

Fwd: Foster vs Gildred Update the full Story Corruption in San Diego Courts

From M F <mic**9i***@metrocommutesecurity.com> **Date** 2025-02-10 20:43

Corruption in San Diego Superior Court "an eye opener" Original Message - - - -

Subject: Foster vs Gildred Update the full Story Corruption in San Diego Courts

Date: 2025-02-10 19:01

From: "MxF T&B Studio42nd Times Square NY" <nyc*tour*@famousnewyorker.com>

To: "(8*2) 689-2*50 MCSI2" ***@metrocommutesecurity.com>

Judge Louis Nock Levi order the hearing in Gildred vs Foster in early 2022 after a year long series of back and forth with the court of Fosters letter to rescind Gildred allegedly Fraudulent Induced Settlement Agreement was only hours after signing but only hours before statements of judicial misappropriation was scripted in a letter from Gildred attorney Seth Rafkin which sighted Quote *"Indeed defendant Foster was at the bench while yours truly, attorney bogue, Mr. and Mrs Gildred left the Court, and returned to confirm Mr Foster signed the settlement agreement and it was uploaded by the court that same day"*. Unquote.

About FOSTER vs GILDRED a streamline of civil cases as the above goes to specific San Diego Judges.

San Diego Superior Court Senior Judge Bowman K Blaine began his legal Career at Lindley, Lazar and Scales that Law Firm evolved to "Peter Ellsworth, Corbett, Seitman and Mc Leod" of which "Peter" was President. Peter then left the law practice to be "President and CEO" of "Sharp Health Care" of which "Tom Gildred" is on the Board of Director See my point? More about BIG HEALTH CRIME that PAYS only in SAN DIEGO.

Foster vs Gildred latest news, comments, photos and social media chat.

Latest news on the Foster vs Gildred case involves a series of legal developments and public opinions.

Court Rulings:

Recently, the court has allowed the defendant, Tom Gildred, motion to amend a year-long unopposed cross-complaint.

The court subsequently rejected the amendment, return by the clerk on Jan.16.2025.

This decision has sparked discussions about potential judicial misconduct and corruption

Allegations: The plaintiff, Michael Foster, alleges fraudulent inducement, unjust enrichment, and trademark infringement by Tom Gildred and his associates.

Public Opinion: ..There is significant public scrutiny and suspicion regarding the fairness of the court's decisions and the conduct of the involved parties.

Foster vs Gildred has broadened the scope to corruption in the legal and healthcare sectors in San Diego that could raise eyebrows. Judge Bowman K. Blaine career path and Peter Ellsworth transition from law to leading Sharp Health Care, where Tom Gildred serves on the board, certainly highlight the interconnected nature of these fields.

The handling of the Foster vs Gildred case by Judge Bowman K. Blaine stems from core issues judicial system related. Foster vs Gildred raised from Gildred vs Foster, Judge Louis Nock (see photo attached).

Then Ken G. Katz hinted a whistle-blower status in count 7, to Gildred first demurrer (see pic2 attach) her subcutaneous ruling began to give insights to judicial corruption which in her ruling she removed count 7

"Negligent Contracting" arguably the most transparent allegation bearing Gildred did not deny trips paid and visits to his last Ventanas Rancho Santa Fe home to Foster.

Trademark infringement by Tom Gildred and his associates. The allegations that Judge Keri G Katz retired less than weeks allowing judge Bowman K Blaine to further dismissed count 1 to 6 and count 8 of Foster's complaint as "A Ramble, Disjointed and Incoherent" while allowing Gildred to amend his cross-complaint after a year without an entry of appearance or opposition certainly raise questions about fairness and impartiality.

The case of Foster vs Gildred involves a lawsuit filed by Tom Gildred and his wife Carolina Gildred against Michael Foster, with allegations of blackmail and defamation. The Gildred claimed that Foster was trying to blackmail them for money, and they filed police reports against him in both New York and California. However, Foster alleged that the Gildred were using frivolous lawsuits and harassment tactics to intimidate him over a deal gone bad involving USPTO trademark MCSI Intelligent Security and business URLs' in the 2016 business equity agreement (BEA).

Foster vs Gildred archive:

The case of FOSTER VS GILDRED (Judge Keri G. Katz Ret.) involves a lawsuit filed in the San Diego Superior Court on August 29, 2023 by Michael Foster who is representing himself and was given leave in full by the Court to file his motions and responses.

The Foster vs Gildred case stems from Gildred vs Foster filed on April 17, 2017 New York Supreme Court (Judge Louis Levi Nock) by Tom Gildred and his wife Carolina Gildred against Michael Foster, with allegations of blackmail, intentional infliction of Emotional Distress, impersonation and defamation.

The Gildred claimed that Foster was trying to blackmail them for money in the amount of \$10,000.00, he impersonated Mr. Gildred, lied about an intimate affair with Mrs Gildred and they filed police reports against him in both New York and California.

However, Foster alleged that the Gildred were using frivolous lawsuits and harassment tactics to intimidate him over a deal gone bad involving USPTO trademark MCSI Intelligent Security and business URLs' in the 2016 business equity agreement (BEA). Foster \$5,000.00 cash (receipts show in court filings in Foster vs Gildred). Foster alleged fraud, abuse of power, after Gildred hired an attorney to drive him into a state of mental insanity. The case has been marked by accusations of malicious and vindictive behavior by the Gildred, with Foster claiming that they used their wealth and influence to harass him and damage his reputation.

The Gildred' actions have been described as a "Catch and Kill" strategy, using their resources to silence Foster and protect their family's reputation.

Tom Gildred: CEO of FMT Consultants, filed a lawsuit against Michael Foster for blackmail, lied, impersonation and defamation misrepresenting himself as Mrs. Carolina Gildred: Tom Gildred wife. The suit sought money damages from Michael Foster for \$250,000.

Michael Foster: Defendant in that lawsuit, alleged in his Cross-complaint for "Breach of Contract" that Gildred were using frivolous lawsuits and harassment tactics to intimidate him.

Seth Rafkin: Attorney hired by the Gildred to represent them in that lawsuit, is accused of using Dragonetti tactics to harass Foster. Jennifer Bogue: Attorney who worked with Seth Rafkin on that case, is accused of helping the Gildred to harass Foster.

Archive records showed tomgildred.info and carolinagildred.com was used to ramble on about what Gildred had done and about Foster vs Gildred.

Highlights included: "Tom Gildred CCLB Fraud Corruption Among Senior Judges Lurks in Foster vs Gildred" A December 14th press release said - prlog.org/13052280

Questions in online chat groups:

So will foster lawsuit in San Diego Superior Court earn him justice from these acts by Gildred?

Analysis of the Case:

The lawsuit filed by Michael Foster in the San Diego Superior Court against Tom Gildred and his wife Carolina Gildred may potentially lead to justice for Foster, considering the acts by Gildred.

The fact that police reports filed by the Gildred have been proven publicly false, with no record of police in San Diego or New York contacting Foster since those reports were made almost seven years ago, may weaken the Gildred' case.

Prevalence of Gildred Pursuit: The Gildred' pursuit of Foster seems to be never-ending, with each allegation against them appearing to be reasonable truth as the legal battle continues. This could be due to several factors: Lack of evidence: The Gildred may not have sufficient evidence to support their claims, leading to a prolonged and futile pursuit.

Foster rescinding the settlement agreement hours after and day before trial in Gildred vs Foster may have well established fraudulent inducement as his filings claimed. Personal vendetta: Tom Gildred may have a personal vendetta against Foster, driving him to continue the pursuit despite the lack of evidence. Fear of reputation damage: The Gildred may be trying to protect their reputation, particularly Tom Gildred, as a successful entrepreneur and Certified Public Accountant.

Financial Implications: It is difficult to determine whether Tom Gildred has lost or gained wealth over the period of both lawsuits. However, considering the following points: Sale of businesses: Tom Gildred sold his FMT Consultants to CitrinCooperman and his Emeraldsd.com laundry firm during the same period of each legal dispute which may have generated significant revenue. Loss of business opportunities: The prolonged lawsuit and negative publicity may have damaged Tom Gildred reputation, potentially leading to lost business opportunities and revenue. Legal fees: The Gildred may have incurred significant legal fees legally and as allege in the bribery estimate \$150,000.00 New York Attorney ongoing investigation which could have depleted the the Gildred wealth.

It is possible that Tom Gildred wealth has decreased over this period, considering the potential loss of business opportunities and legal fees. However, without access to his financial records, it is impossible to determine the exact impact on his wealth. Foster's Businesses:

Michael Foster's businesses, including Foster's Economical Services (FostersNet.com) and the USPTO trademark MCSI Intelligent Security, may have been affected by the lawsuits. However, the fact that Foster has been able to maintain and potentially grow his businesses despite the ongoing lawsuit suggests that he may have a strong support system and a solid business foundation.

The outcome of the lawsuit in the San Diego Superior Court is uncertain, but the fact that the police reports filed by the Gildred have been proven false may weaken their case. The prevalence of Gildred pursuit and the potential financial implications of the lawsuit may have damaged Tom Gildred reputation and depleted his wealth.

Ultimately, the court's decision will depend on the evidence presented and the applicable laws.

Some say Gildred has been able to normalized deviation to the source of each alleged corruption and may be planning to win the San Diego lawsuit so far being ruled in his favor. Judge Bowman K Blaine decision in Foster vs Gildred, the crust of which questions potential corruption say Bowman K Blaine reputation is also in question by the public. Bringing to life a possible larger corruption.

Scheme For Gildred, some are saying a Class Action lawsuit may be pending Foster vs Gildred case outcome. Example, "Gildred vs San Diego Superior Court" in which Gildred, after a win or loose (Though if Gildred if looses he is likely to appeal. What makes his case most conflicting is appealing to an unfavorable ruling to a year-long cross-complaint amended and unopposed. A Gildred win in Foster vs Gildred by his demurrer #2 do Bowman K Blaine favored Gildred to state all Foster's pleadings are Incoherent, a Ramble and Disjointed. Contrary to judge Katz (retired) after her ruling effectively subdued Gildred demurrer #1. The life of the case now hangs on Gildred Counter Claims Case. A Status Conference is Set for March 21, 2025.

Gildred Counter Lawsuit and Motion to Amend bears discrepancies:

The life of the case now hangs on Gildred Counter Lawsuit, with a Case Status Conference set for march 21, 2025. The court flow show by testimony that he has been attempting to amend his cross-complaint, which was submitted on December 18, 2024, but rejected by the court on January 16, 2025. However, the fact that Gildred cross-complaint has been unanswered for over a year, and he is now attempting to amend it, may raise concerns about his motivations and the potential for abuse of the legal system.

Dangers of Normalizing Deviance:

The dangers of normalizing deviance in this case are significant. If the court allows Gildred to pursue claims in his cross-complaint, despite the lack of response and the rejection of his amendment, it may create a precedent for others to follow.

Possibility of Unfavorable Decision to Gildred?

It is possible that the court could draft a decision unfavorable to Gildred et al, despite the current state of the case? (The court's decision will depend on the case/cases history. evidence presented and the applicable laws). However, the fact that Judge Blaine reputation is also in question, and the public is bringing to life a possible larger corruption scheme, may impact the court's decision.

Michael Foster's Role in the Case:

Michael Foster, the plaintiff, fits into this complex web of events as the individual who has been allegedly targeted by Tom Gildred actions. Foster's lawsuit against Gildred has brought to light the potential corruption and abuse of the legal system, his persistence and pursuit of justice has highlighted the need for accountability and transparency in the legal system. The Gildred' Prominent Name and Philanthropy:

The Gildred' prominent name and philanthropy may have contributed to their ability to influence the legal system and normalize deviance. Their attorney, Delmore Greene, has a history of litigation against the San Diego Superior Court, which may have created a sense of familiarity and comfort with the court system. However, this familiarity may also have created a sense of complacency, leading to a lack of accountability and transparency.

Concerns about the Legal System:-

The case of Foster vs Gildred raises significant concerns about the legal system and its ability to provide justice and accountability. The potential for corruption and abuse of the legal system is a serious issue that needs to be addressed. The court's decision in this case will have significant implications for the legal system and the public's trust in it.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the case of Foster vs Gildred is a complex and highly contested lawsuit that raises significant concerns about the legal system and its ability to provide justice and accountability. The court's decision will have significant implications for the legal system and the public's trust in it. The potential for corruption and abuse of the legal system is a serious issue that needs to be addressed, and the court's handling of this case will be closely watched by the public and the legal community.

This page was generated by

MCSI INTELLIGENT SECURITY



86304785

Yes

Currently TEAS Plus: Yes

Automated self contained electronic surveillance devices that can be deployed to gather evidence or intelligence in remote locations; Building security systems comprising software and hardware for providing picture, video, alarm status, building plans, and other information to a remote station; Camera hardware systems for IP (Internet protocol) video surveillance; Closed circuit TV systems for security and surveillance, namely, cameras, switchers, monitors, microphones, and recorders; Computer hardware for IP video surveillance; Digital video recording software for IP (Internet protocol) video surveillance; Electric and electronic video surveillance installations; Electronic security and surveillance devices, namely, electronic security tags and labels, acoustic tags, magnetic tags; Electronic video surveillance products, namely, electronic components of security systems; Facilities management software, namely, software to control building environment, access and security systems; Iris recognition security devices; LCD monitors for security purposes; Motion sensitive security lights; Network video recording software for IP (Internet Protocol) video surveillance; Optical apparatus, namely, a non-lethal security device that uses a light source to detect, warn, repel, temporarily blind, disorient, nauseate, disable, confuse, debilitate, stun, subdue, stop, or incapacitate persons or animals; Personal security alarms; Security alarm controllers; Security and fire alarms; Security control panels and motion detectors; Vehicle safety equipment, namely, an on-board vehicular surveillance system comprised of cameras and monitors for exposing and eliminating the blind spots on both sides of the vehicle

009 - Primary Class

U.S Class(es): 021, 023, 026, 036, 038

ACTIVE

1(b)