# Eliot Bernstein’s Comments to Alan Rose Proposed Orders, Eliot’s comments in Red and prefaced with “Eliot Comment:”

# (ELIOT COMMENT: I OBJECT AND DO NOT CONSENT TO A SINGLE WORD IN THE PROPOSED ORDER AND BELIEVE IT IS PART OF AN ONGOING FRAUD ON AND BY THIS COURT BY ALAN ROSE, TED BERNSTEIN, ROBERT SPALLINA, DONALD TESCHER, STEVEN LESSNE, JUDGE MARTIN COLIN, JUDGE DAVID E FRENCH AND JUDGE JOHN PHILLIPS et al.)

# THE ORDER WAS DRAFTED PRIOR TO THE HEARING BY ALAN ROSE AND NOT SHOWN TO ELIOT UNTIL AFTER ROSE GAVE IT TO THE JUDGE AT THE END OF THE HEARING THUS IT CANNOT ACCURATELY REFLECT THE RECORD AND WAS PREFABRICATED WHOLLY PRIOR AND ELIOT OBJECTS AS IT CANNOT REFLECT THE TRUE RECORD.

# IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA

Probate Division

Case No.: 502014CP003698XXXXNB

TED BERNSTEIN, as Trustee

of the Shirley Bernstein Trust (ELIOT COMMENT: The language of the Shirley Trust Agreement states that TED BERNSTEIN IS CONSIDERED PREDECEASED FOR ALL PURPOSES OF DISPOSITIONS and this filing is regarding disposition of the Shirley Trust) Agreement dated May 20, 2008, as amended,

Plaintiff:

v.

ALEXANDRA BERNSTEIN; ERIC BERNSTEIN; MICHAEL BERNSTEIN; MOLLY SIMON; PAMELA B. SIMON, Individually and as Trustee f/b/o Molly Simon under the Simon L. Bernstein Trust Dtd 9/13112; ELIOT BERNSTEIN, individually, as Tmstee f/b/o D.B., Ja. B. and Jo. B. under the Simon L. Bernstein Trust Dtd 9/13/12, and on behalf of his minor children D.B., Ja. B. and Jo. B.; JILL IANTONI, Individually, as Trustee f/b/o J.I. under the Simon L Bernstein Trust Dtd 9/13/12, and on behalf of her Minor child J.I.; MAX FRIEDSTEIN; LISA FRIEDSTEIN , Individually, as Trustee f/b/o Max Friedstein and C.F., under the Simon L. Bernstein Trust Dtd 9113112, and on behalf of her minor child, C.F., (ELIOT COMMENT: Eliot is sued as Trustee of Trust created under the Simon Trust that has never been produced to Eliot as Trustee or his Children that are alleged beneficiaries. The Trusts were not made part of the original complaint and when requested by Eliot’s retained counsel seeking Pro Hac Vice she was refused the documents that her client Eliot and Trustee and his Children as Beneficiaries are sued hereunder in. Further, these Simon Trusts for his Grandchildren are alleged to have been created the day he died and were not made part of the Simon Trust that was improperly validated by this Court when the Trust language states they are held thereunder. Finally, Spallina and Tescher are court ordered by this Court to have produced ALL their records and in the production copies sent NONE OF THESE TRUSTS WERE INCLUDED and they claim to have created them the day Simon died and therefore should have been included in Production as they should have been made part of this lawsuit and should have been part of the Simon Trust that states they are held thereunder. Eliot does not know the terms of the alleged Trusts he is Guardian for and has never signed or seen such trust as captioned above and the beneficiaries, his minor and now adult children have never been given copies to know what the terms of the trusts state and so this lawsuit is based on NON-EXIST SIMON TRUSTS FOR HIS GRANDCHILDREN that no party possess or has produced and therefore represents yet another Fraud on the Court by Alan Rose and Ted Bernstein. Until such 10 missing trusts are produced and delivered to the trustee and beneficiaries by the alleged fiduciary Ted that is SUING THEM IN THIS CAPACITY UNDER THESE ALLEGED TRUSTS this lawsuit is a FRAUD.)

Defendants.



# ORDER ON SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE'S MOTION TO

**APPOINT A GUARDIAN AD LITEM; FOR A GAG ORDER TO PROTECT THE GUARDIAN AND OTHERS; AND TO STRIKE ELIOT BERNSTEIN'S FILINGS**

THIS CAUSE came before the Court for evidentiary hearing on February 25, 2016, on Successor Trustee's Motion for Appointment of a Guardian Ad Litem to Represent the Interests of Eliot Bernstein's Children etc. (the "Motion"). The Court, having considered the record (ELIOT COMMENT: There was no record created as Alan Rose failed to bring a court reporter and Judge Phillips ignored Eliot’s request to have one present, in disputed Proposed Orders such as this one the rules state that the Judge will go back to the record and determine the voracity of the parties Proposed Orders, therefore if record was created and used by Judge Phillips to approve this PRETRIAL FABRICATED ORDER then I would request the court produce the copy for my appeal will be swift), heard argument of counsel and being otherwise fully advised in the premises, hereby

ORDERS AND ADJUDGES:

1. This Court determined after a trial held on December 15, 2015 that the beneficiaries of The Shirley Bernstein Trust Agreement dated 5/20/2008 (the "Trust") are Simon Bernstein's "then living grandchildren." (ELIOT COMMENT: No information was given at the December 15, 2015 (SEE EXHIBIT DEC 15 2015 Hearing Transcript) hearing regarding who the beneficiaries were as it was merely a trust validity hearing and under the trust this court alleges to be valid Eliot Bernstein Family Trust and Eliot Bernstein are direct beneficiaries under Shirley Bernstein’s Trust Agreement (see Exhibit 1 – Shirley Trust Language on Beneficiaries) that is IRREVOCABLE, thus Alan Rose has misled the Court and this wholly contradicts the record of what transpired in the December 15, 2015 hearing (as the resulting order that was also prefabricated by role prior to the hearing and thus could not have accurately reflected the record, which it does not, see exhibited transcript versus order.) Under that ruling, Simon's children - including Eliot Bernstein - are not beneficiaries of the Trust (ELIOT COMMENT: this Court has held no hearings to determine that Shirley Bernstein’s Trust’s beneficiaries are not Eliot and Eliot Family Trust as so stated in the Trust). This Court entered a written order dated February 1, 2016, determining Eliot Bernstein lacks standing to participate in this proceeding and striking his individual filings (ELIOT COMMENT: the Court again erred and is being appealed on this issue as Eliot has standing individually as he was sued individually and counter sued individually and has standing as a beneficiary of Shirley’s irrevocable trust, as well as standing as the Trustee of the Trust for his children as stated in the Complaint heading (a trust Eliot has never seen, never been given copy of and was not produced ever by Tescher and Spallina who were court ordered to turn over all records to the Curator Benjamin Brown when they resigned after admitting FRAUDULENTLY CREATING AND DISTRIBUTING A FRAUDULENT SHIRLEY BERNSTEIN TRUST AND SENDING IT TO ELIOT’S CHILDREN’S COUNSEL and their LAW FIRM WAS FOUND TO HAVE SUBMITTED MULTIPLE FORGED AND FRAUDULENTLY NOTARIZED FALSE INSTRUMENTS TO THE COURT AND OTHERS, INCLUDING FORGING DEAD PERSONS SIGNATURES) and these ALLEGED trusts he is sued under have NO originals possessed by TED BERNSTEIN who admitted in the December 15, 2015 hearing to not having ever seen the original trusts he is operating under and these alleged grandchildren trusts created on the day Simon died, September 13, 2012 have been refused to be turned over to Eliot or his counsel Candice Schwager despite repeated requests and were not made part of this Complaint filed by Ted suing Eliot in such capacity). Further, Brian O’Connell has order of this Court to have ALL of Tescher and Spallina’s records turned over to him, including ALL ORIGINALS and O’Connell only has one original document in his possession turned over and thus no ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS WERE TURNED OVER and the COURT IS OPERATING ON ALLEGED FRAUDULENT RECREATIONS and PRODUCTION OF ALL ORIGINAL ESTATE AND TRUST AND PROPERTY RECORDS OF SIMON MUST BE TURNED OVER FOR INSPECTION IMMEDIATELY BY WHOMEVER POSSESSES THEM.

Mr. Rose and his client Ted Bernstein have stated they have never seen the original trust documents and do not possess them for any trusts and thus this Court ruled to make copies of the trust valid at a VALIDITY HEARING when the only witness brought to validate them was Robert Spallina who is under an SEC consent order, which he violated as witness when denying his plea to CRIMINAL MISCONDUCT and admitted new crimes of Fraud on the Court, mail fraud and other crimes he stated he never made any party aware of prior to December 15, 2015 hearing before Phillips who now has had knowledge of felony admissions and possible SEC consent violation by SPALLINA an Officer of the Court and former Court Appointed Fiduciary and since learning of these crimes and evidence submitted in filings has taken no steps proper a judge or party with information regarding felony misconduct to report to the proper state and federal tribunals.

Eliot has standing however in regards to any trusts alleged to exist as he is a beneficiary in all but one trust of Simon and was a beneficiary in that trust until a few days before Simon’s death. The trusts for the children that Ted and Rose allege the beneficiaries have never been produced to this court or any party that Eliot is aware of. Eliot is also natural guardian to his children and if they are beneficiaries he is fully qualified to represent them as has already been determined by this court by Order repeatedly competent and thus it is established law of the case already as given to Judge Phillips in the hearing who refused to be admitted it in evidence. See exhibits \_\_\_\_\_\_). These Orders are based on virtually identical filings that were heard in the past but with Phillips signing prefabricated Orders done before the hearings with virtually everything stated by Rose in the accepted prior Orders issued that also were pre written and then blindly Ordered by Phillips who claims to have checked the record but as reflected in the records none of the Orders are factually correct to the record. It is obvious the outcome was preordained and prefabricated and the Orders are thus false and misleading and do not establish the truth of the record and each is being appealed and Eliot will continue to do so.).

1. Eliot Bernstein's three children are among the class of Trust beneficiaries Eliot seeks to use his role as parent and natural guardian of three trust beneficiaries to give him standing to continue his involvement in this case. The primary issue now raised is whether Eliot Bernstein should be permitted to continuing representing the interests of his minor children, as their parent and natural guardian, in this Trust Proceeding. (ELIOT COMMENT: Due to this Court’s removing standing of a named beneficiary Eliot because Eliot did not know the statute that gave him standing as a beneficiary when asked by Judge Phillips (who knows Eliot is pro se) and despite later filings that gave the correct statutes to Judge Phillips to refute his ill gotten and precedent setting Order with no Construction hearing deciding beneficiaries held as the record reflects and thus part of defective and ill-gotten Order.

That Pro Se Eliot not knowing the statute when asked then not have standing becomes precedent setting and jeopardizes any beneficiary of the Florida Court that does not know off hand the code section that gives beneficiaries standing. The removal of standing is a an attempt to silence Eliot’s ability to further prove Fraud in and by the Court and its officers, fiduciaries and judges.

Eliot filed pleadings in several capacities that he has consistently filed under including as Natural Guardian on behalf of his minor children, Daniel Elijsha Abbe Ottomo Bernstein and Jacob Noah Archie Bernstein and his now adult child Joshua Ennio Zander Bernstein. By refusing Eliot’s filings submitted to the court recently claiming Eliot has NO standing despite the pleading being filed in multiple valid capacities and his order only denying individual standing, Judge Phillips has denied the minor children being represented in either of the last two hearings by counsel and thus despite claims that they are beneficiaries they have not been represented at ANY hearings by counsel.

Judge Phillips has refused to delay hearings to get them counsel and delay hearings until Eliot’s retained counsel Candice Schwager, Esq. could get in the case Pro Hac Vice to defend them, while simultaneously Rose and Ted acting as fiduciaries refuse documents that would enable her to review the trusts and come into the case and have refused her documents (SEE EXHIBIT – ROSE EMAILS RE SCHWAGER, also submitted as Evidence to the Court in the hearing at issue of this proposed Order) a pattern and practice of fiduciaries and counsel in this case from day one) and instead of giving her the requested trusts that no one has seen and Eliot is sued as Trustee of in this matter and instead are trying this bizarre attempt to get a predatory guardianship applied instead with their friends or by appointment of the court when all the children really need is counsel or Counsel Ad Litem.

Mr. Rose refused to turn over documents to Schwager and made slanderous allegations in court against her on February 25th at the hearing offering no proof of his allegations or witnesses and thus had no reason when questioned by Eliot as a Witness/Counter Defendant at the hearing for his refusal to turn over documents to retained counsel Schwager, who was trying to get documents to evaluate the complaints and enter Pro Hac Vice for the hearings.

That Eliot claims this court circus in Judge Phillips court is conducted as a further fraud on the court and fraud by the court to cover up MULTIPLE PROVEN CRIMES BY OFFICERS, FIDUCIARIES AND JUDGES of this Court, as there has already been proven fraud and forgery in these cases by Ted Bernstein and his former counsel Spallina and Tescher who are now under consent with the SEC. The Court has been given evidence that in the December 15, 2015 hearing this Court became further aware of criminal misconduct of Spallina, including federal crimes admitted before Judge Phillips and this guardianship is being sought as retaliation and to silence Eliot from exposing further the crimes and Judge Phillips failure to notify authorities, which is a Misprision of Felony and Violation of Judicial Canons as Eliot stated to Judge Phillips in the February hearing that he would be filing charges against him if he did not contact the proper tribunals of the crimes before many witnesses in the Court that day. This Guardian/Gag Order is a further attempt to extort and harass Eliot and his family before the feds and others come in and make arrest, especially where Eliot was on the front page of the Post being interviewed regarding a Guardian Series Exposing Explosive information of Massive Conflicts of Judge Colin and Judge French involving hundreds of cases Colin then recused from. SEE EXHIBIT - PALM BEACH POST)

1. Despite his status as natural guardian, Eliot will not be permitted to do so, and the Court will appoint a Guardian ad Litem, because there is a conflict of interest between the parent and the children, and because Eliot Bernstein has proven to be an inadequate representative of the best interests of his children. (ELIOT COMMENT: No such proof or evidence was given to this court in regard to these cases and in fact the court was given multiple orders stating Eliot and his wife Candice are qualified to represent their children in already established law of the case as exhibited already herein. Also Candice Bernstein is a natural guardian and has no conflict with the matters as she is not a claimed beneficiary and this court has not removed her standing as Guardian so she should be appointed if Eliot is somehow disqualified by further void orders, as Judge John Phillips has refused to disqualify on multiple solid grounds for his disqualification and fear that Eliot will not and has not received a fair hearing and trial by Judge Phillips who the case was improperly transferred to by Judge Colin’s post recusal steering of the case, first to a judge who was a partner in a law firm being sued in these matters as counter defendant and then to Judge Phillips who should have recused for numerous reasons stated in his disqualification papers, SEE ATTACHED.)
2. First, as to the conflict, Eliot's position throughout the case and at trial was that he was a beneficiary of the Trust. He continues advancing that position after trial by prosecuting an appeal of the December 16, 2015 Final Judgment. Eliot's individual interests are in conflict with the interests of his children. Under Florida law, a court should appoint a guardian ad litem when a parent's interest conflicts with the interest of her or her minor child. *Mistretta v. Mistretta,* 566 So. 2d 836, 837-38 (Fla. 1st DCA 1990)(best interests of a minor are ***not*** fully protected when adverse to the interests of the parent); *Florida Nat. Bank & Trust Co. at Afiami v. Blake,* 155 So. 2d 798 (Fla. 3d DCA 1963) (court should have appointed a guardian ad litem for minor child when it was apparent that the interests of the minor conflicted with the interests of the mother and father); *Gilbertson v. Boggs,* 743 So. 2d 123 (Fla. 4th DCA 1999) (guardian ad !item should have been appointed then the parents' interests were adverse to the minor childs). (ELIOT COMMENT: Again Candice Bernstein is a non conflicted party and is a suitable natural guardian and no arguments or evidence was presented at trial that either her or Eliot were unfit in any way.)
3. Second, Fla. Stat. 731.303(4) provides: "If the court determines that representation of the interest would otherwise be inadequate, the court may at any time, appoint a guardian ad !item to represent the interests of ... a minor ..."1 Based upon the evidence presented and the Court's observations at the trial in December 2015 and at the evidentiary hearing on February 25, 2016, and based upon the Court's review of various motions filed by Eliot Bernstein since the trial, it is apparent Eliot Bernstein is not an adequate representative of the best interests of his children. (ELIOT COMMENT: This Order was drafted PRIOR to the hearing so Mr. Rose’s contention that his order reflects the hearing is baseless and could not be true as the hearing had not happened yet, this order was submitted at court with no prior copy submitted to Eliot for review and comment and until Eliot protested the Court did not question if it was unopposed and Eliot should have a chance to respond to this Order and submit his own. As the court is aware if a proposed order is objected to the Court must refer to the record and since the court would not reschedule or allow a reporter to be brought in and moved to hear without creating a record this is now impossible and Eliot OBJECTS TO EVERY SINGLE WORD of the Rose proposed Order as Ted Bernstein is not a validly serving trustee and removal actions are pending that will remove him and his filings as he is considered in Shirley’s Trust as “PREDECEASED FOR ALL PURPOSES OF DISPOSITION” which would include holding validity or construction hearings or just about doing anything with the trust other than review and certainly not making distributions and determinations of the trust which he is doing as part of the ongoing Fraud on the Court.)
4. Eliot Bernstein states that his agenda includes ridding the court system of corruption among judges , lawyers and fiduciaries, regardless of the cost the beneficiaries. He appears to have no interest in the swift and efficient administration of the Shirley Bernstein Trust. He has taken actions to hinder and delay the administration of the Trust, and caused waste of Trust assets to respond to his assertions. (ELIOT COMMENT: All intentional delays in inheritance and wastes of monies have been caused by Ted and his former counsel Tescher and Spallina who committed fraud on this court and the beneficiaries and in their resignation stated they wanted to make reparations for their damages and so all these costs are due to them and they were contracted by Ted and thus should be forced to post bonding instantly to pay ALL ELIOT AND HIS CHILDREN’S LEGAL FEES and their crimes attempted to benefit Ted and his family and where Ted should have been removed as part of the Fraud by this Court which has failed to follow protocol when fraud on the court by officers of the court is proven and instead the court has aided and abetted the fraud and cover up and now tries vicious retaliation with predatory guardian hearings. See EXHIBIT – Tescher resignation letter. This court was made aware on the record that Mr. Spallina through US mail send a Fraudulently created trust document to Eliot’s minor children’s counsel Christine Yates as part of an elaborate fraud and their law firm submitted Fraudulent and FORGED Documents to the Court in these matters for six parties, including a deceased Simon and the Court has failed again to notify authorities or do anything about admissions of officers of the court under sworn testimony before Judge Phillips admitting these crimes as the record reflects. Judge Phillips and Rose and Ted appear to be working together to cover this up and shut this down before all these new crimes are revealed and investigated and prosecuted. So far Eliot’s work has led to arrest of Tescher and Spallina law firm member and has led to admission to PB Sheriff and this court of new crimes that are yet to be prosecuted and the court has admitted it has done nothing about in the hearing on February 25, 2016 in front of multiple witnesses who attended the hearings. Recently Eliot was on the cover of the Palm Beach Post in an articke on the ABUSE OF GUARDIANSHIP IN FLORIDA and the two judges covered in the story are the two former judges in these cases, Colin and French who are accused of similar crimes as those alleged by Eliot by many other parties and for running court proceedings in conflicts that benefited them and Colin’s wife, perhaps this is further reason for Judge Phillips rulings to deny Eliot due process and shut him down after professing he “loved” Martin Colin in the first hearing and would not be reviewing his orders despite claims that he acted outside the color of law in ruling once he failed to disqualify himself when fraud on the court was discovered and he became a witness and possible suspect in the CRIMINAL FRAUD IN AND ON THE COURT THAT WAS PROVEN AGAINST COLIN’S COURT APPOINTED FIDUCIARIES AND COUNSEL TESCHER AND SPALLINA AND TED BERNSTEIN. See EXHIBIT – PALM BEACH POST ARTICLES. Ted Bernstein is under multiple state and federal investigations filed by both Eliot and Creditor William Stansbury.)
5. To the extent not already covered by this Court's Order dated February 1, 2016, Eliot Bernstein is barred from any further participation in this action, whether individually or as purported parent and natural guardian. (ELIOT COMMENT: this Order only removed individual standing and Eliot Bernstein has standing as a named Beneficiary under the Shirley Trust, as Parent and Natural Guardian of his children, as Trustee of the children’s trust and because he was sued and filed counter claims in all of these capacities including individually.) Any and all pending motions, claims or other filings by Eliot Bernstein,
6. In addition, under section 744.3025, the court may appoint a guardian ad litem to represent a minor's interest before approving a settlement of the minor's portion of any cause of action in which the gross settlement of the claim exceeds $15,000 if the court believes a guardian ad litem is necessary to protect the minor's interest, and "shall appoint a guardian ad litem to represent the minor's interest before approving a settlement of the minor's claim in a case in which the gross settlement involving a minor equals or exceeds $50,000." (ELIOT COMMENT: Again, if this were true for Eliot than the minor children of Lisa Friedstein and Jill Iantoni would also be in need of Guardians yet Mr. Rose does not seek Guardian Ad Litem for them and they have not had counsel representing them at all throughout this hearing, Eliot is the only person who has sought and retained counsel for his minor children, SEE YATES EXHIBITS but their counsel was driven off after wasting considerable monies trying to get dispositive documents and then getting fraudulent documents when she finally got them. Ted and Mr Rose attempting to use this predatory Guardianship as a weapon and enlisting the Court to attempt this Child Abuse in efforts to gain control over their money and lives) Here, it is likely that there will be a settlement at some point in which each of minors receives a substantial distribution, and it is likely Eliot will oppose any such settlement on behalf of his children, is hereby stricken from the record, without prejudice to the rights of the Guardian Ad Litem to take whatever actions are deemed appropriate (ELIOT COMMENT: Not sure what this means and would have to see the record to determine the voracity and clarity of this claim.)
7. The parties shall attempt to mutually agree on a guardian ad litem. The Court will appoint whomever the parties agree upon within the next three business days. Eliot Bernstein may participate in such discussions. To the extent the parties, including Eliot Bernstein, are unable to agree on a guardian ad !item, upon notice from the Trustee's counsel the Court shall randomly appoint a guardian ad litem for Ja.B., Jo.B. and D.B. or schedule a further hearing to appoint a suitable Guardian Ad Lietm (ELIOT COMMENT: Eliot will not agree to any guardian proposed by Alan Rose or Ted Bernstein and if this court appoints such a predatory guardian Eliot will also reject any Guardian proposed by Judge Phillips who is acting outside the color of law and is conflicted with these matters. In fact, in the February 25, 2016 hearing Judge Phillips was given a Federal Complaint filing to Judge John Robert Blakey whereby Alan Rose presented into evidence Exhibit A of the complaint, SEE EXHIBIT – MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION etc. and whereby Exhibit A is a list of defendants Eliot is seeking to add as parties to the complaint, including Judge Phillips as a material and fact witness to crimes that occurred in his Court by Robert Spallina at the December 15, 2012 hearing and as an alleged suspect for his failure to report the crimes as required by Judicial Canon and law and Eliot will take any attempt to force Guardian on his children as a reportable criminal act in retaliation. Eliot will be reporting the attempt by Alan Rose and Ted Bernstein shortly.)
8. The Guardian Ad Litem will have full power and autonomy to represent the interests of the children of Eliot Bernstein, subject to the jurisdiction and review of this Court. The Guardian Ad Litern will be entitled to petition the Court for an award of attorneys' fees to be paid out of the gross proceeds of any recovery, distributions or inheritance to be received by Ja.B.,Jo.B,and/or D.B. (ELIOT COMMENT: Any attempt to have a Guardian pay any attorneys fees out of any Estate and Trust assets will also be viewed as criminal conversion of Estate and Trust assets and added to ongoing criminal and civil actions.)
9. To protect the integrity and independence of the guardian, Eliot Bernstein and all persons acting in concert with him: (a) shall make no effort to contact, email or otherwise communicate with the Guardian Ad Litem except at the request of the Guardian Ad Litem; (b) shall make no statement of any kind about the guardian, nor post information about the guardian on the internet in any fashion; and (c) shall not in any way threaten or harass the guardian. This Court alone shall supervise the guardian, and all information concerning this guardianship shall be treated as private and confidential. Any violation of this order may subject the violator to severe sanctions for contempt of court. The Court will use the full measure of its coercive powers to ensure compliance with this Order. (ELIOT COMMENT: This request of the court was never discussed in the Court proceeding and was again written prior to the hearing without any notice to Eliot and appears to attempt to abolish Eliot’s First Amendment Rights and other civil rights and no evidence or witnesses supporting such a Guardian need were brought forth at the hearing. Eliot will not however threaten or harass any party including the Guardian but will file civil and criminal activities uncovered and to deny that right would again be a violation of Constitutional Rights in addition to those Eliot has pled already.)

The Court reserves jurisdiction to enforce all terms of this Order, and to oversee the service of the guardian ad litem appointed. (ELIOT COMMENT: Eliot believes that this Court has taken improper jurisdiction through orders that are being sought to be voided at this time for Fraud on the Court, Fraud by the Court and other violations of Attorney Conduct Codes, Judicial Canons and State and Federal law. The Court should note that the buyer of the Saint Andrews home referenced in the Plaintiff’s complaint was allegedly found dead on February 23rd 2016 of a gunshot wound to the head the Garage and this after Eliot had contacted a person named in the transaction that denied knowing of the transaction approved by this Court and where it was alleged in Federal filings that this sale APPROVED by this Court despite protests by Eliot, was done with fraudulent instruments including an alleged fraudulent deed notarized by Alan Rose. Esq. as already exhibited herein in the Federal papers filed.)