

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

This mailing was inspected and sealed in the presence of an on duty correctional officer, in a fully pre-paid envelope that was addressed to the following,

To Ken Yablonsky of Gunnensroda Ln ALiso Viejo, CA.92656 For CE10400 (M61)  
H.Charles Smith  
550 Orange st.# B  
Redlands ,ca.92374

This service contained the following ;

## Questionnaire

This service was conducted by an adult over the age of 18 years of age,, and mailed in compliance with ordinary daily mail practices and routines that are processed and delivered by the U.S.P.S. from the city of;

Coalinga, and 93210  
city zip code

This service was conducted on ))) 11/3/14 Date

ACCORDING TO THE PRISONER MAIL BOX RULE  
THIS SERVICE IS CONSIDERED FILED ON THE DATE OF THE SERVICE

UNDER THE PENALTY OF PERJURY

The foregoing of this proof of service is the truth to the best and direct knowledge of;

John Henry Yablonsky

Date

My adress is Box 8500 Coalinga,ca.93210

John Henry Yablonsky AL-0373  
Box 8500  
Coalinga, ca. 93210

RE: Case no. FVI 900518  
People v. Yablonsky

Mr. Hal Smith;

Your office represented Mr. Yablonsky for a motion based on Ineffective Assistance of Counsel, with regards to the case number listed above. The state released transcripts and discovery with regards to this case, and it has been brought to the attention of the defendant in that matter, there are discrepancies to that data provided by the state.

Defendant has filed a writ of habeas corpus in the District Court, and is requesting your office answer a set of questions with regards to this [data].

Please provide the answers as soon as possible for they are being disputed now. Your office has no interest in this matter and the questions are self explaining.

On the following page are a few questions that is required of your office. Please be thorough in your answers and accurate. Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Date 11/3/14

John Henry Yablonsky

Case No. EDCV 14-01877-PA(DTB)



Mr. Hal. Smith (attorney at law)

state of california v. Yablonsky Case # FVI900518/EDCV 14-01877-PA

Your office was appointed to review the case #FVI900518 for Mr. Yablonsky to (court instructed) review the case for possible presence of Ineffective Assistance of Counsel. Your office was then given trial transcripts and discovery.

1) Did your office receive exhibits 49 (113 page transcript of the interrogation) and exhibit 49A a copy of the interrogation recording ?

2) Did your office verify that exhibit 49 (113 page) and exhibit 49A (the recording) were accurate in content ?

3) Did your office notice that the recording copy (disc) had over 136 pages of information ?

4) Was your office given a copy of the transcripts of the interrogation ( One 113 pages) and (one 136 pages) ?

5) When detective Alexander under cross examination swore that exhibit 49A was accurately transcribed for the exhibit 49, knowing they were not accurate by at least 23 pages, could that be considered as a misstatement by the detective ? And could that be considered as IAC ?

6) In the trial transcripts, detective Alexander commented during cross examination about the existence and content of the fingerprint report. Yet the defendant's attorney and prosecutor's closing statements are consistent with each other but not consistent with that cross examination ( about the existence and content of the fingerprint report) could that imply the transcripts were not recorded accurately or altered after the closing statements ?



- 1 7) When the recording had been played to the jury and the court  
2 gave the jury an instruction the recording they listened to  
3 was the [original media] knowing it was altered before it  
4 was played to them, could that be considered as an erroneous  
5 instruction ? And could that have been considered IAC ?
- 6 8) Had you been informed by the defendant that detective Alexander's  
7 cross examination statements in the trial transcripts were  
8 not what was asked or answered, would that have affected your  
9 your interpretations of the transcripts ?
- 10 9) If the attorney trial notes are consistent with the attorney's  
11 and the prosecutor's closing statements (about the existence  
12 and content of the fingerprint report) "showing there was  
13 no evidence of a fingerprint report presented in this trial"  
14 but that the trial transcripts show one full page in content  
15 of discussions of the existence and content of that report,  
16 could that imply that the trial transcripts were altered after  
17 the closing statements or recorded incorrectly ?
- 18 10) Is there anything you noticed in this evidence that was  
19 given you that should be brought to light ?

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
THIS CASE IS IN FRONT OF THE DISTRICT COURT, YOUR IMMEDIATE  
RESPONSE IS GREATLY APPRECIATED.

Date 11/3/14

Thank you very much:

John Henry Yablonsky

(2)

