

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

**From:** [Gww1210@aol.com](mailto:Gww1210@aol.com) <Gordon Wayne Watts>

**Date:** Tue, 3 May 2016 01:52:59 -0400

**Subject:** "Case no: 2015-IN-03387" \*\*CONFIDENTIAL\*\* (A follow-up to my prior reply)

**To:** AKrawczyk@iardc.org, Gww1210@aol.com

**CC:** RGolden@iardc.org, RGreggio@iardc.org, gww1210@gmail.com

**Subject:** "Case no: 2015-IN-03387" \*\*CONFIDENTIAL\*\* (A follow-up to my prior reply)

**Mr. Krawczyk:**

This is Gordon Watts, who just emailed you a formal reply regarding "In re: Joseph Younes, in relation to Gordon Wayne Watts, case #: 2015-IN-03387." (See the attachments in this email, where I subsume your February reply to me in my response.)

By and large, everything I said is OK to share with the other parties, against whom I am complaining.

**However, there were two things that I did not mention in my "reply to all," because it was inappropriate** -or would otherwise compromise your investigation, so I am replying to you -- *privately* -- and including only you, your paralegal, Ms. Golden, and your co-counsel, Ms. Greggio, as cc recipients.

**\*\*\* #1** -- First off, Mr. Daniggelis desires to speak with you. That much I vaguely alluded to in my prior reply, but I did not mention that he and I spoke just yesterday, and that he finally withdrew his objections to pass along this information (and his phone number) to you. - Richard B. Daniggelis may be reached at 312-774-4742, but his sleeping hours are odd. He has finally learned how to use voicemail on a cell phone, but he may not be very good at it. (He tells me that he hopes to learn how to use email later this week, but I would not hold my breath on this.)

For your private consumption, I represent to you that Richard has said that he plans to pay you a visit, and address points with more clarity than I can: He reminds me in our conversations, as you might imagine, that he is the "principle" in this matter, and that is it "his" house: If he's said it once, he's said it a million times: "Gordon, I'm the general, and you're the private,..." -- It was primarily because of his prior objections that I did not include his contact information (or, if I did, not as much as I should have).

**\*\*\* #2** -- Secondly, however, you might wonder why I am even suggesting that you contact Daniggelis directly, since he has an attorney (which you pointed out in your reply)...

Well, while I think Andjelko Galic is a man of honour and integrity, I realised some issues that Daniggelis can confirm, if you want to verify my assertions:

Daniggelis is glad for the free representation, but he thinks that Galic has psychological problems, and is "narrow sighted" on what to do, reminding Daniggelis that he (Galic) is a lawyer, and that we (Daniggelis and myself) are not. However, there is a greater problem...

If you view the Law Division docket, GMAC v Daniggelis, 2007-CH-29738, before Hon. Sanjay T. Tailor (it has the same case number and style as the Chancery case that was 'transferred' to the Law Division), you will notice that Galic submitted to Judge Tailor a proposed order to strike or otherwise reject my *Amicus Curiae* brief and related filings.

If taken at "Face Value," without "looking deeper," I am guessing that the reader might either think that Galic is nutty and unbalanced (for indeed: What lawyer in his right mind would seek to strike friendly pleadings that help his case - and you've seen my pleadings: There is nothing 'nutty' about my pleadings, even if I am imperfect & human, etc.)...

Alternatively, you might think that I (myself) am nutty or otherwise unhinged: After all, Galic is an attorney, and I am not, and he is trying to win Daniggelis' case: Why would he have reason to lie? (In fact, one friend, not involved in this case, has told me that "he's the lawyer, Gordon, and you're not -- and if this guy wants you to butt out, you should.)

Galic privately text messaged me, and also emailed me, stating, effectively (paraphrase from memory): "Gordon, you might mean well and have good intentions, but your involvement in Richard's case is not helping it. Please do not involve yourself in it..."

Galic can confirm this -- and, you can see the order, proposed by Galic, in this attachment: "intervene-denied-2007-CH-29738.pdf," referring to the Nov. 16, 2015 order in said case.

So, why am I even telling you? ... I hesitated to tell you because some things are better left unspoken, and telling you might make me look like an idiot.

But, Richard and I discussed it, and he think, based on my description of you, Mr. Krawczyk, that you're a reasonable man, and that you won't let Galic's disfavour here cloud your decisionmaking, and that you won't use this "as an excuse" to throw my redress into the garbage,...

As a practical matter, should you contact Galic and ask to speak with Daniggelis, he might tell you that he doesn't want me to be involved. And, both Robert J. More as well as the anonymous friend referenced above tyhink it'd be 'wise' for me to tell you first, so you won't hear it later from Galic - and think I'm trying to conceal something from you.

This all "begs the question": Why in God's name, would Mr. Galic ask me to butt out if I've raised a few points that he missed, and spoken well of him, telling the court that he's missed a few things - but still done a good job?

Well, only 2 people \*really\* know that answer to this (Galic - and God, Himself), and neither one is saying. (In fact, when I asked Galic what his objections were, he said smarted back & rhetorically asked to the effect: What? Did I think he had all the time in the world to answer my question...)

Mr. Daniggelis and I also discussed this: Again, I can not speak for Galic, but Richard and I both think that Mr. Galic is afraid that my involvement may "irritate" the judges, and that the judges are dishonest or otherwise corrupt, and that by giving the appearance of opposing me, it might "get on their good side," and win the case.

This assessment is not without precedent, Mr. Krawczyk: Not only does your state (Illinois) have a history of corruption (so does my state, Florida, for what it's worth, I'm not poking fun at Chicago-style corruptions), but moreover, look at the Law Division docket: Hon. James P. Flannery falsely claimed that I was representing another person. (See the attached "298-denied.pdf" file -- or see the court's docket -- to confirm.) That claim is a bald-faced lie: I am representing myself - *pro se* - and asking to be allowed to submit a friend of the court brief.

Why even a Federal Appeals court allowed me to participate as an Amicus (see the "FEDERAL-COURT-Order-on-Citro-and-Watts-motions.pdf" attachment -- or view the Federal docket if you doubt me here). What is the problem with these little trial courts not letting a Good Samaritan participate as an *Amicus*? One would think I was asking the court to offer their first-born child as a sacrifice! Or, maybe, that I was asking them to give me a Million dollars!

So, why are these courts not only resistant to my participation as an Amicus, but also (even after ALL THESE YEARS!!) still unable to offer a 'why' to explain that 'what' in judge Otto's court order snatching title away from Daniggelis?

I know that judges sometimes say that they need not offer an explanation for their orders - and maybe this is 'caselaw' in your state (I do not rightly know), but... If the courts can not explain their decisions, then - as a practical matter - and a moral issue -- I think they have something to hide, and are corrupt. (I explain my reasons, right or wrong: Why can't all these judges, surely much smarter than you and me combined!)

So, in conclusion, I understand that at this stage of your investigation, all my complaints are "confidential," and, while my email to you may eventually become "public," I don't have anything to hide, and am OK with you disclosing this email in a public records request -- or to the other parties -- should you need to question them about it.

However, for the time being, all that is in this particular email -- to you, Ms. Golden, and Atty. Greggio, I would appreciate you keeping it confidential for the time being. If you have to disclose certain things in my email, here, in the

court of your investigation, I will trust you to use your best judgment - and, on that point, I will not second-guess your judgement, and only wish you the best, but, for obvious reasons, please keep this much confidential, for whatever time is necessary to complete your investigation.

Since I am asking your help in investigating corruption, it is incumbent upon me to meet you halfway, and do what I can: If I can be of any assistance you -- in my limited human capacity, please let me know. If you have any questions, please feel free to call, write, or email me.

Sincerely,

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

[www.GordonWayneWatts.com](http://www.GordonWayneWatts.com) / [www.GordonWatts.com](http://www.GordonWatts.com)

**BS, The Florida State University, Biological & Chemical Sciences;**

**Class of 2000, double major with honours**

**AS, United Electronics Institute, Class of 1988, Valedictorian**

**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](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**<http://GordonWayneWatts.com> / <http://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**