

DAD

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

JOHN HENRY YABLONSKY
#AL0373-2309342444
9500 ETIWANDA
R.C., CA.91739
IN PROPRIA PERSONA

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SANBERNARDINO

JOHN HENRY YABLONSKY,

PETITIONER

Case No.: FVI900518

**NOTICE OF HABIT AND ROUTINE PRACTICE
OF COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY MICHAEL
RAMOS ADMINISTRATION PURSUANT TO
FEDERAL RULES OIF EVIDENCE RULE 406,
CA. EV. RULE 452(H) FILED IN CONJUNCTION
WITH
NOTICE OF MOTION TO DISMISS BAD FAITH
DESTRUCTION OF MATERIAL EVIDENCE
NOTICE TO JOINDER 1172.6 & 1473(B)(1)**

vs.

THE PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA,

Defendant

**DATE;SEPTEMBER 19, 2025
DEPT; V-3
TIME;0830**

THE HONORABLE JUDGE TAYLOR

TO; JASON ANDERSON AND THE COURT OF RECORD

Please take notice that John Henry Yablonsky (JOHN) will now move the court to take judicial notice California rules of evidence rule 452(h) “facts that are not reasonably subject to dispute” Federal rule of evidence rule 406 “evidence of a person’s habit, organizations routine practice may be admitted to prove that on particular occasions the person, organization acted in accordance with the habit and/ or routine. **THERE IS AN ABUNDANCE OF TANGIBLE**

SCIENTIFIC PROOF THAT FRAUD HAS BEEN COMMITTED UPON CALIFORNIA!

13AD

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

RELEVANT FACTS

On February 3, 2011 John was convicted of first degree felony- murder for a 1985 crime with the deliberate use of "ILLEGALLY SEIZED" and "ILLEGALLY ALTERED" evidence which state prosecutor used as his "CENTERPIECE INCRIMINATING EVIDENCE" in the overwhelming fact that there was no other incriminating evidence that was credible, reliable, or corroborated with the prosecutors theory, from which a reasonable jurist could conclude John as the actual killer. In this case Sanbernardino Sheriff (SBSD) found fifty four (54) piece of actual incriminating evidence at the scene where Rita Mabel Cobb (RITA) had been killed.

DR#1331036-85

Of those actual murder evidences the district attorney admitted they found sixteen (16) separate DNA's, not matching John, thereby exculpating John from this crime. (DSM 4;5-8) **THOSE FACTS WERE NOT REVEALED TO THIS JURY!** The district attorney's office also admits that the only DNA evidence tying John to this crime predates the crime by no less than days by two of the states leading experts. (RT317, 491) (DSM 4; 1) On March 4, 2009 SBSBD in conjunction with Sanbernardino District attorney (SBDA) filed probable cause affidavit to arrest John as their only suspect, after they were already told by their experts that John's DNA was unrelated to Rita's homicide. Then on March 8, 2009 SBSBD & SBDA entrapped John into providing incriminating evidence captured in the "ILLEGAL INTERROGATION". These activities were recorded and used for this case. (EXHIBIT I)

On January 26, 2011 during trial, at a time where verification of the fraudulent activities could be easily discovered District attorney John Thomas (THOMAS) practiced the routine now described herein as fraud when he took states "CENTERPIECE" evidence home to

DAD

1 manufacture probable cause evidence in a case there was no other incriminating evidence for the
 2 jury to consider John as the actual killer. Thomas then presented this evidence to the jury
 3 Between January 27, 2011 and February 3, 2011 as if it had not been altered, knowing that this
 4 evidence was false and misleading. (RT 403, 455, 508-509) **EFFECTIVELY COMMITTING**
 5 **FRAUD UPON THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND JOHNS RIGHT TO A FAIR**
 6 **TRIAL VIOLATING DUE PROCESS RIGHTS UNDER THE 14TH AMENDMENT**
 7 **UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.**

9 **THEN HE MOVESD THE COURT TO INSTRUCT THE JURY**
 10 **TO USE THIS EVIDENCE ALONE TO DETERMINE GUILT (RT569; 16)**

11 Once these frauds achieved their goal of a guilty verdict Thomas then switched out
 12 the January 26, 2011 transcripts for the November 23, 2010 transcripts, destroying the January
 13 26, 2011 transcripts to avoid accountability. These acts violated PC 132 “offering fraudulent
 14 evidence” PC 134 “preparation of fraudulent evidence as genuine and true” PC 135 “willful
 15 destruction of evidence” To wit, the district attorney’s office knew, should have known that they
 16 had committed fraud upon the court in a case where there was no other incriminating evidence
 17 from which reasonable jurists could conclude John committed these crimes. CRPC rules
 18 5-200(A-B), 3.3, 8.4(c) “may not mislead the court or tribunal with known false misleading
 19 evidence or tend to engage in dishonest activities. NAPUE 360 US 264(1959); HOLOHAN 294
 20 US 103(1935)

21 **“THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY OFFICE UNDER THE RAMOS**
 22 **ADMINISTRATION REGIME KNOWINGLY & WITH**
 23 **DELIBERATE INTENT PLANTED FALSE EVIDENCE ONTO**
 24 **JOHN, THEN AFTER ACHIEVING THEIR GOAL DESTROYED**
 25 **THEIR DIGITAL FOOT PRINTS”**

DDA

1 To verify this fact we must look at post trial filing of case #WHCSS1200311 where
2 on October 19, 2012 DDA Eric Ferguson in defense of John's misconduct allegations under
3 habeas collateral attack, the district attorney admitted on pages #10 & 23.
4

5 1) That the jury heard recordings that John stated he had a key to Rita's house on an
6 overhead projector. **(THIS PROVES STATES EXHIBIT 49 HAD A COMPACT DISC
7 CREATED ON JANUARY 26, 2011 THAT HAD AUDIO AND TEXT)**
8

9 2) That the jury were given a hardcopy text transcript the jury took into the
10 deliberations room. **(THIS PROVES STATES EXHIBIT 49A A TEXT TRANSCRIPT WAS
11 CREATED ON JANUARY 26, 2011 THAT MATCHED EXHIBIT 49)**

12 This brings up the topic that on march 14, 2025 the district attorney office now admits
13 in the face of allegations their office committed frauds upon the state and petitioner that the
14 January 26, 2011 transcripts, hard copy audio are missing and have been destroyed, now
15 unavailable for authentication or verifications by petitioner in defense of PC1172.6(c)
16 proceedings where the district now purports to say John is ineligible because the verdict in this
17 case relied on states exhibits 49 & 49A they "NEVER SEEN"!
18

19 20 **RAMOS' HABIT AND ROUTINE**

21 California Supreme Court has discovered and decided that Michael Ramos had in fact
22 defended the use false evidence in the 1993 conviction of William Richards, allegedly that he
23 had killed his wife. That after states leading experts recanted their previous findings that William
24 had killed his wife, Ramos argued that did not matter in 2016, against California Supreme Court
25 decisions to toss the Richards conviction.
26
27

DAD

1 Ramos fought to retry this man even after it was discovered that the conviction was
2 based on the use of false evidence. William Richards spent 25 years behind bars for a crime that
3 he did not commit.

4
5 Then during collateral review it was discovered that Michael Ramos against fought to
6 Prevent Kevin Cooper access to modern DNA testing to discover exculpatory evidence that
7 would prove Coopers innocence. After full development of this evidence experts found it would
8 be impossible to consider Copper as a suspect because although Coopers blood was in deed
9 found at the crime scene, that blood sample recovered had blood preservatives in it. **MEANING**
10 **THAT SBSB COLLECTED COOPERS BLOOD FROM A MEDICAL VISIT AND**
11 **PLANTED IT AT THE SCENE AND ONTO THE VICTIMS CLOTHING.... AND**
12 **RAMOS HAD A DUTY TO KNOW THIS, OR DID AND IGNORED IT ANYWAYS!**
13 ~~Ramos then wanted to try William one more time for the sixth time until defendants lawyers~~
14 ~~filed a dismissal brief targeting vindictive prosecutions.~~

15
16
17
18 This is disturbing because the actual killer in Cooper's case was a Caucasian, Ramos
19 knew that, and that Cooper was African American, and Ramos also knew that. In fact Cooper's
20 case would have evaporated in the wheels of our justice system if Pulitzer Prize winner did not
21 get involved. Columnist Nicholas Kristopher stated "HE'S NEVER SEEN A CASE THAT WAS
22 SO OUTRAGEUOUS". Ramos stood on the side lines demanding that Cooper be put to death
23 anyways, in the face of overwhelming facts that a Caucasian killed the victims and not an
24 African!
25
26
27

1 This brings us to the infamous colonies case where Mark Kirk, Jim Erwin, Paul
2 Biane were allegedly caught stealing \$102,000,000.00 from Sanbernardino bank
3 account...ACCORDING TO MICHAEL RAMOS'S FLIERS! After several years battling for
4 the truth, and several jurors deciding that Ramos was only trying to stick a political feather in his
5 cap, these defendants were acquitted, all except for one. During post trial civil litigations
6 Michael Ramos' true character took over when he deliberately deleted and erased critical files
7 from his personal and campaign storage. Destroying potential material that had potential
8 evidentiary value. The United States District Court found in 2020 that Ramos's acts were in bad
9 faith and against his duty to preserve. That Ramos is a sophisticated member of the court and had
10 access to counsel, and failing to follow rules, the principles of law, he had hoped to escape
11 accountability.
12
13
14

15 **ALLEGATIONS BY JOHN HENRY YABLONSKY**

16 That on October 2008 Michael Ramos was informed that John henry Yablonsky was
17 not a DNA suspect to Rita's homicide which occurred in 1985 by two of his leading experts.
18 (RT317 "that several days passed then she died") (RT491 "That at least one and a half days
19 passed and then she died) That John's DNA was not found on any of the actual murder evidence.
20 (DSM4; 5-8) That there was at least 16 separate DNA profiles not Matching John found on the
21 actual murder evidence. Knowing these facts Ramos then began a campaign to entrap and elicit
22 the help of three agencies to capture incriminating evidence. (EXHIBIT A) Recorded those
23 activities then decided they were not incriminating enough, and they held exculpatory matter, so,
24 he strategically redacted the recordings. (RT403; 6, 455:24) After altering this evidence until it
25 would incriminate Ramos then lied to the jury about its' authenticity. (RT508-509)
26
27
28

DAD

1 This manufactured evidence was discussed more than fifty six times
 2 throughout the trial, effectively telling the jury to base their verdict off what John said during
 3 their "COPY" created on January 26, 2011. (RT455; 6) "Change the answers to make sure they
 4 helped the prosecution and hurt the defendant by redaction of MIRANDA invocation"
 5 (RT455;26)" redacting just enough so that everything sounded good to the prosecutor, and
 6 would injure John" Then and only after the redactions were to the district attorney's liking they
 7 moved the Jury by telling them that altered evidence was (UNALTERED) and (ORIGINL
 8 MEDIA). After the jury were completely mislead about the integrity of the fabricated evidence
 9 the district attorney moved the Court to give an instruction to use this false evidence as the states
 10 sole incriminating evidence to verdict guilt. (RT569; 16) **YOU CAN DECIDE WHO**
 11 **COMMITTED THIS CRIME AND TO WHAT DEGREE BY THE DEFENDANTS**
 12 **STATEMENT EVIDENCE ALONE!** (RT509'15, 548; 16, 550; 23) Once the verdict was
 13 achieved the district attorney then switched out transcripts created on January 26, 2011 for
 14 transcripts created on November 23, 2010. **LET ME BE CRYSTAL CLEAR THAT NONE**
 15 **OF THESE TRANSCRIPTS MATCH REAL TIME RECORDINGS, OR EACH OTHER,**
 16 **AND NOW ACCORDING TO THE DISTRICT ATTORENEY THIS EVIDENCE HAS**
 17 **BEEN DESTROYED!**

POINTS AND AUTHORITY

18 Holohan 294 us @ *3 Due process clause of the 14th amendment authorizes
 19 jurisdiction on this issue to "ANY" reviewing court. That acts of prosecutorial misconduct can
 20 an in by themselves violate due process. (Id @ 111)

DAD

1 (CITING) LOUSINA 272 US @ 316 “state may not deprive defendant of liberty through acts of
 2 deception” and “the known use of deceptive methods to convict and imprison are inconsistent
 3 with rudimentary demands of justice. EWAINWRIGHT 477 US @ 181 “that prosecutors
 4 misconduct is cognizable when those actions violate due process by acts that render the trial
 5 fundamentally unfair” NAPUE @ 260; SIMPSON 912 f3d @ 575 n.17; IN RE HILL 104
 6 Cal.app.5th 804(2024) (Id @ 804 That the 14th amendment due process is violated by the known
 7 use of false evidence that goes un-corrected when it was discovered” (NAPUE @ 265, 269)
 8 IN RE JOHNSON 3 Cal.4th @ 595 “prosecutors have a duty to correct use of false evidence”
 9 PANAH 935 f3d @664, SASSOUNIAN 9 Cal.4th @ 595 **REVERSAL IS REQUITRED IF**
 10 **THE FASLE EVIDENC WAS MATERIAL TO GUILT OR PUNISHMENT! AND THE**
 11 **USE OF THE FALE EVIDENCE HAD A LIKELIHOOD OF AFFECTING THE**
 12 **JUDGMENT OF THE JURY!**

CONCLUSION

16 There is an abundance of evidence found at this crime scene, all of which indicates
 17 that someone other than Yablonsky committed this crime. It is only that Yablonsky
 18 was tried in clear violation to federal law when he was tried under post proposition **115**
 19 law for a 1985 case. It is the use of ex post facto violations that Yablonsky was
 20 convicted with this false evidence which was not corroborated by any of the actual
 21 murder evidence, while knowing that Yablonsky’s DNA predates this crime and
 22 also has no temporal connection to this crime. These practices allowed the Ramos
 23 administration to convict Yablonsky with evidence he manufactured himself, then
 24 destroyed it after use to prevent discovery. There are two experts who found these
 25 facts and are now available to “enlighten the court” with proof of these allegations.
 As such under California Evidence code 452 and federal rules of evidence rule 406,
 this court “MUST” take notice there is more than suffi8ent showing the Ramos
 administration convicted with the deliberate use of false evidence then destroyed
 it hoping to escape accountability.

July 2, 2025

John Henry Yablonsky

097

PROOF OF SERVICE BY AN INMATE

I George Yablonsky an adult and not a party to this action served and filed this motion upon the following parties on (DATE) _____ 2025 by personal service to the following parties at;

Superior Court of California	District attorney
14455 civic center dr	14455 civic center dr
v.v.ca. 92392	v.v., ca. 92392

George Vincent Yablonsky (LEGAL RUNNER)

MUST TAKE NOTICE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28