

RECEIVED

JAN 29 2020

MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE

2020-000122

SC Court of Appeals

Petitioner has numerous issues with Bank of America related to three distinct time periods:

- 1) From 2008-2011 – While A Direct Employee of the company as the Senior Contracting Executive for Network Services, Petitioner was sued by two former officers of the company, and one of their daughters. (See Stritzinger v Wright). Petitioner was sued by these same parties for ten years thereafter by the same parties impacting all of his assets. Furthermore, these two former officers sued all of the other non-party family members in Civil Suits, or hired illegal surveillance to try to destroy the entire Stritzinger family, deprive them of income, and to impact their corporations.

Petitioner believes this issues have been resolved between the Corporation, and himself, but not with the former officers of the Company which are using corporate assets to impair him using upwards of six million dollars of loans which Katherine Wright has not ability to repay. Pétitioner believes that this in fact a gift, far in excess of IRS code, and thus Ms. Wright has literally had an income of the same. Ms. Wright then filed false tax returns, and claims for support contributions in Texas, which an Appellate Court has incorrectly decisioned based on an incomplete record.

This is an ongoing dispute impacting all three brothers, his father, and their families all of which have suffered extreme hardships by Loujs Freeh Jr, a Bank of America retired executive, who is the former director of the Federal Bureau. Furthermore, Ms. Wright has admitted that she was having a physical relationship with the former Governor of Texas Rick Perry, and an Associate Justice of the Texas 5th Court of Appeals, a CIA officer from New England, and another Bank of America officer who she claims is her common law partner. (Barry Baird – Former SEVP of Card Sales & Operations, an officer of Bank of America Corporate like myself). Petitioner believes to the contrary Mr. Baird simply raped my wife just two days before her marriage date, when six other Bank officers got her so drunk she couldn't even speak.

APPELLANT IS THEREFORE ASKING FOR STRITZINGER v WRIGHT TO BE CONSOLIDATED WITH THIS CASE. 2020-000119. FURTHERMORE, THE COMPANY HAS TO PAY FOR ALL LEGAL EXPENSES WITH THIS MULTI-PARTY TRIAL UNDER THE CORPORATE BYLAWS INCLUDING THOSE OF FREEH, VERNON WRIGHT, JOHN. S. STRITZINGER, ANDREA SMITH(CAO), AND BRIAN MOYNIHAN. ALL OF THE OTHER PARTIES EXCEPT MYSELF HAVE BEEN PAID. FURTHERMORE, THE PREVIOUS CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD WALTER MASSEY, TOLD ME THAT I HAD BEEN ELECTED BY THE BOARD TO BE ITS NEXT CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER, OR CEO, AND I HAD TO GO TO CHARLOTTE TO DISCUSS A CONTRACT. AFTER ARRIVING IN CHARLOTTE, A SERIOUS ATTEMPT WAS MADE ON MY LIFE, AND IM TOLD TWO STRITZINGER BROTHERS (DAS, AND JIM JR) HAD SOUGHT TO ENTER MULTIPLE CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS IN ALL 50 STATES, WHILE SEEKING A MUTINY OF THE SAME DECISION. THIS IS RELEVANT TO PROBATE MATTERS, AS PETITIONER IS A DHS EMPLOYEE, AND THIS IS HIGH TREASON A CAPITOL CRIME WHICH CARRIES THE DEATH PENALTY UNDER FEDERAL CODE.

- 2) FROM 2011-2014 PETITIONER WENT TO WORK FOR VERIZON FEDERAL AND AS A DIRECT CONSULTANT/STAFF MEMBER OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BARRACK OBAMA. (TWO FULL TIME JOBS)

DURING PETITIONERS WORK AT VERIZON, A VERIZON LAWYER, JOSEPH PALMIERI, ASKED PETITIONER TO TRANSFER ALL OF THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF BANK OF AMERICA TO HIM WITHOUT PAYMENT, AN INVESTMENT IN CAPITOL LABOR, AND TIME IN EXCESS OF 100B DOLLARS BY BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATION, AS A CONDITION FOR REMAINING AN EMPLOYEE OF THE COMPANY, EVEN THOUGH THE CORPORATION HAD ALREADY APPROVED HIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AGREEMENT ELECTRONICALLY AT LEAST TWO MONTHS BEFORE STARTING WITH VERIZON FEDERAL IN ASHBURN VIRGINIA.

THE ISSUE IS THAT ALL OF PETITIONERS FILES INCLUDING EVERYTING IN THIS CASE IS EITHER MARKED SENSITIVE, CLASSIFIED, TOP SECRET OR DEPARTMENTALLY CLEARED, AND THEREFORE A STATE JUDICIAL OFFICER CANNOT WITH ANY CERTAINTY GET VERIZON TO PRODUCE ANYTHING WITHOUT A REQUEST TO TRANSFER THE CASE TO FEDERAL COURT. VERIZON HAS BEEN SERVED IN VIRGINIA, AND IN THE US DISTRICT COURT IN TEXAS AND HAS NEVER PRODUCED A SINGLE DOCUMENT, AND AS A RESULT, DOCTORS, AND PROBATE LAWYERS CANNOT DETERMINE IF ANYTHING PROPOSED OR PRESENTED IS ACCURATE OR RELEVANT.

Furthermore, After working at Verizon for more than two years on an NSTAC program begun at Bank of America in 2008/9 the US government issued an order for an electronic processing system which involved the combined intellectual property of both Verizon, and Bank of America along with new Intellectual Property in the form of over 200 preliminary patents which are now in dispute including two offers of over 2.1B dollars to acquire the same owned by his corporation(including his children as stockholders) Greenville Associates.

APPELLANT BELIEVES THAT THEREFORE ALL OF THE VERIZON ISSUES SHOULD BE CONSOLIDATED WITH BANK OF AMERICA ISSUES AS LISTED IN SOUTH CAROLINA APPELLATE CAUSE 2020-000121.

- 3) PETITIONER HAS COMPLETED A COMBINED DEPOSITION OF ALL THREE CASES WHICH IS NOW BEING TRANSCRIBED WHICH INCLUDES ALL OF THE INTER-RELATIONS WITH THE THREE CASES WHICH ARE NUMEROUS.
- 4) 2014-PRESENT – PETITIONER STARTED HIS OWN COMPANY, AND RECEIVED AN OFFER FROM BANK OF AMERICA CHAIRMAN CHARLES HOLLIDAY TO RUN A DIVISION OF THE COMPANY UNDER MR. MOYNIHAN AS A PRESIDENT (BAND 0 OFFICER OF TECHNOLOGY AND MORTGAGE).

Petitioner has a verbal and written contract which was approved by the Bank of America Board of Directors, but that the Operating Officers of the Company did not either validate, nor perform against, while he in-fact did.

Furthermore, Bank of America attorneys in the trial court did not answer in a timely or responsive manner to his pleading and is in Default.

Petitioner is therefore seeking a Default Judgement in the Circuit Court with a Directed Order to the Trial Court to issue a binding Judgement or for this court to remand the case back to trial in the Circuit Court, only with the Corporation paying for his own attorney, as well as defending Ms. Smith who effectively would be a peer if the contract is enforced. (IE the same level as Ms. Andrea B. Smith Chief Administrative Officer of the Corporation).

The issue in this case is Ms. Smith is aware of Item #1, has effectively paid for Mr. Freeh, and Mr. Wright to sue him and his family, and is in fact on her own taking actions against another employee which Mr. Moynihan or the Board of Directors strictly prohibits in each and every employment agreement with every officer. As such Petitioner/Appellant believes that Ms. Smith should not just be fired, but should be prosecuted. Ms. Smith is in charge of all payroll and retirement disbursements to Bank of America officers, and all internal Banking services for employees. Thereafter, Ms. Smith sold his house to WSFS Bank(Christiana Trust Division), and stole over 500K dollars in equity which the corporation took for its own expenses. This is in fact grand larceny, and since children, a mutiny, and ongoing actions against a Federal Officer are involved Treason also applies. Ms. Smith is a felon, and should not only be prosecuted but immediately asked to leave the premises.

Instead, Ms. Smith called the Wilmington Police Department in Delaware, and had him locked out of his own building, denied a badge, and requested to leave. Despite leaving in a timely manner, and well off the premises, Ms. Smith, and a Texas third party attorney asked for a criminal proceeding which was served, and then consolidated with two other related cases involving Verizon, and Mr. Biden's office. (NSTAC) which was already heard and dismissed by a Delaware Superior Judge Valvala in his favor. Despite this fact, three lower court judges in inferior courts have tried to retry, and impose sanctions even though their Senior Judge ordered the case sealed. All three are in contempt of the Highest Trial Court of Delaware (Superior Court) where all felonies are heard. The sanctions imposed including visiting with various doctors to review NSTAC actions even though none of the doctors appointed by the lower courts had any security clearances, and were not valid. The State of South Carolina tried to re-litigate this case in Judge Belton's court which is a violation of the US Constitution (5th Amendment) Double Jeopardy provisions, and is also a violation of the Delaware and South Carolina Constitutions on identical grounds.

Appellant tried to explain this to his two attorneys assigned by the state, but both gave him less than 2 minutes to explain the case before they walked into an open court-room it simply wasn't sufficient. When the detail of the Delaware case came forward, they decided it was beyond the scope of the legal agreement they executed with the Probate court, and would exhaust nearly all of their billable time. They thus decided they didn't want to provide any defense, or couldn't overturn the original orders from Judge Smiley. In other words Judge Belton told the parties she could not review doctor's findings from the original case, or overturn their judgement from another peer. Since this was the case, both Bart Bartlett and myself believed that in fact, a combined trial in the Circuit Court was necessary, but noting that medical issues were secondary considerations as Employment Complaints, and proceedings were filed first. The issue in this case is the docket system in the Circuit Court of South Carolina is so terrible, that the Probate courts completed two full trials, and had every order go final before even a preliminary hearing was held. When that preliminary hearing was held with Judge Kelly he was confused if he was allowed to hear evidence in an appellate setting with new original actions without a motion to consolidate. We believe he simply decided not to rule on the matter.

RELIEF REQUESTED

APPELLANT IS SEEKING THE COURT TO CONSOLIDATE CASES
2020-000121, and 2020-000119 with a single record in 2020-000122.

Signed this 29th day of January, 2020

John S. Stritzinger
2156 Cresthill Rd
Columbia, SC 29223



This has been served via facsimile to all parties.