This complaint (about "protection orders" in California) concerns affirmation counting used by judges or commissioners. The proof shows the judges have affirmed an order against a US citizen that was never read. A hearing should have been allowed.

Assumptions:This complaint assumes malicious legals involved add a second TPO (Temporary Protection Order) the judges didn't add into their counting assumptions. With only one TPO the judges count would presumably be correct that someone read the document by checking for signatures from say one commissioner and one judge. The first 30 day TPO order is assumed signed only and not read. This is called weak-link signature or pro-forma. Consequently, the count is two.

The "gaming" is to add a second (or more) TPO to create a count of three (or more) needed. The Judges check for two judges signatures despite the additional TPO. Judges merely affirm two signatures based on the usual one TPO and one judge having looked carefully. Consequently, the proof shows that the protection order, can be gamed by the lawyers, and was likely never read in the civil courtroom nor the criminal courtroom. The second TPO is signed pro forma in this scenario.

Complaint:Assume there are conflicting statements in the TPO. Yet judges signed the order and Judge J affirmed it. Judge G signed it. This means the original TPO was probably not read. It was signed. Why?

The conflicting statements make no sense. If Judge A signed it with conflicting statements, the judge would be incompetent. Furthermore, the competent judge could have asked to see paperwork such as a notarized resignation document as part of the protection order. So, the order has no proof about the resignation. Moreover, it has the conflicting statement. Consequently, we assume the judges did not read it. Remember if they were competent they saw the conflicting statements by reading it and would refuse to sign.

Earlier I stated the original TPO was probably not read. Why? The first TPO is perhaps the weakest link in the chain of signatures. It is the point at which the first lawyer (or law enforcement officer) convinces some judge to sign to begin the chain of signatures. It may be thought of as a pro forma signature without proper inspection. The first lawyer/officer may not have read it either. The TPO is the weakest link; thus that judge's signature in the chain of signatures the weakest link. The weakest link can also be called ***pro forma***.

If Judge A signed it, it may be because it was a mere 30 day TPO. Successive protection orders would not be signed with the conflicting statements assuming a competent judge. Nonetheless, they were signed and affirmed. I conclude no one read what they signed nor affirmed. They were affirming by not reading the previously affirmed order; they were using a previous signature only (or the primary TPO). Thus, the order was a "trust me" based on prior signature as the basis. This is legalization by signature affirmation. Wrong counts create a chain of signatures of decisions where the evidence was not read.

The final judge used signature affirmation and did not read it. That I can assure for my case by witnessing it.

Consequently, the multiple TPOs used by the malicious lawyers confuses the third judge because the second "order" was a TPO. The third judge assumes the second judge did a complete review of the "order". This is because only one TPO is expected.