

jn21-15protctr.tripod.com/esscomptheftdl072318in.html

Document List of 072318 in re ESS Comp Theft - SS

1. D/L of 072318 - ESS SS
2. Proposed... Order of 011818
3. Petition to CPD, CCSA and/or CCCC, IL of 011818
4. Disclaimers
5. Subpoena of 011818
6. Questions of 011818 for CPD Regarding Evidentiary Sufficiency ESS Computer Theft from Robert J. More Concerns
7. Reverse Martial Law Declaration of Unconstitutionality of ...Laws Remedy
8. Issue of Allocation of Resources
9. First Superseding Complaint in re More et al v ESS et al
10. Superseding Component of 072318 Constituting an Amended Complaint in More et al v ESS et al X
11. Issue of Indemnification of Risk and Responsibility for Possibility of Error(s)
12. Authorization of Investigators to Discuss Case Concerns with Persons Other Than Robert J. More
13. Complaint Forms for Complaints Against ISMA Members
14. RJM References
15. Copy of the document delivered to Supt Counsel C. Valiente after police board mtg on 011818

Entries included herein supra adjacent to which there is an "X" have been included in the collection of documents efiled on 072318 in the case this conveyance concerns

Entry # 10 from D/L ...072318

Superseding Component of 072318 Constituting an Amended Complaint in More et al v ESS et al X

Circuit Court of Cook County, IL

Robert J. More et al

v

18M1010368

1. Extra Space Storage Facility 729, Unit 1214 on 072316 at 6:00 a.m. Gate Accesser Whose Name is Yet Unknown, 2. Extra Space Storage Co. 3. 5' Tall Woman Gate Accesser at 6:30 a.m. on 072316, 4. Chicago Police Department, 5. CPD Detective F. Roman, 6. CPD Warrant Officer A. Godbolt, 7. CPD Sgt. Lash, 8. CCCC, IL "Judge" L. Wool, 9. CCCC, IL Judge _ Ryan, 10. Cook County State's Attorney's Office, 11. CCCC, IL Chief Judge Timothy Evans, 12. Cook County Sheriff Thomas Dart

Superseding Verified Component of 072318 of Original Complaint Filed in this Case, Converting Defendants Extra Space Storage and CPD from Respondents in Discovery Pursuant to IL Sup. Ct. Rule 224, into Conventional Defendants and Adding the Other Individuals Listed in the Caption of this Complaint as Defendants in this Case Plead in Abbreviated Format Postulated in IL Supreme Court Rule 281

Introduction:

The following constitutes excerpts from the "Proposed Release and Satisfaction" which RJM delivered to Extra Space Storage ("ESS") via its Site Manager for Facility 729 on 011618:

2. RJM is convinced that Extra Space Storage Incurred Tort and/or Breach of Contract Liability in not providing any information to its customers and/or inquirers into the issue of renting (a) unit(s) from ESS, notifying such type activity conductors that at the time of such thefts [ie. 0722 and 0723 of 2016 in re the thefts this document concerns], that video records of activity conducted in the ESS Facility at 707 W. Harrison St. ("729") were not available to customers at any given juncture renting any unit(s) from ESS at such facility via the transmission of a petition, request and/or demand wherefore from any given customer having submitted a police report of theft and/or trespass, in any given instance, to ESS subsequent to the completion of the perpetration of any given theft and/or trespass.

3. The principles that "innocence not suffer and guilt not go unpunished" and "Qui nocentibus parcit, innocentibus punit" ("he who spares the guilty punishes the innocent") are of paramount importance in the preservation and at this juncture in history, recovery of the protections of the non-counterfeit version of the Rule of Law.

4. Since RJM did not incur bodily injury from the thefts concerned, and given the burdens involved and demonstrable evident eternal opportunity cost of RJM's laboring to procure criminal convictions regarding such thefts, ESS'es evident culpability in not informing its customers of the inavailability to customers of video footage concerning any crime which might ever be committed upon ESS property, and the overall priorities according to which the component of activity of ESS in regard to which RJM is cognizant has been conducted since ESS purchased the Storage Facility in issue from Storage USA, at this juncture the evident least difficult to justify alternative course of

activity for RJM to adopt is to inform ESS that RJM will sign a proposed release and satisfaction regarding such thefts, if ESS remits the sum of \$1000.00 USD to Attorney Thomas Dixon in Osceola, IN immediately to be deposited into a fund from which RJM can not access any funds except for the distribution of vouchers for the purpose of enforcing the protections of the contract the Constitution of the nominal u.s. of A. constitutes and/or otherwise securing the future of such nominal nation against the horrors of euthanasia and the genocide via democide agenda which has been in the process of implementation in such nation during the period in which the theft this document concerns was perpetrated). <<<end.

At this juncture, given the entirety of factors evidently requiring consideration regarding the matters this document concerns, RJM finds it necessary to file an amended complaint in this case in order to get the John and Jane Does whom RJM suspects perpetrated the thefts concerned, included wherein by the second anniversary of the actual perpetrations concerned, such that it will continue to be the case, that if ESS and/or some other Defendant included herein does not provide the consideration necessary to now eliminate RJM's detriment incurrment emanating from the activity conducted by those included herein as Defendants in this complaint, respectively, that "but for" ESS'es non-provision of a.) at least the video capture of the activity conducted in Facility 729 ("ESS 729", "ESS Facility 729", "729") at the junctures of such thefts, in the areas germane to the identification of the perpetrators whereof, or b.) such video capture and the names of those whose activity was captured in such videos, that RJM could have procured the civil legal remedy of a judgment for conversion, such that no exculpation from what RJM remains convinced constitutes ESS's liability in this regard could ever end up in existence via the positing of any legitimate claim that any non-recovery by RJM from the tortfeasor-criminal theft-perpetrators in this matter could be attributed to any non, mis and/or mal feausance of RJM in such regard. It is the theory of tort liability which the SCOTUS referenced in *Monroe v Pape* (U.S.), "...that requires a man to bear responsibility for his actions" upon which RJM relies in this amended complaint.

In a nutshell, it is RJM's understanding that ESS'es burden to provide RJM protection from the thefts concerned - which required nothing more than including anywhere in the version of the lease operative between ESS and RJM on 0722 and 0723 of 2016 notice that the product of the surveillance cameras operative in ESS Facility 729 at such time was not available to ESS 729 customers, independently of any third party over whose activity any given customer would not possess control, such as the local police, was so minute, that ESS must in RJM's understanding, in justice be required to bring the perpetrator's to justice and enable RJM to recover what he has lost to this juncture or else to bear the burden of the reasonably foreseeable consequences of what RJM understands to constitute RJM's "rationally predicated reliance" upon the understanding from RJM's prior experience in RJM's having been provided access to such video product in identifying Vincent Yarborough's theft of RJM's bike wheel (in that case within 40 hours of the theft), that leaving a unit unsecured while departing such facility for a few minutes at any given juncture was so unlikely to result in any incurrment of detriment (because of evident deterrent effect of the difficulty to which any thief would be subjected in avoiding observation constituting an adequate evidentiary basis for apprehension, given the evidence accessible from such cameras regarding the activity ever conducted in and

around any given unit at any given time) that compared to the utility of not having to reload everything ever removed from the unit in any given instance into the unit in order to close and lock the door whereof and then have to re-unload such things upon returning whereto in order to complete any given task ever in need of accomplishment via the use of materials stored in any such unit at any given juncture, the alternative of just leaving the unit unlocked was substantially more attractive than that of implementing the laborious measures described herein - which consequences ended up consisting of the costs of the devices and materials stolen and the comparatively enormous burden which RJM bore after such thefts, and thru January of 2017 in endeavoring to get criminal charges instituted against the thieves within the 18 month SOL for theft of less than \$500 (as RJM still has not found any treatment of the issue of whether the work product upon a processing device is supposed to be included in the amount of loss via a theft whereof), when at every juncture, ESS could have simply provided the entities and/or information RJM needed to RJM.

RJM is in no way expecting ESS to reject the business of those who seek to rent units from it based upon the criteria RJM or any other customer would use in choosing allies or affiliates, nor to conduct any type of expensive background check of customers, nor to expose itself to any type of huckster, gold-digging opportunism litigation by refusing to rent upon any basis which might subject it to liability, nor to provide any type of security not either required by promulgated law, or referenced in the lease RJM signed, but RJM does find it obligatory to require ESS as the author of the contract concerned to bear the burdens of the reliance interests rationally predicated upon its inscribed conveyances according to presently operative consumer protection and other such type laws. RJM and other customers and for that matter the ESS employees are not on equal footing with ESS; and all concerned, but ESS moreso than its customers and employees, must exercise restraint and circumspection in any and all conveyances ever conveyed, ever risking whatever detriment might be incurred from understating rather than exaggerating and embellishing, in any given case. Those fundamental notions of good faith and fair dealing (Prov. 3:1) which constitute the foundation for the "golden rule" certainly require no less.

The promotional claims of ESS that its facilities are "super safe" has a hollow ring to it, to understate the case, as did the former notices on rent increases that accompanied such increases that "from time to time, rental rates must be raised in order to keep up with increasing costs" when in fact, the rent increases were and to RJM's understanding, still are programmed according to a formula which vastly exceeds any "increasing costs". Its promotional claims of being "customer centric" also ring hollow in light of the utter unavailability of any company representative above the level of site manager, the renege to which RJM was subjected when after then SM Delia Williams cut RJM's rate increase in half in November of 2011, if RJM recalls the exact date, at a juncture at which she understood RJM was likely to vacate the facility rather than pay the entire rate increase then imposed, RJM ended up getting billed the amount of the full increase until RJM finally relocated to a different unit in something like March of 2013, after having remitted the full amount under protest with no claim to consideration relinquished in so doing.

Then there were the six different instances in which RJM was prevented from accessing

the facility at 2 or 3 minutes before the former 20:00 gate closing time, in regard to which the situation never got adequately corrected, notwithstanding RJM's numerous complaints to various site managers in this regard, while his phone was synced into the Sprint time identification system. The time that RJM got locked out of the facility on the night he had to relocate his unit (along with a number of other customers) and then admonished for lying outside the front door while waiting for Rachel S. to get the door opened because it "would look bad for business" was not edifying.

Things like SM Judy's refusing to accept a package for RJM requiring RJM to go all the way to Hodgkins to recover it, the locking of the restroom until a few years ago, the absence of any waste bin until recently, the deprivation of access to the dumpster which Storage USA had always provided gratis (making disposal of unuseable items substantially less expensive than the present situation), the elevators being incapacitated for extended periods, the dust during the remodeling, all have been irritating but not so irritating as to elicit the relocation to some other operation which in the fallen human condition is certainly to be replete with irritating arrangements as well.

Hopefully, the matters this complaint concerns can now be resolved in a manner acceptable to all concerned. The evident seeming apathy over customer losses of ESS is not even the only issue here as ESS has possessed and still possesses a COA for tortious interference with prospective business advantage, itself, regarding such matters.

To the best of RJM's present capacity to ascertain the interplay of the several rules applicable to the filing of this amended complaint, RJM has completed and efiled it on 072318, subject to further supersession. No motion for leave to amend the complaint is now evidently necessary, but RJM will file such type motion if it should later seem to be necessary to do so, according to whatever terms and conditions would ever seem to be appropriate.

2. Parties

Plaintiff Robert J. More is a more than 10 year present customer of ESS

Defendants 1. Extra Space Storage Facility 729 is a Facility Owned and Operated by Extra Space Storage Co. 2. Unit 1214 of ESS Facility 729 on 072316 at 6:00 a.m. Gate Accesser Whose Name is Yet Unknown was at such juncture an ESS customer 3. 5' Tall Woman Gate Accesser at 6:30 a.m. on 072316 was observed in Facility 729 several times in the period of the thefts this case concerns, 4. Chicago Police Department - SE, 5. CPD Detective F. Roman, 6. CPD Warrant Officer A. Godbolt, 7. CPD Sgt. Lash, 8. CCCC, IL "Judge" L. Wool, 9. CCCC, IL Judge _ Ryan, 10. Cook County State's Attorney's Office, 11. CCCC, IL Chief Judge Timothy Evans, 12. Cook County Sheriff Thomas Dart

3. Jurisdiction

This Court possesses jurisdiction over the persons involved in this complaint as all activity conducted wherein other than possible communications between the Facility Management and the Corporate Office was conducted in Chicago, IL, within Cook County, IL. Subject matter jurisdiction is also possessed whereby as this Court is a Court

of general and unlimited jurisdiction Herb v Pitcairn (_U.S._)

4. Facts:

Initial Abbreviated Component of 8/4/16 of Report of 8/4/16 in re Criminal R.D. # HZ 360-742, Regarding Theft of Property Perpetrated Against Robert J. More ("RJM") to be Superseded at Various Junctures in the Future as Necessity Would Evidently Ever Require

1. On Friday 7/22/16 at about 2115, RJM departed storage unit #2024 ("2024") of the Extra Space Storage Facility at 707 W. Harrison St., Chicago, IL ("ESS") ("Facility") without burdening himself with closing his storage unit door and locking it as he intended to return to the unit within 15-20 minutes at the most.
2. As RJM was departing the Facility, it is RJM's recollection that there was a vehicle and some various persons, whose particular characteristics did not make any impression upon RJM, possibly because of vehicle doors obstructing RJM's vision of them, attending whereto in the auto/property loading bays, and RJM observed three black males, approximate ages 24-40 either climbing the stairs in the bay area and/or moving along the dock wall, but in any event, moving towards the storage unit area ("SUA") and not towards the outside of the facility.
3. When RJM arrived back at 2024, it occurred to him that the tablet he had used to complete a number of documents prior to exiting the facility was not where RJM last remembered seeing it.
4. RJM immediately scoured 2024 and all cartons in the hallway adjacent whereto and repeated such search, endeavoring to be certain that he had not either placed the then missing tablet under some cardboard and/or papers and/or in the lateral file cabinet in the unit.
5. At about 2140-45, RJM decided to go down to the dock area and RJM did so.
6. RJM encountered the customer in unit 1034 (RJM will provide corrected unit # if this is not the correct number), if RJM's memory serves him correctly, who was moving entities on a hand forklift or a furniture cart.

7. RJM inquired of such customer, who was a 72-73 inch, 185-190 lb Caucasian male, between est. age - 26-38 whether he had seen anyone exiting the building in the prior 20 minutes in any type of suspicious manner as RJM could not locate his tablet.
8. Such customer informed RJM that he had seen a black male about 73" and 190 lbs looking around the dock area and also viewing the dock area from the storage unit area of the facility with his face pressed against the window of the door on the south side of the dock.
9. Such customer informed RJM that the activity of such individual had made an impression upon him and that such individual rented the storage unit closest to that door on the inside (storage unit area) of the facility, which RJM understands to be unit 1214.
10. RJM thanked such customer for such information and returned to 2024.
11. RJM then began brainstorming to ascertain the most likely place to recover his tablet.
12. RJM checked the south side of the facility exit to Vernon street and noticed that that door was not completely closed and fastened at such time.
13. RJM walked through and examined the visible area of the entire facility just to be certain that RJM's tablet had not been left in some hallway.
14. RJM returned to the unit and remained there for some time, assessing his then present options.
15. At some point, RJM decided that the best prospects for recovery of his tablet and the SD card containing the past year's work product of RJM whereupon, would be to remain at the unit, in case the thief might still be in the facility and be inclined to return to 2024.
16. RJM was also concerned to not miss the 6:00 a.m. gate access commencement time facility

accessors, as RJM suspected that any thief who departed the facility on 7/22/16 would be somewhat likely to return when the facility reopened on 7/23/16.

17. At about 5:57 a.m. on 7/23/16, RJM exited the unit and facility in order to observe anyone waiting to enter it at 6:00 a.m. and observed a black male, wearing a white T-shirt and black bandanna-like "Do-rag" on his head, who fit the description of the individual referenced herein supra as renting the unit closest to the south entrance off the dock to the storage unit area (Unit 1214).

18. RJM demonstrated no cognition of any significance in observing such individual but eye contact was definitely made between he and RJM.

19. RJM rode his bike around the block, and paused before recrossing Harrison st. in endeavoring to ascertain the best strategy for recovery of his missing tablet.

20. When RJM returned to 2024, minutes later, it occurred to him that the two book bags RJM had had of laptop computers , cords and a monitor stored in 2024 were missing from his unit.

21. RJM then examined the lateral file and noticed that his virus plagued Trio tablet was also missing.

22. Shortly whereafter, RJM exited the facility and dialed 911 to report the commission of a crime of theft but RJM cannot recall if he referenced it as a crime in progress.

23. When no police appeared, RJM dialed 911 again and emphasized that the matter concerned constituted a crime of a theft in progress.

24. Either the first or second call was placed near to the pedestrian door of the facility in the presence of a light skinned black woman, about 60 inches tall, approximate age of 20-25 and a 67 inch, 175 lb, dark-skinned black male.

25. RJM then moved to a position from which he could observe both the front bay area and the exit on the south side of the facility to Vernon St. with his video recording device ready to record whatever would transpire.

26. At some juncture the customer who rents the unit closest to the door which number is 1214 if RJM's memory serves him correctly in this regard exited the building and inquired of RJM:

"Did you call the police on me?"

27. RJM cannot recall what exactly if anything RJM said in response to such inquiry.

28. While waiting for the police to arrive and RJM knows how long that can take in that area as RJM vividly recalls having to wait 45 minutes in the Jewel on Roosevelt Rd. in December, 2014 as RJM assisted the security contingent there in subduing a 76-77 inch, 240-255 lb, estimated age 35, black male who had endeavored to take something out of that store in contravention of the order of a security guard to refrain from doing so in a standing position, with him intermittently trying to break free, without risking injuring him, in re which the whole restraint could have been rendered incomparably easier, had it been known it would take 45 minutes for police to arrive at a store a mile away from the local District Hdqtrs in regard to a crime then in progress, by forcing him to the floor, RJM remained on the east side of Des Plaines Ave, positioned to continue to observe the exits referenced herein supra.

29. A black male exited the facility in a gray sedan shortly whereafter the developments referenced herein transpired but RJM does not know how good a picture of his front plate RJM procured.

30. A white pick-up truck had backed into the bay area and there was activity in the area of the door adjacent to the unit referenced herein supra and entities were loaded into the back of such pick-up truck.

31. A black male drove that vehicle out of the bay area and down Des Plaines Ave, which is one way south at that latitude.

32. At about 7:10-7:15 a.m. CPD unit # 8907 arrived and two Sargeants inquired of RJM in re the report of a crime in progress at such address.

33. RJM informed the Sgts in re the developments referenced herein and enabled them to access the facility.

34. One of the Sgts. was a Caucasian 35-40 year old male named Sherman and RJM does not know the other Sgt's name.

35. They addressed the customer in unit 1214 (the unit closest to the door) and after 4 or 5 minutes returned to the street.

36. The customer in the unit referenced herein exited the building and inquired of RJM:

"Did you call the police on me?" or something to that effect.

37. Leery of ending up the next innocent victim of some patently frivolous plunder of everything not adequately secured lawsuit, RJM responded: "You have not been accused of anything by me, and to my knowledge, no constitutionally protected right of yours has been in any way infringed in regard to anything this police call concerns, as no search of anything was ever conducted without your permission if indeed any search was conducted at all."

38. Sgt. Sherman informed RJM that the video of the facility would have to be procured and that a separate unit would arrive to take and make a report of the crime.

39. Two officers arrived and RJM activated his recording device in order to produce a record of the encounter.

40. The black male officer report taker (71", 190 lbs) complained about this - see youtube posting in re whereto.

41. Such officer provided RJM a copy of an R. D. document and informed RJM that since RJM could not provide all of the serial numbers of all the devices missing, RJM would have to get a supplemental report made.

42. When ESS On-site manager Will Price arrived, RJM explained what had happened and asked to be permitted to view the video footage of the time period in which the thefts referenced herein were perpetrated as RJM had been permitted to do in 2006 or 2007 when John Butt was the On-site Mgr, which resulted in the apprehension of Vince Yarborough for stilling RJM's bike tire.

43. Mr. Price informed RJM that he could not provide RJM such access without permission from some supervisor.

44. On Monday 7/25/16, RJM addressed an Officer Kucharski at the 12th District CPD Headquarters, which address is accessible on RJM's youtube playlist.

45. The rest of the details of RJM's endeavors to recover the property this document concerns will be added to this report in future components of this document.

46. As of 8/4/16, RJM has been informed that ESS will only permit RJM to access the videos produced of the activity conducted in the facility at the times of the perpetrations of the thefts this document concerns either when a CPD officer is present or after any such officer would have viewed such videos.

47. Thus at t

#48 added via hand inscription on 011718 at Warrant Officer's Office

48. John Doe #1 exited the facility during RJM's wait and surveyed the area as observed on video posted on RJM's youtube channel.

end of Theft report

Related Issue Reference: This Court has been informed that Robert J. More would seek to

procure appointment as a private prosecutor should criminal charges not be instituted in regard to these matters on 011718 and that RJM possesses an abundance of authority demonstrating the need and legitimacy of such petition, and that RJM is complaining that but for the deprivation of the measure of consideration constituting a legitimate criminal investigation and submission of a petition for the institution of criminal charges regarding these matters, attributable to the Chicago Police Department, that charges would have been instituted already in re these matters and that RJM intends to submit a collection of disclaimers in the future regarding these matters, and that this postulation has been necessitated by the deprivations of legitimate reliance interests attributable to various nominal government entities, and that these matters demonstrate the necessity of the protection of the use of demonstrably contra-predatory vigilante, injustice rectification remedies and that the evident invasions of the provinces of the legislature and jury/tribunal of fact these matters concern cannot justifiably remain unremedied.

This document was completed and submitted by and is herein verified pursuant to the provisions of 735 ILCS 5/1-109 and 28 USC 1746 and that Robert More avers to the truth of any and all factual averments included wherein and that Robert More is available to testify under penalty of perjury whereto

Robert J. More

The factual predicates concerning the activity of ESS and/or its agents, the CPD and/or its agents, and the CCSA and/or its agents will be explicated in future versions of this complaint.

Count #1 - Conversion -the factual predicates included herein supra provide adequate coverage of the various elements of the tort of conversion attributable to the John and Jane Does who stole Robert More's computers, tablet, and peripheral devices on 0722 and 0723 of 2018.

Ad Damnum: Should such devices not be returned intact to RJM, then RJM would seek the market value whereof, compensation to offset the opportunity cost of the time and expense to which RJM has been put in order to rectify the injustice this count concerns and punitive damages to be allocated to various unassailable causes, in this regard as well.

Count #2 - Breach of Contract - ESS

Count #3 " "

Count #4 Innominate Tort - ESS

Ad Damnum: As described herein supra, the cost and the risk to ESS of providing RJM access to the video recordings of the facility at the juncture of the thefts was negligible compared to the consequences to RJM of being deprived of access whereto and thus RJM demands adequate recompense for the deprivations this count concerns,

Count #5 - False Advertising - ESS

Count #6 - Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act Violation - ESS

Count #7 - Unconstitutional Conditions Doctrine Constitutional Tort - F. Roman

Count #8 - Constitutional Deprivation Tort - CPD Off. Godbolt, CPD Sgt. Lash, ASA

Count #9 Conversion

/s/Robert J. More

Robert J. More, anselm45@gmail.com, 708 317-8812, P.O. Box 6926, Chicago, IL 60680