

SAID AGREEMENTS CONTAINED MOST IF NOT ALL THE HUD LEASE PROHIBITED PROVISIONS

Pursuant to the HUD AND/OR FEDERAL LAW AND/OR STATE LAW, the following provisions must not be included in an agreement.

a. Confession of judgment.

The prior consent by the tenant to any lawsuit initiated by the owner in connection with the lease and to a judgment in favor of the landlord.

b. Distraint for rent or other charges.

An agreement by the tenant that the owner is authorized to take property of the tenant and hold it until the tenant performs an obligation the owner has determined the tenant has failed to perform.

c. Exculpatory clauses.

An agreement by the tenant not to hold the owner or its agents liable for any acts or omissions, intentional or negligent, on the part of the owner or the owner's authorized representatives or agents.

d. Waiver of legal notice by tenant before actions for eviction or money judgment.

An agreement by the tenant that the landlord may institute suit without notifying the tenant that the suit has been filed.

e. Waiver of legal proceedings.

Authorization for the owner to evict the tenant or hold/sell the tenant's possessions whenever the owner determines a breach or default has occurred, without notice to the tenant or determination by a court of the rights and liabilities of the parties.

f. Waiver of jury trial.

Authorization for the owner's attorney to appear in court on behalf of the tenant and waive the right to a jury trial.

g. Waiver of right to appeal judicial proceeding.

Authorization for the owner's attorney to waive the tenant's rights to (1) appeal for Judicial error in any suit brought against the tenant by the owner or its agent, or (2) file suit to prevent the execution of a judgment.

h. Tenant chargeable with cost of legal actions regardless of outcome.

A provision that the tenant agrees to pay all attorney and other legal costs if the owner brings legal action against the tenant.

Plaintiff allege the Defendants knew and were aware of said racketeering activities interred with the right of Plaintiffs to honest government services, and damaged the Plaintiff or businesses; all or some of said acts were done in violation of the "Hobbs Act," 18 U.S.C. 1951.

Said individual 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 the Plaintiffs in an official proceeding, or to influence, delay, or prevent testimony

1 of any Plaintiffs in an official proceeding, or to coerce or induce any person to withhold
 2 testimony, from an official proceeding, hinder, delay, or prevent Plaintiff's from communication
 3 with a law enforcement Officer or Judge or the United States relating to defendants, commission
 of possible federal or state criminal offense, and such acts violated 18 U.S.C. 1512

4 Said individual Defendants knowingly devised, or intended to devise a scheme to defraud the
 5 Plaintiff individually and or the companies, make the Plaintiff a victim of Rico crime or for
 6 obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representation or
 promises, and to restrain commerce among minority business owners and tenants.

7
 8 Plaintiffs at this time, have intentionally denied Plaintiffs, on account of race, the same right to
 9 make and enforce contracts, and to have the full and equal benefit of all laws or proceedings for
 10 the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, all in violation of the Civil
 Rights Act of 1866, 42 U.S.C. Section 1981.

11
 12
 13 Defendants, had racially discriminatory intent, interfered with Plaintiffs' contracts, and right to
 14 make and enforce contracts with non-white tenants, and with Plaintiffs' right to enjoyment of all
 15 benefits, privileges, terms, and conditions of Plaintiffs' contractual relationships with their non-
 16 white tenants, and have agreed, to make Plaintiffs victims of RICO activities without probable
 cause and have defrauded the plaintiff out of money or property without due process of law.

17
 18 Plaintiffs allege the Defendants have denied Plaintiffs, on account of race, the same rights as are
 19 guaranteed to white persons to purchase, lease, sell, hold and convey real and personal property,
 20 all in violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1866, 42 U.S.C. Section 1982 and did wrongfully
 21 deprive Plaintiffs and their tenants of rights secured by the Constitution and laws of the United
 States, including the due process in the termination of tenancy and the right to due process of
 law, the right to equal protection of the laws, and did act in furtherance of the conspiracy.
 22 Plaintiffs' leases on said rental properties included, but were not limited to, those individuals
 23 who were members of the "protected class," minority owned business owners wrongful
 24 interference was without justification, and was maliciously intended to cause the destruction of,
 or harm to, Plaintiffs' rental relationships and reasonable business expectation.

25
 26
 27 Defendants JOHN DOE 8 is unknown Director of the San Francisco Housing Authority in
 28 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 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 at all times had a legal duty or obligation to comply with Federal or State laws, 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.

At all times mentioned in this complaint received DEFRAUD THE PLAINTIFFS OUT OF MONEY OR PROPERTY billions in grants from the federal government, contracted with the US Federal Government to build, manage and operate public housing across America, pursuant to a HUD regulatory and management agreement, and promised to comply with federal fair housing laws and promised to help tenants to become financially independants, and/or help tenants with their business, such as the Plaintiffs, ratified, approved, failed to comply with Federal and State laws in the Management of the complex, and agreed to used threat, coercion and force public housing tenants into illegal agreements, collect unlawful debts, and commit other over acts against tenants and the Plaintiff and suffered damages and I was injured in business or property in the amount to be proven at trial. Defendant Shawn Donovan, 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 projescts, and instructed HVLP to discriminate against minorities businesses across America and is responsible, and liable to the Plaintiffs for damage and the Plaintiffs have been damaged by the Defendants actions and have compensatory and/or punative damages in an amount according to proof at trial.

Plaintiffs at all times mentioned was directly harmed by the Defendants illegal acts or conspiracies to Defendant the US Govenrment, Plaintiffs are the original source, and have first hand knowledge or the Private Real Estate Investor Criminal acts of fraud and abuse against the US Government, and the Plaintiffs exercised her legal right a filed a lawsuit against the Defendnats in the San Francsico Superior Court on August 2008, entitled Sharon Bridgewater vs.

Hayes Valley Limited Partnership, and dismissed the first amended complaint without prejudice, and decided to file the case in the United States Federal District Court of California. THE DEFENDANTS AT ALL TIMES CONSTITUTED A US AMERICAN GOVERNMENT PRIVATE/PUBLIC ILLEGAL CRIMINAL MONOPOPLY THE DEFENDANTS MUST BE ENJOINED AND RESTRAINED FROM THEIR ILLEGAL ACTS.

**CAUSE OF ACTION
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

All preceding paragraphs are hereby incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein. The Plaintiffs have made KNOWN TO SHAWN DOVANAN AND/OR ERIC HOLDER THE ILLEGAL ACTS OF THE RICO ORGANIZATION OF HAYES VALLEY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND/OR ERIC HOLDER, AT ALL TIMES MENTIONED HAD A LEGAL DUTY OR OBLIGATION TO DISSOLVE, INVESTIGATE, AND REORGANIZE FEDERAL PUBLIC HOUSING FACILITIES THE UNITED STATES EX REL SHARON BRIDGEWATER IS ENTITLED INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, SHAWN DONAVAN AND/OR ERIC HOLDER HAD FAILED TO DUE HIS LEGAL DUTY OR OBLIGATION, OBAMA IS RESPONSIBLE FOR HOLDER AND/OR SHAWN DOVANAN ACTS, and/or preliminary and permanent injunction relief because: (a) Plaintiffs have a reasonable probability of success on the merits; (b) there is a danger of real, immediate, and irreparable injury which may be prevented by injunctive relief; (c) there is no other plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law; (d) the granting of a preliminary injunction will not disserve the public interest; (e) the balance of equities favors the injunction; and (f) the injunction will preserve the status quo pending a trial on the merits To avoid irreparable injury, Plaintiffs request that the Court issue a Temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction and/or permanent injunction pending the trial of merits of the case.

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

Plaintiff allege from Nov. 2, 2007, and/or Dec. 2008, and through the filing of this complaint the Plaintiffs have continually sent numerous letters and/or certified letters, filed numerous motions,

1 and complaints and/or Federal False Claims Disclosure Statements and/or Complaints in the
 2 United States Federal District Court of California and/or Georgia and have reported the crimes of
 3 the Gwinnett County and Dekalb County and/or HVLP to Obama and/or and/or Shawn
 4 Dovanah(the US Department of HUD Director),Armstrong and/or Evan and/or Baverman and/or
 5 Wilkins, and/or United States Department of Justice Eric Holder Jr.,United States Attorney
 6 General, Defendants JOHN DOE 1 unknown employees of the Executive Branch and other
 7 agencies of the U.S. government in their official personal capacity and/or personal "former
 8 "capacities, Defendants JOHN DOE 2 are unknown agents of the Federal Bureau of
 9 Investigation(FBI)in their official personal capacity and/or "former "capacities, Defendants
 10 JOHN DOE 3 unknown Assistant United States Attorney General(s), in their official personal
 11 capacity and/or "former "capacities, Defendants JOHN DOE 4 unknown US "State" Attorney
 12 (ies) General(s). Several to Dovanah (see exh.)

9 Each and Every defendant continuously ignored my numerous letter, certified mails and the
 10 Plaintiff allege the Defendants acts or omission were done to further the objective of the
 11 conspiracy to commit criminal acts against the Plaintiffs.

12 Plaintiff allege that the Defendants, The Defendants purposefully ignored the Plaintiff in an
 13 intentional acts committed criminal acts against the Plaintiffs out of money or property, oppress,
 14 restrain commerce and monopolize the Real Estate Industry

15 In furtherance of the objective of the conspiracy, Plaintiff are informed and believe Obama
 16 and/or Holder (the US Department of HUD Director),Armstrong and/or Evans and those
 17 operating under their direction all, and/or et al, the United States Attorney General, Defendants
 18 JOHN DOE 1 unknown employees of the Executive Branch and other agencies of the U.S.
 19 government in their official personal capacity and/or personal "former "capacities, Defendants
 20 JOHN DOE 2 are unknown agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation(FBI)in their official
 21 personal capacity and/or "former "capacities, Defendants JOHN DOE 3 unknown Assistant
 22 United States Attorney General(s), in their official personal capacity and/or "former "capacities,
 23 Defendants JOHN DOE 4 unknown US "State" Attorney (ies) General(s), knew and were aware
 24 the plaintiff were the " **VICTIMS OF MULTIPLE CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS**
 25 **AND/OR THE VICTIM OF US GOVERNMENT RICO CRIMES** all defendants agreed,
 26 approved, the acts of Rich, Dekalb County, HVLP et,al(Georgia State Rico and/or all
 27 defendants came to the meeting of the minds, entered into an unlawful agreement and conceal
 28 known facts from the Plaintiff, "protect" the Racketeered Influence and Corrupt Organization,
 "Protect Shawn Donovan his Executive Cabinet member" retailate against the Plaintiffs
 "WHISTLEBLOWERS and Federal Witness and Victim of Crime," halt the ability of the
 Complainant to report such crimes, and did overt acts or omission to further the objective of the
 conspiracy.

Holder and/or Shawn Dovanah are charged with enforcing federal CIVIL RIGHTS
 VIOLATIONS AGAINST LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES, FEDERAL FAIR HOUSING
 LAWS AND OF PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS, AND OTHER LAWS, and had a legal duty
 or obligation to REORGANIZE, DISSOLVE, THE RICO ENTERPRIZES their betrayal of their

1 role as US HUD DIRECTOR AND US ATTORNEY GENERAL ARE SERIOUS CRIMINAL
2 ACTS.. HOLDER AND DONANAVAN ACTIONS ARE THE SAME AS HVLP AND
3 DEKALB COUNTY AND/OR GWINNETT COUNTY RICO DEFENDANTS.

Clearly OUR COUNTRY IS IN NEED OF A NEW ATTORNEY GENERAL AND A NEW
HOUSING AUTHORITY DIRECTOR, OBAMA SUPPORTS HIS CABINET MEMBERS.

6 HOLDER AND SHAWN DONAVAN ACTIONS CONSTITUTIONA A DENIAL OF ALL
7 PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS CIVIL RIGHTS, AND CONSTITUTE BIAS, AND
8 DISCRIMINATION, AND A VIOLATION OF FEDERAL FAIR HOUSING LAW, AND
9 CONSTITUTE A VIOLATION OF EVERY US CITIZEN DEKALB COUNTY OR
10 GWINNETT COUNTY GEORGIA CITIZENS CIVIL RIGHTS.

Holder and Shawn Dovanah must account for these serious criminal offenses.

11 On or about Nov. 1, 2007 and continuing thru the filing of this complaint Plaintiffs have
12 repeatedly asked Eric Holder, and/or two or more of the Defendants, et al to return the Plaintiffs
13 possession(FIVE YEARS)business and personal property of Specialty Investments Group
14 LLC, the United States Department of Justice Eric Holder Jr.,United States Attorney General,
15 Defendants JOHN DOE 1 unknown employees of the Executive Branch and other agencies of
16 the U.S. government in their official personal capacity and/or personal "former "capacities,
17 Defendants JOHN DOE 2 are unknown agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation(FBI)in
18 their official personal capacity and/or "former "capacities, Defendants JOHN DOE 3 unknown
19 Assistant United States Attorney General(s), in their official personal capacity and/or "former
20 "capacities, Defendants JOHN DOE 4 unknown US "State" Attorney (ies) General(s). and/or
21 requested and demanded the return of the Specialty Investment Group LLC property, Specialty
22 Global Investments Inc. and/or Bridgewater & Company INC. and property valued over
23 \$5,000.00. (FIVE YEARS), to continue to conduct business.

24 I the Plaintiffs at all times needed my property, to conduct business and/or Real Estate
25 Contracts, and my company Computers, leased by Hewitt Packard and under Specialty Global
26 Investment. The Plaintiffs have spent hours of Legal Work to draft the contracts, and these
27 contracts were valuable trade secrets, and belong to the Specialty Investment Group LLC INC.

28 Plaintiff allege all defendants have knowingly, intentionally deprived the Plaintiff of her business
and personal property and have profited from the illegal confincation of the Plaintiffs property.
And knowingly, intentionally, interfered with the Planitffs lawful employment and deprived the
Plaintiff honest services, and knowingly interfered with the Plaintiffs livelihood.

Plaintiff allege that On or about May 2010, Eric Holder Jr. have shared the Plaintiffs Specialty
Investment Group LLC with McCormack Baron Ragan, et al have, formed a business called
"unknown"Investment Group LLC, and have formed a "Joint Venture" Partnership agreement
with other Investors or Partners based on the Plaintiff the Specialty Investment Group LLC

Contract illegal stolen by Dekalb County and/or have stolen the Plaintiff Solar Company ideals and/or based on illegally stolen from the Plaintiffs Specialty Investment Group LLC.

The defendants actions constution "COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT, ILLEGAL CRIMINAL PROFEETEERING FROM THE PLAINTIFFS, INFRIDGEMENT ON TRADEMARK SECRETS, ETC. AND OTHER OVERT CRIMINAL ACTS.

The Defendants must account for their illegal actions against the Plaintiff the Speciatlty Investment Group LLC. The Specialty Investment Group LLC have been damaged in business and or property from the overt acts of Holder and/or Shawn Donavhan.

The Defendants had no business of keeping the Plaintiff business and personal property, and had no business to gain from the Plaintiff ideals.

Plaintiff allege that Holder and those operating under his direction, constitute a form of active and/or passive form of concealment, fraud, deceit, collusion, and constitute a conspiracy under the color of state law, effectuated through private conduct and willful, intentional, criminal conspiracy under the color of Federal law, FRAUD, MALICIOUS AND CRIMINAL OVERT ACTS, AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA EX REL SHARON BRIDGEWATER COMMENCE CRIMINAL CHARGES AGAINST ALL NAMED DEFENDANTS BOTH SERVERALLY AND JOINTLY AS STATED ABOVE FOR THE MALICIOUS OVERT ACTS.

On or about Oct. 30, 2007 *and continuning through the filing of this complaint* the Plaintiffs have continously requested the return of her business and personal items valued at more than 5000.00 dollars, llegaly taken from the Defendants. the Defendants have consistency refused to return to the Plaintiffs her business and personal items.

In furtherance of the unlawful agreement of the Defendants, the Defendants knowingly, REFUSED TO RETURN TO THE PLAINTIFF BUSINESS AND PERSONAL PROPERTY, adopted the acts of the HVLP, Dekalb County defendants, and/or Rich, Harsh, et al, denied, entered with the Plaintiffs the right to her business or personal property illegal taken by Dekalb County, and have deprive the Plainittff the right to honest services in violation of 18 USC _____ and have knowingly interefered with the Plainittffs lawful employment and livihood and did overt acts or omission to further the objective of the conspiracy. I the plaintiff have suffered damages, due to the defendants acts or omissions and I was injured in business or property in the amount to be proven at trial.

Plaintiff allege the purpose for the Defendants failure to return the Plaintiffs items were to retaliate against the Plaintiff a victim of crime of US Government Rico activities, was to protect the Rico enterprize use the Plaintiffs valuable Real Estate Contracts to profit, and commit fraud

1 before the court or Grand Juror, use illegally obtain evidence in a court of law, and falsely
2 imprison the Plaintiff without due process of law.

3
4 The Defendants actions constitute a conspiracy to restrain commerce, conspiracy under the color
5 of law and a conspiracy to defraud the Plaintiffs. deprive the Plaintiff her right to honest services,
6 The Defendants have knowingly failed to return the Plaintiffss property and interfered with the
7 Plaintiff lawful employment and livelihood, and the Defendants action constitute one or more of
8 the above criminal acts. The Plaintiffs have been injured and damaged in business or property
9 in unknown amount to be proven at trial.

10 Holder et al actions are criminal, illegal, vicious and foul.

11
12 In furtherance of the unlawful agreement of Dective George, et al, Plaintiffs are informed and
13 believe that On or about March 2009, and continuing thru the filing of this complaint, Holder,
14 concealed known facts from the Plaintiffs, conspired under the color of Federal Law,acted in
15 joint participation with Evans or Baverman, transported the Plaintiffs Specialty Investment
16 Group LLC, valuable Specialty Investment Contracts, Solar Energy Company ideals, contracts,
17 intangible property valued at more than \$5,000(of the Specialty Investment Group LLC), and/or
18 family personal possessions across state lines to Eric Holder Jr. and/or caused to be flew in the
19 Plaintiff property to the United States Department of Justice Eric Holder Jr.,United States
20 Attorney General, Defendants JOHN DOE 1 unknown employees of the Executive Branch
21 and other agencies of the U.S. government in their official personal capacity and/or personal
22 "former "capacities, Defendants JOHN DOE 2 are unknown agents of the Federal Bureau of
23 Investigation(FBI)in their official personal capacity and/or "former "capacities, Defendants
24 JOHN DOE 3 unknown Assistant United States Attorney General(s), in their official personal
25 capacity and/or "former "capacities, Defendants JOHN DOE 4 unknown US "State" Attorney
26 (ies) General(s)frabracated evidence, impaneled a Grand Jury before Evans or Baverman,
27 presented illegally obtaine evidence to the Grand Jury, caused an indictment against the
28 Plaintiffss, and violated the Plaintiffs US Constitutional Rights, falsely imprison the Plaintiffs for
the rest of her life, and did overt acts or omission to further the objective of the conspiracy.

24 Holder et al, knew and were aware the Plaintiff and instead of dissolving, and protecting hundred
25 and thousand of public housing tenant civil rights, Holder took a vindictive, to attack, retaliate
26 against a federal witness and victim of crime,indictment of the Plaintiff and under his co-
27 conspirator Evans or Baverman would have resulted in the imprisonment of the Plaintiff,to halt
28 the ability of the Plaintiff to report the crimes.

Pursuant to Federal and or State law when a prosecutor commits the offense as such, they are debarred from practicing law, and/or criminal charges are brought against the perpetrators.

Holder and/or Evans are constitute a scheme to defraud the Plaintiff of money or property, and constitute one or more of the above criminal acts, and Holder and/or Evans, and/or Baverman et al constitute gross prosecutorial misconduct.

In furtherance of the unlawful agreement of the Defendants On or about May 2009 and continuing thru the filing of this complaint, Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Holder et al concealed known facts he/they were under a duty acted in joint participation with Armstrong, and/or the 55 United States Attorney General(OFF THE UNITED STATES) 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 unknown US "State" Attorney (ies) General(s), Evans, Baverman, acted in joint participation to use the Plaintiffs Sharon Bridgewater, to serve a complaint CALCULATED THE AMOUNT OF FEDERAL FALSE CLAIMS HUD RECOVERIES OF HAYES VALLEY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP THEIR PRIVATE REAL ESTATE DEVELOPER PARTNER, acted in joint participation with Armstrong, and/Wilkins, to use the Plaintiff to serve the Sharon Bridgewater vs. Hayes Valley Limited Partnership Federal False Claims complaint on Eric Holder, and/or the Defendants HVLP, ratified, approved to obtained HUD criminal and civil penalties, and as soon as the complaint was served falsely imprison the Plaintiff pursuant to the above acts of the Defendants, paraphraph on page _____ and did overt acts to further the objective of the conspiracy.

HOLDER ET ACTIONS CONSTITUTE A CONSPIRACY TO DEFRAUD THE PLAINTIFF OUT OF FEDERAL FALSE CLAIM HUD RECOVERIES.

Plaintiff is informed and belief Obama knew and were that Specialty Investment Group LLC conducted most of their business in 2005. Plaintiff allege Obama knew and were the Statue of limitations for financial fraud was In furtherance of the unlawful agreement of the Defendants Upon information and believe and/or Plaintiffs. On or about May 2010, Obama signs an Executive Order (Specialty Investment Group LLC)to extends the financial fraud from 5 year to 10 years in 2010.(see page__paragraph 2 Most of the Plaintiffs business was in the year 2005), and the defendants did overt acts and/or omission in furtherance of the conspiracy.

In furtherance of the unlawful agreement of the Defendants, on or about the Plaintiff have filed n

On or about May 2009 and continuing thru the filing of this complaint Plaintiff are informed and believe the federal defendants concealed known facts from the Plaintiffs transported property of the Plaintiffs across state lines, in violation of federal law, concealed known On or about April 12, 2006 thru June 5, 2008 the Defendants deliberately concealed the true facts regarding the the fact they they had fabricated evidence and/or submitted illegally obtain evidence impaneled a grand jury, FRAUDULANT CONCEALMENT & CONSPIRACY TO FRAUDULANT CONCEAL falsely charged and/or transported stolen property of the Plaintiff value at 5000.00 or more across state lines, or caused to be flown in, property of the plaintiff valued at 5000.00 abused the US Federal District Court of Northern Georgia, and/or California impaneled a Grand Jury, submitted illegally, stolen property of the Plaintiff in a court of law, and deliberately concealed the true facts known to them falsely imprisoned the Plaintiff, with the intent to or was done with the intent to induce plaintiff to enter into file a federal false claims complaint against Hayes Valley Limited Partnership, and falsely imprison the plaintiff as soon as the complaint was served on the Defendants HVLP private Real Estate Developer, and by a reasonably competent and diligent investigation and inspection and with due diligence the complainant could not have discovered the fraud. The Plaintiff have been falsely imprisoned for the rest of her life, and have been damaged by the defendants action, and have damages.

The Defendants actions constitute gross prosecutorial misconduct, abuse of the US Federal District Court.

The defendants actions constitute one or more of the above criminal acts, the defendants actions deprived the Plaintiff of her US Constitutional right and the Plaintiff have been damage.

In furtherance of the objective of Obama and/or Holder, Plaintiffs are informed and believe the defendants Obama and/Holder "fixed" all cases filed by the Plaintiff Sharon Bridgewater vs. Rich, Dekalb County et al or Georgia defendants and/or Sharon Bridgewater vs. Hayes Valley Limited Partnership to be assigned to Orinda Evans (An African American Federal Judge), Armstrong, of the United States Federal District Court of Georgia, California, AFRICAN AMERICAN "SISTERS, A BLACK PEOPLE REFER TO EACH OTHER, and did overt acts to further the conspiracy.

US Federal District Court cases are suppose to be randomly assigned as filed by litigants, US Federal District Court Judges mostly consist of Caucasians or other minorities, the chances of the Plaintiffs complaint getting assigned to "ALL AFRICAN AMERICAN FEDERAL JUDGES" are slim. Plaintiff allege that a conspiracy is proven by slight connection, in this case

1 the connection is African American, most of the US Federal District Court Judges are
2 caucisians.

3
4 In furtherance of the unlawful agreement of the Defenants On or about Sept. 2009 and
5 continuing through the date of the filing of this complaint, Plaintiffs Sharon
6 Bridgewater(Specialty Investment Group LLC) filed a FIVE OR MORE CASES, case entitled
7 Sharon Bridgewater Vs. Dekalb County in the Northern District Court of Georgia, Sharon
8 Bridgewater Vs. Randy Rich, Lawrenceville Police Department and various other Georgia
9 Defendants, all these case was assigned to Orinda Evans and Baverman, all the defendants

10 **DISMISSED WITH "PREJUDGE," ALL THE**
11 **PLAITIFFS COMPLAINTS, and did overt acts or**
12 **omissions to further the objective of the conspiracy.**



17 Upon information and belief this is a picture of Evans, an African American
18 US District Federal Court Judge of Northern Georgia.

19
20 Orinda Evans and Baverman issued five or more different Orders extending over a period of two
21 or more years, to the Plaintiffs and theirs actions constitute pattern and practice of mail fraud,
22 and constitute five or more counts of criminal acts of mail fraud.

23
24 Orinda Evans and (Baverman under the direction of Evans) federal court judge charged with
25 enforcing federal anti discrimination laws; and had a legal duty or obligation to make impartial
26 and fair decision while performing their duties for the US Federal District Court, their betrayal of
27 their role as impartial trier of fact are far more serious, and constitute overt acts. Judge Evans
28 and/or Baverman conspired with et al's, to ensure that Plaintiff's case would never to go trial
upon receipt of the Plaintiffs complaint filed. Clearly their has been an obstruction of Justice in
this case.

Orinda Evans and Baverman actions constitute denial of the Plaintiffs first amendment right to free speech, obstruction of justice, tampering with a federal witness, and one or more of the above criminal acts as listed on this complaint.

While judges do commit frauds and obstruct justice from time to time, there is always the appellate arm to keep matters in check.

On or about Nov. 2009, I appeal Orinda Evans dismissal with prejudice of the Sharon Bridgewater vs. Dekalb County(D.C. Docket No. 1:10-cv-01082-ODE)

On or about May/June. 2010, the case was heard by three panel Appeals Court Judges. Upon information and believe and/or the Plaintiff alleges Obama and/or Holder asked a favor from the appeals Judge African American Harvard Graduate to dismiss the Sharon Bridgewater vs. Dekalb County Complaint - Judge Carnes an **"AFRICAN AMERICAN" Harvard graduate**, of the 11th circuit (Obama is a Harvard Graduate- a conspiracy may be a slight connection) and his two other Judges, affirm Orinda Evans, and Baverman decision as follows:

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-15276

Non-Argument Calendar

D.C. Docket No. 1:10-cv-01082-ODE

SHARON BRIDGEWATER,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

DEKALB COUNTY,

by and through Vernon Jones, Chief,

N. T. MARTINELLI,

Executive Officer; Chief of Police for the

DeKalb County Police Department,

C. SCHREINER,

Police Officer; #2491; Individually and in her
 official capacity as the arresting Officer,
 DETECTIVE GEORGE,
 individually and in his/her official capacity
 as Detective.,
 LIEUTENANT HAMILTON,
 Individually and in her/his official capacity
 as Lieutenant,
 DOES 1 THROUGH 50,
 Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
 for the Northern District of Georgia

(June 16, 2011)

Before CARNES, WILSON and BLACK, Circuit Judges.(PER CURIAM:

Sharon Bridgewater, proceeding pro se, filed a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against Dekalb County, the Dekalb County Chief of Police, and various Dekalb County police officers, asserting claims under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments. The action stems from events that occurred in October and November 2007 in Georgia. Bridgewater filed the complaint in April 2010, more than two years after either event. The district court sua sponte dismissed her complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), finding that it was time barred. Bridgewater appears to contend that the statute of limitations should have been tolled under Georgia Code § 9-3-99 while “[c]harges were pending against [her] from 2007 thru [sic] 2009” for “theft by taking.”¹

We review de novo a district court’s dismissal of a complaint for failure to

¹ “We construe pro se pleadings liberally.” *H&R Block E. Enter., Inc. v. Morris*, 606 F.3d 1285, 1288 n.1 (11th Cir. 2010).

² state a claim under to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), viewing all allegations in the complaint as true. *Mitchell v. Farcass*, 112 F.3d 1483, 1489–90 (11th Cir. 1997). The length of the limitations period governing a § 1983 action is dictated by state law. *Wallace v. Kato*, 549 U.S. 384, 387, 127 S.Ct. 1091, 1094 (2007). “[T]he proper limitations period for all section 1983 claims in Georgia is the two year period set forth in O.C.G.A. § 9-3-33 for personal injuries.” *Williams v. City of Atlanta*, 794 F.2d 624, 626 (11th Cir. 1986); see also GA. CODE ANN. § 9-3-33. Georgia provides for statutory tolling of tort claims arising from a crime until the prosecution of the person who committed that crime is final. GA. CODE

ANN. § 9-3-99. That tolling, however, is expressly limited to “any cause of action in tort that may be brought by the victim of an alleged crime.” *Id.* (emphasis added). Bridgewater admits that she was not the victim of the alleged crime, but instead she was the defendant charged with the crime. See *Valades v. Uslu*, 689 S.E.2d 338, 342 (Ga. Ct. App. 2009). Therefore, § 9-3-99 did not toll the two-year statute of limitations period.²

AFFIRMED.

²Even liberally construing Bridgewater’s largely incomprehensible brief, she does not appear to make any additional arguments in it. Therefore, any additional arguments are abandoned. See *Access Now, Inc. v. Sw. Airlines Co.*, 385 F.3d 1324, 1330 (11th Cir. 2004) (“If an argument is not fully briefed . . . we deem [it] abandoned and do not address its merits.”).

Plaintiff had also had her right to appeal denied. This is appeal is unthinkable and has been masked under "DO NOT PUBLISH." . The three panel appeal court Judges decision, were clearly prejudged and partial and bias. The is clearly an action of fraud operative here.

Pro se litigants are entitled to be treated with respect, fairly and impartially. Corrupt Judges must be removed from the bench.

Clearly there is an conspiracy to deprive the Plaintiff of money or property.

Plaintiff allege this judgment was render just for the purpose to aid, assist, Obama, and/or Orinda Evans, and to falsely imprision the Plaintiffs, and defraud the Plaintiff out of money or property. The Plaintiff was unaware of these facts. The Plaintiffs would have acted differently and/or ask Congress for help.

The actions of the Defendants are illegal, criminal and must be investigated by the US Congress.

Despite the Obstruction and extreme economic hardship, tramatic events and criminal acts, threat, coercion, forcible eviction, constant violation of the Plaintiffs civil rights, and committed against the Plaintiffs by Dekalb County, Rich et, al, the Plaintiffs, and multiple horrific memories, and the obstruction of the federal Judges the Plaintiffs continued to exercised her legal rights, and have continue to strive. Plaintiffs at all times had a valid, legally binding, HUD lease agreement and/or contract(HUD rental assistance program) with Roger and Mary Tonna and with the Alameda County Housing Authority, for the premises of 111 Preda Street #7, San Leandro, CA 94577 from June 2009 thru Oct. 22, 2010. Plaintiffs were recovering from the horrific injuries caused by HVLP et al. Plaintiff founded and “NEW REAL ESTATE COMPANY” AND/OR PARENT COMPANY OF THE SPECIALTY INVESTMENT GROUP LLC” - Specialty Global Investments Inc. in 2009. Plaintiff had accumulated business and personal possession again. The Plaintiff was well on her way to gaining her self-esteem, and competing in the Real Estate Industry again. The Plaintiff son now, a licensed Real Estate

1 Broker in the State of California had formed his own company. Bridgewater and Company INC.
2 The Plaintiffs and her son were well on their way to making a lot of money and competing in the
3 Real Estate Market. The Plaintiffs at all times mentioned continued to conduct interstate
commerce, in the State of California and attempted to conduct business as usual, and under
extreme emotional distress, and mental anguish of the traumatic events.

5
6
7 **RICO ARTIFICE AND SCHEME TO DEFRAUD THE AMERICAN PUBLIC AND THE**
8 **PLAINTIFF [TITLE 18 U.S.C. § 1964(c)] RE: INJURY TO BUSINESS AND**
9 **PROPERTY AND DESTRUCTION OF BUSINESS and OBTAINING MONIES BY AND**
10 **PEONGAGE or SLAVERY, FALSE IMPRISONMENT, Federal Principal and Aider and**
11 **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.

12 In furtherance of the unlawful agreement of the Defendants, Obama and/or Holder and/or Shawn
13 Dovanah the US HUD Director et al, adopted the acts of Roger Tonna, Mary Tonna and Jo-
14 Lynne Q. Lee, and/or acted in joint participation with these individuals to use, threat, coercion,
15 force, violate the plaintiffs civil rights again, and and did overt acts or omission to further the
objective of the Conspiracy.

16 The Defendants knew and were aware, the Plaintiff had a valid, legally, and lawful binding
17 "three way" section 8 contract between the Tonna, the Plaintiff Bridgewater, and HUD for the
18 premise of 111 Preda Street #7, San Leandro, CA 94577.

19 The Defendants knew and was aware the HUD contract existed and/or knew and was aware the
20 Plaintiff had contractual relations with HUD.

21
22 The Plaintiff's HUD lease agreement and contract with the Tonna's renewed automatically
23 on a month-to-month basis.

24 Roger and Mary Tonna had a duty and/or obligation and to abide by the HUD contract upon
25 signing the three way HUD contract. The HUD contract can only terminated upon a 90 day
26 notice of termination of tenancy pursuant to Federal and State law, including California Code of
Civil Procedure (C.C.P.)section 1954.53.

1 On or about Dec. 22, 2009, the Plaintiff father died. I The Plaintiff went to Michigan to attend
2 my father's funeral. The Plaintiff suffered horrific terrifying grief on top of all the other
3 tramatic events.

4 On or about Dec. 16, 2009 while the Plaintiffs was at the funeral, Obama and/or Holder and/or
5 Shawn Dovanan the Defendants acted in joint participation with Mary and Roger Tonna,
6 William Gilg(the Tonnas at all times mentioned , acted in joint participation with convicted
7 felons, harbored and hired illegal immigrates, and/or sold drugs from the complex), illegally
8 searched, seized business and personal possession without due process of law, and without the
9 right, and/or acted in joint participation with the convicted felon stole the Plaintiff business and
10 personal possession stolen again out of my apartment without due process of law and did overt
11 acts or omissions to further the objective of the conspiracy.

12 The Plaintiff were damaged by the defendants actions suffered flashbacks, of HVLP, Dekalb
13 County, Randy Rich, et al, suffered trauma, shock, mental ailment, post-tramatic stress syndrome,
14 humiliation, shame, depression, "feelings of helplessness," and low-self esteem, and lost of
15 dignity, and the Plaintiffs was injured in business and/or property and have damages according to
16 proof at trial.

17 Several other tenants eye witnessed the incident. One Federal eye witness in particular knew all
18 about the illegal activities of the Tonna's and vowed to testify for the Plaintiff of the illegal
19 taken, in addition vowed to tell the Judge of the numerous felonies criminal acts of Roger and
20 Mary Tonna et al.

21 .On or about June 16, 2010 the Plaintiff's filed a small claims court action, against
22 the Tonna's.

23 The small claim court case entitled "BRIDGEWATER VS. TONNA the trial was set for
24 August 13, 2010 as follows:
25
26
27
28

Case3:10-cv-04966-MMC

SC-100, Item 3
Page # 1

Sharon Bridgewater
111 Preda Street # 7
San Leandro, CA 94577
In Pro Se

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA**

Sharon Bridgewater,
Plaintiff,

CASE No.

Vs.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

**Negligence; Breach of Implied Warranty of
Habitability; Breach of Contract**

Roger Tonna
And Does 1 thru 50 inclusive

Amount demanded \$ 7,499.00
[SMALL CLAIMS COURT]

Defendants,

Plaintiff alleges:

1. At all times mentioned in this complaint, defendant Roger Tonna and does 1 thru 50 inclusive was the Owner of Apartment units at 111 Preda Street #7, San Leandro, CA 94577.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

- 1 -

Case 3:10-cv-04966-MMC

SC-100, 1 km #3
Page 2

in this complaint was the Owner of 111 Preda Street Apartment(s), Alameda, County, California.

2. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued in this complaint As Does 1 through 50, inclusive, and therefore sue these individuals by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named Defendants is negligently responsible in some manner for the occurrences alleged in this complaint, and Plaintiff injuries and/or damages herein alleged were proximately caused by the Defendant's negligence.

3. At all times mentioned in this complaint defendants, Roger Tonna, and does 1 thru 50, owned and operated, maintained, controlled that certain apartment building at 111 Preda Street, San Leandro, County of Alameda, California.

4. On or about June 15, 2009 the Plaintiff entered into a written lease agreement for premises of 111 Preda Street Apartment #7, San Leandro, CA 94577 with Roger Tonna and Does 1 thru 50.

5. At all times mentioned in this complaint plaintiff performed her obligations under the lease agreement defendants(s) and was in lawful, legal, possession of the apartments at 111 Preda Street Apartment # 7.

6. At all times mentioned the Plaintiff was a part p    in the United States Housing and Urban Development HUD section 8 program.

7. Each month the defendants receive payments from HUD on behalf of the Plaintiff.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

Case 3:10-cv-04966-MMC

SC-100 Km 3
Page 3

7. On or about Sept. 10, 2009 Roger Tonna and Does 1 thru 50 carelessly and negligently hired a single female, Charmaine Martinelli at 111 Preda Street, San Leandro, CA, as Property Manager for the rental units.

8. It is Plaintiff belief that Charmaine Martinelli is a convicted felon; as several tenants in the unit have informed and told the Plaintiff that Charmaine Martinelli, is a convicted felon served time in prison for embezzlement.

9. Several of the tenants in the unit "saw/eye-witnessed" Charmaine Martinelli illegally enter the Plaintiff premise while the Plaintiff was at her father funeral and/or out of town, *a take the Plaintiff items without permission*

10. On or about Dec. 19, 2009 and/or Feb. 5, 2010 Charmaine Martinelli, and other unknown accomplices illegally and unlawfully entered the Plaintiff residence without the Plaintiff without the right to enter, without "an emergency situation" without the Plaintiff's permission and/or knowledge and/or consent.

10. Charmaine Martinelli, stole several items from the residence in violation of State law.

11. Such items include a computer, monitor, expensive eye glasses, a leather rolling brief case, expensive art supplies (paint brushes, oil paint, water paint, stencils), books, disposal of personal and business receipts, personal and business papers.

12. The section 8 hud federal and/or State policy provides that no landlord may hire a convicted felon, while participant and receiving federal HUD program.

Roger Tonna and Does 1 thru 50 failed to exercise ordinary care in and breached the lease agreement of implied warranty of habitability by failing to provide adequate Security of the

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

- 3 -

Case3:10-cv-04966-MMC

SC-100, 1km 3
Page # 24

premises by negligently hiring the former Property Manager and breached the Plaintiff's peaceful and quiet enjoyment of the unit.

13. Roger Tonna and Does 1 thru 50 have a vicarious liability for the actions of Charmaine Martinelli actions, and are liable to the Plaintiff for her damages.

14. Further a lady was found dead in the apartment building and her body discovered 5-10 days later.

15. The Plaintiff have suffered from emotional distress of "horror," fright, fear, shock and is constantly scared.

19. As a proximate result of the negligence of defendants, and breach of implied warranty of habitability Roger Tonna and Does 1 thru 50 inclusive each of them and does 1 thru 50, the Plaintiff is entitled to relocation fee's first and last month rent. The replacement of her items stolen and other things.

20. The defendants are liable to the Plaintiff for damages ^{for her emotional distress.} sustained, and relocation fee's, etc.

21. Plaintiff prayer to this court for damages in the amount of amount of \$ 7,499.00 according to proof at trial.

Dated: June 16, 2010


Sharon Bridgewater

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

- 4 -

Case3:10-cv-04966-MMC

SL-100, Item 3

Page #5

VERIFICATION

I Sharon Bridgewater Declare:

I am the Plaintiff in the above entitled action.

I make this verification because the facts set forth in the complaint are within my knowledge and it is my apartment that was illegally and unlawfully entered into by the former property manager without the right an/or Plaintiff permission.

The Plaintiff have several witnesses and seen the former property manager illegally take possession from the Plaintiff apartment without the right to the possessions.

I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, I except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I Sharon Bridgewater declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: June 17, 2010

At San Leandro, California



Sharon Bridgewater

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

- 5 -

1 Plaintiff is informed and believe that Roger Tonna, et al murdered the Plaintiffs eye-witness who
2 vowed to tell the Judge all of the Defendants illegal activities. The Plaintiff prime witness was
3 found dead approx. 4 days before the small claims court hearing.

The defendants actions constitute one or more of the above criminal acts and/or a crime not listed
in the above criminal causes of actions.

5
6 In furtherance of the unlawful agreement of the Defendants, On or about July 27, 2010, William
7 Gilg, with the consent of and/or in a conspiracy with the Tonna's, Holder, et al, fraudulently
8 concealed known facts from the Plaintiff, including the fact that: William Gilg caused to be filed
9 and recorded written testimony and/or a declaration and/or material matters of the civil unlawful
10 detainer complaint against the Plaintiff in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of
11 Alameda, case number HG10-527647, entitled Roger and Mary Tonna vs. Sharon Bridgewater
12 which included and did overt acts or omission to further the objective of the conspiracy:
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case3:10-cv-04966-MMC

UD-100

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address): WILLIAM E. GILG Attorney at Law, SBN 151991 305 San Bruno Avenue West San Bruno, CA 94066 TELEPHONE NO.: 650-871-8647 FAX NO. (Optional): 650-873-3168 E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiffs		FOR COURT USE ONLY FILED BY FAX ALAMEDA COUNTY July 27, 2010 CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT By Sonya Arredondo, Deputy CASE NUMBER: HG10527647
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA STREET ADDRESS: 24405 Amador Street MAILING ADDRESS: Same CITY AND ZIP CODE: Hayward, CA 94544 BRANCH NAME: Hayward Hall of Justice PLAINTIFF: ROGER TONNA, MARY TONNA DEFENDANT: SHARON BRIDGEWATER		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DOES 1 TO 10 COMPLAINT - UNLAWFUL DETAINER* <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> COMPLAINT <input type="checkbox"/> AMENDED COMPLAINT (Amendment Number): _____		CASE NUMBER:
Jurisdiction (check all that apply): <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ACTION IS A LIMITED CIVIL CASE. Amount demanded <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> does not exceed \$10,000 <input type="checkbox"/> exceeds \$10,000 but does not exceed \$25,000 <input type="checkbox"/> ACTION IS AN UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE (amount demanded exceeds \$25,000) <input type="checkbox"/> ACTION IS RECLASSIFIED by this amended complaint or cross-complaint (check all that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> from unlawful detainer to general unlimited civil (possession not in issue) <input type="checkbox"/> from limited to unlimited <input type="checkbox"/> from unlawful detainer to general limited civil (possession not in issue) <input type="checkbox"/> from unlimited to limited		

1. PLAINTIFF (name each): Roger Tonna, Mary Tonna

alleges causes of action against DEFENDANT (name each):
Sharon Bridgewater

2. a. Plaintiff is (1) ☒ an individual over the age of 18 years. (4) ☐ a partnership.
 (2) ☐ a public agency. (5) ☐ a corporation.
 (3) ☐ other (specify):

b. ☐ Plaintiff has complied with the fictitious business name laws and is doing business under the fictitious name of (specify):

3. Defendant named above is in possession of the premises located at (street address, apt. no., city, zip code, and county):
 111 Preda St., #7
 San Leandro, CA 94577

4. Plaintiffs interest in the premises is ☒ as owner ☐ other (specify):

5. The true names and capacities of defendants sued as Does are unknown to plaintiff.

6. a. On or about (date): June 5, 2009 defendant (name each):
 Sharon Bridgewater

(1) agreed to rent the premises as a ☐ month-to-month tenancy ☒ other tenancy (specify): 1 yr. Sec. 8(2) agreed to pay rent of \$ 225.00 payable ☒ monthly ☐ other (specify frequency):(3) agreed to pay rent on the ☒ first of the month ☐ other day (specify):

- b. This ☒ written ☐ oral agreement was made with

(1) ☐ plaintiff.(2) ☒ plaintiff's agent.(3) ☐ plaintiff's predecessor in interest.(4) ☐ other (specify):

*NOTE: Do not use this form for evictions after sale (Code Civ. Proc., § 1161a).

Form Approved for Optional Use
Judicial Council of California
(UD-100 (Rev. July 1, 2005))

COMPLAINT - UNLAWFUL DETAINER

Page 1 of 3

Civil Code, § 1840 et seq.
Code of Civil Procedure, §§ 425.12, 1166
www.courtinfo.ca.gov

Case3:10-cv-04966-MMC

PLAINTIFF (Name): Roger Tonna, et al	CASE NUMBER:
DEFENDANT (Name): Sharon Bridgewater, et al	

8. c. ☒ The defendants not named in item 6a are:
- (1) ☐ subtenants.
 - (2) ☐ assignees.
 - (3) ☒ other (specify): unknown.
- d. ☐ The agreement was later changed as follows (specify):
- e. ☒ A copy of the written agreement, including any addenda or attachments that form the basis of this complaint, is attached and labeled Exhibit 1. (Required for residential property, unless item 6f is checked. See Code Civ. Proc., § 1166.)
- f. ☐ (For residential property) A copy of the written agreement is not attached because (specify reason):
- (1) ☐ the written agreement is not in the possession of the landlord or the landlord's employees or agents.
 - (2) ☐ this action is solely for nonpayment of rent (Code Civ. Proc., § 1161(2)).
7. ☒ a. Defendant (name each): Sharon Bridgewater
- was served the following notice on the same date and in the same manner:
- (1) ☐ 3-day notice to pay rent or quit
 - (2) ☐ 30-day notice to quit
 - (3) ☐ 60-day notice to quit
 - (4) ☐ 3-day notice to perform covenants or quit
 - (5) ☐ 3-day notice to quit
 - (6) ☒ Other (specify): defendant served 30-day notice because defendant failed to comply with the requirements of the notice by that date.
- b. (1) On (date): July 16, 2010
- (2) Defendants failed to comply with the requirements of the notice by that date.
- c. All facts stated in the notice are true.
- d. ☐ The notice included an election of forfeiture.
- e. ☒ A copy of the notice is attached and labeled Exhibit 2. (Required for residential property. See Code Civ. Proc., § 1166.)
- f. ☐ One or more defendants were served (1) with a different notice, (2) on a different date, or (3) in a different manner, as stated in Attachment 8c. (Check item 8c and attach a statement providing the information required by items 7a-e and 8 for each defendant.)
8. a. ☒ The notice in item 7a was served on the defendant named in item 7a as follows:
- (1) ☒ by personally handing a copy to defendant on (date): June 16, 2010
 - (2) ☐ by leaving a copy with (name or description): a person of suitable age and discretion, on (date): at defendant's residence ☐ business AND mailing a copy to defendant at defendant's place of residence on (date): because defendant cannot be found at defendant's residence or usual place of business.
 - (3) ☐ by posting a copy on the premises on (date): AND giving a copy to a person found residing at the premises AND mailing a copy to defendant at the premises on (date):
 - (a) ☐ because defendant's residence and usual place of business cannot be ascertained OR
 - (b) ☐ because no person of suitable age or discretion can be found there. - (4) ☐ (Not for 3-day notice; see Civil Code, § 1946 before using) by sending a copy by certified or registered mail addressed to defendant on (date):
 - (5) ☐ (Not for residential tenancies; see Civil Code, § 1953 before using) in the manner specified in a written commercial lease between the parties.
- b. ☐ (Name): was served on behalf of all defendants who signed a joint written rental agreement.
- c. ☐ Information about service of notice on the defendants alleged in item 7f is stated in Attachment 8c.
- d. ☐ Proof of service of the notice in item 7a is attached and labeled Exhibit 3.

Case3:10-cv-04966-MMC

PLAINTIFF (Name): Roger Tonna, et al	CASE NUMBER:
DEFENDANT (Name): Sharon Bridgewater, et al	

6. c. ☒ The defendants not named in item 6a are
 (1) ☐ subtenants.
 (2) ☐ assignees.
 (3) ☒ other (specify): unknown.
 d. ☐ The agreement was later changed as follows (specify):
- c. ☒ A copy of the written agreement, including any addenda or attachments that form the basis of this complaint, is attached and labeled Exhibit 1. (Required for residential property, unless item 6f is checked. See Code Civ. Proc., § 1166.)
 f. ☐ (For residential property) A copy of the written agreement is not attached because (specify reason):
 (1) ☐ the written agreement is not in the possession of the landlord or the landlord's employees or agents.
 (2) ☐ this action is solely for nonpayment of rent (Code Civ. Proc., § 1161(2)).
7. ☒ a. Defendant (name each): Sharon Bridgewater
- was served the following notice on the same date and in the same manner:
- (1) ☐ 3-day notice to pay rent or quit (4) ☐ 3-day notice to perform covenants or quit
 (2) ☐ 30-day notice to quit (5) ☐ 3-day notice to quit
 (3) ☐ 60-day notice to quit (6) ☒ Other (specify): defendant served 30-day
 the period stated in the notice expired at the end of the day.
- b. (1) On (date): July 16, 2010
 (2) Defendants failed to comply with the requirements of the notice by that date.
- c. All facts stated in the notice are true.
 d. ☐ The notice included an election of forfeiture.
 e. ☒ A copy of the notice is attached and labeled Exhibit 2. (Required for residential property. See Code Civ. Proc., § 1166.)
 f. ☐ One or more defendants were served (1) with a different notice, (2) on a different date, or (3) in a different manner, as stated in Attachment 8c. (Check item 8c and attach a statement providing the information required by items 7a-e and 8 for each defendant.)
8. a. ☒ The notice in item 7a was served on the defendant named in item 7a as follows:
 (1) ☒ by personally handing a copy to defendant on (date): June 16, 2010
 (2) ☐ by leaving a copy with (name or description): _____ at defendant's
 a person of suitable age and discretion, on (date): _____
☐ residence ☐ business AND mailing a copy to defendant at defendant's place of residence on
 (date): _____ because defendant cannot be found at defendant's residence or usual
 place of business.
 (3) ☐ by posting a copy on the premises on (date): _____ AND giving a copy to a
 person found residing at the premises AND mailing a copy to defendant at the premises on
 (date): _____
 (a) ☐ because defendant's residence and usual place of business cannot be ascertained OR
 (b) ☐ because no person of suitable age or discretion can be found there.
 (4) ☐ (Not for 3-day notice; see Civil Code, § 1945 before using) by sending a copy by certified or registered
 mail addressed to defendant on (date): _____
 (5) ☐ (Not for residential tenancies; see Civil Code, § 1953 before using) in the manner specified in a written
 commercial lease between the parties.
 b. ☐ (Name): _____
 was served on behalf of all defendants who signed a joint written rental agreement.
 c. ☐ Information about service of notice on the defendants alleged in item 7f is stated in Attachment 8c.
 d. ☐ Proof of service of the notice in item 7a is attached and labeled Exhibit 3.

Case3:10-cv-04966-MMC

PLAINTIFF (Name): Roger Tonna, et al	CASE NUMBER:
DEPENDANT (Name): Sharon Bridgewater, et al	

9. ☐ Plaintiff demands possession from each defendant because of expiration of a fixed-term lease.
10. ☐ At the time the 3-day notice to pay rent or quit was served, the amount of rent due was \$ 0.00
11. ☒ The fair rental value of the premises is \$ 7.50 per day.
12. ☐ Defendant's continued possession is malicious, and plaintiff is entitled to statutory damages under Code of Civil Procedure section 1174(b). (State specific facts supporting a claim up to \$800 in Attachment 12.)
13. ☐ A written agreement between the parties provides for attorney fees.
14. ☐ Defendant's tenancy is subject to the local rent control or eviction control ordinance of (city or county, title of ordinance, and date of passage):

Plaintiff has met all applicable requirements of the ordinances.

- 15.
- ☐
- Other allegations are stated in Attachment 15.

16. Plaintiff accepts the jurisdictional limit, if any, of the court.

17. PLAINTIFF REQUESTS

- a. possession of the premises.
- b. costs incurred in this proceeding: 0.00
- c. ☐ past due rent of \$
- d. ☐ reasonable attorney fees.
- e. ☒ forfeiture of the agreement.
- f. ☒ damages at the rate stated in item 11 from (date): July 17, 2010 for each day that defendants remain in possession through entry of judgment.
- g. ☐ statutory damages up to \$800 for the conduct alleged in item 12.
- h. ☒ other (specify): For such other and further relief.

- 18.
- ☒
- Number of pages attached (specify): 4

UNLAWFUL DETAINER ASSISTANT (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 6400-6415)

19. (Complete in all cases.) An unlawful detainer assistant
- ☒
- did not
- ☐
- did for compensation give advice or assistance with this form. (If plaintiff has received any help or advice for pay from an unlawful detainer assistant, state:)

- a. Assistant's name:
- b. Street address, city, and zip code:
- c. Telephone No.:
- d. County of registration:
- e. Registration No.:
- f. Expires on (date):

Date: July 26, 2010

William E. Gilg

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

VERIFICATION

(Use a different verification form if the verification is by an attorney or for a corporation or partnership.)

I am the plaintiff in this proceeding and have read this complaint. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

(SIGNATURE OF PLAINTIFF)

UD-100 (Rev. July 1, 2005)


 Essential Forms

COMPLAINT - UNLAWFUL DETAINER

Page 3 of 3

Case3:10-cv-04966-MMC

Housing Assistance Payments Contract
(HAP Contract)
Section 8 Tenant-Based Assistance
Housing Choice Voucher Program

U.S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development
Office of Public and Indian Housing

OMB Approval: 2577-0169
(exp. 07/31/2007)
HHS REG. 2400-0008
Phone: (510)727-8556

HAP Contract

Part A of the HAP Contract: Contract Information
(To prepare the contract, fill out all contract information in Part A.)

1. Contents of Contract

This HAP contract has three parts:
Part A: Contract Information
Part B: Body of Contract
Part C: Tenancy Addendum

2. Tenant (Enter full name of tenant)
MARION BRIDGEMAN3. Contract Unit
111 BROWN STREET #7
SAN LEANDRO, CA 94577.4. Household
The following persons may reside in the unit. Other persons may not be added to the household without prior written approval of the owner and the PHA.
MARION BRIDGEMAN5. Initial Lease Term
The initial lease term begins on (mm/dd/yyyy): 05/05/2012
The initial lease term ends on (mm/dd/yyyy): 04/04/20156. Initial Rent to Owner
The initial rent to owner is: \$1202.00
During the initial lease term, the owner may not raise the rent to owner.7. Initial Housing Assistance Payment
The HAP contract term commences on the first day of the initial lease term. At the beginning of the HAP contract term, the amount of the housing assistance payment by the PHA to the owner is \$277.00 per month.
The amount of the monthly housing assistance payment by the PHA to the owner is subject to change during the HAP contract term in accordance with HUD requirements.

Previous editions are obsolete.

Page 1 of 10

Form HUD-52643 (1/2007)
HUD Handbook 7420.8

52643A/259667-206/0074809-002/BRIDGEMAN, MARION/5225/8: 24817

1 d 6869-920-059

First Financial

Case3:10-cv-04966-MMC

HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA
22941 ATHERTON ST, RAYWARD, CA. 94541-6633
(510) 538-8876

HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER PROGRAM

October 5, 2009

TO: TONNA, ROGER
PO BOX 266
BELMONT, CA 94002-

Tenant: SHARON BRIDGEWATER
111 PEDA STREET #7
SAN LEANDRO, CA 94577

NOTICE OF CHANGE

EFFECTIVE DATE OF CHANGE: 06/05/09

The reason for this change is due to:

- ☐ REEXAMINATION
Annual Review of family income and / or composition.
- ☐ INTERIM ADJUSTMENT
Interim correction in family income and / or composition.
- ☐ RENT ADJUSTMENT
The owner / agent request for a rent adjustment that has been approved by the Housing Authority.
- ☐ CHANGE IN FAMILY COMPOSITION

Add:

Delete:

☒ OTHER

***** REPORT INCOME CHANGES IMMEDIATELY TO HOUSING *****
ADJUSTMENTS IN PAYMENTS

	FROM	TO
HAP Payment	\$0.00	\$977.00
Tenant Rent	\$0.00	\$225.00
Total Contract Rent	\$0.00	\$1,202.00

TO THE TENANT ONLY

If you disagree with this decision, you may request an informal hearing. If a hearing is desired, you must submit a written request to this office within 14 business days of the date of this notice or your right to a hearing will be waived.

By: LYNN SHANKS
(510) 727-8596

206/03V4809-002/BRIDGEWATER, SHARON/02825A/#: 28917

Owner Copy

First Financial

Case3:10-cv-04966-MMC

VERIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

I have read the foregoing Complaint in Unlawful Detainer

and know its contents.

☐ CHECK APPLICABLE PARAGRAPHS☐ I am a party to this action. The matters stated in the foregoing document are true of my own knowledge except as to those matters which are stated on information and belief, and as to those matters I believe them to be true.☐ I am ☐ an Officer ☐ a partner
☐ a of

a party to this action, and am authorized to make this verification for and on its behalf, and I make this verification for that reason.

☐ I am informed and believe and on that ground allege that the matters stated in the foregoing document are true. ☐ The matters stated in the foregoing document are true of my own knowledge except as to those matters which are stated on information and belief, and as to those matters I believe them to be true.☒ I am one of the attorneys for Plaintiff

a party to this action. Such party is absent from the county of aforesaid where such attorneys have their offices, and I make this verification for and on behalf of that party for that reason. I am informed and believe and on that ground allege that the matters stated in the foregoing document are true.

Executed on July 26, 2010

at San Bruno

California.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

William E. Gilg

TYPE OR PRINT NAME

SIGNATURE

PROOF OF SERVICE

1013a (3) CCP Revised 2004

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF

I am employed in the county of

State of California.

I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is:

On

I served the foregoing document described as

on

in this action.

☐ by placing the true copies thereof enclosed in sealed envelopes addressed as stated on the attached mailing list;☐ by placing ☐ the original ☐ a true copy thereof enclosed in sealed envelopes addressed as follows:☐ BY MAIL☐ I deposited such envelope in the mail at

California.

The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid.

☐ As follows: I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with U.S. postal service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at

California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

Executed on

at

California.

☐ (BY PERSONAL SERVICE) I delivered such envelope by hand to the offices of the addressee.

Executed on

at

California.

☐ (State) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.☐ (Federal) I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made.

TYPE OR PRINT NAME

SIGNATURE

BY MAIL SIGNATURE MUST BE OF PERSON DEPOSITING ENVELOPE IN MAIL SLOT, BOX, OR BAG!

FOR PERSONAL SERVICE SIGNATURE MUST BE THAT OF MESSENGER

NONJC-016 (Rev. 07/01/2010)



VERIFICATION/PROOF OF SERVICE

S301 J30 508

1 The Defendants were under a duty and/or had an obligation to disclose to the Plaintiffs , Sharon
2 Bridgewater, Specialty Investment Group LLC and Specialty Global Investment INC. and/or
3 Bridgewater and Company INC., that the following documents was filed.

4 Plaintiffs would have acted differently if were made aware of the following documents filed in
5 the Superior Court of Alameda.

6
7
8 William Gilg, with the consent of and/or in a conspiracy with the Tonna's was under a duty to
9 disclose to the court all the above known facts.

10
11 In furtherance of the unlawful agreement of the Defendants William Gilg, with the consent of
12 and/or in a conspiracy with the Tonna's then served a copy the verified Unlawful Detainer
13 Complaint on the Plaintiff at her address at 111 Preda Street # 7, San Leandro, CA 94577, and
14 did overt acts or omissions to further the objective of the conspiracy. The actions of the William
15 Gilg, with the consent of and/or in a conspiracy with the Tonna's in fraudulently concealing and
16 filing a the unlawful detainer complaint without providing the Plaintiff with the pre-requisite
17 notice of termination of tenancy as required by Federal or State law "triggered" severe
18 emotional, psychical and psychological trauma, shock, mental ailment, post-tramatic stress
19 syndrome, humiliation, shame, depression, "feelings of helplessness," and low-self esteem, and
20 lost of dignity, and I was injured and/or damaged in business and/or property in an amount to be
21 proven at trial.

22 Plaintiff allege that in order to file an unlawful detainer complaint "A NOTICE OF
23 TERMINATION OF TENANCY IS REQUIRED PURSUANT TO FEDERAL LAW.
24 PLAINTIFF ALLEGE THE DEFENDANTS KNOWINGLY, INTENTIONALLY FAILED TO
25 SERVE THE PLAINTIFF A NOTICE OF TERMINATION OF TENANCY and at all times
26 mentioned had a duty or obligation to serve the Plaintiff with a HUD 90 day notice of
27 termination of tenancy before they could filed the complaint.

28 The Plaintiff had not canceled the section 8 lease agreement and had "not" forfeited the HUD
section 8 lease agreement. The Defendants actions were taken just for the purpose to defraud the
Plaintiff out of money and or property, and use threat, coercion and forcibly evict the Plaintiff
without due process of law The Defendnats actions constitute a conspiracy to defraud,
concealment, abuse of the Superior Court of Alameda County, conspiracy to restrain commerce,
prevent competition, etc.

1 On or about August 2, 2010, the Plaintiff caused to be filed and recorded written testimony
2 and/or a declaration and/or material matters an affirmative defense in the Unlawful Detainer
3 Complaint in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Alameda, case number
HG10-527647, entitled Roger and Mary Tonna vs. Sharon Bridgewater and pled/alleged:

Case3:10-cv-04966-MMC

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name and Address): SHARON BRIDGEMAN 111 PIEDA STREET #7 SAN LEANDRO, CA 94577		TELEPHONE NO.	UD-105 FOR COURT USE ONLY
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): IN PRO PER			FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY AUG 02 2010 CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT By: <i>[Signature]</i> Deputy
NAME OF COURT: Superior Court of California, Limited Jurisdiction			
STREET ADDRESS: County of Alameda			
MAILING ADDRESS: 24405 Armasen Street			
CITY AND ZIP CODE: Hayward, CA 94544			
BRANCH NAME:			
PLAINTIFF: ROGER & MARY TONNA			
DEFENDANT: SHARON BRIDGEMAN			
ANSWER—Unlawful Detainer			CASE NUMBER: HG10527647

1. Defendant (names): **SHARON BRIDGEMAN**

answers the complaint as follows:

2. Check ONLY ONE of the next two boxes:

- a. ☒ Defendant generally denies each statement of the complaint. (Do not check this box if the complaint demands more than \$1,000.)
- b. ☒ Defendant admits that all of the statements of the complaint are true EXCEPT
- (1) Defendant claims the following statements of the complaint are false (use paragraph numbers from the complaint or explain): **The defendant agreed with Plaintiff, the Plaintiff breached an oral agreement, waived the notice to vacate.**
- ☐ Continued on Attachment 2b (1).
- (2) Defendant has no information or belief that the following statements of the complaint are true, so defendant denies them (use paragraph numbers from the complaint or explain):

☐ Continued on Attachment 2b (2).

3. AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES (NOTE: For each box checked, you must state brief facts to support it in the space provided at the top of page two (item 3)).

- a. ☐ (nonpayment of rent only) Plaintiff has breached the warranty to provide habitable premises.
- b. ☐ (nonpayment of rent only) Defendant made needed repairs and properly deducted the cost from the rent, and plaintiff did not give proper credit.
- c. ☐ (nonpayment of rent only) On (date): before the notice to pay or quit expired, defendant offered the rent due but plaintiff would not accept it.
- d. ☒ Plaintiff waived, changed, or canceled the notice to quit.
- e. ☒ Plaintiff served defendant with the notice to quit or filed the complaint to retaliate against defendant.
- f. ☒ By serving defendant with the notice to quit or filing the complaint, plaintiff is arbitrarily discriminating against the defendant in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States or California.
- g. ☐ Plaintiff's demand for possession violates the local rent control or eviction control ordinance of (city or county, title of ordinance, and date of passage):
- (Also, briefly state the facts showing violation of the ordinance in item 3f.)
- h. ☒ Plaintiff accepted rent from defendant to cover a period of time after the date the notice to quit expired.
- i. ☐ Other affirmative defenses are stated in item 3j.

Form Approved by the Judicial
Council of California
UD-105 (Rev. January 1, 2007)

ANSWER—Unlawful Detainer

Page 1 of 2
Civil Code, §1940 et seq.;
Code of Civil Procedure, § 425.12
www.courtinfo.ca.gov
American LegalNet, Inc.
www.Forms4thePeople.com

Case3:10-cv-04966-MMC

UD-105

PLAINTIFF (Name): <u>ROGER & MARY TENNA</u>	CASE NUMBER:
DEFENDANT (Name): <u>SHARON BRIDGEMAN</u>	<u>HG10527647</u>

3. AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES (cont'd)

j. Facts supporting affirmative defenses checked above (identify each item separately by its letter from page one):

(A) 3-d - Plaintiff notice is defective, invalid, doesn't state and/or no box is checked on the notice to person to be served. (This court doesn't)

(1) ☐ All the facts are stated in Attachment 3.(2) ☒ Facts are continued in Attachment 3. have jurisdiction

4. OTHER STATEMENTS

a. ☐ Defendant vacated the premises on (date):b. ☒ The fair rental value of the premises alleged in the complaint is excessive (explain): 0 zero
The defendants fail to provide the Plaintiff with snake doctors and/or fail to maintain a "resident manager" in violation of Cal. Law.c. ☐ Other (specify):

The defendants are breaking Fed. & State law.

5. DEFENDANT REQUESTS

a. that plaintiff take nothing requested in the complaint

b. costs incurred in this proceeding.

c. ☒ reasonable attorney fees.d. ☒ that plaintiff be ordered to (1) make repairs and correct the conditions that constitute a breach of the warranty to provide habitable premises and (2) reduce the monthly rent to a reasonable rental value until the conditions are corrected.e. ☒ Other (specify): further & other relief as deemed just by this court.6. ☐ Number of pages attached (specify):

UNLAWFUL DETAINER ASSISTANT (Business and Professions Code sections 8400-8415)

7. (Must be completed in all cases.) An unlawful detainer assistant ☒ did not ☐ did for compensation give advice or assistance with this form. (If defendant has received any help or advice for pay from an unlawful detainer assistant, state:

a. Assistant's name:

b. Telephone No.:

c. Street address, city, and ZIP:

d. County of registration:

e. Registration No.:

f. Expires on (date):

SHARON BRIDGEMAN
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

(SIGNATURE OF DEFENDANT OR ATTORNEY)

[Signature]
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

(SIGNATURE OF DEFENDANT OR ATTORNEY)

(Each defendant for whom this answer is filed must be named in item 1 and must sign this answer unless his or her attorney signs.)

VERIFICATION

(Use a different verification form if the verification is by an attorney or for a corporation or partnership.)

I, the defendant in this proceeding and have read this answer, I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Date:

SHARON BRIDGEMAN
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

(SIGNATURE OF DEFENDANT)

UD-105 (Rev. January 1, 2007)

ANSWER—Unlawful Detainer

Page 2 of 2

Case3:10-cv-04966-MMC

Continued Attachment 3j (Page 1 of 2)

- ③ The defendant does not state / and / or did not check box 2B and has not complied with the fictitious business name laws and does not have the legal authority to bring a cause of action in this Superior Court.
- ④ The defendant "can not" forfeit a section 8 lease agreement. The defendant must provide a 90 notice of termination of tenancy to the Plaintiff. "as provide by section 8" law.
- ⑤ The defendant is retaliating against the Plaintiff. The Plaintiff has exercised her legal right a filed a small claims court action against the TONNA's for negligence / Breach of Contract / Breach of Implied Warranty of Habitability, hiring a convicted felon who stole Plaintiff's possession from her apartment when the Plaintiff went to her father's funeral in Michigan, and the Plaintiff have "eye-witnesses, that saw."
- The Plaintiff have a court case / date next week 8/13/2010, and for failure to provide "Smoke detectors" and ^{hab. liability issues} other damages. (see case # HS10520747) in this court.
- the defendants are retaliating. (see ex. COURT files)


Case3:10-cv-04966-MMC

Affirmative defenses continued page 3j (Page 2 of 2)

(E) Plaintiff (S) the defendant's have excepted Section 8 rent (July) on behalf of the Plaintiff defendant and waives the right to terminate and/or evict.

(F) Pursuant to "section 8 law" the defendant can not evict a tenant a must have ^{SUCH AS} good cause to evict a "NON-PAYMENT" of rent

Plaintiff (S)
(G) The defendants have failed to maintain the premises, and the ~~Plaintiff~~ ^{defendant} at violated Federal & Statelaw by failing to provide smoke detectors in Plaintiffs defendants apartment.


Steven Bridgman

8/2/2010

1
2
3 Plaintiff allege all these overt acts of the Tonnas, were made known to the the Alameda County
4 Housing Authority on more than three different occasions, and spoke with the Supervisor of the
5 Plaintiff HUD section 8 worker on several different occasion, and the Plaintiffs repeated asked
6 for help or intervention of JOHN DOE Supervisor of the Plaintiff HUD section 8 worker. Further
7 the Plaintiff made known to Shawn Donavhan the Director of HUD in Washington and/or Eric
8 Holder Jr.all of these overt acts of the Tonna, and repeatedly asked for assistance.

9
10 Plaintiff allege the reason for the acts or omission of the Defendants JOHN DOE Supervisor of
11 the Plaintiff HUD section 8 worker and Shawn Donavhan the Director of HUD in Washington
12 and/or Eric Holder Jr. were done in furtherance to retaliate against the Plaintiffs Federal Witness
13 and Victim of Crime of US Government RICO activities, and just on the account for the
14 Plaintiffs exercising her legal rights.

15
16 The above named Defendants at all times had a legal duty or obligation to act, help, the plaintiffs
17 and to prevent the eviction from going forward, and had the power to prevent the tortuous
18 interference with the Plaintiffs hud contract. Plaintiff allege that the above named Defendnants
19 all had the power to prevent and fail to prevent the tortuous interference, malicious breach of the
20 HUD contract and cheered each other on.

21
22 All of the Defendnats named hear acted as accessories or aiders, and abettors, and were agents to
23 these crimes and when they failed to help or report the crimes they witnessed and were the same
24 re guilty of the Roger Tonna, Mary Tonna and William Gilgs, and their actions violate their pthe
25 Professional Rules of Conduct as the United State HUD Director and/or as the United States
26 Attorney General, and/or As the Superior of the Plaintiff HUD section 8 worker of Alameda
27 County Housing Authority and are liable for damages.

28
29 The Defendants actions of not helping, and preventing the tortuous intereferece, caused the
30 Plaintiff to feel treple teamed, trauma, shock, mental ailment, post-tramatic stress syndrome,
31 humiliation, shame, depression, "feelings of helplessness," and low-self esteem, and lost of
32 dignity, and I was injured and/or damaged in an amount to be proven at trial.

33
34 In furtherance of the unlawful agreement of the above Roger and Mary Tonna et al, plaintiff are
35 informed and believe that the Tonnas "killed" the Plaintiffs "prime federal witness" to prevent
36 the Federal Witness from testifying to the Tonnas illegal acts, he was discovered dead in his
37 apartment for days before the Plaintiff small claim court date.

1
2
3 The Plaintiff allege that this is not a coninsdent that the Prime Witness is found dead in his apartment.

4
5
6
7 On or about Aug. 13, 2012, at the small claim court hearing, the Plaintiffs presented evidence of
8 the property stolen. Roger and Mary Tonna, "VERBALLY" TOLD THE JUDGE IN OPEN
9 COURT, THAT THEY HAD STOLEN PROPERTY AND/OR ITEMS FROM THE
10 PLAINTIFFS SHARON BRIDGEWATER(SPECIALTY INVESTMENT GROUP LLC AND
11 SPECIALTY GLOBAL INVESTMENT INC AND/OR BRIDGEWATER & COMPANY INC).
12 Plaintiff are informed and believe Obama and/or Holder, ordered, bride Smith, and paid him to
13 rule in the Tonna Favor.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case3:10-cv-04966-MMC

SC-130

Name and Address of Court:
 Superior Court of California, County of Alameda
 Hayward Hall of Justice
 24405 Amador Street
 Hayward, CA 94544
 (510) 690-2705

SMALL CLAIMS CASE NO. HS10520747

NOTICE TO ALL PLAINTIFFS AND DEFENDANTS:

Your Small Claims case has been decided. If you lost the case, and the court ordered you to pay money, your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court. Read the attached page for further important information about your rights.

AVISO A TODOS LOS DEMANDANTES Y DEMANDADOS:

Su caso ha sido resuelto por la corte para reclamos judiciales menores. Si la corte ha decidido en su contra y ha ordenado que usted pague dinero, le pueden quitar su salario, su dinero, y otras cosas de su propiedad, sin aviso adicional por parte de esta corte. Lea el reverso de este formulario para obtener información de importancia acerca de sus derechos.

PLAINTIFF/DEMANDANTE (Name, address, and telephone of each):

Sharon Bridgewater
 111 Preda Street #7
 San Leandro, CA 94577

DEFENDANT/DEMANDADO (Name, address, and telephone number of each):

Roger Tonna
 P.O. Box 266
 Belmont, CA 94002

L Telephone No. _____

L Telephone No. _____

r

r

Mary Tonna
 111 Preda Street (Warren Manor)
 San Leandro, CA 94577

L Telephone No. _____

L Telephone No. _____

☐ See attached sheet for additional plaintiffs and defendants**NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT**

Judgment was entered as checked below on (date): 08/13/2010

Commissioner

L. Thomas Surh

1. ☐ Defendant (name, if more than one):
 shall pay plaintiff (name, if more than one):
 \$ principal and \$ costs on plaintiff's claim.
2. ☒ Defendant does not owe plaintiff any money on plaintiff's claim.
3. ☐ Plaintiff (name, if more than one):
 shall pay defendant (name, if more than one):
 \$ principal and \$ costs on defendant's claim.
4. ☐ Plaintiff does not owe defendant any money on defendant's claim.
5. ☐ Possession of the following property is awarded to plaintiff (describe property):
6. ☐ Payments are to be made at the rate of \$ per (specify period): beginning on (date):
 and on the (specify day): day of each thereafter until paid in full. If any payment is missed, the entire
 balance may become due immediately.
7. ☐ Dismissed in Court ☐ with prejudice. ☐ without prejudice.
8. ☐ Attorney-Client Fee Dispute (Attachment to Notice of Entry of Judgment) (form SC-132) is attached.
9. ☐ Other (specify):
10. ☐ This judgment results from a motor vehicle accident on a California highway and was caused by the judgment debtor's operation of a
 motor vehicle. If the judgment is not paid, the judgment creditor may apply to have the judgment debtor's driver's license suspended.
11. ☒ Enforcement of the judgment is automatically postponed for 30 days or, if an appeal is filed, until the appeal is decided.
12. ☐ This notice was personally delivered to (insert name and date):

- The county provides small claims advisor services free of charge. Read the information sheet on the next page. -

Form Adopted for Alternative Mandatory Use
 Judicial Council of California
 SC-130 (Rev. July 1, 1998)

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT
 (Small Claims)


Page 1
 Code of Civil Procedure
 www.courts.ca.gov

1 Plaintiff is informed and believe Obama and/or Holder Roger and Mary Tonna et al brided, paid
2 the Judge to rule in their favor, et al ratified, approved to act in joint participation with State
3 Judge with the consent of and/or in a conspiracy with the Tonna's knowingly, intentionally,
ratified, approved to engage in extreme and outrageous conduct.

5 Surely when a defendants "ADMIT IN OPEN COURT THAT THEY HAD STOLEN ITEMS
6 FROM THE PLAINTIFF" SURELY THE JUDGE MUST AWARDED THE PLAINTIFF
7 DAMAGES. THE IS AN OPEN ACT OF FRAUD, AND A CONSPIRACY UNDER THE
8 COLOR OF LAW, CORRUPT JUDGE. The Defendants actions caused the Plaintiff to have
9 lack of faith in every US Judicial Court, caused the Plaintiff trauma, shock, mental ailment, post-
traumatic stress syndrome, humiliation, shame, depression, "feelings of helplessness," and low-self
esteem, and lost of dignity, the inability to regain her personal and business items, and I was
injured and/or damaged in an amount to be proven at trial.

12 In furtherance of the unlawful agreement of the Defendants, Obama and/or Holder and/or Shawn
13 Dovahavan, Roger Tonna, Mary Tonna and William Gilg, et al, conspired, concealed known
14 facts from the Plaintiffs, abused the Superior court of Alameda, acted in joint participation with
15 Jo-Lynne Q. Lee a State Court Judge, and caused to be filed and recorded the following
document:

Case3:10-cv-04966-MMC

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, state bar number, and address): WILLIAM E. GILG SBN 151991 Attorney at Law 305 San Bruno Avenue West San Bruno, CA 94066 TELEPHONE NO.: 650-871-8647 FAX NO. (Optional): 650-873-3168 E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional):		 8095889 FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY SEP 21 2010 CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT By <u>[Signature]</u> Deputy
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiffs SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA STREET ADDRESS: 24405 Amador Street MAILING ADDRESS: Same CITY AND ZIP CODE: Hayward, CA 94544 BRANCH NAME: Hayward Hall of Justice		
PLAINTIFF: ROGER TONNA, MARY TONNA DEFENDANT: SHARON BRIDGEWATER		
JUDGMENT - UNLAWFUL DETAINER <input type="checkbox"/> By Clerk <input type="checkbox"/> By Default <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> After Court Trial <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> By Court <input type="checkbox"/> Possession Only <input type="checkbox"/> Defendant Did Not Appear at Trial		
		CASE NUMBER: HG10-527647

JUDGMENT

1. ☐ BY DEFAULT
- Defendant was properly served with a copy of the summons and complaint.
 - Defendant failed to answer the complaint or appear and defend the action within the time allowed by law.
 - Defendant's default was entered by the clerk upon plaintiff's application.
 - ☐ Clerk's Judgment (Code Civ. Proc., § 1169). For possession only of the premises described on page 2 (Item 4).
 - ☐ Court Judgment (Code Civ. Proc., § 585(b)). The court considered
 - ☐ plaintiff's testimony and other evidence.
 - ☐ plaintiff's or others' written declaration and evidence (Code Civ. Proc., § 585(d)).
2. ☒ AFTER COURT TRIAL. The jury was waived. The court considered the evidence.
- The case was tried on (date and time): September 21, 2010 at 9:00 AM
before (name of judicial officer): Hon. So-Lynne Lee
 - Appearances by:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plaintiff (name each):	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plaintiff's attorney (name each):
Roger Tonna	(1) William E. Gilg
Mary Tonna	(2)
<input type="checkbox"/> Continued on Attachment 2b (form MC-025).	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant (name each):	<input type="checkbox"/> Defendant's attorney (name each):
Sharon Bridgewater	(1)
	(2)
<input type="checkbox"/> Continued on Attachment 2b (form MC-025).	
 - ☐ Defendant did not appear at trial. Defendant was properly served with notice of trial.
 - ☐ A statement of decision (Code Civ. Proc., § 632) ☐ was not. ☐ was requested.

Form Approved for Optional Use
Judicial Council of California
JD-110 (New January 1, 2003)



JUDGMENT - UNLAWFUL DETAINER

Page 1 of 2
Code of Civil Procedure, §§ 415.48,
680(a), 680.5, 1109

Case3:10-cv-04966-MMC

PLAINTIFF: Roger Tonna, et al

CASE NUMBER:
HG10-527647

DEFENDANT: Sharon Bridgewater

JUDGMENT IS ENTERED AS FOLLOWS BY: ☒ THE COURT ☐ THE CLERK

3. Parties. Judgment is

a. ☒ for plaintiff (name each): Roger Tonna, Mary Tonna

and against defendant (name each): Sharon Bridgewater

☐ Continued on Attachment 3a (form MC-025).b. ☐ for defendant (name each):4. ☒ Plaintiff ☐ Defendant is entitled to possession of the premises located at (street address, apartment, city, and county):

111 Preda St., #7

San Leandro CA 94577

5. ☐ Judgment applies to all occupants of the premises including tenants, subtenants if any, and named claimants if any (Code Civ. Proc., §§ 715.010, 1169 and 1174.3).6. ☒ Amount and terms of judgmenta. ☒ Defendant named in item 3a above must pay plaintiff on the complaint:

(1) <input type="checkbox"/> Past-due rent	\$	
(2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Holdover damages	\$	300.50
(3) <input type="checkbox"/> Attorney fees	\$	
(4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Costs	\$	220.00
(5) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify):	\$	
(6) TOTAL JUDGMENT	\$	220.00

b. ☐ Plaintiff is to receive nothing from defendant named in item 3b.☐ Defendant named in item 3b is to recover

costs: \$

☐ and attorney fees: \$c. ☒ The rental agreement is canceled. ☒ The lease is forfeited.7. ☐ Conditional judgment. Plaintiff has breached the agreement to provide habitable premises to defendant as stated in Judgment-Unlawful Detainer Attachment (form UD-110S), which is attached.8. ☐ Other (specify):☐ Continued on Attachment 8 (form MC-025).

Date:

Date:

9/21/10

☒

JUDICIAL OFFICER

☐

Clerk by _____, Deputy

(SEAL)

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE (Optional)

I certify that this is a true copy of the original judgment on file in the court.

Date:

Clerk, by _____, Deputy

UD-110 (New January 1, 2003)

JUDGMENT - UNLAWFUL DETAINER

Page 2 of 2

1 The defendants were under a duty to disclose known facts to the Plaintiff. The concealment
2 cause the Plaintiff to be illegally, and maliciously evicted from her apartment without due
3 process of law

4 Plaintiff allege all defendants acted under the color of Federal and/or State law, Plaintiff allege
5 the purpose of the concealment, William Gilg, with the consent of and/or in a conspiracy with
6 the Tonna's knowingly, intentionally, misused and abused the Superior Court proceeding of trial
7 discriminated against the Plaintiff violated the Plaintiffs due process civil rights in the
8 termination of tenancy process, unlawfully gained possession of the premise at 111 Preda Street,
9 San Leandro, CA 94577; through the misuse and abuse of the Superior Court of Alameda
10 County and defrauded the Plaintiff out of \$722.50, and maliciously breached the HUD section 8
11 lease agreement and/or toriously interfered with the Plaintiff HUD contract, and did overt act or
12 omission to further the objective of the conspiracy.

13 Jo-Lynne Q. Lee was charged with enforcing State of California anti discrimination laws; and
14 had a legal duty or obligation to make impartial and fair decision while performing their duties
15 for the Alameda Superior County Court, her betrayal of her role as impartial trier of fact are far
16 more serious, and constitute overt acts. Jo-Lynne Q. Lee conspired with et al's, to ensure that
17 Plaintiff's case would never to go trial upon receipt of the the Tonna complaint filed. Clearly
18 their has been an obstruction of Justice in this case.

19 Jo-Lynne Q. Lee constitute denial of the Plaintiffs first amendment right to free speech,
20 obstruction of justice, tampering with a federal witness, and one or more of the above criminal
21 acts as listed on this complaint.

22 The Defendants knew and were aware the plaintiff was diagnosed by UM doctors of being
23 disabled after a civil rights violations, and knew this was the prime cause of why the Plaintiffs
24 was "non-function."

25 Plaintiff allege the Defendants actions were taken just for the purpose to cause to keep the
26 Plaintiff mentally and emotionally instable, inflict intentional infliction of emotional distress
27 upon the Plaintiff, and inflict the Plaintiff with undue hardship, oppress the Plaintiffs, restrain
28 commerce to, keep the Plaintiff mentally and emotionally disabled.

In furtherance of the unlawful of the Defendants after the Plaintiff was forced to leave her
apartment the Plaintiff left her furniture, glass table, bed(beauty rest mattesse), leather sofa,
dining table in the apartment(California law provides when a tenant is evicted the tenant may
leave their possession in the apartment for 15 days-and to schedule an appointment with the

landlord to pick the items up). The Plaintiff immediately upon evicted called, the Tonnas, and William Gilg for her items. The Tonna, et al, knowingly, intentionally converted the Plaintiffs furniture and the Plaintiffs possessions to their own use, after the Plaintiff repeatedly the return of her items, and did overt acts or omission to further the objective of the conspiracy.

The Defendants actions constitute theft, conversion, fraud, and the Defendants have unreasonably restrained commerce, and all acted in joint participation with each other and cheered each other on. The Plaintiff have been damaged by the Defendants. "Gilg" with the consent of or under the direction of the Tonnas and/or in a conspiracy with the Tonna's actions.

The Plaintiff at all times mentioned filed motions of writs of mandate all the way to the Supreme Court of California of the Defendants, illegal actions. All writs were denied, Plaintiff is informed and believe Obama and/or Holder requested favors of this Supreme Court Justices to deny the Plaintiff writs of mandate. Plaintiff allege and is informed and believe Obama and/or Holder request a favor from this Supreme Court Justices of California(see exh.)

Surely, the defendants actions are Clearly in violation of federal and/or state law established law, and constitute criminal overt acts against the Plaintiffs.

The Defendants actions caused the Plaintiff to be debarred from the HUD section 8 program. Plaintiff at all times mentioned was forced to leave her home, the plaintiff was then rendered homeless and forced to live in a homeless shelter, and suffered culture shock, was subjected to the Streets of San Francisco, drug needles on side walks, sirens, and was homeless for a year due to extreme mental anguish, emotional instability, (the defendants put the Plaintiff life in dangered of harms way), caused the Plaintiff horrific shock, trauma, pyshcological and other damages. The Defendants actions were "vicious" intentional, contemptible and any citizen would look down on Gilgs et al actions.

JOHN DOE 10 unknown Director of the Alameda County Housing Authority, in his/her individual and official and/or "former "capacity As Supervisor of the Plaintiff section 8 worker, in his or her individual and official and/or "former "capacities at all times mentioned had a legal duty and/or obligation to fulfill their duties as employees of the US department of HUD help the Plaintiff and failed to prevent the actions of the defendants, breached his/her duty or obligation to the Plaintiffs and is responsible.

Defendants JOHN DOE 10 is the unknown Director of the Alameda County Housing Authority, He or She is sued in his/her individual and official current or former capacity as Director of the Alameda County Housing Authority in his or her individual and official and/or "former "capacities at all times mentioned had a legal duty and/or obligation to has to instruct, supervise, and control officers and/or instructed, supervised, and controlled Alameda County Housing

1 Authority employees and/or instructed Alameda County Supervisor to discriminate against and
2 cause damage to the Plaintiffs and is responsible

3 Defendant Shawn Donovan, in his individual capacity As the Director of the United States
4 Housing and Urban Development in his individually and official and/or "former" capacities acts
5 or omissions against the plaintiffs were done in furtherance of a conspiracy to retaliate against
6 the Plaintiff for the Plaintiff exercising her legal rights, and he is responsible for the Alameda
7 County Supervisor and Director actions.

8 Plaintiff allege that Shawn Dovan, Holder Amstrong, Baverman and all the Federal Defendants
9 named in this complaint knew and were aware of the complaint filed Sharon Bridgewater vs.
10 Hayes Valley, and intentionally acted in joint participation and/or failed to prevent the Tonnas
11 from tortuously interfering with the Plaintiff contract, action just to retaliate against the Plaintiff a
12 federal witness, and done in furtherance of a conspiracy.

13 In furtherance of the unlawful agreement of the Defendants, on the one year anniversary of the
14 death of the Plaintiff father, and on Christmas Day. Holder et al, acted in joint participation with
15 the Homeless Shelter Agency and and illegally unlawfully evicted the Plaintiff(home) from the
16 homeless shelter again, and as mentioned in the above paragraph _____.

17 HOLDER ET AL KNEW AND WERE AWARE THAT THE PLAINTIFFS WAS HAVING
18 SUCH HARSHIP AND DUE TO THEIR RICO VIOLATION, AND HAD NO BUSINESS
19 EVICTING THE PLAINTIFF FROM THE HOMELESS SHELTER.

20 HOLDER ET AL MUST ACCOUNT FOR HIS ILLEGAL VIOLENCE AGAINST THE
21 PLAINTIFFS.

22 In furtherance of the unlawful action of the Defendants, Shawn Dovanah and Holder et al, has
23 knowingly and willfully threaten and used physical force against the Complainant Sharon
24 Bridgewater with intent, and influenced, delayed, or prevented the testimony of Complainant
25 Sharon Bridgewater in an official proceeding; and/or caused the complainant Sharon
26 Bridgewater to withhold testimony, or record, or documents, from an official proceeding with
27 the intent and impaired the availability of the object for use in an official proceeding or
28 influenced, delayed, or prevented the testimony 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 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 the Complainant to appear as a witness, or to produce a
record, document, or other object, in an official proceeding; or caused the Complainant to be
absent from an official proceeding to which that person has been summoned by legal process; or

1 hindered, delayed, or prevented the communication to a law enforcement officer or judge of the
2 United States of information relating to the commission or possible commission of a Federal
3 offense in violation of 18 USC section 1512

and

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

7 In furtherance of the unlawful action of the Defendants, Shawn Dovanah and Holder et al, has
8 knowingly and willfully "CUT, STOPPED" THE PLAINTIFF SOCIAL SECURITY CHECKS,
9 WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW, AND WHILE THE PLAINTIFFS WAS LIVING IN
10 THE HOMELESS SHELTER, THE PLAINTIFF HAD TO FILE A LAWSUIT AGAINST
11 DEFENDANTS ENTITLED SHARON BRIDGEWATER VS. SOCIAL SECURITY
ADMINISTRATION(SEE CASE NUMBER _____ IN THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CLAIFORNIA) AND did overt acts or omission to further the objective of the conspiracy.

12 The Defendants actions are constitute grave felonious, ruthless, foul, felonious, criminal, and
13 Holder must pay from his criminal acts, and be removed, and/or barred from practicing law. As
14 the Chief Law Enforcement Officer of the United States Holder is in no position to have this
15 honorary position.

16 Holder et al actions is SHORT FROM MURDER!

17 Plaintiff allege the purpose of Holder and Shawn Dovanah et al knew and were aware the
18 Plaintiff is a University of Michigan Graduate with Master Degree credits, and knew and were
19 aware the Plaintiff was diagnois by UM doctor as having a disability 'DUE TO CIVIL RIGHTS
20 VIOLATIONS BY POLICE OFFICER" was to abuse US Government Power, cause the Plaintiff
21 suffering and mental anquish, just for the purpose to prevent the Plaintiff from exercising her
LEGAL RIGHTS.

22
23
24 The Defenants actions constitute retaliation against a federal witness and victim of US
25 Government Rico activies. And the defendants severally and/or jointly, knowingly and willfully
26 threaten and used physical force against the Complainant Sharon Bridgewater with intent, and
27 influenced, delayed, or prevented the testimony of Complainant Sharon Bridgewater in an
28 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
of the object for use in an official proceeding or influenced, delayed, or prevented the testimony
of the Complainant in an official proceeding; or caused or induced the Complainant to withhold

1 testimony, or withhold a record, document, or other object, from an official proceeding; or
2 altered, destroyed, mutilated, or concealed an object with intent to impair the integrity or
3 availability of the object for use in an official proceeding; or evaded legal process summoning to
4 the Complainant to appear as a witness, or to produce a record, document, or other object, in an
5 official proceeding; or caused the Complainant to be absent from an official proceeding to which
6 that person has been summoned by legal process; or hindered, delayed, or prevented the
7 communication to a law enforcement officer or judge of the United States of information relating
8 to the commission or possible commission of a Federal offense in violation of 18 USC section
9 1512

10 and

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

14 Plaintiffs allege the Defendant maliciously breached the Plaintiff Hud contract and/or tortuously
15 interfered with the Plaintiff HUD contract, defrauded the Plaintiff out of money and/or property
16 restrained commerce, forced Plaintiff out of business. The defendants caused the Plaintiffs
17 horrific damage.

18 In furtherance of the unlawful agreement of the Defendants, Plaintiffs allege On or about Sept
19 1, 2011 thru Oct. 30, 2011 ATTEMPTED TO FILE SHARON BRIDGEWATER(SPECIALTY
20 INVESTMENT GROUP LLC) COMPLAINTS sent to the United States District Court in
21 Georgia two different Dekalb county complaints. Defendants JOHN DOE 7 unknown
22 employees of the U.S. Northern District of Court of Georgia, Atlanta, Georgia in their official
23 personal capacity and/or "former "capacities at all times mentioned had a duty and/or obligation
24 as US Federal District Court Clerks to file the Plaintiffs complaints entitled Sharon Bridgewater
25 vs. Dekalb County.

26 Plaintiff allege on or about Sept 1, 2011, I sent certified mail a Sharon Bridgewater vs. Dekalb
27 county complaint. I received my return receipt that the complaint was delivered. Defendants
28 JOHN DOE 7 unknown employees of the U.S. Northern District of Court of Georgia, returned
to complaint back to me marked unfiled. On or about Oct. 4, 2011 I sent a second complaint
entitled Sharon Bridgewater vs. Dekalb County.(one original and one copy). It was received by,
A. Saunders. I had realized that I filed the wrong complaint, because it had private individual
social security number, etc on the complaint. I immediately called A Saunders and told her not
to file the complaint because it had other individuals private information such as social security
number, etc., and requested her to return the complaint, and for a later filing of the complaint.


1 A. Saunders told me she would immediately return the complaint. A Saunders illegal kept the
2 complaint in her possession for approx. two weeks, acted under the color of Federal law, and/or
3 acted in joint participation with Holder illegally kept one complaint, seized, took, converted, the
Plaintiff personal property of a complaint entitled Sharon Bridgewater vs. Dekalb County for her
own personal use the complainant entitled Sharon Bridgewater vs. Dekalb County Complaint,
and 4th via 5th or 14th amendment US Constitutional right, and sent back one copy of the
complaint, and the defendants did overt acts or omission to further the objective of the
conspiracy.

7
8 The Defendants had no reason to keep my paper work for two weeks and/or no reason not to
accept my court filings.

9
10 A. Saunder and Defendants JOHN DOE 7 unknown employees of the U.S. Northern District of
11 Court of Georgia, Atlanta, Georgia in their official personal capacity and/or "former "capacities
adopt Federal actor under the color of law, actions constitute a conspiracy under the color of law
12 and with Obama and/or Holder et. Al, an illegal conversion of the complainant property, and/or
complaint and/or complaint filed, and also constitute a denial of access to the courts in the
13 Northern District court of Georgia, also constitute tampering with evidence in violation of
Federal and State law.

14
15 Defendants JOHN DOE 7 unknown employees of the U.S. Northern District of Court of
16 Georgia, Atlanta, Georgia in their official personal capacity and/or "former "capacities at all
17 times mentioned knew or should have known to file the Plaintiffs complaints, and to to their
duties and/or obligation as Clerks and breached their a duty and/or obligation as US Federal
18 District Court Clerks. Upon information and belief Defendants JOHN DOE 7 unknown
19 employees of the U.S. Northern District of Court of Georgia, A. Saunders knew of the
conspiracy of Obama and/or Holder et al, and failed to aid and/or help or prevent the criminal
20 acts against the Plaintiffs. and are liable for damages.

21 Plaintiffs allege that said individual Defendants' intimidation, threats, corrupt persuasion, or
22 attempts to do so, or misleading conduct toward Plaintiffs, with intent to influence, delay, or
prevent testimony of any person in an official proceeding, or to coerce or induce any person to
23 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
24 Defendants' commission of possible federal or state criminal offenses, and such acts violated 18
25 U.S.C. 1512



SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG

MAIL FRAUD

THE PLAINTIFFS DO NOT HAVE THIS ORDER IN HER POSSESSESION, HOWEVER ARMSTRONG ORDER, THE PLAINTIFFS TO PAY THE PRE-FILING FEE, AND SERVE THE COMPLAINT ON THE DEFENDANTS.

Plaintiff reallege the above paragraphs. Plaintiff allege that Armstrong act in joint participation with Wilkins, fails to relate the case to coerce the Plaintiff to file a different complaint.

Plaintiff allege On , July 29, 2011 the United States District Court of California, at an "unknown" time at Clay Street, Oakland California, Claudia Wilkins, Federal District Court Judge of California, acted under the color of Federal law and/or acted in joint participation with Defendants JOHN DOE 6 are unknown employees and/or clerks of the U.S. Northern District of California, Oakland, and Division current or former individual capacities originating within the state of California, from Clay Street, the United States Federal District Court of Northern California, California and terminating at 965 Mission Street Suite 409 San Francisco, CA 94104, caused to be placed in a post office, or authorized depository for mail, matter to be sent

and delivered by the Postal to Sharon Bridgewater as follows:

Case4:10-cv-03022-CW Document98 Filed02/11/11 Page1 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,

No. 10-03022 CW

Plaintiff,

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

1
2 Plaintiff's allege that Claudia Wilkins, knew and were aware that this Order was false,
3 deceptive Order.

4
5 Plaintiff's allege Claudia Wilkins intended for the Plaintiffs to rely on the false and
6 deceptive Order.

7
8 Plaintiff is informed and believe Claudia Wilkins issued this order to coerce the Plaintiff
9 to file a federal false claims complaint.

10
11 Plaintiff allege this was designed to halt the ability to report the crimes. Plaintiffs further claims
12 Wilkins knowingly, intentionally, vacated the case management conference in spite of both
13 parties Defendants and Plaintiff filing a case management/settlement statement to defraud the
14 Plaintiffs out of money or property.

15
16 Wilkins actions consitutue a scheme to defraud the Plaintiffs

17
18 Plaintiffs relied on the Order, and further, filed a motion to amend the original complaint,
19 and A MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL served the US Department of Justice Eric Holder Jr.
20 and the United States Attorney General of the California with a the disclosure statement and
21 **"FIRST AMENDED FEDERAL FALSE CLAIMS COMPLAINT"** INSTEAD OF THE
22 ORIGINAL COMPLAINT, and the Plaintiffs had a friend to serve the Complaint on the United
23 States Department of Justice.(see exh.) [the Plaintiff was experiencing so much trauma caused
24 by the Defendants were not able to think or concenstrate, and followed the FRCP wrong for
25 service of the Federal False Claims complaint.

26
27 Plaintiff allege that the deceptive Order was sent to the Plaintiffs just for the purpose to use the
28 Plaintiffs to serve the Federal False Claims complaint on the defendants so Holder et al could
obtain HUD federal false claims civil or criminal penalties, and falsely imprision the plaintiff
without due process of and, and defraud the Plaintiff out of her share of Federal False Claims
recoveries.

29
30 Claudia Wilkins, actions constitute fraud on the court and/or fraud, deception or collusion,
31 concealment and/or a conspiracy under the color of law in her individual personal capacity. And
32 constitute a scheme and/or artifice to and/or mail fraud as defined in USC 1341 or 1343 and/or
33 1345 and constituted a violation of one or more of the criminal charges as listed on on this
34 complaint.

35
36 Plaintiff allege that both parties, Hayes Valley Limited Partnership attorney and the Plaintiff
37 filed case management statement, and for settlement.