

Karrie Gibson
17PSFL000745
DivorceOfJamesGibson@gmail.com

Today is Oct. 25th, 2023. I am responding to a judgment that was entered July 1, 2020 during Covid 19 at a time of Mandatory Stay at Home entered by the state. My name is Karrie Gibson. The respondent, a black woman who is a descendent of chattel slavery, and American Negro. I have been suffering with anxiety and depression as result of living in a 23-year abusive marriage to a white male abusive alcoholic who has ties to the family court. My condition has been magnified because of the anti-black hate crimes, fraud, and the cover-up of the fraud. Judge Sarah Heidel ordered Sheriff deputies to break in my marital home on September 23, 2020, 8:30pm at night. The city of Industries sheriff broke down my back door 8:30pm at night. I have video footage of the sheriff putting me in the street during Covid. California is an anti-black state that routinely harm black people for being black. I've done nothing but be supportive to an abusive alcoholic. The state would rather harm me a black woman rather than treat me equal. The court document is fraudulent. Egregiously claiming that I was present at the hearing. I wasn't present not present and didn't have representation.

RESPONSE TO JUDGEMENT

Family Code 4320

- i. Judgement claims we didn't have any savings. We did have savings. James opened an account with Washington Mutual which is now Chase bank. He brought home papers for me to be added.
- ii Judgement made blatant misrepresentation of life. We ate out regular. When vacation every New Years, Spring Break and small trips during the summer.
- iii. Judgement lied about savings.
- iv .Earning capacity is misrepresented Respondent has not been unemployed for the last 10 years of the marriage. The court lied about response earnings.
- V. Respondent current and future earning capacity has been impaired by the lack of employment, and more crucially her medical conditions.

VI. and mental condition. Respondent suffered from a severe back injury, which caused the long term unemployment during the marriage.

vii The petitioner isn't paying the reasonable amount. The respondent wasn't awarded adequate spousal support equivalent to the standard of living. This was done maliciously by the court to retaliate for speaking out about the racial discrimination and anti-black treatment.

ix. Respondent marital debt was in excess of \$60,000 as reported in response initial answer.

x. The court refused to allow respondent to show debt. Judge Lawrence Riff who is currently a civil court judge initially harmed the respondent as retaliation for requesting to have Judge Sarah Heidel removed from the case for misconduct, racial bias and abuse of discretion.

xii Respondent never committed acts of violence. Respondent is actually the victim of domestic violence. The court egregiously ignored letters written by the petitioner apologizing for his abuse. Letters dated back 20 years. The court maliciously deemed the respondent the abuser committing anti-black hate crimes. The Respondent endured 10 years of abuse. Suffered from mental health issues stemming from the abuse. Respondent received medical treatment in the first 3 years of the marriage due to abuse.

xiii. Respondent has a history of medical issues. Respondent attempted to provide evidence, Judge Heidel ignored and gaslighted the respondent during the trial.

xiv. The court illegally and fraudulently denied respondent to provide evidence or appropriate legal counsel. The court intentionally deprived respondent of legal counsel as outlined by Family Code 2030.

xvi. The court makes unfounded allegations about respondent. Respondent only requested adequate spousal support as outlined by

Family Code 4320 and made several requests for legal fees outlined by Family Code 2030. The court with malice and forethought deprived respondent of her rights under the 14th Amendment. To be treated equally as a non black family court litigant. The weighted evidence demonstrated the court intention are to harm respondent because she is a black woman. Judge Sara Heidel illegally deemed Respondent Vexatious to deprive her of self help. Judge Riff a party to the civil rights violation, and supervision judge advice Heidel to recuse herself.

Gavron Warning

The court caused irreparable harm to respondent. Respondent lived for years in abuse by petitioner. Respondent suffered a severe back injury that interferes with her ability to work, or preform to an average standard. Respondence condition The court is aware, and continues to violate the right of respondent.

C Modification

The court orders spousal support well below the necessary amount needed to live in the standard in which the respondent has experience in the entire 23 year of marriage.

Sale of the Marital home

The court wrongly orders the sale of the home without allowing petition any other option because she is a black woman. Case number on Heidel gave the litigants the opportunity to discuss how to deal with the home. The court allowed the Petitioner to sale the home well below market value. To further harm the respondent and deplete marital assets, the court egregious awarded Petitioner with funds for future litigation when respondent experience financial difficulty. The court has acted aggressive, bias and discriminatory because the respondent is a black woman, and petitioner is a white male.

B. The judgement was created on March 17, 2020 and entered into judgment on July 1, 2020 While there was a mandatory stay at

home order. The court wanted to expose petitioner to the deadly Covid-19 virus without regard for her well-being or her son/tenant. Sterling Scarborough. Ordering to put the sale within sixty days violates the mandatory stay at home order. The court fraudulent order respondent to pay the Petitioner. The respondent has held a job in over ten years. The Petitioner was the primary wage earner. The continues to harm the respondent because she is a black woman.

C. The court has no legal right to delegate \$10,000 for the Petitioner for future litigation knowing that the court harmed the respondent.

iii. Petitioner failed to follow the order. Order is well below the requirement to live in the lifestyle of the marriage for 23 years. The court egregiously falsely claims middle class lifestyle.

Epstein Credit/Watts Charges

- B. The court crookedness, and blatant anti-black treatment is evident in the Epstein Credit. The court orders the Petitioner to Pay \$2747.00 per month for 14 month. Fourteen months that the Petitioner Abandoned respondent. The court orders the respondent, to pay the mortgage when the respondent hasn't held a job since 2008. Petitioner abandoned the respondent. The court doesn't make Petitioner Pay for half the mortgage. This is undeniable evidence that the court with malice and forethought continues to harm the respondent. A black woman descendant of Chattel Slavery. Fraudulently awarding Petitioner \$19,229.00 to deprive the respondent of the means to support herself or afford legal counsel.
- C. The court flagrant disgraceful order for respondent to pay rent on the family home, while simultaneously charging respondent to pay the mortgage further demonstrates the anti-black hate crimes against respondent a black woman, petitioner a white male.

D. Petitioner was unemployed during Jan 2018 and February 2019. Petitioner abandoned respondent. The court is causing irreparable harm to respondent because she is a black woman.

Confirming of Separate Property

The court deprived the respondent of discovery without cause. Judge Lawrence Riff with malice and forethought sanctioned not allow her discovery as outlined by California Family Code.

Respondent has the legal right to Raymond James account ending in 80C000. Respondent paid taxes on this account. Which a was a gift to the community.

Respondent has legal right to be the beneficiary.

Division of Community Property

V. The court denies respondent of marital assets earned during the course of the marriage. Judge Riff blatantly deprived respondent of her rights to discover and marital assets as outlined by the California Family Code. See transcripts Jan 2, 2020. Obvious intentional harm to respondent because she is a black woman.

Other Orders

A. The court continues to making disparaging remarks about Respondent as she is a black woman. The court has fraudulently show blatant bias towards Respondent, a black woman. Respondent has done nothing improper but tried to have a fair trial. Respondent was in a 23 years abusive relationship with the abusive white male alcoholic. She had no reason to do anything inappropriate. She is entitle to half of marital assets, a fail spousal support that is commensurate with the lifestyle of the marriage. The court continues to insinuate that Respondent is difficult or

inappropriate. The judgement was entered on July 1, 202 when there was a strict stay at home order. All aspect of the divorce should have been halted when respondent file a Motion to disqualify Judge Heidel. Also due to the stay-at-home order. Respondent was at a disadvantage due to the court continue violation of Respondent right under the 14th Amendment and due process.

- C. Respondent is without adequate vehicle. The court continued to abuse the rights of respondent a black woman, descendent of Chattel Slavery. Respondent has been homeless a destitute sense Judge Heidel sent City Of Industries sheriff to break in the marital home, on Sept 23, 2020, 8:30 pm/
- D. Petitioner transfer the 401k funds into a fund without the approval or signature of respondent. The court doesn't verify the amount of the fund or what is response fair share. The court continues to allow the Petitioner, a white male abusive alcoholic dictate the specifics of the divorce. The court will not allow the respondent a black woman to participate in the decision associated with divorce issues. The court shows racial biased against petition in ever aspect of the divorce.
- E. The court deprived Respondent of the right to legal counsel as outlined by Family Code 2030. Response has been a disadvantage since the onset of the divorce. She didn't have the money to pay for an attorney because the court deprive respondent of her rights Under Family Code 2030.
- F. Again the court deprive Respondent of her rights. Making mention of a fraudulent order by bias Judge Heidel. A order that was done to harm Respondent because she is a black woman. Respondent wasn't given due process in the order made on February 19.2020. Respondent has been in 23 abusive relationship with a white male abusive alcoholic.

Emergency responders' have been called to the marital home on multiple occasion due to the abuse towards respondent by the Petitioner. The court deprived respondent of her right to speak in court. The court negatively framed respondent a black woman

descent of chattel slavery. The court was abusive, showed blatant bias towards Respondent. Respondent suffered a mental crisis during the trial as a result of the abuse. Respondent ran out of the hearing as result of the abuse and the mental health crisis.

Division of Debt

- A. The court continues to harm respondent financial position. Only acknowledging the debt of the Petitioner but ignoring the marital debit in the name of the respondent. On November 6 2017 respondent filed for FL-160. Respondent document on page 3 of 4 of the FL-160 the following Credit Card Balances
\$32,00
\$52,000
\$10,000
\$94,000 which isn't an accurate estimate. Respondent completed divorce forms without assistance while Petitioner was represented by counsel.
- B. The Shell Gas Card balance was acquired after the date of separations. Respondent did have use of a Shell Card for several years prior to separation.
- C. A Barclaycard wasn't acquired during the marriage. The court is purposely order the respondent to pay for debt that wasn't not acquired during the course of the marriage. The court is initially violating the rights of the respondent, a black woman.
- D. Bank of America card is accurate, the balance hasn't been validated. The respondent also has a Bank of America card. The court refuse to acknowledge any of response debt. This is barbaric and egregious to purposely bring harm to a black woman. A black woman who has endured 23 years of abuse.

Reimbursement

iv Respondent canceled Direct TV, replace the direct tv with Hulu. The court failed to follow California Court Procedures and deprived respondent that opportunity to respond to all proposed debt.

vii. Respondent isn't responsible for 1/2 of the health insurance. Health insurance covered 3 individuals to include the litigant's adult daughter. Respondent isn't responsible for adult daughters' insurance coverage. Petitioner also benefits from tax benefit of adult daughter.