

Evan Gutman JD, CPA
Member Pennsylvania State Bar
Member District of Columbia Bar

1675 NW 4th Avenue, #511
Boca Raton, FL 33432
561-990-7440

"Without publicity, all other checks are insufficient, in comparison of publicity, all other checks are of small account. Recordation, appeal, whatever other institutions might present themselves in the character of checks, would be found to operate rather as cloaks than checks; as cloaks in reality, as checks only in appearances."

In Re Oliver, 333 U.S. 257 (1948)

"Much of a man's lifetime is spent in forming his character. He is made what he is as external forces interact with inherited qualities and accumulating experience. At some turning point the balance shifts: the individual, now comes into his own, brings his character to bear upon the external world."

August Heckscher, Woodrow Wilson - A Biography, Page 275, Charles Scribner's Sons (1991)

Dear Recipient:

Pursuant to my own personal First Amendment Free Speech rights, I am writing to let you know you are one of about **800** people who I anticipate will ultimately be receiving this letter, including all Florida Supreme Court Justices, all Florida District Court of Appeal Justices, virtually all Florida Circuit Court Judges (**over 500**), selected Florida County Court Judges, all Florida State Senators, all US Supreme Court Justices, selected Attorneys and others.

I have instituted an interesting litigation pursuant to the **ORIGINAL JURISDICTION** of the **Florida Supreme Court**. More specifically, on October 30, 2019 a Complaint was served upon me by Discover Bank in the Palm Beach County Circuit Court (Case #50-2019-CA-013570-XXXX-MB). Concurrent with this letter, I have filed a Motion to Disqualify every Single Palm Beach County Circuit Court Judge and to Stay proceedings in the case, pending the Florida Supreme Court's decision on a Motion for Declaratory Judgment filed also Concurrently with that Court. The STAY is requested because the Palm Beach County Circuit Court **LACKS JURISDICTION** to rule upon certain matters in the Florida Supreme Court filing. Copies of these filings will be available as soon as possible at my website **www.gutmanvaluations.com**. The crux of my Motion filed with the Florida Supreme Court pursuant to its Original Jurisdiction is that I can not receive a Fair and Impartial adjudication by **ANY** Judge in the Palm Beach Courts (due to 1 - 4 below). Or, the entire State of Florida for that matter (as regards 1, 3 and 4 below). The reasons are as follows:

1. Florida Rule of Judicial Administration 2.215 unconstitutionally violates the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses of the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, because it substantively deprives litigants in all cases in Florida, both Civil and Criminal, of the right to a fair and impartial adjudication by a **Fully Independent Thinking** Trial Court Judge, not subjected to Undue Influence. The Rule unconstitutionally vests virtually **Unbridled** and Dictatorial Power within one Chief Judge of each County, who then has virtually total power and control over all other Judges in that County, including but not limited to deciding which cases they adjudicate, and declaring them in "neglect of duty" if they fail to comply with any of the Chief Judge's directives. The Rule creates two Classes of Judges with one Class having almost total control over the Subservient Class, even though both are duly Elected or Appointed, and the Subservient Class constitutes the majority of Trial Court Judges.

2. Palm Beach County Court Rule 4 unconstitutionally violates the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses of the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, on the ground it deprives Pro Se Litigants of a fair and impartial adjudication by totally excluding them from its contours, provisions, protections and penalties. The Rule is specifically designed to provide an inferior quality of justice to Pro Se Litigants, by treating them as an inferior class compared to litigants represented by attorneys, thereby exemplifying the existence of a marked judicial animus against Pro Se litigants in order to unconstitutionally favor the interests of well-connected Attorneys.
3. The extension of Absolute Immunity **for commission of Malicious Acts to Members of the Judicial Qualifications Commission (JQC) acting in a Non-Judicial capacity** and also to certain members of the Florida State Bar who are not even Judges at all, in the case of Laura M. Watson v Florida Judicial Qualifications Commission, No. 17-13940 (11th Cir. Fed. Ct. of Appeals, August 15, 2018) unconstitutionally infringes upon the Due Process rights of a Pro Se litigant to receive a fair and impartial adjudication in every single Florida case, both Civil and Criminal, which involves a Pro Se Litigant. This occurs because it diminishes the ability of duly elected Trial Court Judges to think Independently and fairly decide issues, because they are unduly influenced, subjugated and neutralized in favor of potentially and/or possibly "Malicious" goals and interests of the JQC and certain members of the Florida State Bar. The impact is that duly elected and appointed Trial Court Judges no longer have full control over the judicial decision-making process in their cases, due to fear of maintaining their own professional position on the bench.
4. The lack of Uniformity in court rules between judges, critical to equal application of the laws, evidenced by varying Divisional Rules established on a haphazard arbitrary basis by individual Judges violates a litigant's right to due process and equal protection in violation of the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Similarly, the lack of clearly defined Time limits for critical litigation events violates a litigant's due process and equal protection clause rights. Divisional Rules allowing each individual Judge to unilaterally decide upon the time frames when Oppositions to Motions must be filed; the Font size of filings within their individual Court, and the Number of Pages allowed in a Memorandum of Law result in unequal justice for litigants, the quality of which depends upon the predilections of the Judge assigned. Similarly, rules requiring a hearing be scheduled just to obtain a ruling on a motion; along with distinctions between how Pro Se litigants and licensed attorneys are required to schedule hearings violate the Due Process and Equal Protection Clause.

I hope you may view my website at www.gutmanvaluations.com and read the Motion for Declaratory Judgment filed with the Florida Supreme Court. Additionally, please note the Motion **PREEMPTIVELY** indicates even if the underlying case in the Palm Beach Circuit Court is resolved, my Motion is not rendered "Moot." This is because the U.S. Supreme Court has held repeatedly certain challenges in a resolved underlying case are not Moot if the controversy is "**capable of repetition, yet likely to evade review.**" In this instance, matters in my Motion are not only "capable" of repetition, but "certain" of repetition because they affect all Florida cases. Thus, I anticipate the Florida Supreme Court will render an opinion on the merits, or the matter will be brought to the U.S. Supreme Court. Also, just so we are clear, I seek to go 4 for 4 on all issues.

Most Humbly and Respectfully Yours,

Evan Gutman JD, CPA

Member State Bar of Pennsylvania
Member District of Columbia Bar
Admitted to Bar of Federal Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals
Admitted to Bar of Federal Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals
Florida Certified Public Accountant