



Lock your vehicle

**LOCK IT**

Hide your valuables


**HIDE IT**

Keep your property

**KEEP IT**



**DON'T BE  
A VICTIM**



# Justice for Avraham

JUSTICEFORAVRAHAM.WEEBLY.COM

JusticeforAvraham.com is a website devoted to illuminating and correcting the gross injustice done by the Los Angeles Superior Court to Natan (commonly known as Rami) Avraham, an American citizen and father, over the course of his divorce proceedings for his wife.

Over the course of these proceedings the Court repeatedly abused its' power by denying Mr. Avraham the right to a fair and impartial trial, repeatedly allowing inadmissible evidence to be presented to the Court, Court procedure to be ignored entirely, and blatantly inaccurate testimony to be presented to and accepted by the Court as fact.

In the website, you will find scans of original Court transcripts and documents directly linked to date-by-date explanations of the Court proceedings, and it is my hope that by the end of this information the truth will be clear and justice will be close at hand.

It is the duty of the Court system to protect the rights of all citizens, and the injustice done in this case must be corrected if citizens everywhere in similar situations are to feel protected by the system of law.

The facts show that over the course of this hearing and in relation to the preceding court dates the Court acted in a manner that not only violated my rights to a fair and full hearing of all the facts but that violated earlier Court decisions, caused tremendous hardship on myself and my family, and allowed inappropriate evidence to be presented and argued at trial as well as prolonged the trial and the use of Court and State time and resources. All of the mis-steps in this case came to a head on March 20, 2014 when the Court stated "Now, it appears from what I've been told here and what's been testified to, that there were additional assessments, that those assessments amounted to \$143,000 but that Ms. Avraham was found to have been the innocent spouse in those so those should not be assessed against her." (March 20, 2014 Transcript Page 16 Lines 23-28) As the evidence included in this document will show, this could not be more wrong. The Court made a series of errors and misjudgments that led to this final situation and Respondent has been given no choice but to fight for his rights beginning with the fact statement below. It will further be shown that Petitioner in this case has incorrectly claimed legal exemption from taxation as not receiving income from the properties held by the community (she did not sign the returns has received community property improperly even after abusing that property and her responsibilities under the original Settlement), and has extended these courtroom proceedings longer than should have been possible.

---

SEE ATTACHED EVIDENCE AND TRANSCRIPTS ON COMPACT DISC

FILES ALSO AVAILABLE ON WEBSITE

OBJECTION AND DECLARATION  
SUPPORTING DISQUALIFICATION  
OF JUDGE PRO TEM ST. GEORGE

Court continued to  
ignore the judgment  
made earlier in the case

**Mr. Berman requested authorization from the Court to sell the property by emergency Ex Parte Order in January of 2015, and the Court authorized that the sale of the property could be completed without Natan's signature in February of 2015. Even after requesting this emergency Ex Parte by claiming that I would not sign the sale paperwork and having the motion granted, the property remained unsold for more than forty days making it clear that the "emergency" status of the Ex Parte was entirely unnecessary. The property remains unsold at this time, indicating that the additional Court expenses and work of returning to Court to deal with these matters has been frivolous and in bad faith. Dealing with this Ex Parte has so far cost Natan Avraham many thousands of dollars and has deprived him of his Civil Rights under the Law and the Judgment. This Ex Parte action had hurt the community and the value of the property. This has all continued to be allowed by the Court.**

The Court has already ignored Natan Avraham's complaints regarding the Perjuries committed by Petitioner and Petitioner's Counsel in this case in Natan Avraham's Declaration on January 12, 2015 and January 28, 2015.

**Before the March 20 Court date even began the Court made it clear that my odds of doing well in Court that day were not good because I was representing myself in Court that day. By following the record the reader can clearly see what little difference arriving with my own counsel made thus far and that the Court had clearly ignored my Counsel on numerous occasions.**

**Quote:**

“

**The Court: You recall that I told you you were better off with an attorney?**

**Mr. Avraham: My experience was not. I'm coming with attorney, I'm going with more problem.**

“

**It is important to note that not included in the Transcript is the Court shaking his head in disapproval at this decision and saying “I don't think so.”**

**Complaint re: Illegal ex Parte Order for Sale of Wooster Property**

Natan Avraham complains that the recent Ex Parte Order from Mr. Berman regarding the sale of The Wooster property not only acts against the Judgment in this case but has been constructed in a manner that deprives Natan Avraham of his rights under the law and the Judgment in this Case

In 2013, Mr. Berman was made aware of the Ex Parte Order filed by Natan Avraham including The evidence showing that the Shenandoah Property was in danger of foreclosure. In this case

The Court stressed that the Mr. Berman should be informed about the Ex Parte, whereas in this Much larger deal the Court was seemingly willing to allow the sale without Natan Avraham's Personal knowledge the paperwork regarding this sale was not even personally served to Natan Avraham, but instead was left to be found at his residence.

The Court did not trust Natan Avraham's Ex Parte filing, and instead made a call to the office of Mr. Berman and scheduled a hearing on the matter for the next day. Mr. Berman's Ex Parte Cannot be accepted as evidence that Natan Avraham knew about the Ex Parte Order filed by Mr. Berman as the Court did not verify at any time that Natan Avraham knew about the Ex Parte Order No personal message was given to Natan Avraham, and Mr. Berman cannot claim that Any message was left for Natan Avraham as Natan Avraham has no personal voicemail. The Court is acting against the Community by allowing this Ex Parte Order with the clear knowledge That this deal could amount to as much as \$1,600,000.00 and that the escrow and sale process Had already been started for this property without Natan Avraham's knowledge or Acknowledgement The Court has clearly allowed Mr. Berman to act in bad faith.

## **Petitioner and Petitioner's Counsel History**

They abusing the settlement agreement than the judgment The Petitioner have a history of mismanagement all of community property, including allowing the Shenandoah property to be threatened with foreclosure at a huge expense and danger expense to the community. The Respondent from purchasing the Shenandoah property for a tremendous period of time, Petitioner and Petitioner's Counsel block the sale. These delay tactics and misleading statements cost Respondent and huge amount of money, damaged Respondent's credit score, and risked the foreclosure and loss of the property. Furthermore, these actions required Respondent to spend a large amount of time and resources to defend the property from foreclosure. The Petitioner has incorrectly stated that additional money was taken unauthorized from the community escrow account, that Petitioner was granted Innocent Spouse by the Internal Revenue Service and Franchise Tax Board, and that Respondent has a Court Restraining Order Working together with the 3 broker against the properties. From accessing the Barrington and Wooster Properties, all to mislead and lie as wall to the Court.. Misleading the Court and claims not allowed to Wooster and Barrington property on account of restraining orders.



Before the May 20, 2013 Court date even I explained in my declaration that Miri lied to the Internal Revenue Service, and that her release of liability occurred only because she did not sign the claim in question. *See the attached document for evidence supporting these claims.* The Court further ignored my declarations when I stated that no money had been taken from the escrow account. From the beginning the Court has had no legal reason to ignore the Judgment and block the dispersals of my money, basing their actions only upon facts Mr. Berman has pulled from the air. The Transcript makes it clear on October 9, 2013 that the Court and Mr. Berman cooperated to block the dispersal of my money. I'm going to present myself in Court and do the best I can for the representation of my case. The perjury that Mr. Berman committed is easy to verify through the transcript history and account history from the Internal Revenue Service and Franchise Tax Board, and it is easy to see which requests occurred and which did not. The Internal Revenue Service is required to notify me of any requests made by Miri, and so far I have received only the request for Innocent Spouse and Separation of Liability from 2006. In this event Miri filed this request as a claim that this was my separate income. Even in 2006 Miri was not granted Innocent Spouse but only release of liability because she did not sign the returns. The 2006 tax has not yet been paid. It is also a simple matter to show all payment history and assessments that have been applied since the Judgment, and carefully looking at this evidence will make it clear that Mr. Berman committed perjury.

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State, Number, and address):  
NATAN RAHAMIM AVRAHAM (PRO PER)  
P.O. Box 35895  
Los Angeles, CA 90035  
TELEPHONE NO.: (310) 877-9115 FAX NO. (Optional):  
E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional):  
ATTORNEY FOR (Name):

FOR COURT USE ONLY

5, 20

CONFORMED COPY  
ORIGINAL FILED  
Superior Court Of California  
County Of Los Angeles

APR 18 2013

John A. Clarko, Executive Officer/C  
By: Andre Williams, Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
STREET ADDRESS: 1725 MAIN STREET  
MAILING ADDRESS:  
CITY AND ZIP CODE: SANTA MONICA, CA 90401  
BRANCH NAME: WEST DISTRICT

PETITIONER/PLAINTIFF: MIRI AVRAHAM

RESPONDENT/DEFENDANT: NATAN. RAHAMIM AVRAHAM  
OTHER PARENT/PARTY:

REQUEST FOR ORDER  
 Child Custody  
 Child Support  
 Attorney Fees and Costs  
 MODIFICATION  
 Visitation  
 Spousal Support  
 Temporary Emergency Court Order  
 Other (specify): JUDGMENT  
CASE NUMBER: SD 027 039  
ORDER TO AWARD SHENANDOAH REAL PROPERTY TO RESP AS HIS SOLE AND SEPARATE PROPERTY

1. TO (name):  
2. A hearing on this Request for Order will be held as follows: If child custody or visitation is an issue in this proceeding, Family Code section 3170 requires mediation before or at the same time as the hearing (see item 7.)

a. Date: 5-20-13 Time: 8:45am Dept.: F Room: 115

b. Address of court  same as noted above  other (specify):

3. Attachments to be served with this Request for Order:  
a. A blank Responsive Declaration (form FL-320)  
b.  Completed Income and Expense Declaration (form FL-150) and a blank Income and Expense Declaration  
c.  Completed Financial Statement (Simplified) (form FL-155) and a blank Financial Statement (Simplified)  
d.  Points and authorities  
e.  Other (specify): DECLARATION OF NATAN AVRAHAM

Date: MARCH 2013  
NATAN AVRAHAM  
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

(SIGNATURE)

COURT ORDER

YOU ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR IN COURT AT THE DATE AND TIME LISTED IN ITEM 2 TO GIVE ANY LEGAL REASON WHY THE ORDERS REQUESTED SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED.

Time for  service  hearing is shortened. Service must be on or before (date):  
Any responsive declaration must be served on or before (date):  
The parties are ordered to attend mandatory custody services as follows:

You are ordered to comply with the Temporary Emergency Court Orders (form FL-305) attached.  
 Other (specify):

APR 18 2013

David J. Cowan  
Judge Pro Tem

JUDICIAL OFFICER

To the person who received this Request for Order: If you wish to respond to this Request for Order, you must file a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order (form FL-320) and serve a copy on the other parties at least nine court days before the hearing date unless the court has ordered a shorter period of time. You do not have to pay a filing fee to file the Responsive Declaration to Request for Order (form FL-320) or any other declaration including an Income and Expense Declaration (form FL-150) or Financial Statement (Simplified) (form FL-155).

On May 18 2013 already I explain in my discoloration miri lied to the IRS and she release of liability because she don't agree with that assessment.

1 Spouse Relief because she did not agree with the assessment but to the divorce court she agreed  
2 to the income and asked for money. I participated accordingly and filed Form 12508  
3 Questionnaire and provided the information and evidence for non-requesting spouse within the  
4 30 day limit. The IRS contact person said she did not receive my participation and allowed full  
5 relief for 2006 tax year without my right to appeal but when she found out I filed Form 12508  
6 within 30 days she suggested that I file Form 8857 Request for Innocent Spouse relief and she  
7 release me from Petitioner's 50% because Petitioner lied to the IRS. Now I have to pay for a tax  
8 professional and Petitioner is to blame.

9 10. Petitioner and her counsel have abused the settlement agreement and judgment which has  
10 harmed me financially. Attached hereto as *Exhibit H* is a letter from Wells Fargo dated  
11 03/20/2013 informing me that my business and individual credit limits have been reduced due to  
12 Petitioner's failure to pay the mortgage which ruined my credit. If I am given management and  
13 control of the property, I will be able to help my children financially every month as I have done  
14 my entire life. I believe I will have the ability to support my children. I would like to preserve  
15 this asset for the benefit of the children. The goal is for the children to inherit it the residence one  
16 day like most parents. Petitioner will not have to reimburse me 50% under the terms of the  
17 judgment if assume management of the property.

18  
19 **REASONS TO ASSIGN CASE TO ANOTHER DEPARTMENT/JUDGE**

20 11. I have serious concerns about this court's ability to make a fair and impartial ruling in this  
21 matter. I do not trust Commission Cowan to make the appropriate decisions regarding my case  
22 and for that reason I do not trust him. I believe Commissioner Cowan ignored the law and his  
23 duty to perform. I believe the Commissioner abused his power by making rulings against me and  
24 entire community assets. He had no grounds to punish me but did so without reason and  
25

1 that Barrington was a waste asset, foreclosure risk and thereby created money damages. Mr.  
2 Berman did not care about the Barrington Property which generated \$4200 per month as rental  
3 income. Barrington was sold with appraisal and on a high commission. Mr. Berman requested an  
4 appraisal for the house before any argument can be made.

5 8. Mr. Berman was misleading and lied in order to generate more attorney fees which caused  
6 more money to be lost every day. It was clear to Mr. Berman and Petitioner that keeping the  
7 house would cause unnecessary money loss. The house cannot be sold without putting in more  
8 money from our pockets. Also, foreclosure is possible. I offered to be awarded the house.  
9 Petitioner did not have to pull money from her pocket if I was awarded the house. Mr. Berman  
10 escalated the case and requested to appraise the house before any agreement could be made. Mr.  
11 Berman did not ask for the Barrington Property to be appraised and wanted to rush and lie to the  
12 court to sell and not on the public market. Mr. Berman lied and went to the court to sell a  
13 property that generated \$4,200 income per month without appraisal and on a high commission  
14 because the house was on a negative equity and the bank held liability solely on me. Mr.  
15 Berman did not bring the agent to the house and did not go by the August 17th settlement  
16 agreement in regards to the house.

17  
18 9. Petitioner does not care and for 22 months she did not pay the mortgage. She also refused to  
19 cooperate in regards to the house and wants the house to be sold at a short sale or foreclosure.  
20 After I resolved the tax issues and avoided any criminal exposure for us with the minimum  
21 monetary damage and much less from with what Petitioner's attorney made on us spending for  
22 attorney fees. He also made us loose more than \$600,000 on other damages. (Petitioner told our  
23 son that she does not care if all the money goes to attorney fees as long as she does not have to  
24 pay taxes.) After all of this, Petitioner lied to the IRS and filed Form 8857 Request for Innocent  
25

④      ②

On May 20, 2013, the Court asked Mr. Berman if he wanted anything in regard to the \$100,000.00 loan on the Wooster property, and said that he should bring a request. Mr. Berman knows he has no case under the Judgment and that Miri has a liability to pay under the Judgment. Miri was making 10% interest through this loan and Mr. Berman has continued to mislead the Court for two years with every declaration regarding this loan. Mr. Berman claimed he was concerned about wasting the Court's time and resources while he has continued to waste both as well as my time and resources.

To this point Miri has benefitted to a net amount of \$2,500.00 from 9/11/2013 my portion of the community property and this amount must be accounted for. This amount comes from the rent on the Wooster property, and has not been paid.

As indicated in the transcript, I made it clear to the Court that Miri was not paying the mortgage on the Shenandoah Property as outlined in the Judgment. "No. I asked her to deduct the mortgage for Shenandoah, whatever she was paid by the Wooster property she would deduct, that would be the difference. She doesn't do either of these things. It's been 23 months, she's not paying the mortgage according to the Judgment." (Transcript Page 13. Lines 9-13)

There is no evidence that Miri paid the full amounts of money owed to the children in this case. I can confirm that Miri was not paying these amounts as I was told so by the children in this case. I was forced to provide for the children out-of-pocket and at extreme hardship.

I am further of the opinion that the payments Miri was supposed to make were deducted from Miri's tax returns, representing a tax break to which she was not entitled. Miri has made these deductions wrongly, and in doing so has benefitted where she is not legally allowed. Miri has only benefitted from these actions, and there is no argument otherwise.

**OBJECTION AND DECLARATION  
SUPPORTING DISQUALIFICATION  
OF JUDGE PRO TEM ST. GEORGE**

**OBJECTION AND DECLARATION  
SUPPORTING DISQUALIFICATION  
OF JUDGE PRO TEM ST. GEORGE**

(4)

5, 2013

1 MR. BERMAN: I'M SORRY. ONE LAST THING, YOUR  
2 HONOR, IF I MAY. THERE IS A PROPERTY THEY OWN, A  
3 WOOSTER PROPERTY, THAT MR. ABRAHAM TOOK OUT A LOAN OF  
4 \$100,000 AND HE'S BEEN ORDERED TO PAY BACK THAT LOAN,  
5 WHICH HE'S NOT DOING, AND IT'S CAUSING SIGNIFICANT  
6 FINANCIAL STRESS ON MS. AVRAHAM AND --

(7) THE COURT: BRING A REQUEST FOR ORDER RELATING TO  
8 THAT.

9 MR. BERMAN: I THINK IT WOULD BE ENCOMPASSED IN  
10 THIS RFO BECAUSE WE'RE TALKING ABOUT THE PROPERTIES AND  
11 THE PARTIES ARE --

12 THE COURT: I DON'T RECALL SEEING THAT IN YOUR  
13 RESPONSIVE DECLARATION.

14 MR. BERMAN: IT WAS IN THERE, YOUR HONOR. IT WAS  
15 CERTAINLY IN THE RESPONSIVE PAPERS.

16 THE COURT: WHEREABOUTS?

17 MR. BERMAN: TOP OF PAGE FOUR, YOUR HONOR, OF MY  
18 CLIENT'S DECLARATION.

(19) THE COURT: I STILL NEED A SEPARATE REQUEST FOR  
(20) ORDER AS TO WHAT RELIEF YOU'RE ASKING FOR. IF YOU WANT  
(21) THE COURT TO DO SOMETHING -- IF THE PETITIONER WANTS THE  
(22) COURT TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT FILE A REQUEST. THE  
(23) RESPONSIVE ALLEGATION DOESN'T -- I DON'T THINK CREATES  
(24) AN ALTERNATIVE REQUEST.

25 MR. BERMAN: BUT THE CURRENT ORDERS REMAIN IN  
26 PLACE?

27 THE COURT: YES.

28 MR. BERMAN: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

5, 2013

1 MR. AVRAHAM: YOUR HONOR --

2 THE COURT: I'M NOT DOING ANYTHING FURTHER ON THIS  
3 PROPERTY.

4 MR. AVRAHAM: THIS WAS PART OF THE MOTION. I ASK  
5 HER TO DEDUCT THE RENT FROM WOOSTER RENT AND SHE -- THE  
6 MORTGAGE, SHE DOESN'T PAY THE MORTGAGE.

7 THE COURT: I'M NOT MAKING ANY DECISIONS ON  
8 WOOSTER TODAY.

9 MR. AVRAHAM: NO. I ASK HER TO DEDUCT THE  
10 MORTGAGE FOR SHENANDOAH, WHATEVER SHE PAY TO WOOSTER TO  
11 DEDUCT, WOULD BE THE DIFFERENCE. SHE DOESN'T DO EITHER  
12 THESE THINGS. IT'S 23 MONTHS, SHE'S NOT PAYING THE  
13 MORTGAGE ACCORDING TO THE JUDGMENT.

14 THE COURT: AS TO THE SALE OF SHENANDOAH, THE ONLY  
15 ISSUE BEFORE THE COURT, THE COURT CONTINUES THAT HEARING  
16 TO JUNE 18TH AT 10:30.

5, 20/13

17 MR. BERMAN: I JUST WANT TO LEAVE MY CLIENT'S  
18 OPTION TO BUY THAT PROPERTY OPEN.

19 THE COURT: YES.

20 MR. BERMAN: THANK YOU.

21

22 (THE PROCEEDINGS WERE CONCLUDED.)

23

24

25

26

27

28

**Natan Avraham is constructing a Perjury Complaint for the Court, and is only waiting on the receipt of transcripts and records from the Court and from the Tax Authorities. Once this evidence has been gathered Natan will be able to present the facts of the Perjury to the Court, and Natan wishes to make the Court aware that he is working to build this case.**

---

-To be clear, my only interest in pursuing justice for the perjuries committed in my case is to recover the huge losses that these perjuriës have caused. I am working very hard to preserve my property for my children and to have this case reach its' conclusion, and I feel I have no choice left but to fight these perjuries because they have caused my rights to be violated over and over again in Court

I am injured every day by the results of this case and am struggling to make things right

**OBJECTION AND DECLARATION  
SUPPORTING DISQUALIFICATION  
OF JUDGE PRO TEM ST. GEORGE**



1 NATAN AVRAHAM  
1778 s Shenandoah  
2 Los Angeles, CA 90035  
3 (310) 488-6379

4 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
5 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, WEST DISTRICT

6  
7  
8 MIRI AVRAHAM

Petitioner,

9 vs.

10 NATAN RAHAMIM AVRAHAM

11  
12 Respondent.  
13  
14

) Case No.: SD 027 039  
)  
)  
)  
) DECLARATION OF NATAN AVRAHAM  
) RE PERJURY COMPLAINT  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

15 I, NATAN AVRAHAM, declare:

16 1. I am the Respondent in this action and in this proceeding. I offer this declaration in  
17 lieu of personal testimony pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §§2009 and 2015.5; California  
18 Rules of Court Rule 5.118; *Reifler v. Superior Court*, 39 Cal. App. 3d 479,484-85 (1974); *In re*  
19 *Marriage of Stevenot*, 154 Cal. App. 3d 1051, 1059 n.3 (1984). I have personal knowledge of the  
20 facts stated in this declaration, and if sworn as a witness, I could and would competently testify  
21 thereto. I submit this declaration to establish the perjury committed by Petitioner and her counsel  
22 throughout these proceedings.  
23  
24  
25

1  
2 Complaint Regarding:

- 3 1) Perjury Committed  
4 2) Breach of Fiduciary Duty by Petitioner  
5 3) Breach of Contract by Petitioner

6 **FACTS REGARDING PERJURY**

7 2. Respondent asks this court to consider the numerous instances of perjury committed by  
8 Petitioner and Petitioner's counsel, Brett Berman, in and out of court, during the proceedings.  
9 Previously, I have complained to the LASD regarding these false statements and to claim  
10 damages these statements have cause the courts.

11 3. The Court has made a request that individuals take every effort to resolve these matters  
12 outside of Court. I am more than willing to do so and to resolve these acts of perjury outside of  
13 Court so long as the resolution is for the betterment of the children in this case.

14 4. On September 23, 2010, Petitioner and Mr. Berman took action to structure a misleading  
15 Judgment and claimed that there was an existing settlement that would allow the sale of the eight  
16 unit Barrington Property (sold for the low price of 700,000) (Exhibit ) against the conditions of  
17 the Settlement Agreement based on misleading testimony and perjury (Exhibit ) all the while  
18 refusing to acknowledge this future amount in the escrow account and committing an act of  
19 perjury while doing so. This is a violation of a court order-taking action against me as  
20 acknowledged on the record.

21 5. Petitioner signed and approved every payment and she has the ability to review every  
22 transaction. (Exhibit ) However, Petitioner continues to claim that the Internal Revenue Service  
23 and CA Franchise Tax Board have taken funds from this account while trying to gain access to  
24  
25

1 those funds. (See 03/20/2014 Hearing Transcript) **Petitioner and her counsel have misled the**  
2 **court on these facts and testified inaccurately even going so far as to claim that Petitioner**  
3 **was granted Innocent Spouse by the IRS.** An additional \$143,000 went to the IRS and  
4 Petitioner clearly did pay the mortgage on the Shenandoah Property while misleading the court  
5 and claiming at the same time that she was providing her half of the mortgage but was unable to  
6 make contact with me. Both of these statements cannot be trust. Indeed, Petitioner and her  
7 counsel have repeatedly misled the court by claiming the reimbursement and payments were  
8 already resolved by October 9, 2013. (Exhibit )

9 6. As a result of testimony and misleading statements, the court released funds to Petitioner for  
10 which I was entitled. (Exhibit ) Therefore, I had to take further action to fix these issues.

11 Petitioner has worked for three years to block my access to the money in the Wilshire Escrow  
12 account. These actions have prevented me from being able to meet my credit card debts and  
13 other community obligations. As a result, I now have to take on high interest loans to preserve  
14 the property I secured while having to fund tax defense, fees, and penalties created by the  
15 community tax burden. Until now, I was the only one harmed by these tax burdens. Petitioner  
16 has been receiving my rightful property while claiming no responsibility for the community  
17 property to the IRS and FTB.

18 7. I request sufficient time to protect myself and interests from these actions all of which are  
19 clearly being made without the community in mind especially in light of the fact that Petitioner  
20 has been allowed to block my rights for three years based on perjury. In addition, Petitioner's  
21 actions are clearly not in the best interest of the children or the community. Petitioner has been  
22 guiding the court against me with false testimony and perjury repeatedly acting on the incorrect  
23 basis of the Judgment and using the government against me.  
24  
25

1  
2 FACTS REGARDING FINANCIAL BURDENS

3 8. **(1) Funds Lost Due to Perjury- \$336,122.00 (10% plus penalties/fee for the entire**  
4 **Period)**

5 **(2) \$79,500-Additional funds received by Petitioner from the community property sale**  
6 **of the Barrington Property**

7 9. Petitioner claimed when push forward for the sale of the Barrington Property by court order  
8 that the amount of the sale would be used to meet the community tax obligation, which it was  
9 not. (See Declaration ) I am entitled to half of this original amount yet if Petitioner does not  
10 provide these amounts, I am entitled to an equal amount from the community property and would  
11 seek the appropriate sanctions by the Court for the actions of Petitioner.

12 **(3) \$40,900 per the Judgment 6...6.3 Credit Card Reimbursements**

13 10. Respondent is entitled to reimbursements from the community for his credit cards continual  
14 delay on this has caused significant damage to my credit.

15 **(4) \$28,800 per the Judgment 6.8.1 Repairs to Barrington Property**

16 11. Respondent undertook extensive repairs to the Barrington Property to the benefit of the  
17 community.

18 **(5) \$13,000 per the Judgment 7.3**

19 12. Respondent is owed reimbursement for the sale of the Nissan vehicle.

20 *Shenandoah Property*

21 **(6) \$38,000**

22 13. I repeatedly saved the Shenandoah Property from foreclosure and provided for the  
23 mortgage. (See Bank Statements, 05/20 Hearing Transcript, Reply Declaration). Mr. Berman  
24  
25

1 Admits Petitioner did not pay the mortgage (See Statements by the Court and Petitioner's  
2 Counsel) the court under Commissioners Cowan and St. George acknowledged that Petitioner  
3 was not timely paying the mortgage (Exhibit ) while continuing to claim the opposite.  
4 (Exhibit ) I am entitled to reimbursement from Petitioner.

5 **(7) \$22,500 per the Judgment 6.6.5.1 Student Loans**

6 14. The community funds intended to pay off these loans from the sale of Barrington Property  
7 has been blocked by Petitioner for more than four years and has been removed entirely by  
8 Petitioner. These expenses must still be met.

9 **(8) \$14,422 (balance due by 02/18/15) per the Judgment 6.6.2**

10 16. The 2005 tax obligation to the FTB has been blocked by Petitioner even though the  
11 Judgment clearly outlined that the proceeds of the Barrington sale were intended to provide for  
12 these expenses. These funds have been removed and must be replaced by Petitioner.

13 17. It is a fact that no one including Petitioner and her counsel can prove that Petitioner was  
14 granted Innocent Spouse status by the IRS or FTB. (See 08/18/2013 Hearing Transcript) Mr.  
15 Berman specifically requested, "I would ask for 90 days to come back so I could coordinate with  
16 her tax counsel to get evidence together". However, Petitioner still has not produced this  
17 evidence  
18 evidence

19 .  
20 **(9) \$64,500 2006 Community Tax Liability (Exhibit )**

21 15. For more than four years, the penalties and fees have been leveled at me alone even as  
22 Petitioner claims that these amounts have been paid. Petitioner has also falsely claimed that she  
23 has been granted Innocent Spouse while I have maintained the interest and penalties on these  
24 loans for three years.  
25

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

18. In addition, Petitioner can provide no evidence that Petitioner paid her share of the mortgage for the Shenandoah Property to prevent disbursement of reimbursements to me. **The court record clearly establishes the multiples instances of perjury committed by Petitioner and her attorney. I am going to fight for my civil rights.**

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this \_\_\_ day of March 2015 at Los Angeles, California.

\_\_\_\_\_  
NATAN AVRAHAM, Respondent

1  
2 REASONS TO ASSIGN CASE TO ANOTHER DEPARTMENT/JUDGE

3 1. I have serious concerns about this court's ability to make a fair and impartial ruling in this  
4 matter. I do not trust Commission St. George to make the appropriate decisions regarding my  
5 case and for that reason I do not trust him. I believe Commissioner St. George ignored the law  
6 and his duty to perform. I believe the Commissioner abused his power by making rulings against  
7 me and entire community assets. He had no grounds to punish me but did so without reason and  
8 evidence. I have been placed in a very bad situation. I have worked my entire life for my  
9 children. Most children would be very happy to have a father do what did for my children. My  
10 children were one of the happiest children in the world. Without reason, the Commissioner  
11 destroyed everything; our community is losing money every day and my children are still  
12 suffering. Further, Commission St. George allowed Petitioner's attorney, Brett Berman, to abuse  
13 me and lie about the circumstances. I also believe Mr. Berman lied to his client.  
14

15 2. There is no legal grounds and no basis in evidence for the court to sign and enter the  
16 judgment under Code of Civil Procedure §664.4 and no legal grounds to order my attorney Cary  
17 Goldstein to sign the judgment for me which does not conform to the Oral Settlement  
18 Agreement. This motion is for Petitioner to cooperate regarding the house as it concerns the  
19 judgment to start saving the community money and stop making me lose money and stop our  
20 adult children from suffering to the divorce.

21 I filed a complaint against Commissioner St. George. I believe he is biased towards Petitioner  
22 and against me. In this case, St. George's records is so lopsided as to create a reasonable doubt of  
23 his impartiality. see attachment, 9

24  
25  
OBJECTION AND DECLARATION  
SUPPORTING DISQUALIFICATION  
OF JUDGE PRO TEM ST. GEORGE

JUSTICFORAVRAHAM.WEEBLY.COM

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

Just so it's clear I'm going to keep fighting for my rights that commissioner  
Gorge to flow the law to disqualify himself

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing  
is true and correct. Executed this \_\_\_ day of January 2015 at Los Angeles, California.

16  
17  
18  
19  
20

\_\_\_\_\_  
NATAN AVRAHAM Respondent

21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**OBJECTION AND DECLARATION  
SUPPORTING DISQUALIFICATION  
OF JUDGE PRO TEM ST. GEORGE**



KAMALA D. HARRIS  
Attorney General

State of California  
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE



PUBLIC INQUIRY UNIT  
P.O. BOX 944255  
SACRAMENTO, CA 94244-2550  
(916) 322-3360  
TOLL FREE: (800) 952-3223  
TTY: CA Relay Service  
(800) 735-2922

March 27, 2015

PIU: 625896

Natan Avrahm  
1778 S. Shenandoah  
Los Angeles, CA 90035

Dear Natan Avrahm:

Thank you for your correspondence to the Office of the Attorney General.

While we appreciate the time and effort it has taken to contact our office, we are unable to assist you because the Attorney General has no jurisdiction in matters already before the court or in matters where the courts have already rendered a decision. In addition, we are prohibited by law from representing private individuals or providing legal advice, legal research or legal analysis to private individuals under any circumstances.

Therefore, we suggest that you consult with a private attorney to determine any civil remedies that may be available to you. An attorney would directly represent your interests and is the one whose advice would be most helpful to you.

Your complaint about the attorney(s) involved in this case should be directed to the State Bar. The Bar has exclusive jurisdiction over complaints against attorneys. You may contact the Bar as follows:

State Bar of California  
1149 South Hill Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90015-2299  
Telephone: (213) 765-1000 (outside of CA) or  
(800) 843-9053 (toll free)  
Internet: <http://www.calbar.ca.gov/>

We regret that we are unable to assist you. However, we hope the information we have provided clarifies our restrictions in regard to your request. Thank you again for writing.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Christophersen  
Public Inquiry Unit

For KAMALA D. HARRIS  
Attorney General

I have received this letter from the California Attorney General in response to my filed complaint, and in my understanding it outlines two ways in which it is suggested I proceed with my case. First, the letter seems to point out that I should make my complaints known to the California State Bar Association. I have done this. Second, the letter suggests that I seek a private attorney to work with me on civil remedies for what has occurred in my case. I am of the belief that this means that there are civil remedies available to me.

OBJECTION AND DECLARATION  
SUPPORTING DISQUALIFICATION  
OF JUDGE PRO TEM ST. GEORGE

March 1th, 2015

Natan (Rami) Avrahm

1778 S. Shenandoah

Los Angeles, CA 90035

 COPY

California Attorney General's Office

P.O. Box 944255

Sacramento, CA 94244-2550

To Whom it May Concern;

My name is Natan Avraham (commonly known as Rami) and I wish to report what I believe to be a series of acts of perjury during the courtroom proceedings in which I was involved as Respondent to divorce Settlement and Judgment hearings. I have a good faith belief and written evidence in the form of courtroom transcripts, Orders, and depositions that the statements made and actions taken by Petitioner and Petitioner's Counsel during proceedings:

- (1) Were made deliberately and willfully
- (2) Were known to be false
- (3) Were made under oath and/or during courtroom proceedings
- (4) Were material to this case and to the resulting actions

As outlined under California law these statements were acts of perjury and I am seeking assistance from the Office of the Attorney General in seeing these crimes set right.

During the proceedings of my case Petitioner and Petitioner's Counsel were able to structure a series of events that not only violated my Civil Liberties but took advantage of courtroom decorum and oversight by presenting false testimony to the Court and by violating courtroom procedure.

Included material facts and misrepresentations:

- (1) Testimony to the Court that community funds were withdrawn from community escrow by IRS. The only payment to the Internal Revenue Service was made at the closing of sale of community property by both parties. The evidence clearly indicates that there were no such further funds removed. This testimony is directly contradictory to evidence presented in court and these claims have prevented Respondent from rightful access to funds and property, prevented the disbursement of appropriate funds to the children in this case, and irreparably damaged the finances and credit of Respondent (the Judgment allowing the sale of this Barrington property was at this point already based on perjury, yet these damages have already been lost). These funds were specifically intended by the Settlement Agreement to provide for Respondent's credit card debts, the children's wellbeing, and the Franchise Tax Board and were instead removed by Petitioner and Petitioner's Counsel. Finally, the Court Order demanding the sale of the Barrington property and subsequent escrow account clearly indicates that

Petitioner had access to and administration of these funds yet Petitioner and Petitioner's Counsel Claim to be missing this information. On September 23rd, 2010, Petitioner and etitioner's Counsel took action to structure a misleading Judgment and claimed that there was an existing Settlement that would allow the sale of the eight (8) unit Barrington property (sold for the low price of \$700,000!), against the conditions of the Settlemnt Agreement and based on misleading testimony and perjury, all the while refusing to acknowledge this future amount in the escrow account and committing an act of perjury while doing so. The amounts in this account have been fixed from the sale of the community Barrington property and are no mystery to the Petitioner and Petitioner's Counsel

- (2) Following the removal of these funds from their rightful purposes and from the community, Petitioner and Petitioner's Counsel engaged in the misrepresentation of Petitioner's Innocent Spouse status with the Internal Revenue Service and Franchise Tax Board, absent of any corroborating evidence. This claim has caused the community tax burden to shift entirely to Respondent, severely damaging Respondent's finances and credit and endangering the community property while not meeting the liabilities owed to the Internal Revenue Service and Franchise Tax Board to the community. Petitioner and Petitioner's Counsel requested and were rewarded ample time to present evidence to the Court to support their claims and were unable to do so. Petitioner and Petitioner's Counsel were given sixty (60) days to work (after a request for ninety (90) days) with Tax Counsel to ascertain Petitioner's Tax status and provide relevant documents, yet even after this extended period were unable to do so.

- (3) Misrepresentation of mortgage payments covered by Divorce Settlement Agreement that resulted in huge damage to Respondent finances and credit rating (both deemed material assets by the Settlement Agreement and Law) simply to preserve the assets of Respondent and the community. Testimony had already been given in Court that Petitioner was not meeting mortgage payment requirements, yet Petitioner and Petitioner's Counsel later claimed these obligations were being met. 8.12.2013 Petitioner simultaneously claims Petitioner was unable to interact with Respondent, thus this testimony is self-contradictory. . Furthermore, Petitioner and Petitioner's Counsel have claimed that the issues of reimbursements as outlined in the Settlement Agreement and Judgment have been handled. They have not.
- (4) Misrepresentation of Settlement Agreement regarding the awarding of community property to Petitioner as Sole and Separate that allowed Petitioner inappropriate use of community property for more than three (3) years at the expense of Respondent and has further allowed Petitioner inappropriate control of other community property at Wooster. Petitioner and Petitioner's Counsel have further inappropriately claimed that Respondent is under restraining order and not allowed to visit the community Barrington and Wooster (the community children's' home) properties, which is simply not the case.
- (5) The deliberate delay and avoidance of measures that would serve to expedite the proceedings and minimize hardship on both the Court and Parties, as requested by the Court.

These statements by Petitioner and Petitioner's Counsel have been accepted as fact on multiple occasions by the Court and have caused massive damage to Respondent, the children, and the wellbeing of the community. Respondent has attached a number of relevant documents, including:

Judgment

Courtroom transcript may 23 2011 page 6

Courtroom Transcript May 20, 2013 page 5

Courtroom Transcript June 18, 2013 pages 3/4 and 9

Courtroom Transcript August 12, 2013 pages 11/12and13

Courtroom Transcript September 9, 2013 page 12

Courtroom Transcript October 9, 2013 page 11

Courtroom Transcript December 16, 2013

Courtroom Transcript January 9, 2014

Courtroom Transcript March 20, 2014 pages 16 and 17

miri declaration 9 30 2013 and January 1 2014

September 9.2013 Mr Berman ex party argument he claim miri grinded innocent spouse

I believe that the evidence presented clearly documents events in which the Petitioner and Petitioner's Counsel knowingly acted in a manner meant to avoid the appropriate administration of justice and to deprive Respondent and the community of rights, property, and assets clearly protected by both the Settlement Agreement and the law. Respondent can provide evidence that Respondent and Respondent's Counsel have sought multiple means of redressing these issues over the course of this trial. Respondent believes that reporting these acts is the best remaining

option provided by the legal system, and seeks the assistance of the District Attorney in seeing justice served.

Respondent has extensively categorized and preserved records over the course of this case and is willing to rely upon and provide documented physical evidence of the acts in question.

Respondent has sought to remedy these actions with the Court, Petitioner, and Petitioner's Counsel and has seen no success. Respondent has attempted to keep this report extremely brief, and is willing and able to present further evidence on any of these points and further points of contention at any request.

Most Sincerely,

Natan (Rami) Avrahm

**I have received the Court's response to my request for Disqualification. The Court claims that the actions of Commissioner St. George are immune from responsibility in my case, which is simply not true. The facts and examples presented in the response from the Court can be applied only to cases in which the Court has made a mistake or an honest error. Though it is perfectly understandable that any human being can make a mistake, the actions of the Court are clearly and repeatedly against my interests and the interests of my case and the arguments made here do not apply.**

**For this reason, the facts that have been brought forward will clearly show that the Commissioner must be responsible for these actions if an investigation was properly performed.**



# SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Date	10-29-14	Judge	E. GOLDSTEIN	Dept:	WEF
Honorable		Judge Pro Tem	D. ROBERSON	Deputy Clerk	
Honorable	MATTHEW ST. GEORGE	Deputy Sheriff	NONE	Court Assistant	
13	D. JEFFERSON			Reporter	

8:30 am

SD027039

Miri Avraham (N/A)

Counsel For  
Petitioner:


VS.

Natan Rahamim Avraham (N/A)

Counsel For  
Respondent:

no appearances

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk

By: ..   
E. Goldstein, Deputy Clerk

BRETT A. BERMAN  
9595 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 900  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90212

NATAN AVRAHAM  
POST OFFICE BOX 35895  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90035

NATAN AVRAHAM  
1778 SOUTH SHENANDOAH STREET  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90035

# SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Date	10-29-14	Judge	E. GOLDSTEIN	Dept:	WEF
Honorable		Judge Pro Tem	D. ROBERSON	Deputy Clerk	
Honorable	MATTHEW ST. GEORGE	Deputy Sheriff	NONE	Court Assistant	
13	D. JEFFERSON			Reporter	

8:30 am

SD027039

Miri Avraham (N/A)

Counsel For  
Petitioner

VS.

Natan Rahamim Avraham (N/A)

Counsel For  
Respondent

no appearances

### NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: NON-APPEARANCE CASE REVIEW

Non-appearance case review is held.

On October 22, 2014 respondent filed a verified statement of disqualification pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure 170.3(c).

On October 28, 2014 the Court responded to respondent's statement by filing its Order Striking Statement of Disqualification.

A copy of this minute order and the Court's Order Striking Statement of Disqualification is sent to both sides this date.

### CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER

I, the below named Executive Officer/Clerk of the above-entitled court, do hereby certify that I am not a party to the cause herein, and that this date I served Notice of Entry of the above minute order of October 29, 2014 upon each party or counsel named below by depositing in the United States mail at the courthouse in Santa Monica, California, one copy of the original entered herein in a separate sealed envelope for each, addresses as shown below with the postage thereon fully prepaid.

Date: October 29, 2014

OCT 28 2014

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk  
By Ellen Goldstein, Deputy

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

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

MIRI AVRAHAM,  
Petitioner,  
v.  
NATAN RAHAMIM AVRAHAM,  
Respondent.

CASE NO. SD027039

ORDER STRIKING STATEMENT  
OF DISQUALIFICATION

On October 22, 2014, Respondent filed a verified statement of disqualification contending that Commissioner Matthew St. George is biased. The statement is based upon Petitioner's opinion and dissatisfaction with the Court's rulings. On its face, and as a matter of law, it does not present lawful grounds for disqualification.

Code of Civil Procedure §170.3(c)(1) requires that the disqualification statement set forth "the facts constituting the grounds" for disqualification of the judge. Mere conclusions of the pleader are insufficient. *In re Morelli* (1970) 11 Cal.App.3d 819, 843; *Urias v. Harris Farms, Inc.* (1991) 234 Cal.App.3d 415, 426.

A party's belief as to a Judge's bias and prejudice is irrelevant and not controlling in a motion to disqualify for cause, as the test applied is an objective one. *United Farm Workers of America v. Superior Court* (1985) 170 Cal.App.3d 97, 104; *Stanford University v. Superior Court* (1985) 173 Cal.App.3d 403, 408 ("the litigants' necessarily

1 partisan views do not provide the applicable frame of reference.")

2 Rulings and findings based upon evidence and argument officially presented can  
3 almost never constitute a valid basis for disqualification. *McEwen v. Occidental Life Ins.*  
4 *Co.* (1916) 172 Cal. 6, 11 (erroneous rulings, even when numerous and continuous, are  
5 not grounds for bias or prejudice, nor are "judges' expressions of opinion uttered in  
6 what he conceives to be the discharge of his judicial duty"). See also, California  
7 Procedure, 3rd Ed., Witkin, *Courts*, §94, pp. 111-112.

8 A party's remedy for an erroneous ruling is not a motion to disqualify, but rather  
9 review by appeal or writ. See *Ryan v. Welte* (1948) 87 Cal.App.2d 888, 893: "[A] wrong  
10 opinion on the law of a case does not disqualify a judge, nor is it evidence of bias or  
11 prejudice." Otherwise, the court said, "no judge who is reversed by a higher court on  
12 any ruling or decision would ever be qualified to proceed further in the particular case."  
13 The proper remedy, of course was an appeal from the erroneous ruling. See 2 Witkin,  
14 California Procedure (4<sup>th</sup> ed.), *Courts*, Nondisqualifying Opinions, p. 157.

15 As stated in *Liteky v. United States* (1994) 510 U.S. 540, 114 S.Ct. 1147, 127  
16 L.Ed.2d 474, in discussing the extrajudicial source doctrine:


17 "First, judicial rulings alone almost never constitute a valid basis for  
18 a bias or partiality motion. See *United States v. Grinnel Corp.*, 384 U.S.  
19 563, 583 (1966). In and of themselves (i.e., apart from surrounding  
20 comments or accompanying opinion), they cannot possibly show reliance  
21 upon an extrajudicial source; and can only in the rarest circumstances  
22 evidence the degree of favoritism or antagonism required (as discussed  
23 below) when no extrajudicial source is involved. Almost invariably, they  
24 are proper grounds for appeal, not for recusal. Second, opinions formed  
25 by the judge on the basis of facts introduced or events occurring in the  
26

1 course of the current proceedings, or of prior proceedings, do not  
2 constitute a basis for a bias or partiality motion unless they display a  
3 deep-seated favoritism or antagonism that would make fair judgment  
4 impossible. Thus, judicial remarks during the course of a trial that are  
5 critical or disapproving of, or even hostile to, counsel, the parties or their  
6 cases, ordinarily do not support a bias or partiality challenge. They *may* do  
7 so if they reveal an opinion that derives from an extrajudicial source; and  
8 they *will* do so if they reveal such a high degree of favoritism or  
9 antagonism as to make fair judgment impossible . . . A judge's ordinary  
10 efforts at courtroom administration--even a stern and short-tempered  
11 judge's ordinary efforts at courtroom administration--remain immune."

12 Accordingly, since the statement of disqualification on its face discloses no legal  
13 grounds for disqualification, it is ordered stricken pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure  
14 §170.4, subdivision (b). The parties are reminded that this determination of the  
15 question of the disqualification is not an appealable order and may be reviewed only by  
16 a writ of mandate from the Court of Appeal sought within 10 days of notice to the  
17 parties of the decision. In the event that a timely writ is sought and an appellate court  
18 determines that an answer should have been timely filed, such an answer is filed  
19 herewith.

20 GOOD CAUSE APPEARING THEREFOR, It is so ordered

21  
22 Date: October 28, 2014

23   
24 MATTHEW ST. GEORGE  
25 Commissioner of the Superior Court of California  
26 County of Los Angeles  
27  
28

**Following are the Complaints to:**

**1) The Bar Association  
and**

**2) The Commission on Judicial Performance**

**regarding Perjury committed in Court by Mr. Berman.**

**OBJECTION AND DECLARATION  
SUPPORTING DISQUALIFICATION  
OF JUDGE PRO TEM ST. GEORGE**

CD#1

On this Compact Disc can be found evidence, including Transcripts and Courtroom Documents,  
outlining the abuses of power against Natan Avraham and the Community in his divorce  
proceeding by Commissioner Cowan

## Disqualification of Commissioner Cowan on Abuse of Power

August 17, 2010 Settlement Agreement Between Parties

All problems could have been solved by following the Settlement Agreement

From September 23, 2010 onward Mr. Berman was allowed to present misleading statements to the Court that were then accepted as evidence

After allowing Mr. Berman to misrepresent the sale of the Barrington property to the Court, on September 29, 2010 (Pages 33 and 35) Natan Avraham specifically warned the Court that Mr. Berman's actions were not proceeding according to the Settlement Agreement. These warnings and objections by Mr. Avraham were ignored by the Court.

From September 23, 2010, Petitioner and Petitioner's Counsel took action to structure a misleading Judgment and claimed that there was an existing Settlement that would allow the sale of the (8) unit Barrington Property against the conditions of the Settlement Agreement and based on misleading testimony and perjury. The actions by the Court and Mr. Berman caused more than \$600,000.00 in damage to the community through the Barrington property.

Mr. Berman was allowed by the Court under Commissioner Cowan to sneak many pieces of evidence onto the record. Not only does the Court not have the power under California Civil Code Pro 664.6 to allow Mr. Berman to enter these statements onto the record, the Court under Commissioner Cowan ordered

Natan's counsel to sign the judgment without Natan present. This is an abuse of the discretion of the Court, and no consensus was ever reached regarding the Judgment.

These actions have continued to drag all parties back to Court for many years. On May 23, 2011 the Motion to Set Aside the Judgment was denied on a misleading basis by Commissioner Cowan.

Natan's Appellate Attorney filed an Appeal to explain some of the Court actions that had been taken against Natan. The Appellate Court case was shut down immediately on the basis the Natan's Counselor signed the original Judgment (not forgetting that Natan's Counselor was *ordered* to sign the Judgment)



Commission on Judicial Performance  
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 14400  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Natan Avraham  
1778 S. Shenandoah St.  
Los Angeles, CA 90035

Complaint Regarding:

Perjury Committed by Attorney Brett Berman,

To Whom it May Concern;

On September 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2010, Petitioner and Petitioner's Counsel took action to structure a misleading Judgment and claimed that there was an existing Settlement that would allow the sale of the eight (8) unit Barrington property (sold for the low price of \$700,000!), Exhibit, against the conditions of the Settlement Agreement and based on misleading testimony and perjury, Exhibit, all the while refused to acknowledge this future amount in the escrow account and committing an act of perjury while doing so. Mr. Berman was given adequate time to verify all amounts and provide for the appropriate management of this case August 12, 2013 the Court giving Mr. Berman time to present evidence of tax status to the Court, Exhibit. As stated in evidence, Mr. Berman client was responsible not only for being able to access the financial records of the property but also required to as mr berman clint had control over the sale of the property. This is a violation of Court order, taking action against the Respondent as acknowledged in the record. Mr. Berman's client signed and approved every payment and she has the ability and the responsibility to view every transaction, Exhibit, however Mr. Berman continues to claim that the Internal Revenue Service have taken funds from this account all while trying to gain access to those funds, See Transcript March 20, 2014 Exhibit. Mr. Berman has misled the Court on these facts and testified inaccurately, going so far as to claim that his client was granted

Innocent Spouse by the Internal Revenue Service. Also he claimed that an additional \$143,000.00 was taken by and went to the I.R.S.

As a result of testimony and misleading statements the Court granted funds to which the Franchise Tax Board, the children, and also the Respondent was entitled to Mr. Berman instead, Exhibit, forcing Respondent to take actions to try to fix these issues. These funds were meant to be provided to the Franchise Tax Board and to provide for the student loans held by Petitioner and Respondent's son, but they did not. These actions have prevented Respondent from being able to meet credit card debts and other liabilities on the community as these funds were meant. Respondent will be forced by the actions of Mr. Berman to take on high interest loans to preserve the property Respondent himself secured for Respondent and his children in one piece, all while having to fund tax defense, fees, and penalties created by the community tax burden with the Internal Revenue Service and Franchise Tax Board and forced upon the Respondent by the perjuries and misleading testimony of Mr. Berman (claiming that taxes were paid with money meant for that purpose) that until now has left Respondent as the only one harmed by these tax burdens. Mr. Berman's client has been receiving Respondent's rightful property while claiming no responsibility for the community property to the Internal Revenue Service or the Franchise Tax Board.

These decisions have clearly been made without the community in mind—especially in light of the fact that the Mr. Berman and his client have been allowed to block the Respondent's rights for three (3) years followed by perjury. The actions of Mr. Berman to mislead the Court are clearly not in the best interest of the children or the community, and these actions are not only at the expense of the Respondent but of the children in this case. Mr. Berman have been able to guide the Court against natan with misleading testimony and perjury, repeatedly acting on the incorrect basis of the Judgment and using the government against Natan . The Court has a duty to allow the Respondent sufficient time to protect himself and the community from these actionsmr berman have operated with the knowledge that the natan has only a functional knowledge of the English language when bending the Court's decisions against Respondent. This is further misleading because mr berman simply needed to follow the clear language of the original Agreement in order to be sure all needs of all parties were met.

Respondent has filed a complaint with the California Attornet General as well as a series of complaints to the Court and Publice Supervision.

## Summary of Financial Burdens

### **Funds Lost Due To Perjury-S336,122.00**

(Natan paying 10% as well as penalties and fees for the entire period)

**\$79,500** Additional funds received by Petitioner from the community property after the sale of the Barrington Property

**\$40,900** The judgment 16.6.3 Credit Card Reimbursements Responcient is entitled to reimbursements from the community for his credit cards continual delay on this has caused huge damage to Respondent's Credit

**\$25,000** per the Judgment 6.6.5.1 Student Loans The community money meant

to support these loans from the sale of the Bareington Property has been blocked

by and has been removed entirely by mr berman clint

**\$14,422** (balance by 02.18.15) per the Judgment 6.6.2 2005 tax obligation to franchise tax board has been blocked by mr berman , even though the Judgment clearly outlined that the pibeeeds of the Barrington sale were intended to provide for these expenses. These funds have been removed

**\$64,500** 2006 community tax Exhibit

-For more than 4 years the penalties and fees have been leveled at the Respondent alone even as Petitioner has claimed that these amounts have been paid, while Petitioner has further falsely claimed that Petitioner has been granted innoecnt spouse, all while Respondent has maintained interest and penalties on these loans for three (3) years.

(Natan Avraham is working to file a motion in Civil Court in regard to the perjury committed by

Petitioner's Counsel Mr. Berman and, if necessary, Miri (Petitioner) as well).

(Natan Avraham wishes to complain regarding misleading statements and perjury that have been made by Petitioner and Petitioner's Counsel in and out of Court during the proceedings Respondent has complained to the Court Sheriff for relief, a Lieutenant of the Court, to complain and file a violation regarding these

commissions of perjury (statements) and to claim the damage these statements have caused damage to the Civil Courts)

Signed,


Natan Avraham

TRANSMISSION VERIFICATION REPORT

TIME : 03/23/2015 10:48  
NAME : INKGUY WESTERN  
FAX : 12139853655  
TEL : 12133650100  
SER.# : A9J120670

DATE, TIME	03/23 10:47
FAX NO./NAME	14155571266
DURATION	00:00:57
PAGE(S)	03
RESULT	OK
MODE	STANDARD ECM

OFFICE OF CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL/INTAKE  
The State Bar of California  
845 S. Figueroa Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90017-2515




UNITED STATES POSTAGE  
FIRST CLASS PERMIT NO. 7002 LOS ANGELES CA

02 10  
004282546 MAR 26 2015  
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 90015

\$ 00.34<sup>0</sup>

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Natan Avraham  
1778 S. Shenandoah St  
Los Angeles, CA 90035  
Street \_\_\_\_\_  
City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_



---

We have received your complaint against a California attorney and have assigned it the number shown below. We will contact you when our evaluation of your matter is complete.

Thank you for your patience.

OFFICE OF CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL/INTAKE

Inquiry # —

**15-14816**

BF1030 Rev 12/2013

---

Office of the Chief Trial Counsel/Intake  
The State Bar of California  
845 S. Figueroa St.  
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Natan Avraham  
1778 S. Shenandoah St.  
Los Angeles, CA 90035

Re: Inquiry # 15-14816

### **Compact Disc Contents**

The attached Compact Discs include large amount of relevant information on the actions of Mr. Berman, Commissioner St. George, and the Court that deprived me of my Civil Rights over the period of my Court case. The first CD includes a file composed of many pieces of evidence regarding the abuses committed by Commissioner Cowan, and the second CD includes many relevant Transcripts as well as a Summary of the facts of this case. The contents of the second CD can also be found online at [www.justiceforavraham.weebly.com](http://www.justiceforavraham.weebly.com).