


20-5701

No.

ORIGINAL

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES



PRADASH NARAYAN ET AL — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

RABINDEB PRASAD — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT - REJECTED

(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

PRADASH NARAYAN  
(Your Name)

P.O. BOX 232751  
(Address)

SACRAMENTO, CA 95823  
(City, State, Zip Code)

916 422-7278  
(Phone Number)

## QUESTIOONS PRESENTED

1. Why are judges corrupted in California?
2. Why California judges are racist?
3. Why don't judges don't follow laws that are on the books?
4. Why unopposed motion are only one party and not for other party?
5. Why did Judge Brown denied petitioner four unopposed motion to because they were unopposed?
6. Why did judge Brown granted single unopposed motion when petitioners was not able to file with department number but denied four unopposed motion of petitioner?
7. What is the opposition from respondent of Exhibit ZD when petitioner's motion was over 22 pages?
8. Which of law cite please that states plaintiff can file claim Small Claims Court and than in the Superior Court and Federal Court?
9. Which part of laws please cite that states a default judgment that was entered in Small Claims Court for unpaid chiropractor bill a judgment was entered in Superior Court as well?
10. Please cit laws that states as Judge Hershey stated respondent or any one can to as many court as possible they want for same cause of action
11. Why petitioners were not counsel representation and why it was denied by Judge Hershey?
12. Is these prejudices not have counsel present and deny counsel?
13. Why two courts Small Claims Court and Superior Court Can make two judgment on same cause of action for unpaid Chiropractor bill
14. How can proof of service filed 10 months before was cross complaint was filed and why it's within law and which part of law is there petitioners can be served before cross complaint was file? Exhibit R cross complaint was filed field on October 3, 2015 poof of service is January 12, 2015 either Judge Brown is under drugs such cocaine

methamphetamine or so or he is totally blind he was no able to see even after point out this Judge Brown. Why Judge Brown is completely ignorant of laws is the question.

15. Why notice is appeal is untimely or later when last order JNOV Exhibit D was made on December 21, 2017 and notice of appeal was filed on January 17, 2018 Exhibit E?

16. Why petitioners were denied jury trial on request?

17. Why petitioners were now allowed to bring attorney?

18. Why petitioners not allowed providing exhibits?

19. Why petitioners were not provided plaintiff exhibits?

20. Is Judge Brown blind, absent minded under drugs such as cocaine methamphetamine that he can not see following exhibit are not right and if you peace to together Judge Brown looks retarded, mentally and blind.

Exhibit: M, O, P were not opposed but denied he was able to zip code typed wrong in proof of service but he could not see respondent through his attorney was not filling opposition.

Exhibit: ZD responded through his attorney filed opposition what is the opposition was filed Judge Brown accepted as opposition when there is no opposition. Petitioner motion was about 22 pages and 2 lines that no opposition and what was opposed this court should address. Not even single opposition of about pages issues sighted.

Exhibit: L Judge Brown saw that order made by Judge Brown petitioners did not obeyed reason petitioners were not able file corrected motion with department number to extend to file response. Motion was filed by petitioners dated selected by response conflict with petitioners schedule who going of country and will response later. Motion did not had department number court returned motion to extend to file response to petitioners to type department number and file again. How did petitioner disobeyed court is the question?

Exhibit Q : On July 1, 2016 order was made by Judge Brown to provide discovery set no later than July 11, 2016. Did responded provide discovery response by July 11, 2016 answer

no? Why respondent and his attorney records did not obey court of July 1, 2016 when he had no reason not to provide by July 11, 2016 but provided response August 4, 2016 until petitioner filed to dismiss complaint on July 12, 2016?

Exhibit: Y Why responded and attorney of records did not obey court order of August 10, 2016 responded was to provided verification via email on August 10, 2016 but instead it was mailed and received on September 1, 2016? Why Judge Brown continued responded to violate when on August 19, 2016 he made an order to send verification and the verification received was dated July 25, 2016 Exhibit Y?

Exhibit: Y Why verification is not back dated and is not illegal to back date public records when on August 10, 2016 order was made to email verification which court did not had on records and petitioners also did receive see also exhibit W.

Exhibit V Why Judge Brown saw typing error of zip code as 95815 which should have 95818 but not able to see exhibit has no date and signature even after pointing in pleadings is was, no email at the bottom of exhibit AD that he stated in order email is wrong, proof of service exhibit R is ten months before cross complaint was filed or about three months before complaint was filed? Was it Judge Brown under hard drugs, retarded and mentally sick?

Exhibit M motion was granted unopposed due to rejected and pending motion to extend time to be file again with department number.

Exhibit M, O and P three motions were unopposed and they were not granted?

Exhibit AE Why proof of service was not defective when petitioner Payal Narayan was not home 90 days prior to date stated was served and not expected to return home until after September 25, 2016. Proof service states it was served on August 24, 2016.

court granted because it unopposed for the. Judge Brown is either under hard drugs or blind he did not see responded did not oppose four motion and all were denied because they were unopposed. Based on this declaration "WHERE ON THE EARTH PETEIONER WAS SEREVED THEY WERE NOT AT HOME FROM AUGAUST 11, 2016"

21. Why did department 59 Paula lied to petitioners when she said she called phone was disconnected she has no date, no and phone number she called? Exhibit is an email sent inquiring about no phone call.
22. Why and which part of law says only party is served court and other party? Exhibit ZB court document was only given to respondent's attorney and to petitioners.
23. What is the opposition of responded with two lines on exhibit ZD which was filed against petitioner's motion of 25 pages?
24. Is exhibit an opposition to petitioners motion of 25 pages with two lines opposition and if so explain?
25. Is this violation of law to obtain default judgment of unpaid Chiropractor bill Small Claims Court? Then filed another action in Superior Court for unpaid Chiropractor bill?
26. Is it true as Judge Hershey stated you can go to as many court as possible to obtain court on the same unpaid bill or on same action and sue many times as you want in any court? Please cite law that states. Refer exhibit ZF states you can leave on the door complaint and that's proper service.
27. Why Small Claims Court don't proper service as per Exhibit ZF and why it's not defective when it was left in the door?
28. Exhibit ZH why attorney and clerk jailed, Judge held accountable for back dating court records and why exhibit X attorney proof records admitted it was back dated, Exhibit U proof service it was served on August 4, 2016 and response, verification was mailed after court of August 4, 2016 was back dated to July 25, 2016 and US postal service receipts notice is September 1, 2016.
29. Why proof of service is wrong and right Exhibit H and ZI two different judicial council forms one right to serve complaint and one is wrong and which is right of the three proof service?
30. Exhibit J race was used why its illegal to yell in Wal-Mart about this person was

arrest but City using race its nothing wrong. Is race legal to be used in hiring practice or any capacity use race as factor?

#### QUESTIONS RELATED TO OTHER PUBLIC CORRUPTION

31. Petitioner filed the complaint on 2013 and from that date until January 1, 2014 extensive pleadings were filed. Respondent filed three demurrer. Is it within the law to keep filing demurrer and after two unsuccessful prior demurrer?
32. Why did judge made an order to sustain the demurrer "UNOPPOSED" with no leave to amend when opposition was filed?
33. Why the judge did informed petitioner in the oral argument judge can not see opposition that was filed and petitioner should stop arguing that opposition was filed?
34. What are the petitioner and other three plaintiffs' fault when judge could not see three oppositions were filed and one amended complaint filed eleven months ago?
34. Is it because of race, minority or incompetent at the Sacramento Superior Court judges can not see the opposition filed in three cases of all minorities and amended complaint filed in Ali vs. I Design case?
35. Why would judge turned around make another order after oral argument opposition filed in all three cases was untimely after the oral argument?
36. Why couldn't the judges made an order at fist place in three different case they were untimely?
37. Why did the judges made an order after oral argument and after motion filed to vacate an order change the order untimely
  - a. Is it because of race of all three plaintiffs is not white minority and protected class?
  - b. Is it Sacramento court judges are incompetent?
  - c. Is it because Sacramento Superior Court running its affairs on color based of skin since 1998?
38. On case numbers 34-2013-00138376, 34-2011-00113467 and 34- 2013-00152754

a. Petitioner filed motion to extend time to file an opposition for the reason petitioner will out of country which was drop for clerical error while petitioner was out of country to corrected and file again. Upon returning petitioner filed again. Upon return petitioner filed motion to extend time an opposition SIX (6) days before the hearing date of October 2, 2 014. Case number 34-2013-00138376 was filed four days before hearing date.

b. Plaintiff also had filed motion to extend time to file an opposition for the above reason motion was returned for clerical error to corrected and filed again while plaintiff was out of country . Opposition was filed four (4) days before hearing.

“THESE 3 ABOVE WERE ORDER WAS CHANGED FROM UNOPPOSED TO  
UNTIMELY”

case numbers

Case Number 34-2013-00138376 third opposition was filed on October 2, 2014 hearing date was October 6, 2014.

Case number 34-2011-00113467 second opposition was filed on October 6, 2014 hearing date set for October 14, 2014.

Case number 34-2013-00152754 second opposition was filed on October 30, 2014 hearing date set for November 4, 2014.

All these three case demurrer sustained without leave amend unopposed changed to untimely after oral argument and motion to vacate the order.

Case 34-2012-0113-34712 First amended complaint filed and served on December 30, 2013.

“Defendant filed reply on February 6, 2015 after FOURTEEN (14) months late and filed counter claim after THREE (3) years later”

Plaintiff motion to terminate amended complaint and counter claim filed on July 3, 2015 which was unopposed denied by court. Mr. Ali reconsideration was also denied and plaintiff expert motion to terminate and declare amend complaint and counter claim was untimely filed set for hearing on October 30, 2015 was also denied without hearing.

39. Why filing opposition on case number 34-2013-00138376 filed four days before hearing, 34-2011-00113467 filed six (6) days before hearing and 34-2013-00152754 filed five (5) days hearing are UNOPPOSED AND UNTIMELY and flinging amend complaint reply after 14 months and counter claim after 3 years later is timely? Why filing 14 months and 3 years timely and filing before hearing date unopposed and changed to untimely?
40. Why court accepted proof of service for summons and cross complaint judicial council form POS-030 on case number 00134712 and why it is rejected by court on case number 34-2011-0013467? Why judge is saying it correct? (For a reason court denied plaintiff motion denied)
41. Why court accepted proof of service on case number 34-2012-00134712 when California Judicial Council has stated form POS-030 can not be used?
42. Why court denied Mr. Ali's motion when it is wrong to use POS-030 form?
43. Why court back date summons to January 13, 2015 when it was filed on February 6, 2015?
44. Why Sacramento Superior Court used fake jury panel in 1998 medical malpractice case all jurors were from the same hospital where 16 years old Filipino boy died which included the CEO'S wife?
- City vs. Narayan
45. Why did the judge in a employment discrimination case 05AS02862/CO598138 removed petitioners expert witness on a motion to in limine and when there was no motion before the judge to remove the petitioners expert witness?"
46. Why the judge removed petitioner expert witness and retained city's expert witness?
47. Why judge spoke about "ARMY and IRAQ WAR" in a group employment discrimination case?
48. What had ARMY AND IRAQ WAR had to with group employment discrimination case?
49. Why judge did not enforced standing order when city attorney made facial expression when city attorney made facial expression which part of standing order that no should make

facial expression. City attorney made facial expression and when petitioners attorney inform this to trial judge answer was he never saw that.

50. Why did trial judge heavily limited entire witness of petitioner?
51. Why did trial judge did not allow many of petitioners witness to testify in the trial?
52. Why did trial judge stop petitioners witness on the way to court to come and testify for petitioner?
53. Why did Sacramento Superior Court never gave an assurance to petitioner and petitioners attorney petitioner will get fair trial?
54. Why did trial judge threatened petitioners attorney with a state bar complaint with these wordings "DEPENDING WHAT POST TRIAL MOTION YOU ARE GOING TO FILE" trial judge will than file state bar complain.
55. Why did Julie MacManus made a ruling on the motion to disqualify judge who was appointed by California Judicial council and instead another judge made the ruling who was not even appointed.
56. Why there is no discrimination when city admitted race and ethnicity to be used in the trial to hire future employees and the judgment is against the law?
57. Why did city used and trial judge allowed city to use perjured testimony and documents in the trial?
58. Is the judgment which is favor city there was discrimination by firing 5 Indian, only Indian and entire Indian from city employment is against the law when city admitted race should be factor to hire future employees?
59. City had sent Ida Johnson to spy and build up case against the Indian employees why city has been left of the hook despite it illegal conduct by city?
60. Richard Lincoln in his declaration stated petitioner had poor and poor job performance if petitioner had poor job performance why did city fired rest of other 4 Indian employees?
61. Why Richard Lincoln did offered petitioner Mr. Narayan summer job when

cording his declaration petitioner had poor and poor job performance?

62. City did not provided Ms. Reeds letter to FEHA and EEOC when both the agency investigated employment discrimination case for one year or provided in the discovery from 2002 to 2008. Ms. Reeds unsigned letter was place in city's exhibit in 2008.

Discrimination complaint was filed in 2002. Ms. Reed denied writing the letter 5 times in the trial. If she denied writing the letter than it was perjured document used by city why law enforcement refused take any action on this? Is it because City for Sacramento and Indian minority is the one affected and white?

63. Cheri Chord computer typed notes was also placed in the city binder in 2008 that was not produce to FEHA and EEOC or in the discovery from 2002 to 2008. In cross examination Ms. Chord stated she prepared the memo after she receive subpoena for deposition on May 16, 2007 after close to 6 later. In her own words in her own testimony she stated "SHE PREPARED THE MEMO BASED ON HER MEMORY AFTER SHE FOR DEPOSITION" This is another perjured documents city used and law enforcements have refused to investigate this crime why because city is involved and minority's rights are involved and not white. Is this correct?

Question

No hand written notes for 6 years behind how can she recall all the issues date, time and all the incidents?

64. In case number 34-2013-001533355 petitioner filed motion to extend time to file Defendant's opposition petitioner was going out of country and will not be available for oral argument date selected by defendant. In error petitioner did not included department number motion was returned for corrections while plaintiff was out of country. Upon return petitioner found out defendants motion was granted "UNOPPOSED"

## LIST OF PARTIES

- ☒ All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.
- ☐ All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

## RELATED CASES

## TABLES OF CONTENTS

ISSUES PRESENTED.....	1
BOOKS OF GUINNESS RECORDS.....	3
DOUBLE STANDARD LAWS .....	9
COURT ORDER VIOLATION BY ATTORNEY.....	18
WHERE ON THE EARTH PETITIONERS CAN BE SANCTIONED.....	18
LYING DEPARTMENT 59.....	24
OPEN PUBLIC CORRUPTION FULLY CORRUPT JUDGE CULHANE.....	26
VIOLATION OF SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS.....	27
MORAL TURPITUDE.....	31
VIOLATION OF FIFTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS .....	33
VIOLATION OF 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHTS.....	35
VIOLATION OF EQUAL PROTECTION.....	39
LEGAL AND FACTUAL ERRORS.....	41
VIOLATION OF CIVIL PROCEDURE CODE 432.10.....	47
WHY PETITION SHOULD BE GRANTED.....	48

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

Appendix A Decision of Supreme Court of California rejected on August 21, 2018 at 9.55 a.m

Appendix B Petition accepted by California Supreme Court on August 21, 2018 at 8.58 a.m

Appendix C Decision by Third District Court of Appeal dismissing appeal filed on January 17, 2018

Appendix D Trial Court last order denying JNOV dated December 21, 2018

Appendix E Notice of Appeal filed on January 17, 2018

Appendix F Strangers medical records Burke Caryn M and order denying remove wrong medical records

Appendix G Law states only 90 days to accept or deny injury not 12 years

Appendix H Hand picked jury and fake jury panel trial

Appendix I Firing of 5 Indian by City of Sacramento

Appendix J City admitted race reporter's transcription page 1068 and 1069

Appendix K Third District Court of Appeal Court documents lying never received while as it was received

Appendix L Unopposed motion granted

Appendix M First unopposed motion denied

Appendix O Second unopposed motion denied

Appendix P Third unopposed motion denied

Appendix Q Order to provide discovery response no later than July 11, 2016 after close to 9 months later.

Appendix R Reporters transcript RT 6-4 discovery was late

Appendix S Petitioners Discovery set one dated October 3, 2015 and proof of service

Appendix T Petitioners response to respondent discovery set one answers dated September 3, 2018

Appendix U Proof of service by respondent's discovery response was attached dated August 4, 2016 as pleadings

Appendix V Order denying motion to terminate and back dating discovery set one by respondents to July 25, 2016

Appendix W Mailing date of discovery set one by respondent August 4, 2016 and back dating discovery set one to July 25, 2016 by respondents attorney

Appendix X Proof of service August 4, 2016 RT 7-13 and RT 7-19 attorney of records admitted it was back date to July 25, 2016

Appendix Y Court ordered to provide fully verified discovery response to petitioners on August 10, 2016 RT 10-18

Appendix AA Discovery set one from respondent's attorney with no date and signature

Appendix AB on September 29, 2016 court granted respondent ordered petitioners to provided discovery response by October 31, 2016 for not receiving signed and date discovery request from attorney of records. And sanction petitioners to for providing response on September 3, 2016. And signed and dated discovery response was received around August 11, 2016.

Appendix AC Order of September 21, 2016 respondent violated second order by not providing verification via an email on August 10, 2016 but petitioners were sanction moving party. Judge email the bottom is different there is no email address at the bottom email exhibit AD is email that was received August 8, 2016 to August 17, 2016 but no email was received form respondent. Refer Exhibit AD and Y.

Appendix AD Judge stated email provided to respondent or attorney of records was different based on exhibit AC but there I no email at the bottom.

Appendix AE Declaration of Nancy Aragon she is the manager of treatment facility states petitioners was served. Declaration is from independent person server, attorney of records and respondent all committed perjury making false declaration under oath due to public corruption.

Exhibit AF Email sent to Department 59 informing no phone call received and other information.

Appendix ZD Court document was only given to respondent and attorney of records not to petitioners party to the case due to public corruption.

Appendix ZC California laws requires if with multiple attempt parties can not be served than court order must be obtained and than served to state secretary and its violation of law to drop in the front door of petitioners. Due to public corruption law was broken and it dose not matter to trial court.

Appendix ZD Two line opposition by attorney of records and respondent with petitioners filing about 30 pages motion is no opposition.

Appendix ZE Unpaid Chiropractor bill default judgment was obtained using defective proof and service and complaint filed by attorney of records and Judge Hershey stated any person can file for same cause of action as many courts as possible while as plaintiff can not file appeal and its unconstitutional to file action for same cause once any court has decided. Prayer item number one page 4 line one for unpaid Chiropractor bill.

Appendix ZF Small Claims Court orders of unpaid Chiropractor bill

Appendix ZG Attorney clerk jailed and judge charged for back dating court documents but in this action it it's legal to back discovery act to July 25, 2016.

Appendix ZH Proof of service in another case not reacted to this action filed action number 34-201-00253819 rejected by trial court.

Appendix ZI Proof of service filed on

Appendix RT5. Person was charged in Wal-Mart Store for using race because it illegal to use. But not when City of Sacramento admitted race.

Appendix Y Order's of September 1 and 29, 2016. September 1, 2016 order petitioners were sanction filing motion to dismiss complaint for violation of second court order. **September 29, 2016 order file discovery response set one to file provide discovery response no later than October 11, 2016 for resounded to file discovery response on August 30, 2016.**

Appendix Z Declaration of Nancy petitioners was not at home and was treatment facility document was served at home.

Appendix AF Email sent to Department 59 with no response from department 59.

Appendix ZB Documents provide was date of trial on March 20, 2017 which only given to respondent attorney and to one party only and never provided to petitioners.

Appendix ZC Copy printed from court web site at in the evening on Mach 20, 2017 last documents of court records was appendix C which was only given to attorney of records an not to petitioners. Entire court documents are to provide to all parties.

Appendix ZD If any party is unsuccessful to service it must be served to state secretary and court order must be obtained. You can not just dump over complaint in the front door law dose require you do that.

Appendix ZE Peteitioners 32 pages motion with two line opposition from respondent's attorney of records is indication not even single motion was opposed and there is no opposition at all on this motion.

Appendix ZG Complaint of unpaid Chiropractor bill and Small Clams Default judgment was obtained before.

Appendix ZH Small Claims Court order by default for unpaid Chiropractor bill.

Appendix ZI Proof of service in pleading paper was denied after several months later court acted and endorsed stating to plaintiff to use Judicial Council correct form POS-010 right form, 4Y in another case proof of

service was accepted on Judicial Council form POS-030 and another case  
Judicial council form POS 030 was rejected.

Appendix RT5. Person was charged in Wal-Mart Store for using race  
because it illegal to use. But not when City of Sacramento admitted race.

Appendix RT6 history of all and entire public corruption step by step

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

**OPINIONS BELOW**

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

☐ reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

☐ reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☐ is unpublished.

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

☐ reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the \_\_\_\_\_ court appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

☐ reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☐ is unpublished.

## JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No. \_\_\_\_ A \_\_\_\_.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was 8/21/18.  
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No. \_\_\_\_ A \_\_\_\_.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

## ISSUES PRESENTED

Petition is regards to open **public corruption, corrupt court and judges** which gave birth to **“Human created by judges in California To White Collar Aids”**.

**Appendix A** petitioner denied at 10.56 a.m in 1.57 hours creating history.

**Appendix B** petition accepted which received at 8.58 a.m.

**Appendix C** appeal denied by Third District Court of untimely filed on January 17, 2017 in 27 days by law petitioner had until January 20 to file appeal.

**Appendix D** last JNOV and motion to vacate was denied on December 21, 2017.

Before it changed to white collar aids it started with cancer from fake jury of 1998 entire jury were from same hospital where 16 years old Filipino boy died.

Cancer was changed in 2008 followed by group employment discrimination case of firing of 5 Indian, only Indian and entire Indian by City of Sacramento. When city had no defense than city used perjured document testimony to defend the case. Trial Judge spoke about Iraq war and army in group employment discrimination had nothing to do with firing of five Indian. City admitted race should be used to hire future employees which are illegal to use in hiring practice. This case changed aids to **“WHITE COLLAR AIDS IN 2017”**

**“APPEAL DENIED BY THIRD DISTRICT APPENDIX C IS INSULT TO ENTIRE JUDGES AND JUSTICE DEPARTMENT TO USE JUSTICE. LAST ORDER WAS MADE ON DECEMBER 21, 2017 AND APPEAL WAS FILED JANUARY 17, 2018 IN LESS THAN THIRTY DAYS AND IT'S NOT OUT OF TIME BUT DUE TO PUBLIC CORRUPTION APPENDIX E IS NOTICE OF APPEAL”.**

## **BOOKS OF GENIUS RECORDS**

**“HISTORY HAS BEEN CREATED BY SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA DENYING APPEAL IN 1.57 HOURS AND SHOULD GO INTO BOOKS OF GENUINE RECORDS”**

*Commission on Judicial performance dismissed judge from traffic court. A traffic court judge delegated his job to his clerk. While the judge was in chambers, the clerk heard pleas and imposed sentences. “Judge has to deny appeal not clerks” Rejection was signed by clerk not by judge.*

*“There is difference between donkey and horse although they are indicial animal but they two different animals, Same applies here clerk and Judge both works in court clerks do not have same powers as judges and can not deny appeal”*

Its history that California Supreme Court clerks acts as judges of the court who has no legal qualification never practice laws and never attend law school.

California Supreme Court decision accepted petition at 8.58 a.m via an email confirmation. At 10.56 a.m petition was rejected. On August 24, 2018 petitioners received written denial **Appendix A**.

**“ THE ONLY POWERS AND JURIDICATION OF APPEALS COURT IS TO SEE IF LAWS ERRORS OF LOWER AND LAWS AND VOILATION TAKES PLACE , ITS NOT A TRIAL COURT BUT BASED ON THE REJECTION ITS DOSE NOT MATTER”**

Supreme Court in California by send rejection at 8.58 a.m and than mailing denial petition has perjured them. Two orders have been provide an indication **“ONE HAND DOSE NOT KNOW WHAT THE HAND IS DOING”**

***Supreme Court California business opening hours is from 9 a.m pacific time in the morning but rejection was emailed at 8.58 a.m two minutes before Supreme Court of California opened for full business.***

In the past Supreme Court of California act in a similar way and acted in same manner to deny petition where laws had violated by condoning, aiding and abetting judicial misconduct.

### **Examples**

- Fake Jury panel of 1998 medical malpractice entire jury were from same hospital where 16 years old Filipino boy died.
- Group employment discrimination case 5 Indian, only Indian, entire Indian were fired by City of Sacramento. When had no defense they used perjured testimony, trial judge spoke about Iraq war and army both had nothing to with firing of 5 Indian. To make it worst city admitted race and ethnicity should be used to hire employees and it's illegal to use.
- Multiple cases that were trial court state granted demurrer because there was no opposition was filed. However after oral argument and motion to vacate and order trial court change the order to untimely file. **"IF JUDGES WERE NOT CORRUPT, RACIST AND PREJUDICE ONLY ONE ORDER SHOULD BE MADE NOT TWO"**
- Attorney accusation of violation of court order, violating discovery act for 10 months and not filing opposition it's within the law not to provided discovery response and it's within the law for trial court to deny unopposed motion because they were unopposed
- It's within the law to grant a single motion unopposed because petitioner's been out of country and could not type department number and file rejected motion.
- Multiple and multiple motion was unopposed by respondent and entire motions were denied because they were unopposed. **Corruption, plus corruption.**

- Supreme Court of California is out of track and dose not know path they headings towards and denying petition in 1.57 hours by clerk not by judges is because petitioners are not white but minorities.

**“PETITIONERS SINGLE UNOPPOSED MOTION WAS GRANTED BECAUSE IT WAS REJECTED IT DID NOT HAD DPARTMENT NUMBER, PATITIONERS WAS NOT ABLE TO FILE WITH DEPRRAMENT BECAUSE PETIONER WAS OUT OF COUNTRY”**

**“RESPONDEDNT MULTIPLE AND MUTIPELE TIMES DID NOT FILE OPPOSITION BUT WAS DENIED BECASUE THEY UNOPPOSED”**

- Due to the fact of condoning, aiding and abetting judicial misconducts which spread like caner in 1998 fake jury panel up until 2008 group employment discrimination case of firing Indian, only Indian, entire Indian admitting race as factor to hire future employees that changed to aids in the trial court in “2017 OPEN PUBLIC CORRUPTION” is now changed to “WHITE COLLAR AIDS”

***“WHITE COLLAR AIDS CREATED BUY JUDGES AND SUPRERME COURT OF CALIFNRONIA”***

- The very latest injured had been allowed to use none employee of an employer and none injured workers medical records to have qualified medical evaluation. Appendix F injured worker and appendix d strangers medical records ***“TOTAL DISGRACE TO CA SUPREME COURT TO REJECT APPEAL”***

***“TOTAL DISGRACE TO THIRD DISTRICT COURT TO DENY WRIT IN TWO HOURS MAKING LAWS USE ANOTHER PERSON MEDICAL RECORDS AND AFTER ELEVE YEARS LATER TO DENY INJURY”***

- Laws made by legislature in California states employer can only admit or deny injury in “90 days”. But according to Third District Court of Appeal no employee can admit or deny injury after 11 years because it denied petition was that Workers Compensation court granted employer’s motion to admit of injury and deny part of injury after eleven years later. **Appendix G** made part of the petition petition has been rejected.

Petition arises from double stand and discrimination laws created by trial court in Sacramento, California which started with minorities and protected class people in California. Just because appeals court has condoned, aided and abetted judicial misconduct in 2017 it was no longer judicial misconduct but **“OPEN PUBLIC CORRUPTION”**

Followed by Third District Court of Appeal denying an appeal denying appeal that hand pick jury was within the laws clear violation of constitution which states “Jury of peers” and not fake jury hand picked from same hospital 16 years old Filipino boy died. **Appendix H** made part of this petition.

Group employment discrimination firing of Five Indian, only Indian and entire Indian **Appendix I** made part of this petition firing of five Indian.

Trial court never gave an assurance on motion filed by attorney petitioner will get fair trial **“RED FLAG”**

Petitioner did not received fair trial and trial was biased with trial judge only allowed limited testimony from petitioner and petitioner witness only what judge wanted jury to hear that was allowed by petitioner and petitioners witness.

Many of petitioners witness whose names were on the witness list was stopped on the way to trial court and never allowed to testify for witness.

Petitioners witness those who were allowed to testify for their testimony was heavily limited.

City of Sacramento attorney used perjured documents and testimony to defendant the case when city had no defense.

City filed motion to *in limine* to petitioner's expert witness instead trial judge removed expert witness and when there was no motion to remove expert witness.

Judicial Council of California appointed Julie McManus from Nevada to hear motion to disqualify judge. Out of blue judge Downing who was not even appointed by California Judicial Council made the ruling.

Trial Judge James McFetridge in group employment discrimination case spoke about **"ARMY AND IRAQ WAR"** in the trial and how are both are related to group employment discrimination case answer is not related at all.

Race is illegal to use in hiring **"BUT NOT TO TRIAL COURT, THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL AND SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA"** Appendix J made part of this petition. President Trump has stated very clearly judges are not supposed to make laws he is right. **"UNDER THE CONSTITUTION CONGRESS IS THE ONE MAKES LAWS"**. It's illegal to use race in any capacity to use as factor in hiring practice.

Multiple other cases demurer response was filed trial court granted demurrer unopposed dismissed action and after oral argument and motion to vacate trial court changed the order it untimely and Third District Court of Appeal denied all appeal. **"YOU CAN NOT HAVE TWO TUNES WITH ONE FLUTE IN THE HAND IT DEMURER WAS UNPOOSED OR IT WAS UNTMELY BOTH CAN NOT BE RIGHT"**

Appeal file in another case motion was mailed Third District Court of Appeal was denied without making ruling on the motion. When inquired about court what happened to the motion petitioners was informed no motion was received. Motion was received but several weeks petitioners were lied it was not received. After petitioner hand delivered than received information petitioner its being returned date received in fact when it was received and dated when hand delivered nothing than corruption. Appendix K made part of this petition which is a **"TREND"**

XII. Order made on this petition was motion was mailed to court for on January 2, 2016 it takes to deliver according US postal service in Sacramento two days.

**“From January 4, 2016 until January 14, 2016 petitioner kept calling twice a day to find if motion was received entire 10 days petitioner was lied no motion was received”**

On January 14, 2016 petitioner got sick and tied personally took the motion to Third District court of Appeal hand delivered got it stamped and endorsed copy given to petitioner.

***“ON JANUARY 14 COURT RETURNED DOCUMENT STAMP DATED RECEIVED WAS JANUARY 8, 2016 WHICH IS CROSSED DATED JANUARY 8, 2016, IT ONLY TAKES JUST TWO TO DELIVER MAILS IN SACRAMENTO”. Appendix K*** made part of the petitioner how peoples rights are being cheated due to public corruption.

XII. Case number C059138 appeal was filed with by petitioner’s attorney stamp and endorsed copy was given to attorney. ***“SEVERAL WEEKS LATER THIRD DISCTRICT COURT OF APPEAL INFORMED PETITIONERS ATTORNEY AAPEAL WAS LOST”***

If petitioner was on death row petitioner would lost his life because Third District Court of Appeal lost appeal.

Respondent had obtained default judge without properly serving petitioner for Chiropractor bills in Small Claims Court. Respondent agent on the fist visit left Small Claims Complaint in the front door and stated it was properly served at a time neither on the defendant was at home.

After receiving orders from Small Claims Court petitioners file complaint in the Superior Court of California for fraud and defective proof service and so on.

**DOUBLE STANDRAD LAWS**

On this case that was file by petitioners in Sacramento Superior Court for fraud, perjury and so on. Responded filed motion to compel to provide response to discovery response. Date that was selected by respondent would conflict with petitioner who had arranged before and going out of country.

For the reason petitioner will be out country dated selected petitioner filed motion to extend time to file response. Petitioner motion to extend time had an error no department number was included and motion was returned to petitioner to type department number and file again. Trial court is well aware of each department just because petitioner was out of country trial could have filed in the department. However this never took place motion was returned to file again with department number.

***“By the time motion was returned for correction petition was already of country”***

- **UPON RETURN PATITIONER RECEIVED ORDER GRANTNG MOTION UNOPPOSED. Appendix L made part of this petition case number 34-2013-00153355.**

***First Double Standard Court and Judges World Should Not Be Due to public corruption.***

- **PETITIONER FILED MOTION NUMBER ONE TO VACATE AN ORDER PETIONER MOTION WAS UNOPPOSED AND THE MOTION WAS *DENIED BECAUSE IT WAS UNOPPOSED*. Appendix M made part of this petition.**

***Second Double Standard Court and Judges World Should Not Be Due to public corruption.***

- **PETIONER FILED MOTIION NUMBER ONE TO COMPEL TO ANSWER DISCOEVRY RESPONSE PETIONER MOTION WAS *DENINED BECAUSE IT WAS UNOPPOSED*. Appendix O made part of this petition.**

***Third Double Standard Court and Judges World Should Not Be Due to Public Corruption.***

- PETITIONER FILED MOTIION NUMBER TWO TO COMPEL TO ANSWER DISCOEVRY RESPONSE PETIONER MOTION WAS DENIED **BECAUSE IT WAS UNOPPOSED.** Appendix P made part of this petition.

***Fourth Double Standard Court and Judges World Should Not Be Due to public corruption.***

**“Unopposed motion only works for one part and other party is violation of one party which is respondent and not for petitioners”**

- Third motion was filed to compel finally court granted motion asking petitioner to file discovery response no later than July 11, 2016 Appendix Q.

- On July 12, 2016 petitioner filed motion o dismiss complaint and sanction respondent in violation of court by not providing discovery response by July 11, 2016.

- **DUE TO CORRUPPT JUDGE AND COURT PETIONERS MOTION DENIED AND PTEIONERS WEERE SANCTION FOR RESPOSNDENT VIOLATING COURT**

- “THREE CHEERS HIPPIPY HORRAY FOR OUR CORRUPT COURT AND JUGDEGS FOR BEING CORRUPT”

- Respondent than file opposition and attached discovery with court documents as pleadings without serving petitioners. Petitioners had oral argument and argued petitioners had not been served but discovery was attached as pleading and it back dated to July 25, 2016 and discovery that was attached had no verification. Trial coiurt agreed there was no verification.

- Resonedent agreed there was no verification andit was backndated to July 25, 2016 Appendix R RT

- Court orded repsonsde to parovide vefiaction on Auguts via an email Appendix S RT

••

Violation of 14 TH Amendment rights of the constitution of equal protection **DUE TO PUBLIC CORRUPTION.**

- **RESPONSED VIOLATED COURT ORDER OF JULY 1, 2018 AFTER FILING THIRD MOTION TO COMPEL TRIAL COURT HAD FINALLY MADE AN ORDER TO PROVIDE DISCOERVY RESPONSE NO**

LATER THAN JULY 11, 2016. ATTORNEY OF RECORDS VIOLATED COURT ORDER DID NOT FILE RESPONSE ONCE AGAIN. ONLY JULY 12, 2016 PETIONERS FILED ANOTHER MOTION TO COMPEL AND DIMSISSED COMPLAINT IN VIOLATION OF MULTIPLE VIOLATION OF DISCOVERY ACT AND SANCTION RESPONDED. INSTEAD PETIONERS WERE SANCTION (**"RULE OF JUNGLE"**)FOR FILING MOTIONS THAT PLAINTIFF AND ATTORNEY OF RECORD VIOLATED COURT ORDER AND DISCOEVERY ACT **Appendix O** made part of this petition July, 2016 order.

- Appendix P order petitioner for violation of court of July 1, 2016 and plaintiff and attorney of records to continue to refused to provide discovery response. ***"SHAME ON OUR JUDGES AND COURT PETITIONERS WAS SACNTION FOR FILING MOTION THAT RESPONDED HAS REFSUED TO PROVIDE DISCOEVERY SET ONE AS OPRDERED BY COURT AND IN VIOLATION OF COURT"***

***"RESPONDEDNT VIOLTED COURT ORDER OF JULY 1, 2016 BUT PETIONER SACNTION IS NOTHING OTHER THAN PUBLIC CORRUPTION THE WAY JUDGES AND COURT SHOULD NOT BE IN THE WORLD"***

## **VIOLTAION OF DISCOVERY ACT AND PUBLIC CORRUPTION**

Petitioner severed attorney of records discovery set one on October 4, 2015 no response was received. Around December 2015 first motion was filed to compel. No opposition was filed and no discovery response was received. **Motion was denied because it was unopposed "Public Corruption".**  
**Appendix N.**

Second motion was filed by petitioner to compel around February 2016 responded and attorney records did not file opposition and no discovery

response was received. ***Motion was denied because it was unopposed  
“Public Corruption” Appendix Q***

Third motion filed to compel, dismiss complaint in violation of discovery act. Court made an order on July 1, 2016 responded to provide discovery response ***“no later July 11, 2016”.***Appendix G.

No discovery set one response was received as per court order on July 1, 2016. On July 12, 2016 petitioner filed another motion in violation of court of July 1, 2016 to sanction responded dismiss complaint in violation of multiple of Discovery Act Title 4 and court order of July 1, 2016.

“Instead of respondent violating court order and discovery act for close ***“10 MONTHS”*** due to public corruption and corrupt judge

**“PETITIONER WAS SANCTION HITORY OF PUBLIC  
CORRUPTION SHOULD GO IN BOOKS OF GENUIUSE RECORDS  
RESPONDED IS THE ONE WHO VIOLTED COURT NOT PETIONER  
BUT PETIONERS HAD BEEN SACNATION FOR NOT VIOLATING  
COURT ORDER”**

Petitioners requested oral argument on August 10, 2016 had an oral and informed the court discovery response was filed by responded with petitioner motion to sanction and dismiss complaint discovery reason was included as a motion. Discovery set one response was not provided prior to four other motion to compel. Discovery response is not to be filed with the court was violation by attorney records. Attorney of records also back dated discovery response to July 25, 2016 without verification which is required by law not to file with court.

Around October 2016 discovery set two was served no response was received in around January 2017 motion to compel once again was filed.

Motion to was granted and respondent was ordered to file response later than February 21, 2017 than only response was received response.

***“DUE TO CORRUPT COURT AND JUDGES RESPONDED AND  
ATTOREY OF RECORDS CONTIUNED TO VIOLATE DISCOEVRY***

***RESPONSE COURT AND JUDGES CONTINUED TO TAB THEIR  
BACKS WELL DONE***

- Eleven (11) months later interrogatories discovery set one was received clear violation of professional business code due to corrupt court and judges it doesn't matter if discovery laws have been violated on how many times by attorney of records. As long as we have corrupt judges and court the **"HELL GOES LAWS ON THE BOOKS"** Violation civil code 2030.60 attorney of records and responded only had 30 days to provide response not eleven months late due to open public corruption, corrupt judge and court who care what the laws are.

- Attorney of records and responded violated discovery act even after filing **"FIRST"** motion to compel. Neither motion was opposed nor discovery response set one was provided. Around December 15, 2015 after three (3) months later interrogatories discovery set one was served clear violation of professional business code due to corrupt court and judges it doesn't matter what are the laws. Motion to number one was denied due to corrupt court and judges because it was **"UNOPPOSED"** Violation Civil code 2030.260

- Attorney of records and responded violated discovery act even after filing **"SECOND"** motions to compel. Neither motion was opposed nor discovery response set one was provided. Around February 2016 motion to compel was filed after four (4) months later interrogatories discovery set one was not received clear violation of professional business code due to corrupt court and judges it doesn't matter what are the laws. Motion number two was denied due to corrupt court and judges because it **"UNOPPOSED"** Violation Civil code 2030.260

- Attorney of records and responded violated discovery act even after filing **"THIRD"** motions to compel. Around May, 2015 after seven (7) months later interrogatories discovery set one was not received by petitioner clear violation of professional business code by attorney of records due to corrupt court and judges it doesn't matter what are the laws. Motion number three

was granted and responded was ordered to provide discovery response no later than July 11, 2016. due to corrupt court and judges no discovery set response was provided as ordered by court in Violation Civil code 2030.260

- Interrogatories set two was served to attorney of records around October 14, 2016 attorney of records and responded once again violated civil code 2030.6 refused to provide discovery response. On around January 2, 2017 “FOURTH” motion to compel was filed order was made that responded and attorney records provide response no later than February 21, 2017 than petitioners received response.

## **COURT ORDER VIOLATION BY ATTORNEY**

On July 1, 2016 court made an order that responded and attorney of records provided discovery set response no later than July 11, 2016. Attorney of records and responded both violated court order and did not provide discovery response as ordered by court.

Only August 10, 2016 made another order after an oral argument that attorney of records provide discovery respond with verification via an email. Attorney of records did not provide discovery response with verification on August 10, 2016. Instead verification was mailed via US postal service.

## ***WHERE ON THE EARTH PETIONERS CAN BE SANCTIONED?***

On July 12, 2016 petitioner filed another motion to dismiss complaint in violation of discovery act 2030.6 from October 2015 and order of court dated July 1, 2016. Petitioner motion was denied for responded to continue violating discovery act and court order. Respondent and attorney of records violated court of July 1, 2016 by not providing discovery response set one. On July 12, 2016 petitioners filed motion to dismiss complaint and sanction complaint in violation court order and discovery act for close 10 months.

***“Due to corrupt court and judges petitioner were sanction  
for filing the motionA”***

Petitioner did not violated discovery act, petitioner did not violated court order of July 1, 2016 but attorney of records and responded violated discovery act from October 2015 until September 1, 2016 almost for one year is the reason petitioner was sanction. Moving party petitioner was sanction when responded and attorney of records violated court order and discovery act.

**“THIS TYPE OF PUBLIC CORRUPTUON ONLY OCCURES IN USA COURT AND BY USA JUDGES IN CALINFORNIA COURTS”**

On August 10, 2016 petitioner had oral argument argued petitioners did not receive discovery response set one that was attached responded opposition to July 12, 2016 motion to dismiss complaint. Response that was attached to petitioner’s motion, both court and petitioners had not received verification. Court also agreed there was no verification and was filed late. Appendix T RT 6-7. Court ordered attorney of records to provide discovery via an email on August 10, 2016.

Attorney of records and responded violated second court did not email verification as ordered by court on August 10, 2016. Appendix U RT10-14

On August 19 2016 petitioners filed another motion to dismiss complaint in violation of second court not receiving discovery response set one with verification. Motion was denied and petitioners were sanction for filing motion.

**“Due to corrupt court and judges petitioner was sanction for filing the motion Judge Brown agree appendix V email address provide to attorney of records was wrong”**

***“Appendix V has no email at the bottom and entire email received August 11, 2016 and no email was received on August 10, 2016 as an evidence”.***

**“THIS TYPE OF PUBLIC CORRUPTUON ONLY OCCURES IN US COURT AND BY US JUDGES IN CALIFORNIA”**

Appendix W. Violation of discovery act civil code 2030.50 states by attorney of records must sign and dated entire discovery.

Appendix W is discovery request received without signature and date.

Civil code 2030.5 requires attorney of records to sign and date each discovery request because discovery request had no date and signature by attorney of records received no response could be determine when response was due as civil code 2030.260.

Around August 11, 2016 attorney of records for responded filed motion to compel to answers response to interrogatories set one. Attorney records filed false and fake motion discovery set was served around June 2016 while as appendix W has no date and signature and committed perjury.

Attorney of records attached interrogatories set with ha date and signature and date is fraud by attorney of records. Discovery was served without date and signature in violation of civil code 2030.250 and committed perjury.

Upon getting motion to compel and dated and signed discovery response which was received on August 11, 2016.

***“IN 20 DAYS RESPONSE WAS PROVIDED AND PETITIONERS WERE SANCTION IN VIOLATION OF CIVIL CODE 2030.260 BY JUDGE BROWN TO SANCTION ONLY JUDGES IN US AND JUDGES OF USA APPENDIX Q”***

***“JUDGE GRANTED RESOPNDED MOTION TO COMPEL ON SEPTEMBER 29, 2016 PROVIDE DISCOEVRY NO LATER THAN OCTOBER 10, 2016, ONLY IN USA CORRPUT JUDGE BROWN CAN GRANT MOTION TO COMPEL AND SANCATION HIPPY HORRAY THREE CHEERS FOR CORRUPT JUDG, COURT PUBLIC CORRUPTION IN USA. ONLY IN USA, CALIFORNIA JUDGE CAN MAKE ORDER AFTER DISCOEVRY WAS PROVIDED AND ASKED TO PROVIDE TWO MONTHS LATER APPENDIX Y”***

Judge granted responded motion to compel which was opposed and discovery response and petitioner were sanction. Appendix Y

Motion to compel was granted which was opposed and discovery response attached as exhibit in less than one month or thirty days. In violation of civil code 2030.260 which read response to discovery is due within 30 days and response was provide within after signed and date discovery was attached with motion to compel response. **JUDGE BROWN VIOLATED CIVL CODE 203.260**

***“THERE IS ABSOLUTLEY NO VIOTION OF DISCOVERY ACT AT***

***ALL FOR RESPONDING IN LESS THAN 30 DAYS”***

Petitioners four motion were unopposed and entire four were denied because they were unopposed.

Petitioners were sanction provided discovery response in less than 30 days. In other words discovery set one was responded petitioner in **“WENTY 20 DAYS”** and by law and Discovery Act petitioner had another 10 left over to respond to discovery set one.

**“ONLY A RETARTED AND ABSENT MILED JUDGE CAN SANCTION PETEIONERS AND ORDER ON SEPTEMBER 29, 2016 TO FILE RESPONSE NO LATER THAN OCTOBER 10, 2016 WHEN RESPONSE WAS PROVIDED ON AUGUST 30, 2016 EVEN AFTER FILING MOTION TO VACATE THE ORDER WAS DEINED JUDGE BROWN IS RETARTED”**

Due to public corruption and corrupt judge it doesn't matter how stupid it looks like **“BUT I AM THE JUDGE AND WHO CARES IF JUDGE LOOKS RETARTED”**

A corrupt judge and court defective proof of service in the Small Claims Court case complaint was left in the front door ignored the facts of defective

proof of service. Complaint this petition was also left in the front again judge denied defective proof of service. Appendix Z declaration of Nancy Aragon petitioner Payal Narayan was not home on the date who served but the declaration states by an independent person manger that petitioner Payal Narayan was not home on that date and prior to several weeks before and was not expecting to return home soon Petitioner Payal Narayan was at a treatment faculty. It's a trend in Sacramento Superior Court as long you file proof of service it dose not matter if documents had been served or not corrupt court and judges will accept that.

**EXAMPLE:** Served to Jane Doe is clear indication of not serving.

**BUT I AM THE JUDGE AND WHO CARES IF JUDGE LOOKS AT THIS RETARTED JUDGE WILL DISAGREE OF DEFETIVE PRROF OF SERVICE**

Complaint of malicious prosecution was filed on April 13, 2015 by respondent. Cross complaint was file petitioner on October 5, 2015 by petitioners. Respondent denied cross complaint on January 11, 2016.

***“PROOF OF SERVICE BY RESPONDENT IS SIGNED UNDER PEANLTY OF PERJURY IS JANUARY 12, 2015 ALMOST THREE MONTHS IN ADVANCE OR BEFORE MALIICIOUSE PROSEUTION COMAPLINT WAS FILED OR TEN IN ADVAVCE AND TEN MONTHS BFEORE CROSS COMPLAINT WAS FILED”***

Petitioners motion to defective proof of service was denied its went to deaf years that no one can file proof of service before complaint is filed ***“BUT I AM THE JUDGE AND WHO CARES IF JUDGE LOOKS AT THIS RETARTED JUDGE WILL DISAGREE OF DEFETIVE PROOF OF SERVICE”***

Special interrogatories set one response was sent on August 30, 2016 after signed and was received by attorney of records received on August 16, 2016 last date to respond was September 16, 2016..

***“WHERE IN THE WORLD PETITIONERS CANS BE  
SNACTION FOR FILING DISCOERVY RESPONSE IN 20 DAYS.  
ANSWRE STATE OF CALIFRONIA SACRAMENTO SUPERIOR  
COURT SHAME YOU CORRUPT JUDGES AND COURT”***

**LYING BY DPEARTMENT 59**

On February 16, 2017 Petitioners received telephone message on the voice mail named Paula from department 59. Petitioners called back and spoke to Paula who stated she had called about settlement conference statement. Petitioners explained they will not file settlement statement instead due to multiple violation by respondent and attorney of records another motion will be file to dismiss complaint.

Paula than stated to petitioners there was too many issue and she will talk to her supervisor and will drop the matter and she will call back. Paula further provided an email and stated incase if petitioners choose to file settlement statements petitioners could send an email.

With no phone call from Paula as she promised on February 21, 2016 Petitioners sent email to the email that was provided. Appendix V makes part of this petition. Petitioners neither received any response nor were any message email not delivered. It's presumed and its petitioner's inclination email was received.

On February 22, 2017 order was made in department 59 to show cause for petitioners not attending settlement conference. Around February 24, 2017 Petitioners called department and it happened Paula answered the phone call. The following issues were brought with Paula and her response. Emailed was sent to the emailed she provide and there is no response why there was no response.

- She stated she did call phone was disconnected

Petitioners' did not receive phone call or any message that was left over so

- Petitioner's asked her

- what phone she called

***Answer: she has no phone number she called***

- What was the date did she called?

***Answer: she has no date***

- What was the time she called?

***Answer: she ahs no time***

Paula only explanation was the payer she wrote all information has been destroyed.

Petitioners at that time was paying for five years phone in advance and currently its been changed to three years. Petitioners can never be disconnected for none payment petitioners phone was never disconnected and it was not disconnect at that time. Even if petitioner's phone is disconnected every messages left over on petitioner's phone number will go their email. No such message was received from Paula.

***"PUALA JUST LIED TO PETIONER SHE NEVER MADE ANY PHONE CALL AT ALL"***

Paula than asked petitioners to hold on the line and out o "BLUE" male caller answered the phone call.

***"HE STATED TO PETIOENER TO STOP HARRSING HIS STAFF AND HANG UP THE PHONE"***

When petitioners asked his and asked to spell he gave the name but did not spell it. Immediately complaint was filed about rude behavior with Executive Office response was received in writing. At that point after getting response Petitioner realize it's Judge Ben Davidian who took the phone from Paula and in fewer one minute he hanged up the phone. This was nothing other tan cover up Paula lies that she never called and phone was never disconnected because she no date, no time and phone number she called.

**OPEN PUBLIC CORRUPTION**

***FULLY CORRUPPT JUDGE CULHANE***

After all the above public petitioners filed response to motion to show case set for hearing on set for March 20, 2017 at 9 a.m in the morning for not filing settlement conference statement. One of the petitioner's Mr. Narayan attending the hearing in department 47.

Presiding judge Culhane presided over the matter after calling petitioner matter and by looking petitioners were not represented, minority not white and color skin left court room.

Entire attorney in the court and everyone started to get panic when Judge Chulhan never came to court for several hours. Petitioners also not able to decided what was going behind the scene as the attorneys who were waiting as well.

After several hours later judge Culahne came to court called matter and told both parties come at 1.30 dept 45 petitioners matter by than other petitioners Ms. Narayan was in the court. Attorney for records than asked Judge Culhane ***"But we were here for settlement"***. Judge Culhan responded due the fact complaisant was filed against Judge Davidian come at 1.30 p.m

**"AS BOTH PARTIES WERE WALKING CLERKS CALLED ATTORNEY OF RECORDS AND GAVE DOCUMENTS BUT DID NOT GAVE THE SAME DOCUMENTS TO PETEIONER BEING PARTY APPENIX ZB TO THE CASE"**

**"Only one part responded was handed court documents"**

**" AS PETIONERS WERE LEAVING DEPARTMENT 47 PETEIONERS ASKED JUDGEL CULHANE WHAT WERE THEY COMING FOR 1.30 P.M JUDGGE CULLAHNE RESONDED JUST COME"**

***"Late in the afternoon petitioners went to court site and saw it was the last document create on Marc 20, 2017 appendix***

## **DENYING COUNSEL**

## **FULLY CORRUPT JUDGE HERSHEY**

At 1.30 p,m when petitioners arrived in department 45 after waiting for a while Judge Hershey came in. She told she was in criminal trial she had to rush civil after she was call but Judge Culhane.

At that point Petitioners asked what type of trial and they were never informed in the morning about any trial even asking judge Culhne why petitioners were coming at 1.30 p.m.

- Response received by Judge Hershey was that petitioners were informed.
- Petitioners than stated based on an order of from department 59 last notice from court record only matter in the morning of Mach 20, 2017 was to show cause for not filing settlement statement.
- Judge Culhane than asked plaintiff attorney if he was informed of the trial and the response was yes. Under oath attorney lied and judge asked if he has records at that point attorney gave.
- Attorney of records first documents Judge Hersehy stated that's not right.
- Attorney of records than gave second documents Judge Hershey again stated it was not right.
- Attorney provide records than gave third documents and than Judge Hershey stated yes petitioners were notified and copy was given. Documents that were provided Appendix ZB made part was never given to petitioners and petitioner had not received it. Judge than stated she will continue with trial document states about trial.
- Petitioners than informed Judge Hershey because in the morning Judge Culhane stated just come they were never informed of trial.
- Petitioners than stated just because they were never informed of trial petitioners were in department 45 for trial and were not ready for trial.
- Petitioners than informed judge Hershey they no attorney of theirs in the court trial is bogus.

- **JUDGE HERSHEY RESPONDED YOU ARE NOT ALLOWED ATTORNEY.**

**NO WITNESS ALLOWED**

- Petitioners than stated to Judge Hershey they have no witness or witness list trial is bogus.

- **JUDGE HERSHEY THAN STATED NO YOU ARE NOT ALLOWED TO BRING WITNESS OR ASK RESPONED TO BRING WITNESS.**

**NO EXHIBITS**

- Petitioners than asked Judge Hersehy they do not have any exhibit trial is bogus.

- **JUDGE HERESHY THAN RESPONDED YOU ARE NOT ALLOWED TO BRING EXHIBITS NEITHER EXHIBIT WAS PROVIDE TO PETIONERS TO TRIAL JUDGE OR TO PETEIONERS.**

- Petitioners than asked Judge Hersehy there are no jury no jury selection took place and we do have jury.

- **JUDGE HERSHEY THAN TOLD PETEIONERS NO YOU ARE NOT ALLOWED JURY TRIAL.**

- Petitioners s than stated no deposition has been taken and trial is bogus.

- **JUDGE HERSHEY RESPONED YOU CAN TAK DEPOSITION AND NOT ALLOWED TO TAKE DEPOSITION.**

**TRIAL WHILE PENDING DISCOVERY AND MOTIONS**

- Petitioners than stated to Judge Hershey discovery has not been completed and we need to time to complete before trial takes place.

- **JUDGE HERSHY STATED YOU CAN NOT COMPLETE AND YOU ARE NOT ALLOWED TO COMPLETE DISCOEVRY.**

- Petitioners told Judge Hersehy respondent and attorney of records has not provide response to discovery response set 2 trial cannot take place.

- **JUDGE HERHEY INGORED AND VIOLATED DISCOVERY ACT BY REFUSING TO COMPLETE DISCOVERY AND STATED TRIAL WILL CONTINUE**

- Petitioners than informed judge Hershey there were two pending motion and trial can not continue.

4. Motion for reconsideration filed around October 28, 2016

5 Motion to disqualify Judge Brown

- **Judge HESRHEY IGNORED AND STATED TRIAL WILL CONTINUE DESPITE THERE WEERE PENDING TWO MOTOIONS NO RULING HAS BEEN MADE.**

**“OPEN AND FULLY OPEN PUBLIC CORRUPTION BY CORRUPT JUDGES GO AMERICA GO FOR PUBLIC CORRUPTION AND CORRUPT JUDGES”**

**MORAL TURPITUDE**

Judge Culhan orchestrated crime in dept 47 on March 20, 2017 by keeping trial secret even when petitioners asked why they were coming at 1.30 p.m was not provided. Attorney of records was only provided for trial. Court document was only provided to respondent and not to petitioners. Making deal with Judge Hershey to come and have fake and secret trial, bullying, taking advantage of his position, abuse of office on involved in public corruption by setting up secret trial, dishonesty, criminality, harassment, bullying, terrorizing and conspiring to defraud by Justice System. Obstruction of justice, being racist and prejudice because of color of skin.

Judge Brown denying almost entire motion of petitioners with only two lines opposition. Judge Brown granting entire motions of respondent. Judge Brown denying multiple and multiple unopposed motion of petitioner and granted single motion of petitioners unopposed due the fact of having no department and petitioners could not have re-file with department number being out of country was granted unopposed motion. Denied petitioners motion to vacate because it was unopposed.

Sanction petitioners for respondent violation court order twice by attorney of records. First court order was July 1, 2016 and second order was August 10, 2016. Instead of sanction respondent and attorney of records for violation of two court orders petitioners were sanction bullying petitioners. Aiding and abetting public corruption. Complaint and other documents were left in the front door of petitioners not served properly. Appendix Z is an example. Also by law requires if multiple attempt of personnel attempt is unsuccessful than court order must be obtained and complaint must be than served to state secretary Appendix ZD.

Responded violated discovery act of July 1, 2016 but petitioners were sanction bullying and taking advantage of the position and abuse of office. Its responded who violated two court orders not petitioners public corruption.

Four motions were unopposed but it was denied because it was unopposed due to bullying, public corruption Judge Brown denied all also abuse of office and public corruption. Those motion that were opposed were opposed with two lines only. Appendix ZE motion and opposition motion is about is 29 pages opposition is two lines.

Respondent violated August 10, 2016 order by not emailing verification. Petitioners filed motion to sanction and dismiss complaint was denied and petitioners were sanction for not violating "court order but responded violated court order"

Allowing and agreeing discovery response set one was served without signature and date to due corrupt judge in violation of civil code §2030.250 attorney required to sign and date discovery.

Petitioners were sanction for “ FILING DISCOVERY SET ONE ON AUGUST 30, 2016 AND ORDEDED ON SEPTEMEBER 29, 2016 TO FILE DISCOVEY RESPONSE NO LATER THAN OCTOBER 10, 2016 DUE TO CORRUPT JUDGE BROWN WHO IS RETARTED TO SANCTION”

Judge Hereshy bulling and using thereat to be arrested if petitioners refuse to continue fake trial be arrested, counted with fake trial due to public corruption. Denying attorney, denying witness, denying to cross examining responded, denying to take deposition, using perjured document to continue trial. Informing petitioners it dose not matter if Small Claims Court made order. Another court can also make another order. Denying exhibits of responded, denying taking deposition. Using back date documents to continue fake trial dishonesty, criminality, harassment, bullying, terrorizing and conspiring to defraud by Justice System obstruction of justice.

## VIOLTAION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

### FIFTH AMEDMENT RIGHTS

With the above of fake trial petitioners than informed Judge Herashy they will remain quite and would not say anything and use Fifth Amended Rights of the constitution.

“PETITONERS WERE THAN THETETN BY JUDGE HRESHY WITH BAILFF ARREST AND CALLED BAILLIF IN THE COURT WHO SHOULD BY IN THE COURT IN STOOD IN THE COURT ENTIRE FAKE TRIAL”

Rather than get arrested petitioners had no option but to compile and sit in the court for entire fake trial. Judge Hershey also denied petitioner to cross examination and stop petitioner to cross examination

Judge Hershey than continued with fake trial under threat if petitioners continues to assert their rights the will be arrested by bailiff who was standing by.

Petitioners than informed Judge Hershey petitioners will remain silent she denied that and stated

- “YOU CAN USE FIFTH AMEDMENT RIGHTS TO REAMIN SILENT”

Judge Hershey than asked bailiff or sheriff to stand by and refused to request to remain silent involution of Fifth Amendment Rights of the constitution which reads.

*“You have the right to remain silent and not provide information that can incriminate you or affect the outcome your case”*

Fifth Amended rights states you can not tried to two different courts. A default was obtained in the Small Claims Court for unpaid Chiropractor bill with defective proof of service case numbers

Petitioner argued with judge Hershy fake trial can not continue with unpaid Chiropractor bills. Judge Hershey denied petitioners motion sating “NO YOU CAN GO TO MANY COURT AS POSSIABLE AND FAKE TRIAL WIL CPONTINUED”

**Judge Heasrshy violate Fifth Amendment Rights of petitioners by continue right for unpaid Chiropractor bill. Appendix ZF complaint cause of action filed by attorney of records. Appendix order of Small Calims Court. Appendix ZG.**

- Petitioners than informed Judge Hershey you can only choose on one court and that court has entered an order and judgment you can file in another court Judge Hersehy still denied its because of public corruption.

## **VIOLATION OF 14TH AMEDMENT RIGHTS**

### **VIOLATION OF FOURTEEN AMENDMENT RIGHTS**

#### **SECTION 1.**

*“All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws”.*

Petitioners due process rights have violated by judge Brown on case number 34-2013-00153355 granted motion to compel within making order to compel because petitioners' amended opposition with department number filed because petitioners was put of country because motion was **“GRNATED UNOPPOSED”**

After petitioners return to country one month later found an order and field motion to vacate order on October 22, 2014. Motion was unopposed Judge Brown denied the motion because its ***“DENIED UNOPPOSED”***

***“Petitioner's first motion unopposed denied because it was unopposed and unopposed only works for one party only”***

On this petition case number 34-2015-0017787 around October 2015 discovery set one was served to attorney of records. No response was received around December 2015 petitioners filed motion to compel. Motion was unopposed by attorney of records was denied by Judge Brown because it was ***“DENIED UNOPPOSED”***

***“Petitioners second motion unopposed was denied because it was “UNOPPOSED” and unopposed only work for one party only”***

Around February 2016 Petitioners filed another motion to compel for not providing discovery response set one even after filing motion to compel. Motion was unopposed and was denied by Judge Brown because it was ***“DENIED UNOPPOSED”***

***“Petitioners third motion unopposed motion was denied because it was “UNPPOSED” and unopposed only works for one party only.***

**INFACIT NOT EVEN A SINGLE MOTION OF PETEIONERS WERE  
OPPOSED EACH OPPOSITION BY ATTORNEY OF RECORDS WAS  
ONLY TWO LINES OF OPPOSITION.**

**EXAMPLE: APPENDIX ZE AND ZF IS TOW LINE OPPOSITION  
APPENDIX ZE IS 29 PAGES TO VACATE ORDER MOTION TO  
VACATE AN  
ORDER. APPENDIX SM TWO LINE OPPOSITION. WHAT WAS  
OPPSOED PETEIONERS HAS NO IDEA BUT MOTION WAS DENID  
BY JUDGE BROWN.**

**“29 pages motion 2 lines opposition motion denied  
nothing other than public corruption”.**

- Denied attorney representation even on request
- Denying bringing witness
- Denying crossing examination and or bringing witness by respondent
- Denying bringing exhibits
- Refusing to provide and did not provide respondents exhibits
- Providing court documents to respondent only and not to petitioners
- Keeping trial secret and only informing trial to respondent attorney.
- Allowing respondent to tampering with public records by back dating discovery response to July 25, 2016.
- Denying appeal filed in less than one moth order made in December 21, 2016 appeal filed on January 17, 2017 as untimely by Third District Court of Appeal.
- Supreme Court of California rejected appeal in one hour and fifty seven seconds ( 1.57 hours) by clerk not by judge.
- denying jury trial even on request.

Civil Rights Violation civil right was denied because petitioner is protected class by civil rights of an individual are denied or interfered with because of their membership in a particular group or class. Various jurisdictions have enacted statutes to prevent discrimination based on a person's race, sex, religion, age, previous condition of servitude, physical limitation, national origin, and in some instances sexual orientation. Illegally petitioner complaint was sustained without leave to amend as unopposed because plaintiff is minority and white. For several years of filing pleading by defendants and plaintiff was systematically dismiss for being unable to see the opposition was filed or not able to see opposition and amended complaint filed. Plaintiff has no control no to show judges where the opposition was filed to find. Sacramento Superior Court has formed a trend in two others case was dismissing on the same basis or reason demurrer was unopposed while plaintiffs had filed opposition. In another case on October 22, 2014 judge informed plaintiff he can not see the amended complaint filed on December 30, 2013. All the four case that petitioner has knowledge of that judges were unable to documents filed in the court are different minorities and not white. Multiple documents filed in the court in drop sealed box method required to file has been sot and court can not give any answer what has happened which includes petitioner and other minorities' plaintiff has knowledge. The very latest lost documents was on September 30, 2015 motion to demurrer in a different case as of December 15, 2015 court has not been able to enter the motion which was supposed to be hard in November 2015. Petitioner had to file another demurrer on the counter while finding out motion was not entered and plaintiff had filed notice of default. Supervisor Annabel twice promised to petitioner it will be entered and it not lost. Executive office manager Selby also promise to petitioner documents is not lost and it will be returned since petitioner has filed one on the counter. Letter written to Selby about a week ago has not been responded yet. Petitioner and other minorities complaint defendants has filed demurrer all were sustained with leave to

amend. In Narayan vs. Prasad case petitioner filed demurrer court completely denied the demurrer while as in the in this case there time demurrer was filed two were sustained leave to amend and on the third time it has been dismissed unopposed. This shows Sacramento Superior Court has set up vendetta against minorities and petitioner.

### **Violation Equal Protection**

The Equal Protection Clause of the 14th amendment of the U.S. Constitution prohibits states from denying any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. In other words, the laws of a state must treat an individual in the same manner as others in similar conditions and circumstances. A violation would occur, for example, if a state prohibited an individual from entering into an employment contract because he or she was a member of a particular race. The equal protection clause is not intended to provide "equality" among individuals or classes but only "equal application" of the laws. The result, therefore, of a law is not relevant so long as there is no discrimination in its application. By denying states the ability to discriminate, the equal protection clause of the Constitution is crucial to the protection of civil rights.

In this respondent filed three demurrer petitioner was forced by court to file three opposition. Two demurrer were sustained leave amend and third time court sustained without leave to amend.

Narayan vs. City, Kusum vs. SMUD two demurrer were filed one was sustained with, leave to amend and second one was sustained without leave to amend as unopposed while opposition was filed.

Prasad vs. Narayan petitioner filed first demurrer this court denied the demurrer in violation of equal protection. If this court can sustain petitioners and other minorities complaint with leave to amend same should be done when petitioner filed the demurrer but no petitioner demurrer as denied in violation of equal protection.

Same applies to Narayan vs. Prasad defendant did not filed the opposition petitioner's motion to vacate was denied. Defendant filed motion where petitioner filed motion to extend time to file opposition was granted unopposed in violation of equal protection.

IN ONE HAND THIS COURT SUSTAINED DEMURRER NO LEAVE TO AMEND AGAINST PETITIONER ON THE HAND COURT DENIED PETITIONERS DEMURRER IN VIOLATION OF EQUAL PROTECTION BECAUSE OF COLOR OF SKIN, RACE AND NOT WHITE IN VIOLATION OF EQUAL PROTECTION.

ON HAND GRANT DEFENDANTS MOTION UNOPPOSED ON THE DENY PETITIONERS MOTION UNOPPOSED IN VIOLATION OF EQUAL PROTECTION.

Court accepted proof of service on Ali vs. I Design on form POS-030 for summons and complaint and rejected petitioners proof of service that form POS-030 can not be used for proof of service in violation of equal protection.

#### **LEGAL AND FACTUAL ERRORS DUE TO PUBLIC CORRUPTION**

- **Denied attorney representation even on request**
- **Denying to bring witness**
- **Denying to cross examination and or bring witness by respondent**
- **Denying to bring exhibits**
- **Refusing to provide and did not provide respondents exhibits**
- **Providing court documents to respondent only and to petitioners**
- **Keeping trial secret and only informing trial to respondent.**
- **Allowing respondent to tampering with public records by back dating discovery response.**
- **Denying appeal filed in less than one moth order made in December 21, 2016 appeal filed on January 17, 2017 as untimely by Third District Court of Appeal.**
- **Supreme Court of California rejected appeal in one hour and fifty seven seconds ( 1.57 hours) by clerk not by judge.**
- **Denying jury trial even on request.**
- ♣. **PETIONERS MOTION TO EXTEND TO FILE OPPOSITION CASE NUMBER 34-2013-00153355 DUE TO THE FACT DATE SELLECTED BY**

RESPONDENT WOULD CONFLICT WITH PETITIONER, PETITIONERS WAS GOING OUT OF COUNTRY. MOTION HAD NO DEPARTMENT NUMBER WAS RETURNED BY TRIAL TO TYPE DEPARTMENT. BY THEN PETITIONERS WAS OUT OF COUNTRY. BY THE TIME PETITIONERS MOTION WAS RETURNED FOR CORRECTION AND FILED AGAIN WITH DEPARTMENT NUMBER PETITIONER WAS ALREADY OUT OF COUNTRY.

ON RETURN PETITIONERS FOUND OUT ORDER GRANTING RESPONDENTS MOTION TO COMPEL BECAUSE IT WAS UNOPPOSED.

♣ PETITIONERS FILED MOTION TO VACATE ORDER MOTION WAS DENIED BECAUSE IT WAS "UNOPPOSED. (JUNGLE LAW OF CA)

♣. PETITIONER FILED TWO MOTIONS TO COMPEL FOR RESPONDED TO FILE DISCOVERY RESPONSE BOTH MOTIONS WERE UNOPPOSED BUT JUDGE DENIED BECAUSE IT WAS UNOPPOSED. (JUNGLE LAW OF CA)

♣. RESPONDED VIOLATED COURT OF JULY 1, 2016 PETITIONERS MOTION TO DISMISS AND SANCTION RESPONDENT MOTION WAS DENIED AND PETITIONERS WERE SANCTIONED FOR RESPONDENT VIOLATING COURT. (JUNGLE LAW OF CA)

♣. RESPONDED WAS ORDERED TO SEND VERIFIED DISCOVERY RESPONSE VIA AN EMAIL APPENDIX U RT-10-18, ON AUGUST 10, 2016. NO VERIFICATION DISCOVERY RESPONSE WAS RECEIVED. AROUND AUGUST 19, 2016 PETITIONERS MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT AND SANCTION RESPONDED FOR VIOLATION OF SECOND COURT ORDER. INSTEAD PETITIONERS WERE SANCTIONED ONCE AGAIN FOR RESPONDED VIOLATING COURT ORDER OF AUGUST 4, 2016 WAS UNOPPOSED BUT DENIED BECAUSE RESPONDED VIOLATED COURT ORDER. (JUNGLE LAW OF CA)

♣. RESPONDED REFUSED TO PROVIDE DISCOVERY SET ONE RESPONSE FROM OCTOBER 2015 UNTIL SEPTEMBER 2016, EVEN

AFTER FLING MULTIPLE MOTION TO COMPEL. COURT CONTINUED TO DENIED FOUR UNOPPOSED, MOTIONS AND VIOLATED TWO COURT ORDERS WAS GRANTED. ((JUNGLE LAW OF CA)

♣. RESPONDENT AND ATTORNEY OF RECORDS VIOLATED DISCOVERY SET TWO SERVED AROUND OCTOBER 2016 AND REFUSED TO PROVIDE RESPONSE AND COURT AGAIN GRANTED LEeway BY NOT DISMISSING COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF SECOND DISCOVERY RESPONSE.

♣. FOR BACK DATING DISCOVERY RESPONSE TO JULY 25, 2017 AND ADMITTING BACK DATING APPENDIX ZI RT7-19. RESPONSE OF DISCOVERY RESPONSE IT WAS ATTACHED TO PETITIONERS MOTION AS PLEADINGS NOT AS EXHIBIT. WITH 3 MOTIONS TO COMPEL ON DECEMBER 2015, JANUARY 2016 AND MAY 2016, COURT CONTINUED TO VIOLATE PETITIONERS RIGHTS BY GIVING LEeway TO RESPONDENT. DISCOVERY RESPONSE ARE NOT FILED WITH COURT AS WELL.

♣. RESPONDENT BACK DATE VERIFICATION THAT WAS NOT FILED WITH COURT ON AUGUST 4, 2016 WHICH WAS NOT FILED WITH COURT.

♣. COURT DENIED PETITIONERS MOTION

♣. JURY OF PEACE GUARANTEED IN THE CONSTITUTION DENIED

♣. DENIED PRETRIAL RECORDS

♣. DENIED TO TAKE DEPOSITION

♣. DENIED WITNESS LIST

♣. DENIED PETITIONERS TO BRING WITNESS

♣. KEEP TRIAL SECRET

♣. PROVIDING COURT DOCUMENTS TO ONE PARTY RESPONDENT ONLY.

♣. ALLOWING AND GIVING LEeway TO RESPONDENT TO FILE PROOF OF SERVICE SEVERAL MONTHS BEFORE COMPLAINT WAS

FILED. COMPLAINT WAS FILED AROUND APRIL 2015 AND CROSS COMPLAINT FILED IN OCTOBER 2015

♣ OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE BY JUDGE CULHANE, HERESHY AND BROWN

♣ VIOLATION OF RULE 8.30 NOT FILING DISCOVERY RESPONSE FROM OCTOBER 2015 UNTIL SEPTEMBER 2016. FOR NO FILING OPPOSITION TWO MOTION TO COMEPL. NOT FILING OPPOSITION MOTION TO VACATE. FILING PROOF OF SERVICE SEVERAL MONTHS BEFORE COMPLAINT WAS FILED. DENYING UNOPPOSED MOTION OF PETITIONERS, FILING PROOF OF SERVICE TEN MONTHS BEFORE CROSS COMPLAINT WAS FILED LYING UNDER OATH APPENDIX ZA.

NOT SIGNING AND DATING DISCOVERY SET ONE APPENDIX O.

MAKING AND FALSE DECLARATION PETITIONERS WERE SERVED APPENDIX R. EVERY PROOF OF SERVICE DEFECTIVE ENTIRE PROOF SERVICE WAS LEFT OVER IN THE FRONT. LYING UNDER OATH EMAIL THAT WAS APPENDIX W

♣ TAMPERING WITH PUBLIC RECORDS BACK DATING DISCOVERY RESPONSE SET ONE TO JULY 25, 2016. THAN SENDING VERIFICATION AFTER AUGUST 10, 2016. APPENDIX T RT 10-18 COURT ORDERED ON AUGUST TO SEND VERIFICATION DISCOVERY SET WAS NOT RECEIVED "AUGUST 10, 2016" ALSO BACK DATED.

AFTER ORAL ARGUMENT COURT MADE ORDER TO EMAIL ON AUGUST 10, 2016. ATTORNEY OF RECORDS AND RESPONDED BOTH VIOLATED SECOND COURT ORDER BY MAILING VERIFICATION APPENDIX ZK NOTICE FROM POST OFFICE SEPTEMBER 1, 2016

TAMPERING WITH PUBLIC RECORD IS CRIME BUT DUE PUBLIC CORRUPTION IT DOES NOT MATTER WITH TRIAL COURT, THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL AND SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA. APPENDIX ZF ATTORNEY, CLERK AND JUDGE HAD BEEN CHARGED HAD BEEN CHARGED BUT NOT IN CALIFORNIA.

APPENDIX T RT 7-19 ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDED ADMITTED TAMRING WIH PUBLIC RECORDS DISCOVERY RESPONSE WAS BACKED TO JULY 25, 2016 THAT WAS ATTAHCED TO PETEIONEERS MOTION AND SERVED TO PETITIONERS.

♣ VIOLATION OF DISCOEVRY ACT CIVIL CPOSDE §2030-260 SET ONE WAS RESPONDED AROUND SEPTEMEBER 2016 ALMOST ELEVEN MONTHS LATER. SET TWO WAS RESPPONDED AFTER ALMOST FOUR MONTHS LATER. DISCOVERYY ACT STATES RESPOSNE SHOULD BE MADE IN THIRTY DAYS. DISOCEVRY SET ONE WAS DUE ON NOVEMBER 2015 AND SET TWO WAS DUE IN NOVEMBER 2016.

♣. VIOALTION OF CIVIL CODE §2030.80 DISCOVERY RESPONSE ARE NOT FILED WITH COURT BUT ATTORNEY OF RECORDS AND RESPONDENET FILED IT WITH COURT REFUSING TO RESONSE FOR ELEVEN MONTHS, THREE MOTIONS TO COMPEL AND VIOTION OF TWO COURT ORDERS.

♣. VIOLATIONCVIVL CODE §230.80 ATTORNEY IS SUPPSOED TO SIGN AND DATE ENTIRE DISCOEVRY. APPENDIX W WAS SERVED TO PETITIONERS WITHOUT SIGNATURE AND DATE.

♣. TAMPERING WITH EVIDENCE ATTORNEY WAS PROVIDE COURT DOCUMNTES ON MARCH 20, 2017 . HE FAILED TO DISCLOUSE TO JUDGE IT WAS GIVEN TO HIM IN THE MORNING AS ALL PARTIE'S WERE LEVING DEPARTMENT 47. MAKING FALES PROOF OF SERVICE DOCUMENST WERE SERVED AND NOT EVEN SINGLE DOCUMENTS WAS SERVED. APPENDIX Z

♣. VIOLATION OF CVIL PROCEDURE CODE 432.10.

ATTORNEY OF RECORDS AND RESPONDED VIOLTED BY LIVNG ENTIRE DCOUMENTS IN THE FRONT DOOR AND FILING FALSE PROOF SERVICE THEY WERE SERVED. APPENDIX Z IS DECLARATION FROM THE MANAGER OF THE FACILITY PAYAL WAS GETTING

TREATMNT SEVERAL WEEKS BEFEORE ONE OF THE DOCOUMNT  
PRESUMED TO BE SERVED WITHOUT INDEFINITE TIME PAYAL  
WOULD RETRUN HOME AFTER TREATMENT. ATTORNEY OF  
RECORDS STATE IN OPPSITION AT THE BOTTOM OF APPENDIX V  
AND COURT ACCEPTED. APPENDIX WAS ATTCAHED AS AN EXHIBIT  
FOR THE PURPOSE OF INFORMING COURT AND JUDGE SECOND  
COURT WAS VIOLTED DATED AUGUTS 10, 2016 TO SHOW TO COURT  
EMAILS RECEIVED BY PETEIONERS FROM AUGUST 11, 2016 TO 17 NO  
EMAILM WAS RECEIVED FROM ATTORENY OF RECORDS. APPENDIX  
U COURT ORDERD ATTORNEY TO SEND VERFICATION VIA AN  
EMAIL.

### **REASON PETITION SHOULD BE GRANTED**

Due to the fact ***"IREPABLE DAMAGES"*** caused to petitioners court  
judges and court. Due to the fact of **"OPEN PUBLIC CORRUPTION"**  
Due to the fact of **"CORRUPT JUDGES"**. To stamp out all forms of public  
corruption and corrupt judges which started in 1998 fake jury panel, followed  
by group employment discrimination case of 2008, many other case of  
minorities and this case day naked public corruption which engulfed like  
cancer in 1998, that changed to aids in 2008 and in March 20, 2017 which it  
changed to ***"WHITE COLLAR AIDS CREATED BY JUDGES"***.

To remove all forms of public corruption and corrupt judges. To eradicate  
entire forms of corrupt judges. To stamp out all forms of public corruption  
and corrupt judges.

EVEN THERE IS REPORTES TRANSCRIPT DUE TO FAKE TRIAL  
CORRPUT JUDGES AND COURT. ATTORNEY OF RECORDED STATED  
HE DID NOT FILE RESPOISNE TO CROSS COMPLAINT. ATTORENY OF  
RECORDS COMMITED PEJURY IN TWO HIS DENIAL HE DID FILE  
RESPOSNE BECAUSE CROSS COMPALINT WAS DIMSISSED AND HE  
DID FILE RESPONSE, SECONDLY ATTORNEY COMMITED PERJURY

IN HIS DELATION UNDER PEANLTY OF PERJURY DENIAL OF  
CROSS COMAPLINT WAS SERVED ON JANUARY 15, 2015 SOME NINE  
MONTHS BEFORE CROSS COMPALINT AND THREE MONTHS  
BEFEORE COMPLAINT WAS FILED. "COMPLANT BY ATTORNEY OF  
RECORDS WAS FILED ON APRIL 13, 2015 PROFF OF SERVICE IS DATE  
JANUARAY 15, 2015 APPENDIX ZJ" ENTIRE PROOF OF SEVRICE IS  
FALSE AND NEITEHR OF PETEIONERER'S WAS PROPERLY SERVED  
BUT DOCUMENTS WAS LEFT IN THE FRONT DOOR.

"APPEDNDICX Z PETITONER PAYAL WAS NOT HOME SEVERAL  
WEEKS PRIOR AND SEVERAL WEEKS AFTER PROOF OF SERVCIE  
AFTER BUT WAS AT A TREATMENT FACILITY". THIRD PERJURY  
COMMITTED BY RESPONDED AND ATTORNEY OF RECORDS

***"OPEN AND NAKED PUBLIC CORRUPTION CORRUPT  
JUDGES CORRUPT ATTORNEY AND COURT"***

Naked and open public in the court is worst than COVID-19 and Supreme  
Court has to step stop giving birth COVID-20 No 2 by stopping all forms of  
public corruption in our courts.

In 1998 Sacramento Superior public corruption Fake Jury Panel public  
corruption become **"CANCER"**

In 2008 fake trial of group employment discrimination firing of 5 Indians  
changed public corruption into **"AIDS:"**

In 2017 aids changed in to **"COVID-19 "SECRET TRIAL"**

So far Supreme Court has allowed this to continue from cancer to aids to  
COVID-19 and.if Supreme Court dose acts now it will give birth to COVID 20  
No 2 and so on.

In a simple term most of the judges think once they are appointed they  
own the bench and at some they will die that bench will them go to grave  
yard but corrupt judges without take their sin with them.

Detail history are entire naked public corruption most of the judges dose not want the follows laws passed by congress are and as long as I am the **"THE HELL GOES LAWS"**

Detail history are the reason petition should be granted to avoid giving will to birth to second **COVID -20 No 2** which will be worst than COVID-19 if Supreme Court dose not act now Appendix RT 6

**NAKED AND PUBLIC CORRUPTION**

**DOUBLE STANDARD LAWS**

**COURT ORDER VIOLATION BY ATTORNEY**

**LYING BY DEPARTMENT 59**

**OPEN PUBLIC CORRUPTION**

**(FULLY CORRUPT JUDGE CULHANE)**

**VIOLATION OF SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHT**

**(DENYING COUNSEL)**

**FULLY CORRUPT JUDGE HERSHEY**

**JUDGE HERSHEY RESPONDED YOU ARE NOT ALLOWED TO ATTORNEY.**

**NO WITNESS ALLOWED**

**NO EXHIBITS**

**VIOLATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS**

**(FIFTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS)**

**VIOLATION OF 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHTS**

**(SECTION 1)**

**VIOLATION OF EQUAL PROTECTION**

Rest attach is history of public corruption in detail so understand each and every things stated very carefully.

Most of American court and judges are fully corrupted not all but most of them so Supreme Court duty to stop forms of public corruption. Due to ongoing public corruption in courts innocent public are suffering.

Supreme Court highest court of the land can not allow public corruption, corrupt court and corrupt judges and corrupt DOJ to continue.

Petitioners are not only victim of public corruption petitioner Mr. Narayan has unlimited number of times victim of public corruption in California Court and in US Court.

Petitioners have knowledge following who are also victim of public corruption in Sacramento Superior Court.

1. Ali vs. I Design Anwar Ali same court accepted amended response complaint after 12 months or so on cross compliant filed after 18 months late to name so on.


2. Alma Thomas 16 year's old Filipino boy died in Methodist Hospital entire jury hand picked were from same hospital 16 years old boy died.

3. Kusum vs. Eskaton workers compensation case. Kusum was compel to use strangers medical report for Qualified Medical evaluation,, after 12 years later granted Eskaton's motion to deny injury, Kusum not allowed to take deposition, Kusum not allowed to bring witness, Kusum not allowed to obtain new QME with full injured body parts, denied to obtain supplement medical report so on.

4. Kusum vs. California illegal U turn was never provide Fiji/Hindi translator but Punjabi which is not her language Kusum dose not speak, write, reads or understands Punjabi language.

Many more are there and can be provide if Supreme Court needs it's our courts are so corrupted.

DATED: November 19, 2018

Respectfully submitted,  
S/ PRAKASH NARAYAN  
S/ PAYAL NARAYAN  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Petitioners/ Appellant  
Forma Pauperis