SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES MARY CUMMINS Defendant DEC 1 3 2016 645 W. 9th St. #110-140 Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk Los Angeles, CA 90015 In Pro Per Telephone: (310) 877-4770 Email: mmmaryinla@aol.com 5 6 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA 7 **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES** 8 9 Case No. BS140207 BAT WORLD SANCTUARY, 10 AMANDA LOLLAR REPLY TO PLAINTIFF'S REPLY TO 11 Plaintiff MOTION TO QUASH, MODIFY 12 SUBPOENA, PROTECTIVE ORDER CCP 1987.1, REQUEST SANCTIONS 13 MARY CUMMINS Date: December 16, 2016 14 Defendant Time: 8:30 a.m. Room: Dept 24 15 Judge: Honorable Robert Hess Reservation: 161107172170 16 Fee Waiver: August 5, 2014 17 18 REPLY 19 Defendant Mary Cummins, (hereinafter "Defendant") replies to Plaintiff's Reply to 20 Motion to Quash, for Protective order, and will show the court the following. 21 22 I. Introduction Defendant received Plaintiff's Reply today. Defendant is writing, someone else is 23 24 filing, hand delivering this reply as soon as physically possible. 25 Defendant has never defamed Plaintiff Lollar. Plaintiff's attorney Conlogue has 26 misrepresented the underlying case and even actions in this Court. Defendant has filed 27 motions to quash and for protective order. They were not all denied. At least two were 28 MOTION TO QUASH, MODIFY SUBPOENA, PROTECTIVE ORDER CCP 1987.1

granted by this Court and are included in the original motion. Defendant seeks the same action from this Court. Defendant offered to give Plaintiff all of Defendant's bank records. Plaintiff refused and instead keeps filing subpoenas to get the records of other people for harassment purposes only.

# A. <u>Defendant's Motion to Quash, Request for Protective Order is Not in Bad</u> Faith

Defendant has filed motions to quash, for protective orders. They were granted in whole or part. Plaintiff misquotes the record. Defendant requests the same action from this court. Defendant requests that the subpoenas be quashed for records other than Defendant's. Defendant wants the same protective order that this Court previously granted.

## B. Defendant has been Truthful about Animal Advocates

Defendant is not putting Defendant's money into the Animal Advocates account. Defendant is not sheltering assets anywhere. Defendant does not have a bank account, credit card, debit card, any assets. Defendant could legally have a bank account and money. This Court can only take "disposable income." As Defendant has no income, there is no disposable income, nothing to take.

Plaintiff's attorney's wild false allegations of "evidence of money laundering" should be stricken. They are false and not based on any evidence at all. This is just more harassment which is intentionally included in this legal filing so it may have litigation privilege and be posted on the Internet. Plaintiff posts all documents filed in this case in Plaintiff's over 400 blogs and websites devoted solely to defame, harass and cyberstalk Defendant.

Defendant has admitted to filing tax returns for Animal Advocates, writing checks on their behalf years ago. Defendant is not currently filing tax returns or writing checks for Animal Advocates which has almost no money because no one has been fundraising.

#### C. Defendant should not be Sanctioned.

Defendant offered to give Plaintiff all of Defendant's bank records. Plaintiff refused and instead obtained them through subpoena. Plaintiff currently has every bank record for every account Defendant has had in the last seven years. There are no more records.

# II. Defendant's Motion to Quash, for Protective Order should be Granted

## A. The Documents Requested are Overly Broad

Defendant wants to limit the documents to only Defendant's documents.

The Court previously approved this request.

#### B. The Motion is not Moot

Defendant served a copy of the motion to quash, for protective order on First Bank November 7, 2016. First Bank for unknown reason gave the bank records of Animal Advocates to Plaintiff before this hearing. There were no bank records of Defendant.

What Plaintiff stated about Defendant is false and hearsay. Defendant has never "threatened," "aggressively accosted" any First Bank employee. Plaintiff keeps making these wild and false allegations to harm Defendant's image to the Court.

Defendant still requests that Plaintiff be denied the use of the documents again received improperly. They have also not even been authenticated. Defendant still requests a protective order on those documents or Plaintiff will post them online unredacted as they did in the past.

# III. <u>Defendant should Not be Sanctioned. The Motion is not Frivolous. Plaintiff</u> should be sanctioned for again violating the redaction rule.

Plaintiff did not redact the full account number of Animal Advocates, Plaintiff's Exhibit C first and second page next to "Small Business

Checking" has the full account number. As this is a repeat violation Plaintiff's attorney Conlogue should be sanctioned heavily. Defendant requests sanctions under California Rule of Court 1.20(b)(3) and California Rule of Court 2.30(b).

Defendant offered to give Plaintiff ALL of Defendant's bank records. Plaintiff refused and instead decided to subpoena the information. The subpoenas were not necessary.

Defendant was denied one motion to quash records from One West bank.

Defendant appealed. Defendant lost because there was no court reporter record. Defendant did not lose on the merits as they were never even considered.

Plaintiff again falsifies the facts. Animal Advocates does NOT pay
Defendant's rent, utilities... Defendant does not have rent or utilities to pay as
Defendant is staying with friends while awaiting back surgery. Animal
Advocates has had a balance of \$0 to maybe \$800 or so for the last year or
so. There are no charges in there for rent, utilities. There are not enough
funds in Animal Advocates to pay for anyone's rent. There are only very
small deposits from Googles ads on Animal Advocates videos, website and
small corporate donations of \$2 to \$15 per month. Any PayPal money put
into that account came from Animal Advocates' PayPal account. Defendant
has no money in Defendant's PayPal account.

Some of the Animal Advocates ad, charity accounts were opened back in 2002 by Defendant. The account name is "Animal Advocates." Those accounts use the EIN of Animal Advocates and not Defendant's SSN.

Sometimes the name "Mary Cummins" shows up as contact person for account. They are not the accounts or deposits of "Mary Cummins."

IV. Defendant's Request for Protective Order is not Unsuccessful

Defendant did indeed have a meet and confer with Plaintiff's attorney. It is on page six. It states, "Certificate of Conference, Per Los Angeles Superior Court local rule 5.6 Defendant has met and conferred with Plaintiff about filing this motion via email November 7, 2016. Plaintiff did not reply." Plaintiff again flat out lies by stating there was no certificate. This is perjury as Conlogue signed a sworn statement.

Plaintiffs have a six year history of defaming, harassing, cyberstalking Defendant, Animal Advocates, Defendant's lawyers David Casselman, Paul Alan Levy of Public Citizen, veterinarian Dr Jennifer Conrad, Dr Laurie Gage, Animal Advocates' volunteers, fans of Animal Advocates...which has been shown to this Court.

#### V. Conclusion

Defendant should be granted the motion to quash and protective order.

Defendant requests this Court to deny Plaintiff's use of the documents they received from First Bank improperly. First Bank was served the motion the same way the previous ones were served. First Bank should not have given Plaintiff those records until the motion was lost which it wasn't. Defendant requests a protective order on any and all documents received as Plaintiff has a six year long history of posting confidential, financial and other information of other people on the internet. Such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Respectfully saffmitted,

Mary Cummins, Defendant

Dated: December 12, 2016

# PROOF OF SERVICE (FRCivP 5 (b)) or (CCP 1013a, 2015.5) or (FRAP 25 (d))

I am Plaintiff in pro per whose address is 645 W. 9th St. #110-140, Los Angeles, California 90015-1640. I am over the age of eighteen years.

I further declare that on the date hereof I served a copy of:

#### REPLY TO PLAINTIFF'S REPLY TO MOTION TO QUASH, MODIFY SUBPOENA, PROTECTIVE ORDER

on the following interested parties by emailing, faxing this document to First Bank.

Christian Molner Ashley Hunt 12400 Wilshire #1180 Los Angeles, CA 90025

I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this day, December 12, 2016, at Los Angeles, California.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Cummins, Plaintiff Dated: December 12, 2016

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

28

### **DECLARATION OF DEFENDANT MARY CUMMINS**

I, MARY CUMMINS, declare as follows:

- 1. I am Mary Cummins Defendant in pro per. I make this declaration on my personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein.
- 2. Attached to DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO QUASH SUBPOENA, MODIFY SUBPOENA, PROTECTIVE ORDER as exhibits are true and correct copies of the original documents.
- 3. Everything in DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO QUASH SUBPOENA, MODIFY SUBPOENA, PROTECTIVE ORDER was written by me and is the truth to the best of my knowledge.
- 4. I'm positive Plaintiff would use any data in any financial records to harass, stalk or harm me, my family, friends, clients and donors as they have for the past six years.
- I, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on December 12, 2016 at Los Angeles, California.

By:

MARY CUMMINS