a. A court-elected Juror who was "molested" in her youth

b. Court-declared "cynical" Jurors

c. A Medina City elementary school teacher

that was gunning for a conviction. Σ

¶1065 Atty. Stanley... Yes, "he knows things". Things the "untruthful" Danielle feared and that prompted Pros. Eisenhower to move for "mistrial" [¶062]. Having lost that move, she calculated how to use his truthful presence against me. Please, allow for me to explain.

¶1066 Pre-trial, a prosecutor will do their best to commit Pre-Trial Media Character Assassination [¶317], [¶488]. Then, during trial, in a *strict contest of credibility*, the prosecutor knows, for the most part, your goose is cooked. Therefore, the next step is to ensure that no

> Character witness. A witness who testifies as to the general reputation and character of the person on trial (Rothenberg, p.80),

can boost your credibility. This is done by destroying the character witness's credibility via vicious cross-examination[217] by the prosecutor. Yeah, pretty much a *no-holds-barred* event designed to humiliate and discredit, and cause the witness to lose emotion control.

¶1067 The next step in attacking and destroying *your* character reputation, although highly unethical and illegal, is to destroy your attorney's character reputation by making pre-meditated personal and denigrating attacks on your attorney before a jury. Regarding such, in Wall v. Leavitt, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 89953, 2007 WL4219162, *1 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 29, 2007), the Eastern District Federal Court of California ruled that

> (*** personal attacks on opposing counsel would not be tolerated and subject to sanctions). (Citing Sedie v. United States Postal Service, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 113206 at [*9]).

[217] ***, the questioning of an opposing witness. Rothenberg, p.122.

In this manner, if the State can destroy your attorney's reputation by merely alleging his or her bad character, in the eyes of a **Lynch Mob**, your character is also bad. You know... *Guilt by association*, thereby implanting in the minds of the jurors that you're a bad person and deserving some sort of punishment. This is a direct violation of Federal Law because

> By arguing explicitly that the bad character of Keenan's **friends** reflected on Keenan's character, when that character was wholly irrelevant, the prosecutor ignored the fact that "[u]nder the longstanding principles of Anglo-American jurisprudence, an accused cannot be convicted *** by proving he *** [*410] is a bad person." **[emphasis added]**. State v. Jamison (1990), 49 Ohio St. 3d 182, 184, 552 N.E.2d 180, 183). (Citing State v. Keenan, 1993 Ohio LEXIS 1214, HN7. See also HN6).

¶1068 As Pros. Eisenhower is now a member of the *morality police*, consider the fact that she did not attack the character of my **friends** before a sane jury. To the contrary, she attacked my **attorney** before a "cynical" Jury. The legal prejudice is compounded by comparison.

¶1069 Coming full-circle on "because he knows things", Pros. Eisenhower attempted to prove the truthful and credible Atty. Stanley slick, conning, and manipulative, and associate my character with that mindset. Now, to the contrary, nullifying her lies and reckless assertions, Dr. Reed testified voir dire that I am

> "...not slick conning, or manipulative" Σ
> (Exhibit-34: Reed-3, Item 14)

thereby lending credibility to Atty. Stanley's already sterling character. As to the recklessness and flagrancy involved, consider the fact that Pros. Eisenhower heard Dr. Reed testify to this.

¶1070 To be forthright, I have been called "candid", "remarkably sincere", and "too honest" [¶496]. I have also been told "You're integrity is good", and "You're always able to prove what you say." As to the man I am and my word, once given, I keep it. There may be times I am slow in keeping it, or I may have to make a call and personally retract it due to an emergency or, due

to unforeseen events and current circumstance such as prison, I have been temporarily kept from keeping it to my Dad. Still, in the end, it shall be kept. I love my Dad.

Let your word be as iron.
-Conn Iggulden

• • •

Groot: I am Groot!

Frank: Thank you, Groot.

• • •

¶1071a Pros. Eisenhower's plan to "build a record for that", and her personal attack on Atty. Stanley and myself, proves that her pre-meditated

Action is distilled intent.
-Ken Follett

This is specifically due to the fact that she deliberately lied to and misled the Jury, *again*, by implying she possessed certain, specific, and esoteric information from outside the Trial. Thus, she illegally **bolstered** the State's case, *again* [¶969, 3, ii at Footnote 197]. True, for Pros. Eisenhower's attack alleged malicious motives and industrious intent that were *non-existent*. Σ

¶1071b Obviously I prepared my mind to **build a record for that**, as well. ☺

¶1072 Continuing with Pros. Eisenhower's Closing Statements, unguided by any code of ethics, and unrestrained by any moral fiber whatsoever, **prior to** the attack she told the Jury

> Robyn Spencer sat here and said,... I didn't want to go back under the influences of Frank Wood (Tp.493, Ln.13-19).

¶1073 Would someone from the State ***puhleeze*** point this out in my Materially Altered and Incomplete Trial Record?

¶1074 Sorry. I forgot... They can't. Σ

¶1075 What's so amazing about the above is that she said this in and amongst her lying to the Jury about the "pact" [¶716-¶722]. **OMG!**

¶1076 Unable to control her rhetoric and rhapsody, Pros. Eisenhower tripped herself up when she said,

> Well, I'll give you Scott Sadowsky. He's got a reason not to like Frank Wood.[218] That much is true. He was very brave.[219] He came up here and told you exactly what happened... "he's got my wife" (Tp.496, Ln.7-13),

and confirmed the motive of ***SEX*** that I presented to you. Man, they gotta' give me a spot on *20/20*, *Dateline*, or *60 Minutes* when this is over. This shit is just too real.

¶1077 Pros. Eisenhower then proffered this next sadistic statement:

> Now, pornography. Hey, if it's not child pornography, it's pornography, but these girls are telling you the same thing (Tp.498, Ln.18-20).

Now that's enough to piss of the Pope.
-Unknown, with respect of the Papacy (I like Pope Francis)

¶1078 Taking one allegation at a time... While out on bond, Atty. Spears told me that there were allegations of pornography and a computer regarding K.S. I informed him that, while living in Chippewa Lake, we rented a house from Aimee Dudash, and that the utilities, including phone and cable, were in her name with no internet access. Further, I purchased the store model computer from Office Max in Medina, Ohio with a company check. They were going out of business and the computer was cheap. But it had a virus, and I returned it in less than a week. Remarkably, the allegation of this Implanted/Transplanted Memory never made it the

---

[218] Of that I have no doubt.

[219] I had to keep myself from laughing when she said this because she actually *pouted* when she said it. And every time she shouted to object, she whined like a petulant child with "Your Honor..." All I could think was, *'Are you for real, lady?'* Quite unbecoming for a public official.

indictment[220] [¶334a, 1, i]. *Hmmm*. And this didn't raise *any* red flags or questions with Eisenhower or LeSure?

Emphatically: *Damn!*
-Me

As to why the red flags were never flown and the change in story went ignored,

1) "They're having problems with K.S." [¶526]
2) Children's Services missed it... *completely*... just like when Robyn filled out a police report claiming that Ryan kicked two-year-old J.Z. down the garage steps, and they did ***nothing*** about it (Exhibit-08: p.R-2 at ¶3)

Fargon idiots!

¶1079 To the contrary, while K.S. was in the custody of Lynda and Ryan, their home at 375 West Sturbridge in Medina, Ohio had a computer with internet access and *Skype*®. Easily verifiable, this is supported where Robyn's father, a *Motorola*™ employee, was a *telecommuter*: worked from home.

¶1080 Now please recall that K.S. testified TWICE that she could not recall being at an alleged crime scene with me in Chippewa Lake (Tp.386, Ln.21; Tp.387, Ln.11), (Exhibit-03), and she *never* mentioned pornography during Trial. In fact, Pros. Eisenhower *never* even asked her such a question.

¶1081 Next, S.L. testified that I *never* invited her to look at anything on the internet (Tp.255, Ln.9-25). Now, for a painful detail that will send Scott running for the hills, I invite you to recall the contents of (Exhibit-19: OIP; August 31, 2015; p.2 at ¶2). Yeah, it's like that. ☺

¶1082 With no exposure to pornography, at least by me, it is clear that these girls *never* told

[220] Implanted/Transplanted Memory #8 and Unindicted allegation #6.

the Jury "the same thing", thereby proving Eisenhower lied, *again*. Σ

¶1083 Time for a little Q & A.

Q: Why was "pornography" an unindicted allegation regarding S.L.?

A: Because it was also "bullshit" [¶543] [221]

¶1084 Listless and desperate in the *Doldrums*, Pros. Eisenhower told the **Angry Villagers,** regarding S.L.,

> "No. We have a defense like this. "Well, it happened, but it didn't happen *here* and *here*" [*Emphasis added*], (Tp.524, Ln.16-18).

1) *Here* is where Pros. Eisenhower forgot "bullshit"

2) *Here* is where Pros. Eisenhower steered the Jury away from October 1st-3rd of 2004

3) *Here* is where Pros. Eisenhower told the Jury my own Defense Team believed me guilty

4) *Here* is where the State cannot point this out in my Raped, Pillaged, and Plundered Trial Record

5) *Here* is where Pros. Eisenhower ignored the truth of the "intrusive memories" of "the two days before"

6) *Here* is where Pros. Eisenhower told the Jury to find my guilty on any dates that S.L. was with Scott, as in, the "first time" and the "last time" it happened

7) *Here* is where Pros Eisenhower admitted that crimes occurred and reinforced her lies

8) *Here* is where **Prosecutorial Misconduct** peaked

9) *Here* is where **"bullshit"** prevailed

10 *Here* is where **Malicious Prosecution** triumphed

---

[221] Implanted/Transplanted Memory #9 and Unindicted allegation #7.

11) *Here* is where Pros. Eisenhower must be disbarred for life for pursing the wrongful conviction of This Innocent Man and deliberately letting a guilty PERP go free

12) *Here* is where "Put-In-Bay" went ignored

13) *Here* ...

14) *Here*...

15) *Here*...

16) *Merde*!

• • •

[BOOM!]

• • •

¶1085 Then, still pursuing a bogus F-1 rape conviction, Pros. Eisenhower had the *audacity* to fire this one off the port side:

> The Judge is going to tell you "on or about," but that's not[222]
> - - that doesn't really matter (Tp.524, Ln.19-20), [¶1256].
>
> Oh! I know you just did *not* shoot that green shit at me!
> -Will Smith, *Independence Day*

¶1086 So we're all setting the same mosaic tile, Pros. Eisenhower just told the **Tainted and Tampered-With Jury** that

1) The law does not matter

2) To ignore the indicted, testified to, and confirmed dates of sexual abuse regarding October 1st-3rd of 2004 and "Put-In-Bay"

3) To find me guilty of raping a ***Temple Virgin*** from 70 miles away [¶1109, 4]

¶1087 Just buttered that back of that bad boy with some *Type-M* mortar. A real sticky batch,

---

[222] Important?

too. Should set quite nicely. *Hmmm.* I do believe I see a handle forming.

• • •

Rocket: You're a regular *Rembrandt.*

Frank: Why, thank you, Rocket.

Rocket: That was sarcasm.

Frank: The lowest form of wit.

Rocket: Oh.

• • •

¶1088 Lastly, realizing she couldn't set sail, Pros. Eisenhower decided to go fishing with,

> Ask yourself how that's possible when you see two women come in who don't know each other, two girls who come in and don't know each other and they tell you the **same thing [emphasis added]**, (Tp.525, Ln.22-25)

Having lost her bait, a few problems for the State:

1) Under Scott's orders, Danielle sought out Robyn **after** she found out she was

pregnant [¶579, 4], (Exhibit-09: p.D-2, ¶6)

> Men may make history in the light,
> but it is crafted in the shadows by women.
> -Cervantes, p.____

2) The State cannot point this out in my <u>Fondled Trial Record</u>

¶1089 Reader, with absolutely **NO SYMMETRY** between testimonies and allegations, I showed you *why* there was none:

1) Two (2) different M.O.s by two (2) different <u>PERPS</u>

2) Different <u>MOTIVES</u>

3) Different family environments and custodial structures

¶1090 Query: How many times can a prosecutor hide things from and lie to a **Corrupted Jury** before Prosecutorial Misconduct and Malicious Prosecution are declared?

A one... A two... Crunch!... A three.
-Tootsie Pop®

• • •

Frank: Groot, stop that!

Groot: I am Groot!

Frank: Okay. I'll tell them, but give that back to the owl.

Groot: [Inaudible]

Frank: I'll get you some. We'll take a break in a minute. The phone?

• • •

¶1091 Regarding Pros. Eisenhower's misleading misrepresentations, by the bark of his backside, and that's putting it politely, what my fiber-filled friend wants me to tell you is this: If I were not both legally and factually innocent, then Pros. Eisenhower would not have had to

1) Rely on a Tainted and Tampered-With Jury

2) Hide things from them

3) Lie to them

in order to secure a bogus conviction.

• • •

[BOOM!]

Frank: Thanks, Groot.

Groot: I am Groot.

[Exploding fist bump]

• • •

¶1092 Before we press on with Judge Collier's Jury Instructions, I would like to clarify for you, the Reader, how Reviewing Courts approach claims of Prosecutorial Misconduct. When reviewing claims of prosecutorial misconduct, an appellate court determines first whether the statements were improper. The appellate court then looks to see if they were flagrant[223] and warrant reversal. To determine flagrancy, the standard set by reviewing courts is:

1) whether the statements tended to mislead the jury [obviously] or prejudice the defendant [of that there can be no doubt]
2) whether the statements were isolated or among a series of improper statements [more like a chain reaction of spurious litany]
3) whether the statements were deliberately or ***accidentally***[224] [***emphasis added***] before the jury [pre-mediated and well-calculated is more like it]
4) the total strength of the evidence against the accused [which fully exonerates me of both counts in the indictment]. U.S.A. v. Francis and Francis, supra, at HN1 [¶598], [my emphasis added].

¶1093 Reader, you be the Judge for now. But once you reach your reliable verdict [¶1411] as my Jury, I trust you will remember that

> When bad men combine, the good must associate;
> else they will fall, one by one,
> an unpitied sacrifice in a contemptible struggle.
> -Edmund Burke

-Σ-

---

[223] Flagrant. 1. Conspicuously bad or offensive. Pickett, p.433.

[224] We know that: 1) belief determines behavior; 2) the only truth is action; 3) and action is distilled intent. Therefore, ***nothing*** a prosecutor says to a jury is by ***accident***. Confirming, Pros. Eisenhower had access to recorded testimony and continuously referred to her notes during Closing Statement [¶977-¶979] that she had a full weekend to prepare.

¶1094 JURY INSTRUCTIONS

[Drum being slowly tapped]

Ready!

¶1095 Upon then conclusion of Closing Statements, Judge Collier provided the **Firing Squad** with his personal version of Jury Instructions (Tp.529-554) –

• • •

Rocket: Ammunition.

• • •

for the purposes of deliberations. Regarding such, the following instructions are truly deserving of special attention, and are excerpted from (Exhibit-51: Tp.530-540).

¶1096 Defining *his* definition of evidence, Judge Collier explained

1) **What is "evidence"? Evidence is all the testimony you got from the witness stand** (Tp.530, Ln.19-20), [¶572]

Minus: My witnesses that Atty. Green failed to subpoena

Minus: Dr. Reed's testimony

Minus: Specifically the Saligas that Det. Kollar and Pros. Eisenhower chased away

Minus: My testimony

Plus: The Court-declared "untruthful" Danielle's testimony

2) **any exhibits admitted during trial** (Tp.530, Ln.20-21)

Minus: Dr. LeSure's contract that was kept secret for a reason

Minus: Dr. LeSure's report that was illegally suppressed and given to the Court

Reporter for the purposes of destruction

Minus: Montville's report that "terminated" the alleged F-1 rape case, and that was illegally suppressed and given to the Court Reporter for the purposes of destruction

Minus: The pictures of pictures

Minus: The illegally suppressed letter from Children's Services that "closed" the alleged F-1 rape case due to "no evidence"

Minus: My Pre-Trial Histories that were denied for in camera inspection by Judge Collier

Minus: The calendar of October 2004 that was also denied admittance

Minus: Dr. Reed's written report that, per Atty. Stanley, is now mysteriously part of the Trial Record that is on microfilm with the Clerk of Courts[225] [¶1135]

3) **any facts agreed to by counsel** (Tp.530, Ln.21-22)

• • •

Groot: I am Groot?

Frank: Dunno. That's definitely an enigma, but I would like to know exactly **what facts** were discussed and **agreed to** between Atty. Green and Pros. Eisenhower outside the presence of Atty. Stanley and myself.[226]

• • •

4) **or any facts that I require – the Court requires – you to accept as true** (Tp.530,

---

[225] Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record #20.

[226] Presence of the defendant violation #6, and a blatant 6th Amendment violation of my right to counsel.

Ln.22-23)

¶1097 Reader, having confirmed what I told you earlier about the State declaring testimony to be evidence [¶1096, 1], Judge Collier just told the Jury that any evidence he allowed in the courtroom they are required

"to accept as true"

¶1098 (Exhibit-48).

¶1099 Judge Collier successfully ran a one-sided Trial via a plethora of *insidious in subsidiums*, and acted *in subsidium*[227] again as he **bolstered** [¶969 at Footnote 197] the State's case. You see, Judge Collier did not testify. Therefore, he is alleging that he knows things from outside the Trial that would support the State's case. What more, he simultaneously **vouched** [¶598-¶601] for not only the credibility of the State's witnesses, but for anything and everything Pros. Eisenhower told the Jury; including her lies.

¶1100 Having been repeatedly denied my U.S. 6th Amendment right to present a complete defense, or, as in the instant matter, ***any*** defense, with both Court and State bolstering and vouching, I was cast into the gladiator's pit unarmed and outnumbered. Wonderful odds for a warrior at heart, but there was no way I was leaving the arena alive.

Are you not entertained!
-Gladiator

¶1101 *Publius* had the Arena Master's back, and she had the Senate eating figs out of the palm of her crooked hand.

Is this not what you come to see!
-Gladiator

---

[227] *In subsidium* #16.

¶1102 Yeah, and this Gladiator, the one with actual Roman and Spartan genes, is still standing, with a stout heart, undaunted, unconquered, and unbroken.

Aah Ooh!
-300

¶1103 Ignoring every law broken thus far, Judge Collier continued with

> What's not evidence? *** the opening statements by counsel, the closing arguments by counsel, are not evidence ***. The opening and closing statements are designed to assist only you (Exhibit-51: Tp.534, Ln.20-Tp.535, Ln.2).

Reader, assist in what manner if they are not evidence? Oh, I get it... It's a marketing and sales pitch where, just like I showed you with Pros. Eisenhower's *lies* to the Jury,

It's all in the spin.
-Atty. Ron Stanley

¶1104 Reader, let's go deeper... Ever argue with someone? What's always the *last thing* you remember the most? The last shocking statement spoken. The same applies to closing statements and a jury. You see, with *cell assemblies* in play, Pros. Eisenhower's improper, tortuous and misleading Closing Statements *did assist* the Jury by steering them away from the truth. In this light, it is axiomatic 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 deliberation" (Washington v. Hofbauer, supra) [¶549]. (See Berger v. United States, supra) [¶550]. (See U.S.A. v. Francis, supra) [¶598-¶601].

Yes, Judge Collier just lied to the Jury, and he knew it.

• • •

Rocket: Bad manners.

• • •

¶1105 Reader, now you see the lie, and that Judge Collier, simultaneously bolstered and

vouched as he acted *in subsidium*, again. Confirming this is not the first time he directly assisted Pros. Eisenhower, I invite you to recall

1) "we" and the "pact"

2) "we" and Dr. Reed

3) The 16 *insidious in subsidiums* presented thus far

4) "I need to build a record for that"

"I would be doing exactly the same thing"

(See Exhibit-52: Tp.514, Ln.1-2), [¶071-¶073]

With the above in mind, know that Judge Collier actually announced before the Jury that

"This is closing argument, it's not evidence"
(Exhibit-53: Tp.138, Ln.16-19)

• • •

Groot: I am Groot?

Frank: Yes, Groot. Sadly, this was a planned assist. ☹

• • •

¶1106 Pressing on, Judge Collier then told the Jury,

1) **You are the sole judges of the facts of this case** (Exhibit-51: Tp.535, Ln.17-18)

Only of the falsified facts he personally required them "to accept as true".

2) **the credibility of the witnesses** (ibid) (Ln.18)

While never hearing Dr. Reed or being told about the Court-declared "untruthful" Danielle, etc.

3) **To weigh evidence, you have to consider the credibility of the witnesses** (ibid)

(Ln.21-22)

The falsified evidence and the "untruthful" witness he just bolstered and vouched for.

4) **and please apply the test of truthfulness that you are accustomed to applying in**

your daily lives (ibid) (Ln.21-22)

Not only did Judge Collier direct the Jury to accept all of the State's evidence as true, he told them to apply their life-view of truth to these same facts, knowing they were false. Yes, he did this knowing the Jurors were not told about the *Laundry Lists* of lies, half-truths, and withheld information; or the suppressed, destroyed, and withheld evidence that exonerate me.

An informed decision is a wise decision.
-Frank P. Wood, *The Innocent Man*

¶1107 Reader, what do you think the Jury would have done if they

1) Knew Judge Collier called Danielle "untruthful" and why

2) Knew Dr. LeSure lied to the girls and had other doctors condemn her protocols

3) Knew about Dr. LeSure's contract

4) Knew Pros. Eisenhower **declared S.L.'s testimony to be "bullshit** and why

5) Heard Dr. Reed and knew his credentials

6) Read Montville's police report

7) Read the letter from Children's Services

8) Saw the pictures of pictures and were told the truth about them

9) Saw the coached interviews of the girls

10) Saw my two (2) videos

11) Read the Pre-Trial Histories that Collier refused for *in camera* inspection

12) Heard my testimony

13) Heard from my witnesses that Atty. Green failed to subpoena

14) Knew that Judge Collier, Pros. Eisenhower, and Det. Kollar lied to them

15) Knew about the "pact"

17) *Etcetera...?*

18) *Laundry Lists*

¶1108 Reader, let me tell you a for sure thing: Court, State, and Cop *knew*, and that's why the above, *inter alia*, was kept from the Jury. So I'll let you be the "sole judges of the facts of this case" as you "apply the test of truthfulness that you are accustomed to applying in your daily lives." Thank you.

• • •

Rocket: *Touché!*

• • •

¶1109 Knowing the Jury was poorly informed and about to make a poor decision, Judge Collier continued with

1) Now let's talk about the charges (ibid) (Tp.537, Ln.4)

[Drum tapping accelerates to drum roll]

Aim!

2) "Rape." The Defendant was charged with rape (Ln.9)

of a ***Temple Virgin*** (Exhibit-14) from 70 miles away (Exhibit-03)

3) Before you can find the Defendant guilty (Exhibit-51: Tp.537, Ln.10)

He forgot to add *'or not guilty'* as he steered the Jury, but now he tells them how to do it.

4) you *must* find beyond a reasonable doubt that on or about (Ln.10-11) [*emphasis added*]

"that doesn't really matter" [¶1085-¶1086, 1-3]

5) the 1st day of October through the 3rd day of October of 2004 (Ln.11-13)

Which is State-declared "bullshit" [¶948-¶950] because this "intrusive memory" confirms that S.L. was not with me "the two days before". However, this indicted weekend is also the State-

declared "first time" the alleged crime happened [¶958, 3]. Yes, they had the **Poked and Prodded Peasants**, literally, *confused into a conviction*. Verifying, no one else mentioned this specific weekend and incident other than S.L. (Tp.1-560). *Hmmm...* `"intrusive memories."`

6) and in Medina County, Ohio (ibid) (Ln.13),

regardless of S.L. being in "Put-In-Bay" with her "dad" [¶1047] and "not at Frank Wood's house" (Exhibit-03). What more, as with K.S., no one could identify a specific residence or crime scene where such "bullshit" alleged incidents were to have occurred. For verification, recall that Dr. LeSure didn't have this information ***either*** [¶806].

7) that the Defendant *purposely* engaged in sexual conduct with the child with the initials S.L. (Ln.13-15) [*emphasis added*]

This is despite the fact that Dr. Reed confirmed that I am psychologically prohibited from harming a child[228] or someone I love [¶504-¶505]. What more, by declaring *purposely*, this is what Court and State declare, by definition of law, to be *motive*. Strange. As *motive* was never alleged during Trial, Dr. Reed has proven that I do not possess such demented drives.

8) Sexual conduct means vaginal intercourse [¶151, 3] between a male and female,

*** Penetration however slight, is sufficient to complete vaginal or anal intercourse (ibid) (Tp.537, Ln.21-Tp.538, Ln.1)

Reader, we will come back to this in [¶1353-¶1375], in a really ***BIG*** way. I guarantee it. ☺

• • •

Frank: Tell 'em, Groot.

---

[228] I went to spank one child my whole life: J.Z., Robyn's middle daughter. Walked in the room and took one look at her, already in tears from having her moment, I froze, turned, and walked out of the room. I then pointed at Robyn and told her, "That's your job because I'm not doing it." You need to understand that J.Z. would fall asleep on my chest regularly, and, of her own accord, used to call me "Frankie Daddy". Yeah, that was it for me. That little angel broke my heart. ☺

Groot: I am Groot!

[BOOM!]

• • •

¶1110 Judge Collier continued with,

1) "Vaginal intercourse" means penetration of the penis into the vagina

(Tp.538, Ln.1-2)

This refers to the actual indicted charge of *sexual conduct* as the vaginal rape of a nine-year-old prepubertal ***Temple Virgin***.

¶1111 Judge Collier then elected to give the **Corrupt Cerebral Collective** definitions for

1) Anal intercourse

2) Fellatio

3) Cunnilingus (Tp.538, Ln.4-9)

of which, none were indicted or testified to. These unnecessary definitions did nothing more than put the bellows to the coals of an already socially-emotionally enflamed Jury. Yeah, that's what we call *legal prejudice.*

• • •

Rocket: Point!

• • •

¶1112 Following the above, Judge Collier continued with

1) "Purposely." Purpose to engage in sexual conduct is an essential element of the crime of rape (Tp. 538, Ln.13-15).

Again, no one established motive regarding me, while I have sufficiently proven special knowledge, motive, and easy access regarding Scott and S.L., and Ryan and K.S. Further, as I

never testified, how would the Jury have known if I had such motives?

2) It *must* be established in this case that at the time in question there was present in the mind of this Defendant a specific intention to engage in sexual conduct with the victim (Ln.13-15) [*emphasis added*]

A few things:

A) This is the second time Judge Collier used the word *must* in his instructions to find me guilty [¶1109, 4]

B) He declared S.L. to be my victim without a verdict [¶624 at Footnote 130]

C) He heard Dr. Reed testify, regarding me that

i. "He has sexual attraction only to adult women" (Exhibit-34: p.Reed-1, Item 3)

ii. "He was being sexually active regularly, therefore, he would not have needed to turn to a pre-pubescent child" (Exhibit-34, p.Reed-3, Item 17), [¶179, 2]

I'm sorry, but who was not being sexually active regularly with his woman at this time?

• • •

Groot: I am Groot!

Frank: That's right... Scott Sadowsky. Very good, Groot.

Rocket: That was an *icy* stab.

Frank: Hey, affairs involve three people. The first one fails to provide something, then the second seeks out the third to fill the void. Tragically, we all had a part in this.

• • •

¶1113 Reader, at this moment in time, I must remind you that I had neither special knowledge, motive, nor easy access to the girls as did Scott [¶177-¶184], and Ryan [¶872-¶890],

and clarify that both of these men were in long-term positions of privacy, familiarity, and trust [¶508, 3]. Σ

¶1114 Closing on the alleged F-1 instructions, Judge Collier concluded with,

1) I am also going to include a request for special findings from you (Exhibit-51: Tp.539, Ln.22-23)

People, that was ***not*** part of the indictment (Exhbit-02).

2) and that has to do with the age of S.L. This special finding reads as follows – you'll see this attached to the verdict form – it says, "We the Jury in this case duly impaneled and sworn and affirmed (Tp.539, Ln.22-Tp.540, Ln.2)

Reader, we know enough now that it is both legally and factually impossible for a Court-declared "cynical" Jury, with its Court-elected Juror who was "molested" in her youth, and a Medina City elementary school teacher to be impartial to the point of being "duly impaneled" according to law. ***DUH!***

3) further find that the victim (Tp.540, Ln.2)

Again he declares S.L. a "victim" without a verdict and what he knew regarding "the two days before" and "bullshit".

4) was or was not (Ln.3)

Giving them options to find me guilty.

5) less than ten years of age (Ln.3)

"A life rape, Your Honor" (Exhibit-50: Tp.17, Ln.21-24), [¶1043].

6) at the time of the commission of the offense (Exhibit-51: Tp.540, Ln.4)

Judge Collier just told the Jury that they are to "accept as true" what evidence he allowed in the courtroom, that they "must" find this ***innocent*** "Defendant" "guilty" of "purposely" engaging in

"the offense"

7) of rape against her (ibid) (Tp.540, Ln.4-5),

the ***Temple Virgin***, from 70 miles away.

¶1115 To clarify what just transpired, Judge Collier, via "special findings", just gave the Jury the option of finding me guilty on

1) The indicted "bullshit" dates of October 1st-3rd of 2004, the "first time" it happened (Exhibit-03: p.12)

   i. Reader, recall that this date went originally unindicted, uninvestigated, and not testified to, except by S.L., but her whereabouts, Put-In-Bay, were confirmed by the testimonies of S.L., Scott **and** Danielle

2) The unindicted date of October 20th of 2004, the "last time" it happened (Exhibit-03: p.12), when S.L. moved back in with Scott [¶191], [¶188, 2]. In accord, recall that this date was **removed** from the indictment via amendment because that specific date/allegation, regarding me, was "closed" and "terminated"

As to the "special findings", not only is it illegal to ask a jury to adjudicate on an unindicted allegation, this Jury came back with a verdict of "Guilty" on the indicted "bullshit" dates of October 1st-3rd, regarding Put-In-Bay. And who was S.L. with on October 1st-3rd of 2004?

• • •

Groot: I am Groot!

Frank: Right again, Groot... Scott Michael Sadowsky – Not now, Groot. We'll take a *selfie* later.

[Groot sniffs his armpit]

Frank: Groot, I said '*selfie*', not '*smellfie*'.

• • •

¶1116 As to the Jury Instructions regarding the alleged F-3 GSI of K.S., I found nothing out of the ordinary, but it was still "bullshit" that Judge Collier did not dismiss the charges.

¶1117 On Tp.549, Ln.8 Judge Collier turned this mess over to his **Personal Firing Squad** to do his dirty work for him with

[Drum roll begins to crescendo]

1) All right. The case is yours now.

Fire!

[Cacophony of muskets]

¶1118 And that's how you do it in the Trial Court of the Dishonorable Judge Christopher J. Collier (Exhibit-48) of the Medina County Court of Common Pleas.

¶1119 Your tax dollars at work.

¶1120 Lastly, I remain under the impression that, if one were to look closely at the Trial Records and Jury Instructions of other cases that were tried in Judge Collier's Court, one would find a perfect symmetry in the way he silver tongues a jury into doing his bidding.

-Σ-

• • •

Groot: [Sniffling]

Frank: Hey, what's wrong?

Groot: I am Groot?

Frank: No. No, they didn't really shoot me. It's all right. Come on. Let's take a break. Need a hug?

Groot: [Nods yes]

Frank: Bring it on in, fellas. Group hug.

[Group hug]

Frank: Sorry, folks. Teenagers and hormones and all. He'll be all right.

• • •

Chapter 38

¶1121 VERDICT

♪ That's the night that the lights went out in Georgia. ♫
That's the night that they hung an innocent man.
-Reba McEntire, *The Lights Went out in Georgia*

¶1122 Utilizing (Exhibit-54: Tp.555-558), on May 1, 2006, the **Tainted and Tampered-With Jury** was ready to submit its vicious verdict (ibid) (Tp.555, Ln.11-12). For the first time since he lied about my "mafia connections in Europe" [¶305], former Chief Pros. Dean Holman was in the courtroom.[229] He was pacing, elbow in one hand, chin in the other, rubbing his chin, and met my eyes only once, and then looked away. He was clearly not at ease. Yes, he was worried his subordinate screwed up. So, as a just-in-case-measure, he was there to clean things up. You see, lawsuits are so sticky; like crap on ceramic.

• • •

Rocket: Nice metaphor.

Frank: Thank you.

Rocket: Creates quite the mental picture.

Frank: *Hmmm*. I'll have to keep that concept in mind for the future.

• • •

¶1123 When the **Hangman** announced the verdict was reached (Ln.18-23), the verdict forms were handed to Judge collier (ibid) (Tp.556, Ln.8-12). As Collier looked at the verdicts, he

[229] Atty. Stanley was the one who pointed him out to me.

frowned, laid them down, put his face in his hands, took a deep breath, then, as he threw his arms up in the air, he looked directly at *his* **Firing Squad** and said,

"This is going to the Court of Appeals"

as if *they* were to blame for doing what *he* guided and told them to do [¶609].

[*Deadpool* movie moment]

• • •

Rocket: Collier's quite the *thespian.*

Frank: You should have seen it live. Most theatrical.

• • •

¶1124 As this entire pantomime and statement are missing from the Trashed Transcripts,[230] I ask that you recall the truthful witness who was by my side: Atty. Stanley.

¶1125 Determined to destroy the *Monster from Medina*, verdicts of "Guilty" were returned on both bogus counts in the indictment. Deserving special attention, the **Angry Villagers** utilized Judge Collier's illegal "special findings" and found that S.L. was

"a child less than ten in the manner and form as he stands charged in the indictment" (Ln.16-21)

¶1126 *Wow!* This is awesome! With pitchforks and torches, these **Poked and Prodded Peasants** found *me* "Guilty" of raping the ***Temple Virgin*** S.L. on the indicted, testified to, and State-confirmed "bullshit" dates of abuse, while S.L. spent the entire weekend, when "it hurt", in "Put-In-Bay" with her "dad" Scott, and "not at Frank Wood's house" (Exhibit-03)!

[THE CROWD GOES WILD!!!!!!!]

• • •

Frank: Thank you! Thank you! No pictures... please.

---

[230] Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record #21.

Groot: I am Groot.

Frank: Alrighty then. Yes, time for a selfie.

[Flash!]

Frank: Hey, look at that. You *are* photogenic.

Groot: I am Groot.

Frank: Bringing back the 80s... *'Bite me'*.

• • •

¶1127 I know there's case law supporting reversals of convictions where "the jury lost its way", but, in the case at bar, it's more like *'the jury was **guided** off course'* [¶188, 2].

• • •

Rocket: Frank, when you heard the word "Guilty", what exactly did you feel?

Frank: *Wow*! To answer that, I first need to clarify part of my belief system with

Life is not about feeling.
It's about experience.
-FPW

Rocket: Explain.

Frank: Gladly... Society via news, books, TV, movies, music, and the like is focused on *feelings* and *emotions* creating unnecessary drama that is tearing our social fabric to shreds. And when people become obsessed with *"We got drama"* being pumped into their homes, *'They got problems'*. They get hooked on shows like *Jerry Springer* and *Maurey* thinking it's real life. What's worse, movies glamorize drugs, violence, a *lack of emotional control*, and revenge leaving people think *'That's how it's supposed to be'* because what is broadcast is now socially acceptable. This is why a plethora of American movies and shows are prohibited to be broadcasted in certain Middle Eastern countries. Commercials

promote sex, and a romantic comedy glorifies lust, adultery, lies, deceit, foul language, betrayal, and *feelings*. Feelings should be used as positive or negative warning signs, and not used as triggers for emotional outbursts. Neuroplasticity proves that we need to protect our families from these psychological onslaughts with healthy filters and guidance. Why? Emotional outbursts lead to physical violence. This is where people get hurt, or worse. Yeah, the *worse* is known as a *limbic hijacking*. In brevity, emotional control is key to a productive and healthy home. That's where society starts: in the home.

Rocket: Deep.

Frank: As to what I experienced at the moment of verdict, words are nearly inadequate, but I do recall the shock. Everything inside me went silent. Still. No thoughts or emotions stirred my inner being. It was like being wide awake, and at the same time, existing in a void. In hindsight, as a defense mechanism, my mind instantly applied years of mediation practice to protect me. As the drop of water reached the pond, my mind found

The stillness within,
-Buddhist practice

and kept me calm. This is good, for whatever I experience, love or hate or other, it's always deep. That's why I am leery of loving again.

After I was returned to the Sheriff's Department, I went and sat in the basketball court. With Collier's gavel pounding on the door of my heart, I let go. I remember tears burning my cheeks. A kind deputy asked, "Are you alright?" to which I replied, "I didn't rape that girl." I was literally heartbroken. Later, after sentencing, another deputy told me, "You got screwed." Shit. Don't I know it.

Rocket: You meditate a lot?

Frank: Yes, I have to in such an environment as I currently exist, and I want to for personal

growth. I enjoy it. Also, Dr. Reed concluded that I am an "emotional man" (Tp.437, Ln.10). As we are emotional beings, I used meditation to turn this weakness into a strength. Basically, I use my feelings/emotions as positive or negative warning signs to guide and protect me. Fight or flight, you know.

Rocket: How's that?

Frank: They tell me,

Don't go where you're not wanted.
Don't stay where you're not loved.
-FPW

With my emotions/feelings guided and controlled by

The power of stillness,
[and]
The strength of silence,
-FPW

I am calmer, happier, more focused, productive and effective than most, despite my external appearances. Life is full of peripheral bullshit that can and will distract you, just like an abuser's ignorance, if you let it. That's when the bucket begins to fill. So,

When life's out of focus,
Go back to the basics.
Breathe,
-FPW

and empty the bucket of shit.

• • •

¶1128 Reader, before proceeding, to authenticate what's left of my Trial Record, I have enclosed (Exhibit-55: Tp.1), and refer you back to (Exhibit-27) which contains Tp.560: the Court Reporter's CERTIFICATE.

¶1129 After verdicts were pronounced, Atty. Green asked that the Jury be polled (Exhibit-54: Tp.558, Ln.1-8). Basically, a court/judge asks each juror by name if the verdict was theirs. Judge Collier commenced with the polling.

¶1130 At (Exhibit-27: Tp.559, Ln.23-25), notice that Judge Collier is in the middle of asking a polled Juror a question when the dialogue comes to an abrupt end with Tp.560 and the Court Reporter's CERTIFICATE (ibid). Not only is the polled Juror's response missing, but so are those of Juror's #11 and #12.

¶1131 As to the names and responses that are missing, via the process of logical deduction, I invite you to recall:

1) The Court-elected Juror who was "molested" in her youth [¶603-¶607]

2) One of the Court-declared "cynical" Jurors: "Mrs. Polca" [¶060-¶063][231]

¶1132 Deserving dishonorable mention, going from polled Jurors to CERTIFICATE leaves one in the position to rightly deduce that my SENTENCING HEARING transcripts were never transcribed. Since Court Reporter Garrity was there, we're going there now [¶1204].

-Σ-

• • •

Please support the

St. Jude Children's Research Hospital

@

1-800-982-8851

givestjude.org

Amazing people doing incredible things for precious children.

• • •

[231] Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record #22. ***Whoa!***

¶1133 SENTENCING

I'll be back.
-Terminator

¶1134 On May 15, 2006 my Sentencing Hearing was held in Judge Collier's courtroom. Atty. Green and Atty. Stanley were present, as was the media. I was there wearing *Armani Orange* and lots of shiny silver jewelry that extended from my wrists to my waist to my ankles. It was so elaborate that one might have thought I was a pauper turned prince!

¶1135 At that time, Pros. Eisenhower claimed she had a report [¶1096, 2, vi] that she used to convince Judge Collier, as if he needed any convincing at all, to order me to register as a "sexual predator for life". She claimed the report stated I had a **"17% chance of re-offending"**

IF

I was actually guilty. Not only have I proven my innocence, perjury, motive, perps, "bullshit", *in subsidiums*, *inter alia*,...

17% is an **"F"** in any school.
-Wood: A tough fibrous substance

¶1136 [INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

¶1137 The report must have come from Dr. Reed, the only authentic and qualified expert to thoroughly examine my mind and beliefs.

• • •

Rocket: Whoa! Dr. Reed's testimony and report that he read from during Trial were never presented to the Jury. So how did Eisenhower get it?

Frank: A valid question, my good man, especially since it was never entered into Trial Evidence and I never received a copy.

• • •

¶1138 However, just like my hand-written witness list, original Pre-Trial Histories, and the calendar, I firmly deduce through the hands of Atty. Green [¶412].

¶1139 Funny. An **"F"** is all she could pull out of it.

• • •

Frank: And *that* is how you snatch the pebble from the hand of the master.

Rocket: It is time for you to leave the temple.

[GONG!]

[Everyone bows reverently]

• • •

¶1140 Reader, as you already know, Dr. Reed's report and testimony exonerate me. That's why they were never presented to the Jury. What more, as the Jury never heard Dr. Reed, Pros. Eisenhower misused evidence from outside the Trial Record to **bolster** the State's case again [¶968 at Footnote 197]. Mysteriously, the **"17%"** never made it to the papers (Exhibit-32).

¶1141 But wait! There's more... Per Atty. Stanley, Dr. Reed's lengthy report is **now** *part of* my Trial Record that is on file with the Clerk of Courts! Yes, once again, my Trial Record has been altered[232] in the same manner as the pictures and the calendar.

Did someone say, *'Federal Invest'*?

That's one, *one* Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record.
Ha Ha Ha!
That's two, *two* Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Records.
Ha Ha Ha!
That's three, *three* Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Records.
-The Count, *Sesame Street*

---

[232] Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record #23.

¶1142 As to the "sexual predator for life", Dr. Reed, both the State's and the Ohio Attorney General's Expert (Exhibit-46), unbiasedly and scientifically concluded, regarding me, that

there's no predatory deductive manner
(Exhibit-34: p.Reed-3, Item 19)

in my psyche. Σ

• • •

[BOOM!]

• • •

¶1143 As some things just speak volumes all on their own, I am normal.

• • •

Groot: I am Groot!

Frank: Thanks, Groot.

[Fist bump]

• • •

¶1144 On this day, May 15, 2006, against all laws, morals, and facts I was illegally, unethically, immorally, motivationally, and fraudulently shamed to a LIFE-SENTENCE with parole eligibility after 13 years. Yes, all for crimes that

1) Never happened in a place I have never been

2) I did not commit

-Σ-

• • •

Rocket: I can see the conversation that's going to take place between Collier and Eisenhower after we go public.

Frank: Yeah, it's going to be along the lines of

Why'd you kick me there?
Where's your brain?
Why'd you kick me there?
Where's your brain?
-Ferris Beuhler's Day Off

[COLLECTIVE LAUGHTER]

Frank: My Mom *swears* I wrote the script for that movie.

• • •

Chapter 40

¶1145 A WORD ON (EXHIBIT-32)

The flesh,
it is a weak thing.
Make it submit.
-With compliments to Conn Iggulden

¶1146 Reader, earlier in [¶301-¶319] I showed you how former Chief Prosecutor Dean Holman lied to the Court to deny my bond reduction, and then altered his story to the press to

1) Cover up his lie

2) Commit Pre-Trial Media Character Assassination

(Exhibit-29: Medina County Gazette: Tuesday, August 16, 2005)

and made sure the Transcripts of this hearing were never produced, thereby admitting guilt.

¶1147 At that time, I was going to introduce (Exhibit-32: Medina County Gazette: Tuesday, May 16, 2006), [233] but elected to wait for a more fitting moment. Since that moment has arrived, let us now look at how former Asst. Pros. Anne Eisenhower conducted a Post-Trial Media Burial of my remains, *inter alia*. In order to do this utilizing (Exhibit-32), we must first review Atty.

[233] Please note that both articles were written by Denise Sullivan, dsullivan@ohio.net; a reporter who never interviewed me, but is still, and always, welcome to do so.

Green's direct quote:

> "There's no physical evidence that penetration had taken place"

Having quoted this truth publicly, Ms. Sullivan then cites another:

> Green noted several witnesses testified the rape victim was in the custody of her father the weekend the prosecution alleged the crime took place, making this claim impossible.

¶1148 As I have already shown you, these "witnesses" were Scott, Danielle, and S.L. (Exhibit-03) [¶131-¶143], but we still have a two (2) major problems here. Atty. Green

1) Never clarified to the Jury that there was absolutely no penetration

(Closing Statements: Tp.502-522)

2) Never clarified to the Jury that Scott and S.L. were in Put-In-Bay

(Closing Statements: Tp.502-522), [¶117], [¶152, 2], [¶1176]

¶1149 A direct deprivation of my U.S. 6th Amendment right to counsel...

WHY?!?!?!?!?!

$1.2 million

[*Deadpool* movie moment]

Harrison, you're a bum.

¶1150 To counter, Pros. Eisenhower said,

> "(Wood) has had various relationships with women with young children," *** "He seeks them out and become friends with their children, gives them presents and nicknames" (Exhibit-32)

Reader, you know me fairly well by now, and keeping my mouth shut is out of the question when righteous indignation engages. So, there's a few things to clarify:

1) I pursued Robyn and Danielle pursued me

2) Pros. Eisenhower, in declaring I "seek them out", forgot to mention that Dr. Reed,

the Ohio Attorney General's expert, had proven

"there's no predatory deductive manner"
(Exhibit-34: p.Reed-3, Item 19)

3) Regarding "nicknames" and "presents", she's full of "bullshit" because

i. Danielle and I both purchased birthday presents for S.L.'s tenth birthday, and we bought presents for A.S. as well that very day. In fact, Danielle testified that I bought her a "music box" and a "toy horse" (Tp.100, Ln.19-24); my birthday presents to a ***girl***. Was that a sin? Eisenhower and Danielle sure as hell played it up that way

ii. No other "presents" were mentioned during Trial (Tp.1-560)

iii. The only "nickname" mentioned during Trial as when Danielle admitted that I called S.L. by the shortened version of her first name, as did Danielle and most that knew her (Tp.100, Ln.15-16). I gather that's criminal in nature, eh? Well, it must be in Medina County

¶1151 Pros. Eisenhower's printed lies are now patented libel.

¶1152 Pros. Eisenhower then said that I violated "trust". ***Whoa!*** After all I have shown you, every Medina County Court of Common Pleas official, associate, professional, or expert witness involved in this case violated ***your*** public **TRUST**, and used ***your*** tax dollars to do it! I'm sorry, but what did the Ohio Attorney General's expert say? Ah! Yes...

1) He's not sexually compulsive or addicted, in my professional opinion
(Exhibit-34: p.Reed-1, Item 4)

2) His sexual behavior is under his control. He is not out of control, compulsive
(Exhbit-34: p.Reed-1, Item 5)

3) He is not slick, conning, or manipulative
(Exhibit-34: p.Reed-3, Item 14)

As

An honest man with self-mastery
and no vices can be trusted,
-F. P. Wood

my flesh ***submits*** to my moral fiber, conscience, reason, and intellect.

¶1153 Turning the tables, as to those who were in long-term positions of familiarity, privacy ***trust***, with special knowledge, motive, and easy access to the girls, I ask for you to recall

1) Scott Sadowsky: **PERP #1** [¶177-¶184]

2) Ryan Spencer: **PERP #2** [¶872-¶890]

I'll leave that with you, but know there will be a

POST-TRIAL MEDIA RESURRECTION OF MY REMAINS

¶1154 Yes, Frankenstein's monster is coming home.

Bluka!
[Lightning flashes and horses whinny]
-Young Frankenstein

-Σ-

Chapter 41

¶1155 A WORD ON JUDGE COLLIER

Morning, Ralph.
Morning, Sam.
-Looney Toons™

¶1156 Reader, thus far I have shown you numerous *Laundry Lists* of unethical, immoral, and illegal actions by Court and State. I have also provided sufficient law and operative fact to explain each misdeed, and provided legitimate (Exhibits), when necessary and/or possible, for verification of my veracity. I have also shown you a plethora of *insidious in subsidiums* by Judge Collier, revealing his direct and willful participation in my wrongful conviction/imprisonment.

Now, I will clarify another.

¶1157 Judge Collier knew that I was innocent. He knew via testimony that Scott and Danielle, the ***untruthful*** parent that my son calls "Mom", that Scott was guilty of sexually assaulting S.L. in Put-In-Bay. He also knew that I never abused K.S. He also heard Dr. Reed. When the vicious verdict came back "Guilty" on both counts, he should have acted like a judge and engaged his powers of

> Judicial discretion. The power of a judge to act in one way or another in deciding an issue or action. In many instances, a judge may exercise a choice in a contentious matter (Rothenberg, p.256),

and overruled the invalid, illegally obtained, and therefore disposable verdict. Instead, he acted like the sixth man on the basketball court: a bought-off referee, and sentenced me to life in prison.[234]

¶1158 I used to think Judge Collier was a good man. Why? Because, as I stated earlier, I went to Trial believing in the Judicial System, that *True Justice*[235] would prevail, that judges were honorable, prosecutors noble, and police honest. Much to my chagrin, and to your tax-paying surprise, many are not. Why did I believe? Because I was raised to respect authority and society. What more, various forms of media propaganda painted that picturesque scene in my subconscious. *The American Dream*. Propaganda and neuroplasticity work well together. Just ask any politician, marketing agent, Pros. Eisenhower, or Adolph Hitler.

¶1159 *Hmmm*. I wonder how many times Danielle told S.L.

"Frankie raped you"

---

[234] *In subsidium* #17.

[235] Justice. 1. The attempt by judicial means to be fair and to give each party his due, under the law. Rothenberg, p.259.

¶1160 My beliefs told me, *'Justice would prevail'*, misguided as they were. I used to be so open and accept everything and everyone at face value; for what it is or what they are. Never again. Always dig deeper because scratching the surface avails *nothing*.

¶1161 Judge Collier aided in my bogus belief about justice. You see, every morning before Trial, while the Deputy Sheriffs were unshackling me in the back stairwell, Judge Collier would walk by and say, "Good morning, Mr. Wood," and I would return in kind as if this morning ritual was an every day event in our natural lives. Unfortunately, this Ralph-Sam scenario gave me the false impression of neutrality. This subtle deception was so well received by my misguided beliefs that I told Leisa, "Judge Collier's a smart man. He'll see through their lies and figure it out." This deception so set me at ease that I should have pressed harder to testify, even if it meant physically throwing Atty. Green out of the courtroom by the seat of his pants.

¶1162 True Justice did not prevail. However, their twisted version of an Insolent Injustice did. Moreover, knowing I am not the only Innocent Man (or Woman) in prison, I have this to say,

Justice?
Yeah.
Just us.
-Richard Pryor

¶1163 Regarding Judge Collier's actions thus far, earlier in this powder keg I mentioned the Code of Judicial Conduct, Canon 1, [¶530]. The purpose of the Code is to strictly govern the behavior of a judge, both in and outside of a courtroom, because they occupy an elected position of ***trust***. Having since conducted further research, I came across something on the LEXIS system that sheds a brilliant light on Judge Collier's wrongs and responsibilities. Published by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a ***trusted*** legal resource by Court and State, in verbatim capacity, for you direct review and deep consideration, I proudly present Rule 1.2 and the ***trusted***

accompanying notes.

Ohio Jud. R. 1.2
OHIO RULES OF COURT SERVICE

*** Rules current through rule amendments received through May 23, 2017 ***
Code of Judicial Conduct
Canon 1
Ohio Jud. R. 1.2 (2017)

Review Court Orders which may amend this Rule.

Rule 1.2 Promoting confidence in the judiciary

A judge shall act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the *independence, integrity, and impartiality* of the judiciary, and shall avoid *impropriety* and the appearance of *impropriety*.

NOTES: Comment

[1] Public confidence in the judiciary is eroded by improper conduct and conduct that creates the appearance of impropriety. This principle applies to both the professional and personal conduct of a judge.

[2] A judge should expect to be the subject of public scrutiny that might be viewed as burdensome if applied to other citizens, and must accept the restrictions imposed by the code.

[3] Conduct that compromises or appears to compromise the independence, integrity, and impartiality of a judge undermines public confidence in the judiciary. Because it is not practicable to list all such conduct, the rule is necessarily cast in general terms.

[4] Judges should participate in activities that promote ethical conduct among judges and lawyers, support professionalism within the judiciary and the legal profession, and promote access to justice for all.

[5] Actual improprieties include violations of law, court rules, or provisions of this code. The test for appearance of impropriety is an objective standard that focuses on whether the conduct would create, in reasonable minds, a perception that the judge violated this code, engaged in conduct that is prejudicial to public confidence in the judiciary, or

engaged in other conduct that reflects adversely on the judge's honesty, impartiality, temperament, or fitness to serve as a judge.

[6] A judge should initiate and participate in activities for the purpose of promoting public understanding of and confidence in the administration of justice. In conducting such activities, the judge must act in a manner consistent with this code. See Rules 3.1 and 3.7.

Comparison to Ohio Code of Judicial Conduct
Rule 1.2 substantially combines the first portion of Canon 2 and the provisions of Canon 1 of the Ohio Code.

Comparison to ABA Model Code of Judicial Conduct
Rule 1.2 is identical to Model Rule 1.2.

Comment [5] is modified to be consistent with *In re Complaint Against Harper* (1996), 77 Ohio St.3d 211 and *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Medley* (2001), 93 Ohio St.3d 474.

Comment [6] is modified to broaden the scope of activities that are encouraged.

¶1164 Reader, having set this tile in its proper place, I have just one question for you:

During the administration of justice, as in the event of my Trial, did Judge Collier earn your trust by acting in a manner consistent with this code?

¶1165 America, *you* be the Judge.

¶1166 (Exhibit-48).

-Σ-

• • •

Rocket: I wonder if he will run for re-election after this.

Frank: I doubt it, but if he does, I bet his campaign slogan will be

'Let's make Hell great again!'
-Supernatural

• • •

¶1167 INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL

♪ But don't trust your soul to some backwoods southerly lawyer ♫
-Reba McEntire, *The Lights Went out in Georgia*

¶1168 Reader, a while back I mentioned we would discuss this at the appropriate time [¶]. It is now that time.

¶1169 Pursuant to the U.S. 6th Amendment, I have a Constitutional Right to the effective assistance of counsel during a criminal proceeding. Such proceedings include:

1) The filing of pre-trial motions

2) Pre-trial hearings, e.g., evidentiary hearings

3) Trial

4) Post-trial hearings, e.g., sentencing

5) The filing of post-trial motions, e.g., for acquittal, new trial, etc.

6) During the appellate process, when and where applicable

In light of the above, this right to counsel was clarified in *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 688 (1984), 104 S.Ct. 2052, 80 L.Ed.2d 674 (1984). A landmark decision by the U.S. Supreme Court, I could have used this law to raise numerous claims of "ineffective assistance of counsel" against Atty. Green for the plethora of reasons presented thus far. And, for your apprisal,

> To prevail on such a claim, a petitioner must show both that counsel's performance was "deficient," i.e., "fell below and objective standard of reasonableness;" and that the deficiency resulted in "prejudice," i.e., "that there is a reasonable probability that, but for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different." [Strickland]. Id. at 687-88. (Citing Bryan Christopher Sturm, Petitioner-Appellant, v. Superintendent of Indian River Juvenile Correctional Facility, Respondent-Appellee, 2013 U.S. App. LEXIS 3303, HN7).

¶1170 Regarding Atty. Green's "unprofessional errors", below is a fairly comprehensive list of what I have presented to you so far:

1) The "million cash" that became a bounty on my head and caused him to become elusive until
2) He worked with Pros. Eisenhower and Det. Kollar and forced me into waiving my speedy trial rights, under duress, three (3) days **after** Trial was due to commence so they could
3) Fraudulently revoke my $200,000.00 cash bond
4) He failed to file a single subpoena despite my handwritten list
5) He's primarily a civil attorney who
    i. Never tried a child abuse case
    ii. Specializing in medical malpractice suits, was not qualified to handle this criminal case
6) He failed to motion to sever the two (2) unrelated charges
7) He failed to raise a lack of subject matter jurisdiction and motion for change of venue once "Put-In-Bay" was revealed. His comment to the press confirms he knew (Exhibit-32), [¶152, 2]
8) He failed to clarify Put-In-Bay to the Jury
9) He failed to clarify that no rape occurred
10) He failed to clarify to the Jury that K.S. could not recall being at an alleged crime scene with me
11) He refused to work with my trusted and credible Co-counsel Atty. Stanley
12) He failed to let me testify in a strict contest of credibility, which would have

forced the Court to submit my Pre-Trial Histories to the Jury as evidence

13) He failed to explain to the Jury, via State's evidence, that Scott was with S.L. on

i. October 1st -3rd: the "first time" it happened

ii. October 20th: the "last time" it happened

iii. The other 22 days of October

iv. With "no evidence to the contrary. None"

v. Scott's "underwear" vs. my "Jeans"

vi. "approximately fifty times"

vii. Pros Eisenhower's "towel" question

viii. *Laundry Lists*

14) He failed to motion to dismiss the Court-elected Juror who was "molested" in her youth

15) He failed to motion to dismiss the Court-declared "cynical" Jury

16) He failed to motion to have the Court-declared "untruthful" Danielle removed from the Trial

17) He failed to challenge the State's utilization of Court-declared perjured testimony of Danielle

18) He failed to challenge the State to produce the pictures of pictures

19) He failed to challenge Pros. Eisenhower's witness tampering of K.S. via the "pact"

20) During motion for acquittal, he failed to remind Judge Collier of his own admission regarding the alleged F-3 GSI: "What I'm hearing her say is, "No, it didn't happen"

21) He failed to clarify the motives of sex, money, and family to the Jury

22) He failed to bring in a medical expert to help explain to the Jury why Akron Children's Hospital's medical report revealed a ***Temple Virgin***

23) He failed to motion to have all four (4) videos played during Trial

24) He failed to challenge

i. Repeated bolstering

ii. Repeated vouching

iii. Repeated *insidious in subsidiums*

25) He repeatedly failed to object to protect my Constitutional Rights that I never affirmatively waived. With that said,

> Let it be known that the wrongful and perpetual incarceration of an Innocent Man, clearly reveals that he was repeatedly denied every Human and Constitutional Right known – be they expressed or implied – and only serves to validate any pending claims before a Reviewing Court, thereby warranting the Court's exercise of its powers of *sua sponte*,[236] and reversal of conviction.
>
> -Mr. Frank P. Wood, *The Innocent Man*

26) *Etcetera, etcetera, etcetera*

¶1171 Regarding the above *Laundry List* of Atty. Green's "unprofessional errors" (Strickland, supra), when aligned with State's exonerating evidence, I remain under the impression through the process of logical deduction that, had Atty. Green zealously advocated for me before the **Tainted and Tampered-With Jury**, the result of the proceeding would have been distinctly and exceedingly different. Yes?

¶1172 Legitimizing, consider the Montville report and letter from Children's Services that exonerate me. True, Atty. Green did attempt to have Montville's and Children's Service's report admitted, just like Dr. Reed's testimony, but we saw how Judge Collier handled those matters *in*

[236] *Sua sponte*. Latin: "of one's own accord; voluntarily." Garner, p.1650.

subsidium. And, regarding each *insidious* event, the Trial Record is ***void*** of any vocalized objection by Atty. Green regarding Judge Collier's actions. With that in mind, consider LeSure's contract that was secretively withheld from Defense and Jury, and her report that was also withheld by Collier, and then given to Stenographer Garrity for the purposes of destruction.

'Anything for a win'

¶1173 Atty. Green was a strange-acting cat; both before and during Trial. One round he was fighting like a champ, the next he was throwing the fight. Refusing to share any legitimate trial strategy with Atty. Stanley or myself, I never knew where I stood with this guy.

¶1174 In support, back in 2007 I wrote Atty. Green seeking guidance and direction with appealing an unjust appellate court's decision. On June 27, 2007 he wrote me back (Exhibit-56) and stated the following:

> I had a great belief that you would succeed in the appeal as I felt there were considerable prejudicial errors made during the course of the pre-trial motions and during the trial.

For clarity, I **never** received copies of **any** pre-trial motions filed by State or Defense Counsel. And, if you will recall, I was not at a few of the hearings regarding such motions. Further, carefully, Atty. Green never clarifies what the "prejudicial errors" were. As this would have aided me in the appellate process, he continued with:

> It is my opinion that the evidence failed in several aspects relating to the age of the victim and, also, the conduct, in particular, of any rape.

Reader, recall that Atty. Green:

1) Never challenged the "special findings"

2) Failed to explain "Put-In-Bay" to the Jury

3) Failed to provide a medical expert to explain Akron Children's findings of a

Green then continued with:

> Still, I felt the evidence was insufficient as to
> the second gross sexual imposition charge.

Hmmm. The charge he failed to clarify to the Jury that K.S. testified TWICE that she could not recall being at an alleged crime scene with me.

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

¶1175 Guess what time it is?

• • •

Groot: I am Groot!

Frank: That's right, Groot. Time for a little Q&A.

• • •

¶1176 **Q**: What exonerating fact did Atty. Green fail to state in his letter?

A: The fact that he knew S.L. was sexually assaulted in Put-In-Bay by Scott (Exhibit-32), [¶1147-¶1148, 2].

¶1177 Why is this so important? Easy. At the time of receiving this letter, I

1) Had not yet received a copy of my Fornicated Trial Record

2) Had not yet received a copy of my the newspaper article where he confirmed this knowledge to the press (Exhibit-32)

3) They thought I would never figure it out ☺

¶1178 As to Atty. Green's unprofessional errors, they affected not only the outcome of my Trial, but the outcome of my appeals. The end result is nothing less than *compound prejudice*.

-Σ-

¶1179 POST-TRIAL FACTS

> I have discovered something – the effects are stupendous, just like pricking someone with a pin and waiting to see how high they jump. This is what I do: begin on politics. One question, one word, one sentence, and at once they're off! (Frank, p.202).

¶1180 Good morning, Reader. Today is Monday, January 15, 2018, and it is 8:42 a.m. The task for the day, one of several, is to complete the final edit of this chapter and ensure its readiness for type. Although pencils are getting shorter, paper is abundant and perseverance unerring.

¶1181 The main topic if this chapter is not 'Trump' and fake news, but transcripts and facts. Something I have been most eager to share with you, for we are about to prick the consciences of many. So... as

"A quiet conscience makes one strong!"
(Frank, p.271)

it's time to see who has the strength to do the right thing.

¶1182 Let us begin...

¶1183 On 5/18/2006 Judge Collier declared me "indigent" during Sentencing, for I was *robbed* of life and means of self-support, and appointed Attorney Joseph F. Salzgeber (#0063619)[237] ("Atty. Salzgeber") as my Public Defender –

• • •

Rocket: Pretender.

• • •

for the purposes of filing my Direct Appeal (Exhibit-26: p.2 of 6).

---

[237] Ohio Supreme Court Registration Number.

¶1184 On 7/5/2006, nearly two (2) months later, Stenographer Garrity filed a "Request" for a 30-day extension to complete the first round of the necessary butchering of my State-court Record. Judge Collier granted her request that same day (Exhibit-26: p.2 of 6).

¶1185 Reader, before pressing on, please recall that both Atty. Stanley and I contacted Ms. Garrity between late-2013 and early-2014 in order to obtain missing portions of the Trial Record (Exhibits-22 and 23), [¶217]. Thank you.

¶1186 Shortly thereafter, the *Universe*, via *Karma*, *Destiny*, and *Fate* must have spoken because I was put in contact with retired Federal Agent Paul Hartman. Evidently, his son is also innocent and has, in like fashion, suffered unjustly at the hands of Judge Collier, Stenographer Garrity, and the Medina County Prosecutor's Office.

¶1187 On September 16, 2014 I sent Mr. Hartman my first Affidavit Of Frank P. Wood (no Exhibit), which revealed my primary discoveries regarding my Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record. Each discovery has been presented in this Affidavit, and then some.

¶1188 My Affidavit was used as evidence against the State as "Exhibit Twenty-Two" in State v. Hartman, Motion To Dismiss, With Prejudice, On Grounds Of Prosecutorial And Judicial Bad Faith And Misconduct; filed on November 10, 2014; Medina County Case No. 09CR0229 [¶387]. Σ

¶1189 The Hartman case is still active.

¶1190 Reader, I'm not the only one.

¶1191 Due to my active participation in Hartman as a material and adverse witness, and secondary injured party, on February 26, 2015 I filed a *pro se* Motion For Disqualification Of Prosecutor's Office And For Retraction Of State's Brief (Exhibit-57) into the Medina County Court of Common Pleas. The State filed a hateful and spurious response on March 24, 2015 (no

Exhibit). On April 3, 2015, I answered the State's whining and malicious attack with Frank P. Wood's Response To State's Brief In Opposition (Exhibit-58).

¶1192 The premise of my argument is this: the entire Medina County Prosecutor's Office had been disqualified from the Hartman case with good reason. Then, the Supreme Court of Ohio assigned a Special Prosecutor from the Cuyahoga County Prosecutor's Office to the Hartman case. As a witness against the State, with proof they committed a Federal Crime pursuant to Title 18 U.S.C.S. § 1512, the State would be unable to remain impartial regarding any of my post-trial motions. What more, their sole position would be to discredit me. So how could I depend on them to remain impartial under such extraordinary and extenuating circumstances?

You cannot depend on that which you are in conflict with.
(Covey, p.___)

This is especially true because, should I win in the Trial Court, I would gain credibility for the Hartman case.

And *that* they could not allow.

¶1193 Reader, after all I have shown you, would you trust them to remain impartial?

Hmmm?
-Shrek

¶1194 Going forward, the **day after** I filed the Motion To Dismiss, both Medina County Common Pleas Judges: Christopher J. Collier and Joyce V. Kimbler,[238] via recusal,[239] disqualified themselves from my case and requested the appointing of a Visiting Judge from the Supreme Court of Ohio (Exhibit-59). Yes, I do declare that they were slightly unnerved.

---

[238] Joyce Kimbler replaced her retired husband James Kimbler [¶302] on the Bench. Having taken the Bench years after my Trial, I have no idea why she recused.

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

¶1195 **Q**: After presenting fact, truth, and logic, and two (2) county judges recused, why did the Prosecutor's Office stay locked on to my case like a dog on a bone?

A: They didn't want another county's prosecutor's office to know what they did, *again.*

¶1196 Most friends will stick their necks out the first time. After that... Woe unto ye!

¶1197 On April 17, 2015 Chief Justice Maureen O'Conner of the Supreme Court of Ohio assigned Judge Patricia Ann Cosgrove ("Judge Cosgrove"), retired of Summit County, to preside over my case (Exhibit-60).

¶1198 Eventually, via correspondence with the Supreme Court of Ohio, I learned that Judge Cosgrove had *also* been assigned to the Hartman case (Exhibit-61).

¶1199 **Let it be known** that Judge Patricia Ann Cosgrove denied the Hartman Defense Team any and all requested relief.

¶1200 Also pending in the Medina County Court of Common Pleas at that time, and awaiting Judge Cosgrove's review, were my

1a. Application For Order Granting Leave To File Delayed Motion For New Trial Based On Newly Discovered Evidence Pursuant To Crim.R.33(B): February 20, 2015;

the accompanying

1b. Delayed Motion For New Trial Based On Newly Discovered Evidence Pursuant To Crim.R.33(B): February 20, 2015;

and my *pro se*

2. Request For Brady Hearing And Dismissal Of Indictment: March 30, 2015

¶1201 **Let it be known** that, on October 7, 2015, Judge Cosgrove ruled on my three (3) pending motions and denied me any and all requested relief. Undoubtedly, I was shocked and insulted by Judge Cosgrove's offensive rulings. Then, as I studied her ruling on my Motion For Disqualification (Exhibit-62), something struck a cell assembly, so I began to break it down line-by-line and compare it to fact. Follow me on this one, please.

¶1202 At p.2, ¶2 (ibid), Judge Cosgrove admits that

> Wood cites by way of example, the fact the transcript of the [Jury] voir dire of his 2006 trial was never transcribed.

Or so I thought.

♪ [Mysterious music playing] ♫

¶1203 As this is solid ground for new trial went ignored by Judge Cosgrove, Judge Collier told my Jury that

> "A criminal case begins with the filing of an indictment",
> (Exhibit-51: Tp.529, Ln.17-18),

validating my claims of legal entitlement to a complete, unabridged, and unaltered set of Transcripts, beginning with my first arraignment with Judge Kimbler, including Every Missing Pre-Trial Hearing, the elusive Jury *voir dire*, the Trial itself, and ending with my Sentencing Hearing [¶220-¶221],[¶1233-¶1239], [¶1380].

¶1204 Reader, earlier I told you that Stenographer Garrity was present at my Sentencing Hearing [¶1132]. So, after Judge Cosgrove's cavalier and *laissez-fair*[240] approach, that cell assembly started to roll, and I began to recall something from long past. This prompted me to search through old filings. And, like I once told Danielle,

> *"Don't you ever test my memory"*

---

[240] *Laissez-faire*. [French "Let (people) do (as they choose")] (1825). Garner, p.1007.

below is what I found.

¶1205 On September 22, 2006 Atty. Salzgeber filed my Brief Of Appellant into the Ninth District Court of Appeals. He did so **after** my Trashed Transcripts received their ***first*** thrashing. Atty. Salzgeber would have legally received the Transcripts from Ms. Garrity via order of Judge Collier's Court [¶218].

¶1206 Directly from the Brief filed by Atty. Salzgeber, I have included the cover page, and pages 3, 5, 29, and 30 as (Exhibit-63) to support my contentions.

¶1207 On p.3 of the Brief (ibid), Atty. Salzgeber states in a footnote that there are "multiple" Transcript Volumes. Multiple? I only have Volumes I, II, and III [¶1261].

¶1208 On p.5, Atty. Salzgeber then cites the Sentencing Hearing Transcripts **four (4) times.** This brings us to the crux of the matter.

¶1209 In my original Affidavit to the Hartman Defense Team, at ¶15, I professed a firm belief that my Sentencing Hearing Transcripts were never transcribed. For confirmation, turn back to (Exhibit-27) and you will recall that Judge Collier's dialogue with the polled Juror is cut short on Tp.559, and the Record ends on Tp.560 with Stenographer Garrity's CERTIFICATE. Would you not have concluded the same?

¶1210 Contradicting my initial discovery, the contents of the Brief Of Appellant (Exhibit-63) constitute uncontradictable proof that, at one point in time, my Trial Record was whole, but forever remains materially altered and incomplete.

. . .

BOOM!

. . .

I suppose it's too late to put that mushroom
cloud back in that nice, shiny uranium sphere.
-Isaac Asimov

¶1211 **Let it be known** that Attorney Joseph F. Salzgeber (#0063619) is a former Assistant Medina County Prosecutor; my County of Wrongful Conviction.

¶1212 Looking closely at the Chain of Custody and Command regarding my Raped, Pillaged, and Plundered Trial Record,

1) Judge Christopher J. Collier presided over all proceedings from my **second** Arraignment to Sentencing
2) Court Reporter Donna A. Garrity was under the direction and guidance of Judge Collier at every hearing
3) Pursuant to O.R.C. § 2301.20 and O.R.C. § 2301.23, Stenographer Garrity's notes and transcripts from my Trial were "the property" of Judge Collier's Court [¶218]
4) Nearly four (4) months Post-Verdict, with the granted extension of time, Ms. Garrity delivered the first altered version of my Trial Record to Judge Collier, and the Medina County Clerk of Courts: Kathy Fortney, and Atty. Salzgeber
5) Former Clerk of Court Kathy Fortney then forwarded the Record to the Ninth District Court of Appeals
6) Atty. Salzgeber used this version of the Record to file my Brief Of Appellant and cites the missing Sentencing Hearing four (4) times
7) The Record was **then** altered for a second time to delete, at least, the Sentencing Hearing
8) With repeated attempts, it took Leisa nearly a month to obtain the Trial Record from Atty. Salzgeber **after** the Ninth District unjustly denied my Direct Appeal

9) Leisa made a copy of the Record, forwarded the original to me via Atty. Stanley, and sent the copy to Attorney Kenneth R. Spiert (#0038804) of the Office of the Ohio Public Defenders in Columbus, Ohio. Despite repeated attempts, Atty. Spiert refused to return the Record to us **after** he bailed on his promise to represent me with a Writ of Habeas Corpus[241] into the Federal Courts. He bailed **after** I presented proof of innocence and a lack of subject matter jurisdiction [¶131-¶160], and "No, it didn't happen" (Exhibit-03). I still have a letter from him stating there is no lack of subject matter jurisdiction (Letter available upon request) ☺

10) **After** the Record was altered for the second time with the Sentencing Hearing deletion, it was forwarded to the Ohio Attorney General by the Medina County Prosecutor's Office as "evidence" because I filed a *pro se* Writ of Habeas Corpus

11) The Attorney General then forwarded the *minimized* version of the Record that I am using as (Exhibits)

¶1213 The Brief Of Appellant (Exhibit-63), Affidavit Of Attorney Ronald R. Stanley (Exhibit-31), the Trial Record itself via my presentations, Footnotes, and (Exhibits) all provide absolute proof that my Trial Record remains altered and incomplete. Having built a record for that, a compound question remains:

Query: Who did it, knew about it, and gave the orders?

¶1214 Having pinpricked the conscience of many, it's time to see who throws whom under the bus.

---

[241] Habeas Corpus. [Law Latin "that you have the body"] (18c) A writ employed to bring a person before a court, most frequently to ensure that the person's imprisonment or detention is not illegal (habeas corpus ad subjiciendum) • ***. Also termed ***; Great Writ. Garner, p.825.

• • •

Rocket: No skid marks here.

Frank: Sardonic and witty.

Rocket: Comes naturally.

Frank: And the "Pretender" part was perfect.

Rocket: Aiming to please.

Frank: And, Groot... perfect timing with the big gauge, my good man.

Groot: I am Groot!

[BOOM!]

[Collective laughter]

• • •

¶1215 Preserving the Sentencing Hearing Saga, on November 3, 2015 I assembled an affidavit confirming this alteration/deletion and forwarded it to the Hartman Defense Team. I trust them to use it wisely and effectively.

¶1216 Knowing that, by operation of law, the Trial Record was the direct property of Judge Collier's Court, he would have had to give the direct order to Stenographer Garrity to conduct the alterations and deletions, thereby acting *in subsidium*[242] one more time. With such a plethora of *insidious* actions favoring the State, the Ohio Code of Judicial Conduct demands that

> "judges should also refrain from using words or conduct that might manifest bias or prejudice. See Jud. Cond. R. 1.2 and 1.3." Citing Esber Bev. Co. v. Labatt USA Operating Co., LLC, 2016 Ohio LEXIS 1466, HN4.

¶1217 Reader, I fought The Appellate Wars, including other Post-Trial motions, for over a decade with a Materially Altered and Incomplete Trial Record. Therefore, not only did Judge

[242] *In subsidium* #18.

Collier's *insidious in subsidiums* prejudice me of my Constitutional Rights to a fair Trial and a reliable verdict, his actions further prejudiced me of my Constitutional Rights to Due Process, Equal Protection, and Basic Fairness on appeal, *inter alia*. Such **Judicial Bias** was clearly defined in State v. Jackson, 2016 Ohio LEXIS 2103, HN1 as

> "... a hostile feeling or spirit of ill will or undue friendship toward one of the litigants or his attorney with the formation of a fixed anticipatory judgment on the part of the judge, as contradistinguished from an open state of mind which will be governed by the law and facts."

¶1218 Judge Collier's favoritism towards the State is clear and obvious, and there are 18 *insidious in subsidiums*, so far, to confirm this fact. His fixed anticipatory judgments ensured that I would lose during Trial, on Appeal, and with post-trial motions. His decisions revealed the perfected presence of partiality, and a **Judicial Bias** that was not governed by law and fact.

¶1219 Solidifying the above, (Exhibit-03) alone exonerates me, and Dr. Reed (Exhibits-34 and 46) verifies this fact.

-Σ-

• • •

Rocket: I am not a GMO! That's an earth term.

Groot: I am Groot!

Rocket: I AM NOT A GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISM!

Groot: I am Groot!

Rocket: I am genetically perfected!

Frank: [Whispering] Reader, I think I'll stay out of this one.

• • •

¶1220 COURT REPORTER DONNA A. GARRITY

Excuses are for the weak.
Reasons are for the strong.
-Frank P. Wood, *Still standing strong*

¶1221 At the time of my Trial, Ms. Garrity had already been working under Judge Collier's direction and guidance for many years. Skilled and experienced, she knew exactly what she was doing when it came to altering my Trial Transcripts. Think about it for a moment... She was told to alter my Transcripts **after** the Ninth District Court of Appeals shot down Atty. Salzgeber's brief,[243] and to remove, at least, the Sentencing Hearing portion of the Record.

Q: Why?

A: *Cui bono*?

¶1222 Having confirmed Ms. Garrity's collusive culpability, she is not immune from civil suit pursuant to Title 42 U.S.C. § 1983. To verify this axiom of law, I will rely upon the United States District Court For The Southern District Of Ohio, Western Division and its sagacious decision in Robert E. Odom, Plaintiff, v. Linda M. Wilson, Defendant, 1981 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13168; Decided June 26, 1981.

¶1223 Historically, Prisoner-Plaintiff Odom filed a 42 U.S.C.S. § 1983 action against Stenographer-Defendant Wilson, alleging she deliberately altered portions of the transcripts for his criminal trial (Sound familiar?). The Federal Magistrate filed a Report & Recommendation ("R&R") instructing Odom to raise this claim in a *habeas corpus* action. In turn, Odom then filed to have the Southern District Court review the R&R, claiming his §1983 filing was the

[243] Brief. A condensed, abbreviated written statement of a larger document [as in my Trial Record]. A brief is prepared by an attorney to serve as the basis for argument in a lawsuit. It included points of law that the lawyer intends to establish. Rothenberg, p.68-69.

appropriate legal remedy.

¶1224a In vindicating Odom's claim, the District Court utilized McLellan v. Henderson, 492 F.2d 1298 (8th Cir. 1974) to justify its decision. **In pertinent part, as it relates to the instant matter, the District Court declared that**

> HN1 Court reporters do not enjoy absolute immunity from suit under §1983. ***.
>
> HN2 Court functionaries such as clerks are not clothed in judicial immunity because their duties are ministerial, not discretionary, in nature. Judicial immunity is only granted to non-judicial officials, who, like judges, must not be unduly inhibited to exercise discretionary authority by the constant fear of personal liability for damages.

[Until you prove they abused their discretion via bolstering, vouching, insidious *in subsidiums*, violated rule and law, tampered with a jury, gave orders to destroy evidence and alter records, permit witness tampering with pacts, and permit perjured testimony to run rampant in the courtroom]

> Applied to non-judicial officials, judicial immunity is termed quasi-judicial immunity and examples are prosecuting attorneys

[Until you prove they deliberately and repeatedly bolstered and vouched, tampered with witnesses **before** and **during** trial, repeatedly lied to a jury to put an innocent man in prison, and assisted in the altering of State-court Records]

> and parole board members.

[A board member would have to violate State and/or Federal Law to be subject to suit]

> Reporters are like clerks, in that their duties are ministerial in nature and thus are not protected by quasi-judicial immunity.

[Either]

> The Court did, however, also conclude that HN3 court reporters and clerks might have an absolute defense to a §1983 action under qualified immunity.

Id at 199-1300 ***.

HN4 Whether the court reporters are entitled to raise a defense of qualified immunity depends upon whether they "can show that (they were) acting pursuant to (their) lawful authority and following in good faith the instructions or rules of the Court and (were) not in derogation of those instructions or rules." (Citing Slain v. Curry, 574 F.2d 1256 (5th Cir. 1978), id at 1265, quoting McLellan v. Henderson, supra).

¶1224b Now, placing a swift kick where it belongs, in a more recent decision, the U.S. Supreme Court declared that

> ...reporters have no immunity as part of the judicial process. Antoine v. Byers & Henderson, Inc. (U.S. Wash. 1993) 113 S. Ct. 2167, 124 L. Ed. 2d 391, on remand 2 F3d 335, as amended.

¶1225 A real bummer for Ms. Garrity, her actions were deliberate, for she had no "lawful authority" to alter my Trial Record **after** my first appeal was denied. Therefore, it would have been impossible for her to have acted in

> Good faith.[244] Honest intentions; fairness; equity. (One deals in good faith when one attempts, without guile or deception, to settle a controversy [as in my Trial]), (Rothenberg, p.207),

because Judge Collier's "instructions or rules" to have the Record altered were not given in "good faith". In all actuality, the actions of Judge Collier, Pros. Eisenhower, Det. Kollar, Dr. LeSure, Atty. Salzgeber, and Stenographer Garrity all resulted in

> Bad faith.[245] Conduct in which there is a design of ill-will or an ulterior motive to commit deceit or fraud (Rothenberg, p.53),

which **forfeited** their claims to immunity, and left them subject to a

> Bad faith cause of action. A lawsuit based upon the assumption that the opposing party's conduct showed reckless disregard of the suitor's rights and was unreasonable (Rothenberg, p.53).

---

[244] The Latin, *bona fides*, is often used in law.

[245] The Latin, *mala fides*, is often used in law.

¶1226 For greater transparency, these people can only provide excuses, and not reasons, to justify their bad faith actions.

¶1227 I always believed that it is easier to do the wrong thing because, to do so, requires no discipline, no strength, and no *true courage*: no fear of failure. Therefore, to undo the wrong requires more courage and strength than it would have taken to do act ethically and morally right the first time. Σ

¶1228 Still testing mettle.

• • •

Rocket: Uh, Frank?

Frank: Yeah.

Rocket: Bus is coming.

Frank: Better stand back. This is going to get *real* messy.

• • •

¶1229 Getting back to Ms. Garrity, pursuant to O.R.C. Chapter 147, Notaries Public and Commissioners, § 147.07 Powers; Jurisdiction,

> A notary public may, throughout the state, administer oaths required or authorized by law, take and certify depositions, take and certify acknowledgement of deeds, mortgages, liens, powers of attorney, and other instruments of writing, and receive, make, and record notarial protests...

With that said, as Ms. Garrity's responsibilities are further elaborated on in §§ 147.01 through .58, nothing in law gives her the right to alter State-court Records.

¶1230 Reader, once again, it is time to take the obsessive-compulsive-disorder[246] approach, and, like an unwanted enema, legally explore *deeply* the assiduous orders of Judge Collier and

[246] Thanks, Gunner! Inside joke, Reader.

actions of Ms. Garrity, in the most anal-retentive manner possible. ☺

¶1231 As an historical reminder, on 5/15/2006, Judge Collier declared me "indigent" and appointed Public Defender Joseph F. Salzgeber for the purposes of filing my Direct Appeal (Exhbit-26: p.2 of 6). Judge Collier then informed me that I was entitled to a copy of the Transcripts and that I would receive the "copy free of charge" (Missing Sentencing Hearing: Tp.___, Ln.___). This is in agreement with Ohio Crim.R.32 (A)(B)(1)(3)(a)(b) and (c), which states, in pertinent part,

> (c) That if the defendant is unable to pay the costs of documents necessary to an appeal, the document will provided without cost.

These documents are clearly defined in O.R.C. § 2953.08, which states, in pertinent part,

> O.R.C. § 2953.08 Appeals based on felony sentencing guidelines
>
> (F) On appeal of a sentence under this section, the record to be reviewed shall include all of the following, as applicable:
>
> (2) The trial record in the case in which the sentence was imposed.

¶1232 Supporting Crim.R.22 Record of proceedings states, in pertinent part,

> In serious cases **all** proceedings shall be recorded **[emphasis added]**.

The **"all"** that I am legally entitled to begins with my first Arraignment and carries right on through to Sentencing [¶1203], [¶1237].

¶1233 Reader, be it Counsel's Direct Appeal, or any of my *pro se* Post-Trial actions, in Drexelle Green, Petitioner vs. Anthony Brigano, Respondent, 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16664 (supra) [¶220], the U.S. District Court For The Southern District Of Ohio, Western Division, resolved that

> HN2 Prisoners have a constitutional right of access to the courts. See Bounds. v. Smith, 430 U.S. 817, 821, 52 L. Ed. 2d 72, 97 S. Ct. 1491 (1976). The Due

> Process Clause requires that prisoners have "meaningful access." Id at 823 (citations omitted). The only way to assure an adequate and effective appeal is to provide a transcript of proceedings to indigent defendants. Griffin, 351 U.S. 12, 100 L. Ed. 891, 76 S. Ct. 585.
>
> The United [**6] States Supreme Court has consistently held that HN3 denial of a transcript to indigent defendants violates both the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses. Id. Without a transcript the defendant is denied meaningful access to the appellate system. See Hardy v. United States, 375 U.S. 227, 288, 11 L. Ed. 2d 331, 84 S. Ct. 424 (1964) (stating that transcript is "the most basic and fundamental tool" of effective appellate advocacy). ***. Griffin, 351 U.S. at 19 ("Destitute defendants must be afforded as adequate appellate review as defendants who have enough money to buy transcripts."); Lane v. Brown, 372 U.S. 477, 9 L. Ed. 2d 892, 83 S. Ct. 768 (1963) (extending indigent defendant's right to transcripts to state postconviction proceedings). ***.

¶1234 The District Court concluded with

> HN6 ***, the United States Supreme Court has held that a criminal defendant has a right to a transcript even in situations where he does not have a right to an attorney. 3 Gardner, 393 U.S. 367, 21 L. Ed. 2d 601, 89 S. Ct. 580 (granting petitioner access to transcript...) ***.

¶1235 The State of Ohio actually appealed this decision into the United States Court Of Appeals For The Sixth Circuit. In Drexelle Green, Petitioner-Appellee v. Anthony J. Brigano, Warden, Respondent-Appellant, 123 F.3d 917; 1997 U.S. App. LEXIS 22366; 1997 FED App. 0253 P (6th Cir.), the Circuit Court upheld the District Court's ruling. Supporting the lower court's decision, the Sixth Circuit, in determining the value of a transcript in connection to a defendant's appeal (see HN3), declared the following:

> HN4 Pursuant to the Ohio Appellate Rules, an appellant is required to cite specific pages of the record in support of each assignment of error he presents for review. See, e.g., Ohio App.R.16 (A)(7); Ohio App.R.16(D). ***,

and continued with

> (***). Considering that the Ohio Appellate Rules require citation to the record in support of each assignment of error, access to that record is a necessity. See Britt,

404 U.S. at 228. ("Our cases have consistently recognized the value to a defendant of a transcript of prior proceedings, without requiring a showing of need tailored to fit the facts of the particular case.")

¶1236 In consideration of a *pro se* indigent defendant's Constitutional Rights, the Sixth Circuit concluded with

> HN5 [A]n indigent defendant possesses a Sixth Amendment right to proceed pro se, see Faretta v. California, 422 U.S. 806, 834-36, L. Ed. 2d 562, 95 S. Ct. 2525 (1975), and if the state provides appellate review of convictions, a Fourteenth Amendment right to the basic tools of appellate review. See Griffin, 351 U.S. at 19.

¶1237 As previously noted, those "basic tools" include, specifically, the **Complete Trial Record** [¶1232]; Green v. Brigano, 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16664, HN3.

¶1238 Reader, by now you see that

1) I was legally entitled to a Complete Trial Record

2) My Constitutional Rights were violated, repeatedly

3) No one involved can claim any type of immunity, *whatsoever*

4) They are subject to a §1983 action, appropriately

5) What they did was unethical, illegal, and immoral – undoubtedly

¶1239 Closing this chapter with a reminder, I invite you to recall, just one more time, that Atty. Stanley and I contacted Ms. Garrity to obtain missing portions of the Trial Record. In response, Ms. Garrity ***first*** claimed she did not have the means to reproduce the Record ***Then*** she claimed she did not have the proper medium to transcribe the record. ***Then*** she stated that she was under Court Order to destroy her notes [¶217]. With that said, under such terms and conditions, my case must be

Reversed and remanded.
(U.S. v. Garcia-Bonifascio).

(See [¶220-¶221] and [¶1203] of this Affidavit)

-Σ-

• • •

Rocket: Now *that* hurt 'em.

Frank: Like a one-pound chicken laying a two-pound egg.

[BOOM!]

[Collective laughter]

• • •

Chapter 44

¶1240 THE AHA! MOMENT

With compliments to Eliyhu Goldratt[247]
and
Gratitude to Attorney Ronald R. Stanley[248]

¶1241 Reader, at least once or twice in this document, and on my web site, I encourage and invite your ideas, questions, and insights. This is because I may not be clear, move through a concept of law and fact too quickly, or miss a finer point entirely. Easy to do with such a massive, complicated, and inter-connected project. True, for I am doing what is nearly impossible in an environment that is at the opposite end of the spectrum of being conducive to my goals.

¶1241 We've all heard the expression

You can't see the forest for the trees.
-Unknown

Basically, you're so busy looking at the trees (the surface) that you miss the inner beauty (the

[247] Author of *The Goal*
[248] For the book (*The Goal*), and for making me a better *pro se* litigant.

absolute truth) that the forest (the situation) has to offer. This happens when you have

Too many mind.
-The Last Samurai

Please, allow for me to explain.

¶1243 I have a goal, and that goal is to prove my innocence to you, *inter alia*. Everything else presented, every fine detail, has been employed to assist me in that process. But, at times, those details (the trees), they become distracting and, in turn, create *too many mind* : mind on this, mind on that, mind on them, and so forth. Consider my *Laundry Lists*. They became my focus and created choke points in the assembly line of my thought process, thereby self-defeating my own goal! So I chose to take a step back and look at the big picture with

What's truly important?
(Covey, p.___), [¶471, 2, iii]

¶1244 Folks, one of my greatest attributes is flexible and innovative thought processes, obviously. And that process told me something was missing, a tree, a finer detail, from my vision, and that missing piece was keeping me from my goal. But I couldn't figure it out. All these years something was eluding me, like a star behind a cloud in the night sky. Every now and then, the cloud would move and reveal the star, but only for a brief moment, and then another would glide silently in and take its place. Frustrating knowing it was right there and that I just couldn't put my finger on it. So, the other day, I began to contemplate the trees and their placement, and how I could better place these facts, the details, in such a way that the process would flow and the truth be clear. Then it hit me...

Aha!

and the Aha! Moment made itself known. Remarkably, it was a detail within a detail, like a leaf on a branch, which finally struck home [¶471, 1]. And this is how it happened...

• • •

Frank: Rocket. Why is Groot dressed like Doyle's *Sherlock Holmes*?

Rocket: The Aha! Moment excited him so much that he tore off the pirate's patch, looked at me and said, "Watson, the game is afoot!" and took off. Next thing you know he's back dressed like Sherlock, pipe and all, walking around and looking at everything through a magnifying glass mumbling, "Interesting. *Hmmm*. Very interesting."

Frank: Better keep an eye on him. Not sure where this is going. I need to get back to business.

Rocket: Gotchya'.

• • •

¶1245 Pertaining directly to the alleged F-1 rape of the ***Temple Virgin*** S.L.:

1) The case was signed in with Dr. LeSure in September of 2004

   i. **Before** there was an alleged incident

   ii. While the ***seductive siren*** Danielle was sleeping in my bed and she never told me. *Whoa!*

2) Dr. LeSure's diagnosis went mysteriously from "adjustment disorder" to "sexual abuse" **after** she was awarded the contract with Job & Family Services on November 22, 2004. Therefore, the shift in diagnosis occurred

   i. **After** the indicted dates October 1st-3rd of 2004

   ii. **After** the "towel" incident during the second weekend of October 2004

   iii. **After** October 20th of 2004, when S.L. moved back in with Scott until Trial in May-June of 2005

   iv. **After** months of badgering by Danielle with

   "Frankie raped you"

3) Dr. LeSure testified, quoting S.L., that she was abused, "Sometime after my birthday and before Halloween" confirming

   i. S.L. did **not** tell Dr. LeSure everything due to *Stockholm Syndrome*

   ii. In addition, if she did, then we know precisely *why* Judge Collier gave LeSure's report to Stenographer Garrity for the purposes of concealment and destruction

4) Danielle testified I kept an "open door" policy and that there were no problems with our relationship until October 20th of 2004

5) On this day, for the *first time*, without Scott but under his orders, Danielle went to the Montville P.D. alleging I did something to S.L. early that morning

6) Montville refused to file charges

7) **After** months of badgering, on January 11, 2005, S.L. finally caved and told Danielle the story Scott wanted her to hear

8) On this day, Danielle went to Montville for the *second time*, alone and under Scott's orders, **after** she convinced S.L. that

"Frankie raped you"

9) Regarding October 20th of 2004, Montville interviewed me in February of 2005 without the presence of counsel and searched my home without a warrant

10) Montville then "terminated" the case against me due to legally "insufficient evidence" and shared their negative findings with Children's Services

11) Children's Services elected **not** to interview me and "closed" the case due to "no evidence". *Duh!*

12) Montville confirms to Det. Kollar that there was "insufficient evidence" to

prosecute the October 20th allegation and that "no charges" were filed

13) Operating outside his jurisdiction, Det. Kollar sought a **sham indictment** alleging a rape to have occurred between October 1st-31st of 2004

14) Det. Kollar never interviewed me

15) Det. Kollar never interviewed S.L.

¶1246 Stop!

¶1247 **Aha!**

¶1248 Neither Montville, Children's Services, nor Det. Kollar investigated October 1st-3rd of 2004!

Ain't that a bitch!

Montville and Children's Services ONLY investigated October 20th of 2004. My **sham indictment** was amended by Pros. Eisenhower about a week or so **prior to** Trial to October 1st-3rd of 2004 (Exhibit-02).

¶1249 Reader, do you see it? I'm in prison for an alleged crime that

1) Not only never happened

2) In a place I have never been

but that

3) Was never investigated

and that

4) Specifically went initially unindicted until Pros. Eisenhower amended the indictment **right before** Trial to secure

"A life rape , Your Honor,"

thereby ensuring I would never get out of prison and discover the truth

In finality,

5) No one placed my in Put-In-Bay with S.L. via testimony because I was home fornicating with Scott's wife

¶1250 Still sifting the definite and finite facts, with Judge Collier's "special findings" the Jury concluded S.L. was less than 10 years of aged at the time of alleged assault. This placed her in "Put-In-Bay" with "dad" while she celebrated her tenth birthday "on" her birthday" Sunday, October 3rd, and "not at Frank Wood's house" (Exhibits-02 and 03). Remarkably, the Trial Record is VOID of any testimony alleging that I abused S.L. on October 1st-3rd of 2004.

This alone frees me.

¶1251 Validating the above, the testimonies of Scott and Danielle carefully encompassed, **specifically**, October 20th of 2004. When asked about October 20th, S.L.'s "intrusive memories" began to surface. Literally. One minute she could not positively identify me as the perp (Tp.244, Ln.8-17), and the next, she was not afraid of me (Tp.246, Ln.21-22). Shortly thereafter, while being asked about my "dog" (Tp.248, Ln.6-8), this is how she directly responded:

> Well, I - - I enjoyed the birthday, and it was fun, but it was the two days before that really - - he hurt me the two days before (Tp.248, Ln.6-8).

Looking closer at this statement with inserted [Trial facts], S.L.'s voluntary in-court testimony is as follows:

> Well, I - - I enjoyed the birthday [party "on" Sunday, October 3rd], and it was fun [in "Put-In-Bay" and "not at Frank Wood's house"], but it was the two days before [on Friday, October 1st] that really - - he [my "dad"] hurt me ["in my private"] the two days before [on Friday, October 1st of 2004] (Tp.248, Ln.6-8).

¶1252 Having successfully proven a lack of subject matter jurisdiction, and that S.L. was sexually abused in Put-In-Bay by Scott, solely utilizing State's proffered and proven evidence, I call for the immediate arrest of **Scott Michael Sadowsky** (Exhibit-16).

• • •

Rocket: Here! Here!

Groot: I am Groot!

["No, Watson. Dig there!"]

• • •

¶1253 Reader, now you see *why* Judge Collier gave the Montville police report to Stenographer Garrity for the purposes of destruction, and denied the admission of the letter from Children's Services: They exonerate me of the October 20th allegation! Therefore, the police report and letter were not coming in, because Court and State could not let the Jury know the truth. Amazingly enough, based on State-court records, **no other dates** of alleged abuse regarding S.L. and me were investigated. And especially

"the two days before" when "it hurt" in her "private"
(Exhibit-03)

And *that*, dear Reader, is

What's truly important.

Follow me on this one, please...

¶1254 Pros. Eisenhower kept the testimony of the alleged abuse around October 20th **after** she amended the indictment to October 1st-3rd to secure a "life rape". However "the two days before" threw her off her game. That's why she declared S.L.'s "intrusive memories" to be "bullshit". You see, S.L. testified, voluntarily and without influence, to the new and ***uninvestigated*** dates in the indictment. Eisenhower ***knew*** what this meant, and her case against me fell apart with just four (4) truthful words from the heart of an innocent child:

"the two days before"

¶1255 Next, Pros. Eisenhower ***knew*** with whom and where that testimony placed S.L.: With

Scott in Put-In-Bay and not with me at my house. So she pushed for the "calendar" not to come in, and Judge Collier acted *in subsidium*, because he ***knew*** too.

¶1256 Then, to reinforce her lies and deceit, Pros. Eisenhower told the **Firing Squad** that

"there's no evidence to the contrary. None" (Exhibit-03),

and that

"on or about" *** that doesn't really matter [¶1085],

so just

"find him guilty" [¶1028, 2],

anyway, of an allegation that was neither investigated, originally indicted as a "life rape" [¶638, 3, i], [¶1020, 10], nor testified to with me as the actual perp.

'Anything for a win'

-Σ-

• • •

Rocket: No shit, Sherlock!

Groot: I am Groot!

["Then dig deeper, Watson!"]

Frank: What are you two doing?

Rocket: Role-playing.

Frank: I don't think it went that way in the books.

Rocket: Adlibbing?

Frank: Uh, yeah. That's a little more like it. [Whispering] Sorry, Reader. I should never have told them about artistic license.

• • •

¶1257 THE EVER-CHANGING DOCKET

> It's not so much the journey that matters,
> as it is the destination.
> -Middle East proverb

¶1258 Reader, a while back I revealed to you the first alteration to my

> Docket. A written record of the proceedings in a court (Rothenberg, p.151), [¶380 at Footnote 94].

I also told you that this is illegal and we would get back to this at the appropriate time [¶381].

Well, that appropriate time is now.

¶1259 Pursuant to O.R.C. § 2301.141 Retention of documents,

> ***, each clerk of a court of common pleas shall retain documentation regarding each criminal conviction and plea of guilty involving a case that is or was before the court. The documentation shall be in a form that is admissible as evidence in a criminal proceeding as *evidence of a prior conviction* [*emphasis added*]

[Unlike the calendar of October 2004][249]

[Unlike the pictures of pictures][250]

> or that is readily convertible to or producible in a form that is admissible as evidence

[Unlike (Exhibit-33: p.1) that Atty. Stanley obtained from the Clerk of Court][251]

> in a criminal proceeding as evidence of a prior conviction and may be retained in any form authorized by section 9.01 of the Revised Code. The clerk shall retain this documentation for a period of fifty years after the judgment entry in the case, ***.

[My Trial was only 12 years ago]

> This section shall apply to records currently retained and to records created on or after September 23, 2004.

---

[249] Altered-Incomplete Docket #2.
[250] Altered-Incomplete Docket #3.
[251] Altered-Incomplete Docket #4.

[As my Trial was in 2006, records include trial transcripts and discovery files]

¶1260a Next, pursuant to Crim.R.55 Records,

> (A) Criminal appearance docket
>
> The clerk shall keep a criminal appearance docket. ***. In addition *** the names of the parties shall be placed on the case file and *every paper filed* in the action [*Emphasis added*]
>
> At the time the action is commenced the clerk shall enter in the appearance docket the names, ***, of the parties in full, the names of counsel ***.

[At the time of the commencement of Trial, Atty. Stanley was my Co-counsel of Record. His name is missing from the Docket (Exhibit-07: p.1)[252] because

"he knows things"
[¶1059]

In addition, at the time of the time of the commencement of my Direct Appeal, Atty. Salzgeber was listed as my Public Defender (Exhibit-26: p.2 of 6). His name was removed from the Docket (Exhibit-07: p.2)[253] **after** I became a witness in the Hartman case because of *Transcript Manipulation*]

> ***. Thereafter the clerk shall chronologically note in the appearance docket all: process issued and returns, pleas and motions, papers filed in the action, orders, verdicts and judgments. ***.

[Of which, we shall get to in a moment]

> (B) Files
>
> All papers filed in a case shall be filed in a separate folder ***.

[Like my original Discovery File that was declared *missing in action* when Atty. Stanley sought

---

[252] Altered-Incomplete Docket #5.
[253] Altered-Incomplete Docket #6.

pages from it in mid-2017 [¶411].[254] Reader, notice this law does not permit for papers submitted in a case to be filed with the Court Reporter for the purposes of destruction]

¶1260b Folks, now you know that, by operation of law, per the Ohio Revised Code and parallel Criminal Rules, the Clerk of Court is directly responsible for retaining and archiving a Criminal Appearance Docket and all papers submitted and/or filed in a case. What more, any and all such papers must be deemed evidence of a prior conviction, easily accessed, and suitable for use in subsequent proceedings. Having clarified and established the legal premise for this chapter, let us continue...

Time to kick some tires and light some fires, big daddy!
-Independence Day

¶1261 Looking at the 2017 Docket (Exhibit-07), at the top of p.2, come down five (5) entries to the last recorded Action Date of 03/Aug/2006. Here you will see that **five (5) Transcript Volumes** were filed with the Ninth District Court of Appeals. As earlier noted, I only had three (3) [¶1207].

Mental Memo: This makes Missing-Incomplete-Altered Trial Record #24!

¶1262 Right above the last recorded date for 2006 is the Action Date of 02/Apr/2007. What's missing in between is as follows:

1) Brief Of Appellant (Exhibit-63) filed into the Ninth District by Atty. Salzgeber on September 22, 2006[255]

2) The State's Brief Of Appellee (answer brief), of which, I never received a copy[256]

3) Atty. Salzgeber's reply brief, of which, I never received a copy[257]

---

[254] Altered-Incomplete Docket #7.
[255] Altered-Incomplete Docket #8.
[256] Altered-Incomplete Docket #9.
[257] Altered-Incomplete Docket #10.

but the Ninth District's ruling from June 4, 2007 is located at the bottom of p.1 (Exhibit-07).

¶1263 After the Ninth District unjustly denied my Direct Appeal, I filed a *pro se* Application To Reopen Pursuant To Appellate Rule 26(B) ("26B") on August 31, 2007 (Exhibit-64), into the same Court [¶1273]. I accomplished this task utilizing my Materially Altered and Incomplete State-court Record. In this manner, I began the dreadful journey known as the ***Pro Se Appellate Process*** with the destination of HOME in mind.

• • •

Rocket: Dreadful?

Frank: Indeed.

Rocket: Explain.

Frank: Very well...

• • •

¶1264 The *pro se* process, the ***Appellate System*** itself, that which I placed my hopes on, is specifically designed to take an incarcerated *pro se* litigant from ***A*** to ***Z*** to ***You're done!*** [¶1309]. And I'm about to prove this to you. May take the rest of this Affidavit to do so, but you will understand that

There's nothing more abusive than the cruelty of false hope.
-Frank P. Wood, *The Abused*

• • •

Reader, a while back I shared with you how some people are like light sockets. While typing this, after what I witnessed and personally experienced, I have now learned that some people are like candy bars. In brevity, before you engage in conversation and open the package, read the contents *very carefully*, because I guarantee that somewhere on there, you will find:

CAUTION: Contains tree nuts.

I'll leave that with you.

• • •

¶1265 In 2010 I read an article out of a newspaper (*Sun Times*?) from California (no Exhibit). It discussed how Senator Jim Webb (D) VA,[258] went to Congress to create a National Criminal Law System because laws vary from State to State and County to County to obtain convictions. Congress ruled that the States have a right to govern themselves on such matters. The article further stated that Sen. Webb was going to approach Congress again on this matter. Inspired, I wrote Sen. Webb (no Exhibit), and included a copy of (Exhibit-03). I then proffered that, as County Courts have their own Local Rules of Court,

> Laws vary not just to obtain a conviction,
> but to sustain a conviction [¶1309],

and asked him to use my case as an example.

¶1267 With that said, consider the participants in my case: Judge, Prosecutor, Stenographer, Detective, and Psychiatrist, for the most part. Well, they *were* the Trial. Now, when it came to the actual investigation, there were ***no protocols in place to govern, regulate, and monitor*** the unethical and immoral approaches to the minds of K.S. and S.L. As an example, consider these facts:

1) Neither Children's Services, Dr. LeSure, nor Det. Kollar interviewed me (still open to it)

2) Neither Children's Services, Dr. LeSure, nor Det. Kollar interviewed the baseball

---

[258] I claim no political party allegiance. I am a Patriot who loves my Country. Further, I am definitely a bipartisan who sees the pros and cons on both sides, who wishes we could all just get along just once without worrying about our own vested interests. Besides, politics are either too sticky one moment and too slippery the next. I prefer philosophy, finance, economics, and fishing. ☺

roster of players that had access to the minds and bodies of K.S. and S.L.

Remember, the dogma *point-the finger-and-go* causes them to start

making the evidence fit their theory,
instead of making their theory fit the evidence.

(See [¶971] of this Affidavit)

¶1268 Yes, I was arrested on sloppy and incompetent investigative work, tried on "bullshit", convicted on lies, half-truths, and withheld information, and then motivationally sent to prison.

¶1269 ***Damn dogma!***

¶1270 Now consider the criminal process regarding Grand Jury Proceedings, and the Trial Process from Arraignment to Sentencing. No one obeyed the rules and laws. They just did as they pleased. What more, they did so with no one watching over their shoulder, and they ***knew*** that. However, I'm the statistical anomaly: The one who fought back; the one they should have left alone;

The Messenger

¶1271 Supporting, consider what they had done to my State-court Record. Governing rules and laws were casually discarded as refuse. Why? Fear and greed. As they possess the inherent fear that someone would discover what they had done, they possess the same degree of greed for power and dominion over others. Regarding such behaviors, on Wall Street they have a saying:

Bears make money.
Bulls make money.
Pigs get slaughtered.

Don't get greedy.

¶1272 As their fear and greed consumed them and controlled them, they violated rule and law **before** and **during** my Trial. To hide what they had done, they altered my State-court records

after Trial. **Then**, as a *just-in-case-measure*, they altered my Docket (something we're not quite done with), and LOST my Discovery File. How convenient.

• • •

Rocket: Something tells me this is going to get a whole lot worse.

Groot: I am Groot.

["Like an over-extended drought season."]

• • •

¶1273 Getting back to my Docket (Exhibit-07), recall that the last Action Date on the bottom of p.1 is 04/June/2007. The date directly above it reads 27/Aug/2013. With that in mind, recall that my 26(B) was filed on August 31, 2007 [¶1263]. Therefore, it should be placed between these two (2) dates as 31/Aug/2007, but it's not there.[259] What more, it once was, for I once had a Docket that revealed this truth. As to why this filing was removed, I shall now explain.

¶1274 The State *never filed a brief in opposition*, thereby conceding the facts presented through forfeit of challenge [¶1278]. This is due to the fact that my 26(B) filing contained the core contents of my **uncontested** Claim Of Actual Innocence "COAI" (Exhibit-03), and proof of a lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Yes, my 26(B) is a *must read.*

¶1275 As to the contents of the COAI, it's hard to miss the hot-pink 4-ton mastodon in the room. You know... The one with the purple polka dots and yellow tutu. You can close your eyes and turn your head, but it's still there. ☺

• • •

Groot: I am Groot?

Frank: Ha Ha! No, Groot. There's no elephant . It's just a metaphor. You'll get the hang of it.

---

[259] Altered-Incomplete Docket #11.

• • •

¶1276 Although the State *conceded through forfeit*, the Ninth Appellate District

1) Ignored the exonerating facts presented

2) Assumed the role of Prosecutor, thereby acting *in subsidium*[260]

3) Denied me any and all requested relief

As to the tragedy of such an event, if a defendant fails to challenge appropriately and timely, his or her action is dismissed *'for want of prosecution'*. However, violating the Framer's vision and declarations of Due Process, Equal Protection, and Basic fairness, when the Ninth District acted *in subsidium*, they ignored the long-standing principles of

> *Non prosequitur*. *** a judgment in favor of the defendant because the plaintiff [The Prosecutor] fails to pursue the suit. In Latin, the term means, "He does not follow up" [Emphasis added], (Rothenberg, p.316).

Clarifying, there is neither law nor legal loophole that permits a prosecutor to avoid challenge in the Ninth Appellate District Court.

¶1277 Authenticating my valid declarations of *in subsidium* and *non prosequitur*, I have enclosed (Exhibit-65) which contains the cover page, pages 23, 24 and 26 of the Appellate Court's Decision And Journal Entry; June 4, 2007.

¶1278 At the top of p.23 (ibid), the Court relied on Det. Kollar's lies about the pictures that were never shown to the Jury. At {¶55}, the Court failed to acknowledge Dr. Reed's *voir dire* testimony. Obviously, **"we"** was deleted **prior to** Appellate Review. At {¶56}, the Court declared that

> The State presented ample testimony to establish ***, the rape of a victim under the age of 10,

[260] In subsidium #1 of 19 total, with 18 belonging to Judas, uh, I mean Judge Collier.

of a ***Temple Virgin*** from 70 miles away with the "intrusive memories" of "the two days before" when "it hurt" in her "private" to my benefit and Scott's detriment.

¶1279 The Court continued with

> The State presented evidence that Appellant repeatedly

There's that word "repeatedly", again,

> engaged in sexual conduct with S.L.

Really, Folks? After all I have shown you, this is pure **"baligă!"**[261] Am I in error? I think not.

¶1280 At p.24, {¶57} (ibid), the Court said that

> K.S. *** was too frightened to testify.

Pressured into doing this against memory and truth, K.S. was still able to testify TWICE that she could not recall being at an alleged crime scene with me. Although the Trial Court declared, "No, it didn't happen", the Appellate Court conveniently overlooked this fact. What more, the issue at play here is not K.S. being too frightened to testify, for on the stand she looked more confused than anything, but rather

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

Yeah, and notice the **"pact"** and witness tampering went ignored by the Reviewing Court. *Hmmm.*

¶1281 The Court then declared that

> the State presented ample evidence to establish

the alleged crime. *Puh-leeze!*

¶1282 At {¶58} the Court then stated that

> "[T]he weight to be given the evidence and the credibility of the witnesses are primarily for the trier of the facts,"

---

[261] Romanian: "bullshit!"

as in my **Tainted and Tampered-With "cynical" Jury** with its Court-elected Juror who was "molested" in her youth, and a Medina City elementary school teacher. As to the "credibility" of the witnesses, let us not forget the Court-declared "untruthful" Danielle, and the lies told by State witnesses. *Laundry Lists.*

¶1283 Obviously the Jury *voir dire* was removed from the Record **prior to** appellate review. Or was it? *Hmmm.*

Now *that* is worth a Federal Invest. ☺

¶1284 Reader, with the truth in hand, should I break down the Ninth District's ruling like this in totality, it would be a career killer for Judge Carla Moore (ibid) p.26. This is because, as a Reviewing Court, Judge Moore had the ethical and legal responsibilities to do what I have done:

"review the trial record as a whole"

per United States v. Hastings, 461 U.S. 499, 503 (1983). Had she done so, I would ***not*** be in prison. Of course, such a review would have been much easier ***IF*** my Trial Record ***WAS*** whole. Then again, the Appellate Court ***did have*** the two (2) missing Volumes that I am missing. ***Whoa!*** Still, courts rush through, or so it seems, and they are not going to go through the processes of sifting wheat and setting tiles. Not like this, and not to this degree, despite the fact that what I have done is what is required to overturn a wrongful conviction.

¶1285 People, we have the Appellate Process for a reason. Not just because mistakes are made – Oh, No! – But because situations like mine ***exist***. In addition, to clear my name, I need one (1) of two (2) things:

1) A lot of money

2) A lot of time

Possessing a tremendous amount of the latter, I elected *Sifting & Setting.*

¶1286a Unfortunately for me, when the Appellate Court ruled against me without

1) Challenge from the State

2) Citing transcript pages or line numbers

3) A complete Trial Record

4) Citing Akron Children's Hospital's confirmation of a ***Temple Virgin***

5) *Laundry Lists*

and cast it's delinquent decision, this became the

> Law of the case. The doctrine stating that when a point of law is decided by a court, that decision is binding in all subsequent stages of the case [throughout the appellate process], until reversed by an [higher] appellate court (Rothenberg, p.265-266), [Emphasis added],

leaving me to fight this inadequately investigated decision with an altered and incomplete Trial Record from prison. Now that's **"govno!"**[262] Yeah, fought this war in this manner for seven (7) years from the Ninth District all the way into the U.S. Supreme Court, and sought to open this case five (5) times in the Trial Court since. Every time I was treated like the leper amongst lepers.

• • •

Groot: I am Groot!

["Unclean!"]

Frank: Funny, Groot. Real funny.

• • •

¶1286b Reader, now you see more of *why* I went from fighting my case to working my case: *Sifting & Setting.*

---

[262] Russian: "bullshit!"

¶1287 Thanks to an Altered and Incomplete Trial Record, and the Law of the Case Doctrine, no Higher Reviewing Court would pay heed to the proof of innocence ignored by the Ninth District or its *in subsidium* actions. So, on March 25, 2012 I filed the core contents of the COAI (Exhibit-03) in a Petition For Writ Of Certiorari into the U.S. Supreme Court as Frank P. Wood-Petitioner vs. Richard Hall-Respondent(s) (no Exhibit, but available upon request). Due to a change in custody (Warden), the U.S. Supreme Court re-captioned the filing as Frank P. Wood vs. Kimberly Clipper, Case No. 12-9570. Then, on April 9, 2012, the Ohio Attorney General filed a Waiver (Exhibit-66) declaring that their office would not challenge unless ordered to do so by the Court. Although this legal loophole should not exist and allow the State to slip out of the noose of challenging its own evidence, this loophole does not exist in the Ninth District Court of Appeals [¶1274]. Further, the law declares that if a Defendant fails to file a timely response, he or she is deemed to be procedurally defaulted and therefore barred, and the ruling will automatically be in favor of the State. In all actuality, and under this premise, since the State declares that I can be held to the standards of an attorney, they have to treat me like one. ☺ Yes, the Ninth District was legally obligated to rule in my favor due to the State's forfeit of challenge.

• • •

Rocket: Touché.

Frank: They said it, not me. And, if there's one thing I have learned through all of this, it's that the law is a double-edged sword that cuts both ways.

Groot: I am Groot.

Frank: Ah! You remember. Yes, David knocked Goliath down with a stone, a promise of God wielded in faith, but he killed Goliath with his own sword. Nice foreshadowing, eh?

• • •

¶1288 Going forward, on May 28, 2012, despite presenting proof of innocence, and proof that the U.S. Supreme Court previously declared that the

> "Great Writ's basic objectives" include "protecting the innocent against wrongful conviction," Shriro v. Summerlin, 542 U.S. 348, 362 (2004),

with a two-line statement, and without what is known as a reliable

> Finding of fact. A conclusion reached by a court after due consideration; *** (Rothenberg, p.191),

and

> Conclusion of law. The conclusions of the court, based upon the facts which form the basis for the decision of a case. Also, a court's statement of the law on a controversial point or issue (Rothenberg, p.98),

the U.S. Supreme Court unjustly denied me and all requested legal relief (Exhibit-67).

¶1289 Reader, apologies for taking so long to come full-circle on (Exhibit-03). The COAI, my case, they are embarrassments to the State of Ohio, and they have made quite the arduous journey to come this far. As have I.

¶1290 Getting back to the Ever-Changing Docket (Exhibit-07), notice how the majority of my filings are listed as having "No document" available for public "View". Especially the Motion For Disqualification Of State Court Judge And Conflict-Free Rehearings (Exhibit-68), with the accompanying R.C. 2701.03 Affidavit Of Disqualification (Exhibit-69) that I filed against Judge Cosgrove on 24/Feb/2017. These (Exhibits) do not include their internal (Exhibits), for most of them have been included throughout the course of this Affidavit. These two (2) (Exhibits) will explain in greater detail the injustices heaped upon me by Judge Cosgrove, and the true justice she denied me. Perhaps we'll delve into these in the next chapter or so.

¶1291 Next, at the bottom of (Exhibit-07: p.1), you will see that I filed a "Notice" on 27/Aug/2013. This is the Notice Of Dismissal Of Counsel Of Record that I filed officially firing Atty. Green from my case (Exhibit-70: minus internal Exhibits). Although the far right of p.1 reads "View", I had people check. What was once available for public "View" is no longer there.[263] *Hmmm.* Perhaps this will go into the next chapter as well. I have an idea, and, no, they will not like this one, either.

¶1292 Now, contrary to the above, you can "View" a plethora of Court rulings and State filings; the lies, manipulations, and *bullshit they want you to see.* Savvy?

• • •

Groot: **I am Groot!**

["Σ!"]

Frank: It's like preachin' hymns to the choir.

• • •

¶1293 Further, as neither O.R.C. § 2301.141 nor Crim.R.55 permit a Clerk of Court to alter a Docket, and its accompanying files, in any manner, they do not permit a Clerk of Court to pick and choose what becomes available for public "View". Courts are paid with our tax dollars, and that makes them *Public Domain,* just like NASA, pursuant to the Freedom Of Information Act ("FOIA") under 5 U.S.C.S. § 552. In fact, Dr. LeSure's county "contract" with Children's Services falls under this category. With a little bit of research, it would simply amaze you as to what you are allowed to know, and *not* know, when it comes to your tax dollars being spent. True, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.S. § 552, Rule 45(D) [¶006], the Rape Shield Law [¶624], O.R.C. § 149.43 Public Records, and various other laws, certain documents are **not** public record like a

[263] Altered-Incomplete Docket #12.

Presentence Investigation Report, while others may not be disclosed due to

1) A company's proprietary information, e.g., formulas

while some may be released provided that

2) Social Security numbers

3) Bank account and credit card numbers

4) Names and full birthdates of minors

5) Pictures of minors (faces)

6) Certain medical information

7) *Etcetera*

are REDACTED; like "bullshit!" was REDACTED. No, LeSure's contract is not protected by FOIA. Children's Services gave Atty. Stanley's Legal Secretary/Paralegal a line of "bullshit".

¶1294 As various laws govern the above, there are also laws that govern law enforcement records in this matter. Regarding such, in J&C Marketing, L.L.C., Appellee, et al., v. McGinty, Pros. Atty., Appellant, 2015 Ohio LEXIS 800, the Ohio Supreme Court declared that

> HN3 The common law recognizes a qualified privilege for law-enforcement investigatory information, and law-enforcement techniques and procedures. See, e.g., In re New York City, 607 F.3d 923, 941 (2nd Cir. 2010); Puerto Rico v. United States, 490 F.3d 50, 64 (1st Cir. 2007); In re United States Dep't of Homeland Sec., 459 F.3d 565, 570 (5th Cir. 2006); Dellwood Farms Inc. v. Cargill Inc., 128 F.3d 1122, 1124 (7th Cir. 1997) (the law enforcement investigatory privilege is a "judge-fashioned evidentiary privilege").
>
> However, the privilege is not absolute: it is limited by "the fundamental requirements of fairness," so that when the privileged information "is relevant and helpful to the defense of an accused, or is essential to a fair determination of a cause, the privilege must give way." Roviaro v. United States, 353 U.S. 53, 60-67, 77 S. Ct. 623, 1 L. Ed. 2d 639 (1957). A strong presumption militates against lifting the privilege. In re New York City at 929. Plaintiffs may obtain law-enforcement investigatory material only upon showing a "compelling need." Id.

So do your homework before you seek records. And make sure you not only understand the laws involved, but their applications as well.

¶1295 Hey, Kollar!

What's in your wallet?
-Capital One

¶1296 Yes, I would just love to see *his* investigatory material; the material that never made it to the police report (Exhibit-04), my missing Discovery File, the Grand Jury, or my Trial.

¶1297 Lastly, I have just one more thing to say to the Clerk or Clerks of Court involved in the desperate attempt to alter my destiny.

§1983



-Σ-

¶1298 THE "NOTICE" AND SUBSEQUENT FILINGS

Mom! We have a situation!
-Clorox

(That commercial is too funny!)

¶1299 Reader, recall that I filed my Notice Of Dismissal Of Counsel Of Record (Exhibit-70) on August 13, 2013 (Exhibit-07: p.1). Looking closely at the cover page you will see that the document was date-time-stamped as "2013 AUG 27 AM 11:20". Now turn to the State's Brief In Response To Notice Of Dismissal Of Counsel Of Record (Exhibit-71). On the cover page the date-time-stamp reads "2013 AUG 27 PM 3:36". Yes, the State responded to a mere "Notice" precisely four (4) hours and 16 minutes later. *Hmmm...* Think they were worried?

¶1300 Yes, it is highly irregular for *any* prosecutor to file a reply brief to such a notice, and especially in such an expedited manner. So let's look into *why* it was filed.

¶1301 On p.4 of (Exhibit-71), the State declared

> To the extent that the Court was *inclined* to take any action upon the filing of Wood's "Notice," the Court should disregard Wood's "Notice" [*emphasis added*].

¶1302 With the Court *inclined* to take action, not only did I strike a nerve, the State's rapid response time and statement reveal that

1) Judge Collier experienced either a temporary, but fleeting, bout of remorse, or fear, and considered correcting this manifest miscarriage of justice
2) An evidentiary hearing took place regarding the Notice and its (Exhibits), but without the presence of counsel[264] or myself[265]

[264] A direct violation of my U.S. 6th Amendment right to counsel.
[265] Presence of the defendant violation #7.

• • •

♪ [Phone rings]

Groot: [Picks up phone] I am Groot?... I am Groot... I am Groot! [Whispers to and hands phone to Frank].

Frank: Folks, my sapling of a side-kick here just informed me that *Karma*, *Destiny*, and *Fate* are on a conference line. Been looking forward to this... Hang on...Hello. This is Frank... Uh-huh... I see... Absolutely, *Ladies*... I'm a big fan of your work... Ah... Please hold for just one moment... No... Thank ***you***, *Ladies*... Any time.

Hey, Medina!

[Reaches out with phone]

It's for you!

Σ

☺

Frank: Waited nearly 13 years for that.

Rocket: Well, in this situation, timing *is* everything.

• • •

¶1303 With the *Laws of the Universe* at work, I was quite surprised the State filed a response. And, as certain issues could not go unaddressed, I filed my Response (no Exhibit) on 09/Sep/2013 (Exhibit-07). Within my Response, I included the following medical research report:

> #2 Differences in Hymenal Morphology Between Adolescent Girls With and Without a History of Consensual Sexual Intercourse;
> Joyce A. Adams, MD; Ann S. Botash, MD; Nancy Kellog, MD;
> Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med. 2004; 158: 280-285 (Exhibit-71).

¶1304 This is *top-of-the-line* research conducted by leading pediatric child abuse experts (Exhibit-79). As these experts utilized a pre-pubertal hymen, just like S.L.'s, as a *scientific control* to determine if an adolescent's hymen was penetrated (more on this in a few), this research fully supports and is supported by Akron Children's Hospital's finding of a ***Temple Virgin*** (Exhibit-14). Reader, I strongly encourage you to follow me on this.

¶1305 Within my Response, I invited the Collier Court to engage its powers of *sua sponte*, to appoint me an expert witness pursuant to Crim.R.7, and to set a date for hearing. It then took Judge Collier nine (9) months to respond with a denial (no Exhibit) on 22/May/2014 (See Exhibit-07).

¶1306 Still seeking justice, on 13/June/2014 (Exhibit-07), I filed my Application and accompanying Delayed Motion (no Exhibits) for a new trial pursuant to Crim.R.33(B) into Collier's Court with this same medical research.

¶1307 Pursuant to Crim.R.33(B) New Trial,

> Motions for new trial on account of newly discovered evidence shall be filed within one hundred twenty days after the day upon which the verdict was rendered, *** (Exhibit-74: p.3).

Yes, as in my Cynical and Tampered-With Jury's disposable verdict.

¶1308 120 days? Of verdict? 120 days. Yeah. Right. Knowing I was declared "indigent" by the Trial Court, I guess the State still expected me to discover the evidence in my State-issued 2.4 cubic foot locker box. On the other hand, perhaps under my State-issued mattress? Dunno. Then again, since my case was magically signed in for invest **prior to** an alleged incident, and I was deceived, **under duress**, into waiving my speedy trial rights three (3) days **after** Trial was due to commence, so they could fraudulently revoke my $200k cash bond, the State must be convinced that an indigent incarcerated *pro se* litigant has some sort of magical

powers. With that said, the running joke in the prison law libraries goes something like this:

> Hey, Rocky. Watch me pull this rabbit out of my ass.
> Golly gee, Bullwinkle. That sounds like a painfully impossible process.
> -With apologies to *The Rocky and Bullwinkle Show*
> I am a fan. ☺

¶1309 This law is abusive and must be changed, for it supports the design and purpose of the ***Pro Se Appellate Process*** [¶1264]. It takes, on average, 13 ½ years to vindicate someone in the United States. So how the hell is this law fair? There should be no time limit between verdict and discovery, and discovery and filing. What more, there should be a mandatory evidentiary hearing to determine if the evidence warrants a new trial, a lesser sentence, or no sentence at all. No damn exceptions. Killing the game, proof of innocence trumps all laws, so let's dig deeper.

¶1310 Per Crim.R.33(B), if I show that I was "unavoidably prevented from the discovery of the evidence" (Exhibit-74: p.3), I would be granted a new trial. Or so I thought...

¶1311 My Trial was in 2006. The research was generated in 2004. So in the Motion I elected to argue ineffective assistance of counsel regarding Atty. Green. Recall that Atty. Green failed to present either a medical expert or medical evidence/research to aid in my defense, just like he failed to explain the existence of a ***Temple Virgin*** to the Jury. But he sure as shit told the media **after** Trial to make himself look good (Exhibit-32). Eh? Now, having proved the research existed **prior to** Trial and that Atty. Green failed to defend me, that ALONE should have, at least, earned me a legally valid evidentiary hearing with the presence of counsel But not in Medina. Oh, no.

¶1312 Now, as to the 120-day time frame, in the Application I presented the following:

> For historical support, Wood was erroneously found guilty on May 1, 2006, by a Jury that was not of a sound mind. He was then transferred to Lorain County Correctional without delay. Wood was then transferred to Madison Correctional

in southern Ohio. He was then transferred to Lebanon Correctional on September 13, 2006; exactly 121 days after the Jury's disposable verdict.

Indigent, with absolutely no knowledge of the Legal or Medical field, relying on Court-appointed Counsel Atty. Salzgeber, transferred like a rabid kennel dog from one cage to the next, and under constant lockdown, it was impossible for Wood to discover any new evidence on his own that would vindicate him of the fraudulent charges. Also, Wood did not receive a copy of the Trial Record from Atty. Salzgeber until mid-2007. Without the Record to serve as a reference point, Wood did not know where to begin.

Lost in a prison system that nothing in the movies comes close to, to discover and file any evidence within the 120-day time frame pursuant to Crim.R.33(B) was impossible (Application, p.1-2).

¶1313 Reader, by now you see the picture of the bushel of wheat nearing completion as the final tiles of fact are being set in place, how everything I presented to you thus far is intricately and directly connected, and that Court and State knew exactly what they were doing. Σ

¶1314 *To obtain and sustain.*

¶1315 On July 7, 2014 the State filed a Brief (no Exhibit) challenging my June 13, 2014 Application and Motion for new trial. In turn, on July 18, 2014 I answered with my Defendant's Response To State's Brief In Opposition (Exhibit-73). Then, ignoring the **additional nine (9) month delay he caused me**, on September 15, 2014, Judge Collier unjustly denied me access to the courts (Exhibit-74).

¶1316 Reader, on September 23, 2014 I fell asleep thinking about this, only to wake up and ask myself the same question the successful ask themselves before they get out of bed:

What's truly important?
(Covey, p.___)

(See Exibit-75).

¶1317 So, donning the mantle of The Tenth Man, I took counsel with Rocket and Groot. Indeed, it was time to probe and investigate the matter thoroughly. As we have questioned

everything and carried our thoughts to their logical conclusions, we are prepared to begin with the end in mind on the subject matter of this chapter, and to ensure that you are adequately informed. You see, as our minds are of one accord, we believe the mosaic would remain incomplete without these tiles of fact (Exhibits-73 through 77). Thus, you, the Reader, would have been deprived of the big picture. And, since

> It is a capital mistake to theorize before you have all the evidence. [Because] It biases the judgment,
> -Arthur Conan Doyle

like with Det. Kollar and the **Twisted Twelve**, you, too, would have been deprived of arriving at a reliable verdict. With that said...

• • •

Frank: Gentlemen?

Rocket: I bequeath the floor.

Groot: I am Groot.

["Grow where you're planted."]

Frank: Very well...

• • •

¶1318 Let us begin with my Response (Exhibit-73). This document reveals the absurdity and desperation – nay – the FEAR that motivates the State to keep me in prison. This document further reveals that I have presented sufficient law and operative fact to warrant requested legal relief. What more, you very well know the State investigated the medical research. Keep that in the forefront of your minds as we proceed. After all, they had to do *something* with Collier's nine (9) month delay. And once they fully understood its exonerating effects regarding my case, they considered its application to others. No. Can't keep my mouth shut on this one.

Righteous indignation is in full swing, and they earned it.

¶1319 So, via reckless assertions, and ignoring law and fact, the State relied on inferior case law and misapplied it to the distinguishing facts of my case in their challenge on July 7, 2014.

¶1320 Better clarify "inferior case law" before going forward. To do so, we'll take a quick stroll through my ***Pro Se Appellate Process***. It went as follows:

1) Medina County Court Of Common Pleas (Trial)

2) Court Of Appeals For The Ninth Judicial District (Direct Appeal & 26(B))

3) Supreme Court Of Ohio (Highest State Court)

4) United States District Court, Northern District Of Ohio, Eastern Ohio (The first Federal Court in which I sought relief, and handles only Ohio cases)

5) United States Court Of Appeals For The Sixth Circuit (The second Federal Court in which I sought relief, and handle cases from Ohio, Michigan, and Kentucky)

6) Supreme Court Of The United States (Highest Court in the land, and, unfortunately, the last **chance at Justice for many**)

So when I cite a Higher Court's ruling, anything less is considered "inferior case law". The State relied, primarily, not just only inferior rulings, but rulings that *did not apply* to the distinguishing facts of my case.

This is sad. Very sad.
-Avatar

Now you see how and where the *Law of the Case Doctrine* comes into play.

¶1321 Next, Reader, I encourage you to study and compare my Response (Exhibit-73) and Judge Collier's ruling (Exhibit-74) before we press on. This will heighten your understanding of what I am about to say. Thanks. ☺

• • •

Frank: Rocket! Don't let him drink that! That's Weed-Be-Gone®! *Whew!* That would have been a tough one to explain to Stan Lee.

• • •

¶1322 By now you see that, Judge Collier, in denying my requested relief, he used the same line of litigations as former Assistant Prosecutor Matthew A. Kern. In doing so, against law and fact, logic and reason, Judge Collier's decision was clearly unreasonable, arbitrary, and unconscionable. Ah! And remarkably biased since he

1) Ignored Crim.R.33(B) and its proper application

2) Ignored the additional nine (9) month delay *he* deliberately caused me

3) Ignored the distinguishing facts of my case

4) Applied irrelevant and inferior case law to these facts

5) Ignored a Constitutionally valid claim of Ineffective Assistance Of Counsel

6) Now consider every *Laundry List* I showed you, and you will understand *why*

• • •

Frank: Rocket, what rhymes with insidious?

Rocket: *In subsidium.*

• • •

¶1233 There you go. *In subsidium.*[266] Σ

¶1234 It's so hard to find a judge or prosecutor to do the right thing. Every morning when I wake up and ask myself "What's truly important?" (Exhibit-75), the answer is always the same:

---

[266] *In subsidium* #19 for Judge Collier.

1) Love & Family

2) Duty & Honor

But those who did this to me and perpetuate this *Insolent Injustice*, they know not the value and strength of such things. They live their lives in fear because of their greed, worrying about what they had said and done, wondering how to hide it, and, if someone should discover and expose their malevolent machinations, how to either explain it away or cast blame. So far they used the ***Pro Se Appellate Process*** and the Law of the Case Doctrine to do this, but the rabbit can only run so far down the hole; to the source of the lie: Medina's very own town crier: ***The vain and "untruthful" Danielle.***

¶1235 Yes, they chose what's truly important, and so have I.

¶1236 For a better understanding of our differences in mindsets and beliefs,

> Ethically and morally I have evolved into splitting
> the atom while they're still splitting firewood.[267]
> -Mr. Frank P. Wood, *Unconquered*

• • •

Rocket: Now that's deep.

Groot: I am Groot.

["Root deep."]

• • •

¶1327 Now, as to a specific piece of content in (Exhibit-73) that undoubtedly raised not just a few eyebrows, but questions and concerns, I will now elaborate in further detail on what

[267] This quote has been modified to suit my needs. Original content comes from A.G. Riddle's *The Atlantis Plague*, © 2014, p.35 as "We were splitting the atom before you were splitting firewood."

actually transpired with the Victims Of Crime Representative[268] who came to see me (ibid) (p.6-7). Waited a *very* long time for this.

¶1328 On May 9, 2012 at 7:30 a.m., while incarcerated at Grafton Correctional Institution in Grafton, Ohio, I was approached by one of the local Victims Of Crime Representatives: Ms. Cynthia Williams. After Ms. Williams introduced herself, she said,

> "Mr. Wood, the victim in your case - - I apologize, Mr. Wood. The *alleged* victim in your case would like to open a dialogue with you" [*emphasis added*].

¶1329 When she smiled and emphasized "*alleged*", I knew the story changed, again. So I responded with

"Which one? There are two alleged victims in my case."

¶1330 Ms. Williams was unaware as to who made the request, said she would find out, and I readily agreed to the open dialogue.[269]

¶1331 Eventually Ms. Williams found out it was S.L. who made the request. A few months later, when I asked Ms. Williams about the dialogue, she responded with

"They changed their mind because you profess your innocence,"

to which I replied,

"They knew that before they sent you."

She just shrugged her shoulder, smiled, and kept walking.

¶1332 Were they testing the waters and using Ms. Williams without her knowing? Probably. On the other hand, did S.L. change her mind about the interview because of Scott? (Exhibit-81: with internal (Exhibit-B)) and (Exhibit-82). Either way, at this time, Ms. Williams

---

[268] To learn more about them, contact Crime Victim Services, Tannisha Bell, Section Chief, 150 E. Gay Street, 25th Floor, Columbus, Ohio, 43215. (614) 466-5610. And, please, feel free to direct their office to: ***www.freefrankpwood.com.*** Thanks. ☺

[269] Something I am still open to.

knew I was waiting on the decision from the U. S. Supreme Court because I told her. When the Court denied my Petition (Exhibit-67), her expression and mannerisms revealed confusion and disbelief.

¶1333 Although my conversations with Ms. Williams were limited, at one point I asked if she was allowed to tell me what was in my Presentence Investigation Report ("PSI"). She said that she was and stated,

"It says you licked the vaginas of both girls."

In a state of revulsion and wanting to *spit acid*, I replied,

"That wasn't testified to at Trial."

To this she declared,

"I know." [¶350, 9]

Σ

¶1334 Now please recall that, while requesting a Crim.R.29 acquittal of the alleged rape, *outside the presence of the Jury*, Atty. Green stated,

> The little girl, I don't think, gave any indication that there was a rape here. She did not testify as to cunnilingus (Exhibit-45: Tp.462, Ln.22-24).

• • •

[Golf clap]

Rocket: And the crowd goes wild.

Groot: I am Groot.

["Like and untrained grapevine."]

• • •

¶1335 Now, earlier I told you, *showed you* that there is absolutely *no symmetry* between the two (2) allegations, and that the lack of symmetry revealed two (2) different M.O.s from two

(2) different perps: Scott and Ryan, with two (2) different custodial structures, and two (2) different living arrangements. And let us not forget the two (2) different *Baseball Rosters*. I also showed you Pros. Eisenhower's attempts to create the illusion of symmetry with her lies and manipulations to the Jury during Closing Statements. With that said, understand that the Prosecutor's Office was *directly responsible* for generating the PSI, *and* for placing it in the hands of Judge Collier **prior to** sentencing.

¶1336 With the lie of a PSI in hand, Judge Collier sent me to prison

1) Without questioning the contents of the PSI

2) Knowing that cunnilingus went unindicted and was never testified to

thereby acting *in subsidium*, again[270]

¶1337 Reader, as an FYI, please know that the filing of a falsified PSI by the State is another blatant act of **fraud upon the court.**[271]

¶1338 As to the PSI itself,

> R.C. 2951.03 currently requires that the sentencing court permit a defendant or counsel to read the presentence investigation report - - with the exception of specified portions of the report - - **before** sentencing **[emphasis added]**. (Citing State ex rel. Hadlock v. Polito et al, 1991 Ohio App. LEXIS 6516, HN5).

¶1339 Atty. Green never told me if he read the PSI, therefore, by operation of law, I was entitled to read it **before** sentencing. What more, swinging the State's own sword, I am to be treated like an attorney in a court **of** law. Now, **if** Atty. Green did read it, **after** admitting cunnilingus was never testified to, and knowing it went unindicted, he should have told me and challenged the contents of the PSI. You see, it boils down to this:

1) If he didn't read it and failed to motion for me to read it, that's Ineffective

---

[270] *In subsidium* #20 for Judge Collier.

[271] See Footnote 110 at [¶500].

Assistance Of Counsel and a violation of my U.S. 6th Amendment right to counsel

2) If he did read it and failed to challenge, that's also Ineffective Assistance Of Counsel and another direct violation of my U.S. 6th Amendment right to counsel, for he allowed me to be sentenced with materially false information [¶091]. I've done my homework ☺

¶1340 In this light, I informed you that Atty. Green orally communicated two (2) pieces of information to me **prior to** Trial [¶350, 9]. Of which, one (1) was

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

As to the other, which I have waited this long to tell you, is as follows:

"They claim you licked the vaginas of both girls."

¶1341 And there you have it:

1) Proof they implanted memories into the fragile minds of the girls **Pre-Indictment**

2) The Pre-Trial source to the bogus PSI was designated "counsel only" material

3) Two (2) more Implanted/Transplanted Memories[272]

4) Two (2) more unindicted allegations[273]

5) Two (2) more violations of Title 18 U.S.C.S. § 1512, Tampering with witnesses[274]

6) Two (2) more altered cell assemblies that were never testified to

¶1342 Concluding the cunnilingus portion of this chapter, and my conversations with Ms. Williams, one day she looked me straight in the eye and, smiling, and said,

"I know you're innocent."

---

[272] Implanted/Transplanted Memory #9 and #10.

[273] Unindicted allegation #6 and #7.

[274] Tampering with witnesses occurred with the Saligas and every Implanted/Transplanted Memory and Unindicted allegation revealed.