

**Any Judge Who Dismisses these Cases Should Bury His or Her Head in Shame!**

**JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION**

Judge

An official of the judicial branch of government with authority to decide lawsuits and preside over trials brought before the court. The term “judge” may also refer to all judicial officers, including Supreme Court justices. An applicant for appointment as a judge must have been admitted to practice law in California for at least 10 years.

\*\*\*\*\*

**NON-JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION**

**Executive Officer/Clerk**

The Executive Officer/Clerk is responsible for the administrative supervision and control of all non-judicial activities of the Court. The Executive Officer/Clerk also serves as jury commissioner of the court. Court judges select the Executive Officer/Clerk. The Executive Officer/Clerk, under the direction of the Presiding Judge, supervises all administrative activities and personnel, coordinates all staff activities and has charge of planning and improving management methods.

The clerk can review and enter defaults and default judgments in simple cases. The Court may make an order dismissing the case and/or imposing sanctions.

Los Angeles Superior Court Cases [895188](#), [BC385899](#), “Theft by Court”, the Demurrer to Los Angeles Superior Court case [10K18049](#), the [proposed judgment order](#), are not simple cases or issues for any court clerk to render a court decision.

(Los Angeles Superior Court Cases [895188](#), [BC385899](#), “Theft by Court”, the Demurrer to Los Angeles Superior Court case [10K18049](#), the [proposed judgment order](#)). Considering the serious nature, blatant disregard for the rule of law, the [U.S. Constitution](#), the [California Constitution](#), etc., any judge of court of record who attempts to dismiss any one of these cases should bury his head in [shame!](#) Thus far not a single judge of court of record has affixed his or her signature to any valid court document to dismiss either of these cases.

Furthermore regarding Los Angeles Superior Court Case [10K18049](#) , Demurrer to [10K18049](#), [the proposed judgment order](#), neither a [court clerk](#) nor any judge of the court have the lawful right to disparage or deny mandated Constitutional protections, property rights, the rule of law, by entering a default judgment against the only party to the case who appeared in court for the scheduled [January 27, 2011](#) date of the hearing before [Judge Stephen Kleifield](#).

\*\*\*\*\*

## What Happens If The Plaintiff Does Not Show Up For Trial Or Does Not Want To Pursue The Case?

The Court may make an order dismissing the case and/or imposing sanctions.

\*\*\*\*\*

*The only party to appear, regarding Los Angeles Superior Court Case 10K18049 and the Demurrer to 10K18049 on [January 27, 2011](#), is the Defendant, Michael L. Lofton. Based upon this fact, court procedures, and the California Constitution:*

(1) Having been the only party to appear on [January 27, 2011 in department 77](#) of [Los Angeles Stanley Mosk Superior Court](#) of California for the County of Los Angeles where you are the judge of court of record in **Limited Liability Case #[10K18049](#)**: HSBC Bank N.A. vs. Lofton,

(2) Having presented a [\(proposed\) Judgment and Order](#) in **Limited Liability Case #[10K18049](#)**: HSBC Bank N.A. vs. Lofton dated January 27, 2011,

(3) Having proven without doubt of any kind or type that (political) representation requiring execution/enforcement of the constitution and laws, specifically [AMENDMENT 14, US Constitution](#) is non-existent at the [local](#), [county](#), state, and [federal levels of elected representation](#). (Los Angeles Superior Court Cases [895188](#), [BC385899](#), "Theft by Court", the Demurrer to Los Angeles Superior Court case 10K18049, and [the proposed judgment order](#). Considering the serious nature, [blatant disregard for the rule of law, the U.S. Constitution, the California Constitution, etc.](#), any judge of court of record who attempts to dismiss any one of these cases should bury his or her head in endless shame! Thus far not single judge of court of record has affixed his or her signature to any valid court document to dismiss either of these cases.

(4) Having paid the above-entitled court the required three hundred seventy dollars (\$370).

[California Constitution, Article VI, Section 19](#): The Legislature shall prescribe compensation for judges of courts of record.

*A judge of a court of record may not receive the salary for the judicial office held by the judge while any cause before the judge remains pending and undetermined for 90 days after it has been submitted for decision.*

The judge of court of record, [Judge Stephen Kleifield](#), is under oath and mandated by law pursuant to [ARTICLE VI, §19](#), to render a court decision within 90 days from January 27, 2011. As of April 26, 2011, [Judge Stephen Kleifield](#), pursuant to [ARTICLE VI, §19, CC](#), must render a formal court decision for **Limited Liability Case** #10K18049: HSBC Bank N.A. vs. Lofton.

Sincerely,

[Michael L. Lofton](#)

([Hypertext](#) is [linked](#) to [testimony](#), correspondence, [court cases](#), and other supportive evidence.)