

Replying to Atty Herrell's response care of her office staff // Gordon W. Watts

Gordon Watts <gww1210@gmail.com>

Wed, May 2, 2018 at 7:19 PM

To: legalservices@logiklegal.org, sherrell-dcs <sherrell-dcs@juno.com>, sabrina@invisionunow.com Cc: "Gww1210@aol.com" <gww1210@aol.com>, Gordon Watts <gww1210@gmail.com> Bcc: "Gww12102002@yahoo.com" <gww12102002@yahoo.com>, Gordon Watts <gordonwaynewatts@aol.com>, Gordon Watts <gordonwaynewatts@hotmail.com>

My apologies for the delay in replying, Atty. Herrell and staff: Yesterday, when I went to my bank to make a deposit, the teller informed me that the \$20.00 bill, which my father had given me (to increase my 'Available Balance' and help pay your consultation fee was *counterfeit*, and I had to make a *_2nd_* trip to to the bank). Then, after that, I was e-served a Notice of Appearance by plaintiff/appellee, GMAC, in one case, and had to update my online docket to include the new filing (my 'own' docket where you may view & download all the key filings in my case--without paying a Records Search fee to the court. THEN, I noticed the DOJ snooping around my website's online docket page (which is what I'd asked them to do in a recent phone call to the Eastern Division, Northern District US Atty in Illinois), as I felt there were Federal civil and criminal rights violations, as well as state laws broken). [[[See the attachments for the appearance, or see below: "BankStatement-and-US_DOJ-visits-my-OnlineDocket.pdf" "Wed02AMay2018_1-18-0091_GMAC_NoticeOfAppearance.pdf"]]]

On Wed, May 2, 2018 at 8:45 AM, LOGIK Legal LLC <legalservices@logiklegal.org> wrote:

THIS E-MAIL/FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION, INCLUDING FILES AND ATTACHMENTS, MAY CONTAIN CONFIDENTIAL AND ATTORNEY PRIVILEGED INFORMATION FOR THE ADDRESSED INDIVIDUAL(S), OR AGENT(S) THEREOF, ONLY. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OR YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS E-MAIL/FACSIMILE BY ERROR, IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY THE SENDER AND PROPERLY DESTROY THIS COMMUNICATION, WITHOUT READING. ANY IMPROPER USE, COPYING, PRINTING, DISSEMINATION, OR DISTRIBUTION IS PROHIBITED AND PUNISHABLE BY LAW.

ANY MISDIRECTED DELIVERY OF THIS E-MAIL/FACSIMILE MESSAGE DOES NOT WAIVE THE ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGE OR OTHERWISE MAKE PUBLIC CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION AS CONTAINED HEREIN. THIS COMMUNICATION DOES NOT FORM ANY CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATION ON BEHALF OF THE SENDER, ITS EMPLOYER, OR THE EMPLOYER'S PARENT COMPANY, AFFILIATES OR SUBSIDIARIES.

NEITHER THE SENDER NOR ITS EMPLOYER IS RESPONSIBLE FOR DAMAGES CAUSED BY ANY VIRUS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS E-MAIL/FACSIMILE MESSAGE.

I think you misunderstood Ms. Herrell and my message to you.

**** My apologies -- I don't do this every day, so I am not an expert, here...

The normal consultation fee is \$200. It does not have to do with if this office did any work on your case. That is the consultation fee at the beginning of an matter. But you are on appeal and in the supreme court so more of a review is necessary.

**** OK, Gotcha on that... A workmam is worthy of his or her wages, the Bible says, so your fee is justified --which is why I made a Herculean effort to move heaven & earth & make *repeated* visits to friends & relatives, call in favours, and then make repeated visits to my bank, to keep increasing the Available Balance...

There are a lot more documents to review.

**** You may obtain ALL the documents in this (and related) cases at one of the following 3 places: **** 1) The Circuit, Appeals, and Supreme Courts -- but they charge a 'hefty' Public Records fee! **** 2) http://GordonWatts.com/MortgageFraudCourtDocs/DOCKET-MortgageFraudCase.html

**** 3) http://gordonWAYNEwatts.com/MortgageFraudCourtDocs/DOCKET-MortgageFraudCase.html

**** The Chancery case, 2007-CH-29737, on my on-line docket above, was transfered to the Law Division, and it is the same case, with the same case *number*, and is the case which is presently active in Circuit, Appellate, and Supreme Courts --and (confidential!) is being reviewed --upon my request --by the Cook County State's Atty office and the US Attorney for the Northern District (Eastern Division, who is contacting the FBI for documents that the latter requested of me on this matter), and which the Atty General's Office may pick back up (like they were planning to do with Lessie Towns' complaints, tho I don't find any mention of an investigation in my own research), but time will tell...

Ms. Herrell cannot just review a brief that is in court now,

**** By the way, in both Exhibit-M (relationship diagram, with a photo of Gov. Pat Quinn visiting Lessie Towns), and in my Statement of the Case/Facts (and in my own news coverage), I give positive review of Ms. Herrell's handing of the Towns case, and included it in my Rule 383 Motion to the IL Supreme Ct because it is a related case that involved some of the same parties as in *my* case...

she has to go back through the file from beginning to end. If this is not what you want Ms. Herrell understands but is not willing to do a partial review with partial information so this office may not be able to help you.

**** I am OK with a full review of the case by your office staff, paralegals, and attorneys -- indeed, when Mr. Daniggelis told *me* of a duplicate signature, that is precisely what *I* did (as my on--line docket demonstrates, where I post all the filings, e.g., you may **read** the briefs, and not merely see a cryptic docket entry) --- And, I was not paid a DIME to do the background research -- it all came "out of pocket" (e.g., "pro bono," had I been a lawyer, but I'm merely a pro se nonLawyer.)

**** As I gave my word that I would make a 100% attempt to pay your \$400.oo filing fee (and supply the required photo ID, court docs, etc.), I will keep my word to you (not unlike how I was the **ONLY** party in these cases to comply with Rule 11(a), and actually serve ALL the parties!!)...

******** Here is what I was able to do in that regard:

****\$137.95 Available Balance, when I 1st contacted you. (See attached PDF of my bank statement for documentation of this, and see USPS service fees for why I didn't have more money in my bank acct.)
**** I got word from the IL Supreme Court that my *In Forma Pauperis* motion had been granted yesterday, freeing up \$50.00+ in cash on hand I held in 'escrow' in case I had to pay a filing fee ----

****(Deposit of \$79.88 cash on hand, but one bill was a counterfeit \$20.00 LOL...) -- <u>New Balance: \$217.83</u> ****(Had to purchase Carpet Flea Sprays for our cats: -16.81) -- <u>New Balance: \$201.02</u>

****(After much begging/arguments,... Got a **replacement** \$20.00 bill from my father to replace the counterfeit one + \$6.00 donation from my best friend's mother, Norma, + \$8.45 donation from my best friend, Richey = \$34.45 cash in hand: But I had to spend \$3.45 for gas, as I'd given my word that this was, at least, somewhat, for gas --and I was on an empty tank, too --- \$31.00 Cash on Hand)

****(Deposit \$31.oo -- Made 2nd trip to bank to do this) ---- AVAILABLE BALANCE: \$232.02

OK, you requested \$400.00, but this is all I have on hand, so it is what it is... and this means that these are the only possible "solutions" to the current set of variables:

* SOLUTION 1: I pay \$232.02 by Credit Card (or a little less, if using PayPal, which is 0.30 flat fee + 2.9% fee), and the other \$167.98 is paid by one (or a combination) of the following methods:

*** (A) *Pro Bono* (for free -- some attorney do that)

*** (B) Percentage of court awards (Some attorneys charge no initial fee, and don't charge unless they win, so as you all would get some initial fee, this is even a better deal for you, especially since you all are smart attorneys, and capable of winning this case Big Time/ Major League.

*** (C) You could do a 'partial' review, but both your law firm -- and I, myself -- don't want you to do a 'halfway' job, so option '(C)' is off the table, unless you all get bored and have lots of free time.

SOLUTION 2: Your law firm does NOT take the case (which is your choice), but you *MAY* do any one (or a combination) of the following things:

*** (A) Speak to the news media, and give a press release. (Mr. Daniggelis told me that Sabrina promised him that she would advocate this matter to the news media, should he need it, and, while

she could not confirm this due to confidentiality issues, I am not bound by Attorney/Client rules, and I will confirm the veracity of this statement -- and, you may, and I'd like, you to lean on the Free Press to expose evil, and save the little guys -- myself, who is owed moneys via mechanic's lien, and, of course, my elderly friend who owes me these fees, and who was made HOMELESS via title-theft mortgage fraud.

*** (B) File a supporting Amicus Curiae brief in any of my cases (especially Watts v Flannery, no. 123481, in the IL Supreme Ct)

*** (C) No matter your religion (or lack thereof), I would covet and appreciate sincere prayers for me in this regard, as I've done all I can humanly do to help my friend (and myself).

1st PS: Your "sherrell-dcs@juno.com" is over disk quota, and my last emails to this got returned; you might want to delete some large attachments, once they are scanned & downloaded.

2nd PS: Since I would necessarily make myself 100% broke, and draw my Bank Account down to \$0.00, were you to do a 'full' review of my case, via a consultation and review, I would then be **helpless** and financially unable to file (print up, serve by mail, etc.) and future responses, motions, etc., should that be necessary. Therefore, should you chose solution #1, above, and review & consult, for me, I would almost certainly need to retain you, either "pro bono" or for a fee (a percentage of the awards, and I am OK with a 50%-50% split between me and your law firm, should we win the case together). -- Should you chose option #1, therefore, I would almost certainly need for your firm to enter an appearance for me to address any new litigation (see below, and see the 2 small PDF attachments in my email, here).

Whether or not your firm is able to do anything for me, represent me, consult, speak to the press, or refer me to someone else ... Rest assured that I think the world of your lead attorney, Sabrina Herrell, and the rest of your attorneys and staff, for you all are the things of which legends are made -- you all are top-notch living legends, for what you all did in both the Lessie Towns case -- and what you all are doing more currently -- people of honour, dedication, respect, and integrity.*** Regardless of how this pans out, I wish you all the best in your future endeavors, moving forward.

Oh, 1 last thing: Even if your office can't take my case, understand this: If I lose, it will 'send a message' that all that we've learned in the "Lessie Towns" case (namely that it is THEFT and BULLYING of the elderly and poor will NOT be tolerated) is forgotten, and it will be "open season" on theft from the elderly -- and give a 'Green Light' to all those Rich/Powerful bullies... How many *others* will they keep bullying? This must stop, but the *ONLY* way is will stop (barring some miracle) is for me to win my case, as, notice, my case is about the strongest case for justice to date: If even my case loses, this will send a coded message or a signal that ANY elderly victim can be bullied or harassed... Is that right -- oh, really?... so you see how losing is not an option -- whether or not you can help me, losing is not an option.

Gordon Wayne Watts

LOGIK Legal LLC Post Office Box 43504 Chicago, Illinois 60643 P: 773.568.5620 F: 888.78LOGIK (888.785.6445) E: legalservices@logiklegal.org

On Wed, May 2, 2018 at 3:26 PM, <no-reply@tylerhost.net> wrote:



Notification of Service

Case Number: 1-18-0091 Case Style: GMAC Mortgage, LLC v. Watts, Gordon Wayne Envelope Number: 985801

This is a notification of service for the filing listed. Please click the link below to retrieve the submitted document.

Filing Details	
Case Number	1-18-0091
Case Style	GMAC Mortgage, LLC v. Watts, Gordon Wayne
Date/Time Submitted	5/2/2018 12:45 PM CST
Filing Type	\$\$\$filingtype
Filing Description	Appearance for Appellee
Filed By	Rosa Tumialan
Service Contacts	Other Service Contacts not associated with a party on the case: Rosa Tumialan (rtumialan@dykema.com) Dawn Williams (dwilliams@dykema.com) Gordon Watts (Gww1210@gmail.com)

Document Details	
Served Document	Download Document
This link is active for 45 days.	

If the link above is not accessible, copy this URL into your browser's address bar to view the document: https://illinois.tylerhost.net/ViewServiceDocuments.aspx?ADMIN=0&SID=afe9abb1-9a27-4c7b-a46b-9f6c2490b5d8

Gordon Wayne Watts, editor-in-chief, The Register

www.GordonWayneWatts.com / www.GordonWatts.com

ALWAYS FAITHFUL - TO GOD

BS, The Florida State University, Biological & Chemical Sciences

AS, United Electronics Institute

821 Alicia Road, Lakeland, FL 33801-2113

Home: (863) 688-9880 Work: (863) 686-3411 Voice&FAX: (863) 687-6141 Cell: (863)409-2109 See also: http://Gordon_Watts.Tripod.com/consumer.html

Gww1210@aol.com ; Gww12102002@Yahoo.com

Truth is the strongest, most stable force in the Universe

Truth doesn't change because you disbelieve it

TRUTH doesn't bend to the will of tyrants

www.GordonWayneWatts.com / www.GordonWatts.com

Get Truth.

"First, they [Nazis] came for the Jews. I was silent. I was not a Jew. Then they came for the Communists. I was silent. I was not a Communist. Then they came for the trade unionists. I was silent. I was not a trade unionist. Then they came for me. There was no one left to speak for me." (Martin Niemöller, given credit for a quotation in The Harper Religious and Inspirational Quotation Companion, ed. Margaret Pepper (New York: Harper &Row, 1989), 429 -as cited on page 44, note 17, of Religious Cleansing in the American Republic, by Keith A. Fornier, Copyright 1993, by Liberty, Life, and Family Publications.

Some versions have Mr. Niemöller saying: "Then they came for the Catholics, and I didn't speak up, because I was a Protestant"; other versions have him saying that they came for Socialists, Industrialists, schools, the press, and/or the Church; however, it's certain he DID say SOMETHING like this. Actually, they may not have come for the Jews first, as it's more likely they came for the prisoners, mentally handicapped, & other so-called "inferiors" first -as historians tell us -so they could get "practiced up"; however, they did come for them -due to the silence of their neighbors -and due in part to their own silence. So: "Speak up now or forever hold your peace!"-GWW

2 attachments

- BankStatement-and-US_DOJ-visits-my-OnlineDocket.pdf
- Wed02AMay2018_1-18-0091_GMAC_NoticeOfAppearance.pdf 17K