

Cecilia Gower, Court Reporter  
60<sup>th</sup> District Court  
Jefferson County Courthouse  
1149 Pearl St  
Beaumont, TX 77701-3707

October 17, 2017

Re: Request for Reporter's Record  
Klein Investigations v. Kallop Ent. LLC, et al  
Case # B-0199953

Dear Ms. Gower,

I would like to inquire as to what the cost will be for you to please provide me with a copy of the reporter's record from the hearings in this case set for Wednesday, October 17, 2017. I hear talk that there will be need for enforcement action regarding an emergency motion for contempt of court for violating the mandatory injunction and stay that was Ordered by U.S. Bankruptcy Court Judge Marvin Isgar in the Southern District of Texas – Houston Division in the Chapter 11 case involving the Kallop companies.

I heard from some guy about this maybe being filed by noon or so tomorrow and that sanctions will be sought not just against Klein and his attorney John Morgan, but against your Judge Sanderson, too. While some people will say that, pursuant to the U.S. 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals' recent decision in *Burton v. Infinity Capital Mgmt.*, No. 12-15618, 2017 WL 2960021 (9th Cir. July 10, 2017), that you can only get sanctions and

contempt of court findings against the creditor and the attorney for the creditor (in this case Philip Klein and John Morgan) and not against the trial judge (in this case your Judge Sanderson), I say that is BS. I have found case law from other jurisdictions that argue that a small town county judge who is acting not just outside of his jurisdiction, but wayyy outside of his jurisdiction in an intentional and knowing manner can also be sanctioned by the federal court, too!

I have never been one to mind rolling the dice, especially when other people's careers and reputations are at stake. In any event, while the judge may beat the rap, he certainly won't beat the ride.

I also understand from a good friend of mine who used to work in your courthouse that, as a routine matter, that you make audio recordings of all these hearings, too, Ms. Gower. I think it would be really great to get a copy of the recording so that it could be posted on the internet! How much do you charge for an MP3 recording?

Or would it be necessary to have you served with a federal subpoena?

By the way, I am a big fan of some unknown guy in Nederland, TX who likes to complain about corruption among public officials and especially corruption among local judges on his blog, the *Southeast Texas Political Review* ([www.setpoliticalreview.com/](http://www.setpoliticalreview.com/)). So I think he would be

really interested in his own copy of the reporter's records and audio recordings, too!

I read about a man who many people online suspect is a local pedophile and alleged child sex trafficker named Wayne Reaud. So I was quite surprised when I briefly peeked into your court on August 15<sup>th</sup> and I saw Reaud sitting in Judge Sanderson's totally empty courtroom, sitting next to some other guy (a judge!), during the hearing on the motion for new trial in this case.

I later heard that Reaud and maybe this other guy were seen speaking to Judge Sanderson very privately.

People always say that you cannot believe such allegations, especially against a guy who many would consider to be a 'pillar of the community' and all that good stuff. But, in this day and age... yeah, its guys who are **exactly** like that whom you really need to believe do that kind of stuff – and worse! Harvey Weinstein, Bill Cosby, Roger Ailes, Dennis Hastert, and Jerry Sandusky, etc., etc. So when someone tells me that Wayne Reaud is a pedophile involved in local political corruption and child sex trafficking, I believe it – 100%!! (Plus, he really kinda looks the part, don't you think?)

Which is why these reporter's records are so important for the federal court's enforcement actions. My "Spidey sense" is telling me that Reaud is

going to get hit with a subpoena to appear before Judge Isgur with regards to his actions in helping to violate the bankruptcy court stay. I strongly suspect that Judge Sanderson will be called in, too. He can always fight it, but then the public would wonder what it is that he is trying to hide, right?

If I was a betting man, I would bet that the first question asked of Sanderson would be, “Tell me about the communications that you have had with Reaud and, at the time you did speak with him, did you know that he was a pedophile / child sex trafficker?” I suspect that Sanderson’s response to this question will be quite fascinating.

In federal court they do make audio recordings and they do make them available to the public for a very small fee. So I would imagine that my anonymous blogger friend in Nederland would love to do an article about the local judge and the alleged pedophile / sex trafficker.

Of course, should tomorrow’s hearing get canceled, please let me know.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Thomas Retzlaff  
PO Box 46424  
Phoenix, AZ 85063-6424

Judge Justin Sanderson  
60<sup>th</sup> District Court  
Jefferson County Courthouse  
1149 Pearl St  
Beaumont, TX 77701-3707

October 31, 2017

Re: Klein Investigations v. Kallop Ent. LLC, et al  
Case # B-199,953-A

Dear Judge Sanderson,

John Morgan is a lying sack of shit whose words you cannot believe even if his tongue came notarized.

He was arrested and pled guilty to filing a series of false police reports against his ex-wife (an Assistant District Attorney) in an effort to try to steal custody of their 3 children from her.

Morgan was also found guilty of making a false report of child sex abuse in which Morgan tried to get his then 13 yr old daughter, Anne, to falsely accuse her mother of terrible abuse.

And you know that Morgan was arrested for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Degree felony of Aggravated Assault with a Deadly Weapon – Domestic Violence for trying to MURDER his ex-wife and three children with a butcher's knife while naked and high on drugs.

Furthermore, you also know that, based upon a complaint that I filed, the State Bar of Texas filed a disciplinary petition against Morgan which

resulted in Morgan being forced to undergo drug & psych counseling in a plea bargain that he made in order to keep his Bar Card. See attached Exhibit One.

**You know these things, Judge Sanderson, because you are not a stupid person, right?**

Plus, here is Morgan's mugshot from that arrest (courtesy of a very nice person at the Jefferson County Sheriff's Office).



As you can tell, Morgan is much fatter now.

But he clearly has not learned his lesson when it comes to engaging in criminal behavior as just 6 months ago Morgan was hit with over \$65,000 in SLAPP sanctions and attorney's fees for filing a bogus lawsuit against the attorney for his ex-wife. See attached Exhibit Two.

Again, sir, you know this stuff because you are not a stupid man who hides his head in the ground.

With regards to Morgan's claims about his Exhibit "1" (the "James Smith" emails that Morgan attached to his Oct. 30<sup>th</sup> letter), I have always denied any involvement and have repeatedly challenged both Morgan and Klein to come forward with some **admissible evidence** to support their claims.

Again, John Morgan and Philip Klein are two lying sacks of shit who freely make all sorts of wild accusations in unsworn pleadings and "letters" to this judge or that judge or some other judge. But when it comes time to make these claims under oath while risking cross-examination, they are nowhere to be found.

Just like the accusations of pedophilia and child sex trafficking that is being made against Wayne Reaud all over the internet. Do I think that Klein is behind this? I cannot prove it. But we both know that there is only one asshole in your courtroom who likes to sit and blog and tweet and Facebook

all day long like some fucking teenage girl, right? Just look for the big, stupid looking guy with crooked teeth, bad breath, and a shitty haircut and you will find your suspect.

In any event, Judge Sanderson, Morgan and his law practice are circling the drain. Don't let him drag you down with him and his client.

Plus, what does any of this have to do with whether or not the writ of garnishment is valid and the application of the federal court's bankruptcy stay? Answer: Not a god damn thing! **But that doesn't stop Morgan from trying to lead you astray with some smoke & mirrors and waste a whole bunch of your very limited and valuable time does it?**

Respectfully submitted,



---

Thomas Retzlaff  
2402 E. Esplanade Ln.  
PO Box 46424  
Phoenix, AZ 85063-6424

cc  
e-Filing on all parties of record

# EXHIBIT 1

CAUSE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

COMMISSION FOR LAWYER DISCIPLINE,	§	IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF
Petitioner,	§	
	§	
vs.	§	JEFFERSON COUNTY, TEXAS
	§	
JOHN S. MORGAN,	§	
	§	
Respondent.	§	____ JUDICIAL DISTRICT

**ORIGINAL DISCIPLINARY PETITION**

**TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:**

COMES NOW Petitioner, the COMMISSION FOR LAWYER DISCIPLINE, a committee of the STATE BAR OF TEXAS, and would respectfully show unto the Court as follows:

**I. DISCOVERY CONTROL PLAN**

Because Petitioner seeks a sanction pursuant to Rule 1.06Z of the TEXAS RULES OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURE and, therefore, this case is not governed by the expedited provisions of Rule 169 of the TEXAS RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE (TRCP), Petitioner intends that discovery be conducted under a Level 2 Discovery Control Plan pursuant to TRCP 190.1 and 190.3.

**II. PARTIES**

Petitioner is the COMMISSION FOR LAWYER DISCIPLINE (hereinafter referred to as "Petitioner"), a committee of the STATE BAR OF TEXAS.

Respondent is JOHN S. MORGAN (hereinafter referred to as "Respondent"), Texas Bar Card No. 14447475, a licensed attorney and a member of the STATE BAR OF TEXAS.

**III. NATURE OF PROCEEDING**

Petitioner brings this disciplinary action pursuant to the STATE BAR ACT, TEXAS GOVERNMENT CODE ANNOTATED §81.001, *et seq.* (West 2013); the TEXAS DISCIPLINARY RULES

OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT; and the TEXAS RULES OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURE. The Complaint that forms the basis of this cause of action was filed on or after January 1, 2004.

#### **IV. VENUE**

Respondent's principal place of practice is Jefferson County, Texas; therefore, venue is appropriate in Jefferson County, Texas, pursuant to Rule 3.03 of the TEXAS RULES OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURE. Respondent may be served at his business address, 2175 North St., Suite 101, Beaumont, Texas 77701, or any place he may be found.

#### **V. PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT**

The acts and omissions of Respondent, as hereinafter alleged, constitute professional misconduct as defined by Rule 1.06W of the TEXAS RULES OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURE.

#### **VI. CAUSE OF ACTION**

On April 4, 2014, John S. Morgan ("Respondent") pleaded nolo contendere to the misdemeanor charge of making a false report to a peace officer. Specifically, Respondent admitted, by sworn affidavit, that

[o]n April 9, 2012, [Respondent] was interviewed by Det. [Mark] Hogge at Beaumont P.D. During the investigation [Respondent] made a comment to him that several members of the DA's Office of Jefferson County smoke marihuana in their offices. Also, a statement about marihuana being skimmed from dope cases. [Respondent] made these statements to Det. Hogge knowing they were false.

#### **VII. RULE VIOLATIONS**

The acts and/or omissions of Respondent described above constitute conduct in violation of the following Rules of the TEXAS DISCIPLINARY RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT:

**8.04(a)(2)** A lawyer shall not commit a serious crime or commit any other criminal act that reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness or fitness as a lawyer in other respects.

8.04(a)(3) A lawyer shall not engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation.

**VIII.**

The Complaint that forms the basis of this cause of action was brought to the attention of the Office of the Chief Disciplinary Counsel of the STATE BAR OF TEXAS by THOMAS C. RETZLAFF'S filing of a grievance on or about February 17, 2015.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, Petitioner, the COMMISSION FOR LAWYER DISCIPLINE, respectfully prays that this Court discipline Respondent, JOHN S. MORGAN, by reprimand, suspension or disbarment, as the facts shall warrant; order restitution to Complainant, if applicable; and grant all other relief, general or specific, at law or in equity, to which Petitioner may show itself to be justly entitled including, without limitation, expenses, costs of court, and attorneys' fees.

Respectfully submitted,

**STATE BAR OF TEXAS**  
*Office of the Chief Disciplinary Counsel*

**LINDA A. ACEVEDO**  
Chief Disciplinary Counsel



---

**SHANNON BREAU SAUCEDA**  
Assistant Disciplinary Counsel  
State Bar No. 24002896  
600 Jefferson, Suite 1000  
Houston, Texas 77002  
Phone: (713) 758-8200  
Fax: (713) 758-8292  
Email: [ssauceda@texasbar.com](mailto:ssauceda@texasbar.com)

**ATTORNEYS FOR PETITIONER,  
COMMISSION FOR LAWYER DISCIPLINE**

# EXHIBIT 2

NO. 126,841

JOHN S. MORGAN, <i>Plaintiff,</i>	§	IN THE COUNTY COURT
	§	
	§	
v.	§	AT LAW NO. 1
	§	
SHERYL JOHNSON-TODD, <i>Defendant</i>	§	JEFFERSON COUNTY, TEXAS

*Amenable* ORDER AWARDING TCPA ATTORNEY'S FEES AND SANCTIONS

After considering the decision in *Johnson-Todd v. Morgan (Johnson-Todd II)*, 480 S.W.3d 605 (Tex. App.—Beaumont 2015, pet. denied), remanding this case for dismissal of all of Morgan's causes of action and for award of attorney's fees and sanctions, defendant Sheryl Johnson-Todd's motion to award attorney's fees and sanctions pursuant to TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.001, *et seq.*,

Therefore, the Court **GRANTS** Johnson-Todd's motion, **DISMISSES** all of plaintiff's claims and causes of action in this suit with prejudice, and **ORDERS** that plaintiff John S. Morgan shall pay to defendant Sheryl Johnson-Todd the following amounts:

*Morgan v. Johnson-Todd*

*Johnson-Todd's Brief in Support of Amounts of Attorney's Fees and Sanctions Under the TCPA*

①



TRUE AND CORRECT  
COPY OF ORIGINAL  
FILED IN JEFFERSON  
COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE

jmc

bvm

T.C.  
T.C.

- (i) Total reasonable attorney's fees, litigation expenses, and court costs for the trial and first two appeals of \$40,000, as ~~justice and equity require~~;
- (ii) Sanctions sufficient to deter the filing of similar actions by John S. Morgan in the future of \$25,000.

Plaintiff shall pay the foregoing amounts, ~~except for the conditional awards of appellate attorney's fees~~, to Johnson-Todd not later than 30 days after the date this order is signed.

~~Johnson-Todd's counterclaims reflected in her live pleadings in this suit remain for trial.~~

SIGNED the 28 day of April, of 2017.


  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 PRESIDING JUDGE  
 Thomas Chambers  
 By Assignment

TS



I CERTIFY THIS IS A TRUE COPY  
 Witness my Hand and Seal of Office

5/1/17  
 CAROLYN L. GUIDRY, COUNTY CLERK  
 JEFFERSON COUNTY, TEXAS

BY  DEPUTY  
 BRIDGETTE MOORE

Judge Justin Sanderson  
60<sup>th</sup> District Court  
Jefferson County Courthouse  
1149 Pearl St  
Beaumont, TX 77701-3707

November 5, 2017

Re: Your November 2<sup>nd</sup> order  
Klein Investigations v. Kallop Ent. LLC, et al  
Case # B-199,953-A

Dear Judge Sanderson,

The fabric of law is woven with threads of the belief in an impartial judiciary. If people lose faith that grievances and perceived injustices will be weighed by a fair and unbiased judge, that fabric withers to gossamer.

After all, as stated in the first sentence of the first canon of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct, “An independent and honorable judiciary is indispensable to justice in our society.” TEX. CODE JUD. CONDUCT, Canon 1, reprinted in TEX. GOV’T CODE ANN., title 2, subtitle G, app. B. (Westlaw 2017).

With that in mind, can you tell me whether or not your actions in handling this case – and especially your actions on November 2<sup>nd</sup> in signing an order **prohibiting** the clerk from accepting and filing my communications and pleadings with the court about this case – were within the letter and spirit of you being a fair and unbiased judge?

The fact that Wayne Reaud and Gerald Eddins were both sitting in your otherwise vacant courtroom, front and center, so as to “supervise” your ruling on the August 15<sup>th</sup> motion for new trial in this case strikes me as being the complete opposite of “independent”, “honorable.”<sup>1</sup> This is surprising when one considers that, when you announced your candidacy for office, you said, “It has always been my desire to uphold the integrity and professionalism of our justice system,”

You further have stated, “I want to keep that court fair and honest, and give the citizens of Jefferson County access to the court to be treated fairly and equally. I think I would be good for the citizens. A lot of these people need help, and there’s no one there helping them.”

How is allowing Reaud and Eddins private access to your deliberations, and giving them a front row seat in a case that does not involve them, keeping your court “fair and honest”?

And please tell me, sir, how your November 2<sup>nd</sup> order striking all of my pleadings and correspondence is “helping to ensure that the citizens get access to the court to be treated fairly and equally” – **especially when you signed this order without bothering to give either myself or Houston attorney Jeffrey Dorrell notice and an opportunity to be heard, in**

---

<sup>1</sup> Photos of them two guys sitting there were posted online at the speed of light.

**violation of Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 21(b)?** And especially when you signed it knowing that there was already a **mandatory stay** in this case pursuant to (1) Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 664a upon the filing of a motion to dissolve the writ of garnishment; and, (2) pursuant to the mandatory injunction and stay in Title 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) that was Ordered by U.S. Bankruptcy Court Judge Marvin Isgar in the Southern District of Texas – Houston Division on October 1, 2017, in the Chapter 11 case involving all of the Kallop companies that are defendants herein!

The fact you did this after having repeatedly stated on-the-record in this case that:

10 case that's before me. My instructions from the  
11 Bankruptcy Court were that all proceedings in this matter  
12 should be stayed -- or are stayed. And, so, that's how  
13 we're gonna proceed here. I know there were several  
14 pending motions. I'm gonna stay this case in my court  
15 until we get the all-clear from the Bankruptcy Court or  
16 some guidance from them as far as how to proceed or how  
17 not to proceed.

Transcript of October 18, 2017, at page 4.

You later went on to say:

9 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. You know, in  
10 light of my conversation this morning, I'm just gonna stay  
11 the entire proceedings and not make any rulings at this  
12 point with regards to the case that's in front of me.

Transcript of October 18<sup>th</sup> at page 5.

So what's the deal, Judge Sanderson? Do we only get to have rulings from you when it is something that would benefit Morgan and his client (not to mention benefit Reaud!), while everyone else is just SOL?

Oh, and do I need to go into the long-standing business relationship that you have with Tom Hanna? Once you realized that the actions of Tom Hanna, Jr. (the process server in this case) were being seriously questioned and were at issue, you should have stood up and disclosed to everyone (i.e. Mr. Dorrell, his co-counsel, and his out-of-town clients) that you have an extremely close business and personal relationship with Tom Hanna, Sr. (the treasurer for your judicial campaign).

I am not sure why you failed to disclose this.<sup>2</sup>

**And I almost forget:** You have been having *ex parte* communication with Morgan about this case. After all, how else do you explain the fact that

---

<sup>2</sup> The fact that Morgan constantly brings Julie Hanna to ALL of the court hearings in this case is a bit over-the-top don't you think? It is not like the rest of us are stupid and don't know what is going on here between you and her and why he keeps bringing her to your court for no good reason.

my October 17<sup>th</sup> letter to your court reporter, Cecilia Grower, ended up in the hands of Morgan (which he later filed as an ‘exhibit’ to his motion, albeit only after removing the “good parts” that referred to Reaud!)? I did not serve that letter on anyone else, Judge Sanderson. Yet it found its way into the hands of only John Morgan and not anyone else. Grower, as you know, is your employee and responsibility. If she is having *ex parte* contacts with opposing counsel, that’s on you, sir.

Again, “An independent and honorable judiciary is indispensable to justice in our society.” But that is a matter for the Beaumont Court of Appeals (who will be overseeing the writ petition and concurrent appeal in this case), and the State Commission on Judicial Conduct, to both sort out, I suppose.

In any event, I have absolutely no desire to get involved with your petty, small town disputes and other such nonsense. **But for the fact that John Morgan decided to place my name on his court papers, I would not be communicating at all with you and your court, sir.**

In light of the above, I would urge you to please reconsider your November 2<sup>nd</sup> order. As you know, a motion to strike an opponent’s pleadings is an “improper procedural mechanism” in Texas. See, e.g., *Gallien v. Washington Mut. Home Loans, Inc.*, 209 S.W.3d 856, 861 (Tex.

App.—Texarkana 2006, no pet.); *Rodriguez v. U.S. Security Assoc., Inc.*, 162 S.W.3d 868, 870 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2005, pet. denied) (motion to strike pleadings not authorized under the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure). The fact that you signed this order within hours of Morgan filing it – without giving myself or Mr. Dorrell notice and an opportunity to be heard, is a clear indicator of bias and prejudice. How could it be anything else???

Additionally, your November 2<sup>nd</sup> order also cuts off my ability to communicate with the Court about an ongoing case that now affects me and prevents me from preserving for appellate review errors that you have made; thus, it improperly infringes upon my fundamental Constitutional rights of Access to the Courts and Due Process. It also violates the Open Courts provision of the Texas Constitution.

I would respectfully point out that, regardless of whatever orders you make, **the Clerk has a ministerial duty to file all documents submitted.** See *In re Smith*, 263 S.W.3d 93, 95 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2006, orig. proceeding). See also Attorney General Letter Opinion No. 98-016. Your November 2<sup>nd</sup> order also violates the Texas Supreme Court's order of December 11, 2012 – Misc. Docket No. 12-9206, ¶4, 5. See also Tex. R. Civ. P. 21(f)(11) (Clerk may not refuse to file document).

Irrespective as to whether or not the clerk places his or her file mark upon my documents, an instrument is deemed in law filed at the time it is delivered to the clerk, regardless of whether the instrument is file marked. See *Standard Fire Ins. Co. v. LaCoke*, 585 S.W.2d 678, 680 (Tex. 1979); TEX.R.CIV.P. 74. So I am not sure what the point was of your order anyways.

Additionally, despite your November 2<sup>nd</sup> order, once something is filed with the clerk, it cannot be “unfiled” or otherwise removed from the record. There is no authority in Texas law or civil procedure that authorizes the removal of documents from a court record. **That would be a 3<sup>rd</sup> degree felony offense of tampering with governmental records, right?**

Which is why people like Reaud and Eddins have no business “supervising” your rulings in this case – or any other case! This isn’t 20 years ago when stuff like this could be kept hidden. The Internet is forever with an audience of 7.5 BILLION individuals that are constantly watching everything that you do for the rest of your life in public office.

Once the court of appeals gets done and sends the case back to the trial court, I hope that you will do the honorable thing and remove yourself from this case.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tom". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

---

Thomas Retzlaff  
2402 E. Esplanade Ln.  
PO Box 46424  
Phoenix, AZ 85063-6424

email: [Retzlaff@texas.net](mailto:Retzlaff@texas.net)  
Ph# (210) 317-9800

cc

e-Filing on all parties of record

Judge Justin Sanderson  
60<sup>th</sup> District Court  
Jefferson County Courthouse  
1149 Pearl St  
Beaumont, TX 77701-3707

December 27, 2017

Re: Klein Investigations v. Kallop Ent. LLC, et al  
Case # B-199,953-A

Dear Judge Sanderson,

Remember when everybody was in court on October 18, 2017, and you blathered on about how you were in communications with the federal bankruptcy court and how you received special instructions from that court?

6 | motions this morning. There was a bankruptcy filing by --  
7 | at least, I believe, as far as my understanding with  
8 | regard to the bankruptcy court, our conversation this  
9 | morning -- one or more of the defendants that's in this  
0 | case that's before me. My instructions from the  
1 | Bankruptcy Court were that all proceedings in this matter  
2 | should be stayed -- or are stayed. And, so, that's how  
3 | we're gonna proceed here. I know there were several  
4 | pending motions. I'm gonna stay this case in my court  
5 | until we get the all-clear from the Bankruptcy Court or  
6 | some guidance from them as far as how to proceed or how  
7 | not to proceed.

**Transcript of Oct 18, 2017, at pg. 4 -Klein Inv. v. Kallop, et al.**

Unfortunately for you, Judge Isgur totally threw you under the bus at a hearing in front of him last Friday, December 22, 2017. The dude has totally never heard of you.

12                   It is true that Judge Sanderson, in the 60th  
13 District Court, has represented several times to lawyers in  
14 our State Court case, that he considers all collection actions  
15 against all defendants stayed, and he says -- he has told us  
16 this at least twice, that he has done this after consultation  
17 with your Court, Your Honor. He has not specified whether it  
18 is with you or whether it is staff to staff. I had no way of  
19 knowing whether it happened.  
20                   THE COURT: I have not spoken to Judge Sanderson,  
21 so.

**Transcript of Dec 22, 2017, at pg. 7, *In re: Offshore Specialty Fabricators***

So what's the deal? Why did you lie so much? And what else about this case have you lied about??

Once the court of appeals gets done and sends the case back to the trial court, I hope that you will do the honorable thing and remove yourself from this case.

By the way, you wanna know what the guidance was that Judge Isgur gave to John Morgan when he showed up asking that the Stay be lifted?

## **MOTION DENIED - GFY!!!**

(or words to that effect)

Also, and a bit of a “Fun Fact” here: under existing Fifth Circuit law Klein Investments, or Philip Klein, no longer owns that debt / state court judgment, and it is owned – **exclusively** – by the bankruptcy estate.

Judge Isgur specifically stated last Friday that this judgment is the Debtor’s property and that Morgan (and Klein) was violating the Stay – **violating federal law** – by them prosecuting their collection activities.

I am pretty certain that you were told this a bunch of times, weren’t you? Yeah, you were. But you went ahead anyways and let them two assholes cause a whole bunch of problems by you signing orders in violation of the law and in violation of Judge Isgur’s orders.

By the way, copies of the transcripts are on their way to the State Commission on Judicial Conduct as we speak.

You need to remove yourself from this case. Your utter lack of integrity is shocking. Seriously.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tom". The letters are cursive and fluid.

---

Thomas Retzlaff  
2402 E. Esplanade Ln.  
PO Box 46424  
Phoenix, AZ 85063-6424

email: [Retzlaff@texas.net](mailto:Retzlaff@texas.net)  
Ph# (210) 317-9800

cc

e-Filing on all parties of record