

District Court Larimer County, Colorado 201 LaPorte Avenue Fort Collins, Colorado Jeffrey R. Pappenheim v. Stacy Lynne and Jaden	▲ ▲ COURT USE ONLY
Mailing Address: Stacy Lynne 305 West Magnolia #282 Fort Collins, Colorado 80521	Case Number: 11 DR 444 Division Courtroom
SWORN AFFIDAVIT OF CORRECTION TO KENT SPANGLER’S (“MAGISTRATE”) ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR EX-PARTE EMERGENCY HEARING	

1. Stacy Lynne filed an “EX-PARTE MOTION FOR EMERGENCY HEARING” on November 21, 2012.
2. Kent Spangler, an attorney acting as “magistrate” intentionally and with conscious deliberation changed the caption on his denial of Ms. Lynne’s motion. His intent is clear when both captions are compared line by line:
 - a. Ms. Lynne’s caption: EX-PARTE MOTION FOR EMERGENCY HEARING
 - b. Mr. Spangler’s fraudulent caption: MOTION FOR EX-PARTE EMERGENCY HEARING
 - c. Mr. Spangler changed Ms. Lynne’s *ex-parte motion* into *ex-parte emergency hearing*. Ms. Lynne did not file a motion for an ex-parte hearing. Ms. Lynne filed an ex-parte motion for an emergency hearing.
 - d. Mr. Spangler changed the caption so that when he referenced the Uniform Dissolution of Marriage Act, he would be able to claim that an ex-parte emergency hearing was not allowed. Remember: Ms. Lynne did not motion for an ex-parte emergency hearing; only Ms. Lynne’s *motion* was ex-parte for protection of Jaden’s safety and for Ms. Lynne’s safety.
3. Mr. Spangler added the following fraudulent line “*In re The Marriage*” on his denial in the box that lists the plaintiff and defendant names.
 - a. Mr. Spangler did this in a weak attempt to justify his denial in reference to the Uniform Dissolution of Marriage Act.
 - b. Remember: The entirety of case “11 DR 444” is based on the fraudulent claim in writing by attorney Amy Antomarria that there was a marriage.

- i. Proof of a marriage, and, as a matter of undisputed fact, **dissolution** of said marriage, does not exist because a marriage did not exist.
 - ii. If Amy Antomarria is telling the truth about case 11 DR 444 and she has properly classified Jaden's case as "dissolution of marriage", then she, and this court, should be able to provide a copy of the dissolution of marriage decree (also commonly referred to as a divorce decree).
 - iii. No such decree exists.
4. Mr. Spangler asserts in his denial that "The Respondent makes no factual allegations in her motion only the bald assertion that the emergency hearing is necessary to Jaden from child abuse that he is suffering at the hands of Jeffrey R. Pappenheim." (**Important note:** The quote in item #4 is verbatim; Mr. Spangler has written the above sentence and it wholly lacks structural and grammatical sense.)
 - a. Assuming that Mr. Spangler understands that the literal meaning of "bald assertion" means *worthless and without merit*, then most reasonable people will conclude that Mr. Spangler is disparaging the professionals who were listed in Ms. Lynne's ex-parte motion.
 - b. Ms. Lynne specifically states in her ex-parte motion that LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AND SOCIAL WORKERS AND OTHER PROFESSIONALS will be called to testify.
 - c. Mr. Spangler has stated in writing that he believes that law enforcement officers' testimony and social workers' testimony and other professionals' testimony are not worthy and lack merit to justify holding an emergency hearing on child abuse.
 - d. Mr. Spangler's personal biases and prejudices against law enforcement officers and other professionals, as he proves through his carefully crafted "bald assertion" claims, seriously undermine his credibility.
5. Mr. Spangler states in his denial that "There are no factual allegations to support this conclusion."
 - a. Ms. Lynne specifically states that her safety and Jaden's safety are the sole purpose for her filing an ex-parte motion.
 - i. Protection of Jaden and Ms. Lynne requires that Ms. Lynne carefully proceed with procuring a hearing to present evidence of child abuse and domestic violence.
 - ii. If Ms. Lynne provides a list of specific facts regarding Jeffrey R. Pappenheim's abuse, then Jeffrey R. Pappenheim and Amy Antomarria will, as they have proven in the past, use that information to hurt Jaden and Ms. Lynne.

- b. Ms. Lynne provides, in her ex-parte motion, credible witnesses who will be called to testify under oath, and who will prove beyond any doubt and with hard evidence, that Jeffrey R. Pappenheim is continuously abusing Jaden.
6. Mr. Spangler states in his denial that “The Respondent does not specify under which Colorado Statute she is requesting the hearing.”
 - a. Ms. Lynne errantly believed that Kent Spangler, acting as a magistrate in the Larimer County 8th Judicial District, located within the city limits of Fort Collins, Colorado, had sufficient legal knowledge to determine which Colorado Revised Statute applies to an emergency child abuse hearing.
 - b. If Mr. Spangler does not have the background knowledge to know how to appropriately classify an emergency child abuse hearing, he should be immediately removed from his duties as “magistrate”.
7. Mr. Spangler continues to intentionally distort Ms. Lynne’s ex-parte motion by saying, “The Uniform Dissolution of Marriage Act as adopted by Colorado does not provide for an Ex-parte Emergency Hearing. See C.R.S. 14-10-10 et.seq.”
 - a. Ms. Lynne DID NOT motion for an EX-PARTE **HEARING** as Mr. Spangler professes.
 - b. Mr. Spangler cites C.R.S. 14-10-10 as justification for DENYING AN EX-PARTE **HEARING**.
 - c. Ms. Lynne filed an EX-PARTE MOTION.
 - d. Ms. Lynne DID NOT file a motion for an EX-PARTE HEARING.
 - e. Mr. Spangler’s denial of Ms. Lynne’s motion for an emergency hearing is errant and fraudulent.
8. The difference between an EX-PARTE MOTION AND A MOTION FOR AN EX-PARTE HEARING is obvious to even the most ignorant attorney.
 - a. Mr. Spangler, acting as “magistrate” knows the difference between an ex-parte motion and a motion for an ex-parte hearing. However, if Mr. Spangler fails to discern the difference, he should be immediately removed from his duties.
 - b. But, we all know that Mr. Spangler intentionally corrupted the motion because that is the only way he could twist his denial to fit the system.
9. Ms. Lynne explicitly explained the reason for the filing of an EX-PARTE MOTION.
 - a. Jaden’s safety and Ms. Lynne’s safety are of utmost concern.
 - b. Jeffrey R. Pappenheim and Amy Antommara take pleasure in hurting Jaden.
 - c. Ms. Lynne’s ultimate responsibility as Jaden’s mom is to protect him from abuse and she has not ever lost sight of that ultimate goal and she will not cease in her mission to save him.
10. Mr. Spangler has full knowledge that Ms. Lynne’s motion was filed ex-parte to protect her son.

- a. Mr. Spangler, after denying Ms. Lynne’s motion on fraudulent grounds, sent the ex-parte motion to Jeffrey R. Pappenheim and Amy Antomarria, with verifiable intent to harm Jaden and Ms. Lynne.
 - b. Mr. Spangler, by sending the ex-parte motion and denial to the very people who will use that information to hurt Jaden and Ms. Lynne has intentionally and dangerously increased the risk to Jaden’s safety and well-being and Ms. Lynne’s safety and well-being.
11. Non-consent to magistrate (JDF 405) is legally, lawfully and properly on the record in 11 DR 444.
12. Mr. Spangler states, “This Order is issued in a proceeding where consent is unnecessary. Any appeal must be taken within 21 days pursuant to C.R.M. Rule 7(a).”
- a. Mr. Spangler does not have legal or lawful authority to violate Ms. Lynne’s Colorado Constitutionally guaranteed right to be seen by a judge.
 - b. Mr. Spangler does not have legal or lawful authority to violate the United States Constitutionally guaranteed right to be seen by a judge.
 - c. Mr. Spangler does not have legal or lawful authority to violate the Colorado Rules for Magistrates.
 - d. Mr. Spangler does not have legal or lawful authority to disregard and ignore the legal form known as “JDF 405”.
 - e. Consent to assignment to magistrate is not mandatory and upon presentation of JDF 405, assignment to a judge is mandatory.
 - f. Magistrates lack discretion regarding JDF 405.

SUMMARY

- A. Ms. Lynne filed an “EX-PARTE MOTION FOR EMERGENCY HEARING”.
- B. Mr. Spangler made counterfeit claims that Ms. Lynne filed a “MOTION FOR EX-PARTE EMERGENCY HEARING”.

FRAUD BY THE COURT IS A CRIME.

**FRAUD BY THE COURT THAT PERPETUATES CHILD
ABUSE IS SHOCKINGLY EVIL AND FLAGRANTLY
CRIMINAL.**

Stacy Lynne and Jaden reserve all unalienable, Constitutional, natural and all other Rights.

I, Stacy Lynne, swear under penalty of perjury that I have read the foregoing **SWORN AFFIDAVIT OF CORRECTION TO KENT SPANGLER'S ("MAGISTRATE") ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR EX-PARTE EMERGENCY HEARING**. The statements set forth therein are true and correct.

Date: November 26, 2012

Stacy Lynne
Mailing Address:
305 West Magnolia #282
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521

Subscribed and sworn to before me in the County of Larimer, State of Colorado, this 26th day of November, 2012.

My Commission Expires: _____

Notary Public

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a true and accurate copy of the **SWORN AFFIDAVIT OF CORRECTION TO KENT SPANGLER'S ("MAGISTRATE") ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR EX-PARTE EMERGENCY HEARING** has been served to:

1. Clerk of Courts, via hand-delivery to 201 LaPorte Avenue, Fort Collins, Colorado
2. Kent Spangler (magistrate), via hand-delivery to 201 LaPorte Avenue, Fort Collins, Colorado
3. Stephen J. Schapanski, Chief Judge, via hand-delivery to 201 LaPorte Avenue, Fort Collins, Colorado
4. Amy Antommaria, attorney for Jeffrey R. Pappenheim, via US Mail: 1029 14th Street, Greeley, Colorado 80631
5. Larimer County Commissioner Lew Gaiter, via hand-delivery to 200 West Oak Street, Fort Collins, Colorado
6. City of Fort Collins Mayor Karen Weitkunat, via hand-delivery to City Hall, Fort Collins, Colorado
7. Larimer County Sheriff Justin Smith, via hand delivery to 2501 Midpoint Drive, Fort Collins, Colorado 80525
8. And others.

November 26, 2012

Stacy Lynne

Mailing Address:
305 West Magnolia Street, #282
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521