

DISTRICT COURT, DENVER COUNTY, COLORADO
520 West Colfax Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80204

DATE FILED: September 27, 2018

The People of the State of Colorado

▲ COURT USE ONLY ▲

Defendant(s): LAURENCE RENE' GOODMAN

Case Number: 17CR10088

ORDER REGARDING DEFENDANT'S DEMAND AND MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, DEFAULT, JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW, AND DIRECTED VERDICT PURSUANT TO FRAUD ON THE COURT

This matter comes before the Court for consideration of the Defendant's Demand and Motion for Summary Judgment, Default, Judgment as a Matter of Law, and Directed Verdict Pursuant to Fraud on the Court ("Motion"). The Court has considered the Motion, the People's Response filed on September 11, 2018, and the Court's file. The Court has also considered all applicable law. The Court enters the following Order.

The Defendant seeks various orders of the Court which would essentially result in dismissal of all charges brought against him in the Grand Jury Indictment.

To the best of the Court's ability to understand the Defendant's pleading the Defendant does not believe that the Colorado Attorney General or the specific prosecutor, Robert Shapiro, have the right to represent themselves as being "in the service of our State's Public and lawful government..." Without any support, legally or factually, he asserts the Colorado Attorney General and Mr. Shapiro are "acting in the interests of a Private Municipal Corporation which has deteriorated into a Criminal Syndicate."

Without attaching any exhibit, the Defendant references a "Mission" statement of the Office of the Attorney General for the People of the State of Colorado." (Emphasis in the original.) The Defendant conflates this document, if it even exists, to the status of binding law and asserts, essentially and again as the Court's ability to understand his document permits, that the Colorado Attorney General and Mr. Shapiro have violated various provisions of this document and that those violations should mandate dismissal of the charges.

The violations appear to be a failure to respond to various "Notices of Fraud" on the part of the Colorado Attorney General and Mr. Shapiro. Yet the Defendant fails to

explain how the various documents are actually legal documents which would require a response from either the Colorado Attorney General or Mr. Shapiro. The Defendant determines that the Colorado Attorney General and Mr. Shapiro are “on breach of the ‘Public Trust’ ... and they are no longer lawfully recognizable as having legitimate authority...” These leaps of legal logic again fail to have any basis in law or fact.

The Defendant’s attack upon the legal sufficiency of the Indictment has been addressed by this Court in previous orders.

The Defendant’s complaints concerning the discovery mandated by Crim.P. 16 have also been addressed in previous orders of the Court and through various proceedings occurring before the Court in open court. The Defendant’s citation to *Smith v. United States District Court Officers*, 203 F.3d 440 (7th Cir. 2000) does not support his contentions. As had been a common practice with the Defendant, he continually cites to various published legal cases or law but never makes the effort to tie the legal authority to his exact situation. For instance, the Defendant’s citations to Federal criminal laws, 18 U.S.C.A. §2071 and 18 U.S.C.A. §1512, are not linked through argument or the presentation of facts to any other aspect of the case. The Court believes he is trying to assert a counter-complaint which is not legally recognized in criminal law.

In making various statements concerning the legal validity of various documents or actions of the Defendant the Court is incorporating its review of the numerous submissions given by the Defendant over the history of this case.

Finally, the Court must address the reference to the propriety of consolidation with “a federal jurisdiction.” Even if there were some merit to the Defendant’s “numerous criminal-counter-accusations” the consolidation of this criminal matter with a Federal civil case is not permitted under any rule, statute, or law with which the Court may be familiar.

The Motion is DENIED.

So ORDERED on this 27th day of September, 2018.

BY THE COURT:



MICHAEL SPEAR
District Court Judge