

FF WAIVER

11-8-11

MANO G. MITRINI ~~III~~

PO Box 94971
PASADENA, CA
91109

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Filed in Forma Pauperis (CRC 3.50, et seq.) per order
dated: _____
Amount recoverable pursuant to GC §68637
Plus a one time administrative fee upon judgment if the
party becomes a judgment creditor (GC §6103.5, 68638)

Richard
Harris

C.F. 09-02345/1

OCCUPY LOS ANGELES ~~campers~~
VS. City of Los Angeles
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
AND/OR Eric Holder ESQ;
UNITED STATES FEDERAL BARS
FOR THE 9TH, 5TH AND OTHER CIRCUITS
AND Pamela Harris, ESQ.
DOES 1-10 L.A.P.D. officers

NOV 09 2011

Federal Complaint BC 473185

Cause of Action: RICO
Cause of Action: Negligence

3rd Declaratory Relief
4th Temporary Restraining
Order
5th Damages; OR,
Attorney Fee's

COMES NOW PLAINTIFFS in this Federal Lawsuit, organized and speaking as one from a General Assembly comprised from citizens of this community and recognized as the political movement OCCUPY LOS ANGELES (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiffs"), and do bring this Federal Complaint for the purposes of ferreting out and addressing the rampant corruption, inequity and anti-social behavior plaguing their community of Los Angeles and around this nation.

Plaintiffs, as members of this community and nation, have standing to bring this Federal Complaint against the members comprising their own United States Department of Justice and United States Federal Bar in order to receive answers and in some cases remedy and even removal of those Public Servant members who have demonstrated recognized and indisputable behaviors contrary to the oaths of their office which they have taken and the laws of this nation which they have sworn to uphold.

INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs have become aware of numerous specific instances of corrupt and even collusive behavior displayed by members comprising their own offices of public service in both their United States Department of Justice and in their Federal Judiciaries across this nation. Furthermore, Plaintiffs have discovered the recognizable emergence of entities in these Public Service Offices which operate in distinctly defensive patterns in order to protect themselves from the illumination of the cooperation, collusion and corruption inherent and being displayed by some of their members.

Plaintiffs bring this Federal Complaint seeking removal of not only those members contained within these Public Service Offices identified and proven to be corrupt but also

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
2012 MAY -4 AM 9:49
BY _____
CITY CLERK
DEPUTY

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

seeking answers from these Public Service Offices, themselves, for why such unorthodox measures are even necessary by the citizens of this community and this country regarding offices for Public Service which would appear and even purport to be self-policing.

1. Defendants in this lawsuit are:

A: The United States Department of Justice, a self explicative entity covered in Section 1961 of the RICO Act.

B: The United States Federal BARS including but not limited to the United States 9th and 5th Circuit BARS also covered in Section 1961 of the RICO Act.

Plaintiffs do not know the true names of defendants named as DOES 1 through 200, inclusive, and therefore sues them by such fictitious names. However, Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereupon allege, that all said defendants named as DOES 1 through 200, inclusive, are employees/members of defendant UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE and/or one of its UNITED STATES FEDERAL BARS. When the names, capacities and relationship of defendants named as DOES 1 through 200 are ascertained, they will be alleged by amendment to this Complaint.

2. Jurisdiction of this Federal Court is invoked according to the Rules of Federal Court pertaining to an action pursuant to United States Statute Title 18, Chapter 96 of the United States Statutes more commonly known as the Racketeering Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) which has been specifically reserved for our United States District Courts within that Congressional enactment.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: RICO

3. Plaintiff incorporates, herein by reference, each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 2 as though set out in full herein.

4. In August of 2011 author and current member in both the United States 5th and 9th Circuit Federal BARS, JOHN R. SISK, published a book documenting varied and specific instances of what would appear to be blatant corrupt and collusive practices perpetrated by members of our United States Judiciary and even including participants in our United States Departments of Justice Offices located in California, Louisiana and Washington, D.C.

5. In order to circumvent any conceivable objections regarding clarity or ambiguity potentially proffered by these named defendants in this proceeding, said documented and identified instances of collusive and corrupt behavior have been detailed in the free publication entitled: **A Letter to CAS** which is posted for viewing and reading at the free internet domain address www.indiegogo.com.

6. Said publication includes, but is not limited to, an instance where a United States District Court Judge (USDC Judge DEE D. DRELL) stepped in and unilaterally

dismissed 13 named Public Servant defendants in a Federal lawsuit pursuant to the RICO before many were even served with notice and a copy of the RICO lawsuit against them. In short, USDC Judge DRELL simply abandoning his judicial post as an independent and neutral arbitrator of a United States District Court legal proceeding in order to assume the position as attorney, representative and even the defense attorney for these 13 named Public Servants. A judicial measure so shockingly abhorrent to our United States Rules of Court as to describe this violation as not just corrupt but collusive, since the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure EXPRESSLY prohibit any USDC Judge from even attempting to weigh the validity of any factual contention contained in a United States District Court complaint prior to the appearance by the named defendants. Again, in short, USDC Judge DRELL merely acted in a collusive fashion in order to protect these public servants (his apparent purported "legal clients") from even being required to appear and/or answer the allegations of corruption leveled against them while in office.

7. Said publication goes on to illuminate that once an appeal was made to the United States 5th Circuit Court of Appeals, for the premature dismissal of these public servants who had been called upon to answer for the federal allegations of racketeering made against them from their public service offices, then another singular member of our United States BAR (USCA5 Judge THOMAS M. REAVELLY) unilaterally stepped in and ordered that all appellate briefs filed by both petitioner and all responsive appellate briefs filed on behalf of these named public servants simply be concealed from view by any United States 5th Circuit Court of Appeals reviewing panel. Thereby judicially circumventing any review of USDC Judge DEE D. DRELL's own improprieties.
8. Said publication then goes on to further document that members contained in our own United States Department of Justice not only witnessed these aforementioned acts of corruption and collusive practices by these United States Judiciary members but then kept quiet about these clear judicial violations and improprieties which they had each just witnessed occur. As did numerous other members contained within our United States judiciary including but not limited to USDC Judges R. GARY KLAUSNER, TOM STAGG, RICHARD T. HAIK, Sr. and ROBERT JAMES
9. Each and every aforementioned allegation as well as each and every allegation contained in the publication A Letter to CAS is a matter of Public Records of this nation and easily discoverable by these named defendants and, in fact, is already contained within each defendant's own records. Each named defendant being a participant of those improprieties through its members. As such, plaintiffs are relieved of their duties through discovery to produce documents and records pertaining to these alleged improprieties which already comprise defendants own files.
10. Each and every member of our United States Judiciary is required to swear or affirm an oath pursuant to United States statute 28 USCS 453 prior to taking office insuring that they will not only actively work to eradicate political influence and corruption

from our courts but insuring that none will look the other way or keep quiet regarding such instances of impropriety in their midst or entering within each's realm of awareness. Each and every member of our United States Department of Justice is similarly required to swear or affirm such an oath.

11. And further insuring these aforesated Judicial ends, our United States BARS have been created and operate in order to police and enforce just such stated Judicial ends. However, it would appear that ample evidence now exists to support Plaintiffs awareness and even contention that our United States Judiciaries have not only become infiltrated and politicized but on occasion even now appear to exhibit instances of distinctly defensive measures designed to protect itself from the illumination of corruption and politicization concerning its own members. Similar collusive behavior is now evident in our United States Department of Justice.
12. Aforesaid awareness further exemplified by the televised events regarding Monica Goodling in our United States Department of Justice who, yet again, admitted in front of a Congressional hearing that she was aware of the impropriety and even illegality which she was committing while in office while remaining entirely immune from prosecution or address by any member contained within the offices of these two named defendants.
13. Aforesaid awareness further exemplified by David Iglesias and Bud Cummins who actually reported the illegal activities of United States Department of Justice employee Monica Goodling or simply refused to bring the prosecutions of what were clearly politically motivated prosecutions against innocent defendants and instead of being heralded by these named defendants were instead fired or demoted from their Public Service office positions.
14. Aforesaid awareness further exemplified by the illegal detainment and imprisonment for approximately 18 months Dr. Richard Fine whose only crime appears to have now been that he attempted to illuminate these very types of collusive and corrupt behavior within our judiciaries. Said Imprisonment widely televised and covered in our news media yet not a single member from either office of these named Defendants inquired into the motivation of said acts.
15. Further , it is alleged that several Superior Court Judges received what appeared to be a bribe of about \$40,000 from the County of Los Angeles which was never reported per code . And , on information and belief later were appointed to the Federal Bench and ruled on his false detention with out declaring their conflict of interest. Later, several members of the STATE JUDICIARY stated down as a result thereof, including one member of the California State Supreme Court. Full Disclosure broadcasted the same recently and informed the public when attorney Fine was released. Attorney Fine had worked for the Justice Department previously. The aftermentioned Judges alleged herein as Defendants have been the last element used by criminal enterprises (i.e. Mortgage Fraud case filed in San Diego by the United States Justice Department). It is

common knowledge that each criminal enterprise use via influence or direct bribery to rule in the controlling members favor in any pending litigation before the United States District Courts and various State Courts. And , notwithstanding various complaints to the State and the Federal Agencies few prosecution has taken place by either the State Attorney General or the Federal. The F.B.I. Chief recently has failed or refused to do the same unless an public outcry has preceded the complaint or some wealthy person or organization has backed the same, with sufficient news coverage by the main stream news media etc.

16. The list of improprieties can go on, of course, and will with the supplementation of evidence discerned through the subpoena power, deposition power and other discovery tools designed to assist Plaintiffs in further perfecting this United States Federal Complaint against these named defendants.
17. The front page of the October 15th, 2011 edition of the New York Times ran headlines illuminating a new tone being set in this Country setting an initial precedent which heretofore had never been observed by this nation's judiciaries when Bishop Robert W. Finn was indicted for "looking the other way" and failing to take affirmative steps to protect this nation's children from the predatory activities of Priests known to the Catholic Church to possess pedophilic and/or pornographic tendencies.
18. In short, Defendant Fine's case fosters in a NEW ERA in this nation where those who choose to hold such high levels of trust and public service will no longer be allowed the luxury nor benefit of "looking the other way" when impropriety occurs within their midst and will be held accountable for not just their improper actions but their improper inactions. Admittedly Bishop Finn not being held to nor even taking any oath of Public Service to the citizens of this nation like the named defendants herein.
19. The controlling individuals are different from the criminal enterprise and the various enterprises use the Judges who aid and abet one of the 57 crimes listed in the RICO Statute . The are one or more Bankruptcy Judges who are especially guilty of above stated RICO Charges and the details will be more illumin when discovery has been completed. But on information and belief Judge Barry Russel has made several questionable ruling recently which are on appeal and in favor of a potential mortgage fraud criminal enterprise by SRT Partners LLC despite the evidence being clearly against said defendants.
20. These various criminal enterprise could not be successful absent the Judges in the State and Federal venue ruling in the criminal enterprise favor when the law is clearly against the controlling individuals forcing the Plaintiff to appeal and suffer the consequences of said void rulings due to bribery and corruption. RICO Statute holds all aiders and abettors as guilt as the controlling individuals of various corporations , LLC and Public Entities.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: NEGLIGENCE

21. Plaintiff incorporates, herein by reference, each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 17 as though set out in full herein.
22. In the early 1970s United States Senator Knapp initiated the Congressionally funded Knapp Commission hearings in order to attempt to discover to what extent the presence of corrupt and collusive employees contained within our offices of Public Service were to be then present. And what this United States Federally funded Commission found was that 1 in 10 public servants contained within our offices of Public Service were "absolutely corrupt". This Commission going on to coin the phrase "The Blue Wall of Silence" regarding the 8 in 10 other members in any Public Service office who would simply look the other way and not talk about the corruption occurring within their Public Service department. Leaving only 1 in 10 left in any Public Service office to be accurately described as "absolutely honest". The Congressionally funded Moellen commission then studied in 1992 the enigma of the 8 in 10 members of any Public Service office who would claim to be ignorant of the corruption and impropriety occurring within their Public Service Office and found that ignorance to be properly labeled in most cases: "A willful ignorance" by those 8 in 10 member group.
23. Plaintiffs proffer that the Public Service Offices of our United States Federal Judiciary and our United States Department of Justice should have no distinction in its members drawing only from those contained within the 1 in 10 members of any Public Service office who can be accurately described as "absolutely honest". Thereby removing from either of these identified Public Service Offices each and every member who can either be accurately described as "absolutely corrupt" or even those who appear to exhibit instances of "A willful ignorance" regarding improprieties occurring within their Public Service Office.
24. Plaintiffs further proffer those Public Servants illuminated in this Federal Complaint, following discovery, and prior to trial who are willing to relinquish their veil of protection inherent in a lifetime appointment to our offices of Public Service and voluntarily step down from office will be recognized as guilty of the 2nd Cause of Action listed in this Federal Complaint. However, any unwilling to avail themselves of this option will be fervently pursued in order to raise their own culpability to at a minimum "A willful ignorance" regarding ANY corruption and impropriety identified while occupying their office of Public Service and Trust thus securing their placement in the 1st Cause of Action listed in this Federal Complaint.
25. Plaintiffs further proffer that those Public Servants who do not enjoy a lifetime appointment but still occupy one of our Offices of Public Service (ie, those in our United States Department of Justice) following discovery and prior to trial will be afforded the same option with the additional caveat that they contractually agree to refrain from seeking any other office of Public Service in this nation for a period of twenty years or as deemed appropriate by Judge or Jury.

- ✓ 26. Defendant, Pamela Harris the State Attorney can be sued in Federal Court for the above state tort based upon the case law ex younger which allows certain exceptions to the 11th amendment when their are on going Federal Violations and a failure or refusal to file charges against known mortgage fraud enterprises reported to said State Attorney General. News Media Coverage is not a legal precedent condition before a investigation or charge being filed.
27. On information and belief Ms. Harris aid and abetted the Banks by charging a private attorney who was suing the Banks for Mortgage Fraud under the pretext that she was saving the homeowners from fraud who did not want her to save them. However, we did note that recently said State Attorney General has stated she would start to go after white collar crime and we assume via RICO.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as follows:

Plaintiffs are seeking no monetary recovery in this Federal Complaint but rather ONLY to begin to clean up the corruption, politicization and collusion which appears to now be evident within members of both named Defendants. Paradoxically enough, the very duties that Defendants themselves are statutorily and ethically obligated to fulfill without the necessity of this Federal Complaint.

Plaintiffs seek the immediate removal of any remaining member illuminated to exhibit behaviors contrary in any respect to those commonly described as "absolutely honest". In short, those found to have either participated in corrupt activities in their official duties or even to be described as exhibiting tendencies of "A willful ignorance" regarding those who do engage in corrupt or collusive behavior.

Any Attorneys Fees incurred in the prosecution of this Federal Complaint;

All costs of suit incurred by Plaintiff, including but not limited to costs of expert witnesses, deposition fees, filing fees, witness fees, costs and expenses including but not limited to travel, court, filing and all other costs relevant and associated with the preparation, prosecution and presentation of this United States lawsuit;

Any and all other remedies, and other equitable relief granted by this court, and for such damages as may be reasonable and/or appropriate in the premises.


WHEREFORE, Plaintiff further prays for a trial by jury on all issues triable by a jury herein and reserves their right to amend this complaint upon the discovery of additional causes of action amenable to them following discovery measures.

1
Respectfully submitted,

Maria O. Miller

11-8-11

7 III


Chris

CD 9 Meeting/Phone Time Request

NOV 10/18/11

8

Date of Request:

10-18-11

Date Requesting:

ASAP 10-20/21-11
RMW in Mark

To Meet With:

Attorney SR Sick and CR legal SR

From Company/Dept:

Parks Recreation Commission

Meeting Agenda:

Support Resolution Passed

Caller/Contact Person:

CR legal SR 951-346-7523

Contact's Phone Number:

951-346-7523

E-mail Address:

Chris.legal@SR.com

Requested by:

CR legal, SR

Approved by:

Legal Review Committee
in copy LA, 11

I HEREBY MOVE that the
Attorney relative to the City's inv
ADOPT the Los Angeles Hous

March 2, 2011
CF 11-0290

VERIFICATION OF G. NITRINI 111 OF SAID COMPLAINT AND DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF T.R.O.

I MARIO G. NITRINI III , HEREBY DECLARE UNDER THE PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA LAWS THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT:

- 1) THERE HAS BEEN AN ONGOING CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY SUBJECT TO THE R.I.C.O. ACT TO HAVE ME DESTROYED AND /OR MURDERED FOR OVER 15 YEARS CONCERNING MY KNOWLEDGE OF L.A.P.D. COVER-UP CONCERNING THE O.J. SIMPSON CASE AND SAGA INCLUDING EXCUPATORY EVIDENCE WITH IN THE LOS ANGELES DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE , THE F.B.I. AND THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE ;
- 2) THERE HAS BEEN FALSE HOODS AND FALSIFICATIONS ON MY LEGAL FILINGS- SEE EXHIBITS "B" TO "C" AND DISCOVERY WHEN THE SAME IS OBTAINED;
- 3) GIVEN THE WORLD WIDE SUPPRESSION VIOLENCE AND THE SUDDEN PARTIAL DESTRUCTION OF VARIOUS OCCUPATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES - SPECIFICALLY IN OAKLAND , LONG BEACH , RIVER SIDE CALIFORNIA , AND THE STATE OF GEORGIA WHERE THE MAYOR SUDDENLY REVOKED THE WAIVER PREVIOUSLY GRANTED TO SAID OCCUPIERS ETC;
- 4) I SPECIFICALLY HEARD A STAFF MEMBER IN THE CITY HALL OF LOS ANGELES INFORM A GUEST WHEN HE INQUIRED ABOUT THE PRESENCE OF ALL THE TENTS SURROUNDING CITY HALL , THAT THE CITY WAS IN THE PROCESS OF GETTING RID OF THEM AS SOON AS POSSIBLE . I AM CONCERN ABOUT THE POTENTIAL LOSS OF LIFE AND/OR INJURIES THAT WILL OCCUR IF "OLA" IS SUDDENLY DESTROYED WITHOUT LAWFUL NOTICE;
- 5) ON 11-8-2011 WHEN I WAS IN THE CENTRAL DISTRICT SUPERIOR COURT I OVER HEARD A STAFF MEMBER COMMENT THAT THERE WAS GOING TO BE EVICTIONS SOON CONCERNING THE OCCUPIERS OF CITY HALL -AKA "O L.A." , OF WHICH I HAVE BEEN A MEMBER OF SAID MOVEMENT;
- 6) ON 11-8-2011 I NOTICED THREE LAPD OFFICERS WALKING THROUGH THE ENCAMPMENT AT "O.L.A." DOING A SURVEILLANCE OPERATION AND ANOTHER WALK THROUGH OF LAPD OFFICERS OCCURRING THIS MORNING -11-9-2011;
- 7) PREVIOUSLY THE FORREST OFFICERS AND THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT DID A WALK THROUGH AND CONSULTED WITH THE LAPD ON INFORMATION AND BELIEF BY CHRIS LEGAL ,Sr. WHO WAS PERSONALLY PRESENT AND SPOKE WITH THE FORREST OFFICERS ABOUT MITIGATING THEIR MYRIAD OF CONCERNS . I BELIEVE THE LAPD IS LOOKING FOR A REASON TO USE EXCESSIVE FORCE ON THE ENCAMPMENT WHILE THE ENTIRE CITY COUNCIL IS AWAY IN SISTER CITY MEETING IN ARIZONA AND WILL NOT RETURN UNTIL NEXT WEEK;

8) THERE IS MORE EVIDENCE THAT WILL BE COVERED AT A LATER DATE INCLUDING THE CRITICAL STATEMENTS IN SUPPORT OF "O.L.A." BY THE REV. JESSIE JACKSON ON 11-8-2011 AT ABOUT 6:45 PM.

DATED: NOVEMBER 9, 2011

Mario G. Nitrini 111

NOVEMBER 9, 2011

Mario G. Nitrini
III

SUMMARY OF S R T PARTNERS LLC FEDERAL CONSPIRACY CHARGE FOR RICO

S R T PARTNERS LLC OUT OF DELAWARE IS A INVESTMENT LLC FOR THE PURPOSE OF BUYING HOME OWNERS PROPERTY IN FORECLOSURE WHO HAVE EQUITY IN THEIR PROPERTY. THIS IS THE CRIMINAL ENTERPRIZE STRUCTURE. THE INVESTORS ARE WEATHY PEOPLE FROM VARIOUS STATES IN THE UNITED STATES AND THEIR I.D. CAN BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL SINCE THEY ARE A PART OF A LLC IN DELAWARE.

THE CONTROLLING PERSON IS RICHARD FELL, ESQ. PER HIS DECLARATION FILED IN FEDERAL COURT IN DUNCAN VS SRT PARTNERS LLC ET AL.

SCOTT KATO IS ANOTHER CONTROLLING PERSON IN CHARGE OF THE REAL ESTATE UNIT.

THE LAW FIRM OF JOHN TIREY ST JOHN HAS VARIOUS PARTNERS THAT ARE CONTROLLING INDIVIDUALS. AND THEY ASSOCIATED WITH OTHER LAWYERS.

JOHN DOES 1-5 ARE CONTROLLING PERSONS AND THEY WILL BE NAMED WHEN DISCOVERY IS STARTED. THEY ARE BROKERS, SECURITY, STRAW BUYERS, TITLE COMPANY, JUDGES, OFFICERS, ESCROW OFFICERS, CONTRACTORS AND ILLEGAL ALIENS.


THE CONTROLING PERSONS AND THE ATTORNEY CONSPIRER TO COMMIT VARIOUS CRIMES TO FORCE THE HOMEOWNERS OUT OF THEIR HOMES, REPAIR SAID HOMES, LIST SAID HOMES WITH THEIR BROKERS WHO USE S R T ESCROW COMPANY / TITLE COMPANY.

THE CRIMES THEY COMMIT ARE: KIDNAPPING, CONVERSION, FILING FALSE DOCUMENTS WITH THE RECORDERS OFFICE, VIOLATION OF FEDERAL AUTOMATIC STAYS, BRIBERY, BRIBERY OF STATE AND FEDERAL JUDGES TO RULE IN THEIR FAVOR NOTWITHSTAND THE FACTS AND THE LAW BEING AGAINST THEM. THESE ARE THE PREDICATED ACTS OF RACKETEERING THAT ALLOW THE ENTERPRIZE TO MAKE A BIG PROFIT ON BUYING AND SELLING HOMEOWNERS HOMES. THEY BUY LOW AT AUCTIONS, THEN REPAIR THE SAME WITH AND/OR WITH OUT PERMITS SOME TIMES. AND, FINALLY THEY SELL SAID HOMES AT MARKET VALUE WITH NETS A PROFIT. THE PROFIT IS SENT TO THE VARIOUS INVESTORS WHO LIVE IN VARIOUS STATES. SOME OF THE INVESTOR ARE AWARE OF THE CRIMINAL ACTS BY THE ATTORNEY AND CONTROLLING PERSONS IN ORDER TO MAKE THE QUICK PROFITS. OTHER LAWYERS ARE AWARE, SOME JUDGES, SOME POLICE OFFICERS, AND POLITICIANS ABOUT THE INVESTMENT FRAUD. BUT UNTIL SOMEONE PUT ALL THE FACTS AND PROOF BEFORE THE STATE AND FEDERAL AGENCY.

11/11/2011 10:00:00 AM

11

OCCUPY LOS ANGELES, Plaintiff



R

III

DECLARATORY RELIEF CONCERNING ALL OCCUPIERS AT CITY HALL UNDER THE 1ST AMENDMENT

YOUR PLAINTIFF(S) REQUEST THIS COURT TO MAKE A LEGAL DETERMINATION CONCERNING THE RIGHTS OF ALL OCCUPIERS IN THE 1.7 ACRES OF PUBLIC PARK SPACE SURROUNDING CITY HALL EXPRESSING PEACEFULLY THEIR 1ST AMENDMENT RIGHTS.

WHEREAS THE ORGANIZERS OF OCCUPY LOS ANGELES HEREINAFTER "OLA" ENGAGED IN PEACEFUL CONVERSATIONS WITH THE LAPD AND LA CITY COUNCIL LAYING THE GROUND WORK FOR ABOUT 20-30 DEMOSTRATORS TO BRING THEIR TENTS, SIGNS, SLOGANS, MUSIC AND COMPLAINTS AND PEACEFULLY EXPRESS THEIR 1ST AMENDMENT RIGHTS 24 HOURS A DAY SEVEN DAYS A WEEK WITH NIGHTLY RALLIES CALLED GENERAL ASSEMBLIES.

WHEREAS ON 1-1-2011 SAID DEMOSTRATORS OF "OLA" PITCHED THEIR TENTS AND STARTED THE OCCUPATION THE PARK SURROUNDING CITY HALL NOTWITHSTANDING THE LOCAL ORDINANCE PROHIBITING ANY OCCUPATION BETWEEN 10:30 PM AND 5:00 AM THE NEXT DAY.

WHEREAS AFTER "OLA" PEACEFULLY DEMONSTRATED OVER 10 DAYS CONSECUTIVELY THE LA CITY COUNCIL ENDORSED THEIR CONTINUANCE OCCUPATION BY "OLA" EXPRESSING THEIR 1ST AMENDMENT RIGHTS. SEE EXHIBIT "A" ATTACHED HERETO AND EXHIBIT "B" EXCERPTS OF THE 1ST AMENDMENT RIGHTS FROM OUR STATE AND/OR FEDERAL CONSTITUTION.

WHEREAS SAID RESOLUTION HAS BECOME LAW, AND "OLA" HAS OCCUPIED SAID PUBLIC PARK AREA OVER 30 CONSECUTIVE DAYS, NOW "OLA" WANTS A JUDICIAL DETERMINATION THAT THEY HAVE A LEGAL RIGHT TO CONTINUE BASED UPON 1ST AMENDMENT FEDERAL RIGHTS WHICH PREEMPT ANY CITY OR STATE ORDINANCE TO THE CONTRARY, THAT THEY HAVE ESTABLISHED A TENANCY AT WILL THAT IS NOT BASED UPON RENT, THAT THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE BY THE POWER INVESTED IN THE PEOPLE VIA OF CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, THAT ANY CLANDESTINE ATTEMPT BY CHIEF CHARLIE BECK OF THE LAPD OR THE CITY COUNCIL TO PREMATURELY TERMINATE SAID OCCUPATION WITH OUT GIVING THE REQUIRED 30 DAY NOTICE, 60 DAY NOTICE OR 90 DAY NOTICE SHALL BE VOID AND UNLAWFUL. THUS, "OLA" SHALL BE ENTITLED TO AN INJUNCTION TO PROHIBIT THE LAPD FROM ACTING ON THE THREAT OF FORCE, BEING USED

TO REMOVE "OLA" WITHOUT NOTICE. On information and belief Chief BECK IS HIGHLY MOTIVATED TO REMOVE "OLA" DUE PLAINTIFF BEING A MEMBER OF SAID GROUP WHO AGREES WITH THEIR PLEDGE OF NONVIOLENT CONDUCT AND EXPOSING CORRUPTION.

CHIEF CHARLIE BECK KNOWS PLAINTIFF HAS KNOWLEDGE OF CHIEF BECK'S CRIMINAL CORRUPTION DEALING WITH THE REAL KILLER(S) OF NICOLE BROWN SIMPSON AND RON GOLDMAN, BEING MEMBER(S) OF HIS POLICE FORCE. SEE EXHIBITS C AND "D" ATTACHED HERETO

7-10-2011 10:00 AM

AND INCORPORATED HEREIN . ADDITIONALLY , PLAINTIFF REQUEST JUDICIAL NOTICE OF THE O J SIMPSON CASE AND SAGA.

WHEREAS PLAIN T I F F PERSONALLY HEARD A CITY CLERK EMPLOYEE INFORM A GUEST ON 11-8-2011 THAT THE TAKE DOWN OF " O L A " WAS IMMINENT AND IN THE PROCESS . THIS WAS FURTHER CONFIRMED BY A RUMOR AT THE CENTRAL COURT AT 111 N HILL THAT A MASS EVICTION MIGHT BE FORTHCOMING.

WHEREAS " O L A " HAS DILIGENTLY BEEN WORKING WITH ALL LOCAL DEPARTMENTS WITH A TANGENTLE CONNCECTION TO THE PUBLIC PARK SPACE. HOWEVER, THEY HAVE NOT OBTAIN ED A PERMIT DUE TO NO SET PROCEDURE EXIST FOR PAYMENT COLLECT OF THE SAME FROM A NON PROFIT ORGANIZATION EXERCISING THEIR 1ST AMENDMENT RIGHTS.

WHEREAS " O L A " HAS BEEN RESPONSIBLE FOR PAYING ALL COST ASSOCIATED WITH TOILETS , FEEDING THE MANY GUESTS , SUPPORTERS , AND OCCUPIERS ETC.

WHEREAS " O L A " BELIEVES AND THEREFORE ALLEGE THAT THE LAPD AND THEIR CHIEF HAVE NO POWER TO OVER RIDE THE RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE LA CITY COUNCIL ON OR ABOUT 10-12-2011 ALLOWING VIA CONSTRUCTIVE NOTICE THAT ANY CITY ORDINANCE PROHIBITING THE 24 HOURS 7 DAYS A WEEK 1ST AMENDMENT RIGHTS IS WAIVED AND OF NO LEGAL EFFECT UNTIL FURTHER NOTICE.

THEREFORE, PLAINTIFF IS REQUESTING THIS COURT TO DETERMINE THE RIGHTS , NOTICE REQUIREMENT AND PROCEDURE THAT MUST BE FOLLOWED BEFORE ANY TERMINATION OF " O L A " OCCUPATION OF LA CITY HALL. AND , SPECIFICALLY PLAINITIFFS RIGHTS TO REMAIN AND HAVE HIS TENT DECLARED HIS HOME WITH FULL PROTECTION PER CASE LAW FROM ANY VIOLATION OF THE 4TH AMENDMENT OR ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THAT IS APPLICABLE TO

" O L A " AS AN ORGANIZATION OF 1ST AMENDMENT PROTESTORS TO RESTORE DEMOCRACY AND JUSTICE TO OUR COMMUNITIES , COURT SYSTEM AND OUR COUNTRY.

PRAY FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF ,

FOR COST HEREIN

FOR ATTORNEY FEES WHEN RETAINED

FOR INJUNCTION VIA TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER TO PREVENT ANY FORCE OR VIOLENCE BEING USED AGAINST " O L A ' .

Mario G. Rithenry
11-8-11

FR

CF 09-0234-51



I certify that this is a true and correct copy of the original Complaint on file in this office consisting of 58 pages. JOHN A. CLARKE, Executive Officer/Clerk of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles.

Date: APR 24 2012 By: C. Escobar, Deputy

C. ESCOBAR