

Evan S. Gutman CPA, JD
Member State Bar of Pennsylvania
Member District of Columbia Bar
1675 NW 4th Avenue, #511
Boca Raton, FL 33432

"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 checks only in appearances."

In Re Oliver, (U.S. Supreme Court) 333 U.S. 257, 271 (1948)

"The **litigation privilege** applies across the board to actions in Florida, both to common-law causes of action, those initiated pursuant to a statute, or of some other origin. **"Absolute immunity must be afforded to any act occurring during the course of a judicial proceeding. . . . so long as the act has some relation to the proceeding."**

Echevarria v Cole, (Florida Supreme Court) 950 So.2d 380 (2007)

Dear Recipient,

Pursuant to my own personal First Amendment rights, you are one of about **850** people this letter is initially being sent to including about 50 or more Reporters of the mainstream media nationwide, all Circuit Court Judges in Palm Beach and Broward County; all members of the Florida State Senate and State House, all U.S. Senators, ALL FEDERAL COURT OF APPEAL JUSTICES IN ALL FEDERAL CIRCUITS, All U.S. Supreme Court Justices, Governor Ron DeSantis; President Joseph Biden and many selected friends and attorneys. It is also anticipated the number of recipients may increase substantially beyond this initial list in the near future.

The issue is as follows. I am a Defendant in the case of Citibank, N.A. v Evan S. Gutman, Case #50-2020-CC-005756-XXXX-MB involving an alleged credit card debt in the Palm Beach County trial court. I filed a Counterclaim against Citibank alleging multiple illegal acts. Specifically, my main allegation is Citibank has been instituting massive numbers of meritless lawsuits against impoverished litigants predicated upon an invalid legal claim of "Unjust Enrichment." Under Florida law it is well-established if a written contract exists, there can be no legal claim for unjust enrichment. See AgriTrade v Quercia, 253 So.3d 28, 34-35 (2017) (" the law will not imply a contract where an express contract exists "). Thus, the Citibank legal claims are all meritless and they know it.

My Counterclaim was Dismissed. The reason for dismissal was NOT PREDICATED upon any assertion that Citibank's acts were legal. Quite to the contrary. Dismissal was predicated upon the incredible premise that **Citibank had a "PRIVILEGE" to commit illegal acts**. And no, I am not kidding !! That is what the Court actually held relying upon Echevarria, (see above quote). I gotta tell you, it's pretty difficult to win a litigation, when a Court expressly holds your opponent has a "Privilege" to engage in any illegal activity during the litigation. That's about as tough as it can get, to state the matter mildly. Ultimately, when publicized, I believe this will prove to be a massive embarrassment to the Florida Judiciary. So far as I know, no other State in the U.S. has adopted such an outrageous doctrine. In my view, it is a complete abandonment of their constitutional duty to uphold the law. Based on the foregoing, I am now in the process of challenging multiple invidious Judicial policies that cut right to the heart and soul of Judicial Power. Put simply, my focus shifted from the banks and debt collector attorneys; to the Judiciary itself, which is condoning illegal conduct by creating a "Privilege" to engage in illegality. I have already produced on the Court record approximately 68 complaints filed by Citibank that assert the illegal Unjust Enrichment claim, when they know and have actual knowledge written contracts exist, thereby precluding such.

I am also the author of a book titled "State Bar Admissions and the Bootlegger's Son," published on CD-Rom in 2002. At the time, I believe it was the most comprehensive work written about the "Good Moral Character" requirement to obtain a law license. It asserts the intent of the "Good Moral Character" admission requirement was NOT to promote good moral character. Rather it's purpose was to secure an arbitrary power of discretion for

State Bars to exclude individuals they did not like and who would not support them. My records indicate in addition to individual purchasers, my book was purchased by the following law schools and entities:

1. University of Chicago
2. Golden Gate University Law Library
3. Ave Maria School of Law Library
4. University of Alabama
5. Texas Tech University
6. University of South Dakota Law Library
7. Michigan State University - Detroit College of Law
8. Albany Law School
9. University of Connecticut School of Law Library
10. William S. Hein and Company

Ultimately, I contributed the book to the public domain and it was available on a website I maintained for years. Around 2012, I started thinking maybe some language I used in the book was possibly too harsh and I also developed a greater degree of sensitivity for the State Bar's perspective on the issue. Accordingly, while I still adhered to my original position on the issues, I decided to remove my book from the Internet until I considered the issues further. That was 10 years ago. My best guess is there are about 200 CD-Rom copies of the original floating around. After careful consideration, I have decided to put the entire book back on the Internet with just a few minor changes. Put simply, I believe I got it right the first time around. Accordingly, it will be available again for free, contributed to the public domain, at www.gutmanvaluations.com as soon as possible.

My book was cited in 2008 in a Law Review article titled "Are You In or Are You Out? The Effect of a Prior Criminal Conviction on Bar Admission & A Proposed National Uniform Standard" (Hofstra Law and Employment Law Journal), by Anthony J. Graniere and Hilary McHugh, (Volume 26, Issue 1, Page 223, Footnote 2, 2008.)

I am hopeful you may take an opportunity to read my book, which should be available shortly at www.gutmanvaluations.com, and may even be available on my website by the time you receive this letter. I think you will find it to be interesting and also somewhat amusing reading.

Lastly, I write to inform you that I have filed an interesting Motion to Disqualify **Judge Edward Garrison** of the Palm Beach County Court, in the Citibank case. A complete copy of my Motion will also be available on my website at www.gutmanvaluations.com as soon as possible.

Very truly yours,

Evan Gutman CPA, JD