App. "1"

Ed Clark

From:	Ed Clark
Sent:	Monday, May 4, 2026 10:16 AM
To:	'RICHARD BROVER'
Cc:	'hbblonde911@yahoo.com'
Subject:	RE: Settlement - Evidence Code protected offer
Attachments:	response to 4-30-2026 email.pdf

Mr. Brover,

Please see attached response to your 4-30-2026 email

Edward L. Clark, Jr.
5582 McFadden Avenue
Huntington Beach, CA 92649
Cell: 714-448-7145 Office 714-903-4944
www.TheElectricalExpert.com
This message is being sent unsecure

From: RICHARD BROVER <rdb350@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2026 1:01 PM
To: Ed Clark <ed@theelectricalexpert.com>
Subject: Settlement - Evidence Code protected offer

Hello Mr. Clark.

Stephen Bannon of the White House said in early 2018, (a few months before your two-day trial in front of Commissioner Michaelson):

"The Democrats don't matter. The real opposition is the media. And the way to deal with them is to **flood the zone with s**t.**" [emphasis supplied]

Mr. Clark, you had your "day in Court." Two days in 2018. You can flood the Courts with whatever you want to call it, but the bottom line is that the Courts have consistently ruled against you. It is not a conspiracy; it is not collusion. You did **not** pay $1 million to your former wife. You paid $850,000 *and were given credit for that sum.* The "breach of contract" that you claim has already been litigated, and you lost. Furthermore, there is no case to appeal, as the Court Order rendered on February 26, 2019, is valid, was appealed, and that decision was rendered on **June 25, 2025**. Your claim that Court decisions are "void" is **not YOUR determination to make.** It has already been made by the Court of Appeal, and the California Supreme Court declined to change that decision. Those are Court decisions that were the result of your requests, which you, *yourself*, have provided.

Your assertion that the Family Law Court lacks jurisdiction after 10 years has no merit. The Court of Appeal noted that as well, indicating that your actions were "frivolous" – and that you might be deemed a vexatious litigant. You were deemed a vexatious litigant on January 16, 2026. Continued litigation is an abuse of process.

It is suggested that you settle by paying what you owe. You kept the house, and it is a valuable asset. You owe your former wife, and you had a two-day trial in 2018, during which you were represented by counsel. The Courts ruled against you. You appealed to the Court of Appeal three times in that particular case. You have provided copies of those decisions attached to your United States Supreme Court brief. My office has entered an appearance in your US Supreme Court case. That case might cause a delay, but do you really think that four Justices will grant your *writ of certiorari*?

You sued in civil court, and that case was settled by a dismissal with prejudice, *also referred to by the Court of Appeal*. **The time to appeal or challenge those decisions has passed**.

There is no Statute of Limitations issue. To suggest that after 10 years, you could stop paying on a 30-year obligation is equivalent to suggesting that after 10 years on a 30-year mortgage (deed of trust), the obligation has somehow *ended*. Your obligation, per the Judgment of Dissolution, was for periodic payments over 30 years. The Commissioner, to whom your counsel stipulated, calculated and specified the number of payments, all of which came due by March 1, 2024.

There will be enforcement, but you could pay an additional $600,000 and settle to avoid further litigation. That is significantly less than the amount that you in fact owe, and interest accrues at 10%, which will be about $5000 per month. The baseless litigation seems to be a "hobby" for you: *practicing* law. Neither you nor Mr. Pugh are attorneys. Before the real litigation begins, you are urged to settle this case.

While the litigation that you do create is inexpensive to you, in that all that you are incurring is Court filing fees, or seeking a fee waiver from the US Supreme Court, the result will be that the FINDINGS AND ORDER AFTER HEARING from 2019 was and is enforceable. It has already been enforced against Chase Bank. (You did obtain a $500,000 loan against your real property office a month *before* the first Abstract was recorded, but you do have other assets,

This entire email is an offer of settlement and compromise protected by the California Evidence Code. It cannot be recited, used, and/or referred to unless you comply with its terms. **The offer to pay an additional $600,000, by its own terms, will expire 14 days from the date this email was sent.** It is also based upon the assumption that at least the amount of $11,858.08, minus your claimed $3979 Social Security benefit, will be paid to the Sheriff from Chase Bank.

Please be governed accordingly.

Richard D. Brover

App. “2”

May 4, 2026

Richard Brover
Deborah L Clark
350 Redondo Ave.
Long Beach, Ca

Re Clark vs Grover/Clark
30-2025-01530857-CU-CO-CJC
Clark vs Clark
05D000275

NOTICE OF EXTORSION/BANK FRAUD/ ABUSE OF PROCESS

Mr. Grover,

Please be advised your email received on 4/30/2025 does not state any legal authority to be a confidential document. It appears to be merely an effort to continue your threat using the family law division to extort money on a case no longer at issue since 3/21/2016.

There is no legal authority that protects an email used to try to cover up extorsion. While you failed to cite any legal authority, it is irrelevant, it would not shield criminal activity, and threats coupled with demands for money, especially based on illegal or "VOID demands—constituting extorsion rather than legitimate settlement negotiations.

Furthermore, your email is riddled with false information, irrelevant to your Breach of the 7/12/2021 Joint Stipulation "Private settlement contract" AND the 3/21/2016 Private Debt Settlement Contract your client has already concluded is valid and enforceable. I have attached the 7/12/2021 to refresh your memory what your client agreed to in a private contract the family court refused to merge into the record.

However I do appreciate your judicial admission surrounding the execution of 7/12/2021 joint stipulation executed "TO SETTLE CASE. , your understanding the breach of contract case was settled with prejudice as agreed by both parties resulting from both parties agreeing to the terms of settlement clearly outlined in 7/12/2021 private Settlement contract "JOINT STIPULATION TO SETTLE CASE" the family court refused to merge into the record.

Please advised, your email is not protected from disclosure, rather will be used as evidence of yours and your clients illegal activity of Extorsion

In answer to your question, I do believe in our judicial system, I would like to think, the judicial misconduct with local state court judges is not a reflection on the our judicial system as a whole, So yes, I do believe the Justices in the US Supreme court will enforce the law and uphold long standing precedence of VOD orders issued in a court without subject matter jurisdiction is merely a nullity,

You have exposed your client to being an accomplice to very serious Federal Crimes. I suggest you immediately vacate all orders in family court to avoid getting in any deeper.

Please read attachment closely what your client executed, (Leading Document) in order to dismiss first breach of contract action with prejudice as agreed, to prevent a judgment from being entered on your clients credit report.

Next, revisit your false claim:

1. Your claim there is no statute of limitation on a 30-year commitment is a false statement since you failed to mention your client asked to settle case in exchange for $1,000,000. To suggest she only got $850, 000 when a $1,000,000 wire was deposited in her account is just Fraud on the court and just you flat out lying.
2. There is no statute of limitation to challenge subject matter jurisdiction,
3. Since you appear to not understand the statute of limitation for private settlement contracts, it is 4-years for written contracts and 2-years for oral contracts. In both cases, you or your client has never filed a summons/complaint in civil court.
4. Furthermore, you continue to disregard, the undisputable material fact your client not only executed the 3/21/2016 debt settlement agreement, the 7/12/2021 joint stipulation, but made three request to family court to dismiss case and one request asking the court to enter settlement documents into the record. Consequently, both contracts survive as private settlement contracts governed by the California Code of Civil Procedure CCP 664.6 whereby family court does not have subject matter jurisdiction over private settlement contracts, concluding all enforcement issues would require a new summons/complaint in civil court.

Just as a side note to document how distraught and desperate you appear to be, you make a statement in your email, suggesting I lost the first breach of contract case, yet you lie about your client only receiving $ 850,000, you make no argument on why then she got $1,000,000 wired on 4/15/2016 in strict compliance with the $1,000,000 required in 3/21/2016 contract. Furthermore, you fail to make any mention of the terms contained in the joint stipulation your client requested the family court to merge into the record, stating the order issues 4/17/2018 in family court was a breach of conract.

If you care to respond, please advise:

1. Why you refuse to address the fact family court does not have subject matter jurisdiction over private settlement contracts
2. Why you refuse to acknowledge your clients actions executing a joint stipulation 7/12/2021 in front of a superior court judge under oath, and asking family court to enter into the record.

The undisputed facts are you have no defense. You can not provide any authority that circumvents CCP 664.6 that dictates family court does not have subject matter jurisdiction over private settlement contracts not merged into the family court judgment.

PLEASE BE ADVISED YOUR EMAIL IS NOT A PROTECTED SETTLEMENT OFFER, AS YOU HAVE COMMITTED BANK FRAUD, AND ARE TRYING TO EXTORT A SETTLEMENTT USING A VOID ABSTRACT OF JUDGMENT PROCURRED BY FRAUD, IN A COURT WITHOUT SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION OVER PRIVATE SETTLEMENT CONTRACTS

Sincerely,

Edward L Clark

Edward L. Clark Jr.
5582 McFadden Ave.
Huntington Beach, Calif. 92649
In proper. (714) 448-7145

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE

Edward L Clark Jr., Plaintiff, vs. Deborah L Clark. Defendant	Case No.: 30-2019-01087758-CU-BC-CJC Presiding Judge: The Hon. Gregory Lewis **JOINT STIPULATION TO SETTLE CASE** Date: July 14,2021 Time: 10:30 am Department : C-26

TO THE HONORABLE PRESIDING JUDDGE GREGORY LEWIS, THE COURT, ALL INTERESTED PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED, by and between Plaintiff Edward L.Clark Jr. and Defendant Deborah L. Clark that good cause exist and the parties request this court to vacate its order entered 4/26/21 and enter the proposed final judgment and order attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference as Exhibit "A".as the Final Judgment and Order.

1.The agreement entered by and between the parties to enter judgment is below in this joint stipulation:

A. The contract entered between the Parties (Debt Settlement Agreement dated 3/21/2016) is a Valid contract entered by the parties

B. The 3/21/2016 Contract is enforceable

C. Therefore the family law minute order issued 10/12/2018 on case 05D000275 pursuant to the terms contained in the 3/21/2016 is not enforceable, therefore void.

D. Defendant Breached 3/21/2016 contract.

E. As a condition to settle case in an effort to mitigate additional litigation costs both parties release the other party of any and all damages.

2. The Settlement Agreement entered between the parties (proposed final judgment Exhibit "A") provides for inter alia, the filing of Final Judgment and Order pursuant to stipulation.

3: The proposed Final Judgment represents an agreed resolution of disputed claims and is entered into ~~an~~ in order to avoid protracted and expensive litigation.

4. The parties do not waive any personal jurisdiction offenses or defenses it may have in other cases by entering this agreement.

GW

Respectively Submitted,

Date: 7/12/21

Edward L. Clark; Plaintiff In – Proper

DATE 7-12-21

Deborah L. Clark Defendant In – Proper

App. “3”

MARRIAGE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT ENTERED AUGUST 31, 2006

DEBT SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Debt Settlement Agreement (the "Agreement") is entered into as of March 21, 2016. The parties to this Agreement are as follows:

Debtor(s): Edward L. Clark Jr.

Creditor(s): Deborah L. Clark

The Creditor(s) and Debtor(s) agree to negotiate and settle the debt under the following terms and conditions.

The Creditor(s) and Debtor(s) agree that the current outstanding debt is $1,323,775.50. All parties agree that the Creditor(s) will accept a check payment of $1,000,000.00 toward settlement of the debt in full. The Creditor(s) agree to compromise the debt under the condition that they will receive the payment by April 10, 2016.

If the Debtor(s) fail to send in the amount agreed by April 10, 2016, the Creditor(s) shall immediately demand the payment of the original amount owed by the Debtor(s).

This Agreement for debt settlement shall be binding upon the Creditor(s), Debtor(s) and their successors and assignees.

The parties have agreed to settle finally and forever any and all claims between them of any nature whatsoever from any and all liability or damages of any kind, known or unknown, in contract or in tort.

WAIVER OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE, SECTION 1542. The foregoing release extends to all claims whether or not claimed or suspected and constitutes a waiver of each and all the provisions of the California Civil Code, Section 1542 (to the extent it would be applicable), which reads as follows:

> **A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS WHICH THE CREDITOR(S) DO NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN THEIR FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY THEM MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED THEIR SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR(S).**

RELEASORS HAVE READ AND UNDERSTOOD THE FOREGOING AND INDICATE THAT FACT BY PLACING THEIR INITIALS, OR THE INITIALS OF AN AUTHORIZED AGENT, BELOW:

____

Deborah L. Clark

Edward L. Clark Jr.

RELEASORS, AND EACH OF THEM, UNDERSTAND AND ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE SIGNIFICANCE AND CONSEQUENCE OF THIS WAIVER OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE, SECTION 1542, IS THAT EVEN IF THEY SHOULD EVENTUALLY SUFFER ADDITIONAL DAMAGES ARISING OUT OF THE FACTS REFERRED TO ABOVE, THEY WILL NOT BE ABLE TO MAKE ANY CLAIM FOR THOSE DAMAGES. FURTHERMORE, RELEASORS, AND EACH OF THEM, ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THEY WILL NOT BE ABLE TO MAKE ANY CLAIM FOR DAMAGES EVEN AS TO CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES THAT MAY EXIST AS OF THE DATE OF THIS RELEASE BUT WHICH THEY DO NOT KNOW EXIST, AND WHICH, IF KNOWN, WOULD MATERIALLY AFFECT THEIR DECISIONS TO EXECUTE THIS AGREEMENT, REGARDLESS OF WHETHER THEIR LACK OF KNOWLEDGE IS THE RESULT OF IGNORANCE, OVERSIGHT, ERROR, NEGLIGENCE, OR ANY OTHER CAUSE. RELEASORS COVENANT AND AGREE THAT THEY WILL FOREVER REFRAIN AND FOREBEAR FROM BRINGING, COMMENCING OR PROSECUTING ANY AND ALL ACTIONS, LAWSUITS, CLAIMS OR PROCEEDINGS WITH RESPECT TO ANY MATTER THAT HAS BEEN RELEASED HEREIN. FURTHER, IT IS EXPRESSLY UNDERSTOOD AND AGREED BY RELEASORS, THAT THE FACTS WITH RESPECT TO WHICH THIS AGREEMENT IS GIVEN MAY HEREINAFTER TURN OUT TO BE OTHER THAN OR DIFFERENT FROM THE FACTS IN THAT CONNECTION NOW KNOWN OR BELIEVED BY SAID PARTY TO BE TRUE, AND SAID PARTY EXPRESSLY ASSUMES A RISK OF THE FACTS TURNING OUT TO BE SO DIFFERENT, AND AGREES THAT THIS AGREEMENT SHALL BE IN ALL RESPECTS EFFECTIVE AND NOT SUBJECT TO TERMINATION OR RESCISSION BY REASON OF ANY DIFFERENCE IN THE FACTS.

The parties agree that the terms of this Agreement are the result of negotiations between the parties, and constitute a final accord and satisfaction concerning all disputes between them.

All settlement terms herein are dependent upon receipt of final payment by way of check in the amount of $1,000,000.00 to the Creditor(s)' account.

Except only to enforce the terms of this Agreement, each party agrees not to bring any claim of any kind against the other party to this Agreement concerning any matter released by this Agreement. Each party further agrees that this Agreement constitutes a bar to any such future claim.

The parties agree the terms and conditions of this Agreement shall remain confidential, and that no party shall release any part of this Agreement unless the Agreement is subpoenaed or to their own accountants or legal counsel.

All parties agree the other parties are free of any liability or wrongdoing. Any liability or wrongdoing is expressly denied. Furthermore, the parties each agree that neither shall disparage the other to any third party at any time.

No modification to any provisions contained in this Agreement shall be binding upon any party unless made in writing and signed by all parties.

If any provision of this Agreement is held to be unenforceable for any reason, the remaining parts of the Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.

Each party represents he or it has not assigned any portion of the claims released under this Agreement to any third party.

This Agreement shall be construed in accordance with California law.

This Agreement constitutes a single, integrated written contract expressing the entire agreement of the parties to this Agreement. Any other agreements, discussions, promises, and representations have been and are integrated into and superseded by this Agreement.

Each party represents him/herself or it has authority to enter into Agreement on behalf of his/her or its respective organization.

Upon receipt and subsequent clearance of the agreed upon payment, all parties release each other from any further claim or liability.

Signature: ______________________ Date: 3/21/2016
Edward L. Clark Jr.

Signature: ______________________ Date: 3-21-16
Deborah L. Clark

CALIFORNIA ALL- PURPOSE
CERTIFICATE OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of California }

County of Orange }

On March 21, 2016 before me, Alyssa R. Copeland, notary public,
(here insert name and title of the officer)

personally appeared Edward L. Clark Jr. and Deborah L. Clark

who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Notary Public Signature (Notary Public Seal)

ALYSSA R. COPELAND
Commission No. 2101209
NOTARY PUBLIC-CALIFORNIA
ORANGE COUNTY
My Comm. Expires FEBRUARY 23, 2019

ADDITIONAL OPTIONAL INFORMATION

DESCRIPTION OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT

Debt Settlement Agreement
(Title or description of attached document)

(Title or description of attached document continued)

Number of Pages 3 Document Date 03/21/16

CAPACITY CLAIMED BY THE SIGNER

- ☐ Individual (s)
- ☐ Corporate Officer

(Title)

- ☐ Partner(s)
- ☐ Attorney-in-Fact
- ☐ Trustee(s)
- ☐ Other

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THIS FORM

This form complies with current California statutes regarding notary wording and, if needed, should be completed and attached to the document. Acknowledgments from other states may be completed for documents being sent to that state so long as the wording does not require the California notary to violate California notary law.

- State and County information must be the State and County where the document signer(s) personally appeared before the notary public for acknowledgment.
- Date of notarization must be the date that the signer(s) personally appeared which must also be the same date the acknowledgment is completed.
- The notary public must print his or her name as it appears within his or her commission followed by a comma and then your title (notary public).
- Print the name(s) of document signer(s) who personally appear at the time of notarization.
- Indicate the correct singular or plural forms by crossing off incorrect forms (i.e. he/she/they, is /are) or circling the correct forms. Failure to correctly indicate this information may lead to rejection of document recording.
- The notary seal impression must be clear and photographically reproducible. Impression must not cover text or lines. If seal impression smudges, re-seal if a sufficient area permits, otherwise complete a different acknowledgment form.
- Signature of the notary public must match the signature on file with the office of the county clerk.
  - Additional information is not required but could help to ensure this acknowledgment is not misused or attached to a different document.
  - Indicate title or type of attached document, number of pages and date.
  - Indicate the capacity claimed by the signer. If the claimed capacity is a corporate officer, indicate the title (i.e. CEO, CFO, Secretary).