

## Bryan H Schwabenbauer

Here is just a little something on Bryan H Schwabenbauer, can you say "*liability*" and can you also say "*pattern and practice*", can you now also say "*small liability*" to absolutely *HUGE* one?

In fact the county actually rewards criminal conduct of its employees by giving



The screenshot shows a web-based payroll system interface. At the top, there is a navigation menu with options like 'Home', 'Reports', 'System', 'Settings', 'Users', and 'Logout'. Below the menu, there is a header area with the word 'EMPIRE' and a logo. The main content area contains a table with columns for 'EMPLOYEE', 'SALARY', 'BONUS', and 'TOTAL'. The table has several rows of data, with some cells highlighted in green. The interface is designed for data entry and reporting.



This is another screenshot of the same payroll system interface, showing a similar table of employee pay data. The layout and navigation elements are consistent with the first screenshot, including the 'EMPIRE' header and the table with columns for 'EMPLOYEE', 'SALARY', 'BONUS', and 'TOTAL'.

them pay raises.

The images included here show how the county does absolutely nothing to discipline employees who engage in conduct that leads to lawsuits that cost us taxpayers.

Here is Bryan H Schwabenbauer's pay from the years of 2009 to 2014. You will notice that he was given a pay raise every year.

Schwabenbauer also appears to be part of the embedded RICO element in Cattaraugus County. There are two others Schwabenbauer's that are on the public doll here in Cattaraugus County also.

### [UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 10CV210A](#)

***"In mid-December 2007, plaintiff was on AOC premises to test pavement and weather conditions before beginning snow plowing when a Cattaraugus County Sheriff's patrol car pulled into the AOC parking lot. Plaintiff contends that defendant Cattaraugus County Sheriff's Department sergeant Bryan Schwabenbauer ordered plaintiff to step away from his vehicle.***

***According to plaintiff, he repeatedly identified himself as the snow plow contractor but Schwabenbauer ordered plaintiff to shut up, pushed plaintiff onto the sheriff's patrol car and ordered him to place his hands on the patrol car, kicked his legs apart and conducted a pat down search of plaintiff Plaintiff claims that Schwabenbauer demanded to know what plaintiff was doing at the AOC and then proceeded to search plaintiff's vehicle.***

***Almost two years later, on December 9, 2009, plaintiff appeared for work at the AOC when, at approximately 6 am, plaintiff saw a blue flash near an electrical transformer, followed by falling power lines***

and fires; plaintiff immediately reported this to WVES security. Plaintiff entered the non-secured front vestibule of the AOC and went no further into secured areas. Emergency responders arrived, including defendant Schwabenbauer. **Schwabenbauer, when he saw plaintiff on premises, told him (in a profane manner) to leave.** Plaintiff drove to the south end of the parking lot. Schwabenbauer and Dawn Samborski, an agent, employee or contractor of WVES, falsely reported that plaintiff entered secured area. Plaintiff claims that defendants invoked federal law (provisions of the Atomic Energy Act) to ban plaintiff from entering the AOC, claiming that he was trespassing....)

In the first claim of the original Complaint, plaintiff alleges that **Schwabenbauer deprived him of his Fourth Amendment rights** in conducting an illegal search and seizure of his person and vehicle in December 2007. The **Cattaraugus County defendants allegedly were deliberately indifferent in failing to train Schwabenbauer.** Next, in his second claim plaintiff alleges that he was deprived property, his employment with The Krog Corporation, his contract for property maintenance and **his liberty interest in his good name, without due process, in violation of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. He claims in the third claim that defendants retaliated against him for complaining of Schwabenbauer's illegal conduct in 2007, in violation of his First amendment rights. He also alleges, in the fourth claim, that this vindictiveness deprived plaintiff of equal protection of laws, in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment.** Finally, plaintiff alleges in the fifth claim, that Pritchard, WVES, Samborski, Schwabenbauer, and Love tortuously interfered with plaintiff's contractual rights, in violation of New York common law.

**Further, Schwabenbauer is a perjurer;**

*"There were numerous impartial eyewitnesses that discredited the written statement Defendant Schwabenbauer gave to the WVES defendants that he had observed Plaintiff trespassing."*

Among these eyewitnesses were XXXXXXXXX Fire Department Police Captain XXXXXXXXX, Fire Department Chief XXXXXXXXX and Firefighter XXXXXXXXX, and XXXXXXXXX. Upon information and belief, all four provided written and/or spoken statements furnished directly or indirectly to WVES that vindicated Plaintiff and established the falsity of Defendant Schwabenbauer's account.

**Despite actual and constructive notice that the trespass claim made by Defendants Schwabenbauer and, upon information and belief, Samborski was false, and that the supporting affidavit of Defendant Schwabenbauer was perjured,** the WVES Defendants maliciously determined that the claim was true, and suppressed and ignored the mass of exculpatory evidence.

**It gets better....**

The Cattaraugus County Sheriff's Office, deputy Love, and sergeant Schwabenbauer separately answered the Complaint with identical Answers (Doc ket Nos. 2, 3, 4), also asserting an affirmative defense and crossclaim alleging the negligence of the WVES defendants and Samborski that, if plaintiff recovers from the County defendants, the WVES defendants and Samborski should indemnify the County defendants. **(See how they turn on each other; [indemnify](#))**



In the first claim of the original Complaint, plaintiff alleges that Schwabenbauer deprived him of his Fourth Amendment rights in conducting an **illegal search and seizure of his person and vehicle in December 2007**. The **Cattaraugus County defedants allegedly were deliberately indifferent in failing to train Schwabenbauer**. Next, in his second claim plaintiff alleges that he **was deprived property, his employment with The Krog Corporation, his contract for property maintenance and his liberty interest in his good name, without due process, in violation of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments**. He claims in the third claim that defendants **retaliated against him for complaining of Schwabenbauer's illegal conduct in 2007, in violation of his First mendment rights**. He also alleges, in the fourth claim, that this **vindictiveness deprived plaintiff of equal protection of laws, in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment**. Finally, plaintiff alleges in the fifth claim, that Pritchard, WVES, Samborksi, Schwabenbauer, and Love tortuously interfered with plaintiff's contractual rights, in violation of New York common law."

## CONCLUSION

Now, how the whole system works is what is left on the 'record', i.e. *what is left OVER, after everything is done*, so any reasonable person, who looks at the testimony and the evidence in the future can deduct, i.e. *come to a conclusion*, for themselves exactly what occurred. Have you ever heard of "motion to strike", "motion to dismiss", "motion to suppress", if these motions are successful that part of the record which the motions targeted, i.e. *the testimony and the evidence targeted*, is no longer part of the record, so any reasonable person would not see it when reviewing the record in the future. Furtherm Schwabenbauer was a Deputy Sergeant when this case occurred and he still was a Sergeant when he [assaulted a Pro Se litigant](#) years later. It is very apparent that Cattaraugus County does not do anything for this type of behavior or in fact rewards it. This increases the liability of Cattaraugus County substantially for their failure and/or refusal to take actions and hold the responsible party liable for their conduct.

NOW, you who have just read what is on the record, being a reasonable person, what are your conclusions in the above matter?

**Caveat;** you should read the whole case before you make your conclusions, part of which cane be found [here](#).

Have you had an issue with Bryan H Schwabenbauer? Tell us about it.

//