

To: Administrative Office of the Courts
Assigned Judges Program

1. Please consider that justice might have miscarried in the matter of California versus Hanslip owing to Judge Kopp's unwillingness to recuse himself.

I do not believe Judge Kopp should allow himself to sit in regard to a matter where I might have any involvement owing to his extraordinary disposition of a matter on which I appealed to him in his former capacity as State Senator.

As background, allow me to note that I was once the most highly rated Professor at San Francisco State University's Business School. At one point keeping this position required that I participate with other faculty in outright larceny toward students. I refused to do so, and was summarily dismissed on the basis of stylishly lurid, 'anonymous' charges that no one with the least judicial temperament would countenance.

I brought this matter to then Senator Kopp's attention assuming he would not allow any state agency in his jurisdiction to require unlawful behavior as a condition of employment. Instead the Senator sided with the supposedly anonymous faculty, thus providing the only credibility ever to be associated with these transparently absurd charges.

The charges thereby became credible enough to launch a pointless FBI investigation, were later introduced against me in an unrelated tort (which I nonetheless won) and were ultimately the ruin of an academic career I was briefly able to restart at the University of San Francisco. The FBI Special Agent involved with this case was Kathleen Puckett; the Attorney who introduced the 'evidence' in San Francisco Municipal Court was Walter Davis.

This was my first interaction of any kind with the police; and California versus Hanslip has provided the second. Quentin Kopp was in charge both times; and I cannot consider this to be a coincidence.

Please find attached a copy of the earlier charges as they were provided to me for comment by a reporter for the San Francisco Examiner (in whose story I refused cooperation). The reporter's name was Norman Melnick. Also attached are two fairly recent letters by which Judge Kopp should have been reminded of his earlier interactions with me.

2. I can only make sense of my prolonged inability to dissociate myself as a witness in the Hanslip case on the premise of Judge Kopp's willingness to abuse his direct police powers for the purpose of petty harassments having nothing to do with the case that was before him, and no possible motive beyond justifying his earlier participation in having me removed from the State University.

My involvement in the Hanslip matter owes to nothing more than a Pacifica, CA, police recruit's having made a mistake in transcribing witness statements from the night of Hanslip's arrest. An Officer Klier reported that I had made a 911 call that evening; but the call was actually made by a neighbor.

Though I promptly corrected this record with the District Attorneys and the Police (by phone and in writing, naming the actual witness on each occasion) the court continued over a period of two months in its insistence that I "not evade responsibility" for having made the 911 call, and did so until the late evening before the trial actually commenced.

In fact, neither I nor the actual witness participated in the trial. The actual witness was never even subpoenaed, the 911 call might or might not have been made in regard to Hanslip, and the call's subject had nothing to do with the 'crime' of which Hanslip was convicted.

As memorialized in my attached letter to San Mateo County District Attorney Fox, I was nonetheless subpoenaed twice to appear in this matter. The subpoenas were themselves ambiguous, and their service appears to have strategically withheld so as to make it impossible to decipher when, where, or for what purpose I was to appear; and to allow no avenues for clarification.

His Honor apparently attempted to have me arrested for non-appearance at trial on a date from which the trial was in fact continued, this despite Deputy District Attorney Ivan Nightingale's having excused me from attending. At one point, the Judge seems to have identified me to the Pacifica Police Department as the defendant, which news was duly broadcast to my neighbors.

My attempts to resolve these matters with the district attorneys and the police has essentially come down to 'tell it to the Judge' – a civil servant whose identity I was unable to establish until just hours before the trial.

3. I believe Judge Kopp demonstrates bias in favor of conviction in cases wherein the nature of charges offers an intrinsic glamour to the media, and thereby provides some promise of His Honor's achieving further personal prominence as a champion against whatever the public has most recently been incited to fear.

My prior interactions with then-Senator Kopp would be one case in point. And the case in question here was a complaint for domestic violence in which (I am told by defendant Hanslip) the complainant herself did not wish to proceed, and in fact testified for the defense.

I further understand that the essence of the offense then became one of Hanslip's having run from the police at the time of his arrest. I believe his honor knew *before the trial* that the policeman who was to testify as to this behavior was actually engaged in conversation before me at the time of Hanslip's arrest, and therefore could not have seen what actually happened.

These matters are set out in the attached chronology created from contemporaneous notes and recollections of my extensive encounter with Judge Kopp's court. That chronology culminates in a bizarre phone conversation in which Deputy District Attorney Paul Jhin seems to have been acting as some sort of special prosecutor for Judge Kopp – whose identity as the trial judge I only learned at that time.

Though Jhin clearly did not have his heart in whatever his mission was, he was nonetheless presuming to summon me, on no stated authority and with less than twelve hours notice, into some sort of special session in which Judge Kopp and I were to revisit the 911 call yet again, to what potential legal peril I was not informed.

Whatever this conversation might have been about, I made it perfectly clear to the court 1) that a policeman later identified to me as Officer Klier was talking to a witness at a point remote from Hanslip's arrest as the arrest was made; 2) that my prior and current history with Judge Kopp should preclude our being part of any trial together; and 3) that I expected Hanslip's attorney to be given proper notice of these particulars.

Jhin agreed, and informed me on behalf of the court that my attendance was no longer required.

I am told by Hanslip's attorney, Kathleen McCCasey, that Judge Kopp did not inform her as to what I might have offered in her client's defense; nor of His Honor's past and recently revived interactions with me; nor why, after such extraordinary punctilio with respect to his earlier subpoenas, His Honor would have suddenly concluded upon the irrelevance of my (or the actual witness's) input to this case just hours before trial.