

ATTACHMENT B

Incidents that happened at this court which heightened my suspicion of foul play.

1. Jake Levitan was a very kind clerk of this court with whom I often communicated in the months prior to filing my petition. In May of last year, as I prepared to file my petition, he advised that I mailed it to his attention and reassured me that he would take care of it. And then, all of a sudden, I was not able to communicate with him. Months later, after my petition had been denied, I was informed by Jessica Jimenez that he stopped working at this court last May (Ms. Jimenez has been assigned Mr. Levitan's phone extension.)

I find this strange because if he intended to resign, would he have advised me to mail my petition to his attention so he could take care of it? And would he not have informed me that he was leaving? Thus, I have to wonder: Did he resign? Or was he let go in order to keep him from interfering with whatever plan was being devised to deny my petition?

2. It is my understanding that it typically takes a week or two for a petition to be placed on this court's website for public view. Yet, mine took several months. A month after filing it I was told that the delay was due to the fact that a decision about my Motion to File under Seal had yet to be made. But my petition was not placed on the website until months later, and calls to the court regarding this matter went unanswered. Could it be that a decision on my Motion was intentionally postponed in order to keep my petition from being posted on the court's site and prevent court observers from seeing it?

3. Following this court's denial of my petition on November 17, my calls to the court were finally returned. A lady by the name of Sarah Simmons grew upset when I asked about this court's decision-making process regarding petitions. She told me that she could not answer my questions and that I was being argumentative, even though I never raised my voice. She also told me that a list of approved petitions was not posted on the website. However, somebody in her office overheard her and corrected her (a list was in fact posted.) I find it strange that a clerk would not know this, although it is certainly possible. But her annoyance with me and her refusal to answer my questions about this court's decision-making process were suspicious in the context of everything else I am saying.

4. The fact that the NJ government failed to reply to my petition despite its serious allegations against their agency and judiciary suggests to me that it knew my petition would not be granted.

Now, even if there was a logical explanation to all the above points, that would not alter my suspicion of foul play for the reason stated in my letter to this court.

I would like to add that, considering the great shame that the granting of my petition would have brought upon the NJ government; considering how it manages to bend the will of judges, court staff, other agencies' staff and even (I have reason to believe) a petitioner's attorney; and considering the great lengths it has gone throughout my appeal to cover up the wrongdoings committed by its agency and judiciary, I believe it possible and even likely that it has somehow also managed to get some of this court staff members to keep my petition from being properly presented to this court to cause it to be denied.

In closing, I respectfully ask this court to consider listing all petitions on the court's website (both granted and denied) for public view and to include the names of the justices that granted or denied them. That would make it harder for this court staff to do anything improper.

It would also be helpful for the public to have this information.