

FILED
5/9/2024 3:21 PM
IRIS Y. MARTINEZ
CIRCUIT CLERK
COOK COUNTY, IL
2016D009534
Calendar, 23
27628815

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT, DOMESTIC RELATIONS DIVISION**

IN RE THE FORMER MARRIAGE OF:)
)
PETER MATT,)
)
 Petitioner,)
)
 and)
)
MEGAN MATT,)
 n/k/a MEGAN MASON,)
)
 Respondent.)

Case No. 2016 D 009534

**Motion to Dismiss Peter Matt's Petition for Extrajudicial Termination of Minor
Children's American Citizenship**

I, Megan Mason, acting pro se, submit this motion to dismiss Peter Matt's May 3, 2024 Petition for leave from this court to abscond with our minor American children to his native Germany in order to: evade criminal prosecution for his prior and ongoing acts of money laundering and tax evasion in violation of federal law; to evade criminal prosecution for his prior and ongoing acts of conspiracy in wire fraud, identity theft, retaliation toward a federal witness and other predicate racketeering acts; to engage in welfare fraud against the nation of Germany in order to access entitlement benefits for our minor son Angus, despite Mr. Matt's considerable wealth and ability to work; and to inflict heightened abuse on the minor children by permanently separating them from the mother they love and whose care they have enjoyed their entire lives until separated by extrajudicial acts by employees of this court; and finally in order for Mr. Matt to access the financial assets he holds in his native Germany but does not disclose to The United States Treasury Department and does not officially document in this court but of which court employee

FILED DATE: 5/9/2024 3:21 PM 2016D009534

Robert Johnson is fully aware, having read multiple bank statements and financial documents prepared by Mr. Matt himself.

Mr. Matt's petition is not sufficient of court time and this court lacks jurisdiction to order the termination of the American citizenship enjoyed by two young men ages twelve and fifteen who have no wish to leave this country. Specifically:

1. Mr. Matt claims to have jurisdiction to bring this action under (750 ILCS 5/609.2) Sec. 609.2., which indicates that both "(a) A parent's relocation constitutes a substantial change in circumstances for purposes of Section 610.5" and that for this reason such action must commence by the parent who wishes to relocate giving the other parent notice. No such notice has been given.
2. Specifically, under 750 ILCS 5/609, notice is clearly required at least sixty days before a party may seek leave from the court for relocation::

"(c) A parent intending a relocation, as that term is defined in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (g) of Section 600 of this Act, must provide written notice of the relocation to the other parent under the parenting plan or allocation judgment. A copy of the notice required under this Section shall be filed with the clerk of the circuit court. The court may waive or seal some or all of the information required in the notice if there is a history of domestic violence.

(d) The notice must provide at least 60 days' written notice before the relocation unless such notice is impracticable (in which case written notice shall be given at the earliest date practicable) or unless otherwise ordered by the court. At a minimum, the notice must set forth the following: (1) the intended date of the parent's relocation; (2) the address of the parent's intended new residence, if known; and (3) the length of time the relocation will last, if the relocation is not for an indefinite or permanent period. The court may consider a parent's failure to comply with the notice requirements of this Section without good cause (i) as a factor in determining whether the parent's relocation is in good faith; and (ii) as a basis for awarding reasonable attorney's fees and costs resulting from the parent's failure to comply with these provisions."

3. Having not received notice, specifically sixty days before the commencement of this action, and therefore having been denied a legal right to review and respond to Mr. Matt's request to relocate our minor children, this action is on the face of it illegal.
4. Mr. Matt does not have the authority to petition this court for the right to relocate our children but if he did have this right, the court would only be able to do so after a trial of fact and consideration of the children's best interest. This would require the commencement of an action as described above, by first filing notice of an intent to relocate the minor children which specifically codifies my right to response and to assert my parentage rights in this matter.
5. Mr. Matt does not have the authority to petition this court for the right to relocate our children but if he did have this right, the court would have to consider the existence of a parenting plan entered into on September 25, 2017 in this court granting me fifty percent parenting time and decision making and requiring that the children stay in their current school district, which would be impossible if the children were located in a different nation. This court has a duty to uphold law in all expressions, including in the form of a duly enacted parenting plan, and may not set aside laws at whim. This parenting plan cannot be revoked by a court employee without basis and no legitimate action has commenced to modify the parenting plan in any way. This is to say before commencing this action, Mr. Matt must commence a lawful action to modify the duly enacted parenting plan. No such action has commenced, exuberant extra judicial activity notwithstanding. I incorporate by reference Exhibit A, the parties' marital settlement agreement and parenting plan which is the only lawful document assigning parentage rights in this case.

6. Mr. Matt does not have the authority to petition this court for the right to relocate our children but if he did have this right, the court would not at present be able to rule on this matter until the case is assigned to a trial judge who is willing and able to uphold the laws of The United States of America, the laws drafted by the people of Illinois, and the integrity of fact and truth in his court. At present this case has been assigned to court employee Robert Johnson who is prevented by law from ruling in this case for the following reasons:

- a. Robert Johnson, acting personally under the color of law, is a named criminal co-conspirator in acts of wire fraud, identity theft, and conspiracy in tax evasion and money laundering. Therefore at present he is unable to act impartially in any action involving me, a criminal witness and victim to his crimes, or Peter Matt, his criminal co-conspirator.
- b. Robert Johnson's first known documented act of fraud against a party in this case occurred on December 3, 2018 when he or a court employee acting under his authority entered a fraudulent order "to allow" participant Megan Matt to appear before him at the contempt hearing held on December 3, 2018 at 9:30 am in court room CL04 in the Daley Center (Exhibit B). Robert Johnson had never met me when he entered this order and he was aware that I was not in the courtroom at 9:30 am on December 3, 2018 because I was not there and did not speak to him. At this time and until several weeks later I still believed my judge to be Raul Vega and only learned of the hearing when I came home from work at around 4pm on December 3, 2018 and received written notice about a hearing that had already taken place. I immediately wrote to my prior attorney, "I need help. They took me

to court without telling me...” (Exhibit C) and again at 8:50 pm on December 3, 2018:

“Does this happen that attorneys just go to court without you knowing? I can’t imagine they would do it on purpose but at the same time it seems crazy Peter never mentioned going to court or anything like that. And how did they get a court date so fast???? The supposed filing date was less than two weeks ago” (Exhibit D)

- c. Robert Johnson’s first fraudulent entry is one of three fraudulent appearances he entered at trials held without my knowledge in which I am a party because, as I have come to learn, it *does* happen that attorneys go to court without informing a pro se litigant in cases where they are acting personally in furtherance of a criminal conspiracy. Robert Johnson’s first fraudulent act is part of a history of crime that is well established in this court and in case documents related to the divorce case 2016 D 9534. This history of crime is known formally as a series of predicate acts in a racketeering enterprise committed by court employee Robert Johnson.
- d. Specifically, Robert Johnson’s repeated entry of fraudulent orders “allowing” me to represent myself at hearings in his court. In this way, Robert Johnson was able to create a fraudulent paper trail of “missed” court appearances which were repeatedly orchestrated by 1. Mr. Matt filing a spurious action alleging contempt of court. 2. Robert Johnson and others holding hearings to which I was not invited or allowed counsel but was a named party, in order to create a “record” of misconduct as demonstrated in these orders. Because Judge Johnson helped hide the trials from me, he demonstrated knowledge and complicity in the enterprise from the onset.

- e. It is my understanding, according to the unique customs of The Domestic Relations Division, that Robert Johnson received his role as an associate judge, which is subject to political appointment, with the understanding that he must approve illegal orders and facilitate the criminal enterprises of other judges and court appointees in order to maintain his job and one day become a circuit court judge. It is my understanding, based on the unique customs of the Domestic Relations Division, that bribes are paid and facilitated by shady lawyers, like Steve Klein and Christopher Wehrman on behalf of Peter Matt, who then deliver the bribes to Guardian Ad Litem, like Michael Bender or or his predecessor David Pasulka, who are then able to offer political appointments and nominations. For example, my ex husband, through his attorney Steve Klein, paid Michael Bender to fix my divorce case and in turn, Michael Bender told my prior attorney Bradley Trowbridge to throw my case. For payment, Brad Trowbridge was made a circuit court judge. Robert Johnson is also seeking to be paid for his fraud by receiving a nomination to become a circuit court judge.
- f. Robert Johnson is aware that he is a criminal because he is trained in the law and aware of his own actions and knows he committed the crimes of wire fraud, conspiracy in money laundering, conspiracy in tax evasion, and retaliation toward a federal witness through personal acts while employed by the city of Chicago and assigned work duties in this case.
- g. Robert Johnson retained criminal counsel, Robert Blinick because of his criminal liability and Robert Blinick filed an appearance in this case, appearing as counsel for Judge Robert Johnson in the court's efile software Odyssey File where

Robert Johnson is named as a “respondent” (Exhibit F). It is of two-fold necessity that Robert Johnson not act as trial judge. It is a direct violation of the Illinois Code of Judicial Conduct for court employee Robert Johnson to act as trial judge in this case because, according to Rule 2.11 of The Illinois Code of Judicial Conduct, “A judge shall be disqualified in any proceeding in which the judge’s impartiality* might reasonably be questioned, including, but not limited to, the following circumstances”. Specifically judges are required to disqualify themselves if the judge possesses more than a de minimis interest in the case under rule. The retention of legal counsel and identification of Robert Johnson as a party in the case demonstrates that he has more than a de minimis interest in the case.

- h. The reports and documentation of Judge Johnson’s actions in furtherance of a racketeering enterprise are voluminous and well known to this court, specifically to every member of the Cook County Circuit Court Executive Committee who exert administrative authority over court employee Robert Johnson (Exhibit E) including Chief Judge Timothy Evans and Presiding Judge of The Domestic Relations Division Regina Scanniccio.
7. Mr. Matt does not have the authority to petition this court for the right to relocate our children but if he did have this right, it would be impossible for a lawful hearing on this matter until it is assigned to a trial judge who is qualified to hear this case. Just as a woman cannot be a little bit pregnant, an American judge cannot be a little bit corrupt. Therefore Robert Johnson’s every action under color of law subsequent to his first known act of fraud on December 3, 2018 is unlawful, wholly personal in nature, and void.

8. Mr. Matt does not have the authority to petition this court for the right to relocate our children but if he did have this right, the court would have to consider the best interests of the children who do not speak German and do not want to live in Germany, who are now American citizens protected by The American Constitution and The American Government and who have an excellent loving mother in America with whom they wish to live. Mr. Matt did not follow Illinois in presenting his claim nor did he present any argument sufficient to deprive my children of their American citizenship. Were Mr. Matt to file a lawful action he would not have a lawful basis for the court to award his wish for relocation.

WHEREFORE, I ask that this court...

- A. Dismiss Mr. Matt's May 3 Petition to Relocate the Minor children;
- B. Sanction Mr. Matt for abuse of the courts time and as the court sees fit;
- C. Transfer this case to Presiding Judge Regina Scanniccio so she may assign this case to a qualified judge in the domestic relations division;
- D. Write a memo to Presiding Judge Regina Scanniccio, Chief Judge Timothy Evans and the rest of the Cook County Circuit Court Executive Committee, asking them to stop ongoing crimes by employees under their administrative authority and to stop court employees from using resources owned by the state of Illinois, including computer servers, to commit ongoing federal racketeering acts.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Megan Mason Respondent Pro Se

P.O. Box 2572
Asheville, NC 28802