

CLAIM AGAINST SAN DIEGO COUNTY

My name is Diana Napolis and I am filing this claim with the County of San Diego against San Diego Probation Department alleging malfeasance, negligence, false reporting, misconduct by a peace officer, violations of my First Amendment rights to free speech, intentional and negligent infliction of emotional distress, and conspiracy by Probation Officer Stephanie Morehead, her supervisor, Anna Guzman, and the Director of Ohio St. Probation, Lisa Donohoo.

Because I have been misdiagnosed as “mentally” ill by some mental health practitioners, but not others, I am going to briefly explain how and why these misdiagnoses occurred as well as provide an overview of my background which will provide the context of this complaint.

In 1990-1996 I was employed as a Court Intervention Social worker at San Diego Child Protection Services. In 1996-2000 I was self-employed as a Visitation Supervisor for Family Court during custody disputes. In 2000, I obtained my Marriage and Family Therapy license.

In 1994, while at CPS, I formed the Ritual Abuse Court Cases Project which was dedicated to gathering court documentation about the satanic ritual abuse [SRA] of children. I canvassed District Attorneys throughout the United States and published the results of my research in an archive of over 80 cases which can be found at <http://members.cox.net/dnap/srarchive.pdf> This archive was created in response to reporter Mark Sauer’s biased coverage in the San Diego Union-Tribune [SDUT], in which he purported to find no evidence of SRA, and in response to the 1991-92 and 1993-94 San Diego Grand Juries which attempted to sway the public into believing that this type of criminal behavior did not occur.

In 1995-2000 I was on the internet undercover on my own time anonymously debating with others. I published several web pages which provided information about the False Memory Syndrome Foundation [FMSF], an organization which is intent on covering up satanic crime and child sexual abuse; Carol Hopkins, foreperson of the 1991-92 San Diego Grand Jury; Dr. Elizabeth Loftus who is an Advisory Board member of the FMSF; and Michael Aquino, who had been a Lt. Col. in the Army and High Priest of his satanic cult, the Temple of Set, for 20 years. Dr. Aquino had been a military intelligence operative at one point in his career who worked in psychological operations but he was processed out of the Army in 1990 after a ritual child abuse investigation. During this time period I never disclosed that I was a child abuse investigator and chose instead to remain anonymous for my own safety because the people who I was interacting with were sociopathic and dangerous. In several publications Michael Aquino has been openly accused of ritual child molest, kidnapping, murder, and Mind control. Due to the controversial and political nature of my work, there were many attempts to identify and discredit me by members of the FMSF and satanist Michael Aquino. It should be clear,

based on this history, why I would be a target of these people.

In September 2000 Mark Sauer of the SDUT wrote an invasive and defamatory news article about me titled the “Web of Intrigue” after satanist Michelle Devereaux filed a false police report at the San Francisco Police Department so that San Diego State University [SDSU] Campus police would formally identify me for her and the cult group she worked for. This news article was filled with misrepresentations, or libel, by Aquino, Hopkins, Loftus, Sauer, and Devereaux, in efforts to make it appear that I was guilty of some wrong-doing when in actuality I had only lawfully exposed their activities.

On May 12, 2001, eight months after I was publicly identified, I was targeted with what is called “nonlethal” technology which psychologically incapacitated me and caused me to be misdiagnosed with mental illness.

On March 25, 2008 I filed a lawsuit in Federal court, naming SDSU, Mark Sauer, publisher of the San Diego Union-Tribune, David Copley, satanist Michael Aquino, Michelle Devereaux, Dr. Elizabeth Loftus, Carol Hopkins, and several others, for Defamation, False light, Conspiracy to violate my First Amendment rights to free speech, Invasion of privacy, and lastly, I have alleged that Dr. Michael Aquino, previously a Lt. Col. in the Army, intentionally targeted with nonlethal assault weapons in efforts to stop my research and retaliate against me.

The specific technology that I was targeted by includes “Voice to Skull Devices” [V2K] and “Voice Synthesis Devices” which simulate auditory hallucinations, and Computer/brain interface technology. Please read all of the documentation which supports the existence of this technology before dismissing these allegations out of hand.

The definition for Voice to Skull Devices can be found on the web site of the Federation of Scientists at <http://www.fas.org/sgp/othergov/dod/vts.html>. [Exhibit 1] It reads, in part:

Voice to Skull Devices

Definition/Scope:

Nonlethal weapon which includes (1) a neuro-electromagnetic device which uses microwave transmission of sound into the skull of persons or animals by way of pulse-modulated microwave radiation and (2) a silent sound device which can transmit sound into the skull of persons or animals.

The definition for “Voice Synthesis Devices” can be found on the Center for Army Lessons Learned web site at <http://call.army.mil/thesaurus/toc.asp?id=32228§ion=v>. [Exhibit 2] It reads:

Voice Synthesis Devices

Definition/Scope:

Nonlethal weapon which has the ability to clone a person's voice so that a synthesized message in that person's voice can be transmitted (e.g., by satellite) to a selected audience.

As described in these definitions this technology has the ability to send and/or clone "voices" to a selected target via satellite. According to a February 18, 2008 wired.com news article titled, "Nonlethal Weapons Could Target Brain, Mimic Schizophrenia," the US Army Intelligence and Security Command recently declassified an Army addendum titled, "Bioeffects of Selected Non-lethal Weapons," dated 1998, which was released to a private citizen under a Freedom of Information Request. [Exhibit 3] This declassified report which is posted at <http://members.cox.net/dnap/declassifiedmicrowave.pdf> reads, in part, beginning on pg. 6, under Incapacitating Effect: Microwave Hearing:

Tunability

"The phenomenon is tunable in that the characteristics sounds and intensities of those sounds depend on the characteristics of the RF energy as delivered. *Because the frequency of the sound heard is dependant on the pulse characteristics of the RF energy, it seems possible that this technology could be developed to the point where words could be transmitted to be heard like the spoken word, except that it could only be heard within a person's head.* In one experiment, communication of the words from one to ten using "speech modulated " microwave energy was successfully demonstrated. Microphones next to the person experiencing the voices could not pick up the sound. Additional development of this would open up a wide range of possibilities."

Recovery/Safety

"*Humans have been subjected to this phenomenon for many years.*" The energy deposition required to produce this effect is so small that it is not considered hazardous experimentation when investigating responses at the just-perceptible levels."

"Possible Influence on Subject(s)

"Application of the microwave hearing technology could facilitate a private message transmission. It may be useful to provide a disruptive condition to a person not aware of the technology. *Not only might it be disruptive to the sense of hearing, it could be psychologically devastating if one suddenly heard "voices"*

within one's head.

It should be emphasized that this declassified report admits to the usage of technology that can transmit “voices” to a target, they admit that humans have been subjected to this phenomenon for many years, and that it would be “devastating” to hear voices in one’s head. I believe the totality of this evidence provides incontrovertible proof that this technology exists therefore there are other reason why a client might complain of “hearing voices.” There is much more evidence available which documents this technology but I believe the information I have provided is sufficient for the purposes of this complaint.

At one time I was a licensed therapist and studied the Diagnostic Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders [DSM]. Because mental health practitioners are bound by the parameters of the DSM, and this manual does not presently acknowledge the existence of nonlethal technology, mental health practitioners are mandated to diagnose a client with a disorder that is included in the DSM. That would especially be so if they wanted to receive insurance benefits and avoid accusations of malpractice. This is a political issue that needs resolution but it will take the work of many to change it. If the DSM acknowledged that there were other possibilities for the etiology of “hearing voices,” victims of nonlethal technology would not be routinely misdiagnosed as mentally ill, and they would be fairly and justly treated by the mental health and criminal justice systems. However, that is currently not the case.

In October 2002 I was arrested for writing an email threat to a Hollywood figure, Jennifer Love Hewitt, because my perpetrators were playing games with me via V2K and “Voice Synthesis Devices,” and threatened that they would irrevocably injure me within the week. Because of these threats I wanted to have myself placed in the custody of law enforcement for my own protection. The fact that I wrote this email “threat” on purpose to have myself arrested is provable because I clearly wrote in one of my messages that I was “committing a crime,” and I asked Jim Mix (J. Hewitt’s web master) to “contact the FBI” in order to make sure the FBI would be alerted and I would be arrested. These facts are in the record. It should be noted that I was just informed by the District Attorney’s office that they have lost my file, but I have copies of all of these emails and the Public Defender’s office should have them as well. I refer you to the body of my lawsuit which is posted at <http://members.cox.net/legalfed/NapolisvAquino.pdf> for further details about the context of this interaction with “Hollywood” figures.

On 11/05/03 I plea-bargained to PC 646. 9(A) a Stalking offense and was placed on five years probation. I was ordered to attend counseling, to take random lie detector tests, and to take medication as prescribed. Since that date I have been monitored by the Mentally Ill unit of San Diego Probation Department because they have mistakenly believed that hearing “voices“ is a symptom of mental illness in my case. I have now served 4 ½ years on probation and my probationary status should terminate in November 2008.

In 2003, I advised my first probation officer, Brook, (last name unknown) that a satanic

cult had violated me in the past and I expected that they would try to cause trouble for me at San Diego Probation at some point in the future. From 2004 to approximately November 2007 Officer Stephanie Morehead has been assigned as my Probation Officer with Anna Guzman acting as Officer Morehead's supervisor. Lisa Donohoo is Ms. Guzman's supervisor and the Director of Ohio Street Probation. Although Officer Morehead has continued to be involved in some aspects of my case, in November 2007 I was formally assigned Probation Officer Karen Johnson with Ms. Guzman acting as supervisor of Ms. Johnson. Because of ongoing allegations of malfeasance, on April 29, 2008 the Director of Probation, Mack Jenkins, authorized Lisa Donohoo to manage my case until my probationary status ends within the year. From March 2004 to March 2008, Dr. Todd Pizitz was assigned as my psychologist.

In 2004, I began to have difficulty with Officer Morehead and Supervisor Guzman after they made attempts to violate my First amendment rights to free speech, and routinely mischaracterized me in reports presented to the San Diego Superior Court, which has caused me significant emotional distress from 2004 to the present.

In 2004 I was issued a hand-delivered invitation by the producers of the Montel Williams Show to appear on his program. While I was contemplating that decision, my home was raided/searched by Officer Morehead and Supervisor Guzman after which they confiscated my invitation to the Montel Williams Show with no explanation as to why and they never returned it.

In January 2008, after I checked my criminal court case file SCD 171331 for the first time, I discovered a False report dated 6/29/2004 which had been written by Officer Morehead and signed by Supervisor Guzman which I had never seen. My attorney neglected to show this report to me at the time because he too probably believed I was "mentally ill." In this report Officer Morehead seriously mischaracterized me, overtly and wrongly pathologized me, and falsely claimed that I had refused to take a lie detector test.

Officer Morehead began this 6/29/2004 report to the San Diego Superior Court by claiming in the third paragraph that I was in compliance with probationary mandates. [Exhibit 4] Ms. Morehead wrote:

"At various intervals (home and probation office), the undersigned has conducted "med counts" indicating medication compliance. During weekly probation contacts, the defendant has consistently been very curt when confronted regarding her mental illness, and other personal information which would assist probation in guiding her to the services that would benefit her.

Despite her med compliance, the undersigned has noticed her behavior to be unchanged. She continues to minimize her mental illness, has a glassy stare, rarely blinks, and is expressionless. This leads the undersigned to believe that defendant's med compliance is suspect. Her answers to various questions remain the same (ie. fine okay, etc..)"

Over the years Officer Morehead has continued to provide pseudo-clinical assessments of me which are incorrect. I am aware of this as I was a licensed therapist and during my internship I had worked with the chronically mentally ill. I do not believe that either Officer Morehead or her Supervisor Anna Guzman have the academic credentials that would qualify them to make these types of assessments. Because I understood early on that Officer Morehead and Supervisor Guzman did not understand what I was really suffering from, I intentionally kept my communications with Morehead/Guzman to a minimum. In any case I do not believe that having a “glassy stare,” “rarely blinking,” and being “expressionless” is a sign of medication noncompliance. It could also be interpreted as not wanting to communicate with one’s probation officer which was the case in this instance. Officer Morehead continued:

“The defendant was scheduled for a polygraph exam on 04/13/2004. During that interview, she revealed hearing voices. Due to her active psychosis, and the possibility of an inaccurate reading, the examiner did not conduct the polygraph exam ... On 06/14/2000, the defendant was scheduled for a subsequent polygraph test. She reported to the examiner that she was experiencing cramps due to a bladder infection. According to the examiner the defendant reported hearing voices. When confronted with this by the undersigned, she denied telling the examiner that she was hearing voices and claimed it to be a misunderstanding on his part. The examiner was unable to conduct the test ... The defendant is before the Court for a Review hearing. She is unwilling to submit to a polygraph exam, and has given both medical and psychological reasons for this.

The problem with this statement is that I never refused to take a lie detector test. This was a mischaracterization of the situation and was a falsehood which was communicated to the court by Officer Morehead. According to Officer Morehead’s own documentation it was the lie detector facilitators who refused to give me a lie detector test during that time period, not my refusal to take a lie detector test which stopped it from occurring.

In approximately February 2008, I contacted Dr. Todd Pizitz about the content of this recently discovered 6/29/2004 report. He confirmed that he had no record indicating that I had ever refused to take a lie detector test in 2004, or at any other time, despite this false representation to the court by Officer Morehead. Dr. Pizitz routinely reviews the results of all of his client’s lie detector tests in a group setting. I had been in treatment with Dr. Pizitz for 2 ½ months before that report had been written and he had never spoken to me in group about any alleged refusal to take a lie detector test.

In Dr. Pizitz’ report, which was attached to Morehead’s report, it indicated that because I had told the lie detector examiner, Darryl Bullens, that I heard “voices,” Mr. Bullens decided that I was “psychotic” and therefore could not take the test. This occurred twice but, again, I always intended to take the test and never refused which Dr. Pizitz confirmed. It should be noted that in Dr. Todd Pizitz’ report he indicated that he thought I was clinically depressed with a “psychotic” disorder because I reported that I heard “voices.” However, between the years 2004 and 2007, after I furnished Dr. Pizitz with reports and documentation about the existence of nonlethal technology, Dr. Pizitz told me

that in light of this information, he did not know with certainty what my diagnosis was.

Because I am a victim of “Voice to Skull” technology, medication does not, nor has it ever alleviated the “voices” that I hear, which is to be expected. This has left me in an untenable position over the years: If I told the truth about the “voices” that I hear, my medication was increased and the lie detector facilitators refused to test me, after which I was blamed if the examiner refused to conduct a lie detector test. If I did not tell the truth about the voices that I hear, and was able to take a lie detector, I risked not passing this test based on the fact that I tried to cover up the fact that I hear “voices.” Unfortunately, as will be further documented, Officer Morehead also mistakenly decided that if I reported that I heard “voices,” it meant that I was not taking my medication. In fact I have taken my medication as prescribed without fail because I want to be in compliance with Probation mandates. Officer Morehead continued in this report:

“On 3/23/2004, a search was conducted of the defendant’s home ... The search also revealed an envelope addressed to the defendant from the Montel Williams Show. Inside the envelope was a generic pamphlet of the show. When confronted with this, the defendant claimed to have been sought out by the producer to make a guest appearance to “talk about stalking.” Probation contacted the associate producer and requested they cease and desist contact with the defendant. They agreed and were given the Probation Department’s phone number to call in the event the defendant corresponded with them.”

In this report Officer Morehead claimed that San Diego Probation had called the producers of the Montel Williams Show personally to tell them that I could not appear on the program, and then instructed the producers to contact probation if I ever contacted the Montel Williams Show again. The inference was that San Diego Probation had not only stopped my potential interview on this program but would continue to refuse my right to appear on this program. If these officials argue that I was not in “compliance” because of my “refusal” to take my lie detector test at that time, then by their own reasoning, when I passed my test, they should have allowed me to appear on this program and notified me. I have taken and passed many lie detector test since the date of this report. Given that I had not refused to take my lie detector test, which Dr. Pizitz confirms, these officials had no valid reason to have confiscated my invitation. Therefore this was a blatant interference with my first amendment rights because San Diego Probation had no right to dictate in what media I could appear which is a fact that other probation officers have confirmed. On August 27, 2007 I wrote a letter to the Montel Williams show requesting to appear on their show, but they never responded. Now I understand why. Because San Diego Probation employees Morehead/Guzman/Donohoo did not understand the subject of nonlethals, and have malice towards me, they have continually interfered with my rights to speak about the subject, and intentionally and willfully mischaracterized facts about me to the San Diego Superior Court, and singled me out for “special” treatment. However, the First amendment does not just protect popular speech, it protects unpopular speech as well.

Officer Morehead continued:

“Despite what appears to be med compliance, the defendant’s behavior continues to be suspect. Further, the undersigned is concerned that she does not complain of side effects from her meds, leading the undersigned to believe she is not taking them. It is Equally disturbing that the defendant corresponded with a representative of a well-known celebrity talk show. These may be pre-incident indicators for relapse, and does not bode well for her success on probation.”

Again, this type of amateur clinical analysis and representation to the court was typical of Officer Morehead, and again her analysis was faulty and misleading. It should be common knowledge to anyone with experience in the mental health field that not all people experience or report having side-effects from their medication. Because a client does not report side-effects it does not necessarily mean they are not taking their medication. In fact, since 2004 I have gained approximately 50 pounds and now weighs 180 pounds. Gaining weight is a common side-effect of psychotropic medication. However, there has been no mention at any time of my weight gain as a possible side-effect of my medication by Officer Morehead. Officer Morehead also falsely reported to the court that I had sought out representatives of the Montel Williams show when in actuality they had sought me out. Officer Morehead then informed the court that because I was not taking my medication, and had “corresponded” with a well-known celebrity show, these were “pre-incident” indicators for relapse. Officer Morehead was wrong on both counts.

Because I have never refused to take a lie detector test at any time during my probation, and Officer Morehead was misrepresenting the facts, this was the first occasion that Officer Morehead submitted and Supervisor Guzman signed a False Report to the San Diego Superior Court. If I had been aware of this report at the time I would have contested it. It is unclear whether the Public Defenders have a policy not to show reports to their “mentally ill” clients or if this instance was just indicative of attorney incompetence

Because of these continual misrepresentations and violations of my civil rights, beginning in the year 2004, I continually expressed my feelings of violation to Dr. Pizitz about Officer Morehead and Anna Guzman, at first because I believed they had no right to confiscate my invitation from the Montel Williams Show but then because this type of false reporting became a repeated pattern.

In 2004 this bias and agenda was further demonstrated when Officer Morehead informed me that she had been contacted by another media outlet who wanted to interview me. I asked who the media outlet was because I wanted to be interviewed. Officer Morehead told me that she was under no obligation to provide me with that information and actually refused to tell me. I am alleging that this was the second time San Diego Probation interfered with my First Amendment rights to free speech without good cause.

In November 2007 when I was invited to participate in a film project by a University of Southern California student about my case, and I requested “permission” from Officer

Karen Johnson to appear on this film, Ms. Johnson stated that she did not have the right to give or not give “permission” because San Diego Probation did not interfere with probationer’s decisions to appear in the media. If Ms. Johnson stated that this was the official policy then what explains the continual interference from Officer Morehead and Supervisor Guzman of San Diego Probation to keep me away from any television program that wanted to interview me?

In mid 2006 I decided to write several exploratory letters to the Institutional Review Boards [IRB] of University of California at Davis, Berkeley, and Irvine, requesting that they investigate whether a UC Davis professor, a physics student who was known to me, or Dr. Elizabeth Loftus had ever listed me as a human research subject without my consent. The IRB’s are mandated to investigate human subjects abuse and I had every right to request an investigation. I had discovered that Lawrence Livermore Laboratory was on record as researching nonlethal technology and this laboratory was co-run by the Office of the President of the UC School System until 2007.

The Office of the President responded to my request claiming that they had found no record of such events which was to be expected. I was told by UC Irvine that their “Whistleblowers Unit” would handle my complaint. I had expressed in these letters that I had what appeared to be a public “breakdown” which I wanted to explain if it ever became an issue and that I was afraid of a few people I had named in my complaint. I never mentioned at any time in these letters that I was on probation or had a criminal record.

In approximately June/August 2006, Officer Morehead began receiving complaints from the UC Campus Police about the letters I had sent to the IRB’s of UC Davis and UC Irvine. The IRB’s had taken my polite, confidential requests for an investigation and then had apparently notified the individuals involved – despite my advising the IRB’s that I had been afraid to come forward until that time - and turned my correspondence over to the campus police. The campus police and unidentified others then informed San Diego County Probation and Officer Morehead that I had written letters requesting an investigation occur about my victimization by nonlethals. This obviously makes it appear that they had something to hide. This is particularly disturbing because I had not written anything threatening in these letters. In fact, it is obvious someone within the UC system had gone out of their way to discover that I was on probation. It is true I had alleged activity by nonlethals which might have appeared unusual to an inexperienced reader but certainly not after review by someone who had expertise in the subject which the Office of the President of the UC System should have had.

In approximately August of 2006, Officer Morehead told me to cease all communications with the UC System (for that time period) and reiterated that I was not allowed to use the word processor. It became evident that Morehead and the Administration of Probation were speaking to people from these schools and elsewhere who were claiming I was guilty of some activity, but I did not know what that could be. I asked Officer Morehead whether I would be informed about what the exact allegations were so that I could defend myself. Morehead said “yes,” but that was not the case.

In September of 2006, I was informed by my counselor, Dr. Pizitz, that he had received a phone call from Supervisor Anna Guzman who told him she was attempting to build a “legal case” against me based on my long telephone bill and apparently the complaints made by the UC System. Ms. Guzman had phoned several people on my phone bill but unfortunately did not appear to understand the content of the information that she received from those phone calls.

Ms. Guzman had given Dr. Pizitz three examples of what she perceived as my alleged misconduct:

1) Ms. Guzman claimed that I was calling “Capitol Hill.” In reality, I had contacted a few representatives in Washington, DC about past legislation banning nonlethal technology and was referred to others who might be interested in passing future legislation about this topic. There is nothing wrong with contacting government officials and I was always polite in my communications with others. What Ms. Guzman did not know was that there are organizations which consist of people alleging that they are being assaulted by nonlethals and they provide names of governmental officials to contact.

2) Ms. Guzman claimed that I had accessed a “sealed” court file. In reality, I had called several courts in attempts to track the location of a particular lawsuit - John St. Clair Akwei vs. the NSA - and discovered that it was in storage in another State and had to be specially ordered. This case file had never been sealed by a judge and at present I have a copy of this entire case. As a court supervisor, Ms. Guzman should have known that accessing court files is public information and is not illegal. In fact if this case had been sealed it would have been impossible for me to have obtained a copy of these court records.

3) Ms. Guzman then claimed that I was calling people about the “paranormal” and she perceived something wrong with that. I have a Masters Degree in Transpersonal Psychology which includes the field of the paranormal. I had contacted a well-known specialist in another state who was known to me to speak to her about a personal subject. There is nothing illegal about this activity.

I am alleging that this was the third time that San Diego Probation tried to interfere with my first amendment rights. This time for attempting to make it appear that the benign phone calls that I had a perfect right to make were illegal because she did not understand the subject matter.

On 9/14/2006 I wrote a letter to Supervisor Guzman in attempts to correct her misunderstanding about these phone calls. [Exhibit 5] On 9/14/2006 I wrote another letter to Guzman’s supervisor Lisa Donohoo advising her of the mistakes Guzman had made about the nature of my phone calls. [Exhibit 6] In addition I attached information about nonlethals which I requested that she read. I also requested at that time to Ms. Donohoo that I be relieved from being supervised by Officer Morehead and Supervisor Guzman because I believed malfeasance was occurring but my request was denied. I was

told later by Ms. Donohoo that she had not read the information that I had attached about “nonlethals” which proves that these officials were unwilling to be educated about the subject. That was the beginning of my fear that I was going to be arrested due to malice and incompetence by San Diego Probation officials. Because of that I contacted a State representative for protection.

In December 2006, I asked Probation to schedule a hearing at San Diego Superior Court for the return of my belongings that had been confiscated by the District Attorneys office and to request usage of the word processor and the internet/intranet because I wanted to write a book and eventually file a lawsuit.

On 12/14/2006 Officer Morehead wrote and Supervisor Guzman signed a report submitted to San Diego Superior Court titled, “San Diego County Probation Department, Probation Officer’s Supplemental Report.” [Exhibit 7] The entirety of this report was again filled with serious misrepresentations about me for the second time and they never addressed the return of my belongings. I am alleging this was the second False report submitted to the Court about me and the fourth time they interfered with my First amendment rights. Ms. Morehead wrote:

“The Probation Department scheduled this hearing at the request of the defendant to modify probation conditions relative to full computer access and full library privileges and permission to write a “tell all” book. Probation is ‘strongly’ opposed to this modification for the following reasons.”

I responded that I had never requested permission to write a “tell all” book and that it was well within my First amendment rights to write a book if I wished. The court was silent on this issue. I believe the disrespectful characterization of a potential book I might write as a “tell all” book indicated malice. Officer Morehead continued:

“On 5/26/2006, the undersigned received a call from a concerned citizen claiming the defendant was ‘posting’ her manifesto on the internet. His name is mentioned in the manifesto in a derogatory manner. The undersigned directed the defendant not to access the internet. She said she was researching psychotronics aka electronic harassment and remote neural monitoring. The defendant continues her claim to be a victim of psychotronics, which is the sole cause of her schizophrenia. The defendant adamantly denies any mental illness to present.”

In fact I had not been on the internet and there was no evidence to prove otherwise. I regularly take “lie detector” tests and I have never failed a test because I had “accessed the internet.” (I did fail once because I had used the library catalogue which I thought I could do because it was the intranet and provided no access to the internet) Three years earlier, in 2003, a colleague of mine had posted a report on the internet that I had written to the Board of Behavioral Sciences about how I was targeted in response to their revocation of my MFT license due to the fact that I plead guilty to a criminal offense. Many people posted this report on newsgroups and on web pages. I am guessing that the complaining party was an associate of Michael Aquino’s or an FMSF supporter who was

trying to cause trouble for me just as I suspected would happen. The timing was also most peculiar. I had just written exploratory letters about my victimization and coincidentally San Diego Probation began receiving numerous complaints about me. Ms. Morehead continued:

“On 7/26/2007, the undersigned received a phone call from another concerned citizen and stated the defendant was attempting to send a message to her through 3rd parties threatening to expose private information about the caller. Given the sensitivity of these claims as well as the dynamics of the case before the court the undersigned will clarify further at the Courts discretion.”

This type of false report sounded like the false allegations satanist Michelle Devereaux had made to the San Francisco Police Department so that I would be identified. However, Morehead refused to reveal the names of the complaining parties so I was unable to defend myself. Morehead continued:

“On 8/10/2006, the Probation department received information from Detective Henock of the UC Davis police regarding an incident report that had been filed on 8/2/2006. The defendant sent a letter and called to report that she was a subject of unauthorized experiments by a former student and a former staff member using computer/brain interface technology.”

Again, the Institutional Review Boards were set-up by the government to monitor non-consensual experimentation. Although it might appear unusual and even unbelievable when one first hears about the surveillance capabilities of nonlethal technology, it is provable that two-way communication via computer/brain interface can occur, based on the patents that I discovered which reflect that fact. Therefore there was nothing illegal or bizarre about my requests to the IRB’s to investigate this subject because it had a factual basis. Here is the evidence:

According to the U.S Patent office web site, Patent No. 6,011,991 was granted to Aris Mardirossian on January 4, 2000. The patent is titled, “Communication System and Method Including Brain Wave Analysis and/or use of Brain activity,” and it documents the ability for two-way communication via computer/brain interface to occur via satellite. The Abstract and Description reads:

ABSTRACT

“A system and method for enabling human beings to communicate by way of their monitored brain activity. The brain activity of an individual is monitored and transmitted to a remote location (e.g. by satellite.) At the remote location, the monitored brain activity is compared with pre-recorded normalized brain Activity curves, waveforms, or patterns to determine if a match or substantial match is found. If such a match is found, then the computer at the remote location determines that the individual was attempting to communicate the word, phrase,

or thought corresponding to the matched stored normalized signal.”

DESCRIPTION

“This invention relates to a system and method for enabling human beings to communicate with one another by monitoring brain activity. In particular this invention relates to such a system and method where brain activity of a particular individual is monitored and transmitted in a wireless manner (e.g. via satellite) from the location of the individual to a remote location so that the brain activity can be computer analyzed at the remote location thereby enabling the computer and/or individuals at the remote location to determine what the monitored individual was thinking or wishing to communicate.”

As of 5/20/2008 an internet search of “computer/brain interface” reveals over 1000 web sites that discuss this subject. In addition, in a December 2006, report titled, “US Electromagnetic Weapons and Human Rights” by Peter Phillips, Lew Brown and Bridget Thornton of Sonoma State University, they cite their concerns about nonlethals, computer/brain interface, and human rights violations. They write on pg. 3:

“This research explores the current capabilities of the US military to use electromagnetic (EMF) devices to harass, intimidate, and kill individuals and the continuing possibilities of violations of human rights by the testing and deployment of these weapons ... *Americans have little idea about the research concerning the capabilities of electromagnetics, directed acoustics, or computer-human interfacing* ... The majority of American do not know that we are currently using these new-concept weapons in Iraq and Afghanistan. Indiana University law professor David Fidler stated to the Economist, “because these weapons are most likely to be used on civilians, it is not clear that using them is legal under the international rules governing armed conflict...”

However, Officer Morehead continued in her report:

“The defendant also sent a 40 page faxed document outlining her background and stating she was writing to inform the Internal Review Board (IRB) administration about the usage of ultra-sophisticated technology that was used on her by a satanic cult from 2001 to present.”

I had never sent a “40 page” fax to the UC System and I believe this allegation was made intentionally by a yet unidentified party to make it appear that I was somehow “unbalanced.” As previously stated, and which is indicated above, I have alleged in a pending Federal lawsuit that satanic cult leader Lt. Col. Michael Aquino is responsible for having me targeted with nonlethal technology. If one does not bother to review the evidence on which I have based these claims, the allegations that I have made will most likely be misunderstood. Further, it doesn’t appear that Officer Morehead had ever

requested a copy of this alleged "40 page" fax from UC Davis to see if it actually existed nor was I shown this alleged fax and asked if I had written it. Given that the sender's phone number is usually printed on a fax, if the most cursory investigation had been conducted by Officer Morehead, these matters could have been easily resolved before this report to the court was ever written, and to not have done so indicates negligence. Morehead continued:

"The numerous letters sent to others appear to border on harassment to government officials, academic officials, professionals and private citizens. The defendant has been told that no investigations will be conducted in her allegations with the UC system."

This is a provable false allegation. In fact I had written approximately 10 very polite letters to others during that time period which was well within my legal rights to do and not one of them was "harassing." Officer Morehead and Supervisor Guzman had reviewed these letters at an earlier date and had never informed me that they were objectionable in any way. It should also be noted that Officer Morehead provided no excerpts from these alleged "harassing" letters for the court's evaluation, nor did she attach these alleged "harassing" letters to her court report to prove that they were "harassing." If Officer Morehead had actually thought that I was harassing others, then the appropriate action would have been to revoke my probation. The fact that my probationary status remained the same indicates that Officer Morehead did not have the evidence to support her claims and indeed they were eventually proven to be baseless. It appears that Morehead was characterizing these letters as "harassing" because she did not agree with or understand the content of those letters which is directly related to her routine efforts to interfere with my First amendment rights. However, I should never have been penalized because of the lack of cognitive skills by those who supervised me. Morehead continued:

"On 8/17/2006, the undersigned received a fax from Detective Altamarino of UC Irvine consisting of a complaint letter sent to the Subjects Rights Committee from the Defendant to report same/similar conduct of wrongdoing by campus officials since 2001 to present." "On 8/25/2006 the undersigned directed the defendant not to utilize any electronic communicative device until further notice. She was also directed to provide a copy of her phone bills to ensure the defendant will not be accessing the internet via home or cell phone."

"On or about 9/7/2006, the undersigned received a call from Detective Altamarino of UC Irvine Police regarding the defendant's behavior. The defendant mailed three floppy discs and one letter to a UCI professor. The same employee had received e-mails from an unidentifiable person containing information about the Curio Jones files. Curio Jones is one of the defendants AKAs. The employee expressed fear to campus police."

I believed at that time that the unidentified ""UCI professor" was more than likely Dr. Elizabeth Loftus but I was not sure because I was denied my Due Process rights and was

never provided with the name of my accusers so I could defend myself. I had never made personal contact with Dr. Elizabeth Loftus and instead wrote what I thought was a confidential request for an investigation to the IRB's.

Because I believe that Dr. Loftus is fully aware of how I was targeted, and knows that I was never "mentally ill," I do not believe that she would authentically feel "fear" if I ever did contact her, except perhaps for fear that I would lawfully expose her. I also believe that Dr. Loftus is fully aware of the existence of the nonlethal technology that I have referred to. In fact, another member of the FMSF Advisory Board, of which she is a member, writes about nonlethal technology, specifically Dr. Michael Persinger. Dr. Persinger wrote an article titled "On the Possibility of Directly Accessing Every Human Brain by Electromagnetic Induction of Fundamental Algorithms." The abstract reads:

"Contemporary neuroscience suggests the existence of fundamental algorithms by which all sensory transduction is translated into an intrinsic, brain-specific code. Direct stimulation of these codes within the human temporal or limbic cortices by applied electromagnetic patterns may require energy levels which are within the range of both geomagnetic activity and contemporary communication networks. A process which is coupled to the narrow band of brain temperature could allow all normal human brains to be affected by a subharmonic whose frequency range at about 10 Hz would only vary by 0.1 Hz."

He concludes the article with the following statement:

"Within the last two decades a potential has emerged which was improbable, but which is now marginally feasible. This potential is the technical capability to influence directly the major portion of the approximately six billion brains of the human species, without mediation, through classical sensory modalities, by generating neural information within a physical medium within which all members of the species are immersed. "

Regarding the "Curio Files" that this "UCI professor" reportedly received, it was my opponents on the internet who repeatedly referred to my work as the "Curio Files," or the "Curiophiles" which is provable. Curiously, during the time period that Loftus made these allegations, I discovered that references to the "Curio files" were made by one of my opponents "Raven" or John Singleton on the open internet and on a yahoo egroups list called "Witchhunt," which I used to write to. On the "Witchhunt" list, under the pseudonym "S.A. Jordan," Singleton wrote a message on 7/28/2006 titled, "The Curio Jones Files," explaining that he had compiled a set of documents that had been written about me which were being distributed.

On 8/5/2006, under the pseudonym "Raven," John Singleton wrote on another newsgroup, sci.psychology.psychotherapy, that the "Curio Files" were circulating via email. It was in July of 2006 that I had written my request for an investigation occur of Loftus by the IRB's. Obviously, the above evidence could be interpreted that since "Raven" was sending the "Curio Files" to others, Dr. Elizabeth Loftus could have been

included in that list as well. It is possible that Dr. Loftus requested that this material be sent to her so that afterwards she could claim she felt “fear.” Morehead continued:

“On 09/08/2006, the undersigned contacted the defendant at her residence. Outside the residence the undersigned heard the defendant “yelling” at unknown voices instructing them to go away. The defendant depleted her medication, and upon questioning, stated it was to be delivered to her that day. On 09/11/2006, a follow up med count indicated med compliance, however her behavior was inconsistent with the dosage. As such, the undersigned directed the defendant to report to the probation department Monday through Friday to ascertain med compliance.”

Because it appeared that Officer Morehead lacked the necessary clinical skills to conduct a proper psychological assessment, she again misinterpreted my behavior. It is true that I sometimes respond to the “voices” that I hear that are inflicted by V2K technology, which has been proven to factually exist, but these “voices” are externally induced. That I respond to voices cannot be helped and I do not believe it is anyone’s business what I do in the privacy of my own home as long as it is legal. Hearing “voices” is tormenting and the parties who communicate with me are cruel and petty and say mean things to me all day. Of course I respond to them out-loud on occasion but I rarely do in public. However, even if I did actually suffer from schizophrenia, it is not at all unusual for schizophrenics to report that they still hear voices and/or for them to respond to those voices which are internally generated despite their taking high dosages of anti-psychotic medication. Again, this is common knowledge in the therapeutic and psychiatric professions. A psychiatrist should have been making these types of determinations and assessments, not Officer Morehead, and it was negligence for her to make these invalid “clinical” pseudo-assessments to the San Diego Superior Court about me. Due to Officer Morehead’s ignorance, I was forced to travel to San Diego Probation every day for several months so that Officer Morehead could see me swallow pills that I had actually been taking.

During this time period Officer Morehead missed approximately 75% of her scheduled appointments with me and she never once apologized for this. One day I was threatened with incarceration because Morehead believed that I had missed one medication dosage. I later recounted my medication and discovered that she had made a mistake in her math. I then left a message on her answering machine telling her that I didn’t appreciate being threatened with jail time due to the fact that she couldn’t count.

Officer Morehead continued:

“Additionally, the defendant wants to write a book regarding her beliefs on psychoelectronic monitoring which may include the victims in this case.”

“As such, and in order to protect the community, the academic world and the victim’s the Probation Department recommends that the defendants modification be denied and probation be continued on the same terms and conditions as previously ordered on 11/05/2003.”

By making it appear that I had new “victims,” apparently alluding to the anonymous parties calling Officer Morehead, and due to the misrepresentations made by Dr. Loftus, Officer Morehead again reminded the court in this section of her report that I intended to write a book, and she recommended to the court that I not have word processing privileges. Her efforts were clearly dedicated to stopping or impeding me from writing a book about “psychoelectronic monitoring” because it might be about the “victims” and involved a subject that was over her head. If San Diego Probation did not understand what I was writing about then the appropriate action to take would have been to ask me questions. Nobody from probation has ever asked me questions about what I am reporting.

Furthermore, by making these types of allegations, falsely alleging there were “victims” of mine, and alleging the ridiculous notion that the “academic community” needed protection from me, it appeared that Morehead and Guzman were making themselves actors (or being used as puppets) in furtherance of the conspiracy by Dr. Elizabeth Loftus of the FMSF and other parties to stop me from writing about how I was targeted and victimized. It is doubtful that Morehead or Guzman were the originators of the particular complaint that the “academic world” needed protection from me and appears instead to have come from my political opponents. For example, I recently wrote a critique of a pivotal study that was published by “academics” at the UC Davis system titled, “Characteristics and Sources of Allegations of Ritualistic Child Abuse.” I discovered so many serious irregularities in this study that I submitted my critique to the UC School system requesting that they review this study for possible academic fraud. That is the level of my interaction with the “academic community,” and as previously stated, all that some members of this community have to “fear” from me is legitimate and deserved exposure. This critique can be found at: <http://members.cox.net/dnap/goodmancritique.pdf> After reading this critique I believe the legitimacy of my work will be verified as well as the politics involved. Hopefully, this will come out at trial if this case goes to court.

Officer Morehead continued:

“On or about 09/13/2006, the defendant produced her phone bill which indicated hundreds of calls made from June 2006 through August 2006 to numerous numbers throughout the US and Europe. These calls were made to the FBI, CIA, NSA, and The Library of Congress. This conduct/behavior is very concerning to the undersigned that the defendant continues to deny her mental illness blaming her symptoms on psychotronics.

There was nowhere near “hundreds” of phone calls on my phone bill; it was closer to 50. Because I planned to write a book and I was associated with someone who was a member of a radical political organization at one time, I wanted to discover via a Freedom of Information request whether any of the above organizations had a file on me. It was per the advice of a retired police officer and colleague of mine who suggested that I do this and it was a reasonable action to take. There were many phone calls on my bill because I

was at times disconnected, re-routed, and sent to other numbers which I explained to all of these parties. However, based on the false allegations in this report, my request to use a word processor and to have access to the internet/intranet was denied at this court hearing. I was then forced to request a 30 day continuance to allow me time to respond to these false allegations which the court allowed.

On 1/04/2007 I scheduled a hearing with the San Diego Superior Court requesting the court to modify the previous Court Order.” [Exhibit 8] At that time I responded to the allegations in Morehead’s report, in general, because I was unsure who the complaining parties were. On this date, I provided background to the court about my history as a victim, which included being the victim of false allegations in the past by my political opponents, and I informed the court that I was the only “victim” in this present case, not the complaining parties. I also informed the court that I had requested relief from Officer Morehead due to her false reporting. I again requested word processor privileges and internet/intranet access but my requests were denied. Also at this hearing, Public Defender Sal Tarrantino refused to represent me for reasons unknown.

On 1/04/2007 I requested permission of Probation administrator Lisa Donohoo to contact the UC system to investigate the false complaints made about me so that I could correct the record and file a police report. I was given permission to proceed by Ms. Donohoo. I note that it was actually San Diego Probation’s duty to accurately investigate the matter, not mine, especially so because they thought I was “mentally ill.” Ms. Donohoo refused to disclose the number of the police reports which involved allegations against me from UC Davis and UC Irvine because she stated that it was policy that probationers not access police reports. I believe this is a terrible policy. Given this restriction, I have been unable to verify what the exact “evidence” was that Dr. Loftus relied on to make her false allegations, and I have been unable to verify the exact statements that she made about me. This also appears to be a violation of my Due Process rights.

I spoke to UC Davis’ Officer Henoeh and he admitted that I had not sent a “40 pg. fax,” but had sent approximately 40 pages of materials to the UC Davis IRB via the postal mail. I asked Officer Henoeh what was illegal about sending this benign, but unusual material via the postal mail and he acknowledged there was nothing illegal about that activity.

On 1/11/2007, I discovered from Kathie Allen of UC Irvine’s “Whistleblowers Unit” that she had instigated the police report about me on behalf of a party who she refused to identify. The Whistleblowers unit was evidently designed to protect complaining parties from retaliation. However, these individuals did not protect me.

On 1/11/2007, I spoke to UC Irvine’s campus Detective Altamarino who told me that Dr. Elizabeth Loftus had alleged that I had sent discs and a letter to her. Det. Altamarino informed me that the evidence had been sent to the DOJ but I was not implicated. Det. Altamarino stated that a Supplemental report indicating that fact had been sent to San Diego Probation/Officer Morehead.

On 1/21/2007, I confirmed with Det, Altamarino's supervisor, Sgt. Dublin of UC Irvine Campus police, that I had been a suspect in a case in which Dr. Elizabeth Loftus alleged that I had sent her discs, and a letter, after which Loftus felt "fear." Sgt. Dublin confirmed that I was no longer a suspect after DOJ checked fingerprints on the envelopes in question and none of the fingerprints matched mine. Sgt. Dublin reported that their internal logs also revealed that a Supplemental Report with this information had been sent to San Diego County Probation on 9/19/2006 detailing that I was no longer a suspect. Sgt. Dublin told me that he could not release the Supplemental report to me but could release it to San Diego Probation if they requested another copy.

This information indicates that the September 19th Supplemental report, which notified probation that I was no longer a suspect, was sent to San Diego Probation a full three months before Officer Morehead and Supervisor's Guzman's report was submitted to the court on 12/14/ 2006 factually stating that I was guilty of sending a "40 pg. fax" to the UC Davis IRB, and sending emails, discs, and a letter to an unknown UC Irvine professor - who turned out to be Dr. Elizabeth Loftus from UC Irvine. I cleared this up in three phone calls.

I have alleged in my recently filed Federal lawsuit that because I requested UC Irvine's IRB's to investigate whether Dr. Loftus might be involved in or was aware of any Human Subjects Research violations involving me, Loftus intentionally orchestrated emails, files, and discs be sent to herself, on purpose, to set me up in retaliation after I requested that the IRB's investigate her. In fact I believe that it was probably Dr. Loftus who initiated the campus police reports about me which resulted in my requests for investigation being sent to my probation officer. It was perfectly legal for me to request an investigation by the IRB'S of any institution, but it is very illegal to have made false allegations about me in a police report. As previously stated, it is not explained why Loftus would claim she felt "fear," even if I had sent her this material, due to the fact I am still unaware of what the alleged content of this material was, however, I note that a victim's feelings of "fear" is a critical element in a criminal stalking complaint which could have eventually resulted in my reincarceration and the loss of my freedom. Dr. Elizabeth Loftus had been a participant in the past in attempts to ruin my reputation and career when she made false allegations about me in the September 24, 2000 San Diego Union-Tribune article, the "Web of Intrigue," and I believe that she knowingly knew the falsity of those allegations at that time.

After speaking with Sgt. Dublin of UC Irvine, I notified Officer Morehead that there was evidence available releasing me as a suspect and to please write a corrective report to the court. However, Morehead refused, saying it was "no big deal" because my probationary status was not "violated." I told Officer Morehead that I thought it was a very "big deal" to make false allegations about someone in a criminal court proceeding, let alone refuse to correct those false allegations when new information became available. As a prior court officer myself, who was at one time employed by the County, I was appalled by Morehead's attitude.

On 2/1/2007, I notified Anna Guzman, Morehead's supervisor that there was evidence

proving that I was no longer a suspect in the UC Irvine case and to please write a corrective report to the court alerting them to that fact. Ms. Guzman never responded.

On 2/5/2007, I telephoned Guzman's supervisor Lisa Donohoo to let her know that Morehead refused to write a corrective report to the court and I requested that Ms. Donohoo contact UC Irvine's Sgt. Dublin to access the Supplemental Report proving that I was no longer a suspect. Ms. Donohoo promised that she would email UC Irvine and if it was proven that these were false allegations she would make sure a corrective report was written, but her tone to me was not cooperative. She advised me not to make this issue drag "on and on," my probationary status was not violated, and Donohoo advised that because I had only one year left of probation to let the issue "go." Ms. Donohoo further advised me that she would only send one email to UC Irvine's campus police because she would not want them to think that she was "harassing" them. This was an apparent dig on her part to me because there were outstanding allegations that I was "harassing" others. I told Donohoo that I believed that if these allegations were not corrected, it might harm me at a later point and perhaps be used as cumulative evidence as reason to imprison me at a later date. In fact, Dr. Pizitz had informed me that Anna Guzman was attempting to build a legal case against me so I had a reasonable basis for my concerns. Because the Court never believed me, but chose instead to believe San Diego Probation's misrepresentations about me, the corrections had to be made by San Diego Probation to have any meaning. At that time, Ms. Donohoo informed me that she too had been receiving phone calls from people from the UC system, and elsewhere, apparently making allegations about me but she refused to tell me what they were. I then requested for a second time that I be relieved of Officer Morehead and Guzman but that request was denied.

During this time period, Ms. Donohoo ordered me to undergo another lie detector test. In this examination I was asked whether I had sent any material to Dr. Loftus or others. I answered in the negative and passed my test. Afterwards, I discussed the results of my lie detector test with Dr. Pizitz, and my class, and continued to express my emotional distress about San Diego Probation's refusal to correct what was in essence a false report.

On 2/8/2007 I contacted Ms. Donohoo's boss, administrator John Hensley, to request that he investigate the matter and I asked him to access the Supplemental report from UC Irvine because I wasn't allowed to, and then to please see that a corrective report was written to the court.

On 2/20/2007 I telephoned John Hensley to ask if a corrective report was going to be written. Mr. Hensley stated that they would correct the allegation of the "40 pg fax," which they were going to attribute to "human error," but no other corrections were going to be made because there was no reason to believe that the other allegations were false. I explained to Mr. Hensley that I was trying to have the court rule that I could use the word processor and access the internet/intranet and I needed those outstanding false allegations about me corrected. Hensley then told me that he understood that I had a "history" of harassing others on the internet which was one reason why Probation was opposed to me re-accessing the internet. I informed Hensley that a false and defamatory article had been

written about me by Mark Sauer of the San Diego Union-Tribune several years ago alleging that, but these claims were untrue.

After this phone call, I immediately telephoned UC Irvine's Sgt. Dublin to verify again that there was a Supplemental report releasing me as a suspect in the alleged incidents involving Elizabeth Loftus. Dublin again confirmed that this was the case and told me that he had not heard from San Diego Probation and was just waiting for someone from probation to request the Supplemental report. At this point I believe it is clear that San Diego Probation officials, at the very least, were extremely incompetent.

During this time frame I requested that UC Irvine conduct an investigation into what had occurred with Dr. Loftus and I told them I wanted to file an ethical complaint against her for making a false police report about me. Michael Arias, the Assistant Executive Vice Chancellor, responded on 3/14/2007, refusing to investigate the complaint and advised that the "correct forum for this matter is through the court system." Kathie Allan of the "Whistleblowers Unit" responded on 3/19/2007 and also advised me that "the correct forum for your complaint is through the court system and not UC Irvine. Therefore, your allegations will not be investigated."

On 3/9/2007, I scheduled another court hearing at San Diego Superior Court requesting "Clarification of a Court Order," updating the court on the new information which proved that I was no longer a suspect involving allegations made by Loftus of UC Irvine, and an unknown party at UC Davis. [Exhibit 9] At that hearing I again requested computer privileges. However, neither Officer Morehead, Guzman, or Donohoo were present and I was not provided with any corrective report. At this hearing, Public Defender Sal Tarrantino continued to state he would not represent me for unknown reasons. If there was a report available, he did not provide it to me. However, on 3/9/2007, Superior Court Judge Szumowski made a restrictive order allowing me to use the word processor, to own a word processor, and to have access to the internet/intranet via a third party which meant the librarian.

After I discovered that "word processors" were not sold on the market anymore, I requested of Officer Morehead that I be allowed to buy a computer with word processing software only on it. Morehead refused to allow this and told me to access the public libraries. I note that at the library I use a computer which has word processing software only on it which Morehead was aware of which makes it appear that Morehead denied this request out of malice. I also note that I was attempting to gather information so that I could file a lawsuit but because I was forced to access the internet via the librarian and forced to type my work away from home, around library hours, I was challenged to file my lawsuit in a timely manner.

On 3/20/2007 and 4/6/2007 I wrote a letter to Director of Probation Vincent Iaria about Morehead, Guzman, Donhoos, and John Hensley's inability or refusal to access the Supplemental report at UC Irvine which released me as a suspect in the Loftus case. I asked him to intervene and requested that he access this Supplemental report and to write a corrective report to the court. [Exhibit 10] I wrote that Morehead, Guzman, and Ms.

Donohoo were behaving in an unprofessional manner and I believed malfeasance was occurring. Because Director Iaria left his position and was replaced by David E. Cranford, I directed my request for assistance to Mr. Cranford.

On 8/23/2007 I filed a formal complaint about John Hensley's refusal to correct the court record on my behalf.

On 9/14/2007 I received a response from David E. Cranford denying that San Diego Probation Department had made "false allegations" about me but stated that the record would be corrected. [Exhibit 11] He wrote:

"While the Probation Officers reporting of this information as it was received does not qualify as "false allegations," I have directed the supervising Probation officer to provide the court with an "ex parte" report offering additional information on these two matters."

In approximately December of 2007 I was assigned a new probation officer, Karen Johnson. Ms Johnson told me, when asked, that she believed the corrective report to the court had been written and it was in my file. At that time I gave her a copy of the letter that was written by Director David Cranston which indicated that he had ordered the corrective report to be written. During that time period I requested permission of Karen Johnson to appear in a film project and she told me that she had no right to dictate what media events I wanted to participate in which is the opposite of what Morehead and Guzman had done with me when they opposed my appearance on the Montel Williams show in 2004.

On approximately 1/15/2008 I checked the contents of my criminal court file at San Diego Superior Court but did not find the corrective report that Director Cranford had ordered to be written by Officer Morehead in September of 2007. Officer Karen Johnson then told me she had re-checked my probation file and the corrective report was not in the file. However, at that time, I discovered the 6/29/2004 False report in my court file and another False report dated 2/15/ 2007 which indicated, perhaps mistakenly, that Morehead had made a personal appearance at San Diego Superior Court in Dept. 12 with Judge Szumowski presiding. [Exhibit 12] Apparently this was the report that administrator John Hensley had referred to earlier alluding to the fact that Morehead would be correcting the misrepresentation that I had sent a "40 pg fax" to UC Davis. However, in efforts to sway the Judge into ruling against my requests for word processing and internet/intranet privileges, requests which were pending at that time, Morehead wrote to the court:

"The defendant was before the court on 1/04/2007 for a modification hearing. The defendant was seeking computer and intranet access. The modification was denied. The minute order reflected no computer and intranet access direct or indirect. The Probation Department strongly stands by this recommendation. Allowing her computer access will aide and/or promote the loopholes she is seeking that may foster the pathway to the victim(s).

It is not clear what is meant by “victims” but if it included that I might write a threat to a Hollywood figure again, I had clearly and repeatedly told my psychologist and the entire class, that I believed I was made to falsely believe that Jennifer Hewitt was involved in my case, and even so, I had only written a “threat” to her to have myself purposely arrested. Therefore there was never any indication that this particular victim was at risk. I note that at no time in the past 4 ½ years has Officer Morehead or anyone else from San Diego Probation ever asked me about this incident or my stalking offense. If by “victims” Morehead was referring to Dr. Elizabeth Loftus and/or the unknown parties telephoning her who were alleging to be victimized by me, those allegations were false. Instead Morehead continued to assert these false allegations were true. Officer Morehead then wrote to the court:

“Subsequent to the hearing on 01/04/2007, the defendant contacted UC Irvine and UC Davis police to obtain copies of the reports by these agencies.”...“Since that time, the defendant has been fixated on the fact that the undersigned lied in the report. It is noted that UC Irvine received a 40 page fax from the defendant. However, the defendant is adamant that the document she sent was mailed vs. faxed, thus she has been on a campaign to vindicate herself because of this. She has exhausted the Probation Department at all levels including administration with this insignificant claim. A discussion between Probation and the police agency determined the document was in fact mailed vs. faxed. Both agencies have acknowledged this “human error” to the defendant, yet she is insistent/determined the Court be apprised of this information in order for her to be “exonerated.”

In what appeared to have been an effort by Officer Morehead to minimize her culpability, Morehead misrepresented to the Court that I was unnaturally “fixated” on an “insignificant,” claim about a 40 pg fax, when in fact, in addition to that allegation, I had repeatedly attempted to have San Diego Probation correct the more serious allegation that I had sent emails, discs, and a letter to Elizabeth Loftus which causing her to feel “fear” which Probation steadfastly refused to correct! Furthermore, that is documented in writing! Therefore, I discovered yet again that Officer Morehead had played a malicious and underhanded trick on me, and for the third time, made false representations to the court about my case. I believe that it is clear by her report to the court that in addition to negligence, malfeasance was in fact occurring on a grand scale. Peace Officers are not supposed to be making false reports and the fact that this was done three times indicates clear misconduct.

On approximately 1/15/2008, after checking my court file and discovering that the corrective report ordered to have been written by Director Cranston (correcting both false allegations against me) had never been written, I phoned the Director of Probation, now Mack Jenkins, and informed his secretary that the corrective report ordered to have been written by acting Director David Cranston had never been written which meant that Officer Morehead and Guzman refused to follow a direct order by their Director apparently out of malice felt for me. Within hours of that phone call, Ms. Guzman telephoned me, behaving as if she did not know what the issues were, but after I

repeatedly explained, Guzman said she would “investigate.” I was later notified by Ms. Guzman that the corrective report had been written and had been sent to the court. I received a copy of this report dated 1/15/2008. [Exhibit 13] It read, in part:

“The Probation Department is submitting an ex parte report to apprise the Court of two issues that were before the Court on 12/14/2006 depicting the defendant’s conduct relative to matters at UC Davis. The report dated 12/14/2006, stated the defendant faxed a 40 page document to UC Davis when in fact the information was mailed by the Defendant. On 02/15/2007, the undersigned submitted a report clarifying that issue.

On 02/05/2007, Lisa Donohoo, probation director received a call from the defendant claiming she spoke with Detective Altamarino regarding a ‘false report.’ The Defendant stated she (the defendant) was informed by Detective Altamarino that UC Irvine had a supplemental report and/or information exonerating her. On 02/05/2007, Ms. Donohoo contacted Detective Altamarino via e-mail indicating the defendant’s claim and requested reports and or information to that effect.

“On 02/05/2007, Detective Altamarino responded to Director Donohoo’s the e-mail with the following quoted from the investigative supplemental report #06-0918. ‘On 09/18/2006 indicating no identifiable latent prints were found on the floppy discs or the clear tape on the mailing envelope. One identifiable print was developed on the back of the white letter paper that was also inside the envelope. The print was prepared and entered into the Cal-Id AFIS system and was searched against the OC and CA DOJ fingerprint databases. Search results were negative. There were no further reports associated with this case on the defendant.’”

Unfortunately, there were many admissions and further indications of malfeasance by San Diego Probation’s Morehead, Guzman, and Donohoo in this report. According to my notes, I had a conversation with Lisa Donohoo on 2/05/2007, which Donohoo confirmed in this report, requesting that Donahoo follow-up with UC Irvine and speak to Detective Altamarino or Sgt. Dublin, and request their Supplemental report which indicated I was no longer a suspect after Donohoo told me I could not access any police reports myself. It appears that, contrary to what administrator John Hensley had told me on 2/20/2007 (inferring I was still a suspect in the Loftus case), Donohoo did indeed have information proving that I was no longer a suspect as early as 2/05/2007. However, in spite of that fact, that information was not provided to the court for my hearing on 3/9/2007 and instead Morehead falsely represented in a report to the court on 2/15/2007 that there were still outstanding “victim(s)” of mine and that was the reason why I should be restricted from using a word processor, the internet and intranet.

More importantly, if Lisa Donohoo, Anna Guzman, and Stephanie Morehead were aware of as early as 2/5/2007 that I was no longer a suspect regarding allegations made by Elizabeth Loftus, (and perhaps keeping that information from John Hensley) then there is no other explanation other than intentional malice to explain why Morehead and Guzman

failed to accurately describe these facts in their report to the court, dated 2/15/2007, in which Officer Morehead and Anna Guzman mischaracterized me by claiming that I was insisting that a correction be made about an “insignificant” “human error,” about a “40 pg fax.” The fact that this occurred indicates a conspiracy at work. These routine mischaracterizations made to San Diego Superior Court were intentionally made, I believe, to make it appear that I was pathological and “mentally ill.”

I am alleging that these oversights were not attributable to human error at all. Instead these oversights were due to incompetence, negligence, and malfeasance from the start, and is hardly the behavior one might expect of a professional governmental organization in charge of an allegedly “mentally ill” client. If I had been mentally ill I would have been the victim of a severe injustice and I would not have been able to do anything about it. All the investigatory skill required to confirm the sender of a fax would be to obtain a copy of that fax to see what telephone number was on the fax in question. Apparently Ms. Morehead never attempted to obtain a copy of this alleged fax. All the investigatory skill it would have taken to discover an update on my innocence or guilt regarding the allegations made by Elizabeth Loftus in approximately September of 2006 would have been to make a follow-up phone call to UC Irvine before the writing of the 12/14/2006 report which was submitted to San Diego Superior court as fact. That such a phone call was reportedly never made indicates negligence by San Diego County Probation and Officer Morehead because during those three months more information might have been revealed that might have actually implicated me in illegal activity, therefore these employees were not doing their job in either case. It also does not appear that Officer Morehead ever had a copy of the “evidence” that Loftus had submitted to the UC Campus police. In addition, Officer Morehead did not even do me the courtesy, or do her job, by asking me what my side of the story was before false misrepresentations were made to the court. Further not one of my letters or telephone calls to other people were ever “harassing.” That means the 12/14/2006 report to the court should never have been written and was not based on any fact whatsoever.

It has never been explained why or how, despite UC Irvine’s logs reflecting that their Supplemental report was mailed to San Diego County Probation a full three months before Morehead’s 12/14/2006 report factually stating that I was guilty of serially harassing conduct, how San Diego Probation lost, misplaced, or trashed this Supplemental Report which released me as a suspect.

Because of this ongoing incompetence, negligence, and malfeasance, and efforts by San Diego Probation to interfere with my First amendment rights to free speech, I have experienced significant emotional distress for four years now - which Dr. Pizitz could attest to - and it appears that this emotional distress was intentionally inflicted by Officer Morehead, Supervisor, Guzman, and Ms. Donohoo. I discussed the magnitude of my emotional distress with Dr. Pizitz on almost a weekly basis between the years 2004-2008. Again, because of this, I have lived in dread that I might be arrested by these incompetent and malicious officials on a fraudulent charge.

On 1/20/2008, I filed a formal complaint about Officer Morehead and Supervisor

Guzman, alleging malfeasance and requested at that time that I be allowed to terminate probation one year early for good behavior [Exhibit 14] Despite ongoing attempts to make me appear that I was guilty of some activity, I have actually never violated my probation in four years. In that letter I again requested relief from Supervisor Guzman and wrote that I wanted to terminate from Probation early because I felt vulnerable due to the ongoing malfeasance of San Diego Probation employees. I also requested that someone make contact with the producers of the Montel Williams show and inform them that I could appear on their program. I felt that because they had interfered with my ability to appear on this program and might have scared off the producers, I believed it was their responsibility to correct this.

On 1/29/2008 I wrote an update to my complaint about Officer Morehead and Supervisor Guzman after I accessed my court file and discovered what appeared to be several other False reports that were written to the court.

On 2/21/2008 Mr. Jenkins wrote a very polite letter in response to my complaint about Officer Morehead and Supervisor Guzman, apologizing for the delay in writing the corrective report. [Exhibit 15] However, in that letter he did not hold any of his employees accountable for their intentional neglect and malfeasance but attributed the delay in writing the corrective report to a “routing” problem, claiming that Morehead/Guzman never received the directive by Mr. Cranston to write that report four months earlier. The problem with that reasoning is that per Morehead/Guzman’s own report dated 1/15/2008, the Director of Ohio Street Probation, Lisa Donohoo, received information from UC Irvine as early as 2/5/2007 explaining that I was no longer a suspect. Therefore there is no legitimate explanation which accounts for the delay in writing that corrective report to the court for almost one year except negligence and malfeasance. The fact that this is what occurred for over a year, there is no reason why I should believe that these people were unaware of Director Cranston’s directive, due to a “routing“ problem.

Mr. Jenkins also opined in this letter that I had not been “exonerated” as a suspect in the UC Irvine case, it was just proven that the fingerprint on the envelope in question did not match mine. Given the fact that I passed a lie detector about this subject, the fingerprint on the envelope did not match mine, and Dr. Loftus had clear motivation to harm me, it is not known what further evidence would have been required by San Diego Probation to have exonerated me as a suspect. Instead there has been quibbling over whether I was “released” as a suspect or whether I was “exonerated” as a suspect. It would appear that the burden of proof would be on Dr. Loftus and San Diego Probation to prove that I was ever a suspect at any time, let alone be released as a suspect at a later point. It is not my responsibility to prove a negative. Professionals should not be making misrepresentations about a client or a probationer to a court of law without the evidence to prove that accusation. Once a governmental body is informed that they have made false allegations it is their responsibility to correct what, in this case, was a False report. Instead there was another False report written to cover up for the 12/14/2006 False report. In Mr. Jenkins’ response he also neglected to respond to my request to be relieved from Supervisor Guzman.

According to a telephone conversation with Lisa Donohoo in early 2008, I was told that San Diego Probation would not oppose my early termination from probation. According to San Diego Probation's own report, written by John Hensley and submitted to San Diego Superior Court dated 3/4/2008, Probation wrote that I had complied with all mandates of probation and they would submit to the court's discretion about this matter.

However, on the day of the hearing on 3/04/2008, Officer Morehead was in attendance and San Diego Probation did the opposite of what they told me and what they wrote in their own report to the court. [Exhibit 16] Instead, Officer Morehead verbally told the court that San Diego Probation recommended that I stay on probation, be allowed internet privileges, but not have to report to probation anymore. They also recommended that I take another expensive \$300 lie detector test in a few months in order to prove that I was not engaging in any unlawful activities.

On 3/21/2008 my brother died and I was taking care of his funeral arrangements on behalf of my family with their blessing. On 3/21/2008, I phoned Officer Karen Johnson to request a travel pass because I intended to attend my brother's cremation in Riverside County in order to make sure his cremation was properly conducted and to collect my brother's ashes. It should be noted that in the past four years, I have never requested a travel pass. Ms. Johnson left a message for me, stating that Supervisor Guzman was the person who would make that decision and to call her on Monday morning.

On 3/24/2008, I phoned Supervisor Guzman, giving her the name of the mortuary that would be taking care of my brother's body and asked for a travel pass.

On 3/25/2008, I viewed my brother's body at the mortuary. I was told that the cremation was scheduled to occur within the next two days. I then phoned Supervisor Guzman for an update on the travel pass. Ms. Guzman told me, "Your brother is at the County Examiner's Office and you are not even the next of kin. You have no business traveling to another County!" I had just returned from viewing my brother's body at the funeral home. I told Supervisor Guzman that I was assisting my family with my brother's remains and I had every right to take care of this matter and request a travel pass. Officer Guzman told me again, "You are not supposed to leave the County!"

I immediately hung up on Supervisor Guzman and notified administrator John Hensley's office telling them this was an emergency. Hensley was in a meeting but his temporary secretary intervened. Within 15 minutes, Lisa Donohoo called me, and after investigating that the facts as I portrayed them were correct, Ms. Donohoo allowed me to have a travel pass.

On 4/3/2008 I phoned Ms. Donohoo to ask about San Diego Probation's policy on travel passes. She stated that if a probationer was in "compliance," then travel passes were issued. When probationers were not in compliance, the probationer would receive no travel pass. I have been in compliance with San Diego Probation for four years which Probation's own report to the court on 3/4/2008 confirmed. Therefore, according to San

Diego Probation's own policy, there was no legitimate reason to deny my request for a travel pass regarding such a serious issue about the death of a family member. This conduct by Supervisor Guzman was egregious and seriously out of line. I believe it makes my case that there is and there was malice felt for me and San Diego Probation was singling me out for "special" treatment which did not conform to their own policies.

I had request on numerous occasions that Officer Morehead and Supervisor Anna Guzman be removed from my case but these requests were routinely denied. This indicates negligence by San Diego Probation for continuing to actively cause me significant emotional distress by not removing me from the authority of employees who were abusing their power who they refused to censure or correct. Because of Probation's refusal to relieve me of Supervisor Guzman it finally resulted in Guzman subjecting me to emotional cruelty in March 2008 when she refused to grant me a travel pass in a moment of crisis when my brother died in spite of and in opposition to San Diego Probations own policy about granting travel passes. Although Director Mack Jenkins wrote me a letter on 4/29/2008 indicating that I would be only reporting to Ms. Donohoo from now on, that is years too late, and I am not comforted by Ms. Donohoo's participation in my case.

When I informed Ms. Donohoo that I was denied a travel pass by Supervisor Guzman, Ms. Donohoo informed me that Guzman had approached her, asking for a way to give me a travel pass after my phone call with her, and that was how Ms. Donohoo became involved. I asked Ms. Donohoo if she was aware of the content of my phone call with Guzman. Donohoo replied in the negative. I then informed her that this information could not possibly be correct because clearly it was only after I went over Guzman's head and spoke to John Hensley's office that Donohoo contacted me about my need for a travel pass. It was clear to me that Lisa Donohoo was attempting to cover-up for Supervisor Guzman's behavior towards me. Based on all of the above evidence it appears that covering up for the wrongdoings of their employees is standard practice for San Diego Probation. The very definition of a conspiracy is when one or more people engage in an offense or attempt to cover-up for an offense which clearly occurred here.

In summary, I am alleging that Officer Morehead wrote and Supervisor Guzman signed 3 False reports dated 6/29/2004, 12/14/2006 and 2/15/2007 which were submitted to San Diego Superior Court. I was not aware of the existence of the first and third reports until January of 2008. I am alleging that these reports were written due to malfeasance, negligence, and misconduct by a peace officer.

In addition Officer Morehead and Supervisor Guzman have interfered with my First amendment rights to free speech on several occasions 1) by denying me the right to appear on a national television program for no legitimate reason in 2004 and telling the producers to notify them if I ever contacted them again (which meant they were telling these producers I was not to appear on this program at all) 2) by not giving me the name of a media outlet who wanted to interview me in 2004 3) by Ms. Guzman trying to "build" a case against me based on my benign telephone conversations in 2006 which she apparently could not understand, and 4) by recommending to the court on 12/14/2006

court that I be denied word processing privileges and computer access - even the library catalogue - to try to prevent me or impede me from writing a book.

These employees made these recommendations to the court because they did not believe that I was telling the truth about my victimization by nonlethals and instead falsely informed the court that I had “new“ “victims” and should not be allowed computer privileges. However, as was previously stated the first amendment does not protect just popular speech but protects unpopular speech as well. I had a perfect right to speak about my victimization by nonlethals in any forum that I wished as long as it was legal and as long as I was in compliance with Probation. According to San Diego Probation’s own report submitted at my request to terminate early from Probation, I have been in compliance with probationary mandates for four years.

Because Supervisor Guzman was on record as stating she was trying to build a case against me in 2006 but she quickly learned that my behavior was lawful, I believe the report submitted to Court on 2/14/2006, and the stubborn refusal to correct it, was a blatant attempt by these officials to make the court believe that I was guilty of these offenses so that San Diego probation could more easily incarcerate their “mentally ill” client at a later date based on outstanding allegations of misconduct.

I believe it is overwhelmingly clear that I was singled-out for “special treatment.“ Perhaps that was due to the identity of the person I wrote my pseudo-threat to - they were “star-struck” and wanted to personally punish me; perhaps it was due to what my political opponents were stating about me and these employees did not understand the deep politics or the sociopathic nature of the people involved; or perhaps it was due to the fact that I kept reporting that I was a victim of nonlethal technology, and because these employees are not that bright, they could not comprehend what I was reporting, and it was easier for them to believe that I am “mentally ill.” Or perhaps this malice could be explained in part because I kept going over everyone’s head and because these particular employees of San Diego Probation are on a “power-trip,” they didn’t appreciate being corrected. Whatever the reasons, this behavior is completely unacceptable, and because of that I am concerned for other probationers at this particular department.

I am requesting at this time that the names and statements of complaining parties in the files of the San Diego Probation Department be revealed so that I can take appropriate legal action. I also request access to the police reports from UC Irvine and Davis that were filed about me.

Demand is hereby made for relief in the amount of \$750,000.00.

Any and all communications pertaining to this matter should be sent to

Diana Napolis, Pro Per, May 23, 2008

