

Steve Gartin

From: "Judith" <juphillips@comcast.net>
To: "Steve Gartin" <steve@thunderrock.net>
Sent: Monday, April 05, 2004 5:49 PM
Subject: RE: Doc's Angermanagement Issues

Maha Guru Sifu STEVE DOUGLAS GARTIN: Please contact me by telephone or in person. I do not have faith in attorney/client confidentiality over the internet. Your e-mails report to many others. I am worried that you are in exile AND not assisting me for your hearing. We have prepared many times in the past. Relax. Let's work together, roll up our shirt sleeves, and put on your evidence. Many clients become bewildered, emotional, angry, frightened, or belligerent before a hearing. It is not the first time I have appeared on your behalf. I would like to read the law with you. But, time is short. Exercise your strong self-control and religious strength. My telephone line is open to you until 7:00 p.m., seven days a week. I will meet with you at my home or my office. Twenty-four hour answering is provided at 303.484.8229. You have my cell phone number of 720.422.6502. If we have to work late to prepare, you are welcome to stay at my home. I will feed you, provide a bed, and listen, and work with you. If you are afraid of a police raid, I can only recommend that you step back and look at your case, and your life's work, more positively. DOC.

-----Original Message-----

From: Steve Gartin [mailto:gartin@intergate.com]
Sent: Monday, April 05, 2004 11:21 AM
To: Doc Miller; Judith; Frank
Cc: Chas Clements; Caroline M. Stapleton; Pamela Hadas
Subject: Doc's Angermanagement Issues

Good morning Doc,

Chas relayed your message of 9:15 AM 4.5.04

"doc miller calls, incensed at Gartin's last e-mail of Sunday."

I suppose that would be this message:

Doc Miller,

Your refusal to read or communicate with me is creating difficulty in your competent representation of my case and my interests. You have requested information REPEATEDLY that is contained in the Supreme Court Brief. Please simply READ and quit asking me the same questions over and over.

The BIG BLACK wall of NONcommunication is creating problems. I would like you to please take advantage of my long, arduous and continuing effort to communicate with you and to make you available for communication from your other clients.

Turning on your FAX machine is a small thing to ask Doc.

With fond regards,

Steve Douglas, Gartin (your client)

Saturday, March 13, 2004

Good Evening Mr. Miller,

Sunday, April 04, 2004

I realize that it is Sunday evening and that you will not see this communiqué until afternoon tomorrow when you and “Cookie” awaken, but I have not heard from you in recent history and I hope to be in line for your attention when you decide to consider your professional obligations to your clients. After the untold hours of teaching you to communicate on line and the great expense I have carried to make sure that you have email and websites, it seem that the only means of communication I can prod from you is the FAX machine, so I will endeavor one more time to get your attention by FAX at the risk of being accused of felony FAXing again.

As you are aware, your agreement with Marlene Langfield that I will not file any lawsuits expires in less than a week. I don't know what all agreements you intend to “welsh” on, besides the one that Chas retained you to pursue, so during this period of constructive confinement I want to prepare the VanDusen suit, whether or not you intend to participate as you have promised. I have asked you several questions concerning when Renita O’Ferrill was charged, when she was convicted, or plead; and what the charges were against her and what her sentence was, but you have not yet responded to several email requests. I understand that you have lost the first 35 pages of the discovery provided by Joe Gilmore in 01CR3011, which was recently dismissed against me; but I still need that information to prepare the Van Dusen suit. I would appreciate it if you would provide that information VIA email to me, or VIA FAX or phone to Chas or Frank – they are both email literate and can pass that information along to me if you would even be so kind as to call them with the information. I have requested information concerning pending matters, but have received no response from you what-so-ever. I trust that you will take time to email me the information I have requested concerning current and on-going cases. If you have somehow lost my emails or FAXes, ask Chas or Frank to send you copies or to read them over the phone.

Sincerely yours,
 Steve Gartin (your client)
sheriffsteve@justice.com

CC: Chas Clements
 Frank Pugliese
 Caroline Stapleton

www.kuntaosilat.net
www.kuntaosilat.com
www.thunderrock.net

"Doing his case harm."

Actually Mr. Miller, I assumed that this case was well in your control. I am concerned to know which matters you are "welching" on so that I can make preparations to proceed without you. You have assured me that you have the April 8th issues under control.

"Going after Frank for unprofessional conduct- contacting judge directly; aspects of case revealed; attorney-client relationship"

I fail to see what Frank has revealed that is not true, correct and germane to the issues before the Court. I think Judge Leland Anderson would be interested to know about the concerted

conspiracy to prevent me from seeking redress of grievance from the terrible persecution I have been subject to.

"stop saying Gartins' life depends on it."

Mr. Miller, those were your exact words. You have informed me that Marlene Langfield and Gary Clyman are "out to get me" and even more adamant about "getting Chas." Have things changed?

"withdrawing from Gartin's case- not a slave or a combat soldier; attorney decisions on behalf of client interests"

Are you withdrawing BEFORE the final curtain call?

"incensed about being called 'welshing' "

That was your term Mr. Miller, spoken in the presence of a Welshman who had paid you a retainer to proceed in suit against government servants who had grossly violated his constitutionally secured civil rights, when you told him that you were NOT going to do what he had paid you to do. Now, I understand that you are also renegeing on my case for which the STATE has paid you quite handsomely. Perhaps another term would be more appropriate?

"reminded him that I am Welsh; ethnic slur"

"Refuses to go forward with Van Duesen or Paladin henceforth; 'paying clients' who take counsel (as opposed to Gartin and Chas)"

That was my question Mr. Miller. Please IMMEDIATELY return all associated files so that I can begin to prepare to go forward without your assistance. No need to get angry about it. I can handle the details. I'm very disappointed with you, but I'm not mad at you. Since you committed Pamela to the drug rehab center, you have not had much of a legal practice to rely on. It is difficult to proceed in a library science profession when you refuse to read anything except fiction novels. Without Pamela's skills there is little assistance that you can offer, and it now appears even less that you are willing to.

"refuses to use e-mail; bite you in your ass. Too easy to write ill-considered sentences that come back to bite you in the ass."

Well Mr. Miller, you must recall that I told you that when you attempted to squeeze another \$5000 out of Harold Brown by wire transfer before you would agree to meet with him and Kevin to discuss the case they had paid you to consummate. I told you then that it was a bad idea to email that communiqué - and it did indeed cause a problem for you.

"threatens Gartin with Conviction on 8th for disseminating information"

It occurs to me that you have threatened all of your clients with jail, I'm not sure that is ethical behaviour Mr. Miller.

"contempt of court"

You are not the only one who knows the respect I have for the Honorable Leland Paul Anderson. I'm a bit surprised that you would make such a statement, but then again, you have threatened many of your client with similar thinly veiled comments. If Judge Anderson finds

offense with anything I have done, I will be anxious to offer him an apology in open court.

"could have won a week ago, but Gartin has damaged his case with copying in people on e-mails and Doc can no longer represent Gartin"

Well Mr. Miller, you are the one who asked me to gather a crowd for you. As a matter of fact, you said something along the line of "your case will go 6 times better with 60 people in the gallery than with 10 and your life depends on it." I have simply complied with your demands as best I could under the threat that you relayed to me. Estep and Clyman have spent years investigating every aspect of my life . . . right up to present. I have nothing to hide from anyone, anywhere and certainly nothing to hide from Judge Leland Anderson. I fail to understand what information you take exception to. Would it be asking too much that you explain, with specificity, what you are referring to?

I am yet unclear as to *when* you intend to "welsh" on this current case. Do you plan to be there on the 8th, or are you "welshing" today?

Since you have decided to "welsh" on the Paladin case and the Van Dusen case, please return the entire case files, records and any notes, communications and etc. immediately and do NOT set them out on the curb to be recycled as you did the records of the active case which is at issue on the 8th of April and still before the Supreme Court on several original jurisdiction writs. You can deliver them to Chas in lieu of destroying or disseminating them at random.

Please also provide me with your communications and all information on the Flagstaff case and the restraining order case at your earliest convenience.

I understand that you have some very serious anger management issues Mr. Miller, but there is no need to be vitriolic and vituperative with Chas. He has no control or influence over my behaviour and it seems inappropriate to expose an attorney/client relationship to outside parties.

It is unfortunate that you have decided to refuse to communicate by email, especially when I have no other means to communicate at present. You have long known and been fully aware that I do not have a postal address, and for the next few days I cannot communicate by phone; but I'm sure you notice the time stamps on all of the communications you have relayed to me through Chas and Frank. I can and will respond to any of your communications IMMEDIATELY via email. I trust that you will rise to minimal standards of professional performance and communicate with me directly, rather than to relay messages through third parties. At least Frank is still my court appointed Private Investigator and as such has a vested interest in relaying your phone messages. Chas has his own life to consider and is not a party to this case. The cases to which he would have been party are the ones that you have already "welshed" on during our meeting at Chas' house on 4 March 2004, and it is appropriate ethics to speak of those cases in his presence, particularly in light of the fact that he paid you to proceed on those cases.

If you see fit to continue to refuse to communicate with me by email concerning the court appearance on the 8th, please relay that information through Frank, you have his number and email.

Once again, I must ask for your submissions to the court and any replies that Marlene Langfield may have made by now. It appears from this email from Chas that you are withdrawing from this case immediately and I must make preparations to continue un-represented only two days from now. I will expect that information immediately.

I sincerely hope you can manage your anger and proceed in a professional manner to resolve these active issues with some slight modicum of integrity.

Truly,

Steve Gartin
sheriffsteve@justice.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Steve Gartin [mailto:gartin@intergate.com]
Sent: Monday, April 05, 2004 11:21 AM
To: Doc Miller; Judith; Frank
Cc: Chas Clements; Caroline M. Stapleton; Pamela Hadas
Subject: Doc's Angermanagement Issues

Good morning Doc,

Chas relayed your message of 9:15 AM 4.5.04

"doc miller calls, incensed at Gartin's last e-mail of Sunday."

I suppose that would be this message:

Doc Miller,

Your refusal to read or communicate with me is creating difficulty in your competent representation of my case and my interests. You have requested information REPEATEDLY that is contained in the Supreme Court Brief. Please simply READ and quit asking me the same questions over and over.

The BIG BLACK wall of NONcommunication is creating problems. I would like you to please take advantage of my long, arduous and continuing effort to communicate with you and to make you available for communication from your other clients.

Turning on your FAX machine is a small thing to ask Doc.

With fond regards,

Steve Douglas, Gartin (your client)

Saturday, March 13, 2004

Good Evening Mr. Miller,

Sunday, April 04, 2004

I realize that it is Sunday evening and that you will not see this communiqué until afternoon tomorrow when you and "Cookie" awaken, but I have not heard from you in recent history and I hope to be in line for your attention when you decide to consider your professional obligations to your clients. After the untold hours of teaching you to communicate on line and the great

expense I have carried to make sure that you have email and websites, it seem that the only means of communication I can prod from you is the FAX machine, so I will endeavor one more time to get your attention by FAX at the risk of being accused of felony FAXing again.

As you are aware, your agreement with Marlene Langfield that I will not file any lawsuits expires in less than a week. I don't know what all agreements you intend to "welsh" on, besides the one that Chas retained you to pursue, so during this period of constructive confinement I want to prepare the VanDusen suit, whether or not you intend to participate as you have promised. I have asked you several questions concerning when Renita O'Ferrill was charged, when she was convicted, or plead; and what the charges were against her and what her sentence was, but you have not yet responded to several email requests. I understand that you have lost the first 35 pages of the discovery provided by Joe Gilmore in 01CR3011, which was recently dismissed against me; but I still need that information to prepare the Van Dusen suit. I would appreciate it if you would provide that information VIA email to me, or VIA FAX or phone to Chas or Frank – they are both email literate and can pass that information along to me if you would even be so kind as to call them with the information. I have requested information concerning pending matters, but have received no response from you what-so-ever. I trust that you will take time to email me the information I have requested concerning current and on-going cases. If you have somehow lost my emails or FAXes, ask Chas or Frank to send you copies or to read them over the phone.

Sincerely yours,
 Steve Gartin (your client)
sheriffsteve@justice.com

CC: Chas Clements
 Frank Pugliese
 Caroline Stapleton

www.kuntaosilat.net
www.kuntaosilat.com
www.thunderrock.net

"Doing his case harm."

Actually Mr. Miller, I assumed that this case was well in your control. I am concerned to know which matters you are "welching" on so that I can make preparations to proceed without you. You have assured me that you have the April 8th issues under control.

"Going after Frank for unprofessional conduct- contacting judge directly; aspects of case revealed; attorney-client relationship"

I fail to see what Frank has revealed that is not true, correct and germane to the issues before the Court. I think Judge Leland Anderson would be interested to know about the concerted conspiracy to prevent me from seeking redress of grievance from the terrible persecution I have been subject to.

"stop saying Gartins' life depends on it."

Mr. Miller, those were your exact words. You have informed me that Marlene Langfield and Gary Clyman are "out to get me" and even more adamant about "getting Chas." Have things changed?

"withdrawing from Gartin's case- not a slave or a combat soldier; attorney decisions on behalf of client interests"

Are you withdrawing BEFORE the final curtain call?

"incensed about being called 'welshing' "

That was your term Mr. Miller, spoken in the presence of a Welshman who had paid you a retainer to proceed in suit against government servants who had grossly violated his constitutionally secured civil rights, when you told him that you were NOT going to do what he had paid you to do. Now, I understand that you are also renegeing on my case for which the STATE has paid you quite handsomely. Perhaps another term would be more appropriate?

"reminded him that I am Welsh; ethnic slur"

"Refuses to go forward with Van Duesen or Paladin henceforth; 'paying clients' who take counsel (as opposed to Gartin and Chas)"

That was my question Mr. Miller. Please IMMEDIATELY return all associated files so that I can begin to prepare to go forward without your assistance. No need to get angry about it. I can handle the details. I'm very disappointed with you, but I'm not mad at you. Since you committed Pamela to the drug rehab center, you have not had much of a legal practice to rely on. It is difficult to proceed in a library science profession when you refuse to read anything except fiction novels. Without Pamela's skills there is little assistance that you can offer, and it now appears even less that you are willing to.

"refuses to use e-mail; bite you in your ass. Too easy to write ill-considered sentences that come back to bite you in the ass."

Well Mr. Miller, you must recall that I told you that when you attempted to squeeze another \$5000 out of Harold Brown by wire transfer before you would agree to meet with him and Kevin to discuss the case they had paid you to consummate. I told you then that it was a bad idea to email that communiqué - and it did indeed cause a problem for you.

"threatens Gartin with Conviction on 8th for disseminating information"

It occurs to me that you have threatened all of your clients with jail, I'm not sure that is ethical behaviour Mr. Miller.

"contempt of court"

You are not the only one who knows the respect I have for the Honorable Leland Paul Anderson. I'm a bit surprised that you would make such a statement, but then again, you have threatened many of your client with similar thinly veiled comments. If Judge Anderson finds offense with anything I have done, I will be anxious to offer him an apology in open court.

"could have won a week ago, but Gartin has damaged his case with copying in people on e-mails and Doc can no longer represent Gartin"

Well Mr. Miller, you are the one who asked me to gather a crowd for you. As a matter of fact, you said something along the line of "your case will go 6 times better with 60 people in the gallery than with 10 and your life depends on it." I have simply complied with your demands as best I could under the threat that you relayed to me. Estep and Clyman have spent years investigating every aspect of my life . . . right up to present. I have nothing to hide from anyone, anywhere and certainly nothing to hide from Judge Leland Anderson. I fail to understand what information you take exception to. Would it be asking to much that you explain, with specificity, what you are referring to?

I am yet unclear as to *when* you intend to "welsh" on this current case. Do you plan to be there on the 8th, or are you "welshing" today?

Since you have decided to "welsh" on the Paladin case and the Van Dusen case, please return the entire case files, records and any notes, communications and etc. immediately and do NOT set them out on the curb to be recycled as you did the records of the active case which is at issue on the 8th of April and still before the Supreme Court on several original jurisdiction writs. You can deliver them to Chas in lieu of destroying or disseminating them at random.

Please also provide me with your communications and all information on the Flagstaff case and the restraining order case at your earliest convenience.

I understand that you have some very serious anger management issues Mr. Miller, but there is no need to be vitriolic and vituperative with Chas. He has no control or influence over my behaviour and it seems inappropriate to expose an attorney/client relationship to outside parties.

It is unfortunate that you have decided to refuse to communicate by email, especially when I have no other means to communicate at present. You have long known and been fully aware that I do not have a postal address, and for the next few days I cannot communicate by phone; but I'm sure you notice the time stamps on all of the communications you have relayed to me through Chas and Frank. I can and will respond to any of your communications IMMEDIATELY via email. I trust that you will rise to minimal standards of professional performance and communicate with me directly, rather than to relay messages through third parties. At least Frank is still my court appointed Private Investigator and as such has a vested interest in relaying your phone messages. Chas has his own life to consider and is not a party to this case. The cases to which he would have been party are the ones that you have already "welshed" on during our meeting at Chas' house on 4 March 2004, and it is appropriate ethics to speak of those cases in his presence, particularly in light of the fact that he paid you to proceed on those cases.

If you see fit to continue to refuse to communicate with me by email concerning the court appearance on the 8th, please relay that information through Frank, you have his number and email.

Once again, I must ask for your submissions to the court and any replies that Marlene Langfield may have made by now. It appears from this email from Chas that you are withdrawing from this case immediately and I must make preparations to continue un-represented only two days from now. I will expect that information immediately.

I sincerely hope you can manage your anger and proceed in a professional manner to resolve these active issues with some slight modicum of integrity.

Truly,

Steve Gartin
sheriffsteve@justice.com