

1. At my December 2019 hearing, I had an expert forensic examiner in attendance, and "judge" Kyle refused to allow him to inspect the "note" that Kevin Dobie presented as original.
2. Anyone can print off a copy from image files, in fact, they used to present a copy with no "indorsement". But when the "assignment" was easily attacked as invalid, they shifted gears and emphasized the note, which certain laws allow them to try to collect on, as long as it has an indorsement. Suddenly, the Jess Almanza rubberstamp signature appeared.
3. In a WA state case this year, Jess declared that he had in fact NEVER indorsed a note, and that this rubberstamp was used without his authorization, making the indorsements invalid.
4. I inspected a copy of the note Kevin Dobie presented in the summer of 2018. Many issues:
  - a. My closing documents were all legal size, 8 1/2 x 14...this copy was just letter size (8 1/2 x 11).
  - b. This copy was bright white, crisp, new appearing paper, very different from my 13-year-old documents.
  - c. There were NO signature pressure indentations on the back of the paper, as there were on my other documents.
  - d. The odd, strange blue ink in just my signature resembled no ink from a pen I've ever seen, indicative of an autopen forgery [New Autopen Signatures - The Autopen Company \(damilic.com\)](http://NewAutopenSignatures-TheAutopenCompany(damilic.com)).
  - e. My ex's supposed signature was dark black. We shared a pen when we signed instruments together in March 2005.
5. MN 336.9-203 requires proof of acquisition for value, (wire confirm, cancelled check etc.) and an authenticated security agreement. These criminals refuse to provide such required proof-invalidating their false claims.
6. The Pooling and Servicing Agreement/Trust Indenture in section 2.01 at [sec.gov](http://sec.gov) requires that all indorsements be on the "note", and all "assignments" be recorded in the land records.
7. If a "note" and "Mortgage" were properly conveyed to the REMIC trust-there would be three assignments recorded in the land records ...and the note would have three indorsements, the last being by the named depositor, Long Beach Securities.
8. A lone indorsement, even if it was not a fraudulent rubberstamp, is proof that the instruments were NOT conveyed to the trust, meaning the trust could have no valid ownership claim.
9. And the SEC shows that this particular trust closed on 8/30/05, was terminated at the SEC on 1/6/06...and the document to follow shows that the claimed trustee declared on 10/11/07 on a government form that the "trust" is not a trust-more proof it could not have an ownership claim or be a real plaintiff in a lawsuit.