



THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE COURT
P.O. Box 122724
San Diego, CA 92112

ATTENTION: - Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton, Presiding Judge
- Executive Committee of Judges
c/o Michael Roddy, Court Executive Officer

**ILLEGAL AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL
FORCED PESTICIDE SPRAYING IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY AND
CONSTRUCTIVE AND LEGAL NOTICE OF BREACH OF OATH OF OFFICE
--- REQUEST FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS UNDER THE COURT'S AUTHORITY AND DISCRETION ---
Complaint and Declaration by Ricardo Beas**

I, Ricardo Beas, submit this complaint, and declare and state the following:

I am a resident of the County of San Diego, California, and through this letter to Presiding Judge Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton and the Executive Committee of Judges, in care of Court Executive Officer Michael Roddy for proper distribution, request that all judges of this Court immediately cease and desist from issuing any orders regarding forced spraying of pesticides in peoples' residence without proper prior notice or without the authorization of the owner and/or inhabitant of such property within our County as pertains the alleged existence, probable or possible, of Zika Virus infected *Aedes aegypti* mosquitos.

To my knowledge, at least one unidentified judge of this Court (signature not legible and no name typed in the order; see Exhibits 1 and 2) has issued both an "Inspection and Abatement Warrant" and several "Inspection and Abatement Warrant (Forcible Entry) orders." See Court cases number E2016-619, E2016-620 and E2016-622, to name a few.

The purported reason and justification by said Court judge to order the above forced spraying of local residences by way of property trespass is to combat the spread of the Zika virus by supposedly killing the *Aedes aegypti* mosquitos in the area (which are claimed to be able to carry the Zika virus) and destroying their breeding grounds, according to Greg Slawson, Senior Vector Ecologist and the County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health (DEH), whose Declaration such Court judge based his/her decision on to issue such unprecedented orders, infringing on such residents' God-given, Natural Law, Common Law, California and U.S. Constitutional and International rights to be secured of their privacy, property and health.

See California Constitution Article 1, Declaration of Rights, section 7(a), which states in part:

“A person may not be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law or denied equal protection of the laws.”

This is further a violation of each affected person’s U.S. Constitutional rights under the Fourth Amendment (right to be secure of person and property), Fifth Amendment (cannot be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law) and the Equal Protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment (no state shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law).

According to the DEH the Zika virus is a very dangerous virus that can be transmitted by such mosquitos that can infect pregnant women and whose newborn children will probably or surely develop microcephaly. This is not supported by historical facts prior to the publicized Brazilian outbreak of circa 2015, not to mention the fact that none of the areas being sprayed throughout the County and DEH testing have produced a single Zika infected mosquito.

The main governmental agency promoting and pushing for billions of dollars in research, the indiscriminate aerial and ground spraying of pesticides to fight Zika carrying mosquitos, and who is working on authorizing a vaccine that will most likely become available in the near future, and maybe even become mandatory for children and adults alike, is the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), whose deceptive practices are well documented, including some of the following:

1. CDC WHISTLEBLOWER WILLIAM THOMPSON REGARDING MMR VACCINE

CDC whistleblower Dr. William Thompson's confessed that a 2004 CDC study he was involved with and chaired proved that the MMR vaccine causes autism and admitted that the involved CDC lead study group destroyed data to try to hide it. See the fraudulent DeStefano et al (2004) MMR-Autism Study.

In the documentary film “VAXXED: From Cover-Up to Catastrophe,” produced by Del Bigtree, one of the CDC’S top scientific researchers, said Dr. William Thompson, admits that the CDC can no longer be trusted, and that he/they/the CDC lied about the MMR study of 2004, which was intended to identify any possible links between the MMR vaccine and autism. Starting approximately at time frames 1:44 through 2:35 Dr. Thompson makes these statements to Dr. Brian Hooker:

*“I’ve waited a long time to tell my story. And I want to tell it truthfully. **I was involved in deceiving millions of taxpayers regarding the potential negative side effects of vaccines. We lied about the scientific findings. The CDC can longer be trusted to do vaccine safety work. Can’t be trusted to be transparent. The CDC can’t be trusted to police itself.**”*

Subsequently, in August of 2014, working with a whistleblower attorney, Dr. Thompson turned over thousands of documents to U.S. Senator Posey of Florida. One of those documents is from Dr. Thompson’s 2004 studies on the MMR vaccine and shows how African American boys were found to be statistically higher at risk for developing autism, therefore proving that vaccines can cause autism in general, with a higher risk for African American children as to the MMR vaccine, something the CDC has always and still denies.

According to the CDC, no vaccines have ever caused autism; but see Tripedia vaccine insert, Exhibit 3, showing it can and does cause autism and many other serious adverse reactions and diseases, including Guillain-Barré syndrome and Sudden Infant Death Syndrome (SIDS). So, if the CDC new about the Autism link at least since 2004, then ***the CDC has been and continues to forcibly hide this truth from us after 12 years***. Again, no apology, no remorse, and only attacks against all that contradicts them.

See official trailer for the movie "Vaxxed: From Cover-Up to Catastrophe" at the following link: <https://vimeo.com/159566038>.

2. SWINE FLU VACCINE CAMPAIGN OF 1976

In circa 1976 the CDC began a national Swine flu vaccine campaign where millions were vaccinated and thousands were injured, some killed, and the head of the CDC at the time, David Judson Sencer, confessed in an interview with a CBS 60-Minutes reporter that (a) there was not even one confirmed case of Swine flu worldwide when the campaign began, (b) that they started making TV and other propaganda saying that many recognized celebrities had taken the shot, like Mary Tyler Moore, who denied taking the shot, and worse, (c) that the vaccine manufacturers did the safety tests on was one vaccine, and the one given was another. The CDC ended up allowing the vaccine manufacturers to produce and distribute a second different vaccine that had no safety studied (if not negative studies) and which was the one given to unsuspecting Americans. See such televised report at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8eIE7Ct1jWw>.

Yet if you visit the CDC webpage Sencer is a hero with his own museum. In a page dedicated to him, this is what is says about the above swine flu:

"The swine flu vaccination program demonstrated the possibility of organizing and managing an immunization program involving procurement, distribution, liability issues, and adverse event surveillance while vaccinating 43 million persons in 2 months (12). Lessons learned by CDC during the 1976 swine flu vaccination program are being used to improve preparedness for pandemic influenza."

After 40 years there is no apology or repentance by the CDC --- This is what they learned from all the injury and deaths they caused: They use it as a model for all the pandemic scares of the last decade. I contend that what was done by the CDC in the 1976 Swine Flu scare is what is now being done with the Zika contrived emergency.

3. TUSKEGEE SYPHILIS EXPERIMENT

The Tuskegee Study of Untreated Syphilis in the Negro Male, also known as the Tuskegee Syphilis Study or Tuskegee Syphilis Experiment was an infamous and purposeful sadistic clinical study conducted between 1932 and 1972 (a **40 year period**) by the U.S. Public Health Service studying the natural progression of untreated syphilis in rural African-American men in Alabama under the guise of receiving free health care from the United States government.

None of the men infected were ever told they had the disease, and none were treated with penicillin even after the antibiotic became proven for the treatment of syphilis. According to the CDC, the men were told they were being treated for "bad blood", a local term for various illnesses that include syphilis, anemia, and fatigue; but the men were never told that they would never be treated -- only studied and sacrificed.

The legal principle of "*Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus*" (false in one thing, false in everything) clearly applies to the circumstances here, and this Court must take judicial notice of these facts as to the truthfulness of the alleged Zika emergency and the DEH's dependence on the CDC to request the illegal spraying of toxic pesticides in certain county area homes without proper notice and without consent, which may include my residence area in the future or other area which we visit and which may affect me and my family personally.

I have legal standing in this matter to submit this complaint and declaration, and request action by this Court.

ZIKA AND MICROCEPHALY

In the alleged outbreak of microcephaly in Brazil there were many such supposed infected child victims that did not have the Zika virus. That is to say, while the Zika virus does exist in that area and may be common, it is not the one causing the microcephaly. Recently, the *New England Journal of Medicine* published the preliminary results of a large study of pregnant Colombian women infected with Zika, Columbia being a neighbor of Brazil with similar terrain, climate and Zika issues. Of the nearly 12,000 pregnant women with clinical symptoms of Zika infections until March 28, no cases of microcephaly were reported as of May 2, 2016. See Exhibit 4, Science Daily report, quoting from a New England Complex Systems Institute study.

A review of the Wikipedia entry for Zika Virus of November 21, 2009 shows that this virus has been identified since 1947 and that the symptoms have been well documented going back to 1964, 52 years ago, and nowhere does it mention any serious effects related to Zika, much less microcephaly. Neither does the CDC nor the DEH explain how such a virus could have morphed to now produce microcephaly, and only in some places but not in others, as in the neighboring Brazil and Colombia areas. Also, the microcephaly is only found in a few certain areas of Brazil, not countrywide, as would be expected. See Exhibit 5, where it states in part the following:

"The first well documented case of Zika virus was in 1964, beginning with a mild headache and progressing to a maculopapular rash, fever, and back pain. Within 2 days, the rash was fading, and within 3 days, the fever was gone and only the rash remained. There is no vaccine or preventive drug for Zika virus, and only treatment of symptoms is possible. Usually non-steroid anti-inflammatories and/or non-salicylic analgesics are used.

The first outbreak of the disease outside of Africa and Asia was in April 2007, on Yap Island of the Federated States of Micronesia. This virus was characterized by rash, conjunctivitis, and arthralgia, and was initially thought to be dengue. The Chikungunya and Ross River viruses were also suspected. However, serum samples from patients in the acute phase of illness contained RNA of Zika virus. The virus was relatively mild, as there were 49 confirmed cases, 59 unconfirmed cases, no deaths and no hospitalizations."

See other internet medical dictionaries and encyclopedias that show the same mild symptoms, with the exemption of entries after 2015. See Exhibit 6.

Yet, if one reviews the most current Wikipedia entry on the Zika virus, it includes microcephaly as a possible injury caused by the Zika virus and it completely changes and exaggerates the supposed symptoms of such virus. A close review of the history of the editing entries in such Wikipedia Zika Virus shows that simply between August 31 and September 8, 2016, there have been over 40 edits to this entry. See Exhibit 7.

PESTICIDES BEING USED TO FIGHT THE ALLEGED ZIKA VIRUS

A review of the Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS/SDS) for the pesticides being used by the DEH show that such products can have serious effects on human life, domestic pets, bees, and the environment as a whole, containing ingredients that are considered probable or suspect human carcinogens. See Exhibit 8.

The DEH did not provide the involved judge the SDS associated with these pesticides and therefore such judge made an uninformed decision as to the safety of such known toxic chemicals.

BASIS FOR ISSUING THE FORCED SPRAYING ORDER

According to the judge issuing the above orders, such order is based on California Code of Civil Procedure sections 1822.50 et seq, and California Health and Safety Code, sections 2040 through 2050.

The **California Code of Civil Procedure** 1822.51, states in part:

*An inspection warrant shall be issued upon cause, unless some other provision of state or **federal law** makes another standard applicable.”*

Section 1822.56 reads in part,

*“An inspection pursuant to this warrant may not be made ... in the absence of an owner or occupant of the particular place, dwelling, structure, premises, or vehicle unless specifically authorized by the judge upon a showing that such authority is **reasonably necessary** to effectuate the purpose of the regulation being enforced.*

*An inspection pursuant to a warrant shall not be made by means of forcible entry, except that the judge may expressly authorize a forcible entry **where facts are shown sufficient to create a reasonable suspicion of a violation of a state or local law or regulation relating to building, fire, safety, plumbing, electrical, health, labor, or zoning, which, if such violation existed, would be an immediate threat to health or safety** ... Where prior consent has been sought and refused, **notice** that a warrant has been issued **must be given at least 24 hours before the warrant is executed, unless the judge finds that immediate execution is reasonably necessary in the circumstances shown.**”*

As to the **California Health and Safety Code**, while the involved judge referenced sections 2040 to 2050, he failed to include section 2053, which states in part:

“(a) A district may request an inspection and abatement warrant pursuant to Title 13 (commencing with Section 1822.50) of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure.”

“(b) **Subject to the limitations of the United States Constitution and the California Constitution**, employees of a district may enter any property...”

The facts about the Zika virus provided above in combination with the codes cited by the involved judge to issue the forced spraying and entry warrants show that:

1. Such judge’s orders for forced spraying and entry are not reasonable in light of the fact that the Zika virus is not a health threat as described by the CDC, which institution cannot be trusted.
2. The facts show that there is no immediate threat to health or safety by the supposed Zika virus; not to mention that no confirmed cases have been found in mosquito populations in our county. IF THERE WAS ACTUALLY A SERIOUS RISK FROM ANYONE CONTRACTING ZIKA LIVING IN OUR COUNTY, IT WOULD MAKE MORE SENSE TO QUARANTINE THAT PERSON, THAN TO SPRAY WHOLE NEIBORHOODS WITH TOXIC CHEMICALS.
3. Based on the above, the issuing judge cannot find that an immediate execution of a warrant is reasonably necessary under the circumstances.
4. California Health and Safety Code 2053 (b) clearly states that such an order for forced spraying and entry cannot be done if it is in violation of the federal and/or California constitutions; and in this case, if residents refuse the spraying and the entry, and the authorities proceed to enter their property and/or detain the homeowner or resident, they are violating that person’s Fourth, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments rights under the U.S. Constitution as noted above, as well as all equivalent California constitutional rights.
5. The above points contradict and proves incorrect the assertions and unfounded findings of fact and conclusions of law noted in the involved judge’s Inspection and Abatement warrant in that,
 - a. Senior Vector Ecologist Greg Slawson has provided false information as to the seriousness of the Zika virus, or is being misled by CDC propaganda that such virus causes microcephaly.
 - b. There is no “prompt action” required by the involved judge or this Court to protect the public health which would justify failure to seek resident consent, as claimed by Mr. Slawson in one of his declarations.

- c. Mr. Slawson states that the California Legislature recognizes that some diseases can be fatal, and notes this as justification for the unwarranted request to forcibly spray residents' homes and property with toxic pesticides against their will, when not even the DEH has claimed that the Zika virus can be fatal, as implied by Mr. Slawson.
- d. There is no public nuisance caused by the Zika virus and any contaminated mosquito that would justify spraying indiscriminately whole areas, without the DEH even considering the health of the existing residents in the area, their medical condition, sensitivity to the pesticides, etc.
- e. The involved judge mandates forced entry, meaning that all residents that want to comply with the involved spraying orders, if they leave their premises, and/or leaves elder disabled adults in the home, must leave all entries unlocked to give access to the sides and backs of the home, without consideration of the crime we continuously see and hear about in our county, break-ins for robbery, rape and murder. This request goes beyond what the circumstances require as a solution to address the issue in general about mosquitos, and places the resident's person and property at risk of vandalism, robbery, rape and other crimes.
- f. The public is intelligent enough to follow any logical, reasonable and well-established advice by County officials regarding what they can do to minimize breeding grounds for mosquitos of any kind.
- g. Mr. Slawson himself admits that some mosquitos in any spray area will likely survive abatement efforts and that the person infected with Zika may travel outside of the buffer zone, making the spraying ineffective, not to mention detrimental to human, animal and environmental health.
- h. Mr. Slawson noted in his Declaration that the pesticides being used were safe, but never specified to what degree, and individually to humans, domesticated animals, bees or the environment, and failed to provide the involved judge material Safety Data Sheets of these pesticides, which contradict Mr. Slawson statements of the safety of such pesticides.
- i. The involved judge's order to enter any premises without 24 hour prior notice even if not one is present, simply because the access is not locked is unconstitutional and uncalled for as noted above.
- j. The involved judge's order stating the DEH personnel may forcibly spray and enter any outdoor area, or may cut or defeat locks or latches and remove or relocate obstacles if necessary to achieve entry is arbitrary and capricious and an

abuse of discretion. Further, such entry is a breach of both the judge's and Mr. Slawson's Oath of Office, which obligates them not to violate any resident's God-given, Natural, Common Law, U.S. and California Constitutional and international rights, as noted above and below.

- k. There have been no declared health emergencies by either any City Mayor or the Governor of California to the effect that forced spraying and entry is required due to the alleged Zika virus threat. Indeed we just saw the Olympics in Brazil for several weeks on television and most everyone was in their typical summer clothing, with no concerns at all about Zika, where if we believe the exaggerations by the CDC and the DEH, we would have seen panic in the streets.

ARGUMENT AGAINST FORCED ENTRY BY DEH

The DEH is taking the position that the CDC is correct in saying that some mosquitos residing in the United States, including the *Aedes aegypti* mosquitos, can transmit the Zika virus to human beings and that in turn, such virus can cause very serious injury to human life, in particular newborns that may develop microcephaly. Yet, this is not supported by the facts as confirmed herein.

The following facts apply in this case:

- (1) The CDC cannot be trusted to protect the health of the American people, as it has a history of misleading the public and working against the public's best interest.
- (2) For over 50 years the Zika virus has been identified as a virus that causes minimal side effects, with no need of hospitalization, no microcephaly and no deaths, such side effects can be easily treated with non-steroid anti-inflammatories, among others.
- (3) The Brazilian cases of microcephaly also happened in children that tested negative for the Zika virus, unequivocally proving that the Zika virus is not the CDC/DEH claimed cause of the microcephaly. Further, other causes have been identified in Brazil as being individually or in combination responsible for the reported microcephaly which happened in unique geographical areas of the country. These other likely or probable causes of the microcephaly include the following:
 - (a) Toxic pesticides, including Roundup and atrazine. Brazil uses more pesticides than any nation in the world, and many of these chemicals are banned in other countries. See Exhibit 9.
 - (b) Toxic vaccines—for example, the Tdap, which was recommended to pregnant women in Brazil in 2014. The MMR vaccine, as well as other vaccines. Look, for example, at aluminum ingredients, which cross the blood-brain barrier and are neurotoxic. See Exhibit 10.
 - (c) Genetically-engineered mosquitoes, released to combat mosquitoes that carried dengue fever. No human health studies were done. See Exhibit 11.

- (d) Chemicals used to fumigate public places.
 - (e) The mosquito-killing insecticide, pyrethrin, which has been dumped in water supplies in those areas. See Exhibit 12.
- (4) In neighboring country Colombia nearly 12,000 pregnant women had the clinical symptoms of Zika infection, yet not a single one resulted in a case of microcephaly.
- (5) As it has done in the past, the CDC is sounding an unnecessary alarm. While it is known that viruses can mutate, there is no reason to believe that the Zika virus somehow mutated itself into a much more dangerous virus as to its impact on the human body, and the CDC has given no evidence to support such new attributed consequences of Zika infection.
- (6) Pesticides being used are known neurotoxic and potential carcinogens. Further, they affect domestic animals, our environment and other benign insect species, like bees, such as was seen in a recent Zika mosquito aerial spraying in South Carolina that killed millions of bees. See Exhibit 13,
- (7) The CDC itself admits that we have had microcephaly cases in the United States for years and that such microcephaly, whose causes are mostly unknown, can be the result of many of the things noted above, individually or in combination. See Exhibit 14, notwithstanding the added misleading paragraph that the CDC now confirms the Zika virus also causes microcephaly.

CAVEAT TO ALL JUDGES OF THIS COURT INVOLVED IN ISSUING ANY ORDERS REGARDING FORCED SPRAYING OF PESTICIDES AND FORCED ENTRY TO ACCOMPLISH THE SAME AS NOTED ABOVE AND TO INVOLVED DEH PERSONNEL, INCLUDING MR. GREG SLAWSON

We the people of the County of San Diego, California hereby give you Constructive and Legal Notice that by supporting ***the illegal pesticide spraying and invasion of property without consent and due process of law*** you are in breach of your Oath of Office. You swore an oath to uphold, defend and support the California and United States Constitutions upon accepting your position in your public office.

We now give you timely Constructive and Legal NOTICE that:

1. This document EFFECTIVE upon receipt, serves notice of malfeasance to any public, executive, legislative or judicial representative of We the People concerning a primary requirement of public office.
2. You are in breach of your Sworn Oath to Support and Defend the Constitutions of the United States and of the state of California.
3. You are breaching your Voluntary Contract and Mandatory Duties to Support and Defend the California and United States Constitutions, by your acts of promoting, enforcing, legislating, or judging anything contrary to the Constitution of the United States "The Supreme Law of the Land;" in this case the forced spraying of toxic

chemicals without consent by residents of such homes, including forced entry and such occupants' arrest if they refuse such entry.

4. Such actions are an Act of **Insurrection**, violating a requirement of public office, immediately suspending all authority granted by the people, punishable by impeachment, recall or **removal. Insurrection is defined as "any" act or instance of...open resistance to established authority.**
5. We the people's unalienable rights are beyond the encroachment of mortal men and cannot be violated by mere acts of government.
6. Your acts are wholly unconstitutional due to their violative cause and effect on the peoples' rights as secured under the Fourth, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and applicable California law.
7. We will defend our God-given, Natural, Common Law, Constitutional and International rights to not be assaulted by all means necessary, including but not limited to the filing of commercial liens against your real property.

Additionally, you are hereby put on Notice that:

"All laws which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void." *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137,174,176.

"The claim and exercise of a Constitutional Right cannot be converted into a crime." *Miller v. Us.*, 230 F, 2d 286,489.

"The mere chilling of a Constitutional right by a penalty on its exercise is patently unconstitutional." *Shapiro v. Thompson*, 394 U.S. 618.

A law that "impinges upon a fundamental right explicitly or implicitly secured by the Constitution is presumptively unconstitutional." *Mobile v. Bolden*, 446 US 55, 76; *Harris v. McRae*, 448 US 297,312.

"A law that improperly infringes on Constitutional Rights is void from its inception and no person can be obligated to obey such a law." 16A ArnJur2d Constitutional Law, Section 203.

"Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule-making or legislation which would abrogate them." *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436.

We the people of California are demanding your immediate resignation from office for your part in this seditious conspiracy and treasonous acts that are obviously in violation of our Natural and Inalienable rights.

Your liability extends beyond any purported 11th Amendment immunity you think you may have against your criminal acts. You and all others who have or are about to aid and abet your actions in supporting this **illegal pesticide spraying and forced entry** could be charged with

conspiracy to commit a Hobbs Act violation including but not limited to Section[s] **2404. Hobbs Act -- Under Color Of Official Right.**

REMEDY AND RELIEF REQUESTED

Therefore and otherwise, I request that this Court, by and through Presiding Judge Jeffrey B. Barton and this Court's Executive Committee of Judges, do the following:

1. Take this complaint and declaration, and applying this Court's discretion and legal obligation that it construe this complaint as a Writ of Mandamus, noting that I am not an attorney nor learned in the law; that this Court see, consider and interpret my complaint liberality and under less stringent requirements, Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972). This Court cannot expect me, appearing without formal legal training, to adhere to formal pleading requirements, Franklin v. Oregon, 662 F.2d 1337, 1374 (9th Cir. 1981). Under these circumstances, procedural requirements do not place upon me, seeking to raise questions of denial of my fundamental, substantive, procedural and constitutional rights, any burden of complying with legal and procedural technicalities, In Re Swain, 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 (1949); substance governing over mere forms and labels, McGarr v. Hayford, 52 F.R.D. 219 (S.D. Cal. 1971).
2. As an alternative (unless a Writ of Mandamus is more appropriate under the circumstances), I request that this Court construe my complaint as an Amicus Curiae Brief/motion/pleading on behalf of the affected parties (see involved spraying warrants court cases at supra) as may be allowed by law. See In re Veterans' Industries, Inc. (1970) 8 Cal.App.3d 902, 924. The case law cited in 1 above applies in this request as well.
3. That this Court, through the issuing judge or magistrate, rescind any and all orders by any judges or magistrates of this Court regarding any mandatory forced pesticide spraying and forced entry on any home, business or property, regarding the alleged potential spread of the Zika virus.
4. That this Court order all judges not to issue any future orders as noted above that may result in property owner or resident's unauthorized spraying of any chemicals in their property.
5. That all residents of the County be given at least 72 hour notice of any planned spraying in their area for possible entry, subject to the required approval of the home owner and/or resident.
6. That this Court order the DEH to stop all pesticide spraying activities related to the Zika virus as pertains to spraying homes without authorization by the home owner and/or resident to spray or enter the property.
7. That this Court order Clerk Roddy to copy this document and all related exhibits and that it provide a copy to each member of this Court's Executive Committee of Judges.

8. That this Court order the DEH to take disciplinary action, up to and including termination, against Greg Slawson, for violation of his Oath of Office to uphold the U.S. and California constitutional rights of all residents, free inhabitants and citizens of the County of San Diego, California.
9. That this Court take disciplinary action against the involved judge noted above and who issued the warrant for forced spraying and entry (Case No. E2016-619 et al), up to and including suspension from the bench, for violation of his/her Oath of Office to uphold the U.S. and California constitutional rights of all residents, free inhabitants and citizens of the County of San Diego, California.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the information provided above is true and correct in its entirety to the best of my knowledge, beliefs and upon information.

Respectfully submitted,

Ricardo Beas
Non-negotiable autograph
All rights reserved

CC Distribution:

- Channel NBC7, San Diego
- CBS News8, San Diego
- Fox5 News, San Diego
- San Diego Union Tribune
- East County Magazine
- Los Angeles Times
- San Diego District Attorney Bonnie Dumanis
- San Diego Sheriff
- San Diego Mayor
- San Diego County Supervisors
- U.S. Senator Juan Vargas
- American Civil Liberties Union, San Diego

Note: Notice is given to all recipients of this complaint, in any form, that the above named authorities are violating without legal justification San Diego County residents' constitutional rights in order to carry out a spraying program against a threat that does not exist. You have an obligation to report and or take action in this matter, to be objective, and not simply point to the CDC's expertise in believing in this Zika fraud and all its implied illegal government actions, present and future. I showed above how the CDC has committed fraud in the past and how it cannot be trusted. Now it is up to you to protect our communities and everyone's health by informing on this actual conspiracy to violate every human being's God-given, Natural, Common Law, U.S. and California Constitutional and International rights.