

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

From: southsfbayarea@gmail.com
Sent: April 21, 2012 4/21/12
To: david.tindal@sanjoseca.gov
Cc: christopher.moore@sanjoseca.gov, debra.figone@sanjoseca.gov,
chuck.reed@sanjoseca.gov, richard.doyle@sanjoseca.gov,
madison.nguyen@sanjoseca.gov, ash.kalra@sanjoseca.gov,
sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov
Subject: SJPD SECONDARY EMPLOYMENT UNIT

Hello Luitenant Tindal. I am sending you this because it also involves San Jose Police Officers working Secondary Employment Security at the same location. I believe that policy breaches of San Jose Duty Manuel section C 1503 were coupled with Title 42, U.S.C., Section 3631. S.J.P.D. failed to protect Heidi Yauman from the Public Guardian's Office (AND VICA/VERCA)

In late November or early December of 2006, it had been brought to the attention of Deputy Public Guardian: Mary Clarke that a San Jose Police Sergeant had been tormenting her, and had told her to go into her apartment and not come out or she would be arrested although her lease clearly stated she had full entitlement to all the common area's of the apartment complex.

He was also allegedly seen by a neighbor: (ralph apt: 426) snooping around in Heidi's apartment when she was not home. Mary Clarke's response was that "This is not a problem."

On or around December 8th, 2006, Mary Clarke arrived at Heidi's Apt. with assistant property manager: Margarett Hardy.

Margarett Hardy handed a "3 day to vacate" notice to Heidi with fabricated violations. Mary Clarke then said: "She has to be out of here in days"

Mary Clarke did nothing to defend Heidi against these false allegations or advocate for Heidi to help her to appeal this. Heidi was so terrified, she left and was afraid to go home until around Late April or Early May of 2007. She would sneak in and out occasionally to run the watter, turn

on and off the lights and ceiling fan to show fluctuation in the utility bills. No Eviction notice was ever served.

In May of 2008, Property Manager Theresa Coons attempted to evict Heidi (or trick Heidi into believing she was being evicted) because she wrote a confidential letter complaining about this same Police Sergeant. Public Guardian: Dennis Silva tried to facilitate this "supposed" eviction.

This was documented in a letter to San Jose City Council Member Sam Liccardo on May 16th, 2008 followed by a complaint to the Independent

Police Auditors Office / SJPD Internal Affairs Unit. Dennis Silva immediately backed down when he discovered the "sudden & mysterious resignation"

of Theresa Coons and I challenged him to back up any 1 of the 4 allegations against me he wrote in a letter to Heidi. He could not.

Deputy Public Guardian Kanta Jindal was immediately replaced by Rebecca Pizano-Torrez.

While we work on ways to improve the Secondary Employment Unit, it is important to understand the things that went wrong.

Thank You, Cary-Andrew Crittenden

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

From: southsfbayarea@gmail.com
Sent: April 21, 2012 4/21/12
To: dbrookins@da.sccgov.org, jim.odonell@abc7news.com,
ladoris.cordell@sanjoseca.gov
Subject: FW: HUD / Probate file: 1-90-PR-124467

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

From: southsfbayarea@gmail.com
Sent: April 21, 2012 4/21/12
To: smuni@doj.ca.gov

Cc: dbrookins@da.sccgov.org

Subject: HUD / Probate file: 1-90-PR-124467

Hello Mr. Muni. I think that USC Title 42 section 3631 may bring these probate court records into the jurisdiction of the U.S. dept. of Housing and Urban Development. Though I doubt this will provoke a huge investigation, I'm sure it will generate some response if copies of Heidis declarations area sent to HUD with attached notes and references. I think it will be hard for them to weasle out of this without leaving themselves vulnerable to prosecution pursuant to USC Title 18 section: 1001. If you don't mind, would you please follow up with the Santa Clara County Public Guardian's office and the Probate Court concerning this. Thank you kindly, Cary-Andrew Crittenden. [408-401-0023](tel:408-401-0023).

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

From: southsfbayarea@gmail.com

Sent: April 20, 2012 4/20/12

To: rebecca.pizano@pag.co.santa-clara.ca.us,

Carlotta.royal@pag.co.santa-clara.ca.us,

cherie.purdie@pag.co.santa-clara.ca.us,

Donald.Moody@pag.co.santa-clara.ca.us, Lee.Pullen@ssa.co.santa-clara.ca.us

Subject: FW: Case # 1-90-PR-124467

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

From: southsfbayarea@gmail.com

Sent: April 20, 2012 4/20/12

To: yruiz@scscourt.org

Subject: FW: Case # 1-90-PR-124467

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

From: southsfbayarea@gmail.com

Sent: April 20, 2012 4/20/12

To: yruuz@scscourt.org

Cc: rebecca.pizano@pag.sccgov.org,

Carlotta.royal@pag.sccgov.org, cherie.purdie@pag.sccgov.org,
Donald.Moody@pag.sccgov.org, Lee.Pullen@ssa.sccgov.org,
steven.muni@doj.ca.gov, smuni@doj.ca.gov, tcain@scscourt.org,
jim.odonnell@abc7news.com, actionline@mercurynews.com,
dbrookins@da.sccgov.org, caroleh@4fate.org,
info@endguardianshipabuse.com, info@pogo.org, ahs@swissmail.org,
LeslieDutton@FullDisclosure.net, alberta3-judgebusters@hotmail.com,
info@centerforjudicialexcellence.org,
nfje@nfje.net, rachelravenwolf@yahoo.com
Subject: Case # 1-90-PR-124467

Hello Yara

Thank you again for your assistance in providing insight into the alleged inaccuracies submitted into Santa Clara County Probate Court case file: I-90-PR-124467 (The conservatorship of Heidi Yauman) by members of the Santa Clara County Public Guardian's office, and also for sending copies of the necessary paperwork to Heidi to file declarations contesting these inaccuracies which I believe were done by members of the Santa Clara County Public Guardian's office intentionally and may be in violation of California Penal Code Section: 118, California Civil Code 45a and several federal laws.

Unfortunately, Heidi is frightened and upset following a phone call yesterday from her conservator: Rebecca Pizanno-Torrez, and Heidi is now very reluctant to file any court declaration for fear of Retribution from the Public Guardian's Office. According to Heidi, Rebecca told her that there was to be a meeting on Monday April 23, 2011 at her apartment and that Heidi must be there alone without any advocate or witnesses present.

The purpose and intent of this scheduled meeting, (and the exclusion of witnesses) which according to Rebecca was directed by Carlotta Royale of the Santa Clara County Public Guardian's (Rebecca's Supervisor) and the Probate Court seems very peculiar to me since there are no urgent issues that need to be addressed.

The last issue that I am aware of, was my inability to spend sufficient time at Heidi's apartment helping her with house cleaning chores, etc. This was discussed between Rebecca and myself about one week prior to your visit to Heidi's apartment to review her conservatorship. At this time, Heidi had gone to pick up her personal needs money, and I had set aside this time to clean and organise her apartment so that Heidi would not interfere with & undo this progress. Rebecca arrived, and was understandably upset at the condition of the apartment. This was frustrating to me also because it has been very awkward cleaning with Heidi Present because she would often insist on keeping trash items such as empty cereal boxes, etc, and she would also go out to the dumpsters and retrieve discarded items and bring them back to her apartment.

This issue has been mostly resolved because since then, I have since been spending more time at Heidi's Apartment cleaning and helping Heidi to devise an adequate system for cleaning and organising (Not only her space, but also her time.) Many items have been thrown away. Conforming to a schedule and program has been challenging to Heidi and she has not been able to follow it 100%, the Apartment however has been in a much better state ever since. I also spoke with Elaine Bouchard, Heidi's property manager who has requested that Heidi cease her dumpster diving activities at Markham Plaza.

I have re-assured Heidi that Rebecca could not legally prevent her from having an advocate present, and that if such a haphazard tactic were attempted, that it's application be very risky, and that it would most likely be destined to fail. With all things considered, this appears to be a divide and conquer/diversion tactic to disrupt and prevent Heidi from filing probate court declarations that could potentially subject members of the Santa Clara County Public Guardian's office to criminal charges of Perjury and other serious crimes.

The fact remains however, that Heidi is now too afraid

to file a declaration, and I certainly do not want to pressure her under these circumstances. She still exhibits trauma symptoms from her past experiences with deputy public guardians: Rondi Opheim and Kanta Jindal which seem to manifest themselves as panic attacks. (I believe some of the actions of Mary Clarke may have been a contributing factor, if not a cause.)

Although I am legally able to assist Heidi with these matters (court declarations), I am severely limited now because she is feeling upset and intimidated. I believe strongly that libelous/perjurious statements in probate court case file: I-90-PR-124467 may have adversely affected Probate Court related proceedings & decisions effecting Heidi's Conservatorship which in turn may have effected the manner of treatment she has received from the Public Guardians office on a long term basis with residual effects. (You reaffirmed this when you emphasized to Heidi and I that this may provide hurdles that may prevent Heidi from petitioning her conservatorship, and you confirmed to us that this documentation does indeed exist.)

I believe also that some of this documentation may also constitute and indicate violations of Title 42, U.S.C., Section 3631 and some similar statutes that may fall under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development. With the help of my constituents, I will be spending much of the coming days preparing a cover letter and comprehensive report for the U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development (And other agencies/officials), and this report will also include and/or cross reference to documents and case files retained by other government agencies such as (Two HUD case files) (Two Santa Clara County District Attorney's office Case Files) (One San Jose Police Department Case File), Heidi's attorney/advocacy records, and Heidi's conservatorship records retained by the Office of the Public Guardian.

Although you have made it clear to me during our last phone call that emailing the court is fruitless in the respect that it will not make it into Heidi's probate court

case file, at least the court is now aware of the manner these things have upset Heidi emotionally. I hope the court will advise the Public Guardians office to NOT INTERFERE WITH HEIDI'S RIGHT TO ADVOCACY, HER HOUSING RIGHTS, HER 14th AMMENDENT RIGHT TO EQUEL PROTECTION UNDER LAW, which includes equal access to the courts - See also: Title 18, U.S.C., Section 245(1)(b). Additionally, The Public Guardian's office may not exhert any more control than nessesary over Heidi. I cannot understand how anyone could consider it necessary (or in Heidi's best Interest) to even suggest to Heidi that there be no advocates or witnesses present. They need to immediately to revise their course of action, and allow Heidi to live the life that she deserves, which is A FULL LIFE, A FREE LIFE, AND HAPPY LIFE! For crying out loud, can't they see that she has already suffered enough!

Thank you again for your courtesy, time and attention.

Respecfully:

Rev. Cary-Andrew Crittenden | 408-401-0023