trips, road trips, and the like. The **ONLY** pictures in the briefcase pertained directly to my marriage with Robyn. [108]

¶495 Obviously, the cardboard box just didn't sound as dramatic and sinister as a locked briefcase.

• • •

[Groot gestures with arms spread wide and the head-neck bob-and-weave]

Frank: Groot, did you just give me the *'Whassuppp?'*

Rocket: He's hitting his teen years in his regrowing process.

Frank: Yeah, this ought to be good. In about ten minutes he'll be wanting a cell phone.

• • •

¶496 Supporting my candid way of life, Danielle testified that I kept an **open door policy** in the house as a **"rule"** (Tp.114, Ln.7-11). Robyn and I lived the same way. Other than late-night intimacy, if someone was utilizing the bathroom or changing their clothes, the doors stayed open. With no secrets in a family home, and running a public business, why would I lock a damn briefcase and keep pictures in a cardboard box? *Duh!* As an example, when Montville P.D. searched my home on Poe Road without a warrant [¶032], my fireproof box was unlocked. As will be shown, my heart has always been an open book to the point where I have been called "Too honest" [¶1069-¶1071].

Why does honesty make people uneasy?
-FPW

¶497 Back to the pictures, there is one (1) other picture missing: that of L.S. and S.S., the daughters of Dave and Debbie Saliga from Medina, Ohio. Former clients, the picture was a gift and I had it framed. Further, this picture is **not** on the disc [¶553], therefore, Det. Kollar **stole it**

[108] There was **not one** single picture of S.L. in my possession (Exhibit-33).

from my home [¶480].

¶498 As to the pictures presented and those missing, the following exchange took place between Atty. Green and Det. Kollar:

Q Okay. These pictures, have you asked anyone else who these people are in the pictures that you obtained?

A Yes, I have.

Q You just kind of figured out who they were?

A Correct (Tp.453, Ln.4-8), [¶517].

¶499 Obviously, Det. Kollar tracked down every person that he possibly could from the pictures, only to find out that his wasted efforts, and your tax dollars, built a *monument of nothingness*. And, *that*, My Fellow Americans, is the **2nd Reason** why the pictures of pictures were never presented to the "cynical" Jury. As we are not quite done with the pictures, I ask that you stay with me on this one. Thanks. ☺

¶500 Regarding the solicited[109] testimony of Kollar, it is axiomatic that it is illegal to comment on alleged evidence outside the Trial Record. Especially since the "cynical" Jury could not weigh the credibility of Kollar's testimony without the pictures themselves in their deliberations. Det. Kollar knew this and deliberately sought to manipulate the **Emotional-Eleven-Plus-One** by shading the truth about the pictures. In doing so, directly assisted by Judge Collier and Pros. Eisenhower, they committed *fraud upon the court*[110] under State v. Gilbert, supra[111] [¶419]. This adversely affected the Trial Mechanism to my detriment because

---

[109] Solicit. 3. To entice into evil or illegal action. Pickett, p.1075.

[110] Fraud upon the court occurs at [¶500], [¶724a-¶724o], [¶947-¶955], [¶1037], [¶1335-¶1337], [¶721].

[111] Supra: refers to a previously cited legal authority (reviewing court decision/case law).

A half-truth is the blackest of all lies.
-Alfred Lord Tennyson

¶501 True, because such a lie is the ultimate manipulator. Think about the actual contents of the lie itself:

1) There were pictures

2) The pictures did not represent what Det. Kollar wanted the "cynical" Jury to believe

3) They were not in a locked briefcase, but briefcases were present

Such a blend of fact and fiction can manipulate and therefore mislead the most objective mind. For a better insight into this understanding, let us examine the **3rd Reason** why the pictures were withheld from the **Dirty Dozen**.

¶502 Towards the end of Trial, I argued with Atty. Green about his failure to let me testify, and his failure to subpoena a single witness from my hand-written witness list [¶566-¶567]. Eventually, he made a phone call because I demanded that M. Douglas Reed, Ph.D. be called to the stand. As the STATE'S LEADING EXPERT (Exhibit-46), Dr. Reed spent his entire thirty-year professional career working with sociopaths and sex offenders (Tp.475, Ln.22-24). As Dr. Reed had unbiasedly and scientifically proven that I do not possess the psychological capacities to commit such ignorant and heinous acts (Exhibit-34), with special regard to Det. Kollar's lies and manipulations about the pictures, Dr. Reed testified *voir dire*,[112] regarding me, that

> He does not have a stash of child pornography. If he were to be someone who would be a serious or, historically, sex abuser type he would undoubtedly have had a stash. In my thirty years working with pedophiles and sociopaths, they all have had a stash somewhere. He didn't have any (Exhibit-34: p. Reed-3, Item 15), (Tp.475, Ln.19-24).

¶503 America, there's your wheat!

---

[112] Dr. Reed testified *voir dire*, outside the presence of the "cynical" Jury because Judge Collier dismissed them beforehand.

• • •

[POP!]

Rocket: Captain! What the hell was that?

Frank: *Patella Point!*

[HYSTERICAL LAUGHTER]

• • •

¶504 Reader, regarding (Exhibit-34), please understand that:

1) No other State Expert examined me

2) (Exhibit-46) reveals there is **no better qualified** State Expert than Dr. Reed

3) The State made neither request nor offer to have me psychologically evaluated

4) The State proffered no viable and valid psychological evidence to the contrary

5) Dr. Reed concluded, regarding me, that

> Everything he believes and espouses would be **violated**
> if he were to touch a child sexually **[Emphasis added]**,
> (Exhibit-34: p. Reed-3, Item 16), (Tp.475, Ln.1-5).

¶505 As

Belief determines behavior,
-Max Lucado

I present the following truism:

I AM PSYCHOLOGICALLY PROHIBITED FROM HARMING A CHILD OR SOMEONE I LOVE!!!
SOME THINGS IN LIFE ARE STRICTLY FORBIDDEN!!!
Σ Σ Σ Σ Σ Σ Σ Σ Σ

(See [¶805, 3] and [¶1109, 7] of this Affidavit).

• • •

Rocket: Duh!

Frank: That's actually an acronym for when a guy realizes he was wrong for arguing with his girl, slams the heel of his hand into his forehead and says, 'D.U.H.!'

Rocket: What does it mean?

Frank: Didn't Understand Her!

[Group chuckles]

• • •

¶506 Back on track, after Dr. Reed's *voir dire* examination, Judge Collier deemed his testimony to be **"irrelevant"** [¶988-¶1014]. Yes, we will *probe* this matter in *full depth* in a little while. ☺

¶507 Supporting the three (3) reasons why the pictures of pictures were never presented during Trial, and why Dr. Reed's findings and conclusions of my mind and beliefs were deemed "irrelevant", Montville P.D. searched my home on Poe Road and found nothing while Det. Kollar searched my home on Gateway Lane and came up with *squat* (Exhibit-04: p.12).This is specifically because there was never anything to find. Had the computers, beds, clothing and homes of Scott Sadowsky on Jonathan Court in Medina, Ohio and of his family home in Put-In-Bay, Ohio been searched, along with the Spencer Family Home on West Sturbridge in Medina, Ohio, clear and convincing evidence of the two (2) **PERPS** would have been found.

Mark, you failed... miserably.

¶508 When a spouse suddenly dies, they automatically investigate the surviving spouse for motive and foul play, yes? Yes. As motive establishes probable cause [¶467], [¶471], in a sex case,

especially one involving young children, **always** start by investigating **immediate family**. The Tenth Man Rule [¶456-¶472] always applies because it always works. To clarify, in **any** rape

case, it is common knowledge to look into those who

1) Knew the victim

2) Were in long-term positions of trust [¶177-¶184], [¶872-¶890]

3) With young children, especially those under the age of ten (10), the abuser can carry out his actions in the privacy of his own home. Ask any Fed Agent. With adults, the abuse usually takes place in the victim's home or work place; i.e., in public. I have studied a *shitload* of case law to extrapolate these facts and psychological differences. I am right. Yeah, I read some heinous shit that caused tears to burn my cheeks. Literally, I closed the law book, slid it away from me, and walked out of the **prison law** library in shock and silence. There are some real sick bastards in this world. With that said, in sexual assault cases involving young children, those in **long-term positions of privacy, familiarity, and trust** should be investigated first[¶1113]

¶509 Reader, now you see why they refused to show the pictures (Tp.516, Ln.14-16) to the "cynical" Jury (Tp.135, Ln.7-11). Seasoned in their careers, Pros. Eisenhower and Det. Kollar knew *exactly* what they were doing and *exactly* how to work a "cynical" Jury. They also knew, as every prosecutor knows, that the first basic principle of jury psychology is:

"A juror believes he is there to put the bad guy in prison."
-Attorney Terry Gilbert, *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, 2010

(See [¶549] of this Affidavit).

(Atty. Gilbert was quoted **after** Raymond Towler's 2010 acquittal of a double rape).

Not only is this axiomatic, any Business Management 240 class will teach you that

68% of the population will do as they're told [¶398].

¶510 With that said, at the end of her Opening and Closing Statements, Pros. Eisenhower told the "cynical" Jury

1) "you will find him guilty" (Tp.38, Ln.13-24)

2) "you will find him guilty on both counts" (Tp.526, Ln.17-18)

[Golf clap]

¶511 Bravo! Well played.

¶512 Now it's my turn ☺ [¶597].

• • •

Frank: Ensign Groot!

Groot: I am Groot!

Frank: Bosun Rocket!

Rocket: Aye, Captain!

Frank: Adjust course by five degrees north! And pay heed to the rosebud... I want true north.

Rocket: Aye, true north, it is, Captain.

Groot: I am Groot?

Frank: Nay. Let the barnacles build up. I want them to know we're there as we cruise *The Femur Ocean*. And secure the long nines. We just may need them.

Groot: I am Groot!

Rocket: Them's mighty *deep* waters, Captain.

Frank: [Grinning] Don't I know it. ☺

• • •

¶513 Continuing with the pictures of pictures, earlier I informed you that M.Y.'s picture [¶491], and that of L.S. and S.S. [¶497] disappeared from my home **after** Det. Kollar's *Keystone Cop* search (Exhibit-04: p.12). As we know via (Exhibit-04: p.16), M.Y. was interviewed by Det. Kollar much to his chagrin and shame [¶330]. Soon I will show you that L.S. and S.S. were

interviewed, as well [¶553-¶561, 3]. Now I will show you some things that are so shocking that you will demand the law licenses of Judge Collier and Pros. Eisenhower, and Det. Kollar's badge.

[Crowd murmurs in low tones]

¶514 Recall earlier that Det. Kollar spoke with Arlene Harmon and wanted to interview her daughter K.H., but **after** her lies, Arlene didn't want to get involved [¶334c, vi], (Exhibit-04: p.16). What prompted Kollar's attempt at interview was a school picture that was proudly given to me by K.H. (Exhibit-33: p.10). With her name, face, jersey number, and the name of her school printed on the picture, with the help of the Brunswick City Police Department, Det. Kollar actually went to the wrong family first! (Exhibit-04: p.14).People, it would not have taken a super sleuth to do this.

Ain't that right, Uh-huh?
Uh-huhhh!
-The Little Rascals

¶515 Having failed to obtain the desired interviews, Det. Kollar *deliberately* left K.H.'s picture in the photo array that is on file with the Clerk of Court as *evidence*. In doing so, he falsified evidence and eluded to another alleged victim without probable cause.

Gotchy'a, Mark.

¶516 People, think about it... These pictures were part of my Discovery File. Therefore they were unethically and illegally presented to the Grand Jury as *evidence* (Or were they?), and then slanderously testified about but kept from the **Twisted Twelve**. Then they were made part of the altered State-Court Record **after** my Trial, and therefore remain Public Record on microfilm with the Clerk of Court [¶578]. Yes, all of this was done to create an **illusion**. Nothing more. Nothing less.

¶517 Compounding his corruption, recall that Det. Kollar allegedly figured out who the people were in the pictures [¶498]. Having conducted his irrational invest, and found absolutely *nothing*, there was no just cause to use the pictures against me behind the closed door proceeding of the Grand Jury, to mention them during Trial, or to make them part of the Raped Record **after** Trial.

[APPLAUSE!]

¶518 Please, wait! There's more... One day, as Danielle and I leaned back on the love seat in my house, I showed her every picture in that Pepperidge Farm cardboard box. She knew who they were and that they were primarily of my family, while some were gifts. Therefore, Det. Kollar did too [¶579, 14].

My family photos should have been kept out of this, Mark.

Bad manners, again.

¶519 My memory recall always did unnerve the "untruthful" Danielle. Yeah, she gave up playing chess with me because I memorized her game in less than three (3) games. ☺

¶520 Next on the hit list, in Det. Kollar's police report he stated that

> Numerous pictures of children were found throughout the office and kitchen area, many of which were of KREDACTED. I photographed the pictures (Exhibit-04: p.13).

That's interesting because, so far, we know that the pictures and documents pertaining to my former life with Robyn were in an unlocked briefcase, and that the pictures of friends and family were in a Pepperidge Farm cardboard box (Exhibit-33: p.2 and 3). There were no pictures of this elaborate display about K.S. Remember, Atty. Stanley has a *true copy* of Kollar's disc from the Medina P.D.

You lied again, Mark.

Bad manners.

¶521 For clarity, I purchased the house on Gateway Lane to fix up and sell, not turn it into a sadistic shrine so I could pine over a child I never abused and had not seen in years. Sharon, who handled the paperwork to buy the house, had visited several times. Beth and Leisa visited, as well. Further, family, employees, friends, and other contractors had visited on several occasions. As there was not one (1) single photograph displayed in my house, there are no corroborating pictures of pictures on the disc or witness statements to support this lie. What more, the Molested Record reveals that Kollar never made this bogus allegation before the "cynical" Jury (Tp.1-560). Therefore, no matter what rebuttal Kollar or the State has to offer in challenge to this Affidavit, and all I say within,

A liar's word is worthless.
Even on paper.
-In the Heart of the Sea

[THE CROWD GOES WILD!!!]

¶522 Hold! One moment, please! As food for thought, we may now logically conclude, *infer*, that this lie was presented to the Grand Jury because it is in the Police Report (Exhibit-04: p.13). This completely decimates any shred of integrity and credibility he had left. As if he had any to begin with.

[APPLAUSE!]

• • •

[Groot bows in several directions]

Frank: He sure loves the roar of the crowd.

Rocket: Wait until you see what he has planned for later.

Frank: Destined for greatness, I'm sure.

• • •

¶523 Let it be known that Det. Kollar sat at the State's Table during my Trial to bolster a fabricated case. His participation, searches, seizures, photos, and interviews yielded *absolutely nothing*. His lack of jurisdictional presence only enflamed the passions, the very emotions, of an already "cynical" Jury with its **Court-elected juror who was molested in her youth**. Shocking, but we'll nail that hide to the barn door shortly [¶605-¶613]. It's a process.

¶524 Supported by the police report (Exhibit-04: p.9), on June 17, 2005 Det. Kollar met with Social Worker David A. Madjerich to interview Robyn and K.S. at Job & Family Services. Kollar confirms this with his own testimony (Tp.445, Ln.18-Tp.446, Ln.8). However, Robyn's testimony *differs* with:

> Both gentlemen there at Children's Services and Det. Kollar interviewed myself, K[REDACTED], and one of my other children (Tp.366, Ln.12-14), [¶704], [¶740, 7], [¶807], [¶972, 15].

¶525 Remaining under the impression that David Madjerich was one (1) of the two (2) gentlemen, a few questions remain:

1) Why did Det. Kollar fail to mention the other gentlemen's names?

2) Why did neither of these gentlemen testify?

3) Where are their reports? There was nothing of any significance in my Discovery File about K.S. other than the **sham of an indictment** and the useless pictures

As the lack of the gentlemens's reports and testimonies leave Det. Kollar's report and testimony further in the lacking, I am about to answer the above questions. Yes, this is about to get a whole lot worse for Det. Mark Kollar, as in humiliating. But, hey, he did this to himself. Severely disgusted by it all, I am just

The Messenger

¶526 Job & Family Services/Children's Services elected *not* to interview me [¶201] on either

allegation. And they elected not to contact me via letter about K.S. like they did S.L. [¶201-¶203]. To better explain why the polar opposite occurred, and to answer the questions above, on several occasions Atty. Green made it unmistakingly clear to me that

"They're having problems with K.S."

[¶046], [¶350], [¶451], [¶579, 5], [¶687], [¶706], [¶765, 2], [¶808], [¶888, 7], [¶1078, 1], [¶1174]. That's because they had problems getting K.S. to keep her IMPLANTED/TRANSPLANTED MEMORIES straight:

Me in them and Uncle Ryan out of them. Σ

¶527 Revealing a repetitive pattern of behavior and corruption,[113] recall earlier that Pros. Eisenhower, with absolutely no regard for truth and justice, recklessly utilized the Court-acknowledged perjury of the "untruthful" Danielle [¶063]. Now, as I have shown you, we have Pros. Eisenhower directly assisting Det. Kollar with his lies and manipulations to the "cynical" Jury regarding the pictures. Regarding such...

¶528 Solely seeking a conviction, the depravity of mind and absence of virtue is so great between Det. Kollar and Pros. Eisenhower that, once again, I must cite the ABA Standards of Criminal Justice Relating to Prosecutor Function, and reveal how it applies to the **Demented Duo.**

¶529 Under Standard 3-5.6 Presentation of Evidence,

> (a) A prosecutor should not knowingly offer false evidence whether by documents, tangible evidence, or the testimony of witnesses, or fail to seek the withdrawal thereof upon discovery.

Applying this law to fact, Pros. Eisenhower failed miserably as a U.S. Government Prosecutor

---

[113] Corruption. (14c) 1. Depravity, perversion, or taint; an impairment of integrity, virtue, or moral principle; esp., the impairment of a public official's duties by bribery. Garner, p.422.

when she engaged in that solicited and well-rehearsed testimony with Kollar.

¶530 Next, the Code of Professional Responsibility, Canon 1 states that

> A lawyer should assist in maintaining the integrity and competence of the legal profession [¶1163].

• • •

Rocket: Obviously, that didn't happen here.

Frank: Not from Grand Jury proceedings to Sentencing and beyond.

Groot: I am Groot!

Frank: Right. There were too many lies and manipulations proffered by Court, State, and Cop. There was also a tremendous amount of favoritism from Court to State, so much that the Trial was completely one-sided. But, like I said, now it's my turn.

• • •

¶531 Now, supporting the above, according to the *Code's* Ethical Considerations, EC 1-5,

> A lawyer should maintain the high standards of professional conduct and should encourage fellow lawyers to do likewise. [She] should be temperate and dignified, and [She] should refrain from an illegal and morally reprehensible conduct. Because of [her] position in society, even minor violations of law by a lawyer may tend to lessen public confidence in the legal profession. Obedience to the law exemplifies respect for the law. To lawyers especially, respect for the law should be more than platitude [Emphasis added], [¶1029, 1, ii, h].

¶532 *My Fellow Americans*, when it comes to judges, prosecutors, and officers who hold positions of public **trust**,

> Respect for the law should be much more than mere platitude. In all actuality, respect for the law should be a religious fervor that connotes a way of life lived in reverent fear of some unknown god!
>
> -Frank P. Wood

¶533 This goes for police as well, because not only did Det. Kollar sit at the State's Table during Trial, thereby directly assisting in the prosecution of this case, but because,

> When considering whether the state has deprived a person of due process in a criminal trial, there is no suggestion that different "arms" of the government are severable entities, particularly when they are closely connected. Therefore, the city's police department represents the state no less than the prosecutor's office, and the taint on the trial is not less if the police, rather than the state's attorney, are guilty of misrepresentations. Nor, for the purposes of due process, may the distinction be drawn as to whether the prosecutor acted in good faith (State v.DeFronzo, 1970 Ohio MISC. LEXIS 95, HN3),

as in the case at bar.

¶534 With malicious intent, Pros. Eisenhower and Det. Kollar acted in bad faith and tainted the Trial Process itself through the introduction of slanderous testimony without presenting the actual pictures. With the above cited laws and facts confirming Det. Kollar's culpability to be of no less than that of the State's, know that

Action is distilled intent.
-Ken Follett

To clarify their intent, in order to proceed, I must present the following evidence from my Improperly Touched Trial Record.

¶535 Reader, recall earlier that there were two (2) Pre-Trial Hearings where jurisdictional issues were discussed regarding Det. Kollar's unwarranted involvement [¶424]. Avoiding the jurisdictional issue, Judge Collier admitted that the Search Warrant should **not** have been issued by the Municipal Court (Exhibit-55: Tp.7, Ln.10-14), thereby confirming the search warrant was illegal, but overruled the motion to suppress any alleged evidence obtained by Kollar from his illegal search (Exhibit-50: Tp.17, Ln.8-9). Such *Judicial Hypocrisy* allowed for Kollar to testify as a State's witness. I guess the meeting between Collier and Kollar **"in chambers"** (Exhibit-55: Tp.7, Ln.16-18) was not exactly a *Freudian Slip*, eh? [¶538, 6], [¶724f, 5].

¶536 Court, State, and Cop all knew Kollar should never have been permitted to testify. Just like they knew that, if they showed the pictures to the Jury, they would have seen the lie behind

the deception. Stay with me on this one, Folks. We *will* reach our destination.

• • •

Rocket: Captain! Awaiting orders, Sir!

Frank: At three bells, adjust course by seven degrees west.

Rocket: Destination, Sir?

Frank: *Pelvic Coast.*

[Groot giggles]

Frank: [Whispering to Groot] Stop that. We'll lose effect.

Rocket: I sincerely doubt that, Frank – uh – Captain. We've already *penetrated* deep waters.

[Group giggles]

• • •

¶537 Historically, when Pros. Eisenhower went to ask Det. Kollar about the search warrant he exercised at my home on Gateway Lane, Atty. Green asked to approach Judge Collier (Tp.488, Ln.5-17). Atty. Green then mentioned the motion to suppress from the Pre-Trial Hearings, thus prompting the following dialogue between Court, State, and Defense:

THE COURT: Why are we talking about this now? What's the point?

MS. EISENHOWER: There was a briefcase inside the house that contained pictures of little girls, lots of little girls.

THE COURT: The briefcase was locked?

["in chambers"]

MS. EISENHOWER: Hm-hm.

THE COURT: You're seeking to introduce the information of that?

MS. EISENHOWER: That's it.

THE COURT: Sir.

MR. GREEN: Well, I believe that the search warrant was for the computer only, which was not in the K.S. case. You also have the problem, Judge, that it wasn't even within the officer's jurisdiction.

THE COURT: Yes. I think I see the problem. I'm going to overrule the objection. We're going to continue with the examination.

MS. EISENHOWER: Thank you (Tp.449, Ln.10-Tp.450, Ln.5).

¶538 *Merde!*[114] Where to begin! The "problem" Judge Collier saw was that the State needed to bolster its case, and that Atty. Green was right. In addition, take special notice that Judge Collier deliberately avoided the jurisdictional issue he never ruled on at the Pre-Trial Hearings. Once again, Judge Collier

1) Acted *in subsidium*[115]

2) Engaged in case steering

3) Allowed for alleged evidence from outside the Trial Record to be illegally and slanderously testified about before the Court-declared "cynical" Jury

4) Never asked to see the pictures that were to my credibility

5) Never demanded that the pictures be shown to the Jury [¶579, 23], [¶724f, 5]

6) Miraculously asked if the briefcase was locked... **"in chambers"** [¶535]

¶539 With the toxicity of corruption permeating and eroding what's left of the integrity of my already Tainted Trial, as if there was any integrity to begin with, we must now clear the air on the illegalities concerning the bogus warrant and search conducted by Det. Kollar.

¶540 According to Beth Rapenchuk, no Judge at the Court of Common Pleas would sign the

---

[114] French: Shit!

[115] *In subsidium* #4.

search warrant, so Kollar went to the Municipal Court to get it signed. As proof of what I just said, the following exchange took place between Atty. Green and Det. Kollar **after** Judge Collier allowed for Pros. Eisenhower to continue:

Q You said that you searched the Frank Wood house?

A That is correct.

Q What date was that?

A August 5th, 2005.

Q Was he there?

A He was not.

[My arrest was the day **prior** (Exhibit-25), rendering his search illegal due to no consent and lack of jurisdiction]

Q Did he consent to the search?

A No, he did not.

Q This was via search warrant?

A That is correct.

Q Where was this search warrant obtained from?

A The search warrant was obtained from Judge Dale Chase of the Medina Municipal Court (Tp.452, Ln.4-16).

With what has been presented thus far, we now know that

1) Det. Kollar is/was a member of the Medina City Police Department

2) The Medina County Court of Common Pleas wanted nothing to do with a case that was already "closed" and "terminated" due to "no evidence"

3) Det. Kollar secured a search warrant at the Medina City Municipal Court

4) This search warrant was illegally exercised in Medina Township without the aid of local law enforcement

5) The search warrant was never bonded over, legally transferred, from the Municipal Court to the Court of Common Pleas, and there was no record that any such event took place in my Discovery, the police report (Exhibit-04), Trial Record (Tp.1-560), or Docket (Exhibit-07)

¶541 Atty. Green then asked Det. Kollar:

Q In KREDACTED complaint, was there a complaint regarding the use of a computer?

A No, not in that complaint (Tp.453, Ln.1-3).

¶542 There's that grain of wheat we have been sifting for quite a while: The mysterious Criminal Complaint that was never made part of the police report (Exhibit-04) or my Discovery [¶238]. With no Criminal Complaint produced for *either* of the allegations, there was no probable cause for Det. Kollar to act pursuant to Crim. R.3, Crim.R.4, and Crim.R.6, thereby seeking non-existent evidence in my home outside of his jurisdiction.

¶543 The bogus and unindicted computer allegations were made, at one time, regarding both K.S. and S.L. We will come back to them later in [¶1077-¶1083]. For now, the key point I am driving home is that Court, State, and Cop acted in collusion[116] regarding the search warrant, jurisdiction, or lack thereof, and the pictures. What more, this was not their first trial. Yes, they knew exactly what they were doing:

Securing a bogus conviction.

¶544 $1.2 million [¶579, 26].

---

[116] Collusion. 1. An agreement to defraud another or to do or to obtain something forbidden by law [as in my wrongful conviction], [emphasis added]. Garner, p.321.

¶545 As the law declares that

> there is no suggestion that different "arms" of the government are severable entities, particularly when they are closely connected (DeFronzo, supra),

I will concluded my dissertation on the **Tyrannical Trio** with the following four (4) declarations of law.

¶546 Under the U.S. 4th Amendment,

• • •

Rocket: Excellent starting point.

Frank: There could be no other.

• • •

> The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be *violated*, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the person or things to be seized [*emphasis added*].

With lack of complaint, probable cause, a valid search warrant, or jurisdiction, Det. Kollar

1) Illegally arrested me

2) Illegally entered my home

3) Illegally seized personal property and *violated* my "papers and effects" when he

   i. Stole the pictures of M.Y., L.S., and S.S. [¶553]

   ii. Took the pictures of pictures

   iii. Damaged my briefcase that was not locked

   iv. Stole my laptop

Under Ohio Law, not only is this criminal trespassing, destruction of property, and theft, this is

> Abuse of process. (1809) The improper and tortious use of a legitimately issued court process to obtain a result that is unlawful or beyond the process's scope... (Garner, p.12).

¶547 In layman's terms, as with the **sham of an indictment** [¶266], Det. Kollar willfully used a legitimate court process to obtain and exercise a search warrant, which he was clearly not entitled to, in direct violation of my U.S. 4th Amendment Constitutional Rights.

• • •

[Ship's bell rings]

♪ [Ding-ding! Ding-ding! Ding-ding!] ♫

Rocket: Three bells, Captain! Adjusting course by seven degrees west.

Frank: Seven degrees west. Very well, Bosun. Ensign Groot!

Groot: I am Groot!

Frank: I want full sail on the foremast! Fly the jib and eliminate that luft on the main. I want all the speed we can get.

Groot: I am Groot!

Frank: *Pelvic Coast*, your dunes are mine.

• • •

¶548 Although the Tortured Record reveals that Atty. Green never directly objected to the violation of my U.S. 4th Amendment rights, the Record does reflect that he attempted to argue it and that I never affirmatively waived this Constitutional Right.

¶549 Next on the hit list, pertaining directly to Judge Collier and Pros. Eisenhower, under the Code of Professional Responsibility, Disciplinary Rules, DR 1-102 Misconduct declares that

> (A) A lawyer shall not:
> (4) Engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation.
> (5) Engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice [¶1029, 1, ii, d].

Having deliberately engaged in *fraud upon the court* by allowing for Det. Kollar's dishonest and slanderous testimony about the pictures to be presented to the "cynical" Jury, both Judge Collier and Pros. Eisenhower engaged in *conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice* as they willfully ignored the fact that

> Misrepresenting facts in evidence can amount to substantial error because doing so "may profoundly impress a jury and may have a significant impact on the jury's deliberations." Donnelly v. DeChristoforo, 416 U.S. 637, 646, 40 L. Ed. 2d 431, 94 S. Ct. 1868 (1974). For similar reasons, asserting facts that were [**21] *never admitted into evidence* may mislead a jury in a prejudicial way. See Berger v. United States, 295 U.S. 78, 84, 79 L. Ed. 1314, 55 S. Ct. 629 (1935). This is particularly true when a prosecutor misrepresents evidence because *a jury generally has the confidence that a prosecuting attorney is faithfully observing* [her] *obligation as a representative of a sovereignty*. See id. At 88. [*emphasis added*], [emphasis added]. (Citing Washington v. Hofbauer, 200 U.S. App. LEXIS 24938, HN6).

(See [¶509], [¶1029, 1, ii, d, e], [¶1029, 2, i], and [¶1104] of this Affidavit).

¶550 Ultimately, as a Government Prosecutor,

> The United States Attorney is the representative not of an ordinary party, but of a sovereignty whose obligation to govern impartially is as compelling as its obligation to govern at all; and whose interest, therefore, in a criminal prosecution is **not that it shall win a case, but that justice shall be done**. As such, [she] is in a peculiar and very definite sense the servant of the law, the twofold aim of which is that guilt shall not escape or innocence suffer. [She] may prosecute with earnest and vigor- - indeed, [she] should do so. But, while [she] may strike hard blows, [she] is not at liberty to strike foul ones. It is as much [her] duty to refrain from improper methods calculated to produce a wrongful conviction, as it is to use every legitimate means to bring about a just one. (Citing Berger v. United States, 1935 U.S. LEXIS 308, HN5), **[emphasis added]**, [emphasis added].

(See [¶598], [¶1029, 2, i], [¶1104] of this Affidavit).

¶551 With these laws chiseled into the tiles of our mosaic, support by fact, my arrest, the search warrant, the search itself, Kollar's involvement, and his deceptive testimony about the pictures should never have happened [¶213], [¶278], [¶470], [¶1039, 1].

-Σ-

• • •

[Yelling outside]

Frank: What's going on?

Rocket: Do the words *angry mob* ring a bell?

Frank: What do they want?

Rocket: For Judge Collier and Prosecutor Eisenhower to surrender their law licenses... indefinitely.

Frank: As they should. Is that all?

Rocket: No. They want Detective Kollar's badge melted and pounded into something more useful like an ashtray.

Frank: Right on! I gather that would be a step up from its current use.

Groot: [*Burrppp*!]

Frank: Oh, no! Groot ate all the hard tack and drank all the rum. Stan Lee is going to have a fit.

Rocket: It can only get more interesting from here.

Frank: Quite the smile and sway you got there, little buddy.

Rocket: Don't worry... His roots are well over twenty-one.

Groot: I [*Hiccup*!] Groot!

[COLLECTIVE LAUGHTER]

• • •

¶552 FINAL PRE-TRIAL FACTS

¶553 Wrapping up Pre-Trial Facts, earlier I mentioned Dave and Debbie Saliga, and the missing picture of their daughters that was proudly given and honorably received [¶497]. Yes, a picture that was illegally taken from my home by Det. Kollar, just like that of M.Y. [¶492], [¶546, 3, i]. With this precursor to the following, let us continue.

¶554 While out on bond, I gave Atty. Green a hand-written witness list that contained the names, addresses, and phone numbers of my witnesses. The Saligas were on that list.

¶555 My Docket (Exhibit-07) reveals that Atty. Green failed to file a single subpoena on my behalf. And here's why.

¶556 Pursuant to Crim.R.16 Discovery and inspection, under section

> (I) Witness list
> Each party shall provide to opposing counsel a written witness list, including names and addresses of any witness it *intends to call* in its case-in-chief, or reasonably anticipates calling in rebuttal or surrebuttal [*Emphasis added*].

Obviously, Atty. Green *never intended to call* a single witness in my defense. Therefore, by operation of law,[117] Atty. Green was *not obligated* to turn over my witness list to the State pursuant to Crim.R.16 (I). Not a very good trial strategy; no witnesses. Especially in a strict contest of credibility.

¶557 The importance behind this situation is one of Constitutional Magnitude. As we will get to that, while still out on bond, I received a phone call from Debbie Saliga. A call that, upon reflection some years later, was quite odd. Debbie told me that her oldest daughter L.S. turned 18, was considering having sexual relations with her boyfriend, and wanted to discuss this with

[117] Operation of law. A term referring to the determination of rights and obligations merely through application of existing laws covering a situation. Rothenberg, p.330.

me. Knowing the Saligas to be a Catholic family with at least one priest in the mix, I said that L.S. should wait and discuss this with her parents, for this was not my place.

¶558 In hindsight, I questioned why L.S. didn't call. Those kids were never shy with me.

¶559 After the fraudulent revoking of my $200k bond, I called the Saligas from the Sheriff's Department. Debbie told me that Pros. Eisenhower came to their house and told them not to testify for me because

"All sorts of victims were coming forward."

¶560 Well... It's been over 12 years. Where are they? Σ

¶561 For Pros. Eisenhower to approach the Saligas after the fraudulent bond revocation, based on history and law presented thus far, this tells me that

1) Atty. Green gave the Prosecution my witness list without my consent and against the law
2) Det. Kollar used the stolen picture to track down L.S. and S.S. at their local school system. You see, Danielle would have known who they were because
    i. She called me while I spent the prior New Year's Eve with the Saliga family
    ii. I told her who was in the picture
3) This is how Det. Kollar would have obtained the interviews with L.S. and S.S. [¶513]. Indeed, interviews and reports that never made it to (Exhibit-04), the Grand Jury, the "cynical" Jury, or my Discovery File because they were exculpatory

¶562 When I mentioned this unethical and illegal conduct to Atty. Green, he said, "They're allowed to do that." No. They are not. Please, read on.

¶563 Like I stated earlier, I do believe the "million cash" and the $200k cash bond became a $1.2 million dollar bounty on my head.

¶564 Not good.

¶565 After the fraudulent revoking, I went through a battery of tests and was personally examined by the STATE'S LEADING EXPERT: M. Douglas Reed, Ph.D. in the Medina County Sheriff's Department. To obtain further objective and social data on me, I gave Dr. Reed, via Atty. Green, a list of several people in the community who knew me (Tp.470-471), of which, all were in good public standing. **An exact copy of my witness list,** the Saligas were on that list and filled out a *Hare Psycopathy* checklist: a valid and reliable instrument utilized nationally by the American Psychological Association. In addition, although the names I gave Dr. Reed had to remain "anonymous, confidential" at the time of Trial (Tp.470, Ln.23-24) due to doctor-client privilege, upon the signing and notarization of this Affidavit, I do hereby authorize Dr. Reed to release the names on the list I gave him. This will confirm my witness list, *inter alia*.

¶566 For the Real Record, Dave and Debbie Saliga did agree to testify for me. But, as I have made clear on several occasions, Atty. Green failed to subpoena a single witness. Again, this is evidenced by (Exhibt-07) which reveals that no subpoenas were filed. A sad performance on the part of Atty. Green. ☹ Even more so that I had to argue with him to ring Dr. Reed.

¶567 **Q**: What attorney would not want to call Dr. Reed and witnesses, who are highly-regarded in their field and community, and put on a character defense in a strict contest of credibility?

A: An attorney with an ulterior motive [¶351], [¶502].

¶568 I may never know all that was said to the Saligas by Det. Kollar and Pros. Eisenhower, but it must have been quite heinous. So heinous that Dave and Debbie stopped reaching out to me, and never showed up at my Trial to offer testimony, despite lack of subpoena. Further, they never reached out to me in prison. Then, about eight (8) years ago, I mailed them a copy of the

uncontested COAI (Exhibit-03), and asked what was said to them by Kollar and Eisenhower. The Saligas never responded. Perhaps I should explain *why* their lack of response was so painfully disappointing.

¶569 The first time Dave called me to his house as a contractor, he said,

> **"I have watched you work in this development for a few years now. Your work is precision quality and you are sitting at my kitchen table because of your reputation."**

From that moment on, I

1) Finished their basement

2) Built their deck

3) Fixed their roof

4) Replaced their sump pump system

5) Took L.S. and her girlfriend to the movies

6) Sponsored S.S.'s softball team (Debbie had to insist I attend a game as the Sponsor. I worked a lot)

7) Went to a fundraiser with Dave and Debbie

8) Spent New Year's Eve with their family

all because *their family members* asked me to. Further, I performed these activities with absolute honor. After being this close to and supportive of their family, what the hell did Kollar and Eisenhower say that caused the Saligas to turn their backs and abandon me!

• • •

Rocket: Inquiring minds want to know.

Frank: Especially this one.

• • •

¶570 Reader, before proceeding, please understand my personal belief system about honor. First and foremost,

> Honor is respecting not just yourself, but others
> in your thoughts, speech, and actions,
> -FPW

because your

> Thoughts, speech, and actions.
> They are the garments of your soul.
> -A Jewish philosopher and spiritual leader
> whose name I cannot recall at this time

¶571 For a clearer picture, Dave is Lieutenant Colonel Dave Saliga, and a member of the United States Air Force. So were my Father and Brother. To ensure members of my family were not dishonored, I did as Dave's Family asked, without question, and with that same honor. Σ

> When you think about your loved ones,
> the issues become clearer.
> -Ken Follett

¶572 As noted quite some time ago, this case is **VOID** of any DNA, physical or medical evidence of any kind, or a single eyewitnesses to support these bogus and heinous allegations [¶025]. Such a case is nothing less than a **strict contest of credibility**, and the above reveals that the Saligas would have testified to the quality of my character regarding my interactions with their family and within their community. Again, **testimony is evidence** [¶1096, 1]. For Pros. Eisenhower and Det. Kollar to corrupt their minds to act contrarian to our history, thereby depriving me of such evidence, the actions of State and Cop fall under Title 18 U.S.C.S. § 1512 Tampering with witness, victim, or informant (Supra), which states, in pertinent part, that

> (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 - - [*Emphasis added*]

(1) influence, delay or prevent the testimony of any person in an official proceeding;

(2) cause or induce any person to - -
(A) withhold evidence *** from 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 [*Emphasis added*].

¶573 In direct violation of section (j), my actual sentence is **13 to Life**, with *Life* as the *maximum term*. **Yay!**

¶574 Continuing,

(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.

¶575 **13 to Life**. ☺

¶576 I paid Atty. Green $42,500.00 out of my pocket with certified bank checks. Out of that money, he didn't proffer a penny for the subpoenas. I personally paid Dr. Reed for his unbiased and scientific examination of my mind (pricey, but worth it), and I paid a swell amount for the private investigator that Atty. Green never called to the stand (Exhibit-09; p.D-6), while my family and I covered the bond. He could have afforded a few subpoenas. Especially since they are **free** to file and only $25-$50 a piece to serve via Sheriff [¶104].

¶577 The combined efforts of Atty. Green, and the actions of Det. Kollar and Pros. Eisenhower deprived me of my U.S. 6th Amendment right to the compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in my favor. Further, I never affirmatively waived Constitutional Right [¶579, 15], [¶982, 7].

-Σ-

¶578

AN UP-TO-DATE SUMMARY OF MALFEASANCE, MISCONDUCT, AND MALEVOLENT MACHINATIONS

Conspiracy & Collusion: You cannot have one without the other.
-Frank P. Wood, *Since 1967*

¶579 In consideration of what I have presented thus far, and so we're all on the same tile... fraud, conspiracy, collusion, perjury, motives, witness tampering, evidence tampering, record tampering, and *in subsidium* run rampant throughout my case. As an up-to-date-list, because there's much more to come:

1) Scott was the mastermind and Danielle assisted him with the Implanted/Transplanted Memories of S.L. to set me up for revenge and to cover up his sins (Exhibits-03 and 09), [¶196]

   Collusion. Conspiracy. Motives. Victim tampering. Witness tampering.

2) The case regarding the alleged rape of S.L. was signed in with Dr. LeSure **prior to** the occurrence of an alleged incident, but **not** the police, **after** Danielle announced she was pregnant (Exhibits-03 and 09), [¶111-¶116]

   Conspiracy. Collusion.

3) Scott threatened Danielle with a **"million cash"** to take their son A.S. from her if she married me (Exhibit-09), [¶365-¶372]

   Witness tampering via threat and intimidation.

4) Scott told Danielle what to do regarding the alleged rape of S.L., so under Scott's orders [¶205], she went to Montville P.D. alone and on two (2) *separate and distinct*

occasions [¶186], [¶205], and then sought out Robyn (Exhibit-09, p.D-2), [¶1088, 1]

Hos before bros.
-Lucifer

Collusion. Conspiracy. Witness tampering.

5) Lynda and Ryan worked the mind of K.S. with Implanted/Transplanted Memories [¶350], [¶526], (Exhibits-03 and 08)

Collusion. Conspiracy. Victim tampering. Witness tampering.

6) The dual motives of Scott [¶196], and those of Danielle [¶120] and [¶366] are clear (Exhibits-03 and 09)

Collusion. Conspiracy. Motives.

7) The motives of Lynda and Ryan are clear [¶429-¶451], (Exhibit-08)

Collusion. Conspiracy. Motive.[118]

8) The motives of Robyn are clear [¶429-¶451], (Exhibits-03and 08)

Collusion. Conspiracy. Motives.

9) Holman and Kollar knew that all three (3) State-investigative agencies determined there was "no evidence" and therefore no crime pertaining to the alleged F-1 rape of S.L. [¶189-¶207]. Then, with lies, half-truths, and withheld evidence they illegally presented my case to the Grand Jury and secured a **sham indictment** [¶227-¶269]

Collusion. Conspiracy. Fraud. Perjury. Stupidity.

10) So far I have shown you

i. Five (5) Implanted/Transplanted Memories at Footnotes 18 [¶056], 47 [¶178], 50 [¶189, 2], 51 [¶190], and 53 [¶192]

ii. Judge Collier acted *in subsidium* the State four (4) times at Footnotes 28

[118] How far would you go to protect your family secrets?

[¶078], 29 [¶078], 60 [¶209], and 115 [¶538, 1]

Collusion. Conspiracy.

iii. Four (4) unindicted allegations at Footnotes 48 [¶178], 49 [¶187], 52 [¶190], 54 [¶192]

Implanted/Transplanted Memories. Witness tampering.

iv. Eight (8) missing Transcripts at Footnotes 79 [¶303], 81 [¶318], 82 [¶322], 91 [¶376], 93 [¶380], 95 [¶387], 98 [¶398], and 101 [¶425]

Collusion. Conspiracy. Fraud. Record tampering.

v. Crim.R.43 Presence of the defendant was violated twice at Footnotes 83 [¶323], and 90 [¶376]

Collusion. Conspiracy.

11) My Docket was altered and dates of hearings disappeared **after** I appeared in the Hartman case as a witness. See Footnote 94 [¶380]

Collusion. Conspiracy. Record tampering.

12) The letter from Job & Family Services/Children's Services to the Prosecutor that declared "no evidence" and that my case was "closed" was illegally suppressed at Footnote 58 [¶202] by Court and State

Collusion. Conspiracy. *In subsidium*. Suppressed evidence.

13) The Montville police report that surfaced during Trial declaring why the alleged rape case was "terminated" was illegally suppressed by Court and State, and then given to the Court Reporter for the purposes of destruction [¶207-¶225]

Collusion. Conspiracy. Destruction of /Tampering with evidence. *In subsidium*.

14) Det. Kollar deliberately left the picture of K.H. and those of my family in the photo

array [¶514-¶518] to manipulate others into believing there were other alleged victims, while Pros. Eisenhower made sure the illegally obtained pictures were made part of the Trial Record **after** Trial to achieve that same effect [¶516]

Collusion. Conspiracy. Evidence tampering. Fraud. Record tampering

15) Det. Kollar and Pros. Eisenhower corruptly persuaded the Saligas not to testify for me [¶552-¶577]

Collusion. Conspiracy. Witness tampering.

16) Judge Collier, Det. Kollar, Pros. Eisenhower, and Atty. Green conspired and fraudulently revoked my $200k cash bond the day **after** I was forced and manipulated *under duress* into waiving my speedy trial rights three (3) days **after** Trial was due to commence [¶364-¶403]

Collusion. Conspiracy. Fraud. *In subsidium.*

17) Judge Collier failed to remove the "untruthful" Danielle from the stand and permitted Court-declared and State-utilized perjury before the Court-declared and State-utilized "cynical" Jury [¶061-¶064]

Collusion. Conspiracy. Fraud. *In subsidium* Perjury.

18) Pros. Eisenhower failed to remove the "untruthful" Danielle from the stand once her integrity was depleted [¶089-¶090]

Collusion. Conspiracy. Fraud. Perjury.

19) Judge Collier, Pros. Eisenhower, and Atty. Green made no move to remove the Court-declared and State-utilized "cynical" Jury (Tp.1-560)

Collusion. Conspiracy. *In subsidium.*

20) Once the *lack of subject matter jurisdiction* concerning S.L. was revealed, neither

Judge Collier, Pros. Eisenhower, nor Atty. Green motioned to sever the charges and move for change of venue according to law [¶131-¶160]

Collusion. Conspiracy. Fraud. *In subsidium.*

21) After Judge Collier removed K.S. from the stand and declared "No, it didn't happen", Pros. Eisenhower confirmed she made a **"pact"** with this coached State-child-witness, and Judge Collier then permitted for K.S. to be put back on the stand, only to have Pros. Eisenhower lie to the "cynical" Jury about her testimony [¶684-¶715], (Exhibit-03)

Collusion. Conspiracy. Fraud. *In subsidium.* Perjury.

22) The video interviews of K.S. and S.L. were never shown to the "cynical" Jury due to "coaching" [¶246], (Tp.506-507)

Withheld evidence. Witness tampering.

23) The pictures of pictures were illegally and slanderously testified about by Det. Kollar with the direct assistance of Court and State [¶537], [¶538, 5]

Bolstering. Collusion. Conspiracy. Fraud. *In subsidium.*

24) Judge Collier refused to dismiss the Court-declared "cynical" Jury with its **Court-Elected Juror**, as will be shown in [¶605-¶611]

Conspiracy. Collusion. *In subsidium.*

25) **$1.2 million cash!!!** [¶544]

Collusion. Conspiracy. **Motive.**

26) Not to mention the plethora of Constitutional violations involved and the laws and rules violated. Yeah, and we're far from done. But, hey, in Medina County, Ohio the chorus to their theme song is

♪ This how we do it. ♫
-Tone Loc, *Wild Thing*

¶580 The SCARY part? As there is much more to come, there are a few more players on the opposing team that will be assigned prison numbers – uh, I mean jersey numbers shortly. Yes, when we get into what really happened with my Materially Altered and Incomplete Trial Record, there is going to be a *sphincter-tightening experience* for many. ☺

• • •

Rocket: As if it hasn't been already.

Frank: Well, pain *is* a most excellent teacher.

Rocket: True. Quite true.

• • •

Chapter 28

¶581 MY WAY

♪ This ain't song for the broken hearted
a silent prayer for the faith departed
I ain't gonna be just a face in the crowd ♫
You're gonna hear my voice
when I shout it out loud
-Bon Jovi, *It's my Life*

¶582 Reader, I'm not sure who will be more shocked by what I have said thus far, am about to say, and will say afterwards; you, me, or those who did this to the girls and me, and perpetuate this *Insolent Injustice*. But here goes...

¶583 Quoting the introduction, in pertinent part, from ***www.freefrankpwood.com***,

> Through recantation and/or litigation, all of these people have the power to dismantle the malevolent machination that they built with the tools of jealousy, avarice, vanity, and fear. Yes, they could have done this without

damage to their families' reputations and looked like heroes. Possessing neither the honor nor integrity to right their wrong, they made the decision to act for me.

I am just the messenger.

And I have a message for you all.

♪ This is for the ones who stood their ground ♫
Tommy and Gina who never backed down

¶584 Begin message:

Between *Heaven & Hell* you had no right to take what you stole from me: MY LIFE. And with it, you took MY TIME: My most priceless and personal asset. Thieves! Never able to reclaim my stolen time, I will reclaim my stolen life to ensure you do not keep the rest of what you are not entitled to. Such liberty was never granted via law and fact.

I have lost all fear of growing old alone and dying in prison. Nothing matters in here, for it is all just peripheral bullshit designed by dark forces to distract me, and I shall not let the abuses heaped upon me deter me from accomplishing my task. Know that I am highly focused and armed with vision, commitment, sheer will, and determination.

You will lose.

There is no more pain. No more anguish. No more longing. There is only the present, and persevering through the presence of suffering unjustly the effects of penury and poverty. And that is where I exist while I wage war until I take back what is not yours to keep: MY LIFE; the life you stole. It is rightfully mine, and I will take it back.

Mark my words, boy. Σ

End message.

♪ It's my life
It's now or never
I ain't gonna live forever
I just want to live my life alive ♫
It's my life!

¶585 For over a decade, I have waged *The Appellate Wars*[119] with **Honor & Integrity** as I righteously pursued the removal of this **Fraudulent Shame** from the legacy of my family. Armed with sheer will and determination, and knowledge of my innocence, I obeyed the laws and adhered to the rules of engagement as I presented the *colorful claims*[120] of my **Banner for Justice** on one battlefield courtroom after another. Under the hailstorm of lying *enemy fire*: duck and shoot back, I had to avoid procedural landmines, and dodge the lies of deceptive mortar shells. If that wasn't enough, an infantry of Prosecutors formed the impenetrable *British Square.*[121] In the event one of my claims put a dent in it, a cavalry of Assistant Attorney Generals would swoop down from higher ground and box me in. Whew! Talk about getting some work!

¶586 I know that wars are won by many battles, but *chyort voz´mi!*[122] Give a guy a break! I am an incarcerated pro se litigant who never finished college. True, I have courses under my belt

---

[119] The title of *Book Two* of this four-book series, I expect a late-2020 release. Follow my Exoneration Team on FB and my web site for news, publications, and updates on court filings and proceedings.

[120] Federal Courts want you to show "colorful claims" to obtain requested relief. I guess (Exhibit-03) was a little too black and white. Perhaps this Affidavit will be deemed of the right color palette, eh?

[121] A military maneuver where ground troops (infantry and artillery) form a square. If one man went down, he was pulled to the middle as another took his place and the square would readjust with precision movement. The square is a combination of the Roman Legion formations (Rome occupied Britain in the fourth century A.D.) and the ancient over-lapping shield wall. But it operated in all four (4) directions at once! It literally functioned like a flexible living organism. If an enemy managed to punch a hole in it, the square would give way, swallow the enemy whole, and reform. With sides 50 men wide and 20 men deep, a brilliant and formidable force.

[122] Russian: Damn it!

from three (3) different universities, but I am primarily a self-educated man who constantly studies. Someone who likes to learn, I value education **highly**. After all,

Education is the key to financial security.
-Galbraith or DeLoitte

• • •

Please support

WVIZ/PBS *ideastream*

@

http://www.wviz.org/

(216) 916-6100

Our children are counting on it.

• • •

But, as I have stated on many occasion, I am neither a lawyer, doctor, nor private investigator. I'm just doing the best I can with what I have against a relentless and powerful machine-like entity that chose this war without probable cause.

Friday, 12 March, 1943

> Now it occasionally happened that the two cats met; and the result was always a terrific fight. The aggressor was always the warehouse cat; yet it was always the attic cat who managed to win – just like among nations.
>
> Yours, Anne
> (Frank, p.81)

¶587 I expected reviewing courts to do what was right. But that would have been *too much* like right. Instead, with the slice and stab of slick bayonet wording, I ended up in triage every time! As an example, consider my COAI (Exhibit-03) that contains an extensive amount of exonerating data. Its contents have been presented in **every court** from the Trial Court to the

U.S. Supreme Court, with neither challenge to fact nor adjudication of merit. Perhaps they thought this was *friendly fire*: duck and ignore.

¶588 Yes, there are several legal remedies available to reopen my case. Unfortunately, that would involve starting the *Pro Se Appellate Process* all over again in the Trial Court. Why bother? I have already shown you what they had done to me. What more, we're only about 35% through this presentation. *Mein Gott!*[123] If you're not *shell-shocked*[124] now, you will be after you read the rest of this **Shock & Awe.**[125]

• • •

Please support

Wounded Warrior Project

@

HonorWarriors.org

1-877-294-6300

They suffered and suffer for our way of life.

• • •

¶589 With what you have already seen, and knowing that going back to the Trial Court would be as useless as a screen door on a submarine, Albert Einstein said,

---

[123] German: My God!

[124] Known as *combat fatigue*, a post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), true *shell shock* is what happens to the central nervous system after prolonged exposure to the shock waves of continuous bombings. Eventually, the nerves become so damaged that the body continuously tremors with no relief for life. This confirms how prolonged suffering and abuse affects the mind, as well.

[125] Term used by General Schwarzkopf during the Persian Gulf War of 1991 to describe surprise attacking an enemy with an overwhelming force that would stun the enemy into confusion and inaction. Known as *Tenderizing the Enemy* ☺, this method of attack was immediately followed by the insertion of Marines. *Ooh Rah!*

The definition of insanity is doing the same thing
over and over again and expecting different results.

True, yes? And, in support, Benjamin Franklin said,

There is nothing more frightening than ignorance in action.

Further, as I am neither insane nor ignorant (Exhibit-34),

Stupid is as stupid does.
-Forrest Gump

And that's not me. I learn from my mistakes.

¶590 Existing on the opposite ends of both the *Social Intelligence* and *Intellectual* spectrums from insanity and stupidity, I have opted to take this extraordinary pro-social approach **before** going from triage back to the front lines. Why? Without public awareness and support, and exposing them first, I will just be another Unisol: *Universal Soldier*.

♪ Tomorrow's getting harder
Make no mistake
Luck ain't even
You gotta make your own breaks ♫

¶591 But there's much more to this; my method of madness. Many are concerned with the length of this project, my rhetoric, euphemisms, colorful metaphors, and humor. But no one can show me the *guaranteed* way home. I tried it *their* way. What did it get me?

[Cricket noises]

Exactly that! And all my metaphors, quotes, lyrics, and humor are designed to relive frustration and drive points home. Just like in *Black Ops* and police work, the higher the stress level the more the jokes fly. This keeps you connected to the guy next to you and then to the guy next to him, and so forth. It's a chain reaction that provides a sense of security and awareness that keeps your unit connected. What more, I have **no one** in here to run this by. Outside of using Atty. Stanley's legal mind as a filter during our monthly visits, I'm flying solo. So, please entertain

them: my quotes and humor. And, if you're a little wigged out by what I have presented thus far, one must fathom what I held back.

[Litany of expletives, hand gestures, body movements, and sound effects]

I'll leave that up to your imagination. ☺

• • •

Rocket: Did you just have a *Deadpool* movie moment?

Frank: [Shrugs shoulders and grins].

Rocket: What would your godmother say?

Frank: Another light in my life whom I love beyond measure, she knows me better than anyone on this planet. I tell her *everything* and I know that she'll understand. Besides, there was no audio/video. Yeah, she cautioned me against showing anger, but the anger is long gone. What I am displaying is ***absolute disgust*** for those who did this to the girls and to me, and for ***what*** they had done. They deserved the *Deadpool* movie moment.

• • •

¶592 As an innocent man with a double-child-sex-case and a LIFE-SENTENCE, I have a 98.4% change of growing old and dying in prison. I have calculated probabilities, dispersions, and the coefficients of variations (betas: β). Yeah, I've done the math and formulas do not lie. What do I have to lose at this point? I've done it their way and have gotten nowhere, so I choose to do it MY WAY.

♪ My heart is like an open highway
Like Frankie said, 'I did it my way' ♫

And in doing so, I choose not to allow for my circumstances to stifle who I am, but to **live my life out loud**. Much like Anne Frank when she said,

> I hope I shall be able to confide in you completely, as I have never been able to do in anyone before, and I hope that you will be a great support and comfort to me.
>
> Anne Frank. 12 June 1942
> (Frank, p.10)

¶593 Inspired by the heart and courage of this precious young lady,[126] how could I not be so bold and open as she? From the remarkable insights and understanding in her writings, I have learned that, being unjustly forced into hiding with a DEATH-SENTENCE hanging over your head, is no different than being unjustly forced into prison with a LIFE-SENTENCE hanging over your head. Σ

¶594 If anyone reading this knows of one of Ms. Frank's descendants, ***please*** do something to benefit their life in her name. Something I would be privileged to do. If this is not possible, perform some random act of kindness for someone less fortunate than you. In turn, you just may free a soul from a prison without walls. They do exist. Σ

¶595 (See [¶299] and [¶915] of this Affidavit).

> I must proceed as planned. Having passed the point of no return, I must do this my way as I take my life back. I can only hope that you take the time to understand the man who is holding the pencil, and that, somehow, and in some way, I may inspire you to act as Ms. Frank inspired me.
>
> Frank P. Wood. 29 November 2017

♪ I just want to live my life alive ♫
Because it's my life!

-Σ-

[126] If you don't know who you are, or you're not who you want to be, read to understand Ms. Frank.

¶596 TRIAL FACTS: PART I

The only truth is action.
-Marcus Aurelius

¶597 By operation of law, a Trial Court is required to

> ...view [] all the evidence [presented] in a light most favorable to the prosecution. (United States v. Johnson, 1998 U.S. LEXIS 7537, HN2).

(See [¶630a] and [¶981] of this Affidavit)

As this renders the Presumption of Innocence as fraudulent as a constitutionally fair trial, recall that Pros. Eisenhower told the Jury "you will find him guilty" at the end of her Opening and Closing Statements [¶510-¶512]. She never said *'We are here to find the truth'*. Therefore, at the onset of Trial, Pros. Eisenhower vouched for the State's witnesses and the credibility of their testimony **before** and **after** they took the stand. For clarity, her verbatim statements were

1) "We are convinced that when you hear their testimony, you will find him guilty"

   (Opening Statement: Tp.38, Ln.22-24)

2) "The State of Ohio asks that you find this Defendant Guilty"

   (Closing Statement: Tp.501, Ln.18-19)

3) "... you can *feel good* about finding him guilty... and we request that you find him Guilty of both counts" [*emphasis added*]

   (Final Closing Statement: Tp.526, Ln.14-18), [¶1028, 1-2]

¶598 These statements fall under the categories of improper vouching and, therefore, prosecutorial misconduct (Berger, supra), [¶550] because,

> Improper vouching occurs when a prosecutor supports the credibility of a witness by indicating a personal belief in the witness's credibility thereby placing the prestige of the Office of the United States Attorney behind that witness.

> Generally, improper vouching involves either blunt comments or comments that imply that the prosecutor has special knowledge of the facts not in front of the jury or the credibility and truthfulness of witnesses and their testimony. (U.S.A. v. Francis and Francis, 1999 U.S. App. LEXIS 2874, HN2).

(See [¶721] and [¶1092, 4] of this Affidavit)

With such an overwhelming amount of State's evidence proving my innocence, and there's much more to come, the unisolated comments of Pros. Eisenhower placed the prestige of the Prosecutor's Office behind the witnesses. This is specifically due to the facts that she said,

"... you can feel good... "

at the end of Trial as she petitioned the emotions of an already "cynical" Jury, and

"The State of Ohio asks"

because

"We are convinced..."

at the onset of Trial, with the keyword being **"We"**.

¶599 Having clearly identified the first three (3) counts of vouching, that I know of, it is obvious that my Trial was ***not*** a truth-finding mechanism. With dishonest and deceptive words, it was an instrument for revenge and a weapon of destruction. Words are vocalized thoughts, and

> A thought that helps no one not only is not true, in the final result, it never was. For all that is, physical or spiritual or divine, was created only to be a part of the repair of this world of action. And once the repair is done, all that will be true are those things that made it happen. In every thought, look for the power to change the world.
> -Tzvi Freeman

¶600 With that said, Pros. Eisenhower's thoughts were not true. Further, as

Thought is the first creation,
[and]
Action is the second creation,
-Covey, p.__

her actions were only as true as her thoughts. Σ

¶601 Having set the Trial Tempo, I have already shown you the legal definition of vouching in [¶598] above. But before proceeding, I must show you the legal difference between *bolstering* and *vouching*.

> Bolstering and vouching are much alike and go to the heart of the trial. Bolstering occurs when the prosecutor implies that the witness's testimony is corroborated by evidence known to the government but not to the jury (Francis, supra, HN4),

just like when Pros. Eisenhower directly aided Det. Kollar with his deceptive and manipulative testimony about the pictures of pictures [¶485]. (See also [¶721], [¶1099], and [¶1104] of this Affidavit).

¶602 With the field level, let's see what else really happened behind the *closed* doors of a *public* forum during my Trial.

• • •

Frank: Bosun!

Rocket: Aye, Captain!

Frank: Ensign!

Groot: [Snoring loudly]

Rocket: I gather he's sleeping it off, Sir.

Frank: Very well. Maintain full sail and current course. Wake him when the *Pelvic Coast* comes into view.

Rocket: Aye, Captain. Full sail and current course.

Frank: And leave him where he lay. With the sun beating down, photosynthesis will do him some good.

• • •

¶603 My Trial took place from April 24-28 and May 1 of 2006 in the Medina County Court of Common Pleas, Medina, Ohio as State of Ohio v. Frank P. Wood, Case No. 05CR0365.

¶604 I know! Just lil' ol' me against this huge government machine. Talk about daunting. Now I know what Paul experienced when he challenged Rome to prove them wrong. And that he did. And so shall I. ☺

¶605 On Tp.24, Ln.10-15 conducting a jury *voir dire* examination is mentioned by Judge Collier, but on Tp.25, Ln.5-7, the previously selected Jury is seated (Exhibit-35). The Jury Selection phase of my Trial took place on April 24th and 25th of 2006. Therefore the Plundered Record reveals that the Jury *voir dire*, approximately one-and-a-half (1 ½) days of Trial Record is missing.[127] Now let me show you *why*.

¶606 During the *voir dire*, a potential female juror announced, **"I don't think I can do this trial."** Judge Collier then pulled Stenographer Garrity, Det. Kollar, Pros. Eisenhower, Atty. Green, Atty. Stanley, the potential female juror, and myself into a back room. This woman then confessed her painful past by declaring, **"I was molested in my youth."** I recall her and her demeanor. She was white, about 5' 7", medium build, short iron gray hair, late 50s. She was sad, sat with her hands folded in her lap, looking down, would not look any of us in the eye, and spoke in low tones. Obviously, this woman was still traumatized and emotionally biased. She should have been removed from the Trial because she was "not capable of deciding the case solely on the evidence", (Smith v. Phillips, 1982 U.S. LEXIS 69, HN5, HN8), *or lack thereof.* Her declarations and demeanor confirm this as fact.

• • •

Rocket: Land ho! *Pelvic Coast*, Captain! Dead ahead!

---

[127] Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record #9.

Frank: Thank you, Bosun. Ensign Groot!

Groot: I am Groot!

Frank: Prepare to fire the long nines on my command.

Groot: I am Groot.

Frank: Bosun, run *The Big Bone* to ground!

Rocket: Bury her deep, Captain?

Frank: All the way to the gun whale.

Rocket: Aye, Captain. To the gun whale it is, Sir.

• • •

¶607 After her announcement, Judge Collier pleaded with her,

• • •

Rocket: We're in the shallows, Captain.

Frank: Steady...

• • •

and asked,

• • •

Frank: All hands brace for impact!

• • •

"Would you please do this for me?"

• • •

[LOUD SOUNDS OF GRINDING AND TIMBER CREAKING AND SNAPPING]

• • •

What about me, the guy on trial? I'm the one who had a U.S. 6th Amendment right to be tried by

an impartial Jury of my peers.[128] Eventually, this woman conceded to Judge Collier's pressure and manipulations with, **"Alright. I'll do it,"**

• • •

Frank: Fire cannon one!

Groot: I am Groot! [BOOM!]

• • •

and sat in as a **Court-elected Juror** [¶1131, 1]. Fortunately for me,

• • •

Frank: Fire cannon two!

Groot: I am Groot! [BOOM!]

• • •

Atty. Stanley was a truthful witness to this event (Exhibit-31: Item 6).

• • •

Rocket: Now that's how you plant it deep and do damage while you're there.

Frank: Thank you. I take pride in my work. From here on out, the only thing that's going to hurt them is the extraction process.

Groot: I am Groot!

[LOUD COLLECTIVE LAUGHTER]

• • •

¶608 Judge Collier never asked this woman if she could set aside her painful past, which was apparently still too much to bear according to her demeanor. What more, he never asked her directly if she could remain impartial. He just saw another way to act *in subsidium* the State and

[128] There were no African-Americans in the Jury to represent a significant portion of my peer community.

secure a bogus conviction;[129] albeit a wrongful one. Further, her scarred past caused her to naturally prejudge the case. Combine her predisposition with her demeanor, she had **great influence** on the Court-declared "cynical" Jury. All of these elements combined resulted in a **Tainted Jury** that was out to see the hangman's noose drop. Yes, I was doomed from the start.

¶609 With PTSD, as this woman still suffered from the abuses of a previous *authority figure* in her life, she was plainly subjected to and easily manipulated by Judge Collier: a new *authority figure*, into doing the Trial for *him*. Judge Collier's position in doing the Trial was to manage the Trial process itself, and not insert himself into the process *in subsidium*. He targeted this poor woman's vulnerability, and used her to do his bidding [¶1123]. In doing so, he committed *Jury Tampering* with an unauthorized intrusion. (U.S.A. v. Dutkel, 1999 U.S. App. LEXIS 22426), (Remmer v. U.S., 350 U.S. 377, 379, 100 L. Ed. 435, 76 S. Ct. 425 (1956)).

¶610 The "cynical" Jury with its Court-elected Juror prejudiced me of my U.S. 6th Amendment right to be tried by an impartial **Jury pursuant to Crim.R.24(B)(C)(9), for the Jurors**

> possessed a state of mind evincing *enmity*
> or bias toward the defendant or state [*emphasis added*]. Σ

¶611 This woman was molested and remained traumatized. This is demeanor confirmed and wrongful conviction supported. So how was she *not* to evince *enmity* or bias towards me? Judge Collier had two (2) alternate Jurors to choose from [¶069]. Did he? No. He just assumed the role of predator and took his prey. His actions resulted in the deliberate

> Abuse of Power. (16c) The misuse of improper exercise of one's authority; esp. the exercise of a statutorily or otherwise duly conferred authority in a way that is tortious, unlawful, or outside its scope (Garner, p.12),

when he acted *in subsidium* the State, again, and stacked the Jury against me. Reader, now you

[129] *In subsidium* #5.

know *why* the Transcript for the Jury *voir dire* is missing [¶579, 24], [¶731]. Σ

¶612 So much for a reliable Trial Mechanism, eh? Like I stated earlier, when you throw out Due Process, Equal Protection naturally follows suit [¶233]. The result was nothing less than a plain and structural error (See [¶084-¶085] and Footnote 32), that

1) Rendered the Jury's verdict unreliable and therefore disposable

2) Is automatic Constitutional Grounds for reversal

¶613 I know. Horrifying to know that you or one of your loved ones could stand innocent during trial and have this happen [¶165, 1], [¶523]. Σ

¶614 Having previously discussed the testimony of the State's first witness: Officer McCourt of the Montville P.D., we will now move on to that of Danielle Sadowsky: THE STATE'S STAR WITNESS and her Court-declared "untruthful" testimony (Tp.132-133).

¶615 Although the majority of Danielle's misleading and perjured testimony has already been revealed via this Affidavit and (Exhibts-03, 09, 11, 14, 15, 17, 18, and 34), we must now turn to (Exhibit-36: Ohio Innocence Project (OIP) Application; March 10, 2015). I have presented this document for your review and comparison with my letters to the OIP (Exhibit-19) before we continue on. The combined documents are quite revealing and will answer some of the questions either forming in your mind, or that you may have earlier written down. I encourage you to review and compare because this process will aid in preparing your analytical minds for what I am about to show you. But take a break first. I need one too. This pinching pencils and pissing off prosecutors is truly taxing at times. See you in 60.

• • •

♪ [Intermission music] ♫

Rocket: What about *The Big Bone*? She's firmly planted.

Frank: That was the main idea. We could wait until high tide, drag her out, turn her around, and give them *The Big Bone* the same way they gave it to me.

Rocket: Full length, dry, by force, and continuously.

Frank: True. Quite true.

Groot: I am Groot.

Frank: I concur. We'll let them handle the extraction process by pulling my narrow behind out of prison. Especially since the longer she sits there, the deeper she'll sink. Also, a *Declatory Judgment of Innocence* issued from the Trial Court would be nice, too. ☺

[Nods and murmurs of agreement]

Frank: Well, back to work. You guys take a break and let me know if the phone rings. I'm expecting a call.

Groot: I am Groot.

Frank: Thanks.

• • •

¶616 Reader, welcome back. There's still a lot of ground to cover, so let's get back at it.

¶617 On (Tp.109) Danielle stated that she had no idea what type of abuse S.L. suffered (Ln.2-14), and that she did not know if it was sexual (Ln.15-16), only to **change her testimony** and claim she was told it was not sexual (Ln.17-22). By whom? As Danielle's testimony continuously vacillates in this self-conflicting and perjured manner, and she was told it was not sexual, then what was it? For some odd reason, Danielle never gives any details.

¶618 To the contrary of Danielle's testimony, she told me that S.L. *was* sexually abused (Exhibit-09: p.D-1, ¶3) **prior to** her and Scott receiving guardianship. Children's Services was well aware of the past sexual abuse and, as standard operating procedure, would have told the

Sadowskys what signs to look for that would indicate S.L.'s need for further counseling and therapy. If Children's Services failed in this essential duty, then Danielle told the truth. If Children's Services did not fail S.L. in this matter, then the "untruthful" Danielle *lied*. I lean towards the *latter*.

¶619 As to signs, **prior to** my meeting S.L., Danielle found S.L. and her step-brother A.S. behind Danielle's bed. Per Danielle, the children were naked and S.L. was fondling A.S. In a hysterical phone call to me, Danielle shouted, **"She was molesting my son!"** This incident took place in January of 2004 (Exhibit-09: p.D-1, ¶4).

¶620 My Fondled Trial Record reveals that a **second** incident took place in July of 2004 and Danielle called Children's Services in response (Tp.159, Ln.12-14). As Danielle was living with me at that time, and the children were not, I find it to be quite disturbing that she never told me about this. But you know damn good and well she told Scott [¶745], [¶865].

¶621 S.L.'s **prior** abuse, events with A.S., and experiences with Scott that caused Danielle to leave the sanctity of the marriage bed, all gave S.L. **prior** sexual experience and knowledge of the male anatomy **before** she ever met me. Such history would have made the process of IMPLANTED/TRANSPLANTED MEMORIES much easier to accomplish within the already-stressed mind of this abused prepubertal child [¶761-¶764].

¶622 In addition to the above history, it is legally recorded that S.L. was taken from her maternal grandmother's home ("Grandma Alice") by Cuyahoga County Children's Services due to some unknown abuse **prior to** coming into the Sadowsky's home (Exhibit-19: OIP; May 12, 2016; p.1-2). Going back a step further,

What abuse did S.L. suffer that caused her to be placed in grandma's care?

S.L.'s abuse and experiences **prior to** our meeting were, unfortunately for her, quite extensive.

¶623 Naturally, both State (Tp.431, Ln.3-8) and Court (Tp.432, Ln.14-18) would not allow any of S.L.'s past history to be presented to the **Tainted and Tampered-With Jury**. Judge Collier elected to suppress this evidence under the Rape Shield Law because this history would have

1) Verified the "untruthful" Danielle's Court-acknowledged and State-utilized perjury
2) Discredited the testimony of S.L.'s treating psychologist and State expert witness: Dr. Suzanne LeSure [¶724a]
3) Supported Dr. Reed's *voir dire* testimony (Exhibit-34)
4) Casted doubt on S.L.'s "coached" Pre-Trial out-of-court statements to Children's Services, Akron Children's, Montville P.D., Pros. Eisenhower, and Dr. LeSure
5) Worked against the State regarding K.S.'s coached Pre-Trial statements and an allegation that the Trial Court declared, "didn't happen" (Exhibit-03)
6) Gone to my credibility
7) Confirmed that Atty. Stanley "knows things"

¶624 In State v. Hart, 1996 Ohio App. LEXIS 2862,

> HN4 Ohio's rape shield law is codified at R.C. 2907.02 (D). It states
>
> Evidence of specific instances of the victim's sexual activity and reputation evidence of the victim's sexual activity shall not be admitted under this section unless it involves evidence of the origin of semen, pregnancy, or disease, or the victim's past sexual activity with the offender,[130] [¶1112, B] and only to the extent that the court finds that the evidence is material[131] to a fact at issue in the case and that the inflammatory or prejudicial nature does not outweigh its probative[132] value.

---

[130] Notice how an alleged victim is declared a 'victim' and an alleged offender is declared an 'offender' prior to trial and verdict. Disturbing.

[131] Material evidence. Legitimate, pertinent evidence; evidence that is so important and so related to the issues being disputed that a judge or jury may consider it as the vital, decisive factor in the case. Rothenberg, p.384.

[132] Probative facts. Evidentiary facts; facts that tend to prove the matter at issue. Rothenberg, p.384.

and

> HN6 It is within the sound discretion of the trial court to determine the relevancy[133] of evidence, and to apply R.C. 2907.02 (D) to best meet the purpose of the statute.
>
> HN7 It is well-established that "the rights to confront and cross-examine witnesses and to call witnesses on one's behalf" are essential to due process. State v. Gardner (1979) 59 Ohio St. 2d. 14, 16-17, 391 N.E.2d 337 (citations omitted). However, these rights must be balanced against the *State's interest* that R.C. 2907.02 (D) was designed to protect. See id at 17. [*Emphasis added*].
>
> (See [¶1293] of this Affidavit)

¶625 Obliterating any chance of a strict interpretation and application of my U.S. 6th Amendment rights to confront the witnesses against me; especially since S.L.'s past history gave her experience, knowledge, and therefore memories that could be manipulated, Ohio courts declare that

> To determine whether R.C. 2907.02 (D) has been unconstitutionally applied, we must balance the State's interests with the probative value of the excluded evidence. Id. (Hart, supra).
>
> HN8 Legitimate State interest include: guarding the victim's sexual privacy and preventing them from undue harassment; discouraging in sexual assault cases to try the victims rather than the defendant;

¶626 Let me make one thing perfectly clear...

Everyone in a trial is on trial regarding their motives and veracity.

If not, then all I need to do is scream "Rape!" and claim Kollar copped a feel when he cuffed me, rendering him the defendant and me the victim.[134] That's how the Law works! Further,

---

[133] Relevant evidence. Testimony and evidence that bear directly on the issues being discussed or disputed. Rothenberg, p.416.

[134] Just because someone said it, a court ruled on it, or you saw it on the web, this does not make it true, rendering the publications mere propaganda. "Cui bono?"

> HN8 Cont... ***, by excluding inflammatory, prejudicial and only marginally probative evidence,

which leaves any jury in the position to decide a one-sided case without all the facts, while the State claims this process, the denial of my Due Process rights, if for

> HN8 Cont... aiding in the truthfinding process. 50 Ohio St. 2d at 17-18.

¶627 Can anyone show me *how* my one-sided Trial was a truthfinding process... in *any* universe?

¶628 Continuing with Hart,

> HN9 To assess the probative value of excluded evidence, it is necessary to examine its relevance to the issues which it is offered to prove.

And those issues are, again, that S.L.'s past history gave her experience, knowledge, and therefore memories that could be manipulated. When I get to the baseball roster of unqualified people and *children* who interviewed S.L. **prior to** Dr. LeSure, and her unfortunate past history, you will see how all this ties together and confirms her IMPLANTED/TRANSPLANTED & ALTERED MEMORIES [¶634-¶637]. Oh, there's much more to come. I've done my homework. ☺

¶629 Judge Collier had judicial discretion in allowing the evidence of S.L.'s past history into Trial (Hart, HN6), but he chose not to and acted *in subsidium*, again. This is because a higher Reviewing Court

> ... will not reverse a conviction unless it finds that "reasonable minds could not reach the conclusion reached by the trier of facts." id.(citing Jackson v. Virginia (1979), 443 U.S. 307, 319 ***).

¶630 I had a Court-declared and State-utilized "cynical" Jury with a Court-elected Juror who was molested in her youth, and a Medina City elementary school teacher, who were all lied to

with Court-acknowledged and State-utilized perjury, and deliberately lied to by Det. Kollar and Pros. Eisenhower, *inter alia*. Am I missing something here? No, because **anyone** with a functional frontal lobe would have reached a different conclusion due to **State's evidence** Court admissions exonerating me of both **"bullshit"** charges.

¶630a Unfortunately, Reviewing State Courts are well aware of what I showed you earlier in [¶597] about courts viewing evidence presented in favor of the State. Therefore, in determining whether a different conclusion should be reached, these courts unanimously declare that

> The question to be asked by this [or any] court is whether "after viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the prosecution, *** any reasonable trier of fact could have found the essential elements of the crime proven beyond a reasonable doubt." (Hart, HN12; citing State v. Jenks (1991) 61 Ohio St. 3d 259, 273).

¶630b With minds focused on the dogma that *courts are always right*,

> A one-sided approach will always
> arrive at a one-sided conclusion.
> -Mr. Wood

¶630c Judge Collier acted *in subsidium*[135] under the protection of the above dogma when he denied the admission of this relevant, material and probative evidence: The past abuses suffered by S.L. His past pattern of behavior proves this beyond a reasonable doubt [¶972, 14]. Σ

¶631 At one point during Danielle's testimony Judge Collier, Pros. Eisenhower, Det. Kollar, and Atty. Green went into chambers. Danielle sat on the witness stand looking down at her hands, clearly uneasy. I sat alone at the Defense Table with two (2) deputies posted up behind me, and a 50,000-volt shock pack strapped to my leg. **Whoa!** Glad the deputy didn't have an itchy finger, eh? Stenographer Garrity sat at her steno-machine, and the **Tainted Twelve** were still seated. Atty. Stanley was not present as he was in another court.

---

[135] *In subsidium* #6.

¶632 As this clandestine meeting is missing from my Tormented Record,[136] a few things come to mind:

1) When the decision to go into chambers was made, Reporter Garrity stood up to follow. Judge Collier then held his hand up in a 'Stop' motion and shook his head 'No'

2) Since the State claims I can be held to the standards of a licensed practicing attorney, I should have been present at this meeting,[137] and all side bar conversations that occurred during Trial

¶633 Wrapping up Danielle's testimony, (Exhibit-19: OIP; May 12, 2016) reveals the State did **not** want to discuss Rick Lazard, the biological father of S.L. (Tp.108), or S.L.'s Grandma Alice (Tp.107; Tp.438-439). This raises such questions as

1) What did they know?

2) Why didn't any of S.L.'s friends, teachers, or extended family testify? [¶640].

¶634 As to the latter, (Exhibit-18: p.2 of 5) reveals that

> -- Patient has been interviewed by Tricia Carshetti [Sic] – Medina County worker, Officer McCort [Sic], Danielle, Scott, paternal grandmother – Scott's mother, and Dr. LeSure – Cornerstone Psychological Services, and Julie Root – school counselor, Erin Simpson – 4th grade teacher, and patient has talked to **"a few friends" [emphasis added]**

¶635 Well, that's just great! Freakin' great! First we have interviewing S.L.

1) Danielle: previously sexually abused with dual motives

2) Scott: **Perp #1** with dual-motives

3) Scott's mother: **"Grandma Joyce"** whose motives to protect her son and to lay blame on me would have naturally guided her questions

---

[136] Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record #9.

[137] Presence of the defendant violation #3.

4) Julie Root: a school counselor

i. Who had neither the psychological education, certifications, nor *legal right* to interview S.L. regarding such sensitive matters, therefore impeding an investigation **before** it began

ii. Whose leading questions I will never know

5) Erin Simpson: a 4th grade teacher

i. Who had neither the psychological education, certifications, nor *legal right* to interview S.L. regarding such sensitive matters, therefore impeding an investigation **before** it began

ii. Whose leading questions I will never know

6) **"a few friends"**: Wonderful. What impact did the imaginations of a group of 8-10 year-olds have on S.L.'s abused and manipulated mind. Given her past abuses **prior to** meeting me, now you can see more of *why* Judge Collier should *never* have suppressed the events between S.L. and A.S. This is disturbing as whole because we don't know if any of these children were abused themselves, came from broken homes, knew someone that was abused, or were just telling stories

¶636 Adding to the list of people who interviewed S.L. **prior to and after** her being interviewed by Dr. Suzanne LeSure of Cornerstone Psychological Services, she

1) Had a previous treating psychologist: Dr. Jedacek (See [¶735] and Footnote 161)

2) Was interviewed by

i. Officer McCourt of the Montville P.D.

ii. Elizabeth Morstatter at Medina County Job & Family Services

iii. Tricia Carchedi at Akron Children's Hospital

iv. Nurse Practitioner Donna Abbot who conducted her physical examination at Akron Children's Hospital

v. Pros. Eisenhower

vi. And anyone else we do not know about!

¶637 Having performed the *Hippocampus Stomp* on this poor girl were, at least, 13 adults with only two (2) psychologists that were educated and therefore qualified to question her; two (2) social workers; one (1) nurse practitioner that should **not** have questioned her without a psychologist **and** my attorney present; way too many people with ulterior motives; and a **group of children** [¶628], [¶741], [¶780], [¶961], [¶963].

¶638 Well, what did all of this get me? Glad you asked because I am eager to remind you. This got me

1) A ***Temple Virgin*** who spent the entire indicted weekend of alleged abuse in Put-In-Bay with her "dad" Scott and "not at Frank Wood's house" (Exhibits-03 and 14)

2) S.L.'s "mother" Danielle told S.L., **"Frankie raped you"** (Exhibt-03), (Exhibit-18: p.2 of 5)

3) A Life-Sentence for a crime that

i. That went *uninvestigated* [¶1240-¶1256]

ii. Never happened

iii. Originally went *unindicted*

iv. In a place I have never been: Put-In-Bay

¶639 I am **NOT** in my happy spot. ☹

¶640 In consideration of the above data, with State's evidence and experts proving

1) S.L. was a ***Temple Virgin*** (Exhibits-03 and 14)

2) She was sexually assaulted in Put-In-Bay, in some manner, by Scott (Exhibit-03)

3) I was definitely **not** there

4) Motives (Exhibits-03 and 09)

5) Implanted/Transplanted Memories (Exhibits-03 and 18)

6) I do not possess the psychological capacities to commit such ignorant and heinous acts (Exhibits-34 and 46)

the intrusive leading questions of non-experts, when combined with the imaginations of children, left me **FUBAR** before the **sham indictment** was ever sought. Think about the sheer volume of IMPLANTED/TRANSPLANTED MEMORIES that took place from unqualified questioners, improper questioning, ulterior motives, and the imaginations of children. Staggering! Remember the *Telephone Game*? [¶461]. Exactly my point. And this is *why* the unqualified, extended family, and "a few friends" did not testify [¶633, 2]. Further, as Dr. LeSure never interviewed these people, soon I will show you how S.L.'s memories, a.k.a. *cell assemblies*, were altered as a result of the above interviews [¶819-¶822].

¶641 I've been busy. ☺

¶642 Continuing... Nurse Practitioner ("NP") Donna Abbott of Akron Children's Hospital testified (Tp.258-282). NP Abbott performed a complete medical exam of S.L. on January 26, 2005 (Tp.262, Ln.23) because of allegations of sexual abuse (Tp.263, Ln.1-2).

¶643 As noted in (Exhibits-03, 14, 17, and 18), NP Abbott found a ***Temple Virgin*** with IMPLANTED/TRANSPLANTED MEMORIES. With that said...

¶644 During direct examination of N.P. Abbott by Pros. Eisenhower, right after she was asked if she examined S.L.'s "vaginal area" (Tp.266, Ln.10-12), the following is stated at (Ln.14-16):

(Whereupon, a discussion between Prosecutor Eisenhower and Attorney Green was then held out of the hearing of the court reporter.) (Exhibit-37).

¶645 I have no idea what was discussed, and this private colloquy should have been made part of the Record.[138] What more, I should have been present.[139]

¶646 Next, when asked to describe the anatomy of a child S.L.'s age, NP Abbott stated that

> In S.L.'s case, the hymen had a hole in the center only a few millimeters wide that was just large enough to pass a pencil through,

as she mimicked the motion of poking the air with a pencil [¶1373]. Although this statement should be at (Tp.271, Ln.6-7), it has been deleted from the Record (Exhibit-37).[140] *Why?*

¶647 What lends credibility to my claim of the missing statement is found in (Exhibit-14) where the following is stated:

VAGINAL OPENING: Approximately 4-5mm.

This is crucial and we will come back to it later on in [¶1355-¶1375]. Yeah, that's the *Grand Finale*.

Big-botta-boom-botta-bing!
-Fifth Element

¶648 Next, Robyn testified that her daughter K.S. came home from school at age nine (9) after a "good touch, bad touch" class, and stated that someone had improperly touched her when she was four-and-a-half (4 ½), (Tp.364, Ln.1-13), (Exhibit-04: p.9). Per her own testimony, when Robyn asked K.S. "Who touched you?" she answered "Frank?" in the form of a question, revealing doubt and uncertainty [¶768, 6]. As this was part of Robyn's direct testimony on

[138] Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record #10.
[139] Presence of the defendant violation #4.
[140] Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record #11.

Tp.364, her statement/question has been deleted from the Trial Record (Exhibt-38).[141]

¶649 Further, Robyn's voluntary in-court testimony failed to reflect

1) Robyn knew she was pregnant before she met me with her soon-to-be ex-husband's baby and she never told me (Exhibit-38: Tp.361, Ln.4-14), (Exhibit-08)

2) K.S. told Lynda *first* about the alleged abuse (Exhibit-04)

3) K.S.'s history with Ryan (Exhibit-08)

4) Robyn's history with Lynda regarding violence and custody (Exhibit-08)

5) Robyn's past history with Ryan regarding abuse and violence (Exhibit-08)

6) What she and I discussed about all the above (Exhibit-08)

¶650 Still trying to build and bolster a fabricated case, Pros. Eisenhower told Robyn, regarding K.S., "Tell us what she told you" (Tp.362, Ln.19). To prevent Robyn from finishing her inadmissible hearsay testimony, Atty. Green objected, effectively cutting off her answer. In a sidebar, to counter, Pros. Eisenhower told Judge Collier, "Your Honor, I believe that this is going to fit the excited utterance exception" (Tp.363, Ln.4-6). No. It does not. Clarifying...

¶651 Excited Utterance: Evid.R.803(2) is defined as

> A statement relating to a startling event or condition while the declarant was under the stress of excitement caused by the event or condition.

¶652 Quite true. While the alleged event is still fresh in the declarant's mind and **not** four-and-a-half (4 ½) years later.

¶653 Supporting the above, in State v. Dean, 146 Ohio St. 3d 106, at HN12, the Ohio Supreme Court held that

> A four-part test is administered to determine the admissibility of statements as excited utterance: (1) a startling event, (2) a statement made to that event, (3) a statement made by a declarant with first-hand knowledge, and (4) a statement

[141] Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record #12.

> made while the declarant was under the stress of the excitement caused by the event. See Gianelli 2, Evidence, Section 803.9, at 223-224 (3d Ed. 2010). Potter v. Baker, 162 Ohio St. 488, 124 N.E. 2d 140 (1955), paragraph two of syllabus; State v. Jones, 135 Ohio St. 3d 10, 2012-Ohio-5677, 948, ¶166 (following Baker),
>
> and the statement must not be the result of reflective thought, Jones at HN25,

and the statement

> was made before there had been time for such nervous excitement to lose domination over the declarant's reflective faculties. Baker at HN7.

Four-and-half-years (4 ½) is a long time [¶789].

¶654 Eventually, Pros. Eisenhower had to "strike"[142] the question (Tp.363, Ln.15-16) because she knew she was wrong in trying to solicit inadmissible hearsay, and that she was lying about the Excited Utterance law. But she went right back at it with, "And what did she tell you?" (Tp.364, Ln.12). Atty. Green moved too late with his "Objection" (Tp.364, Ln.14-15) as Robyn answered, "She stated to me that he had touched her" (Tp.364, Ln.13), [¶683].

¶655 Evidently, the Medina County Prosecutor's Office motto is:

Anything for a win.

¶656 Having solicited this inadmissible hearsay testimony, Judge Collier did "sustain[143] the objection" (Tp.364, Ln.15-16), but failed to follow up with curative instructions[144] for the Jury. Still, such instructions would have floated like a lead balloon over the heads of the Court-declared "cynical" Jury with its Court-elected Juror who was molested in her youth, and Medina City elementary school teacher. So let's be realistic, People... Such a **Tainted& Tampered With Jury** cannot, and will not unremember something.

---

[142] Strike. 1. To strike a word or passage [or question], means to delete it. Rothenberg, p.466.
[143] Sustain. (13c) 4. (Of a court) to uphold or rule in favor of <objection sustained>. Garner, p.1676.
[144] Curative instructions. (1890) A court's instruction to the jury to disregard something that should not have happened in open court ***. Garner, p.988.

¶657 *Understand* that prosecutors will only ask questions they already know the answers to, and they will ask the same question 10 different ways until they get the answer they want to hear. As Court-acknowledged proof of this declaration (See State v. Keenan, 1993 Ohio LEXIS 1214, HN11, Footnote 2). Now consider the Court-declared "untruthful" Danielle and her State-utilized perjury [¶982, 8]. Yeah, it's like that.

¶658 Getting back to the Medina Police Report, Robyn stated she did not want me contacted or questioned. That's because she knew she was lying for Lynda and Ryan. What more, she claimed that she was concerned for their safety if Det. Kollar contacted me about the allegation (Exhibit-04: p.11). They also got K.S. to say that I was "mean" to them (ibid), (p.11). Now, as these blatant lies were uncalled for...

¶659 **Whoa!** Let's put the brakes on this runaway mule.

When I says *'Whoa'*
I means ***'Whoa!'***
-Yosemite Sam, *Looney Tunes*

¶660 Robyn's guilty conscience testified that she didn't want to go after me (Tp.367, Ln.20), didn't want me to go to jail (Tp.367, Ln.11), out of three (3) girls I never favored one child over the other (Tp.373, Ln.7-9), and I was good to the children (Tp.373, Ln.10-11),[145] (Exhibit-03: p.10, ¶2), [¶805, 2]. Σ

¶661 Wheat from the chaff. No different than sifting fact from fiction.

• • •

Rocket: Like sifting "bullshit" from – uh, lost my rhyme.

Frank: Nice try.

• • •

[145] Guilty conscience speaks #4.

¶662 Under my care, Robyn and the girls ***never*** did without. That's another reason why I find it to be so disturbing that she went to Children's Services and not the police (Exhibit-03). It's like she knew she was doing something wrong and trying to hide it at the same time. Consider how Danielle took S.L. to Dr. LeSure instead of the police (Exhibits-03 and 09). Patterns...

¶663 Robyn's testimony verifies K.S.'s IMPLANTED/TRANSPLANTED MEMORY about me being "mean"[146] and further confirms the witness tampering of K.S. under Title 18 U.S.C.S. § 1512, [¶195].

¶664 Fortifying this fact, Det. Kollar admitted in the report that K.S.'s story was

"probably not accurate in reality"[147]

(Exhibit-04: p.11), [¶768, 5].

¶665 So which parts were? The ones they *wanted* the Grand and Petit Juries to believe?

¶666 Reader, please understand that **no one testified during Trial that they were afraid of me** (Tp.1-560). With that clarified, let's take a real good look at *who should be afraid of whom.*

¶667 During the course of my marriage to Robyn, I called 911 from my business cell phone on two (2) separate and distinct occasions. You see, Robyn was in the habit of throwing things like baby bottles and music boxes. A feisty marriage, she has tackled me twice; punched me in the head because I went to call her former husband and tell him that the baby she was carrying was his; and, at one time, she was in the kitchen smashing wine glasses with her fist and a steak knife that appeared **after** I put the dishes away.

A woman is as dangerous as a loaded shotgun.
-The Godfather, Part I

---

[146] Implanted/Transplanted Memory #6.
[147] The winnowing fork never fails.

¶668 Although Robyn knew she was pregnant before we met in October-November of 1999, at an appointment with her OBGYN, in response to a statement from Dr. Kevin McComsey, she slipped and said,

"That's how I knew I was pregnant. The same thing happened with my first two pregnancies."

After her eyes met mine, she went still and silent. And believe-you-me, it was a COLD car ride home.

¶669 A few months later we were at her divorce/custody hearing in Lawrence, Kansas. The custody portion was in regards to her youngest daughter J.Z. I was amazed at how easily she lied to two (2) attorneys, one (1) judge, and her soon-to-be-ex when she declared that she was not pregnant.

¶670 Reader, you may be wondering why I did not leave sooner. I truly cared for Robyn and the girls, and, knowing what I knew, I couldn't leave K.S. where she was: with Lynda and Ryan. I was going to follow through with getting her out of there. So Robyn and I wed, and together we provided a good home with me working and Robyn as a stay-at-home-mom. Eventually, K.S. came home, and after that, with all that had transpired, as you have seen and will see, it was time for me to go. Although a confusing situation to be in, I value marriage more than you think, and I hated our divorce process. For the record, I spent that night in silence sitting in a dark living room, reflecting on it all [¶334c, 2, i], and wondering if we could have made the life-long-journey. To have that one person who declares *no matter what*. The *One* with whom to partake in both the pleasures and the pains of growing old together. What more could you want?

No matter what.

And, if I am ever blessed, privileged to have my *One*, I have just one thing to say to her:

> You take my hand, you better mean it. *No matter what.*
> Because I am *not* going through this shit again.

¶671 The death of a relationship is hard, and divorce is ugly and painful for everyone involved. That's why God condemns it in the *Bible*. Yeah, pain is always the result of a hardened heart.

¶672 Having learned from and let go of the past, let's go to the *second* 911 call that I made during my marriage with Robyn. This will explain a lot.

¶673 Robyn and I separated between March and April of 2001 (Tp.372, Ln.12-13). That is when she and the girls moved back in with Lynda and Ryan [¶437]. A short stay, eventually Robyn and the girls showed up at my doorstep around Mid-August of 2001 due to *another* physical altercation with her mother Lynda. Robyn had pronounced bruises on her left hip and thigh [¶334, c, 2, i], [¶437], and [¶681].

¶674 Robyn wanted/expected too much as far as rebuilding a relationship. This is part my fault because we should have discussed this situation in detail. And, although I made no promises, I did agree to help them, again. Due my friendship with Arlene, for lack of a better word, when I came through the door, I noticed the children were gone and Robyn was packing. She informed me that she took the children back to her mother's (where Ryan still lived), and that she was leaving. Not wanting to argue, it was about 10:00 p.m. and, as I was wiped out from the day, I still had drawings and a contract to finish up for a client. I then proceeded into my home office. A few minutes later I heard kitchen cabinets and drawer slam shut. I then heard the sound of breaking glass. I came out of the office and asked her, "What the hell are you doing?" She then threw a music box at my head. I caught it and put it back in the close hamper she took it out of and said, "That's for K.S." Having turned towards the kitchen, I saw wine glass rolled up in a newspaper that she was smashing with her fist, and a steak knife on the table next to the debris. As I had done the dishes and put everything away hours ago, *why* the steak knife?

¶675 I then caught movement out of my peripheral as Robyn went to launch the music box for

a second time. I rushed her, grabbed her, disarmed her, and pinned her. I then told her to, "Get out of my house!" I released her and proceeded into the kitchen to grab my cell. Robyn tackled me from behind over the baby gate that was used for the dog. I rolled my shoulder and dropped my weight and we both crashed into the table and chairs. My movements put me behind her, so I grabbed her in a bear hug, picked her up and carried her out of the house, stood her on the deck, kicked the door shut and locked it, and called 911. When 911 answered with, "911, what seems to be the problem?" I responded with, "You want to know what the problem is?" I then held the phone to the door (for about 10-15 seconds) that Robyn was kicking and pounding on with her hands while screaming. I then said, "That's the problem." A unit was dispatched to my house.

¶676 I was arrested for Domestic Violence because I admitted to all of the above. Evidently picking up Robyn was a violation of law. But Robyn *lied* under oath, thereby committing perjury. Hold on to your hats, Folks, because this gets much better.

¶677 On September 22, 2001 we went to Trial in the Court of Common Pleas, Domestic Relations Division, with Judge Mary Kovach[148] presiding.

¶678 Robyn testified that I picked her up and threw her onto the deck, causing her to land on her hands and knees. She then claimed that I picked her up and threw her onto my asphalt drive, causing her to land on her hands and knees, again. There were no bruises on her hands and knees, let alone scratches. What more, having allegedly landed on asphalt, there were no tears in the knees of her jeans, either; Court records confirm.

¶679 Having never deviated from the truth as I testified, because I picked her up, I was found guilty of Domestic Violence, which I thought was dropped to *disorderly conduct* (Exhibit-08), [¶815-¶816, 1]. Was a confusing time. Still, in the end, Judge Kovach place me on short-term

[148] One of the few honest and impartial judges in this world, she took the time to *listen to understand.*

probation, and issued a Civil Protection Order against me on October 1, 2001 (Exhibit-39).

¶680 Reader, please note that Judge Kovach stated the following:

> The Court takes judicial notice that the docket shows the parties collectively filed 9 prior petitions of domestic violence against members of petitioner's [Robyn's] family, 5 of which were dismissed by the Court upon hearing and four withdrawn by the parties [Emphasis added], [¶041], [¶437].
>
> The Court/~~Magistrate~~ hereby makes the following findings of fact: The respondent heard glass breaking + drawers slamming in kitchen. Petitioner acknowledged she was smashing wine glasses to relieve frustration as she prepared to move out. Respondent heard the breaking glass + saw a knife. He removed petitioner from residence by picking her up from behind in a bear hug + placing her [*not throwing her*] outside before slamming door. She presented Medina General ER records + showed the Court she sustained bruises on her lower legs + left side of her hip (The most substantial bruise). The latter injury is *inconsistent with the incident she described.* The respondent's physical removal of petitioner, however, appears to have recklessly caused some injury in violation of R.C.5113.31(A)(1)(a) [*emphasis added*].

¶681 The "latter injury" as described by Judge Kovach came from Lynda, for Robyn showed me the bruises when she and the children came back to my house [¶673].

¶682 As I *never* deliberately or intentionally harmed Robyn, or *any* woman for that matter, this event: the violence between Roby and Lynda, and her untruthfulness under oath were never brought up during my Criminal Trial. Now you know *why*.

¶683 Eventually, Robyn tried to track me down. Several times she called and I refused to answer. Then she pulled up next to me one day in the Medina Home Depot parking lot. She wanted to make peace and said, "I only wanted a hug." I told her, "What you did was wrong and you need to fix this," and drove off. Shortly thereafter, Robyn filed to **have the Protection** Order vacated (Exhibit-40). Now if she would show that integrity just one more time and recant [¶041], [¶444], and especially withdraw her solicited hearsay testimony [¶654].

¶684 Robyn's daughter K.S. testified next. Under Direct Examination, Pros. Eisenhower asked K.S. **not**, *'Who touched you?'* but "Can you tell us what Frank Wood did to you?"[¶769], [¶773] thereby leading the witness. In direct response, K.S. answered with , **"Nothing."** As this event took place between Tp.386, Ln.18-Tp.387, Ln.11, it has been deleted from the Record (Exhibit-41).[149] Now let's dig deeper into *why* the deletion took place.

¶685 Atty. Green responded to the above with, "And I'm a little concerned about the approach here" (ibid) (Tp.387, Ln.5-6). To no surprise, Judge Collier responded with, **"I don't care"** (ibid) (Tp.387, Ln.7), [¶281]. Yeah, that's another *in subsidium.*[150]

¶686 Reader please understand K.S. testified **twice** that a crime never took place by declaring she could not recall being at an alleged crime scene with me (ibid) (Tp.386, Ln.18-21; Tp.387, Ln.9-12), (See also Exhibit-03). Judge Collier then removed her from the stand (Exhibit-41: Tp.387, Ln.13-15).

¶687 "They're having problems with K.S." [¶526].

¶688 Judge Collier then removed the **Tainted Jury** from the courtroom, and began to admonish Pros. Eisenhower with

> I'm not going to have you push the girl like this. I mean, it's just not right (Tp.388, Ln.10-16)... I heard what I heard (Tp.389, Ln.10)... **we** don't have anything (Tp.389, Ln.21), **[emphasis added]**, (Exhibit-41).

¶689 Reader, notice Judge Collier said, **"we."** I'll reference back to this when **we** reach [¶715], [¶784-¶789], and [¶988-¶993]. Yeah, real juicy stuff coming your way.

¶690 Judge Collier then openly declares my innocence regarding the alleged F-3 GSI with

"What I'm hearing her say is, "No, it didn't happen"

(ibid) (Tp.390, Ln.4-5), (Exhibit-03).

---

[149] Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record #13.
[150] *In subsidium* #7.

¶691 With Pros. Eisenhower still under the Court's admonishment, Judge Collier continued with

> When you asked her the question directly [the latter deleted question above in ¶684], almost in a way to get her to - - to lock her in, she says she didn't remember. I know what I saw [emphasis added], (Exhibit-41: Tp.390, Ln. 6-14).

¶692 Pros. Eisenhower then took a brief recess with K.S. and Robyn (ibid) (Tp.393). Then, to sway Judge Collier into letting her recall K.S. to the stand, Pros. Eisenhower declared

> "I'm telling you that I made a **pact** with her to ask her those two questions (ibid) (Tp.394, Ln.17-19), [**emphasis added**].

¶693 As it is highly illegal to make a **"pact"** during Trial with State-child-witnesses, we have achieved witness tampering and coaching in violation of Title 18 U.S.C.S. § 1512 (b) (1). Yes, this leaves Pros. Eisenhower in direct violation of Federal Law [¶195], [¶713]. **Yay!**

¶694 To make matters worse, Judge Collier deliberately ignored this violation of Federal Law, and permitted the recalling of K.S. on a "short leash" (ibid) (Tp.395, Ln.11-13), [¶710].

¶695 K.S. was then asked to identify the man who was "married to you mother" (ibid) (Tp.397, Ln.4-6). As her answer to the question, K.S. pointed directly at me (ibid) (Tp.397, Ln.8-10).

¶696 A remarkable memory for a child who I never abused and had not seen me in several years. Evidently, the **"pact"** must have jarred her memory, because nowhere in the Trial Record did K.S. identify me to the Jury **prior to** the above-cited witness tampering.

¶697 As to Robyn being present during the above witness tampering, during a lunch recess, Atty. Green and I went into another room as I was waiting to be transported back to the Sheriff's Department. In this room, there was a dry-erase board with Robyn's drawings on it of her, her new husband, and the children. Robyn could draw well and I knew her work. Obviously, the drawings were done to entertain and calm K.S. so Pros. Eisenhower could once ***again*** engage in the tampering of this State-child-witness. Sadly, Robyn's actions aided Pros. Eisenhower in her

efforts to coerce and manipulate K.S. Robyn needs to recant.

¶698 When I discussed this with Atty. Green, he said, "Don't worry about it." When I came back from lunch and looked in that same room as I walked past, the dry-erase board was wiped clean.

¶699 Clearly, my vigil, insight, understanding, and Atty. Green worked to my detriment. Yeah, Atty. Green's a bum.

¶700 Just above in [¶693] I said, ***"again"*** regarding Pros. Eisenhower's manipulations and coercions of K.S. I will now use (Exhibits-04 and 41) to explain.

Let me `esplain.
You no `esplain nothing!
-I Love Lucy

¶701 Desperate for a conviction, Pros. Eisenhower wanted to play the video interview of K.S. that took place at Job & Family Services (Exhibit-41: Tp.391, Ln.15-18). After her request, on Record, the following exchange took place between Court and State:

THE COURT: Who was present at the interview?

MS. EISENHOWER: David Madjerich and Detective Kollar (Exhibit-41: Tp.391, Ln.19-22).

¶702 Then, with 'THE COURT' missing from the Record,[151] Judge Collier asked Ms. Eisenhower,

"Were you in the room?"
(ibid) (Tp.391, Ln.23)

¶703 With Pros. Eisenhower's response DELETED from the Record,[152] Judge Collier replied with

[151] Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record #14.
[152] Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record #15.

THE COURT: You can't do it for that reason (ibid) (Tp.391, Ln.24-25).

¶704 Sifted! Pros. Eisenhower was PRESENT when K.S. was first interviewed by Job & Family Services/Children's Services. Yes, as this is a direct violation of my confrontation rights under the U.S. 6th Amendment *and* Crawford v. Washington, (2004) 541 U.S. 36, [¶786], this is also a direct violation of my U.S. 6th Amendment to counsel, for I had no legal representation during Pros. Eisenhower's secretive Pre-Trial examination of K.S., as did the State. Therefore, we may now legally and factually infer that Pros. Eisenhower was directly involved with the manipulations of K.S. from the very onset of the State's so-called investigation. The scary part is that the police report (Exhibit-04), Kollar's testimony, and Robyn's testimony [¶524], [¶972, 16] all fail to mention Eisenhower's illegal and secretive involvement. Σ

¶705 **Q**: Why was Pros. Eisenhower's presence during K.S.'s interview removed from the police report, eliminated from testimony, and nearly deleted from the Record?

A: To eliminate the evidence of prosecutorial malfeasance and misconduct regarding the "coaching" and witness tampering of K.S.

¶706 "They're having problems with K.S." [¶526], [¶728], [¶741, 9], [¶1052].

¶707 I'm sure they were.

¶708 *Rubber biscuit!*

¶709 Sorry. Couldn't conjure up a more polite expletive at this moment in time.

¶710 Getting back to where Judge Collier permitted the recalling of K.S. on a "short leash" [¶694], Pros. Eisenhower's witness tampering of K.S. ended with the following exchange:

Q Do you know Dr. LeSure?

A Yes.

Q And have you talked to her about Frank Wood and what he did to you?

A Yes.

Q Did you tell her the **truth** about what that was? **[Emphasis added]**.

A Hmm-hm, yes (Exhibit-41: Tp. 397, Ln23-Tp.398, Ln.4).

¶711 A few problems for the Court and State.

¶712 Problem #1: These must be the "two questions" Pros. Eisenhower referred to in (Exhibit-41: Tp.394, Ln. 17-22) that she wanted to ask K.S. **after** she coached K.S. What more, these "two questions" are nowhere to be found in my Manipulated Record. This means that a clandestine meeting took place between, at least, Court and State, during Trial, and without the presence of counsel, again violating my U.S. 6th Amendment right, and without my presence.[153]

¶713 Problem #2: The coaching of a State-child-witness, both **before and during** Trial, confirms my claim of witness tampering back in [¶693].

¶714 Problem #3: The above "two questions" are clearly

> Leading questions. A question put to a witness by an attorney that suggests the answer that the witness should give. In other words, a question that "puts words into the witness' mouth," and which will be disallowed by the presiding judge (Rothenberg, p.267),

except in Collier's courtroom.

Anything for a win.

As to the leading, Eisenhower's question suggested to this manipulated child to declare that she told Dr. LeSure the **"truth"**. No. Not looking too good for the Home Team.

¶715 Problem #4: I know! Why stop at three (3)? Right? The above confirms that Judge Collier acted *in subsidium*[154] the state as he allowed the **"pact"**, the recalling of K.S., and the two (2) leading questions. Confirming, please recall **"we"** in [¶689], and see [¶579, 21].

---

[153] Presence of the defendant violation #5.

[154] *In subsidium* #8.

¶716 Adding to unethical and illegal misconduct above, during Closing Statements Pros. Eisenhower told the **Dirty Dozen**, regarding K.S.,

> She came back in here and she could tell you the person that she told about this was Dr. LeSure, and she told her the truth (Tp.493, Ln.15-17).

¶717 Lying and testifying for this coached witness, Pros. Eisenhower continued with

> And she told you who, she pointed at him (indicating), (Tp.493, Ln.18-19).

No. As previously noted in [¶695], and (Exhibit-41: Tp.397, Ln.4-6), K.S. pointed to the man who was "married to your mom."

¶718 Pros. Eisenhower needs to be disbarred for life, and Judge Collier must not escape that same fate.

¶719 As the above reveals how you *bolster* and lie about coached testimony to a **Tainted & Tampered-With Jury**, it is evident that Judge Collier's "short leash" [¶694], was not a retractable.

¶720 He should have used a muzzle [¶982, 1-6], [¶1028].

¶721 Pros. Eisenhower coached the testimony of K.S. **before and during** Trial. She told the **Savage Seven Plus Five** that K.S. said it was me and spoke the "truth" to Dr. LeSure, who we will joyful discredit later in [¶724a-¶724o]. Yes, all **after** K.S. TWICE testified that she could not recall being at an alleged crime scene with me, and Judge Collier said, "it didn't happen." In lying to the Jury, Pros. Eisenhower's claim of "truth" is a pure act of *bolstering and vouching* (see below) in violation of U.S.A. v. Francis, supra [¶601], because the Trial Record neither legally nor factually supports her lies. What more, having willfully and directly lied to the Jury, this is another act of *fraud upon court* (See [¶500] at Footnote 110).

¶722 In harmony, Pros. Eisenhower did not say 'and she said she told her the truth'. No. She said, "and she told her the truth" [¶716], thereby simultaneously committing bolstering and

vouching [¶598]. This lethal combo is highly illegal and constitutes prejudicial, and therefore, reversible error. Especially since the coached *ex parte*[155] communications with this State-child-witness occurred, not just **before**, but **during** the course of a criminal trial, and neither Atty. Green nor I were present for the purposes of cross-examination under the U.S. 6th Amendment [¶969, 3, ii, at Footnote 197], [¶1075].

¶723 Reader, by now you already know that

1) Atty. Green failed to object to the secret meeting and the **"pact"**, thereby failing to protect my U.S. 6th Amendment right to confront the witnesses against me

and

2) I never affirmatively waived this right [¶046], [¶057].

-Σ-

• • •

Rocket: Hey, Frank, check out Groot.

Frank: He's dancing.

Rocket: Yeah, but what do you call that dance?

Frank: Oh, that's what we call the *puppy-monkey-baby* from the Budweiser® commercial.

Rocket: I think you humans may have had an adverse effect on his teen development.

Frank: Welcome to earth.

• • •

[155] *Ex parte*. [Latin "from the part"] (18c). On or from one party only, usu. without notice to or argument form the adverse party. Garner, p.697.

¶724 TRIAL FACTS: PART II

Where in subsidium reigns,
collusion resides, and
conflicts of interest abound.
-Frank P. Wood, *The Totally Screwed*

724a Eventually, the State called its last witness: Dr. Suzanne LeSure [¶623, 2] of Cornerstone Psychological Services out of Medina, Ohio. Dubbed the **"Brain Butcher"** in certain circles, let it be known that Dr. LeSure

1) Has never testified for a defendant

2) Never requested to interview me

3) And that Cornerstone Psychological Services received public money (Your tax dollars) in 2004 through a contract with Medina County Job & Family Services (Exhibit-42: RESERVED) to provide "free" counseling to "sexually abused" children, thereby cementing the existence of a

> Conflict of interest. A situation in which a person's individual interests are in opposition to the interests of others. As an example, an elected public official who owns real estate may approve a ruling or change in zoning that would increase the value of his property (Rothenberg, p.101).

• • •

Rocket: He just opened the can.

Groot: I am Groot?

Frank: *Whoopass!*

• • •

¶724b Reader, according to the Minutes of the November 22, 2004 meeting of the

Medina County Commissioners,

> The second resolution Mead presented was authorizing a professional services agreement between Job & Family Services and Cornerstone Psychological. He explained that Suzanne LeSure and Cornerstone Psychological have been providing, for **over ten years**, free therapy for Medina County children who have been sexually abused. She organized therapists from different agencies to meet with these children at the JFS Building for several hours every week. This agreement would be to trim some of her **administrative costs**. Mrs. Geissman moved to approve the agreement and Mr. Hambley seconded the motion. There was no discussion. Roll Call showed all commissioners voting AYE (Exhibit-43: p.2 of 8).[156] **[emphasis added]**.

724c Now *that* was never mentioned during my Trial.

724d As

Nothing is trivial,
[and]
Everything matters,
-The Crow

for this financial agreement to be withheld from Defense and Jury served the ulterior motives of creating the *dual-illusion* that

1) There was no direct link between Court, State, and Psych

2) Court, State, and Psych were acting as independent entities

What more, having testified for the State for **over ten years** (Exhibit-43), and being **"accustomed to being summoned to court"** (Tp.408, Ln.6-7), [¶736], and under contract with tax dollars and long-term-in-bed-ties, Dr. LeSure is now deemed a public official. Remarkably, the withholding of this impeaching evidence that has now brought her integrity into question was actually preceded by *another* illegal event that took place at the onset of my Trial. You're just

[156] Thanks to Atty. Stanley's Paralegal, this document was first emailed to his office by the Medina County Commissioners in April 2018. I then received it from him in early March 2018.

going to *love* this.

¶724e At (Exhibit-55: Tp.6, Ln.14-20), Judge Collier makes the following declaration and determination regarding a report that was submitted to him **by** Dr. LeSure **prior to** the onset of my Trial, and **not** by Pros. Eisenhower or Atty. Green:

THE COURT: I've spent two weekends looking at it. At this time I'm going to make the determination that there's nothing exculpatory in there (Ln.14-17).

¶724f A few problems here:

1) This determination was made without hearing the voluntary in-court testimony of the girls that contradicted their **coached** Pre-Trial out-of-court statements to Dr. LeSure
   i. Unindicted allegations verify this fact
   ii. Consider Dr. Reed's credentials (Exhibit-46) and his reliable conclusions regarding my mind and beliefs (Exhibit-34)
2) Without seeing the report, Atty. Green did not know what lies and manipulations he had to refute and defend against other than '*He did it*'. Consider
   i. **"Frankie raped you"**
   ii. **"intrusive memories"**
   iii. The ***Temple Virgin*** (Exhibit-14)
   iv. S.L. clearly didn't tell Dr. LeSure the truth about **"the two days before"**
   v. K.S. could **not** recall being at an alleged crime scene with me
   vi. The **"pact"** and **"No, it didn't happen"**
   vii. My **uncontested** COAI (Exhibit-03)
   viii. **"closed" – "terminated" – "no evidence"**
   ix. Prosecutor Eisenhower's **secretive involvement** at Job & Family Services

x. *Laundry Lists*

3) Judge Collier made this determination without knowing Atty. Green's trial strategy

i. If an incarcerated *pro se* litigant could break down and reveal to you what I have done so far, it is reasonable to conclude that a lawyer could do better with the report. Especially since Atty. Green told me that he has done numerous **medical malpractice trials**. So how could Judge Collier determine what my Defense Team would deem exculpatory? Hmmm. Perhaps he did and that's part of the reason **why** he suppressed the report

4) It is axiomatic that all evidence submitted to a Court for consideration is supposed to be *collected and submitted* by Counsel for either State or Defense. I have diligently searched the Ohio Criminal Rules, Rules of Civil Procedure,Crim.R.16 Discovery and inspection, Ohio Rules of Evidence, Ohio Rules of Court, the Ohio Constitution, and the U.S. Constitution in vain attempt to find out where a *State's Expert Witness* is permitted by law to submit evidence to a judge for consideration **prior to** the commencement of a criminal trial. Such an illegal evidentiary submission is a blatant violation of my Due Process rights

i. People, think about this... Dr. LeSure's relationship with Court and State is so strong, that she was completely comfortable in circumventing the axiomatic legal protocols regarding the submission of evidence, and personally walking the alleged evidence into Judge Collier's **chambers**

5) The submission of Dr. LeSure's report seems to coincide with the **"in chambers"** meeting between Judge Collier and Det. Kollar that took place **prior to** the

commencement of my Trial [¶535] in regards to the *pictures of pictures*. Now, Reader, if you will, please recall that Judge Collier blatantly refused my documents (Exhibits-08 and 09) for an *in camera* inspection **during** Trial [¶062], and that he never ordered the pictures of pictures to be shown to the **Evil-Eight-Plus-Four** [¶538, 5]. All of these actions reveal *In subsidium Judicial Hypocrisy* on Collier's part as he steered the case towards wrongful conviction. For clarity, he was controlling the submission of evidence outside the rules of evidence and discovery, and therefore outside the scope of his authority. **Ta-da!**

• • •

Rocket: If memory serves, that's *abuse of discretion.*

Frank: All day long.

• • •

¶724g Judge Collier continued with

THE COURT: *** but what I will do for counsel for the defendant is, I'm going to make a copy of it and place it under seal with my court reporter *** (Exhibit-55: Tp.6, Ln.17-20)

knowing she would destroy it, just like the police report from Montville that explained *why* the case was **"terminated"** against me [¶209].

What did you see, old man?
-Godzilla

¶724h Judge Collier knew the score, the plays, and how to run the game. So whatever he saw, it panicked and prompted him to act *in subsidium* the State (for the *ninth* time), and to illegally suppress exculpatory evidence (for the *third* time), that we know about. Everything I have shown you thus far, and there's more to come, verifies these two (2) facts.

¶724i With the "agreement" granted by the County Commissioners, Dr. LeSure testified that her **"initial diagnosis"** for K.S. (Tp.418, Ln.25) and S.L. (Tp.414, Ln.13-14) was **"adjustment disorder."**

• • •

Rocket: So how did this become a sex case?

Frank: A valid question, my good man, which has a valid answer.

• • •

¶724j Aside from the previously shown motives of Scott, Danielle, Lynda, and Robyn this is best explained by a timeline. As to the series of events that transpired:

1) Danielle learned she was pregnant during the first few days of September 2004 (Tp.86, Ln.16; Tp.144, Ln.12-13), while she and I were living together (Tp.86, Ln.21-22), (Exhibit-03)

2) The case regarding the alleged rape of S.L. was **then** signed in with Dr. LeSure, and **not** the police, by Danielle and Scott on September 24, 2004 (Tp.407, Ln.14) (ibid), without my knowing

3) S.L.'s first "intake appointment" was on November 22, 2004 (Tp.407, Ln.15-16)

4) On that very day, November 22, 2004, Dr. LeSure received notice that the Medina County Commissioners awarded her the contract and funds through Job & Family Services to cover her "administrative costs" to treat sexually abused children. Having provided "free therapy" for these children for over ten years in a philanthropic fashion came at a coveted cost

My hypocrisy only goes so far.
-Doc Holiday, *Tombstone*

5) Two (2) days **later**, on November 24, 2004 Scott signed for "permission" (Tp.407,

Ln.7-9) because, as of October 20, 2004, he was the primary custodian of S.L. [¶191]

6) As I knew S.L. for only 28 partial and intermittent days [¶178], allegations of S.L. being abused **"approximately fifty times"** surfaced **during** her exam with Nurse Practitioner Donna Abbott (Tp.280, Ln.22), [¶1356]. For clarity, this declaration was not made until

   i. **After** S.L. moved back in with Scott until Trial

   ii. **After** the **"untruthful"** Danielle badgered S.L. for months (Tp.92-94; Tp.167-172; Tp.231-232) with **"Frankie raped you"** (Exhibit-03)

   iii. **After** Dr. LeSure received her financial agreement

   iv. **After** Scott signed for "permission" [¶870, 4]

• • •

Frank: Now, in direct answer to your question, Rocket, this case became a sex case due to *compound motives*.

Rocket: I figured as much. Just wanted to hear you say it.

Frank: You know, there are times when you sound just like Atty. Stanley.

• • •

¶724k Before we press on, as not-so-kind-a-word to those who did this to the girls, to me, and to my family, they are free to

Go have sex with –
-The Martian

• • •

Rocket: *Ahem!*

Frank: What! They earned it and I said it politely... *And* this was on public television.

Groot: I am Groot.

Frank: Thank you, Groot. [Fist bump]

Rocket: *Ahem!*

• • •

¶724l With contractual motive to be paid in play, Dr. LeSure should never have been allowed to testify as the State's Expert Witness. This is specifically due to the sheer facts that the "agreement"

1) Was never mentioned during Trial

2) Establishes

i. Bias

ii. Motive

iii. Collusion

iv. Conspiracy

v. Long-term-in-bed-ties with Court and State

What more, as LeSure never interviewed me, it is clear that she didn't want to; for what I had to say would have kept her from getting paid. Ah! That reminds me...

Query: **How much was Dr. LeSure paid for this?**

Under Title 5 U.S.C. § 552 Freedom Of Information Act ("FOIA"), we have the right to know because that "agreement" is not confidential and paid for with our tax dollars. Therefore, with Dr. LeSure on Medina County's payroll, such fraud, collusion, and conspiracy fall under Title 18 U.S.C.S. Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations ("RICO"), and remains worthy of a Federal Investigation just like

1) The "million cash"

2) The fraudulent revoking of my $200,000.00 cash bond

3) Witness tampering

4) Record tampering

5) Jury tampering

6) The testimony of State witnesses was audio recorded during Trial, as evidence by Pros. Eisenhower's too-close-for-comfort twisting of words (recall she never took notes during a weeklong Trial). No, her brainpan could not remember everything. It was recorded [¶977-¶978, 3]

7) The disappearance of my Discovery File from the "vault" in the Courthouse

8) Destruction of evidence

9) In light of the above, there is just one question that must now be posed for reflection:

Query: How many other private entities and offices like Cornerstone Psychological Services are currently being financially honored with your tax dollars to the benefit of Court and State?

¶724m People, think about it... They conducted my Trial with all that I have shown you in the forefront of their minds. They knew Dr. LeSure should never have been allowed to testify, and they didn't care! Everybody was on board and I was tied to the anchor. With the combined motives of Court, State, Psych, and witnesses... I was headed for the deep, and there can be absolutely no question as to *how* Dr. LeSure's diagnoses of the girls went from "adjustment disorder" to "sexual abuse." Everyone had something to gain.

"*Cui bono*?"

Sure as shit wasn't me. For verification of this assertion, if they had nothing to hide, then Dr. LeSure's report and financial "agreement" would have been presented to the Defense and Jury for consideration with neither hesitation nor reservation. Σ

• • •

Rocket: Point!

• • •

Further, and in support, recall that Robyn *first* went to Children's Services as **not** the police (Exhibit-03). Now remember that Danielle and Scott signed in S.L.'s case with Dr. LeSure and **not** the police (Exhibit-03) **after** Danielle marched down to the Montville P.D., on two (2) separate and distinct occasions, and under Scott's *orders*, to file **rape** charges against me **before** S.L.'s first "intake appointment". So how in the hell did LeSure's diagnoses of the girls start out as "adjustment disorder"? Ah! Those pulling the strings lied to LeSure and withheld information hoping that the mental and emotional manipulations of the girls worked. Now here's the real kicker... As both parties were alleging sexual abuse **prior to** meeting with LeSure, thereby claiming that crimes were committed, but they didn't go to the police? Yeah, we have a pattern here. Σ

¶724n Before proceeding, I must remind you of the police report from Montville, and the letter from Job & Family Services – you know – the ones that fully exonerate me, that were illegally suppressed by way of *in subsidium*. Ergo, Judge Collier's recent *in subsidium* with LeSure's report now reveals a repetitive pattern of behavior. Need more proof? Very well... Collier knew that if the report was made part of the Trial Record, anyone could obtain it as a public document. To the contrary, he also knew that if it was **not** made part of the Record, no one would ever see it due to *doctor-client-confidentiality*. So, as a just-in-case-measure, he gave it to Court Reporter Garrity for the purposes of destruction.

¶724o The suppression of this exculpatory evidence, LeSure's financial "agreement" resulted in yet another denial of Due Process under Brady v. Maryland (Supra), and Crim.R.16

[¶203] *because* it brought her integrity and motives into question. In addition, this is a direct violation of

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

2) O.R.C. § 2921.12 Tampering with evidence [¶224]

thereby resulting in an additional count of *fraud upon the court*, because Judge Collier's *ninth in subsidium* resulted in a

> Fraudulent act. An act involving bad faith or dishonesty (Rothenberg, p.198),

(See specifically [¶500] of this Affidavit at Footnote 110)

(See also [¶391], [¶415], [¶721], [¶972, 13, and 20], and [¶1039])

that, in all actuality, resulted in what is known as

> Fraudulent concealment. The hiding of a fact or facts that someone is morally and legally obliged to disclose (Rothenberg, p.198). Σ

¶725a Having established a *close working relationship* between the Trial Court, Dr. LeSure, Job & Family Services, and the Medina County Prosecutor's Office, that existed for **over a decade** (Exhibit-43) **prior to** my Trial, Dr. LeSure has been frequently called by the State as an expert witness in child-sex-abuse-cases and in sex-offender classification hearings. See, e.g., State v. Walker, Medina App. No.CA-006-M, 2007-Ohio-5479; State v. King, Medina App. No. CA-2963-M, 2000 Ohio App. LEXIS 2291 (Dr. Sandra McPherson proffered testimony criticizing the validity of LeSure's interview protocols); Palmer v. State, Medina App. No. CA-2878-M, 1999 Ohio App. LEXIS 4817 (a new trial motion was granted because the accused demonstrated that the child had been told by LeSure that she was abused and felt like she had to go along with it – thus vindicating Dr. Lord's testimony criticizing the validity of Dr. LeSure's

protocols),[157] [¶1006].

Brain Butcher

¶725b So we're all setting the right tile in its proper place, as to testifying at sex offender classification hearings, this is something Dr. LeSure's credentials that were proffered at Trial did **not** qualify her to do (Tp399-400; Tp.411-413). In fact, Dr. LeSure specifically stated that

> I work primarily with children, some adults but primarily children, and have special training and experience in the area of child sexual abuse (Tp.400, Ln.5-7).

¶726 We have successfully exposed the roots of Dr. LeSure's motive to provide "free" counseling to sexually abused children with your tax dollars: **The Money Tree**; a connection that confirms collusion[158] and conspiracy. We have also confirmed that other psychologists have challenged her questionable protocols. Now I will show you *how* Dr. LeSure directly aided in the *Hippocampus Stomp* regarding the minds of K.S. and S.L. with her protocols, or lack thereof.

¶727 Dr. LeSure was first examined during a *voir dire* (Tp.399-410) before she was permitted, naturally, to testify as a State Expert Witness before the **Twisted Twelve** of a Jury (Tp.411-444).

¶728 With her base motive, county connections, and illegitimate protocols universally condemned, Dr. LeSure testified that K.S. was referred to her office by Job & Family Services (Tp.401, Ln.23-24). No surprise there, eh? This would have been **after** Pros. Eisenhower's non-disclosed, secretive, and direct involvement [¶701-¶706].

♪ [Suspenseful music] ♫

¶729 I know!

---

[157] Dr. Dawn Lord and Dr. Sandra McPherson have both publicly criticized Dr. LeSure's protocols with children.

[158] Collusion. An agreement between two or more people to defraud another, or to obtain something they are not entitled to [AS IN MY FREEDOM & YOUR TAX DOLLARS]. Rothenberg. p.90. [EMPHASIS ADDED].

No matter how you dice it,
it comes up prosecutors!
-Wordplay on *Snickers*®

¶730 Shortly thereafter, **without** the Jury present, Dr. LeSure admitted that S.L. had been **"previously"** treated at Cornerstone,[159] and that she was referred by a school counselor (Tp.402, Ln.1-6), [¶741, 4], [¶776].

¶731 To no surprise, there was a Medina City elementary school teacher on my **Tainted Jury**. When Atty. Green sought to challenge for cause and remove her during the *voir dire*, Judge Collier saw no need.[160] I would be most pleased to show this to you, but, as previously revealed, the Jury *voir dire* is missing from my Tampered-With Trial Record [¶605-¶611], (Exhibit-35). This brings us to a little Q&A.

¶732 **Q**: How could an elementary school teacher with motherly instincts, whose career is founded solely on the basic principles of taking care of and protecting children, remain impartial during a child sex-abuse trial?

A: As belief determines behavior, and 80% of our waking actions controlled by our subconscious [¶755], simply put, she cannot. Σ

Ergo, as

The body cannot live without the mind,
-Morpheus, *The Matrix*

that school teacher was going to do *exactly* what her career, motherly instincts, and subconscious told her to do.

¶733 With the above life-axioms clarified,

---

[159] Prior to S.L. and I meeting.
[160] *In subsidium* #10.

The *Scales of Justice* only tip one way,
and, right or wrong,
they tip in the direction of conviction.
-Frank P. Wood, *Undefeated*

¶734 With the above in mind, the following exchange took place between Judge Collier and Dr. LeSure during her *voir dire*:

THE COURT: Is there any - - do you advise these children, when you're asking them about what happened to them, that these statements may be used in court, or that law enforcement may obtain these statements? Are they aware of that? Do you advise them of that?

[As if he didn't know]

THE WITNESS: I actually tell all the children who visit me on their first visit that what they say to me is *private* (Tp.403, Ln.4-12), [*Emphasis added*], [¶769].

¶735 Shortly thereafter, Atty. Green presented a Patient Care Communication from (Exhibit-44) that Dr. LeSure received from Dr. Jedacek,[161] [¶636, 1]. It was marked as "Defendant's Exhibit C" and presented to LeSure, who, in turn, recognized it and admitted to signing off on the form (Tp.405, Ln.2-23). Then the following exchange took place:

MR. GREEN: Can you tell us what you wrote?

THE WITNESS: "I will provide psychotherapy, parent guidance for parents, and support for the legal process" (Tp.406, Ln.4-8).

¶736 Later, when Atty. Green asked Dr. LeSure about "support for the legal process" (Tp.407, Ln.17-18), Dr. LeSure responded with, **"I always anticipate there might be testimony in a case like this"** (Tp.407, Ln.20-22), and that she **"understood"** the statements would be used in court (Tp.407, Ln.23-Tp.408, Ln.2). Dr. LeSure then reinforced this testimony with, **"I am**

[161] *One* of S.L.'s previously treating psychologists (Exhibit-44).

accustomed to being summoned for court" (Tp.408, Ln.6-7), [¶724d]. Of course she is... She's on their payroll! (See Exhibit-43).

¶737 Solidifying the above, Dr. LeSure later stated in front of the Jury,

"I am a mandated child abuse reporter"
(Tp.426, Ln.16-17), [¶788], [¶791],

but forgot to add,

'on contract'

¶738 It is now crystal that Dr. LeSure deems it morally and ethically proper to **LIE** to children "who visit me on their first visit" (above).

¶739 CAVEAT: Without the children knowing that the police will know what they say, and that what they say is *not private*, there will be neither curb nor restraint on the free-flow of IMPLANTED/TRANSPLANTED MEMORIES.

¶740 Dr. LeSure's protocols are beyond questionable, unethical, and immoral. In all actuality, they are contractually biased leaving her results unreliable, and therefore inadmissible in open court [¶1005].

¶741 Before proceeding, recall that we have already seen the *Hippocampus Stomp* that S.L. suffered [¶633-¶637], and LeSure's failure to interview all, or any, of the people who interviewed S.L. **so that** LeSure could discern fact from fiction. Now let's look at the baseball roster of those who had access to the mind and body of K.S., who performed the *Hippocampus Stomp* of her mind, and Dr. LeSure's symmetrical failures as a treating psychologist under ***county contract*** (Exhibit-44):

• • •

Rocket: You just like to say that, don't you?

Frank: Emphatically, ***'Yes.'*** ☺

• • •

1) Lynda: motive

2) Ryan: PERP #2 **and motive**

3) Robyn: motive

4) School teacher: unqualified to question her [¶730]

5) Classmates: from the "good-touch, bad-touch" class, thereby affecting K.S. with the imaginations and/or prior abuses of other children

6) Det. Kollar: lied to, and operated under the premise of *bias* and the dogma of *point-the-finger-and-go!*

7) The "two gentlemen" at Job & Family Services mentioned by Robyn during her testimony [¶524]

8) David Madjerich of Job & Family Services (Exhibit-04), who may have been one of those "two gentlemen" who never testified against me

9) Pros. Eisenhower was secretly involved with the interview of K.S. at Job & Family Services [¶701-¶706]

10) Robyn's new fiancé

11) The numerous male figures in her life [¶804]

¶742 With such parallel existing between the manipulated minds of K.S. and S.L., I must apprise you that the *cerebrum* contains the *hippocampus*, and the *hippocampus* is where memories are formed. Although we will go deeper into this when we get there [¶821], for now, know that

> Strong emotions involve both physical responses and our understanding of what caused them. For example, a person's heartbeat may increase in response to either joy or fear. Memories of recent events help the brain determine which emotion is being experienced.

> Fear is a strong emotion that causes most animals to run, attack, or hold completely still. The body's reaction to fear is largely controlled by a part of the brain called the *amygdala* (uh MIG duh luh). The *amygdala* sits deep within the *temporal lobe*. When a rat smells a cat, for example, the smell activates a pathway from the nose to the *amygdala*, and from there to the *hypothalamus*. The *hypothalamus* triggers the flight-or-fight response. **Many fears are learned through bad experiences**[162] **[Emphasis added]**. Learned fears involve not only the *amygdala*, but also brain regions such as the *hippocampus* (Fetzer. B Volume 2. p.554),

where memories are formed.

¶743 Having established that emotions are directly attached to memories,

> The logic of the emotional mind is associative; it takes elements that symbolize a reality, or trigger a memory of it, to be the same as that reality (Goleman, p.294),[163] (See also Exhibit-19: OIP; August 31, 2015 at p.2).

¶744 As a reality check, have you ever elected to dislike someone because they remind you of someone who did you wrong? Better yet, let's say you went to a *Thai* restaurant and enjoyed the food, service, and company. Now you're going to another *Thai* restaurant with a different person and your emotional mind expecting that same experience. However, at the second *Thai* restaurant you experience bad food, lousy service, and terrible company. Later on down the road, someone else asks you to go to the first *Thai* restaurant where food, service, and company were excellent. As the flight/fight response kicks in and your emotional mind elects to protect itself, you will either instantly decline or hesitate thinking, *'I really don't like Thai food.'* And that's sad because that 'someone' who asked you to lunch was someone who truly cared and valued your friendship [¶909]. But you have already associated a negative feeling/response with the memory because the memory of the second bad experience **changed** the first memory and its

---

[162] As a reminder, at no place in the Trial Record did K.S. or S.L. testify that they were afraid of me (Tp.1-560). In fact, S.L. specifically testified that she was **not** afraid of me [¶193], (Tp.246, Ln.10-21).

[163] Daniel Goleman, Ph.D. is a Harvard graduate and professor.

positive feelings. Yes, new memories and their feelings **alter** the old, and I'll show you this in [¶821].

• • •

Groot: I am Groot?

["Are we there yet?]

Frank: Not yet.

• • •

¶745 Applying the above realities to the instant matter, S.L. was abused by at least two (2) men, one (1) being Scott (Exhibits-03 and 08), and she engaged in sexual contact with A.S. (Tp.160-161) on at least two (2) occasions **prior to** my meeting her [¶619-¶620]. Likewise, K.S. was sexually abused by Ryan **before** she came into my care (Exhibit-08). Both of these girls were in Scott's and Ryan's care long-term with the elements of *privacy*, *familiarity*, and established *trust*. This allowed for their emotional experiences/memories to become firmly planted **before** they entered my intermittent and short-term care. Σ

¶746 With Scott and Ryan, the girls would have experienced the common household affections of simple hugs and kisses. Both girls took to me instantly and hugged and kissed me. At first surprised and humbled, I returned in kind. Failure to do so would have emotionally harmed them. Rejection is painful, and depending on method of delivery, can be deemed abuse and/or neglect. I understand this quite well. Not just because of what I have suffered during my stay in *Hell's Lost Half Acre*, but because I am an A.C.O.D.: an Adult Child Of Divorce.[164] I am well-versed in divorce, adoption, custody, and loss. Therefore, I plainly understood the emotional needs

[164] Parrot and Parrott, *Breaking the Cycle of Divorce*. See also: *Saving Your Marriage Before it Starts* (cannot recall author). If you want a successful marriage, A.C.O.D. or not, I highly recommend you S-T-U-D-Y these two (2) books, as did I.

attached to these experiences. Yes, I understood quite well what the girls were going through, regarding divorce and the like, **before** they met me.

¶747 The advances of Scott and Ryan would have begun with the above-mentioned every day and common household affections. Knowing this to be true, we must take into consideration

1) The abuse K.S. and S.L. suffered

2) The amount of people who interviewed the girls that were

i. Not qualified

ii. Had ulterior motives

iii. **Were children**

3) The leading questions of the unqualified interviewers

4) The imaginations and/or prior abuses of the other children

5) Dr. LeSure's universally condemned protocols and her lying to the girls

6) Dr. LeSure's contractual bias

7) Dr. LeSure functioned just like Det. Kollar: with lies, half-truths, and withheld information

¶748 Now, which way do you think Dr. LeSure's interviews with the girls went?

¶749 The wrong way.

¶750 Through the process of *neuroplasticity*: the opening and closing of *neuropathways*, all Dr. LeSure did was reinforce the IMPLANTED/TRANSPLANTED MEMORIES in the emotional minds of these girls causing further damage. For nowhere in her testimony did she claim that she interviewed all or ***any*** of the people that K.S. and S.L. spoke to so that she could separate fact from fiction. Dr. LeSure conducted blind and biased interviews with me as her target.

¶751 *Hackwork!*

¶752 Reader, I must now take a moment to expand on where Dr. Goleman clarified that "the emotional mind is associative," and how this relates to the IMPLANTED/TRANSPLANTED MEMORIES in this case. It's a process, and I must bring you up to speed on my psych studies so you will understand what I am trying to explain to you regarding the manipulated minds of the girls. Thanks for being so patient. ☺

¶753 In his book *Emotional Intelligence*, Dr. Goleman revealed how your mind will respond with fight or flight, emotionally, 12 milliseconds faster than is does rationally. Yes, every choice you make is based on the emotional premise of greed or fear;[165] accept or reject; want or decline. In other words, you have 12 thousandths of a second to get life right the first time. Now you see why people answer to accept before you do or blow up to decline and then calm down. We *are* emotional beings.

¶754 Sorry, but there are no true forms of altruism despite the best of intentions. And absolute *Stoicism*[166]? A mere hopeful. Welcome to the human race! But there is hope! Let us continue...

¶755 In the book *True Calm*,[167] the author explained how the fight or flight response is actually a *benevolent warning system* we must learn to use properly. Then, in a 4-hour documentary titled *The Brain*,[168] through the mapping of the brain, another doctor revealed that 80% of our waking actions are controlled by our subconscious [¶164], [¶345], [¶732]. Ah! That's where our experiences reside as beliefs that determine our behaviors! So, when someone blows up and says *'I didn't mean that,'* he or she probably didn't. At least not consciously. Nevertheless, we must ***not*** forget that ***choice*** makes up the other 20%, and that someone else's beliefs may not be

---

[165] That's what drives our Stock Market.
[166] Greek school of philosophy founded by Zeno (circa 308 B.C.).
[167] R.S. Seigel?
[168] WVIZ, Cleveland, *ideastream* (2016).

beneficial to your life. True *compatibility*, what we call *chemistry*, is so hard to come by.

¶756 The experiences that reside in us are the result of *scripting*. Using a layman's approach, consider how an actor rehearses, *scripts* or *pre-scripts*, before taking to the stage. Now consider all you have learned since birth. Going deeper, from the moment we are born, we take to survive; e.g., food, shelter, breath, comfort, love, and the like. As our body and brain possess the genetic memories that help us survive at birth, the brain is constantly being scripted and re-scripting [¶821] because we are constantly learning. This is why experts recommend that you do ***not*** fall asleep watching the news, because most of it is ***bad*** news. Yes, the brain never stops taking in stimuli through body and sense, and then processes the data into memories. Then the 80/20 takes over as we walk through life. So remember,

♪ All the world can be a stage ♫
And we are merely players
Performers and portrayers
Each another's audience
Outside the gilded cage.
-Rush, *Limelight*

Yes, in all you do, you are constantly being *measured* in attitude, *watched* in deed, and *overheard* in speech, whether you know it or not (Referenced from my studies of St. Francis of Assisi).

¶757 Pushing the envelope, is it not remarkable how we know to cry to communicate at birth? We are amazing creatures! It's difficult to fathom that a mere 1% DNA and two (2) frontal lobes separate us from primates. *Whoa!*

¶758a With that said, *neuroplasticity*, the brain's ability to rewire and adapt, decreases with age as we get older. Consider *Alzheimer's*. The older we get, the less we explore life. This allows for *neuropathways* to close down. Still, the re-wiring, the re-scripting of the brain is possible and may be able to prevent, delay, or reverse, in part, *Alzheimer's*. So stay active!

¶758b Stay with me, Reader. Again, all this is going somewhere that pertains directly to the abused and manipulated minds of K.S. and S.L. Just had to get this psych-background info to you so you will understand at the appropriate time. Thanks. ☺

• • •

Groot: I am Groot?

["Are we there yet?"]

Frank: No, but we're headed in the right direction.

• • •

¶759 So, how do you correct the subconscious? Through the processes of *neuroplasticity* and *choice*. Linguists say, to learn a new word, you must repeat the word and its meaning 15 times. Then you must use in context seven (7) times. Evidently, a *neuropathway* can be opened or closed in as little as 22 steps!

¶760 Now consider, if you will, all of the people who had access to the minds of the girls **prior to** Trial, and how many times they spoke to each person. *Whoa!*

¶761 Applying the above to the case at bar, when considering the emotional mind of S.L., I tucked her in, gave her medicine, helped her with her math, and read her bedtime stories with an **"open door" policy in**the house (Tp.114, Ln.7-11), all the while with Danielle **"always around"** (Tp.120, Ln.18-23), [¶179, 3]. In S.L.'s mind, *'My dad does this'*. Therefore, association made the processes of implantation and transplantation that much easier, and permitted the altering of her past memories [¶821].

• • •

Groot: I am Groot?

["Are we there yet?"]

Frank: Getting closer.

• • •

¶762 Remember the *Thai* restaurant? Now consider the fact that Danielle **repeatedly** told S.L.

"Frankie raped you"

for months on end.

¶763 Reader, before we move forward, I must advise you that even the Courts acknowledge that memories change over time, and that **"memories fade"** (Doe v. Archdiocese of Cincinnati, 109 Ohio St. 3d 491, 2006 Ohio LEXIS 1565, HN6). What more, the Courts also recognize that memories can be altered and implanted as **"false memories"** through psychotherapy and/or hypnosis because the **"subject wants to please therapist"** (State v. Johnston, OPINION, 1988 Ohio LEXIS 316). As there is much more to this, this is a very serious matter because the above is only a sample of *why* Courts are reluctant to give *Innocent Defendants* new trials, although deserving. This is so serious a blight on our society that the

> False Memory Syndrome Foundation. An organization of parents who claim that their adult children have falsely accused them of childhood sexual abuse. • The organization was formed in 1992 to support people who claim to have been wrongly accused of childhood sexual abuse as a result of the purported recovery of repressed memories -- Abbr. FMSF, (Garner, 720),

was formed. Now please recall V.O.C.A.L. [¶411 at Footnote 99]. This is out of control.

¶764 Next on the agenda, there is also the process of *emotional transference*. Expounding, let's say a grandmother regularly spends time with and takes care of her grandson. The grandmother finds out her own son, the father of the grandson, is in serious trouble. She begins to have bad dreams about the grandson. What happened? She emotionally transferred the worries for the son to the grandson. As proffered by Dr. LeSure, both S.L. (Tp.414, Ln.17-19), and K.S. (Tp.419,

Ln.7-11) suffered from a series of recent stressors. In accord, Danielle was molested in her youth (Exhibit-09: p.D-5, ¶1). Her previous abuse kept her submissive to Scott as he represented the "father image" to her (ibid), and, while under Scott's **orders** [¶205], the natural process of *emotional transference* prompted, **"Frankie raped you."** Not only was this constant badgering of S.L. by Danielle another stressor in S.L.'s life [¶621], previously abused, Danielle had no business interviewing S.L. with her emotional biases.

¶765 Supporting my claims and the above events, in business management technique there is what is known as *self-fulfilling prophecy*. Defining... At times a form of coaching, tell someone something enough times, they will believe it and do it. *Neuroplasticity* works every time, for every time you experience something, a *synapse* fires until the *neuropathway* is constructed: 22 steps! Unfortunately, this can be used for good or bad. Consider *brainwashing*. In addition, to further these truths, through the processes of *emotional association* and *neuroplasticity*, both K.S. and S.L. suffered from Stockholm Syndrome[169] [¶803] until the scrambled egg process of IMPLANTED/TRANSPLANTED MEMORIES such as

1) S.L.'s "mother" told S.L. that Frankie raped her (Tp.300, Ln.22-Tp.301, Ln.8)

for the most part

2) "They're having problems with K.S." [¶526]

had been achieved.

¶766 Yes, I fervently studied the above and much more. Why? I did so not just to figure out what they had done to the girls and to me, but to understand what experiences resided in my subconscious as beliefs that told me the affair with Danielle, you know, the one that got me set

[169] The process by which the abused captive becomes so dependent upon the captor for their survival needs, that the captive begins to take care of and protect the captor. See also *Biderman's Chart of Coercion* at http://www/refocus.org/coerchrt.html.

up and sent to prison, was acceptable. Starting with my childhood, I recalled everything I ever did wrong. Through deep mediation, I brought every memory to the forefront of my mind, and, one-by-one, I relived them in minute detail; e.g., time, day of the week, emotions, who was there, weather, what was said, what happened, etc... Then, after studying them, I re-scripted them the way I should have lived them, with *true nobility*: Greatness of character principle, and then I put each new memory back.

> If the problem is in my mind,
> I can fix it.
> All I need to do is apply my mind.
> -John Nash, *A Beautiful Mind*

What more, as an A.C.O.D., I realized through seven (7) years of study and meditation that I tended to gravitate towards women with children going through divorce. But you see, Dear Reader, I know *why* I made that choice concerning Robyn and Danielle. As life would have it, as an A.C.O.D., I was subconsciously trying to save my family from divorce. As I understand my mind and how the brain basically works, through the processes of *neuroplasticity* and *re-scripting*, I rebuilt my mind so this will never happen again. **See [¶336].**

• • •

Rocket: Can I get an *Amen*?!?!

Groot: I am Groot!

Frank: *Amen and Amen.*

• • •

¶767 It was a tough and frustrating seven (7) years to do that, mind you. Nevertheless, I rebuilt my mind [¶334k] thanks to those who did this to me and continue to do so. No one will ever do this to me again, for not only am I new,