. 2:37 p.m. Attorney Jane Creason agent for HVLP, with malice, intentionally,
12 knowingly, willingly, with the state of mind to extort money, discriminate against Sharon
13 Bridgewater and/or the Specialty Investment Group LLC and/violate Sharon Bridgewater and/or
14 the Specialty Investment Group LLC civil rights, instill fear in the Plaintiff Sharon Bridgewater
and/or the Specialty Investment Group LLC and/or exerted pressure, coerced, induced, used
threat and/or force, and/or intimidation, made an intentional misrepresentation to the Plaintiff,
15 Sharon Bridgewater and/or the Specialty Investment Group LLC and gave the Plaintiff Sharon
16 Bridgewater and/or the Specialty Investment Group LLC an ULTIMATUM, to **immediately**
17 **pay \$2,979.74, or immediately move from the premise of 427 Page Street, San Francisco,**
CA.

18
19 At approx. 2:39 p.m. the Plaintiff Sharon Bridgewater and/or the Specialty Investment Group
20 LLC scared of an immediate eviction again, pleaded for more time to remain in the unit.

21 At approx. 2:46 p.m. Attorney Jane Creason agent for HVLP, with malice, with the intent to
22 defraud Sharon Bridgewater and/or the Specialty Investment Group LLC out of money and/or
23 property presented to the Plaintiffs Sharon Bridgewater and/or the Specialty Investment Group
24 LLC an Official legal document of the Stipulated Judgment for possession of the premises that
25 expressly use language of, "Court of the State of California, County of San Francisco, Hayes
26 Valley Limited Partnership, Plaintiffs vs. Sharon Bridgewater Sharon Bridgewater and/or the
Specialty Investment Group LLC and Does 1 to 10 inclusive, case number CUD-06-17995,
Stipulation for Entry of Judgment Order Thereon Stipulated Judgment, that contained "expressed
27 language", of;
28

.79.

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

IT IS SO STIPULATED by and between the parties hereto through Plaintiff's counsel, KIMBALL, TIREY & ST. JOHN; Plaintiff HAYES VALLEY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, and Defendant, SHARON BRIDGEWATER, that judgment in the above-entitled will be entered as follows should Defendant fail to comply with any of these terms stated herein:

- i. Plaintiff to receive possession of the premises located at 427 PAGE STREET, San Francisco, CA, 94102 on March 17, 2008. A writ for Possession for said premises may issue immediately if Defendant as not restored possession to Plaintiff by vacating said premises on or before March 17, 2008 by the close of business at 6:00 p.m.
- ii. The parties further agree that in exchange for Defendant moving out by April 3, 2008, Plaintiff will waive all past due rent in the amount of \$2,124.74.
- iii. Plaintiff waives \$450.00 attorney fees and \$405.00 costs.
- iv. The rental agreement/lease under which Defendants holds possession of property is forfeited on March 17, 2008.
- v. Defendant SHARON BRIDGEWATER, expressly waives any and all rights to a noticed motion and/or right at a hearing on the entry of a judgment pursuant to this stipulation;
- vi. Defendant SHARON BRIDGEWATER expressly agrees to leave the premises in good repair and clean condition according to California law.
- vii. Plaintiff shall return Defendant's security deposit in the amount of \$600.00 in exchange for keys on March 17, 2008.
- Viii. Defendant SHARON BRIDGEWATER and any others in possession will move March 17, 2008 by 6:00 p.m.
- ix. If Defendants fails to comply with any of the terms as stated, judgment shall enter for possession and the full amount of past due rent, attorney's fee's cost. A writ of execution for money and possession shall issue immediately upon Declaration by Plaintiff's counsel if Defendant fails to comply with this stipulation. Judgment for possession shall be entered pursuant to CCP 415.46 as to any and all occupants.
- x. In the event of non-compliance, Plaintiff shall give 24 hour telephonic notice to the defendant at the following phone number: 415-401-5573.
- xi. This stipulated shall be dispositive of all issues raised in Plaintiff's Complaint and all affirmative defenses which could have been raised in Defendant's Answer, and shall be considered res judicata in any further proceeding initiated by either party.
- xii. It is further stipulated that facsimile signatures shall be deemed originals, per California Rules 2.305(d) and that this Stipulated may be executed in counterparts as circumstances require and shall be deemed fully enforceable upon execution of all parties hereto.
- xiii. In the future, Plaintiff will give only a neutral reference as to dates of

-80-

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1 occupancy and rental amount.
2 xiv. Each signatory hereto represents that they have the express authority from the
3 party they represent to sign for and bind that party to the terms herein

4
5 At approx. 2:38 p.m. the two(HVLP property Manager and Attorney Jane Creason)with the
6 intent to defraud the Plaintiff and/or violate the Plaintiff's Sharon Bridgewater and/or the
7 Specialty Investment Group LLC civil rights, exerted pressure, discriminated against the
8 Plaintiffs Sharon Bridgewater and/or the Specialty Investment Group LLC used intimidation,
9 made an intentional false material misrepresentation, and told the Plaintiffs Sharon Bridgewater
10 and/or the Specialty Investment Group LLC that the apartment needed to be vacated within
11 twenty-eight (28) days and from 427 Page Street, San Francisco, CA 94102.

12
13 At approx. 2:38 p.m.the Plaintiff Sharon Bridgewater and/or the Specialty Investment Group
14 LLC told the Defendant , that it would be impossible to obtain another, and/or conduct business
15 unit with an eviction posted on her record,and no place to live. Subsequently Sharon
16 Bridgewater and/or the Specialty Investment Group LLC told Jane Creason and Hashiah Rashad
17 that more time was needed to find another place to stay and/or more time was need to save for a
18 security deposit , in light of the recent lost of security Deposity on Oakdale Street, San Francisco
19 California. Subsequently Plaintiffs Sharon Bridgewater and/or the Specialty Investment Group
20 LLC told the Defendants Jane Creason and Hashiah Rashad, that Sharon Bridgewater and/or the
21 Specialty Investment Group LLC needed the her full security deposit of \$1,527.00 and good
22 rental reference to secure another unit and/or to conduct business.

23
24 At approx. 2:40 p.m. Property Manager HVLP Hashiah Rahim and/or Jane Creason with malice,
25 intentionally, knowingly, willingly, with the intent to violate the Plaintiff Sharon Bridgewater
26 and/or the Specialty Investment Group LLC civil rights, defraud the Plaintiff Sharon
27 Bridgewater and/or the Specialty Investment Group LLC out of money and/or property and
28 fraudulently induce and/or coerce the Plaintiff to sign the agreement, made an intentional false
material misrepresentation told the Plaintiff Sharon Bridgewater and/or the Specialty Investment
Group LLC 90 days was allot to vacate the unit at 427 Page Street, San Francisco, CA.

29
30 At approx. 2:41 p.m. Property Manager HVLP Hashiah Rahim and/or Jane Creason with malice,
31 intentionally, knowingly, willingly, with the intent to violate the Plaintiff Sharon Bridgewater
32 and/or the Specialty Investment Group LLC civil rights, defraud the Plaintiffs out of money or
33 property and restrain commerce, made an intentional false material misrepresentation would give
34 the Plaintiff good rental reference, and return to Sharon Bridgewater her security deposit to
35 secure another unit.

36
37
38 -8/-

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1 The Property Manager for HVLP Hasinah Rahim, and/or Jane Creason intentionally, knowing,
2 willingly, with the malice, and the intent to defraud the Plaintiff made another intentional
3 material misrepresentation and told the Plaintiff Sharon Bridgewater and/or the Specialty
Investment Group LLC that the full security of \$1,527.00 would be return to Sharon
Bridgewater and/or the Specialty Investment Group LLC up give up possession of the premises
of 427 Page Street, San Francisco, CA 94102.

6 Plaintiff allege the purpose of the false material representation was to induce the Plaintiff Sharon
7 Bridgewater and/or the Specialty Investment Group LLC to sign a stipulated Judgement, force
8 the plaintiff out of business, restrain commerce, and/or defraud Plaintiffs out of money or
property eliminate competition.

10 At approx. 2:42 p.m. Property Manager HVLP Hashiah Rahim and/or Jane Creason with malice,
11 intentionally, knowingly, willingly, with the intent to violate the Plaintiff civil rights, defraud the
12 Plaintiff and coerce the Plaintiff to sign the agreement, made an intentional material
misrepresentation told the Plaintiff she had until April 30, 2008 to vacate the unit.

14 Plaintiff On or about under duress, threat, force or coercion, or extortion, signed the agreement,
15 and enter into the Official legal document entitled, Superior Court of the State of California,
16 County of San Francisco, Hayes Valley Limited Partnership, Plaintiff vs. Sharon Bridgewater,
Defendant case number CUD-06-17995, and Stipulation for Entry of Judgment Order Thereon,

17 The Property Manager for HVLP Hasinah Rahim signed and entered into the Official legal
document entitled, Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Francisco, Hayes
18 Valley Limited Partnership, Plaintiff vs. Sharon Bridgewater, Defendant case number CUD-
06-17995, and Stipulation for Entry of Judgment Order Thereon Stipulated Judgment 427 Page
19 Street, San Francisco, CA 94102

20 Attorney Jane Creason agent for HVLP, made an false, deceptive intentional material
21 representations and presented to the Judicial Tribunal Pro Tem Judge Alex Anolk an Official
22 legal document of a Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Francisco, Hayes
Valley Limited Partnership, and Plaintiff vs. Sharon Bridgewater Defendant Does 1 to 10
23 inclusive, case number CUD-06-17995, Stipulation for Entry of Judgment Order Thereon
Stipulated Judgment, that contained "expressed language", of;

24 IT IS SO STIPULATED by and between the parties hereto through Plaintiff's counsel,
25 KIMBALL, TIREY & ST. JOHN; Plaintiff HAYES VALLEY LIMITED
26 PARTNERSHIP, and Defendant, SHARON BRIDGEWATER, that judgment n the
above-entitled will be entered as follows should Defendant fail to comply with any of
27 their terms stated herein:

28 - 82

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

- i. Plaintiff to receive possession of the premises located at 427 PAGE STREET, San Francisco, CA, 94102 on April 30, 2008. A writ for Possession for said premises may issue immediately if Defendant as not restored possession to Plaintiff by vacating said premises on or before April 30, 2008 by the close of business at 6:00 p.m.
- ii. The parties further agree that in exchange for Defendant moving out by April 30, 2008, Plaintiff will waive all past due rent in the amount of \$2,124.74.
- iii. Plaintiff waives \$450.00 attorney fees and \$405.00 costs.
- iv. The rental agreement/lease under which Defendants holds possession of property is forfeited on April 30, 2008.
- v. Defendant SHARON BRIDGEWATER, expressly waives any and all rights to a noticed motion and/or right at a hearing on the entry of a judgment pursuant to this stipulation;
- vi. Defendant SHARON BRIDGEWATER expressly agrees to leave the premises in good repair and clean condition according to California law.
- vii. Plaintiff shall return Defendant's security deposit in accordance with California law.
- viii. Defendant SHARON BRIDGEWATER and any others in possession will move April 30, 2008 by 6:00 p.m.
- ix. If Defendants fails to comply with any of the terms as stated, judgment shall enter for possession and the full amount of past due rent, attorney's fee's cost. A writ of execution for money and possession shall issue immediately upon Declaration by Plaintiff's counsel if Defendant fails to comply with this stipulation. Judgment for possession shall be entered pursuant to CCP 415. 46 as to any and all occupants.
- x. In the event of non-compliance, Plaintiff shall give 24 hour telephonic notice to the defendant at the following phone number: 415-401-5573.
- xi. This stipulated shall be dispositive of all issues raised in Plaintiff's Complaint and all affirmative defenses which could have been raised in Defendant's Answer.
- xii. It is further stipulated that facsimile signatures shall be deemed originals, per California Rules 2.305(d) and that this Stipulated may be executed in counterparts as circumstances require and shall be deemed fully enforceable upon execution of all parties hereto.
- xiii. In the future, Plaintiff will give only a neutral reference as to dates of occupancy and rental amount.
- xiv. Each signatory hereto represents that they have the express authority from the party they represent to sign for and bind that party to the terms herein
- xv. Defendant reserves the right to sue in the further and do not give up all claims pertaining to further lawsuits.

§ 2

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1 Attorney Jane Creason agent for HVLP presented the document to the Judicial Tribunal, made an
2 intentional material misrepresentation to the Judicial Tribunal Pro Tem Judge Alex Anolk and
3 told him that Sharon Bridgewater, HVLP Property Manager Hashinah Rahim and Attorney Jane
Creason Agent for HVLP had reached a Satisfactory Settlement Agreement of Official legal
document for Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Francisco, Hayes Valley
Limited Partnership, and Plaintiff vs. Sharon Bridgewater Defendant Does 1 to 10 inclusive,
case number CUD-06-17995, Stipulation for Entry of Judgment Order Thereon.

6 Attorney Jane Creason agent for HVLP and/or KTJ knew the material representation made to
7 the Judicial Tribunal Pro Tem Judge Alex Anolk of the Official legal document of a Superior
8 Court of the State of California, County of San Francisco, Hayes Valley Limited Partnership,
9 and Plaintiff vs. Sharon Bridgewater Defendant case number CUD-06-17995, Stipulation for
10 Entry of Judgment Order Thereon, lacked due process of law, contained willful, knowingly,
false statements; and the Plaintiff was coerced and/or fraudulently induced into the Stipulated
Judgment against her will.

11
12 Attorney Jane Creason and/or KTJ with malice, willfully, intentionally, knowing with the into
13 defraud the Plaintiff and/or the Judicial Tribunal, intended the Judicial Tribunal Pro Tem Judge
14 Alex Anolk intended him to rely on her material representation.

15 The Judicial Tribunal Pro Tem Judge Alex Anolk was ignorant, and did not know that the
16 Plaintiff was induced into the The Official legal document of a Superior Court of the State of
17 California, County of San Francisco, Hayes Valley Limited Partnership, and Plaintiff vs. Sharon
18 Bridgewater Defendant Does 1 to 10 inclusive, case number CUD-06-17995, Stipulation for
Entry of Judgment Order Thereon, and signed the agreement under duress, etc.

19 The Judicial Tribunal Pro Tem Judge Alex Anolk was ignorant and did not know the Stipulated
20 Judgment contained fraudulent, false statements and lacked due process of law.

21 The Judicial Tribunal Pro Tem Judge Alex Anolk relied on Attorney Jane Creason agent for
22 HVLP and/or KTJ false material representation.

23 The Judicial Tribunal Pro Tem Judge Alex Anolk had a right to rely on the representation of
24 Attorney Jane Creason agent for HVLP and/or KTJ and relied on Attorney Jane Creason agent
25 for HVLP and/or KTJ as Officer(s) of the Court of law.

26
27 The Judicial Tribunal Pro Tem Judge Alex Anolk signed and legally approved the settlement,
28 issued the Official legal document of a Superior Court of the State of California, County of San

84

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1 Francisco, Hayes Valley Limited Partnership, and Plaintiff vs. Sharon Bridgewater Defendant
2 Does 1 to 10 inclusive, case number CUD-06-17995, Stipulation for Entry of Judgment Order
3 Thereon, and the act was legally done, and case number CUD-06-17995 as follows:

4 Plaintiffs allege that the representation of HVLP Hashiah Rashad, or Jane Creason and/or KTJ
5 were false, in that the Plaintiffs only owed \$424.24 cents for back rent, and/or at the time the
6 Plaintiffs entered into the Stipulated Judgment. Plaintiff allege the Defendants attempted to
7 collect an unlawful debt of illegal attorney fee's, late fees. Plaintiffs allege the agreement
8 violated Federal Fair Housing Laws, violated the Plaintiff US Constitution rights.

9 Plaintiff allege that the Defendants abuse the Superior Court of California.

10 Plaintiff moved from the premise as agreed by April 30, 2008 and Plaintiff allege the
11 defendants knowingly, intentionally discriminated "protected class tenants" and/or against
12 minority business owners have restrained commerce

13 In furtherance of the unlawful agreement of the Defendants. The defendants dismissed the action
14 as follows and did overt acts or omissions in furtherance of the objective of the conspiracy.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

85

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

CIV-110

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name and Address): SHAWN BANKSON SHAWN BANKSON, BAR #223638 KIMBALL, TIREY & ST. JOHN 5994 W. LAS POSITAS BOULEVARD #219 PLEASANTON, CA 94588		TELEPHONE NO.: 800-525-1690	FOR COURT USE ONLY <div style="text-align: center;"> FILED Superior Court of California County of San Francisco MAY 12 2008 GORDON PARK-LI, Clerk <i>IM [Signature] Balasko</i> Deputy Clerk </div>
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): PLAINTIFF (Insert Name of Court and Name of Judicial District and Branch Court, if any): SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA Limited Civil Jurisdiction			
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: HAYES VALLEY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: SHARON BRIDGEWATER			
REQUEST FOR DISMISSAL <input type="checkbox"/> Personal Injury, Property Damage, or Wrongful Death <input type="checkbox"/> Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> Family Law <input type="checkbox"/> Eminent Domain <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): UNLAWFUL DETAINER		CASE NUMBER: CUD06617995	

- A conformed copy will not be returned by the clerk unless a method of return is provided with the document. -

1. TO THE CLERK: Please dismiss this action as follows:

- a. (1) ☒ With prejudice (2) ☐ Without prejudice
- b. (1) ☐ Complaint (2) ☐ Petition
 (3) ☐ Cross-complaint filed by (name):
 (4) ☐ Cross-complaint filed by (name):
 (5) ☒ Entire action of all parties and all causes of action
 (6) ☐ Other (specify):

on (date):
 on (date):

Date: 5/7/2008

SHAWN BANKSON(TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF ☒ ATTORNEY ☐ PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY)

Attorney or party without attorney for:

* If dismissal requested is of specified parties only of specified causes of action only, or of specified cross-complaints only, so state and identify the parties, causes of action, or cross-complaints to be dismissed.

☒ Plaintiff/Petitioner ☐ Defendant/Respondent
☐ Cross-complainant

2. TO THE CLERK: Consent to the above dismissal is hereby given.**

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF ☐ ATTORNEY ☐ PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY)

Attorney or party without attorney for:

** If a cross-complaint or Response (Family Law) seeking affirmative relief is on file, the attorney for cross-complainant (respondent) must sign this consent consent if required by Code of Civil Procedure section 581(f) or (g).

☐ Plaintiff/Petitioner ☐ Defendant/Respondent
☐ Cross-complainant

(To be completed by clerk)

3. ☐ Dismissal entered as requested on (date):
 4. ☐ Dismissal entered on (date): as to only (name):
 5. ☐ Dismissal not entered as requested for the following reasons (specify):
 6. ☐ a. Attorney or party without attorney notified on (date):
 b. Attorney or party without attorney not notified. Filing party failed to provide
☐ a copy to conform ☐ means to return conformed copy

Date:

Clerk, by _____, Deputy

Form Adopted for Mandatory use
 Judicial Council of California
 CIV-110 (Rev. January 1, 2007)

REQUEST FOR DISMISSAL

Legal
 Solutions
 & Plus

Page 1 of 1
 Code of Civil Procedure, § 581 et seq.;
 Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.1380

-86-

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1 HVLP then knowingly, misrepresented that they were the prevailing parties in the case and
 2 caused a "judgement of eviction" to be posted on the complaintant record, defrauded Plaintiffs
 3 out of a security deposit, libeled, defamed the Plaintiffs as "bad" minority owned business
 owners, and/or "bad" protected class tenants.

The Plaintiffs has been damaged, forced and/or restrained from commerce and/or open and fair
 competition by the Defendant RICO actions. Plaintiffs to move out of State and to Hawaii.
 The Complainant Sharon Bridgewater was rendered homeless in Hawaii(see exh.)but was
 6 determined to continue to operate her business. The complaintant started and on-line Real Estate
 # _____

8 The Defenants actions constitute retaliation against a federal witness and victim of US
 Government Rico activies. And the defendants severally and/or jointly, knowingly and willfully
 9 threaten and used physical force against the Complainant Sharon Bridgewater with intent, and
 influenced, delayed, or prevented the testimony of Complainant Sharon Bridgewater in an
 10 official proceeding; and/or caused the complainant Sharon Bridgewater to withhold testimony, or
 record, or documents, from an official proceeding with the intent and impaired the availability
 11 of the object for use in an official proceeding or influenced, delayed, or prevented the testimony
 12 of the Complainant in an official proceeding; or caused or induced the Complainant to withhold
 testimony, or withhold a record, document, or other object, from an official proceeding; or
 13 altered, destroyed, mutilated, or concealed an object with intent to impair the integrity or
 availability of the object for use in an official proceeding; or evaded legal process summoning to
 14 the Complainant to appear as a witness, or to produce a record, document, or other object, in an
 15 official proceeding; or caused the Complainant to be absent from an official proceeding to which
 16 that person has been summoned by legal process; or hindered, delayed, or prevented the
 communication to a law enforcement officer or judge of the United States of information relating
 17 to the commission or possible commission of a Federal offense in violation of 18 USC section
 1512

18 and

20 knowingly, and willfully, and by threats or force, or by threatening letter or communication,
 influenced, obstructed, or impeded, or endeavored to influence, obstructed, or impeded, the due
 21 administration of justice, in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 1503;

24 Defendant JOHN DOE 8 unknown Director of the San Francisco Housing Authority in her/his
 25 official or former personal capacity as Director of the San Francisco Housing
 Authority is the final decision maker for any policy and procedure relating to the termination of
 26 tenancy in the Public Housing Facilty and violation of the Plaintiff civil rights, illegal agreement
 with tenants between HVLP, Shawn Bankson, Jane Creason and/or KTJ and/or RICO activities,

28 87

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1 and is liable as co-conspirator, aider and abetter(Pinkerton vs. United States)

2
3 Said individual Defendants' secret agreements were fraudulently concealed from Plaintiffs, other
4 Said individual Defendants , void Judgments, ignorance of court orders, stipulated
5 Judgement, were discriminatory against minority business owner(s) and/or against
6 protected class public housing tenants, designed to coerced settlements, to violate
7 Public housing and deprive Plaintiffs due process in the termination of tenancy,
8 under extortion, or attempts, or conspiracy to do so, and/or threats of physical
9 violence, under color of official right, that was designed to take, steal, defraud
10 Plaintiff(s) out of money and/or property without due process of law in which it
11 effected interference. with interstate commerce,. was designed to reach the
12 defendants never intended to honor to interfere with the rights of Plaintiffs, and
13 their tenant to honest government services, to force Plaintiff to admit the the truth
14 of statements filed or prepared by Defendants which Defendants knew were false;
15 said racketeering activities intered with the right of Plaintiffs to honest government
16 services, and damaged the Plaintiff or businesses; all or some of said acts were
17 done in violation of the "Hobbs Act," 18 U.S.C. 1951. Said individual
18 Defendants intimidation, threats, corrupt persuasion or attempts to do so, or
19 misleading conduct toward Plaintiffs, with intent to influence, delay or prevent
20 testimony of any person in an official proceeding, or to influence, delay, or prevent
21 testimony of any person in an official proceeding, or to coerce or induce any
22 person to withhold testimony, from an official proceeding, hinder, delay, or
23 prevent Plaintiff's from communication iwht a law enforcement Officer or Judge or
24 the United States relating to defendants, commission of possible federal or state
25 criinal offense, and such acts violated 18 U.S.C. 1512. Said individual Defendants
26 knowingly devised, or intended to devise a scheme to defraud or for obtaining
27 money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representation or
28 promises, and to restrain commerce amoung minority business owners.

24 Plaintiffs at this time, have intentionally denied Plaintiffs, on account of race, the
25 same right to make and enforce contracts, and to have the full and equal benefit of
26 all laws or proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by
27 white citizens, all in violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1866, 42 U.S.C. Section
28 1981.

- 88 -

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1 Defendants, with racially discriminatory intent, interfered with Plaintiffs' contracts,
2 and right to make and enforce contracts with non-white tenants, and with Plaintiffs'
3 right to enjoyment of all benefits, privileges, terms, and conditions of Plaintiffs'
contractual relationships with their non-white tenants.

4 Plaintiffs allege the Defendants have denied Plaintiffs, on account of race, the
5 same rights as are guaranteed to white persons to purchase, lease, sell,
6 hold and convey real and personal property, all in violation of the Civil Rights Act
7 of 1866, 42 U.S.C. Section 1982 and did wrongfully deprive Plaintiffs and their
8 tenants of rights secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States,
9 including the due process in the termination of tenancy and the right to due process
10 of law, the right to equal protection of the laws, and did act in furtherance of the
11 conspiracy. Plaintiffs' leases on said rental properties included, but were not
12 limited to, those individuals who were members of the "protected class," minority
13 owned business owners wrongful interference was without justification, and was
maliciously intended to cause the destruction of, or harm to, Plaintiffs' rental
relationships and reasonable business expectation.

14
15
16 In performing all of the acts set out herein, Defendants defrauded the United States of America
17 by knowingly presenting, or causing to be presented, to one or more officers, employees or
18 agents of the United States of America, a false and fraudulent claim for payment or approval, in
19 contravention of the False Claims Act (31 U.S.C. § 3729(a)(3)), to the damage of the treasury of
20 the United States of America, by causing the United States to pay out money it was not obligated
21 to pay. By virtue of the acts described above, paragraph _____ the Defendants have knowingly
22 made, used or caused to be made or used, a false record or statement to get a false or fraudulent
claim paid or approved by the United States of America, in contravention of the False Claims
Act (31 U.S.C. § 3729(a)(2)), to the damage of the treasury of the United States of America, by
causing it to pay out money it was not obligated to pay in excess of 100 billion dollars.

23
24
25 Defendants JOHN DOE 8 is unknown Director of the San Francisco Housing Authority in
26 her/his official or former personal capacity as Director of the San Francisco Housing
27 Authority, Defendants JOHN DOE 9 unknown employees of the San Francisco Housing
Authority in their official personal capacity or former capacities, Hayes Valley Limited

Partnership (AKA, Hayes Valley Apartments II L.P.), McCormack Baron Ragan Management Services Inc, MBA Urban Development Co., The Related Companies of California, Inc., Sunamerica Affordable Housing Partnership Inc., Hasinah Rahim, Shawn Bankson, Jane Creason, Kimball, Tirey & St. John, LLP knew or should have known to comply with Federal and State law in the management of the complexes of Public Housing. At all times mentioned breached their duty and/or obligation as contractor of the US Federal Government to comply with Federal and/or State laws, in the termination of tenancy process, agreements with Tenants, and to comply with federal fair housing law, etc. and had duties and/or obligation as Federal and/or State Actors and/or receiptant of US Federal Government funds, and manager of Federal Public Housing Complexes, across America, in accordance the the Hud Regulatory and Management agreement.

Defendants JOHN DOE 8 is unknown Director of the San Francisco Housing Authority in her/his official or former personal capacity as Director of the San Francisco Housing Authority, is the final decision maker for any policy and procedure, relating to termination of tenancy, Federal Fair Housing Laws, etc. of Public Housing Projects in San Francisco, and discrimination against minorities businesses and is responsible.

Defendant Shawn Donavan, in his official personal capacity As the Director of the United States Housing and Urban Development in his individually and official and/or "former" capacities has failed to instruct, supervise, and control officers and/or instructed, supervised, and controlled US Government Contractors in Federal Fair housing law in Public Housing projects, and instructed HVLP to discriminate against minorities businesses across America and is responsible.

Plaintiffs allege that RICO persons, and other persons unknown to plaintiffs, acting in concert therewith, are employed by and associated with said RICO enterprise that is engaged in, or activities of which affect, Georgia State and/or federal interstate and/or foreign commerce, and that said Georgia RICO persons, and persons acting in concert therewith, conduct or participate, directly or indirectly, in the conduct of such RICO enterprise's affairs through a RICO pattern of racketeering activity.

Plaintiffs allege RICO Enterprise No. 3: Shawn Donavan, in his official personal capacity Director of the United States Housing and Urban Development, Defendants JOHN DOE 8 unknown Director of the San Francisco Housing Authority He or she in her/his official or former personal capacity as Director of the San Francisco Housing Authority, Defendants JOHN DOE 9 unknown employees of the San Francisco Housing Authority in their official personal capacity or former capacities Hayes Valley Limited Partnership (AKA, Hayes Valley

-90-

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1 Apartments II L.P.), McCormack Baron Ragan Management Services Inc. MBA Urban
 2 Development Co., The Related Companies of California, Inc. Sunamerica Affordable Housing
 3 Partnership Inc., Hasinah Rahim, Shawn Bankson, Jane Creason, Kimball, Tirey & St. John,
 4 LLP and does 18 thru 1000 inclusive, constitutes a RICO enterprise as defined in 1964. Plaintiff
 5 allege at all times mentioned the Defendants severally and/or jointly and/or agreed to and/or
 6 invested in, organized and/or controlled and/or maintained by and through a consensual
 7 hierarchy of partners, managers, directors, officers, supervisors, agents, deputies, and/or
 8 representatives of a Gwinnett County Superior Court who " act under the under the color of the
 9 State law of Georgia, formulated and implement policies relative to the promoting, advancing
 10 and/or otherwise operating a the United States Government, Department of Housing and Urban
 11 Development business organization for the purpose of the facilitating, furthering, and promoting
 12 the Private Real Estate Developers of the US Government, including, but not restricted to, the
 13 raising of monetary funds by and through, abuse of Superior Courts in America, or attempts, or
 14 conspiracy to do so, and/or threats of physical violence, extortion, under color of official right,
 15 force upon "protected class" US Public Housing tenants, violation of tenants civil rights in the
 16 termination of tenancy process, and/or minority owned Real Estate Business Owners employing
 17 federal mails and/or federal interstate wires, as well as and providing documentary materials
 18 such as illegal Stipulated Judgments, judgment for possession of apartments, of such individuals.
 19 Plaintiffs allege that RICO persons defendants, and other persons unknown to plaintiffs, acting in
 20 concert therewith, are employed by and associated with said RICO enterprise that is engaged in,
 21 or activities of which affect, Plaintiffs allege that RICO persons, and other persons unknown to
 22 plaintiffs, acting in concert therewith, are employed by and associated with said RICO enterprise
 23 that is engaged in, or activities of which affect and/or violated federal interstate and/or foreign
 24 commerce, and that said RICO persons, and persons acting in concert therewith, conduct or
 25 participate, directly or indirectly, in the conduct of such RICO federal interstate and/or foreign
 26 commerce, and that said RICO persons, and persons acting in concert therewith, conduct or
 27 participate, directly or indirectly, in the conduct of such RICO enterprise's affairs through a
 28 RICO pattern of racketeering activity, a RICO pattern of racketeering activity.

RICO ENTERPRIZE #4

23 Plaintiffs allege and upon information and belief Defendants Barak H. Obama, In his official
 24 personal capacity as Chief Executive Officer of the United States of America Eric Holder Jr., In
 25 his official personal capacity as the United States Attorney General, Defendants JOHN DOE 1
 26 unknown employees of the Executive Branch and other agencies of the U.S. government in their
 27 official personal capacity and/or personal "former "capacities, Defendants JOHN DOE 2 are
 28 unknown agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation(FBI)in their official personal capacity
 and/or "former "capacities, Defendants JOHN DOE 3 unknown Assistant United States Attorney
 General(s) in their official personal capacity and/or "former "capacities, Defendants JOHN DOE

- 9/-

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

4 is unknown US "State" Attorney (ies) General(s) in their official personal capacity and/or "former "capacities. Defendants JOHN DOE 5 is unknown employees of the U.S. Department of Justice. in their official personal capacity and/or "former "capacities, Sandra Brown Armstrong, in her official personal capacity As United States Northern District Court, Judge of California Claudia Wilkins in her official personal capacity As United States Northern District Court Judge of California Defendants JOHN DOE 6 unknown employees of the U.S. Northern District of California, Oakland, and Division in their official personal capacity and/or "former "capacities Orinda D. Evans, in her official personal capacity As United States Northern District Court Judge of Georgia Allen Baverman, in his official personal capacity As United States Northern District Court Magistrate Judge, Defendants JOHN DOE 7 unknown employees of the U.S. Northern District of Court of Georgia, Atlanta, Georgia in their official personal capacity and/or "former "capacities, Shawn Donovan, in his official personal capacity As the Director of the United States Housing and Urban Development, Shawn Donovan, in his official personal capacity As the Director of the United States Housing and Urban Development, Jo-Lynne Q. Lee, in her official capacity as the Superior Court Judge of Alameda County, Roger Tonna, Mary Tonna, William Gilg, Defendants JOHN DOE 10 unknown Director of the Alameda County Housing Authority, in his/her individual and official and/or "former "capacity As the Director of the Alameda County Housing Authority Defendants JOHN DOE 11 unknown employees of the Alameda County Housing Authority had a duty and/or obligation to comply with Federal and State law. Plaintiff allege that Obama and/or Holder had a legal duty and/or obligation to uphold the United States Constitution, and/or dissolve the RICO Defendants, US Government private partners Public Housing Contractors, reorganize public housing, dissolve the Public/Private Partners due to RICO activities of the Private Partners of the US Government, Plaintiff allege the Defendants had a duty and/or obligation "not" to abuse US Government Power, "not" to conspire with other criminal to commit overt, criminal acts. Sandra Brown Armstrong, in her official personal capacity As United States Northern District Court, Judge of California Claudia Wilkins in her official personal capacity As United States Northern District Court Judge of California, Orinda D. Evans, in her official personal capacity As United States Northern District Court Judge of Georgia Allen Baverman, in his official personal capacity As United States Northern District Court Magistrate Judge, Jo-Lynne Q. Lee, in her official capacity as the Superior Court Judge of Alameda County, had a duty and/or obligation to make impartial non-bias decisions. Obama and/or Holder et al had a duty and/or obligation "not" to commit committ treason against the Constitution, transport US Government Property and/or illegal weapons and/or the Plaintiffs property valued at \$5000.00 or more across state lines, without Congress approval and/or the Plaintiffs approval and/or retailate against FederalWitness and Victims of crime of US Government RICO activities.

RICO ARTIFICE AND SCHEME TO DEFRAUD [TITLE 18 U.S.C. § 1964(c)]
RE: INJURY TO BUSINESS AND PROPERTY AND DESTRUCTION OF BUSINESS
and OBTAINING MONIES BY AND THROUGH FALSE MISREPRESENTATIONS or

-92-

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

FRAUD, Federal Principal and Aider and Abettor, Title 18 U.S.C.A §2(a)-(b), Federal Principal Aiding and Abetting and/or Conspiracy Pinkerton vs. United States

Plaintiffs allege in furtherance of the unlawful agreement of the above named Defendants, Rich, Harsh, Szabo, Dective George, et al, and upon information and belief Barak H. Obama, In his official personal capacity as Chief Executive Officer of the United States of America, Eric Holder Jr., In his official personal capacity as the United States Attorney General, Defendants JOHN DOE 1 unknown employees of the Executive Branch and other agencies of the U.S. government in their official personal capacity and/or personal "former "capacities, Defendants JOHN DOE 2 are unknown agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation(FBI)in their official personal capacity and/or "former "capacities, Defendants JOHN DOE 3 unknown Assistant United States Attorney General(s) in their official personal capacity and/or "former "capacities, Defendants JOHN DOE 4 is unknown US "State" Attorney (ies) General(s) in their official personal capacity and/or "former "capacities. Defendants JOHN DOE 5 is unknown employees of the U.S. Department of Justice. in their official personal capacity and/or "former "capacities, Sandra Brown Armstrong, in her official personal capacity As United States Northern District Court, Judge of California Claudia Wilkins in her official personal capacity As United States Northern District Court Judge of California Defendants JOHN DOE 6 unknown employees of the U.S. Northern District of California, Oakland, and Division in their official personal capacity and/or "former "capacities Orinda D. Evans, in her official personal capacity As United States Northern District Court Judge of Georgia Allen Baverman, in his official personal capacity As United States Northern District Court Magistrate Judge, Defendants JOHN DOE 7 unknown employees of the U.S. Northern District of Court of Georgia, Atlanta, Georgia in their official personal capacity and/or "former "capacities, Shawn Donovan, in his official personal capacity As the Director of the United States Housing and Urban Development, Shawn Donovan, in his official personal capacity As the Director of the United States Housing and Urban Development, Jo-Lynne Q. Lee, in her official capacity as the Superior Court Judge of Alameda County, Roger Tonna, Mary Tonna, William Gilg, Defendants JOHN DOE 10 unknown Director of the Alameda County Housing Authority, in his/her individual and official and/or "former "capacity As the Director of the Alameda County Housing Authority Defendants JOHN DOE 11 unknown employees of the Alameda County Housing Authority adopted the acts of Rich, Harsh, Dective George et al, came to the meeting of the minds, entered into an unlawful agreement to abused US Government, to act in joint participation with Rich, Dekalb County et al, act in joint participation with convicted felons, and others, use threat, coercion and force, violence against the Plainiffs, RETAILATE AGAINST THE PLAINTIFFS FEDERAL WITNESSES AND VICTIMS OF CRIME OF US GOVERNMENT RICO ACTIVITIES, restrain commerce, oppress, use threat, coercion or force, and subject Plaintiff to cruel and usual punishment for the Plaintiffs exercising their US Constitutional legal rights and did overt acts or omission in furtherance of the objective of the conspiracy.

-93

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL



Plaintiff allege that on or about August 2008 Plaintiff filed a lawsuit in San Francisco Superior Court entitled HVLP and on or about Nov. 2008 John Toal one of the general owners of Lewis, Bisgaard and Smith and the Attorney for the US government met with the Plaintiffs at the superior Court house San Francisco. John Toal then asked Sharon Bridgewater and/or the Specialty Investment Group LLC to give him a "dollar amount." Sharon Bridgewater and/or the Specialty Investment Group LLC was under so much distress, I could not think of a dollar amount, and all Sharon Bridgewater and/or the Specialty Investment Group LLC wanted at the time was an apology. I then told John Toal I wanted was a sincere apology first, and subsequently we could discuss a dollar amount later. John Toal looked at me as if "he had never heard that expression "an apology" before." I never received an apology from the Defendants yet. So I continued to litigate the case in court. "No apology" has escalated to the filing of this complaint.²

The defendants breached their duties and/or obligations and are liable for damages

Plaintiff allege On _____, and On _____ I exercised my United States Constitutional right. I filed a "two" Habeas petition, I alleged in the petitions that I was denied ineffective legal counsel. State of Georgia vs. Sharon Bridgewater case # _____.

² **I CAN IMAGINE HOW BRIAN TERRY AND/OR JAMIE ZAPATA, PARENTS, FAMILY MEMBERS AND FRIENDS FEEL.(BRIAN TERRY AND JAMIE ZAPATA WERE WAS THE BORDER PATROL AGENT KILLED IN THE FAST AND FURIOUS AND NEVER RECEIVED AND APOLOGY FOR THEIR RICO ACTIONS, OF THEIR ILIN THE ALLEGED ILLEGAL GUN OPERATION OF OBAMA AND/OR HOLDER).**

- 94 -

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1
2 Plaintiffs allege On April 2009, I exercised my United States Constitutional right, I filed a
3 lawsuit against the Dekalb County Police Department entitled Sharon Bridgewater vs. Dekalb
County Police Department(only five month after Dekalb County Dismissed the illegal charges
of theft by taking pending against me). I alledged in the complaint the Defendant Dekalb County
took by theft my property, etc, and/or a similar complaint as the Plaintiffs alleged in this
complaint. The case was assigned to Orinda Evans and/or Allen Bavernman, case #1:10-CV-
0182.

6
7
8 On or about Jan. 1, 2009 thru todays date, Plaintiff filed lawsuits entitled Sharon Bridgewater vs.
Hayes Valley Limited Partnership. Plaintiff alleged in the complaints THAT HAYES VALLEY
9 LIMITED PARTNERSHIP(USA PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP) USED THREAT,
EXTORTION, COERCION AND FORCE AND WERE STEALING FROM "PROTECTED
10 CLASS" TENANTS LIVING IN PUBLIC HOUSING ACROSS AMERICA AND/OR IN SAN
FRANCISCO CALIFORNIA.

12
13 Plaintiff allege that Armstrong a "seven year former OAKLAND POLICE OFFICER" at all
14 times had a duty and/obligation as a Federal Judge to report the crimes of to report the US
Government RICO Activities to Obama and/or Holder(RICO ACTIVITIES OF US
15 GOVERNMENT FUNDS GIVES ONE THE EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO COMMUNICATE
THIS INFORMATION DIRECTLY TO THE OBAMA), and had a legal duty and/or obligation
16 to aid, assist and/or help the Plaintiffs and/or disqualify herself.

17
18 Plaintiff allege and/or upon information and belief Obama and/or Holder knew and were aware
19 of the US RICO activities, and discrimination against minority owned business owners, and/or
against protected class tenants, and/or the RICO activities of Gwinnett or Dekalb County.
20 Plaintiffs allege Obama and/Holder had a legal duty and/or obligation to remedy the wrongful
actions of Gwinnett, Dekalb County Defendants and/or had a legal duty or obligation to re-
21 organize federal public housing facilities, and/or "cut" funding the the US Government Private
Real Estate Developers Private Partnership.

23
24 In furtherance of the unlawful agreement of the Defendants, Plaintiff allege and upon
information and belief Armstrong communicated the RICO violation to Obama and/or Holder.
25 Plaintiff allege and/or Upon information and belief Obama and/or Holder and/or Armstrong,
and/or Wilkins and does defendant clerk of US Federal District Court of California, came to the
26 meeting of the minds, entered into an unlawful agreement, to retaliate against Plaintiffs
"federal" witness of Rico activity and falsely imprision the Plaintiffs, in addition use the
27 Plaintiffs for the purpose to serve the US Government with the Sharon Bridgewater vs. Hayes

28
- 95 -

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1 Valley Limited Partnership complaint to obtain civil penalties and/or defraud the US
2 Government private Real Estate Developers out of money or property, in addition hired 55
3 States Attorney(s) "based" on the Plaintiffs "the original source of Federal False Claims" to
4 obtain civil penalties (Federal False Claims HUD recoveries) from the US Government private
5 Real Estate Developers, and and halt the plaintiffs ability to report the crime of the US
6 Government against minority business owners, and/or minorities and did overt acts or omissions
7 in furtherance of the objective of the conspiracy.

8 The reason why Plaintiffs believe this is: On or about May 2009, Plaintiff filed a complaint
9 entitled Sharon Bridgewater vs. Hayes Valley Limited Partnership in the US Federal District
10 Court of California, the case was assigned to Armstrong. Armstrong dismisses the Plaintiffs
11 Federal Claims, with prejudice.

12 On or about Nov. 2009, Plaintiffs filed second lawsuit entitled Sharon Bridgewater vs. Hayes
13 Valley Limited Partnership, case number C10-703(SBA). Plaintiffs allege the complaint pled an
14 similar or exact pleading as the above mentioned case dismissed with prejudice by Armstrong.

15 On or about Jan. 2010, Armstrong now "orders" the Plaintiffs to pay the pre-filing fee and filed
16 the Complaint.

17 Plaintiff allege the pupose for this order was to coerce the Plaintiff to serve the US Government
18 with the Sharon Bridgewater vs. Hayes Valley Complaint.

19 Armstrong actions constitute a conspiracy to tamper with a Federal witness or retaliation against a
20 Federal witness.

21
22 The Plaintiff alleged in these many complaints in the Northern District Court of California filed
23 that Private Real Estate Developer were committing RICO activities had violated tenants civil
24 rights, and defrauded the US Government out of money(see exh.) Armstrong had a legal duty
25 and/or obligation to report the crime to Obama and Holder. RICO activities of US Government
26 FUNDS give one the exclusive right to communicate the the President of the United States the
27 Criminal activities.

28 Upon information and belief Armstrong reported the crime to Obama and/or Hodler

46 -

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1
2
3 The Complainant served HVLP with the complaint. On or about 7-14, 2010, I served on or more of HVLP Defendants the with the complaint, "but not all."

4 On July 16, 2010, HVLP post this article in the San Francisco Journal.

5 Upon information and believe Claudia Wilkins commits mail fraud, the reason why the Complainant Sharon Bridgewater believe this is:

6 Plaintiffs allege that on Feb. 11, 2011

7 Claudia Wilkins issues an order while performing duties as a Judge in the City of Oakland, CA
8 with malice, the intent to defraud the Plaintiff Sharon Bridgewater out of damages substaigned by
9 the US Government Public/Private Partnership Hayes Valley Limited Partnership. via federal
10 mails, originating within the state of California, and terminating in the State of California,
11 committed the following mail fraud, to defraud the Complainant out of damages or recoveries
12 sent the follow mails to the Complainant Sharon Bridgewater.

13 On 2/11/2011

14 Claudia Wilkin knowingly, intentionally, willingly enters and orderHagg, the defendants knew of
15 theconspiracy and refuse to aid the complainant

Case 4:10-cv-03022-CW Document 98 Filed 02/11/11 Page 1 of 2

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SHARON BRIDGEWATER,
Plaintiff,

No. 10-03022 CW
PRE-FILING ORDER

v.

HAYES VALLEY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, et
al.,
Defendants.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall not accept for filing any further complaints filed by Sharon Bridgewater until that complaint has first been reviewed by the Court. If the complaint concerns the state unlawful detainer action in the state case Hayes Valley Limited Partnership v. Bridgewater, No. CUD-06-617995, it will not be filed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 2/11/11


CLAUDIA WILKEN
United States District Judge

-98

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1 I then sent my complaint to Obama, Holder, the FBI and with this article as an exhibit, informed
2 Them of the RICO activites. The Defendants refuse to reply or respond.

3 I at all times sent the United States Department of Justice Eric Holder, Rico violations of all the
4 Defendants including and alleging that the Defendants even obtained HUD monies on Single
5 room occupany hotels in San Francisco three times and did not do the work they promised HUD
6 that they were going to do.

7
8
9 Plaintiff alleges that Orinda Evans and/or Baverman either reported the crime to Holder, and/or
10 knew and were aware that the Plaintiff property were illegally taken, and/or failed to do their
11 duty and/or obligations as Federal Judges, made, bias, impartial decision, and upon information
12 and belief acted as prosecutors, violated the Plaintiff civil rights, falsely imprisoned the
13 Plaitntiff without due process of law, and is liable to the Plaintiff for damages.

14 Upon information and belief and/or the Plaintiffs allege Evans, Baverman purposefully
15 dismissed, just for the purpose to act in joint participation with Obama and/or Holder, act as
16 partial bias prosecutors, for the purpose to impanel a grand jury submitt illegally obtained, to
17 themselves, and to falsely imprision the plaintiff without due process of law, and did overt acts or
18 omission in furtherance of the objective of the conspiracy.

19 Plaintiff allege the purpose of Armstrong re-opening the case, was to coerce the Plaintiffs to
20 serve the US Government Private Partner with Sharon Bridgewater vs. Hayes Valley Limited
21 Partnership complaint to prosecute and/or obtain civil penalties from the US Government
22 Private Partnership.

23 In furtherance of the unlawful agreement of Obama, Holder et al, On or about _____ Orinda
24 Evans _____ dismissed the Plaintiff complaint with prejudice and upon information
25 and belief Orinda Evan did overt acts or omissions in furtherance of the objective of the
26 conspiracy.

27
28 - 94

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL

1 On or about from Jan. 2010 thru present upon information and belief and/or Plaintiff alleges that
2 Orinda Evans and/or Baverman acted in joint participation with Obama and/or Holder, concealed
3 known facts, impaneled and grand jury, acted as prosecutors, violated the Plaintiffs due process
1st 4th or 6th via the 5th or 14th amendment US Constitutional, falsely imprisoned the Plaintiffs
without due process of law, without probable cause and defrauded the Plaintiff out of money
and/or property in the amount in excess of one billion dollars, and did overt acts and/or
omissions in furtherance of the objective of the conspiracy.

6 Plaintiff allege Orinda Evans and/or Baverman at all times mentioned knew or should have
7 known to make impartial decisions and had a duty and/or obligation as a Federal Judge to
8 disqualify her/hisself, report the crimes of Rich, Harsh, Szabo, Dekalb County et al to Holder
and/or those operating under the direction of Holder. Orinda Evans and/or Baverman at all
9 times mentioned breached their duty and/or obligation to the Plaintiff s and is liable for damages.

12 Plaintiff allege and/or upon information and belief Armstrong

15 Orinda Evans and/or Baverman at all times had a duty and/or obligation as a Federal Judge to
16 report the crimes of Rich, Harsh, Szabo, Dekalb County et al to Holder and those operating
under the direction of Holder of the Sharon Bridgewater vs. Dekalb County or the Plaintiff
17 Habeas petitions.

19 Plaintiff alleges that Orinda Evans and/or Baverman either reported the crime to Holder, and/or
knew and were aware that the Plaintiff property were illegally taken, and/or failed to do their
20 duty and/or obligations as Federal Judges, made, bias, impartial decision, and upon information
and belief acted as prosecutors, violated the Plaintiff civil rights, falsely imprisoned the
21 Plaintiff without due process of law, and is liable to the Plaintiff for damages.

23 Upon information and belief and/or the Plaintiffs allege Evans, Baverman purposefully
24 dismissed, just for the purpose to act in joint participation with Obama and/or Holder, act as
prosecutors, for the purpose to impanel a grand jury submit illegally obtained, to themselves,
25 and to falsely imprison the plaintiff without due process of law, and did overt acts or omission in
furtherance of the objective of the conspiracy.

28 .95 .

SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. OBAMA, HOLDER, ET AL