



Gordon Watts <gww1210@gmail.com>

Paul, this is Gordon, again... Something odd's happening...

Gww1210@aol.com <Gww1210@aol.com>

Wed, May 17, 2017 at 7:00 AM

To: plshelton@sbcglobal.net

Cc: Gww1210@aol.com, gww1210@gmail.com

Ah, that's the difference between a mere notice of deposition and an official & binding subpoena. Thank you for your detailed analysis, Paul. While your analysis seems foreign to me (and frankly a surprise that I wasn't expecting!), I must assume both possibilities could be true, and look at them for plausibility:

First off, while schemers & scoundrels do exist, I don't think it likely that Daniggelis would risk outright losing the house without any documented payment (other than a few home-improvement loans) for the chance to "get it for free," something I think he would view as unlikely. So, while - theoretically - your analysis is possible, I think it improbably or unlikely. Schemers, who try to steal elderly peoples' houses (those who are seeking refinancing, investors, etc.), also exist, and I think this possibility is more likely/probably. That's just my take, but thank you for the positive feedback on both my legal arguments and your well-wishes for me & my endeavors.

Actually, I *didn't* know the distinction between the notice and the actual subpoena, but then again, I'm not a lawyer (and barely even a legend in my own mind anymore!).

Now, if Rich were dishonest, as you suppose, why would he repeatedly adjure me to be respectful to my mother, listen to me & give me feedback when I want his opinion (like you're being kind enough to do), to listen to his (sometimes longwinded) analyses, and fight so hard for his house, with the aim of doing justice. A wronged person fights much harder. And, remember, he credits you for being much more honest than Younes, which, I think, he would not do were he dishonest. And, while he is as angry as hell (or putting on a good show!), he insists that he does not want to do Younes and great harm more-than necessary to get his house back.

He insists that vindictive and petty vengeance is not morally right, and insists that he believes God will use this matter to show how both courts and "the average Joe" are all dishonest and corrupt, and that we need Jesus to help us be honest and follow god's ways; he has repeatedly said this, and as a man thinketh in his heart, so he does and speaks, and this suggests that you're reading him wrongly. **Also, it was *your* notary seal on the POA, which magically appeared on it after it was signed, scanned, & entered into the court record, suggesting it was probably signed after-the-fact --unless you carried a portable scanner with you when you presented it to him to sign, but I think this highly unlikely, and moreover, why would you scan in a signed, but not notarized, copy -- and then notarize it and scan in a 2nd image? That makes no sense to me, and I'm sure you notarized it after the fact, getting the document from Erika, the black girl, who I thinm met him at a local Starbucks.**

Since you haven't refuted my belief that you probably did notarize it after the fact (and didn't witness it), I believe you were guilty on this point. Either you were guilty of notary without witnessing or not -- but either way, I don't want to bury you or kick you while you're down. **I know it can be hard & risky to address this, but whether you're guilty of the notarizing the POA after-the-fact (and without seeing him sign it) or not, you should address the matter truthfully, and quickly.** Get it out of the way. (Also, Daniggelis used you let poor people stay in his house's 1st floor, i hear from multiple sources, and I think he's more honest than you see, so please be open to that possibility.)

While I don't fully agree with you, thank you for trying to help me. Nonetheless, King Saul, ISRAEL'S first king, was guilty of offering sacrifices, and not obedience, as the books of Samuel in the Old Testament Bible recount. Please don't let that happen to you -- it's good that you care about others' welfare (such as me) and try to clarify tough legal knots, but please also protect and defend yourself. You can be of NO use as an "American National," whatever that is, if you let your name/reputation be marred by the "notary without witnessing" allegation (whether

true or not), and this all will prevent you from fighting for truly just causes (which I still think applies to Richard Daniggelis' case, notwithstanding your views). Even if Rich is dishonest, 2 wrongs make not a right, and we must fight the greater evils, and deal with Rich later. We must fight our own battles of honour and justice - and not be distracted by other things.

Gordon

In a message dated 5/16/2017 11:14:43 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time, plshelton@sbcglobal.net writes:

Gordan:

My main point about the Deed is that Richard sent the woman to the closing, with the knowledge and expectation that the property was being sold to Younes. So, in equity, he expected and authorized the transaction.

But, Richard is a liar and a scammer. He acted exactly as expected, and claimed the house was stolen from him, he never aithorized transfer, the deed was a forgery, etc.

Bottom line, Kharma is a bitch. What was expected to happen did finally happen. He continues to squat, pushing his lie and scam. A scorpion can still sting, even after the head is cut off. he was at the end of the line with refinancing, another bank was after the house in foreclsoure and he is very clever. ou as a legal consultant (and a good lawyer too) can always make an argument for this guy...many scammers and liars have a legal argument...but the story is what it is...he is writhing and fighting as best he can.

Its not a complete anaology, but makes the case: the guy who murders someone, but gets away with it due to a legal technicality...he still did the act...

Richard is dumb like a fox...Hell he has gotten you to waste a lot of time an energy, when that time could have been spent on many others who really deserve it...

Alot of your legal arguments are very valid...but you are fighting for a liar and scammer. I firmly believe that. Your resources are being wasted in the eyes of God.

As for the subpoena versus Notice, the Notice of Dep was issued and I assume LaRocque agreed to appear; that's a much more agreeable situation...once the Judge allows you to issue a Subpoena for Dep it is a required appearance when served, at a set date and place, and the deponent can be held in contempt for not appearing...Not sure what the lawyer's thinking is...But you probably knew all that...

Blessings brother

Paul

[Quoted text hidden]