no merit to the allegation (Tp.66, Ln.3-8). Then, contrary to her actions, Danielle testified that we were intimate a few weeks later (Tp.165, Ln.1-9).

• • •

Rocket: Huh?

Frank: Don't ask. I'm still lost on that one.

• • •

¶187 Strange, yes, I know. By now, it should be easy to discern that Danielle's loyalties vacillated back-and-forth until Scott convinced her that the baby she was carrying was his [¶122]. Wish I could have seen the look on her face when paternity was established while I was out on bond. Especially since her vanity left her no other choice but to proceed as Scott planned. That should explain, in part, why her guilty conscience spoke to my sister [¶125].

¶188 Reader, please note that the Bill of Particulars (Exhibit-02) and the Indictment (Exhibit-25) are VOID of the October 20th allegation, [49] [¶579, 10, iii], and Danielle testified that there were no problems with our relationship until then (Tp.88, Ln.4-6). If this was true, and she was intimate with me again, then

> **Q**: Why was the case signed in for invest with Dr. LeSure nearly a month **prior to** October 20th and a week **prior to** the indicted dates of October 1st-3rd?
>
> **A**: Like I said, patient and careful planning.

¶189 As to the incident report Danielle filed at the Montville P.D., it was never made part of my Discovery File. Why? Further, as to the alleged unindicted abuse regarding October 20, 2004, recall the Trial Record reveals that Danielle and the children moved back in with Scott that very day (Exhibit-03: p.12). Why is the so significant? Glad you asked. There are three (3) reasons:

[49] Unindicted allegation #2.

1) State's evidence placed Scott with S.L. on both dates of alleged sexual assault: the indicted date of October 1-3, 2004 *and* the unindicted date of October 20, 2004

2) October 20th went heavily testified to by Danielle and S.L.[50], [¶579, 10, i]. And, although Judge Collier gave the **DIRTY DOZEN** the option of finding me guilty for October 20th with "special findings", the "cynical" Jury found me guilty of October 1-3, 2004, Put-In-Bay, with "no evidence to the contrary. None" [¶136]. We'll probe October 20th and the "special findings" in [¶1115, 1, 2], [¶1125-¶1127]

3) There are other dates, as well. But first, let's go *deeper* [¶958]

• • •

Rocket: Knee deep or ankle deep?

Groot: I am Groot!

["Ha-Ha-Ha!"]

Frank: I can't believe you went there.

Rocket: Hey, I'm just saying what we're all thinking.

Frank: Hmmm. Very well. Then let's have some fun. Bosun Rocket! Ensign Groot! Weigh the anchor, pull the plank, and prepare *The Big Bone* to set sail. We've got a *long* journey ahead of us.

Rocket: Aye, Captain.

Groot: I am Groot!

Rocket: Destination, Sir?

Frank: *The Ankle Atoll.*

Rocket: Aye, Captain. Aye. *The Ankle Atoll*, it is.

---

[50] Implanted/Transplanted Memory #3.

• • •

¶189 Pertaining directly to the alleged F-1 rape of S.L., the abused Trial Record reveals that all three (3) State-investigative agencies unanimously declared Pre-Indictment, that there was neither evidence nor crime. Looking at them one agency at a time...

¶190 Agency #1: Akron Children's Hospital determined that no rape occurred, having found a ***Temple Virgin*** with an

"intact hymen" with "no abnormalities" or "signs of trauma"
(Tp.262-269; Tp.272-278), (Exhibit-14).

Supporting, the Suspected Child Abuse And Neglect Record (Exhibit-17) reveals that S.L. claimed penile-anal penetration. Contradicted by (Exhibit-14), this is yet another Implanted/Transplanted Memory[51] that went unindicted[52] [¶579, 10, i, and iii].

¶191 Looking closer at (exhibit-17), third section from bottom, S.L. stated that her "Brother lives at mother's house-I just visit." From October 20, 2004 to Trial in April-May of 2005, Scott had complete control of S.L.'s body and mind [¶178], [¶179, 3, i], [¶724j, 5], [¶768], [¶856, 3], [¶866], [¶958, 3], [¶965], [¶985, 3],

"approximately fifty times"
(Tp.280)

¶192 Next I have enclosed page-2 of Akron Children's Hospital's Social Work Intake Summary Form (Exhibit-18). Here, S.L. **repeated** to a second State agency that she "heard" that "Frankie raped her" from "mommy" [¶056, 8], [¶1084, 2]. She also said that she saw "pictures of naked men and women" on a computer (See second section from bottom). Yes, this is yet another IMPLANTED/TRANSPLANTED MEMORY [53]

---

[51] Implanted/Transplanted Memory #4.
[52] Unindicted allegation #3.
[53] Implanted/Transplanted Memory #5.

that went unindicted[54], [¶334a, 1, i], [¶579, 10, i, and iii],(Exhibit-19: Letter to OIP; August 31, 2015; p.3, ¶2-¶3).

¶193 In finality, S.L. testified she had no idea as to *who* actually assaulted her on October 20th, and she could not identify me as the perpetrator (Tp.244, Ln.2-17). S.L. further testified that that she was ***not*** afraid of me (Tp.246, Ln.10-21), [¶204], [¶742, Footnote 162].

Wheat from the chaff, People. Wheat from the chaff. Σ

¶194 Now we must delve into the legal ramifications of the Implanted/Transplanted Memories that Scott and Danielle established in the mind of the abused and then discarded S.L. [¶233].

¶195 Under Title 18 U.S.C.S. § 1512 Tampering with a witness, victim, or informant [¶435], [¶663], [¶693], [¶805],

> (b) Whoever knowingly uses intimidation, threatens, or *corruptly persuades* another person, or attempts to do so, or engages in misleading conduct toward another person, with intent to—
>
> (1) *Influence*, delay or prevent the testimony of any person in an official proceeding;
>
> Shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years or both.
>
> (j) If the offense under this section occurs in connection with a trial of a *criminal case*, the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed for the offense shall be the higher of that otherwise provided by law or the maximum term that could have been imposed for any offense charged in such case.
>
> (k) Whoever conspires to commit any offense under this section shall be subject to the *same penalties* as those prescribed for the offense the commission of which was the object of the conspiracy [55] [*Emphasis added*].

¶196 Both Scott and Danielle engaged in the unlawful act of implanting memories under the

---

[54] Unindicted allegation #4.

[55] Conspiracy. A group or combination of people who join together for the purpose of committing an unlawful act. Rothenberg, p.106.

cloak of concealment, in regards to my criminal Trial, with the dual-purpose of putting me in prison as revenge for the affair and to cover up Scott's sins [¶579, 1]. With that said, the undeserved portion of my sentence regarding the alleged F-1 rape is **10-Life**. Yay!

♪ Sweet Caroline! Good times never seemed so good! ♫
-Neil Diamond, *Sweet Caroline*

¶197 Reader, having set the previously laid tiles in their proper place, at this juncture, I encourage you to read (Exhibit-20: Facebook postings of Scott Sadowsky and Danielle Sadowsky "Smith"). True hypocrisy veiled in vanity.

• • •

♫ [Phone rings]

Groot: I am Groot?... I am Groot!... I am Groot... I am Groot.

Frank: Groot, who was that?

Groot: I am Groot.

Frank: What did she say?

Groot: I am Groot.

Frank: Wow! Folks, I'll try not to lose anything in the translation, but evidently *Karma* called and left of a message for those who did this to me. It is as follows:

She's finishing her drink and sharpening her nails.
She said she'll be with you shortly.
-Unknown

Rocket: Woe unto ye!

Frank: Yeah.

Groot: I am Groot.

["She said she'll stay on hold until we are ready."]

Frank: Thanks.

• • •

¶198 Eventually, regarding both allegations, somebody will come forward and call Director Mark Godsey at the Ohio Innocence Project and recant.[56] There is no shame in it, really; and it's a great way to untarnish the soul. Yes, I have heard stories of Government Prosecutors threatening to throw people in prison for perjury (O.R.C. § 2921.11) if they recant. This mobster-strong-arm-tactic is impotent because

1) It is legal to recant under Chapter 31, Motion for new trial; O.R.C. § 31.106, Newly discovered evidence, which, via its case law progeny, declares that

"The alleged recantation by a witness is
a form of newly discovered evidence."

2) **Statute** of limitations for perjury is six (6) years, and Trial was over a decade ago.

¶199 Reader, like I said, we are about to test the mettle of many [¶014].

¶200 With the above wheat sifted from the chaff, it's time to continue on with Agencies #2 and #3.

¶201 Agency #2: The Office of Medina County Job & Family Services/Children's Services sent the Medina County Prosecutor's Office a letter stating there was

"no evidence to support the allegations of sexual abuse"
(Tp.346, Ln.11),

and that they **"closed"** the case against me (Tp.339, Ln.11), [¶233]. Supporting, as their office *never* interviewed me (Tp.346, Ln.25-Tp.347, Ln.1), [¶468], [¶526], it is simply obvious they saw no need. Had they done so, I would have gladly attended the meeting, for I am still willing to do so.

---

[56] Recant. (16c) 2. To withdraw or renounce prior statements or testimony formally or publicly... Garner, p.1459.

¶202 Alas! It was a true injustice when the EXCULPATORY AND EXONERATING LETTER from Children's Services surfaced in a sidebar conference[57] without my knowing, only to be *illegally suppressed*[58] [¶579, 12] by Court and State (Exhibit-21: Tp.341-347) when Atty. Green sought to question this witness: Tricia Carchedi, because the letter was "inconsistent with what she testified to" (ibid) (Tp.341, Ln.9-23).

¶203 Let it be known that this EXCULPATORY AND EXONERATING EVIDENCE [¶526] that Children's Services forwarded to the Prosecutor's Office was *never* made part of my Discovery. Illegally withheld and suppressed, this is a valid evidentiary violation according to Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), (See Exhibits-84 and 85), its progeny, and Crim.R.16, [¶724a-¶724o].

¶204 In my original Discovery there was a form from Job & Family Services regarding S .L. stating she was "very nervous due to her father's presence" (Exhibit-19: OIP; August 31, 2015: p.3, ¶3). Although this form is long gone, S.L.'s *nervousness* should have been an indicator to the source of them problem. Yeah, they missed it. Now, as previously stated, and to the contrary, S.L. testified that she was **not** afraid of me (Tp.246, Ln.20-21, [¶193], [¶972, 13], [¶1038, 3].

¶205 Agency #3: After months of badgering by Danielle (Tp.94, Ln.1-7), on January 11, 2005 S.L. finally gave in and told Danielle the story Scott wanted her to hear (Tp.94, Ln.8-9), [¶768, 2], [¶965]. Actively pursuing charges against me **under Scott's orders** (Tp.169, Ln.18-Tp.170, Ln.2), [¶120], [¶242], [¶245], [¶579, 4], [¶856, 2], (Exhibit-19: Letter to OIP; August 31, 2015; bottom of p.3 to top of p.4), on this day, Danielle went to the Montville P.D. for the **second** time alone (Tp.170, Ln.11-19), [¶186], [¶578, 4], [¶781, 2].

---

[57] Sidebar conference. (1925) 1. A discussion among the judge and counsel... outside the jury's hearing. Garner, p.1592.

[58] Illegally suppressed evidence #1.

¶206 **As to this event,** Scott admitted he took **"no action"** again (Tp.206, Ln.19-21), [¶245], [¶856, 2]. Why? It was most certainly not due to excellent parenting skills.

¶207 The following day, on January 12, 2005, Montville P.D. interviewed Danielle and S.L. with Job & Family Services (Tp.65, Ln.18-24). Montville then interviewed me on February 16, 2005 (Tp.57, Ln.1-5) without the presence of counsel and searched my home on Poe Road without a warrant (both of my own volition). Eventually their office **"terminated"** the case against me and shared their negative findings with Job & Family Services (Tp.350-351), [¶469], [¶579, 9] Σ.

¶208 The Montville P.D. police report that confirmed the termination of my case surfaced during Trial (Tp.70, Ln.17), confirming **"No charges were brought"** (Tp.74, Ln.23). Per the testimony of Officer McCourt, not only did he *refuse* to charge me **twice** [¶186], his "sergeant" also *refused* to charge me and **"terminated"** the case against me (Tp.74, Ln.13-23).

¶209 When Lead-counsel Green sought to get into the "inconsistencies" of the police report that Off. McCourt was testifying to (Tp.79-80), Pros. Eisenhower objected (Tp.70, Ln.23), fearful Atty. Green would "impeach"[59] the State's first witness (Tp.71, Ln.8). This is because the report this officer used during Trial was **not** the report he read **prior to** Trial (Tp.78, Ln.11-18). Judge Collier then acted *in subsidium*[60] the State by illegally suppressing this exculpatory and exonerating evidence from the "cynical" Jury [¶579, 10, ii), and ordered

> ... the court reporter to keep that [police report] so that any reviewing court can take a look at what happened... (Tp.80, Ln.19-25), [¶216], [¶724g].

¶210 Wait a minute! Which report was it? It could have been

---

[59] Impeach. (14c) 1. To charge with a crime or misconduct; esp., to formally charge (a public official) with a violation of public trust. Garner, p. 869.
See also: impeach. To call the integrity of a public official into question. Rothenberg, p.225.
[60] *In subsidium* #3.

1) Off. McCourt's first report from Danielle on October 20, 2004

2) Off. McCourt's second report from his interview with Danielle and S.L. on January 12, 2005

3) The report from his superior "sergeant" that "terminated" the case against me

4) Another police report that pertained to the opening, closing, and termination of the case against me

Either way, these reports clarified as to **why** the case was terminated, and that is **why** this report was withheld and suppressed *in subsidium*.

¶211 These reports were all mentioned during Trial, contain **exonerating and impeaching elements**, and reveal "inconsistencies" in the testimony of Off. McCourt that Atty. Green picked up on.

¶212 **Q**: Why were there exonerating and impeaching inconsistencies in the police report?

A: Because those providing the information could not keep their stories straight (Exhibit-09: p.D-6, ¶5).

> When you tell the truth the first time, you never
> have to worry about what you said the second time.
> -Frank P. Wood, *Since 1967*

¶213 I had no real knowledge of these reports or their contents until Trial because they were not part of my Discovery, and Atty. Green failed to disclose them to me. Obviously, the reports were withheld from the "cynical" Jury and I did not have them for the purposes of appeal. As it is illegal to comment on evidence outside the Record (Trial proceedings), [¶479-¶551], I am legally entitled to them for the purposes of appeal.

¶214 <u>NOTE ON DISCOVERY</u>: My first retained attorney Ronald Scott Spears from Marco, Marco, & Bailey out of Medina, Ohio was the one who gave me the Discovery File.

¶215 Supporting the missing police reports, my interview with the Montville P.D. was also discussed during Trial (Tp.56, Ln.18-Tp.57, Ln.11), and it was video-recorded. Like the reports, I should have received a copy of the video with its Transcript for the purposes of appeal. And, like the police reports, the video was withheld from the "cynical" Jury [¶972, 17].

¶216 Looking directly at the police report that Judge Collier told the Court Reporter "to keep" (Tp.80, Ln.19-25), [¶209], there are two (2) problems for the State here:

1) Pursuant to O.R.C. § 2301.141 Retention of documents, the police report was supposed to be given to the Clerk of Court as part of the Record for identification and archival. The report was then to be held for a period of not less than fifty (50) years.

2) Court Reporter Donna A. Garrity cannot produce it because Judge Collier gave it to her ***knowing*** she would destroy it. Having said that, let's go there.

¶217 Post-Trial, to obtain missing portions of the Record, I called upon my Co-counsel from Trial, Attorney Ronald R. Stanley. Atty. Stanley then contacted Stenographer Garrity and requested a written estimate for the production of the missing portions of the Record. Ms. Garrity provided a verbal response and declared there might not be an available *"medium"* to transcribe the Record. Frustrated by this spin-move and in need of a written estimate, I sent Ms. Garrity a written request via certified mail on January 12, 2014 (Exhibit-22). On February 17, 2014, she sent a letter to Atty. Stanley stating her notes from Trial are *"no longer available"* (Exhibit-23). Having *changed her story*, Ms. Garrity provided a Judgment Entry from the Common Pleas Court of retired Judge Judith A. Cross dated April 23, 1997 (Exhibit-24). Here, Judge Cross ordered the Court Reporter from **her court** to dispose of all notes after a period of "seven (7) years." Yes, the Law permits the destruction of steno-notes pursuant to O.R.C. § 2301.20(B).

Valuable and irreplaceable evidence lost! But not entirely, as will be shown via affidavit of an honorable and credible eyewitness [¶1185], [¶1239].

¶218 Having done my homework, according to the Office of the Ohio Attorney General:

> Shorthand notes taken pursuant to R.C. 2301.20 and transcripts prepared pursuant to R.C.2301.23 by an official shorthand reporter of a common pleas court are the property of that common pleas court... OAG 89-073; 1989 Ohio AG LEXIS 80, [¶1205], [¶1212, 3].

¶219 Notice that notes and transcripts were the property of "that common pleas court" (Judge Cross') and ***not*** that of Judge Colliers'. Judge Collier and Ms. Garrity had neither legal right nor authority to destroy these records by using a ruling from ***another*** Common Pleas Court. Judge Collier should have issued his own order concerning the matter at hand. For verification of this assertion, in State ex rel Chaney v. Court of Common Please, 2002 Ohio App. LEXIS 545,

> OVERVIEW: ... The appellate court found that the trial court had destroyed the notes from [Chaney's] case pursuant to ***its*** policy... [***Emphasis added***],

and ***not*** that of another court; i.e. that of Judge Cross.

¶220 The trial process begins at arraignment, includes every pre-trial hearing, and carries on through from jury selection to sentencing. Pursuant to App.R.26(B),[61] App.R.16(A)(7), App.R.16(D), O.R.C. Ann. § 2953.08, and Ohio Crim.R.32(A)(B)(1)(3)(a)(b) and (c), as an indigent defendant, I am entitled to a ***full set*** of transcripts. This is supported by Drexelle Green, Petitioner vs. Anthony Brigano, Respondent, 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16664, [¶1233], and a plethora of other rulings

¶221 Vacating all doubt, when

> The official court reporter has lost [her] notes and cannot prepare a record of the proceeding...

[61] "App.R." refers to Rules of Appellate Procedure; a.k.a., "Appellate Rules".

> Under these circumstances we have no choice but to reverse the conviction. Hardy v. United States, 375 U.S. 277, 84 S.Ct. 424, L.Ed.2d 331; United States v. Rosa, 5 Cir. 1970, 434 F.2d 964; United States v. Atilus, 5 Cir. 1970, 425 F.2d 816. [**2].
>
> Reversed and remanded. (citing U.S. v. Garcia-Bonifascio, 443 F.2d 914 (1971), (id. at 915).[62]

Having been denied a Constitutional full and fair adequate appellate review, the same is applicable to the case at bar [¶1239].

¶222 Should Judge Collier and/or Court Reporter Donna A. Garrity fail to produce the suppressed police report ***and*** the missing portions of my Trial Record, that were destroyed and/or altered, they will found guilty direct violation of Title 18 U.S.C.S. § 1512, Tampering with a witness, victim, or informant, [¶267, i], [¶724a-¶724o], which states, in pertinent part, that

> (c) Whoever corruptly—
> (1) alters, destroys, mutilates, or conceals a record, document , or other object, or attempts to do so, with the intent to impair the object's integrity or availability for use in an official proceeding:
>
> shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years of both.
>
> (j) If the offense under this section occurs in connection with a trial of a criminal case, the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed for the offense shall be the higher of that otherwise provided by law or the maximum term that could have been imposed for any offense charged in such case.
>
> (k) Whoever conspires to commit any offense under this section shall be subject to the same penalties as those prescribed for the offense the commission of which was the object to the conspiracy.

¶223 My sentence for the alleged F-1, as previously stated, is **10-LIFE**. And I am most eager to let this cup pass from me and into the hands of those who are truly **DESERVING** of it.

---

[62] In using "id." I am identifying the location of the quote presented in the cited legal authority; a.k.a. "case law".

May they drink deeply.

¶224 Having presented sufficient Federal Law (Title 18 U.S.C.S. § 1512) to clarify the repercussions of the actions by Judge Collier and Stenographer Garrity, I now present State Law to support the above and any such allegations of corrupt activity that follows in this Affidavit. Yes, there is much more to come.

> O.R.C. § 2921.12 Tampering with evidence
>
> (A) No person, knowing that an official proceeding or investigation is in progress, is about to be or likely to be instituted, shall do any of the following:
>
> (1) Alter, destroy, conceal, or remove any record, document, or thing, with purpose to impair its value or availability as evidence in such proceeding or investigation [¶267, ii], [¶724a-¶724o].

¶225 For the Record, "proceeding" is synonymous with "trial process" and "appellate process"; things I did not fairly receive according to Law [¶579, 13], [¶972, 12], [¶1039, 2].

¶226 Now let us sail on!

-Σ-

• • •

Rocket: Captain, we're rounding *The Ankle Atoll*.

Frank: Excellent, Bosun. When we do, alter course by 10 degrees west.

Groot: I am Groot?

Frank: Yes, Ensign. We are headed for the *Straights of Tibia*. So prepare for canal water and secure the hatch to the focsle.

Groot: I am Groot!

• • •

¶227 GRAND JURY PROCEEDINGS

♪ But glittering prizes and endless compromises ♫
shatter the illusion of integrity.
-Rush, *The Spirit of Radio*

¶228 Reader, having found the most clear and concise legal definitions I could find, as they apply to the instant matter, a Grand Jury is

> A group of citizens whose duties include inquiring into crimes in their areas for the purpose of determining the probability [¶237] of guilt of a party or parties. Should a grand jury conclude that there is a good probability of guilt, it will recommend an indictment of the suspects, (Rothenberg, p.208-209);

and an Indictment is

> An accusation by a grand jury, made after thorough investigation, that someone should be tried for a crime. When an indictment is handed down, the accused must stand trial for the alleged offense, but indictment in itself does not mean the accused will necessarily be found guilty (Rothenberg, p.234).

¶229 With that said, in the State of Ohio, grand jury proceedings are primarily governed by Crim.R.6. Under this rule, per sections

> (B) Objections to grand jury and to grand jurors.
>
> (1) Challenges.
>
> > The prosecuting attorney, ***OR*** the attorney for a defendant who has been held to answer in the court of common pleas, may challenge the array of jurors or an individual juror on the ground that the grand jury or individual juror was not selected, drawn, or summoned in accordance with the statutes of this state. Challenges shall be made before the administration of the oath to the jurors and shall be tried by the court [***EMPHASIS ADDED***].
>
> Query: I wonder who determined if ***OR*** I received this Due Process right?

¶230 Fully supported by O.R.C. § 2313.41, Challenge to array, this law confirms that I

should have had an attorney present during the *voir dire* examination.[63] Unfortunately, I did not have legal representation during the selection of the Grand Jurors.

¶231 The lack of representation prejudiced me of my Due Process[64] rights to a legitimate Grand Jury as guaranteed by the U.S. 5th Amendment, and of my Due Process and Equal Protection[65] rights as guaranteed by the U.S. 14th Amendment.

¶232 Sadly, neither the Medina County Court of Common Pleas, nor the Medina County Prosecutor's Office acknowledge these rights. Obviously, I'm in prison [¶269].

¶233 WORD TO THE UNWARY: Whenever you throw out Due Process,
Equal Protection naturally follows suit [¶612].
-FPW Σ

¶234 Continuing, pursuant to O.R.C. § 2939.10, prosecutors and assistant prosecutors shall have access to the Grand Jury for the purposes of securing an indictment. To the contrary, Detective Mark Kollar ("Det. Kollar") of the Medina City Police Department[66] claims he presented **both** charges to the Grand Jury (Exhibit-04: p.11-12). This was despite two (2) relevant facts:

1) As will be shown [¶424-¶426] regarding the alleged F-1 rape of S.L., Det. Kollar admitted **twice** that he knew he was operation outside of his jurisdiction

2) Montville P.D. told him there was **"insufficient evidence"** to prosecute the alleged F1

---

[63] Voir dire examination. An examination of potential jurors to determine whether they are fit to serve or to determine if they should be challenged (French). Rothenberg, p.519.

[64] Due process of law. The regular course of events in the administration of justice, respecting the rights of every person, giving him the time and the right to defend himself without interference and without fear that the law will be unfair to him. Rothenberg, p.154.

[65] Equal Protection of the Law. This phrase grants everyone the equal right to the enjoyment of liberty and the pursuit of happiness, as well as the right to receive the same consideration as everyone else, under the laws of his community, his state, and the federal government. Rothenberg, p.162.

[66] To the best of my knowledge, Det. Kollar now works in Ashtabula County, Ohio.

and that **"(no charges were filed)"** (Exhibit-04: p.9)

¶235 Looking closer at (Exhibit-4: p.9), the conversation with Montville took place on 06/16/05. My indictment was secured on 08/03/05 (Exhibit-25). So what did Det. Kollar learn in the 48-day difference that was so shocking and revealing to justify his pursuit of an indictment regarding the F-1 outside of his jurisdiction? His report reveals absolutely nothing about S.L., save Montville telling him there was no crime. In other words, with no evidence and a mouth full of lies, Det. Kollar presented a case he personally *never investigated.* Σ

¶236 I must now conclude based on law and report, that former Chief Prosecutor Dean Holman[67] and Det. Kollar presented my case to the Grand Jury with *fabricated evidence*,[68] and shall proceed under this valid premise.

¶237 People, let's be realistic... With State's evidence proving no rape occurred [¶190-¶194], and that this case was "closed" [¶201] and "terminated" [¶208] PRE-INDICTMENT, we are left with no other logical choice but conclude that Pros. Holman and Det. Kollar engaged in malfeasance when they deliberately lied to the Grand Jury to secure a bogus indictment on the alleged F-1. Did Montville know what they were up to? I doubt it because "insufficient evidence" legally means no

> Probable cause. A reasonable cause, one that has a good chance of being true; a good ground for suspicion that a crime has been committed. (Rothenberg, p.383), [¶228].

¶238 Supporting, pursuant to Crim.R.3, a complaint must be filed in order to pursue and secure a warrant to arrest pursuant to Crim.R.4(A)(1), and that complaint must be established by

---

[67] Chief Prosecutor Dean Holman lost the 2016 election and was succeeded by S. Forrest Thompson.

[68] Fabricated evidence. Evidence that is either false or so altered that it is deceitful; manufactured evidence. Rothenberg, p.181.

"probable cause". No probable cause means no warrant. Well, that's how it's supposed to work [¶542], [¶1029, 1, ii, a].

¶239 For clarity, pursuant to O.R.C. § 2941.07, as a charging instrument, the Amended Bill of Particulars (Exhibit-02), states that I was charged with one (1) count of rape, regarding a child under the age of ten, pursuant to O.R.C. § 2907.02(A)(1)(b)(B), a felony of the first degree; and one (1) count of gross sexual imposition pursuant to O.R.C. § 2907.05(A)(4), regarding a child under the age of thirteen, a felony of the third degree.

¶240 *You're* shocked? Don't be. Medina can and will indict a ham sandwich alleging it claimed to be a tuna on rye, a felony of the fourth degree.

• • •

Groot: I am Groot.

Frank: We just had pizza.

Rocket: He's still regrowing.

Frank: Oh. Sorry, I forgot. Sandwiches it is.

• • •

¶241 Earlier I told you that we would discuss how these physically and geographically unrelated charges appeared on the same bogus indictment [¶144]. Since [¶227] we have been pulling the facts together in chronological order, one grain of wheat at a time, to explain this anomaly. But there's still one (1) more crucial detail. Yep, you guessed it. Medina's very own ***Town Crier***: the Court-declared "untruthful" Danielle.

[Applause, cheers and jeers]

¶242 Inserting a conveniently State-overlooked fact, we have seen that, when Danielle found out she was pregnant, she told Scott and not me [¶109]. While I was still in the dark on the

pregnancy, one day I came home from work and hugged and kissed Danielle. She pushed me back, a first, and said, "Trust me. The honeymoon's over" (Exhibit-09: bottom of p.D-2 to top of p.D-3). As evidenced by (Exhibit-09), this is when Danielle started asking questions about my former wife Robyn, e.g. where she worked and about her girls. Always open with Danielle, but in a complete state of confusion, I answered her questions. Yes, Danielle sought out Robyn under Scott's **orders** [¶205].

¶243 Through patient and careful planning, without my knowledge, the set-up had begun.

♪ [Suspenseful music] ♫

¶244 Continuing, in the State of Ohio, for the most part, Crim.R.6 governs grand jury proceedings.[69] As to who may be present, Section (D) states

> The prosecuting attorney, the witnesses under examination, interpreters when needed and, for the purpose of taking the evidence, a stenographer[70] or operator of a recording device may be present while the grand jury is in session, but no person other than the jurors may be present while the grand jury is deliberating or voting.

When considering the "witnesses under examination", and under oath, the *Town Crier* must have been there championing the cause for her and Scott. Since Danielle was deemed "untruthful" by the Trial Court, it is readily understood that she delivered the same shovel of –

• • •

Groot: I am Groot!

["bullshit!], [¶948].

• • •

---

[69] See also O.R.C. § 2313.41 Challenge to array; O.R.C. Chapter 2939 Grand Jury; Ohio Constitution art. I § 10; Crim.R.16(B)(1), Testimony by defendants and co-defendants; Crim.R.16(J)(2), Transcript of testimony.

[70] I do not know who the stenographer was for my Grand Jury hearing. However, I do believe he or she was a member of the Medina County Court Reporters, Inc. out of Medina, Ohio.

manure to the Grand Jury. A study of S.L.'s IMPLANTED/TRANSPLANTED MEMORIES and (Exhibits-03, 09, 14, 17, 18, 19, 34 and 46) will remove all doubt.

¶245 So, Reader, as the STATE'S STAR WITNESS, the "untruthful" Danielle is how both physically and geographically **unrelated** charges appeared on the same indictment. True because only **she** acted under Scott's orders [¶205]. Think about it... someone had to testify at the Grand Jury proceedings so Scott play the *coward* and take **"no action"**, TWICE [¶206]. Σ

¶246 Still sifting relevant facts from the Grand Jury Chaff, as proven with State's evidence PRE-INDICTMENT, regarding the alleged F-1 rape of S.L., all three (3) State-investigative agencies declared there was neither evidence nor crime. So what the hell did Pros. Holman and Det. Kollar say to the Grand Jury? It sure wasn't the truth! Reinforcing this declaration, the State had other exculpatory PRE-INDICTMENT evidence: video interviews of K.S. and S.L. [¶1044-¶1053] they refused to show during Trial due to **"coaching"** (Tp.506-507), (Exhibit-19: OIP; August 31, 2015: p.2, ¶4 to top of p.3), [¶579, 22], [¶972, 16].

¶247 Fully supported by the molested Trial Record, the letters to the OIP (Exhibit-19) should be *carefully* studied. They're full of wheat.

¶248 Supported by the "coaching" in the video interviews, with such an overwhelming amount of State's exculpatory and exonerating PRE-INDICTMENT evidence clearing me of all culpability regarding the alleged F-1 rape, for Pros. Holman to assist Det. Kollar in his pursuit of an indictment, was a direct violation of the Ohio Rules of Professional Conduct, III, Advocate, Rule 3.8 Special Responsibilities of a Prosecutor, which clearly states

> The prosecutor in a criminal proceeding **shall not** do any of the following:
>
> (a) pursue or prosecute a charge that the prosecutor knows is not supported by probable cause [¶1029, 1, ii, g]. **[Emphasis added]**.

¶249 With no probable cause, the words **"shall not"** are found in *The Ten Commandments*.

You know... *The Big 10*? Yeah, they're *commandments* and *not* suggestions. Now, don't get me wrong. I broke a few myself. The affair proves that. Not proud of it. In fact, I fully regret it, for it hurt many. But I will ***never*** regret my son, whom I love.

Wisdom comes from imitation, experience, and reflection.
-Far East proverb

¶250 Shedding a little more light on the subject, the malfeasance of lying to a Grand Jury in order to secure a bogus indictment can only be categorized as *malicious prosecution.*[71] I say this because

1) Due to PRE-INDICTMENT evidence, Pros. Holman knew the truth in respect to, at least, the alleged F-1

2) If Pros. Holman did not assist Det. Kollar in pursuit of indictment, he was, at the very least, ethically and legally obligated to stop him

Either way, Pros. Holman's failures resulted in the act of

> Malice of law. The intentional carrying out of an injurious, harmful act without cause or justification. (Rothenberg, p.284).

¶251 In direct consideration of Pros. Holman's actions, according to the American Bar Association Standards of Criminal Justice Relating to Prosecutor Function, Standard 3-3.5 Relations With Grand Jury,

> (c) The prosecutor's communications and presentations to the grand jury should be on the record.

Therefore, there's evidence of what happened somewhere, and I want it.

¶252 Further, pursuant to Standard 3-3.6 Quality and Scope of Evidence Before Grand Jury,

---

[71] Malicious prosecution. (17c) 1. The institution of a civil or criminal proceeding for an improper purpose and without probable cause. Garner, p.1102.

(b) No prosecutor shall knowingly fail to disclose to the grand jury evidence which tends to negate guilt or mitigate the offense.

¶253 As the big picture reveals, PRE-INDICTMENT, the alleged F-1 rape was proven to be an absolute *hoax*: "closed" and "terminated" due to "no evidence" with the badgered and perfected IMPLANTED/TRANSPLANTED MEMORIES of a **Temple Virgin**. Therefore, it is point-blank-obvious that Pros. Holman knowingly failed to disclose this collection of exculpatory and exonerating evidence that negates all guilt.

Multiple sadness. ☹

¶254 Reader, would you indict me on the alleged F-1 based on what you read so far? No. Not in good conscience.

¶255 Getting back to questioning what fabricated evidence he (and Kollar) presented, we need to know because

1) I'm an innocent man in prison serving a Life-Sentence for a crime that Kollar **never** investigated, and that never happened, in a place I have never been
2) The lack of legal ethics in the Grand Jury proceeding have clearly undermined the integrity of the proceeding itself and that of the Prosecutor's Office
3) The public's trust in the local judiciary has been violated by an elected official

¶256 Although grand jury proceedings must be on the record, they are never made part of a defendant's trial record, and therefore, never part of the appellate record. Why? As you have seen, too much to hide. And, traditionally, the defendant is not entitled to them for the purposes of appeal. But this does not mean a defendant cannot get them. Setting a few tiles in order will clarify.

• • •

Rocket: Deep breath, Tiger.

Frank: [Deep breath – Long exhale].

Got it.

Rocket: Go!

• • •

¶257 Beginning with the pertinent part of

Crim.R.6(E) Secrecy of proceedings and disclosure

> ... A grand juror, prosecuting attorney, interpreter, stenographer, operator of a recording device, or typist who transcribes recorded testimony, may disclose matters occurring before the grand jury, other than the deliberations of a grand jury or the vote of a grand juror, but may disclose such matters only when so directed by the court preliminary to or in connection with a judicial proceeding, or when permitted by the court at the *request of the defendant* upon a showing that grounds may exist for a motion to dismiss the indictment because of matters occurring before a grand jury... [*emphasis added*].

¶258 To seek and obtain grand jury proceeding information, one must first consider whether they are seeking grand jury witness testimony

1) Before (McGinty, 2015 Ohio LEXIS 800, [**P38])

2) During (McGinty, 2015 Ohio LEXIS 800, [**P38])

3) After

trial, for each timeframe has a slightly different approach and criteria that must be met.

¶259 Having determined timing and criteria,

> Proceedings before the grand jury may be divided into three categories: testimony of defendant and co-defendant, testimony of other witnesses, and deliberations and votes of the grand jurors. (State v. Owens, 2015 Ohio App. LEXIS 1784, HN1).

¶260 For the Record, as the Defendant, I was neither asked nor subpoenaed to testify before the Grand Jury. Σ

¶261 Next, depending on timing and criteria, pursuant to Crim.R.6(E) and its case law progeny, one may have to show

1) Disclosure outweighs the need for secrecy

i. Secrecy is eliminated post-trial

2) Disclosure can prevent pre- or during trial, or prove and correct post-trial a

> Manifest miscarriage of justice. (1862) A grossly unfair outcome in a judicial proceeding, as when a defendant is convicted despite lack of evidence... (Garner, p.1149)

i. **Especially when State's evidence proves this Defendant innocent**

3) Disclosure will preserve *Constitutional Rights*, or prove violations thereof

¶262 True, this is easier post-trial, as in the case at bar, but one can validate his or her argument by proving the indictment was unlawfully secured by any of the following:

1) Perjury

2) False pretenses

3) Fabricated evidence/tampering with evidence

4) Felony criminal conduct of public officials

5) Implanted memories/witness tampering

6) Withholding mitigating, exculpatory, and/or exonerating evidence

7) Violations of State and/or Federal Law

¶263 Once the argument is set, a 'Petition for Disclosure Pursuant to Crim.R.6(E)'must be filed in the 'Supervisory Court' (a.k.a. 'Trial Court'). Should the Trial Court deny the Petition, this is appealable under the 'Abuse of Discretion' standard, as with *any* trial court's denial of a non-discretionary motion.

¶264 Yes, it's a process.

¶265 So, with the above legal understandings, I am one of the rare few that has proven, with PRE-INDICTMENT State's evidence, that my bogus indictment is

As useless as a rubber beak on a woodpecker.
-Unknown

¶266 True, I could file a 'Motion to Dismiss Indictment With Prejudice' and elaborate, but that is not my intention here. My objective in this chapter are to prove that my indictment (and search warrant [¶547]) was

1) Secured by fraudulent means

2) Not lawfully issued

in direct violation of

O.R.C. § 2921.52 **Using sham legal process**.

(A) As used in this section:

(1) "Lawfully issued" means adopted, issued, or rendered in accordance with the United States constitution, the constitution of a state, and the applicable statutes, rules, regulations, and ordinances of the United States, a state, and the political subdivisions of a state.

(2) "State" means a state of the United States, including without limitation, the state legislature, the highest court of the state that has statewide jurisdiction, the offices of all elected state officers, and all departments, boards, offices, commissions, agencies, institutions, and other instrumentalities of the state. "State" does not include the political subdivisions of the state.

(3) "Political subdivisions" means municipal corporations, townships, counties, school districts, and all other bodies corporate and politic that are organized under state law and are responsible for governmental activities only in geographical areas smaller than that of a state.

"Sham legal process" means an instrument that meets all of the following conditions:

(a) It is not lawfully issued.

(b) It purports to do any of the following:

(i) To be a summons, subpoena, judgment, or order of a court, a law enforcement officer, or a legislative, executive, or administrative body.

(ii) To assert jurisdiction over or determine the legal or equitable status, rights, duties, powers, or privileges of any person or property.

(iii) To require or authorize any search, seizure, indictment, arrest, trial, or sentencing of any person or property.

(c) It is designed to make another person believe that it is lawfully issued.

(B) No person shall, knowing the **sham legal process** to be the **sham legal process**, do any of the following:

(1) Knowingly issue, display, deliver, distribute, or otherwise use **sham legal process**;

(2) Knowingly use **sham legal process** to arrest, detain, search, or seize any person or the property of another person;

(3) Knowingly commit or facilitate the commission of an offense, using **sham legal process**;

(4) Knowingly commit a felony by using **sham legal process**.

(C) It is an affirmative defense to charge under division (B)(1) or (2) of this section that the use of **sham legal process** was for a lawful purpose.

(D) Whoever violates this section is guilty of using **sham legal process**. A violation of (B)(1) of this section is a misdemeanor of the fourth degree. A violation of division (B)(2) or (3) of this section is a misdemeanor of the first degree, except that, if the purpose of a violation of division (B)(3) of this section is to commit or facilitate the commission of a felony, a violation of division (B)(3) of this section is a felony of the fourth degree. A violation of division (B)(4) of this section is a felony of the third degree.

(E) A person who violates this section is liable in a civil action to any person harmed by the violation for injury, death, or loss to person or property incurred as a result of the commission of the offense and for reasonable attorney's fees, court costs, and other expenses incurred as a result of prosecuting the civil action commenced under this division. A civil action under this division is not the exclusive remedy of a person who incurs injury, death, or loss to person or property as a result of a violation of this section.

¶267 Meeting my first objective, during the illusion of the Grand Jury proceeding, Pros. Holman and Det. Kollar acted as witnesses for the State of Ohio. What more, pursuant to Crim.R.3, the complaint they presented had to "be made upon oath". With this in mind, law and fact prove that whatever they said to the Grand Jury resulted in a dual act of perjury in violation

of O.R.C. § 2921.11(A). Further, by withholding exculpatory and exonerating evidence regarding the alleged rape **from all three (3) State-investigative agencies.**

1) Akron Children's Hospital

2) Medina County Job & Family Services/Children's Services

3) Montville Twp. P.D.

these men revealed neither honor nor integrity, and in doing so, directly violated

i. Title 18 U.S.C.S. § 1512, §§[72] (c)(1)(j) and (k) [¶222]

ii. O.R.C. § 2921.12, Tampering with evidence, §§ (A) and (1), [¶224]

¶268 With that said, attacking the unconstitutionality of the bogus indictment,

> Any discussion of the purpose served by a grand jury indictment in the administration of federal criminal law must begin with the Fifth and Sixth Amendments to the Constitution. The Fifth Amendment provides that "No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger;..." This specific guaranty [*sic*],[73] as well as the Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause, are, therefore, both brought to bear here. Of like relevance, is the guaranty [*sic*] of the Sixth Amendment that "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right... to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation..." (Russel v. United States, 1962 U.S. LEXIS 2206, HN4).

¶269 Earlier I showed you that my Due Process and Equal Protection rights were violated when I was not represented by counsel during the Grand Jury *voir dire* [¶229-¶232]. Then I showed you that my indictment was secured via fraudulent means in violation of State Law: **sham legal process,** *inter alia*.[74] Now I am showing you that, due to perjury and the withholding

---

[72] "§§" means "Sections" of the statute cited.

[73] *Sic*. [Latin "so, thus"] (1859) Spelled or used as written• Sic, invariably bracketed and usu. set in *italics*, is used to indicate that a preceding word or phrase in a quote is reproduced as it appeared in the original document. Garner, p.1592.

[74] *Inter alia*. [Latin] (17c) Among other things. Garner, p.932.

of exculpatory and exonerating evidence during the Grand Jury proceeding, I did not "enjoy the right to... be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation" against me. This is specifically because the pinpoint dates of October 1st-3rd of 2004 were not identified until two (2) weeks **prior to** Trial (Exhibit-50), [¶1388]; hardly enough time to prepare such a pinpoint defense, eh? Also, because the accusation was based on lies, manipulations, deceptions, withheld information, and IMPLANTED MEMORIES regarding, at least, that we know of now, the alleged F-1. Such method and fabricated evidence proves my indictment not to be lawfully issued according to Federal and State Law, thereby rendering my **sham indictment impotent** [¶579, 9], [¶1039, 5].

-Σ-

• • •

[Golf clap]

Rocket: Bravo! Bravo, my good man!

Groot: I am Groot!

Frank: Uh, thanks, fellas... I think.

• • •

¶270 ARREST

These aren't the droids you're looking for.
-Star Wars

¶271 On August 4, 2005 an illegitimate *Warrant To Arrest* was issued (Exhibit-25). That afternoon I was standing in my driveway on Gateway Lane, Medina **Township**, Ohio talking on the phone with the former legal secretary of Judge James Kimbler [¶302]: Beth Rapenchuk. About twenty minutes into our conversation, Det. Kollar, a Medina **City** Detective, arrived. Coincidence between phone call and arrival? I think not. There is a prior history here, but we'll get to that later.

¶272 Having stepped out of his car, alone and outside of his jurisdiction with warrant in hand, Det. Kollar approached me as I ended the call. He then asked, "Are you Frank Wood?" I answered, "You know who I am; I'm Frank Wood." He then said, "I have a warrant for your arrest." I responded by holding out my hand and said, "Let me see it." As I read it, I started to laugh. He said, "What?" and I answered, "I know more about why you're here than you do." The stern and confident face he first approached with faded into doubt and confusion. Indeed, he was taken back, but for a moment. And, yes, I reveled in it.

¶273 Sometimes it feels really good to be the smartest guy in the room. ☺

¶274 After a rapid assessment of the situation, I told Kollar to "Let me put my dog in, call my accountant, and lock up the house." He readily agreed. Prepared to exit the house, he cuffed me in the garage and we stepped out. Det. Kollar entered the access code to close the door as I gave it to him. He then placed me in the front seat of his car and we pulled away.

¶275 Obviously, the Jedi mind trick didn't work.

¶276 On the way to the Medina county Sheriff's Department I asked, "Why did you arrest

me?" Having regained arrogance and composure, Kollar vehemently spat, "Because we have evidence!" I quickly retorted, "You don't have shit! I'll call my lawyer."

¶277 For the Record, despite Det. Kollar's claims (Exhibt-04: p.12), he arrested me on his own and I was not Mirandized[75] [¶392]. It was not until the fraudulent revoking of my $200,000.00 cash bond, which we will most definitely get to [¶382-¶397], that Det. Kollar was assisted by local law enforcement.

¶278 With Det. Kollar's credibility decimated in the Grand Jury proceeding and the fraudulent revoking of my bond, understand there's an additional event to be revealed in [¶479-¶551] where he deliberately lied to and deceived the "cynical" Jury during the course of Trial. True, we are **not** done with his lack of ethics and integrity. But, for now, in

> *** Dickerson v. United States, 530 U.S. 428, 444 L.Ed.2d 405, 120 S.Ct. 2326, in which this Court held that Miranda announced is a constitutional rule. The appeals court thus equated Dickerson's ruling with the proposition that a failure to warn pursuant to Miranda is itself a violation of the suspect's Fifth Amendment's rights. (citing U.S. v Patane, 524 U.S. 630, 670 (2004)).

¶279 Although Det. Kollar never interviewed me, he was still constitutionally obligated to Mirandize me upon arrest.

¶280 Supporting the above allegation,

> A Miranda warning is required "when there has been such a restriction on a person's freedom as to render him in custody." Oregon v. Mathison, 429 U.S. 492, 495, 97 S.Ct. 711, 50 L.Ed.2d 714 (1977). ***. A defendant is "in custody" when he is "deprived of his freedom of action in any significant way." Miranda, 384, U.S. at 444. ***. Simply put, "the only relevant inquiry is how a reasonable man in the suspect's position would have understood the situation." Berkemer v. McCarty, 468 U.S. 420, 442, 104 S.Ct.

[75] Miranda rule (warnings). A requirement that before any questioning by law enforcement authorities takes place, individuals receive warnings regarding their privilege against self-incrimination, right to remain silent, and to be represented by an attorney. Rothenberg, p.295.

3138, 82. L.Ed.2d 317 (1984). (citing U.S.A. v. Alcantara, 2009 U.S. LEXIS 114990 (2009)).[76]

¶281 A detective, a warrant, and handcuffed. I would most definitely have to say that my freedom was restricted in a "significant way," and that I perfectly "understood the situation." With my U.S. 5th Amendment rights violated, this constitutes an automatic reversal of conviction. ☺

-Σ-

• • •

Rocket: They're not going to like that.

Frank: In the words of Judge Collier, **"I don't care"** [¶685].

• • •

Chapter 13

¶282 YOUR LIFE AND THE LAW

♪ And the men who hold high places ♫
must be the ones to start
to mold a new reality
closer to the heart.
Closer to the heart.
-Rush, *Closer to the Heart*

¶283 Reader, whether you are aware of this or not, nearly everything you do is governed directly or indirectly by a law, either on the State and/or Federal level. Possibly, on the international level depending on your lifestyle and career.

¶284 Most go about their daily lives in a state of *doing*, for lack of a better word. They make calls, drive their cars, use credit cards, surf the web, go to a doctor, and the like. And, in that state of *doing*, for the most part, people are unaware of the laws that directly affect those they're

[76] "U.S." and "S.Ct." refer to U.S. Supreme Court rulings.

doing business with, thereby indirectly affecting them. It's a constant cycle.

¶285 True, laws were written and enacted via legislative process by elected public officials. Presumably designed to protect everyone's interests, when laws no longer meet that criteria, they undergo the process of

> Repeal. The annulment of an existing statute or law; to revoke a law and to substitute a new one in its place (Rothenberg, p.419).

This is why you must understand ballot issues, the laws attached to them, and exercise your *Constitutional Rights to Vote* under the 14th, 15th, 17th, and 19th Amendments.

¶286 Some laws have always existed. Consider the Law of Gravity established by Sir Isaac Newton. Drop something –

• • •

Rocket: Gravity check

• • •

– and it works. Then there's the pre-existing Second Law of Thermodynamics which reveals how "thermal energy will flow only from a hotter object to a colder object" (Fetzer, T Volume 19, p.253), leaving the Universe in a constant state of cooling down. Someday, probably in a few billion years, the Universe will turn to ice and collapse into a black hole.

• • •

Groot: I am Groot!

Frank: Yeah, it's a bummer. But nothing lasts forever and all of our efforts will eventually end in oblivion.

Groot: I am Groot.

Frank: That is multiple sadness, Groot. And that's why we should strive to love now and not then, because *then* is too late.

• • •

¶287 Some laws have been enacted in your lifetime by our elected officials or by our direct votes. Some have been enacted in like fashion before we were born. But they still govern us. Having said that, let's go there.

¶288 The Constitution Of The United States is commonly known as the

> Law of the land. A law or laws that are in force throughout the entire country, such as the law that everyone in our land is entitled to equal protection under the law. See *Lex Terrae.* (Rothenberg, p.266).
>
> *Lex terrae*. The Law Of The Land (Latin). (Rothenberg, p.275).

The astute and learned authors of this great treatise were commonly known as the **Framers,** for they constructed the foundation and framework that govern the ethical and legal direction of this Great Nation. And, as evidenced by what I am about to show you, not only did the Framers understand human nature, they had it in mind when they put quill to parchment.

¶289 Applying the obvious scenario, my own, I was falsely accused of a crime(s). This rendered me a criminal defendant. Having been placed in such a position, the

> 4th Amendment was enacted to protect me from unlawful search and seizure without probable cause and a properly issued search warrant from of a court of competent jurisdiction.
>
> 5th Amendment was set in place to guarantee a legitimate indictment, a legal Grand Jury proceeding, and to protect me from loss of life, liberty, and/or property without due process of law.
>
> 6th Amendment was written to guarantee my rights to a fair, public, and speedy trial by an impartial jury in a court of competent jurisdiction; to be properly informed of the charges; to confront the witnesses against me via effective cross-examination; to present witnesses in my favor; and to have the effective assistance of counsel.
>
> 8th Amendment was established to protect me from excessive bail, and cruel and unusual punishment.

> 14th Amendment was brought into existence to protect my citizenship, and to protect me from the deprivation of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; and to ensure I was granted equal protection of the laws; all in my State of Ohio.

¶290 As to the protection of my citizenship under the 14th Amendment, it was unlawfully and unethically taken from me under the U.S.13th Amendment, which clearly states that

> 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been **duly convicted**, shall exist within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction. [**Emphasis added**].
>
> 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Not exactly what you read in school, I went from a productive and effective self-employed citizen, to a wrongfully accused criminal defendant, –

• • •

Rocket: He's going there.

• • •

– to being enslaved for profit in direct violation of my Human and Constitutional Rights.

> No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.
> -Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 9
> The United Nations and its General Assembly

• • •

Groot: I am Groot!

["Whoa!"]

Frank: I had to. This, what they knowingly did to me and perpetuate, is wrong on every level and facet of life. You see, a court speaks through its **journal entries**, and this is why all

sentencing journal entries say **"duly convicted."**

• • •

¶291 People, earlier I told you that, on a global level, the United States as a whole makes up 5% of the world's population, holds 25% of the world's prisoners, and that 30% of all Americans have a felony in their background [¶172]. As every fact and statistic can be Googled, in 2016 the U.S. Prison –

• • •

Rocket: Industry.

• • •

– System generated $80 billion dollars in revenue, and that number grows every year. What's more frightening is that privatized prisons, managed by private companies, such as ICE and CCA, have shares of their stock trade on our open exchanges!

¶292 Now consider this: What's the number one desire for a stock? To appreciate in value. How does this happen? Demand; people buy the stock. Let me explain.

¶293 Imagine that I have one (1) pen and 10,000 buyers. What's the price of the pen? Whatever I say it is until interest dies out and I have to lower the price. Now, to the contrary, if I have 10,000 pens and one (1) buyer, what's the price of the pens? Basically, zero, and I'd have to give them away.

¶294 Remember the pen.
-FPW

¶295 Next, what creates demand and encourages people to buy shares of the stock? The company is generating cash flow via income/revenue with translates into the number one word on Wall Street: **Earnings**. With that said, for those who are not on the business/banking level, or not engaged in the field of finance, it is a well known axiom that

Profit is the argument that ends all others.
-Ken Follett

¶296 So how do privatized prisons generate more earnings to increase the demand of their stocks? They collect more of the revenue that funds prisons: *your tax dollars*. As prisons are paid on an annual basis per prisoner, the only way to increase those earnings is to imprison more people. I just happen to be one of the unlucky eggs they broke to make the omlette.

¶297 As fear and greed, raw human emotion, drive the Stock Market, I encourage everyone to peacefully petition our Federal Government to repeal the latter half of the 13th Amendment, and to mold that new reality so it no longer permits slavery for profit in this *Great Nation* [¶170]. If not, you or one of your loved ones could be the next stock option.

• • •

[Golf clap]

Frank: What am I ever going to do with you two?

Groot: I am Groot.

Rocket: Yeah, burgers sound good. Such amazing food on this planet.

Frank: Extra cheese and tomato. Always.

• • •

¶298 Coming full-circle on this topic and the case at bar, the Framers prepared for the eventuality of people being wrongfully convicted by ensuring they can petition the Government for a redress, reconsideration, of grievances under the U.S. 1st Amendment.

¶299 My Fellow Americans, under the U.S. 6th Amendment, you have the right to counsel in a criminal prosecution. However, you are allowed under this law to act *pro se* and represent yourself. Of course, I do recommend retained counsel instead of *pro se* or court-appointed, if

possible. In addition, you are allowed to represent yourself in civil proceedings such as divorce or custody cases. Further, we are emotionally attached to our lives and decisions, and that can cloud your judgment. Again, use an attorney.

He who has himself as an attorney has a fool for a client,
-Unknown,

but sometimes you just don't have a choice... or the money.

¶300 With that said, every common pleas courthouse in the country must provide a public law library. I encourage you to look into not just the laws, statutes, and rules that I cite, but those that affect your daily lives; e.g., opening a business, buying land, selling a car, and the like. So get involved, get informed, and vote. This is your Country too.

-Σ-

• • •

Rocket: We're out of ketchup.

Frank: Look at Groot. He sure loves those fries.

Groot: I am Groot!

[Groot smiles]

Frank: *Ha Ha*! What a mess!

• • •

Chapter 14

¶301 ARRAIGNMENT

♪ The judge said, "Guilty and we'll make the noon trial," ♫
slapped the sheriff on the back with a smile and said,
"Supper's waitin at home and I gotta get to it."
-Reba McEntire, *The Lights Went out in Georgia*

¶302 My first arraignment[77] was before the now retired Judge James Kimbler on August 12, 2005. Judge Kimbler [¶271], [¶1195, Footnote 239], sought recusal[78] because a former member of his Court: Beth Rapenchuk, was a potential witness for the Defense. I sincerely doubt that because of her past actions and questioning of me. If anything, I believe she was working *with* Det. Kollar. What more, at that time there was no witness list.

¶303 Although my tampered-with Trial Record is void of my first arraignment,[79] [¶579, 10, iv], it is listed on my altered Docket (Exhibit-07: p.3 at 12/Aug/2005). Also, as I do not know who the court reporter was for this hearing, I do know that Kathy Fortney was the Clerk of Court and Loretta Seibert was the Deputy Clerk. As of today, David B. Wadsworth is the current Clerk of Court.

¶304 On August 15, 2005 I was arraigned for the second time in the court of Judge Christopher J. Collier ("Judge Collier"). From this hearing on through to Sentencing, Judge Collier presided over my case, and Donna A. Garrity of the

> Medina County Court Reporters, Inc.
> Registered Professional Reporters
> 209 North Broadway
> Medina, Ohio 44256
> Ph: (330) 723-2482

did the same as the Official Court Reporter (Exhibit-27: Tp.560, Court Reporter's Certificate).

¶305 During this hearing, upon verbal motion for bond reduction by my first retained counsel: Atty. Ronald Scott Spears of the *Marco, Marco, and Bailey Law Firm* out of Medina, Ohio, Pros. Holman objected, said I was a "flight risk" because I had "two last names, two social security

---

[77] Arraignment. (16c) The initial step in a criminal prosecution whereby the defendant is brought before the court to hear the charges and enter a plea. Garner, p.130.

[78] Recusal. (1949) Removal of oneself as a judge or policy-maker in a particular matter, esp. because of conflict of interest. Garner, p.1467.

[79] Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record #1.

numbers, and mafia connections in Europe" [¶1122]. As Atty. Spears failed to challenge the Prosecutor's bogus allegations, it is now time to set a few things straight.

¶306 I was born during the early morning hours on December 1, 1967 in the Frank Sinatra Hospital: St. Mary's in Hoboken, New Jersey. The name given to me at birth was Frank Philip Wood, Jr.; Social Security Number xxx-xx-xxx7. As a child, I lived in New Jersey and then Long Island. I never knew my biological father, or, at least, I do not remember him. When I was around seven (7) years old, my mother married a great man, whom, to this day, I love and address as "Dad." The Clint Eastwood of my youth, Dad was a member of the United States Air Force. Eventually we moved to Loring Air Force Base, Maine. Shortly thereafter, Dad adopted two (2) of my other siblings and me in the Aroostock County Court House. My name was then changed to Frank Philip Freiberg; Social Security number xxx-xx-xxx5.

¶307 From Maine we moved to Ghedi Air Base, Italy. Yes, I had a beautiful and somewhat privileged childhood: Rome, Venice, swam butt-naked in the Mediterranean, skied the Apennine Alps, shopped at the Vicenza Army Base, went to school in Verona, stood in the courtyard of Juliet Capulet (American text books have it wrong), lived in a beautiful sunlit valley below the snow-covered mountains of Brescia, and played hide-and-go seek in Vatican City. My sister and I ran straight into Pope John Paul II! He hugged and blessed us while my Mom apologized to the Pontiff. *Ha Ha*! The awkward positions we put our parents in, eh? However, the Pontiff was a man of love and gentleness. He slipped his arm through my Mom's and whispered something in her ear. Then they both threw their heads back in laughter as they sun shown down on us. This is the coolest memory of my Mom and I smile every time I read this. ☺

¶308 Having *never* been abused, neglected, unwanted, or unloved in my family, we spent somewhere around four (4) years in Italy. Not sure exactly how long. Towards the end of our

stay, my parents divorced and my mother brought us all to Ohio. Mistake. I remember that time in life quite well. We lived in HUD apartments, Pres. Reagan was shot, and I delivered the Cleveland Press, no longer in circulation, to buy Christmas presents and help with groceries. Don't get me wrong. Dad continued to provide for us and I spent summers with him and my *awesome* step-mom, whom I love deeply to this day, in New Jersey while I worked a summer job in NYC. What more, Mom kept us kids together, a roof over our heads, and food in our bellies while she earned her Master's in Social Work at Case Western.

¶309 At one point in time, for my own reasons, I elected to legally return to utilizing my birth name: Wood. That's when I gave up being "The Indiana Jones of the Family" and started making plans to open my own business (Exhibit-01), thanks to a wonderful *Choctaw* Indian and Korean War P.O.W. Army veteran: Vess Shaw (Miss you, Spirit Bother). Sometime later, I spoke with a banker about going incorporated, the adoption history, and both last names and numbers. An amazing and intelligent lady, she recommended "merging both names and numbers" so there would be no problems with taxes and identification.

¶310 To handle the matter, I retained the services of Atty. Stanley: another good man who has my respect. We accomplished the merging with a valid name change in the Medina County Court of Common Pleas, Probate Division on August 20, 2000 (Exhibit-28). The Social Security Administration was then notified (no Exhibit).

¶311 Having laid a sure foundation of truth, a few issues are now deserving of special attention:

1) The merging was done in their courthouse **four (4) years pre-arraignment,** confirming the withholding of evidence from Court, Media, and Public
2) IRS records will verify that I never used both names at the same time

3) Det. Kollar searched every major criminal data base with both names and numbers and came up **empty-handed** (Exhibit-04: p.16) Σ

We ain't found shit!
-Spaceballs

4) I broke no laws

¶312 To no surprise, bond reduction was denied without inquiry by Judge Collier. Then the State changed its story the next day from "mafia connections in Europe" to "has ties to at least three other states and one foreign country" (Exhibit-29). Also, the legal name change was mentioned in this article, but the "merging" of Social Security Numbers was not. This was deceptive, for Pros. Holman assumed the *you*, the public are stupid and would just believe whatever he said. He could have called the Social Security Administration and verified the "merging" of numbers. A competent and trustworthy prosecutor would have made the call. If he did, then he withheld information to support his lies and manipulations. If he didn't, well, that's just sloppy investigative work.

¶313 Having changed his story from arraignment to press release to hide his lies, let's dig a little deeper in what actually transpired.

¶314 During this second arraignment, Pros. Homan

1) Knew about the legal name change as compared to

i. "two last names"

2) Knew he could verify the "merging" of numbers as compared to

ii. "two social security numbers"

3) Knew he couldn't support his bogus allegation of "mafia connections in Europe" as compared to

i. Why didn't I hire *Don Juans* in shark skin suits that like to draw blood to

represent me?

4) Knew I was not a "flight risk" as compared to

i. He could have readily verified with several government agencies that I did not have a valid passport

ii. He knew my life was under invest for a year and I did not run

iii. My business, financial support, and immediate family were here

¶315 So directly bold in his reckless assertions, Pros. Holman committed

> Slander. Language used to defame a person, leading to his embarrassment, tending to hurt his reputation, or interfering with his business or livelihood. Implicit in slander is the fact that the accusatory of defamatory remarks are false (Rothenberg, p.452),

as he delivered materially false information. In the end, as Judge Collier elected not to reduce my $200,000.00 cash bond, Pros. Holman's actions resulted in the deprivation of my U.S. 8th Amendment right which was designed to protect a defendant from "Excessive bail."[80] For confirmation of this accusation, Judge Collier's decision and my bond amount were based on Pros. Holman's lies. He believed everything Holman said without question or hesitation, and Atty. Spears just rolled over and played dead. Funny. I remember after getting out on bond Beth Rapenchuk telling me about Kollar asking her how I got out, because the bond amount was set to ensure that I didn't. Hmmm.

• • •

Rocket: Pow!

Groot: [Nods and gestures while eating fries]

Frank. Uh, yes, Groot. We'll get more ketchup.

---

[80] There should be a Federal Law that governs "Excessive" or reasonable bail as a percentage of income per degree of felony. No exceptions.

• • •

¶316 Next, taking the slanderous statements that were printed in the newspaper article into consideration (Exhibit-29), which clearly states

1) "Wood has two Social Security numbers"

i. Again, did he or did he not verify? Either way, he's in the wrong

2) "has recently changed his name"

i. The merging of names took place **four (4) years prior** in their courthouse

3) "has ties to...one foreign country"

i. Still pushing sensationalized reporting (a.k.a. "muckraking"), and the mob connection, at that time I had no knowledge of any living family or friends in Europe

ii. As a *military brat*, I find it highly unlikely that I was sitting on some *Don's* lap sipping red from crystal. Yeah, that would have been cool, but **c'mon!**

¶317 Pros. Holman's cavalier comments were so deceptive that they resulted in

> Libel. Any statement written or in print attacking a living person, thus inflicting damage to his/her reputation, causing him/her humiliation, and exposing him/her to public ridicule (Rothenberg, p.275-276),

thereby committing PRE-TRIAL MEDIA CHARACTER ASSASSINATION. As the Medina County Prosecutor's Office must now print a retraction after reading this, failure to do so would result in a suit of libel. But we'll come back to this later in [¶488] and [¶1066].

¶318 To support and hide Pros. Holman's tortious tale, as with my first arraignment, the improperly touched Trial Record is *void* of the Transcript of this proceeding,[81] [¶579, 10, iv]. Therefore, the record of this hearing was never forwarded to the Appellate Court as part of the

[81] Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record #2.

Trial Record, and I never received a copy for the purposes of appeal.

¶319 Some time after my pre-meditated arraignment, Pros. Holman stepped down from the case, and Asst. Chief Pros. Salisbury, a dangerous prosecutor and killer litigator, refused to try my case. Then, the now former Asst. Pros. Anne Eisenhower took up the torch [¶1146].

-Σ-

• • •

Rocket: Only to get burned in the end.

Frank: Indeed. Where did he get ice cream?

Rocket: Dunno.

Frank: He sure looks happy.

Rocket: Until his acorns freeze.

[Collective laughter]

• • •

Chapter 15

¶320 FIRST BOND HEARING AND RELEASE

¶321 Unlawfully detained in the Medina County Sheriff's Department, I met with John Fish of the Turoczy Bonding Company out of Cleveland, Ohio. Through the combined efforts of family and myself, Mr. Fish filed for and posted my excessively unreasonable **$200,000.00 cash bond.** During the bond release hearing, Mr. Fish asked Judge Collier to define "contact" regarding the Court's order for "No contact with anyone under the age of eighteen" (Exhibit-07: p.3 at 25/Aug/2005). Per Mr. Fish, Judge Collier refused to clarify.

¶322 Judge Collier's refusal to clarify would naturally be in the Transcript for the Bond Hearing proceeding, yes? Well, sorry to disappoint you, but the Transcript for this hearing was

never produced, never forwarded to the Appellate Court as part of the Record, and I never received a copy for the purposes of appeal[82] [¶579, 10, iv]. This is **highly significant** and we will come back to this in [¶365-¶403].

¶323 As to the hearing itself, I was not present. This is a direct violation of Crim.R.43 Presence of the defendant,[83] which clearly states, in pertinent part, that

> ...the defendant must be physically present at
> every stage of the criminal proceeding and trial...

from arraignment on [¶579, 10, v]. No, I never waived this legal right.

¶324 Continuing... On August 26, 2005, I was released on bond. Shortly thereafter, previously retained counsel Atty. Spears forwarded to me the Discovery File pursuant to Crim.R.16. Eventually I dismissed Atty. Spears because he failed to act in my best interest. Yes, I demanded a polygraph TWICE and he failed to make good on his promises [¶347].

¶325 After dismissing Atty. Spears, I made the fatal mistake of retaining

F. Harrison Green
F. Harrison Green Co., L.P.A.
4015 Executive Park Dr., Suite 230
Cincinnati, Ohio 45241
Ph: (513) 796-0840

¶326 At this time I did not know that Atty. Green was "primarily a civil attorney" (Tp.523, Ln.6-7), and not qualified to handle this criminal case, despite his Pre-Trial declarations to me stating otherwise. I should have woven the threads of information together when he told me that

1) Past clients would hand him signed blank checks

2) He wanted to try hypnosis—

• • •

[82] Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record #3.
[83] Presence of the defendant violation #1.

Rocket: Quack magic.

Groot: I am Groot?

["Crackers?"]

Frank: Sure.

• • •

-Σ-

Chapter 16

¶327 A WORD ON THE MEDINA POLICE REPORT

Jealousy is the most corrosive of all human emotions.
-*Taita*, the Slave[84]

¶328 Shortly after my bond release, I spoke with my former accountant Sharon Yarwood ("Sharon"). Sharon informed me that she was contacted by Det. Kollar to interview her daughter M.Y., who would have been around 13 ½ at the time. For approximately the previous seven (7) years, M.Y. and I honorably adopted each other as *goddaughter* and *godfather*. Sharon said that Det. Kollar interviewed M.Y. at Job & Family Services shortly after my arrest.

¶329 Clarifying the French Connection, both Danielle and Beth Rapenchuk knew Sharon through me. It's all connected.

¶330 According to Sharon, Det. Kollar's interview with M.Y. yielded nothing, so he decided to ask a "crude question." At that very moment, M.Y. jumped to my defense and, as she stood up, shoved her finger into Kollar's face and said,

> "Let me tell you something! Whether my mom's around or not, Frankie treats me the same!" [¶513].

¶331 I love you, M.Y. You are a light in this world.

---

[84] Thank you, Wilbur Smith. Love your work.

¶332 As

Manners... maketh... man,
-The Kingsmen

Det. Kollar, your crude approach to an innocent child was *very* bad manners, indeed. You should be ashamed of yourself.

Does your mother know about this?

¶333 For the real Record, M.Y. was never called to testify, her statement was withheld from my Discovery, and, obviously withheld from the Grand Jury proceedings.

¶334a Data mining (Exhibit-04), Sharon, I was thunderstruck to learn that

1) You never told me you inserted yourself into the investigation, thereby aiding Det. Kollar in chasing ghosts. In doing so, you

   i. Helped him investigate the bogus and unindicted allegation of porn on a computer (ibid) (p.16), [¶192], [¶1078]. Why? Because Satan's sister Danielle said so?

   ii. Said that I made statements about M.Y. being "pretty," only to pause and finally admit "no," that I never made inappropriate comments to her (p.15)[85]

2) Forgot

   i. To tell Det. Kollar that you used my name, Social Security Number, and credit without telling me, thereby committing identity theft and fraud

   ii. That I took your children to church, picked them up from school, gave them jobs

   iii. I was there for you when that nut screwed you over and we painted the wall, burned his picture, and prayed together in the church parking lot

[85] Guilty conscience speaks #2.

iv. That I buried M.Y.'s dog because your live-in sociopath ran him over, threw him in the driveway, told you that your dog was dead, and left for work

3) You told me, "It's your fault!" when one of your sons attempted suicide after my arrest because I wasn't there to stop him

4) You told me that Beth and Leisa were the ones who betrayed me

5) After you stole my identity, you told me, "You pay your guys too much." As my accountant, I wonder what else you stole

6) I suggest you remember what we all saw when your mother, you and I prayed together. That army is still behind me. I may have lost faith in God and Christ thanks to you all, but I know something is still there backing me, and you made the mistake of messing with it

7) Then there's the grand I gave you to close out my tax records. Something you failed to do

How I **loved** your family!

• • •

Rocket: This is going to get ugly

Groot: I am Groot.

["Like a forest fire."]

Frank: Kid gloves came off a long time ago. Nothing left to show for it but raw nerve.

• • •

¶334b Beth Rapenchuk... Where to begin? I was stunned that you conveniently forgot to tell Det. Kollar that

1) You deliberately stalked me against court orders (Exhibit-04: p.17) because during

your divorce proceedings, a judge told you to keep you and your children away from me due to the "bullshit" pending allegations

2) My sister had to call you to tell you to stop following me

3) You soon-to-be ex-husband was once under investigation for *raping his sister* while your six-year-old daughter C.R. said that she and I had "bad secrets" (ibid) (p.16), only for you to confirm that I was never alone with your children (p.14). Sounds like Mr. Rapenchuk had implanted a memory to hide something, eh? Just like that leprous bastard Scott Sadowsky

4) Then you had the audacity to tell Det. Kollar that I was "verbally abusive" towards you (p.14). When? I raised my voice without insult, foul language, or threat because you were stalking me against court orders and risking custody of your children! What more, you told me your soon-to-be-ex was verbally abusive. So which is it? Huh?

5) I gave you the funds via gift card that you used to purchase winter boots and coats for your children because your soon-to-be ex wouldn't help you

6) You told me that it was Sharon that betrayed me

7) Need I mention the Jeep title or your journals in detail? We must may go there yet

8) Now recall *why* you said to me, **"I'll never doubt anything you say"**

¶334c Arlene Harmon... A Marine's daughter. *Ooh Rah!* You told Kollar that you stopped seeing me because of "odd behavior" around you daughter K.H. and her friend K.N. (ibid) (p.16).

Bad idea.
-Predator

You lied. For clarity,

1) You forgot that K.N.'s mother knew Atty. Stanley *personally.* Not too bright, for had

there been an issue, she would gone to Ron. What more, those two (2) strong-willed, outgoing, and intelligent young ladies would have said something

Always check the ass you have to kiss *before* you step on the toes.
-F.P.Wood, *Going forward*

2) You neglected to tell Kollar that I stopped seeing you because

   i. Robyn and the children were in trouble [¶673] and I felt obligated to help them, which really fired you up, just like when you wanted to celebrate my divorce and I chose to reflect [¶670]

   ii. I told you directly that I was not mentally or emotionally prepared to enter a new relationship

   iii. You asked Scott (my old neighbor and not the Scott of this case), **"So what color do you cum, Scott?"** When I displayed righteous indignation, you had the nerve to tell me, regarding Robyn, "She ruined a good man." No. I was a good man then and I am a good man now. Even more so. Further, permanently woven into the fabric of truth, that thread of information never left my mind. If you couldn't control yourself with alcohol in front of me, I couldn't trust you behind me

3) You forgot to tell Kollar, that we were intimate several months after we stopped seeing each other

4) In the end, you refused to let Kollar interview you or your daughter (p.16) because you lied [¶514]

5) I know Beth helped Kollar track you down because she told me

6) You forgot to tell Kollar that I spent the following Christmas at your house

¶334d Sharon, Beth, Arlene. Neither you nor your families testified against me. Your

credibility in this matter is shot. Your lies, manipulations, and deceptions merely fueled the fire of this fool into chasing the wrong man: this good man, thus, two (2) perps run free. Congratulations! You have tarnished your souls and shamed your families! Bravo, Ladies! Bravo!

[CROWD CLAPPING]

¶334e But fear not, for you are not alone. Robyn, Danielle, and Leisa are right there with you. When the fail-safe-go-to-guy and his money were gone, you turned on me as if I threw pearls to swine.[86] I am no longer your doormat to dump your problems and wipe your feet. Clearly your families relied on me too much and took be for granted. Never again. You know not what it means to be grateful.

> To be grateful means that, without the blessing of the gift
> received, somehow and in some way, my life would suffer.
> But the love behind the gift is always of the far greater value.
> *-The-Fail-Safe-Go-To-Guy*

¶334f Your vanities, insecurities, ineptitudes, and jealousies over one another and *who-got-what from Frank* controlled you. You have neither personal, situational, nor environmental awareness. No balance. With neither self-control nor self-discipline, you have no self-mastery over your faculties, your passions, or your authority. Train wrecks looking for a place to happen, may you wed men **just like you**.

¶334g You have been exposed to the ugly core of your true natures. Fortunately for you, anyone can change. If they choose.

¶334h They used to call me *Happy-go-lucky-Frankie*. I was the guy who laughed, sang, hummed, joked, worked, helped, motivated, and encouraged others. But **you** killed him. He's *dead*. Because of you, and others like you,

---

[86] Matthew 7:6.

I used to give people the benefit of the doubt. Now I
give strangers the doubt, save children and family, and
the rest have to work their way up to my benefit.
-Mr. Frank P. Wood, *A good man*

¶334i Thanks to you I will ***never*** be able to profess romantically to a woman

1) I love you

2) I do

3) Honey, I'm home

You took that from me. As you are not alone, grouped in your category are all the people who abandoned me when the bomb went off and the dust settled. There there's those who ignored my pleas for help, rejected, abandoned, used, and abused me. Ah! I must not forget the judges, prosecutors, and magistrates on the State and Federal level who have turned blind eyes. Then there are those I helped over the years who never checked on me, turned their backs as if they never knew me.[87] So many of you claimed to be *Good Christians*.

Bah!

¶334j Still, I thank you all. For your total efforts have made me wiser **in** mind, stronger in heart, and more courageous in spirit than all of you combined will ever be. I am Mr. Frank P. Wood and I am a good man. Always.

¶334k The man I rebuilt from scratch during my sojourn in *Hell's Lost Half Acre* [¶766-¶767] shall remain undaunted, unconquered, and unbroken. Scratched, chipped and dented, but never broken.

• • •

Rocket: He hit it!

Groot: I am Groot?

---

[87] Matthew 25: 41-46. Reap it!

• • •

¶335 Yes. Years ago M.Y. wrote me and thanked me for "showing me what a true father is." A heart-breaking moment as tears burned the cheeks that day. I didn't write her back because she was still a minor and I didn't want others to hurt her like they did K.S. and S.L. to get to me. Then, a few years ago as an adult she came to see me. I was able to explain why I did not write and got to thank her for her love and courage as she stood up for me. Her love, courage, and honor are remarkable. When this is over, wherever I go, she will forever be welcome in my life. As to the rest of them, they are better off asking for nothing, because that is exactly what they will get: **nothing**.

• • •

Groot: I am Groot?

• • •

¶336 Leisa? Leisa Kay Willis. I met her through Sharon. We were all members of the same church, and she owned her own home/office cleaning company. We got together, and for the first time in MANY years, I was happy. Then, one day she disappeared. Lonely and confused, I threw myself into my work. Vulnerable, I met Danielle and the rest of that is an ugly history. After Danielle and I broke up, Leisa called. Eventually I told her everything and asked why she left. She claimed she had to get her life ready for me. Whatever that meant. I asked if I failed to treat her like a lady, made her feel undesired, or gave any indication that I wanted more than her. She answered, "No." Wow! Was I ever confused. However, she said she would never leave me again (*Book of Ruth*). Then I went to prison. Believing in the legal system, mistake, we thought the first appeal would bring me home. We discussed marriage, and **three (3) times** I told her to consider leaving me due to the uncertainties of the Life-Sentence. Three (3) times she said she

would never leave me. Believing this was the right thing to do, we married in prison. Never do that! It is always the wrong thing to do. *No matter what*. I married once to help a woman get her children back, a second time because I thought it was the right thing to do. Why could I not marry for love? `See [¶766] in its entirety.`

• • •

Rocket: Where is she now?

• • •

¶337 Not sure. Possibly in Medina. Have not seen her since December of 2008. In January of 2009, during a phone call, I asked if her knew benefactor "Bill" knew she was married. She hung up. A month later we spoke and she said she wanted a divorce. We never spoke again.

¶338 Tired of waiting for papers, I filed for divorce in 2010. Having filed in Lorain County, where the prison sits, the Judge said I had to file in Medina County because that was my county of residence at the time of arrest and conviction. Knowing that Medina will not assist me in this matter, I **WILL** re-file after my vindication. Divorce is an ugly thing, for it hurts many, but this is necessary, and *necessary* means *can't do without*.

¶339 I harbor neither love nor resentment towards Leisa, and I simply cannot trust her to **not** leave me again. What more, her jealousy of Danielle was unsettling. While out on bond I collected things for my son. One item was a picture of Danielle and myself. I wanted to show that his mother and I were not always enemies. He would someday need that. A traditionalist, I tend to keep one eye on the past and one eye on the future. But that didn't matter to Leisa. Very stubborn.

¶340 Having received (Exhibit-04) after all these years, I found an incident report/complaint filed against Leisa on March 2, 2006 as Law Incident # 05-013748. Beth claimed that Leisa

called her about her journals she had sent me in violation of the court order, and was going to send them to her "ex-husband" (ibid) (p.17).

¶341 On August 15, 2017 I wrote Leisa, enclosed a copy of the incident report and a copy of the law she violated, asked for a divorce, **again**, and mailed it to her last known address. It came back "Return To Sender" in October. I am saving that data for our divorce proceedings. Perhaps she will file before hand and eliminate any further damage to her reputation.

¶342 The part that I found to be the most disturbing was that this happened **after** the fraudulent revoking of my $200k cash bond [¶364-¶390], and Leisa married me without telling me. Mind-blowing.

• • •

Groot: I am Groot?

• • •

¶343 Despite all my bravado and machismo, maybe. But it would take an impressive woman to settle me down. A woman of focus, inner strength, and an intellect that can stimulate my mind. A lady who is kind-hearted, gentle, and patient. Tired of insecure, jealous, needy, greedy, violent, and mean women.

Mean people suck camel crap through a straw.
-Frank P. Wood

I have been through too much to settle for less than what I have to offer [¶932], [¶936]. As I have met in the past, and there are many in my family, I desire a woman who is her *own* woman, as I am my *own* man.

• • •

Rocket: Explain.

• • •

¶344 Very well. Clarifying,

> I know my true worth, and someone's half-
> penny's worth of approval or disapproval
> neither adds to nor subtracts from my value.
> *-Agent Carter*

What more, I do not need anyone to validate me. I stand alone just fine, and, as I own all of me; my successes and failures, and I know myself; my strengths and my weaknesses, this is what allows for me to give freely of myself to others [¶905]. Further, if I am ever privileged to have my life graced by such a woman, my *One* [¶932], then I will grow old alone. Something I am prepared to do. Besides, it's not like I have Gal-*the goddess*-Gadot or Scarlett Jo-*heartthrob*-hansson knocking on my door. Perhaps if I were 20 years younger and handsome—

• • •

Rocket: Reality check.

Frank: Thanks, Rocket.

Rocket: Hey, you said, and I quote, "let me know if I miss anything." So don't shoot the messenger.

Frank: [BIG SIGH!]

Rocket: Just doing my part.

Groot: I am Groot?

["Poptarts?"]

Frank: Your tree trunk must be hollow. Toasted?

• • •

¶345 Reader, I warned you back in [¶013] that some of this may seem offensive at times. Then I cautioned you that harsh realities tend to be seasoned with gall [¶014]. I can offer no apologies for speaking and exposing truth in this fashion. I have been silent for far too long. Those who did

this to the girls, my family, and me, and those who perpetuate this *Insolent Injustice*, all acted willfully and deliberately with purpose and intent, whether they understood their own subconscious motives [¶755] or not. These people failed to think before they spoke and to begin with the end in mind. With no environmental awareness, they didn't comprehend that

What we do affects others.
-FPW

For instance, they have no idea what they have done to the girls and my family, to my son. They suffer too. Sometimes I wonder, absent being either a sociopath (no empathic capabilities) or a psychopath (cannot determine right from wrong), how they sleep at night. Do their sins gnaw at their consciences like a hungry dog on a bone? I hope so. Still, although I cannot forgive them for what they have done; this is **barbaric** and I am not so foolish as to let them back in my life. Please understand that, from the moment I chose to pour my pain onto parchment, this became **strictly business** and I am just the messenger. This must be done.

-Σ-

Chapter 17

¶346 A WORD ON DISCOVERY

> Labyrinth was a place with many confusing paths and passageways. According to Greek mythology, Daedalus built it for King Minos of Crete. Minos wanted it as a prison for the Minotaur. He sacrificed seven Athenian youths and seven maidens to the Minotaur every year.
>
> Theseus, the son of the Athenian King, went into the Labyrinth, killed the Minotaur, and found his way out of the twisting passages. Ariadne, **Minos's** daughter, had given him a ball of thread to unwind as he went in. He followed the thread and escaped (Fetzer, L Volume 12, p.19).

¶347 Reader, back in [¶113] and [Footnote 35] I mentioned that a Discovery File "contains the facts or documents disclosed." As they are disclosed from prosecutor to counsel and then to

defendant, I received my Discovery File from previously retained and dismissed counsel: Atty. Ronald Scott Spears [¶324] while out on bond.

¶348 Now, pursuant to Crim.R.16, Discovery and inspection, Section (A) states, in pertinent part, that

> This rule is to provide all parties in a criminal case with the information necessary for a full and fair adjudication of the facts, to protect the integrity of the justice system and the rights of the defendants,

but Section (C) states, in pertinent part, that

> The prosecuting attorney may designate any material subject to disclosure as "counsel only"... Defense counsel may orally communicate the content of the "counsel only" material to the defendant,

while under Section (D), a prosecutor

> shall certify to the court that the prosecuting attorney is not disclosing material or portions of material otherwise subject to disclosure under this rule,

and can claim one (1) of five (5) reasons for not disclosing material, literally, with no chance for rebuttal by defense counsel. *How can you rebut what you don't know about?*

¶349 In consideration of my scantily assembled Discovery File, all a prosecutor has to do is communicate to a court that material was *not disclosed by law*. Scary, eh? After that, should a criminal defendant be fortunate enough to discover what was withheld, exculpatory and/or exonerating evidence that was his or her due, the legal battle to obtain it is long and drawn out because prosecutors *rarely* admit they were wrong. *Dogmas & Pride.*

¶350 Regarding the chain of custody and command of my Discovery File, its contents began with

1) Pros. Holman's and Det. Kollar's misinformed, misguided, and therefore misdirected investigations that were based on lies, half truths, and withheld information

2) With inaccurate and withheld evidence, the "coaching " of alleged victims, IMPLANTED/TRANSPLANTED MEMORIES, and "untruthful" testimony, it was then presented to the Grand Jury

3) Pros. Holman, by law, had to certify to the Court if any non-disclosed evidence was withheld from Atty. Spears. After what I have learned and revealed thus far, I remain under the impression that a certification of non-disclosure took place. No, I never received a copy and there is nothing in the Docket (Exhibit-07) to say such a filing took place

4) I do not know what was designated "counsel only"

5) Atty. Spears never "orally" communicated any information to me

6) Per Crim.R.16, I received my copy of the part-and-parceled Discovery File from Atty. Spears while out on bond

7) Upon dismissal of Atty. Spears, via letter, I asked him to forward Discovery and all material pertaining to my case to Atty. Green

8) Atty. Green may, or may not have, received everything that was in Atty. Spears' possession

9) Atty. Green "orally" communicated two (2) pieces of evidence to me regarding K.S. [¶526], [¶579, 5], and what was to become part of my Presentence Investigation Report ("PSI") [¶1333]

10) Atty. Green was forced to represent me with an inadequate and incomplete Discovery File that was built with inaccurate and withheld evidence, the "coaching" of witnesses, IMPLANTED/TRANSPLANTED MEMORIES, and "untruthful" testimony

¶351 To compound the problem, Atty. Green flatly refused to share any information or trial strategy with Atty. Stanley [¶403] or myself, and failed to subpoena a single witness on my behalf [¶554-¶567].

¶352 Having fallen into the rabbit hole, understand that the law is a labyrinth. Nearly every path you take will bring you back to the Mad Hatter. Once there, you are confronted by a real loon full of riddles designed to confuse you and provide false hope. As soon as you solve one riddle, and you think you are fee, think again. A prosecutor knows the riddles well, and knows how to use them, and the courts, to keep sending you back to the Hatter. With no ball of thread to unwind to help you find your way out, Crim.R.16 is clearly designed to protect the State's interests, be they right or wrong, and allows for a prosecutor to dictate not only the submission of evidence, but the withholding thereof. Adding to the riddles, Ohio Common Pleas Courts claim that

> criminal defendants and their trial counsel have a duty to make a serious effort of their own to discover potential favorable evidence. State v. Anderson, 10th Dist., Franklin No. 12AP-133, 2012 Ohio App. 4733, at ¶14.

¶353 As Judge Collier once quoted that law against me, as will be shown, consider this... With the Prosecutor dictating the withholding and submission of filtered evidence, Atty. Green refusing to work with Atty. Stanley or myself, other than the indicted charges (Exhibit-02), how was I supposed to "discover potential favorable evidence" while defending nothing more than *'He did it'* ? I was blindfolded with both hands tied behind my back because my Discovery File lacked

1) The coached video interview of the girls

2) The transcripts of the video interviews

3) The transcripts of the witnesses' testimony and Danielle's "untruthful" testimony from

the Grand Jury proceeding

4) Any depositions that took place

5) Montville's reports

6) Kollar's police report (Exhibit-04)

7) Dr. LeSure's financial agreement with Medina County (Exhibit-43) [¶724a-¶724o]

8) And anything else I still do not know about [¶378, 2]

¶354 So not knowing what I had to counter, what was I supposed to discover that would have discredited the falsified and fabricated evidence against me? Recall that while out on bond I assembled documents (Exhibits-08 and 09) that Judge Collier refused to accept for an *in camera* inspection [¶062]. Remarkably, I assembled these documents without knowing about Crim.R.16 and the Anderson ruling. Having done my part, Judge Collier engaged in Judicial Hypocrisy. Please, read on...

¶355 Reader, please understand that I am neither a lawyer, doctor, nor private investigator. This is why I exercised my U.S. 6th Amendment right "to have the assistance of counsel for [my] defense" through retained counsel to handle such matters. The Court's decision in Anderson is a State Law in conflict with Federal Law: the 6th Amendment, for it violates my right to the effective assistance of counsel by *forcing me* to act as my own doctor, lawyer, and private investigator regarding discovery issues.

¶356 In support

> Ohio Const. art. IV, § 5(B) states that the Ohio Supreme Court is vested with exclusive authority to prescribe rules governing practice and procedure in all courts of the state, which shall not abridge, enlarge, or modify any substantive right. All laws in conflict with such rules shall be of no further force or effect after such rules have taken effect. (In re W.A.G., 2017-Ohio-2997, HN4).

¶357 Having directly affected my 6th Amendment

> Substantive right. (18c) A right that can be protected or enforced by law (Garner, p.1520),

to Counsel and Discovery, the Ohio Supreme Court must exercise its authority and reverse the lower court's Anderson decision, and declare it to be in violation of the U.S. 6th Amendment, rendering it

> Unconstitutional. (18c) Contrary to or in conflict with a constitution, esp. the U.S. Constitution (Garner, p.1757).

¶358 In sync and support, the Constitution Of The United States, Article VI, ¶2 states that

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, any thing in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding (Rothenberg, p.547).

¶359 Putting it in the most blunt manner possible, **all State Law must coincide with and submit to Federal Law**. This is the legal standard. Via a strict interpretation and application of Article VI, ¶2 to the instant matter, the Anderson's Court's decision dictating that I act as my own retained counsel for Discovery purposes in violation of the 6th Amendment, falls short of this benchmark.

¶360 Why am I driving the Counsel and Discovery issue to fiercely? Glad you asked. I have been looking forward to this for quite some time.

¶361 As will be shown in greater detail [¶1298-¶1378, 3], in a *pro se* capacity, I received and presented newly discovered exonerating evidence in the form of a medical research paper (Exhibit-72) to the Trial Court. The report was produced in 2004 while Trial was in 2006. Atty. Green failed to present either a medical expert or medical evidence to aid in my defense. Had he done *some* research and discovered such evidence, I wouldn't be here. As Atty. Green failed

under his U.S. 6th Amendment obligations, regarding counsel and discovery, Judge Collier used the above Anderson ruling a part of his justification in denying my motion for new trial. He knew he denied my documents during Trial, and then he had the audacity to quote Anderson. Judicial Hypocrisy revealed.

¶362 CAVEAT: Prosecutors will

1) Rely on lower court rulings because they are prolific, random in subject, and cover a variety of evidentiary issues, and that were never reviewed by a Higher Court
2) Cite half of a statement from a piece of case law to suit their needs. So always check it out in full!
3) Raise a new issue and lead you into arguing what they want you to argue. Usually something irrelevant or something you are not prepared for. True, once they open the door you can walk through it, but I recommend you do not. Why? Because not only is this a bait-and-trap-move,
    i. They will take you away from a winning argument
    ii. This may trip you up into either *augmenting* an issue, or raising a new issue that was not raised earlier, thereby leaving you procedurally defaulted, and therefore barred. That always sucks, so if a prosecutor tries to bait you, declare their previously unraised ground to be *procedurally defaulted and of no effect*, let the reviewing court settle the matter, and move on. Don't be a hero!
    iii. A good lawyer always writes his opponent's brief first. Yes, I keep not only their past arguments in mind as I articulate litigation, but their future potential counters as well

Moves and counter moves.
-Hunger Games, Mocking Jay Part I

¶363 Coming full-circle on Crim.R.16(A), I was supposed to receive "information necessary for a full and fair adjudication of the facts." Obviously, that didn't happen. Also, the information that was my due, was to "protect the integrity of the justice system and the rights of the defendants." As to the integrity of the justice system, when it came to Judge Collier's courtroom and the Medina County Prosecutor's Office, I have just one thing to say before we continue on with sifting wheat and setting tiles:

I couldn't find any.

-Σ-

Chapter 18

¶364 WHILE OUT ON BOND

What we have here is
a failure to communicate.
There are some people
you just can't reach.
-Cool Hand Luke

¶365 In late September of 2005, Atty. Green called me and asked if I knew my case had been closed twice. I answered 'Yes' and he then proceeded to ask me, "Who had enough money to reopen your case?" People, if a lawyer ever asks you such a question, get another one. Quickly. Why? So glad you asked. Follow me on this, please.

¶366 Due to what Danielle told me on several occasions, and what I heard Scott scream at her over the phone, Scott repeatedly threatened Danielle with a **"million cash"** to take their son A.S.: Danielle's ***first greatest weakness*** [¶120], [¶122] [¶579, 6] from her if she married me. Scott knew of Danielle's love for her son above all others, and, per Danielle, Scott's mother married into money (Exhibit-09: p.D-2, ¶3 and ¶7), and that unnerved her. Knowing this, Scott

boasted of his step-father's offer for the "million cash" often.

¶367 As you can see, the "million cash" was motive for Atty. Green [¶391], a means for Scott [¶372], and absolute fear for Danielle.

¶368 **Q**: How do you defeat an enemy?

A: Attack what they love with what they fear.

¶369 Remarkably, this truism came out *in part* during Trial via the following exchange that took place between Pros. Eisenhower and Danielle:

Q Did Scott tell you that he was going to take the children?

A He said that once in December of '04 (Tp.122, Ln.20-22).

¶370 Wheat from the chaff.

¶371 Much like another insightful question from Pros. Eisenhower to Scott [¶959-¶967], I find it quite suspect that Pros. Eisenhower knew to ask this highly specific question of Danielle. Σ

¶372 Obviously Scott knew how to put Danielle on a leash to do his bidding. He was the degreed provider and a "father image" to Danielle (Exhibit-09: p.D-5, ¶1). To the contrary, Danielle had no college degree and leased apartments part-time. Combine her lack of education and income, the affair, the pregnancy, the guilt, the daunting "million cash", the fear of losing her son, and her cursed vanity it is easy to see how Danielle became Scott's Pitbull. It would have been easier for Scott to prove marital infidelity than it would have been for Danielle to prove why she left the sanctity of the marriage bed. But that would not have served Scott's dual-purpose of revenge for our affair and securing a scapegoat[88] for his sins [¶367], [¶579, 3]. Σ

¶373 Out on bond, I ran into Det. Kollar at the Cracker Barrel at the intersection of Rt.18 and

[88] Scapegoat: A preacher once told me that the ancient Hebrews would whisper their sins into the ear of a goat and release it into the wilderness. The belief was that, by engaging in this form of confession and cleansing, they would escape punishment for their sins. Hence, the term.

Rt.71 in Medina, Ohio (Exhibit-09: p.D-7, ¶1). There were families present and I strictly maintained "no contact with anyone under the age of eighteen." Kollar did nothing while we stared each other down as I walked by. This is very important and will be explained shortly with just one word [¶399-¶401].

¶374 After the "million cash" conversation with Atty. Green, he became increasingly difficult to reach. Then, on September 29, 2005 someone filed a Motion For Continuance without my knowing, and Trial was tolled[89] until November 8, 2005 (Exhibit-07: p.3).

¶375 When a trial is tolled, the 270-day time limit to try you pursuant to O.R.C. § 2945.71 (C)(2) is legally delayed, or stopped. You see, when a motion is filed the clock stops running until the motion is heard. Basically, *dead time* is used to legally violate your U.S. 6th Amendment right to a speedy trial in Medina County. Yes, everything they do is *deliberate*, so never think otherwise.

Welcome to Ohio.
The hole of it all.
-Me

¶376 Taking a closer look at the Docket printout from 2017, at (Exhibit-07: p.3) the entry for 02/Dec/2005 states that on 11/23/05 a Status Hearing Conference was held without my knowledge or presence in direct violation of Crim.R.43 Presence of the defendant,[90] [¶579, 10, v]. And, as par for the course, the Transcript of this proceeding was never forwarded to the Appellate Court as part of the Record (Exhibit-26: p.2 of 6), and I never received a copy for the purposes of appeal[91] [¶579, 10, iv].

---

[89] Toll. vb. (15c) 2. (Of a time period, esp. a statutory one) to stop the running of;... Garner, p.1716.

[90] Presence of the defendant violation #2.

[91] Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record #4.

¶377 Adding to the gravity of the Crim.R.14 [¶152] and Crim.R.43 violations, at this hearing my legal

> Status. (17c) 1. A person's legal condition, whether personal or proprietary; the sum total of a person's legal rights, duties, liabilities, and other legal relations, or any particular group of them separately considered (Garner, p.1632),

was discussed.

• • •

Rocket: Don't you just love it when people make a life-decision for you.

Frank: The actions of a tyrannical despot.

Groot: I am Groot.

Frank: True, but at least I can expose them now.

• • •

¶378 Still data mining, at (Exhibit-07: p.3), the entry for 02/Dec/2005 also states that all motions will be filed on 12/5/05, and **Trial was set for 2/13/05**. With that said, a few things must be clarified before proceeding:

1) These decisions were made without my knowledge at the status hearing that I was not present for
2) I never received copies of any motions filed by Atty. Green or Pros. Eisenhower (this goes back to the Anderson ruling in [¶352-¶353, 1-8])
3) A trial date, although inaccurate, was set without my knowing
4) A *nunc pro tunc*[92] was filed on 07/Dec/2005 correcting the Trial date from **2/13/05** to **2/13/06** without my knowing. Yes, this was a deliberate change/correction

[92] *Nunc pro tunc*. [Latin] "now for then." A *nunc pro tunc* is traditionally used to correct clerical errors now that were made back then. Again, this was a deliberate correction.

¶379 I was present at the hearing on 12/12/05 [¶413], and so was Court Reporter Donna A. Garrity. The Docket reveals that she billed the Court for her services that same day (ibid) (p.3 at entry 12/Dec/2005). The hearing lasted about 20 minutes. Judge Collier asked if the Defendant's request for Discovery had been met and filed with the Court. Pros. Eisenhower picked up a small file as a prop and said, "That's all I have." **"bullshit."** Pros. Eisenhower presented neither the coached video interviews of the girls nor my interview at the hearing. And, as I have shown, and will continue to show, there is a plethora of other evidence that was not filed with the Court, used during trial, and that was added to the Raped Trial Record **Post-Trial**. Yeah, this is going to get wild. ☺

¶380 Going forward, the earlier Docket printout from 2014 (Exhibit-26) reveals that the Transcript of this proceeding was forwarded to the Appellate Court as part of the Record (ibid) (p.2 of 6). And, to no surprise, I never received a copy for the purposes of appeal,[93] [¶579, 10, v]. What more, compare (Exhibit-26: p.2 of 6) with (Exhibit-07: p.3) and you will see that EVERY hearing **date** of Record that was forwarded to the Appellate Court has since been removed[94] for a reason [¶579, 11], [¶1258].

¶381 Reader, at the appropriate time, I will clarify why my EVER-CHANGING DOCKET is illegal [¶1258].

¶382 Continuing... On 07/Feb/2006, without my knowledge, Pros. Eisenhower filed a Motion For Continuance (Exhibit-07:p.3). Then, on February 8, 2006, Atty. Green called me for the first time since the December 12, 2005 hearing [¶413] and said that we were "ready for Trial," and that we had a Pre-Trial hearing to attend on February 16, 2006 (Exhibit-07: p.3, entry date 17/Feb/2006).

---

[93] Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record #5.

[94] Altered-Incomplete Docket #1.

• • •

Rocket: Wait just a minute! The pre-trial hearing was set for three (3) days **after** trial was due to commence. How is that possible?

Frank: The same way they signed the case in with Dr. LeSure and **not** the police **before** the occurrence of an alleged incident.

Groot: I am Groot!

Frank: Yes, Groot. That was corrupt. It was also predicated on a selfish motive [¶391].

Rocket: And that would be?

Frank: As

> More often than not, the answer to the problem
> is usually found within the problem itself,
> -FPW

we're going there now.

• • •

¶383 On February 16, 2006 Atty. Green and I attended the alleged Pre-Trial Hearing. Much to my surprise, Pros. Eisenhower requested to "renew the State's Motion For Continuance." Upon refusing to concede to this and sign the Waiver of my speedy trial rights, Atty. Green said, "You might as well sign. I have another trial to do next week." Huh?

¶384 With Trial scheduled to start three (3) days ago, and Atty. Green's bluff about a trial to do next week, it's crystal that "ready for trial" was thrown out like yesterday's trash. In this manner, and UNDER EXTREME DURESS, I was forced and manipulated into waiving my U.S. 6th Amendment right to a speedy trial.

¶385 The 2014 Docket reveals that the Transcript for this hearing was forwarded to the Appellate Court as part of the Trial Record (Exhibit-26: p.2 of 6). And, as previously shown, like

all the others, the date of this hearing is also missing from the 2017 Docket printout (Exhibit-07: p.3). Maintaining the *status quo*, I never received a copy of this Transcript for the purposes of appeal[95] [¶579, 10, iv].

¶386 Reader, you may be wondering why the deletions took place and about their significance. There is true validity in your query. As to why the deletions took place to begin with, they

1) Typically go unnoticed by the general public: **You**

2) Aid in hiding corrupt activities

3) Help maintain wrongful convictions

4) Prosecutors know that the most difficult thing for an innocent incarcerated *pro se* litigant to obtain is information, (a.k.a. **Data!**)[96]

¶387 As to my Docket deletions, notice that (Exhibit-26) was printed on 1/24/14. Now look at (Exhibit-07) and notice it was printed on 4/11/2017.[97] So what happened during the interim to prompt such actions? As will be shown [¶1186-¶1188], via court filings in the Medina County Court of Common Pleas, on November 10, 2014 I became a witness against Medina County in State of Ohio v. Matthew J. Hartman, Medina County Case No. 09CR0229, Motion To Dismiss, With Prejudice, On Grounds Of Prosecutorial And Judicial Bad Faith And Misconduct.

• • •

Rocket: Why did you become a witness?

Frank: *Transcript manipulation.*

Rocket: Not looking too good for the home team.

Groot: I am Groot?

---

[95] Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record #6.

[96] Criminal Dockets can be obtained through your local Clerk of Court's web site. I recommend you print and compare annually, if possible.

[97] Both Dockets were printed and forwarded to me by Atty. Stanley.

Frank: Ah! Yes. Legally, Bad faith is

> 1. Dishonesty of belief, purpose, or motive...
> Also termed *mala fides* (Garner, p.167).

• • •

¶388 Having sifted that grain of wheat and placed it in our bushel, here's the CREEPY part...

¶389 After being forced and manipulated into waiving my speedy trial rights on 2/16/2006 (with Trial due to commence three (3) days **prior**), the very next day, on 2/17/2006 (Exhibit-07: p.3) a motion (Exhibit-30) was filed to revoke my bond, and I was arrested that same afternoon. Yes, they planned the illegal waiver and the FRAUDULENT REVOKING OF MY $200,000.00 CASH BOND. It only gets more interesting from here.

¶390 In hindsight, with the magnitude of the Hubble, something tells me that I should never have told Atty. Green about the "million cash" [¶342].

¶391 When you combine the cash and bond amount, there was **$1.2 million** on the line. Now *that* is what I call a real motivator [¶367], [¶415], [¶578], [¶1014, 2]. See also [¶724a-¶724o].

• • •

Rocket: The *sum total of* strikes again!

• • •

¶392 When Det. Kollar arrived at my house on Gateway Lane, outside of his jurisdiction for the second time, he was not alone this time. As I saw him and two (2) other officers walking up my driveway, I remembered what a Medina County Deputy Sheriff told me a few months prior: "Watch your back, Frank. You're not the first person we've seen the Prosecutor's Office set up" (Exhibit-09: p.D-6, ¶3). I immediately called Atty. Green and, as he naturally did not answer, I left a message with his secretary that I was being arrested, again. I hung up the phone and opened the door. So little was said other than, "Frank Wood, I'm placing you under arrest. Put your

hands behind your back," that it seemed more like a funeral procession than anything else. FREAKY.

Now that's what I call a close encounter.
-Independence Day

In addition, I was not Mirandized for the second time [¶277].

¶393 As I was walking towards the cruiser, all I could think of was, "How did Scott pull this off? How!" Anger was building. A **lot** of anger. Then, while in the back seat of the cruiser, through tears of pure fury and rage (something I never before experienced), I swore on my very soul out loud: "Scott Sadowsky, you will pay for this!" Yes, Reader, I knew *then* what was going on. So pay close attention for I will reference this paragraph later [¶972, 18] and [¶1056].

¶394 After my release valve was exhausted, I notice a camera in from of the cruiser pointed at me. Where's the audio/video recording of this event? Why was it not shown at Trial? Where is the report of the Officer who was driving? Don't worry, Reader. All questions have answers. ☺

-Σ-

Chapter 19

¶395 <u>SECOND BOND HEARING</u>

¶396 Shortly after my re-arrest, on March 1, 2006 a bond hearing was held in Collier's Court. Det. Kollar, still lacking jurisdiction, then testified that Leisa's daughter "[] might have seen the back of Mr. Wood's head" as I was leaving Leisa's residence. Her daughter came home from school an hour early and I was caught unaware, so I left having maintained "no contact."

¶397 Continuing... When Atty. Green asked Det. Kollar if he considered this to be "contact", he said, "Yes." Then, as if on cue, Judge Collier chimed in with, "I agree." In this manner, the fraudulent revoking of my $200k bond was secured [¶277]. Σ

¶398 Deserving *dishonorable* mention, the Transcript for this hearing was never forwarded to the Appellate Court as part of the Record (Exhibit-26: p.2 of 6). This hearing is, however, recorded in the Docket (Exhibit-07: p.3). As with the others like it, I never received a copy for the purposes of appeal[98] [¶579, 10, iv]. Further, the fraudulent revoking of my bond provided an illegal tactical advantage for the State [¶409]. Prosecutors *know* jury psychology [¶509]. They knew having two (2) Deputies posted-up next to me during Trial after the pre-trial media character assassination would cast a shadow on my person and sway a jury. Hence, the tactical advantage. Think I'm in error? The "cynical" Jury heard K.S. testify TWICE that she was never at a crime scene with me, "Put-In-Bay" and "not at Frank Wood's house", and all three (3) State-investigative agencies declared "no evidence", "no rape", "closed", and "terminated". Sorry to beat a dead horse, for I am an animal lover, but, People, I'm in prison!

• • •

Please support Rescue Animals

@

JoinASPCA.org

1-888-988-5998

• • •

¶399 "might have seen". Reader, recall I was in a restaurant with Det. Kollar and families present that saw me [¶373], (Exhibit-09, p.D-7, ¶1), and he did nothing. True, because I broke no rule of Court. Now let's compare this with (Exhibit-09: p.D-6, ¶2).

¶400 *Hypocrisy.*

¶401 As earlier promised [¶373], there's your one (1) word explanation.

---

[98] Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record #7.

¶402 It was **after** my bond was fraudulently revoked that Atty. Stanley, at my request, became directly involved. His first appearance in court, as to this case, was at the above-mentioned **bond** hearing. He also confirmed what I have said about that hearing via Affidavit (Exhibit-31: Item 4). Atty. Stanley can be reached at:

P.O. Box 571
Medina, Ohio 44258

Ph: (330) 952-1514
Email: Legal50@aol.com

¶403 After the above corrupt activities, Atty. Stanley came to me concerned and said, regarding Atty. Green, "Where did you get this guy? He won't tell me anything" [¶321-¶322], [¶351], [¶579, 16], (Exhibit-09: p.D-7, ¶3-¶4).

-Σ-

Chapter 20

¶404 AN UP-TO-DATE SUMMARY

♪ Making their way
the only way they know how.
But that's just a little bit more ♫
than the law would allow.
-Dukes of Hazard

¶405 Summarizing the malevolent machinations present thus far, I was set up, falsely accused, and illegally arrested with a **sham indictment** and a **lack of subject matter jurisdiction.** Then the State committed slander, libel, and pre-trial media character assassination. This destroyed my reputation without a verdict. My business, livelihood, and means of support for my defense all but vanished. Banks started closing on my credit lines, calls for contracts stopped, and I was hanging on to life and liberty by the proverbial thread. Yes, much like the poster with the cat hanging on to the knot at the end of the rope by a single claw, but

I'm still hangin' in there, baby! ☺

¶406 Yes, even after all they have done to me, I still have a sense of humor. And, although I must exist in a state of self-defense and self-preservation, I still see the world, the Universe, with a sense of wonder; and *that* they can't take from me.

¶407 Trusim: To those of you who placed your hand upon the handle
and swung the hammer, in your vain attempt to deliver
the fatal blow, know you found and struck an anvil. Σ
-Frank P. Wood, *Unbroken*

¶408 Now, come! Let us not tarry... Atty. Green finds out where the money came from to reopen my case and I don't hear from him for nearly two (2) months. Next thing you know we're "ready for trial" and a Pre-Trial Hearing takes place three (3) days **after** Trial was deliberately due to commence, via *nunc pro tunc*, without my knowing. At this hearing, I was forced through well-strategized manipulations into waiving my U.S. 6th Amendment right to a speedy trial. The **very next day**, my $200k cash bond was fraudulently revoked with a "million cash" bounty on my head [¶415], and my U.S. 8th Amendment right to bail was violated, while I went un-Mirandized in violation of the U.S. 5th, 6th and 14th Amendments, for the second time.

• • •

Rocket: Why fraudulently revoke the bond?

Frank: Ah! Now we are getting to the crux of the matter!

• • •

¶409 The State was in trouble, promoting a fabricated case, and desperately needed that tactical advantage [¶398] to bolster its position and protect itself. The best way to do that was to get me off the street and discredit me. As the fraudulent revoking of my bond never made it to the press, I did something that Beth told me they were not used to: I fought back.

• • •

Groot: I am Groot?

• • •

¶410 Well, the first thing I did when I realized something was amiss, was dismiss Atty. Spears. Then, in hopes of avoiding Medina County's *'Good 'Ol Boy's Club'* (Exhibit-09: p.D-6, ¶3), I hired Atty. Green from out of town. I also had my phone checked for wire taps, and hired a private investigator (Exhibit-09: p.D-6, ¶5). Also, I used to go to the Courthouse weekly, while out on bond, and examine the public record of my Discovery File. They didn't like that, but it was quite interesting to see the looks on their faces as I casually walked by in undaunted defiance.

• • •

Groot: I am Groot?

• • •

¶411 I spoke with a member of V.O.C.A.L. (Victims Of Child Abuse Laws)[99] [¶763] from Louisiana. A former exoneree, he warned me

> "Frank, it's not what they put in your discovery
> after your arrest; it's what they take out."

So that's why I went, religiously. Also, I numbered every page in pencil and kept a ledger. As to the File itself, during May of 2017, at my request, Atty. Stanley went to the Courthouse seeking to obtain certain pages from that original file. Evidently, the File itself, according to those who work in the "vault", is ***lost*** and can't be found [¶1260a].

> ♪ Things that make you go 'Hmmm.' ♫
> -C+C Music Factory

• • •

[99] V.O.C.A.L. was formed because, as I have shown you, such bogus convictions are founded on hearsay, implanted/transplanted memories, "untruthful" and perjured testimony, he-said she-said, no physical evidence, no eye-witnesses, and the emotions of a "cynical" Jury.

Rocket: Pow! Right in the kisser!

Frank: I *knew* you were binge watching *The Honeymooners*!

• • •

¶412 Per Atty. Stanley, the Trial Record is on one (1) section of microfilm while the Record that was forwarded to the Appellate Court is on another. Both sets of microfilm are on Record with the Clerk of Court, but some things are not legible [¶482], some have been altered (e.g., Transcripts and Docket), while others mysteriously appeared **after** Trial [¶1135-¶1138].

• • •

Rocket: Captain, we're rounding *The Ankle Atoll*. Ready to adjust course by 10 degrees west.

Frank: Excellent, Bosun. The *Straights of Tibia* are ours! It should be smooth sailing from here to *Patella Point.*

Rocket: Aye, Sir! *The Big bone* seems to be gliding along nicely.

Frank: Indeed, she's a fine ship. Worthy of *deep* waters.

Groot: I am Groot!

Frank: No worries, Ensign. *Patella Point* is merely a speed bump.

[COLLECTIVE LAUGHTER]

• • •

¶413 Still summarizing, I never received court filings by either Atty. Green or Pros. Eisenhower, although I was supposedly responsible for finding my own favorable evidence. I was not present for at least two (2) hearings that I know of, and my Discovery File was incomplete. Add the fraudulent revoking of my bond to the loss of my small business, I was left in a position where *no money equals no defense*. Yes, it's amazing how

Legal tender can sharpen an advocate's wit.
-Cervantes, p.__.

True, because after I had already paid Atty. Green $42,500.00 with certified bank checks, at the discovery hearing on 12/12/2005 [¶379] he failed to motion to dismiss the indictment for lack of evidence. We argued about this in the parking lot afterwards. His is excuse was, "I'm not ready to do that just yet." Believing him to be full of

Horse hockey!
-Col. Potter, *M*A*S*H*

I responded with, "There's no more money." He actually had the audacity to tell me, "Now don't say that," as I turned my back on him and walked away. Now you know *why* I didn't hear from him until they were ready to fraudulently revoke my bond [¶382]. Σ

¶414 Supporting the above, during Trial, Atty. Green had the nerve to tell Leisa, "You know, I'm taking a real loss here," thereby exposing his greed.[100] Then he possessed the impudence to tell me, "You know, if I get you off this, I'm going to have to go back to my regular rates." I quickly retorted, "You will prove my innocence!" As to rates? Never actually discussed. I made the mistake of trusting him, so, People, learn from my mistake: Everything is in writing. No exceptions. I no longer do handshake deals.

¶415 Fact: The "million cash" and the $200,000.00 cash bond became a bounty on my head [¶391], [¶408]. Σ (See also [¶724a-¶724o] of this Affidavit).

• • •

Rocket: Now you know how I felt when we first met [¶049].

Frank: No doubt about it.

♪ [Music playing] ♫

Frank: Rocket, will you look at this! Groot's primed to karaoke Motley Crue's *Home Sweet*

[100] Guilty conscience speaks #3.

Home.

Rocket: Now that's a classic.

Frank: Reader, if you could only see this. This is great. Get on it, Groot!

♪ You know I'm a dreamer ♫
but my heart's of gold

Frank: Uh, Rocket? Where did he get the Vince Neil hair?

Rocket: The same place I got the karaoke machine.

Frank: Another four-finger discount?

Rocket: I didn't *exactly* steal it.

Frank: Then if it's not stealing, what do you call it?

Rocket: Borrowing for an indefinite period of time.

Frank: *Without* their knowing.

Rocket: Semantics.

♪ I'm on my way,
just set me free,
home sweet home! ♫

• • •

Chapter 21

¶416 FRAUD UPON THE COURT

The preferred path is a course of action that
avoids casting doubt on one's decisions.
-John J. Wild, accounting professor

¶417 Due to the corrupt activities I have presented thus far, from Implanted/Transplanted Memories to altered and missing court records, the following individuals have broken the Public's and Humanity's trust: Judge Collier, Pros. Holman, Det. Kollar, Stenographer Garrity,

Scott Sadowsky, Danielle Sadowsky, and who ever made the judgment call to alter my Transcripts and Criminal Docket.

We're dooooomed!
-Dr. Smith, *Lost in Space*

¶418 Very soon I shall show you *others* who acted unethically and immorally: Robyn Spencer-Speelman, Lynda Spencer, Dr. Suzanne LeSure, and Atty. Joseph F. Salzgeber. I could go back and recall the *Witches of Eastwick* (Exhibit-04), but, at this juncture, they are in the rear view and fading fast.

¶419 As these people have lost all credibility in the instant matter, and there's still more to come, in State v. Gilbert, 143 Ohio St. 3d 150, 2014 Ohio LEXIS 2714, The Supreme Court of Ohio clarified the meaning of their corrupt activities with the following decision:

> [*158] [**P28] ("'Fraud upon the court' is an elusive concept. *** It is generally agreed that '*** any fraud connected [***500] with a presentation of a case to a court is fraud upon the court, in a broad sense.' 11 Wright & Miller, Federal Practice & Procedure (1973) 253, Section 2870").
>
> (See [¶500] of this Affidavit and Footnote 110).

¶420 Legally, by definition, Fraud on the court is

> (1810) In a judicial proceeding, a lawyer's or party's misconduct so serious that it undermines the integrity of the proceeding. • Examples are bribery of a juror and introduction of fabricated evidence (Garner, p.776).

¶421 Such fraud was committed when my case was presented to the

1) Grand Jury

2) Trial Court

3) Ninth District Court of Appeals ("Appellate Court")

As once is an indicator, twice is a pattern, three times is confirmation, and four is commitment (Exhibit-81: p.5-6), I do not know what other commitments/decisions of the human psyche were made in the Higher Courts by these people.

¶422 Reader, as we proceed, I ask that you hold the legal concept of *fraud on the court* and this pattern of human behavior/nature in the forefront of your analytical and problem-solving minds. I thank you because, as you will see, this *is* truly important.

-Σ-

Chapter 22

¶423 PRE-TRIAL HEARINGS

¶424 Two (2) Pre-Trial hearings were recorded on my docket (Exhibit-07: p.3) pertaining to an Order of the Court on 17/Feb/2006, and are itemized below [¶535].

¶425 Hearing #1: 3-23-06 at 1:00 P.M. – Discovery Status Conference

I was present for this hearing and distinctly recall jurisdictional issues being debated regarding a search warrant that was exercised by Det. Kollar, that yielded *absolutely nothing*, and Det. Kollar admitted that he knew he was operating outside of his jurisdiction. Judge Collier then instructed Atty. Green and Pros. Eisenhower to prepare their arguments for jurisdiction and evidence suppression. The Transcript of this proceeding was never forwarded to the Appellate Court (Exhibit-26: p.2 of 6), and I never received a copy for the purposes of appeal[101] [¶579, 10, iv].

¶426 Hearing #2: 4-12-2006 at 1:00 P.M. – Suppression Issues/Final Pretrial [¶480]

This is the follow-up hearing that is recorded in my vitiated Trial Record (Tp.6-17). I was present for this hearing and Det. Kollar, for the second time [¶234, 1], admitted he was operating outside his jurisdiction (Tp.12, Ln.13-19). This is key because, in all actuality, **it did** regarding

[101] Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record #8.

K.S. and her Uncle Ryan PERP #2 (no picture available), (Exhibit-03: p.11, ¶2), (Exhibit-08: p.R-1 through R-3). Det. Kollar was so very close to his UNSUB,[102] but something, or someone, led him off course. So, before proceeding, please note that (Exhibit-08) reveals two (2) of the motives for revenge previously listed: ***Money & Family***.

¶427 At this point in time, I must make you readily aware of the two-fold motive of ***Family***:

1) First Rule in Life: There's nothing more important than family,
and you never give upon family.
No matter what.
-Frank P. Wood

2) Secrets: Every now and then, you will come across a family with a secret that they will go to any length to hide. This is known as the *Skeleton in the Closet.*

¶428 With that said, Reader, it is now time to open the closet and rattle some bones. In order to do this, let us continue with the building or our mosaic and Det. Kollar's deceptively misguided and deliberately misdirected "thought" process [¶445].

¶429 Det. Kollar's unwarranted involvement evolved around K.S. and the alleged F-3 GSI. To prompt his involvement, someone had to file an Incident Report, which may be accompanied by witness statements. With the actual "Complainant" listed as "Confidential" in the police report (Exhibit-04: p.2), Robyn testified that she went to Children's Services and not the police (Tp.365, Ln.21-Tp.366, Ln.3) when the money stopped (Tp.380, Ln.13-Tp.381, Ln.6), (Exhibit-03: p.10). Hmmm... Much like Danielle went to Dr. LeSure instead of the police. Regardless, Robyn further testified that she **"didn't"** want me to go to jail (Tp.367, Ln.10-11). Well, when you run your mouth in anger, like when you swore to ruin me for divorcing you, something is going to go wrong; e.g.,[103] my wrongful imprisonment.

---

[102] Unknown Subject.
[103] *Exempli gratia*: [Latin]: for example.

¶430 Ultimately, Robyn testified that a bank employee where she used to work[104] heard I was under "investigation" and contacted her "mother" Lynda Spencer ("Lynda"), (Tp.365, Ln.15-20). This raises questions because her former co-workers knew she took employment with the Auditor's Office just off the Medina Square. So why not contact Robyn directly? Who went to the police as a Confidential Complainant? The police report reveals that David A. Madjerich, a Social Worker (Exhibit-03: p.2), contacted Det. Kollar on 06/16/05 (ibid) (p.9). So, with the Confidential Complainant still a mystery, it's time to

Sift some wheat from the chaff.

♪ [Intense music] ♫

¶431 With ***Family*** as Lynda's two-fold motive for revenge, (Exhibit-08) reveals that she had K.S.'s biological father relinquish his paternal rights, via contract and attorney, *while* Robyn was giving birth. Lynda then had Robyn sign over her maternal rights, *while* she was in recovery and under sedation, under the false pretense of "guardianship for medical benefits" so Robyn could finish college. Per Robyn, she later found out that, in the State of Florida, Co-plenary Guardianship was the same as custody. The 'Co' part was for her parents only.

¶432 Let's reflect on this for a moment... According to Robyn, Lynda showed up with contract in hand and an attorney at her side while Robyn was in delivery. Yes, Lynda planned this, had that contract drawn up **pre-delivery**, and kept her attorney on speed dial.

¶433 At all cost, Lynda wanted that baby.

• • •

Rocket: That's twisted.

Frank: Charles Manson twisted.

---

[104] First Merit Bank on south Court in Medina, Ohio: The **same place** Danielle and I banked.

• • •

¶434 To verify what Robyn told me, K.S.'s D.O.B. matches the date of the signing of the guardianship papers that are on file with the Broward County Court of Common Pleas, Probate Division in Broward County, Florida [¶041], [¶814].

¶435 Reader, before we press on, I must encourage you to read (Exhibit-08). This way we are all on the same track and riding the same train-of-thought as I explain why Lynda coached K.S. with IMPLANTED/TRANSPLANTED MEMORIES in violation of Title 18 U.S.C.S. § 1512 [¶195]. Thank you. ☺

♪ After these messages... ♫
We'll be right back!
-Best Saturday morning cartoons ever!

♪ [Intermission music] ♫

• • •

Frank: Popcorn?

Groot: I am Groot!

Frank: Why am I not surprised?

Rocket: Sweet butter and salt!

• • •

¶436 Reader, now you see that Lynda

1) Wanted revenge because I took the *Trophy Child* and gave her back to Robyn

2) Had to protect her son Ryan: PERP #2

3) Had to keep the skeleton in the closet

and that Robyn

4) Had to obey her mother and protect her brother

5) Sought revenge because I divorced her and the money stopped

6) Worked with Lynda to protect the *Family Secret*

But there's more to this. Watch...

¶437 Neither Lynda nor Ryan testified despite the fact that K.S. lived with them from November 1999 through August of 2000, when the guardianship was overturned (Tp.375, Ln.2-16), [¶042], [¶878]. K.S. also lived with them again while Robyn and I went through our divorce [¶673]. So why not testify? Probably because of the nine (9) Civil and Temporary Protection Orders that Robyn and I filed collectively against them [¶680]. These were filed to protect Robyn and the children as there were **"a lot of fights with [Robyn's] parents over K.S."** (Robyn: Tp.371, Ln.18-20). Some of which were physical (Exhibit-08), [¶673].

¶438 People, you have no idea how nuts life was back then.

¶439 Lynda and Ryan also failed to testify so the family skeletons would stay in the closet. However, as I will now show, they forgot to lock the door.

♪ [Suspenseful music] ♫

• • •

Rocket: Frank, that train-of-thought rides like she's on rails.

Frank: Ha Ha! Thanks.

• • •

¶440 With what I have told you about this case, and the guardianship fully supported by Ohio and Florida Court records, Robyn testified, as to both of us, **"We both had trouble with Ryan"** (Tp.378, Ln.8). What more, when Atty. Green asked her, **"Did Ryan ever molest you?"** (Tp.376, Ln.15), with the snap of a deer that heard the gun, Robyn's head turned to me, and, with eyes bulging out like a cartoon character, locked eyes with mine. Please, allow for me to explain

the significance of this event.

¶441 Pupils dilate for a number of reasons, including sexual attraction, *fear*, and curiosity. With that said, the part of the *peripheral nervous system* called the *parasympathetic nervous system* prepares us for fight or flight; a.k.a., the *Fight/Flight Response*. A positive or negative stressor can occur at any time, thereby activating this response, and especially when we perceive a threat. Once a threat is perceived, the pupils dilate to take in more data (Hartley, Karnich. p.99). The dilation causes the *sclera*, the white of the eye to appear enlarged. Muscles then contract and eyelids pull back seeking more light, adding to this effect. Combined with increased heart rate and blood pressure to the head and eyes, all triggered by Robyn's *fear* of the family's skeleton in the closet being exposed, she was remarkably easy to read.[105]

¶442 With Robyn's eyes locked on mine like a deer caught in headlights, I surreptitiously tapped my right temple with my right index finger and mouthed the words "I remember." So does Robyn. Atty. Green confirmed my memory to the Court with, "That was information given to me by my client" (Tp.378, Ln.23-24). Yes, the same information packet Judge Collier refused for *in camera* inspection [¶062]. No, Collier didn't want to know the truth.

¶443 After Robyn and I discussed Ryan and Robyn, and Ryan and K.S. (Exhibit-08), I very well understood what happened. But the gravity of the abuse Robyn suffered because of Ryan did not come clear until Dr. LeSure, K.S.'s treating psychologist, testified [¶724-¶871], (Exhibit-08: bottom of p.R-1 to top of p.R-2).

¶444 Getting back to the Medina Police Report (Exhibit-04), it is <u>VOID</u> of the

1) CPOs and TPOs

---

[105] It should be non-optional State and Federal Law that **all** criminal proceedings be audio-video recorded. Known as *verbatim reporting*, this would induce honesty, reduce corruption, and aid in the verifying the veracity of a witness. Actions *do* speak louder than words.

i. Further evidencing that Det. Kollar did not do his job

2) Personal events between Ryan and Robyn

3) The sexual event I witnessed with Ryan and K.S.

4) The custody battle for K.S.

5) The domestic violence between Ryan and Robyn (Exhibt-08: p.R-2, ¶3)

6) The domestic violence between Robyn and myself where

i. I called 911 for the *second time* in our marriage

ii. Judge Mary Kovach did not believe her story [¶673-¶683]

7) The money recently stopped

8) Robyn swore to ruin me for leaving her with my sister and Aimee Dudash present

¶445 The above omissions, lies told, witness tampering, and withheld evidence are what deliberately misguided, and therefore misdirected Det. Kollar's "thought" process [¶428]. As the bogus allegation prompted him to proceed like a cheetah out of a shotgun, it was aimed at the wrong target: me. What more, the omissions left him so misinformed that he conducted an inadequate investigation and arrived at a concocted conclusion: me.

¶446 Your tax dollars at work.

¶447 Oddly enough, "Lynda Spencer" was present when K.S. reported the alleged incident to Robyn (Exhibit-04: p.9). But Robyn never mentioned this during Trial, and her testimony leads you to believe that K.S. approached her first [¶457] about *Uncle Ryan*. Also, Lynda's presence allowed for her to monitor and coach K.S. when she spoke to Robyn (ibid). Please, keep reading.

¶448 Still sifting, Det. Kollar confirmed, regarding K.S. that

> In response to further questioning, K[REDACTED] stated she felt bad that she wasn't telling her mom, so one day she "confessed" (implying she felt like she had done something wrong). She also stated she told her *grandmother*, about a year ago (ibid, p.11), [*emphasis added*].

• • •

Rocket: Out of the mouths of babes.

Frank: Exactly my point. K.S. made special mention of this for a reason. And that reminds me... *Uncoached*, S.L. testified *where* she was, *whom* she was with, and *when* it happened (Exhibit-03: p.7-8). These girls know much more than they were initially coached to say. Much more.

• • •

¶449 Having taken the *Trophy Child* from Lynda, the initial motive for revenge of ***Family*** has been revealed and clarified. Further, my affair with Danielle was the catalyst that allowed for Lynda to seek that revenge, protect Ryan, and keep the family skeleton in the closet, thereby satisfying her Family's second motive: ***Secrets***.

¶450 Too late! Them bones are a rattlin'!

[Sound of bones rattling]

¶451 In finality, there can be no doubt that Lynda Spencer is the Confidential Complainant in the police report (Exhibit-04), [¶579, 7, and 8], and that she was directly responsible [¶526] for implanting the false memories in K.S.'s mind in violation of Title 18 U.S.C.S. § 1512.

-Σ-

• • •

♫ [Phone rings]

Groot: [Answers phone]... I am Groot... I am Groot... I am Groot.

[Hands phone to Frank]

Frank: Hello, this is Frank... Great! How have you been?... Could only imagine...Yes, your sister *Karma* is on the line as we speak... Termination points... Sure. I'll tell them... Fractals...

Uh-huh... You and your sisters never fail to arrive on time... No problem. I am a patient man... Thanks. Talk to you in a while. [Hangs up phone]. Well, that was *Karma's* sister *Destiny*. She is going to hold until we are ready for her. However, she asked for me to convey a message to those who did this to the girls and me.

Rocket: And that would be?

Frank: *Destiny* is the result of your choices.

[Eerie silence]

• • •

Chapter 23

¶452 THE LAW OF THE ECHO

What we do in life echoes in eternity.
-Gladiator

¶453 There was a little boy who was constantly alone: picked last for the kickball team, shunned because he wasn't rich like the other kids, and picked on because he was the smallest kid in his class. Too shy to ask his teachers questions, some went so far as to think him stupid. But some of the other kids would take things too far and abuse him at will. Not much of a scrapper, he ran when he could and kept things bottled up inside.

¶454 One day the ridicule and taunting went too far. Fuming as he walked through the house, he let out an expletive to describe his abusers. Having shocked the family into silence, his mother grabbed him by the hand, walked him to the edge of the valley, and had him shout the expletive as loud as he could.

¶455 When the echo of what he shouted came back to him, his mother asked if he understood what she was trying to show him. He answered with, "Yes, Mother. All we say and do

eventually comes back to us"[106] [¶1031-¶1032].

-Σ-

Chapter 24

¶456 THE TENTH MAN RULE

When ten people receive the same information,
and nine out of those ten interpret that information
and arrive at the same conclusion,
as a precaution against error,
it is the duty of the tenth man to start digging
under the presumption that the other nine are wrong.
-World War Z
(Paraphrased for application)

¶457 Det. Kollar's presence and participation in this case is wholly unjustified jurisdictionally, factually, and legally. Through Pre-Trial Hearings, he admitted *twice* that he knew he was operating outside his jurisdiction. Factually, he operated on lies, half-truths, and withheld information. Legally, well, *illegally* (Exhibit-04) is void of a signed Incident Report and lacking any signed witness statements, as was my Discovery File. Since K.S. reported an alleged incident to Lynda first [¶447], and then to Robyn on two (2) separate and distinct occasions, there should be two (2) separate and distinct signed witness statements. Further, Robyn's testimony fails to mention that K.S. went to Lynda first while K.S. made it clear she had done just that. Σ

¶458 From personal experience, I do believe that Robyn acted in fear of Lynda and Ryan. I have seen her do so before. Moreover, I know that skeleton in the closet must be painful and embarrassing. Supporting my belief and understanding, Robyn never directly testified that I did wrong by her and the children. Still, she should recant.

[106] Apologies. I do not recall where I read this before or who wrote it. However, it is most fitting at this juncture.

¶459 Legally, Det. Kollar could not act without these missing statements and secure a Criminal Complaint pursuant to Crim.R.3. This complaint must be "made upon oath" and presented to the Grand Jury pursuant to Crim.R.4 in order to secure a Warrant for Arrest. Further, Crim.R.4 states there must be "probable cause", i.e., a ground for suspicion, and that the "probable cause may be based upon hearsay." That's scary, and I am about to show you exactly *why*.

¶460 Although Hearsay is

> Traditionally, testimony that is given by a witness who relates not what he or she knows personally, but what others have said, and that is therefore dependent on the credibility of someone other than the witness (Garner, p.838),

Ohio recognizes admissible and inadmissible hearsay. This is how they get 20 people, who never saw or heard a damn thing, to tell different versions of the same story to confuse a jury and obtain a wrongful conviction. The State also relies on a hearsay rule and a hearsay exception to that rule. So be careful and study them all, because whatever method they use to justify the admission of any type of hearsay into your trial, it all boils down to the sheer fact that the admission of hearsay is always wrong because

He said-she heard.

She said-he heard.

¶461 To clarify this comedy of errors, recall the *Telephone Game* we played in school as children. Remember? Of course you do. You and your classmates sat in a circle, and the teacher whispered a statement into your ear. Then you would have whispered the statement into the ear of the kid next to you. He or she would have done the same until the statement came full-circle, only to discover that what started out as '*We are having cheeseburgers for lunch*' finished as '*Scooby Doo has a spaceship*'. We adults are no different as we engage in the communication process [¶640].

¶462 With the ever-present static of life affecting the transmission and content of a message from sender to receiver, the receiver filters what he or she sees and/or hears through the biases created in the subconscious by experiences. As *no one* is immune to this, these preconceived notions, known as beliefs and preferences, create distortions, thereby interpreting the data as we want to see or hear it.

¶463 Verifying, there are three (3) principles of human nature at work here:

1) Belief determines behavior
-Max Lucado

2) People have a tendency to believe what they want to believe
-Frank P. Wood

3) People tend to gravitate towards what they want
-Unknown

With that said, let's take a look at a few well-known books as examples.

¶464 First is the Christian *Bible*. I have read the King James, New King James, and the New International Version. Then I compared them to the *Torah* and *Koran* (*Quran*).[107] I learned something by comparing data, source, and method of delivery. If I read the *Bible* looking for the wrath of *God*, I most definitely found it. If I read it looking for *Divine Love*, it was there.

¶465 After the above years of study, I developed a simple rule of observation:

Whatever you look for,
right or wrong,
that's what you'll find.
-Frank P. Wood, *An observer of fact*

To test this revelation, I studied *The Prince* by Niccolo Machiavelli. A brilliant piece of work by that Italian Statesman, I read each paragraph five (5) times from five (5) different points of view:

1) As a spiritual man

[107] I studied these books, and more, with the mindset of compare/contrast. Remarkable results.

2) As a family man

3) As a business man

4) As a politician

5) As a warrior – *Aah Ooh!*

and got five (5) different results. You should try it. It's fascinating and revealing to explore life and literature in this manner.

¶466 Now that you see how our preconceived notions; our internal mental dispositions that are our beliefs that were forged by experiences, and that the static – the *chaos* of life [¶162-¶176] can directly affect how we receive and interpret information, you can also see and understand more of how they affect our *retransmission* of that same information to another. Therefore, with **LIFE** as my premise, hearsay evidence is wholly unreliable and should **never** be admitted into any court under any circumstances. Having introduced you to Hearsay 101, let us now apply the *She said-he heard, he said-she heard* scenario to Det. Kollar's hearsay investigation with the following in mind:

> She said, "Does this dress make me look fat?"
> He heard, "Do you want to sleep on the couch?"
> -Larry the Cable Guy

¶467 For all intents and purposes, Det. Kollar is a police officer. Traditionally, his job is to uphold the law and put the bad guy in jail. With the mindset of this preconceived notion, Det. Kollar acted according to what he believed as he sought probable cause to secure a warrant for my arrest. Worst of all, his beliefs were amplified by witness tampering, lies, half-truths, withheld information, and hidden motives [¶508]. Sadly, to him, what information he received from my accusers, his predisposition as an officer caused him to interpret this information as probable cause. A ***dangerous*** thing to do because, in all actuality,

As belief determines motive,
motive establishes probable cause,
-Frank P. Wood, *Since 1967*

[¶508], of which, I had none. Follow me on this one, please.

¶468 In Medina County, probable cause is a **Witch Hunt**: *point-the-finger-and go!* True, because Job & Family Services [¶201], the Prosecutor's Office, and Det. Kollar all elected not to interview me. And, for clarity, as previously noted, I was never brought before the Grand Jury to testify. This reveals that personal beliefs created bias, legal prejudice, and sloppy investigative work. Not just because proof of motives, perps, and innocence, but because the

Truth is best discovered by seeking answers on both sides of the question.
-Lord Byron

¶469 Common sense, yes? Especially since the only State-investigative agency to interview me **"terminated"** the alleged F-1 rape case against me [¶207], while Det. Kollar's direct involvement pertained directly to the alleged F-3 GSI that was based on *hearsay*.

• • •

Rocket: Point!

• • •

¶470 Det. Kollar failed to act like a detective [¶012] under The Tenth Man Rule (next paragraph) and pose Cicero's surgical question: *"Cui bono?"* Instead, he obeyed his beliefs and engaged in the **dogma**: *point-the-finger-and go!* because he believes everyone accused of a crime is guilty, and will resort to any illegal and immoral tactic to secure a conviction. His screw up was that he failed to question the motives of the those who brought forth bogus allegations. So hold on to your hats, Folks, because, after this chapter, there is much more of Kollar's *chicanery* to come [¶479-¶551]. Yeah, we're far from being done with cooking this guy's goose.

¶471 Consistent with Lord Byron's sagacious insight into truth, Det. Kollar should have remained objective, donned the mantle of The Tenth Man, and followed these five (5) simple steps that every good detective knows:

1) Probe and investigate a matter thoroughly.

> To solve a problem, you must first find the source.
> Only then can you begin to ask the proper questions [¶1244].
> -Far Eastern proverb

2) Question everything.

> i. In a criminal investigation,
> always operate under the premise that
> everyone is lying [¶626].
> -Unknown former U.S. District Attorney
>
> ii. "*Cui bono*?"
> -Cicero
>
> iii. What's truly important? [¶1243]
> -Covey, p.__

3) Seek wise counsel

> There's always somebody smarter.
> -Mr. Wood

4) Think the problem through.

> i. Carry your thoughts to their logical conclusion.
> -Patrick Obrian
>
> ii. Use *Socratic Thinking*: If-Then.
> Computers function in this direct fashion,
> and you depend on them *every day*.
> -Frank P. Wood

5) Begin with the end in mind [¶796].
-Covey, p.__

Use concentrated focus and do no harm.
-Buddhist tenets

In doing so, Det. Kollar would have acted and thought like a detective, and established motives between accuser and accused, which would have ultimately led him to the truth [¶508].

Daft arse!

¶472 Truism: To get anywhere in life,
You have to read a lot of books.
-Raold Dahl

Obviously, Det. Kollar needs to let go of certain dogmas and enhance his education. Well, this document should help because I did his job for him [¶508]. ☺

• • •

Rocket: And the State's.

Groot: I am Groot!

["Point!"]

• • •

¶473 Reader, as you can tell, I have been working my own case with the above tried and proven true method of discovery. Now, had Det. Kollar properly performed the functions of his public duties and used such a reliable method, instead of lurking behind me in Home Depot (Yeah, I saw you, Mark), I would **not** be in prison with ignoble prosecutors and dishonorable judges denying my appeals through **lies** by declaring there is a "plethora of medical evidence" that proves I "repeatedly" raped a ***Temple Virgin*** (Exhibit-14) from three (3) counties away (Exhibit-03), [¶1383-¶1387]. Yeah, we're going to get to that. Word up. *Ooh Rah!* For now...

¶474 Show me this evidence. It's ***not*** in my Raped Trial Record or my Missing Discovery File.

¶475 What more, "repeatedly" illegally implies additional charges that went ***unindicted***,

leaving these bogus and insolent allegations in the category of ***libel***, and subject to suit [¶1388-¶1390].

¶476 Since Court and State are so confident in their reckless assertions, please, ***do not let these charges go!*** To do so, regarding the alleged victims that you have not checked on since my Trial, would be to ***fail*** them according to the ***Finality Of Justice*** doctrine. In fact,

> **I, FRANK P. WOOD, DO HEREBY FORMALLY**
>
> **CHALLENGE THE MEDINA COUNTY PROSECUTOR'S**
>
> **OFFICE TO A STRICT CONTEST OF CREDIBILITY, WILL,**
>
> **INTELLECT, AND TRUTH IN OPEN PUBLIC FORUM:**
>
> **INDICT ME ON THESE ADDITIONAL COUNTS OF LIBEL,**
>
> **AND LET'S DANCE – JUST ONE MORE TIME. ☺**
>
> -Mr. Frank P. Wood, *The one you should have left alone*

¶477 Under such honorable and intellectual circumstances, since we are both claiming truth, and only one of us has it... Yeah, that would be me...

> When a man is challenged,
> he is bound by duty and honor
> to take up that challenge.
> -Patrick Obrian

Aw, c'mon!

> What's the matter, Colonel Sanders...
> Chicken?
> *-Spaceballs*

¶478 Unfortunately for me, I'm the *last man* Medina County wants to see back in a courtroom [¶1391].

-Σ-

• • •

Rocket: Now that's truth.

Frank: Yep. All day long.

• • •

Chapter 25

¶479 PICTURES OF PICTURES

♪ Who needs pictures
with a memory like mine? ♫
-Brad Paisley, *Who Needs Pictures*

¶480 Coming full-circle with Det. Kollar's unwarranted involvement in this case, at the Pre-Trial Hearing that was held on 4-12-2006 [¶426], Kollar admits that he "did not seize any photographs" [¶492-¶497], but rather "took photographs" of them (Tp.13, Ln.1-24). As the pictures of pictures were part of my initial Discovery (Tp.13, Ln.25-Tp.14, Ln.12), the following exchange took place between Atty. Green and Det. Kollar:

Q And there's nothing indicating in the return [of indictment] that there were photographs taken to be used as evidence in this case, was there?

A I don't believe so, no (Tp.15, Ln.3-6).

¶481 Reader, with that sifted grain to serve as the premise for this chapter, I am about to show you that these pictures were slanderously testified about and never presented to the "cynical" Jury, but somehow are part of the Falsified Record that is on microfilm with the Clerk of Court. *Whoa!* This leaves me no other choice but to conclude that they were made part of the Record **Post-Trial** without my knowing. Further, I will show you that both Court and State directly assisted Kollar in his manipulative and deceptive testimony regarding the pictures, and that he illegally entered my home and stole what he was not entitled to [¶1036].

• • •

Frank: Bosun!

Rocket: Aye, Captain!

Frank: Prepare to round *Patella Point*. Keep her steady as she goes.

Rocket: Aye, Captain. Steady as she goes.

Frank: Ensign!

Groot: I am Groot!

Frank: Confirm our location by sextant, and then take to the *crow's nest*. Keep a sharp eye, too. It's going to be a *tight* fit.

Groot: I am Groot!

Frank: Now let's rake some shoals.

[COLLECTIVE LAUGHTER]

• • •

¶482 Utilizing (Exhibit-33), the first page is one (1) of many that, at my request, Atty. Stanley obtained from the Clerk of Court. Evidently, the pictures of pictures were not initially professionally done, printed, copied, transferred to microfilm, printed, and then sent to me. Knowing I could not use them to make my point perfectly clear, in July of 2017 I asked Atty. Stanley to file a Public Records Request with the Medina City P.D., hoping he could obtain a direct copy of the originals. In turn, Atty. Stanley received a disc that he printed the pictures from and sent them to me [¶412].

¶483 Taken directly from the disc, I have presented **every** picture relating to children (Exhibit-33). Apologies for having to downsize recopies, but you'll get the picture. Pun intended. ☺

¶484 For your apprisal, the photos are primarily of my family, while some are of friends that

were given to me. True, male and female of various ages, all legally and morally appropriate for public display. As this is the **1st Reason**, of three (3), *why* the pictures were not shown to the "cynical" Jury, there is much more to come, so let us *press* on.

• • •

[Groot giggling]

• • •

¶485 The State knew its case was fabricated and falling apart. So when Kollar took the stand, he and Pros. Eisenhower engaged in a well-rehearsed colloquy, known as illegal *bolstering* [¶601], as he slanderously testified about an allegedly "locked briefcase" that supposedly contained pictures of "young females" (Tp.450, Ln.10-Tp.451, Ln.22).

¶486 Wow! Whoa! WTF! That's *'What the fish!'* Gotchya'! Minds out of the gutter. ☺

¶487 The "locked briefcase" that was never locked... This was just another lie to irk the ire of an already emotionally charged "cynical" Jury that was gunning for a conviction. Over the years, all of my college and business briefcases were either Velcro® and/or zipper sealed. As Det. Kollar overlooked at least two (2) other such briefcases in my home office and one (1) in my work truck, the unlocked briefcase was a gift from Doug Kriz, son of Deputy Sheriff Marie Kriz: a great lady I used to call Mom Kriz. Yes, I knew the family well as I had the privilege of going to school with all four (4) Kriz siblings. Doug, in his amazing sense of humor, set the combination for the briefcase to **"007"**. If it was locked, a fifth-grader could have opened it by accident. Further, when I got out on bond, I noticed that *Inspector Gadget* mangled the locks and asked myself '*Why?*'

¶488 The unlocked briefcase contained my High School Diploma, college transcripts, Marriage and Divorce records; pictures of Robyn, Santa and the children, the children and me, and various

other documents such as certifications, medical records, my Birth and Adoption records, school memorabilia from my time in Italy, Marine Corps records, *Ooh Rah!*, etc. Yes, despite what has been done to me by State and local government, I am still a Patriot and **love** my Country. So, with all these documents, *inter alia*, yes, Court, Cop, and State knew the truth **before** the slanderous Arraignment Hearing that turned into printed libel [¶301-¶317], [¶1066].

¶490 **Q**: Det. Kollar alleged the briefcase was locked, so why was it not presented to the "cynical" Jury?

A: Because anyone could see that, if the briefcase was locked, it could have been opened with a butter knife.

¶491 People, this was **not** *James Bond* action and Det. Kollar is **not** *Jason Bourne*. This was simply biased and sloppy investigative work that was presented in the most desperate and corrupt manner to obtain a bogus conviction. Knowing they were wrong in having destroyed my reputation and business, they elected to proceed with my wrongful persecution to save their reputations and careers. Such chicanery!

¶492 Continuing... Other people in the pictures (Exhibit-33) are of my siblings, cousins, nieces, and nephews. What more, my goddaughter M.Y.'s picture was in my possession, but disappeared [¶480], [¶513] from my house **after** Kollar's illegal search of my home, and is **not** on the disc [¶553]. In addition, several of the pictures (ibid) were given to me by friends **and** their children. To many I was *"Uncle Frank"* and I love the sound of those words. ☺

¶493 I know... I'm such a monster! *Grrr!*

¶494 Now here's the rub... The majority of the pictures were **not** in the **unlocked** briefcase; they were in a *Pepperidge Farm* cardboard gift box that Det. Kollar actually took a picture of (Exhibit-33: p.2). No secrecy there, eh? Further, in that box were pictures of my dog, fishing