


JMOT
Agent for DEFENDANT SACHS
P.O. Box 2
Paron, AR 72122
(479) 317-1159
no fax number
kaustinsachs@gmail.com

Electronically Filed
10/14/2025 1:49 PM
Steven D. Grierson
CLERK OF THE COURT



**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA (A FOR-PROFIT CORPORATION)**

**THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Putative Plaintiff, Fictitious Plaintiff**

Vs.

**KIMBALL AUSTIN SACHS
Defendant**

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CASE NO. C-19-343540-2

DEPT NO. 8

**JOINDER TO OCTOBER 7 2025 EMERGENCY MOTION TO SET ASIDE OR MODIFY THE
NO-CONTACT ORDER**

PREFATORY STATEMENT OF NECESSITY & PROTECTION FROM SANCTIONS

I submit this Joinder **pro se** and under **urgent necessity**, despite the existence of court-appointed counsel, because that attorney, Mr. Jess Marchese, has repeatedly, in writing, refused to perform the ministerial act of filing this Joinder, a task that requires less than 10 minutes to complete. This refusal, supported by no legal justification, violates his active duties under Nevada law and governing ethical and procedural rules.

As detailed in **EXHIBIT G**, I made multiple formal, time-stamped, and well-documented demands (October 12, 13, and 14, 2025) to Mr. Marchese, instructing him to file this Joinder by specific deadlines. His response, delivered via email, was an explicit refusal to file anything on my behalf until the Court rules on his motion to withdraw. This position is legally untenable. He remains counsel of record as of the time of this filing and is therefore bound to act.

I also issued written and verbal notice to **Susan Bush**, Director of the Clark County Office of Appointed Counsel (OAC), who holds direct supervisory authority over Mr. Marchese and the conduct of all panel attorneys under Nevada Supreme Court Order ADKT 411. Despite being provided with a full record of the issue and its urgency, she has not intervened, responded, or taken any corrective action. Her failure to act constitutes administrative dereliction under her office's supervisory obligations.

I. CONTROLLING NEVADA LAW — DUTY OF COUNSEL TO ACT

Under **Nevada Supreme Court Order ADKT 411**, Section 4(1):

“Appointed counsel shall act diligently, competently, and promptly in representing the client’s legal interests until relieved by the court.”

Further, under the **Nevada Rules of Professional Conduct**:

- **Rule 1.1 (Competence)** – Requires adequate legal knowledge, skill, and preparation.
- **Rule 1.3 (Diligence)** – Requires reasonable and prompt action to protect the client’s interest.
- **Rule 1.4 (Communication)** – Requires timely communication with the client and compliance with reasonable requests for action.
- **Rule 1.7 (Conflict of Interest)** – Prohibits personal conflicts from impairing representation.

In **Crump v. Warden**, 113 Nev. 293, 934 P.2d 247, 255 (1997), the Nevada Supreme Court reaffirmed that representation by appointed counsel must be meaningful and effective, not merely symbolic or passive. A refusal to file a key pleading when counsel is still officially assigned is a dereliction of these binding duties.

II. FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO ACCESS THE COURTS

The **United States Supreme Court** has long held that the right of meaningful access to the courts is protected by the Constitution:

“The fundamental constitutional right of access to the courts requires prison authorities to assist inmates in the preparation and filing of meaningful legal papers...”
— *Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U.S. 817, 821 (1977)

Although *Bounds* addressed incarcerated individuals, the core principle applies broadly: **a litigant cannot be denied access to file critical materials**, especially when their attorney fails or refuses to act.

Moreover, in *Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806, 819 (1975), the Court held:

“The right to defend is personal. The defendant... must be allowed to make his own defense.”

Where counsel is failing to file evidence critical to a defense, the individual must be permitted to act. Likewise, in *McKaskle v. Wiggins*, 465 U.S. 168, 183–84 (1984), the Court prohibited any interference that “seriously undermines” the core of a defendant’s personal control over his case.

III. PROHIBITION AGAINST SANCTIONS IN THIS CONTEXT

I submit this Joinder with a full record of:

- Documented good faith attempts to have appointed counsel file on my behalf;
- Written refusals by counsel;
- Silence from the supervisory authority (OAC Director);

- Medical urgency and pending hearing deadlines;
- Supporting expert medical evidence and third-party declarations;
- Impending irreparable harm to my son.

I therefore assert that any effort to **strike, disregard, or sanction** this Joinder would violate my due process rights, my right to participate in my own defense, and my constitutional right of access to the courts, especially given that my filing was made only after **exhausting all lawful alternatives** and only to **preserve the integrity of the record** for the October 20, 2025 hearing.

I respectfully request that this Court accept this filing into the record, take judicial notice of the documented misconduct and obstruction by Mr. Marchese and the OAC, and ensure that my legal arguments and the attached expert documentation be given full and fair consideration under the law.

Kimball Austin Sachs, AGENT for DEFENDANT SACHS and stepfather of Yichen Liu aka Eason, respectfully joins in the EMERGENCY MOTION TO SET ASIDE OR MODIFY THE NO-CONTACT ORDER filed by my wife through her counsel, Mr. Shetler. This joinder is submitted in full support of the immediate vacation of the unlawful sealed September 18, 2025, no-contact order, which is legally baseless, constitutionally infirm, and a grave injustice inflicted upon this family.

INTRODUCTION

1. This Court and the District Attorney have repeatedly and willfully ignored controlling facts, deliberately disregarded expert medical testimony, and based their rulings on omissions, misleading statements, and false narratives portraying us, the innocent parents, as a danger to our own son, an absurd and baseless claim. Their ongoing enforcement of the no-contact order, which separates a devoted parent from his son, constitutes cruel and unusual punishment under the law and the U.S. Constitution.

This joinder demands this Court immediately reverse course, vacate the no-contact order, and cease this unprecedented assault on parental rights, fairness, and justice.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

MEDICAL HISTORY AND EXPERT FINDINGS

2. The medical saga that birthed this case began in January 2019 when Yichen Liu (hereafter “Eason”) suffered a severe neurological event, triggered by ingestion of food containing MSG, as documented in the attached expert report by Dr. Richard C. Semelka, M.D., dated January 13, 2025 (**EXHIBIT A**). Dr. Semelka is a world-renowned authority on radiology and gadolinium toxicity, ranked in the top 0.05% of scholars worldwide in his field.

Contrary to the false and malicious allegations of abuse or neglect persistently peddled by prosecutor Rinetti, Dr. Semelka’s report unequivocally states:

“At all times, the welfare of Eason has been central to Mr. Sachs’s and Ms. Zhang’s efforts. Their choice to pursue integrative medical care and a holistic diet was, in my expert opinion, the better strategy for Eason’s complex immunological condition.”

The report meticulously dismantles every claim of neglect or abuse, revealing instead a family fighting tirelessly for their son’s health against both medical and legal adversaries.

JURISDICTION AND RESIDENCE

3. Since 2021, Eason has lived and attended school in Arkansas, fully outside the jurisdiction of Nevada courts. A Christian Academy Administrator (Ola Christian Academy) and Head of School (Legacy Christian Academy) have provided character references (**EXHIBITS B and C**), affirming the stable, nurturing environment provided by us, the parents.

These letters, written by mandatory reporters with years of direct, daily observation of Eason and our parenting, make clear that there has never been any evidence, suspicion, or incident suggesting we are a threat to our child in any way. The State’s continuing attempt to justify its illegal assertion of jurisdiction by insinuating danger or unfitness is not only completely refuted by these firsthand reports but also offensive in light of our documented medical efforts and consistent parental involvement. The narrative pushed by the prosecution is a provable falsehood, and the Court’s willingness to entertain such fiction, despite overwhelming contrary evidence, further illustrates that this proceeding is legally defective and morally bankrupt.

Nonetheless, this Court continues to assert unlawful jurisdiction and maintain the no-contact order, flagrantly violating the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (UCCJEA), codified in NRS § 125A.305 et seq., which mandates exclusive jurisdiction lies with the child’s “home state.”

Pursuant to NRS § 125A.085, the “home state” is defined as:

1. The state in which a child lived with a parent or a person acting as a parent for at least 6 consecutive months, including any temporary absence from the state, immediately before the commencement of a child custody proceeding.

Eason has lived in Arkansas for well over three years. Accordingly, under NRS § 125A.085, Arkansas, not Nevada, is his legal home state.

The relevant portion of NRS § 125A.305 (Initial Child Custody Jurisdiction) further confirms:

1. Except as otherwise provided in NRS 125A.335, a court of this State has jurisdiction to make an initial child custody determination only if:

(a) This State is the home state of the child on the date of the commencement of the proceeding or was the home state of the child within 6 months before the commencement of the proceeding...

That statutory requirement is not met here, as Nevada has not been Eason’s home state for over six years. As such, this Court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction to issue or maintain any orders, including the no-contact order, involving Eason.

Continuing to assert jurisdiction in clear violation of these binding statutes is not just legally unsupportable, it is unconstitutional and actionable.

The Court's refusal to yield jurisdiction constitutes a clear ultra vires act, i.e., an exercise of authority entirely outside the boundaries of the law. It is well-established that judicial immunity does not protect judges acting in the absence of jurisdiction (see *Stump v. Sparkman*, 435 U.S. 349 (1978)).

Furthermore, the continued interference with the constitutional right to parent (see *Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U.S. 57 (2000)) in the absence of jurisdiction amounts to a colorable civil rights violation under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, exposing all actors involved to personal liability, regardless of their official title or claimed immunity.

To persist in enforcing a custody-related order from a state that no longer possesses legal authority over the child is not only a legal nullity, it is a willful abuse of power, and the record shall so reflect.

To further eliminate any room for judicial evasion or prosecutorial misrepresentation, we clarify that we, the parents, have also been bona fide residents of Arkansas since 2020. The UCCJEA and corresponding provisions of NRS Chapter 125A make clear that jurisdiction follows the child's home state and the residency of the parents or guardians, not the whims of a Nevada court that refuses to relinquish control. This Court's attempt to continue asserting authority over custody matters affecting Arkansas residents, long after all involved parties permanently relocated, is a textbook jurisdictional overreach. No interpretation of law, no matter how tortured, can convert a Nevada court into a de facto Arkansas authority. To be absolutely clear: Nevada has no jurisdiction over our child, no jurisdiction over us, the parents, and therefore no jurisdiction over this matter. Any further judicial action taken under the false pretense of authority will be viewed as a willful constitutional violation and responded to accordingly through all available legal remedies, both state and federal.

NOTE: FRAUD UPON THIS COURT AND ITS DEVASTATING CONSEQUENCES TIED TO THE UNLAWFUL SEALED NO CONTACT ORDER:

4. While a separate filing will formally document these matters, it is essential to emphasize the following irrefutable facts, some of which were provided in my wife's affidavit, that my former court-appointed counsel, Mr. Charles Goodwin, refused to file my affidavit (**EXHIBIT D**):

The September 8, 2025 hearing stands as an abomination of brazen fraud upon this court. Prosecutor Rinetti, who, along with every officer of this court, is deemed to know the law, misled the court into believing that we, the parents, had violated a "no-contact order." In reality, the document in question was nothing more than the original 2019 summons, which is not a court order, bearing an unauthorized handwritten note stating "no contact with the named victim." That notation was rendered void by the enactment of NRS 178.4845 (2021).

This one deliberate falsehood was then embraced by the presiding judge, who, without verifying any such order and without due process, announced she was issuing bench warrants. Those warrants were fraudulent on their face. As a result, my wife and I were instantly treated as fugitives by state actors who have no excuse for such brazen ignorance of the very laws they are sworn to uphold.

This proceeding bore all the hallmarks of a kangaroo court, undermining every principle of fairness and due process. My wife and I were forced to endure nine agonizing days waiting for justice while the fraudulent warrants were eventually quashed. During that time, we were compelled, against our will and out of fear for our child's safety, to place our son on a plane back to China to protect him from the overreach of Child Protective Services, which has shown itself to function as a state-sponsored child-seizure apparatus rather than a protector of families.

We suffered severe emotional and financial damage as a result of this cascade of legal fraud. The injury did not end there. On September 26, 2025, we were wrongfully detained for over three hours by local law enforcement in Arkansas, who claimed there were “outstanding warrants” despite those warrants having been formally quashed on September 17, 2025 by judge Peterson’s own admission (during the October 1, 2025 hearing) on the court record that her law clerk quashed the warrants after this hearing.

To date, no one has explained how this miscarriage of justice could have occurred. But the truth will come to light, and every person responsible for this unconscionable chain of misconduct will be held fully accountable under the law especially prosecutor Rinetti who instigated this entire FRAUD.

CLEAR PATTERN OF RAMPANT MISCONDUCT/FRAUD ON DISPLAY DURING THE SEPTEMBER 17 2025 HEARING TO QUASH FRAUDULENT BENCH WARRANTS TIED TO THE UNLAWFUL SEALED NO CONTACT ORDERS (EXCERPTS):

5. Judge Jessica Peterson:

“Your client just took it upon themselves and yours as well Mr. Shetler to do whatever they wanted to do with no regard to the orders that has been entered by this court.”

Judge Peterson’s statement presumes the existence of a valid court order barring contact, despite the fact that no such order was ever lawfully signed, filed, noticed, or served on us. This presumption is not supported by the court record and directly violates due process rights under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution, and Article 1, Section 8 of the Nevada Constitution, both of which require fair notice and the opportunity to be heard before any deprivation of liberty or fundamental rights, such as the right to familial association.

Her reliance on an implied or nonexistent order to justify subsequent judicial actions, including the issuance of fraudulent bench warrants, amounts to a gross abuse of discretion and an arbitrary exercise of power. These warrants were not supported by factual or legal grounds, but were rather instigated by false claims and misrepresentations by Prosecutor Rinetti, and thus are unlawful on their face.

Such conduct violates NRS 178.4845, which mandates that no-contact orders as a condition of pretrial release must be explicitly stated, renewed every 120 days, and based on a valid legal foundation. There was no such lawful basis here. The judge’s action further breaches the Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct, particularly Rule 2.2 (requiring judges to uphold and apply the law fairly and impartially) and Rule 2.5(A) (requiring judges to perform judicial duties competently and diligently). Judicial rulings must be grounded in actual law and fact, not assumptions or unverified claims by prosecutors or third parties.

By issuing bench warrants based on an implied order that never lawfully existed, Judge Peterson committed a serious due process violation and failed in her constitutional and ethical obligations, warranting serious scrutiny, reversal of the resulting orders, and confirmation of the need for judicial disqualification.

6. Mr Charles Goodwin (court-appointed attorney for Mr. Sachs):

“It takes digging to find any kind of no contact order. It’s not really listed anywhere. And on the summons it’s handwritten in so we don’t actually, that’s what’s confusing about the whole entire situation.”

Goodwin's own statement, that "it takes digging to find any kind of no contact order" and that the restriction was merely handwritten on a summons, confirms that no valid, formal court order was ever issued against my wife or I. Under Nevada law, such informal notations are not legally enforceable.

Nowhere in Nevada law is a handwritten notation on a summons recognized as a valid substitute for a formal court order. To the contrary, Nevada law requires that all enforceable orders, including no-contact provisions, be issued by judicial authority, reduced to writing, signed by the judge, and entered into the court record (see NRS 178.484, governing conditions of release in criminal cases, and NRCP 58(c), which defines when an order is considered entered). A notation that does not meet these procedural requirements, such as a handwritten remark on a summons without a signed, filed, and properly noticed order, is, by definition, not legally enforceable under Nevada law.

Furthermore, NRS 178.4845 requires that any no-contact condition be explicitly ordered by the court and supported by specific findings. Despite acknowledging the absence of a proper order, Goodwin failed to take necessary legal action to challenge its validity or to protect his client from its enforcement. This failure constitutes a violation of my constitutional right to effective assistance of counsel under *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 68 (1984), as Goodwin's performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness and led to prejudicial consequences, particularly where liberty or familial integrity was at stake. Goodwin's inaction also enabled a violation of procedural due process, as courts cannot impose liberty-restricting conditions without a clear, written, and properly served order, requirements grounded in Nevada procedural law, including NRCP Rules 5 and 58, as well as established constitutional protections. Furthermore, Goodwin's conduct appears to breach multiple provisions of the Nevada Rules of Professional Conduct, including Rule 1.1 (Competence), Rule 1.3 (Diligence), and potentially Rule 8.4(d) (Misconduct), by allowing unlawful judicial action to proceed without objection. The correct authority lies in the Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure and general due process doctrine. In sum, Goodwin's failure to act on a known procedural defect enabled unlawful enforcement against his client and violated both ethical duties and fundamental constitutional rights.

7. Judge Jessica Peterson:

"It's not lost on this court that your client thinks that he can do things whichever way he wants and that there are not going to be consequences."

This statement shows clear judicial bias and violates Canon 2.2 (impartiality) and Canon 2.3(B) (bias, prejudice, and harassment) of the Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct. It reveals prejudgment of the party's intent and unlawfully imputes motive without due process or evidentiary findings. The U.S. Supreme Court has held that judicial neutrality is essential to due process (see *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S. 868 (2009)). The judge's expression of personal disapproval, rather than applying legal standards to facts, also violates NCJC Rule 2.6(A), which guarantees every litigant the right to be heard with respect and neutrality. Such remarks undermine public confidence in judicial integrity (Canon 1.2).

8. Judge Jessica Peterson:

"Previously Mr. Shetler brought a motion to change the conditions of the release so that Ms. Zhang could have her passport back ... the court granted that. Maybe had your client done the same thing ... we could have had argument ... But that was never brought to this court."*

*NOTE: Despite Judge Peterson's statement on the record claiming that she previously granted a motion allowing my wife to retrieve her passport, there is no written order in existence, nor any oral ruling reflected in any transcript, that ever authorized such relief. Even my wife's own court-appointed counsel, Mr Shelter, confirmed during this same hearing that my wife did not get her passport back from this court. This judge's inability to accurately recall or document her own rulings, especially when they concern restrictions on liberty and property, undermines the integrity of the judicial process and subjects affected individuals to extrajudicial restraints not grounded in law or procedure.

Here, the judge shifts the burden onto the defendants to seek clarification or modification of a release condition that did not exist in enforceable form. This is improper. Courts cannot enforce "implied" or informal conditions, especially when the right at stake is constitutionally protected (parental custody/contact). Imposing punishment for failure to seek relief from a non-existent order violates both procedural due process and NRS Chapter 178 which governs release conditions. The judge's logic defies NRS 178.4845(4) which limits no-contact orders to 120 days unless properly extended and reviewed. Judicial burden-shifting here also violates the right to fair notice and is contrary to the Nevada Supreme Court's guidance on enforcing ambiguous or unentered orders.

Under Nevada law, as established in *Millen v. Eighth Judicial District Court*, 148 P. 3d 694 - Nev: Supreme Court 2006, a court's oral pronouncement from the bench, a clerk's minute entry, or an unfiled written order are generally ineffective for any purpose, unless they concern purely administrative or emergency matters. Because the purported no-contact restriction here was never reduced to a signed, filed, written order, enforcing it would amount to unconstitutional judicial burden shifting, depriving the parties of fair notice and due process.

9. Judge Jessica Peterson:

"I don't think that anybody is arguing that he was being abused, Mr. Goodwin."

This statement is contradictory to the very basis of the criminal charges and appears to acknowledge there was no abuse, undermining any justification for a no-contact provision. If the court itself recognizes the absence of abuse, continued enforcement of a no-contact rule constitutes judicial overreach, a violation of constitutional rights to family integrity (*Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U.S. 57 (2000)), and malicious prosecution. Moreover, continuing to uphold the threat of a bench warrant or criminal prosecution under such circumstances would violate *Brady v. Maryland* by withholding or ignoring exculpatory material. It may also constitute prosecutorial misconduct if the DA misrepresented facts to obtain the initial conditions which is certainly the case here.

10. Judge Jessica Peterson:

"It's my understanding based on what has been provided in the motion to quash the bench warrant that the child has been returned to the father."*

*NOTE: Referring to the biological father in China.

This statement admits reliance on secondhand or unofficial information rather than proper evidentiary findings or testimony. Judicial findings must be based on evidence properly entered into the record, not "understandings." Ruling based on assumption violates Rule 2.9(A) of the

NCJC (prohibiting ex parte or extrajudicial sources of information), as well as due process rights.

11. Judge Jessica Peterson:

"You're telling me, are you literally sitting there ... telling me right now with a straight face that your clients ... did not know based on CPS ... that they were not disallowed from having contact with that minor."*

*NOTE: Judge Peterson directed this statement at Mr. Goodwin, who was, as plainly visible in the publicly available court footage (see *Our Nevada Judges*, September 17, 2025 hearing on YouTube), standing, not sitting. While this may seem trivial, it is emblematic of a larger pattern: a judicial officer unable to accurately describe what is occurring directly before her, let alone apply the governing Nevada Revised Statutes with the clarity and precision her position demands. Such repeated factual and legal misstatements undermine the credibility of the court and further expose its decisions to rightful scrutiny.

This statement presumes as fact that the clients "did not know" of a prohibition on contact, without any factual or evidentiary support, and imputes motive or willful ignorance, in effect prejudging the defense. That violates judicial impartiality under Rule 2.2 of the Revised Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct (a judge must perform duties impartially, without bias), and Rule 2.3 (Bias, Prejudice, Harassment) by manifesting a hostile attitude. It also violates the parties' due process right (U.S. and Nevada Constitutions) by shifting credibility burdens without a hearing, undermining the presumption of innocence and fair hearing. Further, by treating an alleged nondisclosure as a basis for judicial action without first establishing a valid, enforceable, lawful order, the court contravenes NRS 178.4845 (which prescribes how no-contact orders must be imposed), and basic principles of notice and clarity in criminal procedure (you cannot punish for violating an order that was never validly entered, filed, served, or clear).

12. Mr. Goodwin (defense counsel):

"I'm trying to say that the legal mechanism for them to not have contact is murky."

This admission underscores that there was no clear, valid, enforceable order restricting contact, which means any enforcement is based on ambiguity rather than lawful command. Enforcing or sanctioning on that basis violates due process (void-for-vagueness doctrine), *Grayned v. City of Rockford* principles, and criminal procedure norms requiring clarity in restrictions. It also highlights ineffective assistance of counsel since Goodwin failed to research or identify legal authority or challenge the prosecutor/judge, which raises Sixth Amendment issues. It also confirms a violation of Nevada Rules of Professional Conduct since counsel failed in the duty to research and advise properly.

13. Mr. Goodwin (defense counsel):

"I have no idea what happened in the CPS hearing ... I don't even know if this CPS record was substantiated because I haven't seen documents."

This statement admits counsel's failure to obtain or review foundational evidence (CPS records) relevant to the charges and contact restriction, which amounts to a lack of due diligence and ineffective assistance of counsel under the Sixth Amendment and Nevada state equivalents. It also reflects a breakdown in the adversarial process, which undermines equal protection and fairness.

14. Mr. Goodwin (defense counsel):

"What I do understand is that there was an order that was written on the summons but ... going through the docket ... I did not once see ... a clear no contact order."

This confirms that the "order" was a handwritten notation on a summons, not a signed, filed, served judicial order, which cannot be lawfully enforced under Nevada procedure. Enforcing it by bench warrant or contempt violates the requirement that orders be clear, reduced to writing, docketed, served, and properly entered. It violates NRS 178.4845, judicial procedure governing no contact provisions, and the fundamental fairness guarantee (due process) forbidding punishment for violation of an unclear or nonexistent order.

15. Judge Jessica Peterson:

"We have ... hearings ... where it was specifically stated on the record ... no contact with the victim in this case."

This statement attempts to rely on oral pronouncements from prior hearings, even if not reduced to a written order, to justify enforcement. That is legally deficient because oral statements on the record do not replace a properly entered, filed, served, clear order in criminal procedure. Enforcement based on those remarks violates due process, transparency, and clarity requirements (a party must have notice of the precise command). It further violates the judge's duty under Code of Judicial Conduct Rule 2.5 (competence, diligence, preparation) by failing to ensure the record and orders are clear and properly memorialized.

16. Judge Jessica Peterson:

"I don't have them in front of me right now."

By admitting lack of preparation and inability to locate relevant hearing records, Judge Peterson violated Rule 2.5(A) (Competence, Diligence, and Cooperation) of the Revised Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct, because a judge must perform duties competently and diligently. Her failure to have essential documents ready also undermines the duty to efficiently adjudicate and afford the parties fair process (due process under U.S. and Nevada Constitutions). The statement reflects disregard for court procedure and recordkeeping requirements, and breaches her judicial oath to administer justice faithfully.

17. Judge Jessica Peterson:

"I did see them so that I can make that representation on the record that I did in fact see 3 different minute, um, from hearings ... and I'm sure that Rem ... could probably find those before the end ..."

By relying on an off-record representation and delegating to her executive assistant to locate records (rather than ensuring the records were already in the court files), Judge Peterson engaged in behavior that undermines judicial transparency, integrity, and impartiality (Canon 1 and Rule 1.2) of the Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct. This also implicates impropriety in judicial administration, because the judge effectively placed the burden on staff rather than abiding by her obligation to maintain orderly records. Further, it suggests arbitrary reliance on unreliable memory or staff, which can compromise due process and equal protection.

18. Judge Jessica Peterson:

“Contrary to Mr Sachs’s statement that a no contact order cannot extend for more than 120 days it CAN when it is a condition of a release on bail.”

By asserting that a no-contact order may be extended indefinitely when tied to bail, Judge Peterson misstates the controlling statute NRS 178.4845, which requires that no-contact conditions expire after 120 days unless renewed by a new signed court order. Enforcing or extending a nonexistent or expired restriction violates due process, the rule of law, and the statutory mandate. This misstatement is also a misuse of her judicial authority, conflicting with Rule 1.1 (Compliance with the Law) and Rule 2.5 (competence and diligence) of the Code of Judicial Conduct. By proceeding on that erroneous basis, the court commits fraud on the court, abuse of discretion, and violates the parents’ constitutional rights to familial association and fair hearing.

19. Mr. Goodwin (defense counsel):

“The ones that I was able to see ... were not ones that he would have been actively present and admonished personally by the judge.”

By admitting the hearings he located did not involve the defendant being personally admonished, Mr. Goodwin underscores that no formal no-contact order was ever entered or served against his client in those hearings. This means any enforcement or contempt claims are void, since procedural requirements (proper entry, service, signature) were never satisfied. That implicates due process violations, void-for-vagueness doctrine, ineffective assistance of counsel (for failing to locate or challenge proper order), and court rule violations concerning order enforcement.

20. Mr. Goodwin (defense counsel):

“I’m not sure if the summons was sent directly to him ... or if he ever received it ... if he were told by their attorney at the time ... whether or not they received that summons ... it’s not in any official order.”

By acknowledging uncertainty about whether the defendant ever received the summons or knew of the purported “no contact” notation, Goodwin highlights lack of notice, lack of legal enforceability, and confirms that the “order” was never incorporated into the official docket. That triggers violations of due process, notice and service requirements, and criminal procedural norms forbidding punishment without proper notice. It also raises ineffective assistance of counsel issues, because his own client’s defense is jeopardized by lack of clarity and awareness.

21. Judge Jessica Peterson:

“So, on September 25th ... that’s the grand jury indictment.”

By conflating or confusing a grand jury indictment with a no-contact judicial order, Judge Peterson demonstrates a fundamental misunderstanding of criminal procedure, namely, that an indictment is not a no-contact order, but used it as supposed proof of a restriction. That mischaracterization violates Rule 2.5(A) (competence), Rule 1.1 (compliance with law), and undermines the rule of law. It also suggests judicial arbitrariness or capricious reasoning, which is contrary to due process and proper judicial analysis.

22. Judge Jessica Peterson:

“There is only one. ... contrary to Mr Sachs’s statement ... it CAN ... when it is a condition of a release on bail ...”

By vacillating and giving contradictory or shifting rationales about whether a no-contact condition could or could not persist, Judge Peterson is acting without consistency or legal grounding, violating Rule 2.5 (diligence, coherence, preparation) and Rule 2.2 (impartiality, fairness). Her inconsistent statements reveal lack of reasoned decision-making, which is incompatible with due process and the judicial oath to decide matters based on law and fact.

23. Mr Goodwin (defense counsel):

“Your honor, that, um, specific statute that’s being referenced is actually referring to no contact orders as a condition of bail.”

Mr. Goodwin accurately referenced NRS 178.4845, which governs the imposition and renewal of no-contact orders as conditions of pretrial release, including mandatory expiration every 120 days unless renewed by a court via written order. This demonstrates the court’s failure to comply with this statutory mechanism. The judge’s disregard of this statute violates the supremacy of duly enacted law under the Nevada Constitution (Art. 4, §1) and U.S. Constitution (Supremacy Clause), and the obligation of all officers of the court to follow controlling law. Additionally, it reveals systemic prosecutorial misconduct for failing to disclose that no valid, renewed, or filed order existed, a clear Brady violation, given the due process implications of enforcing an unrenewed or non-existent restriction.

24. Judge Jessica Peterson:

“Well, the court can extend it past that timeframe.”

This statement constitutes a clear misstatement of law and an act of judicial overreach, as the court cannot unilaterally extend a no-contact condition that was never lawfully entered, filed, or served, let alone renewed as required under NRS 178.4845. No-contact orders under this statute expire every 120 days unless a new written, signed order is issued after hearing. Further, her assertion demonstrates either willful ignorance or contempt for binding statutory law, violating Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct Rules 1.1 (compliance with the law), 2.2 (impartiality), 2.5(A) (competence and diligence). The judge also violated her oath of office under NRS 282.020, which requires all judicial officers to uphold both the U.S. and Nevada Constitutions and the laws of Nevada.

25. Mr. Goodwin (defense counsel):

“That’s correct your honor, however, uh, I believe that according to the statutory language it has to be renewed by the court every 120 days with a new order signed.”

Here, Mr. Goodwin reiterates what is clearly stated in NRS 178.4845(4): that any no-contact condition not explicitly renewed every 120 days by signed order is automatically extinguished. The court’s continued enforcement of such an expired or phantom condition violates the defendant’s right to due process (U.S. Const. Amend. V & XIV; Nev. Const. Art. I, §8) and makes any resulting arrest, bench warrant, or charge based on “violation” of the nonexistent order void ab initio. Goodwin’s statement, while accurate, further highlights the court’s noncompliance with controlling law.

26. Prosecutor Dena Rinetti:

“And that statute was is a new statute did not apply back.”

Prosecutor Dena Rinetti’s statement, “And that statute was is a new statute did not apply back,” even when interpreted in the most charitable light, that she meant NRS 178.4845 cannot be applied retroactively to conduct occurring before its October 1, 2021 effective date, is still grossly misleading and legally deficient in the context of this case. The underlying and dispositive truth is this: *there was never a valid no-contact order in place against either parent at any point in 2025*. Therefore, any assertion by prosecutor Rinetti that we were in violation of such an order, especially her instigation of our arrests and the subsequent cascade of punitive legal actions, was premised on a provable legal falsehood. Her conduct was not the result of a misunderstanding of statutory applicability, but rather a deliberate misrepresentation to the Court about the existence and enforceability of an order that never lawfully existed in the first place.

Rinetti’s attempt to shield her misconduct behind statutory timing only further reveals the prosecutorial gamesmanship at play. Even if NRS 178.4845 does not apply retroactively to conduct prior to its enactment, her September 8, 2025 courtroom actions occurred *years after* its adoption, and her interpretation of the statute as wholly irrelevant to this case is legally untenable. Moreover, her knowing misuse of a non-existent no-contact order to trigger bench warrants, interfere with parental rights, and influence judicial proceedings rises to the level of actionable misconduct. It violates Nevada Rules of Professional Conduct (NRPC) 3.3(a)(1), which prohibits knowingly making false statements of fact or law to the tribunal, and 3.3(a)(3), which requires prompt correction of falsehoods once discovered. It further breaches NRPC 3.8, which governs prosecutorial conduct and mandates that prosecutors act in the interest of justice rather than engage in wrongful prosecutions.

In addition, prosecutor Rinetti’s failure to disclose the non-existence of a valid no-contact order constitutes a Brady violation, as this is evidence favorable to the defense that directly undermines the prosecution’s theory and would have dramatically altered the legal landscape had it been candidly acknowledged. Her conduct also gives rise to constitutional due process and equal protection violations, as we were deprived of liberty interests, including familial association and parental decision-making, based on false pretenses. Lastly, her behavior opens the door to personal civil rights liability under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, as prosecutors who knowingly fabricate or facilitate unlawful deprivations under color of law are not shielded by immunity when acting outside the bounds of their authority.

In short, whether one interprets her comment narrowly or broadly, it cannot justify or excuse her initiation of judicial and law enforcement actions based on a fictitious legal instrument. The entirety of the bench warrants were built upon the supposed violation of a no-contact order that is fundamentally fraudulent. The prosecutor’s role in orchestrating this fiction, particularly as the original instigator of the September 8, 2025 hearing that set it all in motion, is now documented as a central and disqualifying abuse of power. Let the record reflect that this prosecution rests on falsehoods, not facts, and its perpetuation is a stain on the integrity of this court.

27. Judge Jessica Peterson:

“At the end of the day it doesn’t change the court’s analysis ... if something’s murky you don’t just take matters into your own hands.”

This reasoning constitutes a due process violation because it punishes the defendant for allegedly violating a restriction that was, by the court’s own admission, “murky”, i.e., not clearly defined or legally enforceable. This violates the void-for-vagueness doctrine under *Grayned v.*

City of Rockford, 408 U.S. 104 (1972), which prohibits punishment under unclear legal standards. It also reflects an abuse of judicial discretion, as the court admits ambiguity yet continues enforcement, ignoring that ambiguity in criminal law must be resolved in favor of the defendant (*Rule of Lenity*). Further, it violates NRS 178.4845, which sets clear procedural conditions that were not followed. The failure to provide proper notice, a hearing, and a valid written order also violates U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; Nev. Const. Art. I, §8(2).

28. Judge Jessica Peterson:

“Essentially ... if CPS had a separate order ... then he’s in violation of that CPS order.”

This statement is legally absurd and shows profound misunderstanding of Nevada family and juvenile law. Child Protective Services (CPS) cannot issue binding legal orders. Only a juvenile court judge may issue enforceable orders regarding custody, removal, or placement. As such, referring to a “CPS order” as though it has legal force is a judicial error of law and misleads all parties. It violates NCJC Rule 2.5(A) (competence), and if used to justify a bench warrant or continued prosecution, it amounts to a fraud upon the court. No person can be held in contempt or arrested for violating something that is not a lawful order.

29. Judge Jessica Peterson:

“There was at least enough here for the court to issue the warrant ... as to being in violation of the release conditions.”

This statement is an unlawful post hoc justification for the issuance of a bench warrant, without identifying any clear, written, docketed, served court order that had been violated. A court may not lawfully issue a warrant based on assumed, ambiguous, or nonexistent orders, particularly when the statutory and constitutional rights to notice and hearing have not been respected. Issuance of the warrant in this context violated NRS 178.4845, NRS 171.106, and the Nevada Supreme Court’s standards for contempt or bail condition enforcement. It also offends due process, the presumption of innocence, and rights to family integrity under *Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U.S. 57 (2000). Such action may also rise to the level of judicial misconduct under NCJC Rules 1.1, 2.2, and 2.5, and an abuse of discretion sufficient to vacate the order and suppress any derivative proceedings.

30. Judge Jessica Peterson:

“Here’s the only problem. The bond at this point has been forfeited.”

Judge Jessica Peterson’s statement, “Here’s the only problem. The bond at this point has been forfeited.”, is a materially false assertion made without any supporting record, filing, or verified judicial finding. The pronouncement of a “bond forfeiture” where none has occurred constitutes a clear violation of due process under both the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and Article I, § 8 of the Nevada Constitution, which prohibit the deprivation of liberty or property without lawful procedure and factual substantiation.

The statement further violates Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct Rule 2.5(A), which mandates that “a judge shall perform judicial and administrative duties competently and diligently.” By announcing a legal consequence that had not occurred and that was later contradicted on the record through the court’s remote Zoom chat by the falsely accused, Judge Peterson demonstrated a reckless disregard for accuracy, procedural integrity, and the rights of the defendants. Her baseless declaration, made without consulting the clerk’s docket, the bond company, or any formal order, amounts to judicial misrepresentation, which rises to the level of

fraud upon the court, as defined in *Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.*, 322 U.S. 238 (1944).

Moreover, such conduct violates Rule 1.1 (Compliance with the Law) and Rule 1.2 (Promoting Confidence in the Judiciary) of the Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct, as a reasonable observer would view this reckless misstatement as evidence of bias, incompetence, or gross negligence. A judge's solemn oath of office requires adherence to truth and fairness; to assert a forfeiture that did not exist is to breach that oath and to act "in the clear absence of jurisdiction," a circumstance where judicial immunity does apply under *Stump v. Sparkman*, 435 U.S. 349 (1978).

This episode is not an isolated lapse but part of a well-documented pattern of chronic factual misrepresentations by Judge Peterson dating back to her assignment to this case in January 2024. Repeated instances of demonstrable falsehoods, including her fabrication of nonexistent CPS orders and citation of nonexistent statutes, have rendered her incapable of impartial adjudication. Such misconduct satisfies the criteria for judicial disqualification under NRS 1.235(1)(a) (personal bias or prejudice) and NRS 1.230 (failure to perform judicial duties with fidelity and integrity).

That we, the falsely accused parents, have sought justified disqualification three separate times of this sitting judge based on obvious and overt bias of judge Peterson, only to have Chief Judge Jerry Wiese deny those motions through contradictory and selective citation of case law, a form of procedural abuse commonly referred to as lawfare, compounds the due-process violations and reveals systemic corruption within the Eighth Judicial District Court. When a supervising judge shields a subordinate judge's misconduct through manipulation of precedent, the judiciary ceases to function as a neutral arbiter and instead becomes a racketeering enterprise under color of law, consistent with the elements of a RICO violation (18 U.S.C. § 1961 et seq.): namely, a pattern of racketeering activity (fraud, deprivation of rights under color of law, and obstruction of justice) committed by individuals within a judicial institution.

In short, Judge Peterson's reckless and false pronouncement that "the bond... has been forfeited" is not merely a procedural error, it is a symptom of judicial rot, demonstrating contempt for due process, factual truth, and the very notion of lawful authority. This court's continued tolerance of such misconduct further confirms the necessity for higher intervention and disciplinary review, as the integrity of the proceedings has been irreparably compromised. This now amounts to a RICO operation and shall not go unchecked.

31. Judge Jessica Peterson:

"I know that he was out on bond but ... the second that we issued the bench warrant that bond got quashed or the bond got forfeited."

By presenting contradictory versions, that the bond was forfeited after a bench warrant, without record support, the judge demonstrates procedural confusion, lack of record transparency, and arbitrary reasoning, violating judicial impartiality (Rule 2.2) and competence (Rule 2.5), and undermines public confidence in the judiciary (Canon 1). Pursuing enforcement based on conflicting or unsupported factual assumptions also threatens due process and the presumption of innocence by treating the defendant as though guilt or default has been conclusively established without proper hearing or proof.

32. Judge Jessica Peterson:

"She must have it [the passport] because supposedly she went back to China."

Judge Peterson's statement, "She must have it [the passport] because supposedly she went back to China", reflects an impermissible presumption of fact made without any evidentiary basis. At no point has this court issued a written order releasing my wife's passport, nor is there any entry in the record to support that it was ever returned to her. In fact, my wife's own court-appointed attorney, Mr. Shetler, clarified during the same hearing that she had not received her passport back from the court. Despite this, the judge proceeded to rely on an unsupported assumption to imply wrongdoing, effectively substituting speculation for fact. This constitutes a violation of the fundamental principles of due process and the right to an impartial tribunal, as enshrined in both the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution, as well as Article 1, Section 8 of the Nevada Constitution. Furthermore, this conduct directly violates Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct Rule 2.2 (impartiality and fairness) and Rule 2.5(A) (competence, diligence, and bias avoidance), both of which mandate that judges base decisions only on proper evidence and legal procedure, not on assumption or rumor. The judge's repeated factual misrepresentations and false assumptions, particularly after being on notice via prior sworn filings accusing her of dishonesty, rise to the level of judicial misconduct, demonstrate a disqualifying bias, and substantiate a pattern of chronic misrepresentation in favor of a prosecution that itself has shown repeated disregard for lawful procedure. This incident further confirms the need not only to vacate the unlawful no-contact order, but also to remove this judge from any further involvement in proceedings where her personal credibility is at issue and where impartiality can no longer be reasonably presumed.

33. Judge Jessica Peterson:

"To the extent that there is not a written order the same way that there would be in civil, that doesn't mean that your clients have not been admonished in open court that these are the conditions of their release."

This statement attempts to validate enforcement of a no-contact condition based purely on oral admonishments rather than a written, signed, docketed, and served order, which violates NRS 178.4845 (which requires clear written orders for no-contact conditions, with renewal every 120 days), the requirement of notice and clarity under due process, and the basic principle that oral statements cannot substitute for formally entered orders in criminal procedure. It also breaches judicial responsibility under Rule 1.1 (compliance with law) and Rule 2.5 (competence) by failing to adhere to procedural norms.

34. Judge Jessica Peterson:

"I need to do an actual order that says your clients are to have no contact with the minor. I will do so and I will have the state submit it and I will sign off on it and we can make it clear."

By conceding that no formal order yet exists and that she will "make it clear" only now, the judge admits that until that moment no enforceable order was in place, which means all prior enforcement was unlawful. This violates NRS 178.4845, due process, and the principle against retroactive orders or ex post facto restrictions. It also highlights the judge's previous failure of competence (Rule 2.5) and failure to respect procedural safeguards for imposing restrictions on fundamental family rights.

Furthermore, this statement is a judicial admission that, up to that point, no formal no-contact order existed. Her declaration that she "will do an actual order" exposes that any previous enforcement of a no-contact condition was entirely baseless and therefore unlawful. Under NRS 178.4845, the only lawful mechanism to impose a no-contact condition as part of a bail or

release order requires that it be *explicitly stated in writing and personally served upon the defendant*. Absent such an order, there is no legal basis for arrest, detention, or any form of restriction.

Accordingly, every action taken by this court and by the prosecution that relied upon the *fiction* of a no-contact order, including the September 8, 2025 oral directive to issue bench warrants, and the fraudulent September 9 and September 11 filed bench warrants, constitutes fraud upon the court and a deprivation of liberty under color of law, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Fraud upon the court occurs when officers of the court, including judges and prosecutors, deliberately misrepresent or fabricate a material fact that corrupts the judicial process itself (*Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.*, 322 U.S. 238 (1944)).

Judge Peterson's conduct here is the epitome of such fraud. By acknowledging that she must now "make it clear," she tacitly concedes that the court has been acting in the absence of any lawful order, a condition that renders the September 9th and 11th 2025 warrants and proceedings *void ab initio*. To knowingly enforce a non-existent order constitutes an ultra vires act, one performed outside any lawful jurisdiction. As such, the judge's actions are stripped of judicial immunity under *Stump v. Sparkman*, 435 U.S. 349 (1978) and its progeny, which hold that immunity does not extend to acts taken "in the clear absence of all jurisdiction."

Moreover, this misconduct violates multiple canons of the Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct, including:

- Rule 1.1 – Compliance with the Law,
- Rule 1.2 – Promoting Confidence in the Judiciary, and
- Rule 2.5 – Competence, Diligence, and Impartiality.

By issuing or facilitating the issuance of fraudulent bench warrants based on nonexistent legal authority, Judge Peterson also violated Article I, § 8 of the Nevada Constitution and the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution, which guarantee that no person shall be deprived of liberty without due process of law.

The record now establishes that both the judge and prosecutor knew or should have known that no lawful no-contact order existed, yet proceeded to act as if one did. That deliberate misrepresentation to the court and to law enforcement officials triggered unlawful arrests, reputational harm, and financial damages. Such coordinated misconduct between the bench and the prosecution satisfies the elements of conspiracy to deprive rights under 18 U.S.C. § 241, and further supports a colorable RICO claim (18 U.S.C. § 1961 et seq.) predicated on the repeated use of judicial processes to commit fraud and extortion under color of law.

In plain terms this was not a clerical error, misunderstanding, or lapse of communication, it was a premeditated fraud. The September 8th "shotgun" hearing, and fraudulent September 9th issued bench warrant, and subsequent court issued fraudulent September 11th bench warrant correction proceedings represent the precise moment where the machinery of justice was hijacked by a lawless judge (Jessica Peterson) acting in collusion with a deceitful prosecutor (Dena Rinetti). The result was the unlawful transformation of two innocent parents into fugitives of a court order that never existed.

This pattern of deliberate fabrication and enforcement without authority is intolerable in a constitutional republic. It is an offense not only against the defendants but against the very fabric of judicial integrity. Such conduct demands immediate investigation, vacatur of all

resulting orders and warrants, and referral of Judge Peterson and Prosecutor Dena Rinetti to the Nevada Commission on Judicial Discipline and the State Bar of Nevada for perjury, fraud upon the court, and systemic due-process violations.

35. Judge Jessica Peterson:

“And so to the extent that there were not orders issued I don’t think it changes the fact that there was at least an understanding or should have been an understanding by both of your clients that they were not to have contact with this minor child.”

This assertion enforces an implied “understanding” rather than a lawful order, thereby punishing behavior without statutory authorization or due process. This violates due process, the void-for-vagueness doctrine, Rule of Lenity, and the constitutional right to familial association, because individuals cannot be bound by abstract understandings when no valid order exists. It also reflects judicial overreach and misconduct under Rule 2.2 (impartiality) and Rule 2.5 (competence).

36. Prosecutor Dena Rinetti:

“You’re honor, I’m asking you not to quash the warrant. I think the court’s actually correct. I mean there was a summons that was given to the defendants, um, it had no contact order.”

Prosecutor Dena Rinetti’s statement, “I think the court’s actually correct. I mean there was a summons that was given to the defendants, um, it had no contact order”, constitutes a deliberate false representation of legal authority and the case record. A handwritten notation on a summons is not a court order, and under NRS 178.4845, no enforceable no-contact restriction may exist without a signed, filed, and served judicial order renewed every 120 days. By falsely representing this notation as a valid order and urging the court to sustain enforcement actions, including bench warrants that were later quashed on September 17, 2025 as baseless, Ms. Rinetti materially misled the tribunal in violation of NRPC 3.3(a)(1) and committed intentional due process violations against both defendants.

These actions fall entirely outside the scope of prosecutorial immunity, as clearly delineated in *Buckley v. Fitzsimmons*, 509 U.S. 259 (1993), where the U.S. Supreme Court held that a prosecutor acting as an investigator, administrator, or legal advisor outside the courtroom or outside proper legal channels is entitled to neither absolute nor qualified immunity. The issuance and maintenance of knowingly false legal claims, such as treating a non-order as an enforceable order, and pressing for custody actions, warrants, or restrictions based on it, is not a core prosecutorial function but rather an unlawful administrative act rooted in deception and fraud. Additionally, under *Kalina v. Fletcher*, 522 U.S. 118 (1997), prosecutors who personally misrepresent facts in affidavits or court representations are subject to personal liability and not immune from suit under § 1983. Ms. Rinetti’s conduct squarely meets these criteria.

Further, by misusing the authority of the court to enforce a non-existent order, and by failing to correct the record even after the misrepresentation was apparent and material, she engaged in fraud upon the court, a sanctionable act under the court’s inherent powers and a textbook abuse of process. This goes beyond professional misconduct; it rises to a civil rights violation actionable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and no form of immunity shields her from liability stemming from these knowingly deceptive and unconstitutional actions. Ms. Rinetti is now on formal notice that her conduct has opened the door to state bar sanctions, disqualification motions, and personal civil liability for damages arising from false imprisonment, wrongful process, and

violation of clearly established constitutional rights, for which any claim of qualified or absolute immunity is now legally unavailable.

In light of the egregious nature of her misconduct, Prosecutor Dena Rinetti must immediately disqualify herself from any further involvement in this matter. Her demonstrated pattern of knowingly misleading the court, engaging in unauthorized enforcement efforts, and repeatedly violating ethical and constitutional standards renders her participation untenable and incompatible with the impartial administration of justice. Continued involvement by Ms. Rinetti would irreparably harm the integrity of the proceedings and further prejudice our rights. The court should require her to step aside forthwith and refer her conduct for appropriate disciplinary and legal investigation.

Furthermore, pursuant to Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct Rule 2.15, the presiding judge is obligated to report any known misconduct by attorneys, including prosecutors, to the appropriate disciplinary authority. Given the clear and repeated violations by Prosecutor Dena Rinetti, including misleading the court and violating constitutional rights, the judge must fulfill this mandatory duty without delay. Failure to do so not only perpetuates the ongoing injustice but raises serious questions about the impartiality and integrity of the judicial process in this case.

37. Prosecutor Dena Rinetti:

“There’s no doubt about these defendants knew that they were not supposed to have contact.”

Prosecutor Rinetti’s baseless assertion that “there’s no doubt about these defendants knew that they were not supposed to have contact” flagrantly disregards the foundational legal principle that guilt and intent cannot be presumed absent clear, lawful orders and proper notice. This statement amounts to a presumption of guilt without any legally enforceable restriction in place, directly violating the presumption of innocence guaranteed by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution, as well as the equal protection clause. One cannot be legally bound to comply with restrictions that were never validly imposed, nor punished for failing to abide by restrictions that lacked formal issuance, proper service, or clear definition.

Moreover, this prosecutorial statement violates Nevada Rules of Professional Conduct (NRPC) 3.3(a)(1) by making a materially false or misleading statement to the tribunal, thereby undermining the fairness and integrity of the judicial process. Ms. Rinetti’s insistence on enforcing a non-existent order, despite being confronted with uncontroverted expert evidence, specifically Dr. Richard Semekla’s January 13, 2025 report, which decisively refutes allegations of abuse or neglect, demonstrates a willful blindness that goes beyond negligence into the realm of prosecutorial vindictiveness and bad faith. A reasonable prosecutor, charged with the duty to seek justice rather than convictions at any cost, would have immediately dropped these baseless charges after reviewing such a comprehensive expert opinion. Instead, Ms. Rinetti’s continued pursuit of these allegations evidences not only a reckless disregard for exculpatory evidence but also a profound abuse of prosecutorial discretion that undermines public confidence in the justice system.

Her conduct embodies prosecutorial misconduct on multiple fronts:

- Violation of due process through enforcing vague, unenforceable restrictions;
- Misuse of prosecutorial authority by advancing unfounded allegations despite expert rebuttal;

- Ethical breaches under NRPC 3.3(a) for failing to correct false statements and misleading the court;
- And a blatant failure to uphold the fundamental principle of fairness that should guide all criminal proceedings.

Given these circumstances, Ms. Rinetti's actions warrant not only immediate disciplinary review and recusal but also preservation of civil rights claims arising from this egregious violation of constitutional and ethical norms.

38. Prosecutor Dena Rinetti:

"Not only from the criminal side but also from CPS."

Prosecutor Dena Rinetti's statement, "Not only from the criminal side but also from CPS," represents a fundamental mischaracterization of the distinct and limited role of Child Protective Services (CPS) within the legal system. CPS is an investigative and protective agency, not a judicial body, and lacks any authority to impose or enforce court orders or criminal sanctions. By invoking CPS actions as if they carry the force of judicial or prosecutorial authority, Ms. Rinetti not only misleads the court but also violates her ethical duties under NRPC 3.3 to ensure accuracy and honesty in her representations.

This conflation amounts to a dangerous abuse of prosecutorial discretion, allowing the prosecutor to improperly leverage administrative CPS findings or recommendations as a basis for criminal enforcement actions without proper judicial review or due process safeguards. Such conduct undermines the foundational separation of powers doctrine by treating non-judicial CPS determinations as de facto court orders, thereby circumventing essential procedural protections guaranteed by law.

The court must recognize that CPS involvement alone cannot justify criminal enforcement absent valid, properly issued court orders and must hold Ms. Rinetti accountable for conflating these roles to advance a fundamentally flawed and unlawful prosecution. This improper conduct further supports the urgent need for her disqualification and referral for disciplinary proceedings.

39. Prosecutor Dena Rinetti:

"If you remember correctly ... the defendants are charged for the actions at UMC in January of 2019."

Prosecutor Rinetti's statement, "If you remember correctly ... the defendants are charged for the actions at UMC in January of 2019", goes far beyond a neutral reference to the charging timeline. It is a deliberate attempt to conflate unresolved allegations with justification for an unlawful no-contact order that never existed in valid form. This mischaracterization is particularly egregious given that the January 2020 Joint Declaration of Kimball Austin Sachs and Yuxia Zhang, filed under penalty of perjury and supported by over 90 exhibits, already established with overwhelming clarity that our son's condition resulted from iatrogenic gadolinium poisoning, not abuse or neglect. That conclusion was later reaffirmed by Dr. Richard Semelka in his January 13, 2025 report, which decisively confirmed what the record has shown for more than six years: that we, the parents, are innocent, and our son was harmed by medical negligence, not by us. Despite this conclusive medical evidence, Ms. Rinetti continues to invoke outdated, factually false claims as if they justify criminal restrictions, no-contact enforcement, or denial of family rights. In doing so, she has violated due process and equal protection under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, as well as NRPC 3.3(a)(1) by knowingly making materially misleading

representations to the court. Her conduct also constitutes prosecutorial misconduct through malicious and vindictive prosecution, particularly in light of her refusal to withdraw charges once clear exculpatory evidence emerged. Moreover, by abusing her discretion to pursue this meritless case in the face of dispositive expert rebuttal, she has stepped outside the protective boundaries of both qualified and absolute immunity as recognized in *Buckley v. Fitzsimmons*, 509 U.S. 259 (1993), and *Kalina v. Fletcher*, 522 U.S. 118 (1997). Rinetti's continued involvement in this matter is not merely unjustified, it is retaliatory, lawless, and inexcusable. Her presence now serves only to obstruct justice, further harm innocent parents, and erode the legitimacy of these proceedings. She must be disqualified immediately and referred for disciplinary review without delay.

40. Prosecutor Dena Rinetti:

"And for Mr Goodwin to say that Arkansas has done nothing is absurd. As soon as the evidentiary hearing was done on Friday as a mandatory reporter I contacted Child Protective Services."

During the grueling 5.5-hour evidentiary hearing, where Dr. Richard Semelka testified in support of our defense, Prosecutor Dena Rinetti committed retaliatory misconduct so egregious that it demands immediate accountability. Dr. Semelka explained that our son Eason had been brought to his clinic for DTPA-IV chelation therapy, accompanied by blood and urine lab tests that confirmed retained gadolinium, evidence that has never been rebutted and which fully supports our defense. When asked who brought Eason to receive this treatment, Dr. Semelka answered truthfully: it was us, his parents. At that moment, Rinetti, driven by hostility and spite, wrongly assumed, or pretended to assume, that we were violating a court order prohibiting contact, despite the fact that no such valid or enforceable order existed. She immediately took retaliatory action by contacting Arkansas Child Protective Services (CPS), under the false pretense of being a mandatory reporter, without any factual or legal basis to justify that call. Her intent was transparent: to harass and intimidate us by turning CPS into a weapon, and if possible, to orchestrate the removal of our son from our care under completely false pretenses.

This abuse of power was not an isolated lapse in judgment but part of a broader pattern of manipulation. The most damning evidence of Rinetti's duplicity came during the September 17, 2025 hearing, when she had the audacity to state the following: *"And instead of allowing CPS and law enforcement to check out that child for them to make an assessment of whether that child was safe, the child was okay and could potentially stay in their care what do they do? They buy a one-way ticket for an unaccompanied minor from Dallas, Texas, back to China."* This statement is not only dripping with deceit but is also self-indicting. Her claim that our son "could potentially stay in [our] care" is flatly incompatible with her own actions just days earlier, specifically, her orchestration of fraudulent bench warrants based on a handwritten notation she knew was legally meaningless. It is beyond obvious that had Arkansas CPS gotten access to our son, she would have ordered or strongly pressured them to seize custody based on the same fraudulent premise, that we were in violation of a no-contact order that never legally existed.

She cannot now claim she simply wanted CPS to "assess" whether our son was safe. That is pure gaslighting. The truth is, she was setting a trap, one that, if we had not anticipated and avoided, would have resulted in the illegal removal of our child. Her actions were not just unethical; they were premeditated, retaliatory, and malicious. For her to now pretend she was offering us a chance to remain with our son is prima facie proof of her bad faith and dishonesty. You don't seek to have defendants jailed and their child seized, and then claim you were leaving the door open for them to keep custody. That is the behavior of a manipulator caught in her own lies, and it directly undermines every claim of good faith or legitimate prosecutorial intent.

This conduct violated our right to due process, our right to familial integrity, and our right to a fair trial free of state retaliation. It also violated Rinetti's ethical obligations under NRPC 3.3 (candor to the tribunal) and NRPC 3.8 (special duties of a prosecutor), both of which she disregarded with stunning arrogance. She knowingly misled the court, misrepresented the existence of an enforceable order, and weaponized her position to attempt extrajudicial punishment, all while ignoring binding exculpatory evidence from a qualified medical expert. She also undermined the separation of powers by using CPS, an executive agency, to carry out what she could not lawfully achieve through judicial means. This is not protected prosecutorial discretion. This is abuse. It is malicious prosecution and retaliation under color of law.

What's more, in orchestrating and executing these actions outside her role as courtroom advocate, Rinetti stepped far beyond the scope of any lawful immunity. Under U.S. Supreme Court precedent, including *Buckley v. Fitzsimmons*, *Kalina v. Fletcher*, and *Van de Kamp v. Goldstein*, 555 US 335 - Supreme Court (2009), prosecutors who act as investigators, or who engage in administrative or retaliatory conduct outside their core advocacy function, are not immune from civil liability. Rinetti's conduct falls squarely into that non-immunized category. Her phone call to Arkansas CPS was not a protected courtroom action. It was a unilateral, investigative, and punitive act rooted in personal animus and a deliberate misrepresentation of the law.

This conduct must be referred to the State Bar of Nevada for investigation and discipline. In addition, because the judge presiding over this case is under Canon 2.15(B) of the Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct obligated to report attorney misconduct that raises a substantial question about honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness, any failure to do so would be a further violation of judicial ethics. Prosecutor Rinetti has shown herself unfit to continue on this case. She has forfeited any claim to good faith or impartiality, and she must be immediately disqualified. The record now reflects not just a rogue prosecutor, but a state actor willing to trample rights, invent facts, and wield state agencies to carry out retaliatory acts against innocent parents who have done nothing more than pursue legitimate medical treatment for our child.

41. Judge Jessica Peterson:

"That's not what he's saying. What he's saying is prior to that. What he's saying is that had there been an order ... they were to have no contact ... there should have been some sort of trigger ... that let the school know ..."

By speculating about what "should have been" done before any valid no-contact order existed, Judge Peterson is engaging in impermissible speculation and hindsight rationalization, thus violating the duty of impartiality and fairness (Rule 2.2) and failing to decide based on actual law and fact, which undermines due process and the judicial oath to act under law. Her remarks reveal arbitrary reasoning and risk judicial bias by attributing to parties a duty that legally could not exist absent a lawful order.

42. Mr. Goodwin (defense counsel):

"That is correct your honor."

While Mr. Goodwin's agreement is less overtly improper, his unqualified assent to a speculative scenario about a non-existent order may amplify the court's error and reflect counsel's failure (or inability) to correct the record, which raises concerns about ineffective assistance of counsel under the Sixth Amendment and Nevada equivalents because defense counsel must protect clients from factual or legal mischaracterizations by the court.

43. Prosecutor Dena Rinetti:

"They knew they has this warrant as of Monday of last week."

Prosecutor Dena Rinetti stated: *"They knew they has this warrant as of Monday of last week."* This statement, made without any evidentiary support, is a direct violation of her ethical duty of candor to the tribunal under NRPC 3.3(a)(1). While it is true that Judge Peterson verbally stated at the conclusion of the September 8, 2025 hearing that she was issuing bench warrants, that verbal assertion was based on a non-existent, unsigned, and unenforceable no-contact order, a fact the judge herself later admitted on the record when she stated she still needed to "make it clear" and have the State submit a formal order for her to sign. Until such an order is reduced to writing, signed, and filed into the court record, it has no legal force under NRCP 58(c), and the Nevada Supreme Court's longstanding requirement for written, filed orders to be enforceable. Therefore, the issuance of those warrants was itself unlawful.

Rinetti's assertion that we knew about the warrants is especially egregious because there is no record of notice, service, or proof of actual knowledge. Her statement is not just speculative, it's knowingly false, designed to mislead the court into believing we were in willful defiance of judicial authority when, in fact, no valid order existed to defy. Her conduct here reflects a broader pattern of prosecutorial misconduct, one that includes misstating the existence and legal status of court orders, fabricating knowledge, and attempting to justify unconstitutional enforcement retroactively. By weaponizing false narratives to manufacture guilt and punish us outside lawful process, Rinetti violated our due process rights under the Fourteenth Amendment, and our right to be free from arbitrary government action.

These actions are not protected by prosecutorial immunity. When a prosecutor knowingly advances false statements and engages in enforcement based on non-existent legal authority, she steps outside the bounds of legitimate courtroom advocacy. Rinetti's misconduct has now contaminated the record beyond repair and warrants her immediate disqualification and referral for disciplinary action under the Nevada Rules of Professional Conduct and the Nevada Supreme Court's disciplinary framework.

44. Prosecutor Dena Rinetti:

"At the end of the day, they knew they has this warrant ... Over, the prior to that, law enforcement CPS had tried to go out to their house. They wouldn't open the door ... they can't, they have access to that child."

Prosecutor Dena Rinetti's statement, *"At the end of the day, they knew they has this warrant ... Over, the prior to that, law enforcement CPS had tried to go out to their house. They wouldn't open the door ... they can't, they have access to that child."*, is a dense and insidious conflation of legal functions that no ethically minded prosecutor would make, but one that in our case is fully consistent with her pattern of misconduct.

By weaving together references to CPS, law enforcement, and warrant knowledge in a single sweeping narrative, she intentionally blurs the separation between investigative agencies and prosecutorial argument, thereby undermining the neutrality and due process of the fact-finding process. This conflation suggests to the court that CPS or law enforcement have already made a determination of risk or custody rights, and that she, as prosecutor, is merely ratifying that decision, when in fact no such decision or legal authority exists in our record under valid order. Her remarks imply guilt and presuppose authority for forced entry or removal of our child without any judicial authorization or factual showing to support it.

That tactic threatens multiple constitutional and ethical protections: her statements disregard the presumption of innocence, invite judicial deference to extrajudicial acts, and erode the fundamental liberty interest in familial integrity. More critically, by couching her argument in terms of what “*law enforcement and CPS had tried to do*,” then layering in “*they wouldn’t open the door*,” she is insinuating that noncooperation with illegal intrusion justifies escalation. In doing so, she is effectively arguing post hoc for state-sponsored trespass or seizure, all under the mantle of prosecutorial authority, which is entirely improper. This is a textbook example of *authoritative overreach*, attempting to coerce or justify entry and control of a home or child without due judicial process.

Moreover, because her narrative is unsupported by any proof (no valid warrant, no lawfully authorized CPS or law enforcement action verified in the record), she is misleading the court through assertion rather than evidence, a violation of her duty of candor under NRPC 3.3(a)(1). She also crosses into prosecutorial misconduct, not merely by presenting argument, but by presenting a narrative that subsumes investigatory conclusions on behalf of CPS or law enforcement. That is, she’s not just arguing her case, she is staging facts and authority that she has no lawful basis to introduce.

In light of our documented trauma, the fact that the bench warrants were quashed, the absence of any enforceable no-contact order, and the public and recorded nature of these proceedings, this misrepresentation is not a harmless slip, it is part of a continuing campaign of retaliatory lawlessness. It further supports our claims for civil liability, sanctions, and the immediate disqualification of Rinetti from this case.

45. Prosecutor Dena Rinetti:

“They circumvent not only the court’s order but trying to circumvent child protective services ... all while ... on bail ... of multiple felonies ... of child abuse ...”

By stating that the defendants “circumvented the court’s order” when, as has been irrefutably shown on the record, no valid order ever existed, Prosecutor Rinetti is not merely mistaken, she is deliberately misrepresenting the law and record in order to lend apparent legitimacy to her enforcement efforts. That conduct is a direct violation of NRPC 3.3(a)(1) (duty of candor to the tribunal) and amounts to fraud upon the judicial process: she is arguing for the enforcement of a legal fiction. In doing so, she enhances the due process violation by persuading the court to act as though a lawful restriction existed when it did not.

Her linkage of alleged “circumvention” with the fact that we are on bail for multiple serious charges further compounds the misconduct. She is implying that our bail status and purported “flight risk” justify the imposition or continuation of restrictions, restrictions which she has no proper basis to enforce. This creates a retroactive application of restriction and punishment based on her own mischaracterization, a classic ex post facto risk, violating the prohibition on retroactive penal statutes and principles of fairness. It also constitutes prejudgment, presuming wrongful conduct in order to sustain ongoing deprivation of liberty.

Additionally, such falsely grounded rhetoric has a chilling effect on every exercise of our constitutional rights, from traveling to seeking medical care to interacting with your child, because it conditions those rights on compliance with non-existent legal restraints. It pressures the court to treat us as criminals from the outset, not as individuals entitled to due process, thus subverting the fairness and neutrality of the tribunal. Finally, incorporating this fabricated narrative into the judicial record itself taints subsequent proceedings by anchoring future rulings to a false premise, forcing us to litigate against a shadow of fiction instead of real law. All of these factors amplify the degree of prosecutorial overreach and strengthen the foundation for

civil rights liability, sanctions, and immediate removal of Ms. Rinetti from participation in this matter.

46. Prosecutor Dena Rinetti:

"Their actions ... should give this court absolutely no assurances whatsoever that they'll abide by any of the court rules."

This inflammatory statement is a clear attempt by Prosecutor Rinetti to undermine the presumption of innocence and subtly shift the burden of proof onto us. The presumption of innocence is a cornerstone of the criminal justice system, protected under U.S. Const. Amend. XIV and Nev. Const. Art. I, § 8. By implying that we, the parents, residents of Arkansas since 2020, are inherently untrustworthy, she presumes bad faith and prejudice, which directly compromises the fair trial rights and due process protections afforded to us under both state and federal law.

However, this statement goes beyond mere prejudice. Prosecutor Rinetti continues to assert jurisdiction over parents who have been residents of Arkansas since 2020 and whose minor child, Eason, has lived in Arkansas for years. This claim of jurisdiction by a Nevada prosecutor is completely unfounded. Since 2021, Eason has lived and attended school in Arkansas, which is his legal home state as defined by NRS § 125A.085, and his home state jurisdiction is protected under the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (UCCJEA), specifically NRS 125A.305.

Prosecutor's Rinetti's actions demonstrate a blatant disregard for these laws and for the rights of parents who have had no contact with Nevada (except for court/attorney matters) for over six years. Her continued insistence that the Nevada courts have jurisdiction over Eason and us, his parents, is an unlawful extension of authority with no legal or factual basis. Prosecutor's Rinetti's repeated false representations in court about the applicability of Nevada jurisdiction and her direct mischaracterization of the parents' legal rights must be recognized as an abuse of prosecutorial discretion and a continuation of fraudulent conduct.

Moreover, her statement reveals a contemptuous disregard for the rule of law and highlights her role in engendering lawlessness by asserting jurisdiction and issuing orders that contravene basic constitutional principles and statutes. This is compounded by the fact that the no-contact order, which she relies upon in her arguments, does not exist as a valid legal order, and her insistence on pursuing such claims in the face of overwhelming evidence to the contrary is indicative of prosecutorial misconduct.

Prosecutor Rinetti's sustained campaign of dishonesty and attempts to mislead the court about jurisdiction and factual matters create an environment where due process is completely undermined. Her reliance on the invalid no-contact order and her unsubstantiated claims about the parents' actions show a failure to uphold ethical standards under the Nevada Rules of Professional Conduct (NRPC), including:

- NRPC Rule 3.3(a)(1) – Duty of Candor to the Tribunal
- NRPC Rule 3.4 – Fairness to Opposing Party and Counsel
- NRPC Rule 4.1 – Truthfulness in Statements to Others

In light of these actions, Prosecutor Rinetti is directly complicit in perpetuating an unlawful and unconstitutional proceeding. By continuing to assert jurisdiction in the face of overwhelming

evidence that Arkansas, not Nevada, is the legal home state of our son, she is acting outside the bounds of her authority and violating the constitutional rights of the parents.

Prosecutor Rinetti's deceptive conduct not only violates the U.S. and Nevada constitutions but also the fundamental rights of the parents to freely live in the state of their choice and to raise their child free from unlawful interference by an overreaching court. This case exemplifies the abusive and lawless behavior of both the prosecutor and the court system in Nevada. Prosecutor's Rinetti's role as the prosecutor in this matter has resulted in significant harm to us, the parents, who have been unlawfully accused, maligned, and subjected to coercive measures based on a complete lack of jurisdiction and legal authority of which she has no reasonable defense whatsoever.

By making a blanket statement that we, the parents, cannot be trusted to follow court rules, Rinetti is portraying a presumption of bad faith and questionable characterization, which risks compromising the presumption of innocence, fair trial rights, and neutrality of the proceedings, and constitutes prejudicial argument improperly influencing the court.

47. Mr. Goodwin (defense counsel):

"I don't think any citizen naturally has a duty to always comply with what law enforcement's doing."

This statement challenges compulsory compliance with law enforcement in a way that could be misinterpreted as condoning defiance; although defenders may argue constitutional limits on searches, in this courtroom context that remark may imperil courtroom decorum or authority, but standing alone it is less a clear violation of procedure or statute than a rhetorical position.

48. Judge Jessica Peterson:

"I issued a bench warrant ... He's actively avoiding ... that's the problem."

By asserting that she "issued a bench warrant" as a matter of fact, the judge omits any discussion of whether the legal prerequisites (a valid, existing no-contact order, notice, hearing) were met, thereby risking enforcement of process without due process. This conduct violates due process guarantees under the U.S. and Nevada Constitutions by depriving a party of liberty absent lawful procedural safeguards, breaches Rule 2.5(A) (competence and diligence) and Rule 2.2 (impartiality) of the Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct by failing to ensure factual and legal adequacy, and amounts to judicial misconduct in issuing warrants on unclear or invalid bases.

49. Judge Jessica Peterson:

"This court issued a bench warrant on the basis of there being a violation of conditions, the pre-release conditions. That condition mainly being in the indictment summons that indicated that there was to be no contact with the named victim."

This assertion claims that the bench warrant was justified by a violation of release conditions that allegedly stem from a "no contact" directive contained merely in an indictment summons. That violates NRS 178.4845, which requires that no-contact orders must be imposed by properly entered and served order, and that mere notations or provisions in a summons are

insufficient. It also violates due process and void-for-vagueness principles by punishing alleged noncompliance with ambiguous, non-judicially adopted conditions. Additionally, it violates the judicial duty under the Code of Judicial Conduct (Rules 1.1, 1.2, 2.5) and the judge's oath to administer justice faithfully, because the judge is enforcing a punitive remedy (bench warrant) based on a non-existent or invalid legal foundation.

50. Judge Jessica Peterson:

"What's the statute again?"

By asking "What's the statute again?" in the midst of argument, Judge Peterson reveals that she lacks familiarity with the controlling law, which violates her obligation under Rule 1.1 (Compliance With the Law) of the Revised Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct. She also undermines the judicial duty of competence (Rule 2.5) and suggests inadequate preparation contrary to due process. Further, she breaches her oath of office to apply the law faithfully in adjudicating the parties' rights.

51. Prosecutor Dena Rinetti:

"178.4851 or. No problem. And there's 178.4845 that was enacted in 2021."

By misidentifying the controlling statute as 178.4851 (which is incorrect in this context) while also acknowledging 178.4845 (which governs no-contact conditions) only partially, Rinetti commits a misstatement of law that violates her duty of candor under NRPC Rule 3.3(a)(1), misleads the court, and contributes to enforcement of invalid restrictions, thereby aiding in constitutional violations of due process and statutory compliance.

52. Judge Jessica Peterson:

"So, 1784845 was enacted in 2021. So, at the time that the original order was put into place, that was not a statute that was effective."

Judge Jessica Peterson's assertion that "NRS 178.4845 was enacted in 2021, so at the time the original order was put into place, that was not a statute that was effective," reflects a misunderstanding of both the legal nature of the underlying document and the statutory preconditions for enforcement under § 178.4845. The so-called "original order" was in fact a 2019 arraignment summons issued after a grand jury returned a true bill, bearing the chief judge's signature, but containing only a handwritten note stating "no contact with named victim." While it may have carried judicial formality, it did not constitute a formal no-contact order lawfully imposed under Nevada law. There was no evidentiary hearing, no advisement of rights, and no formal entry of conditions of release pursuant to NRS 178.484. This renders the notation legally insufficient as an enforceable "court order" under § 178.4845, which requires a valid predicate no-contact order issued by the court after proper process.

Worse still, this summons and subsequent prosecution were tainted by multiple serious violations of statutory and constitutional rights, including prosecutorial misconduct and defense counsel's failure to fulfill their statutory obligations under NRS 172.241. Specifically, paid defense counsel failed to notify us, the parents, of the formal notice of State's Intent To Seek Indictment, thereby depriving my wife and I of the lawful right to testify before the grand jury, a right explicitly protected under Nevada law. That omission independently undermines the validity of the indictment and any orders flowing from it. Combined with the prosecution's suppression of

key exculpatory evidence, specifically, the role of iatrogenic gadolinium poisoning in our son's condition, the grand jury process was structurally compromised.

Against this background, Judge Peterson's reference to the effective date of NRS 178.4845 is not only a red herring but a legal misstep. There was no enforceable "order" to violate, regardless of the statute's enactment date, because the foundational legal processes leading to that summons were compromised. Applying § 178.4845 in this context wrongly attempts to criminalize alleged conduct in violation of a non-existent or void order, exceeding statutory limits, violating due process, and undermining confidence in the impartial administration of justice. No lawful violation under § 178.4845 can occur in the absence of a valid, procedurally sound court order, and none existed here.

53. Judge Jessica Peterson:

"Likely what should have probably transpired is once that statute came into effect ... we should have probably had an order that extended that which the court could do under 178.4841."

Judge Jessica Peterson's public misstatement referencing a nonexistent statute, NRS 178.4841, reveals a troubling lack of familiarity with controlling Nevada law, an inexcusable deficiency for a state district judge who is presumptively charged with mastery of the statutes governing criminal procedure. By suggesting the court could "probably ... extend" restrictive conditions without any hearing or adherence to proper procedural safeguards, the judge flagrantly disregards the fundamental principles of due process, statutory construction, and judicial restraint. This cavalier attitude not only constitutes a clear violation of the Nevada Rules of Professional Conduct Rule 1.1, which mandates competence and knowledge of the law, but also breaches Rule 2.5's imperative for diligence and conscientiousness in judicial duties. Such an approach fosters arbitrary and unlawful extensions of restrictions, effectively sanctioning judicial overreach, and undermines the rule of law, the integrity of the judiciary, and the constitutional rights of litigants, including that of my wife. This pattern of ignorance and procedural abuse is an embarrassment to the judiciary and raises serious concerns about impartiality and fairness, particularly in light of the ongoing harassment documented since early 2024.

54. Judge Jessica Peterson:

"So that is what the court is going to do now is I am going to enter an order extending that no contact order ... that will be in place from today until the time of trial and or if we go more than 120 days we will renew it in 120 days."

In deciding unilaterally to extend a no-contact order without prior hearing, notice, or adjudication, even acknowledging there was none properly in place, the judge violates NRS 178.4845 which requires renewal only after notice and hearing, infringes due process, engages in ex post facto or retroactive restraint, breaches judicial fairness and impartiality (Rule 2.2), fails the competence duty (Rule 2.5), and contravenes her judicial oath to act within lawful bounds.

55. Judge Jessica Peterson:

"I am also going to, even though it was murky, the court does believe that Mr Sachs as well as Ms Zhang had at least a knowledge that they were not supposed to have this minor child in their custody and therefore based on that the court does find that that was a violation of their release conditions."

By imputing knowledge and violating conduct based on a “murky” basis, the judge presumes guilt without clarity or valid legal basis, thereby infringing the presumption of innocence, violating due process, enforcing conditions lacking proper notice or definition (void-for-vagueness), and breaching Rule 2.2 (impartiality) and Rule 2.5 (competence), as well as the judicial oath not to punish absent lawful process.

56. Judge Jessica Peterson:

“I will quash the warrant upon presentation of a new amount ... I’m increasing it by \$15,000 for each one of them.”

By conditioning the quash of a warrant on a new bail amount without first establishing a lawful predicate (a valid no-contact order or proven violation), the judge imposes arbitrary and coercive bail modifications, violating Nevada Rules of Criminal Procedure and NRS 178.4851 (which governs conditions of bail), and undermining due process, equal protection, and the prohibition against excessive bail.

57. Judge Jessica Peterson:

“If that is not done then I will consider issuing a new bench warrant at that point.”

By threatening a new bench warrant issuance absent procedural safeguards or demonstration of valid basis, the judge engages in coercive judicial overreach, escapes meaningful reasoned decision making, and undermines due process, judicial impartiality (Rule 2.2), and the judicial oath to administer justice within the bounds of law.

CONTINUED CLEAR PATTERN OF ONGOING RAMPANT MISCONDUCT/FRAUD ON DISPLAY DURING THE OCTOBER 1 2025 HEARING TO RECONSIDER FRAUDULENT BAIL INCREASE TIED TO THE UNLAWFUL SEALED NO CONTACT ORDERS (EXCERPTS):

58. Judge Jessica Peterson

“And as the court said at the last hearing there was still a CPS order ... to my knowledge still in place that he was not supposed to have contact with the child.”

This statement violates due process, judicial impartiality (Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct Rules 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 2.5), and the oath of office because CPS (Child Protective Services) has no statutory authority to issue “orders” binding on parents under Nevada law, only a juvenile court judge may issue an enforceable order under NRS Chapter 432B (see *NRS 432B.490* and *NRS 432B.530*). By repeatedly referencing a supposed “CPS order” without producing it or verifying its existence, Judge Peterson adopts the role of advocate for the State, denies the defendants’ right to notice and hearing (U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; Nev. Const. Art. 1 § 8), and enforces a nonexistent restriction, rendering any warrant or bail action void.

59. Judge Jessica Peterson

“So even if there was an order from this court that would have expired regarding the no contact, there was arguably a CPS order that was in place regarding the no contact.”

By speculating that an “arguably” existing CPS order continues to control, the judge violates the rule of law and competence requirement (Rule 2.5), acts without evidence, disregards NRS 178.4845 which strictly limits and times no-contact orders in criminal cases, and infringes the parents’ due process right to a definite, valid order before punishment or restraint. It also

evidences bias in favor of the State, contrary to Rule 2.2 (impartiality), and a breach of the judicial oath to uphold the Constitution.

60. Judge Jessica Peterson

“So, and I don’t know, I don’t know if there is an active CPS order out there or not.”

Judge Jessica Peterson’s October 1, 2025 statements concerning the alleged existence of a CPS no-contact order reflect a pattern of judicial misconduct that is not merely negligent, it is dangerous, disqualifying, and deeply corrosive to the legitimacy of the bench she occupies. At that hearing, Judge Peterson made three materially contradictory statements regarding the existence of a CPS order restricting parental contact: first claiming it was “still in place,” then speculating it was “arguably” in place, and finally admitting, “I don’t know if there is an active CPS order out there or not.” This sequence is not a minor lapse in judicial memory, it is the epitome of reckless adjudication.

It is intolerable for any judge to impose, reference, or rely upon a liberty-restricting order, particularly one allegedly issued by another agency, without first requiring formal production of that order, verification of its legal validity, and confirmation that it was properly served and enforceable. Here, Judge Peterson enforced or gave weight to a supposed CPS order she openly admits she cannot confirm exists, which is a profound violation of Nevada due process standards, judicial ethics, and the constitutional rights of the accused.

Her conduct violates:

- Rule 1.1 (Competence) – A judge must know and apply the law. Claiming the existence of an order one moment, speculating about it the next, and confessing ignorance afterward reveals either outright falsehood or disqualifying incompetence.
- Rule 2.5 (Diligence and Impartiality) – No diligent judge would invoke an unverified external order to justify continued restrictions on a parent’s liberty. Doing so exhibits conscious disregard for fairness and procedure.
- Rule 1.2 (Promoting Public Confidence in the Judiciary) – This conduct destroys public trust. No reasonable observer would see such contradictions as anything less than reckless arbitrariness. When a judge swings from declarative certainty to admitted ignorance within moments, all while depriving a defendant of fundamental rights, the result is an intolerable appearance of bias, incompetence, or dishonesty.
- EDCR 1.10 (Requirement of Written Orders) – Enforcement of a non-court order without it being properly entered into the record violates core rules of court practice. The judge’s failure to demand written confirmation of the alleged CPS order renders her enforcement of it procedurally lawless.
- NRS 178.4845 (Conditions of Release) – This statute controls how no-contact conditions can be imposed in criminal proceedings. Judge Peterson’s reliance on an off-record, unconfirmed external “order” to justify no-contact restrictions is a direct circumvention of the statute and an improper backdoor imposition of conditions without a motion, hearing, or evidentiary basis.
- United States Constitution, Amendments V and XIV, Liberty cannot be curtailed without due process of law. Here, Judge Peterson did precisely that and continued to treat a restriction as legally operative after admitting uncertainty as to its very existence. This is

textbook arbitrary deprivation of liberty, actionable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 in federal court when resulting in actual harm.

INTERIM CONCLUSION: THIS JUDGE MUST RECUSE

61. Judge Peterson's repeated pattern of legal misstatements, procedural shortcuts, and erratic adjudication, all documented under penalty of perjury by the affected parties and now captured on the YouTube channel, Our Nevada Judges, supports a powerful claim for mandatory disqualification under NRS 1.235. Her inability or refusal to confirm facts before imposing restrictions, and her demonstrated hostility and unreliability in prior rulings, shows that she cannot meet the minimum standard of impartiality, competence, or lawfulness required of her office.

No reasonable person, especially a parent whose rights are on the line, could possibly believe they are being afforded a fair hearing before a judge who lies, speculates, and admits ignorance about the very orders she uses to curtail basic liberties.

62. Judge Jessica Peterson

"My point is, is that your clients were clearly aware by the fact and the virtue that the client that their son was taken by CPS, placed on a plane to China and that there was nothing changing that result that they at least had an implied awareness that they were not to have that child."

This statement violates presumption of innocence, due process, and void-for-vagueness principles because it substitutes "implied awareness" for actual notice of a valid order. Under NRS 178.4845, no-contact conditions must be explicit and renewed every 120 days after hearing; implied or assumed restrictions are void. Judge Peterson's reasoning also violates Rule 2.2 (impartiality), Rule 2.5 (competence), and the judicial oath by shifting the burden to the parents to guess at restrictions that were never lawfully imposed.

63. Judge Jessica Peterson

"And so, um, based on that, this is why this court originally issued the warrant that it did."

Issuing a warrant based on an unverified, possibly nonexistent CPS order and "implied awareness" violates NRS 178.4845 (requiring a valid no-contact order), NRS 178.484(2) (conditions of release), the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments (probable cause and due process), and constitutes judicial overreach inconsistent with Rule 1.1 (law compliance), Rule 2.5 (competence), and the oath of office. Because CPS cannot issue enforceable orders under Nevada law, the court's warrant is void ab initio and any subsequent bail increases or restrictions are the fruit of the poisonous tree. Furthermore, CPS does not issue binding "orders" in Nevada. Under *NRS Chapter 432B*, CPS may remove a child in emergency circumstances and then must promptly petition the juvenile court for an order (*NRS 432B.390–432B.530*). Only a juvenile court judge may issue a protective custody order, placement order, or no-contact order. CPS cannot, on its own, create or extend a no-contact condition that binds parents. A judge citing a "CPS order" without producing a signed juvenile court order is enforcing a legal nullity.

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

64. The Court and Prosecutor's Willful Disregard of Truth, Medical Ethics, and Law Constitutes Judicial and Prosecutorial Misconduct

This Court and the prosecuting attorney have repeatedly been shown, through sworn court filings under penalty of perjury, to be relying on false evidence while systematically ignoring credible evidence and expert testimony. The opposing counsel has never refuted these accusations of chronic dishonesty.

In particular, the doctors who testified before the grand jury never mentioned gadolinium or gadolinium toxicity, a critical omission that undermines the entire fairness and justness of the grand jury's decision. Gadolinium-based contrast agents such as Gadavist, administered to Eason on January 26, 2019, carry the FDA's Black Box Warning, the agency's most serious warning, highlighting risks of death.

Dr. Adib Rodriguez Solares, who administered the contrast, never disclosed these risks to Eason's biological parents, who are primarily Chinese speakers and didn't have an interpreter present at the critical time of consent. This amounts to clear medical malpractice and a gross failure to disclose material facts about the known dangers of Gadolinium-Based Contrast Agents. It is also a blatant violation of medical ethics and informed consent laws.

Further, the hospital discharge report, authored by Dr. Solares and Dr. Vonita Chawla, falsely claimed that Eason was "in good condition, moving all four limbs, alert, and in no distress." This report is contradicted by the UMC surveillance video obtained by Detective Christopher Slack, which shows Eason being carried limp and dazed by his stepfather out of the hospital, an image starkly inconsistent with the false discharge summary.

Detective Slack's affidavit dated February 20, 2019, states:

"Eason can be seen being carried by Austin as they enter the elevator on the pediatric floor upon discharge. Eason is continued to be carried by Austin as they exit UMC and walk towards the parking lot."

The video evidence is undisputed, yet no attempt was made by prosecution or the court to reconcile these facts or question hospital staff on this contradiction.

This very point is emphasized in Dr. Semelka's expert report:

"Regarding conflicting reports between Mr. Sachs and hospital staff and physicians ... I am far more prone to believe Mr. Sachs' account than the hospital personnel involved. In my personal experience and my study of the subject, there is a tremendous tendency during times of medical misadventure for hospital employees, either due to faulty recall or deliberate dishonesty/dissimulation, to provide false testimony of events. Furthermore, the reporting at discharge of Eason being in good shape I consider false. I have seen the hospital photo image of Mr. Sachs carrying Eason out of the hospital the day of discharge, Jan 26, 2019, and the boy looks limp and with a dazed expression on his face."

The cumulative effect of these falsehoods and omissions constitutes judicial and prosecutorial misconduct, violating the core principles of due process.

The Nevada Supreme Court mandates that:

“Prosecutors and judicial actors are bound to act with honesty, candor, and fairness in all proceedings.”, *Williams v. State*, 103 Nev. 106, 109, 734 P.2d 700, 707 (1987)

The ongoing enforcement of a no-contact order founded on such material misrepresentations and deliberate ignorance of truth is an affront to justice.

65. The Expert Report of Dr. Semelka Confirms No Abuse or Neglect, and Supports Parental Decisions

Dr. Semelka’s detailed, scientifically grounded report (**EXHIBIT A**) establishes that Eason’s medical condition was misdiagnosed by hospital staff, worsened by inappropriate treatment (including the administration of the gadolinium-based contrast dye without proper informed consent), and best managed by the parents’ integrative medical care. He states explicitly:

“Parents acted in an appropriate best management for Eason. Their decision to not continue anti-seizure medications after discharge was more likely beneficial.”

Under the controlling legal standard of *Hallmark v. Eldridge*, 189 P. 3d 646 - Nev: Supreme Court (2008), this expert testimony demands deference and controls over contradictory hearsay or speculation from state employees.

66. The No-Contact Order Unlawfully Infringes on Fundamental Parental Rights Guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution

The U.S. Supreme Court has firmly held that parents have a fundamental liberty interest in the care, custody, and control of their children, which cannot be infringed without compelling evidence and due process (*Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U.S. 57, 65 (2000)).

The Court’s enforcement of a no-contact order, lacking any credible proof of harm or danger to Eason, violates these constitutional protections and amounts to a punitive measure against loving and competent parents.

67. The Court’s Bias and Loyalty to State Institutions Constitutes a Denial of Due Process

Dr. Semelka has observed the Court and prosecutor’s unwarranted bias toward state institutions, including the hospital, over the parents and the truth. Such partiality is a denial of the neutrality and fairness required by law.

The Supreme Court has condemned such state favoritism as violating due process:

“Due process requires impartiality and fairness by state actors.”, *Marshall v. Jerrico, Inc.*, 446 U.S. 238, 242 (1980).

This Court’s ongoing actions amount to a flagrant abuse of judicial power.

68. Nevada Courts Lack Jurisdiction Over Eason Under the UCCJEA — Arkansas Is the Proper Forum

Eason has resided in Arkansas since 2021, attending school there and living under the care of his parents (**EXHIBITS B and C**). The UCCJEA - Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (Nev. Rev. Stat. § 125A.010 et seq.) governs jurisdiction in child custody

matters and explicitly prohibits Nevada from exercising jurisdiction over a child who has a home state elsewhere.

As Nevada explained in *Ogawa v. Ogawa*, 125 Nev. Adv. Op. No. 51, 221 P.3d 699 (Nev. 2009) subject matter jurisdiction over interstate child custody matters is governed by the UCCJEA, which prioritizes the child's home state unless exceptional circumstances justify otherwise.

Judge Peterson's continuing assertion of jurisdiction and imposition of a no-contact order violates the UCCJEA, rendering the order unlawful and void.

CONCLUSION

69. This family has endured six years of judicial and prosecutorial lawlessness, lies passed off as truth, expert evidence discarded, parental rights trampled, and most tragically, a child torn from the embrace of his stepfather and mother without legal or moral justification.

The no-contact order is unlawful, unconstitutional, and a form of cruel and unusual punishment that must be vacated immediately. The Court must honor expert medical testimony, uphold parental rights, comply with the UCCJEA, and restore justice. If this Court fails to act promptly, the injustice will escalate, and legal consequences, including sanctions for misconduct, will be pursued to the fullest extent.

But let us now say what must be said, clearly, fully, and without fear.

What has transpired in this courtroom is nothing less than a sustained pattern of lawless tyranny, a grotesque abuse of prosecutorial discretion and judicial authority that mocks the very principles of justice. The continued enforcement of a no-contact order, absent any credible, admissible, or constitutional basis, is not merely a legal error. It is an orchestrated campaign of retaliation and suppression.

This court has taken it upon itself to brand two dedicated, attentive, and loving parents as "dangerous" to their own child, despite not a single shred of evidence to support such a slanderous claim. What evidence has been offered? None, just recycled innuendo and a prosecutorial fiction that disintegrates under even minimal scrutiny.

In contrast, the evidence *against* this no-contact order is voluminous, expert-supported, and unrefuted.

70. Dr. Richard Semelka, MD – World-Renowned MRI and Gadolinium Toxicity Expert

Dr. Semelka, a global authority on Gadolinium Deposition Disease (GDD), ranked in the top 0.05% of medical scholars worldwide, reviewed the full timeline and medical history of Eason. His conclusions are unequivocal:

- Eason experienced two known neurological insults: food-based neurotoxicity and Gadolinium-Based Contrast Agent (GBCA) Gadavist injection at UMC on Jan 26, 2019.
- Following the GBCA MRI with *Gadavist*, Eason became unresponsive, limp, and incontinent, and had to be carried out of the hospital by his stepfather, a condition documented both photographically and clinically.
- Dr. Semelka confirmed gadolinium toxicity through provocation testing and symptom response, concluding that Eason suffers from GDD aka gadolinium toxicity aka gadolinium poisoning, a treatable but serious medical condition caused by the very institutions claiming to act in his interest.

- He noted that Mr. Sachs had explicitly objected to the use of GBCA (NOTE: This fact is confirmed by virtue of UMC Children's Hospital medical records for Eason in four separate entries), and that both parents' decision to pursue integrative medicine, including chelation, was reasonable, safer, and medically justified.
- Dr. Semelka concluded with a stark moral indictment:

"I do believe that Mr. Sachs and Ms. Zhang have suffered injustice at the hands of state institutions in Nevada up to the present time, and that this has come to the detriment of the welfare of Eason. This is tragic and shameful."

71. Dr. Jeff Baker, MD – Integrative Physician, Immanuel Clinic

Dr. Baker, who has overseen Eason's recent chelation therapy using Zn-DTPA-IV chelation therapy, provided evidence of:

- Quantifiable reductions in gadolinium from 0.16 mcg/24 hours to 0.023 mcg/24 hours over a 4-month treatment period, proof that the original diagnosis and course of action were medically sound.
- While he noted that seizure activity remained constant during the treatment window, his findings reinforce the biochemical basis for Eason's condition and the family's medically informed strategy to detoxify him.
- This is the very care that the court and prosecutor continue to demonize as "abuse", when in fact, it is documented, monitored, and yielding results.

72. Dr. Paul Drake, MD – Pediatric Neurologist, Arkansas Children's Hospital

Dr. Drake, Eason's treating neurologist since March 2024, wrote unequivocally:

"In my professional interactions with them, I have found them to be consistently attentive, deeply concerned for their child's well-being, and wholly committed to pursuing the safest and most effective medical care for Eason."

"Based on my direct observations, they are in no way a threat to their son."

"In fact, they are currently advocating for more detailed testing to determine alternative treatment options for Eason in order to provide him with the greatest control of his disorder"

Let us be clear: three separate doctors, each with no motive other than medical accuracy and child welfare, have confirmed what this court continues to ignore:

- Eason suffers from Gadolinium Deposition Disease (GDD). This is not speculative, and it is not theoretical. It is confirmed by objective medical documentation. Dr. Regina Sutton formally assigned International Classification of Diseases - ICD-10 codes specific to gadolinium toxicity in 2023 (**EXHIBIT E**). ICD-10 codes are not mere opinions; they are standardized diagnostic codes recognized across the global medical and insurance community. The assignment of a gadolinium toxicity ICD-10 code is prima facie medical evidence of diagnosis and causation. For Prosecutor Rinetti to continue denying this medical reality, especially in light of the overwhelming and consistent documentation we have provided over the past six years, is not merely misconduct, it is deliberate misrepresentation and brazen fraud on this Court. Her denial of this established fact is

an attempt to erase the scientific record, obstruct our defense, and uphold a false narrative of child abuse, all for the purpose of preserving her malicious prosecution. It also further illustrates her complete lack of fitness to remain on this case, and underscores why she must be disqualified immediately.

- His injuries were iatrogenic, caused by reckless and poorly informed Western medical interventions in 2019.
- His parents acted rationally, cautiously, and medically appropriately.
- And they continue to do so, years later, with diligence, integrity, and relentless devotion.

NOTE: See **EXHIBIT F** for recent letters from Doctors Semekla, Baker, and Drake respectively.

73. **MANDATORY REPORTERS WITH YEARS OF EXPOSURE TO THIS FAMILY**

Ola Christian Academy – Jody Sandberg, Administrator

Ms. Sandberg oversaw the academic, social, and personal development of Eason from August 2021 through May 2023, and had regular, routine interactions with both parents. Her letter could not be more direct:

“At no point did I ever witness anything but a loving, respectful, and appropriately involved relationship between them and their son.”

“Any suggestion to the contrary would be entirely at odds with everything I personally observed.”

“I affirm without reservation that both parents have demonstrated nothing but dedication and concern for Eason's well-being and academic success.”

Ms. Sandberg, as a school administrator and mandatory reporter under Arkansas law, is legally obligated to report even the slightest suspicion of abuse or neglect. She never did. Why? Because there was nothing to report.

Legacy Christian Academy – Jawanza Whitfield, Founder and Head of School

Mr. Whitfield, alongside his wife, Dr. Martha Wall-Whitfield, the school principal, oversaw Eason's education during the 2024–2025 academic year and interacted with both parents on a near-daily basis.

“It was routine for Ms. Zhang to drop Eason off each morning and for Mr. Sachs to pick him up in the afternoon.”

“They are deeply committed and attentive parents who care immensely about Eason's academic progress and overall well-being.”

“Based on our extensive personal experience with them over the past year, there is no question in my mind that both Mr. Sachs and Ms. Zhang are responsible, engaged, and loving parents.”

Again, not a single report, red flag, or concern ever raised. This is not a snapshot or a passing observation, this is sustained, daily contact over multiple academic years. And like Ms. Sandberg, Mr. Whitfield and his wife are also a mandatory reporters.

74. So, how has this court responded to this mountain of truth?

By enforcing a no-contact order it admits may not even be valid. On October 1, 2025, this Court stated on the record:

"So, and I don't know, I don't know if there is an active CPS order out there or not."

Let us repeat that: the judge did not know whether the order she was enforcing even existed. Yet it was enforced anyway, ripping a child from his parents and extinguishing their right to even see, hold, or speak to him.

This is not due process.

This is not neutrality.

This is state-sanctioned emotional torture, driven by bias, incompetence, and a sustained desire to avoid accountability.

The pattern is now impossible to deny:

- Exculpatory medical evidence was suppressed by the prosecution in violation of *Brady v. Maryland*.
- Parental testimony before the grand jury was obstructed, violating *NRS 172.241*.
- Judicial neutrality was destroyed by a judge who lies on the record, then doubles down when challenged.
- Rules of procedure, judicial canons, and constitutional guarantees have been treated as optional or ignored entirely.

Meanwhile, this family has been:

- Publicly slandered.
- Privately traumatized.
- Legally dispossessed.
- Psychologically tortured.
- Financially devastated.

All while doing exactly what loving, responsible parents do: fight for their child's health when the system failed him.

This no-contact order is not just defective, it is the embodiment of a corrupt, vengeful, and constitutionally bankrupt judicial machine.

It must be vacated. Immediately.

And let this conclusion serve as a record, not just for this court, but for every appellate judge, federal tribunal, media outlet, or oversight commission who reviews it:

If you continue to enforce this order, you are complicit in one of the most egregious civil rights violations ever committed under the guise of "child protection" in modern Nevada legal history.

You may try to silence voices, bury evidence, and weaponize procedure, but you cannot defeat truth. And you will never undo the damage this family has already suffered.

The time for pretending is over.

This Joinder and the evidence it contains shall be published on the State of the Nation website and formally shared with Alex Falconi, founder of *Our Nevada Judges* (*LINK to all the Our Nevada Judges YouTube videos of this frame-up: https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLsKMpjAPcB2vENMuRhH_nSceRUWIZaLol*), whose media organization continues to document the brazen lawlessness of Nevada's judiciary and prosecutors, not to mention Steve Sanson of Veterans In Politics. Independent media outlets will further disseminate this material. The misconduct exposed herein will not remain hidden behind courtroom walls. In due time, the world will come to know the full scope of the repugnant, retaliatory, and unconstitutional conduct carried out by this Court, this judge, and this prosecutor. **The ripple effects will be far-reaching, and permanent.**

VACATE THIS ORDER. RESTORE THIS FAMILY. RETURN THIS CHILD TO HIS PARENTS. NOW.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the law of the State of Nevada that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on 10/14/2025 /s/ Kimball Austin Sachs
Agent for DEFENDANT SACHS

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the attached JOINDER TO OCTOBER 7 2025 EMERGENCY MOTION TO SET ASIDE OR MODIFY THE NO-CONTACT ORDER was e-filed on October 14, 2025 to:

Steven Wolfson, clark county district attorney
Dena Rinetti, chief deputy district attorney

EMAIL: motions@clarkcountyda.com
dena.rinetti@clarkcountyda.com

/s/ Kimball Austin Sachs
Agent for DEFENDANT SACHS

COURTESY COPY EMAILED TO:

lee@nvcourts.nv.gov

cadish@nvcourts.nv.gov

parraguirre@nvcourts.nv.gov

stiglich@nvcourts.nv.gov

herndon@nvcourts.nv.gov
pickering@nvcourts.nv.gov
bell@nvcourts.nv.gov
gibbons@nvcourts.nv.gov
bull@nvcourts.nv.gov
westbrook@nvcourts.nv.gov
pio@supremecourt.gov
aharper@nvcourts.nv.gov
nvscclerk@nvcourts.nv.gov
aocmail@nvcourts.nv.gov
cip@nvcourts.nv.gov
judicial@nvcourts.nv.gov
dgordon@nvcourts.nv.gov
amayeaux@nvcourts.nv.gov
rluque@nvcourts.nv.gov
sirigoin@nvcourts.nv.gov
MediaInquiries@nvcourts.nv.gov
reference@nvcourts.nv.gov
michaelgibbons@nvcourts.nv.gov
sosmail@sos.nv.gov
sosexec@sos.nv.gov
carrie.Buck@sen.state.nv.us
nicole.Cannizzaro@sen.state.nv.us
skip.Daly@sen.state.nv.us
fabian.Donate@sen.state.nv.us
marilyn.DonderoLoop@sen.state.nv.us
edgar.Flores@sen.state.nv.us
pete.Goicoechea@sen.state.nv.us
scott.Hammond@sen.state.nv.us
ira.Hansen@sen.state.nv.us
dallas.Harris@sen.state.nv.us
lisa.Krasner@sen.state.nv.us

roberta.Lange@sen.state.nv.us
dina.Neal@sen.state.nv.us
rochelle.nguyen@sen.state.nv.us
james.Ohrenschaal@sen.state.nv.us
julie.Pazina@sen.state.nv.us
melanie.Scheible@sen.state.nv.us
heidi.Gansert@sen.state.nv.us
pat.Spearman@sen.state.nv.us
jeff.Stone@sen.state.nv.us
robin.Titus@sen.state.nv.us
natha.Anderson@asm.state.nv.us
shea.Backus@asm.state.nv.us
shannon.BilbrayAxelrod@asm.state.nv.us
tracy.BrownMay@asm.state.nv.us
max.Carter@asm.state.nv.us
lesley.Cohen@asm.state.nv.us
venicia.Considine@asm.state.nv.us
rich.Delong@asm.state.nv.us
jill.Dickman@asm.state.nv.us
reuben.DSilva@asm.state.nv.us
bea.Duran@asm.state.nv.us
danielle.Gallant@asm.state.nv.us
cecelia.Gonzalez@asm.state.nv.us
michelle.Gorelow@asm.state.nv.us
ken.Gray@asm.state.nv.us
bert.Gurr@asm.state.nv.us
gregory.Hafen@asm.state.nv.us
alexis.Hansen@asm.state.nv.us
melissa.Hardy@asm.state.nv.us
brian.Hibbetts@asm.state.nv.us
sandra.Jauregui@asm.state.nv.us
heidi.Kasama@asm.state.nv.us

gregory.Koenig@asm.state.nv.us
selena.La.Rue.Hatch@asm.state.nv.us
elaine.Marzola@asm.state.nv.us
richard.McArthur@asm.state.nv.us
brittney.Miller@asm.state.nv.us
CH.Miller@asm.state.nv.us
daniele.MonroeMoreno@asm.state.nv.us
erica.Mosca@asm.state.nv.us
sabra.Newby@asm.state.nv.us
duy.Nguyen@asm.state.nv.us
PK.Oneill@asm.state.nv.us
david.Orentlicher@asm.state.nv.us
sarah.Peters@asm.state.nv.us
shondra.SummersArmstrong@asm.state.nv.us
angie.Taylor@asm.state.nv.us
clara.Thomas@asm.state.nv.us
selena.Torres@asm.state.nv.us
howard.Watts@asm.state.nv.us
steve.Yeager@asm.state.nv.us
toby.Yurek@asm.state.nv.us
susan.Furlong@asm.state.nv.us
governor@govmail.state.nv.us
info@catherinecortezmasto.com
info@rosenfornevada.com
officeofthemayor@lasvegasnevada.gov
info@veteransinpolitics.org
ralston@thenvindy.com
e@thenvindy.com
rlarraz@lasvegastribune.com
peggy@thehealthyamerican.org
gknapp@8NewsNow.com

vmurphy@8NewsNow.com

13investigates@ktnv.com

darcy.spears@ktnv.com

news@news3lv.com

desk@fox5vegas.com

saintrayfilmproductions@arkwest.com

senator@cotton.senate.gov

martin@pytela.com

support@life-enthusiast.com

stew@thepcradioshow.com

whistleblowers@infowars.com

vipint@infowars.com

insider@naturalnews.com

kunhongwei@gmail.com

jiamei@rate.com

info@wethepatriotsusa.org

dessie.andrews@gmail.com

hmakow@gmail.com

editor@mercola.com

editors@thenvindy.com

fibes1@gmail.com

randg369@yahoo.com

rcain101@aol.com

richardcornforth@aol.com

journal@trib.com

speakout@annistonstar.com

epage@bhamnews.com

news@cullmantimes.com
dsnews@thedailysentinel.com
enterpriseledger.news@thomnews.com
tjnews@times-journal.com
brian.blackley@troymessenger.com
oawebmaster@thomnews.com
news@selmatimesjournal.com
vent@timesdaily.com
timesdly@timedaily.com
tjnews@times-journal.com
news@valleytimes-news.com
mailbox@postherald.com
cpappas@dailyhome.com
news@mountaineagle.com
dothaneagle.news@thomnews.com
gtnewsroom@yahoo.com
htimes@htimes.com
fcoleman@mobileregister.com
editor@montgome.gannett.com
info@speakinoutnews.com
wao@wao.com
newsroom@waaytv.com
news@waff.com
tv8@waka.com
wani@aunetwork.com
info@wbcf.com
comments@abc3340.com
info@wbrc.com
mail@wcov.com
wdfx@ala.com
wdhn@aol.com
eagle1023@aol.com
rsteale@amfm.com
wgad@cybrtyme.com
info@wdxx.com
celeste@whnt19.com
webmaster@whoa32.com
tv5@wkrq.com
wopp@www.wopp.com
nbc15@wpmi.com
wsfa@traveller.com
newsroom@wtvnews4.com
wvnn@wvnn.com
13news@nbc13.com
GM@fox54.com
roy@couriernews.com
citizen@cswnet.com
jpublish@oztec.com
jmorris@nwaonline.net
gmoritz@abpg.com
voices@ardemgaz.com
arktimes@arktimes.com

banrnews@ipa.net
batguard@ipa.net
newsroom@nwanews.com
dailywor@ipa.net
dqbee@ipa.net
editor@earknewsleader.com
eldnews@ipa.net
hotsr@direclynx.com
newsroom@jonesborosun.com
main@kait.com
news4@kark.com
tv7@katv.com
keld@arkansas.net
mailbox@nbc24-51.com
kfsm@kfsm.com
tv40news@khbs-khog.com
info@klrt.com
fox46@ipa.net
mailbox@nbc24-51.com
webmaster@kwhn.com
kzng@hotsprings.net
lavilla_editor@lavillanews.com
mail@thecabin.net
mdrecord@ipa.net
editor@nwarktimes.com
destes@paragoulldailynews.com
letters@pbcommercial.com
letters@swtimes.com
tamjohns@ipa.net
opinions@arizonarepublic.com
bisbeeobserver@theriver.com
phoenix@amcity.com
edit.courier@prescottaz.com
dispatch@primenet.com
kingmannewspapers@mcimail.com
letters@azstarnet.com
azdnews@azdailysun.com
forum@aztrib.com
eacourier@aepnet.com
powersthatbe@kfyi.com
commentsonline@knst.com
news15@knxv.com
news@kold.com
customerservices@kpho.com
tv12news@aol.com
talk@ktarmail.com
ktnn@cia-g.com
news@kvoa.com
kvoi@kgms-kvoi.org
kymanews@kyma.com
mvdnews@mohaveaz.com
nt@primenet.com

feedback@phoenixnewtimes.com
info@redrocknews.com
svhnews@c2i2.com
news@havasunews.com
letters@tucsoncitizen.com
publicom@azstarnet.com
newsroom@yumasun.com
letters@advocate.com
joeshea@cal.net
eangargus@newschoice.com
sanjose@amcity.com
info@thebizpress.com
chicoer@maxinet.com
atn@vvdailynews.com
drnews@dailyrepublic.com
revlet@angnewspapers.com
tripnews@cc.northcoast.com
editor@davis.com
letters@palmspri.gannett.com
drudge@drudgereport.com
info@freelancenews.com
staff@fresnobee.com
kathib@thestandard.com
letters@dailybulletin.com
newsroom@lompocrecord.com
letters@modbee.com
napaopinion@napanews.com
nvnews@aol.com
triblet@angnewspapers.com
recorder@link.freedom.com
letters@pe.net
news@thepresstribune.com
editor@recordnet.com
opinion@sacbee.com
letters@the-signal.com
editor@scindy.com
bill@sonomanews.com
srg@thespanishradio.com
starnews@earthlink.net
letters@times-standard.com
wgroshong@thetribunenews.com
janetl@theunion.com
newsroom@uniondemocrat.com
opinion@timesheraldonline.com
iscs3assoc@aol.com
letters@avpress.com
laura_nicholson@link.freedom.com
editor@asbarez.com
dhardisty@bakersfield.com
info@beiruttimes.com
dnforum@aol.com
editors@frontpagemag.com

gnp@latimes.com
hemetnews@koan.com
jeremy@nmaonline.org
jkestelyn@mfi.com
abc7@abc.com
kaef23@hotmail.com
kazn@am1300.com
fox29@tidepool.com
cbs2news@channel2000.com
pr@klbs.com
kcbs@kpix.xom
kcoy@kcoy.com
kesqtv3@aol.com
ron@kfax.com
kfbk@kfbk.com
programming@kfi640.com
news8@kfmb.com
sniff@kfmb.com
kfrc@aol.com
kglw@kglw.com
feedback@kgoam810.com
info@kgoe.com
10news@kgtv.com
khsitv@maxinet.com
kiem-tv@humboldt1.com
info@kiev870.com
info@kigs.com
kion@digital-sherpas.com
ask47@kjeo.com
info@kkla.com
klivnews@earthlink.net
news@mkir-tv6.com
knco@nccn.net
editorials@knx1070.com
info@knzr.com
dwb@sunset.net
lisa@reddingradio.com
mz@ksco.com
onair@ksfo560.com
uhl karen@hotmail.com
talk@kvec.com
info@kven.com
talkshows@kvon.com
letters@laweekly.com
c.marroquin@pe.com
laprensa@ix.netcom.com
letters@lodinews.com
speakout@ptconnect.infi.net
letters@latimes.com
editor@maderatribune.com
opinion@marinij.com
sunstar@mercedsun-star.com

biano@cncnet.com
msc@metcruz.com
letters@metronews.com
networkmag@mfi.com
editor@newtimesla.com
letters@nctimes.com
letters@ocweekly.com
lsteere@us.oracle.com
reiff@ocbj.com
letters@link.freedom.com
csamson@arguscourier.com
letters@reason.com
letters@redding.com
rbeditor@sunset.net
cbaker@redlandsdailyfacts.com
feedback@sfweekly.com
voice@sbcsun.com
letters@uniontrib.com
chronletters@sfgate.com
letters@examiner.com
letters@sjmercury.com
nwallace@newspress.com
editorial@santa-cruz.com
moriarty@pressdemo.com
sun@tahoe.com
letters@sjmetro.com
editor@siskiyoudaily.com
tribune@tahoe.com
world@tahoe.com
letters@tracypress.com
udj@saber.net
letters@advocate.com
joeshea@cal.net
eangargus@newschoice.com
sanjose@amcity.com
info@thebizpress.com
chicoer@maxinet.com
atn@vvdailynews.com
drnews@dailyrepublic.com
revlet@angnewspapers.com
tripnews@cc.northcoast.com
editor@davis.com
letters@palmspri.gannett.com
info@freelancenews.com
staff@fresnobee.com
kathib@thestandard.com
letters@dailybulletin.com
newsroom@lompocrecord.com
letters@modbee.com
napaopinion@napanews.com
nvnews@aol.com
triblet@angnewspapers.com

recorder@link.freedom.com
letters@pe.net
news@thepresstribune.com
editor@recordnet.com
opinion@sacbee.com
letters@the-signal.com
editor@scindy.com
bill@sonomanews.com
srg@thespanishradio.com
starnews@earthlink.net
letters@times-standard.com
wgroshong@thetribunenews.com
janetl@theunion.com
opinion@timesheraldonline.com
randy@LynnHarper.com
contact@igc.org
wtp@wtp.org
iscs3assoc@aol.com
letters@avpress.com
laura_nicholson@link.freedom.com
editor@asbarez.com
dhardisty@bakersfield.com
dnforum@aol.com
dailypilot@latimes.com
merrill_mccarty@link.freedom.com
editors@frontpagemag.com
gnp@latimes.com
hemetnews@koan.com
jeremy@nmaonline.org
jkestelyn@mfi.com
abc7@abc.com
kaef23@hotmail.com
kazn@am1300.com
fox29@tidepool.com
cbs2news@channel2000.com
pr@klbs.com
kcbs@kpix.xom
kcoy@kcoy.com
kesqtv3@aol.com
ron@kfax.com
kfbk@kfbk.com
programming@kfi640.com
news8@kfmb.com
sniff@kfmb.com
kfrc@aol.com
kglw@kglw.com
feedback@kgoam810.com
info@kgoe.com
10news@kgtv.com
khs1tv@maxinet.com
kiem-tv@humboldt1.com
info@kiev870.com

info@kigs.com
info@kkla.com
klivnews@earthlink.net
news@mkir-tv6.com
knco@nccn.net
editorials@knx1070.com
info@knzr.com
dwb@sunset.net
lisa@reddingradio.com
mz@ksco.com
onair@ksfo560.com
uhlkaren@hotmail.com
talk@kvec.com
info@kven.com
talkshows@kvon.com
letters@laweekly.com
c.marroquin@pe.com
laprensa@ix.netcom.com
letters@lodinews.com
speakout@ptconnect.infi.net
letters@latimes.com
editor@maderatribune.com
opinion@marinij.com
sunstar@mercedsun-star.com
biano@cncnet.com
msc@metcruz.com
letters@metronews.com
backtalk@motherjones.com
networkmag@mfi.com
editor@newtimesla.com
letters@nctimes.com
letters@ocweekly.com
lsteere@us.oracle.com
reiff@ocbj.com
letters@link.freedom.com
csamson@arguscourier.com
letters@reason.com
letters@redding.com
rbeditor@sunset.net
cbaker@redlandsdailyfacts.com
feedback@sfweekly.com
salon@salon.com
voice@sbcsun.com
letters@uniontrib.com
chronletters@sfgate.com
letters@examiner.com
letters@sjmercury.com
nwallace@newspress.com
editorial@santa-cruz.com
moriarty@pressdemo.com
sun@tahoe.com
letters@sjmetro.com

editor@siskiyoudaily.com
tribune@tahoe.com
world@tahoe.com
letters@tracypress.com
udj@saber.net
edit@upside.com
letters@TheReporter.Com
letters@insidevc.com
wdailynews@earthlink.net
editor@wired.com
apenonline@infosphere.com
cctimes@chaffee.net
news@thedailycamera.com
kj@gjds.com
fiel@greeleytrib.com
news@leadvilleherald.com
editor@journal-advocate.com
editor@peaksnewsnet.com
news@theflume.com
magazine@americannewsnet.com
comments@americannewnet.com
rcarroll@aspendailynews.com
gtop@gazette.com
dp_edit@cmn.net
news@reporter-herald.com
letters@denverpost.com
letters@durangoherald.com
fmtimes@fmtimes.com
editor@hcn.org
mailroom@kcncnews4.com
info@kcol.com
feedback@kdvr.com
dannahendricks@clearchannel.com
feedback@kjct8.com
tips@nbc11news.com
webmaster@hottalk1460.com
7assignments@kmgh.com
LeeAnnNye@ClearChannel.com
news@koaa.com
drose@krdotv.com
newswest@krextv.com
krez@frontier.net
kusa@9news.com
info@kxrm.com
mail@ljtd.com
opinions@times-call.com
dailypress@gwe.net
pueblo@chieftain.com
talk2rcr@crain.com
letters@rockymountainnews.com
jstebbins@journalgroup.com
news@summitdaily.com

lincicome@swiftnews.com
denver-editorial@westword.com
letters.advocate@scni.com
editor@bristolpress.com
editor@thechronicle.com
darnr@bcnnews.com
editor@newlondonday.com
faircn@bcnnews.com
editor@newbritain.com
editor@middletownpress.com
mconnolly@newstimes.com
ncnews@bcnnews.com
achurch@record-journal.com
regcit@connix.com
steve-m@cyberbury.net
focus@uconnect.net
edit@snet.net
mconnolly@newstimes.com
letters.greenwich@scni.com
letters@courant.com
jiads@snet.net
letters@nhregister.com
al_urbanski@intertec.com
talkback@watr.com
wfsb@wfsb.com
whineline@wili.com
wprx1120@aol.com
programming@fox61.com
wtic@wtic.com
wtnh@wtnh.com
nbc30@nbc.com
wptnews@bcnnews.com
stacy.palmer@philanthropy.com
news@thecommondenominator.com
letters@economist.com
hillnews@aol.com
info@thenation.com
tni@pop.dn.net
letters@njdc.com
tnr@aol.com
editor@pollingreport.com
editors@thepublicinterest.com
libertylobby@earthlink.net
forum@washblade.com
twbnews@aol.com
twells@dcbar.org
LettersToEd@washpost.com
wtnews@wt.infi.net
editor@weeklystandard.com
ben_beach@twi.org
exed@worldandimag.com
ADAction@ix.netcom.com

smartin@apa.org
ar@aim.org,
awgnews@mcgraw-hill.com
takeaction@americasvoice.com
kz@aei.org
PGibson@cahners.com
publiccom@apa.org
afteditor@aol.com
editorial@asaenet.org
mstearns@mcgraw-hill.com
inquiries@interactive.wsj.com
ferrisc@tfn.com
rcowan@bridge.com
jessell@cahners.com
bibooks@brook.edu
viewer@c-span.org
billthomas@capstyle.com
cns@nccbuscc.org
warrenpub@mindspring.com
lpeck@njdc.com
cookreport@njdc.com
info@covertaction.org
current@ix.netcom.com
cstern@canners.com
donreydc@aol.com
kelvinc@mediainfo.com
jroberts@cmp.com
env@heldref.org
comments@foxnews.com
mdefrancis@jointcenter.org
editor@ceip.org
currie@afsa.org
comments@foxnews.com
mailbox@governing.com
letters@govexec.com
jmcclenahen@penton.com
insight@wt.infi.net
info@intellectualcapital.com
edkelleher@kiplinger.com
gblonston@krwashington.com
legaltimes@legaltimes.com
73163.3063@compuserve.com
jhall@media-general.com
rweissenstein@crain.com
mmquery@aarp.org
edhearn@aol.com
mmcelvee@nbmag.com
trish.nicholson@apha.org
pnn@pacifica.org
polrev@heritage.org
preservation@nthp.org
bryanm@rtnda.org

yorkedial@aol.com
radioa@radioamerica.org
letters@rollcall.com
SRpolitics@aol.com
jmayne@ntca.org
FBloom@aaas.org
FREMEAUD@mcpssm.org
hwymanspr@aol.com
editor@stripes.com
states2@aol.com
betty.yeary@atlahq.org
feedback@wamu.org
webteam@wjla.com
nbc4dc@nbc.com
slevy@wtopnews.com
9news@wusatv9.com
mail@wascp.com
editors@washingtonmonthly.com
info@washington-report.org
nated@wt.infi.net
editorial@washingtonian.com
ww@heldref.org
bwood@aiadc.org
awest@newszap.com
newpost@dca.net
wdelnews@wdel.com
mail@wdov.com
njnews@newsjournal.com
opinion@elherald.com
editor@cedarkeybeacon.com
keynoter@keynoter.com
jaxstaff@jacksonville.com
sperez@nytimes.com
editor@newschief.com
editorial@stuartnews.com
hackworth@sunletter.com
tdedit@taldem.com
letters@thecrier.com
media@brucewilliams.com
dklement@knighttridder.geis.com
citrus@citrus.infi.net
letters@n-jcenter.com
letters@brevard.gannett.com
letters@sun-sentinel.com
voice@gvillesun.com
rnolte@hernandotoday.com
highlandstoday@tampatrib.com
dschultz@nytimes.com
david.brown@lakecityreporter.com
HeraldEd@herald.com
flevine@miamimetro.com
feedback@miaminewtimes.com

cnews@gate.net
letters@mfmag.com
letters@naplesnews.com
info@naplesnews.com
feedback@newtimesbpb.com
tomc@nwfdailynews.com
ehamaker@starbanner.com
soinsight@aol.com
dailynews@gbso.net
letters@pbpost.com
sbornhoft@pcnh.com
newscoast@home.com
toeditor@staugustine.com
letters@sptimes.com
rlajoie@sni-news.com
tribletters@tampatrib.com
feedback@tcpalm.com
info@fox30-upn47.com
nbc2news@nbc-2.com
jedwards@ccpalmbeach.cc
comments@wcjb.com
wcoa@pcola.gulf.net
wctv6@nettally.com
wear@aol.com
wele1380@wele.com
newsch2@wesh.com
news@wfla.com
news4@wfor.cbs.com
ggraves@wfts.com
wftv@aol.com
news@wftx.com
winknews@winktv.com
lshepard@ccmiami.com
info@wjhg.com
news@wjxt.com
feedback@wkmg.com
talk1430@wlkf.com
wmbb13@aol.com
woca@woca.com
wofl@wofl.com
wogx@wogx.com
talk@wokv.com
wpectv12@aol.com
wpgs@wpgs.com
news@wplg.com
numero1@wprd.com
visitor@wpsl.com
wpso@wpso.com
wptv@msn.com
info@wstu.com
7news@wsvn.com
tantalk@aol.com

aboyd@pgtv.com
contact12@aol.com
tampas10@aol.com
wtvj@nbc.com
13@wtvt.com
wtxl@wtxl.com
wwsbnews@aol.com
news@abc-7.com
albanyherald@surfsouth.com
editor@thebrunswicknews.com
comments@thecentralgeorgian.com
dcn@dodgecountynews.com
talkmaster@mindspring.com
atrthom@surfsouth.com
editor@onlineathens.com
atlanta@amcity.com
conedit@ajc.com
letters@augustachronicle.com
bcnews@accucomm.net
viewpoint@daily-tribune.com
cobbtimes@mariettaga.net
leletter@Ledger-Enquirer.com
brunge@surfsouth.net
press@courier-herald.com
gwinnpost@mindspring.com
henry-news@news-daily.com
msneed@news-daily.com
ldn@wp-lag.mindspring.com
webmaster@macontel.com
observer@surfsouth.com
editor@newnan.com
mwendra@savannahnow.com
sherald@bulloch.com
tte@rose.net
editgaz@surfsouth.com
union@accuconm.net
vdtnews@mail.valuu.net
feedback5@wagatv.com
wagt@wagt.com
walb@walb.com
wbmq@wbmq.com
tv22wjcl@aol.com
wcoh1400@aol.com
dj@wdmg.com
radiocenter@wdun.com
danat@wfxg.com
wfxl@wfxl.com
wgac@wgac.com
WGNXTV@aol.com
eagle1023@aol.com
wltz38@knology.net
talkback@13wmaz.com

wmgt@hom.net
mail@country102fm.com
wnegtv@bellsouth.net
wrbtlv3@mindspring.com
wrdw@wrdw.com
ddyer@ngweb.net
mail@wsav.com
mail@wtocvt.com
info@11alive.com
bill_wolpin@intertec.com
wjhnews@gate.net
ginews@aloha.net
letters@honoluluadvertiser.com
lfuller@amcity.com
dave@hilohawaiiitribune.com
citydesk@starbulletin.com
kgmbnews@pixi.com
ddames@excite.com
mbuenconsejo@khnl.com
khon@pixi.com
info@khvh830am.com
news4@kitv.com
haltimes@maui.net
editor@mauinews.com
wht@aloha.net
editor@moscow.com
sip@safelink.net
twinews@micron.net
editor@cdapress.com
swilliams@idahonews.com
info@mtexpress.com
vholbrook@idahopress.com
jmayor@journalnet.com
editorial@boise.gannett.com
webmaster@2online.com
kidktv3@srv.net
news@localnews8.com
mary.beth@klewvt.com
webmaster@kmvt.com
kpvinews6@aol.com
ktrvtv@cyberhighway.net
tell7@ktvb.com
fox35@magiclink.com
alajr@lmtribune.com
editor@news-examiner.net
mike.chapin@exchange.copleypress
editorial@carmitimes.com
chris.bailey@exchange.copleypress.com
courier.news@exchange.copleypress.com
advocatepress@wworld.com
sherren@SaukValley.com
editorial@dailyherald.com

dyledgr@theramp.net
tdeneal@dailyregister.com
thetimes@theramp.net
editorial@daily-journal.com
lee.trig@exchange.copleypress.com
jrogers@journalstandard.com
sentinelvoice@yahoo.com
danhagen@sullivanil.com
charles.Selle@copleypress.com
bwills@pantagraph.com
whig@whig.com
lewis1@midwest.net
carl_rexroad@southernillinoisan.com
sjr@sj-r.com
cindyl@times-press.com
telegraph@primary.net
inde@inde-news.com
editor@thezephyr.com
irma.N.Aviles@abc.com
edit@adage.com
letters@bnd.com
bdrnews1@aol.com
benton@intrnet.net
biweb@crain.com
sentinelvoice@yahoo.com
letters@news-gazette.com
letters@suntimes.com
TribLetter@aol.com
rkfdinst@hughestech.net
lsmith@dancomnews.com
dev@ais.net
ldr1comp@fcg.net
drmc@midwest.net
editor@reviewatlas.com
southstr@ais.net
hrnews@herald.com
lee.Trigg@exchange.copleypress.com
jama-letters@ama-assn.org
news7@khqa.com
editorial@kcchronicle.com
starcourier@cin.net
journal@macomb.com
tpetro@mariondaily.com
info@mbjournal.com
mdherald@cbcast.com
letters@nwherald.com
news@parisbeacon.com
jsteinfel@pekin.net
sschramm@crain.com
forum@pjstar.com
mtv@intrnet.net
newnews@rrstar.com

jlaron@svnmail.com
wand@aol.com
news@wcia.com
talk@wdws.com
webmaster@week.com
wfldtv@aol.com
news@wgem.com
wgnradio@tribune.com
whcoradio@whcoradio.com
TALKBACK@hoinews.com
news20@fgi.net
talkto23@ixnetcom.com
wkan@staradio.com
sheila@xlc.com
nbc5.chicago@nbc.com
wmay@wmay.com
wmbdtv@wmbd.com
wpeo@wpeo.com
wpna@virtualconduit.com
wqad@wqad.com
wrex@wrex.com
programs@wrsptv.com
wsil3@midamer.net
wtad@wtad.com
cleach@evansville.net
enews@mis.net
thestar@local.net
ftimes@intranix.com
recorder@indy.net
stareditor@starnews.com
jgnews@jg.net
editor@journal-courier.com
ha1@netnitco.net
letters@howpubs.com
editor@thepoint.net
opinion@michigancityin.com
terryh@kpcnews.net
perutribune@intranix.com
pilot@thepilotnews.com
andrea@sigecom.net
soundoff@therepublic.com
news@rochsnet.com
letters@howpubs.com
tribune@link.freedom.com
plaindealer@intranix.com
ebernsee@ccrtc.com
btimes@intranix.com
newsexaminer@newsexaminer.com
dailydemo@decaturnet.com
truthmkt@elktruth.com
nsnews@news-sentinel.com
ptvoice@aol.com

news@GoshenNews.com
dailynews@seidata.com
thb@indol.com
letters@heraldt.com
tribune@ktonline.com
letters@thestarpress.com
ctimes@thecouriertimes.com
comments@pharostribune.com
reporter@reporter-times.com
republic@seidata.com
shelbynews@shelbynews.com
SBTNews@sbtinfo.com
VOP@sbtinfo.com
tmnews@tmnews.com
max.jones@tribstar.com
bschmitt@suncommercial.com
wane-tv@cris.com
oldies105@go.com
wcsi@wcsiradio.com
info@wevv.com
wfft@fwi.com
wfft@mail.fwi.com
newswatch14@dynasty.net
live@whbu.com
wibc@emmis.com
wishmail@wish-tv.com
feedback@nbc33.com
wlf2@holli.com
newscenter16@wndu.com
info@wowo.com
wpta@wpta.com
wrtv@aol.com
wsal@wsal.com
wsbtnews@wsbt.com
fox28@skynet.net
newsroom@wthi.emmis.com
wthr13@aol.com
dick_wrtc@am1340.com
fox7news@wtvw.com
wxintv@mail.wxinc.com
news@timeswrsw.com
mmaust@dmrtc.net
freepress@nwkanas.com
tribune@chanute.com
edit@cjournal.com
dailyu@dailyu.com
eldtimes@southwind.net
egazette@valu-line.com
opinion@gctelegram.com
jbloom@hutchnews.com
register@midusa.net
letters@themercury.com

nknews@thekansan.com
odn@joconews.com
letters@ottawaherald.com
tbell@saljournal.com
weedit@wichitaeagle.com
globe@npgco.com
rzinn@augustagazette.com
editorial@derbydailyrep.com
news@kake.com
tacom@kansas.net
kloe@goodland.exks.com
wayne@krsl.com
csanders@informatics.net
foxfeedback@foxkansas.com
27news@ksnt.com
ksnlistens@ksn.com
49email@newssource49.com
ktmj@ktmj.com
news@kwch.com
kckdaily@discoverynet.com
letters@ljworld.com
mcpsent@southwind.net
editor@parsonssun.com
editor@swdtimes.com
letters@cjonline.com
13news@wibw.com
wdn@idir.net
courier@winfieldcourier.com
advocate@amnews.com
cjletter@louisv02.gannett.com
letters@dailyindependent.com
editor@bgdailynews.com
jwilson@barrencountyky.com
rjenkins@thegleaner.com
kyedits@cincypost.com
ponto@maysvilleky.net
letters@the-messenger.com
ne@ne.infi.net
mthrower@paducahsun.com
editor@richmondregister.com
newsroom@timesleader.net
news@ucadvocate.com
bb@winchestersun.com
cknj@kyol.net
editor@kentuckynewera.com
heditorial@herald-leader.com
jstovall@heraldledger.com
news@messenger-inquirer.com
wave3news@wave3tv.com
wbko@wbko.com
news@fox41.com
mgreenwe@whas-tv.com

wkyl@lex.infi.net
wlex@wlex.tv
wlky@iglou.com
aunderwood@wpsdtv.com
36listens@wtvq.com
egf@kih.net
readerswrite@thetowntalk.com
letters@houmatoday.com
acasmg@theadvertiser.com
dailyiberian@aisp.net
dailynws@neosoft.com
news@daily-review.com
star@i-55.com
news@americanpress.com
sentry@neosoft.com
letters@shreveporttimes.com
tpletters@aol.com
bbankston@theadvocate.com
letters@dailyworld.com
krystal@kadm.com
fox14@mail.bayou.com
31news@klax-tv.com
news@klfy.com
kmss@kmsstv.com
knoetv8@iamerica.net
info@kplctv.com
ksla@ksla.com
ktal@ktal-tv.com
ktbs@aol.com
region10@bayou.com
hcomeaux@watchfox.com
webmaster@press-herald.com
rdlnews@ruston-leader.com
wafb@raycommmedia.com
wbrz@aol.com
info@wdsu.com
feedback@fox44.com
wgno-tv@tribune.com
fox8@wvue.emmis.com
editors@prospect.org
letters@phx.com
oped@csp.com
newsroom@gazettenet.com
newsroom@enterprisene.com
letters@recorder.com
newsroom@S-T.com
aturco@stonehamonline.com
opinion@thesunchronicle.com
worcetser-feedback@phx.com
david.brudnoy@wbz.com
howiecarr@mindspring.com
eagle@berkshire.net

letter@globe.com
letterstoeditor@bostonherald.com
letters@capecodonline.com
letters@eagletribune.com
hgazette@tiac.com
editor@heraldnews.com
gstorey@mail.joc.com
postmaster@lowellsun.com
editpage@ledger.com
sen@ecnnews.com
sentinel@medianewsgroup.com
comments@masslive.com
stratbus@aol.com
newstips@telegram.com
news@mvgazette.com
newstips@wbz.com
wcvb@aol.com
news40@wggb.com
newstips@whdh.com
news@wwlp.com
letters@telegram.com
sysop@lol.shareworld.com
news@ellsworthamerican.com
kjedit@centralmaine.com
letters@sunjournal.com
news@TimesRecord.com
bdnmail@bangornews.infi.net
news@journaltribune.com
msedit@centralmaine.com
letters@pressherald.com
probertson@wabi-tv.com
news@wagm.com
email@wcsh6.com
tvmail@wgme-tv.com
wlbz@wlbz.com
wmtw@wmtw.com
fox51@wpxt.com
wviitv@aol.com
jmcgovern@aa-news.com
editor@thedailyreporter.com
fj@FlintJ.com
hlldsn1@sentinelnet.net
tribune@hdtinfo.com
jcpnews@citpat.com
edit@macombdaily.com
MDNletters@mdn.net
mmjournal@upgroup.com
news@tdi.net
journal@voyager.net
huckle@cadillacnews.com
telegram@lenconnect.com
editpg@freepress.com

letters@detnews.com
lpainter@grandhaventribune.com
pulse@gr-press.com
ldn@ludingtondailynews.com
petoskeynews@petoskeynews.com
dmiller@record-eagle.com
wbkp@wbkp.com
wdiv@aol.com
weyitv25@aol.com
wgtu@aol.com
wilx@brigadoon.com
contact@fox2detroit.com
wjrt@cris.com
wlajnews@wlaj.com
wlns@sojourn.com
tv6news@wluctv6.com
wnemtv5@mdp.com
woodtv@woodtv.com
wotv@wotv.com
tv7-4@tv7-4.com
bhobson@wsmh.SBGnet.com
wwmt99b@prodigy.com
news@tv9and10.com
feedback@wxmi.com
talkback@wxyztv.com
wzzmtv@aol.com
dailyd@brainerd.net
djournal@prtel.com
editor@mankato-freepress.com
ting@livewireprinting.com
editor.postreview@ecm-inc.com
letters@winonadailynews.com
tribune@wolf.co.net
herald@wolf.co.net
dglobe@rconnect.com
news.staff@fergusfallsjournal.com
newstrib@duluth.infi.net
echo@rea-alp.com
independent@oweb.com
mail@kaaltv.com
kare11@kare11.com
channel6@kbjr.com
kcco@kccotv.com
news3@kdlh.com
keycmail@keyc.com
news@kttc.com
lamonitor@lamonitor.com
letters@citypages.com
opinion@startribune.com
letters@postbulletin.com
sentnews@ronnect.com
sctimes@cloudnet.com

letters@pioneerpress.com
editor@utne.com
choice@wcco.com
wdio@aol.com
feedbackK@fox29.com
wadenapj@wcta.net
feedback@wctrib.com
dbrendel@examiner.net
esimpson@joplinglobe.com
editor@marshallnews.com
letters@riverfronttimes.com
jrobertson@tribmail.com
editor@digmo.org
bhunt@dddnews.com
webmmaster@hannibal.net
dbrendel@examiner.net
newstribune@ultraweb.net
kctv@kctv.com
feedback@fox27.com
kmbc@blairlake.com
info@kmiz.com
kolr10@kolr10.com
news@komu.com
kqtv@aol.com
web13@socket.net
ksdk@accessus.net
news@kshb.com
knsftv@aol.com
kspr33@pcis.net
ktvi2@aol.com
dquesenberry@ktvotv3.com
ky3@ky3.com
thestar@kcstar.com
editor@lebanondailyrecord.com
pitch@pitch.com
rdn@rollanet.org
letters@semissourian.com
mmaness@springfi.gannett.com
letters@mpgco.com
letters@postnet.com
74774.3704@compuserve.com
news@bolivarcom.com
desotoappeal@desotoappeal.com
mslink@misnet.com
toeditor@sunherald.com
msanders@afa.net
maildrop@sunherald.com
djnews@djjournal.com
FayetteNews@hotmail.com
letters@jackson.gannett.com
editor@jacksonprogressive.com
letters@onlinemadison.com

mjb@msbusiness.com
picitem@datastar.net
staff@vicksburgpost.com
jrogers@wabg.com
wapt@misnet.com
mind@wbci.com
input@wdam.com
wdbd@netdoor.com
krys@wboc.com
news@wlbt.com
wlox@wlox.com
wtok@netdoor.com
wtva@netdoor.com,
wxvt@tecinfo.com
newsed@dailyinterlake.com
editor@helenair.com
enterprise@ycsi.net
editor@mtstandard.com
mteagle@digisys.net
speakup@bsw.net
citydesk@gomontana.com
bgifford@havredailynews.com
news@montana.com
news@montana.com
kfbb@kfbb.com
khmt@khmt.com
kerrjar@yahoo.com
kpax@kpax.com
krtv@krtv.com
ksvi@ksvi.com
program@ktgf.com
ktmf@ktmf.com
news@montana.com
q2news@ktvq.com
kulr8tv@wtp.net
abc18_28@abc18-28.com
leader@cyberport.net
lctimes@ttc-cmc.net
newsdesk@missoulain.com
westnews@libby.org
editor@alliancetimes.com
editor@nque.com
news@sarpytimes.com
telegram@megavision.com
editor@theindependent.com
newsplex@ketv.com
khas-tv@navix.net
news@ntv.kearney.net
klkntv@aol.com
intouch@kmtv3.com
knop@nponline.net
teneleven@aol.com

ktvg@usa.net
kearneyhub@kearney.net
feedback@nebweb.com
ndnews@ncfcomm.com
pulse@owh.com
smiller@wespub.com
sixonline@wowt.com
editor@citizen-times.com
newstimes@aol.com
criscoe@courier-tribune.com
elizabethcity@coxnews.com
letters@jacksonvilledailynews.com
mschulken@coxnews.com
eletters@fayettevillenc.com
news@newsargus.com
letters@herald-sun.com
letterbox@hpe.com
letters@jdnews.com
Shelby_Star@link.freedom.com
pilot@southport.net
info@wilsondaily.com
news@journalnow.com
opinion@charlotte.com
edpage@greensboro.com
forum@nando.com
sunjournal@link.freedom.com
rockymount@coxnews.com
timesnews@freedom.com
webmaster@wbvtv.com
station@fox18wccb.com
6news@nbc6.com
news@wcti12.com
wect@wect.com
news2@wfmy.com
fox8@wghp.com
witn@witntv.com
wfl@nando.net
wlosnews@ioa.com
keith.acree@nbc.com
rgall@wral-tv.com
fox26@wsfx.com
wtvd@aol.com
wway@wwaytv3.com
newschannel12@wxii.com
news@wxlv.com
citydesk@wilmingtonstar.com
bismarcktribune@ndonline.com
newspres@ctctel.com
js@jamestownsun.com
daily@minot.com
letters@forumcomm.com
kgrinde@gfherald.com

general_delivery@kfyrtv.com
kbmykmcy@btigate.com
feedback@kmot.com
kqcd@dickinson.ctctel.com
kumvtv@nccray.com
feedback@kvlytv11.com
kxjb@kx4.com
kxmbtv@btigate.com
wday@forumcomm.com
DailySun@mountwashingtonvalley.com
edit@rcnewspapers.com
letters@keenesentinel.com
news@telegraph-nh.com
pbakke@cmonitor.com
letters@fosters.com
theul@aol.com
pherald@aol.com
wmurtv@wmur.com
editor@alliancetimes.com
editor@nque.com
news@sarpytimes.com
telegram@megavision.com
editor@theindependent.com
newsplex@ketv.com
khas-tv@navix.net
news@ntv.kearney.net
klkntv@aol.com
intouch@kmtv3.com
knop@nponline.net
teneleven@aol.com
ktvg@usa.net
kearneyhub@kearney.net
feedback@nebweb.com
ndnews@ncfcomm.com
pulse@owh.com
smiller@wespub.com
sixonline@wowt.com
cnletter@c-n.com
letters@dailyrecord.com
filexpress@aol.com
jjletters@aol.com
comments@NJHerald.com
newstips@pressplus.com
editor@pacpub.com
eleletters@starledger.com
news@njtimes.com
editor@trentonian.com
editors@american-politics.com
yourviews@app.com
gtaber@njbiz.com
LettersToTheEditor@bergen.com
GCTimes@Medianewsgroup.com

cpmetro@courierpostonline.com
letters@thnt.com
opinion@msnbc.com
esojsunbeam@newschoice.com
wmgmtv@acy.digex.net
letters@abqtrib.com
herald@riolink.com
copydesk@sfnewmexican.com
adn@zianet.com
opinion@abqjournal.com
dtimes@cyberport.com
editlight@zianet.com
news@hobbsnews.com
kasatv@kasa.com
news7koat@aol.com
kobtv@kobtv.com
newsroom@kobftv.com
admin@cbssouthwest.com
hcousland@lcsun-news.com
leader@leaconet.com
sierra@nmbiz.com
rdr@lookingglass.net
rc@tahoe.com
elkind@sierra.net
HomeNewsNV@aol.com
info@kenv.com
klasinfo@klas-tv.com
NewsChannel8@KOLOTV.com
comments@krnv.com
kntv13@kntv.com
ktvn@ktvn.com
ch3@kvbc.com
fox5news@mdp.com
letters@lvvj.com
letters@lasvegassun.com
appeal@tahoe.com
bonanza@tahoe.com
rc@tahoe.com
rgjmail@nevadanet.com
adtrib@bright.net
letters@theblade.com
dthom@en.com
letters@rep-printing.com
ECT@ohio.net
postedits@cincypost.com
letterstotheeditor@thecourier.com
crescent@defnet.com
editor@sourcenews.com
newsroom@delgazette.com
opinion@ohio.net
dallen@journalink.com
ponto@ntr.net

letters@limanews.com
news@madison-press.com
judy@marysvillejt.com
editor@recordpub.com
jlampert@oweb.com
tribune@tribune-chronicle.com
woosterdr@aol.com
vop@thebeaconjournal.com
letters@enquirer.com
letters@freetimes.com
letters@plaind.com
scene@clevescene.com
letters@dispatch.com
dglobe@richnet.net
edletters@CoxOhio.com
gbrock@cosmg.com
info@logandaily.com
buckeye2@valunet.com
news@goreflector.com
sminter@penton.com
editorial@plasticsnews.com
btaylor@gie.net
enoga@crain.com
newsroom@sanduskyregister.com
Karla_Harshaw@coxohio.com
editorsb@suite224.net
enoga@crain.com
jcardenas@wbns10tv.com
wcmh4@erinet.com
wtdn@erinet.com
giveme5@wews.com
news@wfmj.com
7online@erinet.com
news@whizamfmtv.com
wjwfox8@en.com
comments@wkbn.com
nbc22@erinet.com
wkrc@one.net
wkyc@aol.com
w8hdu@wllo.com
mail@wlwt.com
webmaster@nbc24.com
fox67@vright.net
wsyx@aol.com
cbeutien@wtol.com
wto@wto.com
viewer@wtt.com
wupw@wupw.com
wytv33@cboss.com
jswygart@wapakwdn.com
editorial@wastenews.com
cdxpress@telepath.com

jbridwell@ardmoreite.com
yourviews@oklahoman.com
editor@bannernet.net
letters@edmondsun.com
news@stwnewspress.com
editor@normantranscript.com
news@poncacitynews.com
stu@renet.com
gketchum@news-star.com
wdn@itlnet.net
carol@altustimes.com
editor@claremoreprogress.com
bmorgan@durantdemocrat.com
enidnews@enid.com
news@kfor.com
news@kjr.com
5news@kocotv.com
news@fox25.net
fox23@fox23.com
hevans@kotv.com
kswo@sirinet.net
info@ktul.com
news@kwtv.com
drtimes@galsta.com
pdns@pdns.com
tulsaworld@tulsaworld.com
albanydh@proaxis.com
bulletin@bendbulletin.com
opinion@gtconnect.com
mail@currypilot.com
pwebb@dailyastorian.com
wmcalister@newsregister.com
letters@news.oregonian.com
rhensley@eastoregonian.com
rgletters@guardnet.com
heraldandnews@heraldandnews.com
custserv@katu.com
nwnews@kcby.com
rmaiuri@kdrv.com
rmaiuri@kdrv.com
kezi@kezi.com
fox39@kfxo.com
newspersonnel@kgw.com
bob@klsrfox.com
info@nbc16.com
kobi@kobi5.com
koin@koin.com
koti@koti2.com
viewrmail@kpdx.com
nwnews@kpcc.com
ktvl@ktvl10.com
news@ktvz.com

kval@kval.com
lebanonexpress@dswebnet.net
tellus@mailtribune.com
newsroom@statesmanjournal.com
editor@wallowa.com
yourvoice@citizensvoice.com
timesletters@calkinsnewspapers.com
wreader@centredaily.com
somnews@shol.com
dailycourier@tribweb.com
letters@dailyitem.com
newsroom@i21.com
info@thederrick.com
LGoodlin@EveningSun.com
news@eveningtimes.com
publisher@express-times.com
gazedit@indianagazette.net
akerr@calkinsnewspapers.com
newera@lnpnews.com
news@lockhaven.com
mlt@i21.com
letters@pottsmmerc.com
letters@mcall.com
nieditor@ptd.net
editpage@patriot.microserve.com
letters@poconorecord.com
nuzdesk@pottsville.infi.net
newsroom@scrantontimes.com
toeditor@epix.net
sentinel@acsworld.net
standard@epix.net
tneeditor@ptd.net
davej@leader.net
review@epix.net
awd610@aol.com
editor@chestercounty.com
news@dailylocal.com
letters@ldnewsonline.com
letters@timesnews.com
info@eveningsun.com
info@gburgtimes.com
hsnews@hhs.net
intellletters@lnpnews.com
kdkatv2@kdka.groupw.wec.com
tips@kyw.com
tribune@metromead.com
ORnews@observer-reporter.com
DailyNews.Opinion@phillynews.com
inquirer.letters@phillynews.com
cpotter@steelcitymedia.com
letters@post-gazette.com
paje@epix.net

letters@readingeagle.com
feedback@pittsburghlive.com
wbre@msn.com
nbc10@nbc.com
news8@wgal.com
jtrently@whptv.com
wilsoncl@redrose.net
12news@wicu12.com
wjac@citipage.com
wjet@erie.net
wneptv@aol.com
fox43@aol.com
news@wpvi.com
wsee@erie.net
tpetner@hearstsc.com
wtajnews@thrid-wave.com
fox8tv@floodcity.net
wyou@microserve.net
wto@penn.com
letters@ydr.com
pjnews@projo.com
providence-feedback@phx.com
editor@pbn.com
wjar10@nbc.com
fox64@fox64.com
wpri@wpri.com
feedback@warwickonline.com
item@ftc-i.net
state@thestate.com
editorial@duesouth.net
editor@andersonsc.com
lettoed@beaufortgazette.com
editor@postandcourier.com
editorial@morningnewsonline.com
NewsLetters@greenville.infi.net
letters@islandpacket.com
information@parentsjournal.com
buzz@heraldonline.com
citydesk@shj.com
jausband@thesunnews.com
udt@carol.net
wachnews@aol.com
wbtw@wbtw.com
newsroom@wciv.com
listen43@wfxb.com
fox21@whns.com
wistv10@aol.com
newschannel7@wspa.com
news4@wyff.com
daily@santel.net
jon@madisondailyleader.com
mweishaar@aberdeennews.com

office@capjournal.com
dakpress@nvc.net
news@kdlt.com
info@keloland.com
fox7news@blackhill.com
skarinen@newscenter1.com
kotanews@rapidnet.com
ksfy@ksfy.com
bpore@midco.net
editor@argusleader.com
editor@BanderaReview.com
sunnews@baytownsun.com
thepaper@ih2000.net
tbhweb_feedback@link.freedom.com
letterseditor@theeagle.com
dandrews@lonestarbbs.com
dailysentinel@coxnews.com
cbarbee@leader-news.com
genmail@empiretribune.com
opinions@thefacts.com
newsroom@galvnews.com
cking@herald-coaster.com
item@lcc.net
ajnews@lubbockonline.com
lufnews@coxnews.com
newsmessenger@coxnews.com
MonitorMail@link.freedom.com
news@herald-zeitung.com
editor@theparisnews.com
polknews@livingston.net
swtred@mwec.com
ttrib@swbell.net
dcobb@vicad.com
ljackson@journal-spectator.com
info@jimhightower.com
letter@abinews.com
newslead@aol.com
opinion@amarillonet.com
news2@athensreview.com
letters@statesman.com
dailysun@airmail.net
swilk@dallasnews.com
feedback@dallasobserver.com
editor@dallasvoice.com
jtrimble@dentonrc.com
opinion@elpasotimes.com
letters@star-telegram.com
dailyregister@nortexinfo.net
editor@hcnews.com
hci@chron.com
feedback@houstonpress.com
kamc28@abc28.com

nbc4@kamr.com
email@kauz.com
kavu@icsi.net
kbmt@kbmt.com
mail@kbtv.com
info@kcbd.com
news@kdbc.com
kdfw@airmail.net
kens1@kens-tv.com
nbc56@nbc56.com
keye@keye.com
news10@newschannel10.com
comments@KFDM.com
kfdx@cyberstation.net
tv4@kgbttv.com
11listens@khou.com
kidy@foxsanangell.com
kidz@foxabilene.com
kjac_msn@msn.com
comments@klbk.com
klsb@klsb.com
klstnews@wcc.net
comments@kltv.com
news@big2.com
kmol@kmol.com
kpej@pwrnet.com
news2@kprc.com
9news@abilene.com
news@krgv.com
kris@kristv.com
ktab@camalott.com
news@fox7.com
ktrk@aol.com
ktsmtv@whc.net
ktvt@ktvt.com
ktvt@ktvt.com
star12@ktxs.com
kveopgrm@hilene.net
kvia@kvia.com
pronews7@kvii.com
news@kvue.com
kwestv9@kwes.com
news@kwtv.com
news36@kxam.com
news36@kxan.com
nbc5dfw@nbc.com
comments@kxii.com
news25@kxxv.com
kztl@mail.usld.net
odie@lmtonline.com
LeeCullum@prodigy.com
tribune@cleaf.com

oa@link.freedom.com
kbd@pan-tex.net
dnandrews@texasonline.net
newsomt@dfwcn.com
rcowles@panews.com
standard@texaswest.com
letters@express-news.net
tdt@vvm.com
tcsunnews@texascitysun.com
wilsonc@wtr.com
webster@tomjoyner.com
hbcu@facultyvoice.com
randyd@valleystar.com
news8@wfaa.com
letters@mail.wacotrib.com
editor@wilsoncountynews.com
wcmessenger@ntws.net
bpress@inquo.net
panorama@sisna.com
hjnews@hjnews.com
ncnoaker@medianewsgroup.com
reapered@richfieldreaper.com
MPerry@thespectrum.com
newsjournal@benewsjournal.com
citizen@cache.net
clippe59@idt.net
letters@desnews.com
eyewitness@ksl.com
news@fox13.com
news@4utah.com
letters@standard.net
reader.advocate@sltrib.com
editor@sunad.com
tbp@tooeletranscript.com
news@newsleader.com
dailypro@cfw.com
lemerson@citizenet.com
ftdeditor@timespapers.com
letters1@flstarweb.com
letters@gazettevirginian.com
info@martinsvillebulletin.com
rwimer@newsadvance.com
publisher@thenews-gazette.com
nvd@shentel.net
tommyd@roanoke.com
potent357@aol.com
correspondence@spectator.org
editor@blandnews.com
tenglish@virginia-newspapers.com
cavdaily@cavalierdaily.com
info@creators.com
ddentel@starexponent.com

rbnews@gamewood.net
news@formmag.com
gcishare@info.gannett.com
ltmeditor@timespapers.com
editor@njournalg.com
opinion@potomacnews.com
radiobiz@aol.com
RadioWorld@imaspub.com
RappNews@timespapers.com
newspres@netscope.net
ombudsman@timesdispatch.com
lcasey@commtek.com
editor@smythnews.com
news@newsleader.com
scowles@media-general.com
connielawn@aol.com
editor@usatoday.com
vareview@cfw.com
pilot@pilotonline.com
comment@wava.com
wavy10pgm@aol.com
info@wcyb.com
news@wdbj7.com
whsv@whsv.com
news@wric.com
fox35@fox35.com
wset@wset.com
news@wsls.com
staff@newschannel6.com
wvbtppgm@aol.com
webmaster@nbc29.com
news12a@prodigy.com
ethomas@bellingh.gannett.com,
news@chonline.com
news@columbian.com
letters@tdn.com
letters@thedailyworld.com
pschmidt@kvnews.com
newshound@heraldnet.com
hltimes@seanet.com
editor@islandtimes.com
isspress@isspress.com
editor@sanjuanjournal.com
journal@spokanejournal.com
editor@methowvalleynews.com
sds@p.tribnet.com
news@theolympian.com
omaknews@eaglenewspapers.com
letters@peninsuladailynews.com
star@televar.com
SunNews@thesunlink.com
letters@tri-cityherald.com

warner@wenworld.com
feedback@goanacortes.com
ballardnews@seanet.com
letterstoeditor@eastsidejournal.com
kappnews@kapptv.com
news@kcpq.com
newsroom@keprtv.com
q6news@khq.com
kima@kimatv.com
kingtv@king5.com
newstips@kirotv.com
news@23nbc.com
tips@komo4news.com
news@krem.com
kviewnews@kviewtv.com
news4@kxly.com
liberty.editors@LibertySoft.com
lyndentrib@nas.com
letters.to.ed@mi-reporter.com
press@djv.com
editpage@seattle-pi.com
opinion@seattletimes.com
letters@seattleweekly.com
nlewis@skagitvalleyherald.com
letters@slate.com
publishr@valleyrecord.com
letterstoeditor@southcountyjournal.com
letters@ubnet.com
wsherald@wolfenet.com
opinion@yakima-herald.com
cpcnews@earthlink.net
intermtm@neumedia.net
sentinel@eurekanet.com
news@register-herald.com
editor@bdtonline.com
dmnews@dailyemail.com
news@dominionpost.com
hdnews@zoomnet.net
timeswv@timeswv.com
wboy@wboy.com
news8@wchstv.com
info@wchstv.com
wdtv@wdtv.com
news@woay.com
wowk@ramlink.net
newschannel3@wsaz.com
wtaf1@citynet.net
wtrf@hgo.net
feedback@wvva.com
editorial@wizardsinc.net
office@codyenterprise.com
jhguide@wyoming.com

editorial@trib.com
kfnb@coffey.com
news5@cbs5.com
news@kjwy2.com
k2@k2tv.com
info@parentalrights.org
foundation@parentalrights.org
media@adflegal.org
info@momsforliberty.org
media@momsforliberty.org
admin@ournevadajudges.com
SOTNeditor1@gmail.com
sotneditor@protonmail.com
milesmathis@protonmail.com
hmakow@gmail.com
richardcornforth@aol.com
richm222@hotmail.com
dessie.andrews@gmail.com
richardsemelka@gmail.com
immanuelclinic@gmail.com
info@veteransinpolitics.org
fibes1@gmail.com
sun677777@yahoo.com
apollo8flight@gmail.com
randg369@yahoo.com
support@davidwolfe.com
jwhitfield@legacyarkansas.com
jawanza.whitfield@gmail.com
martha.whitfield@legacyarkansas.com
legacychristian2024@gmail.com
mwallwhitfield@gmail.com
jodys@arkwest.com
susan.bush@clarkcountynv.gov

EXHIBIT A

DR. RICHARD SEMELKA, MD. CONSULTING. PLLC.

RADIOLOGY CONSULTANT & GADOLINIUM TOXICITY EXPERT | RICHARDSEMELKA.COM

January 13, 2025

re: Yichen Eason Liu

To whom it may concern,

I am Richard C Semelka, MD. I am a peer-reviewed+literature expert in MRI, Medical Imaging, safety in Radiology, Gadolinium toxicity, Standard of Care in Radiology, management of Gadolinium toxicity, and management of complex disease involving heavy metals. I also have non-peer reviewed expertise in medical misconduct. Scholar GPS provides an excellent summary of my status, for my career as of 2024, they rated me # 10 in MRI, # 14 in Medical imaging, and in the top 0.05% of scholars in all subjects. The case of Yichen Eason Liu (Eason) is complex and has required all areas of my expertise to evaluate. My current cv will follow.

I will summarize the case and provide my overall evaluation. I am using my clinical judgment on a complex case that had originated 6 years ago. My assessment has been made based on records provided to me by Eason's step-father Kimball Austin Sachs and his attorney. I followed up with a phone conversation with Mr Sachs on Jan 11, 2025 to clarify points.

Eason experienced the initiation of a medical condition on Jan 19, 2019, that manifested as a severe neurological event that resulted in seizure-like activity and bladder incontinence that appears to have arisen following ingestion of chicken dumplings that contained MSG. On Jan 20, 2019 he was transported to St Rose Siena Hospital, at which he received a CT scan of the head, and subsequently was transferred to University Medical Center of Southern Nevada Children's Hospital (UMC) the same day. The CT scan of the head was interpreted as unremarkable.

Eason was admitted to UMC. He was under the care of Dr Rachel D Fisher as the primary physician. He was started on a regimen of medications that included anti-seizure drugs (Keppra, Fosphenytoin), benzodiazepines and antihistamines. It is the impression of Mr Sachs that Eason showed further deterioration on the medical regimen he has on, with progressive inability to ambulate and use his arms over the course of admission. He apparently was not able to speak beginning Jan 19, and this carried on through the period of his admission to UMC. On the morning of Jan 26 he underwent MRI with the gadolinium contrast agent Gadavist in a dosage of 2 ml. Following the MRI Eason was considered by Mr Sachs to be limp, quite unresponsive, demonstrated urinary incontinence, and he was discharged several hours after the MRI with instructions to keep on the anti-seizure medications.

Dr. Vonita Chawla wrote in her discharge summary that Eason was in good condition at discharge. The summary by the resident on service Dr Josephone Jaw-Yi Sun reported a different interpretation of his condition and her report described he was not talking normally nor responding to physicians. Eason's weight was not recorded at discharge. Despite being placed on anti-seizure drugs he did not undergo EEG during his admission, but instead the discharge recommendations were for an outpatient EEG.

There are additional contentious reports from activity during the inpatient stay of Eason. The UMC social worker Brittany Skorek had described in testimony that Mr Sachs became loud and boisterous with staff and had to be escorted out of the facility, and yet there is no evidence that he was escorted out of the center.. Dr Enrique Solares wrote discharge progress notes that Eason was doing well, yet there is no clear evidence she examined the boy.

The parents of Eason, the step-father Mr Sachs and biological mother, Yuxia Zhang, opted to not give Eason the medications as prescribed by physicians at UMC. Instead they opted for an integrative medicine approach using a juiced and pureed diet of vegetable based diet. They brought Eason in to see Dr Hazel Gois on Friday Feb 1, 2019. On Feb 1 Dr Terry Pfau administered to Eason Myers cocktail, which the parents feel he responded well to. There she administered to him an iv of Myer's cocktail, which apparently improved his condition. The following day the parents wanted a repeat Myers cocktail because Eason responded well to it, but since her clinic was closed Dr Gois recommended them to go to another clinic IV Vitamin Therapy Clinic to get the infusion. The clinic refused to give Eason Myers cocktail, recommending the patients instead to take him into UMC. A worker at the clinic phoned Child Protective Services (CPS) the next morning Feb 3. On Feb 3 CPS members Melinda Pacell and Alison Spencer picked up Eason from the parents home, accompanied by a police officer. Two police officers appeared to observe a different status for Eason, where Officer Liedkie observed him to be quite normal, whereas officer Olson perceived he had diminished mental capacity.

Eason was admitted to UMC and other related facilities for 45 days beginning Feb 4, 2019.

Detective Slack was the detective who investigated the care of Eason, in particular paying attention to the history of parental care.

The parents in the fall of 2019 were charged with child abuse and neglect. In the court proceedings, I call into question the observations of Mr Slack, Furthermore in my opinion the parents experienced unfair and biased treatment by the District Attorney, and biased oversight by the judge. The parents also changed lawyers on a couple of occasions, being unsatisfied with the representation they were given.

In my assessment, this is a complex case. As an overview, there is no question that UMC is a credible institution and works to serve the needs of patients. Additionally there is no question that CPS is an extremely important agency and an invaluable organization to protect children. There are also two truths about parents, good parents will do anything they can to protect and care for their children, while abusive parents are generally troubled humans and can be devious in their mistreatment of children. It is also my experience when misadventure

DR. RICHARD SEMELKA, MD. CONSULTING. PLLC.

RADIOLOGY CONSULTANT & GADOLINIUM TOXICITY EXPERT | RICHARDSEMELKA.COM

occurs in a medical center invariably there is considerable effort made to protect the institution by many, perhaps most employees, which at times involves that they fabricate falsehoods. Similarly the legal and judicial system in most circumstances strives to be fair, and especially look after the interest of children. Finally the other piece involved in this account is the difference between formal Western medical care and Integrative and alternative medical care.

I have been an authority in formal, medical care for the 37 years of my career as a board certified radiologist, over the last 7 years of my career I have established myself as the world authority on Gadolinium toxicity: Gadolinium Deposition Disease, (GDD) through direct patient care and treatment. In this latter capacity I have appreciated that optimal health care is often a balance and a merger between two, often incorrectly thought of as opposing schools of thought, Western formal medicine, which often emphasizes pharmaceuticals, and Integrative medicine, which often emphasizes a wholistic strategy, with an emphasis on diet. . They should be considered however a continuum of the core of creating patient health. With the benefit I have of a broad and profound knowledge and the use of the retroscope this is my assessment of the circumstance.

At all times, the welfare of Eason has been central to Mr Sach's and Ms Zhang's efforts. That they chose to follow a path of care for Eason that focused on nutrition and healthy food, rather than traditional western medicine and pharmaceuticals, is, in my understanding of Nevada Law, up to their discretion. In fact in this particular case of Eason I think this was the better strategy. In my evaluation, Eason's condition was brought on by an immunological reaction to a component of the chicken dumplings, likely this is MSG. Much less likely a viral cause, as there is no medical report evidence of systemic symptoms of fever, no history of virus, and no supporting lab test at admission.. In children immunological reactions can be more devastating and more neurological in type than often seen in adults. The abnormal brain functioning is generally not true seizures. Although UMC followed standard protocol for a seizure disease, this likely was not ideal for a more immunological type disease. This is supported by the evidence that he appeared, by Mr Sachs accounting, to become worse over the course of this admission from Feb 20-26, 2019. A large measure of the worsening is that the anti-seizure drugs Keppra and Fosphenytoin have side effects of muscle weakness. This side effect would account for his progressively worse ambulation. His inability to speak throughout this period was likely due to the immunological reaction to MSG. It had not been clear to me whether the parents gave consent for the MRI and more importantly the Gadolinium agent Gadavist from the records submitted to me, which included UMC records. I therefore phoned Mr Sachs on Jan 11, 2025 at approximately 3:30 pm to inquire from him how the MRI was initiated. He informed me that on the morning of Jan 26, 2019 Dr Solaris spoke to the biological mother and father of Eason, neither of whom speak english as a first language, and apparently informed them that: ' if they agreed to having Eason undergo MRI with Gadolinium contrast, then he could be discharged today'. Apparently there was no description of the possible side effects of Gadavist. At that time, Gadavist was recognized to cause serious side effects including: seizures, weakness, and confusion. Dr Solaris should have mentioned this to the parents, especially since Eason had been admitted with 'seizures', and failure to do so breaches the standard of care. At the time, it may not have been widely known in medical practice that pre-

existent recent onset severe immunological disease increases significantly the possibility that an individual would experience these severe symptoms, which are the symptoms of GDD. The physicians and staff at this time though should have been aware of the large study that was reported from Ontario Canada of fetal and neonatal deaths secondary to Gadolinium contrast. My opinion is Eason did experience Gadolinium Deposition Disease secondary to the MRI, which thus worsened his overall condition. Furthermore, the parents not continuing the anti-seizure drugs after discharge, more likely than not, was beneficial for his health recovery. His parents acted in an appropriate best management for Eason.

Regarding conflicting reports between Mr Sachs and hospital staff and physicians, which I have described above. I am far more prone to believe Mr Sachs' account, than the hospital personnel involved. In my personal experience and my study of the subject, there is a tremendous tendency during times of medical misadventure for hospital employees, either due to faulty recall or deliberate dishonesty/ dissimulation, to provide false testimony of events. Furthermore the accounting of weight loss under the care of the parents in early Feb 2019 is unsubstantiable, because patient weight was not obtained at discharge on Jan 26, 2019. Furthermore the reporting at discharge of Eason being in good shape I consider false. I have seen the hospital photo image of Mr Sachs carrying Eason out of the hospital the day of discharge, Jan 26, 2019, and the boy looks limp and with a dazed expression on his face.

I do not have sufficient information, and I may not be asked to weigh in on the conduct of the District Attorney or judge. It is however abundantly clear in the current news in the USA how in general individuals in these positions can behave in a very biased fashion. I would also say in my own experience there is an enormous tendency for state officials such as judges and state attorneys to side on the part of state institutions, such as large medical centers, siding and ruling on the part of loyalty rather than truth.

I do believe that Mr Sachs and Ms Zhang have suffered injustice at the hands of state institutions in Nevada up to the present time, and that this has come to the detriment of the welfare of Eason. This is tragic and shameful. I am prepared to vigorously support the entire family in court proceedings: Eason, Mr Sachs and Ms Zhang.

I am,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Richard Semelka". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Richard" and last name "Semelka" clearly distinguishable.

Richard C. Semelka, MD

EXHIBIT B



**Ola Christian Academy
307 West Pennington St
Ola, AR 72853**

October 10, 2025

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Jody Sandberg, and I am the Administrator, and upper level supervisor of Ola Christian Academy in Ola, Arkansas. I am writing to confirm that Yichen Liu, also known as Eason, was a student at our school from August 18, 2021, through May 4, 2023.

Throughout that time I became antiquated with both his mother, Cici Zhang, and his stepfather, Austin Sachs. I met with them frequently. Their presence became a normal and welcome part of our school community. Whether it was for academic testing, or interaction with the other students, both parents were consistently involved and engaged.

What stood out to me most over those two school years was the level of care, presence, and attentiveness they showed toward Eason. This was not occasional or performative, it was continuous and sincere. At no point did I ever witness anything but a loving, respectful, and appropriately involved relationship between them and their son.

Given the interaction I had with both Ms. Zhang and Mr. Sachs, as they sought to nurture and educate their son, I can say with complete confidence that they posed no harm, threat, or danger whatsoever to Eason. Any suggestion to the contrary would be entirely at odds with everything I personally observed.

This school fosters close relationships with our families, and we get to know them well over time. Based on nearly two years of contact I have had with this family, I affirm without reservation that both parents have demonstrated nothing but dedication and concern for Eason's well-being and academic success.

If further clarification is needed, I can be reached directly at (479) 264-2569.

Sincerely,

Jody Sandberg
Administrator
Ola Christian Academy
Phone: (479) 264-2569

EXHIBIT C

Legacy Christian Academy

13224 Sardis Rd

Mabelvale, AR 72103

Phone: (804) 502-6243

October 9, 2025

To Whom It May Concern:


My name is Jawanza Whitfield, and I am the Founder, Head of School, and a teacher at Legacy Christian Academy, located at 13224 Sardis Road in Mabelvale, Arkansas, 72103. I am writing this letter to confirm that Yichen Liu, also known as Eason, was enrolled at Legacy Christian Academy for the 2024–2025 academic year, beginning on August 19, 2024.

During the school year, I had the opportunity to interact with Eason's stepfather, Mr. Austin Sachs, and his biological mother, Ms. Cici Zhang. It was routine for Ms. Zhang to drop Eason off each morning and for Mr. Sachs to pick him up in the afternoon.

Both my wife, Dr. Martha Wall-Whitfield, who serves as our school's Principal and is also a co-founder and teacher, and I have spoken with both Mr. Sachs and Ms. Zhang on multiple occasions. Through these interactions, I observed committed and attentive parents who care about Eason's academic progress and overall well-being. Based on our personal experience with them over the past year, I believe that Mr. Sachs and Ms. Zhang are responsible, engaged, and loving parents.

Should you require any further information or wish to speak with me directly, please contact me at (804) 536-0449.

Sincerely,



Jawanza Whitfield

Founder | Head of School | Teacher
Legacy Christian Academy

EXHIBIT D

AFFIDAVIT OF TRUTH SPECIFIC TO THE BAIL RECONSIDERATION HEARING FOR JUDGE PETERSON'S CONSIDERATION

I, a man, am over the age of consent, am of sound mind, am a creation of God-Almighty and a follower of God's laws first and foremost, and the laws of man when they are not in conflict (Leviticus 18:3,4). Pursuant to Matthew 5:33-37 and James 5:12, let my yea be yea, and my nay be nay, as supported by Federal Public Law 97-280, 96 Stat. 1211 - *"Whereas the Bible, the Word of god, has made a unique contribution in shaping the United States as a distinctive and blessed nation and people"* and *"Whereas Biblical teachings inspired concepts of civil government that are contained in our Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States"* and *"Whereas..the Bible is "the rock on which our Republic rests"'*". I have personal knowledge of the matters stated herein and hereby asseverate, understanding both the spiritual and legal liabilities of, "Thou shall not bear false witness against thy neighbor".

1. Officers of this court are deemed to know the law and have no excuses, Owen v. City of Independence, 445 US 622 (1980).

2. The specific controlling law that applies in this matter is NRS 178.4845, "Court order prohibiting contact with victim."

3. Paragraph 4 of NRS 178.4845 states:

"An order imposing a condition of release prohibiting contact, and any modification thereof, expires within such time, not to exceed 120 calendar days, as the court fixes."

4. Prosecutor Rinetti stated during the September 8, 2025, status check hearing that she found a 2019 no contact order that was in fact a "summons", not an order, that had a handwritten note, "no contact with named victim".

5. Even if this summons were treated as a no contact order its force and effect would have expired sometime in 2021 when NRS 178.4845 was adopted.

6. Based on the foregoing, the September 9th and 11th 2025 bench warrants were issued in error.

7. Any/all subsequent alleged wrongdoing by the accused parents would fall under the doctrine of fruit of the poisonous tree.

8. Based on this doctrine, the court was in error in stipulating an astronomical \$15K bail increase (each parent) to a family who has been financially devastated by this criminal case and is 50% below the Federal Poverty Level and simply cannot afford to be punished for a void no contact order.

9. For this court to demand the accused to pay a combined \$30k bail increase whereby the 15% bail bondsman's fee would equal \$4,500.00 is cruel and unusual punishment and shocks the conscience of this court.

10. The accused respectfully requests the bail remain as is without any increase.

Reserving ALL my Natural God-Given Unalienable Rights, Waving None, Ever.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the law of the State of Nevada that the foregoing is true and correct.

09/27/2025
Executed On

/s/ Agent for DEFENDANT SACHS
Agent for DEFENDANT SACHS

EXHIBIT E

AHA Coding Clinic® for ICD-10-CM and ICD-10-PCS - 2023 Issue 4; New/Revised ICD-10-CM Codes

AHA
Coding Clinic®
for ICD-10-CM
and ICD-10-PCS

Gadolinium Toxicity

Subcategory, T56.82, Toxic effects of gadolinium, has been created with unique codes to identify gadolinium toxicity. The new codes are as follows: • T56.821, Toxic effect of gadolinium, accidental (unintentional) • T56.822, Toxic effect of gadolinium, intentional self-harm • T56.823, Toxic effect of gadolinium, assault • T56.824, Toxic effect of gadolinium, undetermined Gadolinium is a heavy metal with magnetic properties. This metal is used in many electronics, such x-ray detectors, various optical components, microwave applications, refrigeration, and as a contrast agent to improve the clarity of images for diagnostic purposes. Side effects of gadolinium-based...

To read the full article, sign in and subscribe to AHA Coding Clinic® for ICD-10-CM and ICD-10-PCS .

[previous](#) [index](#) [next](#)

- The official AHA publication for ICD-10-CM and ICD-10-PCS coding guidelines and advice
- Current newsletters added each quarter
- Full Archives - over 3100 articles
- ALL years/issues back to 1984 organized by year and issue
- Includes ICD-10-CM/PCS Articles since 2013
- Fully searchable through Find-A-Code's Comprehensive Search
- Codes mentioned in articles are linked to Code Information pages
- Code Information pages link back to related articles
- View all the articles associated with any code, right from the code page!

Access to this feature is available in the following products:

- AHA's Coding Clinic® - ICD-10-CM/PCS +Archives


[sign in](#) [sign up](#)

demo
request yours today

subscribe
start today

newsletter
free subscription

Thank you for choosing Find-A-Code, please Sign In to remove ads.



Includes:

cpt Assistant **cpt** Knowledge Base **cpt** Vignettes

AMA
AMERICAN MEDICAL
ASSOCIATION

LEARN MORE TODAY!

Elevate Your Coding Skills with the CPT® Advanced Coding Pack

FIND-A-CODE™ Quick, Current, Complete - www.findacode.com

Printed 2025-10-12 from https://www.findacode.com/newsletters/aha-coding-clinic/icd/gadolinium-toxicity-1104044.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com

Copyright © 2000-2025 InnoviHealth Systems Inc - CPT® copyright American Medical Association

EXHIBIT F



theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

letter

Richard Semelka <richardsemelka@gmail.com>
To: theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

Fri, Oct 3, 2025 at 7:00 PM

Dr. Richard Semelka, MD. Consulting. PLLC

To Whom it may concern,

Oct 3, 2025

re: Yichen Liu

Yichen was born on Oct 19, 2010.

He experienced seizures and unresponsiveness following eating dumplings on Jan 19, 2019.

He was admitted to St Rose, Siena Jan 20, 2019, and transferred to UMC. During the course of his admission he showed improvement in his condition.

On Jan 26, 2019 he underwent MRI with Gadavist injection. Immediately following this MRI he became unresponsive and incontinent and was removed that day in this state by his stepfather Austin Sachs.

Of note, Mr Sachs had stated that he did not want Yichen to receive a GBCA injection to the physicians at UMC..

In analyzing this story, Yichen had 2 insults which all predispose to childhood seizures: i) food toxicity with seizure, and ii) GBCA injection. It is well recognized that there is an additive nature to insults that can increase the likelihood of seizures and developing them in a persistent state. It is clear, as is often the case with Gadolinium Deposition Disease (GDD), that the Gadolinium injection at MRI often serves as the final and most significant cause of patient symptoms. Also of all immune dysregulations, GDD is often the only one that can be treated, and the treatment is with DTPA chelation.

To determine if GDD is present the best confirmatory test is to perform a DTPA provocation, to look for Gd increase in urine, but more importantly to look if symptoms transiently worsen. I performed this chelation in my clinic in Carrboro, NC this spring. Gd was increased in the urine post chelation.

Interrogating the son through his mother he did describe feeling transiently more confused following the DTPA injection. It is always difficult to be absolutely certain about symptoms in children, especially if translation is involved. This said, my opinion is he had enough of a reaction when Gd was removed, and therefore a component of GDD is present. When there is a strong likelihood that GDD is present following 1 GBCA administration, appropriate minimal care is 5 chelation sessions with DTPA, and re-assess from there. DTPA is a very safe agent, so this a safe and important treatment to make, assuming that GDD was an important contributor to his condition, which is my opinion.



Richard C. Semelka, MD

IMMANUEL CLINIC

900 Dorman Suite E

Springdale, AR 72762

(P) 479-756-3251

(F) 479-756-9186

9/19/2025

Regarding Yichen (Eason) Liu

DOB: 10/19/2010

This patient had four IV chelation sessions at this office, each with administration of Zn-DTPA 1000mg per protocol: 5/1/2025, 5/29/2025, 6/26/2025 and 7/24/2025

Eason had a post IV provocation urine Gadolinium level of 0.16 mcg/24 hours on 04/01/2025 and after the above noted IV therapy had a post provocation Gadolinium urine content of 0.023 mcg/24 hours, which suggests progress in serial Gadolinium detoxification. To my knowledge, his seizure activity appeared unchanged for better or worse during this relatively short time frame of engagement. Although the family and clinical partners are hopeful, I am unable at this time to determine with certainty if Gadolinium removal will be a primary factor affecting his long-term clinical status.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Baker MD', written in a cursive style.

Jeffrey R. Baker M.D.



ORDER: 250403 10
TEST: U250403-zu10-1
PATIENT: Yichen Eason Liu
ID: LIU-Y-00970
SEX: Male
AGE: 14 DOB: 10/19/2010

CLIENT 3501
DOCTOR: Richard Semelka MD
Richard Semelka Consulting
3901 Jones Ferry Rd
Chapel Hill, NC 27516 U.S.A.

Toxic Metals; urine 24 hour

TOXIC METALS				TOXIC METALS			
		RESULT µg/g Creat	REFERENCE INTERVAL	RESULT µg/24 hr	REFERENCE INTERVAL	WITHIN REFERENCE	OUTSIDE REFERENCE
Aluminum (Al)		8.1	<25	9.0	<20		
Antimony (Sb)		0.029	<0.15	0.032	<0.15		
Arsenic (As)		12	<30	14	<30		
Barium (Ba)		1.8	<5	2.0	<5		
Beryllium (Be)		<dl	<0.01	<dl	<0.10		
Bismuth (Bi)		<dl	<1	<dl	<1		
Cadmium (Cd)		0.45	<0.15	0.50	<0.25		
Cesium (Cs)		7.5	<7	8.4	<7		
Gadolinium (Gd)		0.15	<0.3	0.16	<0.3		
Lead (Pb)		3.9	<0.6	4.3	<0.6		
Mercury (Hg)		0.30	<0.7	0.33	<1		
Nickel (Ni)		4.6	<5	5.1	<7		
Palladium (Pd)		<dl	<0.3	<dl	<0.3		
Platinum (Pt)		<dl	<0.1	<dl	<0.1		
Tellurium (Te)		<dl	<0.5	<dl	<0.5		
Thallium (Tl)		0.52	<0.4	0.58	<0.4		
Thorium (Th)		<dl	<0.02	<dl	<0.02		
Tin (Sn)		0.11	<3	0.12	<3		
Tungsten (W)		0.076	<0.4	0.085	<0.4		
Uranium (U)		0.017	<0.04	0.018	<0.04		

		URINE CREATININE				
	RESULT mg/24 hr	REFERENCE INTERVAL	-2SD	-1SD	MEAN	+1SD +2SD
Creatinine	1110	600-2100				

Comments:

Date Collected: 04/01/2025

Date Received: 04/03/2025

Date Reported: 04/04/2025

Methodology: ICP-MS QQQ, Creatinine by Jaffe Reaction

Provoking Agent: CA DTPA 1000MG

Provocation: Post Provocative

Collection Period: 24 hours

pH upon receipt: Acceptable
Urine Volume: 1500 mL

< dl: less than detection limit

Results are creatinine corrected to account for urine dilution variations. Reference intervals are based upon NHANES (cdc.gov/nhanes) data if available, and are representative of a large population cohort under non-provoked conditions. Chelation (provocation) agents can increase urinary excretion of metals/elements.



ORDER: 250726-2081
TEST: U250726-2081-1
PATIENT: Yichen Eason Liu
ID: LIU-Y-00970
SEX: Male
AGE: 14 DOB: 10/19/2010

CLIENT #: 23109
DOCTOR: Jeff Baker MD
Immanuel Clinic
900 Dorman #e
Springdale, AR 72762 U.S.A.

Toxic Metals; urine 24 hour

TOXIC METALS				TOXIC METALS			
		RESULT µg/g Creat	REFERENCE INTERVAL	RESULT µg/24 hr	REFERENCE INTERVAL	WITHIN REFERENCE	OUTSIDE REFERENCE
Aluminum	(Al)	5.5	< 25	6.7	< 20		
Antimony	(Sb)	0.018	< 0.15	0.023	< 0.15		
Arsenic	(As)	29	< 30	36	< 30		
Barium	(Ba)	3.9	< 5	4.8	< 5		
Beryllium	(Be)	<dl	< 0.01	<dl	< 0.10		
Bismuth	(Bi)	<dl	< 1	<dl	< 1		
Cadmium	(Cd)	0.36	< 0.15	0.44	< 0.25		
Cesium	(Cs)	6.5	< 7	8.0	< 7		
Gadolinium	(Gd)	0.019	< 0.3	0.023	< 0.3		
Lead	(Pb)	2.8	< 0.6	3.4	< 0.6		
Mercury	(Hg)	0.14	< 0.7	0.17	< 1		
Nickel	(Ni)	1.8	< 5	2.2	< 7		
Palladium	(Pd)	0.06	< 0.3	0.07	< 0.3		
Platinum	(Pt)	<dl	< 0.1	<dl	< 0.1		
Tellurium	(Te)	<dl	< 0.5	<dl	< 0.5		
Thallium	(Tl)	0.97	< 0.4	1.2	< 0.4		
Thorium	(Th)	<dl	< 0.02	<dl	< 0.02		
Tin	(Sn)	0.15	< 3	0.18	< 3		
Tungsten	(W)	0.064	< 0.4	0.079	< 0.4		
Uranium	(U)	0.007	< 0.04	0.008	< 0.04		

URINE CREATININE					
	RESULT mg/24 hr	REFERENCE INTERVAL	-2SD	-1SD	MEAN
Creatinine	1230	600 – 2100			

SPECIMEN DATA		
Comments:		
Date Collected: 07/25/2025	Provoking Agent: DTPA 5 MLS	pH upon receipt: Acceptable
Date Received: 07/26/2025	Provocation: Post Provocative	Urine Volume: 1300 mL
Date Reported: 07/29/2025	Collection Period: 24 hours	
Methodology: ICP-MS QQQ, Creatinine by Jaffe Reaction		

< dl: less than detection limit

Results are creatinine corrected to account for urine dilution variations. Reference intervals are based upon NHANES (cdc.gov/nhanes) data if available, and are representative of a large population cohort under non-provoked conditions. Chelation (provocation) agents can increase urinary excretion of metals/elements.

V. Erin Willis, MD
Neurology Section Chief

ACH Little Rock

Kapil Arya, MD
Sarah Cobb, MD
Paul Drake, MD
Diana Escalona-Vargas, MSc, PhD
Tara Johnson, MD, FAAP
Tim Kosick, PhD
C. Paul Manbeck, MD
Mark McManis, PhD
Adrianne Parkey, MD
Freedom F. Perkins Jr., MD
Debopam Samanta, MD
Gregory B. Sharp, MD
Aravindhan Veerapandian, MD
William D. Walters, MD, MPH

Child Neurology Residency

Kapil Arya, MD – Program Director
Malinda Scott, CMA, C-TAGME-
GME Program Coordinator

Residents

Nayana Prabhu, MD (PGY-5)
Praveen Ramani, MD (PGY-4)
Hannah Lewis, MD (PGY-3)

Advanced Practice Nurses

Julish Selvy, DNP, MSN, APRN, CPN

Little Rock-Specialty Nurses

Crystal Salser, BSN, RN, CPN
Molly Winkler, BSN, RN
Tena Brooks, LPN
Anna Bevis, BSN, RN
Tiffany Boyd, BSN, RN, CPN
Jacqueline Edens, BSN, RNC-NIC
Jenna Haire, BSN, RN, CPN
Meg Hoyt, BSN, RN, CPN
Haley Mansfield, BSN, RN
Crystal Salser, BSN, RN, CPN
Molly Winkler, BSN, RN
Tena Brooks, LPN

Office Manager

Anna Russell

Administrative Staff

Jacob Adney
Kim Harris
Kelly Howey

ACNW – Springdale

Tonya Balmakund, MD
Stephen G. Jones, MD
Collin Swafford, DO

ACNW-Specialty Nurses

Adrianne Crabtree, BSN, RN,
CNRN, CPN
Macy Cazier, BSN, RN, SCRNP
Renee Sics, BSN, RN

ACH-Jonesboro Clinic

Jonesboro-Specialty Nurse

Mary Beth Poe, LPN

Date: 10/07/2025

Patient: Yichen Liu

DOB: 10/19/2010

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Dr. Paul Drake, and I am a licensed neurologist practicing at Arkansas Children's Hospital. I am writing this letter in my capacity as the treating neurologist for Yichen Liu, also known as Eason.

I have been Eason's neurologist since March 13, 2024 and have met with his parents, Austin Sachs and Cici Zhang, on multiple occasions. In my professional interactions with them, I have found them to be consistently attentive, deeply concerned for their child's well-being, and wholly committed to pursuing the safest and most effective medical care for Eason. Based on my direct observations, they are in no way a threat to their son. In fact, they are currently advocating for more detailed testing to determine alternative treatment options for Eason in order to provide him with the greatest control of his disorder possible.

If you have any questions, I can be reached at 501-364-1850.

Sincerely,



Paul Drake, MD

Assistant Professor, Department of Pediatrics
Director, Headache Clinic
Associate Program Director, Pediatrics Residency
Pediatric Neurology Section
Arkansas Children's Hospital

EXHIBIT G

**EMAILS TO FIRE MR MARCHESE AND TO GET HIM TO WITHDRAW ON AN ORDER
SHORTENING TIME TO INCLUDE WAIVING HIS PHYSICAL APPEARANCE AT A HEARING
WHICH HE REFUSED TO DO WHICH HAS CAUSED ME TIME DELAYS/DAMAGES**



theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

Court case

10 messages

jess marchese <marcheselaw@msn.com>

Thu, Oct 2, 2025 at 7:34 PM

To: "kaustinsachs@gmail.com" <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

This is your new attorney Jess Marchese. I just received an electronic file from Mr. Goodwin and am beginning to review it. I will call you tomorrow. I was going to call now, but I forgot you are in a time zone ahead of me.

theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

Thu, Oct 2, 2025 at 10:08 PM

To: jess marchese <marcheselaw@msn.com>

Cc: susan.bush@clarkcountynv.gov, Richard Semelka <richardsemelka@gmail.com>, Immanuel Clinic <immanuelclinic@gmail.com>, Buddy Rich <fibes1@gmail.com>, Ronald Sachs <ron@ronaldsachs.com>, Ronald Sachs <sun677777@yahoo.com>, david sachs <apollo8flight@gmail.com>, Gia Sachs <randg369@yahoo.com>, richardcornforth@aol.com, Dessie Andrews PhD <dessie.andrews@gmail.com>, Alexander Falconi <admin@ournevadajudges.com>, Managing Editor <SOTNeditor1@gmail.com>, SOTN Editor <sotneditor@protonmail.com>, richm222@hotmail.com, Milesmathis <milesmathis@protonmail.com>, Henry Makow <hmakow@gmail.com>, 张育霞 <cicyzhangyu@gmail.com>

Bcc: theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

Mr Marchese,

Thank you for your email. I had every expectation that you were going to call me within 24 hours of yesterday's hearing (Wednesday, October 1, 2025) as you stated on the court record that you were going to do so and failed to do. That much is now documented. At 18 minutes and 30 seconds into today's hearing, I stated, "Excuse me judge, may I just ask the question of new counsel's name to get his spelling correct and his telephone number please?" Judge Peterson responded, "yes". You then stated, "you're not going to get my cell phone number, but I will reach out sir". **I didn't ask you for your cell number, I asked you for your telephone number.** (You appear to be SO CLUELESS as to fact that your own public website lists your cell phone number!) **It appears that YOU DON'T LISTEN.** It also appears that for a man who is REQUIRED to pay attention to detail as a defense attorney, that you actually do NOT pay attention to detail. For you to have stated what you did when you did leads me to believe you ALREADY have a "chip" on your shoulder. **That you have been purposely assigned to my case to sabotage me sir.** THAT IS WHAT ANY REASONABLE MAN WOULD DEDUCE GIVEN THE FOLLOWING:

You are **ALREADY compromised:**

You have a **pending case** for a civil rights lawsuit in PACER that was filed this past Friday, September 26, 2025 from a Nava Reyes. I went into PACER and read two of those documents and quickly surmised you threw this individual "under the bus" and **did not timely contact him** or **defend him zealously** as you were required to do per your contractual duty under **Nevada Supreme Court order ADKT 411** of which I am intimately familiar. Sir, I've had my **LIFETIME FILL** of court appointed attorneys not timely responding to me and you are **ALREADY** on the court record as a **LIAR** because you told judge Peterson that you were going to reach out to me "within 24 hours" (yesterday's hearing ended around 11am your time, so your 7:35pm email is most certainly past 24 hours). Lest there be any doubt about my TRUTHFUL CLAIM, you can simply watch yourself on the YouTube channel Our Nevada Judges (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IDwfnNtuwQQ&list=PLsKmpjAPcB2vENMuRhH_nSceRUWIZaLol&index=30)

You were **officially reprimanded** by the State Bar of Nevada on June 10, 2015 where you acknowledged, in writing, **your guilt.**

Then we have some INCREDIBLY damning public reviews (of which you, apparently, have **refused to refute** and your silent acquiescence IS evidence of your guilt as well and these complaints **ARE consistent with what Nava Reyes stated in PACER**):

From [yelp.com](#):

[Alex R.](#)

Las Vegas, NV

Jun 12, 2024

This "attorney" didn't show up the day of my case, he had me go in front of the judge with some fill in young kid who didn't know his ass from his head. I had to extend the case myself. Then 3 weeks later when he decided to show up he had me take a battery charge when public disturbance was on the table. He told me a battery charge takes 1 year to seal and that he would help me seal it. When I reached out again he realized it takes 2 years to seal and never responded.

He's an arrogant person who really doesn't care but will collect \$\$\$

DO NOT GO THIS ROUTE !! Keep looking !



[Elizabeth C.](#)

Lancaster, CA

Feb 13, 2024

He doesn't have time for his clients. He doesn't communicate well. For him, he's clients are just a case number not real people. Everyone has the right to counsel it's a constitutional right. He will not fight for you.

From [Avvo](#):

Posted by Dustin | July 28, 2025 | Hired Attorney

I would hire someone else.

He did not make me feel like a priority at all. Took my money and offered me no advice or help. All he did was show up to court for me. I really wish I would have looked into another lawyer. If you are paying someone to fight for you, you would expect to see a little fight. This guy just wants a paycheck. He does not care to help you out at all.

Sir, I have studied Nevada law/statutes against my will for over 6 years now. I have also, as a layman, filed a valid/ bona fide writ of mandamus to the Supreme Court of Nevada to have the grand jury reconvene pursuant to NRS 172.241 (which is non-discretionary) only to have the 3 member panel of chief justice Cadish and justices Stiglich and Herndon cite CIVIL case law as their AUTHORITY to deny my CRIMINAL case frame-up. Sir, as the expression goes, I ain't no dummy and I CANNOT be fooled. What they did was unlawful/illegal and was exposed as such publicly on the State of the Nation website. I am NOT going to tolerate, even for a second, substandard counsel, which you are based on the FACT that you did not timely contact me (within 24 hours) and the FACT that you have a PENDING civil rights lawsuit against you and the FACT that you have quite NEGATIVE public feedback (again, consistent with Nava Reyes suit) **whereby I am in a position to REASONABLY DETERMINE YOU CANNOT BE TRUSTED WHATSOEVER.**

At this time, I respectfully REQUIRE you to WITHDRAW as my court appointed counsel immediately. Should you choose to refuse, you leave me no choice but to EXPOSE you publicly for your infractions/public reprimand/pending public suit/negative public reviews. I am a 59 year old veteran (honorably discharged) with a ZERO criminal history that also worked many years for the National Institutes of Health. My record is CLEAN as is that of my wife. We are NOT going to tolerate your **questionable/compromised record** to serve as my court appointed attorney UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES.

I require, within 24 hours of the verifiable date of receipt of this email, your written acknowledgment of this email and your understanding that you SHALL promptly remove yourself as my court appointed attorney as I shall **NEVER** agree

to you representing me under ANY CIRCUMSTANCES BECAUSE OF YOUR COMPROMISED HISTORY/
BACKGROUND, I COULD NEVER TRUST YOU.

Mr Sachs

[Quoted text hidden]

jess marchese <marcheselaw@msn.com>
To: theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

Fri, Oct 3, 2025 at 12:26 AM

I will be withdrawing from your case. Good luck.

From: theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 2, 2025 8:08 PM
To: jess marchese <marcheselaw@msn.com>
Cc: susan.bush@clarkcountynv.gov <susan.bush@clarkcountynv.gov>; Richard Semelka <richardsemelka@gmail.com>; Immanuel Clinic <immanuelclinic@gmail.com>; Buddy Rich <fibes1@gmail.com>; Ronald Sachs <ron@ronaldsachs.com>; Ronald Sachs <sun677777@yahoo.com>; david sachs <apollo8flight@gmail.com>; Gia Sachs <randg369@yahoo.com>; richardcornforth@aol.com <richardcornforth@aol.com>; Dessie Andrews PhD <dessie.andrews@gmail.com>; Alexander Falconi <admin@ournevadajudges.com>; Managing Editor <SOTNeditor1@gmail.com>; SOTN Editor <sotneditor@protonmail.com>; richm222@hotmail.com <richm222@hotmail.com>; Milesmathis <milesmathis@protonmail.com>; Henry Makow <hmakow@gmail.com>; 张育霞 <cicyzhangyu@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Court case

[Quoted text hidden]

theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>
To: jess marchese <marcheselaw@msn.com>
Cc: susan.bush@clarkcountynv.gov, Buddy Rich <fibes1@gmail.com>, Ronald Sachs <ron@ronaldsachs.com>, Ronald Sachs <sun677777@yahoo.com>, david sachs <apollo8flight@gmail.com>, Gia Sachs <randg369@yahoo.com>, richardcornforth@aol.com, Alexander Falconi <admin@ournevadajudges.com>, richm222@hotmail.com, 张育霞 <cicyzhangyu@gmail.com>
Bcc: theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

Fri, Oct 3, 2025 at 7:38 AM

Thank you for your timely response. Please file your motion to withdraw asap.

Thank you.

Mr Sachs

[Quoted text hidden]

theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

Fri, Oct 3, 2025 at 8:02 AM

To: susan.bush@clarkcountynv.gov

Cc: Buddy Rich <fibes1@gmail.com>, Ronald Sachs <ron@ronaldsachs.com>, Ronald Sachs <sun677777@yahoo.com>, david sachs <apollo8flight@gmail.com>, Gia Sachs <randg369@yahoo.com>, richardcornforth@aol.com, Alexander Falconi <admin@ournevadajudges.com>, richm222@hotmail.com, 张育霞 <cicyzhangyu@gmail.com>

Ms Bush,

At this time, I respectfully request a list of the attorneys your office has contracted with for felony criminal cases.

Thank you.

Mr Sachs

[Quoted text hidden]

theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

Fri, Oct 3, 2025 at 11:08 AM

To: jess marchese <marcheselaw@msn.com>

Cc: susan.bush@clarkcountynv.gov, Buddy Rich <fibes1@gmail.com>, Ronald Sachs <ron@ronaldsachs.com>, Ronald Sachs <sun677777@yahoo.com>, david sachs <apollo8flight@gmail.com>, Gia Sachs <randg369@yahoo.com>, richardcornforth@aol.com, Alexander Falconi <admin@ournevadajudges.com>, richm222@hotmail.com, 张育霞 <cicyzhangyu@gmail.com>

Mr Marchese,

I neglected to mention/request that you file your motion to withdraw on an order shortening time as I have urgent matters that must be attended to.

Thank you.

Mr Sachs

On Fri, Oct 3, 2025 at 7:38 AM theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]

theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

Fri, Oct 3, 2025 at 6:00 PM

To: jess marchese <marcheselaw@msn.com>

Cc: susan.bush@clarkcountynv.gov, Buddy Rich <fibes1@gmail.com>, Ronald Sachs <ron@ronaldsachs.com>, Ronald Sachs <sun677777@yahoo.com>, david sachs <apollo8flight@gmail.com>, Gia Sachs <randg369@yahoo.com>, richardcornforth@aol.com, Alexander Falconi <admin@ournevadajudges.com>, richm222@hotmail.com, 张育霞 <cicyzhangyu@gmail.com>

Bcc: theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

Subject: Immediate Filing Required: Motion to Withdraw on OST

Mr Marchese,

As of 4:00 p.m. today, October 3, 2025, your Motion to Withdraw as counsel has still not been filed, despite your written agreement to do so last night and my clear follow-up request this morning to file it on an Order Shortening Time (OST). This continued delay is absolutely unacceptable.

I have urgent and time-sensitive matters that must be addressed, particularly the emergency motion to vacate the fraudulent no-contact order that continues to endanger my son's health and violate my rights as a parent. Your inaction is now actively obstructing access to justice and impeding efforts to protect a medically vulnerable child.

There is no excuse. This is a simple, ministerial filing that your paralegal could have completed and submitted in minutes. Your failure to act promptly, after agreeing to withdraw, is causing real and irreparable harm. You are not just wasting time, you are standing in the way of life-saving legal intervention.

I demand that you file your Motion to Withdraw **immediately** and on an **Order Shortening Time**, as previously

requested. If you do not file this today, I will have no choice but to place this on the record in the most direct and public way possible, including filings with the court and communications with the Nevada State Bar, outlining the damage caused by your inexcusable delay.

You are now on notice. Please do your job. Thank you.

Mr. Sachs

[Quoted text hidden]

jess marchese <marcheselaw@msn.com>
To: theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

Fri, Oct 3, 2025 at 6:20 PM

I am not sure what written agreement you are referring to. All I said is I would withdraw and now you are adding facts that simply were not discussed or agreed upon.

I will file a motion to withdraw like I said. I will not do it on an order shortening time as I am in trial next week and will not be able to appear.

Please stop contacting me.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 3, 2025 4:00:00 PM
To: jess marchese <marcheselaw@msn.com>
Cc: susan.bush@clarkcountynv.gov <susan.bush@clarkcountynv.gov>; Buddy Rich <fibes1@gmail.com>; Ronald Sachs <ron@ronaldsachs.com>; Ronald Sachs <sun677777@yahoo.com>; david sachs <apollo8flight@gmail.com>; Gia Sachs <randg369@yahoo.com>; richardcornforth@aol.com <richardcornforth@aol.com>; Alexander Falconi <admin@ournevadajudges.com>; richm222@hotmail.com <richm222@hotmail.com>; 张育霞 <cicyzhangyu@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Court case

[Quoted text hidden]

theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>
To: jess marchese <marcheselaw@msn.com>
Cc: susan.bush@clarkcountynv.gov, Buddy Rich <fibes1@gmail.com>, Ronald Sachs <sun677777@yahoo.com>, Ronald Sachs <ron@ronaldsachs.com>, david sachs <apollo8flight@gmail.com>, Gia Sachs <randg369@yahoo.com>, richardcornforth@aol.com, Alexander Falconi <admin@ournevadajudges.com>, richm222@hotmail.com, 张育霞 <cicyzhangyu@gmail.com>
Bcc: theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

Fri, Oct 3, 2025 at 6:27 PM

Subject: Final Notice Regarding Your Withdrawal as Counsel

Mr. Marchese,

Your recent response was both inappropriate and unprofessional. Let me remind you of the following:

1. **You agreed to withdraw**, in writing, on October 2, 2025. Your email was clear. I then immediately followed up with a good faith request that you file your Motion to Withdraw on an Order Shortening Time, due to urgent

matters that cannot move forward until you are officially relieved.

2. Your refusal to file on OST, despite knowing full well the severe time-sensitive nature of this case — including the fraudulent no-contact order that continues to place my son's medical safety in jeopardy — demonstrates a reckless indifference to your ethical obligations under the **Nevada Rules of Professional Conduct**, specifically Rules **1.1, 1.3, and 1.16**.
3. Your claim that you "will not be able to appear" next week is entirely beside the point. This is not a complex evidentiary motion. It is a routine procedural filing that could have already been submitted by your office. Your paralegal or assistant could have completed this in minutes — and you know it.
4. Your abrupt instruction for me to "stop contacting" you, while you still remain counsel of record, is wildly inappropriate and could be interpreted as an attempt to obstruct or delay a pro se defendant's right to pursue legal redress.

Let me be absolutely clear: **I will place your conduct on the record if this matter is not resolved immediately.** This includes, but is not limited to, written filings with the Court and a formal complaint to the Nevada State Bar.

You must file your **Motion to Withdraw without delay**. If you are unwilling to file it on OST, **you must at least file it TODAY**, so that the court can act promptly. I will not tolerate any further delay that jeopardizes my son's welfare or my ability to defend myself.

Govern yourself accordingly.

Mr Sachs

[Quoted text hidden]

theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

Fri, Oct 3, 2025 at 7:06 PM

To: jess marchese <marcheselaw@msn.com>

Cc: susan.bush@clarkcountynv.gov, Buddy Rich <fibes1@gmail.com>, Ronald Sachs <sun677777@yahoo.com>, Ronald Sachs <ron@ronaldsachs.com>, david sachs <apollo8flight@gmail.com>, Gia Sachs <randg369@yahoo.com>, richardcornforth@aol.com, Alexander Falconi <admin@ournevadajudges.com>, richm222@hotmail.com, 张育霞 <cicyzhangyu@gmail.com>

Bcc: theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

SUBJECT: Reconsideration of Prior Demand and Renewed Request for Immediate Withdrawal on Order Shortening Time

Mr. Marchese,

Upon reconsideration of my last correspondence, I have concluded that your stated excuse for not filing your Motion to Withdraw on an Order Shortening Time is invalid and unacceptable under the circumstances.

You previously confirmed via email that you would withdraw as counsel. Given that confirmation, and considering that I have been expressly prohibited by the presiding judge from filing any pro se pleadings under threat of contempt, **you are now the sole procedural gatekeeper** between me and access to the court. Every hour you delay is directly obstructing my ability to seek critical legal and medical relief for my son.

Your claim that you are in trial next week **does not** relieve you of your ethical and procedural obligations. You could easily:

1. Have your paralegal draft and file the motion and OST request, this is standard practice;
2. **Request that the court waive your appearance**, since the motion is uncontested and procedural;
3. File the motion to be heard on the pleadings without oral argument.

In short, **nothing about your schedule prevents you from fulfilling your duty** to withdraw promptly and professionally. A five-minute procedural matter cannot justify prolonging your role as counsel of record when you have already agreed to step aside. If your presence at a hearing were even required (which is doubtful), any competent

attorney would request that it be waived given the circumstances.

Let me remind you: I am currently unable to act on my own behalf. Your failure to file this motion is keeping my son in danger, keeping a void no-contact order in place, and continuing the obstruction of our constitutional rights as parents.

Accordingly, I am reiterating and escalating my demand:

- **File your Motion to Withdraw immediately**, no later than **close of business, Monday, October 6, 2025**.
- **Request the motion be heard on an Order Shortening Time**, explaining the urgency, and if necessary,
- **Request that the court waive your appearance or allow the motion to proceed on the pleadings**.

This is not a favor I'm requesting this is your **minimum obligation** under the Nevada Rules of Professional Conduct, particularly Rules 1.1 (Competence), 1.3 (Diligence), and 1.16(d) (Obligations Upon Termination of Representation).

If you continue to delay, I will have no choice but to report your conduct to the State Bar of Nevada and request disciplinary review for willful neglect, obstruction, and abandonment in a case with significant constitutional and medical implications.

Respectfully,

Mr Sachs

[Quoted text hidden]

EMAILS TO GET MR MARCHESE TO FILE MY JOINDER TO MY WIFE'S EMERGENCY MOTION TO VACATE THE UNLAWFUL NO CONTACT ORDER WHICH HE WILLFULLY AND WANTONLY REFUSED TO DO CAUSING ME TIME DELAYS AND DAMAGES EXPOSING HIS ROLE IN ACTIVELY SABOTAGING MY DEFENSE OF WHICH HE HAS NO EXCUSES NOR A DEFENSE TO

AND

AN EMAIL TO SUSAN BUSH, DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF APPOINTED COUNSEL (EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT) WHO HAD A DUTY TO GET MR MARCHESE TO TIMELY FILE MY JOINDER. SHE UNLAWFULLY IGNORED MY EMAIL AND STAYED SILENT BUT LET'S NOT FORGET SUSAN BUSH'S PUBLIC MOTTO:

“Public service because THAT is what my department is based on.”*

*SOURCE: FACEBOOK from a short Clark County Rapid Fire video where the interviewer asks Ms. Bush, “What Clark County core value do you resonant with and why?”

WEBPAGE LINK:

<https://www.facebook.com/ClarkCountyNV/videos/clark-county-rapid-fire-susan-bush/1159782978515498/>

CLEARLY, IGNORING MY EMAIL REQUEST FOR HELP MS BUSH IS NOT PUBLIC SERVICE, IT IS BETRAYAL OF WHICH YOU HAVE NO EXCUSES NOR OR A DEFENSE TO

THE RECORD MADE HERE ALSO CLEARLY REFLECTS THE FACT THAT MR MARCHESE REFUSED TO PROVIDE A WRITTEN LAWFUL REASON FOR HIS REFUSAL TO FILE MY JOINDER = JESS MARCHESE IS LAWLESS



theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

TIME SENSITIVE: DEMAND FOR IMMEDIATE FILING OF JOINDER TO MOTION TO VACATE NO CONTACT ORDER — OCTOBER 13, 2025

6 messages

theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

Sun, Oct 12, 2025 at 9:24 PM

To: jess marchese <marcheselow@msn.com>

Cc: Travis Shetler <travis@shetlerlawfirm.com>, Mary Chopski <mary@shetlerlawfirm.com>, Alexander Falconi <admin@ournevadajudges.com>, Managing Editor <SOTNeditor1@gmail.com>, SOTN Editor <sotneditor@protonmail.com>, richardcornforth@aol.com, richm222@hotmail.com, Richard Semelka <richardsemelka@gmail.com>, Immanuel Clinic <immanuelclinic@gmail.com>, Buddy Rich <fibes1@gmail.com>, Ronald Sachs <ron@ronaldsachs.com>, Ronald Sachs <sun677777@yahoo.com>, david sachs <apollo8flight@gmail.com>, Gia Sachs <randg369@yahoo.com>, 张育霞 <cicyzhangyu@gmail.com>, Jody Sandberg <jodys@arkwest.com>, Jawanza Whitfield <jwhitfield@legacyarkansas.com>, "Mr. Jawanza Whitfield" <jawanza.whitfield@gmail.com>, Martha Wall-Whitfield <martha.whitfield@legacyarkansas.com>, Martha Whitfield <legacychristian2024@gmail.com>, Martha Wall-Whitfield <mwallwhitfield@gmail.com>

Bcc: theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

DEMAND FOR IMMEDIATE FILING OF JOINDER — OCTOBER 13, 2025

To: Jess Marchese, Esq.

Date: Sunday, October 12, 2025

Re: Immediate Filing of Joinder (ATTACHED) by COB Monday, October 13, 2025

Dear Mr. Marchese,

This letter constitutes my first formal demand that you immediately file my Joinder (ATTACHED) to Motion to Dismiss the Unlawful No-Contact Order no later than close of business on Monday, October 13, 2025.

This is not a casual request. **This is a matter of legal urgency, constitutional consequence, and potential medical catastrophe.** The judge presiding over this case is known to reject late filings if not submitted with adequate lead time, and we are now just seven days away from the October 20, 2025 hearing.

Your failure to act will:

- Further violate my right to participate in my own defense.
- Deny the Court and opposing counsel legally admissible expert evidence.
- Jeopardize my son's access to life-preserving medical care that is scheduled in early November.
- Create a permanent record of your willful disregard of a lawful client instruction, in violation of NRPC 1.1, 1.3, and 1.4.

Let me remind you that:

Three licensed U.S. physicians (Dr. Richard Semelka, Dr. Jeff Baker, and Dr. Paul Drake) have submitted expert letters in support of our position. They confirm not only the iatrogenic nature of my son's ongoing seizures due to gadolinium toxicity, but also that his mother and I are not a danger, and instead competent, engaged, and protective caregivers.

Two mandatory reporter institutions (Ola Christian Academy and Legacy Christian Academy) fully support our parental fitness after years of daily contact with our family.

The biological father in China has stated his preference that all of Eason's medical care take place in the United States.

Eason is presently in China without access to proper medications (prescription meds are of low quality in China), with increasing seizure frequency, and the next available U.S.-based medical care (including a 24-hour EEG and follow-

ups with Dr. Semelka) is scheduled in early November.

Given all of the above, you are now on notice that any delay in filing my Joinder will be treated as gross negligence, placing both a vulnerable child and this family in immediate harm's way. **The judge has stated on the court record that if either my wife or I have ANY contact with our own son, she will absolutely issue NO BAIL bench warrants for our immediate arrest. Given these dire circumstances, this is sickening beyond all belief, therefore, my truthful account (JOINDER) must be put in the court record without further ado.**

If you fail to file my Joinder by COB Monday, October 13, 2025, I will immediately issue a final demand letter with a strict noon deadline for Tuesday, October 14, 2025, after which:

- **You will be formally put on notice of a multi-million-dollar legal malpractice lawsuit for breach of fiduciary duty and ineffective assistance of counsel.**
- I will request that my wife's attorney file the Joinder in your place if you continue to obstruct.
- I will also file a complaint with the Nevada State Bar and submit all relevant communications and timelines.
- Your inaction will be reported to independent media outlets and judicial watchdogs, including Our Nevada Judges and State of the Nation, both of which are actively tracking corruption in Nevada's courts.

This is your first and only opportunity to resolve this matter professionally and ethically. The facts are irrefutable. The evidence is in hand. The law is on our side. The time to act is now.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email by noon tomorrow, Monday, October 13, 2025.

Thank you.

Mr Sachs

P.S. Your paralegal can get my JOINDER filed in less than 10 minutes. I know because I have efiled HUNDREDS of documents in the court's Odyssey system over the past 6 years.



SACHS JOINDER TO EMERGENCY MOTION TO SET ASIDE NO CONTACT ORDER.pdf
8017K

theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>
To: jess marchese <marcheselaw@msn.com>
Cc: 张育霞 <cicyzhangyu@gmail.com>
Bcc: theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

Mon, Oct 13, 2025 at 9:02 AM

Mr Marchese,

There were a few minor typos in the original JOINDER emailed to you yesterday. Attached is the corrected version and labeled as such. Please file this one (attached) instead.

Thank you.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email upon receipt.

Thank you.

Mr Sachs
[Quoted text hidden]



CORRECTED SACHS JOINDER TO EMERGENCY MOTION TO SET ASIDE NO CONTACT ORDER.pdf
8016K

jess marchese <marcheselaw@msn.com>
To: theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

Mon, Oct 13, 2025 at 5:13 PM

You indicated that you did not want me as your attorney and said a bunch of derogatory things to me. I will not be filing anything on your behalf until Judge Peterson rules on my motion to withdraw.

In the interim, if I were you I would consider asking the Judge for permission to represent yourself at the next hearing.

From: theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, October 13, 2025 7:02 AM

To: jess marchese <marcheselaw@msn.com>

Cc: 张育霞 <cicyzhangyu@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: TIME SENSITIVE: DEMAND FOR IMMEDIATE FILING OF JOINDER TO MOTION TO VACATE NO CONTACT ORDER — OCTOBER 13, 2025

[Quoted text hidden]

theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

Mon, Oct 13, 2025 at 7:22 PM

To: jess marchese <marcheselaw@msn.com>

Cc: Travis Shetler <travis@shetlerlawfirm.com>, Mary Chopski <mary@shetlerlawfirm.com>, Alexander Falconi <admin@ournevadajudges.com>, Managing Editor <SOTNeditor1@gmail.com>, SOTN Editor <sotneditor@protonmail.com>, Milesmathis <milesmathis@protonmail.com>, Henry Makow <hmakow@gmail.com>, richardcornforth@aol.com, richm222@hotmail.com, Dessie Andrews PhD <dessie.andrews@gmail.com>, Richard Semelka <richardsemelka@gmail.com>, Immanuel Clinic <immanuelclinic@gmail.com>, info@veteransinpolitics.org, Buddy Rich <fibes1@gmail.com>, Ronald Sachs <ron@ronaldsachs.com>, Ronald Sachs <sun677777@yahoo.com>, david sachs <apollo8flight@gmail.com>, Gia Sachs <randg369@yahoo.com>, 张育霞 <cicyzhangyu@gmail.com>, Chaga Inc <support@davidwolfe.com>, Jawanza Whitfield <jwhitfield@legacyarkansas.com>, "Mr. Jawanza Whitfield" <jawanza.whitfield@gmail.com>, Martha Wall-Whitfield <martha.whitfield@legacyarkansas.com>, Martha Whitfield <legacychristian2024@gmail.com>, Martha Wall-Whitfield <mwallwhitfield@gmail.com>, Jody Sandberg <jodys@arkwest.com>

Bcc: theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

To: Jess Marchese, Esq.

Date: Monday, October 13, 2025 - 5:22pm PDT

Subject: FINAL DEMAND – File my Joinder by 12:00 PM PDT, Tomorrow, Tuesday, October 14, 2025 or Face Legal, Professional, and Public Consequences

Mr. Marchese:

This is your final demand.

As of today, **Monday, October 13, 2025**, you remain my court-appointed counsel and are therefore legally, **contractually**, and ethically obligated to act in my best interest and to file the attached **Joinder to Motion to Dismiss the Unlawful No-Contact Order as previously instructed to do so**.

Your October 13, 2025 email, in which you stated:

"You indicated that you did not want me as your attorney and said a bunch of derogatory things to me. I will not be filing anything on your behalf until Judge Peterson rules on my motion to withdraw."

—is a transparent attempt to excuse your refusal to meet the basic duties of your profession. Let me correct the record:

- **Nothing "derogatory" was said.** I issued **fact-based concerns**, supported by **public records, your disciplinary history, court performance, and client reviews**, all of which any reasonable person would cite in declining representation.
- I issued my formal request that you **withdraw immediately** on **October 2, 2025**, with a documented history of your **broken court promises**, your **reprimand by the Nevada State Bar**, a **civil rights lawsuit filed in**

federal court (Reyes v. Marchese), and your consistent failure to **timely contact or defend clients**.

- In response, at **12:26 AM CDT on October 3**, you stated, *"I will be withdrawing from your case. Good luck."* Yet when I requested you file a simple **emergency motion to expedite your withdrawal, waiving your physical appearance**, you declined, **leaving me stuck with you** until October 20 while you sit back and refuse to act.

That's **not professional lawyering**, that's obstruction.

Let me remind you that your ethical obligations under the **Nevada Rules of Professional Conduct, Nevada Supreme Court ADKT 411**, and your **signed contract with the Clark County Office of Appointed Counsel (OAC)** **remain fully enforceable until the Court signs an order relieving you:**

Your Enforceable Duties

- **ADKT 411 – Section 4(1):** *Appointed counsel shall act diligently, competently, and promptly in representing their client's legal interests until relieved by the court.*
 - **NRPC 1.1 (Competence):** You are bound to perform with the legal knowledge, skill, thoroughness, and preparation reasonably necessary for the representation.
 - **NRPC 1.3 (Diligence):** You must act with commitment and dedication to the interests of your client.
 - **NRPC 1.4 (Communication):** You are required to keep your client reasonably informed about the status of the matter and comply with reasonable requests for information.
 - **NRPC 1.7 (Conflict of Interest):** If your personal feelings or interests are impairing your duties, that is an ethical breach.
 - **Clark County Office of Appointed Counsel – Contractual Obligations:** As an appointed attorney, **you are under contractual duty** to represent indigent clients with diligence and timeliness. **Refusing to file a document due to personal offense is a clear breach.**
-

This Joinder you're withholding is **not trivial**. It contains:

- **Expert medical letters** from **Dr. Semelka, Dr. Drake, and Dr. Baker** confirming my son's seizures are iatrogenic.
- Verified evidence of **medical harm, constitutional violation, and judicial overreach**.
- Support from **two mandatory reporter schools** and the **biological father** affirming our parental fitness.
- A ticking clock: my son remains overseas, suffering from **untreated seizures**, and **U.S. medical appointments are scheduled in early November**.

This filing is time-sensitive. The judge has stated late filings will not be considered. Your refusal to act on a ten-minute task places a medically fragile child at risk and will be documented as **gross negligence**.

Your Deadline & Consequences

You have **until 12:00 PM (NOON) tomorrow, October 14, 2025** to file my Joinder. If I do not receive a filing confirmation by that time, I will take the following actions immediately and simultaneously:

1. **Bar Complaint:** File a formal complaint with the **Nevada State Bar**, citing **NRPC 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.7, ADKT 411**, and your **refusal to execute basic legal duties** while remaining counsel of record.
2. **Civil Malpractice Lawsuit:** **File a claim for \$2,500,000+ in damages for breach of fiduciary duty, gross negligence, dereliction of duty, and intentional infliction of emotional distress.**
3. **Motion to Remove for Cause:** Request the Court immediately remove you **at the October 20 hearing** and note **your refusal to file life-preserving evidence on the record.**

4. **Media and Watchdog Exposure:** Submit a full timeline, communications, and supporting documentation to:

- **Our Nevada Judges**
- **State of the Nation**
- **Judicial Watchdogs**
- **Civil Rights Advocates**
- **Veterans' Legal Defense Organizations**

Final Notice

You do **not** get to selectively pick and choose when to act while the clock runs out on my child's safety. **You signed up for this job.** You accepted the case. You made promises in court. **You are not relieved of duty** until Judge Peterson says so, and the Court hasn't.

You are not the victim here. Your feelings are irrelevant. The facts are what matter, and the record is not in your favor.

Do your job. **File my Joinder by 12:00 PM (NOON) tomorrow. Remember, it's a less than 10 minutes task via your paralegal.**

Mr. Marchese, please do not forget, should you fail in your **contractual duty** to timely file my JOINDER, this and ALL previous correspondence between you and I shall be included in my JOINDER as EXHIBITS to explain to judge Peterson why I am justified in filing my JOINDER pro se because you failed in your **CONTRACTUAL DUTY** to do so. You have no excuses.

Sincerely,
Mr. Sachs

[Quoted text hidden]



CORRECTED SACHS JOINDER TO EMERGENCY MOTION TO SET ASIDE NO CONTACT ORDER.pdf
8016K

theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

Tue, Oct 14, 2025 at 8:30 AM

To: susan.bush@clarkcountynv.gov

Cc: Travis Shetler <travis@shetlerlawfirm.com>, Mary Chopski <mary@shetlerlawfirm.com>, Alexander Falconi <admin@ournevadajudges.com>, Managing Editor <SOTNeditor1@gmail.com>, SOTN Editor <sotneditor@protonmail.com>, Milesmathis <milesmathis@protonmail.com>, Henry Makow <hmakow@gmail.com>, richardcornforth@aol.com, richm222@hotmail.com, Dessie Andrews PhD <dessie.andrews@gmail.com>, Richard Semelka <richardsemelka@gmail.com>, Immanuel Clinic <immanuelclinic@gmail.com>, info@veteransinpolitics.org, Buddy Rich <fibes1@gmail.com>, Ronald Sachs <ron@ronaldsachs.com>, Ronald Sachs <sun677777@yahoo.com>, david sachs <apollo8flight@gmail.com>, Gia Sachs <randg369@yahoo.com>, 张育霞 <cicyzhangyu@gmail.com>, Chaga Inc <support@davidwolfe.com>, Jawanza Whitfield <jwhitfield@legacyarkansas.com>, "Mr. Jawanza Whitfield" <jawanza.whitfield@gmail.com>, Martha Wall-Whitfield <martha.whitfield@legacyarkansas.com>, Martha Whitfield <legacychristian2024@gmail.com>, Martha Wall-Whitfield <mwallwhitfield@gmail.com>, Jody Sandberg <jodys@arkwest.com>, jess marchese <marcheselaw@msn.com>

To: Susan Bush, Director
Office of Appointed Counsel
Eighth Judicial District Court – Clark County, Nevada

Date: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 – 6:30 AM PDT

Subject: DEMAND FOR IMMEDIATE INTERVENTION — Jess Marchese Must File Joinder by 12:00 PM (NOON) Today

Dear Ms. Bush,

I am writing to you in your official capacity as Director of the Office of Appointed Counsel (OAC) for the Eighth Judicial District Court. You have received **multiple prior emails** and **two voicemail messages** from me in recent weeks. I have received **no response whatsoever**. I write now to demand your immediate intervention in a matter of extraordinary urgency involving court-appointed counsel **Jess Marchese**, who remains assigned to my case.

As Director of OAC, you have an **affirmative and irrefutable duty** to ensure that appointed attorneys **adhere to their contractual obligations**, act in compliance with **Nevada Supreme Court Rule ADKT 411**, and fulfill the standards imposed by the **Nevada Rules of Professional Conduct (NRPC)**, particularly when failure to do so places a vulnerable minor child and constitutionally protected parental rights at risk.

Mr. Marchese has:

1. **Refused to file a fully prepared and attached Joinder** to a Motion to Dismiss an unconstitutional No-Contact Order, despite being instructed to do so and possessing no legal justification to delay.
2. **Openly admitted in writing** that he will “not file anything” on my behalf unless and until Judge Peterson rules on his motion to withdraw.
3. **Acknowledged he remains counsel of record**, yet has taken no action to protect my rights or preserve critical evidence that must be submitted in advance of the October 20 hearing.
4. **Refused to expedite his own removal** via an emergency motion with an order shortening time, even after confirming (in writing) he would withdraw.
5. **Violated Nevada Supreme Court Order ADKT 411 and his signed contract with your office**, which requires appointed counsel to act **diligently, timely, and competently** unless and until they are formally relieved by the Court.

The Joinder at issue includes **letters from three licensed U.S. physicians** (Dr. Richard Semelka, Dr. Paul Drake, and Dr. Jeff Baker) regarding my son's medical condition and the implied need for ongoing medical care. It also makes clear my son is currently without proper treatment in China (due to low quality prescription meds there), and that there is **no legal basis for the no-contact order**. This evidence must be filed today to meet the judge's required lead time for review. **Failure to timely file this Joinder will constitute irreparable harm** and a direct violation of my right to participate in my own defense.

Let me be absolutely clear: **Jess Marchese is still the appointed attorney on this case**. Unless and until Judge Peterson signs an order relieving him, **your office is responsible for ensuring his compliance with the duties imposed on him by your own program**.

You, Ms. Bush, are not a passive administrator. Your silence to date has already created an appearance of complicity, and I am now documenting your continued inaction for submission to the State Bar of Nevada, judicial oversight bodies, and independent legal watchdogs tracking misconduct and administrative failures in Clark County.

You are now officially placed on notice:

- **You must intervene immediately** to ensure that Mr. Marchese files my Joinder no later than **12:00 PM (NOON) today, Tuesday, October 14, 2025**.
- **You are contractually and professionally obligated** to oversee attorney compliance and must act where clear violations of duty are occurring.
- If Mr. Marchese continues to refuse to act, and your office continues to stay silent, you will both be named in:
 - A **State Bar complaint** for ethical violations and administrative dereliction;
 - A **multi-million-dollar civil legal malpractice and breach-of-contract suit** for failure to supervise appointed counsel;

- A public accountability effort through **Our Nevada Judges, State of the Nation**, and other outlets tracking systemic misconduct in Clark County.

Time is no longer a luxury. This matter is urgent. A child's safety and a constitutional defense are on the line.

You have **until 12:00 PM (NOON) today** to acknowledge receipt of this message and confirm in writing that your office has **instructed or ensured** that Mr. Marchese files the Joinder. I will not accept silence or excuses in response to this demand. If there is no meaningful intervention by that deadline, I will proceed with the aforementioned actions without further notice.

Sincerely,
Mr. Sachs

[Quoted text hidden]



CORRECTED SACHS JOINDER TO EMERGENCY MOTION TO SET ASIDE NO CONTACT ORDER.pdf
8016K

theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

Tue, Oct 14, 2025 at 9:38 AM

To: jess marchese <marcheselaw@msn.com>

Cc: Travis Shetler <travis@shetlerlawfirm.com>, Mary Chopski <mary@shetlerlawfirm.com>, Alexander Falconi <admin@ournvadajudges.com>, Managing Editor <SOTNeditor1@gmail.com>, SOTN Editor <sotneditor@protonmail.com>, Milesmathis <milesmathis@protonmail.com>, Henry Makow <hmakow@gmail.com>, richardcornforth@aol.com, richm222@hotmail.com, Dessie Andrews PhD <dessie.andrews@gmail.com>, Richard Semelka <richardsemelka@gmail.com>, Immanuel Clinic <immanuelclinic@gmail.com>, info@veteransinpolitics.org, Buddy Rich <fibes1@gmail.com>, Ronald Sachs <ron@ronaldsachs.com>, Ronald Sachs <sun677777@yahoo.com>, david sachs <apollo8flight@gmail.com>, Gia Sachs <randg369@yahoo.com>, 张育霞 <cicyzhangyu@gmail.com>, Chaga Inc <support@davidwolfe.com>, Jawanza Whitfield <jwhitfield@legacyarkansas.com>, "Mr. Jawanza Whitfield" <jawanza.whitfield@gmail.com>, Martha Wall-Whitfield <martha.whitfield@legacyarkansas.com>, Martha Whitfield <legacychristian2024@gmail.com>, Martha Wall-Whitfield <mwallwhitfield@gmail.com>, Jody Sandberg <jodys@arkwest.com>, susan.bush@clarkcountynv.gov
Bcc: theaustinpowers <kaustinsachs@gmail.com>

To: Jess Marchese, Esq.

Cc: Susan Bush, Director, Office of Appointed Counsel (Eighth Judicial District Court)

Date: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 – 7:38 AM PDT

Subject: Immediate Written Explanation Required — Refusal to File Joinder by 12:00 PM Today

Mr. Marchese,

This message serves as a formal and final demand that you provide, **in writing and on the record**, a **lawful justification** for your refusal to file my **Joinder to the Motion to Dismiss the Unlawful No-Contact Order** by **12:00 PM (NOON) today, October 14, 2025**.

As you are fully aware, **Judge Peterson has expressly stated on the record that I am not permitted to file anything pro se while you remain counsel of record**. Consequently, your inaction has the direct effect of silencing my defense and preventing critical medical and factual evidence from reaching the Court prior to the October 20 hearing.

You have written that you “will not file anything” on my behalf until the Court rules on your motion to withdraw. That statement conflicts with your binding obligations under:

1. **Nevada Supreme Court Rule ADKT 411** – which mandates that appointed counsel act *diligently, competently, and promptly* in representing a client's legal interests *until formally relieved by the Court*;
2. **NRPC 1.1 (Competence), 1.3 (Diligence), 1.4 (Communication), and 1.7 (Conflict of Interest)**; and

3. **Your contractual duties with the Clark County Office of Appointed Counsel**, which require faithful and timely performance of representation unless and until the Court grants withdrawal.

You are therefore directed to answer the following, in writing and **before noon today**:

1. **What specific lawful authority** permits you to refuse to file my Joinder while you remain counsel of record?
2. **Under what statute, rule, or order** do you claim exemption from your duties under ADKT 411, the NRPC, or your OAC contract?
3. **Why have you not filed the Joinder** despite knowing that I am prohibited from filing it myself and that the Court will not consider late submissions?

Failure to provide a written, legally grounded explanation, and to file the Joinder **by the stated noon deadline**, will be documented as willful obstruction, gross negligence, and breach of fiduciary duty. This record will be transmitted to the **State Bar of Nevada**, the **Clark County Office of Appointed Counsel**, and judicial oversight authorities.

Ms. Bush, as the Director of the Office of Appointed Counsel, you are **courtesy copied** because your office bears supervisory and contractual responsibility for ensuring appointed attorneys fulfill their duties. Continued silence from your office will be construed as acquiescence in this breach. Time is of the essence; the Court's deadlines and a child's medical welfare depend on immediate compliance.

Please confirm receipt of this correspondence **immediately** and provide your **written response and/or filing confirmation by 12:00 PM (NOON) today, October 14, 2025**.

Sincerely,
Mr. Sachs

[Quoted text hidden]

TEXT MESSAGES SENT TO MR MARCHESE TO GET HIM TO DO HIS JOB THAT HE GETS PAID APPROXIMATELY \$130/HOUR* TO DO AND THAT WAS TO SIMPLY FILE MY JOINDER

***Previous court appointed counsel, Mr Charles Goodwin, told me that he was reimbursed at \$130/hour from the court's Office of Appointed Counsel for being my attorney**

(Note: His 702-349-5506 cell phone number is listed on his public website)

Sunday, October 12, 2025

7:36pm - Mr Marchese, this is Mr Sachs, I sent you an urgent email, please read asap. Thank you.

Monday, October 13, 2025

9:13am - Mr Marchese, I just left (9:09am) you a brief phone message regarding the filing of my JOINDER asap. Please acknowledge receipt of this and last night's text messages to you. Thank you. Mr Sachs

Tuesday, October 14, 2025

6:51am - Mr Marchese, please direct your attention to the email I sent to Ms Bush this morning, Tuesday, October 14, 2025, at 6:30am, PDT. It shall be in your best interests to file my lawful JOINDER without further obstruction of justice. Govern yourself accordingly. Mr Sachs

7:57am - Mr Marchese, please also direct your immediate attention to the 7:38am, PDT, email sent to you this morning to formally address in writing the specific lawful reason why you have, up to this point, WILLFULLY and WANTONLY refused to file my JOINDER? You are also put on NOTICE, that this, and previous text messages sent to you encompass the record of my repeated good faith attempts for you to comply with your CONTRACTUAL DUTY to represent me and to timely file my JOINDER as you have not been relieved of such duty by judge Peterson. Govern your accordingly. The record shows thus far you most certainly have acted in bad faith and that your hands are dirty. Mr Sachs

10:59am - Mr Marchese, you have approximately 2 hours to get my JOINDER filed. Mr Sachs

FOR THE RECORD: Mr Marchese did not respond to any of my text messages.

**PHONE CALLS TO MR MARCHESE TO ALERT HIM TO DO HIS JOB THAT HE
GETS PAID TO DO* TO SIMPLY FILE MY JOINDER**

*Because he didn't do his job, he is not entitled to any reimbursement from the county and any request for such should be viewed as FRAUD.

Monday, October 13, 2025

9:09am - Brief call to Mr Marchese's cell phone for him to file my JOINDER (message left).

Tuesday, October 14, 2025

9:00am - Brief call to Mr Marchese's business/office as listed on his website (702-385-5377) for his staff to have him call me as this is a matter of life and death (that of my stepson, Eason) (message left).

10:11am - Brief call to Mr Marchese's office after an hour had elapsed with no return call and for him or his staff to file my JOINDER prior to noon PDT today (message left).

FOR THE RECORD: Neither Mr Marchese nor his staff returned my phone calls.