

Jillian's Koch's Criminal Conduct and Criminal Conduct of other Cattaraugus County Court Clerks

Cattaraugus County NY District Attorney and Court Criminal Cabal Exposed



CatCountyCorruption.com

Have you ever been a Pro-Se litigant in Cattaraugus County New York, or a honest lawyer or judge, or just a average Joe public official for that matter? Once you exert your rights in any court in Cattaraugus County you will soon discover that you will become the target **by the most abusive and corrupt court system in the United States**. Anything you do will be labeled "reactionary" or "conspiratorial", you will be accused of...

Cattaraugus County NY District Attorney and Court Criminal Cabal Exposed



CatCountyCorruption.com

yelling at the clerks, being combative, argumentative, just about anything they can throw at you to make it appear that you are not acting in a 'normal' fashion so they can sic their cronies on you when you demand that your public servants follow the very law's they claim you have to follow.

Once you understand the law, you will easily discover that your rights are being violated by the very

individuals who are sworn to uphold them. Lets take a look at the terms these criminals masquerading as court clerks play in Cattaraugus County New York do to citizens and taxpayers who dare exercise their (and your) rights.

When we were investigating the reasons for the 4 million dollar lawsuit we decided to take a visit to the Cattaraugus County Court house again to inspect the file that led to the lawsuit. [The individual who is suing the county because of the criminal Lori Rieman](#) wanted to review the papers in his file. We will start with two of the papers that he discovered in his appeal that cause him concern. He has not been able to get a full time job because of these fraudulent reports, why should that matter, the court clerks of Cattaraugus County get a kick out of destroying peoples life's, whether innocent or guilty... They don't care, it's not effecting them.

They are called Uniform Sentence & Commitment Reports (USC-854).

One researcher made some startling discoveries that proves Jane St John and Jillian Koch have no problem tampering with the public record, which is up to a twenty year prison sentence. I mean they have [no problem destroying public records and having their law firm attempt to cover it up](#), so why should tampering matter? This is Cattaraugus County after all.

Here is the issue;

If you are ever accused of a crime and you plea bargain you lose all of your rights to appeal it and sue. However you still do have the right to appeal based on lack of jurisdiction, coercion and tainted evidence. Other then that, its over, you have to abide by all the conditions of the plea bargain.

But lets take a look at the most important fact. YOU CAN'T APPEAL, IF YOU DO IT WILL BE THROWN OUT.

In the thesis People v . Thomas: The Conditional Guilty Plea by Gerard A. Riso wrote;

The traditional guilty plea finally disposes of the case in that it waives a defendant's right to appeal any issue except those issues relating to the validity of the plea itself, or to the jurisdiction of the court (1). *New York State's Criminal Procedure Law section 710.70 (2) has modified the traditional guilty plea by giving a defendant the right to appeal a denial of a motion to suppress evidence. The conditional guilty plea, by contrast, is the result of an agreement between the prosecutor, the trial judge, and the defendant whereby the plea is conditioned upon the defendant's ability to appeal certain issues of law (3). In People v. Thomas,(4) the New York Court of Appeals refused to recognize a conditional guilty plea attempting to preserve for appeal issues outside the scope of section 710.70(2), at least where "[t]he legal sufficiency of a conceded set of facts" to support the guilty plea was challenged (5).*

In other words, its over if you plead. So lets take a look at the appeal of the man who is now suing the Lori Rieman for destroying his family and his business for no legal reason. If he loses the appeal it could jeopardize his suit against Rieman. Now I am a taxpayer just like the rest of you, but crime is crime and when someone commits a real crime (you know when someone is actually hurt), the person who committed the crime has to pay. In this case it is Lori Rieman who will have to pay out of her own insurance policy (3 million to be exact).

Lori can't afford to lose the suit, so she enlists her criminal cohorts Jane St John and the worst one, Jillian Koch.

As a side note: it appears one of her relatives is running for office right now as of August 12, 2015, you

Cat County Corruption

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

see the signs all over the place. Please take note, I bet most of Koch signs you see in yards are state and local government employees who like the corrupt system, or they were told to place the signs in their yards for fear of retribution, that should tell you something).

So Jillian and Jane St John decide to fabricate to Uniform Sentence & Commitment reports (USC-854) that claim that Rieman's victim voluntary pleaded guilty to 3 charges, all of which are complete lies, which is a twenty year prison sentence. Verna, once you get to know her, you come to the rationalization that she is just a patsy and does what she is told. The true criminals are Koch and St John...

The victims lawyer "overlooks" the fabricated evidence and allows it to become part of the evidence packet, in appeals its called the appendix and his lawyer places these fabricated pieces of evidence on page 2 and 3. how convenient. Everyone always looks at the first couple of pages then they start to skim the rest. It's human nature....

Let's take a look at these documents;



Here is the USC (Uniform Court Report) created by Jillian Koch that claim's Rieman's victim plead guilty to a Violation of Probation (VOP). So guess what, when the appeals court see this it is curtain's time for the appeal and the victim loses.

Now how could his lawyer miss something so critical as this?

Further, notice the charges in the upper right corner, there are two of them and one mysteriously disappears in the sentencing box. (the second large rectangular box at the top right below the first one).

Wow, the Bermuda triangle UCR form. I am sure a lot of other individual who have been judge guilty would love to have a form like this, where their charges just 'disappear'. Koch claims he only plead guilty to the violation of probation, what happened to the alleged DWI charge Chillian? Where did it go? Are you now claiming it is still pending?

This is a complete lie and total fabrication by Koch and up to a twenty year prison sentence to boot... She is a criminal psychopath who takes pleasure in destroying a innocent persons life.

Verna Dry had no problem giving Rieman's victim a certified copy of this forgery, but when the victim asked for a certified copy of the other USC created and signed by Jane St John Verna said no, you can't have one, now why would she do that?

Well... lets take a look at it....



Take closer look at the judges name and the date of the charge. First of all, the victim never had a DWI charge in front of Ploetz. It was a different judge and that judge was in Buffalo and it states in the remarks that "probation revoked", yet you don't see ANY probation violation anywhere, do you? This is another complete fabrication by the criminals at the Cattaraugus County Court Clerks Office and it is signed by Court Clerk Jane St John.

The most startling fact about these bogus pieces of paper is the name of the judge on it. Its "County Court Judge" Ronald Ploetz. He wasn't even a judge in 2011 (click here for story), he was elected as one in 2012!

They have no problem committing [fraud upon the court](#) anytime they want to cover their tracks.

These people are pure satanic Evil. Now lets get on to the other crimes they have no problem committing.

What these criminals will do is accuse you of 'yelling' at them, or being 'combative', or 'argumentative'. These are statements and are an attempt to get on the record falsified evidence that they can use against you in sentencing (if found guilty) or at a jury trial (to sway the jury), or for other nefarious purposes.

Here is another trick a corrupt DA and court clerks will play on you. The Pro-Se understanding that Jillian has no problem tampering with the public record, which is up to a twenty year prison sentence, went back to the court to review the files to see if Jillian tampered with them again. **As expected, she did, you can't teach an old criminal how to go strait.** There were three new documents in the file, however they were not new, the Pro-se had seen them in the original file way back.

See... the Pro-se asked Jillian for a letter stating that she had reviewed the file and could not locate any signed/verified simplified informations. Jillian produced the letter, however in it she claimed that the "traffic Infractions" were signed.

Sorry Jillian, you have been caught in another lie again. What were signed were the Appearance tickets, NOT the simplified traffic informations, the actual charges that are delivered to the court. The actual documents that confer jurisdiction to the court.

Let's look at the legal definition of 'criminal' conspiracy;

In "the People of the State of New York, Respondent, v. Maurice E. Connolly and Frederick Seely, Appellants 253 N.Y. 330; 171 N.E. 393; 1930 citing People v. Miles, 123 App. Div. 862, 875; affd., 192 N. Y. 541", the court ruled;

"It is not necessary to prove a conspiracy before evidence of specific acts of the alleged

conspirators can be received. The conspiracy itself can be established by evidence of particular acts, which, taken together, furnish a basis for a finding that a conspiracy exists."

In other words, you don't even have to know the other person involved in denying the targeted victims rights, as long as you keep denying that person's rights you are liable, and/or any act that furthers the conspiracy is all the proof you need to prove it exists.

•

Did the Criminal Rieman move forward with prosecuting the Pro-Se when she knew, or should have known that there were no verified simplified informations? YES

•

Did the county court when the Pro-Se informed them in the motion to reargue/renew hearing, that the county court fraudulently turned into another motion to change venue hearing, move forward and move the matter to another court? YES

•

Did the Little Valley Court, when the Pro-Se pointed out fact to the court that the implied informations were not signed and therefore the court did not have any jurisdiction move forward and set a trial? YES

Look's like a conspiracy to us, what about you?

This is the trick the criminal Jillian Koch, who is also the Little Valley Court Clerk attempted to play on the Pro Se on August 12th, 2015. She claimed that the appearance tickets (UTT part 1 15 CRR-NY 91.7 (a)), was the actual simplified traffic information. IT IS NOT. UTT part 2 IS THE SIMPLIFIED TRAFFIC INFORMATION THAT IS REQUIRED TO BE FILED IN THE COURT (see 15 CRR-NY 91.7 (b)) and most defendants and some lawyers fall for this line of BS too.

15 CRR-NY 91.7 (b) (1);

"Part II; of the packet is the simplified traffic information, and after having been verified, i.e. signed, or affirmed by the officer is delivered to the court in which the alleged violator is notified to appear."

We will show you the difference. This is a simplified information, a UTT (uniform traffic ticket) part 2 (15 CRR-NY 91.7 (b));

CPL § 1.20(1) shows that a simplified information is an accusatory instrument;

"Accusatory instrument" means an indictment, an indictment ordered reduced pursuant to subdivision one-a of section 210.20 of this chapter, an information, a simplified information, a prosecutor's information, a superior court information, a misdemeanor complaint or a felony complaint. Every accusatory instrument,

regardless of the person designated therein as accuser, constitutes an accusation on behalf of the state as plaintiff and must be entitled "the people of the state of New York" against a designated person, known as the defendant."

This is a appearance ticket simplified information, UTT (uniform traffic ticket) part 1 (15 CRR-NY 91.7 (a);

On an actual ticket, sometimes called the appearance ticket (part 1) or summons you will have a notice to appear and the ability to plead out. You don't have that on a simplified traffic information. Further at the top left side of the ticket there is a little note that states *"To be completed by police officer and given to motorist"*. This is the actual ticket, NOT THE CHARGE THAT IS MANDATED TO BE FILED IN COURT. Further 15 CRR-NY 91.7 (b) Part II is very clear. Part II of the packet is the simplified traffic information, and after having been verified or affirmed by the officer IT IS MANDATED THAT IT MUST BE delivered to the court in which the alleged violator is notified to appear.

It is well settled that an appearance ticket is not an accusatory instrument and its filing does not confer jurisdiction over the [alleged] defendant. *People v. Horner*, 176 Misc 2d 93(App. Term 1998) citing *People v. Cooperman*, N.Y.L.J., Jan. 17, 1989, at 26, col 4 (App. Term, 9th & 10th Jud. Dists.); *People v. Gregory*, N.Y.L.J., Dec. 5, 1991, at 30, col 2 (App. Term, 9th & 10th Jud. Dists).

STUDY IT, KNOW IT AND UNDERSTAND THE DIFFERENCE SO YOU DON'T GET SCREWED BY THE CRIMINALS IN CATTARAUGUS COUNTY.

This is how evil Jillian Koch is, she has no problem lying and creating falsified documents and placing them in the public record. She is a psychopath, plain and simple. Now let's review the e-mail the Pro-Se sent to her.

Notice it states he is asking her to review the file and generate a letter stating that she cannot find any signed/verified simplified informations in the file?

Here is her response. She claims that the "traffic infractions" are signed. Notice the terms she uses, "infractions", not simplified informations.

The "infractions" she is referring to are the appearance tickets that mean nothing in a court when it comes to jurisdiction as stated above.

Also, she only states in her fraudulent letter that the "infractions" were only in the 30.30 motion and the motion to recuse. She conveniently leaves out the motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction.

So here you have a court clerk with years of experience acting like she does not know what a simplified information is, the actual document that gives the court jurisdiction of the matter. Yeah, right, she doesn't know the difference OK, we have property to sell you on the moon.

The best part is when she claimed the Pro-Se was "combative and confrontational", sorry, but she serves us and when she does not respond or provide a citizen the information he seeks the citizen has every right to confront her when she fails to do so. The citizen has every right to demand her to perform her duty. That is not "combative and confrontational" that is telling her to do her job, and if the citizen believes she, as a public servant is committing a crime they have every right to call them out on it. PERIOD, they don't like stones of truth being thrown at their crumbling fake houses of glass.

Case cites;

1. Brady v. United States, 397 U.S. 742 (1970); McMann v. Richardson, 397 U.S. 759 (1970); Parker v. North Carolina, 397 U.S. 790 (1970) [hereinafter referred to as the Brady Trilogy]. Toilet v. Henderson, 411 U.S. 258 (1973), is an extension of this line of cases. As Toilet summarized: [A] guilty plea represents a break in the chain of events which has preceded it in the criminal process. When a criminal defendant has solemnly admitted in open court that he is in fact guilty of the offenses with which he is charged, he may not thereafter raise independent claims relating to the deprivation of constitutional rights that occurred prior to the entry of the guilty plea. He may only attack the voluntary and intelligent character of the guilty plea by showing that the advice he received from counsel was not "within the range of competence demanded of attorneys in criminal cases."; Jurisdictional defects void a conviction even if factual guilt is admitted. Thus, a guilty plea would not waive the following: a double jeopardy claim, Menna v. New York, 423 U.S. 61, 62 (1975); a claim that the sentencing court lacks jurisdiction, Blackledge v. Perry, 417 U.S. 21, 30 (1974); or a claim that the statute under which the prosecution is brought is unconstitutional, Haynes v. United States, 390 U.S. 85, 87 n.2 (1968). In New York, the leading cases are: People v. Case, 42 N.Y.2d 98, 365 N.E.2d 872, 396 N.Y.S.2d 841 (1977) (guilty plea does not waive a claim that the indictment is defective and does not effectively charge the defendant with the commission of a crime); People v. Armlin, 37 N.Y.2d 167, 332 N.E.2d 870, 371 N.Y.S.2d 691 (1975) (guilty plea does not waive a claim that the defendant is incompetent to stand trial); People v. Blakely, 34 N.Y.2d 311, 313 N.E.2d 763, 357 N.Y.S.2d 459 (1974) (claims based upon the constitutional right to a speedy trial survive a plea of guilty); People v. Michael, 48 N.Y.2d 1, 394 N.E.2d 1134, 50 N.Y.S.2d 1031 (1979) (failure to timely raise a double jeopardy claim does not waive that claim).
2. New York CPL § 710.70 (2) (McKinney 1971). Section 710.70(2) allows appeals from denials of motions to suppress evidence which is the fruit of an illegal search and seizure, eavesdropping, involuntary statement, or identification, N.Y. CPL § 710.20(1), (3) & (5) (McKinney Supp. 1980). N.Y. CPL § 710.70(2) provides: An order finally denying a motion to suppress evidence may be reviewed upon an appeal from an ensuing judgment of conviction notwithstanding the fact that such judgment is entered upon a plea of guilty.
3. But cf. United States v. Moskow, 588 F.2d 882 (3d Cir. 1978) (recognizing the plea over the government's objection). The defendant would be permitted to withdraw his plea should his appeal succeed. See generally J.E. BOND, PLEA BARGAINING AND Guilty PLEAS § 7.22(2) (1978). The conditional guilty plea differs from section 710.70(2) in that the defendant's right to appeal under section 710.70(2) is unilateral; it requires neither the consent of the district attorney nor of the trial judge.
4. 53 N.Y.2d 338, 424 N.E.2d 537, 441 N.Y.S.2d 650 (1981).
5. d. at 340, 424 N.E.2d at 538, 441 N.Y.S.2d at 651.