

"DA" Lori Rieman & the Crystal Ball of Truth. Rieman throws her employee under the bus.

oh what webs we weave when first we practice to deceive



Discover the Criminal Conduct of the District Attorney of Cattaraugus County New York

CatCountyCorruption.com

There is no Honor Among Thief's and Lori Rieman Proves it Again. In this matter, a case in which a citizen of the state is suing Cattaraugus County and Lori Rieman in federal court for various violations of law, which is nothing new for her, Rieman engaged in numerous acts of criminal conduct that led to the lawsuit. Because the system is corrupt we will go over the ways the corrupt system will most likely attempt to cover up her criminal conduct that should land her in jail...

oh what webs we weave when first we practice to deceive



Discover the Criminal Conduct of the District Attorney of Cattaraugus County New York

CatCountyCorruption.com

In a corrupt system, like it is here in [Cattaraugus County](#), the system will attempt to cover up the acts of their agents by getting the victims of the corrupt system to 'overlook' or 'misdirect' their focus to something other less critical factor that will make it look like 'justice is served'.

Cat County Corruption

~~Cattaraugus County, New York State Corruption & the Powers of the NYS Jury & Grand Jury System~~

After all, if it was any of us that committed acts like this, where do you think we would be now? Its called due process and being treated equally under the law, which in Cattaraugus County, New York they claim that does not apply to the District Attorneys or Sheriffs Office. Sorry, but it does apply to everyone, especially law enforcement and other public officials who are to be held above reproach and their conduct requires and deserves scrutiny when they in fact engaged in lawlessness. The Grand Jury mandates of the New York State Constitution prove it;

[New York State Constitution](#), **Article I, Section 6, Paragraph 2**; *The power of grand juries to inquire into the **wilful misconduct in office of public officers**, and to find indictments or to direct the filing of informations in connection with such inquiries, **shall never be suspended or impaired by law**. No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law.*

What has Rieman stolen from this victim of her criminal activity? His life, liberty and happiness illegally by ruining his family life, his business, throwing him in jail, etc... [that is why the lawsuit occurred](#) and **it will stop it from happening to other people and reduce future potential liability issues for us, the taxpayers. Rieman has to go...**

Based on the review of the case and interviews with various witnesses to the crimes committed by Rieman that led to the federal lawsuit, we believe that there are two acts of criminal conduct that the corrupt system will attempt to get Riemans victim to overlook in the Appeal so Rieman can be let off the hook, so-to-speak;

Below are the issues that a corrupt system will use to cover up, or attempt to cover up and the one they will use in an attempt to get her off the hook;

1. The second amended VOP (violation of probation) that the county is claiming occurred in November of 2012 in which the victim was alleged to have failed to report contact with a police officer within 48 hours. Which he did do, calling them as well as paying a visit to the probation office along with a witness. **This is what is on appeal now.**
2. The September 2013 court transcript that proves there was no amended violation that occurred in November 2012,
3. The alleged notice to the victim that a probation violation, which was mandated the probation department to serve/notice the victim of the alleged violation pursuant to [CPL § 440.40](#)

Number one and two does not let Rieman off the hook. Number three does, however it does place the blame for the screw up on the probation department. Will Rieman and her cronies do that?

Lets look at history to determine if Rieman will throw the probation department and it's personal under the bus in this matter;

Rieman threw one of her own employees under the bus in her answer to the present lawsuit, in her answer to the lawsuit, paragraph 9 she blamed "ADA" William Preston Marshall for the whole issue that occurred which caused the lawsuit;

*"9. ...Plaintiff alleges that the actions of the ADA **were taken on behalf of, at the direction of and/or with the knowledge of Defendant Lori Rieman**. (Complaint, paragraph 57) Accepting the allegations of plaintiff at face value, **and assuming arguendo that Ms. Rieman knew of the ADA's decision to move to restore plaintiff's case to the local court calendar...."***

The key term here is "arguendo" which is defined as;

"When the phrase in [arguendo](#) is used by a party during the course of a trial, it indicates that his or her

comment is made as a matter of argument or illustration only. The statement does not bear directly upon the remainder of the discussion."

There is no honor among thief's and **here is just another example of how they throw each other bus and blame others for their crimes.** I wonder how her employee William Preston Marshall feels about this? I wonder how all her employees feel about this? This "no honor among thief's" tactic also occurred in the case in which [Bryan H Schwabenbauer](#) and the Cattaraugus County Sheriffs office was sued, Schwabenbauer was accused of basically assault and perjury in which numerous individuals, including four other public officers proved he committed perjury and the county attempted to get themselves off the hook by blaming the other party named in the lawsuit. I would think twice about entering into any agreement with the county;

*"The Cattaraugus County Sheriff's Office, deputy Love, and sergeant Schwabenbauer separately answered the Complaint with identical Answers (Docket 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**"*

The key term here is "indemnify" which is defined as;

To [indemnify](#) another party is to compensate that party for loss or damage that has already occurred, or to guarantee through a contractual agreement to repay another party for loss or damage that occurs in the future.

See how they turn on each other and blame each other for their liabilities that arose from their actions?
Notice the pattern and practice here?

Back to the main aspect of this article, will the corrupt system attempt to get Lori Rieman off the hook and if so, how will they attempt to do it?

The alleged amended VOP (2nd violation of probation) that the county is claiming occurred in November of 2012. **THE CRYSTAL BALL:** They will attempt to get the victim to ignore this issue and overlook it. If they do this they will be able to use the failure or refusal to adhere to the [CPL § 440.40](#) and blame the whole issue on probation department personal. There is two issues with this though;

The September 2013 court transcript that proves there was no amended violation that occurred in November 2012. This was **testified too by the probation officer AND the COURT CLERK**, and Rieman testified that it was amended to the original VOP in court. **This is in their own words, not the victims, again: RIEMAN'S AND THE PROBATION OFFICERS OWN WORDS.** I don't know how much more proof then you need then that.

For the sake of "arguendo" lets say they did testify that there was a notice of violation filed in November of 2012 and it was legitimate, again **Rieman in her own words claims it was amended to the original violation that occurred months earlier**, which that can't happened either because it was two separate incidents, but this is Catt County of course, so lets pretend it can.

The key term here is "amend" which is defined as;

[Amend:](#) To alter or change by adding, subtracting, or substituting. One can amend a statute, a contract or

In other words, the 2nd VOP was made part of the 1st VOP which was part of the Appeal. The Appeal of the victim was won in December of 2013, if the 2nd VOP (Nov 2012) was amended to the original VOP (May 2012) and the original VOP was thrown out then the 2nd VOP should have been thrown out too. **This proves it was a completely illegal proceeding instigated by Rieman in complicity with the County Court, and others, to deny Riemans victim AGAIN of his Rights. Tell me again, who has to go?**

THE CRYSTAL BALL

OK, we are still in Cattaraugus County, the land of fairy tales and lies. Lets pretend that the 2nd violation was filed as a separate incident and not amended to the 1st VOP, that it did occur and was filed properly in 2012 and that the appeal was lost. The county still failed to abide by the mandates of [CPL § 440.40](#) which violated the victims rights to notice and opportunity to defend, so this present appeal (on the 2nd VOP violation) should be upheld. We believe that this is the approach the corrupt system will attempt to use, unless they decide to actually follow the law. But again, this is Catt Co. They will throw the Cattaraugus County Probation Department under the bus and use it as the scape goat in a attempt to get the victim to overlook the more serious criminal conduct of Rieman to get her off the hook. In the interviews with the victim, he wants justice to be served in the form of criminal indictments of Rieman and her cohorts and for them to serve time in jail like they have done to so many other innocent victims.

A Blind Man Who Cannot Hear Could Easily Determine there is a Pattern and Practice Here.