UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Central District of California

NATAN	AVRAHAM.
TANTATA	AYKAHAM.

Plaintiff(s)

COMMISSIONER MATTHEW ST., GEORGE, LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, ANGELES AND STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No. -05792 VAP (JCE

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address)

COMMISSIONER MATTHEW ST. GEORGE, N. HILL STREET, LOS ANGELES CA 90012, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, c/o 95814-2919

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

Date: 8/4/2017

CLERK OF COURT

Signature of Clerk or Deputy &

NATAN AVRAHAM 1 1778 S. Shenandoah St. 2 Los Angeles, CA 90036 2017 AUG -4 AM 11:59 3 310-877-9115 CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF. LOS ANGELES 4 Plaintiff Pro Se 5 6 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 11 NATAN AVRAHAM, 12 CX.17-05792VAFIJIG PLAINTIFF. 13 COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR DEFAMATION, DECLARATORY RELIEF AND INJUNCTION TO PREVENT VIOLATIONS OF U. S. CONSTITUTION AND U.S. CIVIL RIGHTS ACT 14 15 16 V. 17 ACT 18 COMMISSIONER MATTHEW ST., GEORGE, LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, ANGELES AND STATE OF CALIFORNIA, JURY TRIAL DEMANDED 19 20 21 DEFENDANTS. 22 23 Plaintiff, Natan Avraham, shows: 24 25

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

This matter arises under the rights granted to citizens of the United States under the United States Constitution and Civil Rights Act of 1986, as amended.

26

27

1	Plaintiff made a claim to Commissioner Matthew St. George, the Los Angeles Superior Court, the County of Lord
2	Superior Court, the County of Los Angeles and the State of California at various
3	times between September 2015 and April and May of 2017. This claim was
4	rejected by letter from D. Brett Bianco, Court Counsel of the Los Angeles
5	Superior court on May 26, 2017. The letter contained a warning that plaintiff had
6	only 6 months from the date of the letter to file a court action pursuant to
7	Government Code Section Sec. 945.6. This suit is filed within 6 months of the
8	date of notice of rejection, May 26, 2017.

- 3. All the individual parties to the complaint are residents of the County of Los Angeles, California. All the actions taken by the parties took place in Los Angeles County, California.
- 4. The defendants attempted to deprive the plaintiff of a right secured by the U.S. Constitution while acting under color of state law. His statement in open court implying the the plaintiff was a terrorist or crazy person was intended to limit the right of free expression of Plaintiff guaranteed to all citizens of the United States by the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and the Civil Rights Act of 1986.

PARTIES

- 5. The plaintiff is Natan Avraham, a resident of Los Angeles County, California.
- 6. The defendants are Matthew St. George, Commissioner of the Los Angeles Superior Court, the Los Angeles Superior Court and the County of Los Angeles, a government entity authorized by the Constitution of the State of California and the State of California.

26.

//

24 | 25 |

7. In 2015, the plaintiff was a party in a divorce proceeding pending in the Los Angeles Superior Court, at the Santa Monica Courthouse, Case No. SD027039. Plaintiff was represented by Attorney Charles M. Green. The case was being adjudicated by Commissioner Matthew St. George. In the morning of September 3 2015, Plaintiff filed a substitution of attorney placing himself in proper in the matter. In this capacity Plaintiff filed a Statement of Disqualification pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Sec. 170.3(c). After it was filed Mr. Green again became his attorney of record.

- 8. The court adjourned until the afternoon. Plaintiff left the courthouse and Mr. Green appeared for plaintiff. Prior to this time Plaintiff had been pretesting the handling of his case by Commissioner St. George. When the Commissioner returned to the bench after lunch he denied to request for disqualification. Later it appeared that the Commissioner had made disparaging and defamatory statements about the Plaintiff, the full extent of which were not known to the following January of 2016 when a transcript was obtained.
- 9. About September 15, 2015 Plaintiff was startled to find a minute order which advised that the Commissioner that he was considering having a Sheriff patrol his house and if Plaintiff was seen he would be arrested. fro and requested his attorney to disqualify the commissioner.
- 10. Prior to the hearing on September 3, 2015, Pl;aintiff had prepared a sign which he placed on his car when he was present at the Santa Monica Courthouse in connection with his pending court case at the Santa Monica Courthouse ase. The purpose of the sign was to suggest to Commissioner St. George that he disqualify himself from the case. The sign read, "JUSTICE FOR AVRAHAM, justiceforavraham.weebly.com." Below this heading the following words appeared, "If Commissioner MATTHEW ST. GEORGE is not going to follow the law and disqualify himself from my case, I'm going to do my best to enforce

the law on him."

1

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

At a hearing on September 3, 2015, Commissioner St. George made 2 disparaging remarks about the plaintiff, in open court. His remarks were reported by a court reporter. According to the court reporter's transcript, the following statements were made. (From page 10 of the transcript for hearing on September 3, 2015.) 10.

At page 10, line 7, "AND IF HE [Plaintiff] WANTS TO SPEND HIS TIME DRIVING AROUND TOWN, HE'S FREE TO DO SO. HE CAN PUT A PLACARD UP WHEREVER HE WANTS.

BUT I WANT TO LET HIM KNOW THIS. I AM CONSIDERING HAVING SHERIFF PATROLS AROUND MY HOUSE BECAUSE PEOPLE LIKE HIM [Plaintiff] ARE A THREAT TO SOCIETY. WE'VE SEEN IT IN THE NEWS EVERY DAY. EVERYBODY SAYS, OH, THEY ARE JUST A LITTLE CRAZY. YEAH, AND THE NEXT THING YOU KNOW THEY GET A GUN AND SHOOT A LOT OF PEOPLE OR KILL MY FAMILY.

"WHAT AM I SUPPOSED TO DO? I'M DOING MY JOB. SO MR AVRAHAM SHOULD KNOW THAT I'M CONSIDERING GETTING A SHERIFF PATROL, AND SHOULD HE COME NEAR MY HOUSE -- I'M NOT TELLING YOU WHERE I LIVE. I LIVE SOMEWHERE IN LOS. ANGELES -- IF HE COMES BY MY HOUSE HE WILL BE DETAINED AND POSSIBLY ARRESTED."

Following the tirade by the Commissioner, Plaintiff's attorney, Charles M. Green, resigned as plaintiff's counsel and refused to assist Plaintiff further in the divorce. This placed Plaintiff in a very difficult position of having to act as his own attorney in subsequent proceedings.

FIRST CLAIM AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS FOR VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Plaintiff incorporates all prior allegations. 12.

- 8	1 10
	1 13. On September 3, 2015, the defendants engaged in actions that were meant
2	to chill the Plaintiff's right to Free Expression of his views under the First
3	Amendment to the IIS Constitution Defends of this views under the First
4	Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Defendant, Commissioner Matthew St.
5	or the control of the
	The statements of the Defendant were made in response to
6	sign that Plaintiff had placed on his car, with the wording set forth above.
7	14. At no time did the plaintiff threaten the Commissioner with violence or
8	harm. The Plaintiff was simply expressing his views of what should happen in
9	his divorce case, then pending in the Santa Monica Courthouse. At no time did
10	Plaintiff indicate any intention of the santa Monica Courthouse. At no time did
11	Plaintiff indicate any intention of harming the Commissioner or his family.
	Despite the complete absence of any threat, the Commissioner indicated that he
12	would obtain the services of the Los Angeles County Sheriff to patrol the streets
13	of Los Angeles with a view to arresting the Plaintiff for his exercise of free
14	speech, a right guaranteed by the First Amendment of the U.S. Constituion.
15	15. The Commissioner at the time and now (as far as Plaintiff is aware) is an
16	employee of the Los Angeles Superior Court and Los Angeles County and was
17	acting in his official capacity are as a second and Los Angeles County and was
	acting in his official capacity as a commissioner thereof. The Superior Court is

The threats, make in a public place to the Plaintiff and others present that 20 16. day were intended to stop the Plaintiff from exercising his right to free 21 22

an agency of Los Angeles County, a County operating under California state law.

expression of his ideas and views.

18

19

23

24

25

26

27

28

The intent of the Commissioner and his employer was to limit Plaintiffs civil rights as expressed in the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Said actions are prohibited the U.S. Civil rights law, 11 U.S.C. sec.1986 et seq.

The Plaintiff seeks an injunction to prevent further attempts by the 18. Commissioner and the Superior Court of Los Angeles County to inhibit the Plaintiff's exercise of free speech under the First Amendment to the U.S.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES, DECLARATORY RELIEF AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

Constituion.

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

28

The Plaintiff further seeks a declaration that the Commissioner in making his remarks in court exceeded the Judicial Rules of Ethics applicable to all 3 judges and lesser officials of the State of California. Further the declaration should contain an admission that the Commissioner had no information available to him at the time of his disparaging remarks to support the conclusion that the Plaintiff was a terrorist or crazy person.

> SECOND CLAIM AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS FOR DEFAMATION OF CHARACTER AND REPUTATION OF THE PLAINTIFF.

- 20. Plaintiff incoporates all prior allegations.
- 14 Commissioner St. George defamed the reputation of Plaintiff with his 21. remarks made in open court on September 3, 2015, as set forth above.
- 16 These statements made directly or implied by the Commissioner's tirade in open court on September 3, 2015 were not true. Plaintiff has never been a 17 terrorist nor crazy person. 18
- 19 23. The statement made by Commissionar were not privileged as the remarks involved a violation of the right to free expression guaranteed by the First 20 Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. 21
- 22 24. The statements made by Coimmissioner St. George were made to the general public in an opens session of the Courthouse at Santa Monica on 23
- September 3, 2015. 24
- The statements made to the general public on that day alleged immoral and 25 25. unethical conduct by Plaintiff damaged the reputation and good name of 26 27 Plaintiff.
 - 26. These unfounded remarks caused great pain and suffering to the Plaintiff COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES, DECLARATORY RELIEF AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

and damaged his repuration as an honest and law abiding member of society. The defendants should pay damages in an amount to be determiend at trial for the damage that defendants caused to the reputation and good standing of the Plaintiff. Plaintiff believes that damages of \$ 10,000,000 would be appropriate plus costs and attorney fees.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff asks for relief as set forth above, attorneys and costs as shall be determined.

JURY REQUESTED

The plaintiff requests a jury to hear his claims as provided by law.

July 31, 2017

Natan Avraham Plaintiff pro se.