

Analysis of Ogletree Deakins/Attorney Steven Seymour Letters Found in Evidence

(Copies of the referenced letters follow this 3 page analysis)

The corporate attorneys hired a specialist attorney to “take care of their problem.” Online research indicates Atty. Seymour is well-connected to Lane County. He is, nominally, a very reputable attorney. Anyone has the right to write letters to our police and prosecutors. *What is shocking is how no matter what this Citizen wrote, it was disregarded and derided as a PHYSICAL threat. It was carefully cherry-picked for offense, not for its exculpatory content, which was the majority of it.*

That contrasts with Atty. Seymour’s letters which are taken as Gospel by police and prosecutor amid clouds of fealty and influence peddling and used to create the ultimate personal threat: false arrest/kidnapping using corrupted police/prosecutors. Here are significant features of the letters:

Generally, it is not how stalking complaints are handled. Oregon has well defined procedures and somewhat defined mandates for Stalking Protective Orders prior to stalking arrest in communication-only situations. State of Oregon v. Ryan appears to support that concept and is included as another exhibit. Such direct and long-term involvement of an attorney for a corporate stalking complainant appears to have absolutely no precedent, probably because nobody ever imagined a corporation would try to access stalking laws, particularly attorney who should be acting less aggressively and creatively with the Oregon Law for their corporate and personal benefit.

May 30, 2013 letter to Det. Tony Veach, Eugene Violent Crimes. This letter was almost two months prior to the July 18, 2013 police visit to my home to share their personal Art opinions with me under color of law. That suggests there was no actual threat or police would have intervened at that time. Waiting two months to talk to me about the conduct indicates police/corporate emotional entrapment activity. Most insulting to Lane County, he transmitted to our police a cartoon vampire picture from a Youtube Art Video I created. Prosecutor Hasselman held it up in Demurrer Court as the most concrete and positive evidence of an actual threat. It is a cartoon vampire picture on Youtube. If people don’t like it, they do not have to watch. If they hate it and complain to Youtube, it is usually summarily removed by Youtube out of caution. So, they had many other options they did not use, instead selecting the absolute most aggressive path of jailing. Art is not stalking nor is it a threat.

The trail of his influence peddling and name-dropping is clear. He mentions Prosecutor Barkovic suggested they talk. That implies Barkovic likely reported that back to Attorney Seymour as if it were an operational progress report. It suggests there were telephone calls and maybe other letters or emails. It is undue influence by fealty and via assumed authority of Attorneys in legal matters, never

considering they are CIVIL attorneys fulfilling corporate interests and are much more powerful than the Citizens our leaders are supposed to be representing.

June 21, 2013 letter to Prosecutor Erik Hasselman: this is a formal request for stalking protection order, dated a month before the actual arrest. *Important: Leah Lively is not listed as a complainant.* She could have personally applied for a stalking protective order and it would have been instantly granted, that as not applied for or obtained. That is corporate-arranged usurpation of Oregon Law.

There is no benign reason I can think of that satisfactorily explains why a Stalking Protective Order was not presented to a judge (as requested). There is no apparent reason for police waiting another month after that dire letter reporting “imminent fear of personal violence” to mention it to me. The only reason I found is that it appears Ogletree Deakins/Attorney Seymour was working a different track with Tony Veach and the purpose of the Stalking Protective Order letter and the personal Hasselman meeting was to facilitate prosecution once an ARREST was accomplished.

Here are some important details of the letter:

1. The only recipient who received exhibits was Det. Tony Veach. They appear to have been routed through the Prosecutor’s office to Det. Veach. It is possible that if the others (attorneys) saw the exhibits they would not have approved any actions against me.
2. Dr. Dennis Davis is shown in the CC’s His biography is attached. He never met me, we never talked. He is a doctor by benefit of PHD but appears to have tight connections with police and police processes. I assert his name was placed there to provide police/prosecutor some notion of authority from a professional. I assert it is also prima facie conspiracy.
3. The second page of the letter states that 2500 communications were sent to them in two years. That was ‘morphed’ by Tony Veach to “2500 to Ogletree Deakins regional offices” which was parroted by Prosecutor Hasselman. That was never confirmed to be accurate and the actual number is maybe 250, which is a couple per month on average.
4. The second page also states the entire staff is in fear of imminent violence yet did nothing in Portland about it, indicating they were lying and exaggerating in writing to our Prosecutor. Regardless, no such threat was ever confirmed by police.
5. They cherry-picked the choicest comments out of context. It is like all those CNN headlines that make a reader ‘click’ but then the story is not as dramatic as the headline. It is an advertising technique, not stalking. Taking material out of context and presenting it as a threat is a deceptive practice without presenting the majority-content or the background facts.
6. They speak of a two year period but the Arrest Information speaks only of a one year period.

Logically, any numbers they use in letters should correspond to the timeframe of the charges.

So should any evidence but that is not the case and many of the faxes in evidence have no receipt date or recipient, many are duplicated.

July 18, 2013 letter from Attorney Seymour to myself: this letter was found in my home by Det. Tony Veach during the home/computer search and seizure. He collected my mail for me and opened it which does not appear to be provided for in the search warrant. I assert he needed another warrant to search, open, and seize US Mail but I have nothing to hide . Nevertheless, it is major exculpatory material and demonstrates simultaneous corruption of police and prosecutor to affect arrest while pretending to Prosecutor they want a stalking protective order.

I did not collect my mail in that timeframe due to my circumstances then I was placed in jail for a week on July 25, 2013. It is understandable that I did not see that letter as it was placed in a bag by others in the home while I was incarcerated and upon release, the back-mail was not a priority.

Once again: this letter does not show Leah Lively as a complainant. It is the FIRST constructive notice necessary to obtain a Stalking Protective Order. There was no basis for the arrest and the letters indicate Police took matters into their own hands with arrest. Other communication with police/prosecutor indicates there was significant contact between Det. Veach and attorney Seymour just prior to the arrest.

The letter implies to me a very direct, immediate communication channel between Atty. Seymour and Det. Veach, who allowed himself to be corrupted over time by their fealty and name-dropping. Once arrested and jailed Prosecutor Hasselman was, possibly unwittingly “stuck between a rock and hard place”. I am convinced if Mr. Hasselman had all the facts up front he would have not prosecuted.

Simply put: my corporate accusers presented major lies in their complaints to police who acted upon them without confirming them. That is a crime committed by my corporate accusers. It is also shoddy, derelict, improperly supervised corporate-directed police work.