

## How Electronic Public Records are Tampered with in New York

So How Can Electronic Records Be Tampered with? The system that all New York State villages/towns and use is called the [CourtRoom Program®](#) created by Service Education, Inc. of Victor, NY., a private corporation, **why is a private corporation in New York allowed to handle the very documents the courts can use to lock you away? We also found another worrisome issue when investigating this stealthy corporation that should set off alarms bells everywhere in New York...**

[CourtRoom Program®](#) It is an electronic docketing system designed to track every case from start to finish. It allows the Court to immediately update the case with current adjournment information, preventing cases from 'falling through the cracks' and assuring timely adjudication and reporting. [This individual](#) appears to possibly be the one who developed the architecture for it. It is run by a private company for the New York State Unified Court System. Here is the other interesting issue. While all courts have the [CourtRoom Program®](#) in place, only 13 counties in the state have [WebCrims](#), a "FREE" public service by the NYS Unified Court System that allows you to look up your case. Cattaraugus County is not one of them. I wonder why?

[CourtRoom Program®](#) integrates on the back end with OCA, the electronic data system of the New York State Unified Court System. Every electronic public record in New York State, at least when it deals with alleged 'crimes' integrates with the [New York Statewide Police Information Network](#) (NYSPIN). It is where local police agencies input the data and it is sent off to the various agencies, including the Department of Motor Vehicles and the Unified Court System of New York.


The [CourtRoom Program®](#) works and and glove with the UTT (uniform traffic ticket, which was used in the Pro-Se's matter) and New York State Police e-ticket system. People v Rose [11 Misc 3d 200] basically laid out the requirements/concerns for the e-ticket and UTT system. Originally, the issue when the E-Ticket and UTT system was the signature of the officer attesting to the facts of the allegations under penalty of perjury, just like what was required for the 'old-fashion' hand signed versions. New York state law predated

federal legislation in this area and in 2002, the New York definition of "electronic signature" was circumscribed to provide symmetry with federal law [State Technology Law § 304 (2) & 305 (3)].

What troubled the court on the Rose case was that with regard to accusatory instruments certain additional statutory safeguards and procedural protocols needed to be put in place. In other words how to eliminate the tampering of the public record and and the proper verification process to ensure a charge was valid. These are the terms they use as safe-guards [People v Rose].

Let's look over the safe-guards that reason and logic would dictate;

- Tamper proof. Once finalized it can't be altered;
- Limited access. Only the original can be made available at the original(s) location;
- Only the police officer has the ability to place his electronic signature upon the UTT 15 CRR-NY 91.7 (b) (1); People v. Boback 23 N.Y.2d 189; People v Radak 52 Misc.2d 300;
- The button to apply the officers signature must have the jurat, *i.e. you are signing it under penalty of perjury.*



So basically charges submitted with the proper buttons pushed it can't be altered, or can it?

Here is the issue with going electronic, it can be easily hacked, or anyone that has access to it can therefore alter it. In this case logic dictates that once a police officer submits the information they can no longer go in and tamper with it and the Rose case lays out these concerns.

However it being a computer program, systems administrators would have to have access at all levels of the system for maintenance, emergency and upgrade purposes. So if indeed the unsigned/unverified simplified informations in the Pro-Se's case do mysteriously appear in the court case signed, the fingers will point directly to the system administrators at the three levels described in the image (A, B or C).

There appear to be three areas that tampering with electronic public records could occur;

- **A - at the DMV level, with the [TSLED/TraCS system](#)**
- **B - at the Unified Court System level, with the [OCA system](#)** however, the **Unified Court System** gets it data entered through the [TSLED/TraCS system](#) and then it is transferred to the OCA which is then transferred to the OCA system
- **C - at the private level with the [CourtRoom Program®](#)**

So which one would allow for tampering? I think the "odd man out" phrase would apply in this matter. You

will notice that all entities are actual government agencies, except one that is a private corporation. **When developing a computer program, especially for the government, it is looked at very closely by everybody, the public, lawyers, etc... and can always be under scrutiny of a concerning public eye. But a private corporation? Nope, that why it is called a private corporation. It is much harder to get the information on what they are up to, unlike government agencies which are governed by law and freedom of information (FOIL), and private corporations are not, etc... private corporations you most always need subpoenas and utilize other legal methods that can be costly to acquire the information you seek. This can effect every New Yorker's rights.**

That's why every New Yorker should be concerned with the fact that it is a private corporation that handles the UTT system, WHY? Look at the diagram, its all public agencies from the police all the way down to the unified court system then it goes private then public again. WHY? if the police UTT system has direct access and accountability to the TSLED system then why doesn't the town/village court system have direct access to the OCA of the unified court system?

Again, a private corporation can ignore public inquires and scrutiny unless upon a court order, subpoena, etc... costly legal process... **Because of this, we believe that if the Pro-Se simplified informations come up mysteriously signed it will have occurred at level C, via the [CourtRoom Program®](#) . There needs to be a state investigation as to why a private corporation would be allowed to handle such sensitive data that can effect every New Yorker**

**This is where gets really weird folks.** We figured that Service Education, Inc. of Victor, NY would own the [CourtRoom Program®](#) so we decided to find out if it actually did. So we checked into it. Guess what, its privately listed! In other words the whois database is using a private listing company to hide the actual owners of the website for [CourtRoom Program®](#) Private listing companies allow website owners to hide their identity. This is serious, this is a website/system that handles New York States court public record documents and we as New Yorkers don't know who owns it?

There needs to be a through review and investigation on this to insure that the private end is up to par with the public end or completely eliminate it altogether and have the courts connect directly to the Unified Court System OCA system. **Here is the other kicker - the town and village courts already have to access to the OCA ticket system now anyways, so what is the purpose of the [CourtRoom Program®](#) ? Is it to allow easier access to tamper with public record outside of the public eye?**

**Below is the proof that the simplified traffic informations were not signed well after the arraignment and after the case was moved to Machias. These are actual videotapes taken in the original court well after arraignment.**

**If the charges mysteriously appear signed it will prove the corruption goes all the way to the top in Albany, This is one of the reasons the criminal Verna Dry now claims it is illegal to videotape your court file.**

**Video one** is the video inspection of the court file after the originals was were moved to the new court in late November of 2014, well after the time allowed to verify which is no later than arraignment, which occurred in June of 2014. It clearly shows the unsigned reduced versions and provides a time stamp of December 11th, 2014 as to when the video was made.

**Video two**, while it briefly shows the unverified/unsigned simplified informations, it was made before the case was moved to the next court. The purpose of this video was to document the perjury committed by "ADA" Elizabeth Ensell. It clearly shows that the video was made on, or after August 27th, 2014, again well after the time allowed to produce verified/signed simplified traffic informations.

This is why the Criminals [Verna Dry](#) and [Lori Rieman](#) freak out when you want to videotape the contents of what is in your file. It's very clear Verna and her gals have no problem falsifying and/or tampering with YOUR public records whenever they want to, which is a 20 year jail sentence. After all, if they were acting within the law, they would have no problem providing a defendant with the ability to document what is in the file, now would they?

**There were many more videos the Pro-Se made just to play it safe, he only provide these two to show the after arraignment and after record was moved.**

**Do you think DA or someone else will tamper with the records in order to cover up the DA's and other public official crimes?**