

Case CIVDS1921276 - SHIGENO -V- DRISKILL

<i>Viewed</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Action Text</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Image</i>
	08/12/2019 8:30 AM DEPT. S32	HEARING ON CIVIL HARASSMENT FILED BY ERIC TOMOMI SHIGENO. - Minutes		
	08/08/2019	PROOF OF SERVICE OF RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR CIVIL HARASSMENT BY MAIL ON 08/08/19 AS TO ERIC TOMOMI SHIGENO, FILED.	Not Applicable	
	08/08/2019	RESPONSE TO TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER FILED BY JAMES MARTIN DRISKILL, PARTY REPRESENTED BY PRO/PER.	Not Applicable	

<http://openaccess.sb-court.org/OpenAccess/CIVIL/CivilDetails.asp?courtcode=X&casenumber=DS1921276&casetype=CIV&dsn=>



ONLINE WRITTEN AND SPOKEN VOICE TEXT NARRATIVE OF THE FOLLOWING ADDRESS THAT I REQUEST TO BE ABLE TO ADDRESS TO THE COURT AND PUBLIC:

I would like to address the court and make a public statement for the commonwealth interests that are above what is either the plaintiff or defendant's positions in regards to this case. That would be the understanding of the causes of mass gun shootings and the methods to which the society can apply to stop the epidemic of this ongoing and seemingly never-ending event after event after event of human slaughter killings.

Dear Your Honor, opposing council Attorney Dale Henderson, the petitioner of a restraining order Doctor Eric Tomomi Shigeno, supporters of the defendant appearing in court to include my mother and neighbor along with all interested peoples of the public commonwealth as this case is being recorded and will become an imperishable record for all-time human history.

I relate as an author here what are current "published works" as they are presented currently on the publicly accessible surface web indexed informational society medium formats.

This includes a history of every single fax directed by this author to petitioner as well as recent faxing directed to his counsel. I consider these faxes published works. Does anyone wish to disagree with this?

Review Public Directory Contents of:

<http://doctor-eric-tomomi-shigeno.fuckeduphuman.net/Faxes/>

I ask for you to consider these logically applied thoughts into view and by having such application of view creates a condition that cannot be perceived as words issued by this author as threats.

The standard that I would like to mention is the use of language.


If an author mentions "suicide" within the text body of their words, the presence of such a word term "suicide" does not imply nor should it ever by default that the author's intention reflects the position as being suicidal. Taking this out of context to apply to any author on this subject to imply such an intention would be dangerous to consider as a standard approach. Dangerous that no author would write about suicide if such a standard existed. If such a standard existed, it would oppress the ability for the freedom of expression and the first amendment to the United States Constitution to have the ability to discuss suicide in any format.

We can apply this same argument on the mere mention of the word "homicide" does not imply that the author is homicidal. If a standard exists, it must allow for the freedom of expression to exist to freely express the subject of homicide without being inverted upon the author as the intention to cause homicides. We must find that logic exists in the use of language standards.

Now as these logics continued, the mere mention of "Mass Gun Shootings" does not imply the standard by default that such a mention by an author should take a standard that the author is intended on acting out harm by a mass gun shooting event at all, nor would it imply a target to be implicitly directed against a single person. Taking this mere mention of phrase into consideration and holding such a deviation of standard approach that targets the author as the mass gun shooter would be dangerous to the freedoms of expression and the freedoms of speech.

Now apply this to the term also being characterized as a threat, "mass murder". If such a deviation of standard exists that places the mere mention of the phrase "Mass Murder" as an issued threat, then this article can not be referenced.

Mass Murder is Capitalist Misery: Economy Meets Psychology



BY HARRIET FRAAD | JULY 1, 2017

https://www.democracyatwork.info/capitalist_misery_economy_meets_psychology

This article is the source of #9Scourges12Steps : The 9 Scourges of Inequality and the 12 Steps of Social Improvement to Rebuild Trust In Our Communities.

See Meme Directory:

<http://meme.gruwup.net/%239Scourges12Steps/>

The standard that must be applied here must allow the freedom of speech to express the term "mass gun shootings" and subsequently the term "mass murder" as a point of discussion and a deviation from this standard that has been applied here in this case by the method that is explicitly said is the position of the petitioner.

Implied threats can not be reached nor can the petitioner expand on any expression of words together from author outside these terms by themselves that shatters the petitioner's emotions to imply that mere mention of the phrase "Mass Gun Shootings" or "Mass Murder" scares him to an irrational mind.

Are we going to allow the irrational mind to rule over the logistics of rational thinking here? That is dangerous and has the effect to suppressing my freedoms of speech.

This to not consider the expression fully of the English Language upon the authored words which are now "published works" of this author for the entire public to review.

As the court has imposed a deviation of the standard that is dangerous to apply to the use of the word "suicide", the use of the word "homicide" and subsequently as this case applies the use of the phrases "Mass Gun Shootings" and "Mass Murder".

Now, why is this deviation of a rational standard that has been applied in this case dangerous to the author's freedoms of speech?

Because it is noteworthy and the public has the ability to review, the total of all faxes directed to the petitioner was to engage a discussion point of reference on the subject of "Mass Gun Shootings" that this author actually has the implicit point of view of one who is attempting to get a public's attention to the solution, or at least referenced and filed in the defendant's answer, an "antidote" to apply on a conscience level across society to place a counter-pointing force to stop these mass gun shootings.

But if you allow the deviation of standard to apply to this case as it has already shown, is dangerous to my authorship and any other authorships future forward to the corrective needs that must be addressed in a public arena to discuss on how to address any kind of "social correction" or "fix" for the conditions that are in place that is at the foundation of the cause for "mass gun shootings".

How can this court apply this deviation of standard and such an application that is dangerous to anyone who might also wish to publically discuss this topic? To hold a discussion without having such inversions that have been applied into the filing of this case to be continued. In that deviation of standard, we are never able to hold a discussion forward about the topic of "mass gun shootings" and they will continue to never be able to be addressed for public discussion.

That is what is before you in this case.

All defendant is asking for is a public forum and discussion about the termination of a hate conspiracy embedded in the Ryan White Care act funded social service agencies and doctor provider care network as such a conspiracy has taken into consideration is one major source of the erosion of trust that is causing mass gun shootings. The two subjects are inter-dependant and are inseparable to consider before you this day.

By holding the misapplied logics deviation of standard against this author is dangerous to the freedoms of speech and should not be allowed.

If the petitioner could pull out a fully formed worded threat that is expanded directly to imply upon the author's words, have him do so before this court or have this case dismissed immediately and the petitioner and counsel reprimanded for their obvious attempt to deceive and manipulate the court proceedings at the detriment to the intention of defendant to find and provide an answer for discussion to resolve these mass gun shooting events.

Thank you.

My mother would like to also address this court.

Can she please be given that time to address this court for how the hate received from the source of social services from these circumstances has drastically altered the life course of the defendant, her son.