

Shealy, Brenda

From: Koffskey, Dawn V.
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2019 11:38 AM
To: Shealy, Brenda
Subject: FW: CORRUPTION WITHIN THE COURTS - First Set
Attachments: INTRO.docx; HONORABLE JUDGES.docx

From: Cathy Bishop <cathy_bishop2002@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2019 11:17 AM
To: Jones, Marjorie L. <[REDACTED]>; Koffskey, Dawn V. <[REDACTED]>; McLean, Denise S. <[REDACTED]>; Reynolds, Alexis K. <[REDACTED]>; Flinchum, Debra J. <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Fw: CORRUPTION WITHIN THE COURTS - First Set

Part 1 of 5

It is noted that there has been no response from:
Donald Beatty
John Kittredge
Kay Hearn
John Few
George James

Thus, the following information is now being resent a second time, and to a second set of email addresses.

Do let it be known that by the end of today, unless notified that there is a temporary injunction on the foreclosure auction sale of 306 Coral Way, Belvedere, SC 29841 case number 2016CP0200381 of Aiken County SC 29841 there is a Criminal Complaint to be filed based upon the same information provided which proves the use of forged documents, robo-signing by Aiken County Clerk of Court, no to mention numerous other issues of PERJURY, SUBORNING PERJURY, Lack of Due Process, Bias, Conflict of Interest (Commission based on foreclosure sale), Deprivation of Right of Counsel of Choice, Deprivation of Right to Contract, Deprivation of Right Under Color of Law, and EXTORTION.

As noted a Black Robe does not preclude the adherence to Law, which makes it clear that these Judicial Members, which could take action to stop the ILLEGAL THEFT of said property from which the State is party to the action by that of it's members, deems they will be held accountable as either Misprision of Felony and Accessories After the Fact, if not outright COMPLICIT in the said action entirely!

Therefore, I expect notification by END OF DAY that there is a Temporary Injunction of this said foreclosure, else the criminal complaint that will be forced to be filed will be inclusive of said individuals listed above. This is not to be taken as a threat or extortion, but as merely a statement of fact as these individuals have and had a DUTY to take action once notified of the trespass of rights and criminal conduct of individuals under their purview! Thereby there lack of action and then not themselves not notifying the said Executive Branch to take Appropriate Action when they themselves have abrogated their DUTY to Protect the Public and therefore are no longer under any protection afforded them as being judges. If they have knowledge of CRIMINAL ACTIONS and fail to act or forward the information to someone that can act then they themselves are in violation of:

18 U.S. Code § 4 - Misprision of felony
18 U.S. Code § 3 - Accessory after the fact

Therefore, this letter and the attachment of information is to be treated as not an attempt, but second attempt to rectify Corruption within the Court for which the above individuals may not proclaim IGNORANCE of the FACT when said charges are brought in regards to the INFORMATION now provided a second time in regards to this issue before us!

Please Contact us at (803) 341-4278 today to inform us of action being undertaken by the said individuals listed above in regards to this issue/case!to

This information being sent by a VETERAN who took an Oath to Protect and defend the Public and their RIGHTS against all enemies both foreign and domestic. Likewise, the oath of the above individuals is to the same extent, therefore lack of action is also a BREACH OF CONTRACT and OATH with that of We the People known before the Court as South Carolinians! As noted nowhere within these oaths of office does it signify that one's oath of office in protecting America against CRIMINAL ACTIONS ends when one leaves their office and or position within the Military or Government!

Please call and ask for Ms, Catherine Bishop, Suzan Hardee, or myself Mr. Watters in that of informing us as to the disposition of these judges in regards to this matter, so that appropriate action may be taken. Likewise, providing no call-back and or email by 5:00 PM EST will be deemed as they have refused any action in regard to this matter, and will be treated as that of being complicit in the action of the BANKSTERS (Banking Cartel) and the criminal actions of their judges under their purview and charges filed appropriately!

(8030 341-4278

cathy_bishop2002@yahoo.com

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Cathy Bishop <cathy_bishop2002@yahoo.com>

To: [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, January 28, 2019, 1:05:22 PM EST

Subject: CORRUPTION WITHIN THE COURTS - First Set

Please read attached document and call back at (803) 341-4278

If not responded to within 24 hours then I will proceed with filing criminal charges in both within the state and federal jurisdiction and list every one of you as complicit; as once you were informed as an officer of the court you have a duty yourself to report this to the executive branch under that of misprision of felony if not taking action immediately to rectify the issue as presented!

Mr. Watters

IN SEARCH OF

ONE

HONEST

&

HONORABLE

JUDGE

THIS NOTICE AND REQUEST IS BEING SENT TO:

Chief Justice Donald W. Beatty

Justice John W. Kittredge

Justice Kaye G. Hearn

Justice John Cannon Few

Justice George C. James, Jr.

I request that any of the Judges hereby listed **immediately engage an injunction** against the foreclosure auction sale of the property owned by Ms. Catherine Bishop, located at 306 Coral Way, Belvedere (Aiken County) SC. Scheduled for the 4th of February.

Court Case Number is: 2016CP0200381

Do take notice that **within 24 hours unless contacted** at (803)341-4278 I will be forwarding a CRIMINAL COMPLAINT INCLUSIVE of not only those listed herein but also each and every name of you the self-proclaimed HONORABLE JUSTICES as Aiding and Abetting these Individuals of the Courts in their CRIMINAL ACTIVITY against the individuals residing in South Carolina, as you have been informed and therefore have a Duty to not only Protect and Uphold the RIGHTS of "We the People", but also to report the said activities to the appropriate authorities within the Executive Branch!

It is time to prove your HONOR

Will you stand for "We the People" or are you beholden to the BANKSTERS engaged in this SCAM-SCHEME-FRAUD against America (inclusive of South Carolina)?

Take notice that I have been left no alternative than to send this REQUEST directly to you as the Judicial System has not only failed in Protecting the God-Given RIGHT proclaimed as LIBERTY within that of the Court System but also embraced CORRUPTION at its CORE!

Within this said corruption is the violation of Rights coupled with Denial of Appeal unless paying for a product even if not needed, wanted, or affordable, much less trusted!

This Whole Court Foreclosure Process from beginning to end has reeked of being nothing less than a Kangaroo Court for which makes things up as it goes along, in order to protect the BANKSTERS in their SCAM-SCHEME-FRAUD against America (inclusive of the Individuals within the geographical boundaries known as South Carolina.

TAKE NOTICE OF THE FOLLOWING:

party in an appeal to receive costs from the losing party.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Why do I need to order transcripts?

The transcript shows what evidence and arguments were put before the lower court. This information is required for the Court's review of the appeal. In some cases, a transcript is not required, because all necessary information appears in court papers.

Rule 207 requires the appellant to order the lower court transcript from the court reporter when a transcript is required for the appeal. Generally, this must be done within ten days of serving the notice of appeal in civil cases and within 30 days of serving the notice in criminal cases. Refer to Rule 207 for exact details.

The transcript referred to in this rule is the circuit court transcript, not the transcript from proceedings before a magistrate, municipal judge, probate judge, or the like.

This transcript must be ordered from the circuit court reporter. Do not attempt to order it from the Court of Appeals, from the Supreme Court, from the lower court judge, from the Circuit Court Clerk, or from the Office of Court Administration. If you do not know the name of the court reporter, you may contact the Office of Court Administration to learn the name. However, you must still order the transcript within the time limits established in the Rule.

If a transcript is not required for the appeal, you need not order it.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

NOW ANSWER THREE SIMPLE QUESTIONS

Question 1: Does it not state quite clearly **“In some cases, a transcript is not required, because all necessary information appears in court papers.”**?

Question 2: Does it not state quite clearly in the second paragraph **“requires the appellant to order the lower court transcript from the court reporter when a transcript is required for the appeal.”** THE KEY EMPHASIS BEING ON THE WORD **“WHEN”** WHICH IMPLIES AS STATED IN THE FIRST PARAGRAPH THAT IT IS NOT ALWAYS NEEDED AND OR REQUIRED!

Question 3: Does it not state in the last sentence **“If a transcript is not required for the appeal, you need not order it.”**?

Now comes along your Clerk of Court Jenny Abbott Kitchings, and Deputy Clerk of Court and they engaged in EXTORTION by proclaiming that unless Ms. Catherine Bishop pays for TRANSCRIPTS that she doesn't need, want, or trust in the amount of \$550-\$600 per transcript; for the same recording of the court proceedings that she was denied to record on her own accord!

Thus, utilizing EXTORTION; i.e. a pay to play court system! Denial of Due Process unless you purchase something that one may neither need, want, nor trust! Ms. Catherine Bishop tried to resolve this by asking for their supervisor's name, position, and contact information; for which they refused to relinquish this information.

After much time, and many phone calls someone finally let it slip that it was Judge James E, Lockemy for which he was sent a letter stating the same thing that I now present before you in regards to the appeal, but he played a bafoon and even went as far as to state he believed I was submitting a motion; when the letter stated outright that it was a complaint and even stated the issue and the EXTORTION. Instead he reiterated that Ms. Catherine Bishop was to pay for these TRANSCRIPTS that she doesn't need and then proceeded to have the Court Deny her Appeal. Likewise, the who FAQ Section for the Appeals Process was taken down from the Judicial Website in order to HIDE the EXTORTION RACKET that is taking place!

It should also be noted that after another month of run-arounds I was finally led to Judge Clifton Newman of the Rules Advisory Commission for which I have presented him the same questions; and of which has fallen on deaf ears... as is everything within this KANGAROO COURT SYSTEM!!!

Therefore, unless I hear back within 24 hours I plan on submitting a CRIMINAL COMPLAINT listing every last one of you as complicit in the said SCAM-SCHEME-FRAUD against America; inclusive of South Carolina! There is no way to claim ignorance or lack of knowledge as I am supplying but just maybe 1/3 of the total information that would have been in the Appeal without any said TRANSCRIPTS... The Court Documents Speak for themselves, not to mention I have proof of Court Records being added after the fact, deleted in part , and even shown as being submitted after that of the actual date submitted!

Thus, let it not be said that none of you Justices were not informed as to the CRIMINAL activity that has been engaged by members of the Court under your leadership; if you choose not to act!

Please find attached a Motion to Vacate and that upon notification I will wire or send you a check, however since this is being sent to all FIVE of YOU, I will wait until one of you will act on my behalf to have the Clerk of Court and Deputy Clerk of Court accept my payment and process it without trying to engage in EXTORTION!

Upon 24 hours and no contact I will then be lodging a CRIMINAL COMPLAINT within and outside the State; with other regulatory agencies as well as the DOJ and FBI for
RACKETEERING

Do take notice that I have downloaded all the foreclosure data from 2000 – present in all 46 Counties, for which this SCAM-SCHEME-FRAUD by the BANKSTERS, with the help of the COURTS has engaged in against the People of South Carolina! Therefore, the true Question is whether anyone of you are men and women of HONOR or if you all work for the
BANKSTERS?

Take Notice of Document attached called: Honorable Judges

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE
SUPREME COURT**

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Supreme Court

APPEAL FROM AIKEN COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

M. Anderson Griffith, Master-in-Equity Court Judge

Docket No.2016CP0200381

Bank of America N.A.,

Plaintiff

v.

Catherine Bishop,

Defendant (Appellant).

MOTION FOR IMMEDIATE INJUNCTION AND VACATE OF ORDER

Chad Burgess (Brock & Scott)
Westpark Center
3800 Fernandina Road
Suite 110
Columbia, South Carolina 29210
803-454-3540
Attorney for Plaintiff

Catherine Bishop
306 Coral Way
Belvedere, South Carolina 29841
(803) 341-4278
Pro Propria Personam

IMMEDIATE ACTION REQUESTED OF COURT

I seek the **IMMEDIATE INJUNCTION** against Ms. Catherine Bishop's Property (306 Coral Way, Belvedere, South Carolina 29841) being sold at the Foreclosure Auction scheduled for February 4th of 2019 in Aiken County, by that of the County Master-in-Equity Court due to Major DEFECTS and Actions that bring into question both the VALIDITY of Ruling/Order enjoined by Felonious Actions by that of Court Personnel; inclusive of TWO Judges. This injunction being only TEMPORARY until the issues, as made known below, can be properly: researched, reviewed, and addressed.

INDEX

UNDERSTANDING THE SCAM-SCHEME-FRAUD.....	03-06
Statement of the Case.....	07-17
Questions Presented.....	18-19
Arguments.....	20-113
Conclusion and Action Requested of the Court.....	114-114
Supporting Documents of TRUTH.....	ATTACHED

UNDERSTANDING OF THE SCAM-SCHEME-FRAUD

(HYPOTHETICAL – 1)

1. Myself being a BANK and Part of the FEDERAL RESERVE (ILLEGAL and UNCONSTITUTIONAL FOREIGN CARTEL operating on American soil; have the said FEDERAL RESERVE lower the interest rates, which has a POSITIVE effect on creating jobs, increasing job growth, and due to increase in incomes makes the Cost of Living come down, as well as make homes more affordable.
2. I use every means of media to induce the public to seek a LOAN from my BANK; this includes the use of the mail system, television and radio ads, not to mention Bank Brochures, Emails, and even online advertisements.
3. The Borrower finally applies for a loan with my bank for which I scrutinize to ensure that they both have a history of making payments on time, as well as lack the knowledge of the TRUTH of the Lending Process!
4. Finally, I am happy that I have found a MARK, in this case called a BORROWER, to engage my SCAM-SCHEME-FRAUD upon!
5. I schedule an appointment for the SCAM-SCHEME-FRAUD to be engaged; this is what is commonly known as the “CLOSING PROCESS!”
6. Now, despite myself having knowing that a NOTARY is to witness the said signatures, I ensure that rarely is such an individual at this process; thereby I ensure that nothing that I might state to the MARK (BORROWER) will be utilized against me later when I foreclose; (and of which I know that I will be foreclosing upon 70% or more of these said closings within 20 years).
7. I utilize Fannie Mae Mortgage Forms and May even have the MIN, Mortgage Identification Number, from MERS (Mortgage Electronic Registration System) shown on the Promissory Note or Mortgage because It is my INTENT from the very beginning to both Securitize the Said Property and Monetize the MARK's (BORROWER) Signature. Likewise, I even have the convenient TYPO included within these said documents that states your signature on these said documents constitutes that you are signing for a LOAN that you have already received!
8. Despite the ACTS within Step 7; both TILA (Truth in lending Act) of 1968 and RESPA (Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act) of 1974 as codified Title 12, Chapter 27 of the United States Code, I purposefully withhold or NEVER DISCLOSE the following:

- (A) That I am in fact going to use your Promissory Note; i.e. your signature upon it to give my BANK a CREDIT in the amount of the LOAN that you are requesting from me. Thereby, I have not DISCLOSED to you that you the BORROWER have in fact LOANED myself, the BANK, the amount you are requesting for your said LOAN!
- (B) That I am going to create a DEMAND DEPOSIT Account in your name and or linked to said Property without your knowledge or Consent!
- (C) That I am then going to use that said CREDIT, which has ACTUAL CASH VALUE (the same as the denoted dollar bill used in the everyday monetary transaction of paying bills) derived from your Promissory Note and hand it back to you and call FRAUDULENTLY call it a LOAN in order to deceive you; as I know that I have not given you one red cent of money that was derived from any other banking source except that of the account created from that of your said Promissory Note, or even out of thin air!
9. That after I have you sign the said documents I am then going to sale your said mortgage and or property over and over again to third-parties and hide these ASSIGNMENTS (SALES) from the County Records Office through the use of MERS, Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems.
10. While engaging in all these sales of the said Promissory Note and or Mortgage to numerous Third-Parties I likewise sale your said note and mortgage to Fannie Mae, so that while I am engaging in all these sales of you said mortgage and Promissory Note; Fannie Mae also bought your said Mortgage and or Promissory Note with that of Investors (GAMBLERS) Money through the creation of MBS, Mortgage Backed Securities) that they have bundled together and sold as Stock Certificates (OWNERSHIP)! However, despite knowing that they have BIFURCATED the said Promissory Note from the Mortgage they still proclaim within the Courts that they are the OWNERS of the Promissory Note and Mortgage, while at the same time proclaiming to the IRS that they OWN NO PROPERTY! Likewise, as noted their purchase of said Promissory Note is NEVER recorded with the County Recorder's Office!
11. While I as now a SERVICER for Fannie Mae, I continue to sell your Promissory Note and Mortgage Electronically to more third-parties, while collecting payments from you, due to the fact that you were led to believe that I actually LOANED you the Bank's Money (when in TRUTH all I did was Exchange or Swap you one form of CREDIT for that of another) thereby handing you back your own PROPERTY but in that of another FORM!

12. While engaging in these sales of your Promissory Note and Mortgage, over and over again I never once inform you or the County Records Office of these SALES!
13. Now, while all the above is happening I and my other cohorts of the BANKING CARTEL saturate the Housing Market with as many sales as we can SUCKER IN!
14. Upon saturating the Housing Market with these bogus LOANS, we now have the FEDERAL RESERVE RAISE the Interest Rate; thereby causing stagnant wages, loss of jobs, loss of job growth, increase in unemployment, and likewise a raise in the Resources, Services, and Products known as Cost of Living!
15. Due to our actions above many of our BORROWER'S (MARKS) cannot afford their home Mortgage Payments! Thus, we start foreclosures against these said borrowers for which they are still under the BELIEF that not only they have been making payments on a LOAN, but also that myself (THE BANK) is still the OWNER of the said Promissory Note and Mortgage!
16. Now, us of the BANKSTER CARTEL being of such high MORALS and ETHICS as denoted by our actions seek out the assistance of other individuals also of such high moral and ethical standards as set by the other ILLEGAL and UNCONSTITUTIONAL BAR Association brought forth onto American soil by those from the Crown Temple of England!
17. Now, we engage in the Filing of Foreclosures starting with the assistance of our Brethren of the BAR; for which they being of such Lower Integrity and Honor as us or more than willing to say "F""U" to the RIGHTS as enshrined in the Bill of Rights and United States Constitution for America. This is a FACT which is substantiated by the FACT that the SEVENTH AMENDMENT is DISREGARDED with ABANDON by our said Lawyers and or Attorneys demanding said Non-Jury Trials, and the Courts all so willing to oblige us!
18. Next, we utilize the Judges that not only refuse to question our CRIMINAL ACTS, but are more than willing to COVER-UP and excuse the CRIMINAL ACTS by the our hired paid LIARS (LAWYERS) even to the point of acting as Document Authentication Experts in regards to our FORGED DOCUMENTS presented to the Courts!

19. These Judges are more than willing to overlook this VIOLATION of the SEVENTH AMENDMENT, and are even willing to omit informing the DEFENDANTS, that they have the RIGHT to a TRIAL by Jury of their Peers; but of course that very well could be because our Lawyers and Attorneys who work for the Bankers have infiltrated the Legislative Branch of Government and passed Legislation that gives these said Judges and Courts an INCENTIVE to find in FAVOR of us wonderful BANKSTERS! They even have their minions alter, delete, and or modify the records of the court in order to ensure that their actions taken can be claimed as they didn't have that information and or document in making their said determination in the matter!
20. By the time the DEFENDANTS have gone through our deceptive practices most of the time they just finally give up and let us STEAL their Property. However if they file an Appeal with either the Court of Appeals or the State Supreme Court we have a solution to that! We engage in the Practice of ELITISM, (Pay-to-Play) and even EXTORTION in order for them to utilize this step. As most individuals cannot afford an Attorney, we know that most likewise cannot Afford the PRICES of TRANSCRIPTS that we force them to buy from us or our selected Private Third-Party Entities; while at the same time refusing to let them make their own recordings of the said proceedings of which we now demand they purchase despite them not needing them to make their case!
21. If these DEFENDANTS; Ninety-Nine Percent for which lack any representation requests information on who and what to file with the Court to address this issue of Corruption, we withhold it from them! Likewise, the Judges do our bidding in the Judicial Disciplinary Counsel for the State by policing their own yet never holding any of them accountable for their action, and NEVER bring charges against them for their ILLEGAL ACTIONS taken on behalf of us wonderful BANKSTERS!

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In November of 2003 the Defendant finally took a leap of FAITH into Home ownership due to the advertisement being seen by her on a daily basis. After the Bank engaged in scrutiny of my finances and employment they agreed that I qualified to receive a LOAN from them. Many years went on by, but then due to the rise in Cost of Living she started having issues around the year 2013 for which she would get a little bit behind, but then catch herself up with her Tax Return. This Pattern however, was worsened when the Defendant's sister Suzan was diagnosed with Cancer and had to come live with her, as well as Suzan's Husband for which was needed for her continual care. Thus, this meant she was doing her best to provide for a household of three while at the same time the INTEREST RATE and the Cost of Living was increasing; thereby outpacing her actual payment in her profession of nursing for a special needs child. Things worsened in 2015, to include the home needing its heating unit repaired and replacement of its hot water heater; and even a refrigerator replacement.

Then in November of 2015, she made her payment, they refused her payment in December of 2015, but then accepted her payment in January of 2016; followed by Bank of America filing for foreclosure with the Courts in February of 2016. However, unbeknownst to the Defendant the Lawyer and or Attorney from Brock & Scott did engage in violating the Defendant's RIGHT as enshrined in the Bill of Rights and the Seventh Amendment of the United States Constitution for America. The Plaintiff's Lawyer requested that the Circuit Court grant them to by-pass her RIGHT on the Plaintiff's demand for a Non-Jury Trial. It should be noted that there is question in legitimacy and billing for said serving service of GCW as denoted by the proof of their actions as demonstrated/displayed within their own Court Filings.

Upon receipt of Notice of Foreclosure via through said service being served not on herself, but her Brother-in-Law did hire an Attorney to engage in the Process of Bankruptcy in order to try and save her home. Thus, as noted it is a requirement that said Notice of Foreclosure and all other debts are retained by these said Bankruptcy Attorneys, in confirmation of that of debts, so that they may be properly remedied and or cured! Thus, from 26 Feb 2016 until 28 FEB 2018 she was making payments as agreed to by that of the Bankruptcy, but then once again she was MET with Monetary Issues beyond her control, as the Septic Tank for her said Property Collapsed thereby rendering the TOILETS, TUBS and SINKS for the house inoperable! Therefore, the Defendant (Ms. Catherine Bishop) was forced to miss a payment for which she had to make a down payment towards the repairs and then occurred another debt for the Septic System (\$3,000.00-\$4,000.00) in total. That might not seem like a lot to a Judge, Lawyer, or Attorney living in homes valued at \$150,000 and North thereof, but for the Common Folk barely living pay check to paycheck and just trying to make the payment on that of a \$70,000.00 dollar home just to cover the Cost of Living being controlled by the same bankers this is an extreme amount; in that it is 5% of the entire amount of the House Cost upfront now needing to be paid up front when one is already in Bankruptcy and barely making these payments! It should be noted that in the 5 years prior to this point she had tried repeatedly to have her said LOAN modified, for which she was given nothing but the run-around and delay after delay prior to the said bankruptcy before even this said Septic System Disaster.

This now brings us to the First Hearing with the Master-in-Equity Judge, Judge M. Anderson Griffith, of Aiken County for which was noted/witnessed as being shocked when the Defendant made herself known and that she was there to Fight for her home. It should also be known that her said Bankruptcy Attorney had refused to represent her in the said proceeding. The Judge being CLEVER and Quick Witted asked the said Defendant if she had signed a Promissory Note with the Plaintiff for which she replied TRUTHFULLY that she had, but was contesting the amount in question in arrears presented to the Court. It was witnessed by the Defendant's sister, Suzan that the Judge never once asked her if the Promissory Note presented to the Court was in fact the Promissory Note in question that she had signed! Likewise, this same Judge never informed her of her RIGHTS; inclusive of that of her Right to a Trial by that of her Peers as guaranteed in the Seventh Amendment of the United States Constitution for America.

It is also noted that the Judge asked the Defendant why she had not contested the said Notice of Foreclosure, for which she honestly replied that she didn't know she could! One must remember that she when filing engaging the Attorney for said Bankruptcy that she had to provide this Notice of Foreclosure and other debts to the said Attorney. Thus, to her understanding the said Attorney was handling the issue now before the very Court. Therefore, she didn't even have the said NOTICE any more in which to act upon; and even if she did she still would not have the knowledge and or skills necessary to engage in the arena known as Law and Rules of Procedure. Thus, the hearing was ended with the Plaintiff being informed that they would need to produce a witness for which can validate the said arrears in question. The Judge likewise informed Ms. Bishop that she needed to seek an Attorney to represent her, while knowing that she could not afford any such representation; not to mention that to anyone with Common Sense they can easily tell within that of 5 minutes of talking with her that she lacks any knowledge or ability to represent herself in matters of Law.

It should be noted that between the filing of Notice to foreclose and the First Hearing; for which was held on March 6, 2018 and even the next scheduled Hearing/Trial of June 5, 2018 the Plaintiff refused to Provide the Information and Documentation as required by Law to that of the Defendant. It is also confirmed that after this First Hearing, the Defendant's sister asked me if I could possibly take a look at the foreclosure issue of her sister. Therefore let it be known that I agreed to take a look at the said issue as I have an extensive history in researching Technical Issues, inclusive of Laws, Regulations, and Directives in that of Operations and Matters of Security in dealing with issues in that of Military Intelligence. Likewise, my history is that of 17 years' service in the Military Intelligence arena and of which was inclusive of providing briefings (Weekly, Monthly, Quarterly to that of RSOC Commanders, visiting Dignitaries, and Echelon Above Corps Officers, as well as Training Numerous Special Operations teams in that of Communications, Signal Intelligence Operations, Operations of technical equipment, and even the legal and technical issues for which the said Special Operations teams may encounter or need to know. As noted yes, I had a TS-SCI Clearance with numerous additional letter classifications pertaining to many different technical arenas. Thus, my TRUTHFULNESS and HONESTY is beyond reproach and I will gladly take a Public Polygraph on each and every FACT provided herein. Likewise, I request that these said judges and Court Personnel be compelled to do so as well, so that we might separate the Wheat from the Chaff; thereby EXPOSING the TRUTH; and of which any Judge knows was the purpose of/for the Courts origination on American soil!

As my skills embrace researching issues and being able to represent that stated material with anyone while still having the ability to break down complex issues into simple, easy to understandable TRUTH; I agreed to review the issue for Ms. Bishop at the bequest of her sister Suzan! Likewise, I take my original OATH of Loyalty to my Country and the protection of the RIGHTS of the American People very seriously, as this OATH was before God! It should be made clear to all that those of us now deemed to be Veterans that our Oath to God and Country did not end the day we left Military Service; as the said Oath was never inclusive of a said end-date! It should also be noted that I never claimed to be a Lawyer or an Attorney; much less ever promise any said result from my research, nor ever accepted any pay for my said service to Ms. Bishop!

My first area of interest was to research the LOAN process, and the legal definitions used within the said constraints of the foreclosure process in addition to the Rules of Civil Procedure for which may have been not utilized by her or made applicable against that of the Plaintiff! I must admit that I WAS SHOCKED by the TRUTH! While I spent seventeen years of my life with a focus on Protecting American from that of FOREIGN ENEMIES, I found that America in TRUTH has been and is under attack by those within the proclaimed Government of America; and that these said individuals have and do the bidding of their MASTER BANKSTERS, for which I will expose throughout the rest of this stated history of the case before you. Upon learning the TRUTH of the BANKSTER CARTEL and its SCAM-SCHEME-FRAUD against America it is duly noted that I likewise found to my dismay that many within the said government engage in criminal activities to protect the BANKSTERS in their Criminal Endeavors, instead of Protecting the American People from this BLIGHT on the World as we know it!

Immediately, I took notice that the Plaintiff in this case had failed to adhere to the Rules of Civil Procedure in that of the providing of Information, Documentation, and Acknowledgement of the people involved to that of Ms. Catherine Bishop. Therefore, we had to learn as best we could how to prepare and serve both Interrogatives and Document Discovery Requests on that of the Plaintiff. It is noted that I ensured that much of the requested Information and or Documents was inclusive of that which the Plaintiff had already failed to Produce that which is already to be provided to the Defendant without having to serve a single Interrogative and document Discovery Request on the Plaintiff. It should be noted that prior to my said researching of the foreclosure issue as applicable to Ms. Catherine Bishop's case she had no knowledge of the SCAM-SCHEME-FRAUD that had been perpetrated upon her by Bank of America, (Plaintiff); thus, as she was unaware as such during and prior to that First Hearing she never challenged on the foreclosure on that specific point. Until the research exposed the TRUTH she believed, just as does Millions of America that she had received a LOAN (i.e. the use of the Bank's Money) in the purchase of her home. It should also be noted that even when presented this information by myself for which I produced the actual Legal Cases and the Bank Manual "Modern Money Mechanics" she still had a hard time believing that the COURTS(Judges) would ever let this action be engaged in against America as a whole.

After THIRTY days the Plaintiff finally responded to the Interrogatives and the Document Discovery Requests, if you can call refusing to answer or providing any information requested as being that of an answer. This action as denoted proves that the Plaintiff's not adhering to the General Rules of Civil Procedure in the production of information, documentation, and identification of individuals knowledgeable of the said case was not an accident but a purposeful, willful, and deliberate action; that is to anyone with COMMON SENSE who is not CORRUPT!

Thus, upon researching it was found that the proper next step would be that of filing a motion with the Court in regards to this refusal to adhere to the Rules of Civil Procedure. As noted NO ONE can have a FAIR and HONEST Trial/Hearing when the DEFENSE is not allowed access to the information, documents; and identification of witnesses in connection with the said SCAM-SCHEM-FRAUD! Please see the First Set of Motions in the Supporting Facts Documents

It should also be noted that during this time Ms. Catherine Bishop was notified of the said Trial/Hearing being scheduled for June 5, 2018. Due to the refusal of the Plaintiff to provide that which is required by LAW, there was a motion for DISMISSAL of said case filed with the Court, upon which within 24 hours of filing said motion Ms. Catherine Bishop was contacted DIRECTLY via phone by that of the Court that instead of the said Trial/hearing there would now be a Motions Hearing on the same day as previously scheduled for the Trial/Hearing but an hour later (and in the same court room).

Due to Ms. Catherine Bishop lacking the knowledge of the said cases in support of her Motions as well as her lack of articulation and ability to respond immediately in that of being (quick-witted) to respond to questions before the Court she asked if I, Mr. Watters, would agree to represent her in this matter. This being asked to me was just a few days prior to the said Motions Hearing. I agreed, as I could clearly see that she was incapable of truly representing herself; and for which the Judge should clearly have been made aware during the First said Hearing. Anyone talking to Ms. Catherine Bishop can tell within the first five minutes of talking to her that she lacks the ability and knowledge to properly represent even that of herself in any legal matter. To ensure that nothing was being misconstrued or of any claim being made in regards to my representation of her there was a Power of Attorney drawn up and Notarized assigning me as her representative in the legal matters pertaining to her property in this matter. Likewise, this Power of Attorney also clarified that she was not paying me a single cent for this action and that I was not and had not given her any promise of outcome of said action. It should also be noted that within the said Power of Attorney Document it clarified that I was laying no claim of being either that of an Attorney of Law or Lawyer, therefore at best the TRUTH the designator being engaged would be that of an Attorney of FACT; as I would be doing just that – PRESENTING THE FACTS and therefore the TRUTH of the matter before the Court on her behalf!

It should be note that in the weekend before this said Motions Hearing I was made aware through more research that it was Fannie Mae was proclaiming to be the Owner of the Ms. Catherine Bishop's Mortgage and Promissory Note. Therefore, a screenshot was taken to confirm this FACT/TRUTH!

Now comes the day of the Motions Hearing for which after the Judge's presence was made known by the proclamation of him be noted as the "HONORABLE Judge M. Anderson Griffith presiding" what took place established him as anything but HONORABLE! After were supposedly given permission to sit, I stood up (while being next to Ms. Catherine Bishop) and stated Your Honor my name is Darren Watters and I will be representing Ms. Bishop in this matter. As noted it was not the Plaintiff that objected, but instead the Judge interjected and asked if I had a LICENSE to Practice Law, for which I replied no as no such LICENSE exists! He argued that I had to have this LICENSE, for which I then requested that the Judge have Mr. Burgess the Attorney representing Bank of America then be required to produce this said LICENSE. Again the Attorney NEVER OBJECTED, but again it was the judge who interjected that he most likely didn't have it on him! However, he was allowing the said Attorney for the Plaintiff to continue in the same hearing without NO LICENSE being produced. We went over a few issues and I addressed the Issue of that of Rights and asked him if his oath was to uphold the United States Constitution for America, for which he would not answer! It was at this point that Ms. Bishop spoke up, interrupting the said debate at hand, and asked the Judge if it mattered if she had a Power of Attorney; for which she proclaimed she did! He then asked for her to let him see it, for the next few moments he read the said Power of Attorney Document, for which was even NOTARIZED. After what seemed like a few minutes the Judge finally blurted out to the Plaintiff's Attorney "Well aren't you going to object?" of which the Attorney replied "oh, uh, uh, yes I object!" As noted the JUDGE had engaged himself and LED the Plaintiff Attorney in the action, thereby establishing that the Judge was acting as a Second Attorney for the Plaintiff in this same HEARING for which he was to be presiding (CONFLICT OF INTEREST) and likewise (the Judge Practicing Law from the Bench) which according to the Law is NOT LAWFUL and or permitted! As, note the Plaintiff Attorney never based the objection on any specific Point, therefore this precluded for myself or any other individual from being able to argue against the said point for which the Objection was being made!

As noted, from this point on the judge would not allow me to speak, which clearly violated both her RIGHT to choose an individual to represent her, as well as violated her RIGHT to Contract; for which both are enshrined in the United States Constitution for America under that of "LIBERTY!" Much to say, as she is not knowledgeable of the Laws and Cases she stumbled her way through trying to address the motions, and I did my best while sitting by her side to converse with her and try to get her to address specific points, yet she couldn't comprehend or keep up with this information; and therefore the points were argued/stated insufficiently AT BEST! It is noted that one of the said reasons for the Motion to Dismiss was based on the fact of the Promissory Note before the Court not being the Original, however the Judge refused to have the Plaintiff provide proof of Chain Title, and then even went as far as to proclaiming the Promissory Note before the Court being the ORIGINAL due to the fact that it has the stamp on it from him! Thereby, now not only had the Judge acted as a Second Attorney for the Plaintiff, but also was now interjecting himself as a Document Authentication Expert on behalf of the Plaintiff. He did have the Plaintiff produce the Promissory Note for Ms. Catherine Bishop to look at it, but as she does not know what to look for or discern as to the legitimacy of the document this action was MUTE at best! Much to say the HEARING finally ended and now came to the point that one could only PRAY that this Judge who had proved himself LACKING of ANY HONOR, would somehow come to his senses when forced to address the issues in that

of his Ruling on the issues.

It should be noted that at the end of the Motions HEARING that Judge M, Anderson Griffith once again told the Plaintiff to produce a witness for the next/final Trial/Hearing; despite knowing that the Plaintiff had by the answers, or rather non-answers of the Interrogatives, had proclaimed that no such WITNESS to the LOAN existed! It is also noted that within the said Motion that the Judge was requested to act via Sui Juris in regards to the issue of the Plaintiff not adhering and providing the INFORMATION, DOCUMENTS, and IDENTIFICATION of the said LOAN Process, yet the Judge NEVER ADDRESSED the Plaintiff at all in reference to this action (or rather lack thereof)!

Now, while sitting and waiting I have and had been continually researching more and more in regards to the SCAM-SCHEME-FRAUD being perpetrated not only against Ms. Catherine Bishop, but against Millions of Americans by ALL the MAJOR BANKS! Now comes the 7th of July 2018 and Ms. Catherine Bishop receives notice not from the Court or the Judge, but by that of the Plaintiff that an Order has been filed denying her Motion to Dismiss. As noted within this said Notice by that of the Plaintiff in regards to the action of the Judge, Ms. Catherine Bishop was not able to find out the reasoning for said Ruling until Monday the 9th as the 7th was on a Saturday. Likewise, it is on this date that we learned of the State's website that lets you pull up and see the actions happening on the cases before the courts. This notification was followed by receipt of notification by not the court or the judge, but by the Plaintiff once again on the 17th of July in reference to a Final Hearing being scheduled by the Court for that of the 8th of August; (a mere 21 day [3 weeks] not including the day of the mail received and the actual day of the said hearing)! This was followed by notice on the 20th of July of a MIRACULOUS WITNESS now existing for which the Plaintiff provided absolutely NO INFORMATION in reference to the said Witness as required by the established Rules of Civil Procedure; coupled with the fact once again that the Plaintiff and the Courts were saying "F""U" to the rules of Civil Procedure in that of timely notice, extent of notice, and even the use of such an individual for which on a LEGAL document it was proclaimed by no names being provided that no such witness existed in reference to any matter! Likewise, this established the Plaintiff engaged in Perjury, and Obstruction of Justice and the Judge proved that the Master-in-Equity Court under his guidance was and is nothing short of the Legal Definition of a Kangaroo Court! It is noted, that while the Judge instructed the Plaintiff to produce a witness then he must also acknowledge that upon notice of said witness that along with the notice is to be information in reference to the witness, their qualification, experience, and knowledge of matters; not to mention adherence by the Plaintiff and the Court in that of the established number of days that must be provided to the Defendant before a Trial/Hearing can be Scheduled/Held in the matter before the court!

In response to the MOTIONS RULINGS for which Ms. Catherine Bishop was provided on the 7th of July but not able to see the actual Ruling and the written words of the Judge until the 9th of July there was another set of Motions immediately worked on which addressed not only the Judge's Ruling, but also his action as denoted in the MOTIONS HEARING, as well as his written response that clearly EXPOSED that he is BOUGHT and PAID-FOR by the BANKS in his action. This Second set of MOTIONS was a continual change as Ms. Catherine Bishop was notified with only three weeks of that of a Final Hearing on the 8th of August 2018, and then

once again blindsided with less than weeks' notice of a witness for which the Plaintiff would not relinquish any of the information to her; as required by that of the Rules of Civil Procedure! By the August 3rd of 2018 the Court was provided the Second set of motions; thereby Ms. Bishop had responded to the previous rulings within 30 days; and responded in TRUTH just 26 days from being availed to the actual wording within the said previous Ruling on the first set of Motions. This Second set of Motions was inclusive of responding to the Lack of Notice by the Court and likewise the Subornation of Perjury by the Allowance and Production of a witness by that of the Plaintiff, as well as the failure of the court/Judge to adhere to the Rules of Civil Procedure in reference to the timely notice of a witness and the proper time given to the Defense in that of preparing for a proper cross of such witness. This time there was NO Phone call, and no written communication in rescheduling of said Hearing/Trial to address these issues but instead what ensue was that of a Banana Republic Kangaroo Court in Action! It should be noted that this Second Set of MOTIONS was inclusive of:

MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION ON:

- Right to Counsel
- Lack of Capacity
- Failure to state a Claim
- Fraud upon the Court
- Reference – Interrogatives & now Motion to Compel
- Reference – Document Discovery Request & now Motion to Compel

MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE

MOTION FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION

AND;

MOTION FOR THE RECUSAL: (OF THE JUDGE)

** due to his actions as denoted in the MOTIONS HEARING as well as his written response actions denote within the written ruling (a legal document) therefore inclusive of PERJURY.

What took place on the 8th of august at the said Final Hearing/Trial was nothing short of TACTICS utilized in Banana Republics, as stated above. When arriving 30 minutes early for the Hearing/Trial we were shocked to find the Court Reporter/Stenographer hanging-out with the Plaintiff in the Judge's Secretary Office with inner connecting door to the Judge's Office. When entering the Secretary's Office to give notice of our presence, it was noted that the Plaintiff and the Court Reporter tried to cower in a corner while the Secretary ushered us out of her office! Thus, this fact along with other facts substantiates that there was Ex-parte Communication between the Plaintiff, the Judge and or Court, and definite reason of suspicion in regards to that of any TRANSCRIPTS produced by the said Court Reporter/Stenographer in regards to this case.

Likewise, it was noted that on this hearing date unlike that of all the others was that of a lot of officers on the said floor prior to the hearing, that one would question as to maybe something had been taking place prior to our arrival. Due to the issues denoted in the action of the judge previously noted at the first Motion Hearing and the written ruling, I asked one of the officers if they would arrest a judge if the Judge was found to be engaged in Perjury and Deprivation of Rights for which the Officer laughed and said "NO." Thereby; establishing that these Officers of the Court will not uphold their Oath of Office, but are merely paid Hooligans of the Judge!

When entering the Court Room it was clear that this increased number of Officers was for OUR Hearing/Trial! It was noted that the second Chair for the DEFENSE table was REMOVED and one of the Officers quickly made it be known that he was not allowing me to ASSIST Ms. Bishop in that of Counsel. It is also noted that instead of the usual one or none presence of Officers in the Court, at this specific Trial/Hearing there was the MAX ALLOWED (3)! Now, to those of us of COMMON SENSE, if you are not doing anything DISHONEST and CRIMINAL in NATURE then what do you have so much FEAR from?

The Judge made it known from the very beginning that he wouldn't allow Ms. Catherine Bishop to have the assistance of Counsel during her said Trial/Hearing much less Compel the Plaintiff to Produce anything or grant that of a Continuance due to Lack of Notification by that of the Court for the said Hearing/Trial and Lack of timely notice or the providing of information in regards to the said witness. When bringing up the fact of the production of witness constitutes Perjury; the Judge responded that it wasn't perjury as the Plaintiff had amended their Interrogative (another act of perjury by that of the judge). It should be noted that when referencing Ex-Parte Communications by that of the Judge and the Plaintiff that he proclaimed that he was not in contact with the Plaintiff and that he had no duty to inform Ms. Catherine Bishop of his Rulings and or even notice of Hearing/Trial (that he is only required to inform the Plaintiff – not the Defendant because he had already proclaimed her to be in default!)

When Ms. Catherine Bishop referenced the FRCP, Federal Rules of civil Procedure in that of the requirements set forth in the usage of said witness the Judge responded that the said RULE does not apply, and to stop quoting these Rules! (This was stated before the Defendant's Sister Suzan, her brother-in-law Brian, and of course myself)! Likewise, when addressing Ms. Catherine Bishop's MOTION for his RECUSAL he stated that he did not remember himself taking the actions as denoted in the MOTION(S) HEARING. However, while Catherine is normally meek in nature she raised her voice and stated clearly "Well, I do!" However, the judge swept this under the rug; in that he refused to recuse himself! It was at this point myself and her brother-in-law were shaking our heads in disbelief, not saying a word (and sitting in the back row for which no other witnesses to the incident were present then us and Suzan). The Officers of the Court quickly interceded and stated that if we so much as shook our heads in disgust, one more time, that we would be removed from the court! This was followed by Ms. Bishop reminding him of the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure applicable to the matter, and once again the Judge interceded and stated, once again, for her to stop quoting the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; this time adding that they do not apply in HIS COURTROOM!

It should be noted that at that specific point in time, I spoke up and instructed Ms. Catherine Bishop to challenge the Jurisdiction of the Court; of which I immediately got up to leave the said court room (for which the Officer then tried to assert control by threatening me. Upon leaving the Court Room I turned to get the Name of the Cop for which at first tried to deny me the knowledge as to his name. As noted he had another 3 Officers waiting at the bottom of the stairs to ensure my removal from the building, which is a PUBLIC BUILDING paid for not by them but by the PUBLIC! I was later informed by Brian (the brother-in-law) that the judge refused to have the Plaintiff prove Jurisdiction; much less himself prove jurisdiction of the court, but instead just stated that he had the Jurisdiction and that was that!

I later also learned by conversation with Suzan, sister of the Defendant, that eventually the Witness was produced who provided NO PROOF, (evidence), of any existence of debt or payments by that of Ms. Catherine Bishop. Now, here comes the kicker Ms. Bishop had asked the Witness who owns the LOAN, who is she supposed to really be making these said payments too? She was witnessed as stating that FANNIE MAE owned the LOAN and that Bank of America was acting as a Power of Attorney in collecting the said debt!

IT MUST BE NOTED THAT UNTIL THIS VERY POINT IN TIME THE PLAINTIFF HAD CLAIMED THAT THEY WERE THE OWNER OF THE MORTGAGE AND PROMISSORY NOTE! LIKEWISE, THE JUDGE HIMSELF HAD PROCLAIMED IN HIS RULING AND EVEN ACTED AS THE DOCUMENT AUTHENTICATION EXPERT OF THE PLAINTIFF IN PROCLAIMING THE PRMISSORY NOTE BEFORE THE COURT WAS THE ORIGINAL AND THAT NO ASSIGNMENT OR SALE OF THESE DOCUMENTS TO A THIRD PARTY EXISTED!

YOU CAN'T HAVE IT BOTH WAYS!!!

AS NOTED THE PLAINTIFF LAID NO CLAIM OF A THIRD PARTY OR REPRESENTING THAT OF A THIRD PARTY IN THEIR SAID FORECLOSURE LAWSUIT! THIS FACT IS SUBSTANTIATED BY THE PROMISSORY NOTE ITSELF RECORDED WITH THE COURT WITH THE JUDGE'S GREEN STAMP.... THIS NOTE SHOWS ABSOULTELY NO ASSINGMENT OR SALE TO ANYONE, MUCH LESS FANNIE MAE!!! THUS, THERE IS NO POSSIBLE WAY FOR THIS PROMISSORY NOTE PRESENTED TO THE COURT, TO ORIGINATE THE SAID LAWSUIT, AS NOT BEING THAT OF A FORGERY! LIKEWISE, THE FACT OF MULTIPLE SALES BEING SHOWN ON THE MERS WEBSITE AND SCREENSHOTS OF THE TRUTH WERE PRODUCED WITHIN THE MOTIONS AS WELL AS MENTIONED IN COURT , FOR WHICH TH JUDGE WOULD NOT ADDRESS OR FOR THAT MATTER EVEN ACKNOWLEDGE!

However, the Judge swept this fact under the Rug, and Ms. Catherine Bishop never forced the issue, as she is not quick witted and failed to understand the TRUTH that was just exposed before the Court. This was witnessed by her sister Suzan! Much to say this Hearing/Trial finally ended, and we were left to wait for the final Ruling/Verdict of this CORRUPT JUDGE!

Eventually Ms. Catherine Bishop was finally notified that UNREMARKABLY the Judge had ruled in FAVOR of the Plaintiff (Bank of America). Thus, due to the many issues of contention were inclusive of that of Violation of RIGHTS; there was a filing of Intent to Appeal with that of the State Supreme Court.

Approximately 10-14 days after submission of said Intent, Ms. Catherine Bishop received a Letter from the Court (Clerk of court and or Deputy Clerk of Court) that she was now being FORCED to buy TRANSCRIPTS at a cost of \$550-600 per transcript (times 3 for all three Hearings) for a total of \$1,650 to \$1,800 dollars else her Appeal would be denied! Immediately there was a letter sent back stating in general that they were in error in that of their thinking or actin as the State's own Judicial Website stated that if one had enough Court Documents to support their claim that they need not purchase said transcripts. Likewise, the website made it clear that these TRANSCRIPTS are not always needed for all cases! However, the Clerk of Court and Deputy Clerk of Court proceeded to insist that these TRANSCRIPTS would be bought by her, else she would not be allowed to Appeal the Decision of the Lower Court.

Thus, the Clerk of Court and Deputy Clerk of Court were sent a response informing them that:

1. She had enough Supporting evidence and Court Documents to support her case without the said transcripts.
2. She did not want to utilize these said transcripts in question.
3. She did not even trust these same transcripts in question due to the Court Reporter being found huddled up with and hiding in the Judge's Secretary's Office with the Plaintiff, prior to the said hearing. As noted by the fact that they tried to cower/hide in a corner upon the Defendant entering the Secretary's Office to inform them of her presence for the Hearing/Trial.

Likewise, now at this point the Clerk of Court and Deputy Clerk of Court were also informed that their action was legally defined as EXTORTION; which constitutes that of a CRIMINAL ACT (FELONY). As noted their own website section of the FAQ, Facts Answers and Questions Area in that of the Appeals Process.

The next action speaks volumes, as they again threatened state they were denying her the stated Appeal and that if she wanted she could pay them another \$50.00 for them to address the issue; and then likewise had the WEBSITE SECTION (FAQ) in reference to the Appeals Process removed from the Public View as this exposed the TRUTH of their engagement of EXTORTION!

ONE MUST REMEMBER THAT THIS ONLY BUT ONE CASE, HOW MANY OTHERS WERE ALSO CONDUCTED IN THIS SAME MANNER AS WELL? 100? 1000? TENS OF THOUSANDS? HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS?

It was at this point that I tried to get the information from the Deputy Clerk of Court and Clerk of Court as to who was their Supervisor; for which they refused to relinquish/provide! Likewise, I placed was many calls of which numerous individuals when made known of the issue, and likewise refused to provide this information! However, after weeks of calls I was eventually informed that the Supervisor I was searching for was Judge James E. Lockemy; for which he was sent a letter informing him of the said issue and asking that he address the actions being engaged by that of his Clerk of Court and Deputy Clerk of Court!

The response was remarkable as the Judge demonstrated: Lack of Integrity, Lack of Honor, and Lack of knowledge in that of English Comprehension! Instead he proclaimed that he believed the letter of FACT of EXTORTION being engaged by his underlings was somehow a MOTION!!

He then went on in latter correspondence to reiterate that EVERYONE MUST MAKE SAID PURCHASE of TRANSCRIPTS; and then his underlings proceeded to DENY Ms. Catherine Bishop's PAID FOR Appeal and kicked it back down to the Lower Court to now SALE her Property at Auction; for which also is corrupt as the Master-in-Equity Court/Judge receives 1% Commission on ALL his verdicts/sales of foreclosed properties which was made so by his Ruling!

CAN WE SAY HUGE CONFLICT OF INTEREST?

This concludes the statement of the Case History to this specific Point in time; with the exception that this next week these same facts is being present to the Judicial Disciplinary Commission; (Mark Hammond) South Carolina Secretary of State, (Alan Wilson) South Carolina State Attorney General, and likewise also being provided to the SEC, FTC, and DOJ as this whole SCAM REEKS of RICO! With State Employees (inclusive of judges) being implicated as Accessories After the Fact if not directly implicated as Principals in this matter and 1000's of others!

**TO SIMPLIFY THE ISSUE BEFORE THE COURT IN REGARDS TO THIS MATTER
WE WILL ONLY ADDRESS FOURTEEN QUESTIONS OF TRUTH
THAT EXPOSE THE
SCAM-SCHEME-FRAUD AS A WHOLE!**

QUESTIONS PRESENTED (01-08) – COMMON SENSE

01. If you purchase something for someone else with their money, (on their behalf), then who owns that which was purchased?
02. As Fannie Mae purchases Mortgages and Promissory Notes with Investors (Gamblers) money then How can the BANK that sold the proclaimed Mortgages and or Promissory Notes to Fannie Mae Claim ownership of the Mortgage and or Promissory Note; likewise How can even Fannie Mae claim ownership of the Mortgages and or Promissory Notes?
03. Do BANKS have any Constitutional Power and or Authority to Create Money out of thin-air?
04. As the Federal Reserve already established that the Banks are not LOANING a SINGLE RED-CENT to the Home-Buyers (Borrowers) as clarified in Modern Money Mechanics and the Jerome Daly Case of December 1968, but are in fact creating money out of thin air based upon the Borrowers signature on the said Promissory Note then how can ANY BANK proclaim any damage; much less prove CONSIDERATION as required for a legally binding contract?
05. Is there anything within TILA and or RESPA that allows the BANKERS to OMIT DISCLOSING the fact that they are going to create an account in the Borrower's Name or Property; and then create a CREDIT on their Books for the amount stated on the Promissory Note signed by the Borrower without the said consent or knowledge of the Borrower, and then hand back to the Borrower something that was none existent until the Money was created out of thin air and derived from the Borrower's signature on the said Promissory Note and then deem it to be a LEGAL CONTRACT?
06. How is the BAR and BANKING Associations not UNCONSTITUTIONAL Monopolistic CARTELS?
07. How is it not a DIRECT Conflict of Interest for any Judge, much less any court, to engage in Trials/Hearings for which their Verdict/Ruling enriches the said judge and or court in that of Monetary Enrichment?
08. How can a Bank Claim any damage for non-repaid LOAN when in TRUTH they never loaned a single cent of the bank's own money, and then controlled the economy which caused inflation, thereby increasing the Cost of Living, stagnant wages, loss of jobs when this CLEARLY violates the **Prevention Doctrine** and or **Prevention Performance Doctrine** in that of a Binding Contract under Common Law?

QUESTIONS PRESENTED (09-18)

09. How did the Circuit Court not violate the Seventh Amendment RIGHT of the Defendant by allowing the said Case File Number 2016CP0200381 being assigned to a Master-in-Equity Court without the DEFENDANT's Consent?
10. How does the Circuit Court Robo-Signing the Documents originating the said Case 2016CP0200381 not Null & Void any Ruling of said case?
11. Did Judge M. Anderson Griffith violate the RIGHT to CONTRACT and RIGHT of Choice of the Defendant by not allowing her to be represented by someone other than a member of the BAR Association?
12. Is it not a DIRECT Conflict of Interest for any Judge to act as the Document Authentication Expert on behalf of the Plaintiff, and yet not recuse him/her self from the proceedings as a Judge?
13. Is it not an IMMORAL ACT and FELONY for a Judge to turn a Blind Eye to Observable TRUTH and then engage in the action of covering it up within that of a written ruling for which anyone with COMMON SENSE would denote as Obstruction of Justice?
14. Can any Court Case be considered to be Fair and Honest when the Judge allows the Plaintiff to withhold Information requested by the DEFENDANT in that of Interrogatives and Document Discovery Requests, for which the information being requested was already to be provided without such requests/demands under the General Rules of Discovery?
15. Is it acceptable that State Courts refuse to let Defendants Record the Court Proceedings, and then FORCE these same Defendants to purchase a product, (TRANSCRIPTS), else be denied to Appeal their case without said TRANSCRIPTS; even when they have more than enough Court Documents to Substantiate their Appeal?
16. Can you show the PUBLIC anywhere within Rule 207 that one MUST PURCHASE these TRANSCRIPTS in order for them to Appeal their Case even if they do not NEED such TRANSCRIPTS, WANT such TRANSCRIPTS, or TRUST said TRANSCRIPTS due to circumstances that question the VALIDITY of them?
17. How is the Deputy Clerk of Court and Clerk of Court not engaging in Denial of Due Process, Deprivation of Rights, Deprivation of Rights under Color of Law, and EXTORTION when they deny a party to APPEAL their case unless paying for a product that they may not need, want, or even TRUST in substantiating their Claim/appeal?
18. Are Court Hearings and or Trials to be Fair and Honest; inclusive of both parties held accountable in that of Rules of Civil Procedure?

ARGUMENTS

These Arguments are directly, number by number, associated to the corresponding numbers above in that of the Questions. Number 1 in this Section of ARGUMENTS is referenced to Question 1 of Section QUESTIONS above in that of Pages 18-19

1. If you purchase something for someone else with their money (not your own), (on their behalf), then who owns that which was purchased?

It is amazing that we need to go all the way to the State Supreme Court of Kansas in the Landmark v Kesler Case of August 28, 2009. While this case was in reference to MERS vs Investors the same principal exposed holds true in that of Fannie Mae and Investors! In Kesler it made it clear that it was the investors as shown in MERS that were and are the actual OWNERS of the said Titles/Deeds of the properties in question. Likewise, it was affirmed that since each individual investor was owner of the same properties as 100's, and even 1,000's of others that the Deeds/Tiles were in fact clouded if not outright DEFECTIVE, as the Mortgage and the Promissory Note has been SPLIT among 1000's of investors which as stated in Carpenter v Longan, (83 U.S. 271, 21 L. Ed. 313, 1872 U.S. L.E.X.I.S. 1157 (1873)), the separation of said mortgage from the Promissory Note is therefore BIFURCATED and thus Null and Void on its face value!

Bank of America, MERS, and even Fannie Mae are none other than NOMINEES after the investors partake through purchase of said interest in the Mortgages and or Promissory Notes of the said property being foreclosed upon. Therefore, only the individual investors have STANDING to bring said lawsuit, not Bank of America, not MERS, and not even Fannie Mae! To those of us with COMMON SENSE and not a Judge owned by the BANKSTERS, we see the TRUTH that once the investors buy an interest in the said property then it is they alone that have STANDING not their intermediary that purchased the property on their behalf with the investor's money. As the Bank, MERS, and Fannie Mae never put up a single cent in the purchase of the said property then absolutely none of them have claim of STANDING!

IT'S REALLY QUITE THAT SIMPLE!! THEREFORE, THE REASONING WHY THE COURTS AND THEIR BANKSTER FRIENDS FIGHT TO ENSURE THAT WE THE PEOPLE ARE NOT ALLOWED TO ENGAG OUR 7TH AMNDMENT RIGHT!

AS NOTED WE THE PEOPLE WOULD NOT STAND FOR THIS BOVINE EXCREMENT BEING ENGAGED BY SUCH "HONORABLE" JUDGES OF THE COURT!

2. As Fannie Mae purchases Mortgages and Promissory Notes with Investors (Gamblers) money then how can the BANK that sold the proclaimed Mortgages and or Promissory Notes to Fannie Mae Claim ownership of the Mortgage and or Promissory Note; likewise how can even Fannie Mae claim ownership of the Mortgages and or Promissory Notes?

I refer you back the same information provided in the ARGUMENT of point one, above!

3. Do BANKS have any Constitutional Power and or Authority to Create Money out of thin-air?

As clearly put forth in Article 1, Section VIII of the United States Constitution for America which are very LIMITED Powers and or Authority bestowed upon the government by "We the People" nowhere was any BANK given this Power and or Authority to CREATE MONEY. Likewise, nowhere was the government bestowed the Authority and or Power to abrogate or delegate these Powers and or Authority onto that of anyone! This is clearly established:

Clause 2 - To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

Clause 5 - To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

Clause 6 - To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

Clause 18 - To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

As these are the Clauses as put forth in the Enumerated Powers please take notice that nowhere within these powers was the government given the Authority and or Power to have anyone other than Congress to print and coin money.

Thus, the very existence of the Fed is un-Constitutional. Of course, some would argue "stare decisis," saying the Fed's been around so long it's "settled law" and shouldn't be uprooted. Stare decisis has become nothing more than a justice/judge's excuse for side-stepping a controversial issue. But if you want to argue from that perspective, there's nothing in U.S. law more "stare decisis" than the Constitution. It is, in its own words, the "supreme law of the land." There never has been an amendment to the Constitution to change that. Nor can it be changed by any court ruling, even one of the SCOTUS. Nothing can legitimize the Fed in any way.

Likewise, I would like to bring your attention to the Jerome Daly Case of December 1968, also known as the Credit River Decision, for which the BANKER, (Mr. Morgan), himself admitted on Record of the Court that the BANKERS have NO CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY to CREATE MONEY, much less create it out of thin air!

Mr. Morgan admitted that all of the money or credit which was used as a consideration was created upon their books, that this was standard banking practice exercised by their bank in combination with the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, another private Bank, further that he knew of no United States Statute or Law that gave the Plaintiff the authority to do this. Plaintiff further claimed

If you doubt the validity of this information provided you can download a copy yourself at:
https://archive.org/stream/pdfy-83f9GYTm1KE7PLuo/Jerome-Daly-The-Mahoney-Credit-River-Decision_djvu.txt

The above SNIPPET was taken from the bottom of Page 1 of the Link provided above.

4. As the Federal Reserve already established that the Banks are not LOANING a SINGLE RED-CENT to the Home-Buyers (Borrowers) as clarified in Modern Money Mechanics and the Jerome Daly Case of December 1968, but are in fact creating money out of thin air based upon the Borrowers signature on the said Promissory Note then how can ANY BANK proclaim any damage; much less prove CONSIDERATION as required for a legally binding contract?

Page 1 (Modern Money Mechanics): TOP OF PAGE

Introduction The purpose of this booklet is to describe the basic process of money creation in a "fractional reserve" banking system. The approach taken illustrates the changes in bank balance sheets that occur when deposits in banks change as a result of monetary action by the Federal Reserve System - the central bank of the United States. The relationships shown are based on simplifying assumptions. For the sake of simplicity, the relationships are shown as if they were mechanical, but they are not, as is described later in the booklet. Thus, they should not be interpreted to imply a close and predictable relationship between a specific central bank transaction and the quantity of money.

Page 1 (Modern Money Mechanics): **What is Money?**

If money is viewed simply as a tool used to facilitate transactions, only those media that are readily accepted in exchange for goods, services, and other assets need to be considered. Many things - from stones to baseball cards - have served this monetary function through the ages. Today, in the United States, money used in transactions is mainly of three kinds - currency (paper money and coins in the pockets and purses of the public); demand deposits (non-interest bearing checking accounts in banks); and other checkable deposits, such as negotiable order of withdrawal (NOW) accounts, at all depository institutions, including commercial and savings banks, savings and loan associations, and credit unions.

Page 3 (Modern Money Mechanics): **Who Creates Money?**

Changes in the quantity of money may originate with actions of the Federal Reserve System (the central bank), depository institutions (principally commercial banks), or the public. The major control, however, rests with the central bank. The actual process of money creation takes place primarily in banks. (1) As noted earlier, checkable liabilities of banks are money. These liabilities are customers' accounts. They increase when customers deposit currency and checks and when the proceeds of loans made by the banks are credited to borrowers' accounts.

(1) In order to describe the money-creation process as simply as possible, the term "bank" used in this booklet should be understood to encompass all depository institutions. Since the Depository Institutions Deregulation and Monetary Control Act of 1980, all depository institutions have been permitted to offer interest bearing transaction accounts to certain customers. Transaction accounts (interest bearing as well as demand deposits on which payment of interest is still legally prohibited) at all depository institutions are subject to the reserve requirements set by the Federal Reserve. Thus all such institutions, not just commercial banks, have the potential for creating money.

Page 6 (Modern Money Mechanics): BOTTOM PAGE 6 TOP OF PAGE 7

If business is active, the banks with excess reserves probably will have opportunities to loan the \$9,000. Of course, they do not really pay out loans from the money they receive as deposits. If they did this, no additional money would be created. **What they do when they make loans is to accept promissory notes in exchange for credits to the borrowers' transaction accounts.** Loans (assets) and deposits (liabilities) both rise by \$9,000. Reserves are unchanged by the loan transactions. But the deposit credits constitute new additions to the total deposits of the banking system.

If you doubt the provided snippets from the said manual (Modern Money Mechanics), you can download your own copy at:

<http://www.rayservers.com/images/ModernMoneyMechanics.pdf>

Likewise, I would like to bring your attention to the Jerome Daly Case of December 1968, also known as the Credit River Decision, for which the BANKER, (Mr. Morgan), himself admitted on Record of the Court that the BANKERS have NO CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY to CREATE MONEY, much less create it out of thin air!

Mr. Morgan admitted that all of the money or credit which was used as a consideration was created upon their books, that this was standard banking practice exercised by their bank in combination with the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, another private Bank; further that he knew of no United States Statute or Law that gave the Plaintiff the authority to do this. Plaintiff further claimed

If you doubt the validity of this information provided you can download a copy yourself at:
https://archive.org/stream/pdfy-83f9GYTm1KE7PLuo/Jerome-Daly-The-Mahoney-Credit-River-Decision_djvu.txt

The above SNIPPET was taken from the bottom of Page 1 of the Link provided above.

05. Is there anything within TILA and or RESPA that allows the BANKERS to OMIT DISCLOSING the fact that they are going to create an account in the Borrower's Name or Property; and then create a CREDIT on their Books for the amount stated on the Promissory Note signed by the Borrower without the said consent or knowledge of the Borrower, and then hand back to the Borrower something that was none existent until the Money was created out of thin air and derived from the Borrower's signature on the said Promissory Note and then deem it to be a LEGAL CONTRACT?

Please feel free to download TILA and RESPA

<https://www.federalreserve.gov/boarddocs/supmanual/cch/til.pdf>

<https://www.federalreserve.gov/boarddocs/supmanual/cch/respa.pdf>

I have read every single page of both ACTS in their entirety and these prepared documents and I have searched high and low for anything that would allow for the BANKS to OMIT DISCLOSING that they were not LOANING a single cent of its own money but was CREATING a CREDIT on its books derived from the Signature by the Borrower on the Promissory Note; thereby utilizing the Promissory Note as a DRAFT under UCC as a DEPOSIT from the Borrower. Nowhere, has any Borrower (Home-Buyer) or did any Home-Buyer ever agree to LOAN the Bank Money, that the Bank would then hand back to the Borrower (fraudulently claiming what they were giving the Borrower) was an existing Asset of the Bank prior to the said LOAN Process!

06. How is the BAR and BANKING Associations not UNCONSTITUTIONAL Monopolistic CARTELS?

Let us first begin with EXPOSING the LIE that is told by the Judges within the Courts.

THE LIE: "The policy of prohibiting laymen from practicing law is not for the purpose of creating a monopoly in the legal profession, nor for its protection, but to assure the public adequate protection in the pursuit of justice, by preventing the intrusion of incompetent and unlearned persons in the practice of law."

This LIE was spewed in the Judge's RULING in that of the First Set of Motions for which he denied Ms. Catherine Bishop from being represented by someone she had chosen to represent her! Let it be known that ANYONE when talking to her all of FIVE MINUTES lacks any knowledge of Law or Rules of Civil Procedure. Thus, I don't mean to be condescending but let us address the facts:

FACT 1: The Judge was fully aware that Ms. Catherine Bishop was incapable of truly representing herself in court!

FACT 2: The Judge was fully aware that the Plaintiff had not provided the information as was required by that of the General Rules of Civil Procedure.

FACT 3: The Judge was fully aware that Mr. Watters not only was more qualified to represent her, as established by the Interrogatives and Document Discovery served on the Plaintiff, but also that Mr. Watters was well knowledgeable of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as referenced within the Motions before the Judge for the Plaintiff's ACTION, or rather Lack of Action as it were!

FACT 4: The Judge was fully aware that Ms. Catherine Bishop had a Power of Attorney that spelled out that Mr. Watters not only had not made any promise in the outcome of the said action, but that also he was to receive, nor had requested, a single penny for his assistance.

Thus, this brings us to simple questions of:

1. How was and is denying Ms. Catherine Bishop from being represented by Mr. Watters for ,which he had researched the issue and the rules in regards to her issue?
2. How was she to be harmed by Mr. Watters (when he is and was more knowledgeable of the Court Cases, and the Rules of Civil Procedure)?

3. Was Ms. Catherine Bishop not harmed more by the Judge refusing to let Mr. Watters represent her, as now she is losing her home? One must remember the Power of Attorney proclaimed that Mr. Watters was offering no guarantee of Outcome, and likewise not receiving any payment of any kind for his said service to her on this issue!
4. This refusal of a Judge to let someone be represented by an individual of their choice reeks of corruption as this Judge and or Court enriches itself financially by ensuring that the DEFENDANTS are not represented by anyone more knowledgeable than the said DEFENDANT in the case, thereby ensuring the lowest level of defense, unless it being another member of the BAR for which is beholden to the Judge, and dependent for their livelihood! As noted the Judge and or Court Enriches itself by this action!

Please Take Notice of the State's own Judicial Website which exposes that the Judge and or Court is enriched by this action, not to mention incentivized to rule in favor of the BANKSTERS. Likewise, Ms. Catherine Bishop's Power of Attorney for Mr. Watters to represent her in this issue!

ⓧ AOL Mail - Inbox
ⓧ (17) Ibanez Case -
ⓧ (17) YouTube
ⓧ Banks Create Moni
ⓧ Public Index Search
ⓧ Public Index Se
ⓧ Court Roster Detail

← → ↺ Ⓜ
https://publicindex.sccourts.org/Aiken/PublicIndex/CaseDetails.aspx?County=028;CourtAgency=020033;Casenum=2018CP02005875;CaseType=V3dHKe
★ ☆ ⓧ

Aiken County
Second Judicial Circuit
Public Index

[Aiken County Home Page](#)
[South Carolina Judicial Department Home Page](#)
[SC.GOV Home Page](#)

Switch View

Bank Of America N A VS Joe Louis Green , defendant, et al

Case Number:	2018CP0200587	Court Agency:	Master In Equity	Filed Date:	05/15/2018
Case Type:	Common Pleas	Case Sub Type:	Foreclosure 420	File Type:	Non-Jury
Status:	Sale Roster	Assigned Judge:	Griffith, M. Anderson		
Disposition:	Ended by Non Jury	Disposition Date:	06/21/2018	Disposition Judge:	Griffith, M. Anderson
Original Source Doc:		Original Case #:			
Judgment Number:	2018CP0200587	Court Roster:			

Case Parties
Judgments
Tax Map Information
Associated Cases
Actions
Financials

Summary

Fine/Costs:	\$475.18	Total Paid for fine/costs:	\$475.18	Balance Due:	\$0.00
-------------	----------	----------------------------	----------	--------------	--------

Costs

Description	Cost Code	Amount	Charge Action	Disbursed Amount
Master's Order of Reference Fee (\$100)	MIEFEE	\$100.00		\$100.00
Master's Deed Fee	MDEED	\$25.00		\$25.00
Master's 1% Commission on Sale	MIEBCF	\$350.18		\$350.18

Payments

Payment Date	Receipt Number	Entered By	Transaction Type Code	Payment Amount
09/13/2018	14930	c02sjowers	PY	\$350.18
05/24/2018	14720	c02sjowers	PY	\$125.00



Aiken County Second Judicial Circuit Public Index



[Aiken County Home Page](#)
[South Carolina Judicial Department Home Page](#)
[SC.GOV Home Page](#)

Switch View

Bayview Loan Servicing Llc A Delaware Limited Liability Co VS Margie Yaun

Case Number:	2018CP0200357	Court Agency:	Master In Equity	Filed Date:	04/16/2018
Case Type:	Common Pleas	Case Sub Type:	Foreclosure 420	File Type:	Non-Jury
Status:	Sale Roster	Assigned Judge:	Griffith, M. Anderson		
Disposition:	Ended by Non Jury	Disposition Date:	05/22/2018	Disposition Judge:	Griffith, M. Anderson
Original Source Doc:		Original Case #:			
Judgment Number:	2018CP0200357	Court Roster:			

Case Parties Judgments Tax Map Information Associated Cases Actions Financials					
Summary					
Fine/Costs:	\$709.00	Total Paid for fine/costs:	\$709.00	Balance Due:	\$0.00
Costs					
Description	Cost Code	Amount	Charge Action	Disbursed Amount	
Master's Order of Reference Fee (\$100)	MIEFEE	\$100.00		\$100.00	
Master's Deed Fee	MDEED	\$25.00		\$25.00	
Master's 1% Commission on Sale	MIEBCF	\$584.00		\$584.00	
Payments					
Payment Date	Receipt Number	Entered By	Transaction Type Code	Payment Amount	
07/10/2018	14811	c02sjowers	PY	\$584.00	
04/30/2018	14668	c02sjowers	PY	\$125.00	

CP020035 5/1/2018 South Carolina Judicial Department - All rights reserved



Aiken County Second Judicial Circuit Public Index



[Aiken County Home Page](#)
[South Carolina Judicial Department Home Page](#)
[SC.GOV Home Page](#)

Switch View

Department Of Agriculture United States VS Angela D Fishalow

Case Number:	2017CP0202777	Court Agency:	Master In Equity	Filed Date:	06/18/2018
Case Type:	Common Pleas	Case Sub Type:	Foreclosure 420	File Type:	Non-Jury
Status:	Sale Roster	Assigned Judge:	Griffith, M. Anderson		
Disposition:	Ended by Non Jury	Disposition Date:	07/24/2018	Disposition Judge:	Griffith, M. Anderson
Original Source Doc:		Original Case #:			
Judgment Number:	2017CP0202777	Court Roster:			

Case Parties | Judgments | Tax Map Information | Associated Cases | Actions | Financials

Summary					
Fine/Costs:	\$534.00	Total Paid for fine/costs:	\$534.00	Balance Due:	\$0.00

Costs				
Description	Cost Code	Amount	Charge Action	Disbursed Amount
Master's 1% Commission on Sale	MIEBCF	\$409.00		\$409.00
Master's Deed Fee	MDEED	\$25.00		\$25.00
Master's Order of Reference Fee (\$100)	MIEFEE	\$100.00		\$100.00

Payments				
Payment Date	Receipt Number	Entered By	Transaction Type Code	Payment Amount
09/10/2018	14924	c02sjowers	PY	\$409.00
06/29/2018	14780	c02sjowers	PY	\$125.00

CP020277 5/1/2018 South Carolina Judicial Department - All rights reserved

**Aiken County
Second Judicial Circuit
Public Index**

[Aiken County Home Page](#)
[South Carolina Judicial Department Home Page](#)
[SC GOV Home Page](#)

Switch View					
Dlj Mortgage Capital Inc VS Jennifer L. Sessions , defendant, et al					
Case Number:	2018CP0201281	Court Agency:	Master In Equity	Filed Date:	07/10/2018
Case Type:	Common Pleas	Case Sub Type:	Foreclosure 420	File Type:	Non-Jury
Status:	Sale Roster	Assigned Judge:	Griffith, M. Anderson		
Disposition:	Ended by Non Jury	Disposition Date:	09/28/2018	Disposition Judge:	Griffith, M. Anderson
Original Source Doc:		Original Case #:			
Judgment Number:	2018CP0201281	Court Roster:			

Case Parties Judgments Tax Map Information Associated Cases Actions Financials					
Summary					
Fine/Costs:	\$1,424.37	Total Paid for fine/costs:	\$1,424.37	Balance Due:	\$0.00
Costs					
Description	Cost Code	Amount	Charge Action	Disbursed Amount	
Master's Order of Reference Fee (\$100)	MIEFEE	\$100.00		\$100.00	
Master's Deed Fee	MDEED	\$25.00		\$25.00	
Master's 1% Commission on Sale	MIEBCF	\$1,299.37		\$1,299.37	
Payments					
Payment Date	Receipt Number	Entered By	Transaction Type Code	Payment Amount	
11/30/2018	15072	c02sjowers	PY	\$1,299.37	
07/31/2018	14845	c02sjowers	PY	\$125.00	

Copyright © 2013 South Carolina Judicial Department - All rights reserved

**Aiken County
Second Judicial Circuit
Public Index**

[Aiken County Home Page](#)
[South Carolina Judicial Department Home Page](#)
[SC GOV Home Page](#)

Switch View					
First Guaranty Mortgage Corporation VS Anita Michelle Dean , defendant, et al					
Case Number:	2018CP0200227	Court Agency:	Master In Equity	Filed Date:	04/19/2018
Case Type:	Common Pleas	Case Sub Type:	Foreclosure 420	File Type:	Non-Jury
Status:	Sale Roster	Assigned Judge:	Griffith, M. Anderson		
Disposition:	Ended by Non Jury	Disposition Date:	06/22/2018	Disposition Judge:	Griffith, M. Anderson
Original Source Doc:		Original Case #:			
Judgment Number:	2018CP0200227	Court Roster:			

Case Parties Judgments Tax Map Information Associated Cases Actions Financials					
Summary					
Fine/Costs:	\$925.00	Total Paid for fine/costs:	\$925.00	Balance Due:	\$0.00
Costs					
Description	Cost Code	Amount	Charge Action	Disbursed Amount	
Master's Order of Reference Fee (\$100)	MIEFEE	\$100.00		\$100.00	
Master's Deed Fee	MDEED	\$25.00		\$25.00	
Master's 1% Commission on Sale	MIEBCF	\$800.00		\$800.00	
Payments					
Payment Date	Receipt Number	Entered By	Transaction Type Code	Payment Amount	
09/13/2018	14950	c02sjowers	PY	\$800.00	
05/09/2018	14688	c02sjowers	PY	\$125.00	

Copyright © 2013 South Carolina Judicial Department - All rights reserved

As noted, these are just but FIVE examples, for which I have considerably more downloaded copies of in not just Aiken County, but every County of South Carolina! Do take notice that the Judge and or Court are receiving an INCENTIVE of 1% for every house that it forecloses on!

NO FORECLOSURE = NO PAY DAY!

Power of Attorney

THIS Power of Attorney is given by me Catherine L. Bishop (the "Principal"), presently of 306 Coral Way, Belvedere, SC, 29841, on this 4th day of June, 2018. C.B

Previous Power of Attorney

1. REVOKE any previous power of attorney granted by me.

Attorney-in-fact: Private Attorney General: Next Friend: Counsel

2. APPOINT Durren L. Walters, of 308 Coral Way, Belvedere, SC, 29841 to act as my Next Friend, Attorney-in-fact, Private Attorney General, or Counsel on my behalf.

Governing Law

3. This document will be governed by the Laws of South Carolina State, Common Law, and Canon Laws of Ethics with Jurisdiction the deciding factor as to Scope.

Liability of Attorney-in-fact: Private Attorney General: Next Friend: Counsel

4. My Next Friend, Attorney-in-fact, Private Attorney General, and Counsel, will not be liable to me, my estate, my heirs, successors or assigns for any action taken or not taken under this document, except for willful misconduct or gross negligence.

Effective Date

5. This Power of Attorney will not come into effect until 12:01 AM local time on the 5th Day of June, 2018, and will cease to be in effect on 12:01 AM local time on the 5th Day of June, 2038, or upon any time of my choosing prior to said date, and substantiated by that of Declaration of the revoking of said powers; before that of a South Carolina State, recognized Notary.

Powers of Attorney-in-fact: Private Attorney General: Next Friend: Counsel

6. My Attorney-in-fact, Private Attorney General, Next Friend, and Counsel will have the authority to do anything on my behalf that I may lawfully do.

A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY

Catherine L. Bishop
By *Durren L. Walters* Date 6/3/18
Deputy Clerk *JSR*



ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2018 JUN 29 3:05 PM - AREN - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2016CH020381

Specific Powers

7. Without restricting its generality in any way, the following power(s) are specifically included within the foregoing General Power:

Initials

X AB Real Estate Transactions

- a. To deal with any interest I may have in real property and sign all documents on my behalf concerning my interest, including, but not limited to, real property I may subsequently acquire or receive. These powers include but are not limited to, the ability to:
- i. Purchase, sell, exchange, accept as gift, place as security on loans, convey with or without covenants, to pay or contest taxes or assessments, control any legal claim in favor of or against me, partition or consent to partitioning, mortgage, charge, manage or otherwise deal with real estate and any interest therein; and
 - ii. Execute and deliver deeds, transfers, mortgages, charges, leases, assignments, surrenders, releases, satisfactions and other instruments required for any such purpose.
 - iii. Act as Legal Representative in all Legal and Court proceedings in reference to my Mortgage, Promissory Note, and all other matters as it applies to my property located at 306 Coral Way, Belvedere, South Carolina, 29841.

X CA Banking Transactions

- b. To do any act that I can do through an Attorney-in-fact, Private Attorney General, Next Friend, or Counsel with a bank or other financial institution. This power includes, but is not limited to, the power to:
- i. Open, maintain or close bank accounts (including, but not limited to, checking accounts, savings accounts, demand deposit accounts, certificates of deposit, and promissory notes), brokerage accounts, and other similar accounts with financial institutions.

- ii. Conduct any business with any banking or financial institution with respect to any of my accounts, known or unknown, including, but not limited to, making deposits and withdrawals, negotiating or endorsing any checks or other instruments with respect to any such accounts, obtaining bank statements, obtaining procedural practice documents in regards to any of my accounts, passbooks, drafts, money orders, warrants, and certificates or vouchers payable to me by any person, firm, corporation, or political entity;
- iii. Borrow money from any banking or financial institution if deemed necessary by my Attorney-in-fact, Private Attorney General, and or Counsel, and to manage all aspects of the loan process, including the placement of security and the negotiation of terms;
- iv. Perform any act necessary to deposit, negotiate, sell or transfer any note, security, draft of the United States of America, including U.S. Treasury Securities, or International Promissory Notes, and Personal Promissory Notes;
- v. Have access to any safe deposit box that I might own, or having been unknowingly established in my name, including its contents; and
- vi. Create and deliver any financial statements necessary to or from any bank or financial institution.

X CA Claims and Litigation Matters

- c. To institute, maintain, defend, compromise, arbitrate or otherwise dispose of, any and all actions, suits, attachments or other legal proceedings for or against me. This power includes, but is not limited to, the power to: appear on my behalf, and the power to settle any claim against me in whichever forum or manner my Attorney-in-fact, Private Attorney General, Next Friend, Counsel deems prudent, and to receive or pay any resulting settlement.

X CB Tax Matters

- d. To act for me in all matters that affect my local, state and federal taxes in relation to my property located at 306 Coral Way, Belvedere, South Carolina, 29841 to include: prepare, sign, and file documents with any governmental or private body or agency.

X ~~CB~~ **Chattel and Goods Transactions**

- e. To purchase, sell or otherwise deal with any type of personal property I may currently or in the future have an interest in. This includes, but is not limited to, the power to purchase, sell, exchange, accept as a gift, place as security on loans, to pay or contest taxes or assessments; mortgage or pledge.

X ~~CB~~ **Estate Transactions**

- f. To do any act that I can do through an Attorney-in-fact, Private Attorney General, Next Friend, or Counsel with regard to all matters that affect any trust or TRUST, probate estate, conservatorship, or other fund from which I may receive payment as beneficiary. This power includes the power to disclaim any interest which might otherwise be transferred or distributed to me from any person, estate, trust, or other entity, as may be appropriate. However, my Attorney-in-fact, Private Attorney General, Next friend, Counsel cannot disclaim assets to which I would be entitled, if the result is that the disclaimed assets pass directly or indirectly to my Attorney-in-fact's, Private Attorney General's, Next Friend's, Counsel's estate.

Attorney-in-fact, Private Attorney General, Next friend, Counsel Compensation

8. My Attorney-in-fact, Private Attorney General, Next Friend, Counsel will receive no compensation associated with the carrying out of my wishes.

Personal Gain from Managing My Affairs

9. My Attorney-in-fact, Private Attorney General, Next Friend, Counsel is not allowed to personally gain from any transaction he may complete on my behalf.

Delegation of Authority

10. My Attorney-in-fact, Private Attorney General, Next Friend, Counsel may not delegate any authority granted under this document.

Attorney-in-fact, Private Attorney General, Next Friend, Counsel Restrictions

11. This Power of Attorney is not subject to any conditions or restrictions other than those noted above.

Power of Attorney – Page 5 of 6

Notice to Third Parties

12. Any third party who receives a valid copy of this Power of Attorney can rely on and act under it. A third party who relies on the reasonable representations of my Attorney-in-fact, Private Attorney General, Next Friend, Counsel as to a matter relating to a power granted by this Power of Attorney will not incur any liability to the Principal or the Principal's heirs, assigns, or estate as a result of permitting the Attorney-in-fact, Private Attorney General, Next Friend, Counsel to exercise authority granted by this Power of Attorney up to the point of revocation of this Power of Attorney. Revocation of this Power of Attorney will not be effective as to a third party until the third party receives notice and has actual knowledge of the revocation.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2018 JUN 28 3:05 PM - Aiken - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2016CP0200361

Power of Attorney – Page 6 of 6

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2018 JUN 28 3:05 PM - AIKEN - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2018CV0200381

Acknowledgement

13. I, Catherine S. Bishop, being the Principal named in this Power of Attorney hereby acknowledge:

- a. I have read and understand the nature and effect of this Power of Attorney;
- b. I am of legal age in the State of South Carolina to grant a Power of Attorney; and
- c. I am voluntarily giving this Power of Attorney.

IN WITNESS WHERE OF I hereunto set my hand and seal at the City of North Augusta in the State of South Carolina, this 4th day of June, 2018.

SIGNED, SEALED, AND DELIVERED

In the presence of:

Witness: William B. Harrell III (Sign)
Witness Name: WILLIAM B. HARRELL III
Address: 3016 CORRAL WAY
NORTH AUGUSTA SC 29841

Catherine S. Bishop
(Principal)

Witness: Karla R. Monweather (Sign)
Witness Name: Karla R. Monweather
Address: 537 Edgefield Rd
North Augusta, SC 29841

NOTARY ACKNOWLEDGMENT

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF Aiken

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 4th day of June, 2018.

by Elizabeth A. Russo

My Commission Expires
July 10, 2020

Now that we have established that the TRUE REASON why the Judges and the Courts have engaged in stripping UNCONSTITUTIONALLY the RIGHT of an individual to choose who they wish to represent them; i.e. for their FINANCIAL GAIN, let us also use some COMMON SENSE (AS HARD AS THAT MAY BE)!

If “We the People” need to have our Freedom of Choice, (LIBERTY), stripped from us because **you have decided** that we lack the Capacity to make our own decisions, then explain to “We the People” how then you can at the same time deem that any Home Loan is Legitimate; as according to you we are INCOMPETENT to make choices. I mean let’s face the TRUTH entering into a Mortgage Contract with all these Legal Documents you DEEM we are COMPETENT, yet Choosing someone to represent us, we are INCOMPETENT? Forgive me for stating the OBVIOUS, but choosing someone to represent us requires a lot less Competency then Reading, Comprehending, and signing of these Contracts! Therefore, as you (THE COURTS AND JUDGES) have deemed us TOO INCOMPETENT to choose someone to represent us in a Civil Court Proceeding then how are we likewise not to be deemed as TOO INCOMPETENT as to have entered into the Mortgage Loan Contracts?

Am I TOO STUPID as to understand the Due Process Clause, (Fourteenth Amendment, Section I), “[N]or shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.” As none of “We the People” have engaged in a CRIME to have our LIBERTY (Freedom of Choice and to Contract) stripped from us, then Where do you believe you were given the Authority and or Power to STRIP “We the People” of a God-Given RIGHT?

Likewise, I am sure you’ve heard of:

“The practice of Law CAN NOT be licensed by any state/State.”

((Schware v. Board of Examiners, 353 U.S. 238, 239), (1957) U.S. LEXIS 980)

“The practice of Law is AN OCCUPATION OF COMMON RIGHT!”

(Sims v. Aherns, 271 S.W. 720 (1925))

Do take notice that Judge M. Anderson Griffith was provided this TRUTH in the Second Set of Motions, for which he received prior to the said Final Hearing! Thus let us see what the Judge Received and therefore cannot claim IGNORANCE of the LAW or the FACTS:

RECONSIDERATION


(Right to Counsel)

Now comes the Defendant, Ms. Catherine Bishop, bringing forth this Motion for RECONSIDERATION of Judge M. Anderson Griffith's RULING on multiple reasons and issues for Dismissal of said Mortgage Foreclosure Complaint brought by the Plaintiff (Bank of America, N.A.).

The first issue is one of your Honor engaging in depriving myself of my Constitutional Right to Counsel of my choosing. You stated for the record as e-filed on 27 June 2018 the following "The South Carolina Constitution assigns to this Court the duty to regulate the practice of law." You then went on to reference S.C. Const. Art V, §4. "South Carolina, like other jurisdictions, limits the practice of law to licensed attorneys," *Brown v. Coe*, 365 S.C. 137, 139, 616 S.E. 2d 705, 706 (2005) (citation omitted). "The policy of prohibiting laymen from practicing law is not for the purpose of creating a monopoly in the legal profession, nor for its protection, but to assure the public adequate protection in the pursuit of justice, by preventing the intrusion of incompetent and unlearned persons in the practice of law." *State ex. Daniel v. Wells*, 191 S.C. 468, 5 S.E. 2d 181, 186 (1939). *Boone v. Quicken Loans*, 420 S.C. 452, 803 S.E. 2d 707 (2017). The individual was not a licensed attorney and was not allowed to represent the interests of the defendant.

The RULING for which you denied me my Right to Counsel of "MY CHOOSING" is found to not only have errors of law, but also CONTRADICTS STATE EVIDENCE that supports the TRUTH of my said RIGHT to have Mr. Watters act as my representative in this matter before the court.

First off I present a SCREENSHOT of the STATE's website for which declares the PROFESSIONAL OCCUPATIONAL LICENSES issued by the STATE!



I will now provide TWO more screenshots taken from the South Carolina JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT website. (Please see them below)

[illegible]

The screenshot displays the official website of the South Carolina Judicial Department. The header includes the department's name and a navigation menu with links such as Home, About Us, Contact Us, and various court-related services. The main content area is titled "Court Forms" and lists several forms available for download, including the "Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus" and the "Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Out of State)". Each form is accompanied by a brief description of its purpose and a link to the form itself.

To give you a better view let me provide you the same screenshot, but not from the Courts Copy of the Second Set of Motions:

<https://www.sccourts.org/forms/pdf/SCCA761.pdf>

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA	)	
	)	CIVIL CASE NUMBER
COUNTY OF _____	)	
	)	IN THE MAGISTRATE'S COURT
_____	)	
Plaintiff(s)	)	
	)	
vs.	)	AUTHORIZATION FOR
	)	NON-LAWYER REPRESENTATIVE
_____	)	
Defendant(s)	)	

I, the undersigned, as _____ of _____
authorize _____, a non-lawyer, to represent this business in the
above-titled civil action. I acknowledge that the business is legally bound by all actions undertaken by
the representative during the course of the representation, as well as to any judgment of the Court
obtained there from.

Sworn to and Subscribed before me	)	
this _____ day of _____, 20 _____	)	
	)	
Magistrate or Notary Public for South Carolina	)	Signature
	)	
My Commission expires _____	)	For _____

SCCA/761 (Amended 05/2003)

<https://www.sccourts.org/forms/pdf/SCCA762.pdf>

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF _____

IN THE MAGISTRATE'S COURT

AUTHORIZATION FOR
NON-LAWYER REPRESENTATIVE

I, the undersigned, as _____ of _____
authorize _____, a non-lawyer, to represent this business in civil
actions in Magistrate's Court. I acknowledge that the business is legally bound by all actions
undertaken by the representative during the course of the representation, as well as to any judgment of
the Court obtained there from. I further acknowledge that it is my responsibility to notify the Court of
any change in the status of this authorization.

Sworn to and Subscribed before me
this _____ day of _____, 20____

Magistrate or Notary Public for South Carolina

Signature

My Commission expires _____

For

SCCA/762 (Amended 05/2008)

We the People wait patiently for you, being supposedly an HONORABLE Judge to inform us as to why these two forms, as noted above on (Page 38 and 39), exist if no such RIGHT exists for us to be able to choose who we wish to represent us? Common Sense would have us NON-LEGALESERS believing that the COURT and THE JUDGES THEREIN only use this claim when you deem that you or your brethren of the BAR would stand a chance of losing the said case by that of the individual actually having someone represent them who doesn't have loyalty its brethren or the BAR Association. In TRUTH any CIVIL Matter not handled via a Jury of One's Peers in matters exceeding \$20.00 dollars in value has an immediate Conflict of Interest as the Judge and the Plaintiff both belong to the same Country Club (Bar Association)! Thus, the REASONING the Founding Fathers ensured the inclusion of the Seventh Amendment in the Bill of Rights and the United States Constitution for America because they foresaw the probability of Corrupt Judges and Courts due to the Nature of Man! The solution was simple by ensuring that "We the People" were to be guaranteed a Jury of our Peers as it's extremely hard to HIDE the CORRUPTION from the Public, in this manner!

Thus as established and proven by Common Sense and fact of INCENTIVIZED JUDGES not only proves it is UNCONSTITUTIONAL but also a Corrupt Monopolistic Cartel; the same as the Unconstitutional BANKING Cartel! Of course no Judges want to address this issue as this MONOPOLY structure is what ensures you and all other members of the BAR with your livelihoods!

Now let us continue with the rest of the cases and facts that was presented to Judge M. Anderson Griffith in that of the Second Set of Motions filed with the Court.

As noted, above, there are forms for the AUTHORIZATION OF NON-LAWYERS to be used as a representative in JUDICIAL MATTERS (which is inclusive of CIVIL Litigation). As noted the Masters in Equity Court is a JUDICIAL COURT which derives its cases from the Circuit Courts in matters of CIVIL LITIGATION which includes Mortgage Foreclosures as it entails CONTRACTS!

So, now that I have shown you that the STATE does not issue any LICENSE to PRACTICE LAW, and I have shown you that the STATE's own JUDICIAL WEBSITE includes forms itself so that individuals may have NON-LAWYERS Represent them, do you now concede that you had no AUTHORITY to DEPRIVE myself of the Right to have someone represent me because he did not have a LAW LICENSE?

Likewise, it must be pointed out that Mr. Watters did request that you have the Plaintiff's Attorney/Lawyer produce this said LICENSE, for which HE did not respond, but "YOU DID!" The Plaintiff never objected to my being represented until you PROMPTED him by saying "Well, do you object?" for which he retorted uh, yeh I object! As noted the plaintiff never once argued any grounds for the objection, but you yourself declared yourself to be the Attorney for the Plaintiff and argued on behalf of the Plaintiff (FROM THE BENCH)! You even proclaimed "that he most likely didn't have it on him" while knowing the TRUTH that no such LICENSE exists!

Let me provide even more proof of the error of your decision:

If you adhere to your Oath of Office, which I must say is doubtful as you NEVER answered the question asked by Mr. Watters "Judge, is your loyalty and oath not to uphold the United States Constitution?)"

Everyone with COMMON SENSE knows and understands that the basis of the CONSTITUTION is to PROTECT and DEFEND against ALL ENEMIES FOREIGN and DOMESTIC the encroachment against THE AMERICAN PEOPLE and their GOD GIVEN RIGHTS! Not government given, Not BAR ASSOCIATION given, but GOD GIVEN!

These rights are noted within the CONSTITUTION as: LIFE, LIBERTY, and the PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS.

As noted, LIBERTY is inclusive of FREEDOM of: (MOVEMENT, CHOICE, SPEECH, and DEFENSE). Likewise, PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS is inclusive of one's RIGHT, not PRIVILEGE, but RIGHT to engage in Hunting, Fishing, and engaging in any business and or occupation to provide for themselves and their families without being fined or fee'd for such activity!

AS NOTED a LICENSE is: <http://thelawdictionary.org/License/>

In the law of contracts, A permission, accorded by a competent authority, conferring the right to do some act which without such authorization would be illegal, or would be a trespass or a tort.

State v. Hipp, 38 Ohio St, 220;

Youngblood v. Sexton, 32 Mich, 406, 20 Am, Rep, 954;

Hubman v. State, 61 Ark, 452, 33 S, W, 843;

Chicago v. Collins, 175 Ill, 445, 51 N. E, 907, 49 L. R. A, 405, 67 L. R. A, 224.

Thus, Judge M. Anderson Griffith, are you proclaiming that a GOD GIVEN RIGHT is ILLEGAL? If yes then please state where you believe that you, the BAR, or even the Government has the authority/jurisdiction to convert God Given Rights into such an illegality that one needs permission from the BAR; which is not even the Government but a Private Association! As noted neither one of the cases you cited stated where they obtained the authority from God to change his RIGHTS bestowed upon man to being that of an ILLEGAL ACTION!

Do you proclaim that because a member of the BAR infiltrated the LEGISLATIVE BRANCH and passed a STATUTE to proclaim a GOD GIVEN RIGHT to be ILLEGAL, unless the Individual joined your ASSOCIATION that we the American Sovereigns, also noted as South Carolina residents, are to be deprived of such RIGHT? Well, Judge, I see you your State Statute and Raise you (or should I say I raise the issue of My GOD GIVEN RIGHTS as enshrined within the same United States Constitution, for which I believe is referred to as the Supreme Law of the Land) thereby I refer you to the following:

"The practice of Law CAN NOT be licensed by any state/State."
(Schware v. Board of Examiners, 353 U.S. 238, 239)

"The practice of Law is AN OCCUPATION OF COMMON RIGHT!"
(Sims v. Aherns, 271 S.W. 720 (1925))

Likewise, as noted the conversion of a Sovereigns RIGHTS into that of a PRIVILEGE is nothing short of TREASON!

"No state may convert a secured liberty into a privilege, and issue a license and fee for it."
(MURDOCK v. PENNSYLVANIA, 319 U.S. 105)

"If the state does convert a right into a privilege and issue a license and charge a fee for it, you can ignore the license and fee and engage in the right with impunity."
(SHUTTLESWORTH V. BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA, 373 U.S. 262)

"The claim and exercise of a constitutional right cannot thus be converted into a crime"
(Miller v. US (5th Circuit) 230 F. 2d. 486 (1956) Miranda v. Arizona 384 US 436 (1966))

"Where rights are secured by the constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them."
(Hale v. Henkel 201 US 43 (1906))

"...a legislative act contrary to the constitution is not law...an act of the legislature repugnant to the constitution is void."
(Norton v. Shelby County 118 US 425 (1886))

Might I remind you Judge M. Anderson Griffith that your Oath of Office is to protect the residents of South Carolina and America against ILLEGAL and UNCONSTITUTIONAL STATUTES, not to ENFORCE THEM against us!

"...an ordinance which makes the peaceful enjoyment of freedoms which the constitution guarantees contingent upon the uncontrolled will of an official - as by requiring a permit or license which may be granted or withheld in the discretion of such official - is an unconstitutional censorship or prior restraint upon the enjoyment of those freedoms."
(United States v. Jackson 390 US 570 (1968))

"If a law has 'no other purpose...' than to chill the assertion of constitutional rights by penalizing those who choose to exercise them, then it [is] patently unconstitutional."
(Cohens v. Virginia (6 Whenton) 19 US 264 (1821))

"...It is the duty of courts to be watchful for the constitutional rights of the citizen, and against any stealthy encroachment thereon."
(Marbury v. Madison (1 Cranch 170) 5 US 137 (1803))

Likewise, your choice to try and enforce such a MONOPOLISTIC piece of Bovine Excrement to deprive me of a God Given Right deems that you should be put on notice:

"The Eleventh Amendment provides no shield for a state official confronted by a claim that he had deprived another of a federal right under the color of state law...when a state officer acts under a state law in a manner violative of the federal constitution. And he is, in that case, stripped of his official or representative character, and is subjected in his person to the consequences of his individual conduct. The state has no power to impart to him any immunity from responsibility to the supreme authority of the United States."
(Staub v. Baxley 355 US 313 (1958))

"A law cannot exceed the authority of the lawgiver. We have no more right to decline the exercise of jurisdiction which is given, than to usurp that which is not given. The one or the other would be treason to the constitution. The several state legislatures and judiciaries, are all bound by solemn obligation of an oath, to support the federal constitution;...willfully legislating in violation of that constitution...[is] guilty of perjury. [309]"
(United States v. Murdock 290 US 389 (1933))

So, Much for the BAR MORALITY CLAUSE! Bar members (i.e. engaging in the violation of the Separation of Powers Clause, as well as Articles I, II, and III of the United States Constitution) by enacting ILLEGAL and UNCONSTITUTIONAL STATUTES and then other BAR members (yourself included) enforcing these ILLEGAL and UNCONSTITUTIONAL STATUTES which it thereby enriches the BAR. The last time I looked I believe that fits the definition of EXTORTION, RACKETEERING, CONSPIRACY AGAINST RIGHTS, and DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF LAW.

Likewise it should be noted that your Black robe and Title does not protect you from prosecution for engaging in such behavior!

It should be noted that since you are so apt at wanting to usurp the United States Constitution by exerting Unconstitutional STATUES on myself and other residents of South Carolina that you and your brethren of the BAR should take notice of:

"...statutes have been passed extending the courts of admiralty and vice-admiralty far beyond their ancient limits for depriving us the accustomed and inestimable privilege of trial by jury, in cases affecting both life and property To supersede the course of common law and instead thereof to publish and order the use and exercise of the law martial and for altering fundamentally the form of government established by charter. We saw the misery to which such despotism would reduce us."

(Causes and Necessity of Taking Up Arms, (1775))

You, Mr. Griffith are engaging in the same actions that your BAR Organization already attempted some 243+ years ago against America! It didn't sit well with the American SOVEREIGNS then, and likewise, the American SOVEREIGNS are waking up and taking notice of the FRAUD(S) being perpetrated by the courts of today!

Chris Duke said it best!

Legality is the shelter for swindlers and thieves they make for themselves by passing statutes and acts. It is NOT law unless you consent to it.

(Chris Duke)

As noted STATUTES are NOT LAW! They are in fact Corporate Policies for United States Citizens, i.e. corporate employees of the United States Corporation, nothing more, nothing less! Statutes do not apply to living breathing beings outside the scope of your corporation for which you work! If you don't believe me, I suggest you read *A Manual of Parliamentary Practice* by Thomas Jefferson! You will quickly note that a law cannot be law unless it meets TWO CONDITIONS:

1. It must be voted on by the People of each individual state, not the bar members who infiltrated the senate, the congress, and even the executive branches of government in violation of the Constitution itself, but by actual votes of the People; the same as what is noted during some election processes! i.e. it (the legislation) is put before THE SOVEREIGNS on that of a ballot!
2. It must not abridge any RIGHT(S) of any individual, i.e. a REPUBLIC is based on the individuals and their INDIVIDUAL GOD GIVEN RIGHTS, not MOB RULE!

If one studies History they will see in the days of old every law had to be voted on by the Sovereigns of each State (not by the Representatives, but the Sovereigns), then the Representatives would come together in Congress and Were to vote the WILL of the Sovereigns of their perspective Districts. Each Bill was to pass with 2/3rds Majority Vote! So each county and its districts would vote and each district would have to obtain 2/3rds vote, then the District Representatives would come together and Vote the Will of the Sovereigns in their Respective Districts (today we refer to these districts as counties). So, the Representatives of the 46 Counties of South Carolina would come together and vote the will of their individual counties. Now, if the legislation met the TWO CONDITIONS ABOVE, and 31 of the 46 counties voted favorably to the legislation then it would pass and go to the Governor's desk to be signed!

Likewise, if in passing a Federal Law it would get passed by the Senate or the Congress at the Federal Level, but then it had to be pushed down to the states for the Sovereigns to Vote on it. If it passed 2/3rds vote then it was handed back up to the Federal Government and then sent to the President for signing or VETO! Well, low and behold the BANKERS and the BAR figured out that they couldn't hide their FRAUD(S) from the Sovereigns in such a manner, as it was the LEGISLATION that was the main NEWS for which everyone would read! Thus, they stopped passing LAWS that way after they FRAUDULENTLY and UNCONSTITUTIONALLY established the United States Corporation in 1871 and quickly replaced the TRUE process for legislation to come into law and CODIFIED it as STATUTES.

Now, since they weren't passing LAWS, they could by-pass the SOVEREIGNS and keep their FRAUD(S) hidden from the PUBLIC! Thus, at this point the BAR and the BANKERS used ENCROACHMENT and INDOCTRINATION to hide the TRUTH from the Sovereign Americans! The SOVEREIGNS were told not to worry about the STATUTES as they only applied to the said Corporation in Washington D.C., then later they spread the BAR JUDGES Far and Wide across this country to implement these STATUTES by converting the legitimate REPUBLIC Government into the UNCONSTITUTIONAL CORPORATION calling itself the government today! That was the ENCROACHMENT PART, but the SOVEREIGNS still had to be dumbed down and reprogrammed (INDOCTRINATED) to believe that Bills became Laws without direct voting by the sovereigns. Thereby they took full control of the schools and made it part of the curriculum to show that only the Legislators did the voting, not the sovereigns as individuals! They even produced videos and took control of the media (PBS) to ingrain the FRAUD as being the TRUTH by TELEVISIONING "I'm just a Bill" which was nothing short of Brainwashing/INDOCTRINATION! This solved TWO issues for the FRAUDSTERS:

1. As the sovereigns would not read the legislation anymore, they wouldn't know what was within it.
2. Now that the Statutes were in place they started using the STATUTES against the public and kept referring to the Statutes as LAW, while knowing they were nothing more than that for which they really are (STATUTES)! (Corporate Policies)

The difference is that statutes are NOT PASSED in accordance with the required methods of being a REAL LAW. Thus, there was a REMEDY for this FRAUD and it was called REBUTTAL. However, over time with enough dumbing down of the population by the Stat Controlled (INDOCTRINATION) Education System for which they started believing that the Statutes were Law because the Police, and the BAR MEMBERS (Judges) kept stating they were Laws i.e. synonymous with each other while knowing the TRUTH that they are not; i.e. the BAR was in fact engaging in FRAUD against the American Sovereigns!

AS MORE PROOF THAT THE STATUTES THAT YOU REFERENCE ARE NONE APPLICABLE:

"The people have succeeded to the rights of the King, the former sovereign of this State. They are not, therefore, bound by general words in a statute restrictive of prerogative, without being expressly named. E.g., the Insolvent Law."

(THE PEOPLE v. HERKIMER, Gentleman, one, &c - 4 Cowen 345; 1825 N.Y. LEXIS 80)

Likewise, Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons

"Under basic rules of construction, statutory laws enacted by legislative bodies cannot impair rights given under a constitution. 194 B.R. at 925. "

In re Young, 235 B.R. 666 (Bankr.M.D.Fla., 1999)

And Last but not Least let us reference the Supreme Court itself on this matter of who the STATUTES are applicable to:

"The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights as a citizen. He is entitled to carry on his private business in his own way[unregulated by the government]. His power to contract is unlimited. He owes no duty to the State or to his neighbor to divulge his business, or to open his doors to an investigation, so far as it may tend to criminate him. He owes no such duty to the State, since he receives nothing therefrom, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State, and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. Among his rights are a refusal to incriminate himself, and the immunity of himself and his property from arrest or seizure except under a warrant of the law. He owes nothing to the public [including so - called "taxes" under Subtitle A of the I.R.C.] so long as he does not trespass upon their rights." (Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43, 74 (1906))

Thus, as anyone with COMMON SENSE can see the STATUTES that you refer to only apply to those who work for UNITED STATES CORPORATION! As I am not a United States Citizen, but am in fact an American Citizen. Likewise, I was not born in South Carolina nor am I an employee of your corporation, your cited STATUTES are hereby REBUTTED!

Thus, as stated your logic and use of law to deprive me of my RIGHT for Mr. Waters to Represent me in my Litigation Matter before the Court is, and was, both unlawful and unconstitutional, as my power to contract is unlimited, and I contracted via Power of Attorney from which you took and did not return during the Motions Hearing on 5 June 2018. Let it be known that you not only Deprived me of my RIGHT, but also engaged in utilizing a STATUTE for which does not, and never did, apply to me; as I am not an employee of the United States Corporation for which they were derived!

"State Citizenship is a vested substantial property right, and the State has no power to divest or impair these rights."

(Favot v. Kingsbury, (1929) 98 Cal. App. 284, 276 P. 1083)

Likewise, on must remember that just because Members of the BAR got together and concocted legislation, does not mean that I consented to it;

"There, every man is independent of all laws, except those prescribed by nature. He is not bound by any institutions formed by his fellowmen without his consent."

(CRUDEN v. NEALE, 2 N.C. 338 (1796) 2 S.E. 70.)

I believe that the Dissenting opine by Justice Marshall Harlan in Downes v. Bidwell 182 U.S. 244 clarified it quite well!

"Eliminating, then, from the opinions of this court all expressions unnecessary to the disposition of the particular case, and gleaning therefrom the exact point decided in each, the following propositions may be considered as established:

(That the District of Columbia and the territories are not states within the judicial clause of the Constitution giving jurisdiction in cases between citizens of different states) and;

(That the territories are not within the clause of the Constitution providing for the creation of a supreme court and such inferior courts as Congress may see fit to establish.)"

Thereby "Two national governments exist, one to be maintained under the Constitution, with all its restrictions, the other to be maintained by Congress outside and independently of that instrument."

I hereby await for you to reconsider your ruling in regards to DEPRIVING me of my RIGHT to choose who I deem appropriate to Represent myself as Counsel in this matter before the Court; and uphold your supposed Oath to the United States Constitution!

As noted Judge M. Anderson Griffith was supplied with the facts, the documents from the State's own website, and the cases as applicable to the issue as shown above; for which he never in truth addressed these facts in his Ruling/Rebuttal!

One should take notice that the COURT SYSTEM, being a De Facto CORPORATION (Government Fiction Entity) itself has NO LEGAL JURISDICTION presiding over MATTERS of "We the People" as the COURTS are in TRUTH Part and Parcel of the United States Corporation that went BANKRUPT in 1933 while working for the SAME BANKSTERS committing this FORECLOSURE SCAM-SCHEME-FRAUD against America on this very day!

Now, to anyone with COMMON SENSE, the COURTS are working for the same BANKSTERS to repay the ILLEGITIMATE and UNCONSTITUTIONAL DEBT caused by other Politicians and Judges that turned a blind eye to the actions of the BANKSTERS in order to enrich themselves!

The Purpose of the Courts is to repay a debt to the same BANKSTERS stealing the Property of America! These same Judges walk the act of SHAME every day when they enter the PEOPLE's COURTS (NOT THEIRS) and have to be boosted in their morale by hearing "the HONORABLE JUDGE (name inserted) NOW PRESIDING! This statement is nothing more than to deceiving the Public that JUDGES are of HONOR and boosting the morale of these JUDGES who understand the TRUTH of their ACTIONS!

Any Judge of HONOR would understand that paying off a FRAUDULENT DEBT cannot be accomplished in FRACTIONAL RESERVE BANKING SYSTEM devised by the same BANKSTERS that the JUDGES are beholden too! As anyone with COMMON SENSE can tell that if the one making the LOAN says CREATES \$100 dollars; that means there is only \$100 dollars available to pay back the LOAN with as that is the amount of money in circulation. It is noted that the BANKSTER is requiring that the LOAN be paid back with 10% interest meaning \$110 is to be repaid. Now it might be hard for a grown man or woman wearing a Black Robe to understand the TRUTH that if there is only \$100 dollars in circulation then it is physically impossible to repay \$110 dollars! To ensure the SCAM more complete they CONFISCATED all America's Gold in the United States Bankruptcy of 1933. And then progressed the monetary system into the Fractional Reserve; thereby creating a system where nothing can be paid for, as no real money now existed in the hands of America!

Thus, the TRUTH is that you self-proclaimed MEN and WOMEN of "HONOR" work for the BANKSTERS in their SCAM-SCHEME-FRAUD and the CONFISCATION of the properties of the American People is part of the BIGGER BANKRUPTCY of a CORPORATION that has it itself defrauded/deceived the Public into believing it to being a De Jure Government entity, while in TRUTH being a De Facto Government installed through DECEPTION!

This above fact is so ABUNDANTLY CLEAR that your own CEO, Donald J. Trump, knows the TRUTH and therefore engaged the refunding and restructuring of GITMO for the Prosecution of Judges, Politicians, and Corporate Leaders engaged in Racketeering Actions, Human Trafficking, Pedophilia and other Crimes against humanity and America, because he understands that the Courts are RIGGED against “We the People” and in FAVOR of the CRIMINALS for which you self-proclaimed women and men of HONOR serve!

To ensure this Corrupt Criminal Enterprise of the BANKSTERS is allowed to flourish they have their Political Minions pass UNCONSTITUTIONAL legislation depriving “We the People” of our RIGHT of LIBERTY, in that of Choosing Who we want to represent us, and who we wish to Contract with; and instead proclaim that we cannot engage this LIBERTY because it’s for our own PROTECTION!

PURE BOVINE EXCREMENT!

If the COURTS, i.e. you Judges proclaim that we are TOO INCOMPETENT as to choose who we wish to Contract with in regards to representing us in COURT, then by the same right any and all Mortgage Contracts with these BANKSTERS on its face value then also must be NULL and VOID, due to us having been TOO INCOMPETENT! Likewise, the claim could then be made that the BANKSTERS were well aware of this fact as the Lawyers and Attorneys of the same BAR Association as you Judges helped construct their Legal Documents to be used against “We the People” for whom you Judges already declared us to be INCOMPETENT! Therefore, your action as Judges to Deprive of us of our LIBERTY of CHOICE it was outright FRAUD from the very beginning and as anyone reputable in Law understands is that those engaged in FRAUD is/are not allowed to profit for their actions when confronted in a True Court of Law!

(THEREFORE)

WILL ONE JUDGE OF “TRUE HONOR” PLEASE STAND UP!

Now that we have addressed the UNCONSTITUTIONALITY of the BANKING and the BAR Cartels as substantiated by their own actions, let us continue!

07. How is it not a DIRECT Conflict of Interest for any Judge, much less any court, to engage in Trials/Hearings for which their Verdict/Ruling enriches the said judge and or court in that of Monetary Enrichment?

As already shown in Page 26-28 of this document the Court and or Judge is receiving a 1% Kickback for every foreclosure! THIS FACT IS BEYOND DISPUTE!

So Let us take a look at what your own laws have to say about this:

We must first start with the FACT that the Judge and or Court is a PRINCIPAL in the SCAM-SCHEME-FRAUD being perpetrated against America; and Ms. Catherine Bishop directly as substantiated by the pay-off for the ruling by the judge!

18 U.S. Code § 2 – Principals

18 U.S. Code § 201. Bribery of public officials and witnesses

18 U.S. Code § 208. Acts affecting a personal financial interest

18 U.S. Code § 219. Officers and employees acting as agents of foreign principals

18 U.S. Code § 225. Continuing financial crimes enterprise

Would anyone of COMMON SENSE not believe that the JUDGE and or COURT receiving 1% of **all the foreclosure sales** is not (BRIBERY) i.e., an INCENTIVE that affects a personal financial interest of the Judge and or Court?

As the BANKSTERS and in TRUTH the BAR Association which is under the Lawyers Guild, both are originated out of the Crown Temple of England this definitely equates that members of the BAR, yourself included, are in fact Officers and Employees acting as agents of foreign principals, despite your or anyone else's claim otherwise! Likewise, as this SCAM-SCHEM-FRAUD (Foreclosure Fraud was exposed /revealed by a RENEGADE BAR member (Jerome Daly in December of 1968) and has been allowed to continue, yet known to the COURTS, clearly establishes ALL you judges in allowing the continuation of this financial crimes enterprise of the BANKSTERS, for which you are taking a kickback in the proceeds of the action clearly establishes all thee above U.S. Codes being violated by you so-called Men and Women of so-called "HONOR"!

Let it be known that all of these CODES as stipulated above are CODIFIED under that of CONFLICT of INTEREST!

Sure seems like a whole lot of CONFLICT of INTEREST by the Judges and the Courts is going on!

(THEREBY)

PLEASE TELL WE THE PEOPLE WHAT IS SO HONORABLE BY YOUR ACTIONS?

When will the Courts and the Judges start STANDING UP for "We the People" and Stop working for the BANKSTERS? Please let us know so that we can mark that date on our Calendars!

08. How can a Bank Claim any damage for non-repaid LOAN when in TRUTH they never loaned a single cent of the bank's own money, and then controlled the economy which caused inflation, thereby increasing the Cost of Living, stagnant wages, loss of jobs when this CLEARLY violates the Prevention Doctrine and or Prevention Performance Doctrine in that of a Binding Contract under Common Law?

As noted this FACT of how the said money is CREATED and the LACK of DISCLOSURE has been fully substantiated in the Jerome Daly case of 1968 and in the Publication by the FEDERAL RESERVE ITSELF "Modern Money Mechanics". If need be and am I forced to bring both Criminal Charges and Civil Charges against the State, do not think for a Minute that I will not be subpoenaing numerous ECONOMIST to include the IMF's own Michael Kumhof, World renowned Economist Richard Werner, and even some of your United States Corporation Actors, calling themselves Senators and Governors!

As far as directly from this case of Catherine Bishop you know that no proof of the creation of money can be proven as of yet because she was denied all requested information and documents sought by that of your CORRUPT JUDGE! The Fact of this non-production of Information and Document Discovery was covered up by your so "HONORABLE" Judge..... Please explain how this Judge can be called HONORABLE in any sense for the tactics that he engaged in during this said case?.

THIS CORRUPT JUDGE AND HIS ACTIONS WILL BE NOTED IN THE QUESTIONS AND ARGUMENTS OF THE FOLLOWING POINTS OF 9-15.

09. How did the Circuit Court not violate the Seventh Amendment RIGHT of the Defendant by allowing the said Case File Number 2016CP0200381 being assigned to a Master-in-Equity Court without the DEFENDANT's Consent?

FIRST: We must agree that the United States Constitution is the SUPREME Law of the Land!

SECOND: We must agree that the word "SHALL" is that of a Command and or Order, NOT a **request**! An example of this word usage is noted none other than in the TEN COMMANDMENTS! I know God saying thou shall do this, or shall not do that was merely meant as a MAY do this, or MAY not do that!!!

THIRD: The Seventh Amendment explicitly states:

"In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law."

** I believe we can agree that the amount in controversy exceeds twenty dollars, therefore the RIGHT of Trial by Jury is to be preserve!

Now, comes the hard part for you judges, in that of your Oath of Office is to uphold and Protect these RIGHTS of We the People enshrined in the United States Constitution!!!!

Please answer how this RIGHT

Even in accordance with South Carolina State Rule 53(b) the first sentence states “(b) In an action where the parties consent”

In this case the DEFENDANT, Ms. Catherine Bishop **NEVER CONSENTED!** Instead, the Judge proclaimed her to be in DEFAULT, despite the Plaintiff not proving that a debt even existed... NOTHING MORE THAN HERESAY! Likewise, the Judge tried to proclaim she should have responded, yet she had by engaging the help of a Bankruptcy Attorney; for which she believed was handling the issue! So, let us understand that a brethren of the BAR messed up somewhere or BEING SO QUALIFIED AND HONEST, failed to file the right paperwork proclaiming she was not in default!

Nonetheless, the Judge also proclaims that she did not contest signing the Promissory Note, which again is FALSE(as she stated she signed A Promissory Note, yet never once stated that the Promissory Note before the Court was the Original, and for which the Judges own words in his Rulings proclaiming that there was NO ASSIGNMENTS proves beyond a shadow of doubt that the Promissory Note for which the Judge acted as the Document Authentication Expert for the Plaintiff during the MOTIONS Hearing (CONFLICT OF INTEREST) proclaiming the Promissory Note before the Court to being the original because it had his green stamp on it! However, the Judge by making this proclamation proves beyond a shadow of doubt that the Promissory Note is in fact a FORGERY!

I KNOW IT MAY BE HARD BUT LET US USE SOME GOOD OLE' COMMON SENSE! ACCORDING TO THE JUDGE THERE HAS BEEN NO ASSIGNMENTS, AND THE COUNTY RECORDS OFFICE LIKEWISE HAS NO RECORDINGS OF ANY TRANSACTIONS AS WELL. YET MAGICALLY THERE ARE NUMEROUS TRANSACTIONS/SALES OF THE PROPERTY IN QUESTION (ONE OF WHICH WAS BY BANK OF AMERICA ITSELF)! LIKEWISE, FANNIE MAE PROCLAIMS IT OWNS THE MORTGAGE AND THE NOTE, FOR WHICH EVEN THE PLAINTIFF'S OWN WITNESS STATED IN OPEN COURT THAT FANNIE MA WAS THE OWNER OF THE PROMISSORY NOTE AND MORTGAGE, YET NOWHERE IS THIS TRANSACTION, OR ANY OF THE OTHER TRANSACTIONS, NOTED ON THE PROMISSORY NOTE BEFORE THE COURT!

Take heed of the Following for which was provided to Judge M. Anderson Griffith during the MOTIONS HEARING:

Exhibit "C1"

FILED 5.22.18

Robert B. Dwyer
Deputy Clerk

[Home](#)
[Training and Support](#)
[MERS ServicerID](#)
[MERS eRecording](#)
[MERS eClosing](#)
[MERS eLending](#)
[MERS eSettlement](#)
[MERS eTitle](#)
[MERS eTransfer](#)
[MERS eVerify](#)
[MERS eWorkflows](#)

[Download MERSID](#)
[MERSID](#)
[MERSID](#)
[MERSID](#)
[MERSID](#)
[MERSID](#)
[MERSID](#)
[MERSID](#)
[MERSID](#)
[MERSID](#)


The Mortgage Industry's Utility

MERS® ServicerID
 Search for servicer information

☐ Search by MIM
 Search by a MERS® System Mortgage Identification Number

☐ Search by Property Address/Borrower Details
 Search by property address and borrower information

☐ Search by Property Address Only

Your address may be either local or foreign.
 Fields marked with an asterisk are required.
 Enter the street without a direction or the suffix. For example, "E. Main St." should be entered as "Main".

Street Number: Street: Use:

City: State: Zip Code:

Select Expanded Street Search to match an existing street name.
☐ Expanded Street Search
 With expanded street search, a search on "Main" will return "Mainland", "Maple St." or "East Main Ave".
 Please note: selecting this option will increase the time taken for your search results to be displayed.

☐ Search by Borrower Name and Property Address
 Search by Borrower Name, SSN and Property Zip Code

☐ Search by FHA/VA/ML Certificate
 Search by Federal Housing Administration / Veterans Administration Case Number or Mortgage Insurance Certificate Number.

For more information about Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. (MERS) please go to [www.merscorp.com](#)

3306 Coral Way, Belvedere, South Carolina, 29841 – MERS - Address Search – RESULTS

Exhibit "C2"


FILED

540

18

Robert L. White
CCCP # 92
Rhonda B. Dawley
Deputy Clerk

Deputy Clerk



The Mortgage Industry's Utility

3 records matched your search:

Answer: **2**

MIN: 1000522-1701845009-4 Note Date: 10/15/2014 MIN STATUS: Active

Server: PNC Mortgage, a Division of PNC Bank, National Association Phone: (800) 822-5626

Miamisburg, OH

If you are a borrower on this loan, you can click here to enter additional information and display the investor name.

MIN: 100629-1000019707-7 NXE Date: 09/01/1976 MIN Status: Inactive

Server: Aurora Loan Servs, LLC Phone: (720) 645-3064
Scottsdale, AZ

If you are a borrower on this loan, you can [click here](#) to enter additional information and display the investor name.

MHN: 1000137-0002034570-0 Note Date: 00/38/2005 MHN Status: Inactive
 Server: Winnova Mortgage, a division of Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. Phone: (651) 405-3711
 Minneapolis, MN

If you are a borrower on this loan, you can [click here](#) to enter additional information and display the Invoice name.

Exhibit D-5

For more information about Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. (MERS) please go to www.mersinc.org

Exhibit "C3"

FILED 5:22 PM
Rhonda B. Dransky
Deputy Clerk

Download STN.Ms. Web Call/Facebook Bank of America - C Convey Lender - Lm Job Board (363) W Green (Southwest) New York of America's Project Funding Plan Map The Adventure of

MERS
ServicerID

The Mortgage Industry's Utility

MERS® ServicerID
Search for servicer information

Search by PIN
Search by a MERS® System Mortgage Identification Number.

Search by Property Address/Borrower Details
Search by property address and borrower information.

Search by Property Address Only

Enter address that is a four letter or 10-digit code.
Fields marked * are required.
Enter the STATE without a contraction or designation. For example, "E. Main St." should be entered as "Main".

Street Number: 306 Street: Coral Way

City: North Augusta State: SC Zip Code: 29841

Select Expanded Street Search to search on similar street names.
☐ Expanded Street Search
When expanded street search, a search on "Main" will return "Main Street", "Main St." or "East Main Street".
Please note: selecting this option will increase the time taken for your search request to be processed.

Search

Search by Borrower Name and Property Address
Search by Borrower Name, SSN and Property Zip Code

Search by FHA/VA/MI Certificate
Search by Federal Housing Administration, Veterans Administration, State Agency or Mortgage Insurance Certificate Number.

For more information about Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. (MERS) please call 1-800-368-6773

Exhibit "C4"

FILED 5-22-18
Rhonda B. Dawsey
 Deputy Clerk

MERS
Service

The Mortgage Industry's Utility

3 records matched your search:

MEMO	MEMO DATE	MEMO STATUS
MEMO: 1001001-0100043040-0 Service: <u>1001001-0100043040-0</u> Memphis, TN	MEMO DATE: 07/20/2009	MEMO STATUS: Active Phone: (800) 848-4136
If you are a borrower on this loan, you can click here to enter additional information and display the investor name.		
MEMO: 1001001-3000999129-0 Service: <u>1001001-3000999129-0</u> Coppell, TX	MEMO DATE: 09/30/2012	MEMO STATUS: Active Phone: (800) 480-3432
If you are a borrower on this loan, you can click here to enter additional information and display the investor name.		
MEMO: 1001001-0201000047-0 Service: <u>1001001-0201000047-0</u> Richmond, VA	MEMO DATE: 12/12/2004	MEMO STATUS: Active Phone: (800) 634-7028
If you are a borrower on this loan, you can click here to enter additional information and display the investor name.		
MEMO: 1000000-1000004187-7 Service: <u>1000000-1000004187-7</u> Columbia, SC	MEMO DATE: 06/20/2016	MEMO STATUS: Inactive Phone: (803) 896-9858
If you are a borrower on this loan, you can click here to enter additional information and display the investor name.		
MEMO: 1001001-0000001001-1 Service: <u>1001001-0000001001-1</u> San Jose, CA	MEMO DATE: 04/20/2005	MEMO STATUS: Inactive Phone: (800) 848-4467
If you are a borrower on this loan, you can click here to enter additional information and display the investor name.		

Likewise, the Judge was provided proof of Fannie Mae Claiming Ownership:

← 0 | https://www.knowyouroptions.com/loanlookup

KnowYourOptions
by Fannie Mae

About Us | Fannie Mae Help | Loan Lookup | Overview | En Español

Search

Rent Buy Sell Refinance Avoid Foreclosure Get Help Find Resources

Fannie Mae Loan Lookup Results: Match Found

Foreclosure consequences
What can happen if you are foreclosed on? Find out here so you can be prepared.
[Learn more](#)

It appears that Fannie Mae owns your loan, based on the information you entered:

CATHERINE BISHOP
306 CORAL WAY
NORTH AUGUSTA, SC 29841

Last 4 Digits of Social Security Number: ****
Mortgage Loan Closing Date: 11-12-2003
Mortgage Company: BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.

Results—Our Records Indicate:

- Fannie Mae owns your loan that was closed on or before May 31, 2003. Knowing the Loan Closing Date is important because some programs such as the [Home Affordable Refinance Program \(HARP\)](#), are available only for the loans closed on or before May 31, 2003. You may be eligible for this program.
- You may also be eligible for other mortgage assistance programs available exclusively for Fannie Mae-owned loans.
- There may be circumstances that prohibit you from financing home energy improvements with a Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) loan since Fannie Mae owns the first mortgage on your home. Contact your mortgage servicer before getting a PACE loan.

Options Finder:

Type here to search

10:24 PM 6/4/2018

So, as we note when doing a MERS SEARCH and Fannie Mae for M.s Catherine Bishop's property at 306 Belvedere, SC 29841 and 306 Coral Way, North Augusta, SC 29841

** This Property is the same; the post office recognizes both of these to be the same address:

Thus I will List the FINDINGS in Note Date Order & will indicate it as either Belvedere or North Augusta.

AS NOTED NONE OF THESE SALES ON THE PROPERTY IN QUESTION INCLUDED THAT OF THE CLOSING OF MS. CATHERINE BISHOP IN NOVEMBER OF 2004, NOR THE SALE OF THE MORTGAGE AND OR PROMISSORY NOTE TO FANNIE MAE, YET WITH ALL THESE TRANSACTIONS NOTED THE JUDGE DOES NOT QUESTION THE VALIDITY OF THE PROMISSORY NOTE BEFORE HIM? IT SEEMS AS COMMON SENSE, CRITICAL THINKING SKILLS, INTEGRITY, MORALS, AND HONOR IS NULL AND VOIDED ONCE DONNING A BLACK ROBE!

As seen only ONE Sale was prior to November 2004 (Closing Date for Ms. Catherine Bishop)

MIN:1000259-2000019707-7 Note Date:09/01/1976 MIN Status:Inactive
Servicer: Aurora Loan Services LLC Phone:(720) 945-3964
Scottsbluff, NE
** (306 Coral Way, Belvedere, SC 29841)

Catherine Bishop does closing with Bank of America - November 2004

As noted below all of these sales on Ms. Catherine Bishop's property of 306 Coral Way, (Belvedere or North Augusta) SC 29841; and one of these was by Bank of America itself!

MIN:1000104-0201009867-5 Note Date:12/20/2004 MIN Status:Active
Servicer: SunTrust Bank Phone:(800) 634-7928
Richmond, VA
** (306 Coral Way, North Augusta, SC 29841)

MIN:1000157-0004912016-1 Note Date:04/19/2005 MIN Status:Inactive
Servicer: Bank of America, N.A. Phone:(800) 669-6607
Simi Valley, CA
** (306 Coral Way, North Augusta, SC 29841)

MIN:1000137-0003934520-0 Note Date:09/28/2005 MIN Status:Inactive
Servicer: Wachovia Mortgage, a division of Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.
Phone:(651) 605-3711
Minneapolis, MN
** (306 Coral Way, Belvedere, SC 29841)

MIN:1002091-0100043040-8 Note Date:07/30/2009 MIN Status:Active
Servicer: JP Morgan Chase Bank NA Phone:(800) 848-9136
Monroe, LA
** (306 Coral Way, North Augusta, SC 29841)

MIN:1000522-1701845909-4 Note Date:10/15/2014 MIN Status:Active
Servicer: PNC Bank, Retail Lending Services Phone:(800) 822-5626
Miamisburg, OH
** (306 Coral Way, Belvedere, SC 29841)

MIN:1000608-2100044187-7 Note Date:06/20/2016 MIN Status:Inactive
Servicer: South Carolina State Housing Finance & Dev Authority Phone:(803) 896-1727
Columbia, SC
** (306 Coral Way, North Augusta, SC 29841)

MIN:1001056-3000999129-6

Note Date:09/20/2017

MIN Status:Active

Servicer: Nationstar Mortgage LLC

Phone:(888) 480-2432

Coppell, TX

** (306 Coral Way, North Augusta, SC 29841

Likewise, while Fannie Mae Proclaims ownership of Said Mortgage and Promissory Note, they have refused to provide ANY EVIDENCE of said Purchase! They have proclaimed that they were contacting their Service Provider (Bank of America) and that they would provide this, but Bank of America and its LAWYERS/ATTORNEYS have refused to produce anything showing said purchase by Fannie Mae!

Therefore, any claim of Ms. Catherine Bishop being in default or any application of a RULE would or should allow the Courts or a Judge to say "F""U" to the Supreme Law of the Land in the non-adherence to the Seventh Amendment does not hold any water!

Now I am not a BRAIN SURGEON but COMMON SENSE says States cannot pass any legislation or bring into origination any RULE that would abrogate a RIGHT of "We the People!"

10. How does the Circuit Court Robo-Signing the Documents originating the said Case 2016CP0200381 not Null & Void any Ruling of said case?

Yes, you heard that right; it's not bad enough that we have banksters engaging in Robo-Signing, we now even have Clerk of Courts Signatures being used when those individuals are no longer in those positions! One must ask if that is because the Court Clerks are getting a kickback from the Judges 1% Commission on the sale of these foreclosed properties!

In this case we will be addressing the individual Liz Godard, or rather her signature! In December of 2015 she was replaced.

https://www.aikenstandard.com/news/aiken-judge-swears-in-new-clerk-of-court-and-probate/article_155a55ca-d2d3-11e6-a11f-5713bed6b6d8.html

An Aiken County judge officially swore in two new elected officials Wednesday at the Aiken County courthouse.

Robert J. Harte, local attorney and former Second Judicial Circuit solicitor, was sworn in as the new Aiken County Clerk of Court.

Liz Godard was the clerk of court for 31 years before announcing she was stepping down in December 2015.

** However, though she stepped down and was replaced in December of 2015, we find the following: **(TAKE NOTE OF THE DATES SIGNED)**

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF AIKEN

Bank of America, N.A.,

Plaintiff,

vs

Catherine L. Bishop,

Defendant.

2016 LP02 00084
IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

CIA NO. _____

2016 LP02 00381

LIS PENDENS

2.24.16

105

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT an action has been or will be commenced in this Court upon complaint of the above-named Plaintiff against the above-named Defendant(s) for the foreclosure of a certain mortgage of real estate given by Catherine L. Bishop to Bank of America, N.A. dated November 12, 2004 and recorded on November 15, 2004 in Book 2695 at Page 126, in the Aiken County Registry (hereinafter, "Mortgage").

The premises covered and affected by the said Mortgage and by the foreclosure thereof were, at the time of the making thereof and at the time of the filing of this action, more particularly described in the said Mortgage and are more generally described as:

All that certain piece, parcel or lot of land, together with improvements thereon, situate, lying and being in the Town of Belvedere, Aiken County, South Carolina, and being known and designated as LOT NO. 7, BLOCK 17, OF BELVEDERE RIDGE SUBDIVISION as shown on a plat thereof recorded in Plat Book 1, at page 154, records of Aiken County, South Carolina, and being more recently shown on an individual plat of said lot for G. Paul Jacobs and Linda H. Jacobs by Thomas M. Graham, Jr., R.L.S., dated March 22, 1973, and recorded in Misc. Book 205 at Page 129 in the Office of the RMC for Aiken County, to which said plat reference is herein made for a more specific description of the meter and bounds of said property.

This being the same property conveyed to Catherine L. Bishop by deed of Clark A. Erlense dated November 9, 2004 and recorded on November 15, 2004, in Deed Book 2467 at Page 91, in the RMC Office of Aiken County, South Carolina.

PLS 34-16-0381

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF AIKEN

Bank of America, N.A.,

Plaintiff(s)

vs.

Catherine L. Bishop,

Defendant(s)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

CIVIL ACTION COVERSHEET

2016-CP-07-00381

Submitted By:

Sarah O. Leonard, SCB# 80165

Address:

Bruck & Scott, PLLC
3806 Fernandina Road, Suite 110
Columbia, SC 29210

Telephone #:

844-856-6666

Fax #:

316-415-7101

Email:

ConsumerContact@bruckandscott.com

NOTE: The coversheet and information contained herein neither requires nor supplements the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law. This form is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of docketing. It must be filled out completely, signed, and dated. A copy of this coversheet may be placed on the defendant(s) along with the Summons and Complaint.

DOCKETING INFORMATION (Check all that apply)
If Action is Judgment/Settlement do not complete

- ☐ JURY TRIAL demanded in complaint. ☒ NON-JURY TRIAL demanded in complaint.
☐ This case is subject to ARBITRATION pursuant to the Court Approved Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules.
☐ This case is subject to MEDIATION pursuant to the Court Approved Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules.
☒ This case is exempt from ADR (Proof of ADR Exemption Attached)

NATURE OF ACTION (Check One Box Below)

- | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| Contracts | Torts - Professional Malpractice | Torts - Personal Injury | Real Property |
| ☐ Continuations (110) | ☐ Dental Malpractice (200) | ☐ Conversion (110) | ☐ Claim & Delivery (400) |
| ☐ Debt Collection (110) | ☐ Legal Malpractice (210) | ☐ Motor Vehicle Accident (122) (110) | ☐ Condominium (110) |
| ☐ General (130) | ☐ Medical Malpractice (220) | ☐ Premises Liability (130) | ☒ Foreclosure (420) |
| ☐ Breach of Contract (300) | Previous Notice of Intent Case # | ☐ Products Liability (300) | ☐ Mechanic's Lien (430) |
| ☐ Fraud/Und. Deal (150) | to _____ | ☐ Personal Injury (150) | ☐ Partition (440) |
| ☐ Failure to Deliver Warranty (160) | Notice of Late Med Mal (130) | ☐ Wrongful Death (160) | ☐ Possession (450) |
| ☐ Employment Discrimination (170) | ☐ Other (299) | ☐ Auto/Danery (270) | ☐ Building Code Violation (460) |
| ☐ Employment (180) | | ☐ Slander/Libel (180) | ☐ Other (499) |
| ☐ Other (199) | | ☐ Other (299) | |
| Special Petitions | Administrative Law/Helief | Judgments/Settlements | Appeals |
| ☐ PCR (300) | ☐ Revoke/Inv. License (800) | ☐ Debt Settlement (700) | ☐ Arbitration (500) |
| ☐ Mandamus (320) | ☐ Judicial Review (810) | ☐ Foreign Judgment (710) | ☐ Magistrate Civil (710) |
| ☐ Habeas Corpus (330) | ☐ Injunct (820) | ☐ Magistrate's Judgment (720) | ☐ Magistrate Criminal (520) |
| ☐ Other (399) | ☐ Permanent Injunction (810) | ☐ Motion Settlement (730) | ☐ Municipal (730) |
| | ☐ Perpetual Petition (840) | ☐ Transcript Judgment (740) | ☐ Probate Court (940) |
| | ☐ Forfeiture—Consent Order (195) | ☐ Lis Pendens (750) | ☐ SCUDOT (970) |
| | ☐ Other (199) | ☐ Transfer of Structured Settlement Payment Rights Application (760) | ☐ Worker's Comp (990) |
| Special/Complex/Other | | ☐ Confession of Judgment (770) | ☐ Zoning Board (910) |
| ☐ Environmental (600) | ☐ Pharmaceuticals (550) | ☐ Prison for Workers Compensation Settlement Approval (780) | ☐ Public Service Comm. (900) |
| ☐ Automobile Acc. (610) | ☐ Uniform Trade Practices (640) | ☐ Other (799) | ☐ Employment Security Center (950) |
| ☐ Medical (620) | ☐ Out-of-State Depositions (630) | | ☐ Other (999) |
| ☐ Other (699) | ☐ Motion to Quash Subpoena in a Out-of-Court Action (640) | | |
| ☐ Sexual Predator (612) | ☐ Pre-Suit Discovery (650) | | |

Submitting Party Signature: _____

Date: 2-23-16

Note: Frivolous civil proceedings may be subject to sanctions pursuant to SCRPC, Rule 11, and the South Carolina Frivolous Civil Proceedings Sanctions Act, S.C. Code Ann. §15-36-10 et. seq.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF AIKEN

Bank of America, N.A.,
Plaintiff,

vs.

Catherine L. Bishop,
Defendant(s).

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

C/A NO.: _____

2016 CP 0200381

**CERTIFICATE OF
EXEMPTION/WITHDRAWAL FROM
ARBITRATION AND MEDIATION**

FILED 2.24.16
[Signature]
[Signature]

I CERTIFY THAT THIS ACTION IS EXEMPT FROM ARBITRATION AND MEDIATION BECAUSE:

- ☐ This is a special proceeding or action seeking extraordinary relief such as mandamus, habeas corpus or prohibition;
- ☐ This action is appellate in nature;
- ☐ This is a post-conviction relief matter;
- ☐ This is a contempt of court proceeding;
- ☐ This is forfeiture proceeding brought by the State; or,
- ☒ This is a mortgage or HOA lien foreclosure action.

[Signature]

Sarah O. Leonard, SCB# 80165
Brock & Scott, PLLC
3800 Fernandina Road, Suite 110
Columbia, SC 29210
Phone 844-856-6646 Fax 866-676-7658
Attorneys for Plaintiff

NOTE: Motion must be presented to the court, a hearing held, and a finding made, for exemption or withdrawal from arbitration for "strong and compelling reason" sought pursuant to Rule 1(d), Rules of Circuit Court Arbitration.

B&S No.: 16-02824

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF AIKEN

Bank of America, N.A.,
Plaintiff,

vs.

Catherine L. Bishop,
Defendant(s).

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

C/A NO.: _____

2016 CP0200381

SUMMONS AND NOTICES

(Non-Jury)

FORECLOSURE
OF REAL ESTATE
MORTGAGE

2-24-16

[Handwritten signatures and initials]

TO THE DEFENDANT(S) ABOVE NAMED:

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED and required to appear and defend by answering the Complaint in this action, a copy of which is hereby served upon you, and to serve a copy of your Answer on the subscribers at their offices at 3800 Fernandina Road, Suite 110, Columbia, SC 29210, within thirty (30) days after the service hereof, exclusive of the day of such service; except that the United States of America, if named, shall have sixty (60) days to answer after the service hereof, exclusive of the day of such service; and if you fail to do so, judgment by default will be rendered against you for the relief demanded in the Complaint.

TO MINOR(S) OVER FOURTEEN YEARS OF AGE, AND/OR TO MINOR(S) UNDER FOURTEEN YEARS OF AGE AND THE PERSON WITH WHOM THE MINOR(S) RESIDES, AND/OR TO PERSONS UNDER SOME LEGAL DISABILITY:

YOU ARE FURTHER SUMMONED AND NOTIFIED to apply for the appointment of a guardian *ad litem* within thirty (30) days after the service of this Summons and Notice upon you. If you fail to do so, application for such appointment will be made by Attorney for Plaintiff.

B&S No.: 16-02824

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF AIKEN

Bank of America, N.A.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Catherine L. Bishop,

Defendant(s).

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

C/A NO.: 2011CCPO 700381

COMPLAINT

(Non-Jury)

FORECLOSURE
OF REAL ESTATE
MORTGAGE

(Deficiency Judgment Waived)

2-24-16

FILED

[Signature]
105
[Signature]

The Plaintiff above-named, complaining of the Defendant(s) herein, alleges that:

1. Plaintiff, Bank of America, N.A., is a business entity duly authorized to conduct business in the State of South Carolina.
2. Upon information and belief, the Defendant(s), Catherine L. Bishop, may claim some interest in the real estate, which is the subject of this action and this Court has proper jurisdiction over said Defendants.
3. The real property hereinafter described, that is the subject of this action, is situated and located in the County of Aiken, State of South Carolina, and this Court has proper jurisdiction over the subject matter and the parties of this action.
4. Heretofore, Catherine L. Bishop (hereinafter, "Borrower(s)") made, executed, and delivered to Bank of America, N.A. (hereinafter, "Lender") a certain Fixed Rate Note dated November 12, 2004, in writing (hereinafter, "Note"), wherein and whereby Catherine L. Bishop promised to pay to Bank of America, N.A., the principal sum of \$66,900.00, together with interest at the rate of 5.75% per annum on the unpaid balance; said principal and interest being payable in monthly installments thereafter until the said Note is fully paid.
5. In order to secure the payment of said Note, the said Catherine L. Bishop (hereinafter, "Mortgagor(s)"), did make, execute, and deliver to Bank of America, N.A., its successors and assigns, a certain mortgage dated November 12, 2004 (hereinafter, "Mortgage") securing the below described real property, including any and all improvements to the property, located in the County and State aforesaid

B&S No.: 16-02824

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF AIKEN)
Bank of America, N.A.,)
Plaintiff(s))
vs)
Catherine L. Bishop,)
Defendant(s))

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
CASE NUMBER: 2016-CP-02-381
FILE NUMBER: 16-02824
AFFIDAVIT OF NON SERVICE

PERSONALLY appeared before me the undersigned, who says under oath that he/she did not serve, the below listed documents for the following reason:


- () Civil Action Coversheet; Summons and Notices; Certificate of Exemption;
- () Withdrawal From Arbitration and Mediation; Lis Pendens; Complaint;
- () Notice of Right To Foreclosure Intervention


In this action on Defendant Catherine L. Bishop.

The undersigned attempted service at:



539 Hugh Court, North Augusta, SC 29841 - 2/26/16 - 10:41 AM; 2/29/16 - 4:56 PM; 3/4/16 - 8:23 AM; 3/8/16 - 1:24 PM; 3/13/16 - 4:01 PM; 3/18/16 - 3:25 PM; 3/23/16 - 11:24 AM; 3/28/16 - 2:46 PM; 3/31/16 - 4:26 PM; 4/3/16 - 7:26 PM - No one was home on any attempt, but there was a dog inside barking on the first knock and then quiet, and a white automobile in the driveway. Defendant may be avoiding service.

That the Deponent is unable to obtain a place of employment or habitation and is therefore unable to serve Defendant in a timely manner. That the Deponent is not a party to, or interested in this action.


Joni Starkaitis
GWC Process Service

Sworn before me this:
4th Day of April 2016


Notary Public for South Carolina
My commission expires: 5/16/2024

FILED 4-5-16

330

Deputy Clerk

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA) IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
COUNTY OF AIKEN)

BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.,)
Plaintiff(s))
CASE NUMBER: 2016-CP-02-381
FILE NUMBER: 16-02824

vs.)

CATHERINE L. BISHOP,)
Defendant(s))

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

FILED 4-7 2016

[Signature]
Clerk of Court

1235

The Undersigned being sworn deposes and says that he/she served a copy of the following:

- (X) Civil Action Coversheet; Summons and Notices; Certificate of Exemption;
- (X) Withdrawal From Arbitration and Mediation; Lis Pendens; Complaint
- (X) Notice of Right To Foreclosure Intervention

In this action on Defendant Catherine L. Bishop by delivering same to:

- () the Defendant Personally,
- (X) Brian (brother-in-law -- did not verify last name) a person of discretion residing at the same address as the Defendant, and when asked if the Defendant resides with you at this address the person served stated yes.

Description of Person Receiving Document:

Race: W Sex: M Color Hair: Brown Facial Hair: None Glasses: N
Approximate Age: 55 Approximate Height: 6'0" Approximate Weight: 350 Lbs.

- (X) To the best of my knowledge and belief said person was not engaged in the U.S. Military at the time of service.

And leaving with him/her a copy of same at: 306 Coral Way, North Augusta, SC 29841

On the 5th day of April, 2016, at 4:30 PM and the Deponent knows the person so served to be the Defendant mentioned and described in the pleadings served, and the Deponent is not a party to, nor interested in this action.

[Signature]
Kimberly Simpson
GWC Process Service

Sworn to before me this:

6th Day of April 2016

[Signature]

Notary Public for South Carolina

My commission expires: 10/18/2020

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF AIKEN

Bank of America, N.A.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Catherine L. Bishop,

Defendants.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
CASE NO. 2016-CP-02-00381

MOTION AND ORDER OF STAY
DUE TO BANKRUPTCY FILING

Upon motion of Attorney for the Plaintiff, and it appearing that the Defendant, Catherin Bishop has filed Chapter 13 Bankruptcy on May 13, 2016, Bankruptcy case number 16-02394, as evidenced by the Bankruptcy Court Docket Report attached hereto as Exhibit "A", and such filing results in an automatic stay in the present case.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the above case be stricken from the active roster of pending cases with leave to restore the action with the same civil action number, original filing date, and no further filing fee after the Bankruptcy case is dismissed or the Plaintiff has been granted a relief from the automatic stay by the Bankruptcy Court.

Date:

5-31-16

M. Eady
Presiding Judge/Clerk of Court
Aiken County, South Carolina

ISO MOVE:

Kristen E. Washburn

Kristen E. Washburn SC Bar 101415

Brock & Scott, PLLC
3800 Fernandina Road, Suite 110
Columbia, SC 29210
Phone: 803-454-3540
Attorney for Plaintiff

FILED

6.1.16

Shirley Hadard
Clerk of Court
Wanda Thelwell
Deputy Clerk



This judgment was entered on the 1 day of June, 2016, and a copy mailed first class or placed in the appropriate attorney's box on this 1 day of June, 2016, to attorneys of record or to parties (when appearing pro se) as follows:

Sarah Leonard
ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE PLAINTIFF(S)

ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE DEFENDANT(S)
Sh. Stodard by [Signature]
CLERK OF COURT

Court Reporter: Judith Warner

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING DECISION BY THE COURT AS REFERENCED ON PAGE 1.

This action came to trial or hearing before the court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision rendered.

16-02824

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF AIKEN
Bank of America, N.A.,

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
C/A NO.: 2016-CP-02-00381

Plaintiff,

vs.
Catherine L. Bishop,

Defendant(s).

MOTION AND ORDER INFORMATION FORM
AND COVER SHEET

Plaintiff(s) Attorney:

Kristen E. Washburn SC Bar 101415
Brock & Scott, PLLC
1800 Fernandina Road, Suite 110
Columbia, SC 29210
phone: 844-836-6646
fax: 336-438-7305
email:

ConsumerContact@brockandscott.com

Defendant(s) Attorney:

- ☐ MOTION HEARING REQUESTED (attach written motion and complete Sections I and III)
☒ FORM MOTION, NO HEARING REQUESTED (complete Sections II and III)
☐ PROPOSED ORDER/CONSENT ORDER (complete SECTIONS II and III)

SECTION I: Hearing Information

Nature of Motion:

Estimated Time Needed:

Court Reporter Needed: ☐ YES ☒ NO

SECTION II: Motion Type

- ☐ Written motion attached
☒ Form Motion/Order

I hereby move for relief or action by the court as set forth in the attached proposed order.

Signature of Attorney for ☒ Plaintiff / ☐ Defendant Date Submitted 03/10/2016

SECTION III: Motion Fee

- ☐ Paid - Amount: \$25.00
☒ Exempt:

- ☒ Motion for Stay in Bankruptcy
☐ Rule to Show Cause in Child or Spousal Support
☐ Domestic Abuse or Abuse and Neglect
☐ Indigent Status ☐ State Agency v. Indigent Party
☐ Sexually Violent Predator Act ☐ Post-Conviction Relief
☐ Motion for Publication ☐ Motion for Execution (Rule 69, SCRPC)
☐ Proposed order submitted at request of the court or, reduced to writing from motion made in open court per judge's instructions

Name of Court reporter:

or Other:

JUDGE'S SECTION

- ☐ Motion fee to be paid upon filing of the attached order.

☒ Other:

JUDGE

Code:

Date:

CLERK'S VERIFICATION

Collected by:

C. Motion fee Collected:

C Contested - Amount Due:

FILED 03-1-16

Liz Godard
Clerk of Court
03/01/2016

B&S file no.: 16-02824

As noted above:

Pages 60-65 Court Documents Originating said Civil Lawsuit were supposedly signed by Liz Godard on 2-24-2016 the only problem being that she was replaced as Clerk of Court

over two months earlier by that of Robert J. Harte and in TRUTH it wasn't signed physically by her, but was in FACT a STAMP! For which anyone with COMMON sense and not blinded to the TRUTH, by wearing a Black Robe, can CLEARLY SEE!

This was followed again, another two months later, with an Affidavit of Non-Service (for which states on ten separate visits they tried to serve notice at an address; and proclaimed they had no other noted address to serve the notice (an out right LIE utilized to drive up fees of the case) as proven by the Affidavit of Service (1st attempt) at the actual address of the property in question was to be notarized on the very next day! Likewise, the signatures by the Clerk of Court (4 months after a new Clerk of Court had already been sworn in, once again showed Liz Godard!)

It should also be noted that the signature shows signed on the 5th of April, yet the Judicial Website showed submitted on the 6th of April; and these signatures by observance of the stress of the letters indicates signed by someone other than Liz Godard, as there is too much differentiation.

Likewise, on the 7th of April (pages 67-69) Show that miraculously 2 of the 3 three documents were supposedly signed by Liz Godard did not match the previous signatures of Liz Godard as noted on that of the letter "o" and then one must question that between those two said documents was that of one that was signed for Liz Godard by someone for which it clearly states (Thus if Liz Godard was there for the signing of these other two documents then why was this document signed by someone else in her place?)

IT'S NOT BAD ENOUGH THAT WE HAVE THE BANKSTERS ENGAGING IN ROBO-SIGNING, AND THEIR FORECLOSURE MILLS ENGAGING IN ROBO-SIGNING (FOR WHICH BY ANYONE ELSE WOULD CALL IT WHAT IT IS "FORGERY!") BUT NOW WE EVEN HAVE THE COURTS ENGAGING IN THE SAME PRACTICE; AND ONE MUST ASK IF THAT IS NOT BECAUSE OF THE 1% COMMISSION THE JUDGE AND OR COURT IS RECEIVING ON EACH AND EVERY ONE OF THESE FORECLOSURES PUSHED THROUGH THE COURTS IN FAVOR OF THE BANKSTERS?

11. Did Judge M. Anderson Griffith violate the RIGHT to CONTRACT and RIGHT of Choice of the Defendant by not allowing her to be represented by someone other than a member of the BAR Association?

As noted, to understand the TRUTH one merely needs to start with the Preamble of the United States for America, which states "We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to

ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.”

The main focus before us today, in this issue, is:

Securing the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity!

As clearly put forth by our Founding Fathers of America the LIBERTY as proclaimed was a BLESSING; therefore bestowed upon man-kind by God (The Creator)! As such the FREEDOM to make one's own decision in their own welfare is a Natural (God-Given) RIGHT; therefore not within any PURVIEW, POWER or AUTHORITY of any State or Federal Government to Legislate or Regulate, as NO GOVERNMENT ENTITY MAY Legislate that for which they have not created!

This fact of TRUTH was addressed by both the Great John Locke and Thomas Jefferson:

John Locke: “All men are naturally in a state of perfect freedom to order their actions, and dispose of their possessions and persons as they think fit, within the bounds of the law of Nature, without asking leave or depending upon the will of any other man.”

Thomas Jefferson: “Rightful liberty is unobstructed action according to our will within limits drawn around us by the equal rights of others. I do not add “within the limits of the law” because law is often but the tyrant's will, and always so when it violates the rights of the individual.”

This Fact of LIBERTY (Freedom of Choice and to Contract) is enshrined in the United States Constitution and to ensure the prevention of encroachment of TYRANTS the Seventh Amendment was included to ensure that no individual's property in an amount of excess of twenty dollars may be taken from any individual without a Trial by their Peers; as the founding fathers understood that “We the People” would not allow SCAMS-SCHEMES-FRAUDS to be perpetrated on their fellow man!

This FACT is even supported by Court Cases prior to the BAR Association assisted the BANKING CARTEL in taking UNCONSTITUTIONAL control of America's Monetary System!

Sims v. Aherns. 271 SW 720 (1925).

“The “COMMERCIAL” practice of law, pleading for hire, should not be confused with the common law right to practice law. The former being fully subject to the regulation of law as a commercial endeavor, and the latter being the exercise of a common right beyond legislation.”

Schwartz v. Board of Examiners, 353 U.S. 238, 239 (1957)

“The practice of Law CAN NOT be licensed by any state/State.”

Lest we not forget:

Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 U.S. 390, 399, 400. (1923)

“the term [liberty] ...denotes not merely freedom from bodily restraint but also the right of the individual to contract, to engage in any of the common occupations of life, to acquire useful knowledge, to marry, to establish a home and bring up children , to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience... The established doctrine is that this liberty may not be interfered with, under the guise of protecting public interest, by legislative action.”

If one needs to be reinded of the definition of “LIBERTY”:

Freedom; exemption from extraneous control. The power of the will, in its moral freedom, to follow the dictates of its unrestricted choice, and to direct the external acts of the individual without restraint , coercion, or control from other persons.

**** This FACT is substantiated in:**

Booth v Illinois, 184 U.S. 425 (1902);

Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113, 142 (1876);

This brings us back to the question “Did Judge M. Anderson Griffith violate the RIGHT to CONTRACT and RIGHT of Choice of the Defendant by not allowing her to be represented by someone other than a member of the BAR Association? The answer is an undisputed “YES” as this was not an activity of COMMERCE! Likewise, Ms. Catherine Bishop also made it clear that she was not before the Court as Pro Se (inclusive of a Corporation and or Agent thereof) but In Pro Propria Personam(a proper living, breathing entity)!

Thereby, it really shouldn't be was her RIGHTS VIOLATED; THEY WERE! The real question coupled therein is whether the Judge did so out of IGNORANCE, INCOMPETENCE, OR OUTRIGHT CORRUPTION?

As a NON-LAWYER, NON-ATTORNEY, provided this information within the said Second Set of Motions which the Judge was presented in about three weeks after being informed by of the first Ruling in regarsd to the Motions Hearing of June 5, 2018 one can confirm it was the resulting action of CORRUPTION by the Judge, and that his action of refusing her to engage in LIBERTY was for his enrichment of 1% Commission for which h was to partake directly or indirectly due to him gettting a favorable ruling/outcome for the Plaintiff (BANKSTER)! Please take notice of Pages (26-28), (29-46) which was derived from the Second Set of Motions.

12. Is it not a DIRECT Conflict of Interest for any Judge to act as the Document Authentication Expert on behalf of the Plaintiff, and yet not recuse him/her self from the proceedings as a Judge?

The Judge acted as a document authentication expert, as well as led the Plaintiff in Objecting to Ms. Catherine Bishop being allowed to engage in her RIGHT of CHOICE and Right ot Contract! Please see the following pages which is a copy of Sworn

Affidavits by Witnesses to this FACT! Likewise, let it be known that the Witnesses (Suzan Hardee, Brian Hardee, and Darren Watters) are all willing to take PUBLIC POLYGRAPHS WITH MEDIA PRESENT and LIKEWISE REQUEST THAT YOU HAVE JUDGE M. ANDERSON GRIFFITH, HIS SECRETARY, THE COURT STENOGRAPHER, LIZ GODARD, JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS, CLAIRE ALLEN, JUDGE JAMES E. LOCKEMY ALL BE MADE TO PRESENT THEMSELVES FOR THIS PUBLIC POLYGRAPH OF THEM AS WELL!

PLEASE SEE THE AFFIDAVIT OF WITNESS TO THE COURT HEARINGS BELOW:

11 October 2018

SWORN AFFIDAVIT

RE: Catherine L. Bishop vs Bank of America

Case# 2018-001768

Dear Judge(s)

This is my testimony in regards to Catherine L. Bishop, Case# 2018-001768. My name is Suzan Hardee. I, along with my husband, live with my sister Catherine and I have been to all 3 of her hearings in the Aiken County Court of Equity. I am submitting for record what took place at these hearings, understanding that I am under oath. To the best of my recollection this case played out as follows:

1st Hearing... Catherine appeared before Judge Anderson Griffith around the first week of April 2018. She was never informed of this hearing by that of the court. Catherine stated to the judge that she was there to save her home. A lawyer from Bank of America (BOA) was also present stating that Catherine was 6 months behind in her house payments, to which Catherine replied it was only 2 payments. Judge Griffith asked Catherine why she had not appealed. Catherine told the judge that she didn't know she could and that she had no knowledge of laws. The judge then granted Catherine time to appeal stating that she needed to get a lawyer. (Something she cannot afford) The judge then told the lawyer from BOA to produce a witness to testify at the next hearing to explain to Catherine how she may be 6 months behind in payments. He then dismissed court. No court reporter was present at this hearing.

Side Note... Following this hearing, I asked our neighbor and friend, Darren Watters, if he could research this situation. Mr. Watters has 17 years' experience in conducting extensive research within the military intelligence community. He researched the issue and the Law, and helped Catherine prepare 21 Interrogatives questions that are allowed out of 25. Catherine sent them to Brock & Scott LLC, and also filed them with the court. It took over a month for a reply. The law firm stated the all questions were too broad or too vague. Likewise, there was also 25 document requests for which she sent to the Plaintiff's Attorney, and for which was filed with the court as well. There was no truthful reply from the Plaintiff. I noticed the Plaintiff had refused to give any information on any witness names or anyone with knowledge about Catherine's supposed debt or mortgage that would be present in the court hearing. Also please note that though out all these hearings that Bank of America has proclaimed that they own this house at 306 Coral Way in North Augusta, SC. We also discovered that the lawyer requested to be seen by the Equity Court w/o knowledge or agreed on by Catherine. We have proof of this. (Also see Rule 53B)

Following the non-responsive answers of the Plaintiff I asked if he could help Catherine prepare the needed motions for the court, due to the inaction by the Plaintiff. He was then made Power of Attorney for Catherine, by Catherine, as she requested that he might speak for her in the court hearing. Please note that at no time has Mr. Watters asked for any money for his time and assistance in this matter. Likewise he has never claimed to be an attorney to anyone or given any promise of outcome.

2nd Hearing... On June 5th, 2018, Catherine, Mr. Watters, my husband and myself showed up about 20 minutes early to find the plaintiff's lawyer, Mr. Burgess already sitting in the court room going through his paperwork. As the hearing started, Catherine requested that Mr. Watters speak for her since she had no knowledge of law and the fact that Mr. Watters did all the research in this matter. Judge Griffith denied her stating that Mr. Watters did not have a "Law License". When Mr. Watters asked the judge to see Mr. Burgess' "Law License", the judge then raised forward stating "He most likely doesn't have it on him." Catherine then asked if Mr. Watters was her Power of Attorney, would he then be allowed to speak for her. The judge then looked at the papers. When the lawyer, Mr. Burgess said nothing, Judge Griffith asked Mr. Burgess "Well?" "Are you going to object or not?" Mr. Burgess stammered replying, "Uhm Uhm, Yes, I object." No reason was given for the objection and the judge never asked for a reason. So again this judge played assistant lawyer for the lawyer, Mr. Burgess. Catherine again asked the judge to change his mind and he refused her plea. She was denied her right to counsel and to contract several times. Later Catherine asked to see the Original Note/Title of the house which the lawyer supposedly produced. When it was in question, Judge Griffith proclaimed from the bench that it was the original and said "It is the original because it has my green stamp on it." Now the judge has made himself an expert on documentation authentication as well as being an aid to a professional member of the BAR. I am very doubtful that this is the original because we have a form of Brock & Scott LLC requesting a Certified Copy of the Mortgage from the county records office. Also the size of this document that was produced was not correct. It was a standard size sheet of paper. (To my understanding, aren't the Mortgage/Deed and Promissory Note to remain together as ruled by the Supreme Courts in a ruling in 1872?) Several times I noticed the judge look at Mr. Burgess who nodded his head at the judge. It was hard at times for me to figure out who was actually in charge of this hearing, the judge or the lawyer! The court reporter was present at this hearing, but no witness appeared as was instructed to do so in the very 1st hearing by Judge Griffith. Catherine also produced a MERS form showing that there are 7 different banks holding the Mortgage and or Note to this home dated after she moved in on November 4th of 2004, of which the judge threw out as evidence. It should be noted that one of the seven was by that of Bank of America itself within 5 months AFTER her closing.

3rd Hearing... On August 8th, 2018, I arrived along with my sister Catherine, Mr. Watters and my husband Mr. Hardee. We arrived about 30 minutes early on this day. As I entered the judge's secretary's office, I saw the lawyer Mr. Burgess, the witness and the court reporter all huddled together in a corner outside the judge's chambers, which is adjacent to his secretary's office. I was quickly ushered out and we were put in the outer most waiting hall until the start of the hearing. As we walked in to this 3rd court hearing we all noticed that there was only one chair at the defendants table where Mr. Watters was seated at the 2nd hearing. There were also 3 uniformed officers in place who came into that small court room. I felt very intimidated by this and I'm sure this is why the officers were placed there. Again Catherine was not allowed to have Mr. Watters speak for her. Catherine was also never given the chance to testify to facts on her own behalf. She was only allowed to ask the witness questions. She was not prepared for this witness because Brock & Scott denied to her that a 3rd party existed. When Catherine asked the judge why there was a witness there because Brock & Scott never informed her of it in the interrogatory questions, the judge told her that it had been amended by the law firm. We have yet to find it in any court files posted nor has a copy of it ever been sent to Catherine. The judge flat out LIED to Catherine in my opinion. Catherine did however think to ask this witness who owned the home to which the BOA witness stated that "Panny Mac owns it." "We are just a Power of Attorney for them" My question is this: Why was Catherine not permitted to have a Power of Attorney speak for her also? And Why was Bank of America allowed to lie in court about ownership, also under oath, then get away with it? I once read a banner stating:

"BANK OF AMERICA FORECLOSING ON HOMES THEY DON'T OWN!!"

As the hearing went on Catherine cited some laws in court at which the judge became irritated and he told Catherine "Stop quoting Federal Laws to me. They do not apply in my court!!" At which time Mr. Watters was removed by threat of force by Officer McFarland for stating that Catherine should challenge jurisdiction as he was walking out. As this hearing went on, my sister Catherine complained that he was holding her to the same standard of the BAR attorney, to which the judge replied it was because Catherine was there as 'Pro-Se', which in the motions clearly state that she was there "Pro Propia Personam" and NOT "Pro-Se" At this time my husband became upset calling the court "Crooked" and walked out with Officer McFarland in his face ordering him to "Get out!! Get out now!!" In the 2nd motions to the court Judge Griffith was asked for his recusal because of his actions in aiding Mr. Burgess in the courtroom. Catherine explained what he did and the judge claimed he did not remember doing anything or aiding Mr. Burgess. He told Catherine that he would not step down. Catherine asked if there was a way to get a jury trial on this matter. The judge replied "No, its too late for that. This will be the final hearing." Even though she had asked for it in her 2nd set of motions! As of this date Catherine has never received an explanation of how she was 6 months behind in her payment. BOA accepted her payment in December of 2017, then refused her payment in January of 2018 citing she was in foreclosure.

I remind you that this 3rd hearing was held on August 8th, 2018. On August 23rd I called the Clerk of Court to find out why no ruling was received in the mail or why nothing was filed and posted yet on their Court Site. She told me that Judge Griffith had not requested them to be filed yet. Then by some miracle it was posted on the very next day on their court web site. We received the ruling in the mail several days later that was dated 8/24/18. Which was the date it was mailed out. This Judge/Court have used stall tactics since the beginning which in turn would only leave us 2-3 weeks to file motions and appeals. In my opinion, this is not the way this court/legal system was created to run. These proceeding to date have reeked nothing short of a Kangaroo Court in action.

Thank you for your time in this unusual matter.

Suzan B. Hardee

Suzan B. Hardee

SWORN THIS 30th DAY
OF ~~August~~ September, 2018
NOTARY IN THE STATE OF
SOUTH CAROLINA

My Commission Expires
July 16, 2020

17 October 2018

SWORN AFFIDAVIT

RE: Catherine L. Bishop vs Bank of America

Case# 2018-001768

Dear Judge(s)

My name is William B. Hardee. I am the brother in law of Ms. Catherine Bishop. Both my wife, Suzan and I live with her at 306 Coral Way Belvedere SC, 29841. I was not able to attend Ms. Bishop's 1st hearing, but was present at her 2nd and 3rd hearings under Judge Anderson Griffith. To the best of my memory and under oath, I will testify to what I recall took place at these two trials.

2nd Hearing... We got to the court house about 20 minutes early and saw the lawyer for Bank of America already sitting in court. At the start of the hearing it was called into question if Mr. Watters could talk for Catherine. He told her No. When she ask the judge if having a Power of Attorney contract with Mr. Watters would make a difference, the judge asked to see the contract. He looked up at Mr. Burgess who was there for the bank and asked if Mr. Burgess was going to object or not. Mr. Burgess stuttered, "Uh, Uh, I guess so. I object." He never said why he objected. The judge would not accept papers into evidence that showed that Fannie Mae owned the house and not Bank of America, who claimed several times in court that they owned it. Judge Griffith also refused to look at a MERS paper showing that 7 other banks held the note/mortgage to her home which were all dated AFTER she closed on the house in November of 2004, or to let it be entered into evidence also. After this, I do not remember what the judge said or how he closed out the hearing.

3rd Hearing... On August 8th, 2018 we were about 30 minutes early. My wife walked into the office with me right behind her. We were all rushed out and told to sit in a large hall across from the elevators outside. I looked back and saw the court reporter, Mr. Burgess and a lady come out of the office and put into the court room. I later found out during the hearing that this lady was a witness for the bank. As we walked into the court room, we all saw that a chair was missing at Catherine's (defendant) table. There were also 3 officers by the doors and in the back of the court room where we were sitting. I could not understand why they were there since the officers were not there at the 2nd hearing. As the hearing started, Catherine asked the judge again if Mr. Watters could talk for her. He denied her again. Catherine was left to fend for herself even after she told the courts many times that she didn't know how or what to do. (This was done at the 2nd hearing also.) After this, the witness was asked to answer Catherine's questions.

Catherine asked the judge why they were allowed to have a witness since Mr. Burgess said he didn't have any. The judge was quick to say that the interrogatory questions had been amended. She still hasn't got a letter from the lawyer or courts stating this fact. My wife looked on the courts web site and no amendment to this day has ever been filed! Catherine asked the witness who owned the home. The witness said that Fannie Mae owns it and the bank was only a Power of Attorney for them. When Catherine asked the judge to recuse himself because of his aiding the lawyer in the 2nd hearing, he refused and brushed Catherine off saying he didn't remember that. When Judge Griffith said he didn't remember coaxing the lawyer (Mr. Burgess) my wife, Mr. Watters and I all shook our heads while not saying a word. Officer McFarland got up in each one of our faces and growled: "If you shake your heads again just one more time, I will throw all of you out!! DO YOU UNDERSTAND ME?? This is when I understood why the police were there at this hearing... To strong arm us & to intimidate us. It's a show of force with no good reason.

This judge also interrupted Catherine several times during her questions to the witness saying she was testifying while asking a question. Catherine didn't know how to form the questions she wanted to ask, and was not prepared to ask any questions because Mr. Burgess said there was NO WITNESS.

Mr. Watters had made some notes on laws for Catherine just in case the judge wouldn't let him speak for her. As she went on to quote some laws from the pages, the judge got mad and yelled at her stating: "Federal Laws DO NOT Apply In MY Court!!" Mr. Watters was very annoyed by this and walked out of the court room telling Catherine to challenge the jurisdiction of the court. As Mr. Watters got to the doorway, Office McFarland threatened to remove him by force, even though Mr. Watters was already walking out.

Later, Catherine became upset at all the judges interruptions and asked the judge why she was being held to the same standard as Mr. Burgess who is a Pro BAR Member. Judge Griffith said it was because she was there Pro-Se. If this judge would have read all of the motions as he claimed when asked by Catherine, he would have seen that she was there as Pro-Propia-Personam,...NOT Pro-Se. At this moment I got angry, got up walking toward the door and in a regular voice said: "This court is crooked." At the door, again this Officer McFarland got in my face shouting: "GET OUT!! GET OUT NOW!!" When I walked out into the hallway going to the elevators, McFarland pushed me in my back. He had no reason to touch me at all. I told him that if he did it again that I would sue him for Police Brutality and Assault. I am 60 yrs old and suffer from painful back problems. I went outside and joined Mr. Watters, who had left the courtroom earlier, until the hearing was over and waited with him for my wife, Suzan and sister in law, Catherine to come out.

Thank you for taking time in this case.

SWORN THIS 30 DAY Nov 19 2019
OF North Charleston
NOTARY PUBLIC IN THE STATE OF
SOUTH CAROLINA

My Commission Expires
July 16, 2020

13. Is it not an IMMORAL ACT and FELONY for a Judge to turn a Blind Eye to Observable TRUTH and then engage in the action of covering it up within that of a written ruling for which anyone with COMMON SENSE would denote as Obstruction of Justice?
14. Can any Court Case be considered to be Fair and Honest when the Judge allows the Plaintiff to withhold Information requested by the DFENDANT in that of Interrogatives and Document Discovery Requests, for which the information being requested was already to be provided without such requests/demands under the General Rules of Discovery?

This argument is in regards to the both question 13 and 14 above!

It is noted that there was a Motion Filed due to numerous issues, so let us start with the most blatant disregard to the rules of Civil Procedure that was not only allowed but conveniently disregarded by Judge M. Anderson Griffith!

Before I type one word I request that you take a look at the following Interrogatories that and the Plaintiff's Response thereof:

As you will notice of 23 Interrogatories - NOT A SINGLE ONE WAS ANSWERED!

You will also take notice that included in numerous INTERROGATIVES was the request for INFORMATION THAT THE PLAINTIFF WAS ALREADY TO PROVIDE TO THE DEFENDANT UNDER THE GENERAL RULES OF DISCOVERY.

Likewise, take notice of 20 Document Discovery Requests for which the response was take what we give you, it may or may not be what you requested but that is all that we are going to give you!

Very Damn Little was provided that was requested!

However, deposite this DELIBERATE and WILLFUL INTENT TO WITHHOLD INFORMATION and DOCUMENTS the Judge proclaimed:

The Defendant argued that the Plaintiff had failed to provide answers to the Defendant's interrogatories and the request for production. In this matter, the Defendant has never filed an answer and was in default at the time of the first hearing. When a defendant fails to deny an allegation, the allegation is admitted. Rule 8(d) SCRCPP. The Defendant has not contested signing the Note and Mortgage or the default in payment. "Generally, the party seeking foreclosure has the burden of establishing the existence of the debt and the mortgagor's default of that debt. Bank of America v. Draper, 405 S.C. 214, 746 S.E. 2d 478 (2013). The Plaintiff has already established the existence of the Note and Mortgage. The Defendant has never pled any defense contesting those documents or the breach of the terms of the agreement. The remaining issue is

for the Plaintiff to establish the amount of damages. The court does agree that the Plaintiff should be provided the name and information of the witness who will testify at the damages portion of the next hearing. The Plaintiff has already produced numerous documents as shown on the attached exhibit 1 to this order.

**** Let us expose the TRUTH of the MATTER!**

As seen in the COURTS own record she was being provided legal counsel through a Bankruptcy Attorney, thus it was a member of the BAR Association that failed to represent her and ensure the proper papers were filed.... Maybe if she had a non-bar representative this would never have occurred! Likewise, she made it known and it was witnessed as shown in the Affidavit on Page 73 of this document that she didn't know she could! Let it be known that this lady has absolutely NO KNOWLEDGE of LAW or any process for said Foreclosure!

Need I not remind you as I did Judge. M Anderson Griffith that:

"The Federal Rules rejects the approach that pleading is a game of skill in which one misstep by counsel may be decisive to the outcome and accept the principle that the purpose of pleading is to facilitate a proper decision on the merits." According to Rule 8(f) FRCP and the State Court rule which holds that all pleadings shall be construed to do substantial justice."

Justice Black in Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41 at 48 (1957)

As noted in **Puckett v. Cox**, it was held that a pro-se pleading requires less stringent reading than one drafted by a lawyer (456 F2d 233 (1972 Sixth Circuit USCA).

Likewise, **"Pleadings in this case are being filed by Plaintiff In Propria Persona, wherein pleadings are to be considered without regard to technicalities. Propria, pleadings are not to be held to the same high standards of perfection as practicing lawyers."**

See:

Haines v. Kerner 92 Sct 594, also See Power 914 F2d 1459 (11th Cir1990);

Hulsey v. Ownes 63 F3d 354 (5th Cir 1995);

HALL v. BELLMON 935 F.2d 1106 (10th Cir. 1991).

Therefore, the statement by Judge M. Anderson of **"When a defendant fails to deny an allegation, the allegation is admitted. Rule 8(d) SCRPC"**

The claim that he can use Rule 8(d) to justify her entire case goes without merit and is contradictory to a Fair and Honest Hearing/Trial! Likewise, the Judge was informed that at the specific point in time of the very first hearing she still had no knowledge that she had been defrauded by the bank! **(AS CLEARLY ESTABLISHED BY THE JEROME DALY CASE OF 1968 AND THE FEDERAL RESERVE MANUAL "MODERN MONEY MECHANICS."** We could easily have proven Ms. Catherine Bishop's current case but the Judge has proclaimed that Ms. Catherine Bishop is only entitled to that for which the CROOKS want to provide to her, instead of what according to Law she is to be provided!

Likewise, as stated earlier Ms. Catherine Bishop does not contest signing a Note or Mortgage, but she does and did **CONTEST** that the document before the court was the original for which she provided substantial proof as there were **SEVEN SALES** of her said property after her closing date, not including the sale to Fannie Mae (**EIGHT IN TOTAL**)!

I refer you back to pages (52-56) of this document!

It should also be noted that she produced proof that the Plaintiff had ordered a **CERTIFIED COPY OF THE SAID MORTGAGE AND OR NOTE FROM THE COUNTY RECORDERS OFFICE! THUS, CLARIFIES THAT THERE DEFINITELY WAS A TIME FOR WHICH THEY WERE NOT IN POSSESSION OF SAID MORTGAGE AND OR NOTE WHICH PRESENTS THE PROBLEM OF THE NOTE FOR WHICH THE JUDGE HIMSELF DECLARED IT TO BE THE ORIGINAL, WHEN QUESTIONED BY MS CATHERINE BISHOP AS TO ITS AUTHENTICITY.**

TIME FOR A SESSION IN COMMON SENSE

For what purpose would the Plaintiff need to order a **CERTIFIED COPY** of the Mortgage and or Note if they were already in Possession of it?

If they were only ordering just the Mortgage and or Note then the Promissory Note and Mortgage has or had been separated, thereby making the Promissory Note **NULL and VOID** to be acted upon! This was clearly established in *Carpenter v. Longan*, 83 U.S. (16 Wall.) 271. **FORWHICH JUDGE M. ANDERSON GRIFFITH WAS MADE KNOWN WITHIN THE MOTIONS!**

The Judge even went on to state "The Plaintiff has already established the existence of the Note and Mortgage." Yet by the judges own statement and confirmation by the Plaintiff's own witness who was brought before the court in action of **PERJURY** due to their non-existence, this is **FALSE!**

The witness stated in open court which was witnessed by the Defendant's sister that she said Fannie Mae owned the Mortgage and or Promissory Note, which corroborates the screenshot shown on page 56 of this document. Now, the judge stated that **NO ASSIGNMENTS EXISTED!**

So, Common Sense would then dictate that if Fannie Mae owned the Mortgage and or Promissory Note that then this would be noted on that of the Promissory Note and Mortgage before the Court, yet **AMAZINGLY THE DOCUMENTS BEFORE THE COURT SHOWS NO SUCH TRANSACTION! THEREFORE, BY DEDUCTIVE REASONING OF COMMON SENSE, THE PROMISSORY NOTE AUTHENTICATED BY THE JUDGE ACTING AS THE DOCUMENT AUTHENTICATION EXPERT ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFF IS A FORGED/FRAUDULENT DOCUMENT!**

DO TAKE NOTICE THAT AS YOU READ THIS CRIMINAL CHARGES ARE BEING FILED WITH THE JUSTICE SYSTEM IN REGARDS TO ALL THE IRREGULARITIES NOTED AND ALL THE INDIVIDUALS INVOLVED!

Likewise, the Judge stating "The Defendant has never pled any defense contesting those documents or the breach of the terms of the agreement." **IS FALSE!!!!**

She contested it during the MOTIONS HEARING and in the Final Trial, as well as within the MOTIONS! Thus, the Judge by making these FALSE statements has in fact committed PERJURY!

Also of note is that within the first set of motions Ms Catherine Bishop did make it known that she was challenging whether she had received a loan; thereby implied breach of contract was before Judge M. Anderson Griffith and he cannot claim otherwise!

The Motion even included the following:

Despite the above court cases, Ralph Gelder, Superintendent, Department of Banks and Banking, State of Maine, said on Feb. 20, 1974, "A commercial bank is able to make a loan by simply creating a new demand deposit (so called checkbook money) through bookkeeping entry." This is in total contradiction to what the courts have said. Yet, that is exactly how the banks create the money to loan to its customers or to buy government bonds.

It should also be noted that the Judge made claims that the Plaintiff had produced most of the documents requested... In truth the following was produced, and the Plaintiff was shocked when it was requested by the Defendant to have it entered into evidence!

Pay very close attention to the Next Page for which the Judge tried to make it appear that the Plaintiff had produced a lot, while hiding the real TRUTH of the matter!

However, if one reviews the disk that was submitted into evidence it shows tons of multiple copies of the same thing, blank pages, pages where everything was blacked out, etc!!! You would think it was a file going before Congress from the IRS or FBI!!! Most of what was in the said disk was pure garbage!!!! Likewise, even with in that which was requested the documents produced were nil to none for that which was sought, and the judge knew it! Instead of addressing the Plaintiff not producing the information and documents requested he tried to engage in "SPIN" and thereby PERJURING himself when stating that the Plaintiff had produced most if not all documents and information being sought!

Even in regards to a witness that the Plaintiff made clear did not exist in the Interrogatories now with less than three weeks before the Final trial Ms. Catherine Bishop received notice of her NAME ONLY; once again a total disregard for the Rules of Civil Procedure, for which the Judge was well aware! No contact info for the said witness,

experience noted, positions held..... ABSOLUTELY NOTHING WAS PROVIDED TO THE DEFENDANT IN REGARDS TO THIS WITNESS MIRACULOUSLY APPEARING, NOR DID THE DEFENDANT EVER CONFIRM ANY DEBT OF SAID DEFENDANT DURING THE TRIAL!

Bank of America v. Catherine L. Bishop 2016-CP-02-00381

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF DVD DISC- EXHIBIT 5

NOTE-

MORTGAGE- PAGE 5

LOAN MODIFICATION AGREEMENT- 21

RESIDENTIAL LOAN APPLICATION-34

STATEMENT OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES-37

RESIDENTIAL APPRAISAL REPORT-41

SETTLEMENT STATEMENT-43

TAX TRANSCRIPTS SUMMARY-47

TAX RETURNS-48

LOAN #2760- PAGE 102

NOTE-103

LETTER FROM BOA DATED 5/10/11-PAGE 109

MORTGAGE-111

CHICAGO TITLE INS. COMPANY-LOAN POLICY-127

BOA NOTICE OF INTENT TO ACCELERATE, DATED 8/17/15- PAGE 135

BOA NOTICE OF INTENT TO ACCELERATE DATED 9/17/12- PAGE 143

BOA LETTER DATED 11/24/15- PAGE 147

BOA REINSTATEMENT CALCULATION DATED 2/8/18- PAGE 161

BOA LETTER RE LOAN HISTORY DATED 3/5/18- PAGE 199

BOA LETTER REINSTATMENT CALCULATION DATED 3/1/16- PAGE 211

DEED-239

APPRAISAL REPORT- 241

Plf Ex. 1

Compare what was requested via the INTERROGATIVES and DOCUMENT DISCOVERY REQUESTS BELOW TO THAT WHICH WAS PRODUCED FOR THE DEFENDANT BY THAT OF THE PLAINTIFF!

SEE BELOW:

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF AIKEN

Bank of America, N.A.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Catherine L. Bishop,

Defendant.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
C/A NO.: 2016-CP-02-00381

**PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO THE
INTERROGATORIES OF
DEFENDANT CATHERINE L.
BISHOP**

TO: CATHERINE L. BISHOP, PRO SE DEFENDANT:

Pursuant to Rule 33 of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure, the Plaintiff responds to the Interrogatories of Defendant as follows:

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

The Plaintiff generally objects to the Interrogatories on the grounds set forth in paragraphs "A" through "K" below. All general objections shall be deemed to be continuing and shall be construed as supplementing each specific objection and/or response to the Interrogatories. No specific objection and no response contained herein shall be interpreted as limiting in any way the scope or effect of any general objection.

- A. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that they exceed the scope permitted by the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure.
- B. Each response is subject to all objections as to relevance and materiality or any other objections that would require the exclusion of any statement herein if such statement were to be made by a witness present and testifying in Court.
- C. A response to any Interrogatory is not intended and should not be construed to be a waiver by the Plaintiff of all or any part of any objection to any Interrogatory.
- D. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that they assume



facts that are inaccurate.

- E. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that they are argumentative.
- F. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that they are defective in form.
- G. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that they are overly broad.
- H. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that they are unduly burdensome.
- I. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that they are oppressive.
- J. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that they are not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
- K. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that they impose on it an unreasonable burden of inquiry.
- L. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that they seek information that is subject to the attorney-client privilege, work product privilege, or any other privilege or legal protection. The inadvertent or mistaken production of information and/or documents subject to the protections of the attorney-client privilege, work product privilege, or any other privilege or legal protection shall not constitute a general, inadvertent, implicit, subject matter, separate, independent, or other waiver of such privilege or protection and does not put in issue or constitute the affirmative use of the advice of counsel or of any privileged communications. All such inadvertently produced information and/or documents shall be returned to the Plaintiff's attorneys, along with any copies made thereof.
- M. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that they seek information that is of a confidential, proprietary, or trade secret nature.
- N. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that they seek information that was prepared in anticipation of litigation.
- O. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that they are not

- properly limited as to time.
- P. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that they seek documents not in its possession, custody, or control.
 - Q. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that they seek conclusions or request opinions or contentions that relate to the application of law to facts.
 - R. The Plaintiff reserves its right to supplement its responses and objections to the Interrogatories to the extent necessary and appropriate.

RESERVATIONS

- 1. These responses are made without waiver of, and with preservation of:
 - (a) The right to object to all Interrogatories as to competency, relevancy, materiality, confidentiality, privilege, and admissibility of the responses, or the subject matter thereof, as evidence for any purpose in any further proceeding in this action (including the trial of this action) or in any other action;
 - (b) The right to object to the use of any such responses, or the subject matter thereof, on any ground in any further proceeding in this action (including the trial of this action) or in any other action;
 - (c) The right to object on any ground at any time to a demand or request for production or other document request or other discovery proceeding;
 - (d) The right to object on any ground to any Interrogatories revised by the Defendant in response to any objection herein that an Interrogatory, or any part thereof, is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, or unduly burdensome; and
 - (e) The right at any time to revise, correct, add to, supplement or clarify any of the responses contained herein.
- 2. The following responses, and any further responses to the Interrogatories, or to their subject matter, are made expressly without acknowledgment of materiality or relevance of documents described in the Interrogatories, or that the Interrogatories are in any way reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

If one or more documents are produced which are protected by the attorney-client privilege or any other privilege, such production is inadvertent and is not intended as a waiver of such privilege.

RESPONSES AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS

INTERROGATORY 1

Please identify each person who answers these interrogatories and each person (attach pages if necessary) who assisted, including attorneys, accountants, employees of third party entities, or any other person consulted, however briefly, on the content of any answer to these interrogatories.

RESPONSE 1:

The Plaintiff objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, overly broad, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. To the extent not objected to, the undersigned counsel for the Plaintiff prepared the enclosed responses to these interrogatories with the assistance of agents or employees of the Plaintiff.

INTERROGATORY 2

For each of the above persons please state whether they have personal knowledge regarding the subject loan transaction.

RESPONSE 2:

The Plaintiff objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY 3

Please state the date of first contact between Bank of America and the borrower in the subject loan transaction, the name, address and telephone number of the person(s) in your company/corporation who was/were involved in that contact.

RESPONSE 3:

The Plaintiff objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY 4

Please identify every potential party to this lawsuit

RESPONSE 4:

The Plaintiff objects to this Interrogatory as it calls for speculation and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. To the extent not objected to, the Plaintiff asserts that the named parties in this action are the currently known proper parties to the lawsuit.

INTERROGATORY 5

Please identify the person(s) involved in the underwriting of the subject loan. "Underwriting" refers to any person who made representations, evaluations or appraisals of value of the home, value of the security instruments, and ability of the borrower to pay.

RESPONSE 5:

The Plaintiff objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY 6

Please identify any person(s) who had any contact with any person or third party regarding the monetizing of the Defendant's "Signature", as well as: securitization, sale, transfer, assignment, hypothecation of any document or agreement, oral, written or otherwise, that would affect the funding, closing or the receipt of money from a third party in a transaction that referred to the subject loan.

RESPONSE 6:

The Plaintiff objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of

admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY 7

Please identify any person(s) known or believed by anyone at Bank of America who had received physical possession of the note and allonges, the mortgage, or any document (including but not limited to assignment, endorsement, allonges, Pooling and Servicing Agreement, Assignment and Assumption Agreement, Trust Agreement, letters or email or faxes of transmittals including attachments) that refers to or incorporates terms regarding the monetizing of Defendant's "Signature", as well as: securitization, sale, transfer, assignment hypothecation or any document or agreement, oral written or otherwise, that would affect the funding, or the receipt of money from a third party in a transaction and whether such money was allocated to principal, interest or other obligation related to the subject loan.

RESPONSE 7:

The Plaintiff objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY 8

Please identify any document that the Defendant signed for which the Plaintiff was authorized, i.e. given permission, to monetize the Defendant's Signature within the mortgage loan process, or thus utilized in any regard to acquiring the property hereby located at: 306 Coral Way, Belvedere, South Carolina 29841 or 306 Coral Way, North Augusta, South Carolina 29841.

RESPONSE 8:

The Plaintiff objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY 9

Please identify all persons known or believed by anyone at Bank of America or any affiliate

to have participated in the monetizing of the Defendant's Signature, as well as securitization of the subject loan including but not limited to mortgage aggregators, mortgage brokers, financial institutions, Structured Investment Vehicles, Special Purpose Vehicles, Trustees, Managers of derivative securities, managers of the company that issued an Asset-backed security, Underwriters, Rating Agency, Credit Enhancement Provider.

RESPONSE 9:

The Plaintiff objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY 10

Please identify the person(s) or entities that are entitled, directly or indirectly to the stream of revenue from the borrower in the subject loan.

RESPONSE 10:

The Plaintiff objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The Plaintiff affirmatively asserts that it is a real party in interest with standing to bring the instant foreclosure action.

INTERROGATORY 11

Please identify the person(s) in custody of any document that identifies the loan servicer(s) in the subject loan transaction.

RESPONSE 11:

The Plaintiff objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY 12

Please identify any person(s) in custody of any document which refers to any instruction or authority to enforce the note or mortgage in the subject loan transaction.

RESPONSE 12:

The Plaintiff objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY 13

Other than people identified above, identify any and all persons who have or had personal knowledge of the subject loan transaction, underwriting of the subject loan transaction, monetizing of the Defendant's Signature, as well as: securitization, sale, transfer, assignment or hypothecation of the subject loan transaction, or the decision to enforce the note or mortgage in the subject loan transaction. Include name, title, entity, and their contact information.

RESPONSE 13:

The Plaintiff objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY 14

Please identify any party or entity known or suspected by Bank of America or any of you officers, employees, independent contractors or other agents or servants of your company/corporation who might possess any claim rights under subject loan or mortgage and/or note.

RESPONSE 14:

The Plaintiff objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is not applicable and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY 15

Please identify the custodian of records that would show all entries regarding the flow of funds for the subject loan transaction prior to and after closing of the loan. (Flow of funds, means any record of money received, any record of money paid out and any bookkeeping or

accounting entry, general ledger and accounting treatment of the subject loan transaction at Bank of America or any affiliate including but not limited to whether the subject loan transaction was ever entered into any category on the balance sheet at any time or times, whether any reserve for default was ever entered on the balance sheet, and whether any entry, report or calculation was made regarding the effect of this loan transaction on the capital reserve requirements of Bank of America or any affiliate.

RESPONSE 15:

The Plaintiff objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY 16

Please identify the auditor and/or accountant of Bank of America's financial statements or tax returns.

RESPONSE 16:

The Plaintiff objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY 17

Please identify any lawyer or attorney in which Bank of America has consulted or who rendered an opinion regarding the subject loan transaction or any pattern of monetizing of Defendant's Signature used in funding the said loan as well as securitization that may have affected the subject loan transaction directly or indirectly.

RESPONSE 17:

The Plaintiff objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY 18

Please identify any person who served as an officer or director with Bank of America commencing 6 months prior to closing of the subject loan transaction through present. (This

list is to include all company/corporate officers who are/were authorized, directed or empowered in the name of the company/corporation to execute re-conveyance documents, acts of conveyance, deeds in lieu of foreclosure, grand deeds, deeds of trust, including foreclosure deeds, releases of liens, escrow instruments, contracts for purchase and sell of Company/Corporation REO properties, grants of easement and any and all related documents and instruments purporting to affect an interest or the transfer of an interest in real estate, in the name of the Company/Corporation. This provided list will clarify: Title, Date Hired, First Name, Last Name, and noted Date of Departure or Firing if not still currently employed by Bank of America.

RESPONSE 18:

The Plaintiff objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY 19

Did any investor/certificate holder approve or authorize foreclosure proceedings for the property location of 306 Coral Way, Belvedere, South Carolina 29841 or 306 Coral Way, North Augusta, South Carolina 29841, for which the Defendant resides?

RESPONSE 19

The Plaintiff objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY 20

Please identify the person(s) involved or having knowledge of any insurance policy or product, plan or instrument describing over-collateralization, cross-collateralization or guarantee or other instrument hedging the risk of default as to any person or entity acting as an issuer of any securities or certificates. (Such instrument(s) relate to the composition of a pool, tranche or other aggregation of assets that was created, included or referred to the subject loan and the pool or aggregation was transmitted, transferred, assigned, pledged or

hypothecated" refers to any person who suggested, approved, received or accepted the composition of the pool or aggregation made or confirmed representations, evaluations or appraisals of value of the home, value of the security instruments, ability of the borrower to pay.)

RESPONSE 20

The Plaintiff objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY 21

Please identify the person(s) involved or having knowledge of any credit default swap or other instrument hedging the risk of default as to any person or entity acting as an issuer of any securities or certificates. (Such instrument(s) relate to the composition of a pool, tranche or other aggregation of assets that was created, included or referred to the subject loan.)

RESPONSE 21

The Plaintiff objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY 22

Please identify all persons having first-hand knowledge of any material fact alleged in the pleadings of this case and, with regard to each person, state what they know about each such fact and how they came to know it.

RESPONSE 22

The Plaintiff objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY 23

Please identify the person(s) involved or having knowledge of any credit default swap or other instrument hedging the risk of default as to any person or entity acting as an issuer of any securities or certificates. (Such instrument(s) relate to the composition of a pool, tranche or other aggregation of assets that was created included or referred to the subject loan in regards to the Defendant or said property located at: (306 Coral Way, Belvedere, South Carolina 29841 or 306 Coral Way, North Augusta, South Carolina 29841.)

RESPONSE 23

The Plaintiff objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

The Plaintiff will supplement these responses as additional information and documentation is obtained and as required by the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure.


Chad W. Burgess, SC Bar No: 72520
Attorney for the Plaintiff
Brock & Scott, PLLC
3800 Fernandina Road, Suite 110
Columbia, SC 29210
Phone 803-454-3540
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Columbia, SC

Date: May 1, 2018

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF AIKEN

Bank of America, N.A.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Catherine L. Bishop,

Defendant.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
C/A NO.: 2016-CP-02-00381

**PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO THE
REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF
DEFENDANT CATHERINE L.
BISHOP**

TO: CATHERINE L. BISHOP, PRO SE DEFENDANT:

Pursuant to Rule 34 of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure, the Plaintiff responds to the Requests for Production of Defendant as follows:

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

The Plaintiff objects generally to these Document Requests inasmuch as they do not appear to be proper Requests as contemplated by the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure and further appear to be sham filings and should be stricken from this matter pursuant to Rule 12(f) of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure. Further, the Plaintiff generally objects and responds to the Document Requests on the grounds set forth in paragraphs "A" through "S" below. All general objections shall be deemed to be continuing and shall be construed as supplementing each specific objection and/or response to the Document Requests. No specific objection and no response contained herein shall be interpreted as limiting in any way the scope or effect of any general objection.

- A. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Document Requests to the extent they exceed the scope permitted by the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure.
- B. Each response is subject to all objections as to relevance and materiality or any other objections that would require the exclusion of any statement herein if such statement were to be made by a witness present and testifying in Court.
- C. A response to any Document Request is not intended and should not be construed to



be a waiver by the Plaintiff of all or any part of any objection to any Document Request.

- D. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Document Requests to the extent they assume facts that are inaccurate.
- E. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Document Requests to the extent they are argumentative.
- F. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Document Requests to the extent they are defective in form.
- G. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Document Requests to the extent they are overly broad.
- H. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Document Requests to the extent they are unduly burdensome.
- I. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Document Requests to the extent they are oppressive.
- J. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Document Requests to the extent they are not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
- K. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Document Requests to the extent they impose on it an unreasonable burden of inquiry.
- L. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Document Requests to the extent they seek information that is subject to the attorney-client privilege, work product privilege, or any other privilege or legal protection. The inadvertent or mistaken production of information and/or documents subject to the protections of the attorney-client privilege, work product privilege, or any other privilege or legal protection shall not constitute a general, inadvertent, implicit, subject matter, separate, independent, or other waiver of such privilege or protection and does not put in issue or constitute the affirmative use of the advice of counsel or of any privileged communications. All such inadvertently produced information and/or documents shall be returned to the Plaintiff's attorneys, along with any copies made thereof.
- M. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Document Requests to the extent they seek information that is of a confidential, proprietary, or trade secret nature.

- N. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Document Requests to the extent they seek information that was prepared in anticipation of litigation.
- O. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Document Requests to the extent they are not properly limited as to time.
- P. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Document Requests to the extent they seek documents not in its possession, custody, or control.
- Q. The Plaintiff reserves its right to supplement its objections and responses to the Document Requests to the extent necessary and appropriate.
- R. The Plaintiff objects to producing any document that does not relate to the claims or defenses asserted in this action by any party. Production of documents that do not relate to the claims and defenses set forth therein shall not be deemed an acknowledgment that such documents are relevant or admissible.
- S. The Plaintiff objects generally to the Document Requests to the extent they seek to require the Plaintiff to produce documents in a form other than as they are kept in the usual course of business.

RESERVATIONS

- I. These responses are made without waiver of, and with preservation of:
 - (a) The right to object to all Document Requests as to competency, relevancy, materiality, confidentiality, privilege and admissibility of the responses, or the subject matter thereof, as evidence for any purpose in any further proceeding in this action (including the trial of this action) or in any other action;
 - (b) The right to object to the use of any such responses, or the subject matter thereof, on any ground in any further proceeding in this action (including the trial of this action) or in any other action;
 - (c) The right to object on any ground to any Document Request revised by the Defendant in response to any objection herein that a Document Request, or any part thereof, is vague, ambiguous, overbroad or unduly burdensome; and

- (d) The right at any time to revise, correct, add to, supplement or clarify any of the responses contained herein.
2. The following responses, and any further responses to the Document Requests, or to their subject matter, are made expressly without acknowledgment of materiality or relevance of information described in the Document Requests, or that the Document Requests are in any way reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. If one or more documents are produced which are protected by the attorney-client privilege or any other privilege, such production is inadvertent and is not intended as a waiver of such privilege.

RESPONSES AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS

REQUEST 1

Any document as to which a claim of privilege is or will be asserted should be identified by author, signatory, description (i.e., letter, memo, telefax), title (if any), dates, addresses (if any), general subject matter, present location and custodian and a complete statement of the grounds for the claim of privilege should be set forth.

RESPONSE 1:

The Plaintiff objects to this Request on the grounds that it does not appear to be a valid document request pursuant to the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure.

REQUEST 2

Any and all documents or correspondence which in any way describe, depict, reference, relate to, or refer to the allegations contained in the underlying foreclosure complaint, including without limitation any and all documents relied upon in preparing said complaint.

RESPONSE 2:

The Plaintiff objects to this Request on the grounds that is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Notwithstanding and without waiving the foregoing objections, and to the extent that the information requested is applicable, the Plaintiff directs attention to the enclosed documents.

REQUEST 3

Copies of the legal services and retainer agreements for each law firm representing plaintiff in the instant action including without limitation the scope of services to be provided and fees for handling this action.

RESPONSE 3:

The Plaintiff objects to this request on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and to the extent that it seeks information protected by the attorney/client privilege.

REQUEST 4

The original Mortgage and Note, signed by the defendant, is required to be produced, within (30) days of receipt of this demand for document production, at 306 Coral Way, Belvedere, South Carolina 29841.

RESPONSE 4:

The Plaintiff directs attention to a copy of the subject Note and Mortgage enclosed herewith. Counsel for the Plaintiff will make the original Note available for inspection and copying at his office at a convenient time upon request.

REQUEST 5

Copies of all documents which support plaintiff's claim that it owns the underlying Note and Mortgage without limitation copies of any and all transfers, assignments, mergers, purchase and sale agreements, endorsements or other documents that demonstrate plaintiff has standing to bring this Complaint in Foreclosure at the time suit was filed.

RESPONSE 5:

To the extent the information requested is applicable, the Plaintiff directs attention to the enclosed documents.

REQUEST 6

Copies of any and all documents which create or demonstrate the existence of a nominee or

agency relationship by, between, or otherwise relating to a third party that has any and all interactions with the Plaintiff as it applies to the stated Note, Mortgage or Defendant in any regard.

RESPONSE 6:

The Plaintiff objects to this Request on the grounds that it does not appear to be applicable to the instant action. The Plaintiff further objects to this Request on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Notwithstanding and without waiving the foregoing objection, and to the extent that the information requested is applicable, the Plaintiff directs attention to the enclosed documents.

REQUEST 7

Copies of any and all documents relied upon by the Plaintiff to prove who actually owned the Mortgage and Note in this case at the time suit was filed including without limitation copies of relevant internal rules and guidelines relating to recording transfers and assignments with appropriate state property records office.

RESPONSE 7:

The Plaintiff objects to this Request on the grounds it is vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST 8

A copy of all document(s) that are relied upon by the Plaintiff to demonstrate the Plaintiff has standing to bring and maintain this lawsuit.

RESPONSE 8:

To the extent that the information requested is applicable, the Plaintiff directs attention to the enclosed documents.

REQUEST 9

Copies of all documents that Plaintiff intends to rely upon at trial that have not already been provided to the Defendant.

RESPONSE 9:

To the extent that the information requested is applicable, the Plaintiff directs attention to the enclosed documents.

REQUEST 10

Copies of documents provided to the Defendant at the time of application through closing, including all TILA and RESPA disclosures.

RESPONSE 10:

To the extent that the information requested is applicable, the Plaintiff directs attention to the enclosed documents.

REQUEST 11

Copies of any and all default notices sent to defendant by plaintiff and/or any prior owner or servicer of the Note or Mortgage which purport to comply with the acceleration and notice requirements contained in the Note and/or Mortgage as well as any and all other notice related documents.

RESPONSE 11:

To the extent that the information requested is applicable, the Plaintiff directs attention to the enclosed documents.

REQUEST 12

Copies of any and all correspondence sent to defendants by plaintiff or any prior owner or servicer of the Note and Mortgage including without limitations copies of all notices indicating a change in the ownership or servicing of the Note and Mortgage required by the relevant loan documents.

RESPONSE 12:

The Plaintiff objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Notwithstanding and without waiving the foregoing objections, and to the extent that the information requested is applicable, the Plaintiff directs attention to the enclosed documents.

REQUEST 13

Copies of any and all documents or information relating to defendants and in possession of the plaintiff or prior owner or servicer of the Note and Mortgage that have not previously been disclosed above.

RESPONSE 13:

The Plaintiff objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Notwithstanding and without waiving the foregoing objections, and to the extent that the information requested is applicable, the Plaintiff directs attention to the enclosed documents.

REQUEST 14

Copies of all internal rules and procedures pertaining to proper document retention and measures employed to prevent loss or destruction of relevant materials pertaining to the foreclosure process including the identification of the exact location where the Note and Mortgage have been stored.

RESPONSE 14:

The Plaintiff objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST 15

Copies of all non-confidential employment records for each employee involved directly or indirectly in handling any aspect of the foreclosure process prior to or during the pendency of the suit.

RESPONSE 15:

The Plaintiff objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST 16

Copies of all licenses and authority to provide notary services required for each notary

utilized for any portion of the pleadings or filings utilized in this case by plaintiff.

RESPONSE 16:

The Plaintiff objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST 17

Copies of all financial transactions performed by the Plaintiff to include: account creation (Demand Deposit Account) or any other account creation, financial recording in regards to the Defendant, general journal entries, balance sheet adjustments, and deposit of money, check, or credit to said Plaintiff in relation to the Defendant, Promissory Note with Defendant Signature, or said property 306 Coral Way, Belvedere, South Carolina 29841 or 306 Coral Way, North Augusta, South Carolina 29841.

RESPONSE 17:

The Plaintiff objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST 18

Copies of all financial transactions performed by the Plaintiff in regards to any and all interactions with the said mortgage insurance company who is inclusive to the payments by the Defendant in regards to property located at 306 Coral Way, Belvedere, South Carolina 29841 or 306 Coral Way, North Augusta, South Carolina 29841.

RESPONSE 18:

The Plaintiff objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Notwithstanding and without waiving the foregoing objections, and to the extent that the information requested is applicable, the Plaintiff directs attention to the enclosed documents.

REQUEST 19

Copies of all Mortgages and Notes showing as started for 306 Coral Way, Belvedere, South Carolina 29841 or 306 Coral Way, North Augusta, South Carolina 29841 from January 2003 through present date on Plaintiff known nominee, (Mortgage Electric Registration Systems).

website.

RESPONSE 19:

The Plaintiff objects to this request on the grounds that it vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Notwithstanding and without waiving the foregoing objections, and to the extent that the information requested is applicable, the Plaintiff directs attention to the enclosed documents.

REQUEST 20

Copies of all Documents between the Plaintiff and MERS, , Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, from January 20003 to present date in regards to property noted as 306 Coral Way, Belvedere, South Carolina 29841 or 306 Coral Way, North Augusta, South Carolina 29841.

RESPONSE 20:

The Plaintiff objects to this Request on the grounds that it does not appear to be applicable to the instant action. The Plaintiff further objects to this Request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

The Plaintiff will supplement these responses as additional information and documentation is obtained and as required by the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure.



Chad W. Burgess, SC Bar No.: 72520
Attorney for the Plaintiff
Brock & Scott, PLLC
3800 Fernandina Road, Suite 110
Columbia, SC 29210
Phone 803-454-3540
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Columbia, SC

Date: May 1, 2018

15. Is it acceptable that State Courts refuse to let Defendants Record the Court Proceedings, and then FORCE these same Defendants to purchase a product, (TRANSCRIPTS), else be denied to Appeal their case without said TRANSCRIPTS; even when they have more than enough Court Documents to Substantiate their Appeal?

This brings us to the Appeals Process for which as noted Ms. Catherine has tons of Court Documents, exhibits, and evidence of what took place. However, the Clerk of Court Jenny Abbott Kitchings and Deputy Clerk of Court despite in the FAQ SECTION of the Appeals Process stated that if not needed then the Appellant need not order it. However these Clerks took it upon themselves to proclaim that everyone MUST order these TRANSCRIPTS at \$550-600 a pop * 3 transcripts for a total of \$1650-\$1800 dollars else denied, therefore engagin in EXTORTION!

16. Can you show the PUBLIC anywhere within Rule 207 that one MUST PURCHASE these TRANSCRIPTS in order for them to Appeal their Case even if they do not NEED such TRANSCRIPTS, WANT such TRANSCRIPTS, or TRUST said TRANSCRIPTS due to circumstances that question the VALIDITY of them?

As noted, the following was sent to Judge Clifton Newton (Rules Advisory Commission), and numerous calls have been placed to him, for which the letter and phone calls have gone unanswered! Even his Secretary and or Executive by the name of Catherine has gone unanswered as well!

Dear Judge Clifton Newman,
SUBJECT: Clarification of Rule


As noted, this letter is in regards to a Rule within that of the Appeals Process in that of a Civil Case. I am not asking for your opinion on the said case, but am only seeking the TRUTH in the application of the said Rule. As you have a Reputation of Honesty and being Straight Up in the application of Law, not to mention holding the Position of Chair in that of the Rules Advisory Committee makes you the most knowledgeable to address this clarification.

When someone is engaging in an Appeal, many times, one may **need to** order Court Transcripts to substantiate their Claims being brought before the Appeals Judges. It is noted that many times for which these court Transcript are requested that the Appellant may be in need of information within the said Transcripts due to lack of supporting Court Documentation in their case; therefore it makes sense that they would order these said transcripts. As noted in Rule 207 (TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDING) under that of 207(b)(1) it states in the second to the last sentence "If a party to the appeal unjustifiably refuses to agree to order less than the entire transcript, appellant may move to be awarded costs for having unnecessary portions transcribed; this motion must be made no later than the time the final briefs are due under Rule 211."

Now, I am not asking whether one should have to provide the ENTIRE TRANSCRIPT; for as we know in a Fair and Honest (Hearing/Trial) the TRUTH in its entirety should be exposed. Therefore, **when** one is utilizing a TRANSCRIPT in that of substantiating their claim(s) it is only proper that an entire TRANSCRIPT be provided, to preclude that any statement being provided to the Court was, and is, not being taken out of context.

The question therefore has to be: Does the COURT have the Power and or Authority to FORCE an Appellant to purchase a TRANSCRIPT, or TRANSCRIPTS, when the Appellant has sufficient Court Documentation to make its case without this said TRANSCRIPT or TRANSCRIPTS? Is it not the CHOICE of the Appellant as to decide what INFORMATION and DOCUMENTATION they are going to utilize to make their case before the Appeals Judges?

I refer you to the following that was even posted on the South Carolina Judicial Website:



POINT 1 - As noted in the second sentence it states clearly "In some cases, a transcript is not required, because all necessary information appears in court papers."

POINT 2 - Likewise, it also states clearly in the first sentence of the second paragraph "Rule 207 requires the appellant to order the lower court transcript from the court reporter when a transcript is required for the appeal."

POINT 3 - And last but not least is the final sentence shown in the screen shot which states blatantly clear "If a transcript is not required for the appeal, **you need not order it.**"

If an Appellant has the necessary information within their Court Papers to substantiate their claim(s) within their Appeal then, as shown in (POINT 1), does the Court have the Authority/Power to FORCE the Appellant to purchase any TRANSCRIPT; when they have not even yet received the Initial Brief and therefore have no knowledge upon the DOCUMENTATION and FACTS for which the Appellant is utilizing? As noted in (POINT 2) one can only conclude that the usage of the word "WHEN" indicates that a TRANSCRIPT is not always necessary and or needed for the APPEAL! This fact is then also stated quite clearly in (POINT 3) "If a transcript is not required for the appeal, **you need not order it.**"

Thus, what is trying to be assessed here is since the Appellant paid his/her Filing Fee for an Appeal, then what right does the Clerk of Court or Deputy Clerk of Court have to deny said Appeal unless the Appellant purchases a said TRANSCRIPT for which they NEITHER NEED, NOR WANT, NOR TRUST due to

such instances as the Court Reporter was found Co-Mingling within the Plaintiff AND their witness prior to the said hearing (and tried to hide when seen by the Defendants Party)!

Therefore, is it the DECISION of the Clerk of Court and Deputy Clerk of Court what an Appellant may use in their APPEAL, or is that decision that of the Appellant?

Now, to us of just COMMON SENSE for a Court to Deny an Appeal unless one purchases a product, for which they do not need nor desires for their appeal, then this denotes both a Denial of Due Process and establishes a Pay-to-Play Court Scheme; as well as EXTORTION as one is only allowed access to the Appeals Process by that of Purchasing a Product for which they may neither need nor want!

Should an Appeal be denied an Appellant by that of the Clerk of Court or Deputy Clerk of Court, or should the Appeals Brief be presented to the Judges and the Appeals Case be judged upon the MERITS (Court Documents and Facts) of the Case?

Thus, the questions being outright asked are:

1. If the Appellant has sufficient DOCUMENTATION for their Appeal, does the Clerk of Court have the Authority and or Power to deny said Appeal unless the Appellant purchases a Product for which they neither need nor want; much less trust?
2. What Power and or Authority does the Clerk of court have to proclaim what an Appellant must utilize in their Appeal?
3. How does being denied Due Process, (for which the Appellant paid the Filing Fee), unless agreeing to paying even more money for something that one does not need, nor want, not constitute a Pay-to-Play Court System and Extortion?

I need these issues of said utilization of Rule 207 being utilized (FORCED) upon Appellants, as I know of an individual for which their Appeal is being threatened with DENIAL due to the FACT that they neither want nor need in that of their Appeal. Therefore, the response being expedited in that of an email response to cathy_bishop2002@yahoo.com is and will be greatly appreciated! Likewise, due to yourself being held in the highest esteem I would believe that you would wish to have the sanctity of the Court to be held in high esteem as well and not be blemished or diminished in view by that of the actions being engaged by that of Court Employees unaware of the intent, and true usage and application of Rule 207!

cathy_bishop2002@yahoo.com
(803)341-4278
(803)215-0580

17. How is the Deputy Clerk of Court and Clerk of Court not engaging in Denial of Due Process, Deprivation of Rights, Deprivation of Rights under Color of Law, and EXTORTION when they deny a party to APPEAL their case unless paying for a product that they may not need, want, or even TRUST in substantiating their Claim/appeal?
18. Are Court Hearings and or Trials to be Fair and Honest; inclusive of both parties held accountable in that of Rules of Civil Procedure?

How is it FAIR and HONEST for the Courts and Judges to forsake their Sworn Oath of Office in protecting and upholding the United States Constitution by allowing the disregard of the Seventh Amendment to that of ALL Americans; thereby the Courts and the Judges beholden to the BANKSTERS under the Bankruptcy of the FRAUDULENT United States Corporation feigning at being a legitimate De Jure Republic Government guaranteed within the same United States Constitution?

How is it FAIR and HONEST for the Courts and Judges to not only allow Forged and Robo-Signed Documents but actually engage in Robo-signing documents in these foreclosures of homes as well?

How is it Fair and Honest for the Courts and Judges to not only allow these forged and robosigned documents into the courts, but actually engage themselves as Document Authentication Experts on behalf of the Plaintiff (BANKSTERS) in regards to these said documents?

How is it Fair and Honest for the Courts and Judges to receive COMMISSION on Properties Ruled and Foreclosed by the Courts and Judges on behalf of the BANKSTERS? SURE SOUNDS A LOT LIKE: A PAYOFF, BRIBERY, AND AN OUTRIGHT CONFLICT OF INTEREST WHEN ONE IS SUPPOSED TO BE FAIR AND IMPARTIAL!

How is it Fair and Honest for the Courts and the Judges to allow the Plaintiff (BANKSTERS TO SAY "F""U" to the Rules of civil Procedure, yet amazingly hold the Defendant responsible to the rules of Civil Procedure down to every "i" being dotted and every "t" being crossed?

How is it Fair and Honest for the Courts and the Judges to withhold information on how to or where to send forms, motions, or other documents to address their grievance with the actions of those of the COURTS?

How is it Fair and Honest for the Courts and the Judges to ALLOW the Plaintiff (BANKSTERS) to not only disregard Interrogatives and Document Discovery Requests, but then engage in covering up this fact within the Judge's Ruling?

Please see the following see the following notice of the said witness and her information that was provided by the Plaintiff and take notice that this notice was recived with around only three weeks to trial, in violation of the Rules of Civil Procedure requiring 90 Days notice before use of a said witness in trial. Take notice by the second set of motions that the Judge was made fully aware of this fact! But then again the whole proceeding under this judge reeks and reeked of a Kangaroo Court in Action!

The following was the said notification of wintess:

**BROCK
& SCOTT**
P.L.L.C.

Consumer Hotline
844-856-6616
Phone:
803-254-3540

3800 Fernandina Road, Suite 110, Columbia, SC 29210
Consumer Contact: Contact@brockandscott.com
www.brockandscott.com

Fax:
803-254-3541

July 16, 2018

Catherine L. Bishop
506 Coral Way
Belvedere, SC 29841

RE: Case reference: Bank of America, N.A. v. Catherine L. Bishop
Case Number: 2016-CP-02-00381
B&S File No.: 16-02824

Dear Ms. Bishop:

Pursuant to Judge Griffith's Order filed June 27, 2018, I am writing to provide you with the name of the witness who will attend and testify on behalf of the Plaintiff at the hearing scheduled for August 8, 2018. The Plaintiff's witness is Laura Elder and she is an employee/agent of Bank of America, N.A.

Sincerely,



Chad W. Burgess, Esquire

THIS COMMUNICATION IS FROM A DEBT COLLECTOR. THIS IS AN ATTEMPT TO COLLECT A DEBT, AND ANY INFORMATION OBTAINED WILL BE USED FOR THAT PURPOSE. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED A DISCHARGE IN BANKRUPTCY, AND YOU HAVE NOT REAFFIRMED THIS DEBT, THIS NOTICE CONSTITUTES NEITHER A DEMAND FOR PAYMENT NOR A NOTICE OF PERSONAL LIABILITY.

As noted this is the only notice of witness and the information in regards to the witness (ABSOLUTELY NOTHING)!!! SO MUCH FOR THE RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE!

Likewise this was received by DEFENDANT on July 20, 2018 Approximately 20 days before said FINAL Trial! Take note that this was included in the second set of motions with the court prior to the final trial/hearing!

Please see attached both sets of motions as it exposes a lot of the actions of the judge and the court.

** Please see attached both sets of motions and the REAL LACK OF RESPONSE provided

Now let us delve into the EXTORTION being conducted by your Clerk of Court and Deputy Clerk of Court.

After filing Intent to Appeal, approximately 10 days in Ms. Catherine Bishop received notice that she to have her Appeal automatically denied unless she agreed to purchase Court Transcripts.

However, as already shown to you in this document; page (109) your Judicial website made it clear that if there was sufficient court documents that no such transcripts are necessary! However, when eventually being provided the supervisors name, he was sent the following:

See the letter attached called: James Lockemy Letter 1

Likewise, see his response attached called: James Lockemy Order

Thus, see the follow up letters attached called: James Lockemy Letter 2 and James Lockemy letter 3

Do take notice that Judge Lockemy was provided with a set of interrogatories for which he engaged in the same action of saying "F" "U" that he should have to provide an answer to anything!

To ensure that you have the facts in their entirety please see attached likewise both sets of motions and take notice that Judge M. Anderson Griffith only provided SPIN and said "F" "U" to any rules being applicable in the court Room unless it was in favor of him and the Plaintiff (BANKSTTERS)!

I am not attaching the exhibits, but I will provide them upon request, as that would be adding another 50-60 pages!

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated, petitioner asks the Court to grant the ACTION of IMMEDIATE INJUNCTION against the foreclosure auction sale of the said property to be conducted on February 4, 2019. And that there be appropriate action taken in regards to this case.

I request that lower case number 2016CP0200381 be vacated and that Ms. Catherine Bishop actually be given a FAIR and HONEST Trial/Hearing for which the Plaintiff and the Court will be made to follow the Rules of Civil Procedure, including adhering to the Right of a Trial by Jury!

I likewise, ask that you contact me via phone (803) 341 – 4278 and inform me of your INTENT, else I am left but no alternative to file a CRIMINAL CHARGES IN THIS MATTER, with every single Government Employee listed as COMPLICIT in this SCAM-SCHEME-FRAUD being committed against America; inclusive of South Carolinians!

Mr. Darren Watters on
behalf of Ms. Catherine Bishop
(803) 341-4278

P.S. Other authorities are being contacted as you read this and I am sure they will be interested in your actions, or lack thereof in regards to the corruption in the court!

Likewise, do take notice that judge M. Anderson Griffith answered very little of the questions that was presented to the second set of motions, prior to the final Trial/Hearing!

Do take notice of the file called Motion CONTINUANCE on the judicial website in reference case 2016CP0200381 with date time stamp 08/03/2018-09:45
08/03/2018-09:45 ** THE COURT HAS DELETED ALL THE MOTIONS AS WAS:
THE REST OF DISCOVERY RECONSIDERATION; ALL OF THE FOLLOWING:
LACK OF CAPACITY, FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM, FRAUD UPON THE
COURT, LACK OF JURISDICTION AND RECUSAL!

Likewise, the judge Miraculously does not address these issues in his final ruling!!! Let it also be known that the exhibits filed with the motion was done on the same day, yet now it sows 20 days later, after the said trial!!!! Document Destruction of Legal Documents is a CRIME (FELONY)!

