

June 25, 2006

Via: US Mail

Presiding Judge of San Diego Superior Court  
Family Law Court  
The Honorable William J. Howatt  
1501-55 Sixth Avenue  
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: RECENT TELEPHONIC COMMUNICATION WITH [REDACTED] COLUMNIST

Your Honor:

Due to the admiration I have held for you over the years, I feel a recent phone call I received from a [REDACTED] Reporter should be brought to your impendent attention. I trust you are appreciative of the need for my anonymity. My practice necessitates my not being a party to this quandary.

This Reporter expressed that he was contacting many involved in San Diego Family Law, citing he was doing "a follow-up story regarding the recent June 6, 2006 Election". His initial questions were relatively general in nature, inquiring of the duration of time I had been in practice, if I had ever contemplated running against an Incumbent Judge for a seat in Superior Court, and if I had witnessed an Family Court Judicial seat opposed in prior elections.

He then inquired if I had ever had encountered cases where children had been left by presiding Family Law Judges in the care of "Registered Sexual Offenders" or "abusive parents", of Judges not acknowledging submitted evidence of child abuse and/or endangerment or of "only removing one child from an abusive parent's home while leaving other siblings in a parent's care", inappropriate Ex Parte communication and/or evidence of personal relationships between Judges or their family members with litigants, children's removal from competent parents due to "personal Judicial biases", of Judges removing calendared hearings requested by "PRO PER litigants without due cause", of persons appearing in Propria Persona being ruled against due to their financial inability to retain Counsel and thus "lacked knowledge of proper legal ethics and procedure due to no fault of their own." He repeatedly made requests of any evidence pertaining to "Parental Alienation" and Support Arrears being amended and either fully waived or dramatically lessened, "Like what Howatt did to Betty Broderick years ago."

His questions eventually became more specific, and it became apparent that his primary emphasis was in obtaining defamatory data pertaining primarily about Judge Trapp but also about yourself. When I manifested that I had no intentions of responding further, he began providing me "direct quotes" from Transcripts, citing Case Names and Numbers plus the names of other Family Law Counsels who had "openly" conversed with him and provided him "documentation" pertaining to their supposed "substantiated evidence against both Judges Trapp and Howatt."

He inquired if I were aware that "Judge Randa Trapp has left a young child in the care of a Convicted Sexual Predator, Rebecca Robertson". He claimed that this "female Registered Sex

June 25, 2006

-Page 2-

*Offender*” had married a child’s Military Officer father and, despite the Court being properly noticed of this individual’s criminal history, “*Judge Trapp has left a five year old child in this woman’s primary care while the child’s father was deployed overseas though this young girl has a competent mother seeking custody*”.

He cited Case Law, and provided several Case Names and Numbers in which Support Arrears had been “*dramatically and inappropriately*” reduced by Judge Trapp. He voiced his being in possession of documentation regarding “*more than ten rulings of Judge Trapp’s*” that are currently before the Appellate Court. He voiced having been in contact with “*Lisa Lake*”, claiming this Local 10 News Anchor had opposed Judge Trapp’s reelection and is supposedly amenable with assisting him in his current endeavors of “*bringing these Judges’ ongoing ‘Abuse of Discretion’ to the public’s attention*”. He additionally made mention of “*representatives of CBS News Anchor, Katie Couric’s*” having expressed an interest in their involvement upon Ms. Couric’s upcoming visit to San Diego.

He appeared to have consequential awareness of Attorney Jim Hairgrove, and his candidacy against Judge Trapp’s reelection. He cited specific Case Names and Numbers of this Counsel’s which had gone before Judge Trapp, claiming that her “*personal biases*” against Mr. Hairgrove “*have been reflected in her rulings against his clients*” and is “*well documented*”. He further emphasized a “*future Recall Election of Judge Trapp*” and his fervid endorsement of this recall.

This journalist claimed that two individuals, who had been “*actively involved in the campaign of Attorney James Hairgrove’s*”, had recently approached the Court over Judge Trapp’s recusal from presiding further over their Cases. That these persons had both emphasized fearfulness of “*further bias in her future rulings against them*” for their having opposed her candidacy and “*their ex-partners’ relationships with and communication with Judge Trapp’s husband.*” He stated that he has evidence to verify that one individual’s request was adjudicated and “*reluctantly granted*” by Judge Trapp on May 30, 2006. The disposition of the other’s request for Judge Trapp’s recusal for supposed “*identical reasonings*” was, however, presumably denied.

He inquired if I were aware of a June 2006 Hearing where you had been approached over “*Ex Parte communication and a long-term friendship between Judge Trapp’s Law Enforcement spouse and a petitioner’s Sheriff’s employee ex-husband*” with a request for Judge Trapp’s recusal. I stated that I had knowledge of some ‘scuttlebutt’ floating around Family Court recently regarding this Case but had no direct knowledge of what had taken place. He then claimed that you had “*financially sanctioned*” the Petitioner for approaching you over this matter while you cited that this was “*not an Emergent matter that warranted ex parte intervention.*” That you had voiced that Judge Trapp had the discretion of not recusing herself despite her knowledge of her Law Enforcement husband’s friendship with this individual’s ex-spouse “*for in excess of fifteen years*” and also of “*this petitioner’s active involvement with Attorney Hairgrove’s campaign opposing her reelection*”.

He further voiced that Judge Trapp’s “*actions of Parental Alienation*” toward petitioners “*she has personal biases against*” was evidenced in her rulings of not returning children to a mother’s custody despite court-submitted documentation having corroborated that “*loss of child custody*” had been exclusively based on “*erroneous information against her*” and was presented to the Court by her Law

June 25, 2006

-Page 3-

Enforcement ex-spouse's Counsel. He cited that Judge Trapp had further ordered one mother's children removed from her care because this woman had approached the Judge over her children's refusal to visit with a father whom they voiced having fear of and no relationship with. That he has evidence of Judge Trapp's spouse having had prior "*ex parte communication*" with this individual's Attorney ex-partner and the father of her children, claiming "*proof of Trapp's evident bias in this father's favor before she ever made such a ruling against this woman*"

That one mother was ordered by Judge Trapp only supervised contact with her teenaged children following their run-away attempts from their alleged "*abusive Law Enforcement father*" despite any lack of evidence to implicate the mother's involvement in her children's actions. He spoke of the "*emotional devastation*" which Judge Trapp's rulings had caused by her having left a five year old in the care of a "*Registered Sex Offender*" while being "*alienated from a competent, loving school teacher mother.*"

He additionally read me a portion of a Transcript where Judge Trapp had refused a woman's requests of her to obtain and view "*a Sheriff's Department/ Chadwick's Hospital's Child Abuse Report and Video-Tape*" despite the mother informing Judge Trapp that minor's counsel had failed to acknowledge this alleged "*relevant verification of the father's abuse*". He also read from another Court Transcript where Judge Trapp had ordered a mother be permitted only supervised contact with her children because this woman had refused to agree to a proposal of minor's counsel's that she agree to her children remaining in their "*Law Enforcement father's primary care against her children's desires to the contrary*".

He took great strides in attempting to convince me that 'Parental Alienation' is rampant in Family Court, especially where it involved Judge Trapp's rulings.

This columnist claimed that on more than two occasions following the June 6, 2006 Election, Judge Trapp has asked for "*a show of hands in her Courtroom*" as to who had voted in favor of her candidacy. He voiced the names of four local Counsels who have contacted him with claims of their presence at recent Hearings when this "*abhorrent request*" of Judge Trapp's was made of those in attendance.

His questioning then shifted in your direction, inquiring that as Judge Trapp's "*Superior*", did I feel you were cognizant of her supposed "*discrepant actions and rulings*" and yet chose to "*disregard her Judicial incompetency*". He informed me of your alleged "*prior cover-up and protection of Mark Barber*", and also made inferences pertaining to the Honorable Janis Sammartino, Assistant Presiding Judge, and to Jeffrey C. Fritz, Esq.

This reporter gave the appearance of having devoted extensive time and energy into gathering a humongous array of documentation against Judge Trapp, yourself and others. He further voiced his intentions of placing this information obtained into upcoming articles "*once all has been substantiated*". Following this exchange, I did verify that this [REDACTED] Reporter was, in fact, who he represented himself as being, but I am unable to authenticate the validity of what was stated.

My most sincere of regards.

cc: The Honorable Janis Sammartino, Presiding Judge-Elect