

PROOF OF SERVICE ACCORDING TO PRISONER MAIL BOX RULE

This service and mailing was conducted by a party to this action, and was conducted in accordance with facility practice and the Title 15, div.3 section §3142, also Penal Code § 2601(b).

5

2

3

4

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

6

that was addressed to the following, TO KEN YMBLENSKY 6 MMEMSANG LAW N. V. CH. 92656 FOR CORTIFIED MAILING

7 8

Superior court Of California

Attention Shawnna Manning Office reporter CSR 12827 Victorville Superior court

9

10

This service contained the following;

Questions with regards to transcripts

12

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

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 del; ivered by the U.S.P.S. from the city of; Coalinga

> zip code city

This service was conducted on)))

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 forgoing of this proof of service is the truth to the bets and direct klnowledge of;

John Henry Mabilmsky

My adress is J Box 8500 Coalinga, ca. 93210

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

Superior Court Case No.FV1900518 Dept.V-2 The Honorable Judge John Tomberlin

RE; Court Trial Transcripts

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

REQUEST FOR SWORN AFFIDAVIT UNDER THE PENALTY OF PERJURY

The case noticed above is under dispute in the federal court and concerns of authenticity are required with regards to a court's reporters notes by Shawnaa Manning,Office reporter CSR No.12827.

This officer of the court recorded trial transcripts from case number FVI900518 of the Victorville Superior court in department V-2, People v. Yablonsky on January 27,2011.

The following questions are requested under the authority of C.Ev.Code §§ 135,1401 and 1402 of the local rules of evidence with regards to the content of Ms.Mannings work product and it's authenticity.

The party gin dispute (John Henry Yablonsky) is asking the party in response (Shawnaa Manning Office Reporter CSR No.12827) to answer the following questing under the penalty of perjury with regards to case number EDCV 14-01877-PA(DTB) in the Federal District court.

- 1) Were you the court reporter for the case People vs. Yablonsky on January 27,2011 ?
- 2) Was your licence and certification current and valid at the time this reporting was conducted ? You must show proof.
- 3) The reporting was conducted for this trial date how?
- 4) Were you the only person that had access to those records before they were transcribed?
- 5) Did you use a computer with regards to that date of recording, and was this recording accessible through Wi-Fi?

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STO. (13 (REV. 3-95)

- 6) Is this recording device under your possessive control at all times during and after your work product had been installed onto the equipment?
- 7) Did yogu personally record the information that was conducted that day in Department V-2 of the Victorville Superior Court room for Case No.FVI900518 People vs.Yablonsky on Jabuary 27,2011 P.M. session?
- 8) Is it possible there were recording errors during that recording session as the record was being inserted into the device you used for this type of hearing?
- 11 9) Were you able to hear the trial clearly during that hearing?
 - 10) Is it possible that you input incorrect information the trial was presenting on this specific day?
 - 11) Is it possible that clerical errors occur during your course of woork, occaisionally ?
 - 12) During this specific day in question January 27,2011, the court was conducting witness testimony as well as recording devices with regards to interviews that were conducted by the Detectives of the case and Mr.Yablonsky. The state presented on the screen (visual) and over court speaker (audio) of that interview/Interrogation. Did your equipment record the segment played to the jury (The interrogation recording)? WHELE IS THAT PROPERTY USED FOR THE VISUAL DISC HAD AUGUS DISC USED FOR THE INFRIBLED THAT DAY? PROVIDE COPIES.
 - 13) With regards to that same session and day, there was testimony by Detective Alexander while being cross-examined by Defense attorney Dave Sanders. Pages 517 and 519 of that recording. Your records show a section that is incorrect, is it possible there was an error in recording this information.?

- 14)When was this transcript first transcribed for defense purposes and who was it for? Who ceneers it? 2 15) How many times was this section of the transcripts transcribed for any purposes ? 4
 - 16) Did you have complete control of your equipment at all times from the trial dates until they were gtranscribed?
 - 17) Is there a password that protects your computer that holds these court recordings of trials? WHAT KIND OF PROTECTION 19 THERE
- 18) Mr. Yabhonsky noticed that when you took your breaks, you left your computer unattended, and left the room. Is it possible 11 that when you leave your computer, you leave the computer program 12 running and on, to preserve records that were recorded ? NOT YET SHUED, FOR BREAK PURPOSES!
 - 19) Have you ever left the court room where your computer was located during a court ssession, while the atborney's and judge stayed behind, leaving your program on and servicable?
 - 20) is there a recording device of program that records the amount of access and by wnom, and for how long on your program ? On yourm computer for the information you install ? BE MNY OTHER ERMIPMENT! THE WOULD IN DICATE AND ALTERING OF SOME (ANGLE ALL)
 - 21) Do you still have the computer program the information in querstion was recorded on ? and if not where is the entire computer used during that session ?
 - 22) Your computer uses a hard drive while in use, where is the hard drive that was in the computer that was used during this specific trial ?
 - 23) Is it possible that your program was accessed after information was input by yourdelf, by someone else to alter the actual recordin g to something else ?

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

24) Since the interrogation recording was played during your appointed session, was it your responsibility to control the recordings that ewere played to the jury ? Where ALE THOSE DISC/S?

- 25) Do you store your computer at your personal residence when your not at work?
- 26) Do you have any other personal information on this recording dewice in question, that does not relate to criminal or civil recordings?
- 27) Does anyone have access to your equipment when your not working and at the courthouse?
- 28) When you prepare transcripts of the recording you make into your equipment, is there a way you verify the comtent before you pront and send the transcripts?

 What is that process?
- 29) There? is a serious discrepency in the trial transcript with regards to the "cross examination" by defendants attorney Dave Sanders and Detective Alexander, with regards to several lines and correspondences on pages 517-519 of that recording. Is it possible the transcripts were altered after you &prepared them?
- 30) Is it possible your equipment went unprotected and an alteration was made without your knowing?
- 31) Did you know the transcripts were altered ?
- 32) Do you know who altered the transcripts ?
 - -Final question and i'm sorry for having to ask, but it pertains to your equipment and access to this MFCEMATION
- 30) Did you alter the content of that cross examination between Detective Alexander and Sanders on PAGES 5170519 ?