

**APPENDIX**

**NO FURTHER APPENDIX NECESSARY.**

**ALL DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE ONLINE AND FROM COURT CLERKS.**

**DUE TO FINANCIAL INDIGENCE NO COPIES HAVE BEEN MADE OR WILL  
BE MADE FOR THE COURTS. THE FEDERAL SUPREME COURT WILL BE  
IN CHARGE OF ORDERING THEIR OWN COPIES AND READING ONLINE.**

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS

-- -- -- --

NO. 20-0793

JULES DYLAN STUER  
v.  
SUSAN DUESLER

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Dallas County,  
  
5th District.

January 8, 2021

Petitioner's petition for review, filed herein in the above numbered and styled case, having been duly considered, is ordered, and hereby is, denied.

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★

I, BLAKE A. HAWTHORNE, Clerk of the Supreme Court of Texas, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of the orders of the Supreme Court of Texas in the case numbered and styled as above, as the same appear of record in the minutes of said Court under the date shown.

WITNESS my hand and seal of the Supreme Court of Texas, at the City of Austin, this the 11th day of February, 2021.



*Blake A. Hawthorne*

Blake A. Hawthorne, Clerk

By Monica Zamarripa, Deputy Clerk

**DISMISS and Opinion Filed August 17, 2020**



**In The  
Court of Appeals  
Fifth District of Texas at Dallas**

---

**No. 05-19-00752-CV**

---

**JULES DYLAN STUER, Appellant  
V.  
SUSAN DUESLER, Appellee**

---

**On Appeal from the 298th Judicial District Court  
Dallas County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause No. DC-18-07494**

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Before Chief Justice Burns<sup>1</sup>, Justice Pedersen, III, and Justice Evans  
Opinion by Justice Evans

Appellant Jules Dylan Stuer appeals the trial court's order dismissing his case against appellee Susan Duesler. Representing himself without an attorney, Stuer filed an appellant's brief. We notified him that his brief was deficient and instructed him to file an amended brief to comply with the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Honorable David L. Bridges, Justice, participated in the submission of this case, however, he did not participate in the issuance of this opinion due to his death on July 25, 2020. Chief Justice Robert Burns has substituted in for Justice Bridges and has reviewed the briefs and the record before the Court.

Stuer's amended brief is also deficient and fails to comply with the rules. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal.

## **BACKGROUND**

### **A. Family Court**

On April 6, 2017, Duesler was appointed as the amicus attorney for a minor child that was the subject of a custody dispute between Stuer and his wife in the 255th Family District in Dallas County. The family court held a trial regarding the divorce and custody proceeding in January 2018 and signed a Final Decree of Divorce on March 23, 2018.

### **B. District Court**

On June 8, 2018, Stuer filed a lawsuit against Duesler in Dallas County District Court alleging a claim for defamation and damages. Duesler sought immunity in her answer pursuant to Texas Family Code section 107.009.<sup>2</sup> Duesler then filed a motion to dismiss pursuant to Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 91a. The district court granted the motion to dismiss on October 5, 2018 ("October order"). On May 31, 2019, the district court heard Duesler's motion for attorney's fees related to her motion to dismiss. The district court assessed attorney's fees against Stuer by order

---

<sup>2</sup> "A guardian ad litem, an attorney ad litem, a child custody evaluator, or an amicus attorney appointed under this chapter is not liable for civil damages arising from an action taken, a recommendation made, or an opinion given in the capacity of guardian ad litem, attorney ad litem, child custody evaluator, or amicus attorney." *See* TEX. FAMILY CODE § 107.009.

dating May 31, 2019 ("May order"). Stuer filed a notice of appeal regarding the October order and the May Order.

### **C. Court of Appeals**

Stuer filed an appellant's brief on October 17, 2019. By letter dated October 28, 2019, the Clerk of the Court sent Stuer a letter which stated as follows:

The appellant's brief in the above referenced case does not satisfy the requirements of Rule 38 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure. Specifically, the brief is deficient as follows:

\*\*\*

  X   The table of contents does not indicate the subject matter of each issue or point, or group of issues or points. TEX. R. APP. P. 38.1(b).

  X   It does not contain an index of authorities arranged alphabetically and indicating the pages of the brief where the authorities are cited. TEX. R. APP. P. 38.1(c).

  X   It does not contain a concise statement of the case, the course of proceedings, and the trial court's disposition of the case supported by record references. TEX. R. APP. P. 38.1(d).

\*\*\*

  X   It does not contain a concise statement of the facts supported by record references. TEX. R. APP. P. 38.1(g).

  X   It does not contain a succinct, clear, and accurate statement of the arguments made in the body of the brief. TEX. R. APP. P. 38.1(h).

  X   The argument does not contain appropriate citations to authorities. TEX. R. APP. P. 38.1(i).

  X   The argument does not contain appropriate citations to the record. TEX. R. APP. P. 38.1(i).

\*\*\*

☒ Text of brief is not double spaced. TEX. R. APP. P. 9.4(d).

\*\*\*

☒ It does not contain a proper certificate of compliance. TEX. R. APP. P. 9.4(i)(3).

☒ It does not contain a proper certificate of service. TEX. R. APP. P. 9.5(e)(2)(3).

☒ Documents in appendix must be redacted to remove name of child. TEX. R. APP. P. 9.8(b).

☒ Documents in appendix must be redacted to remove name of parent. TEX. R. APP. P. 9.8(b).

☒ Documents contain sensitive data. TEX. R. APP. P. 9.9 or 9.10.

The letter further informed Stuer that his failure to file an amended brief that complied with the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure within ten days could result in dismissal of his appeal. Stuer filed an amended brief on November 7, 2019.

## ANALYSIS

### A. Failure to Comply with Rule 38.1

In Texas, an individual who is a party to civil litigation has the right to represent himself at trial and on appeal. TEX. R. CIV. P. 7. The right of self-representation carries with it the responsibility to adhere to our rules of evidence and procedure, including our appellate rules of procedure if the party chooses to represent himself at the appellate level. *See Bolling v. Farmers Branch Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 315 S.W.3d 893, 895 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2010, no pet.). Courts regularly

caution pro se litigants that they will not be treated differently than a party who is represented by a licensed attorney. *Id.* To comply, an appellant must articulate the issues we are asked to decide. *Lee v. Abbott*, No. 05-18-01185-CV, 2019 WL 1970521, at \*1 (Tex. App.—Dallas May 3, 2019, no pet.) (mem. op.). The brief fails if we must speculate or guess about the appellant's contentions. *Id.* We are not responsible for identifying possible trial court error, searching the record for facts that may be favorable to a party's position, or doing legal research that might support a party's contention. *Id.* Were we to do so, even for a pro se litigant untrained in law, we would be abandoning our role as judges and become an advocate for that party. *See Valadez v. Avitia*, 238 S.W.3d 843, 845 (Tex. App.—El Paso 2007, no pet.).

Our appellate rules have specific requirements for briefing. TEX R. APP. P. 38. These rules require appellants to state concisely the complaint they may have, provide understandable, succinct, and clear argument for why their complaint has merit in fact and in law, and cite and apply law that is applicable to the complaint being made along with record references that are appropriate. TEX R. APP. P. 38.1(f), (h), and (i). When deciding whether an appellant's brief is deficient, we do not adhere to any rigid rule about the form of a brief. *See Bolling*, 315 S.W.3d at 895. Pro se litigants may not be versed in the form of briefing favored by seasoned appellate practitioners. *Id.* We do, however, examine briefs for compliance with prescribed briefing rules, including specifically, in this case, rule 38.1. TEX. R. APP.

P. 38.1. After a close examination, if we can conclude a brief complies with the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure, we submit the appeal for review and decision on the merits. *Lee v. Abbott*, 2019 WL 1970521, at \*1. If we cannot, we may dismiss the appeal as we are authorized to do. TEX. R. APP. P. 42.3.

In this case, our notice to Stuer informed him that his brief failed to comply with the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure. Stuer's amended brief, however, fails to remedy these deficiencies. Although Stuer purports to present six issues for our review, his brief fails to present applicable facts, argument, authorities and record references for each purported issue. To the contrary, Stuer's brief is largely incoherent and consists of a string of jumbled and chaotic references to laws, constitutional rights, alleged crimes, wrongdoing and complaints which are irrelevant to the underlying case. For example, Stuer's amended brief references violations of "Federal Victim's Rights Law," "Federal Victim's Rights Act," and due process law. Although Stuer mentions that the trial court "erred in grant[ing] Dismissal of the full Defamation case" in the issues presented to review, there is no legal analysis of this argument or any citation to relevant supporting authorities. The amended brief also complains of action and wrongdoing by individuals who are not defendants in the underlying action such as his ex-wife's attorney in the divorce proceeding. Further, the amended brief is completely devoid of record references. *See Hernandez v. Dallas Indep. Sch. Dist.*, No. 05-17-00227-CV, 2018 WL 1835692, at \*2 (Tex. App.—Dallas Apr. 19, 2018, no pet.) (mem. op.) ("Because

Hernandez's brief is unsupported by appropriate citations to the record, he has preserved nothing for our review."'). Because Stuer has failed to comply with the briefing requirements of our appellate rules after having been given the opportunity to do so, we dismiss appellant's appeal. TEX. R. APP. P. 42.3.

**B. Motion to Dismiss**

Even if we had concluded that Stuer's amended brief met the procedural requirements, Stuer has failed to assert how the trial court erred in granting the dismissal of the case.

Dismissal is appropriate under Rule 91a "if the allegations, taken as true, together with inferences reasonably drawn from them, do not entitle the claimant to the relief sought . . . [or] no reasonable person could believe the facts pleaded." *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 91a. Appellate courts review a trial court's award of a dismissal under Rule 91a under a de novo standard of review. *City of Dallas v. Sanchez*, 494 S.W.3d 722, 724 (Tex. 2016).

In her motion to dismiss, Duesler argued that the trial court should dismiss Stuer's defamation case for two reasons:

- (1) Plaintiff's defamation cause of action has no basis in fact as the alleged defamatory statements of Ms. Duesler to Faith & Liberty's Place Family Center (and the transmission of a court's Final Decree of Divorce) were based on Plaintiff's own statements (See Plaintiff's own admission in his First Amended Petition, Paragraph 10(c): "This was based on conditional statements."); and
- (2) Plaintiff's defamation cause of action has no basis in law as Ms. Duesler's statements and transmission of the court's Final Decree of

Divorce were made in her official capacity as an Amicus Attorney for which she enjoys immunity.

The trial court did not specify the ground or grounds upon which it granted the motion to dismiss. Accordingly, Stuer was required to challenge both grounds raised by Duesler in the motion to dismiss. *See Estate of Savana*, 529 S.W.3d 587, 592 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2017, no pet.) (“If an order granting a Rule 91a motion does not specify the grounds for dismissal, a party appealing the order must challenge every ground upon which the trial court could have granted the motion.”).

We first note that Stuer did not address Duesler’s first argument in either his trial court pleadings or on appeal. Accordingly, he has failed to challenge all grounds upon which the trial court could have granted the motion to dismiss and the appeal fails for this reason. *See Parkhurst v. Office of Att’y Gen. of Tex.*, 481 S.W.3d 400, 402 (Tex. App.—Amarillo 2015, no pet.) (quoting *Berger v. Flores*, No. 03-12-00415-CV, 2015 WL 3654555, at \*4 (Tex. App.—Austin June 12, 2015, no pet.) (mem. op.)) (“[I]t is appropriate to impose upon an appellant attacking a dismissal under Rule 91a the same obligation as one attacking a summary judgment when the trial court fails to mention a particular ground on which it relied. In each situation, he must negate the validity of each ground upon which the trial court could have relied. If he fails to address any particular ground, ‘we must uphold the [order] on the unchallenged ground.’”).

In regard to the immunity argument, the Texas Family Code provides that “[a] guardian ad litem, an attorney ad litem, a child custody evaluator, or an amicus attorney appointed under this chapter is not liable for civil damages arising from an action taken, a recommendation made, or an opinion given in the capacity of guardian ad litem, attorney ad litem, child custody evaluator, or amicus attorney.” TEX. FAM. CODE §107.009(a). The statute further provides that “[s]ubsection (a) does not apply to an action taken, a recommendation made, or an opinion given: (1) with conscious indifference or reckless indifference to the safety of another; (2) in bad faith or with malice; or (3) that is grossly negligent or willfully wrongful.” *Id.* at §107.009(b). In this case, Stuer fails to assert which exception applies in this case so that Duesler may be held liable. Further, Stuer failed to present any facts or argument in support of his assertion that Duesler is not immune from liability based upon her role as an amicus attorney in the divorce proceeding.

For all of these reasons, we conclude that had we looked at the merits of the case, we would affirm the trial court’s order granting dismissal of the case.

## **CONCLUSION**

As Stuer failed to comply with the briefing requirements of our appellate rules after having been given an opportunity to do so, we dismiss appellant's appeal.

/David Evans/

DAVID EVANS  
JUSTICE

190752F.P05



**Court of Appeals  
Fifth District of Texas at Dallas**

**JUDGMENT**

JULES DYLAN STUER, Appellant

No. 05-19-00752-CV      V.

SUSAN DUESLER, Appellee

On Appeal from the 298th Judicial  
District Court, Dallas County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause No. DC-18-07494.  
Opinion delivered by Justice Evans.  
Chief Justice Burns and Justice  
Pedersen, III participating.

In accordance with this Court's opinion of this date, the appeal is  
**DISMISSED.**

It is **ORDERED** that appellee SUSAN DUESLER recover her costs of this  
appeal from appellant JULES DYLAN STUER.

Judgment entered this 17th day of August 2020.



**Fifth Court of Appeals**  
600 Commerce Street, Suite 200  
Dallas, Texas 75202

June 25, 2019

RE: Case No. 05-19-00752-CV

Style: Jules Dylan Stuer  
v. Susan Duesler

The Court today filed appellant's notice of appeal in the above referenced cause. The 5<sup>th</sup> Court of Appeals follows the Standards of Conduct adopted by Texas Supreme Court and Court of Criminal Appeals order.

Trial Court Case No. DC-18-07494

Lisa Matz, Clerk

---

THE HONORABLE EMILY G. TOBOLOWSKY  
298TH DISTRICT COURT  
GEORGE ALLEN SR. COURTS BLDG.  
600 COMMERCE, BOX 822  
DALLAS, TX 75202  
\* DELIVERED VIA E-MAIL \*



**Fifth Court of Appeals**  
600 Commerce Street, Suite 200  
Dallas, Texas 75202

June 25, 2019

RE: Case No. 05-19-00752-CV

Style: Jules Dylan Stuer  
v. Susan Duesler

The Court today filed appellant's notice of appeal in the above referenced cause. The 5<sup>th</sup> Court of Appeals follows the Standards of Conduct adopted by Texas Supreme Court and Court of Criminal Appeals order.

Trial Court Case No. DC-18-07494

Lisa Matz, Clerk

---

RYAN MCFARLIN  
THE MCFARLIN FIRM, PLLC  
PO BOX 224114  
DALLAS, TX 75222-4114  
\* DELIVERED VIA E-MAIL \*



**Court of Appeals  
Fifth District of Texas at Dallas**

**MANDATE**

**TO THE 298TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF DALLAS COUNTY,  
GREETINGS:**

Before the Court of Appeals for the Fifth District of Texas, on the 17th day of August 2020, the cause on appeal to revise or reverse the judgment between

JULES DYLAN STUER, Appellant

No. 05-19-00752-CV      V.

SUSAN DUESLER, Appellee

On Appeal from the 298th Judicial  
District Court, Dallas County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause No. DC-18-07494.  
Opinion delivered by Justice Evans.  
Chief Justice Burns and Justice  
Pedersen, III participating.

was determined; and this Court made its order in these words:

In accordance with this Court's opinion of this date, the appeal is  
**DISMISSED.**

It is **ORDERED** that appellee SUSAN DUESLER recover her costs of this appeal from appellant JULES DYLAN STUER.

**WHEREFORE, WE COMMAND YOU** to observe the order of the Court of Appeals for the Fifth District of Texas, in this behalf, and have it duly obeyed and executed.

WITNESS the HON ROBERT D. BURNS, III, Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals, with the Seal thereof affixed, at the City of Dallas, this 25th day of February 2021.



*Lisa Matz*

Lisa Matz, Clerk

## **Case Numbers Sheet:**

AG:		CGS-73496
OAG:		0013611355
CPS 2017-2018:		457-369-27
CPS 2019:		723-073-92
CPS 2020:		735-292-49, 740-387-24
255 <sup>th</sup> Court Divorce:		DF-17-05507
255 <sup>th</sup> Court Child Custody:	Defaulted	Recused.
191 <sup>st</sup> Court Defamation:		DC-18-07493
298 <sup>th</sup> Court Defamation:		DC-18-07494
Malpractice:	Defaulted	Recused. <b>DC-19-16060</b> <b>DF-20-16005</b> <b>Now in: <u>68<sup>th</sup> Court</u></b>
162 <sup>nd</sup> Court Finance:		DC-19-18091
5 <sup>th</sup> Court of Appeals:	05-18-01220-CV Dismissed, 05-19-00752-CV	
Supreme Court TX:	20-0793	
Writ of Mandamus:	05-18-01346-CV	
State Auditor's Office Control # for Crimes:	21-0927, 3883-01-262	
Texas Commission on Judicial Conduct (SCJC) #:	21-0312, 21-0313	
Ross and Mathews Legal Shield Membership Number:		10148624959 TX-6N8-43W

**2021-301901** for Recipient Fraud IG area General Investigation

**2021-301902** for Recipient Fraud was sent to IG area WIC Recipient.

**TREC COMPLAINT:** 180508

**US Department of Justice Civil Rights Case:** 31-041-JCN, 62291-LWN

**Child Solicitation Case:** 82-070527

**Missing and Exploited Child:** 817-12756

**AG- CV Compensation Program:** VC-211-10679

**US Department of Treasury claim number for Whistleblowers program:** 2021-004815, 2021-007250

**FTC:** 131232589

**SEC:** 16158-374-106

Sincerely,

**Mr. Jules Dylan Stuer obo DBA**

**The Estate of Lily Ana Stuer**

**Criticalfiles00777@gmail.com**

**(469) 471-4200**

**1238 Dalhart Dr.,**

**Richardson, TX 75080**

**NCBE:** N-10562079

**LSAC:** L-41102125

**FBI Victim ID:** 5735064

# **Case Brief Sheet:**

**255<sup>th</sup> Court Divorce:**

**DF-17-05507**

**(Stuer vs Stuer, 255<sup>th</sup>, Judge Cooks Now Recused, Defaulted Decree to Marital Settlement Agreement / Property Division Agreement, in 68<sup>th</sup> Malpractice Court)**

**Facts:** Multiple instances of Aggravated Perjury from misrepresentation of Amicus, opposing lawyer Tadlock, and mother to protect their positions together constructively, maternal child abuse (visitation and alienation now fully documented for CPS, Department of Justice, and Department of Corrections in 2021), and Fraud in Court. Crimes overcome the truth in the 255<sup>th</sup> Court. The 255<sup>th</sup> Court does **NOT** check for aggravated perjury, fraud, or maternal child abuse patterns (parental alienation or parental visitation child abuse of children and as such break their own Standing Order). The Court is heavily sexist and slanted toward biased rulings and collecting child support for women. The Court has authorized attorneys acting as Amicus to “strip children naked”, lie about it in other Courts (As in Duesler Testimony 298<sup>th</sup>, Court), accept Title IV Child Support, due to RICO violations, and or for some possible profit in fee or solicitation money, and subjectively break their own Codes of Conduct, Standing Orders, and Federal VRA laws whenever they’d like. These facts were shown through various civil lawsuits, complaints, after a father didn’t receive his daughter once home during divorce without signs of serious maternal abuse issues and was illegally blamed in Decree, through subjective libel, for the issues. The 255<sup>th</sup> Court is systematically victimizing adults and victim children in their rulings without regard for law. The father was subsequently set up, defrauded, and blamed for mother’s poor behavior on Decree, to simply solidify child support, without any real evidence or criminal prosecution for crimes: “stalking” and “neglect”.

**Procedure:** The victimization and defrauding of Mr. Stuer and maternal abuse of Miss. Lily Ana Stuer was not a secret as Mr. Stuer profusely documented it with time stamped notes, representatives from federal agencies, video, and audio files.

**Issue:** If crimes are allowed to be performed constructively what is the Court really running? Do Court officials get to biasedly discriminate against sex, simply to support Title IV functions for lawyers to collect fees? Do Court officials get to make up subjective lies and become complacent to crimes about subjects in order to achieve political outcomes or sexist / biased based monetary income or other malicious biased outcomes? Is a fraudulent document (with obvious subjective libel and forgery) filed by the Court still enforceable?

**Reasoning:** Federal VRA rights prevent maternal child abuse and should have prevented it in this case. Federal laws were conveniently overlooked by lawyers and the Court to fit their own designated outcomes for the case. Title IV access is only given to government agencies not individual attorneys but Judge Cooks ruled against this access and found that she could direct monies to Court sponsored attorneys. Fraud and perjury are constructive crimes that take officials complacent to those crimes in order to achieve the nefarious outcomes and sexist directives in order to procure political immunity and money for the Court. Through time if the Judges are improper in their ruling they will ultimately try to cover it up by enforcing contempt, framing individuals into criminals, and holding them in contempt for lack of payments even if they are victims of crimes.

**Rule:** Federal laws against constructive crimes, RICO laws, and Federal VRA laws are necessary to achieving outcomes of restoring Miss. Lily Ana Stuer with her father along with reconstructed estate monies which have been defrauded. Appointment of Ombudsman with FBI has been offered to Judge Hoffman of the 68<sup>th</sup> Court in case: DC-19-16060 as of 2021. Federal Criminal Complaints have been lodged with various agencies due to the treatment of victims. Fraud takes time and money to find out and prosecute. Appointment of other financial representatives was necessary as well due to time involved in procuring things from well-known frauds through various agencies and places so that the numbers work out in unison as to the goals for all involved. Appointment of representatives for the Pro Se father, in the 68<sup>th</sup> Court, is necessary to curb the pain and provide relief for victims.

**Disposition:** This case has not been disposed of. It has transformed into two Defamation cases, one of which has made it to the USA Federal Supreme Court, and a Malpractice case (where it is currently Defaulted four years after judgment,

and a Child Custody case which was finally Defaulted due to lack of due process time) by Recused Judge Kimberly Cooks, with the victim child in limbo now after being damaged with maternal child abuser, child support still asking for payments after four years of duty to them, and abusive mother still on the run. This case is in absolute shambles due to the criminals now involved and formed against Federal Contractor Mr. Stuer who has forced criminals to accept responsibility for their own actions against him as a victim and his victim child.

**Dissent:** Maternal abuser Stephanie abused the child throughout the divorcing procedures, was guilty of multiple counts of aggravated perjury, fraud (constructive/ conspiracy to defraud, Medicaid fraud, and child support fraud), and due to the poorly run court's ability to detect such crimes the crimes have continued to run rampant, within the family and friend circles of victims. The accused maternal abuser was simply given blanket control over 100% of the estate, without any oversight or question, no punishment or accountability, her actions four years later have now stunted a victim child's learning abilities, people are questioning whether the victim child has had her nose broken by the mother or other maternal abusers, actors, and crimes have continued constructively against Pro Se father Mr. Stuer for years due to Court's elongated due processing, lack of care, and financial indigence brought to the victim father after being blamed illegally for Stephanie's maternal child abuse syndrome. Emboldened by her success Stephanie seeks to enforce Child Support and even goes so far out of spite to seek Medicaid as well in an obvious fraud (With her, her father, her mother, and her husband's current estates worth over \$100 million USD) reported under 2021-301901 and 2021-301902.

**255<sup>th</sup> Court Child Custody:**

**DF-20-16005**

**(Stuer vs. Reynolds, 255th, Judge Cooks Recused, Defaulted Judgment, to 68<sup>th</sup> Malpractice Court)**

**Facts:** After four years of providing for, aiding, and abetting crimes Judge Kim Cooks was recused in this case due to issues with Enforcement of Contempt for nonpayment of Title IV fees to a lawyer who stripped a child naked against Federal VRA laws. Judge Cooks also has a serious issue with the Decree as it has not been followed for access to the child by Stephanie due to ongoing maternal child abuse

crimes. Judge Kim Cooks also acted against Federal VRA laws by allowing for crimes, subjective language, and maternal child abuse to go unreported in her courtroom. Judge Kim Cooks chose to biasedly side with maternal criminal and not to allow constituents to even answer the father back through email about Emergency Issues with the now Exploited Missing and Solicited child. The Judge still continued to try and collect Title IV Child Support for the Amicus illegally and through illegal Contempt against State Constitutional laws to cover up her bad decisions on the bench.

**Procedure:** This case got to where it stands by persistent work by a Pro Se father who was incorrectly accused of neglect and stalking, on Decree, when the mother had actually brought home the daughter, of the couple, every single time with signs of maternal alienation child abuse and maternal visitation abuse, including a bleeding rectum after staying with only adults, drug dealers, and being left by the maternal abuser. Ultimately the procedure was followed against Federal law and as the father uncovered the various crimes committed by the Court, Court officials, and the mother it became obvious that "sexism", crimes, and systematic child abuse painted the 255<sup>th</sup> Court's poor decisions regularly. Complaints have been lodged to the USDOJ for review, recusal paperwork was given, and a Malpractice case outside of the Court has been designated for a new agreement between the parents as furthered criminal issues unfold maternally.

**Issue:** Is Federal VRA law allowed to be broken against a victim child and victim father while perjury and fraud are present in a civil divorce Court? What does a Pro Se father do about such extreme sexism, fraud, perjury, and maternal child abuse in family court as an indigent victim then of certain crimes? Can a child be protected through an Emergency Protective Order, Writ, along with new sibling(s), reconstructed estate, and child support now due to the father? (After four years of continued constructive crimes against the victims have shocked the Courts, with two recusals (possibly a third in the 68<sup>th</sup> Court if Federal laws are not followed), Affidavits of Prosecution against certain Judges have even made certain Judges involved partial toward criminals in a bid to save their own positions on said crimes. It is yet to be seen whether or not the Courts are involved enough in checking for crimes in the Civil Courts to make a difference. The indifference and disregard for criminal issues in Civil Court has shocked a Pro Se victim father and victim daughter as they seek relief from crime and civil disobedience.

**Reasoning:** Federal VRA Laws, Standing Orders, Lawyers Ethics and Conduct

**Rule:** Standing Orders, Federal VRA laws, Recusal of Judges, Penal Codes

**Disposition:** After ruling that a child can be given back to a victim father as a victim with estate reconstruction, and child support for said father, a Bill of Review and Decree will be issued to finalize the cases. The father will now need to expunge his record to clear up issues with credit, criminal issues, and overall dignity. Federal Supreme Court writs and funds to prevent such child abuse, perjury, and fraud from happening in the future are being sought.

**Dissent:** Dissent from Recused Judge Tobolowsky, Cooks, other Judges, lawyers, and actors now being sought for Federal crimes due to being lazily duped into constructive fraud and filing false records with the Courts by criminals against a victim father and his victim child. This is in turn curtailed by Lis Pendes Orders and Assigning power to the 68<sup>th</sup> Court and the Federal Supreme Court to handle these types of issues which arise in Dallas County, throughout the State, and throughout the nation as no one should ever have to live with false accusations in a Decree or Writ based on constructive crimes.

**191<sup>st</sup> Court Defamation:**

DC-18-07493

**(Stuer vs. Tadlock, 191st, severe latency in due process ultimately siding with Defendant after No Discovery was made without any further study or proof)**

**Facts:** Judge Slaughter heard the case and made a decision in the case without adequate Discovery or Interrogatory in the case after promising to get back with Pro Se litigant with information the following Monday after the oral arguments were made. She did not get back to him but in the form of Dismissal letter over a month later while the Pro Se litigant was out of town so he could not appeal the decision.

**Procedure:** This case shows a consistent lack of care from Judges toward Pro Se litigants, no reporting of maternal child abuse or crimes by the Judge even after asked, no discovery, and ultimately no movement from the Court AT ALL against a constructive criminal who misrepresented his case and client simply for a quick win.

**Issue:** Is a BAR Certified Attorney allowed to simply disregard Federal Laws, Civil Standing Orders, and Lawyers Code of Ethics, and defame a father subjectively on Writ of Attachment to a victim child? Then defame the father further on a Decree by forcing time constraints on him coercively by use of constructive crimes? Yes; at least for a time. Perjury and Fraud have been effective and efficient weapons for an abusive fraudulent mother, her legal team, the Amicus, and the 255<sup>th</sup> Court who continue to shield their lies, perjury, defamation, and blame others for their own neglect preposterously.

**Reasoning:** With active perjury, fraud, crimes against the victim child, defamation about victim and hero Mr. Stuer taking it's toll, no Discovery, the 191<sup>st</sup> Court missed their chance to help victims and in so doing prolonged the pain, agony, suffering, and torture. It gives a glimpse into victims' issues with reparations, estate reconstruction, and compensation once crimes have been committed and also a possible reason why most victims never receive any form of compensation. Lack of care by the Courts and dismissing issues of utmost importance to victims shows a serious problem and inconsistency with Federal VRA laws.

**Rule:** Rules must, in the future, require Court reporting of ALL crimes, even if alleged, in order to better serve the commonwealth and keep track of victims and criminals. Federal VRA laws require:

The right to full and timely restitution as provided in law.

The right to proceedings free from unreasonable delay.

The right to be treated with fairness and with respect for the victim's dignity and privacy.

**Disposition:** Tadlock then afforded himself all awards, removed himself from the family case, and is now fully unavailable for any service, documents, or questioning even four years after the maternal child abuse has continued by disallowing father access every two weeks to his child as Court ordered. The maternal child abuse has continued in various forms of constructive crimes involving mutual family members, friends, leaving the father without any voice effectively defrauded and led to be declared vexatious by recused Judges. The visitation being proof of maternal child abuse enough, now that vexatious

declaration has been made, and Mr. Tadlock freed from the case after writing in all orders to his own unfair advantage, with libel and missing numbers inherent, has left the Pro Se victim father and his victim daughter without any viable legal remedy other than the 68<sup>th</sup> Malpractice Court and the Federal Supreme Court.

**Dissent:** Dissent by Judge Slaughter due to saying on record that she would: "Get back to [you] Monday" and without further ado dismissed the case after the period of time ungiven. Judge Slaughter also refused on record to "get involved" with any type of required documentation in regards to certain criminal/civil cases. Judge Slaughter gave blanket immunity to Attorney Gerald Tadlock whilst Mr. Tadlock had committed the crime of perjury, in ink, in her courtroom Federal victim status was not respected nor accounted for in the 191<sup>st</sup> Court and a criminal was allowed to offset due process yet again exponentializing pain to victims.

**298<sup>th</sup> Court Defamation:**

**DC-18-07494**

**(Stuer vs. Duesler, 298th, Judge Tobolowsky: Recused.)**

**Facts:** No Discovery or Interrogatory was given again but some oral arguments were made in Court. Duesler was viewed as perjuring herself in Court by saying that she "did Not strip Lily Ana Stuer naked", but then about face said she "did", on record during the same testimony in an obvious aggravated perjury, further rambling on to admit that "she didn't see any signs of child abuse" in the case where she was specifically summoned for the reason of maternal child abuse and the father gave her and CPS a 200+ file USB outlining such maternal child abuse. If she "didn't see any signs of child abuse", like she said, why would she then strip the child naked as solicited by the abusive mother? Her attorney Ryan McFarlin was also seen perjuring himself as saying: "the case is over in appeals" to the Judge when the case had not reached an opinion yet from Appeals. He then went on to appeals and said the "Defamation case was over" when it was not yet over thus confusing the Courts as to the direction they should take to improperly influence them collectively. Judge Tobolowsky ultimately refused to report child abuse, various other crimes, and Dismissed the case making full awards to Duesler and McFarlin. The Pro Se father then uncovered RICO issues with political corruption as Mr. McFarlin is directly related to an Associate Judge on a similar Court. Judge Tobolowsky was also found to have Sorority ties with Susan Duesler.

She was later Recused from the bench in the case after making judgments that the Pro Se father was simply somehow "vexatious", in a Malpractice Case, which was then defaulted to the 68<sup>th</sup> Court, again without Discovery / Interrogatory.

**Procedure:** Aggravated Perjury of the Defense proved to work again in the 298<sup>th</sup> Civil Court for Duesler. Subjective slander and libel were used in addition to Perjury to confuse the Judges collectively, improperly influencing them fraudulently, into non-action, and dismissal.

**Issue:** Can litigants openly use Aggravated Perjury to win cases without any Discovery / Interrogatory? Can Judges fail to report child abuse, fail to protect a child, and fail to comply with Federal VRA laws, and various other crimes in their Court rooms and show this type of biased favoritism?

**Reasoning:** It was later found, after the Judge had called Mr. McFarlin to her bench that the Judge obviously knew him, and Susan Duesler personally through an Associate Judge and various other associations. Duesler later hired other attorneys abruptly to hide the association after Mr. Stuer found out about the conflict of interest and possible RICO violation from a sororal order of ties.

**Rule:** Attorney Ethics and Conduct Codes show that any crimes, subjective slander, or improper conduct is strictly prohibited.

**Disposition:** Duesler then used this case to further her agenda to exploit the victim child and her victim father through Contempt to "Pay her or Go to Jail" and furthered her agenda to smear Mr. Stuer's good name by declaring him vexatious in the 298<sup>th</sup> Court during Malpractice suit which was subsequently Defaulted. All the while Mr. Stuer was without his rightful ½ of his estate and victim daughter and had every right to be upset about being continually victimized and alienated.

**Dissent:** The issues with this case then caused retaliation by Susan Duesler to "finish [Mr. Stuer] off" as she claimed to Mr. Fordham a Court appointed Attorney who protected Mr. Stuer from 10 years in Jail, for Contempt in the 255<sup>th</sup> Court, for being financially unable to pay Child Support, due to then ongoing crimes, being a victim of fraud, and being declared financially indigent.

**(State of TX, LAAAS, Stuer vs. Duesler, Etl, 68<sup>th</sup> Court, Phase 5.)**

**Facts:** This is a Court which handles Malpractice Attorneys. The Judge never answered the proposed Order to Clarify, in the 30 day request for information and therefore has broken Federal VRA laws as well as other Courts. Mr. Stuer is still being harassed to pay for illegal conduct from attorneys, still in an unspoken Contempt in the 255<sup>th</sup> Court for being financially indigent, not succumbing to now Court sponsored extortion, constructive maternal crimes, and he is still listed online as a "vexatious litigant" even after a full recusal of Judge Tobolowsky who made such declaration illegally and with more subjective libel, this time, in the form of accusations about forgery (which serves as yet another fraudulent document filed by the Court). The report from Susan Duesler about maternal child abuse was a grand total of two pages. The vexatious litigant Motion due to fear of crimes committed by herself, was upwards of 500 pages (which show her concern not to protect the victim child but to cover up her own crimes), including various emails, and facebook posts with no real value at all except to show that Mr. Stuer was being stalked by the attorney and her cohorts, really cares for his daughter, is not negligent, and that he was upset about the treatment of himself and daughter as victims of various crimes (which is no secret). Mr. Stuer reserves the right to be disgusted and upset by his and his daughter's treatment as victims of ongoing crimes which have now damaged his daughter for most of her life. No further negotiations or solutions have been given by Duesler or Tadlock as they continue their constructive fraud for more and more monies now assigned illegally. Other Judges are now being sought for aiding and abetting criminals and for various crimes associated with Failure to Report Child Abuse, Failure to Comply with Federal law, and Failure to Protect a Victim Child.

**Procedure:** The Case is wrought with Level 5 Security, Third Party Funding, FBI Ombudsman/woman and Federal Codes Statutes if allowed by the Judge, Citations, and Laws in Regards to Federal Victims of Crimes and Exploitation. In regards to law it is required that certain secrecy and permission regarding time are given to unlance certain deliverables for time, ex parte, and through time to best effect the victim children. **These deliverables have not yet been respected to the knowledge of the Plaintiff.** Mr. Stuer nor his daughter have been treated with

fairness or dignity as victims in this 68<sup>th</sup> Court to their knowledge. The Court has either done nothing or is doing something without any reasonable correspondence to Mr. Stuer about his daughter. Therefore, leaving Mr. Stuer to continually email the Court, the AG, and other organizations for help which to his knowledge has also been unforthcoming. **Without action from the 68<sup>th</sup> Court the Federal Supreme Court is the last and only venue for relief.** Mr. Stuer is requesting that his daughter and monies awarded be returned by June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2021 or another recusal will be issued for Judge Hoffman. Without relief in this case two victims will continually be victimized, without movement by the Federal Supreme Court, due to crimes and unscrupulous work by lawyers and Judges who simply just do not care enough about others, are too lazy to research, order transcripts, and find out, where Perjury and Fraud were performed by accused maternal abuser, and are too complacent with crimes for their place. **The child has remained in danger due to the maternal abuse for four years, has been damaged by the maternal child abuse, and now due to monies being sought (with money hungry and abusive mother) is in eminent danger for further injury.** **Miss. Lily Ana Stuer is a caricature of her former self due to being exhausted by the maternal child abuse and child abuse by various maternal actors who have solicited the child. Emergency issues should be dealt with immediately.**

**Issue:** Ultimately this case has shown how far behind Courtrooms in Texas are in dealing with Child Abuse, Fraud, and Perjury efficiently and effectively in a civil setting. The main issue facing the 68<sup>th</sup> Court is: How is time conducted until a safe return of the Missing Exploited Solicited and Victim Child? How does the 68<sup>th</sup> Court manage, appoint, and unlayer the Emergency Enforcement Order, Writ of Attachment for multiple children (in a family unit), now that maternal criminal has complicated the situation with another child, yet another husband, has over 20 trusts, properties, accounts? How is the financial aspect of appointments, legal actions, and the settlement to return reconstructed estate awards alongside of the child procured without substantial risk to the child (from a money hungry and maternally abusive mother along with various other criminal actors), as a Pro Se Attorney? The primary issue is that the 68<sup>th</sup> Court Judge Hoffman may enter into an all too common issue of lack of care and simply Dismiss the case, or not follow up with appointments and paperwork, due to laziness, which may have been the

ultimate excuse for other Courts as well to not protect victims. Laziness and Complacency with crimes is an issue that needs to be dealt with on a Federal level for VRA cases, by the Federal Supreme Court, in order to deal with the issues at hand or the victims become victimized on a greater scale and justice is not served. Furthermore, Judges and Attorneys begin to aid and abet in the crimes constructively as is the case with Cooks, Duesler, and Tadlock to save their own skin. A simple appointment by a Pro Se litigant should be enough to gain access to Federal VRA ombudsman/woman and processes. Pro Se litigants are by no means required to have no emotion toward torturous treatment of their only child and 100% knowledge of Court processes. Pro Se victims should be afforded certain rights which others are not. Courts who have no incentive to look into the truth of cases which involve regular child abuse allow abusers frauds and criminals like Stephanie to effectively get away with prolonged maternal child abuse (4 years), fraud, and perjury, amongst other crimes which indeed mar not only the victim child but a whole family of people. If the Judges don't care about protecting and redeeming victims in some form of due process then who will?

**Reasoning:** Various lawyers and Judges are very poorly studied at Federal law in regards to safety for children and are improperly prepared to deal with high level criminal activity: Perjury (aggravated) and Fraud. The intent of this case is to provide the Pro Se father with further study into law, legal processes, and to educate and allow for negotiations by appointed authors to prevail at the end of June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2021. Ex Parte is a necessary option for victims of Federal crimes. (It was actively used on the victim father, through the 255<sup>th</sup> Court, for Writ and Decree, without any crimes being committed by him, due to subjective defamation, and as such ex parte Orders should be afforded for him and his victim daughter due to that problem the 255<sup>th</sup> Court created for itself in Default.) Judges and Lawyers should also be required to go to jail for such egregious violations of the law and laziness with at least three charges: Failure to Protect a Child, Failure to Report Child Abuse, and Failure to Comply with Federal VRA laws. If they were punished or even simply educated these types of issues wouldn't take 2/3s of a child's young life to remedy and they would be less prone to lazy behavior, lack of research, lack of Federal Compliance, and lack of study.

**Rule:** Federal Victim's Rights Act Rules, IRS Whistleblower Rules, TX AG Civil Rules

**Disposition:** This case ends in criminal court with the maternal abuser and other actors (possibly even Judges and attorneys) being sentenced to their crimes, by FBI ombudsman and State of Texas Prosecutors, after settlement monies are paid in full to the State of Texas, IRS, FBI, other enforcement agencies and departments, Mr. Jules Dylan Stuer, and The Estate of Lily Ana Stuer through the 68<sup>th</sup> Court or the Federal Supreme Court.

**Dissent:** Dissent will come in the form of civil and criminal litigation throughout this case and others due to civil devices already appended before Recusal of such Judges and lawyers guilty of crimes, defamation, and improper malpractice conduct. Two things that must be quelled, removed, and struck from the record, by the 68<sup>th</sup> Court, or the Federal Supreme Court, during this case by gaining control over other Courts in Default, are: 1) Contempt charges to the victim father for being defrauded, losing his "family businesses, assets, etc" in full, and being forced into severe bouts of poverty as a financially indigent victim. 2) Vexatious designation which ruins every facet of litigation, education, and life due to victim predator criminals, attorneys, and Judges. With contempt and vexatious charges in place it gives the maternal abuser, bad lawyers, bad judges, more excuses to evade the law and violate the victims.

**162<sup>nd</sup> Court Finance:**

DC-19-18091

**(Stuer vs. LVNV etc, 162<sup>nd</sup> Court)**

**Facts:** There were no facts given by the LVNV conglomerate. They never provided adequate Discovery / Interrogatory and were therefore dismissed by the Court. Mr. Stuer could not find where the numbers were mixed up during the Dismissal but after a certain number of days Mr. Stuer did request that the Court Dismiss his case and that no balance should be leveraged. In so doing he set precedence in Court and was awarded with the ability to not be served, by Officer of the law, due to harassment. Victims may now request with Federal VRA protection to only be contacted by certified mail while they are victims of fraud, crimes, etc. The Case was ultimately Dismissed with various time quotients being set with the 162<sup>nd</sup> Court in regards to removing any balances due. Balance was erased by litigation's design (after 90 day stipulations).

**Procedure:** Form is posted next to mailbox within 2 Feet.

**Issue:** Whether a giant conglomerate holdings company could pursue a victim of crimes for monetary award and loans while going through the effects of crimes. Might there be a pendency in boisterous and cash laden requests and loans while victimized? Yes, the Court, to victim Mr. Stuer's knowledge, then agreed and Dismissed the case along with all claims for debt leaving a 0 balance.

**Reasoning:** Victims who are Financially Indigent and Indentured Apprentices are \*Federally Protected Classes who are afforded VRA rights at any time after crimes were committed and victimization was progressing.\*

**Rule:** Various Federal laws from VRA, including but not limited to Constitutional laws, Civil laws, and what constitutes "rights to be happy". Thus victims may be free from harassment about finances after being defrauded and any further planned victimization based on finances may be curtailed for a time if legal and appropriate.

**Disposition:** It will dispose of with Credit Agencies due to victim status. Contested balances are still an ongoing issue to the heartlessness of corporate deviance.

**Dissent:** Corporate Dissent has occurred in this case due to issues arising from amount of debt at time of closure. They have tried to trick the credit agencies at this point into collections with other collection agencies and attorneys. Mr. Stuer has recently put a freeze on his and Lily's credit account as it has also been ravaged by illegally procured Title IV child support. Stuer also opened up an FTC and SEC case in regards to "marriage terrorist" criminals, attorneys, and judges.

**5<sup>th</sup> Court of Appeals:** 05-18-01220-CV Dismissed, 05-19-00752-CV Dismissed

**Highlights:**

- Susan Duesler and other attorneys perjuring themselves in Court, during the pendency, about whether the case in the 191<sup>st</sup> and 298<sup>th</sup> were done or not to improperly influence Judges and further deceive the Courts.
- The Court of Appeals Judging on old copies not Amended Versions which were sent in due time. Not enough research into case, not enough Federal Protection, or rights granted for victims of crimes by 5<sup>th</sup> Appeals Judges.
- No effort made at all to read the Amended version of Petition sent.

- Dismissed case without any forethought in an absolutely abhorrent display of ignorance in Federal Victims Rights laws, penal codes, and abilities to link cases, problems, or complaints at all causing further victimization.
- Further services could have been chances to report to Federal agencies for Compensation funds or due to educational programs which were funded but unforthcoming in this case. Federal Victims' Rights Act is something that encompasses all civil and criminal issues intertwined in this case. \*Once crimes have been committed in Civil Court it is against the law to fail to report crimes, protect a victim child from crimes, and to follow Federal acts even for Appeals Court and Supreme Court Judges.\*

**(Stuer vs Duesler, 5<sup>th</sup> COA, Judges reluctant to act on behalf of victims ultimately aiding, abetting, and contributing to further crimes/victimization.)**

**Facts:** Duesler performed criminal acts (**from which there is no immunity**) to a victim child by stripping her naked, lied about it in the 298<sup>th</sup> Court to the victim child's victim father, claimed "she didn't see any child abuse", when that was what she was appointed to do, lost access to Lily, who ultimately became Missing and Exploited (along with all of her and her father's estate money), and promptly went on to forcibly collect child support from a father out of malice and sexism trying to "finish off" the victim father in jail or a mental institution the whole time. As the Court records and CPS records show the victim child was not returned home once to the Pro Se father without severe signs of maternal abuse which makes Duesler's actions out of bad faith and malice. The woman the Amicus Duesler subjectively defamed Mr. Stuer for, defrauded him socially and financially, is now wanted for over 12 crimes, including Exploitation of Child for Child Support. Ms. Susan Duesler and other attorneys Perjuring themselves in Court various times in various Court rooms tried to let excessive time, Malpractice, and Defamation ruin the victims. The 5<sup>th</sup> Court of Appeals, dizzied by constant litigation by an obviously **not negligent** but persistent Pro Se father, faltered on which Judges were in charge and contributing to the case, and one Judged on old copies of a Petition not Amended Versions which were sent. Not enough research into case was given, no criminal research into testimony at all, and ultimately **no** Federal Protection or rights were granted for victims of crimes. The Judges thus contributed to various

constructive crimes against victims. This case shows an inherent issue with the 5<sup>th</sup> Appeals Court for victims of Federal Crimes who show up from Civil Court.

**Procedure:** This is something that could have been cleared up a long time ago with the right choices by the judiciary. Unfortunately they did not foresee the effects of certain types of ongoing maternal child abuse syndrome, fraud, and perjury and what they would have as a "long term effect". In this case since it has been a brutal torturous battle for the victim child and her victim father that The State of Texas, Agencies, Departments within the Federal government were requested to be contacted to see if that relief would be granted with International, Federal, and State laws. The 5<sup>th</sup> COA dismissed the requests, relief, and made commands to force a financially indigent victim to pay the criminals who constructively defrauded him in further bouts of extortion and due to this certain Judges have been asked to take Federal VRA classes or be prosecuted for Failure to Report, Protect, Comply, and various other crimes.

**Issue:** Is certain Defamation (when it involves social isolation which contributes to maternal parental alienation syndrome) considered malice? Is Duesler simply "immune" to crimes, her code of conduct, and any actions she took to craft and exploit two Federal victims (one now Missing, Solicited, and Exploited directly because of Duesler's actions in Court)? Are Judges required to report crimes? Help victims of crimes? If they do not are they required to take VRA classes and to correct the actions? Or can they simply dismiss victims' claims, disregard any proof, and disregard all responsibility?

**Reasoning:** Are Amicus attorney's really immune to law breaking (stripping children naked, sexism, crimes, defamation)? Does Constructive Defamation, Fraud, and Aggravated Perjury play into Maternal Alienation Syndrome?

**Rule:** Federal Victims Rights Laws, RICO, International, Federal, Civil, Standing Orders, USA

**Disposition:** The case was simply thrown out and Dismissed apparently due to grammar mistakes, poor follow up by the 5<sup>th</sup> COA, victims which are denied protection, Failure to Comply with Federal laws, and crimes which again go unreported.

**Dissent:** Dissent may come from Enforcement and other Judges in the Supreme Court. Proof has been given, may be given at any time, and is available on the record.

**Writ of Mandamus:**

05-18-01346-CV

**(Stuer vs. Duesler, 5COA)**

**Facts:** Writ of a Mandamus would overturn negative impacts toward a child in unfair biased defamatory litigation. Susan Duesler and Gerald Tadlock used slanderous subjective terms, against their Rules of Conduct and Code of Ethics, to defame Mr. Stuer in a Decree and in Writ. Due to the circumstances, of being Pro Se, Mr. Stuer went after Mandamus, again and again to perfect the Petitions, ultimately the Opposing Counsel scared the Court about him committing a crime with one of the Petitions in their libelous paperwork submitted to the Court and suggested he forged a document. This was later found to be furthered evidence of documented Perjury and Libel (of which each lawyer eventually found that they had multiple counts of trying to cover for all the lies of the maternal criminal.).

**Procedure:** Dismissed and Deferred to the Federal Supreme Court due to offenses of certain COA 5<sup>th</sup> Appeals Court Judges for breaking Federal VRA and criminal laws.

**Issue:** Father's Rights over his Estate and Victimized Child, Does a father have the right to lodge a Mandamus with the Court?, Yes. But does the father have a right to have it properly investigated and acted upon in a way that would protect the child, as victims, without further penalty?

**Reasoning:** Child's Rights. International rights toward children. Federal and State alliance with Standard Orders. Federal and State alliance with Federal VRA Orders.

**Rule:** The Rule becomes that Judges and Attorneys must take Federal Victims' Rights Training within 90 days or be prosecuted to the furthest extent the law will allow.

**Disposition:** It is Disposed of and redirected to the Federal Supreme Court and the 68<sup>th</sup> Court.

**Dissent:** Mother misusing dismissals for inherent win to continue depriving father and daughter of time together. Due process not respected by any party and used to further torture victims of crimes. Civil Orders for father to see child further broken by the mother. Further harm and damage to the child's focus and learning abilities done due to maternal syndrome.

**Supreme Court TX:**

**20-0793**

Dismissed the case without any formal reason due to lack of care, overloaded Courts, and Covid-19 issues with economy illegally after an over 90 day Default, and no answer by Defense in 2020.

**Federal Supreme Court:**

**number pending**

**Please order transcripts** for further documentation and for more lower Court opinions. TXcourts.gov also has options to recover old Court documents for the Federal Supreme Court.

The lower Court opinion of the Texas Supreme Court has been given in an attachment to satisfy Rule 14.1.

Updates have been sent to opposing counsel via email: [susan@dueslerlaw.com](mailto:susan@dueslerlaw.com), [ryan@mcfarlinfirm](mailto:ryan@mcfarlinfirm) and [fraudreport@texasbar](mailto:fraudreport@texasbar) to satisfy rule 14.5.

## **Criminal Court:**

**F-? Stephanie's False Report Abuse/Family Violence used to ruin family and defraud estate due to parental alienation syndrome, post pardum, and big three drug addiction**

**(State of Texas vs Stuer, Criminal Court)**

**Facts:** Stephanie was willing to hit and choke herself to steal a sleeping child by waking her up in an abusive way and running out the door with the family dog to further hurt herself in bouts of serious big three drug addiction (meth, heroin, cocaine). To cover up her addiction and syndrome she blamed it all on Mr. Stuer and he was arrested for the crime. Mr. Stuer later tested the nursing child and found evidence of big three addiction in the nursing baby's urine. Stephanie went back to deny that she was ever in danger. Stephanie denied that Mr. Stuer ever hurt her, was physically abusive, or ever hit her in the 255<sup>th</sup> Court to Judge Beauchamp during divorcing procedures. Later in the 255<sup>th</sup> Court divorcing procedures she began lying, led by her attorney Tadlock, and Amicus Duesler, in order to cover up her own maternal child abuse patterns, big three addictions, and familial suicide issues.

**Procedure:** The family was shook by the news due to Stephanie's forward planning and deception which took place over the course of years. She used this case to pre-position herself to defraud Mr. Stuer during divorce.

**Issue:** Stephanie on her own accord wrote a letter to the AG disavowing the issue. Is it the position of the Court to further test or accuse Mr. Stuer? No., The question facing the court then becomes: Should it be dismissed? Yes; was the answer the Court found. Now is it necessary to revisit the case in order to better understand her deception and place Stephanie in Jail for a False Report?

**Reasoning:** Family Violence is a regular event. This event was planned by Stephanie and not regular. Mr. Stuer was being unseated, gas lit, and victimized by his wife during a furthered emotional bout of maternal child abuse syndrome, big three drug addition, and something didn't make sense to the Court about her claims.

**Rule:** Penal Code: False Report

**Disposition:** This case was disposed of and will be further sealed at a certain point in Re: Expunge All Criminal Records of Mr. Stuer.

**Dissent:** Dissent was further gleaned by further acts of maternal child abuse, maternal perjury, and maternal fraud. Stephanie was then able through this case to claim Mr. Stuer was abusive and found herself empowered to endanger, neglect, abuse her own child to gas light and blame Mr. Stuer illegally, unethically, and immorally during divorce proceedings

**F-1714800Y Interfere with Public Duties (due to breach of Federal VRA law, by lawyers and Judges, which led to a dangerous breaking and entering, assault, attempted murder, and kidnapping for ransom by Civil Peace Officers)**

**(State of Texas vs Stuer, Criminal Court)**

**Facts:** Miss. Lily Ana Stuer was being maternally abused by her mother ritualistically and sadistically at the onset of this case during every visitation. Mr. Stuer, after having been tortured with the fact of constructive mistreatment of him and his only child, by lawyers and judges who simply chided and cheered along with Stephanie which further enabled and empowered her to abuse the victim child, defraud the estate, and perjure herself in Court, found himself subject to a carefully planned early morning breaking and entering where he was beat, shocked with over 3 million volts, and almost shot in the face, while his daughter screamed in terror, due to broken Federal VRA laws. He had warned the opposing counsel that he would not put up with any more maternal child abuse before his victim child was returned to him at the beginning of July 2017 with a full body of rashes, by her neglectful mother, and rushed to the emergency room. Mr. Stuer did not feel comfortable returning his child to her maternal abuser in August, 2017 and had recently placed a Full Custody Motion in to the 255<sup>th</sup> Court to stay until Court in September. The opposing attorneys went to Court without him and his damaged daughter, defamed him, lied to Judge Beauchamp about Lily maybe getting abducted to Mexico, amongst various other lies, taken out of context and place from emails, and furthered a Writ to Lily's body dead or alive using subjective libel and misplaced diction. In the end due to Mr. Stuer's temperament, advanced martial arts prowess, kind will, and piety he did simply escape the beating and

gunpoint to return to the 255<sup>th</sup> Court with paperwork, that following Friday, only to be led away in restraints after his heroic legal action.

**Procedure:** This case has been Conditionally Deferred and now Dismissed.

**Issue:** Was Mr. Stuer right to interfere with a Public Duty after crimes were committed against him and his only daughter? The Court agreed Yes, he is., Is Mr. Stuer dangerous to peace officers? No, they weren't scratched or bruised according to their own testimony, Issue then facing the Court becomes: Why did Duesler Tadlock and Stephanie characterize Mr. Stuer as such a monster when he was protecting his only daughter and Federal Victims' Rights Act Laws?

**Reasoning:** Civil law, Criminal law, and Federal VRA laws.

**Rule:** Federal VRA rights ensure that children are NOT to be returned to accused abusers. No Writ and No Decree should have been offered, negotiated, or given if there is an accused or admitted child abuse patterns in the mother. To leave that out of Decree and blame it on Mr. Stuer is Constructive Fraud, Filing a False Document with the Court, Aggravated Perjury, amongst other crimes.

**Disposition:** The process after Writ and Decree libel and fraudulent documents to the Court now includes criminal action which makes civil cases more complex. In addition to marring Mr. Stuer's record with criminal charges the opposing attorneys vowed to "finish him off" in jail or a mental institution. Since they have been unable to set him up to be further defrauded out of his domicile or murdered in recent criminal conspiracy, but they have tried, and they have continued to try to ruin his credit record and criminal record by such activity.

**Dissent:** Is found by mother then able to break Standing Orders, not to disturb the child, Decree to allow the father to see the child, and thus commit crimes without any enforcement by the Court. Winning by unethical and criminal means then becomes the norm for bad lawyers, Stephanie, and various criminal actors.

## **F-2045675 AA/DW Dismissed / Deferred / Nonsuited**

### **Highlights:**

- Failure to protect, False Report, Endangerment (due to Covid outbreak), and a Failure to Comply with civil law (castle doctrine) for Officer Collins
- Great work by Sgt. Willardson and Officer Montemoyaeze to clear out the home away from criminal trespassers, who left without incident, before Officer Collins took Mr. Stuer to jail and allowed the criminals back in to steal and vandalize more than \$80,000.00 worth of weapons, equipment, and do damages to the home.
- Mr. Stuer has paperwork for "power of attorney" over Tina who was a subject to the illegal criminal trespassing and criminal conspiracy, which specifically states: "no right to possession" for anything in the home, "no rights to autostay" also held. Tina is a criminal guilty of conspiracy with Torrie Kollar Shaw, David Shaw, Nicholas Dee, James Kollar and Stephanie to defraud and murder Mr. Stuer.

### **(State of Texas vs. Stuer, Criminal Court)**

**Facts:** This case is in regards to crimes by Officer Collins who went after the innocent instead of criminal trespassers. This is also a false report of assault as Mr. Stuer was the one who was assaulted in front of his friend Ms. Kimberly Kass. The subject Nick Dee was a convicted criminal terrorist who had a history of bossing people around and physical abuse. He was a criminal trespasser and Mr. Stuer had the advantage of the castle doctrine. Mr. Stuer was eventually forced to defend himself against the criminal trespasser and aggressor. Mr. Stuer was rightfully and eventually Non Suited in the case by the State.

**Procedure:** False Charge, Investigation, Dismissal.

**Issue:** Home security away from terrorist predators, big three drug addicts, criminal conspiracy actors, and criminal trespassers is the main issue. The main question facing the Court is can you defend your own property against criminal trespassers involved in big three drug addiction, criminal conspiracy, and terrorism in Texas? The Court ruled in favor of a victim, Mr. Stuer, private contracts, liberties, and home security.

**Reasoning:** Civil and Federal laws.

**Rule:** Castle Doctrine

**Disposition:** This case is essentially disposed of and will be permanently disposed of when papers to expunge are submitted, accounted for, and authorized by a judge.

**Dissent:** Dissent may be a problem in the future by various actors of Stephanie's conspiracy to defraud through friends and family due to time as a victim, furthered violations, furthered victimization by slow moving Court officials, lawyers, and any furthered monetary, space, and time deprivation caused by current criminal record before expunction, 68<sup>th</sup> Court action, or Federal Supreme Court action.

**Justice of the Peace:**

**Mercedes Benz: Theft by Deception**      **JS-18-00323-N,**      **JS-18-00244-N**  
**(Stuer vs. England, JP)**

**Facts:** Mr. Stuer had Mr. England sign an agreement that was for his Mercedes Benz, a rent to own agreement if Mr. England could keep his promise, if not the agreement would be called off to Mr. Stuer's favor. Mr. England was never again found after the disappearance of Mr. Stuer's Mercedes along with some of his own father's drumming equipment. Mr. England essentially stole from Mr. Stuer and was never able to be served thereafter. The agreement and title to a Lincoln Continental were ultimately stolen from Mr. Stuer during conspiracy to defraud him from multiple criminal actors to further his victimization and make it harder on him to work, make it to Court, etc. This case was even followed up on by the Judge Judy Show.

**Procedure:** The case (multiple cases filed) was initiated by Mr. Stuer who had claim to the car and the title. The case was ultimately dismissed. Mr. Stuer was further victimized and left without a car. The car agreement has since been stolen along with a car title for a Lincoln Continental by criminal actors.

**Issue:** How do you find someone who had an intent to steal from you? At what point does a thief become known and at what point may we follow up with the

Court about a theft by deception?, Issues facing the Court then become investigative by talking to investigator, following up with Mr. Stuer, offering continuances. Judge involved was complacent with the Defendant's crimes. The Judge was more concerned about the indentured apprenticeship and financial indenture of Mr. Stuer leaving him to explain himself multiple times, paying full amounts, from other persons, to file with the Court, and eventually came to the conclusion that he "didn't believe" Mr. Stuer without any further reasons why and all evidence he had asked for provided; dismissed the case.

**Reasoning:** This may be the only form of sustenance available to a Petitioner and as such he may have to pay, through indentured apprenticeship if necessary, to even be heard. If issues involving a theft by deception are thrown out in Court, why waste money, and time in civil court, or with contract? I tried multiple times to summon the Defendant, he simply hid from summon, and was allowed by the Court to continue stealing vehicles, and committing crimes.

**Rule:** Penal codes against theft by deception, conspiracy crimes, etc.

**Disposition:** Criminal procedure. Reporting of change in license plate number on NTTA cameras with NTTA authentication device and tracking down criminals involved in theft and conspiracy crimes.

**Dissent:** NTTA charges still coming through as car has illegally switched license plate numbers and been effectively stolen / hi-jacked.

**Failure to Maintain Financial Responsibility A3902030 (Stuer vs. State of Texas, MC)**

**Case forced to payment under Extortion and Threats of Contempt for Non-Payment. Mr. Stuer was unable to plead innocent due to costs associated the plea (Costs around \$400.00 to plea Not Guilty). The Municipal Court created a scenario where Mr. Stuer was forced to Plead No Lo Contendre, by disallowing his Not Guilty plea, and therefore was immediately found guilty and forced to pay.**

Due to finances Mr. Stuer had to use indentured apprenticeship to pay for the citation and now has it permanently on his record for insurance hikes as the Court never offered any way to dismiss the claims and only accepted their designated

monetary amounts as a remedy or jail by contempt. The Judge Gumbert refused to report ongoing maternal fraud or maternal perjury in her Court and required Mr. Stuer to pay for fees associated with this citation illegally (pay or be jailed by contempt) and by extortion.

**Failure to Maintain Fence / Yard N1201574A/B (Stuer vs. State of Texas, MC)**

**Case Still Pending Trial**

Due to victimization through divorce, loss of finances, being declared financially indigent, and indentured apprenticeship Mr. Stuer is now unable to pay for various things people often take for granted, has been on the verge of starvation numerous times, has been 8 months without running water, etc.

He now risks losing his domicile due to the ongoing victimization, maternal fraud, financial indigence, financial indenture, debt, criminal record now pending expunction, credit report harassment over child support amounts fraudulently due to someone who stole his rightful half of an over million dollar estate, attorneys, and judges complacent with the defrauding and victimization of him.

His sisters joined the maternal fraud along with oldest sister's husband Mr. Chaz English to try and report to the IRS that they were living at 1238 Dalhart, and had control of Trust Yonv in order to get a homestead tax exemption illegally and move Mr. Stuer out to make him homeless at the beginning of 2021, all the while missing a trust meeting in 2020. This charge, Failure to Maintain, is another attempt to extort more money by Judge Gumbert (who has afforded no relief to Mr. Stuer as a victim of various crimes and refused to report perjury in her own Court), due to vandalism which occurred on a portion of the fence, as well as issues paying \$100.00 for mowing, bi-weekly. Mr. Stuer owes \$2,000.00 on bills and \$8,000.00 on taxes due July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2021 and has had his home broken into as criminals continue to victimize him, his once proud estate, and his victim daughter without any relief from the Courts or Enforcement.

### **Affidavit of Prosecution**

My name is Jules Dylan Stuer and as a victim of crimes I have had to endure, along with an infant victim child of 2 years old, the following crimes:

**Ms. Stephanie Marie Woodall Baggett -Ebbesen -Stuer Reynolds:**

- Perjury / Aggravated Perjury (multiple counts during 255<sup>th</sup> Court trial) (Penal Code § 37.03)
- Fraud (Medicaid, Child Support, Conspiracy to Defraud)(Penal Code § 15.01)
- Conspire to Commit Person to Mental Facility(Penal Code § 571.020)
- Conspire to Murder or Cause Injury (Criminal Conspiracy)( Penal Code § 15.02)
- False Report of Family Violence (Penal Code § 261.107)
- Child Abuse / Neglect False Report (Penal Code § 261.107)
- Obstruction or Retaliation (Penal Code § 36.06)
- Prevention Detection of Fraud (Perjury to Medical Officer) (Penal Code § 32.0391)
- Interfere with Investigation of Abuse / Neglect (Penal Code § 261.3032)
- Record of Fraud to the Court (Penal Code § 37.13)
- Use of Child for Sales / Solicitation (Penal Code § 51.0145)
- False Alarm and Report of Emergency (Penal Code § 42.06)

**Mr. Gerald Allen Tadlock:**

- Perjury / Aggravated Perjury (multiple counts during 255<sup>th</sup> Court trial) (Penal Code § 37.03)
- Fraud (Constructive, Destroy Remove Concealment)(Penal Codes § 15.01, § 37.101, § 32.47)
- Conspire to Commit Person to Mental Facility(Penal Code § 571.020)
- Child Abuse / Neglect False Report (Penal Code § 261.107)
- Obstruction or Retaliation (Penal Code § 36.06)
- Failure to Report Child Abuse (Penal Code § 261.109(b))
- Knowingly Fail to Make Required Child Abuse Report (Penal Code § 261.109(a))
- Record of Fraud to the Court (Penal Code § 37.13)
- Prohibited Conflict of Interest (Penal Code § 305.031)
- Failure to Comply with Federal VRA law (§ 122.204) Failure to Protect (§ 22.04)

**Ms. Susan Duesler:**

- Perjury / Aggravated Perjury (multiple counts during 255<sup>th</sup> Court trial) (Penal Code § 37.03)
- Fraud (Constructive, Destroy Remove Concealment)(Penal Codes § 15.01, § 37.101, § 32.47)
- Conspire to Commit Person to Mental Facility(Penal Code § 571.020)
- Child Abuse / Neglect False Report (Penal Code § 261.107)
- Obstruction or Retaliation (Penal Code § 36.06)
- Exploitation of a Child for Title IV Child Support (Penal Code § 32.53)
- Failure to Report Child Abuse (Penal Code § 261.109(b))

- False Report Childcare (Penal Code § 42.0447)
- Knowingly Fail to Make Required Child Abuse Report (Penal Code § 261.109(a))
- Record of Fraud to the Court (Penal Code § 37.13)
- Prohibited Conflict of Interest (Penal Code § 305.031)
- Failure to Comply with Federal VRA law (§ 122.204) Failure to Protect (§ 22.04)

**Mr. Ryan McFarlin:**

- Perjury / Aggravated Perjury (multiple counts during 298<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Appeals Court trials) (Penal Code§ 37.03)
- Fraud (Constructive, Destroy Remove Concealment)(Penal Codes § 15.01, § 37.101, § 32.47)
- Failure to Report Child Abuse (Penal Code § 261.109(b))
- Knowingly Fail to Make Required Child Abuse Report (Penal Code § 261.109(a))
- Record of Fraud to the Court (Penal Code § 37.13)
- Prohibited Conflict of Interest (Penal Code § 305.031)
- Failure to Comply with Federal VRA law (Penal Code § 122.204)
- Failure to Protect a Child (Penal Code § 22.04)

**Mr. Carrie Phaneuf:**

- Perjury / Aggravated Perjury (multiple counts during 298<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Appeals Court trials) (Penal Code§ 37.03)
- Fraud (Constructive, Destroy Remove Concealment)(Penal Codes § 15.01, § 37.101, § 32.47)
- Failure to Report Child Abuse (Penal Code § 261.109(b))
- Knowingly Fail to Make Required Child Abuse Report (Penal Code § 261.109(a))
- Record of Fraud to the Court (Penal Code § 37.13)
- Prohibited Conflict of Interest (Penal Code § 305.031)
- Failure to Comply with Federal VRA law (Penal Code § 122.204)
- Failure to Protect a Child(Penal Code § 22.04)

**Notice has been given to the following Judges:**

**Judge Cooks, 255<sup>th</sup> Court:**

- *Failure to Report Child Abuse (Penal Code § 261.109(b))*
- *Knowingly Fail to Make Required Child Abuse Report (Penal Code § 261.109(a))*
- *Record of Fraud to the Court (Penal Code § 37.13) For Decree*
- *Exploitation of a Child for Title IV Child Support (Penal Code § 32.53)*
- *Obstruction or Retaliation (Penal Code § 36.06)*
- *Failure to Comply with Federal VRA law (Penal Code § 122.204)*
- *Failure to Protect (Penal Code § 22.04)*

**Failure to follow: Texas Family Code - FAM § 264.123 and**

**Texas Code Of Criminal Procedure - CRIM P Art. 63.0091 Art. 63.0091!**

**Law Enforcement Requirements Regarding Reports Of Certain Missing Children.**

**Judge Beauchamp, 255<sup>th</sup> Court:**

- *Failure to Report Child Abuse (Penal Code § 261.109(b))*
- *Knowingly Fail to Make Required Child Abuse Report (Penal Code § 261.109(a))*
- *Record of Fraud to the Court (Penal Code § 37.13) For Writ*
- *Failure to Comply with Federal VRA law (Penal Code § 122.204)*
- *Failure to Protect (Penal Code § 22.04)*

**Judge Slaughter, 191<sup>st</sup> Court:**

- *Perjury / Aggravated Perjury (Penal Code § 37.03) for promises to get back with me following Monday and simply dismissing the case a month later*
- *Failure to Report Child Abuse (Penal Code § 261.109(b))*
- *Knowingly Fail to Make Required Child Abuse Report (Penal Code § 261.109(a))*
- *Failure to Comply with Federal VRA law (Penal Code § 122.204)*
- *Failure to Protect (Penal Code § 22.04)*

**Judge Tobolowsky, 298<sup>th</sup> Court:**

- *Failure to Report Child Abuse (Penal Code § 261.109(b))*
- *Knowingly Fail to Make Required Child Abuse Report (Penal Code § 261.109(a))*
- *Record of Fraud to the Court (Penal Code § 37.13)*
- *Failure to Comply with Federal VRA law (Penal Code § 122.204)*
- *Failure to Protect (Penal Code § 22.04)*

**Chief Justice Burns, 5<sup>th</sup> Appeals Court:**

- *Failure to Report Child Abuse (Penal Code § 261.109(b))*
- *Knowingly Fail to Make Required Child Abuse Report (Penal Code § 261.109(a))*
- *Failure to Comply with Federal VRA law (Penal Code § 122.204)*
- *Failure to Protect (Penal Code § 22.04)*

**Justice Pederson, 5<sup>th</sup> Appeals Court:**

- *Failure to Report Child Abuse (Penal Code § 261.109(b))*
- *Knowingly Fail to Make Required Child Abuse Report (Penal Code § 261.109(a))*
- *Failure to Comply with Federal VRA law (Penal Code § 122.204)*
- *Failure to Protect (Penal Code § 22.04)*

**Justice Evans, 5<sup>th</sup> Appeals Court:**

- *Failure to Report Child Abuse (Penal Code § 261.109(b))*
- *Knowingly Fail to Make Required Child Abuse Report (Penal Code § 261.109(a))*
- *Failure to Comply with Federal VRA law (Penal Code § 122.204)*
- *Failure to Protect (Penal Code § 22.04)*

**Justice involved in TX Supreme Court Decision, Judge Hawthorne:**

- *Failure to Report Child Abuse (Penal Code § 261.109(b))*
- *Knowingly Fail to Make Required Child Abuse Report (Penal Code § 261.109(a))*
- *Failure to Comply with Federal VRA law (Penal Code § 122.204)*
- *Failure to Protect (Penal Code § 22.04)*

I am of sound mind and able body. My lack of finances and powerful emotions toward my cases are a result of 4 years of victimization. My child is now 6 years old and a caricature of her former self due to the crimes committed against her and I. Please prosecute all involved with our torturous treatment and offer relief so that we can heal from this problem created by maternal child abuse, maternal aggravated perjury, maternal fraud, and criminal actors.

**Sincerely,**

**Mr. Stuer**

**Additional material  
from this filing is  
available in the  
Clerk's Office.**