

Stopped working on the following incomplete defense when UCLA PD refused to provide a copy of the police report before the court date. Upon turning up to plead “not guilty” Defendant was informed that the case was rejected by the City Attorney’s office “because there was not enough evidence,” which would only make sense if corrupt UCLA PD planned to try and add bogus criminal threat charges, which is surely what they were fishing for based on Petition for not limited to Graduate Admission. The City Attorney’s Office allegedly has the right to file until the statute of limitations expires, but there is no case because there was no crime, just a remaining unfair punishment, being a campus wide library ban, obstructed admissions, defamation, and damages as a result, for which Defendant and true Victim has a lengthy ten year statute of limitations to file honest RICO charges as a Plaintiff vs. UCLA etc. This issue can still be resolved through ADR. (01/03/2020)

Motion To Dismiss CCW Charge § 100015(c)

I. SUMMARY:

A) Defendant was **illegally charged** with carrying a concealed weapon on campus @ UCLA.

B) Defendant, an affiliate to UCLA, **was not carrying a dangerous weapon**, but rather a small tool being a box cutter with a dull estimated half inch razor blade; ridiculous to consider dangerous, and nevertheless good intent of having meant to leave it in the storage unit he was digging through for laundry detergent the day prior to arrest without even realizing it was still one of his many jacket pockets until after being unlawfully detained, seized, and search had commenced like an hour prior to being offered a Miranda Warning.

II. ARGUMENT:

It is impossible to state an honest claim against the Defendant. There are four completely separate arguments against the **frivolous charge**, any of which are independent grounds to dismiss this case. The main defense is the fact that the law cited by the police, only one of the aforementioned four arguments, has three different essential elements that are not met where the presence of only one requires the court to dismiss.

A) The actual law corresponding to the false allegation(s) by UCLA Police clearly voids the incompetent charge for three separate reasons:

(§ 100015. Weapons.) @

[https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Document/110314A00D48811DEBC02831C6D6C108E?viewType=FullText&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=CategoryPageItem&contextData=\(sc.Default\)](https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Document/110314A00D48811DEBC02831C6D6C108E?viewType=FullText&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=CategoryPageItem&contextData=(sc.Default))

- 1) **Defendant has multiple “affiliations” to UCLA** and UCLA Police were made aware:
 - a) Defendant was a former student at UCLA with a Bruin ID card and number.
 - b) Defendant has an active UCLA Library membership (card was in stolen wallet).
 - c) Defendant did volunteer work on campus for UCLA just prior to arrest.
 - d) Defendant has two additional Bruin ID numbers from grad school applications past and present and is petitioning for PhD/MFA to a department that has motive.
 - e) Defendant lived in dorms on campus while working/teaching at a computer camp.
 - f) Defendant has a patient history at UCLA Medical Center
 - g) Parents are UCLA alumni, donors, and lifelong family season ticket holders.

“No non-affiliate shall, on University property, carry upon his/her person or have in his/her possession or under his/her control any Dangerous Weapon.” (§ 100015)

- 2) The instrument in question is **not considered a dangerous weapon by law**. It is technically a guarded box cutter razor blade; not a pocket knife §100015(c). The list of prohibited weapons makes a specific distinction between razor blades considered to be a weapon and listed “unguarded razor blade §100015(e)” where the tool in Defendant’s possession was not only guarded and in the locked shut position, but had absolutely nothing to do with the bogus reason UCLA PD was called to the scene.

“For purposes of this Section, ‘Dangerous Weapon’ means and includes, but is not limited to: E. Any razor with an unguarded blade.” (§ 100015)

- 3) Defendant was not only carrying the item in good faith, but did not even realize it was still in his pocket until he was unlawfully seized and searched. Defendant did not make a threat and it is not illegal to briefly yell at someone who was quietly warned twice that the noise and distractions they were causing for over an hour in the back of the quiet reading room of the library was wrong and annoying.

Defendant is and was the good focused man doing hard work.

“This section shall not apply if, at the time of the alleged violation, the instrument or device alleged to be a Dangerous Weapon was **in good faith** carried upon the person” (§ 100015)

B) The law is also voided by this is a **textbook example of entrapment**. Defendant is the victim were the **criminal complainer** invaded the Defendant’s isolated home office **fishing for false imprisonment** and there are layers of motive for UCLA; not vice versa.

- 1) Efforts were made to inform the university about stalkers prior to arrest (email history).

- 2) Defendant is the Plaintiff in an active federal lawsuit filed for not limited to almost identical entrapment, stalking, attempted assault, etc.
- 3) Stalker who reported was not doing honest work but rather fishing for an altercation.
- 4) Library security and UCLA PD did not follow protocol or law enforcing alleged offense. Defendant was quietly sitting at a computer in the back of the quiet reading room of the library not only minding his own business but had also obviously gone out of the way to select a location to work where he should not have been bothered.

“When enforcing this Chapter, an officer or employee authorized to maintain order on the campus or facility should make a reasonable attempt to warn and advise a non-affiliate subject to cease the prohibited conduct or activity before citing and/or arresting the non-affiliate subject for violation of this Chapter, except where the conduct violating this Chapter reasonably appears to create a threat to or endanger health, safety or property.”

(§ 100002) @

[https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Document/I0B6DCE80D48811DEBC02831C6D6C108E?viewType=FullText&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=CategoryPageItem&contextData=\(sc.Default\)](https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Document/I0B6DCE80D48811DEBC02831C6D6C108E?viewType=FullText&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=CategoryPageItem&contextData=(sc.Default))

C) Defendant was fraudulently denied a CCW in 2014 and has an active federal lawsuit in the Supreme Court of The United States regarding not limited to that claim, and assuming relief for damages is awarded by law, Defendant will be retroactively issued a federal or at least **California CCW permit**, which would allow possession of a real weapon in this scenario had Defendant been in possession of anything more dangerous than a most common tool. This case must be dismissed, or at least postponed until SCOTUS has come to an ultimate decision.

D) **Illegal Search & Seizure**; Did not have probable cause for search before trying to impartially communicate with Defendant who was both peacefully working on the computer when UCLA PD interrupted, but also was completely cooperative, permitted to logout of the computer and gather belongings to go outside and talk before being abruptly and wrongfully detained and searched on the spot by bad cops prematurely jumping the gun where a good peace officer would have got both sides of the story before making an arrest like they had a death warrant.

III. EVIDENCE:

A) This entire **defense** is not only supported by **clear and convincing facts and evidence**, but that evidence includes previous complaints by Defendant to the Chancellor and head Librarian with emails, witnesses, photographs and a receipt proving that Defendant indeed visited his storage unit and the laundromat the day prior.

- 1) Photos: Stalker LPs, Patio, Dirty Library

- 2) Emails: Complaint About Dust Causing People Allergies, Email Stalker Complaint
- 3) Previous Legal Complaints

B) Character Witnesses:

- 1) Defendant has been spending ***a lot of time in libraries for the past few years, without any other problems***, and is usually cool with all the staff and security.
 - a) Multiple Senior Lead Officers @ LAPD will testify to the following:
 - b) Multiple librarians from separate libraries will testify to the following:
 - c) Multiple private library security guards/companies will testify to the following:
- 2) Defendant is not a racist, minds his own business, and does not cause problems.
- 3) Defendant is actually very nice to all races, ethnicities, religions, and sexualities.
- 4) Defendant has integrity, often finds and returns items.
- 5) UCLA Alumni Association Volunteer Work Connections

IV. VIOLATIONS ON THE OTHER SIDE:

All the elements are met, but this is just for reference and only with pure intent to influence UCLA and UCLA PD to comply with demands and grant the fair petition over qualified application.

A) UCLA PD VIOLATIONS:

- 1) **Excessive Force:** Officers surrounded and arrested a man who was minding his own business and peacefully working alone in the back of the library without a civil conversation. The decision was made before they arrived and most probably before the false report.
- 2) **False Imprisonment:** There was no criminal violation and any competent impartial peace officer should have recognized this upon information shared by compliant and respectful Defendant.
- 3) **Dishonesty/Fraud:** Letter banning Defendant from the library was based on lies. Defendant never yelled racial slurs, has never at least consciously done so, is not racist, but white people are certainly trying create a misdirecting not limited to race but also special interest group war against Defendant based on their greed and envy in attempt to steal.

- 4) **Defamation/Libel:** Lying about a professional not limited to humanitarian who has compassionate love for all lifeforms and is building an international company, falsely accusing them to be a racist, is a big deal and should be considered serious criminal fraud on top of defamation. Conspirators are literally trying to create a physical war and have people assault Defendant.
- 5) **Espionage:** Who has seen the mugshots?
- 6) **Illegal Search & Seizure:** Not only did UCLA PD not have the right to search Defendant, but they did not have the right to search his backpack, nor did they have the right to seize the box cutter as evidence, nor did they have the right to steal the number one clipper attachment, which was located in the grooming bag that was in the backpack. UCLA PD is suspected to have made and used a copy the key to Defendant's storage unit because of laundry detergent that was found spilled on the inside of the unit upon Defendant's return.
- 7) **Theft:** UCLA PD stole something very petty as if to make a dumb statement that Defendant is not number one. There is no reason to make this up. A simple email to the manufacturer resulted in a free replacement being shipped almost immediately.
- 8) **Invasion of Privacy:** All of this from the harassing and entrapping invasion of space, to the false imprisonment, to being photographed, and even the mind rape is all a terrible invasion of privacy and in a place where Defendant sought sanctuary and should have been safe and unbothered.
- 9) **Conspiracy:** Obvious conspiracy, based on intentional adoption regardless of proven collusion makes all conspirators guilty of all causes of action not limited to within this complaint, but to those of Defendants currently active federal lawsuit where the Defendant in this case is truly the victim and Plaintiff.

B) UCLA EMPLOYEE VIOLATIONS:

- 1) **Espionage:** Library computers are networked with software that permits screen sharing/watching/spying. Arrest occurred not too long after Defendant had started to write to technical people on campus with neglected questions about the software and who has access.
- 2) **False Report:** The white guy who complained to security was harassing Defendant, not the other way around, and the security guard who should not have called the cops without trying to see what was going on is also a problem that was planted at his post more than once in various locations for the purpose of false report.

- 3) **Stalking/Harassment:** They guy who complained was going out of his way to be extremely annoying and create an altercation to give false justification to a complaint for over an hour. The other attempted entrapment/assault was also stalking, and there have been other incidences.
- 4) **Attempted Battery:** Someone assigned a custodian for no reason to hose down the paved grade that leads into campus from Defendants bus stop on the daily as soon as Defendant recovered from a broken foot caused by federal Defendant John Does and started skateboarding again. They were trying to make him fall and get hurt. Defendant complained to the custodian once, and then to the security guard who was positioned at that location on the first day it happened, but then the custodian who continued to hose down the path for no reason like the next day told Defendant that he was ordered to do it and Defendant understood and left him alone despite the very evil intention behind it. Recently, as of today, September 12, 2019, federal Defendant John Does have been getting hispanic people to try and do the same things; they spilled oil all over Defendant's path, followed by another hosed down area with the hose left in the way, other obstacles, people pulling out of driveways with poor visibility or pretending to look the other way, with vanity/name/number hack license plates, etc. These attacks could result in death. This is not ok and the people behind it should be brought to justice.
- 5) **Conspiracy:** Again, the obvious pattern of literal racketeering activity is so obvious that collusion need not be proved as this tort only requires adoption of the same criminal attacks to make the violators legally liable for all causes of action here and in Defendant's truly Plaintiff federal lawsuit. Information both omitted from this report and expected to turn up during discovery in SCOTUS should positively link each individual and their role in this tiny scene of the much bigger picture.

Motive:

Disrupt Computer Access / Work

Disrupt Legal

Disrupt Freedom

Steal Business

Family Frauds

Noncoincidences:

Number Hacks: All of the engaging UCLA PD officers had number hack badges corresponding to complaints in Defendant's federal Plaintiff lawsuit.

Name Hack Officer Chavez: Officer Chavez appeared to be running the show on both the first day, and when he came back with the ban letter a week later. Chavez is the suspected real name of an evil entrapping LADOT parking officer who lied and had Defendant falsely

imprisoned when he was living in a mansion in the Hollywood Hills with his car parked in the private garage. There is a lot more to say about both Chavezs.

UCLA STUDENT & ALUMNI VIOLATIONS:

- 1) **Stalking / Harassment:** Fashion hacks and cute girl stalkers while Defendant is trying to get an answer to a marriage proposal to his one love being controlled by Defendants of federal lawsuit where this Defendant is technically the Plaintiff.
- 2) **Human/Sex Trafficking:** Trying to control, disrupt, and create unwanted relationships through espionage, stalking, coercion, etc. Suspect that both bad family and John Doe defendant(s), specifically one POS representing USC/etc. over UCLA, was using or generously for now, "coercing" recent graduate sorority girl and family friend's daughter, GPS hacks, and gang stalking to violate a space were only legal work for freedom and an existing relationship were on mind.

Conspiracy: All the involved are technically guilty of all causes of action through conspiracy.

Most of this was calmly and rationally explained to the completely one-sided officers. They were warned that the Defendant is an unlicensed yet very powerful attorney, and that violating his rights would result in criminal RICO charges, yet the still proceeded with the incompetent arrest. Defendant just wants this to go away. Comply with all of the following demands and Defendant will not amend UCLA PD/individuals into the current case @ SCOTUS or a new one.

DEMANDS:

- 1) Drop the charge and seal the case.
- 2) Delete the record, all photos, surveillance, officer cell phone data, etc.
 - a) Provide Original Copy To Defendant First
- 3) Reverse the UCLA library ban.
- 4) Investigate the other side.
- 5) Advise UCLA to grant the petition.
- 6) Support Defendant in SCOTUS

WHAT DEFENDANT WAS DOING ON CAMPUS:

- 1) UCLA libraries are public with unlimited computer usage and Defendant is an affiliate.
 - a) Laptop was stolen and needed to use computers.
- 2) Defendant was originally using library computers to rewrite the 40+ page Petition for Writ of Certiorari that is now on the docket at the Supreme Court of The United States, which

was originally located on the stolen laptop.

- 3) Defendant was spending so much time perfecting his legal work that he decided it also made sense to petition UCLA for admission into a proposed PhD/MFA program that would only be worth Defendant going back to school if granted.
- 4) After months of hard work and keeping a very low profile in the library, Defendant finished and submitted both petitions, and then proceeded to produce a new no less than vlog and podcast with a goal of broadcasting on TV and radio.
 - a) Defendant was just about done creating amazing motion graphics for the various segments.
 - b) The show will surely cause envy and influence decision makers to grant petitions.
 - c) Defendant has no problem privately showing you his mind blowing unreleased creative work is only one of several foundations of evidence proving innocence.
- 5) Plaintiff was also working on other daily web publications, job hunting, etc.
- 6) Most importantly, Defendant was literally going out of his way to be unbothered, minding his own business, and these people invaded the Defendants space and victimized him with another false arrest very obviously connected to previous attacks.

ATTEMPTED ENTRAPMENT REPEATED: BH & LAF

Defendant recently had to file another LAPD police report against not limited to private security guards and locker room creeps stalking and attempting to entrap Defendant at his home gym where he has been working out everyday and a member of for something like five years. This is surely connected. They all use the same repetitive pattern of racketeering tactics and with the phone/body cameras attached to their belts usually in the horizontal position.

A lot of people have been creeping on Defendant around the Beverly Hills library, were Defendant is slight left more alone than UCLA, less in the Hollywood libraries, but the stalking pattern is present and obvious and demonstrable with clear and convincing facts and evidence for each location and claim.

BACKGROUND:

This is a razor with a guarded blade. It is a tool; not a weapon. I randomly polled several officers who agree. I have used it in good faith literally to shave hair/dead skin off my hand, to cut boxes and string, but have never had any intent for any illegal purpose. Sure it could be used in self-defense and can cause bodily injury, but so can the scissors I had in my backpack, located in my grooming kit from which the petty conspiring badge number hack cops stole my number one clipper attachment. I also carry a skateboard, and that is a much better weapon for

defense, but that is really my transportation as is a car for anyone. I did not even realize the razor/box cutter was still in my pocket and had intended to leave it in my storage unit, which I was rummaging through for laundry detergent yesterday. I took my jacket off while I was at storage where I have better legal knives and objects that could also be used as weapons, which I would have been carrying if I had anything but the best faith. I have a receipt from paying my storage bill in cash, plus witnesses that prove that I was indeed dealing with clean laundry business and my storage unit the day before this bogus charge.

The person who complained about me was intentionally harassing me. He was pacing back and forth behind me a ridiculous amount of times with a keychain hanging from his belt that was both making a lot of noise and intentionally drawing my attention to the phone he was wearing as a spy body camera that he kept pointing at me. I have briefly complained to the university about students stalking me with their camera phones when dealing with more important things like the PhD I am petitioning for. If you are really working then you measure twice and cut one, not measure literally 10 to 20 times in about 10 spots without taking any notes or photos for your work and in the presence of all of the other non-coincidences. I asked the suspected stalker "What are you doing? You are annoying the shit out of me and pretending to work. GTFOH." I also said something about his body camera before briefly raising my voice once. I have been in the library almost daily for months and do not even talk. This guy was digging. I think he would not quit because I was not letting him get a good video or picture of my face, so he then walked closer and took from a bad angle before going to the security guard who has been creeping on me since I reported the custodian who was watering down the pavement going downhill from where I enter campus to try and make me fall on my skateboard similar to how stalkers caused me to break my foot the night before Christmas Eve last year. I was explaining this to the one-sided arresting officers who only proceeded to similarly violate my rights in a more harassing way I could not defend at the time and could irreparable damage.

I did not know the razor was in my jacket pocket when I sitting at the computer in the cold library minding my own business, nor have I ever seen the trapper before, nor could I possibly have had bad faith in possessing my tool, or confronting the real criminal. I did not make any sort of threat or do anything that could be considered harassment. The security or library staff had a responsibility to confront me before calling crooked university cops. Again the cops got it backwards most definitely an attempted entrapment. The razor was discovered when by my voluntary verbal disclosure upon illegal search and seizure. Actually booking me was false imprisonment and cruel and unusual punishment, which they took further by verbally commanding a 7 day stay away order they would not put in writing if that is even legal. They said the stay away order was for harassment, but there is no way I was the harassing person, which is why they slapped me with possession of something completely legal. The officers had every intention of making an arrest and refused to let me tell my complete side of the story specifically in regards to the guy who was harassing me until I told him to GTFOH, which I had every right to do, staff or not, he was disturbing the quiet "Reading Room" in the library during normal hours.

There are multiple motives for all of their crimes, but no motive for me, nor is there a history of bad behavior in the libraries on campus where I have been friendly with library staff and never cause a problem, nor is there any bad faith on my spiritual level of all you need is love. I even have not one but two emails from conspiring university haters threatening to involve the police on campus when I was doing nothing more than seeking support with my petition, asking questions, and following up for responses when neglected.

My conduct and complete cooperation in no reasonable way created a threat to or endanger the health, safety or property of anyone; especially in regards to the alleged violation for possession of what was not discovered until I was unfairly detained.

UCLA PD @ <https://www.police.ucla.edu/>

Chief of Police

Tony Lee

tlee@ucpd.ucla.edu

Investigations Division Lieutenant

Scott Scheffler

scheffler@ucpd.ucla.edu

Request Report

Public Records / FOIA / Subpoena No Fee

Form @ <https://ucla.app.box.com/v/reportrequest>

Web @ <https://www.police.ucla.edu/services/records-unit/request-copy-of-a-report>

Complaint Form @ <https://ucla.app.box.com/v/complaintform>

Procedures / Web @ <https://www.police.ucla.edu/other/commendations-complaint-procedures>

General Contact

info@ucpd.ucla.edu

Phone: (310) 825-1491

601 Westwood Plaza Los Angeles, CA 90095-1364