

RECEIVED

FEB 03 2020

SC Court of Appeals 2020-000119

NOTICE OF FOREIGN JUDGMENT IN ERROR AND BRIEF FILED IN THE TEXAS SUPREME COURT OFFERED
BY REFERENCE AND REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT
MOTION FOR REMAND TO TAKE ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE
OR A FORMAL BILL OF EXCEPTION FOR EITHER SOUTH CAROLINA OR TEXAS WHICH IS NOT POSSIBLE IN
TRAVIS COUNTY TEXAS DUE TO JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT.

Petitioner would like this court to consider the Briefs he filed in the Texas Supreme Court, and the Third Court of Appeals Texas in the following context:

- 1) Ms. Wright has told a Federal Law Enforcement officer she was having a physical relationship with Robert Harrison Pemberton of the Texas Third Court of Appeals at the time he entered a Judgement in her name, which we take to be true. (And for more than five years)
- 2) The Supreme Court of Texas did not order the Texas Third Court of Appeals to make a statement on item #1, on whether that allegation by Ms. Wright was true.
- 3) The Third Court of Appeals, and the District Court said they could not, or would not rule on matters of Federal Law, or the Application of the relative Judgement in Forrest Groves School District v TA already decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in 2009, at approximately the time of the last trial on this case.
- 4) The State of Texas has refused to take additional formal bills of Exception under TRCP270 which go without respect for time.
- 5) The Third Court of Appeals Texas took exception that he asked the US Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit to review a Texas Judgement due to Issue #3, the State of Texas simply never reviewed Federal precedent or the opportunity to do so. Furthermore Local Rules of Federal Appellate Procedure (Rule 15) allow a US Circuit Court to review any Judgement of Any Agency in its Jurisdictional Area under original Jurisdiction, **yet the court will not allow a non-bar member to file an original petition in its court for any reason (nor will the Supreme Court of the United States).**
- 6) **The State of Texas in this case ordered Three Children with Disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to a non-regulated Texas private School where there was no special education with a 100% tax to Petitioner/Appellants current and future income (IE they ordered 100% of his money to Katherine Wright), allowed Ms. Wright to sue him for 12 years in a row, and despite five doctors who stated her Histrionic Personality Disorder, and Narcissistic Personality disorders would make it impossible for her to parent. At the same time Appellant was the Chief Operating Officer of Bank of America, had an office in Charlotte North Carolina, and already had an agreement by the Premier Private School in Charlotte to admit his children. The issue Ms. Wright was having**

an affair with the Governor of Texas, and a Texas appellate judge, her dad is a billionaire, and after being ordered to remain in Texas until the children were 18, hired Louis Freeh Jr (The Former head of the FBI, and a Bank of America retired officer) to try to dig up dirt to free Ms. Wright from her obligation.

- 7) Ms. Wright was having sex with a CIA Field Operations officer in New Hampshire (paid for by her dad) every summer, and had asked another boyfriend to kill him among other issues at about the same time.
- 8) Judge Dietz, had already ordered his oldest daughter to a school for dyslexic children when she was severely behind age and grade, based on Appellants actions, and within three years (and lots of home study with her dad using Lexia learning) she was back to grade level. The Chief Judge of Travis County was so impressed with Appellant that he gave me my license to practice law in Texas, AND, he told me to think about how to TEACH ALL THE CHILDREN IN TEXAS TO READ..... and I told him they simply needed to buy Lexia learning and spend 30 mins with a parent who loved them every night.
- 9) Ms. Wright was a horrible parent, a drunk, and a drug addict when we divorced. She also had severe sexual misconduct issues which were not even discussed with her therapists because they were so extreme that it wasn't possible to try them in a court of law. I doubt very highly if 6M dollars, and at least six partners on the side have abated, but I will say by 2009 she was doing much better.
- 10) Bank of America effectively loaned Ms. Wright money to litigate against their own officer, and those loans were directly from Ms. Andrea B. Smith former head of HR, and Chief Administrative Officer. Appellant made this issue known to the Audit committee, the HR Hotline, Ms. Smith, and her SVP working on sensitive associate issues and they offered to meet with me in Charlotte two years ago. Then they cancelled at the last minute stating Mr. Moynihan had intervened.
- 11) Appellant notes, he believes that Ms. Wright's attorney James Richardson had threatened the board, called the FBI, and tried to get the US Attorneys office to prosecute him, because Appellant had copies of Ms. Wrights communications which she left on their joint hard drive where they both had administrative rights to all six or seven people she was dating at the same time formally, formally Ms. Wright was using the "Stritzinger last name to solicit sex on public bulletin boards" and not her own or an alias which was the final straw for Appellant and when Appellant decided to file for divorce.
- 12) After Appellant filed for divorce, Vernon Wright sent Ms. Wright a Stack of paperwork at least three feet high and she spent two who days transferring joint assets out of her name in various unknown Maryland Trusts. Appellants attorneys said they would need between 500K dollars and 2M dollars to fly to Maryland and Start deposing Maryland professionals who had been hired to commit Texas crimes, and Federal Crimes.
- 13) Ms. Wright he believes took up these additional paramours to prevent a Fraud Criminal proceeding, as she has claimed in person and quite serious she was already married when she walked down the Aisle in Annapolis Maryland. Appellant does not believe his asset problems cannot be resolved without a Federal Subpoena involving Bank of America and at least six Trusts in Maryland which he did not care about until Ms. Wright/Bank of America, and Vernon Wright sued him to exhaustion, noting that a Separate property tracing showed 95% of the marital assets were his own, and not Ms. Wrights.

- 14) Appellants attorney Charles Bowes who he believes was incompetent in this proceeding, within two weeks of the parties final decree entry, received donations from an unknown party to start up his own law practice, so that he could not assist in modifications to the work already done by Becky Beaver Law Firm. And Ms. Beaver claimed she was not close enough to the details, and had to start completely over at a similar 200K or more fee.
- 15) James R. Stritzinger Jr has not material information to add to this pleading, and hasn't seen his children to his knowledge since 2009, and despite having sufficient assets, hasn't made any effort to locate or communicate to them. Furthermore, his children, and the cousins of Lucy, James, and Hannah Stritzinger have also made no effort to drive or fly to see them, or inquire into their condition. James R. Stritzinger is the minor/now adult children's uncle and he cares only about himself, and sowing the seeds of discontent following his own financial incompetence and bankruptcy.
- 16) The STATE OF TEXAS since this Order of Denial in the Supreme Court of Texas, has denied him any relief in the District Court since 2011 (Almost nine years) even though his income dropped to near ZERO. They also said they would not review Petitions to reopen, or Reinstate lower court decisions without a criminal action. The Criminal Action should have been against Judge Yelenosky, who committed several felonies by ordering disabled children to a school with no ability to help them which is CHILD ABUSE, and a felony on Virginia, New Jersey, and Federal code. Since the 345th District Courts orders were effectively felony issues of the presiding judge they can in fact both be reviewed, and amended without respect for time, ALTHOUGH THE VIRGINIA SUPREME COURT ALREADY WROTE HIM TO TELL THEM THEY COULD NOT REVIEW ANOTHER STATES JUDGEMENT WITHOUT A TRIAL IN A VIRGINIA COURT OF LAW, EVEN IF THAT TRIAL WAS SIMPLY AN EFFORT TO FILE A FOREIGN TRANSCRIPT IN A VIRGINIA COURT. BUT AFTER CONSULTING WITH AT LEAST FIVE VIRGINIA LAW FIRMS WHILE WORKING FOR VERIZON.... ALL SAID THE CHILDREN HAD TO BE PHYSICALLY IN VIRGINIA TO PROCEED, EVEN IF FOR SUMMER BREAK.
- 17) Judge Yelenosky after his own felony, despite Ms. Wrights condition, and the children's disabilities entered restrictions on him seeing the children based on a taped recorded call of the oldest child Hannah crying to her mom on the phone. The court however did not have the phone records of Hannah which showed her mom had CALLED HER 15 TIMES IN A ROW, before the call that was played to the district court, and despite Hannah later telling a therapist she had lied to her dad about finishing her homework. She had effectively told Appellant she had completed her homework, was tired, and wanted to go to bed. Ms. Wright then called to wake her up, to yell at her 15 times in a row, and on the very evening of a physical custody hearing Ms. Wright had already told her was happening the following day, despite Ms. Wright having a permanent injunction not to discuss legal issues with the children. After this incident, and Hannah already knowing about the trial the next day, asked for Clarification, and she got a very adult answer. The answer was the truth, that her mom was mentally imbalanced, and was seeking full custody the very next morning, which made her cry more. It was a difficult evening, but it was a coerced tape recording by literally an insane parent, Katherine Wright.
- 18) Ms. Wright had a severe drug habit in her teens and was expelled from Bennington University for various types of misconduct which exceeded her addiction, then went on a global tour of the Southern Hemisphere where she developed typhoid, a thyroid problem,

and other diseases which left her near death. She stated that her dad did nothing to help her, and wanted her to die, and when she came home a therapist recommended the issue was so severe that she should have sex with her father. (A Maryland professional). She complained that he molested her since high school as had her brother. Furthermore, Lucy Wright was running a center for battered women as Katherine Wright's childhood home, and had surrounded herself with hundreds of women who did not set a good example for my children. Despite these massive impediments to living in Baltimore, Ms. Wright was promised a massive house in Hunt Valley if she married Barry Baird, and moved back to the Bank of America site. When this was denied by Charles Cawley the CEO of MBNA, Mr. Wright began to sue, pay for Ms. Wright to see other men, and hired various private investigators including Mr. Freeh, who apparently had literally video taped Ms. Wright's bachelorette party, or had obtained copies of the same via subpoena. Three Bank of America officers told me they were seeking to litigate in Delaware and had Delaware Superior Court judges signing discovery orders in a state neither party had lived in more than 10 years, because Mr. Baird and Mr. Wright were still working there, along with Mr. Wright's brother Wilfred, and other brother Harper in Chester England. In other words there were three senior Wrights, six female officers of Bank of America who were engaged in a felony, and two retired board members (Freeh and Bonavalenta) who thought they could interfere with Charlotte Based Bank of America's succession plan all at the same time in 2009, but only because James R. Stritzinger Jr, and David A. Stritzinger had told them what was about to happen and had contacted Mr. Moynihan who was corporate secretary, Mr. Richardson, and Mr. Wright.

In summary the issues from 2000-2008 were very nearly horrible, and probably the worst and most serious divorce proceeding in Texas History according to Judge Dietz, the chief Judge of Travis County. He said it was the longest running proceeding he had in his 20 years on the bench, and he need it needed to continue when, and only when he saw that Texas leading Neuropsychologist had tested James, and he had the EXACT SAME SET OF TEST SCORES AS HIS SISTER ON READING PRECURSORS, but unlike Hannah, he did not have a speech impairment. James to the contrary has nearly incredible speaking skills and is very animated and articulate. (A less severe condition).

FROM 2009 to the PRESENT

Now with all that being said, when the court rules the transcript, they will see that the Children were doing well in 2009, they were happy, Hannah the oldest daughter was back to grade, Katherine's behavior was better and was in a relationship, and Lucy the youngest daughter was normal and had no special requirements. The court will notice that a Texas Special Education Professional (Dr. Lyon from SMU) who had never met my children, had never visited their schools (Either Waldorf, or Rawson Saunders), and whose entire testimony was inadmissible was taken, while the court did not allow the FOUR TREATING EXPERTS ALL PROTECTED BY PERMANENT INJUNCTION TO TESTIFY AT TRIAL. They all recommended for James to join his sister at Rawson Saunders, and for Lucy to go to an adjacent public school which was the best in the Austin Independent School district (A

different district) which required a court order to get all of the children on the same street and in the same neighborhood, as Rawson Saunders was a 30 minute drive down Bee Cave road for both parents, while the Waldorf School was an additional hour from Rawson Saunders at Rush Hour. Thus if either parent was late, they got stuck in traffic for over 1.15 hours. When Appellant's family came to Texas, Appellant believed they could take James and Lucy to school in the direct route, and then he simply needed to get Hannah to school, or vice versa, my dad even offered to drive Hannah to school every morning, but Ms. Wright objected because he was drinking heavily at night, and we both believed it was a risk even with 10 hours sleep. As such James Stritzinger's Sr was asked to move out and return to Delaware at which time he went to the Texas police and entered an unknown criminal complaint against both Ms. Wright and himself because he had lost his business in Delaware over the dispute. Furthermore, William R. Stritzinger, the CEO of Aston Development had entered both a Federal Criminal Complaint, and a Delaware state criminal complaint against Ms. Wright for the same reason. This made three State Attorney Generals, The Attorney General of the United States, President Obama, and Mr. Biden all involved in the case, and little did anyone know that Ms. Wright had two more major problems in Texas.

Why is this case absurd. Appellant was the Chief Operating Officer of Bank of America at the time of trial, but didn't yet have a contract from the board in September of 2009. The children were happy. Hannah was back to grade. They had just returned from a Summer break where they had spent almost three months with their cousins from both sides, and Hannah was told she could go back to her old school if she wanted to or if the court ordered it. James However was two years behind grade at Waldorf, could not read, and needed a change. I believe that the court simply needed to move James to Rawson Saunders, and Hannah back, and the proceeding should have taken 15 mins. Instead Ms. Wright plead that the world was burning, that I intended to kidnap the children and move them to Charlotte (and had served me pleadings to my apartment in NC rather than at my house in Texas), and complained that Marilyn and James Stritzinger Sr whom she personally had forced into bankruptcy had to be restricted from seeing the children. A women who was already found unfit to parent who needed three nannies to cook dinner and put the children to bed, and who was literally a prostitute, was asking to be the primary custodian over the Chief Operating Officer of Bank of America, and a Federal Judge under NSTAC who had equal physical custody since the parties separated FIVE YEARS EARLIER, and whose litigation to SAVE HANNAHS LIFE HAD ALREADY BEEN VALIDATED BY JUDGE DIETZ.

WHY? MS. WRIGHT REPLEAD THE ENTIRE CASE, AND WAS ASSIGNED A NEW JUDGE WHO HAD NEVER SPOKEN TO ANYONE AND HE DIDN'T WANT TO READ THE TRANSCRIPTS OR TALK TO JUDGE DIETZ ABOUT WHAT HAD HAPPENED MOSTLY IN HIS CHAMBERS FOR FIVE YEARS. JUDGE YELENOSKY WAS LATER REMOVED FROM THE BENCH BY THE STATE OF TEXAS AND FORCED TO RETIRE

Judge Yelenosky was a District Judge, but had no power to overturn the Chief Judge, and so the pleadings were all defective. Furthermore a brief to exclude experts was presented Ex-parte to a Visiting Judge, who had never heard a single hearing in the case, who had never

met Appellant before, and the Brief said it had been served. That was not true, and James Richardson submitted a Brief he had never sent to proceeding until two weeks after the court had already struck four experts who were protected by Permanent injunction on an emergency hearing because Mr. Richardson said he didn't know their opinions on his move to change all of their schools for the FIFTH TIME IN FIVE YEARS. Mr. Richardson knew their opinions because he had met with them all five years in a row, and their opinions never changed.

Dr. Nussbaum told the court that if the Children went to the Waldorf School with disabilities they would fall more and more behind every year, and that's exactly what happened. Furthermore, Dr. Nussbaum(a UT professor, and the leading neuropsychologist in Texas by everyone's admission even Dr. Lyon said the court could not get a better opinion than they already had) told the court, and it was ordered that the children be tested every 18 months until their issues were resolved.

When the time came to test the children or appointments were made, Ms. Wrights attorneys would simply call the professional they were going to see and threatened them with lawsuits. Effectively they were committing FEDERAL FELONIES BY THE DOZEN. Mr. Richardson, Mr. Friday, Ms. Kazen, and others called to harras the professional who were evaluating schools and their educational problems forcing new litigation, while in the Public school such litigation is unnecessary because the Public schools test children every spring, and if there are problems they develop IEPs. The Austin Waldorf School performs no educational testing because they are NOT LICENSED TO DO SO... teachers don't even have to have a state teaching certificate from a State or Foreign University. **That's right they don't even have to be education college graduates to teach at the waldorf school. Judge Yelenosky knew all of these details, and didn't care, and neither did the court of appeals.**

The Texas Regulatory bodies, and the Public Schools who heard my complaint were nearly in disbelief, but that Governor Perry, and Abbott had eliminated their funding to certify and regulate Private Schools. In other words the 10th Amendment says the State of Texas has to regulate its own schools, yet I have demonstrated they simply don't do so for private schools which under state code all includes "HOME SCHOOLERS", liberal moms who hate anyone else talking to their children are included in this statute. And believe it or not the code in Maryland is nearly the same. The Public Schools of Maryland and Texas both have strong educational protections, but there are none or almost none for Private School students. (No Regulations at all). Virginia, and New Jersey however simply add one rule... you can do anything you want as long as your child doesn't have a disability, in which case you have to have a special education license to teach them or work with them including parents. That's right if your child has a disability you cant do anything with your child that's not court ordered including using tools like Lexia learning. I will advise the court however that Dr. Nussbaum, and Dr. Swank told him to buy Lexia and use it with the children, but Ms. Wright sued to state this was improper as she did nothing to help them at home.

SUPPORT FOR VIRGINIA LAWS – WHERE APPELLANT IS A RESIDENT

The court will note that Virginia does not distinguish with requirements for public school or private school teachers and effectively polices Home Schooling by simply saying you have to be qualified to teach your children. If you know your child has a disability, as we did in our case, than Ms. Wright or the Private or Public School who taught our children would have to be qualified with the qualifications listed below.

- i) Section § 22.1-298.1 of the **Code of Virginia** requires that every **teacher** seeking an initial **license** in the Commonwealth with an endorsement in the area of career and technical **education** shall have an industry **certification credential** in the area in which the **teacher** seeks endorsement.
- ii) <https://hslida.org/content/hs101/VA.aspx>

<p>1. Ensure that you possess one of four home instructor qualifications.</p>
--

You may qualify to provide home instruction in one of the following four ways:

- Possess a high school diploma or higher degree,
 - Possess a current Virginia teacher's license,
 - Provide your child with a curriculum or program of study as part of your home instruction program, *or*
 - Give evidence that you are able to provide your child an adequate education.
- iii) <https://law.lis.virginia.gov/admincode/title8/agency20/chapter81/section40/>

8VAC20-81-40. Special Education Staffing Requirements.

A. School age programs. The following specifies the staffing patterns for special education services for school age (five to 21, inclusive) children, in addition to the Standards of Quality (§ 22.1.253.13:2 of the Code of Virginia) and Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia ([8VAC20-131-240](#)).

1. Staffing shall be in accordance with the requirements of [8VAC20-81-340](#) in the following settings.

a. Students with disabilities shall be instructed with students without disabilities in general education settings and classrooms, as appropriate, and in accordance with the Individualized Education Program (IEP). The service level, Level I or II, is based on the amount of time the student receives special education.

b. When children with disabilities are removed from the general education setting and classroom to provide instruction, special education and related services, they may receive services with children with the same disability or with children with different disabilities.

2. Personnel assignment.

- a. Each student shall receive special education services from special education personnel assigned in accordance with the Virginia Licensure Regulations for School Personnel (8VAC20-22).
- b. Special education teachers who are the teachers of record shall be highly qualified.
- c. General education qualified personnel who are knowledgeable about the students and their special education, may implement special education services in collaboration with special education personnel.
- d. Special education services include those services provided directly to the student and those provided indirectly.

3. Caseload standards.

- a. The maximum instructional caseloads for special education teachers and speech-language pathologists, for which public schools receive state funds in accordance with the Virginia Appropriation Act are listed in 8VAC20-81-340. Special education services for children with visual impairment are established, maintained, and operated jointly by the local school board and the Virginia Department for the Blind and Vision Impaired.
- b. If children with disabilities in a single building receive academic content area instruction from multiple special education teachers, the teachers' caseloads shall be determined by using a building average.

(1) A building average is computed by dividing the total weights (found in 8VAC20-81-340) for all children served in this fashion by the number of special education teachers providing services. Any itinerant teacher shall be counted according to the amount of time the teacher spends in the school. Subdivision 3 d of this subsection applies for any teacher assigned to administrative duties or to providing services to children who do not have disabilities.

(2) The building average shall not exceed 20 points if services are provided to students receiving Level I services and to children receiving Level II services. The building average shall not exceed 24 points if services are provided only to children receiving Level I services.

(3) No more than 14 children shall be assigned to a single class period if there are similar achievement levels and one subject area and level are taught. No more than 10 students shall be assigned to a single class period when there are varying achievement levels.

c. Special education personnel may also be assigned to serve children who are not eligible for special education and related services under this chapter, as long as special education personnel hold appropriate licenses and endorsements for such assignments.

d. When special education personnel are assigned to provide services for children who do not have a disability under this chapter or are assigned to administrative duties, a reduction in the caseload specified in the Virginia Appropriation Act shall be made in proportion to the percentage of school time on such assignment.

(1) This provision does not apply when special education and related services are provided in a general education class, based on the goals of the IEP of at least one child in that classroom, and children without disabilities incidentally benefit from such services.

(2) When special education personnel provide services in a general education classroom based on the IEP goals of at least one child in that classroom, the special education caseloads do not include children with disabilities who incidentally benefit from such services.

B. Staffing for early childhood special education.

1. Children of preschool ages (two to five, inclusive) who are eligible for special education receive early childhood special education. The amount of services is determined by the child's individualized education program (IEP) team. A schedule comparable in length to school age students shall be made available if determined appropriate by the IEP team.

2. Staffing requirements.

a. Children receiving early childhood special education services may receive services together with other preschool-aged children with the same or with different disabilities.

b. Each student shall receive special education services from special education personnel assigned in accordance with the Virginia Licensure Regulations for School Personnel (8VAC20-22).

c. The maximum special education caseloads, with and without paraprofessionals, are set and funded in the Virginia Appropriation Act. See 8VAC20-81-340 for the funded caseloads. Special education services for children with visual impairment are established, maintained, and operated jointly by the local school board and the Virginia Department for the Blind and Vision Impaired.

C. Staffing for education programs in regional and local jails. Special education personnel with any special education endorsement, except early childhood special education, may provide instructional services to eligible students with disabilities incarcerated in a regional or local jail.

D. Alternative special education staffing plan. School divisions and private special education schools may offer for consideration of approval, an alternative staffing plan in accordance with Virginia Department of Education procedures. The Virginia Department of Education may grant approval for alternative staffing levels upon request from local school divisions and private special education schools seeking to implement innovative programs that are not consistent with these staffing levels.

E. Educational interpreting services.

1. The qualification requirements for personnel providing interpreting services for children who are deaf or hard of hearing are as follows:

a. Personnel providing educational interpreting services for children using sign language shall:

(1) Have a valid Virginia Quality Assurance Screening (VQAS) Level III; or

(2) Have a passing score on the Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA) Written Test along with a minimum of a Level 3.5 on the EIPA Performance Test or any other state qualification or national certification (excluding Certificate of Deaf Interpretation) recognized by the Virginia Department for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing as equivalent to or exceeding the VQAS Level III.

b. Personnel providing educational interpreting services for children using cued speech/language shall have a Virginia Quality Assurance Screening Level III for cued speech or hold a national Transliteration Skills Certificate from the Testing, Evaluation and Certification Unit (TEC Unit) or equivalent recognized by the Virginia Department for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing.

c. Personnel providing educational interpreting services for children requiring oral interpreting shall meet minimum requirements for competency on the Virginia Quality Assurance Screening written assessment of the Code of Ethics.

2. Personnel who provide interpreting services for children who use sign language or cued speech/language and who do not hold the required qualifications may be employed in accordance with the following criteria:

- a. Personnel shall have a valid Virginia Quality Assurance Screening Level I, or its equivalent, as determined by the Virginia Department for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing; or
- b. Personnel shall have a passing score on the EIPA Written Test and a minimum score of 2.5 on the EIPA Performance Test upon hiring date in any local educational agency in Virginia.

3. The following qualification requirements for personnel providing interpreting services for students who are deaf or hard of hearing will become effective in 2010:

a. Personnel providing educational interpreting services for children using sign language shall hold:

(1) A valid Virginia Quality Assurance Screening (VQAS) Level III; or

(2) A passing score on the Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA) Written Test along with a minimum of a Level 3.5 on the EIPA Performance Test or any other state qualification or national certification (excluding Certificate of Deaf Interpretation) recognized by the Virginia Department for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing as equivalent to or exceeding the VQAS Level III.

(3) Under no circumstances shall local educational agencies or private special education schools hire interpreters who hold qualifications below a VQAS Level II, EIPA Level 3.0 or the equivalent from another state.

(4) Interpreters hired with a VQAS Level II, EIPA Level 3.0 or the equivalent shall have two years from the date of hire to reach the required qualifications.

b. Personnel providing educational interpreting services for children using cued speech/language shall have a valid Virginia Quality Assurance Screening Level III for cued speech/language or hold a national Transliteration Skills Certificate from the Testing, Evaluation and Certification Unit (TEC Unit) or equivalent recognized by the Virginia Department for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing.

(1) Under no circumstances shall local educational agencies or private special education schools hire educational interpreters to provide cued speech services who hold qualifications below a VQAS Level I or the equivalent from another state.

(2) Educational Interpreters to provide cued speech hired with a VQAS Level I or the equivalent have three years from the date of hire to reach the required qualifications.

c. Personnel providing educational interpreting services for children requiring oral interpreting shall hold a national Oral Transliteration Certificate (OTC) or equivalent recognized by the Virginia Department of Deaf and Hard of Hearing.

4. For a child who is not deaf or hard of hearing but for whom sign language services are specified in the IEP to address expressive or receptive language needs, the sign language services shall be provided by an individual meeting the requirements determined appropriate by the local educational agency.

Statutory Authority

§§ 22.1-16 and 22.1-214 of the Code of Virginia; 20 USC § 1400 et seq.; 34 CFR Part 300.

Historical Notes

Derived from Volume 25, Issue 21, eff. July 7, 2009.

Website addresses provided in the Virginia Administrative Code to documents incorporated by reference are for the reader's convenience only, may not necessarily be active or current, and should not be relied upon. To ensure the information incorporated by reference is accurate, the reader is encouraged to use the source document described in the regulation.

As a service to the public, the Virginia Administrative Code is provided online by the Virginia General Assembly. We are unable to answer legal questions or respond to requests for legal advice, including application of law to specific fact. To understand and protect your legal rights, you should consult an attorney.

ARGUMENTS

Ms. Wright was in fact trying to force a Federal Trial to terminate the Jurisdiction over her fraud with Mr. Baird, and because she wanted to talk about email to her partners including Mr. Pemberton, and Mr. Perry according to her if she lost(as she runs an educational foundation and painful though it may be she wants a supreme court judgment in this case).

The issue for me was, I am sure both gentlemen are simply going to deny it(IE their relationship with Ms. Wright) , so we can argue again over a hard drive which is in the safe of my attorney's office and which I have not looked at in 16 years. That hard drive had GROSS emails between Ms. Wright and Mr. Baird, that were sent to an MBNA.COM address, (The Corporate Mail Servers), and because Mr. Baird was a corporate officer were kept under the retention policy. In other words Ms. Andrea B. Smith, and Louis Freeh Jr had Ms. Wrights Instant Messaging, and Email communications to MR. Baird, his location data, and his expense reports which proved without a shadow of a doubt he was having sex with Ms. Wright as early as 1996, while his wife was pregnant with their second child. Ms. Baird was the party who actually informed me of the affair in mid December 2004, at which time I looked, and the situation was far worse than I imagined.

Furthermore, according to Michael Grant, Criminal investigators in Delaware, had already gotten all of these emails, and they are in the Delaware State archives, meaning they are very clear what had happened in this case. Ms. Wright was having unprotected sex with as many as six men, and the paternity of all three children was in question. Ms. Wright decided her body was sufficient for roulette, and in a NO FAULT STATE, her actions could not even be debated in a Texas State Court. In fact Dr. Dalton told me I had to sue in her federal court, because her misconduct, and the issues were so great.

So where are we today. These are the facts: James Richardson using loans from Vernon Wright and Bank of America sued the Stritzinger family 10 years in a row until everyone was

bankrupt. Furthermore, the State of Texas ordered disabled children to Texas private schools which are unregulated and had no special education rules (and where there is no enforcement code in the Texas Criminal Code), even though the Texas Public Schools have the strongest Dyslexia and Special Education laws in the Nation. The issue is FIVE board certified attorneys in Texas knew all of this, and instead of simply asking the court to send the children to the obvious choice of the Public Schools, decided to litigate away from the obvious decision SO THEY COULD STEAL SEVEN MILLION DOLLARS FROM THE STRITZINGER AND WRIGHT FAMILIES, AND FORCE 16M DOLLARS IN DAMAGE TO ASTON DEVELOPMENT AND ITS SHAREHOLDERS INCLUDING WILLIAM R. STRITZINGER AND JAMES R. STRITZINGER SR WHICH INCLUDED MOST OF THE FRIENDS AND BUSINESS PARTNERS OF THE STRITZINGER FAMILY FOR 50 YEARS, While Louis Freeh Jr, who had no job at Bank of America other than to chase people who owed the company money, got paid 1M Dollars a year in retirement benefits, and the Chief Operating Officer of the company neither got a contract or any benefits due to his EX-WIFES MISCONDUCT WITH BARRY BAIRD, and having nothing to do with his own misconduct because Ms. Smith was trying to help Mr. Moynihan in a Mutiny from a board decision where she was very aware she was going to be the first person fired, and prosecuted as I already told her that she was gone immediately.

So why does this matter. Even if this court decides none of this old information matters, what I am advising the court is I cannot revisit the Texas Withholding orders in Texas without an attorney, and because every attorney I have consulted with in Texas believes that ultimately the Texas Criminal Court of Appeals is going to roll up and summarize the entire case, they believe an appropriate Trial fee is on the order of 5M dollars, as they believed they have to read the summaries and expert reports on the order 50 Texas professionals and REFRESH THEM ALL, and after they do they think further testimony might take a MONTH OF COURT TIME, only to re-inforce a further consolidation in the Texas Third Court, and then eventually the Texas CCA. So in other words the barrier in Texas is over 5M from even establishing my income for a change in support except with a junior attorney who literally cannot handle Ms. Wrights team (which is good and experienced).

The Texas Child Support office refuses to help me, as they have told me they have been served by Mr. Richardson who wants to attach my companies, and force me into bankruptcy too. So my perspective is I want Mr. Richardson to be subpoenaed to a foreign court where he is not licensed to practice so he is just a fact witness, and I assure you he will end in prison where he belongs. Mr. Richardson apparently has never lost a case in Texas in the District Court, and all of his clients give him unlimited money to litigate. Ms. Wrights annual retainer excluding court time was over 500K dollars a year from 2004-2011. Mr. Wright paid for all of those fees, and Mr. Wright had only source of income Bank of America. Mr. Wrights Bank of America stock is worth over 1B dollars, and he has no need for ongoing retirement payments which he funneled almost exclusively to litigate in Texas not just against me personally but against my entire family.

Ms. Wright was a drunk, a drug addict, and a mental health patient, but when you google the Texas Judgement, you would think she was a saint. That's not what the trial record shows.

This case needs to be consolidated. A Quick review of old financial issues is required in a neutral court of law, if for no other reason to submit this transcript to a Texas Appellate court, and not to a trial court for yet another District Court proceeding which is unfair. Otherwise Appellant literally has to move to Dallas, and get a Dallas Court to overturn a ridiculous Travis county decision which the Texas 5th Court of Appeals has already advised.

Furthermore, the Statute of Limitations for civil relief in South Carolina is 20 years, giving us four more years to resolve this matter before it cant be revisited in any court, until Mr. Wright passes, and the issue of Ms. Wrights debts which she cant repay is brought forward likely in Maryland along with Trust funds that Ms Beaver, and Mr. Bowes made no effort to located before recommending he give 100% of his money and all future income to Ms. Wright.

BAR COMPLAINT AGAINST CHARLES BOWES ESQUIRE A TEXAS ATTORNEY
BAR COMPLAINT AGAINST MR. CASEY DOBSON ESQUIRE A TEXAS CIVIL ATTORNEY
BAR COMPLAINT AGAINST MR. PETE KENNEDY – GRAVES DAUGHERTY

Mr. Dobson and Mr. Bowes recommending actions which lead to the forced bankruptcy of Aston Development, Unlimited Prosecutorial Actions by the Federal Government, and 100% of Appellants assets being transferred to Katherine Wright even before they had completed discovery in Maryland by Christopher Grant, Esquire. Furthermore, Mr. Kennedy represented an agreement between all of the parties would terminate civil and criminal actions in the case, and Appellant notifies this court that the FBI, The State of Delaware, The State of Pennsylvania and The State of Maryland do not agree because they simply did not serve all of the parties when they had sufficient resources to do so, or file in the US District Court where such actions were sufficient under 28 USC 1332. They did so because Ms. Wrights counter petition in the State Court including a Federal Criminal action that on removal would have cost as much as 5X more to try in the US District court with another Judge who also had a personal conflict, forcing the case to Houston, Dallas or San Antonio at even greater expense. At the end of the day, Ms. Wright was raped by a Bank of America associate, and rather than sue him, she claimed he was her husband, and asked Bank of America for money to defend their relationship which was provided in unlimited quantities for the daughter of RETIRED OFFICER who had an ironclad MBNA contract entered in Delaware, while Mr. Massey, Biden and Mr. Obama denied him one at all due to TARP. They objected to a Bank of America executive making more than the President of the United States who makes about 250K dollars a year. At the time Bank of America was losing money, but the US Government was in near default. **All three attorneys have refused to take new retainers to fix their mistakes, nor to appear in ongoing issues which they created which now spans seven states due to THEIR GROSS INCOMPETENCE. They wont even provide referrals.**

Sincerely,
 John S. Stritzinger
 2156 Cresthill Rd
 Columbia, SC 29223
 843-352-3459

EXHIBIT A – LINK TO TEXAS BRIEF

The screenshot shows the Texas Judicial Branch website. The main heading is "Supreme Court". Under "CASE INFORMATION", the case number is 11-0224. The case type is "Petition for Review under Tex. R. App. P. 63.1". The parties are listed as JOHN STEWART STRITZINGER vs. KATHERINE WINDYNT. A section titled "APPELLATE BRIEFS" contains a table with the following data:

Date	Event Type	Description	Remarks	Document
04/27/2011	Motion for Rehearing	Rehearing filed in Petition for Review	E-FILED Motion for Rehearing filed on behalf of John Stritzinger. H&D COPIES RECEIVED	1401701431
05/25/2011	Supplemental appendix	Petitioner	E-FILED Volumes 1 and 2 of Supplemental Appendix filed on behalf of John Stritzinger. H&D COPIES RECEIVED	1401701441
04/28/2011	Supplemental appendix	Petitioner	Supplemental Appendix (11) filed on behalf of John Stritzinger	1401701442
05/27/2011	Appendix Filed	Petitioner	Appendix (1) filed on behalf of J.S.	1401701443
04/28/2011	Petition for Review	Petitioner	Petition appendix attached (1) filed on behalf of J.S.	1401701444

<http://www.search.txcourts.gov/Case.aspx?cn=11-0224&coa=cossup>

<http://www.search.txcourts.gov/SearchMedia.aspx?MediaVersionID=bfe36e4f-f535-49a9-ba33-daa2f13256fd&coa=cossup&DT=BRIEFS&MediaID=3f671625-af0a-4bdb-8012-65e963fb12d0>

FILED
IN SUPREME COURT
OF TEXAS

MAR 28 2011

11-0224

BLAKE HAWTHORNE, Clerk
By _____ Deputy

IN THE TEXAS SUPREME COURT

JSS

v.

KBW

Texas 3rd Court of Appeals # 03-10-455-CV

Travis County Docket # D-1-FM-04-004690

PETITION FOR REVIEW
