

OCT 22 2021

Sherri B. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court
By: Juliete Almanza, Deputy

Ernest L. Moore
3651 S. La Brea Ave
#510
Los Angeles, CA 90016
Legaln2k@gmail.com

In Pro Per

**Superior Court of the State of California
For the County of Los Angeles**

In re the)	Case No. BP108870
)	
The Conservatorship of the Person and)	DECLARATION OF ERNEST MOORE
Estate of Britney Jean Spears)	AS INTERESTED PARTY & ADVOCATE
)	SEEKING PROBATE COURT REFORMS
)	C.C.P. § 170.1
)	(RICO) Act § 1503, §1510, §1511, §1513, §1952,
Ernest L. Moore,)	§1957
)	PENAL CODE § 368(d)(e)
Interested Party & Advocate)	WIC §15600
)	<i>Date: 11-4-2021</i>
)	<i>Time: 11:00 AM</i>
)	DEPT: 4
)	Los Angeles Superior Court
)	Stanley Mosk Courthouse
)	111 North Hill Street
)	Los Angeles, California
)	90012
)	Supervising Probate Judge:
)	Hon. Brenda J. Penny

Interested Party and Advocate Ernest L. Moore ("Interested Party") files his declaration seeking probate court reforms, probate judicial officer disciplinary actions, and relief for PVP victims in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse Probate departments.

I.

Introduction

Ernest L. Moore is an interested party in the Britney Jean Spears Conservatorship and was victimized by a related Probate Volunteer Panelist (PVP) attorney & Guardian Ad Litem **Samuel D. Ingham III**. PVP Ingham III was the 2nd court-appointed PVP attorney for Myrtle L. Moore (BP097063). See Decl. of Ernest L. Moore ¶3.

Ernest L. Moore was victimized by a related judge in his probate case that presided over the Britney Spears conservatorship Judge **Aviv K. Bobb**. Judge Aviva K. Bobb acted in concert with the opposing attorney Daniel Herbert from the law firm (*MANNING & KASS ELLROD, RAMIREZ, TRESTER LLP*) in his probate trust case and the conservatorship of his mother, Myrtle Moore. Judge Aviva K. Bobb approved all of the fraudulent accountings of the conservatorship and the trusts filed by the former co-conservators over written and verbal objections of Interested Party and objections filed by several attorneys on his case. See Decl. of Ernest L. Moore ¶12

Judge Aviva K. Bobb's prejudiced rulings and criminal misconduct in Interested Party's Probate cases allowed the waste of the conservatee's estate, loss of his inheritance and protected the former co-trustees from the penalties of their financial malfeasance and embezzlements. See Decl. of Ernest L. Moore ¶17

Ernest L. Moore will provide substantial evidence from his own experiences in the Los Angeles Superior Court Probate Department 11 as presented in his declaration and exhibits to prove the operation of judicial officer racketeering activity performed as part of an ongoing criminal enterprise under the color of authority by probate judicial officers and Los Angeles County Sheriff's deputies that protect their crimes. All Los Angeles County Superior Court probate Judges have acted in concert with Sheriff Deputies and the Probate Attorneys that review all court documents filed in the Probate court to cover up the Financial and physical abuse of Elders and Dependent Adults. This professional misconduct is a violation

1 of Welfare and Institutions Code section 15600 "Financial abuse" of an elder or dependent
2 adult & PENAL CODE § 368(c) (Abuse of Elders and Dependent Adults).

3 Superior court judges, the court probate attorneys, and PVP Panelist lawyers are
4 mandated reporters of suspected elder and dependent adult abuse, including financial
5 exploitation. WELFARE & INSTITUTIONS CODE § 15630 (Mandated Reporters of Abuse).
6
7
8

9 **II.**

10 **Statement of Facts**

11
12 Interested Party, Ernest L. Moore, is a former Children's Social Worker III in the Los
13 Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services who specialized in Family
14 Reunification Units. Ernest L. Moore is an unlicensed Marriage & Family Therapist. Mr.
15 Moore has extensive experience with mothers that experienced separation from their
16 children by DCFS interventions due to drug and alcohol abuse. Interested Party is a
17 licensed security professional with the State of California. See Decl. of Ernest L. Moore ¶28

18 Interested Party believes that a conservatorship of the Person and estate is
19 contraindicated at this time for Ms. Spears. Interested Party believes from his own
20 victimizations in the Los Angeles Superior court Probate Department that this level of
21 intervention cannot be in the conservatee's best interest due to the corruption that all
22 probate judges maintain, including PVP panelist attorneys, court Probate attorneys, and
23 court-appointed fiduciaries. Interested Party's assessment of the Britney Spears
24 conservatorship is that it is merely a **judicial approved "Gang Rape"** of the estate of
25 Britney Spears and will ultimately destroy her family as his family was torn apart and his
26 mother's estate was looted under the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles Superior Court Probate
27 Department 11 since 2004.

1 When PVP **Samuel D. Ingham III** was assigned to this Interested Party's mother, he
2 took no actions to protect the Person or the estate of the conservatee Myrtle L. Moore. See
3 Decl. of Ernest L. Moore ¶4.

4 As the Guardian Ad Litem of Myrtle Moore, PVP Ingham III never filed any
5 documentation that he interviewed Myrtle Moore in person or by telephone. See Decl. of
6 Ernest L. Moore ¶5

7 In his 6-16-2016 *PETITION FOR TRANSFER OF CONSERVATORSHIP TO*
8 *ANOTHER STATE PVP*, Samuel D. Ingham filed false and misleading information
9 pertaining to the case status of the conservatee to support the transfer of the
10 conservatorship of Myrtle Moore to the State of Georgia. See Decl. of Ernest L. Moore ¶6 &
11 *Exhibit A: 6/16/2016 Petition to Transfer Conservatorship to Another State.*

12 In his petition, PVP Ingham failed to state that the Los Angeles Probate Court had
13 removed the former co-trustee and co-conservator Jean Robinson from the Myrtle Moore
14 Living Trust and the Moore Family Trusts due to her malfeasance and waste of the estate of
15 her conservatee. See Decl. of Ernest L. Moore ¶7 & see *Exhibit B: 11/26/2012 Order After*
16 *Hearing.*

17 In his petition for transfer of the conservatorship, PVP Ingham intentionally did not
18 report that the former co-conservator failed to take any actions to protect the conservatee
19 from emotional abuse and medical neglect of the other co-trustee and co-conservator Dr.
20 David Moore. See Decl. of Ernest L. Moore ¶8 & *Exhibit C: 6/26/2009 Notice of Hearing and*
21 *Temporary Restraining Order (Elder or Dependent Adult Abuse Protection) against David*
22 *Moore.*

23 PVP Ingham took no actions to stop the foreclosure sale and embezzlement of the
24 proceeds taken by the former co-conservators from an illegal reverse mortgage on the
25 conservatee's home in Los Angeles, California. See Decl. of Ernest L. Moore ¶9 & *Exhibit D*
26
27
28

1 pages from *July 21, 2015, Respondent Keith J. Moten's Notice of Demurrer; Demurrer To*
2 *Petition For Damages; Memorandum of Points And Authorities page 4 lines 14-23.*

3 PVP Samuel D. Ingham III refused to take any actions against the first court-
4 appointed PVP panelist for Myrtle Moore, Andrea G. Van Leesten. PVP Leesten
5 intentionally neglected to protect the person or estate of Myrtle Moore. See Decl. of Ernest
6 L. Moore ¶10

7 PVP Andrea G. Van Leesten intentionally acted to cover up the numerous breaches
8 of trust and embezzlements of the co-conservators during the hearings pertaining to the
9 accountings by false and misleading statements to the court. These false statements
10 included misleading facts about a commercial property in the State of Georgia that was
11 purchased with funds from the Myrtle Moore Living Trust. See Decl. of Ernest L. Moore ¶11
12 & Exhibit E: *Pages from the 12/4/2008 Court Transcript P. 4, 25-28, P. 5, 24-28, P.17, 7-24*
13 & *DEED TO SECURE DEBT & SECURITY AGREEMENT.*

14 Former PVP attorneys Samuel D. Ingham III nor Andrea Van Leesten took any
15 appropriate actions against the fraudulent accountings filed by the former co-conservators
16 or any measures to recover the lost assets from the conservatee's estate. See Decl. of
17 Ernest L. Moore ¶13.

18 There has been no full accounting of the Moore Family Trusts or the Myrtle Moore
19 Living Trust since the beginning of Los Angeles Probate jurisdiction in 2004. The current
20 trustee of the Myrtle Moore Living Trust, **Jeffery Siegel**, has continued this type of
21 professional malfeasance since he was appointed as temporary trustee in 2015. Jeffery
22 Siegel has numerous complaints from other victims assigned to him from the Los Angeles
23 Probate courts with the California Professional Fiduciaries Bureau. See Decl. of Ernest L.
24 Moore ¶14 & Exhibit F: *Ernest Moore's Objection to 3rd Account Current*

25 Former Judges Aviva K. Bobb, Lesley C. Green, and Barbara R. Johnson, including
26 the current judge on Interested Party's probate case Ana Maria Luna have denied all court
27 actions filed by this Interested Party to recover the lost assets from the Moore Family Trusts

1 and the Myrtle Moore Living Trust (*Obstruction of justice*). See Decl. of Ernest L. Moore ¶15
2 & See Exhibit G: *March 24, 2021, Court Trial Minute Order*

3 Recently in July 2021, Judge Ana Maria Luna denied the ex-parte application to stay
4 the foreclosure on Ernest Moore's property with an illegal mortgage attached to the title
5 secured by Jeffery Siegel. Her only false justification of her denial was that "**Petitioner**
6 **does not have standing to pursue the requested relief.**" See Decl. of Ernest L. Moore
7 ¶16 & See Exhibit H: *Court Order for Ex Parte & Public rating of Judge Ana Maria Luna on*
8 *The Robing Room.*

9 Judge Aviva K. Bobb¹, who presided over Interested Party's initial probate case, took
10 no actions against the multiple perjuries by attorney Daniel Herbert (MANNING & KASS
11 ELLROD, RAMIREZ, TRESTER LLP) in his court documents and oral testimony in court
12 hearings. See Decl. of Ernest L. Moore ¶17

13 From information and belief, Plaintiff has information that Judge Brenda J. Penny
14 worked for judge Aviva K. Bobb in some capacity during the years that she presided over
15 his probate case. See Decl. of Ernest L. Moore ¶18

16 The court has informed Interested Party that Judge Brenda J. Penny is the
17 supervising judge of the Probate Department in the Los Angeles Superior Courts. See Decl.
18 of Ernest L. Moore ¶19

19 Judge Brenda J. Penny has taken no actions against the excessive and inappropriate
20 compensation for Samuel D. Ingham III from the estate of Britney Spears for
21 \$10,000.0/week. See Decl. of Ernest L. Moore ¶20 & See Exhibit I: *January 5, 2009, Order*
22 *Appointing Probate Conservator of the Person of Britney Spears Page 3 #21.*

23
24
25
26 ¹ Judge Aviva K. Bobb presided over the McMartin preschool day care sexual abuse case in the 1980s. *The case lasted*
27 *seven years and cost \$15 million, the longest and most expensive criminal case in the history of the United States legal*
28 *system, and ultimately resulted in no convictions - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/McMartin_preschool_trial. This was a*
testament to her incompetence as a judicial officer and her corruption! They eventually dumped her off in the Los
Angeles Superior Court Probate Dept. 11.

1 Radio star Casey Kasem's wife Jean Kasem's lawsuit against PVP Samuel D.
2 Ingham III was based on evidence that Mr. Ingham conspired with Kasem's adult kids "to
3 isolate and kill Casey Kasem for financial gain." See Decl. of Ernest L. Moore ¶21

4 Interested Person has filed numerous complaints against the judges and lawyers in
5 his probate case to the previous supervising probate judge and the California BAR
6 Association. Plaintiff has only received continued retaliation from the judges and lawyers
7 reported in his complaints. See Decl. of Ernest L. Moore ¶22

8 Ernest Moore has filed numerous complaints to the **Los Angeles County Board of**
9 **Supervisors** and specifically to the former Supervisor **Mark Ridley-Thomas** in writing and
10 in oral presentations demanding criminal prosecutions and public agendas for probate court
11 reforms. See Decl. of Ernest L. Moore ¶23

12 The current Board of Supervisors nor the previous board did not take any actions to
13 reform or give exposure to the crimes in the Los Angeles Superior Court Probate
14 Department 11 that I have reported to them. See Decl. of Ernest L. Moore ¶24

15 Interested Party's complaints to the California BAR Association were responded to
16 with a recital of all of the criminal misconduct reported to them with a statement that they
17 were not going to do anything about it! See Decl. of Ernest L. Moore ¶25 & See Exhibit J:
18 *July 13, 2021, Nathan Talei closing letter from The State Bar of California.*

19 Interested Party's former attorney Kwaku Duren was disbarred for arriving late to a
20 hearing. His so-called violations were nothing like those of Daniel Herbert and Nathan Talei.
21 Kwaku Duren was a former high-ranking Black Panther in the Los Angeles Chapter of the
22 1970s Black Panthers and one of the attorneys of record for Ernest L. Moore. See Decl. of
23 Ernest L. Moore ¶26

24 Judge Reva G. Goetz approved the initial excessive and inappropriate attorney
25 compensation for Samuel D. Ingham III **of \$10,000.00 per week!** See Decl. of Ernest L.
26 Moore ¶27 & See Exhibit I: *January 5, 2009, Order Appointing Probate Conservator of the*
27 *Person of Britney Spears Page 3 #21*

1 Ernest Moore's mother, Myrtle Moore, was employed by Los Angeles County and
2 worked as an elementary school teacher for the Los Angeles Unified School District. She
3 was active in the **Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority** since her college days. See Decl. of Ernest
4 L. Moore ¶29

5 Dr. Charles H. Moore was the father of Ernest Moore. He was a prominent dentist in
6 Los Angeles. He graduated from the Howard University dental school before relocating to
7 Los Angeles, California, in the 1960s. He was an Air Force Veteran and a Tuskegee
8 Airmen. See Decl. of Ernest L. Moore ¶30.

9 Ernest Moore attempted to make citizen's arrests of Samuel Ingham III and Nathan
10 Talei in the courtroom and hallway on multiple occasions over the years. Sheriff's deputies
11 would not accept his arrests or take any type of police reports. See Decl. of Ernest L. Moore
12 ¶31 & See Exhibit K: *8/25/2017 Letter from Regan Fitzgerald, Operations Sergeant Stanley*
13 *Mosk Courthouse*, and Exhibit L: *July 10, 2019, Court Transcript: P. 3 lines 26-28, P. 4*
14 *lines 4-26, P. 8 lines 18-28 & P. 9 lines 1-11.*

15 III

16 LEGAL ANALYSIS

17 Judicial Officer Misconduct

18 This professional misconduct and flagrant disregard for the laws and rules of
19 this court is further evidence that all jurisdiction and immunity has been lost by all Los
20 Angeles County Judicial Officers currently presiding over probate cases. Judges and
21 prosecutors have absolute immunity unless they totally lack subject matter or personal
22 jurisdiction in the case.
23

24 "A judge acting without subject-matter jurisdiction is acting without judicial authority.
25 *Cohens v. Virginia*, 19 U.S. (6 Wheat) 264, 404, 5 L.Ed 257 (1821) The U.S. Supreme
26 Court, in *Scheuer v. Rhodes*, 416 U.S. 232, 94 S.Ct. 1683, 1687 (1974) stated that "when a
27 state officer acts under a state law in a manner violative of the Federal Constitution", he
"comes into conflict with the superior authority of that Constitution, and he is in that case
stripped of his official or representative character and is subjected in his Person to the

1 consequences of his individual conduct. The State has no power to impart to him any
2 immunity from responsibility to the supreme authority of the United States."
3 State officials may be sued as individuals in § 1983 actions. *Brokaw v. Mercer County*, 235
4 F.3d 1000 (7th Cir. 2000).

5 JUDICIAL CANON OF ETHICS:

6 I. CANON 2 A. Promoting Public Confidence, A judge shall respect and comply with the law
7 and shall act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and
8 impartiality of the judiciary. Judge Ana Maria Luna has not **followed any laws** in her past
9 rulings and at the March 24, 2021 trial.

10 II. Canon 3 B. A judge shall be faithful to the law* regardless of partisan interests,
11 public clamor, or fear of criticism, and shall maintain professional competence in
12 the law

13 III. C. Administrative Responsibilities section (1) (1) A judge shall diligently discharge the
14 judge's administrative responsibilities impartially,* on the basis of merit, without bias or
15 prejudice, free of conflict of interest, and in a manner that promotes public confidence in the
16 integrity* of the judiciary. A judge shall not, in the performance of administrative duties,
17 engage in speech, gestures, or other conduct that would reasonably be perceived as (i) bias
18 or prejudice, including but not limited to bias or prejudice based upon race, sex,
19 gender, religion, national origin, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, marital
20 status, or socioeconomic status, or political affiliation, or (ii) sexual harassment.: The
21 crafters of this document including the phrase "including but not limited to when describing
22 the types of discriminatory behavior judges should avoid precisely because they wanted
23 them to avoid all types of discriminatory behavior.

24 IV. (2) A judge shall maintain professional competence in judicial administration, and shall
25 cooperate with other judges and court officials in the administration of court business.:
26 It is well stated in CCP 170.1 (a) (6) (C) a person aware of the facts might reasonably
27 entertain a doubt that the judge would be able to be impartial. Bias or prejudice towards a
28 lawyer in the proceeding may be grounds for disqualification. The previous corresponding
statute--Sec. 170, subdivision (a)(5)--which was repealed in 1984, had been construed to
require bias in fact, with the enactment of Sec. 170.1, however, a party seeking to disqualify
a California judge for cause was no longer required to prove that the judge was actually
biased. The test to be applied in evaluating recusal and disqualification of judges was
clearly stated many years ago in *Berger v United States* (1921) 255 U.S. 22: Does the
[Declaration] of Prejudice give fair support to the charge of a bent of mind that may prevent
or impede impartiality of judgment (225 U.S.) In the case *United Farm Workers of America v*
Superior Court (1985, 4th Dist) 170 Cal App 3d 97, 216 Cal Rptr 4. Code Civ. Proc., §

1 170.1, subd. (a)(6)(C) (Judge disqualified if Person aware of facts might reasonably
2 entertain doubt that judge would be impartial) makes the disqualification standard
3 fundamentally an objective one. It represents a legislative judgment that due to the
4 sensitivity of the question and inherent difficulties of proof as well as the importance of
5 public confidence in the judicial system, the issue is not limited to the existence of an actual
6 bias. Rather, if a reasonable man or woman would entertain doubts concerning the judge's
7 impartiality, **disqualification is mandated**. To ensure that the proceedings appear to the
8 public to be impartial and worthy of their confidence, the situation must be viewed through
9 the eyes of the objective Person. The reason for the objective standard of proof is the
10 difficulty in showing that a judge is biased unless the judge so admits. In addition, **public**
11 **perceptions of justice are not furthered when a judge who is reasonably thought to**
12 **be biased in a matter hears the case. (emphasis added)"** *Catchpole v Brannon* (1995, 1st
13 Dist) 36 Cal App 4th 237, 42 Cal Rptr 2d 440.

14 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO)

15 Passed in 1970, the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) is a
16 federal law designed to combat organized crime in the United States. It allows prosecution
17 and civil penalties for racketeering activity performed as part of an ongoing criminal
18 enterprise.

19 Section 1503 (relating to obstruction of justice), Judge Ana Maria Luna has denied all
20 of the court actions initiated by Interested Party to recover assets stolen from the Moore
21 Family Trusts and the Myrtle Moore Living trust since the time she has presided over his
22 probate case. Judges Leslie Green and Judge Barbara Johnson rendered highly prejudicial
23 decisions in most of the petitions and motions filed by Interested Party before Judge Ana
24 Maria Luna. Interested Party has attempted and demanded citizens' arrests during multiple
25 court hearings and has been restricted by judges Leslie Green, Barbara R. Johnson, and
26 Ana Maria Luna. §1510 (relating to obstruction of criminal investigations), § 1511 (relating to
27 the obstruction of State or local law enforcement), section 1512 (relating to tampering with a
28 witness, victim, or an informant), All of the judicial officers presiding over Interested Party's
probate case have demonstrated retaliation against him by rendering biased or prejudiced
decisions that do not follow the law in his case. §1513 (relating to retaliating against a
witness, victim, or an informant)

1 **PENAL CODE – PEN §368**

2 (c) A person who knows or reasonably should know that a person is an elder or
3 dependent adult and who, under circumstances or conditions other than those likely to
4 produce great bodily harm or death, willfully causes or permits any elder or dependent adult
5 to suffer, or inflicts thereon unjustifiable physical pain or mental suffering, or having the care
6 or custody of any elder or dependent adult, willfully causes or permits the Person or health
7 of the elder or dependent adult to be injured or willfully causes or permits the elder or
8 dependent adult to be placed in a situation in which his or her Person or health may be
9 endangered, is guilty of a misdemeanor. A second or subsequent violation of this
10 subdivision is punishable by a fine not to exceed two thousand dollars (\$2,000), or by
11 imprisonment in a county jail not to exceed one year, or by both that fine and imprisonment.

12 (d) A person who is not a caretaker who violates any provision of law proscribing theft,
13 embezzlement, forgery, or fraud, or who violates Section 530.5 proscribing identity theft,
14 with respect to the property or personal identifying information of an elder or a dependent
15 adult, and who knows or reasonably should know that the victim is an elder or a dependent
16 adult. Welfare and Institutions Code section 15600 "Financial abuse" of an elder or
17 dependent adult & PENAL CODE § 368(c) (Abuse of Elders and Dependent Adults).

18 Superior court judges as well as the court probate attorneys and PVP Panelist
19 lawyers, are mandated reporters of suspected elder and dependant adult abuse that includes
20 financial exploitation. WELFARE & INSTITUTIONS CODE § 15630 (Mandated Reporters of
21 Abuse). ARTICLE 3. Mandatory and Nonmandatory Reports of Abuse [15630 - 15632]

22 **15630** (a) Any person who has assumed full or intermittent responsibility for the care
23 or custody of an elder or dependent adult, whether or not they receive compensation,
24 including administrators, supervisors, and any licensed staff of a public or private facility that
25 provides care or services for elder or dependent adults, or any elder or dependent adult
26 care custodian, health practitioner, clergy member, or employee of a county adult protective
27 services agency, county in-home support services agency, county public authority, or a local
28 law enforcement agency, is a mandated reporter.

(b) (1) Any mandated reporter who, in their professional capacity, or within the scope
of their employment, has observed or has knowledge of an incident that reasonably appears
to be physical abuse, as defined in Section 15610.63, abandonment, abduction, isolation,
financial abuse, or neglect, or is told by an elder or dependent adult that they have
experienced behavior, including an act or omission, constituting physical abuse, as defined
in Section 15610.63, abandonment, abduction, isolation, financial abuse, or neglect, or
reasonably suspects that abuse, shall report the known or suspected instance of abuse by
telephone or through a confidential internet reporting tool, as authorized by Section 15658,
immediately or as soon as practicably possible. If reported by telephone, a written report
shall be sent, or an internet report shall be made through the confidential internet reporting
tool established in Section 15658, within two working days.

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

CONCLUSION


Relief Requested

- 1.) Order former PVP Panelist Samuel D. Ingham III to refund all fees paid to him in the Myrtle Moore Living Trust case.
- 2.) Order former PVP Panelist Samuel D. Ingham III to refund all fees paid to him in all cases assigned to him in the Los Angeles Probate courts.
- 3.) Removal of judge Ana Maria Luna from the Myrtle Moore Living Trust case and reverse all of her prejudiced orders.
- 5.) Order the shut down of the PVP Panelist program in the Stanly Mosk Courthouse
- 6.) Request a specialized pool of pro bono attorneys with citizen oversight from the LA County Board of supervisors for the Probate Department.
- 7.) Refer the judges, PVP Panelists, Trustee Jeffery Siegel, his lawyers, Attorney Daniel Herbert, and Kirsten Brown out for immediate criminal prosecutions to the Los Angeles County District Attorney, FBI & state attorney general.
- 8.) Issue complaints to the Los Angeles County BAR Association against former Guardian Ad Litem of Myrtle Moore Samuel D. Ingham III & against former Guardian Ad Litem Andrea G. Van Leesten.
- 9.) Issue letters to the U.S. Vice President to notify her of the crimes against Myrtle Moore and Charles H. Moore in the Los Angeles Probate court.
- 10.) Issue complaints to the Los Angeles County BAR Association against judges Aviva K. Bobb, Lesley C. Green, Barbara R. Johnson & Ana Maria Luna.
- 11.) Issue complaints to the Los Angeles County BAR Association against Samuel D. Ingham III, Andrea G. Van Leesten, Daniel Herbert, Kirsten Brown, Nathan Talei, and Sarah Talei.

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

Dated:

10/22/21



Ernest L. Moore
Interested Party & Advocate

1 **DECLARATION OF ERNEST MOORE AS INTERESTED PARTY**
2 **& ADVOCATE SEEKING PROBATE COURT REFORMS**
3

4 I, Ernest L. Moore, declare as follows:
5

6 1. I am an interested party in this action. I am over the age of 18 years. I have
7 personal knowledge of the facts contained in this declaration, and if called as a witness,
8 could and would testify competently to the facts as stated herein.

9 2. I make this declaration seeking probate court reforms

10 3. Attorney Samuel D. Ingham III was the 2nd court-appointed Probate Volunteer
11 Panelist (PVP) & Guardian Ad Litem in the conservatorship of my mother Myrtle L. Moore
12 BP 097 063.
13

14 4. PVP Samuel D. Ingham III did nothing to protect my mother or her estate
15 before she passed away in July 2017.

16 5. PVP Samuel D. Ingham III did not communicate with my mother at any time
17 while he was her acting Guardian Ad Litem.
18

19 6. PVP Samuel D. Ingham III filed a *PETITION FOR TRANSFER OF*
20 *CONSERVATORSHIP TO ANOTHER STATE* on 6-16-2016 that contained false,
21 misleading, and (lied) inadequate case status information about my mother to support the
22 transfer of her conservatorship to the Georgia Probate court. See Exhibit **A: 6/16/2016**
23 *Petition For Transfer of Conservatorship To Another State*
24

25 7. In the 6/16/2016 Petition for Transfer of Conservatorship, Samuel D. Ingham
26 III did not state that the court had removed Jean Robinson as co-trustee of the Myrtle Moore
27

1 Living Trust for her malfeasance and waste of the estate and trusts of her conservatee
2 Myrtle L. Moore. See Exhibit **B**: *11/26/2012 Order After Hearing*.

3 8. In his 6/16/2016 Petition for Transfer of Conservatorship, Samuel D. Ingham III
4 did not state that the former co-trustee & co-conservator Jean Robinson did nothing to
5 protect the conservatee Myrtle Moore from the emotional abuse and medical neglect of the
6 other former co-trustee & co-conservator Dr. David Moore. See Exhibit **C**: *6/26/2009 Notice
7 of Hearing And Temporary Restraining Order (Elder or Dependent Adult Abuse Protection)
8 against David Moore*.

9
10 9. PVP Samuel D. Ingham III did nothing to stop the foreclosure sale and
11 embezzlement of the proceeds taken by the former co-trustees by an illegal reverse
12 mortgage on my mother's home in California. See Exhibit **D**: pages from the *July 21, 2015,
13 Respondent Keith J. Moten's Notice of Demurrer; Demurrer To Petition For Damages;
14 Memorandum of Points And Authorities page 4 lines 14-23*.

15
16 10. PVP Samuel D. Ingham III refused to take any actions against the 1st court-
17 appointed PVP for my mother, **Andrea G. Van Leesten**, who did nothing to protect my
18 mother's Person or estate.

19
20 11. PVP **Andrea G. Van Leesten** covered up evidence of the crimes of the former
21 co-conservators of my mother during the hearings on the accountings of her estate by false
22 and misleading statements to the court regarding a commercial property in the State of
23 Georgia that was purchased with funds from my mother's trusts. See Exhibit **E**: Pages from
24 the 12/4/2008 court transcript & *DEED TO SECURE DEBT & SECURITY AGREEMENT*

25
26 12. The first judge on my probate cases was Judge Aviva K. Bobb. Judge Bobb
27 approved all of the fraudulent accountings of the conservatorship and the trusts filed by the

1 former co-conservators over my written and verbal objections. Objections were filed by
2 several attorneys on this case as well. Judge Aviva K. Bobb acted in concert with the
3 opposing attorney Daniel Herbert from the law firm (*MANNING & KASS ELLROD,*
4 *RAMIREZ, TRESTER LLP*) in his probate trust case and the conservatorship of his mother,
5 Myrtle Moore.
6

7 13. PVPs Samuel D. Ingham III nor Andrea Van Leesten did not take any actions
8 against the fraudulent accountings filed by the former co-conservators or to recover any of
9 the lost assets from my mother's trusts.
10

11 14. There has been no proper accounting of the Moore Family Trusts or the Myrtle
12 Moore Living Trust since I filed this case in 2004. The current trustee of the Myrtle Moore
13 Living Trust, **Jeffery Siegel**, has continued this type of professional malfeasance since he
14 was appointed as temporary trustee in 2015. Jeffery Siegel has numerous complaints from
15 other victims assigned to him from the Los Angeles Probate courts with the California
16 Professional Fiduciaries Bureau. See Exhibit F: *Ernest Moore's Objection to 3rd Account*
17 *Current*
18

19 15. Former Judges Aviva K. Bobb, Lesley C. Green, and Barbara R. Johnson,
20 including the current judge on my probate case Ana Maria Luna has denied all actions that I
21 have filed to recover the lost assets from the Moore Family Trusts and the Myrtle Moore
22 Living Trust (*Obstruction of justice*). See Exhibit G: *March 24, 2021, Court Trial Minute Order*
23

24 16. Judge Ana Maria Luna denied my ex-parte application to stay the foreclosure on
25 my property with an illegal mortgage secured by Jeffery Siegel attached to the title. Her only
26 false justification of her denial was that I **have no standing in my probate case**. See
27

1 Exhibit H: Court Order for Ex-Parte & *Public rating of Judge Ana Maria Luna on The Robing*
2 *Room.*

3 17. Judge Aviva K. Bobb, who presided over my initial probate case, took no
4 actions against the multiple perjuries by attorney Daniel Herbert (MANNING & KASS
5 ELLROD, RAMIREZ, TRESTER LLP) in his court documents and oral testimony in court
6 hearings. Judge Aviva K. Bobb's prejudiced rulings and criminal misconduct in my case
7 allowed the waste of my mother's estate, loss of my inheritance and protected the former
8 co-trustees from the penalties of their financial malfeasance and embezzlements.
9

10 18. I have been informed that Judge Brenda J. Penny worked for Aviva K. Bobb
11 for about ten years.
12

13 19. I have been informed by the court that Judge Brenda J. Penny is the
14 supervising judge of the Probate Department in the Los Angeles Superior Courts.
15

16 20. Judge Benda J. Penny has taken no actions against the excessive and
17 inappropriate compensation for Samual D. Ingham III from the estate of Britney Spears. See
18 Exhibit I: *January 5, 2009, Order Appointing Probate Conservator of the Person of Britney*
19 *Spears Page 3 #21.*

20 21. Radio star Casey Kasem's wife Jean Kasem accused PVP Samuel D. Ingham
21 III of conspiring with Kasem's adult kids "to isolate and kill Casey Kasem for financial gain."
22 In her civil lawsuit.
23

24 22. I have filed numerous complaints against the judges and lawyers in my
25 probate case to the former supervising probate judge and the California BAR Association. I
26 only received increased retaliation from the judges and lawyers that I reported.
27

1 23. I have filed numerous complaints to the Los Angeles County Board of
2 Supervisors and specifically to the former Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas in writing and
3 oral complaint presentations demanding criminal prosecutions and public agendas for
4 probate court reforms.

5
6 24. The current Board of Supervisors nor the previous board did not take any
7 action to reform or expose the crimes that I have reported to them concerning the corruption
8 in the Los Angeles Superior Courts Probate Dept. 11.

9 25. My complaints to the California BAR Association were responded to with a
10 recital of all of the criminal misconduct reported to them with a statement that they would not
11 do anything about it! See Exhibit J: July 13, 2021, Nathan Talei closing letter from The
12 State Bar of California.

13
14 26. One of my former attorneys Kwaku Duren, was disbarred for arriving late to a
15 hearing. His so-called violations were nothing like those of Daniel Herbert and Nathan Talei.
16 Kwaku Duren was a former high-ranking Black Panther in the Los Angeles Chapter of the
17 1970s Black Panthers and one of the attorneys of record in my probate cases.

18
19 27. Judge Reva G. Goetz approved the initial excessive and inappropriate
20 attorney compensation for Samuel D. Ingham III of **\$10,000.00 per week!** See Exhibit I:
21 *January 5, 2009, Order Appointing Probate Conservator of the Person of Britney Spears*
22 *Page 3 #21*

23
24 28. I am an unlicensed Marriage & Family Therapist (M.F.T.) and former
25 Children's Social Worker III in the Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family
26 Services (DCFS). My specialty was working in Family Reunification Units. I had extensive
27 experience with mothers like Britney Spears that had their children removed by DCFS


1 because of untreated drug abuse. I am a licensed security professional with the State of
2 California

3 29. My mother, Myrtle L. Moore, was employed by Los Angeles County and
4 worked as an elementary school teacher for the Los Angeles Unified School District. She
5 was active in the **Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority** since her college days.
6

7 30. My father, Dr. Charles H. Moore, was a dentist in Los Angeles. He graduated
8 from dental school at Howard University. He was an Air Force Veteran and a Tuskegee
9 Airmen.

10 31. I have attempted to make citizen arrests of Samuel Ingham III and Nathan Talei
11 in the courtroom and hallway on multiple occasions over the years. Sheriff's deputies would
12 not accept my arrests or take any type of police reports. See Exhibit K: 8/25/2017 Letter
13 from *Regan Fitzgerald, Operations Sergeant Stanley Mosk Court*, and Exhibit L: *July 10,*
14 *2019, Court Transcript: P. 3 lines 26-28, P. 4 lines 4-26, P. 8 lines 18-28 & P. 9 lines 1-11.*
15
16
17
18
19

20 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America and the
21 State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was
22 executed on October 22, 2021, at Los Angeles, California.
23

24 

25 ERNEST L. MOORE
26 Interested Party & Advocate
27

EXHIBIT A

6/16/2016 Petition to Transfer Conservatorship to Another State

DECLARATION OF ERNEST MOORE AS INTERESTED PARTY & ADVOCATE
SEEKING PROBATE COURT REFORMS

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address): Samuel D. Ingham III, Esq. 66279 LAW OFFICES OF SAMUEL D. INGHAM III 444 South Flower Street, Suite 4260 Los Angeles CA 90071-2966 TELEPHONE NO.: (310) 556-9751 FAX NO. (Optional): (310) 556-1311 E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): singham@inghamlaw.com ATTORNEY FOR (Name): MYRTLE MOORE (Guardian Ad Litem)	FOR COURT USE ONLY
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES STREET ADDRESS: 111 North Hill Street MAILING ADDRESS: 111 North Hill Street CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles, California 90012 BRANCH NAME: Central District	
<input type="checkbox"/> GUARDIANSHIP <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CONSERVATORSHIP OF THE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PERSON <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ESTATE OF (Name): MYRTLE L. MOORE <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (PROPOSED) CONSERVATEE	
NOTICE OF HEARING - GUARDIANSHIP OR CONSERVATORSHIP	CASE NUMBER: BP 097 063

This notice is required by law.
 This notice does not require you to appear in court, but you may attend the hearing if you wish.

1. NOTICE is given that (name): SAMUEL D. INGHAM III
 (representative capacity, if any): Guardian Ad Litem for MYRTLE L. MOORE
 has filed (specify):
 PETITION FOR TRANSFER OF CONSERVATORSHIP TO ANOTHER STATE
2. You may refer to documents on file in this proceeding for more information. (Some documents filed with the court are confidential. Under some circumstances you or your attorney may be able to see or receive copies of confidential documents if you file papers in the proceeding or apply to the court.)
3. The petition includes an application for the independent exercise of powers by a guardian or conservator under
 Probate Code section 2108 Probate Code section 2590.
 Powers requested are specified below specified in Attachment 3.
4. A HEARING on the matter will be held as follows:

a. Date: June 16, 2016 Time: 8:30 a.m. Dept.: 11 Room:

b. Address of court same as noted above is (specify):

Assistive listening systems, computer-assisted real-time captioning, or sign language interpreter services are available upon request if at least 5 days notice is provided. Contact the clerk's office for *Request for Accommodations by Persons with Disabilities and Order* (form MC-410). (Civil Code section 54.8.)



GUARDIANSHIP CONSERVATORSHIP OF THE PERSON ESTATE CASE NUMBER:
 OF (Name): MYRTLE L. MOORE
 MINOR (PROPOSED) CONSERVATEE

NOTE:*

A copy of this *Notice of Hearing-Guardianship or Conservatorship* ("Notice") must be "served" on-delivered to each person who has a right under the law to be notified of the date, time, place and purpose of a court hearing in a guardianship or conservatorship. Copies of this Notice may be served by mail in most situations. In a guardianship, however, copies of this Notice must sometimes be personally served on certain persons; and copies of this Notice may be personally served instead of served by mail in both guardianships and conservatorships. The petitioner (the person who requested the court hearing) **may not personally perform either service by mail or personal service**, but must show the court that copies of this Notice have been served in a way the law allows. The petitioner does this by arranging for someone else to perform the service and complete and sign a proof of service, which the petitioner then files with the original Notice.

This page contains a proof of service that may be used only to show service by mail. To show personal service, each person who performs the service must complete and sign a proof of personal service, and each signed copy of that proof of service must be attached to this Notice when it is filed with the court. You may use form GC-020(P) to show personal service of this Notice.

* (This Note replaces the clerk's certificate of posting on prior versions of this form. If notice by posting is desired, attach a copy of form GC-020(C), Clerk's Certificate of Posting Notice of Hearing-Guardianship or Conservatorship. (See Prob. Code, § 2543(c).)

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

1. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to this cause. I am a resident of or employed in the county where the mailing occurred.
2. My residence or business address is (specify):
444 South Flower Street, Suite 4260, Los Angeles, California 90071
3. I served the foregoing *Notice of Hearing-Guardianship or Conservatorship* on each person named below by enclosing a copy in an envelope addressed as shown below AND
 - a. depositing the sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service on the date and at the place shown in item 4 with the postage fully prepaid.
 - b. placing the envelope for collection and mailing on the date and at the place shown in item 4 following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this business's practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid.
4. a. Date mailed: March / , 2016 b. Place mailed (city, state): Los Angeles, CA
5. I served with the *Notice of Hearing-Guardianship or Conservatorship* a copy of the petition or other document referred to in the Notice.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date: March / , 2016

JESSICA NGUYEN
 (TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF PERSON COMPLETING THIS FORM)

Jessica Nguyen
 (SIGNATURE OF PERSON COMPLETING THIS FORM)

NAME AND ADDRESS OF EACH PERSON TO WHOM NOTICE WAS MAILED

	Name of person served	Address (number, street, city, state, and zip code)
1.	Please see attached service list.	
2.		
3.		
4.		

Continued on an attachment. (You may use form DE-120(MA)/GC-020(MA) to show additional persons served.)

CONSERVATORSHIP OF MYRTLE MOORE
SERVICE LIST

Conservatee

Myrtle Moore
5352 Deep Springs Drive
Stone Mountain, Georgia 30087

Conservator (CA) - Guardian (GA)

Jean Robinson (Daughter)
5352 Deep Springs Drive
Stone Mountain, Georgia 30087

Former Conservator

David Moore, M.D. (Son)
1822 Brandau Street
Knoxville, Tennessee 37921

Son of Conservatee

Ernest Moore
5728 Corbett Street
Los Angeles, California 90016

Court Investigator's Office

111 North Hill Street
Room 208
Los Angeles, California 90012

Attorney For Conservatee (Georgia)

Lindsey G. Cambardella, Esq.
Bryson Law Firm
4045 Smithtown Road
Suite K
Suwanee, Georgia 30024

Georgia Court

Gwinnett County Probate Court
75 Langley Drive
Lawrenceville, Georgia 30046

FEB 24 2016

1 SAMUEL D. INGHAM III
2 State Bar #66279
3 444 South Flower Street
4 Suite 4260
5 Los Angeles, California 90071-2966

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk
By: Efrain Alvarez, Deputy

4 Telephone: (310) 556-9751
5 Fax: (310) 556-1311
6 E-mail: singham@inghamlaw.com

DATE OF HEARING:

6-16-16

6 Guardian Ad Litem For MYRTLE L. MOORE

Times: JPD Dept.: 11

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

9 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

11 In the Matter of the Conserva-
12 torship of the Person and Es-
13 tate of

No. BP 097 063

PETITION FOR TRANSFER OF
CONSERVATORSHIP TO ANOTHER
STATE

[Probate Code §2001]

14 MYRTLE L. MOORE,

Department: 11

17 Conservatee.

19 Petitioner, SAMUEL D. INGHAM III, alleges:

21 1. Petitioner Is Guardian Ad Litem

22 By Order Appointing Counsel dated April 6, 2015 in
23 the proceeding for the MYRTLE MOORE LIVING TRUST under Declaration
24 Of Trust dated March 7, 2002¹, I was appointed as guardian ad litem
25 for the conservatee, MYRTLE L. MOORE. I have not been discharged
26 and continue to serve in that capacity.

28 ¹ LASC Case No. BP 141 987

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

2. Appointment of Temporary Conservators

At a hearing on March 7, 2006, DAVID MOORE and JEAN ROBINSON were appointed temporary conservators of MYRTLE's person and estate. The "ORDER APPOINTING TEMPORARY CONSERVATORS" was filed on March 24, 2006 but letters of temporary conservatorship were apparently never issued.

3. Appointment of Permanent Conservators

At a hearing on March 6, 2007, DAVID MOORE and JEAN ROBINSON were appointed permanent conservators of MYRTLE's person and estate. The "ORDER APPOINTING PROBATE CONSERVATORS" was filed on March 14, 2007 and letters of conservatorship were issued on July 10, 2007.

4. Conservatorship Of Estate Terminated

By "ORDER SETTLING FIRST ACCOUNT AND REPORT OF CONSERVATOR AND PETITION FOR ATTORNEY FEES" dated January 30, 2009, the conservatorship of the estate was terminated.

5. Resignation Of DAVID MOORE

By "RESIGNATION OF DAVID MOORE AS CO-CONSERVATOR" dated December 12, 2012, DAVID MOORE resigned as co-conservator.

6. Conservatorship Of Person Only

Based on the foregoing facts, it appears that JEAN ROBINSON is presently the sole conservator of MYRTLE's person. There is no conservatorship of her estate.

///

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

7. Transfer to State Of Georgia

Petitioner seeks to transfer this conservatorship to the State of Georgia based on the following facts.

8. Address of Conservatee

MYRTLE has resided for many years at: 5352 Deep Springs Drive, Stone Mountain, Georgia 30087. She is physically present in Georgia and has moved there permanently. This Court made an "ORDER AUTHORIZING AND FIXING CONSERVATEE'S RESIDENCE OUTSIDE THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA" dated September 27, 2013. This order fixed MYRTLE's residence at the foregoing address in Georgia.

9. Address of Conservator

JEAN ROBINSON resides at 5352 Deep Springs Drive, Stone Mountain, Georgia 30087.

10. Plans For Care Reasonable and Sufficient

Petitioner is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that plans for care and services for MYRTLE in Georgia are reasonable and sufficient.

11. Conservatorship Proceeding Commenced In Georgia

JEAN ROBINSON filed a "PETITION FOR RECEIPT AND ACCEPTANCE OF FOREIGN GUARDIANSHIP AND/OR CONSERVATORSHIP" in the Probate Court of Gwinnett County, Georgia on October 5, 2012.² On June 8, 2015, the Georgia court made a "SPECIAL ORDER" staying this

² Case No. 12-C-000748

1 petition. A copy of the order is attached as Exhibit "A" and
2 incorporated by this reference. Petitioner has no further informa-
3 tion regarding the status of the Georgia proceeding.

4

5 12. Best Interests of the Conservatee

6 Petitioner believes that the transfer of the
7 conservatorship to the State of Georgia is in the best interests of
8 the conservatee because:

9 a. MYRTLE has been living in Georgia for many years
10 and has not lived in Los Angeles County since she moved. Neither
11 she nor her present conservator have any plans for her to return to
12 Los Angeles County; and

13 b. Keeping the conservatorship under the jurisdic-
14 tion of the Los Angeles County Superior Court will serve no useful
15 purpose.

16

17 13. No Veteran's Benefits

18 The conservatee does not receive money from or
19 through the Veterans Administration. The conservatee does not
20 receive revenue or profit from money obtained from the Veterans Ad-
21 ministration or from property wholly or in part acquired with money
22 from the Veterans Administration. The conservatorship estate does
23 not include property acquired, wholly or in part, from money from
24 the Veterans Administration.

25

26 14. No Confinement In State Hospital

27 The conservatee has not been confined in a state
28 hospital in California during the pendency of these proceedings.

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

15. No Request For Special Notice

There have been no requests for special notice.


WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays that this Court make an order:

1. Provisionally granting this petition for transfer the conservatorship of the person to the State of Georgia;

2. Directing JEAN ROBINSON as conservator of the person to petition for the acceptance of the conservatorship in the State of Georgia; and

3. Granting such further relief that the Court may deem proper.

Dated: February 24, 2016


SAMUEL D. INGHAM III
Guardian Ad Litem For MYRTLE L. MOORE


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

VERIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

I have read the foregoing PETITION FOR TRANSFER OF CONSERVATORSHIP PROCEEDING TO ANOTHER STATE and know its contents. The matters stated in the foregoing document are true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are stated on information and belief, and as to those matters I believe them to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration is executed this 24 day of February, 2016 at Los Angeles, California.


SAMUEL D. INGHAM III

IN THE PROBATE COURT OF GWINNETT COUNTY

STATE OF GEORGIA

FILED IN OFFICE
CLERK PROBATE COURT
GWINNETT COUNTY GA
2015 JUN -8 PM 2:44

IN RE: ESTATE OF
MYRTLE MOORE,
WARD

) ESTATE NO. 12-C-000748 ^{SB} CLERK
)
) PETITION FOR RECEIPT AND
) ACCEPTANCE OF FOREIGN
) GUARDIANSHIP AND/OR
) CONSERVATORSHIP

SPECIAL ORDER

On October 5, 2012, Jean Robinson filed a Petition for Receipt and Acceptance of Foreign Guardianship and or Conservatorship. A hearing was set regarding the above-described Petition for February 27, 2013. The Petitioner was ordered to supply a copy of the final order from the California court regarding the transfer of the guardianship. On January 7, 2013, this Court received notice from the Los Angeles Superior Court that it was declining to transfer the ward's guardianship and conservatorship to Gwinnett County, and the California court requested that Jean Robinson file a new request in Georgia. The California court provided that upon that request being granted by this Court, the California court would terminate its conservatorship.

Counsel for the Petitioner informed this Court that the California court had ordered a forensic accounting before it would release the ward's conservatorship.

By Order dated March 8, 2013, the Petition for Receipt and Acceptance was stayed until this Court received notice from the Los Angeles Superior Court that it had released the guardianship and conservatorship and allowed the transfer to this Court.

On October 30, 2013, counsel for the Petitioner filed a Motion for Hearing with a copy of an Order entered by the Los Angeles Superior Court granting a Petition for an Order Fixing Conservatee's address Outside the State of California. The Order is not clearly releasing jurisdiction of the ward's conservatorship to this Court and appears to be simply allowing the conservator to move the ward out of California and to Georgia. By Order dated November 6, 2013, the Court gave the Petitioner thirty (30) days to file a copy of the Petition for Order Fixing Conservatee's Address Outside the State of California so that this Court could confirm what the California court actually approved. To date, nothing has been filed.

On May 29, 2015, this Court received a copy of the Los Angeles Superior Court's


EXHIBIT A

September 27, 2013 Order allowing the conservator to move the ward to Georgia and a copy of the Los Angeles Superior Court's January 30, 2009 Order, stating that the Estate portion of the Conservatorship is terminated; however, these documents are duplicative of documents previously filed with the Court. Based on the foregoing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Petition for Receipt and Acceptance continues to be stayed until this Court receives a copy of the Petition for Order Fixing Conservatee's Address Outside the State of California and notice from the Los Angeles Superior Court that it has released the guardianship and conservatorship and allowed the transfer to this Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a deputy clerk of this Court shall serve a copy of this Order on Jean Robinson and her counsel by first-class mail.

SO ORDERED this 8 day of June, 2015.



Christopher A. Ballar, Judge
Probate Court of Gwinnett County

EXHIBIT B

11/26/2012 Order After Hearing.

DECLARATION OF ERNEST MOORE AS INTERESTED PARTY & ADVOCATE
SEEKING PROBATE COURT REFORMS

Exhib 1 1

1 B. KWAKU DUREN & ASSOCIATES, PC
2 B. Kwaku Duren - SBN: 147789
3 4716 Crenshaw Boulevard
4 Los Angeles, California 90043
5 Tel: (323) 290-6146
6 Fax: (323) 290-1645
7 Email: b.kwaku.duren@bkdlawoffices.com
8 Attorney for Ernest Moore

CONFIRMED COPY
ORIGINAL FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

NOV 26 2012

John A. Clarke, Executive Officer/Clerk
By: V. Dove, Deputy

9 SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES - UNLIMITED CIVIL

11 In Re:

Case No. BP-084530

12 THE MOORE FAMILY TRUSTS

13 ORDER AFTER HEARING

14 DAVID MOORE and JEAN
15 ROBINSON, Successor
16 Trustees of the Moore
17 Family Trusts, including
18 the Myrtle Moore Trust,

Petitioners,

19 vs.

20 ERNEST MOORE,

Respondent.

21
22 This matter came on regularly for hearing, on October 25, 2012, at 8:30 a.m., after
23 Notice duly given to all parties by the court. Ernest Moore, along with his attorney of
24 record, B. Kwaku Duren, appeared; there was no appearances, or court-calls, by the other
25 parties. i.e., David Moore and Jean Robinson, Co-Trustees, in pro per.

26 //

27 //

28 *Order of the Court*

Page 1 of 3

Ernest + 1

1 **THE COURT MAKES THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS AND ORDERS:**

- 2 1) David Moore was not present for this hearing as ordered previously by the
3 court, nor did he participate in submitting a "Joint Trial Statement" by
4 October 19, 2012, as ordered by the court.
- 5 2) Therefore, the court set today's hearing for an OSC [Order to Show Cause]
6 regarding sanctions against David Moore, under C.C.P §177.5; and -
- 7 3) The court will proceed with sanctioning David Moore \$1,000.00 [One
8 Thousand Dollars] for failing to comply with the "joint trial statement"
9 requirements and for "failure to appear" in court today; the "sanctions"
10 pursuant to C.C.P §177.5 are to be paid no later than December 27, 2012.
- 11 4) The court hereby suspends David Moore and Jean Robinson as Trustees of
12 the Moore Family Trusts, and issues an Order that they have "no authority"
13 to act on behalf of the trusts, pending further Court order.
- 14 5) The court will also deny without prejudice the "Petition for Accounting" on
15 calendar today because neither David Moore nor Jean Robinson appeared to
16 prosecute the trial on the Accounting; the Court finds that there is no
17 evidence before the court that this "Accounting" is proper.
- 18 6) The court hereby orders that an OSC [Order to Show Cause] shall issue to
19 both David Moore and Jean Robinson [as co-Trustees], to be heard on
20 December 27, 2012, 11:00 a.m., in Department 11. Both David Moore and
21 Jean Robinson shall appear and show cause why they failed to appear for
22 the Trial, and shall provide the court with a "further accounting."
- 23 7) The hearing on the OSC regarding "surcharges," raised by Ernest Moore in
24 his objections to the Accounting, against the David Moore and Jean Robinson,
25 is continued to December 27, 2012, at 11:00 a.m.
- 26 8) The Court also orders Ernest Moore, through his attorney of record, to re-
27 file his Petition to Appoint a Successor Trustee on or before November 23.

28 //
Order of the Court

Exhibit 1

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

2012, and the hearing for that matter is also to be scheduled for December 27, 2012, at 11:00, in Department 11.

- 9) The sheriff department shall personally serve David Moore and Jean Robinson with this court's order.

[Handwritten signature]

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: NOV 26 2012

MICHAEL I. LEVANAS, Judge
Honorable Michael I. Levanas

EXHIBIT C

6/26/2009 Notice of Hearing and Temporary Restraining Order (Elder or
Dependent Adult Abuse Protection) against David Moore.

DECLARATION OF ERNEST MOORE AS INTERESTED PARTY & ADVOCATE
SEEKING PROBATE COURT REFORMS

EA-120

**Notice of Hearing and
Temporary Restraining Order**

K.C. Clerk
FILED
Clerk stamps date here when form is filed.
LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT

JUN 26 2009

JOHN A. CLARKE, CLERK
Attorney
BY **D. HARRING**, DEPUTY

1 Name of person asking for protection:
Myrtle Moore by Paula Moore Guardian ad litem

Address (skip this if you have a lawyer): (If you want your address to be private, give a mailing address instead):
5786 Rodeo Road Suite #264 *Superior Court by the Court*

City: Los Angeles *Inglewood* State: CA Zip: 90016

Your telephone number (optional): () *909-400-1111*

Your lawyer (if you have one): (Name, address, telephone number, and State Bar number):

Fill in court name and street address:

Superior Court of California, County of
Los Angeles Superior Court
Southwest District Inglewood
One Regent Street
Inglewood, CA 90301

2 Name of person to be restrained:
Dr. David L. Moore

Description of that person:

Court fills in case number when form is filed.
Case Number:
YQ012426

Sex: M F Height: 5' 7" Weight: 280 Race: Black

Hair Color: Red Eye Color: Brown Age: 52 Date of Birth:

Home Address (if known): 3500 Manchester Ave

City: Inglewood State: CA Zip: 90305

Work Address (if known): 5517 Holmes Ave

City: Los Angeles State: CA Zip: 90058

To the person in 2:

3 **Notice of Hearing**
A court hearing is scheduled on the request for orders against you to stop abuse:

Hearing Date	Date: JUL 16 2009	Name and address of court if different from above:	
	Time: 7:30 AM	Dept.: N	Rm.: 502

If you do not want the court to make orders against you, file Form EA-110. Then go to the hearing and tell the court why you disagree. You may bring witnesses and other evidence. If you do not go to this hearing, the court may make restraining orders against you that could last up to 3 years.

4 **Court Orders**
The court (check a or b):

a. Has scheduled the hearing stated in 3. No orders are issued against you at this time.

b. Has scheduled the hearing stated in 3 and has issued the temporary orders against you specified on pages 2, 3, and 4. If you do not obey these orders, you can be arrested and charged with a crime. You may have to go to jail, pay a fine of up to \$1,000, or both.

This is a Court Order.

EXHIBIT D

pages from *July 21, 2015, Respondent Keith J. Moten's Notice of Demurrer; Demurrer To Petition For Damages; Memorandum of Points And Authorities* **page 4 lines 14-23**

DECLARATION OF ERNEST MOORE AS INTERESTED PARTY & ADVOCATE
SEEKING PROBATE COURT REFORMS

COPY

1 Keith J. Moten, Esq. (#240381)
2 LAW OFFICES OF KEITH J. MOTEN, APC
3 6601 Center Drive West, Suite 500
4 Los Angeles, California 90045
5 Telephone No.: (310) 348-8138
6 Facsimile No.: (310) 348-8139

NON-PROFIT COPY
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

JUN 17 2015

7 Attorney In Pro Per

Sherril R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk
By: Andra Watts, Deputy

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES - CENTRAL DISTRICT

10
11 In Re

CASE NO. BP084530

12
13 MOORE FAMILY TRUST,

RESPONDENT KEITH J. MOTEN'S
NOTICE OF DEMURRER; DEMURRER
TO PETITION FOR DAMAGES;
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES:

14
15 Trust.

JUL 21 2015
Date:
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Dept: 11
Jud. Officer: Hon. Lesley C. Green

BY FAX

16
17
18
19 TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

20 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on JUL 21 2015, at 10:00 a.m., or as soon
21 thereafter as the matter may be heard in Department 11 of the above-entitled Court, located
22 at 111 N. Hill Street, Los Angeles, California, 90012, Defendant KEITH J. MOTEN, as
23 ("Respondent") will demur, generally and specifically to the Petition for Damages.

24 This Demurrer is brought on the ground that the Petition fails to state facts sufficient
25 to constitute a cause of action, and the defects to the Petition appear from matters judicially
26 noticeable.

1 This Demurrer is based on the Notice of Demurrer, Demurrer and Memorandum of
2 Points and authorities attached hereto, as well as the records, pleadings and papers on file
3 herein and upon such oral argument and other documentary evidence as may be presented
4 at or before the hearing on this Demurrer.

5


6 Dated: June 17, 2015

LAW OFFICES OF KEITH J. MOTEN

7

8

9



KEITH J. MOTEN, Attorney In Pro Per

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

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

DEMURRER

Respondent KEITH J. MOTEN, ("Respondent") demurs to the Petition for Damages as follows:

DEMURRER TO PETITION FOR DAMAGES
(MATTERS JUDICIALLY NOTICEABLE)


The Petition for Damages fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action as against Respondent. Furthermore, defects to the Petition appear from matters judicially noticeable.

DEMURRER TO PETITION FOR DAMAGES
(RES JUDICATA)

The Petition for Damages fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action as against Respondent. Furthermore, said Petition is barred by the doctrine of res judicata

Dated: June 17, 2015

LAW OFFICES OF KEITH J. MOTEN


KEITH J. MOTEN, Attorney In Pro Per

1 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

2 I.

3 STATEMENT OF FACTS

4 On May 2, 2013, Respondent was appointed as Temporary Trustee of the
5 MOORE FAMILY TRUST ("Trust"). Respondent took the appropriate measures to
6 marshal all Trust assets, but was met with undue hostile resistance from Petitioner--who
7 was the prior Trustee of the Trust--as to the location and character of the assets of the
8 Trust. Petitioner's interference with the administration of the Trust included, but was
9 not limited to a civil suit as against Respondent (LASC Case No. BC512031), which
10 was dismissed without leave to amend pursuant to a Demurrer by Respondent, and
11 multiple undue and baseless objections along the way.

12 Respondent ultimately became aware of a sole remaining asset of the Trust, a real
13 property located at 3500 Manchester Blvd., Unit #313, Inglewood, CA, 90305
14 ("Property"). There were no remaining cash assets in the Trust, as Respondent is
15 informed and believes that Petitioner, the Trustee of the MYRTLE MOORE TRUST, a
16 subtrust of the Trust, absconded with the liquid assets of the Trust.

17 However, upon learning of the Trust asset, Respondent simultaneously found out
18 that the Property was in foreclosure, with a scheduled imminent sale date. On
19 November 25, 2013, Respondent immediately attempted to file a ex parte Petition for
20 Fees, and for Monies to Cure Default in order to cure the default and create liquidity in
21 the Trust. Petitioner objected to said Petition, and said Petition was continued. Due to
22 the time-sensitive nature of the foreclosure sale, the Property was sold in or about
23 January 2014 through no fault of Respondent.

24 On March 25, 2015, Petitioner and Respondent attended a Bench Trial for
25 Petitioner's Request for Fees. In her ruling at Trial, Hon. Lesley C. Green found that
26 "... the foreclosure of the Manchester Property ... [was] not attributed to Mr. Moten's
27
28

1 negligence" (Exhibit "A", pg 3, lines 18-21); that it "...was unlikely that he [Mr. Moten]
2 or any Trustee could have prevented that foreclosure on the reverse mortgage..."
3 (Exhibit "A", pg. 3, lines 22-26); that Mr. Moten "...acted in good faith, and that the
4 success or failure of the Trust was not attributable to him. (Exhibit "A", pg 4, lines 8-
5 10". See Exhibit "A". See also Request for Judicial Notice of Case File, LASC
6 Case No. BP084530.

7
8 **II.**
9 **LEGAL ARGUMENT**

10 **A.**
11 **PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR DAMAGES FAILS TO STATE A CAUSE OF**
12 **ACTION AGAINST RESPONDENT. IS BARRED BECAUSE OF THE**
13 **DOCTRINE OF RES JUDICATA, AND MUST BE DISMISSED WITH**
14 **PREJUDICE**

15 Pursuant to *Cal.C.C.P §1908(a)(1)*, the effect of a judgment or final order in an
16 action before a court or judge of this state in respect to the administration of the estate of
17 a decedent, or in respect to the legal condition of a particular person, the judgment or
18 order is conclusive upon the administration, or the condition or relation of the person.
19 Additionally, in other cases, the judgment or order is, in respect to the matter directly
20 adjudged, *conclusive* between the parties and their successors in interest by title
21 subsequent to the commencement of the action, litigating for the same thing under the
22 same title and in the same capacity, provided they have notice, actual or constructive, of
23 the pendency of the action or proceeding. *Cal. C.C.P §1908(a)(2)*.

24 Here, the competency, good faith and culpability of Respondent with regard to
25 the administration of the Trust was at issue at trial, and was actually adjudicated.
26 Petitioner had actual notice of the pendency of the action, and was actually present at
27 trial when the ruling finding good faith and no culpability on the Respondent's part was

1 made. See Exhibit "A". See Also Request for Judicial Notice. As such, Petitioner's
2 instant Petition is a subsequent attempt to relitigate a matter involving the same parties
3 and the same controversy which has already been finally determined. Accordingly,
4 Respondent's Demurrer must be sustained without leave to amend, and Petitioner's
5 Petition must be dismissed with prejudice. The doctrine of res judicata gives certain
6 conclusive effect to a former judgment in subsequent litigation involving the same
7 controversy. *Benasra v. Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp* (2002) 116 Cal.Rptr.2d 644, 96
8 Cal.App.4th 96. In applying doctrines of "res judicata", "estoppel by judgment", and
9 "merger of judgments", it is immaterial what form the proceedings take so long as they
10 arise out of the same act or right. *Slater v. Shell Oil Co.* (App. 1 Dist. 1943) 58
11 Cal.App.2d 864, 137 P.2d 713. Res judicata precludes parties or their privies from
12 relitigating a cause of action that has been finally determined by a court of competent
13 jurisdiction. *Morris v. Blank* (App. 2 Dist. 2001) 114 Cal.Rptr.2d 672, 94 Cal.App.4th
14 823; *Acuna v. Regents of University of California* (App. 2 Dist. 1997) 65 Cal.Rptr.2d
15 388, 56 Cal.App.4th 639. Under doctrine of "res judicata", a matter of fact once
16 adjudicated by a court of competent jurisdiction, concurrent or exclusive, may be relied
17 upon as an "estoppel" in any subsequent collateral suit in the same or any other court, at
18 law, in chancery, in probate, or in admiralty, where either party or the privies of either
19 party alleges anything inconsistent with such adjudicated fact regardless of whether
20 subsequent suit is upon the same or a different cause of action. *Denio v. City of*
21 *Huntington Beach* (1946) 168 P.2d 785, 74 Cal.App.2d 424.

22 ///
23 ///
24 ///
25 ///
26 ///
27 ///

1 B.

2 PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR DAMAGES FAIL TO STATE A CAUSE OF
3 ACTION AS AGAINST RESPONDENT BECAUSE DEFECTS TO THE
4 PETITION APPEAR FROM MATTERS JUDICIALLY NOTICEABLE

5 Pursuant to *Cal. Evidence Code §452(d)*, the records of any court of this state
6 may be judicially noticed. Pursuant to said notice, Respondent has filed, along with this
7 Demurrer, a Request for Judicial Notice of the entire file of this case, LASC Case No.
8 BP 084530, as long as a Request for Judicial Notice of the partial transcript of the ruling
9 at Trial in this matter wherein it was adjudicated that "... the foreclosure of the
10 Manchester Property ... [was] not attributed to Mr. Moten's negligence" (Exhibit "A",
11 pg 3, lines 18-21); that it "...was unlikely that he [Mr. Moten] or any Trustee could have
12 prevented that foreclosure on the reverse mortgage..." (Exhibit "A", pg. 3, lines 22-26);
13 that Mr. Moten "...acted in good faith, and that the success or failure of the Trust was
14 not attributable to him. (Exhibit "A", pg 4, lines 8-10". **See Exhibit "A". See also**
15 **Request for Judicial Notice of Case File, LASC Case No. BP084530.** As such,
16 Petitioner's Petition for Damages fails to state a cause of action as against Respondent
17 because the defects to the Petition—notably—its being barred by the doctrine of res
18 judicata—appear from matters judicially noticeable: the records of the instant case,
19 including the transcripts from the Trial Ruling. Petitioner's Petition must be dismissed
20 without prejudice, and Respondent's Demurrer must be sustained without leave to
21 amend.

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27

28

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

PRAAYER FOR RELIEF


WHEREFORE, Respondent KEITH J. MOTEN prays for relief against Petitioner DAVID MOORE, as follows:

WITH RESPECT to Petitioner's Petition for Damages in its' entirety, Respondent prays for an order against Petitioner as follows:

1. For an order sustaining Respondent's Demurrer to Petitioner's Petition for Damages without leave to amend; and
2. Dismissing Petitioner DAVID MOORE'S Petition for Damages with prejudice; and
3. For such further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: June 17, 2015

LAW OFFICES OF KEITH J. MOTEN



KEITH J. MOTEN, Attorney In Pro Per

EXHIBIT E

Pages from the 12/4/2008 Court Transcript & *DEED TO SECURE DEBT &
SECURITY AGREEMENT*

DECLARATION OF ERNEST MOORE AS INTERESTED PARTY & ADVOCATE
SEEKING PROBATE COURT REFORMS

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

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT NO. 11

HON. AVIVA K. BOBB, JUDGE

IN THE MATTER OF THE
CONSERVATORSHIP OF

MYRTLE MOORE,

)
)
) NO. BP097063
) PB084530
)
)
)

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

DECEMBER 4, 2008

APPEARANCES:

FOR OBJECTOR ERNEST
MOORE:

LAW OFFICES OF M. ALAN BUNNAGE
BY: M. ALAN BUNNAGE, ESQ.
8383 WILSHIRE BLVD., SUITE 360
BEVERLY HILLS, CALIFORNIA 90211
323-655-3450

P.V.P. COUNSEL:

LAW OFFICE OF ANDREA G. VAN LEESTEN
BY: ANDREA G. VAN LEESTEN, ESQ.
6101 W. CENTINELA AVENUE, SUITE 270
CULVER CITY, CALIFORNIA 90230
310-410-1717

ALSO PRESENT:

DAVID MOORE
MYRTLE MOORE
ERNEST MOORE

COPY
ORIGINAL

Laurie Miller, CSR #6457
OFFICIAL REPORTER

1 WANT? I DON'T THINK THERE'S ANY EMERGENCY.

2 MS. VAN LEESTEN: I DON'T THINK THERE'S ANY
3 EMERGENCY. AND BEFORE WE GO, I'D JUST LIKE TO REALLY FRAME
4 THE ISSUES. AND AS I WAS SPEAKING TO MR. BUNNAGE OUTSIDE,
5 THIS CONSERVATOR REALLY ONLY HAS THE MONEY THAT MRS. MOORE
6 RECEIVES, HER OWN CASH, HER OWN RETIREMENT, THAT'S ALL
7 THAT'S IN IT, AND WE ALLOWED HER TO HAVE THE DISCRETION TO
8 SPEND HER MONEY AS SHE CHOSE, AND NOW THERE ARE QUESTIONS,
9 AS THERE SHOULD BE, BECAUSE THERE ARE NO EXPLANATIONS. WE
10 DIDN'T SAY WE HAD TO PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION. WE SAID THAT
11 SHE COULD HAVE HER MONEY AND SPEND IT THE WAY SHE HAD BEFORE
12 SHE HAD A CONSERVATORSHIP, AND ONE OF THE THINGS THAT SHE
13 ALWAYS DOES IS SHE SPENDS IT ON ERNEST MOORE'S CHILDREN WHEN
14 THEY COME, AND SHE DOES WHAT SHE WANTS TO DO. SHE TRAVELS,
15 SHE DOES -- I WAS AT HER HOUSE VISITING WITH HER YESTERDAY,
16 AND MR. MOORE'S WIFE --

17 THE COURT: THEN WHY DO WE NEED TO HAVE A
18 CONSERVATORSHIP OF THE ESTATE?

19 MS. VAN LEESTEN: WE HAVE A CONSERVATORSHIP BECAUSE
20 IT BECAME AN OFFENSIVE TOOL BECAUSE OF MR. MOORE AND THE
21 MOORES' INTRAFIGHTING. WE HAVE A TRUST, THE TRUST COULD
22 HAVE BEEN OPERATED WITH A SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE, BUT SHE HAD HER
23 OWN MONEY, SHE DIDN'T WANT IT TO BECOME A PART OF THE TRUST,
24 AND IT JUST BECAME A TOOL TO BE OFFENSIVELY FIGHTING OFF --

25 * THE COURT: IT DOES APPEAR TO ME THERE'S ALMOST NO
26 MONEY IN THE TRUST.

27 * MS. VAN LEESTEN: THERE IS NO MONEY IN THE TRUST,
28 YOUR HONOR.

1 EVERYBODY OR FOR NOBODY.

2 MS. VAN LEESTEN: I RECOMMEND YOU APPROVE IT FOR
3 EVERYBODY, YOUR HONOR.

4 THE COURT: THANK YOU.

5 MR. ERNEST MOORE: CAN SHE PAY MY STUDENT LOANS,
6 TOO? I HAVE A STUDENT LOAN.

7 THE COURT: PROBABLY WOULD BE BENEFITED IF YOU'D GO
8 TO SOME PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL. WOULD PROBABLY BE A GOOD
9 THING.

10 TELL ME ABOUT THE BAYVIEW LOAN.

11 MR. DAVID MOORE: THE BAYVIEW LOAN IS A LOAN THAT
12 WE ENDED UP INHERITING.

13 THE COURT: FROM?

14 MR. DAVID MOORE: BEFORE MY MOTHER'S HEAD INJURY,
15 THEY WERE NEGOTIATING A LOAN. NOW, IT MAY HAVE BEEN CLOSED
16 THE DAY SHE HAD HER HEAD INJURY OR WHATEVER, BUT IT'S FROM
17 WAY BACK IN 2004. MY MOTHER COSIGNED A LOAN FOR MY SISTER,
18 AND MY SISTER GENERALLY PAYS ON THE LOAN UNLESS IT GOES INTO
19 DEFAULT.

20 MR. ERNEST MOORE: THAT'S NOT TRUE. MY SISTER
21 PURCHASED THAT PROPERTY WHEN MY MOTHER WAS IN A
22 SEMI-COMATOSE CONDITION IN THE HOSPITAL AFTER HER HEAD
23 INJURY.

24 * * MS. VAN LEESTEN: IF I MAY, YOUR HONOR, THERE IS NO
25 PROPERTY.

26 MR. ERNEST MOORE: AND MY SISTER'S NAME IS ON THE
27 DEED. MY SISTER AND HER HUSBAND AND MY MOTHER'S NAME IS ON
28 THE DEED. I'VE FAXED COPIES OF THIS TO THE P.V.P. SEVERAL

1 WEEKS AGO.

2 MR. DAVID MOORE: IT'S CLEAR HE AGREES THAT --

3 MS. VAN LEESTEN: IF I MAY.

4 MR. DAVID MOORE: -- THIS IS PRIOR TO THE
5 CONSERVATORSHIP, PRIOR TO US, YOU KNOW, EVEN BECOMING
6 TRUSTEES, AND HE'S EVEN AGREEING TO IT.

7 * MS. VAN LEESTEN: YOUR HONOR, IF I MAY, TO MY
8 UNDERSTANDING, AND WHAT I HAVE LEARNED FROM DAN HERBERT, THE
9 PREVIOUS ATTORNEY FOR THE CONSERVATOR, THIS WAS A LOAN THAT
10 MRS. MOORE COSIGNED ON WITH HER DAUGHTER WHO LIVES IN
11 ATLANTA TO START A DAYCARE. IT'S FOR A DAYCARE BUSINESS.
12 THERE IS NO REAL PROPERTY THAT BACKS UP THIS LOAN. IT IS AN
13 UNSECURED LOAN THAT A MOTHER MADE TO HER DAUGHTER TO START A
14 BUSINESS.

15 * IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING, AND I'VE LEARNED THAT THERE
16 IS A WRITTEN AGREEMENT THAT JEAN, DAVID AND CHARLES, WHO IS
17 NOW DECEASED, SIGNED THAT JEAN WOULD REPAY THIS LOAN BACK TO
18 THE TRUST AND BACK TO HER MOTHER PRIOR TO ANYONE'S PASSING,
19 AND IF SHE DID NOT PAY IT BACK BEFORE HER MOTHER PASSED, IT
20 WOULD BE AN OFFSET AGAINST HER SHARE.

21 MR. ERNEST MOORE: WHY IS MY MOTHER STILL PAYING ON
22 IT?

23 * MR. BUNNAGE: WELL, YOUR HONOR, I'D LIKE TO HAVE
24 THAT WRITTEN DOCUMENT AVAILABLE SO THERE'S SOME PROTECTION.

25 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

26 MS. VAN LEESTEN: AND IT'S ON THE RECORD.

27 THE COURT: OKAY. MS. VAN LEESTEN, ARE YOU WAIVING
28 THE MATTERS TO BE CLEARED ON BEHALF OF YOUR CLIENT?

38696
00108

012/080

BK 38696 PG 0108

FILED AND RECORDED
CLERK SUPERIOR COURT
GWINNETT COUNTY, GA

04 JUN 16 PM 2:00

TOM LAWLER, CLERK

UPON RECORDING RETURN TO:

InterBay Funding, LLC
4601 Sheridan Street, 6th Floor
Hollywood, Florida 33021
Attention: Post Closing Department

Return to Shirley Herren
Trinity Title Ins. Agency
437 E. Ponce De Leon Ave.
Decatur, GA 30030-1938

49595.04

DEED TO SECURE DEBT
AND
SECURITY AGREEMENT

GEORGIA INTANGIBLE TAX PAID
\$ 990.00
TOM LAWLER
SUPERIOR COURT GWINNETT
COUNTY, GEORGIA

[GEORGIA]

Myrtle Moore

(Borrower)

To

InterBay Funding, LLC, a Delaware Limited
Liability Company

(Lender)

108613

3038524

na

BK 38696 PG 109

THIS DEED TO SECURE DEBT AND SECURITY AGREEMENT (the "Security Instrument") is made as of May 14, 2004, by Myrtle Moore, having an address at 3500 W. Manchester Blvd Unit 313, Inglewood, CA 90305, as grantor ("Borrower"), to InterBay Funding, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company, having an address at 4601 Sheridan Street, 6th Floor, Hollywood, Florida 33021, as grantee ("Lender").

RECITALS:

Borrower by its promissory note of even date herewith given to Lender is indebted to Lender in the principal sum of Three Hundred Thirty Thousand Dollars (\$330,000.00) in lawful money of the United States of America (the note together with all extensions, renewals, modifications, substitutions and amendments thereof shall collectively be referred to as the "Note"), with interest from the date thereof at the rates set forth in the Note, principal and interest to be payable in accordance with the terms and conditions provided in the Note. The Maturity Date of the Note is June 1, 2019.

Borrower desires to secure the payment of the Debt (hereinafter defined in Article 2) and the performance of all of its obligations under the Note and the Other Obligations (defined in Article 3).

ARTICLE 1. - GRANT AND CONVEYANCE

Section 1.1. **PROPERTY CONVEYED.** Borrower does hereby irrevocably, grant, bargain, sell, pledge, assign, warrant, transfer and convey to Lender, and grant a security interest to Lender in, the following property, rights, interests and estates now owned, or hereafter acquired by Borrower (collectively, the "Property):

(a) **Land.** The real property described in Exhibit A attached hereto and made a part hereof (the "Land");

(b) **Additional Land.** All additional lands, estates and development rights hereafter acquired by Borrower for use in connection with the Land and the development of the Land and all additional land and estates therein which may, from time to time, by supplemental mortgage or otherwise be expressly made subject to the ten of this Security Instrument;

(c) **Improvements.** The buildings, structures, fixtures, additions, enlargements, extensions, modifications, repairs, replacements and improvements now or hereafter erected or located on the Land (the "Improvements");

(d) **Easements.** All easements, rights-of-way or use, rights, strips and gores of land, streets, ways, alleys, passages, sewer rights, ditches and ditch rights, wells and well rights, well permits, springs and spring rights and reservoirs and reservoir rights appurtenant to or historically used in connection with the premises and all of Borrower's rights and interests under applicable state or Federal law to all water, and to use or consent, to use all water, contained in or available from any part of the water bearing formations underlying the Premises, together with all associated easements and rights of way; any and all rights to obtain water, sewer and other services from service districts, water, water courses, water rights and powers, air rights and development rights, all crops, timber, trees, shrubs, flowers and lands aping plants and materials now or hereafter located on, under or above the Premises, and all estates, rights, titles, interests, privileges, liberties, servitudes, tenements, hereditaments and appurtenances of any nature whatsoever, in any way now or hereafter belonging, relating or pertaining to the Land and the Improvements and the reversion and reversions, remainder and remainders, and all land lying in the bed of any street, road or avenue, opened or proposed, in front of or adjoining the Land, to the center line thereof and all the estates, rights, titles, interests, dower and rights of dower, courtesy and rights of courtesy, property, possession, claim and demand whatsoever, both at law and in equity, of Borrower of, in and to the Land and the Improvements and every part and parcel thereof, with the appurtenances thereto;

(e) **Fixtures and Personal Property.** All machinery, equipment, fixtures (including, but not limited to, all heating, air conditioning, plumbing, lighting, communications and elevator fixtures) trade fixtures and other property of every kind and nature whatsoever owned by Borrower, or in which Borrower has or shall have an interest, including without limitation, letter of credit rights, deposit accounts, payment intangibles, investment

2038324

present and future funds, accounts, instruments, accounts receivable, documents, causes of action, or claims now or hereafter held, created or otherwise capable of credit to the Debtor/Borrower; and

(o) Other Rights. Any and all other rights of Borrower in and to the items set forth in Subsections (i) through (n) above.

Section 1.2. ASSIGNMENT OF LEASES AND RENTS. Borrower hereby absolutely and unconditionally assigns to Lender Borrower's right, title and interest in and to all current and future Leases and Rents; it being intended by Borrower that this assignment constitutes a present, absolute assignment and not an assignment for additional security only. Nevertheless, subject to the terms of this Section 1.2 and Section 3.8, Lender grants to Borrower a revocable license to collect and receive the Rents. Borrower shall hold a portion of the Rents sufficient to discharge all current sums due on the Debt, for use in the payment of such sums.

Section 1.3. SECURITY AGREEMENT. This Security Instrument is both a real property Deed to Security Debt and a "security agreement" within the meaning of the Uniform Commercial Code. The Property includes both real and personal property and all other rights and interests, whether tangible or intangible in nature, of Borrower in the Property. By executing and delivering this Security Instrument, Borrower hereby grants to Lender, as security for the Obligations (defined in Section 2.3), a security interest in the Personal Property to the full extent that the Personal Property may be subject to the Uniform Commercial Code.

Section 1.4. PLEDGE OF MONIES HELD. Borrower hereby pledges to Lender any and all monies now or hereafter held by Lender, including, without limitation, any sums deposited in the Escrow Fund (defined in Section 3.5), Net Proceeds (defined in Section 3.7) and condemnation awards or payments described in Section 3.6, as additional security for the Obligations until expended or applied as provided in this Security Instrument.

Section 1.5. SECURITY DEED. This Security Interest is intended to operate and is to be construed as a deed passing the title to the property to Lender and is made under those provisions of the existing laws of the State of Georgia relating to deeds to secure debt, and not as a mortgage, and is given to secure the debt (hereinafter defined) and Other Obligations (hereinafter defined) and any and all renewals, modifications, consolidations, replacements and extensions thereof.

CONDITIONS TO GRANT

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD THE ABOVE GRANTED AND DESCRIBED PROPERTY TO THE USE AND BENEFIT OF LENDER, AND THE SUCCESSORS AND ASSIGNS OF LENDER, IN FEE SIMPLE FOREVER;

PROVIDED, HOWEVER, THESE PRESENTS ARE UPON THE EXPRESS CONDITION THAT, IF BORROWER SHALL WELL AND TRULY PAY TO LENDER THE DEBT AT THE TIME AND IN THE MANNER PROVIDED IN THE NOTE AND THIS SECURITY INSTRUMENT, SHALL PERFORM THE OTHER OBLIGATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THIS SECURITY INSTRUMENT AND SHALL ABIDE BY AND COMPLY WITH EACH AND EVERY COVENANT AND CONDITION SET FORTH HEREIN AND IN THE NOTE, THESE PRESENTS AND THE ESTATE HEREBY GRANTED SHALL CEASE, TERMINATE, BE VOID AND BE CANCELED OF RECORD.

ARTICLE 2. - DEBT AND OBLIGATIONS SECURED

Section 2.1. DEBT. This Security Instrument and the grants, assignments and transfers made in Article 1 are given for the purpose of securing the payment of the following, in such order of priority as Lender may determine in its sole discretion (the "Debt"):

- (a) the indebtedness evidenced by the Note in lawful money of the United States of America;
- (b) interest, default interest, late charges and other sums, as provided in the Note, this Security Instrument

BK 38696 PG 0117

(a) Borrower shall keep and maintain at all times at the Property or the management agent's offices, and upon Lender's request shall make available at the Property, complete and accurate books of account and records (including copies of supporting bills and invoices) adequate to reflect correctly the operation of the Property, and copies of all written contracts, leases, and other instruments which affect the Property. Following a default by Borrower, the books, records, contracts, leases and other instruments shall be subject to examination and inspection at any reasonable time by Lender.

(b) Following a default by Borrower, Borrower shall furnish to Lender all of the following:

(1) within ten (10) days following Lender's written request and thereafter annually within 120 days after the end of each fiscal year of Borrower, a statement of income and expenses for Borrower's operation of the Property for that fiscal year, a statement of changes in financial position of Borrower relating to the Property for that fiscal year and, when requested by Lender, a balance sheet showing all assets and liabilities of Borrower relating to the Property as of the end of that fiscal year;

(2) within ten (10) days following Lender's written request and thereafter annually within 120 days after the end of each fiscal year of Borrower, and at any other time upon Lender's request, a rent schedule for the Property showing the name of each tenant, and for each tenant, the space occupied, the lease expiration date, the rent payable for the current month, the date through which rent has been paid, and any related information requested by Lender;

(3) within ten (10) days following Lender's written request and thereafter annually within 120 days after the end of each fiscal year of Borrower, and at any other time upon Lender's request, an accounting of all security deposits held pursuant to all Leases, including the name of the institution (if any) and the names and identification numbers of the accounts (if any) in which such security deposits are held and the name of the person to contact at such financial institution, along with any authority or release necessary for Lender to access information regarding such accounts;

(4) within ten (10) days following Lender's written request and thereafter annually within 120 days after the end of each fiscal year of Borrower, and at any other time upon Lender's request, a statement that identifies all owners of any interest in Borrower and the interest held by each, if Borrower is a corporation, all officers and directors of Borrower, and if Borrower is a limited liability company, all managers who are not members;

(5) within ten (10) days following Lender's written request and thereafter monthly a property management report for the Property, showing the number of inquiries made and rental applications received from tenants or prospective tenants and deposits received from tenants and any other information requested by Lender;

(6) within ten (10) days following Lender's written request and thereafter monthly a balance sheet, a statement of income and expenses for Borrower and a statement of changes in financial position of Borrower for Borrower's most recent fiscal year; and

(7) within ten (10) days following Lender's written request and thereafter monthly a statement of income and expense for the Property for the prior month or quarter.

(c) Each of the statements, schedules and reports required hereunder shall be certified to be complete and accurate by an individual having authority to bind Borrower, and shall be in such form and contain such detail as Lender may reasonably require; provided that Lender, in Lender's sole discretion, may require that any statements, schedules or reports be audited at Borrower's expense by independent certified public accountants acceptable to Lender.

(d) If Borrower fails to provide in a timely manner the statements, schedules and reports required hereunder, Lender shall have the right to have Borrower's books and records audited, at Borrower's expense, by independent certified public accountants selected by Lender in order to obtain such statements, schedules and reports, and all related costs and expenses of Lender shall become immediately due and payable and shall become an

BK 38696PG0119

its permanent residence, all as set forth in Subsection 5.18 below, Borrower shall immediately notify Lender in writing. Borrower shall execute and deliver such additional financing statements, security agreements and other instruments which may be necessary to effectively evidence or perfect Lender's security interest in the Property as a result of such change of principal place of business or residence

ARTICLE 4. - SPECIAL COVENANTS

Intentionally deleted

ARTICLE 5. - REPRESENTATIONS AND WARRANTIES

Borrower represents and warrants to Lender that:

Section 5.1. WARRANTY OF TITLE. Borrower has good and marketable title to the Property and has the right to mortgage, grant, bargain, sell, pledge, assign, warrant, transfer and convey the same and that Borrower is seized of an unencumbered fee simple absolute estate in the Land and the Improvements and that it owns the Property free and clear of all liens, encumbrances and charges whatsoever except for those exceptions shown in the title insurance policy insuring the lien of this Security Instrument (the "Permitted Exceptions"). Borrower shall forever warrant, defend and preserve the title and the validity and priority of the lien of this Security Instrument and shall forever warrant and defend the same to Lender against the claims of all persons whomsoever, and shall make such further assurances to perfect fee simple title to the Property as Lender may reasonably require.

Section 5.2. LEGAL STATUS AND AUTHORITY. Borrower (a) is duly organized, validly existing and in good standing under the laws of its state of organization or incorporation; (b) is duly qualified to transact business and is in good standing in the state where the Property is located; and (c) has all necessary approvals, governmental and otherwise, and full power and authority to own, operate and lease the Property. Borrower (and the undersigned representative of Borrower, if any) has full power, authority and legal right to execute this Security Instrument, and to mortgage, grant, bargain, sell, pledge, assign, warrant, transfer and convey the Property pursuant to the terms hereof and to keep and observe all of the terms of this Security Instrument on Borrower's part to be performed.

Section 5.3. VALIDITY OF DOCUMENTS.

(a) The execution, delivery and performance of the Note, this Security Instrument and the Other Security Documents and the borrowing evidenced by the Note (i) are within the power and authority of Borrower; (ii) have been authorized by all requisite organizational action; (iii) have received all necessary approvals and consents, corporate, governmental or otherwise; (iv) will not violate, conflict with, result in a breach of or constitute (with notice or lapse of time, or both) a material default under any provision of law, any order or judgment of any court or governmental authority, the articles of incorporation, by-laws, partnership or trust agreement, articles of organization, operating agreement, or other governing instrument of Borrower, or any indenture, agreement or other instrument to which Borrower is a party or by which it or any of its assets or the Property is or may be bound or affected; (v) will not result in the creation or imposition of any lien, charge or encumbrance whatsoever upon any of its assets, except the lien and security interest created hereby; and (vi) will not require any authorization or license from, or any filing with, any governmental or other body (except for the recordation of this Security Instrument in appropriate land records in the State where the Property is located and except for Uniform Commercial Code filings relating to the security interest created hereby), and (b) to the best of Borrower's knowledge, the Note, this Security Instrument and the Other Security Documents constitute the legal, valid and binding obligations of Borrower, enforceable in accordance with their terms.

Section 5.4. LITIGATION. There is no action, suit or proceeding, judicial, administrative or otherwise (including any condemnation or similar proceeding), pending or, to the best of Borrower's knowledge, threatened or contemplated against Borrower, a Guarantor, if any, an Indemnitee, if any, or against or affecting the Property that has not been disclosed to Lender by Borrower in writing.

Section 5.5. STATUS OF PROPERTY.

BK 38696 PG 0139

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Security Instrument has been executed by Borrower the day and year first above written.

Signed, sealed and delivered on May ²⁶ 24, 2004

BORROWER:

Myrtle Moore

Witness
Charles H. Moon

By: *Myrtle Moore*

Notary Public *Twila M. Balara, Notary Public*

Print Name: Myrtle Moore

My Commission Expires: *November 10, 2005*

Title: *Myrtle E. Moore*

(Official Notary Seal)

This Instrument Prepared by: Antonio Chimienti, Esq.



InterBay Funding, LLC
4601 Sheridan Street, 6th Floor
Hollywood, Florida 33021
Attention: Post Closing
Department

BK 38696 PG 0140

Exhibit "A"

All that tract or parcel of land lying and being in Gwinnett County, Georgia, being more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at a point on the Southerly Right-of-Way of Killian Hill Road (100' Right-of-Way) with the intersection of the land lot line common to Land Lots 90 and 91, also being the Westerly land lot line of Land Lot 90; thence Easterly along said Right-of-Way 319.00 feet to an iron pin found; thence South 03 degrees 57' 00" East, a distance of 10.12 feet to a point, said point being the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING of the tract of land herein described; thence continuing along the curvature of said Right-of-Way an arc distance of 127.57 feet, said arc being subtended by a chord having a bearing of South 88 degrees 47' 36" East and distance of 127.37 feet to an iron pin found; thence South 00 degrees 14' 57" West, 421.54 feet to an iron pin found; thence North 73 degrees 25' 00" West, 102.50 feet to an iron pin found; thence North 03 degrees 57' 00" West, 393.90 feet to a point on the Southerly Right-of-Way of Killian Hill Road, said point being the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING of the tract of land described and containing 1.09 acres.

LESS & EXCEPT property described in Right of Way Deed in favor of Gwinnett County, dated February 11, 1988, recorded in Deed Book 4851, page 285, Gwinnett County records.

EXHIBIT F

Ernest Moore's Objection to 3rd Account Current

DECLARATION OF ERNEST MOORE AS INTERESTED PARTY & ADVOCATE
SEEKING PROBATE COURT REFORMS

1 ERNEST L. MOORE
2 3651 S. La Brea Ave #510
3 Los Angeles, CA 90016
4 Legaln2k@gmail.com
5 In propia persona

CONFORMED COPY
ORIGINAL FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

SEP 08 2021

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court

6
7 **SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
8 **FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – CENTRAL DISTRICT**
9

10 In re Matter of the:) Case No.: BP141987
11)
12 MYRTLE MOORE LIVING TRUST, Under) **ERNEST L. MOORE’S OBJECTION TO**
13 Declaration of Trust dated March 7, 2002) **THIRD ACCOUNT CURRENT**
14)
15) Date: September 24, 2021
16) Time: 8:30 a.m.
17) Dept.: 11
18)
19)
20)
21)
22)
23)
24)
25)
26)
27)
28)

1 Objector, Ernest Moore ("Objector"), as a beneficiary of the Myrtle Moore Living Trust (the
2 "Trust"), submits the following objections to the Third Account Current of Jeffrey Seigel ("Trustee"), as
3 Temporary Successor Trustee of the Trust, set for hearing on September 24, 2021.

4 1. The Third Account Current fails to account for all assets as identified in Schedule A of the
5 Trust. On August 4, 2015, this Court ordered the Trustee to investigate and report on all assets of the
6 Trust. A true and correct copy of the Order is attached as **Exhibit A**. Schedule A includes real property,
7 stocks, bonds, bank accounts, investment accounts, and personal property. A true and correct copy of
8 Schedule A is attached as **Exhibit B**. Upon information and belief, while the Trustee reported on the real
9 property and cash on hand in its Third Account Current, he failed to report on the stocks, bonds, bank
10 accounts, investment accounts, and value of the personal property. Indeed, Trustee has failed to report
11 on the stocks, bonds, bank accounts, investment accounts, and value of the personal property in any of
12 his accounts, including the first and second account. Probate Code section 1061 requires all accounts to
13 contain a summary showing the property on hand at the beginning of the period covered by the account
14 and the property on hand at the end of the prior account. However, the Third Account Current fails to
15 include all such property as identified in Schedule A.

- 16 a. The summary of accounts identifies only the following cash assets:
- 17 i. Cash assets in Preferred Bank, account number 004-127544
- 18 ii. Property management assets from Ingenious Asset Group, Inc, held in Preferred
19 Ban, Account numbers 004-127285, 004-127277, and 004-127293.
- 20 b. The summary of accounts identifies only the following non-cash assets:
- 21 i. Apartment building located at 5712-5722 Corbett Street, Los Angeles, CA
- 22 ii. Apartment building located at 5724-5736 Corbett Street, Los Angeles, CA
- 23 iii. Commercial real property located at 5517 Holmes Avenue, Los Angeles, CA
- 24 iv. One-Half interest in commercial real property located at 1024 W. Vernon Avenue,
25 Los Angeles, CA
- 26 c. Schedule A identifies the following additional assets not reported in the Third Account
27 Current:
- 28 i. 178.728 shs. Amex Mutual Fund Class A Acct. No. 507-1880304

- 1 ii. 200 shs. Coca Cola Co.
- 2 iii. 450 shs. Home Depo
- 3 iv. 1,083.70 shs. Amex Cash Mgmt. Fund Class A Acct. No. 113-1880304-3-002
- 4 v. 2,914.86 shs. Amex Cash Mgmt. Fund Class A Acct. No. 513-1880304-9-002
- 5 vi. Acct. No. 0693-308777, Wells Fargo Bank Business Checking (Corbett Apts.)
- 6 vii. 916.695 shs. Amex new Dimensions Fund Class A Acct. No. 506-1880304-8-002
- 7 viii. 3,113.905 shs. Amex Utility Income Fund Class A Acct. No. 123-1880304-1-002
- 8 ix. 2,462.530 shs. Amex Blue Chip Advantage Fund Class A Acct. No. 131-1880304-
- 9 1-002
- 10 x. 1,164,313 shs. Van Kampen Growth & Income Fund Acct. No. 5000058722
- 11 xi. 85 shs. Waterworks Bond
- 12 xii. Acct. No. 09406-06980, Bank of America Checking
- 13 xiii. Acct. No. 09409-06344, Bank of America Savings
- 14 xiv. Charles H. Moore Dental Corp.
- 15 xv. Jewelry, clothing, household furniture and furnishing, and other personal effects

16 Because the Trustee failed to include the stocks, bonds, bank accounts, investment accounts, and
17 value of the personal property in its Third Account Current, or any account for that matter, Objector is
18 unable to make any satisfactory evaluation of the Trustee's management of these trust assets.

19 2. Upon information and belief, the Third Account Current fails to report on the assets from
20 the Moore Family Trust dated May 28, 1993 (the "Moore Family Trust") that were transferred to the
21 Trust. As stated in Jean Robinson's April 9, 2019 Objection to Ernest Moore's Petition for Appointment
22 of Successor Trustee, the majority of the assets of the Moore Family Trust were transferred to the Trust.
23 A true and correct copy of the Objection is attached as **Exhibit C**. Despite this transfer, the Trustee failed
24 to report of any of these assets in his Third Account Current, or any account for that matter. Upon
25 information and belief, the Moore Family Trust has several assets, including an interest in Allied totaling
26 \$709,102.00 and an interest in Amalgamated Development Association and Amada Enterprises, Inc.
27 totaling \$1,181,574.00. A true and correct copy evidencing these interests is attached as **Exhibit D**.
28 Upon information and belief, the Moore Family Trust includes other assets that were supposedly

1 transferred to the Trust that have never been accounted for. As a result, Objector is unable to make any
2 satisfactory evaluation of the Trustee's management of these trust assets.

3 3. The total cash assets on hand in the Summary of Account by Category does not balance.
4 The total credits subtracted from the total charges added to the cash assets on hand at the beginning of
5 the account period does not equal the cash assets on hand at the end of the account period. The summary
6 by category shows the following charges:

- 7 a. Cash assets on hand at the beginning of the account period: \$135,008.51
- 8 b. Receipts from interest paid, rent paid, and other receipts: \$452,901.48
- 9 c. Gains on sale: \$165,000.0
- 10 d. Other charges (transaction after transfer of properties to the beneficiaries): \$22,096.98
- 11 e. **Total: \$775,006.97**

12 The summary by category shows the following credits:

- 13 a. Credits from attorney and trustee's fees, disbursed through escrow, general administrative
14 expenses, property rental expenses, tax expenses, and miscellaneous: \$765,348.32
- 15 b. Other credits (assets transfer to the beneficiaries): \$2,201,125.70
- 16 c. Other credits (transaction after transfer of properties to the beneficiaries): \$24,658.30
- 17 d. **Total: \$2,982,132.32**
- 18 e. **Total (minus the assets transferred to the beneficiaries): \$781,006.62**

19 Per the Third Account Current, the total cash assets on hand at the end of the account period is
20 \$493,874.65. However, subtracting the total credits from the total charges does not equal the
21 \$493,874.65. Therefore, this accounting does not accurately compute the total cash assets on hand at the
22 end of the account period.

23 4. Schedule B shows a gross sale price of commercial real property located at 5517 Holmes
24 Avenue, Los Angeles, CA as \$675,000.00 with a carry value of \$510,000.00 and \$165,000.00 gains on
25 sale. Exhibit 8 of the Third Account Current is the Seller's final settlement statement that shows net
26 proceeds of \$565,941.49. The Trustee failed to report in the Third Account Current where the
27 \$565,941.49 net proceeds went as such proceeds would have added to the cash assets on hand. As a
28


1 result, Objector is unable to make any satisfactory evaluation of the Trustee's management of these trust
2 assets.

3 5. Upon information and belief, Schedule D of the Third Account Current fails to include all
4 disbursements during the period of account from June 1, 2018 through February 28, 2021. Specifically,
5 the last property rental expense reported for 5712 Corbett Street, Los Angeles, CA is September 27, 2019.
6 As a result, Objector is unable to make any satisfactory evaluation of the Trustee's management of these
7 trust assets.

8
9 WHEREFORE, Objector requests:

- 10 1. That the Court disallow the account;
11 2. That the Objector be awarded attorney's fees incurred in bringing these objections; and
12 3. Any other and further relief that the Court deems proper.

13
14 DATED: September 8, 2021

15
16 By: 
17 ERNEST MOORE
18 In propria persona

19 **VERIFICATION**

20 I am the objector in this action. I have read the foregoing petition and it is true of my own
21 knowledge, except as to those matters stated on information or belief, and as to those matters, I believe
22 it to be true.

23
24 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and
25 correct, and that this verification was executed on September 8, 2021 at Los Angeles, California.

26 
27 ERNEST MOORE
28

EXHIBIT G

March 24, 2021 Court Trial Minute Order

DECLARATION OF ERNEST MOORE AS INTERESTED PARTY & ADVOCATE
SEEKING PROBATE COURT REFORMS

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

**Probate Division
Stanley Mosk Dept. - 11,**

BP084530

In re: MOORE FAMILY TRUST

**March 24, 2021
8:30 AM**

Honorable Ana Maria Luna, Judge

Silvia Avetisian, Judicial Assistant
Innas Islam, Court Services Assistant

Czarina Scolari (#8996), Court Reporter

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: Court Trial Re: Petition - Trust/Pursuant Prob Code Sec 17200 (Subsequent) filed on February 7, 2019 by Ernest Moore.

The following parties are present for the aforementioned proceeding:

Daniel Herbert, Attorney (appearing via LACourtConnect)
Ernest Moore, Petitioner (appearing via LACourtConnect)
Jeffrey Siegel, Trustee
Kirsten Brown, Attorney
Nathan Talei, Attorney

The cause is called for trial.

Petitioner's requests for a continuance and to withdraw the petition/motion are denied.

The Court finds that insufficient evidence has been provided to grant the matter on calendar this date based upon the reading of the moving papers and consideration of all presented evidence.

The Court sustains the objections filed by Jean Robinson on 4/10/2019.

The Petition - Trust/Pursuant Prob Code Sec 17200 (Subsequent) filed on 2/7/2019 by Petitioner(s) Ernest Moore is denied with prejudice.

The Court denies with prejudice the Petitioner's request for the following orders as set forth in his supplement filed 5/20/2019:

1. To pass former co-trustees Jean Robinson, David Moore (now deceased) and beneficiary Charles Moore Jr. (now deceased) as predeceased.
2. For sanctions against Daniel Herbert & Jean Robinson for perjury.
3. For sanctions against Daniel Herbert & Jean Robinson for contempt of court.
4. For Daniel Herbert to bear the costs of a forensic accounting of the Moore Family Trusts.
5. For damages and double damages according to proof.
6. For punitive damages for fraud.
7. For \$455.00 in court filing costs for filing this petition.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Probate Division

Stanley Mosk Dept. - 11,

BP084530

In re: MOORE FAMILY TRUST

March 24, 2021

8:30 AM

8. For attorney's fees and costs herein incurred by Petitioner in 2019 in researching, preparing and drafting this petition.

EXHIBIT H

Court Order for Ex Parte & Public rating of Judge Ana Maria Luna on The Robing
Room

DECLARATION OF ERNEST MOORE AS INTERESTED PARTY & ADVOCATE
SEEKING PROBATE COURT REFORMS

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

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

In the Matter of:

Myrtle Moore Living Trust

Case No.: BP141987

ORDER ON EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR
TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER ETC

DATE: JULY 6, 2021

TIME: 8:30 AM

DEPT: 11

The Honorable Ana Maria Luna

Ex Parte Application FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER etc

Filed by Ernest Moore

The Court finds: Petitioner does not have standing to pursue the requested relief.

The above Application/Petition was presented Ex Parte. The COURT ORDERS:

The Application is: **Granted In Part** **Denied Without Prejudice**

A Hearing Date is set for at in Department

Additional Orders:

**Notice of this order shall be given by Petitioner
to all persons required to be given notice as set forth in the Probate Code.**

Date: July 6, 2021



Ana Maria Luna
Ana Maria Luna
JUDGE

Superior Court Judge
GAW

CALIFORNIA THE ROBINING ROOM

where judges are judged

[Home](#)

[FAQs](#)

[Contact](#)

[Privacy Notice](#)

[Legal Notice](#)

RATE A JUDGE

Hon. Ana Maria Luna

[See Rating Details](#)

Judge
Superior Court
Los Angeles County

[See Comments](#)

Attorney Average Rating: 1.9 - 13 rating(s)
Non-Attorney Average Rating: 2.0 - 49 rating(s)

Please send me alerts on this judge

E-mail Address:
legaln2k@gmail.com

Add your own rating

E-Mail Address (will not be displayed) legaln2k@gmail.com

Confirm E-mail Address legaln2k@gmail.com

Zip 90016


Occupation Litigant

Non-attorney rating (if applicable)

How would you rate this judge's overall performance No Opinion (1= worst, 10=best)

Comments

Please type what you see below:



Verify text here

What others have said about Hon. Ana Maria Luna

Comments

Litigant

Comment #: CA34480

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

This is another very bad judge in the Los Angeles Superior Court Probate Dept. 11. She should be in jail for what she has done to me and my family. She is very prejudiced against me to protect a bunch of criminal lawyers!! She either does not know the law or does not care about any laws including probate statutes while she is on the bench!! She has got to go!!

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 3/29/2021 1:54:36 AM

Criminal Defense Lawyer

Comment #: CA33993

Rating: Not Rated

Comments:

"The Robing Room: CA State Judges

This creature, who obviously can't manage her own life, was in charge of making decisions in her courtroom for the rest of us. For children.

The damage she did to me is immeasurable.

Her reckoning is going to have to happen on some other level than on this terrestrial plane.

Ana Maria, if you are reading this, know that your cruelty, greed, and ego is going to catch up to you.

Your criminality is the worst, because the public might expect a fair and honorable judge.

You are the antithesis of anything of the sort.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 3/3/2021 7:38:35 PM

Other

Comment #: CA33992

Rating: Not Rated

Comments:

I can't stand that my taxpayer money is going to her big fat salary and will be going to her big fat retirement package.

Sickening

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 3/3/2021 7:21:19 PM

Criminal Defense Lawyer

Comment #: CA33987

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

Unfortunately, our judicial system continues to keep judges that are completely incompetent and burned out. This woman -- supposedly a Judge is NOW IN THE PROBATE DEPT. AT L.A. MOSK. She has been transferred all over the place and for some unknown reason was placed in the Probate Division, where it is obvious she does NOT understand Probate, the Probate laws or the process. She has made rulings that are not in compliance with the Probate Statutes and allows disbarred attorneys to be present in her courtroom. Not to mention she is prejudice with those that are self-represented and does not allow people to speak and completely cuts them off. SHE IS A DISGRACE TO OUR JUDICIAL SYSTEM AND MUST BE REMOVED IMMEDIATELY. I THINK ALL THAT HAVE PRESENTED COMPLAINTS AGAINST HER SHOULD FILE COMPLAINT WITH THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION. SHE MUST BE REMOVED IMMEDIATELY. BY READING ALL OF THE COMPLAINTS, SHE HAS GONE FROM COURT TO COURT --FROM DIVISION TO DIVISION AND STILL ENGAGES IN HER ABUSIVE BEHAVIOR AND COMPLETE INCOMPETENCE. I am confident she has subjected a majority of her cases to appeals.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 3/3/2021 5:20:45 PM

Other

Comment #: CA33916

Rating: Not Rated

Comments:

Almost anyone that has had to experience Judge Ana Maria Luna, in Los Angeles County, which includes Hill Street and Long Beach; often winds up alleging, that they have been SUBJECT, or has been a witness, to her pattern of abusive conduct; and it is paramount that these people SPEAK UP.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 3/2/2021 3:18:21 PM

Other

"The Robing Room: CA State Judges

Comment #: CA33338

Rating:Not Rated

Comments:

What happened to Judge Ana Maria Luna? She is one of the worst. She has been transferred all over the place. She never should have been near any any family court, women, DV violence victim, mom or her child. Comment, asking "Where is WALDO?", is a very good question.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 1/30/2021 1:38:44 PM

Other

Comment #: CA32548

Rating:Not Rated

Comments:

If you know anyone that has had Judge Ana Maria Luna, in Los Angeles County, which includes Long Beach; someone who alleges they have been subject, or witness to her pattern of abuse, please have them review the links below.

1.<https://www.facebook.com/groups/judgeanamarialuna>

2.<https://www.uglyjudge.com/judges/corrupt-california-judges/los-angeles-2/judge-luna-ana-maria/?amp=1>

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 11/27/2020 7:41:22 PM

Other

Comment #: CA31328

Rating:Not Rated

Comments:

This judge should not be anywhere near a family court. Biased toward fathers. Ignores facts and evidence. Disregards the law.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 7/19/2020 12:11:13 AM

Other

Comment #: CA31269

Rating:Not Rated

Comments:

Factual, negative comments on this judge have been ignored, while she has also ignored the best interest of the child, while acting anti-mom , anti-women. She also ignores solid evidence, of DV, perpetrated against women and DV perpetrated against the protective mom.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 7/12/2020 7:35:34 PM

Other

Comment #: CA31172

Rating:Not Rated

Comments:

Judge Luna rules in favor of dads and men; she is an anti-mom, anti-female, judge. Ignores strong evidence of DV and this is not in the best interest of any child, or mom-female, victim. She is biased, uninformed, rude and does not belong in family court.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 7/2/2020 4:24:31 PM

Litigant

Comment #: CA31046

Rating:1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

"The Robing Room: CA State Judges

All the negative comments about this judge are true. Ignored well-evidenced DV with thorough testimony and witnesses. Also did something else completely out of line and against the best interest of the child(ren) to punish mother that I cannot speak about without it giving away who I am.

I will just say that it wasn't anything related to allegations of abuse or alienation, or anything else common that you would guess that pro-dad/anti-mom judges would even use to justify an order.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 6/24/2020 3:21:28 PM

Other

Comment #: CA30662

Rating: Not Rated

Comments:


This judge is motivated by power and politics. She should be nowhere near a courtroom, when they re-open. If you are connected, you will have no problem.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 6/2/2020 3:32:49 PM

Other

Comment #: CA29466

Rating: 1.0 

Comments:


Update to Comment #29179, apparently Luna is no longer in Mosk Department 88. I'd heard in February that she was supposed to be transferred again. LA County court website shows that she is now in Dept. 79, but upon contacting that courtroom it was confirmed that she is not presiding in that courtroom. Is this a case of "Where is Waldo," but substituting Luna. There's a parent who has been calling around LA County courts, the probate division (where she was alleged to have been transferred), the State Bar and the CJP, but no sign of Luna. I sure do hope that this is direct confirmation that her career as a serial abuser of DV survivors, women and children has been derailed. Even if she rears her incompetent, deficient head again the fact of the matter is that she's taken a hit to her reputation despite Harriet Buhai hosting her on a panel in January (what a joke and a sure sign of how they can't be trusted as an organization.)

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 4/20/2020 4:54:07 AM

Other

Comment #: CA29179

Rating: 1.0 

Comments:

This judge is not qualified to litigate a paper airplane. She's grossly incompetent, probably mentally and emotionally compromised herself and many in the DV community recognize this. She gets a collective groan whenever her name is mentioned in DV circles. Instead of complaining about this judge online, utilize the tools that are available by writing a competent complaint to the Commission on Judicial Performance. They have already transferred her to Mosk because of her gross incompetence and I heard in February that she is supposed to be transferred again. She is bad and LA County does not know what to do with her other than putting her in the last courtroom in Central. Her staff (bailiff, clerk and court reporter) all abandoned her long before she was removed from Long Beach. Use the resource that is available to you as a citizen and stopped wasting your time on this site. Make a competent complaint to the CJP, get help putting it together from an attorney at a legal aid clinic or DV agency. She is a public servant and should be removed from the bench for her abuses of authority and discretion. If grousing on here makes you feel better fine, but actually standing up to this poor excuse of a judge/women by filing a formal complaint is empowering.

Signed,
Somebody Who Knows

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 4/3/2020 10:17:19 AM

Other

Comment #: CA29133

Rating: Not Rated

Comments:

She was was rude and made comments about my physical appearance while i was extremely ill. While i was on the stand she told my atny i looked like i had no thought process in my head,correct. next morning i was hospitalized recieving 2 pints of blood. Yet moments after her observation she allowed me to go out into the hall and sign deeds over to my ex. I understood nothing of what i signed. Both atnys were aware my own as well before he auit representing me and laughed. He purposely left outmedical records and letters from drs. Forensic accts made an absurd mistake causing a 2 yr delay while i was left sick and in fear being stalked on the streets,nudge luna decided not to use thier findings and decided on her own that i was able to find gainful employment after my exs atny said look at her.. Nobody would hire her now. She used to be a pretty woman. He was awarded 100% of community property,i never saw judgement or signed it. Foensics report showed \$18,000 avail for spousal support. I asked for \$6,000 expecting maybe \$4,000.

I got \$2,500 and have to pay my own health insurance. I am still unders dr care and unable to work.

It is a divorce completely void.

How can these people hold thier jobs?

If there were ever a judge that should. be a complete void it wld be judge luna for pergerly as she took her vows under oath. She wasnt a family law judge yet back then im sorry to all it ever happened.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 3/26/2020 12:30:44 PM

Criminal Defense Lawyer

Comment #: CA29118

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

this judge is the worst judge in the world Unfair to the mother Unfair to the grand parents she needs to be fired

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 3/23/2020 1:24:22 PM

Other

Comment #: CA29117

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

this judge has taken away my grand daughter from my daughter for No valid reasons. Judge Luna had it out for my daughter and should never have been a judge in the California courts. The judge should be ashamed in doing this to any parent. My daughter is a Nurse for Kaiser and was the only parent this grand daughter ever had. the father is a bum . My daughters lawyer was a hack and did nothing good. The judge should be repremanded for her unfairness. I do believe that one of her court reporters, the fathers mother got to the judge and made this injustice happen. the judge needs to be removed. all of her other judgements were against the mothers rights and she is a disgrace to the court system

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 3/23/2020 1:22:02 PM

Litigant

Comment #: CA29018

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

Did they find her on Craigslist? Truly horrible judge who has some sort of bias against mothers wanting custody and support orders. Favors fathers and takes kids away from mothers without any criminal or civil records, abuse issues of any kind.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 3/15/2020 7:15:44 PM

Other

Comment #: CA28875

Rating: Not Rated

Comments:

Somebody please tell me that her judgements can be overturned. Undue process is a hobby to her and having pockets lined a regular course of action. I want my case reheard and her judgement void.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 3/11/2020 2:41:20 PM

Criminal Defense Lawyer

Comment #: CA28013

Rating: Not Rated

Comments:

I have always believed and trusted that the court system would always do the right thing and be fair. That's not what I experienced in judge luna's court room. She is the personification of what is wrong in the family court system. Loving fathers being do not stand a chance in front of this power hungry monster. She does not respect the oath she took. I wish she would just be removed as a judge so nobody has to go through what I went through while in her court room. I went through a divorce with a minor child involved. we separated almost two years before we filed. My ex kept the apartment and I stayed at my parents place. I still provided financial support (more than what I pay in support now) Well. My Ex accused me of couch surfing, drunk driving with while our child was with me, and she accused me of domestic violence. she accused me of being and absent father. When she filed for the domestic violence order, I went to the court without an attorney but was confident that with me taking all my records, criminal and dmv and photos that me and my child have together would help me. I was wrong without any proof supporting my ex case, Judge Luna granted a DVO and kept me at 5% visitation. I felt like the system failed me. She didnt even let me plead my case. she sided with my ex. Judge luna was rude and would not even let me talk. She is very demeaning. I then retained an attorney and appealed the DVO and eventually got it removed. Judge luna said that she had already made up her mind about the case and it wasnt in my favor even though I never got the chance to truly present my case. I literally negotiated with my ex's attorney and it made me sick through my stomach that my ex used giving more time with my daughter if I gave her an extra 100 bucks per month. Also she agreed to remove the DVO willingly. Judge luna pretty much let her get away with murder. By the way she was always late and left early and would say that we had to hurry because she had other things that take priority over my case. so I dont think she has the best intention for the child. she has the best intention for herself.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 2/2/2020 7:56:11 PM

Other

Comment #: CA26581

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

"Judge Luna" is loved by many... with money and connections... If you have neither and the other parent has one or both prepare for the ride of your life...She's not "father's rights" she is just happy to be bought.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 12/22/2019 10:54:25 PM

Litigant

Comment #: CA26448

Rating: 10.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

She quickly reviewed our Grandparents Visitation case and made a ruling for visitation immediately. Our Lawyer may have mumbled a sentence but that was it. She is excellent as she does follow the law, and has "Best interest for the child ". I imagine she sees and hears crap, lies and bs every day. I appreciate her expertise and thank her tremendously

"The Robing Room: CA State Judges

for our outcome on 12-11-19. We can reunite with our 9 year old Granddaughter 2 weekends by Christmas and thereafter.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 12/18/2019 11:39:26 PM

Other

Comment #: CA26023

Rating: 9.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

While in her family law courtroom I witnessed her incredible ability to quickly see through any and all B.S. I understand how her manner can seem somewhat cold but I experienced how it helps cut any wasted court time...so your case can be heard in a timely manner. After listening to my reason for a DVRO and looking at my ex's rap sheet, she flatly said to him, "The criminal justice system has failed you. You'll find that the family court system won't be able to help you either. You must make significant changes to your life if you want to be, in any way, a part of your son's life." I thought it was a little dramatic at the time but she called it correctly. After the DVRO was granted he got his 3rd DUI that same week, was sentenced to 145 days in jail and served exactly 1 night in jail....stamped Time Served.

The ball is in his court, he can sober up and see his boy or stay drunk. I will be forever grateful to Judge Luna. My baby is safe and thriving.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 12/6/2019 5:32:08 PM

Civil Litigation - Private

Comment #: CA24747

Rating: 8.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

My experience appearing before Judge Luna has limited to Family Law matters. She is knowledgeable, and polite. She however does not suffer fools. Given the congested calendars for those appearing before her she expects them to be prepared whether an attorney or one representing himself/herself.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 10/17/2019 4:30:02 PM

Litigant

Comment #: CA24089

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

VICTORY!!!

Time for all of us who have gone before, and all those that will follow in the future – the exit of possibly the worst judge that any person (particularly a woman) could ever be unlucky enough to be assigned to – to CELEBRATE.

I have quite a bit of experience in family court (years, and not entirely my choice) and nothing I experienced in all those times could compare to the utter insanity and lawlessness that I witnessed in Luna's courtroom.

I was insulted, I was humiliated, I was berated; and have the transcripts to prove this. She deprived me of money, and quite a bit of it - in the form of a threat.

Although I am concerned that she has merely been "transferred" and fear other chaos she may create in another venue, society will be better served without her malevolent behavior in family law court.

This news about Luna is a representation of VICTORY over EVIL.

In my world, she is the most evil and treacherous human being I have ever personally encountered. I not alone in my opinion.

May God bring healing to all of those that have suffered from the terrible behavior and rulings from this judge.

May her removal from this position create TRUE justice in this county,

"The Robing Room: CA State Judges

state, and nation; and greater harmony on this planet.

WE THE PEOPLE are responsible to hold our public servants accountable to uphold the rule of law. Do NOT fear standing up to judicial tyranny.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 9/19/2019 7:45:48 PM

Litigant

Comment #: CA23967

Rating: Not Rated

Comments:

She is finally gone! Judge Luna has been transferred no loner at long beach court. All your complaints helped clean up this court.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 9/14/2019 1:17:54 AM

Other

Comment #: CA22747

Rating: Not Rated

Comments:

Ana Maria Luna was supposed to be transferred over 8 months ago, but they probably don't know where to put her. Bad judges are like bad teachers, hard to get rid of

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 8/5/2019 10:56:40 PM

Litigant

Comment #: CA22342

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

Sarah Huckabee with Mommy Issues who could care less what you think and tells you so in the court room.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 7/24/2019 2:45:22 PM

Litigant

Comment #: CA21578

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

HEY LAWYERS!

Department 14 is the place to go with your discriminating clients for regressive, third world-style, extra-legal, patriarchal rulings.

As a bonus, Luna will insult and denigrate your opponents, too.

Don't believe this? She is untouchable and can't be challenged. She knows she can do and say anything she wants, and does it with flamboyant cruelty and contempt.

Trust me. Make a deal with her, and you can concoct any filmy or non-existent story to win your case.

Why? She does not feel beholden to evidence or law. She is a law unto herself.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 7/5/2019 2:21:22 PM

Other

Comment #: CA20177

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

"The Robing Room: CA State Judges

Comments:

Judge Luna Is nothing but a LIAR! Mothers if you love your children! Do not go before this Judge! My beautiful granddaughters life is forever changed, removed from a loving caring home!! Removed from a Mother, 2 small brothers that cry for their sister!! For no good reason!! Living in a home with a horrible absent father being raised by his new wife!! Judge Luna stated if she did bad in school she would remove her and send her back! Nope LIED LIED LIED !!! PLEASE TELL ME HOW DOES ANY MOTHER GET THROUGH THIS! You wake up every morning hoping it's a dream!! REMOVE JUDGE LUNA!!! REMOVE JUDGE LUNA!!!

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 6/10/2019 1:21:13 AM

Criminal Defense Lawyer

Comment #: CA19204

Rating: Not Rated

Comments:

Finally...thankyou to those that are stronger than i was 12 yrs ago when i had to be revictimized.
It didnt just happen inside of the courthouse though.. they take it further.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 4/26/2019 8:36:08 AM

Litigant

Comment #: CA18860

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

This woman is an abomination to our justice system.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 4/10/2019 9:21:58 PM

Litigant

Comment #: CA17052

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

Judge Anna Maria Luna has the best Sharia court in Los Angeles.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 1/31/2019 9:51:52 PM

Other

Comment #: CA14851

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

To Commenter #CA14848

My situation differs in Luna's court vastly from the Christine Blasey Ford situation.

My case was not based on a 36-year-old memory, it was based on documentation that I carefully maintained over a number of years.

I am also a well-spoken, intelligent female who was barely allowed to speak in Luna's courtroom. The other litigant was not able to produce any substantive documentation to refute my claims, and that which was produced was ridiculous.

It was clear that the "fix" was in before I walked in the door.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 9/27/2018 4:23:27 PM

Criminal Defense Lawyer

Comment #: CA14474

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

Would not recommend her as a Judge in general because she is biased and overly opinionated. She allows her personal views to interfere with professional judgment; overall she cannot be objective.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 8/30/2018 9:32:08 AM

⊖ Litigant

Comment #: CA14473

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

Ana Maria Luna is a true narcissist and dare I say sadistic. You will not receive and impartial judgment from this woman and really she should not be on any bench. She is way too sympathetic to perpetrators and I believe she may be racist. If you are assigned to her immediately file a peremptory challenge. Not only that she is such the Queen Bee that she will continue your case two or three times because she cannot manage her calendar timely. Do yourself a favor and get your case heard before another Judge.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 8/30/2018 9:28:51 AM

⊖ Other

Comment #: CA14462

Rating: 10.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

Honorary Ana Maria Luna, I was removed from the Jury Monday and just wanted to say thank you for the professionalism. The way you treated everyone with respect, patience, kindness and exacting clarity in your communication was incredibly beautiful to watch. Wanted to reach out and just wish you well and give a warm thank you. You are a gift to our society.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 8/29/2018 12:23:09 PM

⊖ Other

Comment #: CA14308

Rating: Not Rated

Comments:

I think Judge Luna is fair and awesome judge. She can see through all these women who use there kids as a way to get back at the kids father. It's about time someone stands up and tells the truth about what's going on. Women stop using your kids as a tool to get back at the fathers. If you are a woman that don't hurt your kids by keeping the father away then this message is not for you.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 8/17/2018 11:15:09 PM

⊖ Litigant

Comment #: CA14246

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

What is frightening about Ana Maria Luna is how brazen and shameless she is. That indicates to me that she is confident there will be absolutely no consequences for her disgraceful behavior or totalitarian-style decisions.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 8/12/2018 3:35:32 PM

⊖ Litigant

Comment #: CA14244

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

This judge, in my opinion, is fascinating. What was so shocking about her was the glee she appeared to experience when she did the horrible thing that she did to me, which felt much like a "set-up." I maintain all documentation submitted by the petitioner, respondent and the transcript of the proceeding; which I believe clearly shows the utter violation of my rights under the law, and what reflects the vicious, scornful way in which I was treated. The transcript is a cornucopia of many interesting utterances, but two things stand out: (1) I was respectful toward her (2) Whenever she asked me a question, she rarely allowed me to finish a sentence. I pray for all of those who have endured her in the past, and those who will endure her in the future. The situation in our courts, feels to me, tragic.

[View Detail](#)[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 8/12/2018 10:45:21 AM

Other

Comment #: CA14236

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

Judge Luna is nothing but a bully and only listens to hearsay does not listen she allows attorneys for children to degrade and laugh at a parent! she removes children from a perfectly good and loving mother giving them to a father that is nothing less than a horrible father the only thing that I can see here is that there must be some illegal bribery and payoffs because there is no possible way that this person should be allowed to practice law in this country she needs to be disbarred and removed from her position she is not an advocate for children in anyway shape or form

[View Detail](#)[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 8/11/2018 12:22:53 AM

Litigant

Comment #: CA14026

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

Was she hired through Craigslist?
She made a ruling on my ex parte child visitation case without even HEARING the case, on her break in chambers by herself by signing her assumption to the order based on paperwork alone. Stupid woman.

[View Detail](#)[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 7/21/2018 2:05:30 AM

Litigant

Comment #: CA13438

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

If you have been in front of another family court judge as I have, Judge Luna will be a big shock to you.

She is rude, perma-annoyed, irritable, disengaged, and truly could not care less about the evidence in a case. She acts like a person who has a really bad hangover and can't think clearly.

She has the Dr. Laura Schlessinger attitude that if a woman makes a "bad choice" that she should be punished for it - law withstanding.

It seems like she just wants to get the whole thing over with, because things are too much trouble for her to deal with.

This is the wrong job for her. Avoid her courtroom at any cost.

[View Detail](#)[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 5/23/2018 7:15:20 PM

Litigant

"The Robing Room: CA State Judges

Comment #: CA13397

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

This judge exemplifies the dark side of diversity hiring.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 5/19/2018 8:21:26 PM

Litigant

Comment #: CA13265

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

My husband is diagnosed with borderline personality disorder and plead guilty to felony battery of a spouse and has repeatedly hidden money to avoid paying support and violated literally all other ATROS and she did not care. I lost a child as the result of being beaten and this arrogant biased horrible excuse for a human being aided in his favor for joint custody. She re-victimized me in court until I threw up. Request a new judge. This woman is a disgrace to women and to the system.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 5/7/2018 11:07:17 PM

Litigant

Comment #: CA13178

Rating: Not Rated

Comments:

Don't even think of stepping into the courtroom of this judge if she doesn't have a deal with your attorney.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 4/28/2018 6:02:03 PM

Litigant

Comment #: CA13075

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

My kid came home burned, with black eyes, and told me that my ex tried to drown her in the bathtub in later years.

YET...Luna ruled against my ex paying back \$300+ per month child support (that he did not pay) when he was making about \$250K per year, and I was making a fraction of that and also paying for child care.

She is a sick twist. Sick, sick, sick.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 4/16/2018 10:39:33 PM

Other

Comment #: CA13068

Rating: Not Rated

Comments:

Poor Ana Maria!

Her head has swollen so much that it is going to explode, and bury all of Southern California with the EGO PUDDING in her brain!

How long does she think she would be able to go on with cutting backdoor deals to ingratiate herself with her scummy peers? How long does she think she was going to get away with playing with people's lives to give herself a hit of power-rush?

She ought to start seeing herself as servant of the people, a servant of the LAW. She behaves as though she thinks she is G-D. Not a wise thing to do.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 4/15/2018 7:18:50 PM

Other

Comment #: CA12690

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

The worst judge ever. If your a woman do not even show up to court because you do not have a chance. You will lose and your kids will lose. Do not bother getting an attorney and waisting money. You still will not win.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 2/6/2018 9:42:36 PM

Other

Comment #: CA12689

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

The worst judge ever. If your a woman do not even show up to court because you do not have a chance. You will lose and your kids will lose. Do not bother getting an attorney and waisting money. You still will not win.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 2/6/2018 9:40:01 PM

Other

Comment #: CA12507

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

Oh Hear Lawyers!

Judge Luna is the Patron Saint of your liars, beaters, and child support cheaters.

She's the go-to girl. She's the One.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 1/12/2018 9:14:59 PM

Other

Comment #: CA12499

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

My daughter is being heard by this judge as I write. We asked to change judge, and continuance. She denied both and would only give continuance if boys move back to California. The boys are 5 j& 2. The father has not been active in their life for a year. He also wants full custody and resides with a new woman with kids!

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 1/12/2018 1:15:42 PM

Other

Comment #: CA12497

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

She is a disgrace to the court system and women everywhere. She will not listen to women speak, only men and their lawyers. Very unfair. Does not review case. Rude. Save yourself from anger and heartache! Get a different judge!

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 1/12/2018 2:11:41 AM

Litigant

"The Robing Room: CA State Judges

Comment #: CA12178

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

Do yourself a favor, ignore the obvious posts below from Luna sycophants, and file a 170.6 Preemptory Challenge to move to another Judge or Commissioner who will be objective about your case. This judge should consider that if she didn't act out her bizarre agenda in a court of law, she wouldn't have to be so busy manipulating this discussion.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 11/15/2017 10:37:59 PM

Other

Comment #: CA12171

Rating: 10.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

Judge Ana Maria Luna is a very passionate judge and takes time to make right decision. She is fair and looks at every fact in order to make right decision. She does not favor any party. She makes sure and looks into safety of children and each individual. I got her after 3 years and and I really admire her work.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 11/14/2017 10:46:28 PM

Other

Comment #: CA12143

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

This bench officer is openly hostile to women and does not hide her bias in favor of the primary wage earner. If you are female and/or are seeking support, this bench officer should be avoided. Go to the clerks office and file a 170.6 Preemptory Challenge to move to another Judge or Commissioner who will be objective. If she is the duty officer when you have an ex parte, withdraw your ex parte and refile it on another day when she is not the duty officer. She also openly favors attorneys that are frequent flyers in her courtroom so female litigants representing themselves do not have a chance of getting an objective, unbiased review of your case.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 11/10/2017 3:14:11 AM

Litigant

Comment #: CA12125

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

Abuse of authority
Denial of due process
Decisional delays
Did not look at all my evidence
Gave the other party more time to speak and viewed all of their evidence
Dishonorable judge sided with an abuser and endangered a females life once again.
She should be removed from the bench.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 11/6/2017 11:11:55 PM

Civil Litigation - Private

Comment #: CA12069

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

Disgraceful temperament, condescending character, wrongful use of power, ruled by emotions, shows little concern for victim, sides with abuser, unwilling to listen to both sides and abide to court etiquette and California law, no place in the court room nor in family law trials. A disgrace to her profession and to California judicial system.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 10/27/2017 4:42:01 PM

Court Staff

Comment #: CA12058

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

LATE TO COURT
UNPROFESSIONAL
BIASED
UNFAIR
LACKS EMPATHY
NEEDS TO BE VOTED OUT

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 10/27/2017 5:55:27 AM

Civil Litigation - Govt.

Comment #: CA12056

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

Get another judge! Do not expect a fair trail! Unchecked power, rude and uncaring demeanor and she is a disgrace to women and her profession. Biased towards men. Get another judge!

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 10/27/2017 5:30:26 AM

Court Staff

Comment #: CA12055

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

I wish judges were easier to vote off the bench. She is routinely late to court and shows little interest in her job. Her courtroom is perfect for Judge Judy and is a complete joke. She misuses her power, she doesn't follow court etiquette, she often sides with men, she disregards other branches of justice such as the police investigative report and district attorneys office documents, she is drunk with power and has no place to serve on the bench.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 10/27/2017 5:21:50 AM

Court Staff

Comment #: CA12054

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

I have whitnessed Ana Maria Luna time and time again show up extremely late to court, abuse her power, be condescending, not take all evidence into account and she does not give a fair trial. She let's her emotions and ego reign in the court room and lacks fair judgement. This woman should not be on the bench.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 10/27/2017 5:11:49 AM

Civil Litigation - Private

Comment #: CA12053

Rating: 1.0 ☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Comments:

Biased and refused to look at all the evidence but she took all evidence from other party. This judge is burned out, had no heart and should retire. She lacks discernment and judgment. She was biased towards the abuser and a batterer, any judge should know abusers are great liars and manipulative and not to take their word as truth. This judge is an

"The Robing Room: CA State Judges


idiot and a disgrace to women in need of protection and safety. I had no motive other than my safety of wanting a restraining order, no property, no marriage, no children just concerned for my safety. I had photos of security camera footage and therapist documentation noting PTSD from being assaulted. She refused to follow court protocol and look at my solid evidence. She violated her discretion and did not hold the court accountable to the law. This woman does not deserve to be on the bench. Please get another judge if you want a fair trial. This woman is nauseatingly unjust and lacks any discernment.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 10/27/2017 5:05:06 AM

Other

Comment #: CA12032

Rating: 10.0 

Comments:


Honorable Judge Ana Marfa Luna follows the law and treats cases in a fair manner taking the time to review proven evidences. Is extremely professional and was very pleased on how she handled domestic violence case. Thank you Honorable judge

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 10/24/2017 11:02:44 PM

Litigant

Comment #: CA12021

Rating: 1.0 

Comments:

Ana Maria Luna is the living, breathing definition of judicial misconduct. As far as the comments below about her being biased in favor of men, my experience was that she IN FACT devoted 90% of the proceedings to catering to my ex-husband and his attorney. It was almost as if I did not exist. She also took great joy in humiliating me, even though I presented myself carefully and respectfully. Not only did she cause me great financial harm, she threatened me with much greater financial harm should I decide to challenge her decision. I will never recover from being figuratively raped and literally robbed by this woman.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 10/22/2017 5:32:01 PM

Criminal Defense Lawyer

Comment #: CA12002

Rating: 1.0 

Comments:


This judge has no place in the courtroom, she is burned out, dislikes her job and is late to court. Judge abused her discretion and did not order court to follow law in a domestic violence case with clear evidence of video footage and medical notes of injuries. She is biased towards men and not fair in any regard. This judge should be fired and held accountable by California law.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 10/21/2017 3:56:59 AM

Civil Litigation - Private

Comment #: CA11990

Rating: 1.0 

Comments:

This judge will side with abusers in simple protection orders. STAY AWAY! She is a danger to women.

[View Detail](#)

[Send e-mail to this poster](#) 10/19/2017 11:34:50 AM

Litigant

EXHIBIT I

*January 5, 2009 Order Appointing Probate Conservator of the Person of Britney Spears
Page 3 #21*

DECLARATION OF ERNEST MOORE AS INTERESTED PARTY & ADVOCATE
SEEKING PROBATE COURT REFORMS

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address):
 Geraldine A. Wyle 089735, Jeryll S. Cohen, 125392
 LUCE, FORWARD, HAMILTON & SCRIPPS LLP
 601 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 3900
 Los Angeles, CA 90017
 TELEPHONE NO. (213) 892-4992 FAX NO. (213) 892-7731
 e-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional) gwyle@luce.com
 ATTORNEY FOR (Name): James P. Spears, Conservator of the Person

FOR COURT USE ONLY

FILED
 LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT

JAN 05 2009
 JOHN A. GRANER, CLERK
Amended
 BY ANDREA MURDOCK, DEPUTY

CASE NUMBER
 BP 108870

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF Los Angeles
 STREET ADDRESS 111 N. Hill Street
 MAILING ADDRESS Same as above.
 CITY AND ZIP CODE Los Angeles, CA 90012
 BRANCH NAME Central District

CONSERVATORSHIP OF
 (Name): BRITNEY JEAN SPEARS
 CONSERVATEE

ORDER APPOINTING SUCCESSOR PROBATE CONSERVATOR OF THE
 PERSON ESTATE Limited Conservatorship

WARNING: THIS APPOINTMENT IS NOT EFFECTIVE UNTIL LETTERS HAVE ISSUED.

- The petition for appointment of successor conservator came on for hearing as follows (check boxes c, d, e, and f or g to indicate personal presence):
 - Judicial officer (name): Reva G. Goetz, Judge Pro Tem
 - Hearing date: October 28, 2008 Time: 8:30 a.m. Dept.: 9 Room:
 - Petitioner (name): James P. Spears
 - Attorney for petitioner (name): James P. Spears
 - Attorney for person cited the conservatee on petition to appoint successor conservator.
 (Name): Samuel D. Ingham, III (Telephone): (310) 556-9751
 (Address): 9440 Santa Monica Boulevard, Suite 510
 Beverly Hills, CA 90210-4608
 - Person cited was present. unable to attend. able but unwilling to attend. out of state.
 - The conservatee on petition to appoint successor conservator was present. not present.

THE COURT FINDS

- All notices required by law have been given.
- Granting the conservatorship is the least restrictive alternative needed for the protection of the conservatee.
- (Name): Britney Jean Spears
 - is unable properly to provide for his or her personal needs for physical health, food, clothing, or shelter,
 - is substantially unable to manage his or her financial resources or to resist fraud or undue influence,
 - has voluntarily requested appointment of a conservator and good cause has been shown for the appointment.
- The conservatee
 - is an adult,
 - will be an adult on the effective date of this order.
 - is a married minor,
 - is a minor whose marriage has been dissolved.
- There is no form of medical treatment for which the conservatee has the capacity to give an informed consent.
 The conservatee is an adherent of a religion defined in Probate Code section 2355(b).
- Granting the successor conservator powers to be exercised independently under Probate Code section 2590 is to the advantage and benefit and in the best interest of the conservatorship estate.
- The conservatee is not capable of completing an affidavit of voter registration.

Do NOT use this form for a temporary conservatorship. Page 1 of 3

CONSERVATORSHIP OF (Name): BRITNEY JEAN SPEARS, Conservatee	CASE NUMBER: BP 108870
CONSERVATEE	

9. The conservatee has dementia as defined in Probate Code section 2356.5, and the court finds all other facts required to make the orders specified in item 27.
10. Attorney (name): **Samuel D. Ingham, III** has been appointed by the court as legal counsel to represent the conservatee in these proceedings. The cost for representation is: \$
The conservatee has the ability to pay all none a portion of this sum (specify): \$
11. The conservatee need not attend the hearing.
12. The appointed court investigator is (name): **Frank Cowen**
(Address and telephone): **111 N. Hill Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012**
(213) 893-0473
13. (For limited conservatorship only) The limited conservatee is developmentally disabled as defined in Probate Code section 1420.
14. The successor conservator is a professional fiduciary as defined by Business and Professions Code section 6501(f).
15. The successor conservator holds a valid, unexpired, unsuspended license as a professional fiduciary issued by the Professional Fiduciaries Bureau of the California Department of Consumer Affairs under chapter 6 (commencing with section 6500) of division 3 of the Business and Professions Code.
License no.: _____ Issuance or last renewal date: _____ Expiration date: _____

16. (Either a, b, or c must be checked):
- a. The successor conservator is not the spouse of the conservatee.
- b. The successor conservator is the spouse of the conservatee and is not a party to an action or proceeding against the conservatee for legal separation, dissolution, annulment, or adjudication of nullity of their marriage.
- c. The successor conservator is the spouse of the conservatee and is a party to an action or proceeding against the conservatee for legal separation, dissolution, annulment, or adjudication of nullity of their marriage. It is in the best interest of the conservatee to appoint the spouse as successor conservator.
17. (Either a, b, or c must be checked):
- a. The successor conservator is not the domestic partner or former domestic partner of the conservatee.
- b. The successor conservator is the domestic partner of the conservatee and has neither terminated nor intends to terminate their domestic partnership.
- c. The successor conservator is the domestic partner or former domestic partner of the conservatee and intends to terminate or has terminated their domestic partnership. It is in the best interest of the conservatee to appoint the domestic partner or former domestic partner as successor conservator.

THE COURT ORDERS

18. a. (Name): **James P. Spears** (Telephone): **(213) 892-4992**
(Address): **601 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 3900**
Los Angeles, CA 90017

is appointed successor conservator limited conservator of the PERSON of (name):
Britney Jean Spears and Letters of Conservatorship shall issue upon qualification.

b. (Name): _____ (Telephone): _____
(Address): _____

is appointed successor conservator limited conservator of the ESTATE of (name):
and Letters of Conservatorship shall issue upon qualification.

19. The conservatee need not attend the hearing.
20. a. Bond is not required.
- b. Bond is fixed at: \$ _____ to be furnished by an authorized surety company or as otherwise provided by law.
- c. Deposits of \$ _____ are ordered to be placed in a blocked account at (specify institution, and location): _____

and receipts shall be filed. No withdrawals shall be made without a court order.

Additional orders in attachment 20c.

CONSERVATORSHIP OF (Name):

BRITNEY JEAN SPEARS, Conservatee

CASE NUMBER

BP 108870

CONSERVATEE

20. (cont.) d. The successor conservator is not authorized to take possession of money or any other property without a specific court order.
21. For legal services rendered, conservatee conservatee's estate shall pay the sum of \$
to (name): Samuel D. Ingham, III
- forthwith as follows (specify terms, including any combination of payors):
The Order previously made with regard to Samuel D. Ingham, III, for his services as PVP counsel for the Conservatee, is to remain in full force and effect. (Prior Order: Samuel D. Ingham, III is to receive weekly compensation for legal services rendered on account of no more than \$10,000 per week.)
- Continued in attachment 21
22. The conservatee is disqualified from voting.
23. The conservatee lacks the capacity to give informed consent for medical treatment and the successor conservator of the person is granted the powers specified in Probate Code section 2356.
- The treatment shall be performed by an accredited practitioner of a religion as defined in Probate Code section 2355(b)
24. The successor conservator of the estate is granted authorization under Probate Code section 2590 to exercise independently the powers specified in attachment 24 subject to the conditions provided.
25. Orders relating to the capacity of the conservatee under Probate Code sections 1873 or 1901 as specified in attachment 25 are granted.
26. Orders relating to the powers and duties of the successor conservator of the person under Probate Code sections 2351–2358 as specified in attachment 26 are granted. (Do not include orders under Probate Code section 2356.5 relating to dementia.)
27. Orders relating to the conditions imposed under Probate Code section 2402 on the successor conservator of the estate as specified in attachment 27 are granted.
28. a. The successor conservator of the person is granted authority to place the conservatee in a care or nursing facility described in Probate Code section 2356 b(3).
- b. The successor conservator of the person is granted authority to authorize the administration of medications appropriate for the care and treatment of dementia described in Probate Code section 2356 5(c).
29. Other orders as specified in attachment 29 are granted.
30. The probate referee appointed is (name and address)
31. (For limited conservatorship only) Orders relating to the powers and duties of the successor limited conservator of the person under Probate Code section 2351.5 as specified in attachment 31 are granted.
32. (For limited conservatorship only) Orders relating to the powers and duties of the successor limited conservator of the estate under Probate Code section 1830(b) as specified in attachment 32 are granted.
33. (For limited conservatorship only) Orders limiting the civil and legal rights of the limited conservatee as specified in attachment 33 are granted.
34. This order is effective on the date signed date minor attains majority (specify)
35. Number of boxes checked in items 18–34: _____
36. Number of pages attached: _____

Date:

JUDICIAL OFFICER

 SIGNATURE FOLLOWS LAST ATTACHMENT

EXHIBIT J

July 13, 2021, Nathan Talei closing letter from The State Bar of California.

DECLARATION OF ERNEST MOORE AS INTERESTED PARTY & ADVOCATE
SEEKING PROBATE COURT REFORMS



The State Bar
of California

OFFICE OF CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL

845 S. Figueroa Street, Los Angeles, California 90017 (213) 765-1097

July 13, 2021

Ernest Liggett Moore
527 W. 7th Street Suite 922
Los Angeles, CA 90014

RE: Case Number: 21-O-07210
Respondent: Nathan M. Talei

Dear Mr. Moore:

The State Bar's Office of Chief Trial Counsel has reviewed your complaint against Nathan M Talei to determine whether there are sufficient grounds to prosecute a possible violation of the State Bar Act and/or Rules of Professional Conduct.

You stated that Mr. Talei is the attorney for Jeffery Siegel, the court-appointed temporary trustee of the Myrtle Moore Living Trust. Per an August 4, 2015 court order appointing Mr. Siegel, he was to investigate all assets of the trust or any associated sub-trusts. You alleged that Mr. Talei advised Mr. Siegel not to conduct any investigations or produce any documentation of investment accounts as part of a scheme to submit fraudulent accountings. Over your objection, the court approved the accountings. You stated that in 2017 Mr. Talei used false and misleading financial information to petition for authority to obtain a loan. The court similarly approved the loan over your objection. You also objected to Mr. Talei's request for attorney's fees of \$80,757.50. Finally, you stated that Mr. Talei responded to your discovery requests with only objections and thus violated the court's July 13, 2020 order to provide all loan records for the trust's property.

Based on our evaluation of the information provided, we are closing your complaint. Under the laws of California, the facts as you have alleged them would not be grounds for disciplinary action.

An attorney's act of dishonesty may constitute professional misconduct. However, here, the information presented does not support the charge that Mr. Talei conspired to submit fraudulent accountings to the court or used misleading information to request the court's authorization for a loan. Even if there were a sufficient basis to investigate Mr. Talei, the

investigation would be limited by the confidential attorney-client relationship between Mr. Talei and Mr. Siegel. In response to a disciplinary inquiry, Mr. Talei would be forced to assert attorney-client confidentiality with respect to his representation of Mr. Siegel.

An attorney's failure to obey a court order may also involve misconduct. However, the information presented does not show that Mr. Talei violated a court order. As shown in the emails attached to the pleadings you provided, Mr. Talei attempted to meet and confer with you to understand the nature of the information you requested via discovery. Mr. Talei asserted that he did not understand your responses, and thus was forced to respond to the discovery requests with general objections. Therefore, the State Bar could not show that Mr. Talei violated the court's order to complete discovery.

For these reasons, the State Bar is closing this matter.

Please note that the State Bar does not have jurisdiction to investigate the conduct of sitting judicial officers. The agency authorized to investigate and prosecute state judicial officers is the Commission on Judicial Performance. If you decide to pursue a written complaint against the judge presiding over the case, you may submit your complaint and accompanying documents to the Commission on Judicial Performance at 455 Golden Gate Avenue, #14400, San Francisco, CA 94102.

If you have new facts and circumstances that you believe may change our determination to close your complaint, you may submit a written statement with the new information to the Intake Unit for review. If you have any questions about this process, you may call me at (213) 765-1097. If you leave a voice message, be sure to clearly identify the lawyer complained of, the inquiry number assigned, and your telephone number including the area code. Your call should be returned within two business days.

If you are not aware of new facts or circumstances but otherwise disagree with the decision to close your complaint, you may submit a request for review by the State Bar's Complaint Review Unit, which will review your complaint and the Intake Unit's decision to close the complaint. The Complaint Review Unit may reopen your complaint if it determines that your complaint was inappropriately closed or that you presented new, significant evidence to support your complaint. To request review by the Complaint Review Unit, you must submit your request **in writing**, together with any new evidence you wish to be considered, post-marked within **90 days of the date of this letter**, to:

The State Bar of California
Complaint Review Unit
Office of General Counsel
180 Howard Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-1617

The State Bar cannot give you legal advice. If you wish to consult an attorney about any other remedies available to you, a certified lawyer referral service can provide the names of attorneys who may be able to assist you. In order to find a certified lawyer referral service, you may call our automated Lawyer Referral Services Directory at 1-866-442-2529 (toll free in California) or 415-538-2250 (from outside California) or access the State Bar's website at www.calbar.ca.gov and look for information on lawyer referral services.

We would appreciate if you would complete a short, anonymous survey about your experience with filing your complaint. While your responses to the survey will not change the outcome of the complaint you filed against the attorney, the State Bar will use your answers to help improve the services we provide to the public. The survey can be found at <http://bit.ly/StateBarSurvey1>.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, most State Bar staff are telecommuting. If possible, please send your response to this letter, and any further communication directed to the State Bar, using email in lieu of regular mail. My email address is david.aigboboh@calbar.ca.gov.

Thank you for bringing your concerns to the attention of the State Bar.

Sincerely,



David Aigboboh
Deputy Trial Counsel

DA

EXHIBIT K

8/25/2017 Letter from Regan Fitzgerald, Operations Sergeant Stanley Mosk
Courthouse

DECLARATION OF ERNEST MOORE AS INTERESTED PARTY & ADVOCATE
SEEKING PROBATE COURT REFORMS



(no subject)

3 messages

Fitzgerald, Regan P. <rpfitzge@lasd.org>

Fri, Aug 25, 2017 at 12:21 PM

To: 

Mr. Moore,

I am writing this email to follow up with our phone conversation earlier this morning and reiterate why the bailiff (Deputy Gee) in Depart 11 of the Stanley Mosk Superior Court did not take a criminal report based on your assertion that presiding Judge Green, as well as the attorneys representing the other litigants, acted in an illegal manner during these proceedings. Court proceedings that you indicated have been ongoing since 2004.

I fully understand how being involved in a civil matter such as this could be very frustrating, especially when you feel you've been treated unfairly knowing what you know. What I mean to say is, only you and the other litigants are privileged to the details of the case and truly know whether or not those details are true.

That being said, you must understand the sole purpose of a court bailiff while assigned to a courtroom is to ensure the personal safety of everyone within. This includes the litigants, attorneys, civilian staff, the Judge and of course you. In addition, it is of the utmost importance for the bailiff to remain completely neutral when dealing with the various litigants and their attorneys and never show favoritism or bias to either side. So it would be completely out of line and out of the bailiff's jurisdiction to insert himself in the ongoing court proceedings by taking a criminal report based on assertions that you made regarding these same court proceedings.

Regarding the duties of the judge, it is up to the judge to interpret the law, assess the evidence presented, and control how hearings and trials unfold in their courtrooms. The judge is the one who decides whether the evidence is credible and which witnesses are telling the truth. The judge then applies the law to these facts to determine whether a civil claim has been established and whether there is proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

As I mentioned to you over the phone, on your behalf I contacted Mr. Chris Herrera of the Court Advocacy unit at the Stanley Mosk court and advised him of your concerns. Mr. Herrera is located on the first floor of the courthouse and located in room 109. Mr. Herrera indicated he would be happy walk you through the process should you decide to make your concerns known to the Commission of Judicial Performance, or the Bar Association.

I wish you well and hope things work out for you.

Sincerely,

Regan Fitzgerald,
Operations Sergeant
Stanley Mosk Court
(213) 972-3807

Ernest Moore [REDACTED]
To: "Fitzgerald, Regan P." <rpfitzge@lasd.org>

Fri, Aug 25, 2017 at 3:03 PM

Deputy Regan Fitzgerald,

I have received your response.
I will follow up on your recommendations.

Thanks,

Ernest L. Moore
[REDACTED]



[Quoted text hidden]

--

[Redacted]

Ernest Moore [Redacted]
To: Cheryl Gaines <CNewmanG@da.lacounty.gov>

Fri, Aug 25, 2017 at 3:33 PM

Hello Cheryl Gaines,

This is a letter from Deputy Regan Fitzgerald. He contacted me about a complaint that I made against the Bailiff in my probate case Deputy Gee, who refused to take a police report or accept my citizens arrest several times over the years that he has been stationed at Department 11.

I submitted this complaint about a month ago on the LA County Sheriff's Website.

He basically stated that your case is civil not criminal and we have no jurisdiction over the court room, we can not investigate any criminal complaints or take your report and investigate!

I did record this investigative conversation.

I did inform him that my probate case is "civil" but what has been going on for over 12 years is criminal!

Ernest L. Moore

[Redacted]

[Quoted text hidden]

--

[Redacted]

EXHIBIT L

July 10, 2019, Court Transcript.

DECLARATION OF ERNEST MOORE AS INTERESTED PARTY & ADVOCATE
SEEKING PROBATE COURT REFORMS

1 CASE NUMBER: BP141987
 2 CASE NAME: IN RE: MOORE
 3 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA MONDAY, JUNE 10TH, 2019
 4 DEPARTMENT 11 BARBARA R. JOHNSON, JUDGE
 5 REPORTER: LISA C. RIDLEY, CSR #5886
 6 TIME: 10:24 A.M.

7 -- 000 --

8
 9
 10 (THE PARTIES AND COUNSEL HAVING
 11 BEEN PREVIOUSLY DULY SWORN IN
 12 OPEN COURT, THE FOLLOWING
 13 PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN
 14 COURT:)

10:24:27 15
 10:24:30 16
 10:24:35 17
 10:24:59 18
 10:25:17 19
 10:25:18 20
 10:25:21 21
 10:25:23 22
 10:25:27 23
 10:25:28 24
 10:25:31 25
 10:25:31 26
 10:25:37 27
 10:25:39 28

16 THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, MYRTLE MOORE TRUST,
 17 3001.
 18 VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE: HE IS RIGHT HERE.
 19 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THIS IS THE MYRTLE
 20 MOORE LIVING TRUST, NUMBER 3001.
 21 PARTIES, YOUR APPEARANCES, PLEASE.
 22 MS. BROWN: KIRSTEN BROWN ON BEHALF OF JEAN
 23 ROBINSON.
 24 MR. TALEI: NATHAN TALEI ON BEHALF OF JEFFREY
 25 SIEGEL.
 26 ERNEST MOORE: ERNEST MOORE.
 27 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THIS IS A MOTION FOR
 28 RECONSIDERATION OF ORDER GRANTING JEAN ROBINSON'S

10:25:42 1 PETITION FOR PRELIMINARY DISTRIBUTION, IN PART.

10:25:49 2 THE TENTATIVE IS TO DENY.

10:25:54 3 THE COURT FINDS THAT THE MOVANT FAILED
10:25:56 4 TO ACT WITH DILIGENCE IN RAISING, ASSERTING NEW OR
10:25:59 5 DIFFERENT FACTS, LAW AND CIRCUMSTANCES.

10:26:02 6 ADDITIONALLY, THE MOVANT FAILS TO
10:26:04 7 DEMONSTRATE ANY OF THE IDENTIFIED NEW OR DIFFERENT ITEMS
10:26:08 8 THAT WOULD WARRANT RECONSIDERATION.

10:26:12 9 THE OPPONENT INDICATES THAT THERE MAY
10:26:14 10 HAVE BEEN SOME DEFECT IN THE NOTICE. HOWEVER, THAT
10:26:17 11 DEFECT WAS NONPREJUDICIAL BECAUSE EVEN ASSUMING THAT
10:26:22 12 THERE WAS SOME DISCREPANCY IN THE DATES, MISS ROBINSON
10:26:25 13 PLAINLY SUFFERED NO PREJUDICE BY IT BECAUSE HER
10:26:28 14 OPPOSITION EXPRESSLY LISTS THE HEARING DATE AS BEING
10:26:32 15 JUNE 10TH.

10:26:35 16 THE MOTION IS UNTIMELY AND ALTHOUGH MISS
10:26:37 17 ROBINSON, THE MOTION MISS ROBINSON CLAIMS IS UNTIMELY,
10:26:41 18 IT IS TIMELY.

10:26:43 19 ALTHOUGH MISS ROBINSON CLAIMS THAT WE
10:26:44 20 SHOULD START FROM NOVEMBER 16TH, 2018 AS THE STARTING
10:26:49 21 DATE, THE ORDER WAS APRIL 26TH, 2019. AND THEREFORE,
10:26:57 22 THE 2018 ORDER CONTEMPLATED A MORE FORMAL ORDER. SO IT
10:27:01 23 IS TIMELY.

10:27:04 24 AS TO THE REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION,
10:27:08 25 MR. MOORE, ERNEST MOORE IDENTIFIES A NUMBER OF NEW OR
10:27:13 26 DIFFERENT FACTS; HOWEVER, HE LISTS THEM. IT DOESN'T
10:27:17 27 PROVIDE ANY CLEAR EVIDENTIARY SUPPORT OR DETAILED
10:27:21 28 EXPLANATION FOR THE ACCUSATIONS.

1 HE PROVIDES A DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF
2 THE MOTION AND ATTACHED SOME DOCUMENTS, BUT THE
3 DOCUMENTS WELL PREDATE THE ENTRY OF THE ORDER AND HE
4 DOESN'T PROVIDE ANY SUBSTANTIVE DISCUSSIONS AS TO WHY
5 ANY IDENTIFIED NEW OR REASONABLE OR DIFFERENT FACTS OR
6 CIRCUMSTANCES CANNOT HAVE BEEN BROUGHT EARLIER AS TO
7 DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE DILIGENCE.

8 AS TO MR. MOORE'S CONTENTION THAT HE WAS
9 NOT GIVEN OR COMPLAINING THAT HE WASN'T GIVEN AN
10 EVIDENTIARY HEARING, THE ISSUE IS ACTUALLY DISCUSSED AT
11 PRIOR HEARINGS AND THIS WOULDN'T BE A NEW FACT OR ISSUE
12 TO DISCUSS AND SHOULD HAVE BEEN BROUGHT EARLIER.

13 AS TO SANCTIONS, THE COURT IS NOT
14 INCLINED TO GIVE SANCTIONS AGAINST MR. MOORE, BECAUSE
15 MISS ROBINSON HAS FAILED TO FOLLOW THE 21-DAY SAFE
16 HARBOR PROVISIONS OF SECTION 128.7.

17 ANYONE LIKE TO HAVE ANY ARGUMENT?

18 I WILL PUT ALL THIS IN WRITING FOR THE
19 BENEFIT OF MR. MOORE.

20 ERNEST MOORE: I DO.

21 THE COURT: GO AHEAD.

22 ERNEST MOORE: BASICALLY WHAT YOU ARE SAYING
23 IS MISLEADING.

24 THE COURT: WHAT I AM SAYING IS MISLEADING?

25 ERNEST MOORE: YES.

26 FIRST OF ALL, I WASN'T ALLOWED TO
27 PRESENT ANY EVIDENCE AT THE PRELIMINARY HEARING. SO THE
28 ONLY THING I BRING UP IS NEW EVIDENCE.

10:29:04 1 THE COURT: YOU MEAN AT THE HEARING FOR
10:29:05 2 PRELIMINARY DISTRIBUTION?

10:29:06 3 ERNEST MOORE: YEAH.

10:29:06 4 THE COURT: OKAY.

10:29:07 5 ERNEST MOORE: I THINK THERE WERE SEVERAL
10:29:08 6 THINGS GOING ON THAT DAY.

10:29:09 7 AND YOU JUST DISTRIBUTED MY SISTER'S
10:29:11 8 PROPERTY.

10:29:12 9 YOU DIDN'T TAKE TIME TO TAKE A LOOK AT
10:29:15 10 ANY EVIDENCE.

10:29:17 11 THE COURT: OKAY.

10:29:18 12 AS I RECALL, MR. --

10:29:20 13 ERNEST MOORE: SO ANYTHING I PRESENTED IN MY
10:29:22 14 MOTION IS NEW EVIDENCE.

10:29:25 15 THE COURT: OKAY.

10:29:26 16 ERNEST MOORE: AND IT IS VERY SUBSTANTIAL.

10:29:29 17 AGAIN, BECAUSE I AM ALLEGING FELONY
10:29:32 18 CRIMES.

10:29:38 19 OKAY. SO SINCE YOU RELEASING MY
10:29:40 20 SISTER'S PROPERTY TO MY SISTER, THEN I WANT MY BUILDING
10:29:44 21 RELEASED TO ME TODAY.

10:29:45 22 AND THERE IS ENOUGH MONEY FROM THE LOANS
10:29:46 23 THAT WERE TAKEN OUT ILLEGALLY ON MY PROPERTY TO PAY OFF
10:29:50 24 THE MORTGAGE THAT'S REMAINING ON MY BUILDING THAT COULD
10:29:55 25 BE CLEARED TO RELEASE IT TO ME FREE AND CLEAR TODAY.

10:29:58 26 THE COURT: I THOUGHT YOUR PROPERTY HAD
10:30:02 27 ALREADY BEEN RELEASED TO YOU, MR. MOORE, A LONG TIME
10:30:04 28 AGO.

10:30:04 1 ERNEST MOORE: NO. I HAVEN'T GOTTEN NOTHING.
10:30:04 2 I HAVEN'T GOTTEN ONE DIME.

10:30:07 3 THE COURT: HE DIDN'T GET HIS PROPERTY?

10:30:08 4 MS. BROWN: RIGHT. AT THE HEARING ON THE
10:30:11 5 DISTRIBUTION, IT WAS OFFERED TO MR. MOORE TO ALSO
10:30:13 6 RECEIVE HIS DISTRIBUTION, ALSO. HE REFUSED TO TAKE
10:30:17 7 OWNERSHIP BECAUSE THERE ARE MORTGAGES ON THE PROPERTY.
10:30:21 8 SO HE DID NOT WANT TO RECEIVE HIS DISTRIBUTION UNLESS IT
10:30:24 9 HAD, UNLESS IT WAS FREE AND CLEAR. BUT THE PROPERTY IS
10:30:28 10 NOT FREE AND CLEAR.

10:30:29 11 JEAN TOOK HER PORTION SUBJECT TO THE
10:30:33 12 CURRENT MORTGAGES THAT ARE ON IT.

10:30:36 13 THE COURT: SO NOW YOU ARE SAYING THAT YOU DO
10:30:37 14 WANT YOUR PROPERTY?

10:30:38 15 ERNEST MOORE: YES.

10:30:39 16 THE COURT: CAN THAT BE ARRANGED?

10:30:40 17 MR. TALEI: I DON'T KNOW.

10:30:42 18 THE COURT: I'M SORRY.

10:30:43 19 MR. TALEI: I DON'T KNOW. WE WOULD HAVE TO
10:30:44 20 LOOK INTO IT. IT IS NOT BEFORE THE COURT TODAY.

10:30:49 21 MS. BROWN: JEAN DOES NOT HAVE AN ISSUE WITH
10:30:51 22 IT.

10:30:51 23 THE COURT: I THOUGHT THERE WAS A DISTRIBUTION
10:30:52 24 ALREADY.

10:30:54 25 MR. TALEI: NO. THE ONLY DISTRIBUTION THAT
10:30:55 26 WAS ORDERED WAS MISS ROBINSON'S PROPERTY. WE ARE
10:30:58 27 WAITING FOR ONE LAST PIECE OF PROPERTY TO SELL. WE ARE
10:31:01 28 CLEARING UP THE TITLE ISSUE.

1 AND WE SHOULD BE BACK TO SELL THAT PIECE
2 OF PROPERTY IN JULY AND ONCE THAT IS DONE, WE SHOULD BE
3 ABLE TO DISTRIBUTE.

4 THE COURT: BUT WHAT DOES THAT HAVE TO DO WITH
5 MR. MOORE'S PROPERTY?

6 MR. TALEI: I DON'T KNOW IF WE CAN DISTRIBUTE
7 IT NOW. I KNOW EARLIER HE WAS ABLE TO TAKE OVER HIS
8 PORTION OF THE LOAN.

9 THE COURT: MR. SIEGEL INDICATED THAT HE HAD
10 NO OBJECTION TO DISTRIBUTING MR. MOORE'S PROPERTY AT
11 THAT TIME.

12 SO I AM SAYING WHAT HAS CHANGED?

13 MR. TALEI: NOTHING. I AM DON'T KNOW AT THIS
14 POINT.

15 ERNEST MOORE: I AM SAYING THAT THERE IS --
16 THERE IS ENOUGH MONEY NOW TO CLEAR THE LOAN, THE
17 MORTGAGE THAT WAS TAKEN OUT ON MY BUILDING ILLEGALLY.

18 IN FACT, I INCLUDED THAT IN MY FIRST
19 SUPPLEMENTAL --

20 THE COURT: WELL, MR. TALEI HAS --

21 ERNEST MOORE: THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN HEARD AT
22 THE LAST HEARING, THAT YOU DIDN'T, YOU DIDN'T DISCUSS
23 THAT AT ALL.

24 THE COURT: OKAY.

25 THAT'S BECAUSE THEY WERE GOING TO GIVE
26 YOU YOUR PROPERTY.

27 THERE IS NOTHING TO DISCUSS. MR. TALEI
28 DOES HAVE A POINT THAT IT IS NOT BEFORE ME AT THIS

10:32:04 1 HEARING.

10:32:05 2 ERNEST MOORE: YEAH. WELL I HAD, MY
10:32:06 3 SUPPLEMENTAL WAS TO COMPEL THE TRUSTEE TO DISTRIBUTE MY
10:32:09 4 PROPERTY TO CLEAR THE LOAN.

10:32:10 5 THE COURT: THAT'S NOT IN THIS CASE.
10:32:11 6 THAT'S -- YOUR MOTION WAS TO RECONSIDER.

10:32:16 7 ERNEST MOORE: WELL, YOU COULD ORDER HIM --

10:32:18 8 THE COURT: RECONSIDER THE ORDER GRANTING --

10:32:21 9 ERNEST MOORE: -- TO CLEAR THE LOAN ON MY
10:32:22 10 PROPERTY AND DISTRIBUTE IT TO ME.

10:32:24 11 THE COURT: WELL, YOU ARE ASKING TWO THINGS;
10:32:25 12 TO CLEAR THE LOAN ON YOUR PROPERTY AND DISTRIBUTE IT TO
10:32:27 13 YOU.

10:32:28 14 THE ORDER GRANTING MISS ROBINSON'S
10:32:31 15 PETITION FOR PRELIMINARY DISTRIBUTION WAS TO HER AND TO
10:32:33 16 YOU.

10:32:34 17 THAT HASN'T CHANGED.

10:32:36 18 AS TO CLEARING THE MORTGAGE IS SEPARATE.

10:32:43 19 MR. TALEI: I KNOW THAT THIS ISN'T THE ISSUE
10:32:45 20 BEFORE THE COURT BUT I DON'T THINK THE TRUST WOULD COVER
10:32:47 21 THE LOAN AND THEN DISTRIBUTE THE PROPERTY. I THINK IT
10:32:50 22 WOULD JUST DISTRIBUTE THE PROPERTY SUBJECT TO THE LOAN.

10:32:52 23 BUT THAT'S NOT THE ISSUE TODAY.

10:32:56 24 THE COURT: OKAY.

10:32:57 25 ERNEST MOORE: WELL THEN YOU GET --

10:33:00 26 THE COURT: THE ORIGINAL ORDER --

10:33:01 27 ERNEST MOORE: -- GET JEFFREY SIEGEL TO PAY IT
10:33:04 28 OUT OF HIS OWN POCKET.

1 THE COURT: THIS IS FOR RECONSIDERATION. I AM
2 NOT RECONSIDERING. THE ORIGINAL ORDER FOR DISTRIBUTION
3 STANDS.

4 MR. TALEI: I UNDERSTAND. I WAS JUST
5 CLARIFYING THAT IF THE PROPERTY OR WHENEVER THE PROPERTY
6 IS DISTRIBUTED, I AM FAIRLY CERTAIN IT IS DISTRIBUTED
7 SUBJECT TO ENCUMBRANCES.

8 THE COURT: AND HE JUST SAID HE IS GOING TO
9 TAKE IT SUBJECT TO THOSE ENCUMBRANCES.

10 MR. TALEI: I THOUGHT HE WANTED US -- I
11 THOUGHT HE WANTED THE TRUST TO COVER THE LOAN.

12 THE COURT: HE DID SAY THAT AT FIRST BUT THEN
13 I TOLD HIM HE CAN'T DO THAT AND MR. ROBINSON --

14 ERNEST MOORE: WHY NOT? WHEN I HAVE EVIDENCE
15 TO SHOW THAT THERE IS ENOUGH MONEY IN THE TRUST TO CLEAR
16 THE LOANS ON MY BUILDING.

17 THE COURT: WELL, SIR, AGAIN --

18 ERNEST MOORE: AND HE IS LYING. THE REASONS
19 TO SELL THAT PROPERTY IS A BUNCH OF LIES.

20 THE COURT: AGAIN --

21 ERNEST MOORE: I WANT TO DO A CITIZEN'S ARREST
22 RIGHT NOW.

23 THE COURT: SIR.

24 MR. TALEI: DO NOT TOUCH ME.

25 THE COURT: YOU CAN'T TOUCH HIM, SIR.

26 THE BAILIFF: SIT DOWN.

27 ERNEST MOORE: I WANT TO DO A CITIZEN'S
28 ARREST. I AM TIRED OF THIS SHIT.

10:33:56 1
10:33:57 2
10:34:01 3
10:34:02 4
10:34:04 5
10:34:05 6
10:34:07 7
10:34:09 8
10:34:10 9
10:34:12 10
10:34:13 11
10:34:15 12
10:34:17 13
10:34:19 14
10:34:22 15
10:34:27 16
10:34:30 17
10:34:33 18
10:34:39 19
10:34:40 20
10:34:44 21
10:34:44 22
10:34:44 23
10:34:44 24
10:34:44 25
10:34:44 26
10:34:44 27
28

THE BAILIFF: WE HAVE GONE THROUGH THIS BEFORE, NO ONE IS GETTING ARRESTED.

THE COURT: UNLESS YOU TOUCH HIM, THEN YOU CAN GET ARRESTED.

ERNEST MOORE: OH, TAKE ME TO JAIL AND LET THE CRIMINALS GO FREE.

THE COURT: I AM JUST SAYING, DON'T TOUCH ANYBODY.

ERNEST MOORE: I AM AN AMERICAN CITIZEN, I CAN MAKE A CITIZEN'S ARREST.

THE COURT: NO, NOT IN THIS COURT.

ERNEST MOORE: ESPECIALLY FOR AN ILLEGAL CRIMINAL ALIEN.

THE COURT: OKAY, SIR, YOUR MOTION IS DENIED. SANCTIONS ARE DENIED. THE NEXT HEARING IS WHENEVER IT IS.

AND IF THE ORIGINAL ORDER, I AM THINKING, WAS FOR, FOR DISTRIBUTION, THAT REMAINS.

THANK YOU.

MS. BROWN: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

MR. TALEI: THANK YOU.

(THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER WERE CONCLUDED.)

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

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT 11

HON. BARBARA R. JOHNSON, JUDGE

IN THE MATTER OF MYRTLE
MOORE LIVING TRUST.

)
)
)
) CASE NO. BP141987
)
_____)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) SS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

I, LISA C. RIDLEY, OFFICIAL REPORTER OF THE
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, FOR THE
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE
FOREGOING PAGES, 1 THROUGH 9, COMPRISE A TRUE AND
COMPLETE TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS HELD IN
DEPARTMENT 11 ON MONDAY, JUNE 10TH, 2019.

DATED THIS 23RD DAY OF JULY, 2019.

LISA C. RIDLEY, OFFICIAL REPORTER.

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2
3 I am over the age of 18 and not a party to this action.

4 I am a resident of or employed in the county where the mailing occurred; my
5 business/residence address is: 316 W 2nd St, #110, Los Angeles, CA 90012

6 On 10/22/21 I served the foregoing document(s) described as:

7 **DECLARATION OF ERNEST MOORE AS INTERESTED PARTY & ADVOCATE**
8 **SEEKING PROBATE COURT REFORMS**


9
10 to the following parties:

11 Samuel D. Ingham, III, Esq. 12 444 South Flower St. 13 Suite 4260 14 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2966 15 Email: singham@inghamlaw.com	Lynne Spears c/o Yasha Bronshteya Ginzburg & Bronshteyn, APC 11111 Santa Monica Blvd #1840 Los Angeles, CA 90025
16 Attorney for Lynne Spears 17 Gladstone N. Jones, III 18 Lynn E. Swanson 19 Jones Swanson Huddell & Daschbach, L.L.C. 20 601 Poydras Street 21 Suite 2655 22 New Orleans, LA 70130	Attorney for James P. Spears, Co-Conservator of Estate Vivian L. Thoreen, Esq. Jonathan H. Park, Vivian M. Rivera, Jennifer Vane HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP 400 South Hope Street, 8th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 Email: vivian.thorceanthlaw.com jonathan.park@hklaw.com roger.coven@hklaw.com
23 Attorney for James P. Spears, 24 Co-Conservator of Estate 25 Geraldine A. Wyle, Esq. 26 Freeman, Freeman & Smiley 1888 Century Park East, Suite 1500 Los Angeles, CA 90067	David C. Nelson Ronald Pearson Loeb & Loeb L.L.P. 10100 Santa Monica Blvd. Suite 2200 Los Angeles, CA 90067

<p>1 Conservatee 2 Britney J. Spears 3 c/o Matthew S. Rosengart 4 Greenberg Traurig, L.L.P. 5 1840 Century Park East 6 Suite 1900 7 Los Angeles, CA 90067</p>	<p>Temporary Conservator of the Person Jodi Montgomery c/o Lauriann C. Wright Marie Mondia Wright Kim Douglas ALC Glendale, CA 91205</p>
<p>6 Litigation Counsel for Conservatee 7 David Nelson, Esq. 8 Ronald Pearson, Esq. 9 Loeb & Loeb 10 10100 Santa Monica Blvd., Ste. 2200 11 Los Angeles, CA 90067 12 Email: dnelson@loeb.com; rpearson@loeb.com</p>	<p>Jamie Lynn Spears c/o George Short Brownstein Hyatt Faber Schreck 1021 Anacapa Street 2nd Floor Santa Barbara, CA 93101-2711</p>
<p>11 <u>Request For Special Notice</u> 12 Amanda Goad 13 ACLU of Southern California 14 1313 West 8th Street 15 Los Angeles, CA 900174</p>	<p>Attorney for Jodi Montgomery Lauriann C. Wright, Esq. Wright Kim Douglas, ALC 130 S. Jackson Street Glendale, CA 91205 Email: Lauriann@wkdlegal.com</p>
<p>15 <u>Request For Special Notice</u> 16 Kevin Cauley 17 624 S. Grand Avenue 18 Los Angeles, CA 90017</p>	<p><u>Request For Special Notice</u> Zoe Brennan-Krohm DRBA 39 Drumm Street San Francisco, CA 94111</p>

23 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
24 is true and correct.

25 DATED: 10/22/21

26 
27 _____
28 Signature