

Derek Syphrett  
252 Fountayne Ln.  
Lawrence Township NJ, 08542

**Derek Syphrett, Esq.**  
Attorney; Citizen of New Jersey; Real Party of Interest; Witness-of-Fact

**ATTN: SPECIAL AGENT VERNON ADDISON**  
(October 22, 2014)

**To:** ATTN: Special Agent Addison & Agents I spoke to 10/16  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS (F.B.I.)  
(609-896-1469 & 609-689-7980)

**From:** Third Party Persons  
Delivering

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY  
Chief Justice Rabner & SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY  
MICHELLE M. SMITH – CLERK OF THE COURT  
(609-984-6368 & 609-984-6988)

Written Legal Notice of  
Derek Syphrett  
No Return Fax

Phone: 609-936-0025  
Email:  
[dsyphrett@gmail.com](mailto:dsyphrett@gmail.com)

*John Tonelli & The Advisory Committee on Judicial Conduct*

**Re:** FALSE CLAIMS ACT ISSUES

*Petition for Redress & Grievance*

**CC:** ALL PARTIES INCLUDED IN  
THE FOLLOWING PAPERS

COMMENTS:

Please kindly consider the **attached 6 pages**, and consider contacting me for the identities of over 40 other similiary situated residents of New Jersey, who have been victimized under-the-color-of-law by a Superior Court and agents acting under the color of law, to in fact commit acts of theft, kidnapping, extortion, coercion, mail-fraud, etc.

In my case alone there is clear and convincing evidence of: FALSE CLAIMS ACT ISSUES, AND FURTHER RACKETEERING INFLUENCES (e.g. Cash for Kids, Cash for Lies, Cash for Abuse of Process, etc)

**AGAIN: If this were happening in Cuba:** every politician in the U.S. Would be railing against it, yet when our politicians and our state government participate in these criminal activities, it is somehow a non-issue for our local politic?

**LET'S CALL "A SPADE", "A SPADE"**

- If the Mafia did this it be a crime.
- It's still a crime, when the state does it.

See the referenced Federal Law (Title IV-D of the Welfare Act):

When a "broke" state such as New Jersey attempts to balance its budget by submitting false claims to the Federal Government, as a result of willfully covering up abuse of legal process, or simulating a legal process under the color of law, for the sake of making federal claims....

WELL THEN:

IT'S A FEDERAL ISSUE

ITS A FALSE CLAIMS ACT ISSUE

IT IS WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE: ... IT'S RACKETEERING WRIT LARGESSE

10/22/2014

Derek C. Syphrett  
Pro se litigant (Defendant)  
252 Fountayne Ln,  
Lawrence Township, NJ 08648

**URGENT & SENT IN THE "INTERESTS OF JUSTICE"**

**VIA CERTIFIED U.S. POSTAL MAIL & FACSIMILE:**

Chief Justice Rabner, Full Panel of Justices, and Clerk of the Court  
Supreme Court of New Jersey &  
25 Market Street  
Trenton New Jersey, 08611

Chief Justice Michelle M. Smith; Ronald E. Bookbinder, John Tomasello (in official / individual capacities)  
Superior Court of New Jersey  
Hughes Justice Complex  
Trenton New Jersey, 08608

Administrative Office of the Courts & Judge Glenn Grant, J.A.D.  
Superior Court of New Jersey  
Hughes Justice Complex  
Trenton New Jersey, 08608

**RE: ADDENDUM – FALSE CLAIMS ACT GRIEVANCES – TITLE IV-D**

- **NEW JERSEY USES DOMESTIC RELATIONS LAW TO INCREASE STATE REVENUE IN A MANNER CONTRARY TO BINDING SUPREME COURT LAW.**
- **RECENT AUDITS HAVE REVEALED THAT NEW JERSEY'S METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATING ITS TITLE IV-D RELATED EXPENSES IS WOEFULLY DEFICIENT OF ANY REAL CONTROLS:**
  - **MUCH OF THE COSTS ARE ESTIMATED VIA CONTRIVED & AGGRESSIVE ACCOUNTING.**
  - **THE PURPOSE APPEARS TO BE TO DEFRAUD THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, AND SUBMIT FALSE CLAIMS.**
- **NEW JERSEY'S DOMESTIC VIOLENCE LAWS ARE USED TO CRIMINALIZE CIVIL OFFENSES, AND DEPRIVE DEFENDANT'S OF RIGHTS CRIMINAL DEFENDANTS ARE ENTITLED TO.**

- **THE STATISTICS RELATED TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE IN NEW JERSEY AND THE COURTS MANIFEST INVITATION OF FRIVOLOUS CLAIMS IS SELF EVIDENT, AND SELF-SERVING... ITS A RACKET.**

MY PERSONAL CLAIM, AS WITNESS OF FACT TO FALSE CLAIMS ACT ISSUES:

**My Marital Litigation Creates False Claim Act Issues:**

1. My divorce included ex-parte trial dates, refusals to allow me to cross examine witnesses in my own divorce case, after direct exams were complete. This was done at the direction of John Tomasello, who in fact is a retired, judge rather than a judge assigned by any manner prescribed in the New Jersey State Constitution.
  - (a) John Tomasello (A Retired, and recalled former Judge) presided over the matter without my consent, and over my objections, despite his lack of common-law, and constitutional standing to even sit as a judge.
  - (b) See State v. Buckner, and my Writ of Coram Nobis, and my post-trial motions in FV-03-1154-14, whereby I raised novel legal issues of the constitutional standing of a retired judge sitting as judge without nomination by a governor, or appointment by the senate.
2. My first amendment rights to speak in court were temporarily taken from me in a manner that is unlawful, via a sua sponte court order by Judge Catherine Fitzpatrick on 6/4/2013, without any evidence put before the court or any opportunity to object, or examine witnesses, prior to this outrageous and unlawful occurrence. Notably, I'd won my last motion before the court and demonstrated legal competence on 4/15/2013.
3. By court order of Judge Ronald E. Boobkinder, I was ordered, to be prohibited from appearing in court at my own trials, even though I was the attorney-in-fact. This is clearly unlawful, prejudicial, and results in a loss of jurisdiction by any lawful court, yet the court continued to purport it had jurisdiction, and that such orders were lawful. **THEY CAN NOT BE LAWFUL ORDERS, BECAUSE BY OPERATION OF LAW, THEY CAN NOT EXIST, PURSUANT THE SUPREME COURT DECISIONS IN HAINES V. KERNER, AND BINDING STATE LAW VIA HAWKINS V. HARRIS, 1995.**
4. A child support order was issued based on flawed legal process, with objections made regarding the process, and denied without any basis in the law provided to support the same.
5. The Child support order issued in my divorce is now used as part of the basis for New Jersey's Title IV-D claims to the Federal Government. Since the court order is void, the collection of reimbursement for expenses purported to be a result of the court order, is in fact a FALSE CLAIMS ACT issue.

## PREVENTION OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ACT – FALSE CLAIMS ISSUES

6. I was charged with domestic violence in FV-03-1154-14, after an ex-parte hearing by Judge R.D. Hoffman, who was at the time my legal adversary, in an open legal matter, still then pending in Superior Court. This was unlawful pursuant state law and federal due process decisions.
7. I filed an immediate appeal, which is a statutory right in New Jersey. The immediate appeal was never scheduled by the court, nor was summons issued to the Plaintiff regarding my immediate appeal, and the pleadings themselves were never considered by the court on their merits, despite relying in part on Justice Albins position that an indigent defendant has a right to counsel. I requested counsel, as an indigent, and was denied even a hearing on the matter, despite the fact that DV cases carry consequences of magnitude, and they are in fact infamous affairs.
8. I filed two motions in limine, which the Plaintiff did not oppose, and the court promptly lost prior to my hearing. Upon alerting the court to the fact that my pleadings and motions had not been heard, the court basically told me to get lost, and John Tomasello fabricated a procedural history in his 9/12/2014 opinion, that is patently false in numerous manners and ways described in my subsequent Writ of Coram Nobis.
9. 2/19/2014 I was subject to an order prohibiting me from appearing in court. The trial of FV-03-1154-14 occurred on 2/19/2014 without me present, and without ANY EXPRESS PERMISSION FROM A SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE FOR ME TO BE PRESENT AT MY OWN TRIAL AS ATTORNEY-IN-FACT OR A WITNESS-OF-FACT.... THIS IS CRIMINAL WITNESS-TAMPERING, AND EXTRINSIC FRAUD.... YET THE COURT HAS DONE NOTHING TO REMEDY THE DAMAGE CAUSED TO ME OR MY FAMILY.
10. The statistics related to my putative guilt of domestic violence, and the fees demanded from me as a result of this putative guilt finding are in fact False Claims by the State of New Jersey. Again The state lost jurisdiction when it ceased providing due process.

---

## GLOBAL – STATE-WIDE FALSE CLAIMS ACT ISSUES:

### Introduction to my legal / moral position on this matter:

I Helped my mother graduate college with a masters degree, and I am perhaps surprisingly a self-described “flaming” feminist, but in the true sense of the word (independence, equality, and responsibility)

### Federal Law and Issues Indicating False Claims Act Issues & Racketeering:

Post Roe v. Wade (U.S. Supreme Court) the entire concept embraced by the New Jersey Courts that female parents have somehow been victimized by their SOLE decision (pursuant their federal rights) to give birth, after consenting to have a sexual relationship with a man of their own choice, somehow creates

a legal entitlement to become a (in some cases) a lifelong dependent of their male partner, is legally incongruous with the facts and the law.

**Put more simply – as a true feminist I assert:**

1. An independent woman can not make claim to any entitlement because SHE CHOSE to give birth, to the child of a man SHE CHOSE to conceive a child with.
2. A WOMAN CAN NOT be both solely responsible for her decision to give birth, but not also solely responsible for the result!
3. Nor can such a woman claim that she was damaged by her male partner, because she chose to become a house wife / home-maker rather than continue her own career.
4. A woman should not be allowed to claim legal damages, or legal entitlement to a claim because she has chosen to have a child, suspend her career or education, of her own free will. It is not the state's right to create a post-hoc contract between that man and that woman.
5. The state is imposing a regime of irresponsibility upon the public, writ largesse ! Women should not be encouraged by our laws or courts, to “jump first” into parenthood, and ask responsible questions later. But in fact that is what New Jersey is selling here. Make a baby, and get paid, no matter how stupid or irresponsible you were, or how badly you choose your sexual partner, better yet, if you help the state of New Jersey get Title IV-D Welfare Act Money (as an irresponsible parent) AND IMPORTANTLY:
  - (a) WE (THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY) WILL NOT EVEN REQUIRE YOU TO SPEND THE MONEY YOU GET FROM THE OTHER PARENT, ON YOUR CHILDREN
  - (b) ... JUST HAVE AT IT LADIES AND GENTS... FREE MONEY FROM SOMEONE ELSE, FOR WHATEVER ELSE – **YOU NEED NOT REAR A CHILD WITH THIS MONEY!**
  - (c) **IN FACT, IN SOME CASES:** IF YOU OWE LEGAL FEES TO AN ATTORNEY, WE (THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY) WILL ACTUALLY HOLD YOU IN CONTEMPT IF YOU DO NOT SEND YOUR CHILD-SUPPORT MONEY TO THE ATTORNEY WHO REPRESENTED YOU, WHO IS ALSO AN OFFICER OF OUR COURT!

**Further:**

It is asinine (on its face) to suggest that when a woman exercises her sole right to conceive a child, she can post-hoc coerce payments from another person, simply because of the woman's potentially irresponsible decision to create a child, which she had no ability to support. Such a circumstance is an insult to feminists in a post-Roe v. Wade world.

Further:

For the state to intervene in a man's ability to rear his children as he sees fit, violates the tenants of:

**In Parham v. J.R. et al 442 U.S. 584 (1979)** in toto AND

*Santosky v. Kramer 455 U.S. 745 (1982)* in toto

In this regard, the state is intervening, and disintermediating fathers. Rather than encouraging a woman to co-parent, for the sake of financial support, this state has encouraged and profited from the creation of an adversarial divorce / custody process, that in fact, provides perverse incentives to custodial parents (generally mothers) to interfere with a father's natural right to rear his children, for the sake of such custodial parents, reaping even a larger financial reward from the court, via "legal coercion", which discourages custodial parents (generally mothers) from co-parenting, in the best interests of their children.

**TO BE CLEAR:**

*Pursuant Parham v. J.R.* And *Santosky v. Kramer:* the state courts do not even have the legal right to manage custody issues for the majority of fit parents. That right has been reserved to the fit parents, who enter court with the presumption they are fit parents.

This perhaps explains why the State of New Jersey, often attempts to use the legal process to coerce custody agreements from the litigants pre-trial.

Frankly it appears that in all instances where a trial judge decides a custody matter where both parents are in fact fit, the court is in fact encroaching on rights reserved to the fit parents themselves.

Here too: I'd have everyone note the Federal Courts' "domestic relations exception" doctrine, the federal courts clearly don't believe the government has a real role in family affairs generally, given the cases cited above, its certainly not clear what role the state courts have in the majority of contested divorces between fit parents. It would appear that 50%/50% or 100%/100% parenting time should be the norm in most cases handled in New Jersey, yet the legal outcomes clearly do not reflect such a circumstance.

**THE INESCAPABLE REALITY REGARDING THE STATE'S DOMESTIC RELATIONS LAWS:**

**IT'S A "RACKET"**

The truth is were the state not the recipient of federal funds supporting the ancillary costs and extra resources that come with domestic relations law, it is likely the state wouldn't now be a real party of interest (a financial beneficiary) with regard to the adjudication of domestic relations law.

Underneath the states domestic relations law: there is a perverse incentive for the state to preach the perverse, such as: women are victims of their own choice to give birth; or that women are not capable of fleeing domestic violence; or that police are not capable of protecting women with harassment and assault statutes.

Of course none of this is true. While child welfare and domestic violence are real issues which courts should address in very specific, and urgent cases, in New Jersey it is clear that children and women are used as part of a racketeering enterprise. The majority of domestic violence claims are dismissed now-a-days, the fraudulent complaints are not prosecuted, and the flood gates have been opened to allow thousands of frivolous claims to be filed without consequence, other than that the State receives federal

grants based on the number of domestic violence complaints filed. THIS IS RACKETEERING. ITS ABUSE OF PROCESS. IT'S DESTROYING LIVES.

**AS A FEMANIST MYSELF:** I 100% support female independence, equality, responsibility. Yet the state's position on custody, child-support, and domestic violence are all prejudicial against these lofty and just objectives. Females are encouraged to conceive children without securing the financial where-with-all to support them, females are encouraged to believe they can not file credible criminal complaints via harassment, or assault statutes, so they should instead use legally suspect domestic violence laws, which presume a woman (generally) could not possibly prove her case to a reasonable doubt standard in a criminal court, or that a woman would not possibly have the common-sense to distance herself from a clear and obvious threat to her well-being. SUCH THINKING AND SUCH LAWS ARE AN INSULT TO WOMEN AND FEMANIST MALES SUCH AS MYSELF!

Kind regards,



**Derek C. Syphrett, Esq.**

**Attorney-in-fact**

**Petitioner, Pro Se**

**Indigent Person, pursuant court order**

**Disabled Person, Pursuant the Federal A.D.A.**

**Citizen of New Jersey (a constitutional creation)**

**Citizen of the United States (a constitutional creation, obligated to report felonies by law)**

**Resident of New Jersey**

**Naturalis Homo In Carne**

**A member of the Public (an appendage to Public and Public Trust)**

**The Sovereign & Other Authorities, in lege, et in carne, pursuant Constitution For The United States, 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment**