

I Deborah Ann Bujdos on this 16th day of December 2016 firmly believe I have been subjected to public wrongs, or crimes and misdemeanors, are a breach and violation of the public rights and duties, due to the whole community, considered as a community, in its social aggregate capacity by

all the parties listed on this request for a full investigation that I am submitting today.

THE COMPLAINT LISTED INVOLVES ALL THE PARTIES THAT COOPERATED WITH ATTORNEY WHALEN TO COMPLETE HER SCHEME TO DEFRAUD ME.

THIS STATES VARIOUS CAUSES OF ACTIONS AGAINST ALL PARTICIPANTS , JUDGE HARRY SMAIL, JUDGE CHRIS SCHERER MASTER HENRY MOORE,

MASTER ERIC BONONI, ATTORNEY LINDA WHALEN AND MR. LAURENCE BUJDOS, HOWEVER ALL COMPLAINTS BEGAN WITH ATTORNEY WHALEN

'S UNETHICAL AND ILLEGAL SCHEME SHE BEGAN IN DECEMBER 2012 TO DEFRAUD ME. OUR MARITAL ESTATE IS VALUED AT 5 MILLION. SHE

TOOK \$3700.00 OF MY JOINTLY OWNED RETIREMENT ANNUITIES FROM

METLIFE AND JOHN HANCOCK, MONTHLY INCOME THAT I WAS RECEIVING SINCE 2008 WITHOUT MY PERMISSION. IN DOING THAT I WAS

ONLY GETTING HALF OF THE SPOUSAL SUPPORT I WAS AWARDED IN OCTOBER 2012 . THAT WAS HER FIRST PART OF HE SCHEME TO

FINANCIALLY SUPPRESS ME. WHILE GIVING MY MY HUSBAND THE UPPERHAND IN THIS CASE FINANCIALLY, HE HAD 18,000.00 NET MONTHLY

INCOME AND I HAD ONLY 3,582.00 MONTHLY , INSTEAD OF THE ORIGINAL SUPPORT ORDER THAT STATED I WAS TO GET 4,400.00 SUPPORT FROM MY

HUSBAND AND THAT WAS BASED ON ME CONTINUING TO GET MY RETIREMENT MONEY MONTHLY 3,700.00 SO THE TOTAL I WS TO GET

ORIGINALLY WAS \$8,100.00. ONCE SHE TOOK MY MONEY AND PUT IT HER FIRMS NON INTEREST BEARING ACCOUNT I WAS LEFT WITH THE

\$3582.00 A MONTH TO USE FOR MAINTAINING THE MARITAL HOME I WAS LIVING IN ALONE AFTER MY HUSBAND WAS REMOVED VIA PFA IN

SEPTEMBER 2012. ATTORNEY WHALEN TAKING MY INCOME DENIED ME THE RIGH TO EQUAL JUSTICE TO BE ABLE TO AFFORD TO DEFEND MY SELF

AND PAY MY MONTHLY OBLIGATIONS . I COULD NOT AFFORD AN

ATTORNEY AND LOST MY PERFECT CREDIT RATING AT THE AGE OF 60. FROM NOT BEING ABLE TO PAY ALL OF MARITAL CREDIT CARD DEBT. MY MONTHLY EXPENSES WERE TO START LIKE THIS, 18,000.00 FOR MORTGAGE AND TAXES, 700.00 HEALTH INSURANCE, 400.00 LIGHT, 200.00 HOME OWNERS, 300.00 GAS, PHONE 100.00 JUST THOSE TOTAL 3,500.00 SO I HAD 82 DOLLARS LEFT FOR PAYING ON MARITAL CREDIT CARDS , LEGAL FEES, FOOD, TRANSPORTATION. TO DATE I STILL ONLY RECEIVE THE 3,582.00 PER MONTH. HER ACTION LEAD TO ME BEING MADE HOMELESS ON MARCH 11,2016 ATTORNEY WHALEN HAS REPEATEDLY REFUSED TO RELEASE MY SHARE OF THE JOINT RETIREMENT INCOME THAT SHE KEEPS THE RETIRMENT INCOME IN HER FIRMS ACCOUNT. SHE HAS WRITTEN CHECKS OUT OF THIS AS THOUGH IT WAS HER OWN. SHE PAID A DIVORCE MASTER 10,000.00 THAT SHE HAD APPOINTED EX PARTE BEFORE MY DISCOVERY WAS DONE. SHE PREVENTED ME FROM DOING DISCOVERY FOR 3 YEARS BY HER HOLDING MY MONEY TO PAY FOR THE EXPERTS NEEDED TO DO DISCOVERY. SHE REPEATEDLY IGNORED REQUESTS FOR DOCUMENTS NEEDED FOR DISCOVERY FROM MY ATTORNEYS AND MYSELF. SHE REFUSED TO PRODUCE A BOILERPLATE RELEASE FOR 4 MY FORENSIC ACCOUNTANT TO LOCATE 2.3 MILLION THAT WAS UNACCOUNTED FOR. SHE SPENT 3 YEARS HAVING VEXATIOUS HEARINGS FOR DOG VISITS, CAT, CARE, CAR VISITS, AND OTHER MERITLESS REQUESTS. THE DOCKET AND THE TRANSCRIPTS AND LETTERS BETWEEN HER AND MY ATTORNEYS , THE ANNUITY COMPANYS , HER OWN INVOICE AND RECORDS OF THE MONEY SHE KEPT FROM ME ALL TELLS THE TRUTH AND EXPOSES HER CRIMES WITH CLEAR AND COMVINCING EVIDENCE OF THE CRIMES I AM ACCUSING HER OF. SHE DID NOT FOLLOW THE PROTOCOL WHEN KEEPING CLIENTS FUNDS. SHE PREPARE A FAKE POA FOR MY HUSBAND TO GAIN CONTROL OF THE ANNUITY SO THAT SHE DID NOT HAE TO WAIT MONTHS TO GET MY SIGNATURE FOR HER TO DEPOSIT THEM IN HER FIRMS ACCOUNT , THIS CAN BE VERIFIED WITH THE POA AND HER RECORD OF THE FUNDS SHOW

SHE MADE MULTIPLE DEPOSITS FROM MONTHS OF HOLDING THEM. SHE CLAIMED SHE NEVER USED THE POA BUT IN A LETTER SHE WROTE TO MY ATTORNEY BOJARSKI IN DECEMBER 2014, SHE TELLS HER THAT SHE HAS 6 LIVE CHECKS AND NEEDS MY SIGNATURE EVEN THOUGH SHE SAYS SHE HAS A POA.

SHE TOLD MY ATTORNEY SHE HAS NOT TOLD THE BANK WHERE SHE KEEPS THE MONEY ABOUT HER POA. IT WAS FAKE. I ONLY LEARNED OF ITS EXISTENCE AFTER MY FIRST ATTORNEY HEIDI DE BERNARDO, NORTON LEFT MY CASE. I LEARNED OF IT IN AUGUST 2015 WHEN I CALLED METLIFE TO SEE WHY I WAS NO LONGER GETTING THE INFORMATION ON OUR INVESTMENTS WHEN THEY TOLD ME THAT IN FEBRUARY 2015 MY HUSBAND HAD MY NAME REMOVED FROM THE ANNUITY AND THEN THE CHECKS WERE BEING SENT TO HIM IN HIS NAME ONLY, ATTORNEY WHALEN KNEW HE REMOVED MY NAME ILLEGALLY AND CONTINUED TO TAKE THEM DURING FEB. 2015- AUGUST 2015 WHEN I CALLED METLIFE AND HE TOLD ME SOMEONE TOOK MY NAME OF THE ANNUITY. I IMMEDIATELY REVOKED HER POA. IN A LETTER I TOLD HER I DID NOT EVER GIVE HER MY PERMISSION TO TAKE MY MONEY AND DID NOT GIVE HER PERMISSION TO CONTINUE TO ACT AS A DUAL FIDUCIARY. I DID CONTINUE TO TELL HER I DID NOT WANT HER HOLDING MY FUNDS ANY LONGER. SHE CONTINUES TO IGNORE EVERY ATTEMPT I MAKE TO GET IT RELEASED.

SHE BEGAN A SCHEME TO EVICT ME FROM THE HOME WHILE I HAD A PFA 3 TIMES. SHE DID THAT KNOWING HER CLIENT WAS IN ARREARS EACH TIME. 1ST. WAS DEC. 12-2012 SECOND WAS MAR. 7, 2013, THEN AGAIN IN A SNEAKY AND SECRETIVE WAY SHE TRIED AGAIN IN APRIL 17, 2013, WITHOUT TELLING MY ATTORNEY WHAT SHE WAS DOING. SHE WAS SECRETLY SUBPOENING BANK PEOPLE WHERE MY MORTGAGE WAS. THEY HAD HOPED I MISSED A PAYMENT HOWEVER I WAS LUCKY ENOUGH TO HAVE HAD IT PAID THE DAY BEFORE. SHE HAD MY HUSBAND

GO TO THE TAX COLLECTOR TO PAY MY RUBBISH BILL THE SAME DAY I WAS THERE , HE ARRIVED THERE BEFORE ME BUT THE TAX COLLECTOR PLACED A NOTE N M BILL THAT I COULD SHOW IN COURT THAT I WAS THERE TO PAY IT BUT THEHUSBAND CAME IN EARLIER THE SAME DAY AND PAID HOPING THEY COULD USE THAT AGAINSTME TO HAVE ME EVICTED WHILE I HAD A PFA. MY MORTGAGE WAS NOT EVEN REALLY LATE WHEN I PAID IT THE DAY BEFORE THE SURPRISE EVICTION HEARING. ATTORNEY WHALEN WAS THEONE SURPRISED WHEN I HAD ALL OF MY BILLS PAID, SO SHE LOST THAT DAY AND MOST DISCUSTINGLY AFTER SHE LOST SHE GAVE ME THE 15,000.00 CHECK SHE OWED ME FOR MONTHS AND SHE KNEW MY HUSBAND HAD BEEN INFORMED APRIL 1, 2013 THAT HE WAS BEHIND NEARLY 8,000.00 ON PAYING SUPPORT. THE SURPRISE UNDERHANDED EVICTION HEARING WAS ON APRIL 17, 2013. SEE HER ATTACHED INVOICE IS SHOWS THE PAYMENT TO ME ON THE SAME DAY FOR 15,000.00 AND IT SHOWS HOW SHE PREMEDITATED THIS HEARING BEHIND MY ATTORNEYS BACK. YOU WILL SEE SHE WAS SENDING SUBPOENAS OUT FOR WITNESSES FROM THE BANK, BEFORE MY MORTGAGE WAS EVEN LATE. HER ATTACHED RECORD OF THE FUNDS ALSO SHOWS SHE FINALLYGAVE ME THE 15,000.00 SHE OWED ME FOR MONTHS ON 4-17-13 BUT ONLY AFTER SHE LOST THE HEARING. MY ATTACHED LETTERS TO MY ATTORNEY WILL SHOW THAT WE HAD NO IDEA THERE WAS GOING TO BE AN EXCLUSSIVE POSSESSION OF THE HOME HEARING ON 4-17-13. INFACT WHEN MY ATTORNEY HEIDI ASKED WHAT THE HEARING WAS FOR SHE TOLD HER SHE DID NOT KNOW. SHE SAID MY HUSBAND JUST LIKES TO HAVE HEARINGS. YOU WILL SEE THIS IN MY ATTACHED EMAILS TO HEIDE . INCIDENTLY, HER INVOICE WILL SHOW SHE PREPARED THE FAKE POA FOR MY ATTORNEY TO GET ME TO SIGN, GIVING MY HUSBAND MY POWER OF ATORNEY SO THE HAD TOTAL CONTROL OF THE JOINT CHECKS SHE WAS KEEPING FROM ME. THE POA HAS A SIGNATURE THAT LOOKS LIKE MINE BUT I KNOW I NEVER

SIGNED IT. WHY WOULD I GIVE MY HUSBAND MY POWER OF ATTORNEY, I WOULD NEVER. MANY ATTACHED EMAILS TO MY ATTORNEY HEIDE

Charges :

1. § 1979. Pp. 365 U. S. 170-171.

constituting a deprivation under color of state authority under § 1979. Pp. 365 U. S. 170-171.

2. Pp. 365 U. S. 168 deprivation under color of state authority/ remedy to parties deprived of constitutional rights, privileges and immunities by an official's abuse of his position.

Pp. 365 U. S. 171-187.

3. § 1979. Pp. 365 U. S. 170-171 remedy to parties deprived of constitutional rights, privileges and immunities by an official's abuse of his position. Pp. 365 U. S. 171-187.

4. Pp. 365 U. S. 172-187., . Pp. 365 U. S. 174-180., . P. 365 U. S. 183. § 1979. United States v. Classic, 313 U. S. 299; Screws v. United States, 325 U. S. 91. Pp. 365 U. S. 183-187., ."P. 365 U. S. 187., Page 365 U. S. 168

specific intent to deprive a person of a federal right."P. 365 U. S. 187.

1. § 1979. Pp. 365 U. S. 170-171. Allegation of facts constituting a deprivation under color of state authority of the guaranty against unreasonable searches and seizures, contained in the Fourth Amendment and made applicable to the States by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, satisfies to that extent the requirement of § 1979. Pp. 365 U. S. 170-171.

5. . Pp. 365 U. S. 171-187. Attorney Whalen keeping my own retirement income deprived me of my of constitutional rights, privileges by her utilizing her license to practice law to take control of my money is an official's abuse of her position.

Attorney Whalen is guilty of this by Whalen holding annuities see rohrer no double dipping

THE COURT WAS AWARE ATTORNEY WHALEN HAD BEEN ILLEGALLY HOLDING MY INCOME FROM MY ANNUITY

The Superior Court held that “money included in an individual’s income for the purpose of calculating support payments may not also be labeled as a marital asset subject to equitable distribution.” Rohrer, at 465

6.

THE DOCKET , ORDERS, MOTIONS AND ATTORNEY WHALEN’S OWN INVOICES AND THE TRUST RECORD CLEARLY PROVE SHE KNEW HER services have been improperly utilized in a civil case to place false testimony or other material into evidence, the rule generally recognized is that the lawyer must disclose the existence of the deception to the court or to the other party, if necessary rectify the deception. See paragraph (b) and Rule 1.05(h).

See also Rule 1.05(g). Such a disclosure can result in grave consequences to the client, including not only a sense of betrayal by the lawyer but also loss of the case and perhaps a prosecution for perjury.

. Pp. 365 U. S. 172-187 The statutory words "under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory" do not exclude acts of an official or policeman who can show no authority under state law, custom or usage to do what he did, or even who violated the state constitution and laws. Pp. 365 U. S. 172-187.

7. ALL PARTICIPANTS I FILED CHARGES AGAINST ARE GUILTY OF Specific intent to deprive a person of a federal right

8. ALL PARTICIPANTS I FILED CHARGES AGAINST ARE GUILTY OF DEFRAUDING WIFE OF HER OWN INCOME

ALL PARTICIPANTS I FILED CHARGES AGAINST ARE GUILTY OF

9. Misuse of power possessed by virtue of state law and made possible only because the wrongdoer is clothed with the authority of state law is action taken "under color of" state law within the meaning of § 1979. *United States v. Classic*, 313 U. S. 299; *Screws v. United States*, 325 U. S. 91. Pp. 365 U. S. 183-187.

10. "P. 365 U. S. 187. to deprive a person of a federal right

Since § 1979 does not contain the word "willfully," as does 18 U.S.C. § 242, and § 1979 imposes civil liability, rather than criminal sanctions, actions under § 1979 can dispense with the requirement of showing a "specific intent to deprive a person of a federal right."P. 365 U. S. 18

citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress."

they acted "under color of the statutes, ordinances,

12. ALL PARTICIPANTS I FILED CHARGES AGAINST ARE GUILTY OF

18 U.S.C. § 241 made criminal a conspiracy "to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution," U. S. 542; *Ex parte Yarbrough*, 110 U. S. 651; *Guinn v. United States*, 238 U. S. 347

Page 365 U. S. 171

I WAS DENIED MY guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment satisfies to that extent the requirement of R.S. § 1979. See *Douglas v. Jeannette*, 319 U. S. 157, 319 U. S. 161-162. So far, petitioners are on solid ground. For the guarantee against unreasonable searches and seizures contained in the Fourth Amendment has been made applicable to the States by reason of the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. *Wolf v. Colorado*, 338 U. S. 25; *Elkins v. United States*, 364 U. S. 206, 364 U. S. 213.

13. official's abuse of his position to give a remedy to parties deprived of constitutional rights, privileges and immunities by an official's abuse of his position. Cf. Williams v. United States, 341 U. S.

97 Ex Parte Virginia, 100 U. S. 339, 100 U. S. 346-347, that Congress has the power to enforce provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment against those who carry a badge of authority of a State and represent it in some capacity, whether they act in accordance with their authority or misuse it. And is a remedy to parties deprived of constitutional rights, privileges and immunities by an official's abuse of his position. Cf. Williams v. United States, 341 U. S. 97; Screws v. United States, 325 U. S. 91; United States v. Classic, 313 U. S. 299. We conclude that it did so intend.

15. I WAS DENIED EQUAL PROTECTION BY ALL PARTICIPANTS I FILED CHARGES "If the State combinations of men are allowed by the Executive to band together to deprive one class of citizens of their legal rights without a proper effort to discover, detect, and punish the violations of law and order, the State has not afforded to all its citizens the equal protection of the laws."

"This section gives to any person who may have been injured in any of his rights, privileges, or immunities of person or property a civil action for damages against the wrongdoer in the Federal courts. The offenses committed against him may be the common violations of the municipal law of his State. It DOES give rise to numerous vexations and outrageous prosecutions, inspired by mere mercenary considerations, prosecuted in a spirit of plunder, aided by the crimes of perjury and subornation of perjury, more reckless and dangerous to society than the alleged

16. Page 365 U. S. 181 ALL PARTICIPANTS I FILED CHARGES AGAINST ARE GUILTY OF CONSPIRACY TO DEFRAUD ME AND DEPRIVE ME OF MY OWN RIGHTS, perjury, subornation of perjury, criminal obstruction of legal process resistance of officers in discharge of official duty

Conspiracy ". . . perjury, subornation of perjury,

Ignored by Judge Smail and Attorney Whalen are guilty of

criminal obstruction of legal process REPEATEDLY, if one or more of the parties to said conspiracy or combination shall do

Page 365 U. S. 181

any act to effect the object thereof, all the parties to or engaged in said conspiracy or combination, whether principals or accessories, shall be deemed guilty of a felony. . . ."

But § 1 -- the section with which we are here concerned -- was not changed as respects any feature with which we are presently concerned. [Footnote 27] The words "under color of" law was in the legislation from the beginning to the end. The changes hailed by the opposition -- indeed, the history of the evolution of § 2 much relied upon now -- are utterly irrelevant to the problem before us, viz., the meaning of "under color of" law.

18.

Page 365 U. S. 184

JUDGE SMAIL, JUDGE SCHERER, MASTER MOORE AND MASTER ERIC BONONI ARE GUILTY OF THIS

"Misuse of power, possessed by virtue of state law and made possible only because the wrongdoer is clothed with the authority of state law, is action taken 'under color of' state law."

Id. 313 U. S. 326. There was a dissenting opinion, but the ruling as to the meaning of "under color of" state law was not questioned.

JUDGE SMAIL VIOLAED THE COLOR OF LAW

19. That view of the meaning of the words "under color of" state law, 18 U.S.C. § 242, was reaffirmed in *Screws v. United States*, supra, 325 U. S. 108-113. The acts they're complained of were committed by state officers in performance of their duties, viz., making an arrest effective. It was urged there, as it is here, that "under color of" state law should not be construed to duplicate in federal law what was an offense under state law. Id., (dissenting opinion) 325 U. S. 138-149, 325 U. S. 157-161. It was said there, as it is here, that the ruling in the *Classic* case as to the meaning of "under color of" state law was not in focus, and was ill advised. Id. (dissenting opinion), 325 U. S. 146-147. It was argued there, as it is here, that "under color of" state law included only action taken by

officials pursuant to state law. Id. (dissenting opinion), 325 U. S. 141-146. We rejected that view. Id., 325 U. S. 110-113 (concurring opinion), 325 U. S. 114-117. We stated:

"The construction given § 20 [18 U.S.C. § 242] in the Classic case formulated a rule of law which has become the basis of federal enforcement in this important field. The rule adopted in that case was formulated after mature consideration. It should be good for more than one day only.

The Court, however, ultimately rejected this expansion of the powers of Congress in *United States v. Morrison*. In *Morrison*, the Court invalidated a provision of the Violence Against Women Act that established a federal civil remedy for victims of gender-motivated violence.

JUDGE REFUSED TO RECUSE 3 TIMES IN MY CASE

The argument was made that there was a pervasive bias against victims of gender-motivated violence in state justice systems, and that the federal remedy would offset and deter this bias.

Judge Smail is Bias against women EVIDENCE OF THIS IS FOUND IN THE TRANSCRIPTS OF HIS PROCEEDINGS

ATTORNEY Whalen holding my annuities see rohrer no double dipping

The Superior Court held that "money included in an individual's income for the purpose of calculating support payments may not also be labeled as a marital asset subject to equitable distribution." Rohrer, at 465.

Attorney Whalen is guilty of this

§ 4113. Misapplication of entrusted property and property of government or financial institutions.

(a) Offense defined.--A person commits an offense if he applies or disposes of property that has been entrusted to him as a fiduciary, or property of the government or of a

financial institution, in a manner which he knows is unlawful and involves substantial risk of loss or detriment to the owner of the property or to a person for whose benefit the property was entrusted.

18 Pac's. § 1102(c) 13 4

the second degree if the amount involved exceeds \$50; otherwise it is a misdemeanor of the third degree.

Cross References. Section 4113 is referred to in section 5508.3 of Title 53 (Municipalities Generally); section 6017 of Title 64 (Public Authorities and Quasi-Public Corporations).

MASTER HENRY MOORE, JUDGE Christian Scherer, Judge Harry Smail special master Eric Bononi

§ 4953. Retaliation against witness, victim or party.

(a) Offense defined.--A person commits an offense if he harms another by any unlawful act or engages in a course of conduct or repeatedly commits act which threaten another in retaliation for anything lawfully done in the capacity of witness, victim or a party in a civil matter.

(b) Grading.--The offense is a felony of the third degree if the retaliation is accomplished by any of the means specified in