

TABLE OF CONTENTS 3-12

3. Because I was constantly exposing the guardianship fraud on my Mother since May 2021, in June 2023, weilheimer broke the law. She claimed she had the county IT person, Olivieri, ONLY block my email to her office based on her lies about what I was doing. She lied. Wilheimer's husband is chief legal counsel for the Philadelphia Inquirer for many years. He kills all stories that deal with corruption in Montgomery County Orphans Court.
4. Weilheimer LIED! Olivieri emailed weilheimer's legal assistant, Copestick, and me saying he did what weilheimer told him to do and blocked my email address to ALL county departments, including the DA, commissioners, sheriff, etc, just to harass me and block my attempts to help my Mother. Olivieri was not supposed to have sent me that email.
5. Many, many times I protested in front of the courthouse exposing the guardianship scam on my Mother.
6. My former lawyer had filed an appeal on a legal matter involving Mother and he pointed out many deliberate mistakes by weilheimer to protect the mafia, including her obvious hate of me for exposing the mafia. Read each paragraph.
7. In mid 2024, democrat governor Shapiro nominated weilheimer to be a judge in a U.S. District Court. Weilheimer is close friends with the wife of Shapiro.
8. I contacted many important people to help me get my Mother back home, out of the corrupt guardianship and prosecute those people. None of them did anything. Those contacted included FBI, state politicians, DA of Montgomery County Steele, county commissioners, county and state agencies that deal with the elderly. None of them wanted to get involved to help my Mother and the many other families whose loved ones were victims of guardianship corruption of Orphans Court.
9. I contacted FBI Agent Pacchioli in the Ft. Washington FBI office within a month Mother was kidnapped. Despite 2, 2 hour meetings with him and gave him many documents that proved Mother was a victim of guardianship fraud, Pacchioli claimed it was a civil matter, not criminal. BS! Look at the article about how the Philadelphia FBI office, IRS and chester county DA prosecuted guardian Gloria Byers for stealing over \$1 million from her 105 elderly "clients". Shallcross worked in the state attorney general's office for the elderly. The AG office also refused to get involved in Mother's case and many, many other families whose loved ones were victims of guardianship fraud.
10. I got tired of FBI Pacchioli refusing to do his job, so I taped my sign to their door telling them to investigate and prosecute. Pacchioli did not like that. See #11.
11. Pacchioli then sent me a threat that if I taped another sign on the door of the FBI, he would arrest me for trespassing. He thinks I should be arrested for caring about my Mother? WTF? Does he know the Philadelphia FBI office DOES consider guardianship fraud a crime?
12. In 2023, I filed complaints against Fenstermacher and Jaskowiak with the lawyer disciplinary board to be disbarred for corruption. I submitted over 200 documents to the board proving both lawyers were engaging in many criminal acts and violating both federal and state laws, including those laws for guardianship and the Rules of Conduct for lawyers. They replied

they did not think those 2 lawyers did anything wrong. Would the disciplinary board want Fenstermacher and Jaskowiak to be in charge of their Mother or Father?

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

3,

PRESIDENT JUDGE
CAROLYN TORNETTA CARLUCCIO
ASSOCIATE JUDGES
WILLIAM R. CARPENTER
THOMAS M. DELRICCI
THOMAS C. BRANCA
STEVEN T. O'NEILL
THOMAS P. ROGERS
GARRETT D. PAGE
KELLY C. WALL
WENDY DEMCIIICK-ALLOY
PATRICIA E. COONAHAN
LOIS EISNER MURPHY
RICHARD P. HAAZ
GAIL A. WEILHEIMER
STEVEN C. TOLLIVER, SR.
DANIEL J. CLIFFORD
RISA VETRI FFRMAN
TODD D. EISENBERG
JEFFREY S. SALTZ
WENDY G. ROTHSTEIN
HENRY S. HILLES, III
VIRGIL B. WALKER
MELISSA S. STERLING
A. NICOLE TATE-PHILLIPS



MONTGOMERY COUNTY
THIRTY-EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
NORRISTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA
19404

SENIOR JUDGES
JOSEPH A. SMYTH
BERNARD A. MOORE
CHERYL L. AUSTIN

June 22, 2023

VIA EMAIL &
FIRST CLASS MAIL

Mr. Arthur Hetting
26 Chancery Court
Souderton, PA 18964

RE: Jane Herring
Orphans Court #2021-X2110

Dear Mr. Herring:

I have mentioned to you numerous times during court proceedings, in correspondence and in Orders that the Court will not proceed with litigation by correspondence, and directed that you must file a petition, if you want the Court to take action. Despite this repeated directive, you have not filed any petitions requesting court action. You instead repeatedly send my assistant emails. As the number of emails and the demands of your emails has become harassing, you are prohibited from contacting the Court via email. As of today, the County IT department will be blocking delivery of your emails to any member of my staff. Nothing precludes you from filing a petition with Orphans' Court if you are requesting action by the Court.

Sincerely,

Gail Weilheimer

GW/kmc

cc: David Jaskowiak, Esquire
Thad Gelsinger, Esquire
Brittany Camp, Esquire
Ronald Fenstermacher, Jr., Esquire

4.

Copestick, Karen

Thu, Jun 22 • 11:32

Olivieri, Anthony

Anthony.Olivieri@montgomerycountypa.gov
to: tomlinher1925@tutanota.com + 5 ▾

Thu, Jun 22, 2023 • 11:36

RE: Jane T. Herring; No. 2021-X2110

Thank you Karen.

Please note that tomlinher1925@tutanota.com has been blocked from sending email to anyone at the County. Please let me know if you need anything more.

Be well.



Anthony Olivieri


Chief Information Officer
Information and Technology

P: (610) 278-5200

www.montgomerycountypa.gov

5.

BRING MY
MOM HOME
SHE IS NOT YOUR
BANK ACCOUNT
JUDGE WEINSTEIN



Concise statement of matters complained on appeal for eviction & contempt
decided by order on 10/7/22
1/8/23


6.

in his Petitions for Contempt and Eviction which error led to an error of process and procedures that resulted in unfavorable decisions on both the Contempt and Eviction issues. The law applied by the Court in denying calling counsel as a witness on his own Petitions without sufficient explanation violated his own client's (Jane Herring's) constitutional rights and the constitutional rights of the Appellant as well. Such exclusion of information as requested in the Pre Hearing Motion and at trial were both improper exclusions of evidence. The Appellant is unable to readily discern the basis for the judge's decision as to why such evidence was denied and/or not permitted at trial of both the Contempt and the Eviction.

3. On May 11, 2022 the Court at page 5 in the Notes of Testimony limited the hearing to a review hearing at page 5. The Court would not allow Appellant to call Mr. Logie the first Guardian to testify as to anything calling any testimony from Mr. Logie as not relevant even though he had filed a response to Appellant's Supplemental Petition For Review. Mr. Logie was present in the Courtroom but was not permitted to testify. Such exclusion was an improper exclusion of evidence. The Court determined that since he was resigning his testimony was not relevant. The Appellant is unable to readily discern the basis for the judge's decision as to why such evidence was denied and/or not permitted at trial of both the Contempt and the Eviction.

→ 4. It was error for the Court to determine in advance of hearing the evidence at page 10 of the May 11, 2022 Transcript that "As for the request to return to her home, for the same reasons I have just stated, I will not consider returning Jane to her home if Arthur is living there". This statement, repeated many times by the Court, was prejudicial and in error in that despite Dr. Ledakis's first report statement to the effect that Jane could live home in her residence with her son to assist her and without any hearing in Court as to the reasons Mr. Logie the first guardian removed Jane from her home, the Court prejudged Appellant's Petition for Review Hearing and dismissed the idea of returning Jane to live at home despite the Court's own expert, Dr. Ledakis, statements in his report. Such prejudgment in advance of the hearing was in error as to process and procedure and as such resulted in an unfavorable decision.

5. The Court erred in finding that the email notice from Guardian Logie dated August 25, 2021 and Appellant's response to that same email somehow constituted legal notice to vacate his mother's residence where Appellant had been living for some period of time at his mother's request and approval. Email notice to vacate a property is not legal notice under Pennsylvania Law and recognition of such notice as a basis to evict someone from their mother's residence against her wishes violates

 process who Pamela Blumer was, does not act inappropriately but at the same time on page 80 overruling Appellant counsel's objection to any reference to the second Dr. Lekakis report in her testimony. Later on page 83 Pamela Blumer contracts herself in that she states dementia patients need routine, familiarity and consistency, but, yet thinks it is better to keep Jane Herring in a lock down facility not with her son and not at home which it seems only logical that Jane would be more familiar with her home, as opposed to a one room nursing home without family and friends, her normal and routine hairdresser appointments and doctor's appointment and better off with strangers, limited access and visits with her family, no telephone, no fresh air, no walks nor exercise and basically in a prison of sorts because it is a lockdown area. On Page 91 of the October 3, 2022 hearing Pamela Blumer states Jane is not on any psychotic drugs but failed to understand that mirtazapine is an approved treatment for major depressive disorders. If Jane is so well adjusted and happy at Manatawny Manor, why is she on mirtazapine. Another reason why the Court denying access to Jane's medical records was an error. The Appellant is unable to readily discern the basis for the judge's decision to keep Jane at Manatawny Manor after contradictory and ambiguous testimony from Pamela Blumer.

20. The Court erred in overruling Appellant counsel's objection at page 84 of the October 3, 2022 hearing transcript when testimony was allowed about unnamed persons who were asked to help with Jane Herring by the Guardian of the Person but allegedly refused because of Appellant's online presence. The Appellant is unable to readily discern the basis for the judge's decision to overrule the objection.

21. The Court erred in failing to consider the testimony of Pamela Blumer at pages 83, 84, and 85 of the October 3, 2022 hearing that Jane Herring is in the lowest level of care, not needing much care at all but that such care had to be at Manatawny Manor in a dementia unit as opposed to home or another facility with less restrictive living conditions which is a mistake of the law which favors least restrictive environment for such persons as Jane. The Appellant is unable to readily discern the basis for the judge's decision not to allow Jane to come home and/or come home and live with her son which is her written express desire in the letter to the Court.

22. The Court erred at page 92 and 95 of the October 3, 2022 hearing when it refused to allow questions about medical issues as it does relate to Jane Herring's needs and appropriate placement at home versus Manatawny Manor while Jane is "exit-seeking" and apparently depressed to the point she is on major depression drugs, which Jane was not on while living with her son at home. The Appellant is unable to readily discern the basis for the judge's decision not to allow Jane to come home

Problematic Montco Judge Tapped For Fed Court — Montgomery County Common Pleas Court Judge Gail A. Weilheimer has been nominated by Joe Biden to serve as United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

The nomination was recommended by Pennsylvania's Democrat senators
Bob Casey and John Fetterman.

Judge Weilheimer is involved with the troubling stories regarding family
court matter in Montco, including the torture inflicted on Arthur Herring.
She is the wife of Philadelphia Inquirer Vice President and Chief General
Counsel Larry Weilheimer, and closely connected to Gov. Josh Shapiro.

With Democrat control of the US Senate her confirmation is basically
assured.



Willamette
Online.com

Bill Lawrence

July 12, 2024

Child Services Family

Courts, Federal Courts

Montco

1 Comment

Ed. Note: We have left out Arthur's last name as he fears using it will give the Montco courts an excuse to throw him back in prison.



Arthur at the March Montco Commissioners Meeting

70-Year-Old Man Risks Prison To See 99-Year-Old Mom


8,

tomlinher1925@tutanota.com

 Sun, Nov 12 - 08:43

9.

tomlinher1925@tutanota.com


 Sun, Nov 12 - 08:43

tomlinher1925@tutanota.com

 Sun, Nov 12 - 13:05

tomlinher1925@tutanota.com

to: tomlinher1925@tutanota.com + 1 ▾

 Sun, Nov 12, 2023 - 13:05

6 attachments (1.8MB) ▾

jane herring a victim

Date: Nov 12, 2023, 08:43

From: tomlinher1925@tutanota.comTo: fbi_fwra@fbi.govCc: tomlinher1925@tutanota.com, dshallcross@attorneygeneral.gov

Subject: jane herring a victim

Mr. Pacchioli, Mr. Shallcross,

How is THESE documents of weilheimer ordering the county to block all of my emails to them and my very detailed, 500 paragraphs of facts attached not criminal? Weilheimer has NO legal authority to block my email address to anyone she wants. The actions of the Racket are only to steal money for themselves, totally ignore the welfare of my mother and totally ignore the law, Title 20, section 5521, is PROOF that the guardian of person blumer, her husband she hired and his other lawyers in his firm he hired, guardian of estate fenstermacher who is allowing their fake invoices to be paid and has worked with my sister several times to steal my mother's money but I stopped them, weilheimer's assigned lawyer jaskowiak to my mother, "care manager" klock, weilheimer and my sister are a criminal organization or whatever you want to call them.

9,

They are denying my 98.5 mother the happiness, freedom and me. They are allowing her mind and her body to become useless because of their inhumane and barbaric treatment of her keeping her locked up in solitary confinement and in a sensory deprive environment for 2 years now.

WHO ORDERED THE KIDNAPPING OF MY MOTHER ON AUGUST 25 2021? WHY?

WEILHEIMER NEVER ISSUED ANY ORDER TO DO SO. BUT, SHE KNEW IT HAD HAPPENED. SHE NEVER REVERSED IT. WHY?

Are you two supposed to enforce the law and protect the innocent or not?.

Rev. Arthur herring III

--

Sent with Tuta; enjoy secure & ad-free emails:

<https://tuta.com>

FBI_FWRA@FBI.GOV

Thu, Nov 16 • 16:41

tomlinher1925@tutanota.com

Sun, Nov 19 • 12:55

FEDERAL BUREAU
OF INVESTIGATION
FORT WASHINGTON
RESIDENT AGENCY
PHILADELPHIA
DIVISION

10.

200

FBI
JANE HERRING
IS A VICTIM of
GUARDIAN
CORRUPTION
INVESTIGATE!!

VERNON
TELECOMMUNICATIONS DIVISION
ALTERNATIVE OFFICES

**FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
FORT WASHINGTON
RESIDENT AGENCY
PHILADELPHIA
DIVISION**

10.

August 12, 1999

200

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI (100-441111)
FROM: SAC, PHILADELPHIA (100-100000)

RE: MONTGOMERY COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
ARTHUR WELTHEIMER, JR. (MONTGOMERY COUNTY DA)

FBI

Mont. Co. DA

Refuse to

Investigate Judge

Weilheimer For

Illegal Blocking Arthur's

Emails to All County

Agencies to Help Mother.

INVESTIGATE!



*Division of Security & Administration
Philadelphia Resident Agency*

11,

FBI_FWRA@FBI.GOV

FBI_FWRA@FBI.GOV

to: tomlinher1925@tutanota.com ▾

Thu, Nov 16, 2023 - 16:31

Notice of Trespass

Mr. Herring

The FBI has received your many complaints and have repeatedly advised you that no action will be taken. We are in receipt of the flyers you recently posted on our office door. **You are hereby provided notice of trespass.** If you return to our office located at 501 Office Center Drive, Suite 200, Fort Washington, Pennsylvania 19034 or continue your repeated communications, you are subject to arrest for defiant trespass and or harassment.

tomlinher1925@tutanota.com

Sat, Nov 18 - 10:39

warkie9@tutanota.com

Sat, Nov 18 - 12:03

Thomas J. Farrell
Chief Disciplinary Counsel

Raymond S. Wierciszewski
Deputy Chief Disciplinary Counsel

Jane M. Palko
Counsel-In-Charge, Central Intake
Frick Building, Ste. 1300
437 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
(412) 565-3173

THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD
OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA



OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
www.judicialbranch.org

Intake Counsel

Anna M. Clardi
Frick Building, Ste. 1300
437 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
(412) 565-3173

Robin B. Godfrey
1601 Market St., Ste. 3320
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2337
(215) 560-8266

Samuel F. Napoli
Frick Building, Ste. 1300
437 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
(412) 565-3173

Dana M. Pirone
820 Adams Ave., Ste. 170
Trooper, PA 19403
(610) 650-8210

Elizabeth J. Rubin
1601 Market St., Ste. 3320
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2337
(215) 560-8266

November 27, 2023

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Arthur Herring, III
258 N. West End BL #153
Quakertown, PA 18951

Re: Complaint Against David Allan Jaskowiak, Esquire
File Reference #C2-23-1083

Complaint Against Ronald W. Fenstermacher, Jr., Esquire
File Reference #C2-23-1084

Dear Reverend Herring:

We reviewed the complaints you submitted regarding Attorneys David Allan Jaskowiak and Ronald W. Fenstermacher, Jr. After our review, we dismissed the complaints.

The matter about which you complain is a guardianship established for the person and estate of your mother. You assert in the complaints that the guardianship was unnecessary, and was established so that others could misuse your mother's assets. According to the complaint, Mr. Jaskowiak was appointed by the Court to represent your mother with regard to the guardianship, and Mr. Fenstermacher was appointed as guardian of your mother's estate in May of 2022. You allege that Mr. Jaskowiak and Mr. Fenstermacher conspired with the Court and others to misuse your mother's assets. You claim that, as part of their conspiracy, they deprived you of proper contact and visits with your mother. In addition, you allege that, as part of the conspiracy, the Court had you incarcerated for contempt of court.

Arthur Herring, III
Page Two
November 27, 2023

At the outset, it is important for you to know some limitations on this office's consideration of your disciplinary complaint. First, our jurisdiction and authority is limited to attempting to enforce the Rules of Professional Conduct, a set of minimum ethical standards with which all attorneys must abide. While the Rules are quite broad in their scope, they simply do not prohibit all conduct by an attorney which might be considered as unprofessional, inappropriate, or "unethical." Second, even though you have submitted complaints, this office does not represent you or your personal interests. We are not your attorney and cannot provide you with any personal legal advice. We cannot attempt to obtain any remedy or damages you might feel you are entitled to nor can we interfere with or intercede in any pending or future legal proceedings you might be involved in.

We reviewed all of the information which you provided. This includes the complaints, as well as all of the documents which you included with the complaints. In addition, we obtained and reviewed the docket of your mother's guardianship matter. Further, we obtained and reviewed the dockets of appeals filed by you or on your behalf concerning the guardianship.

Regarding your dissatisfaction with the establishment and handling of the guardianship for your mother, we note that such concerns with the court-appointed attorney and guardians for your mother are matters that are more appropriate for the civil courts to review and determine. It is not the role or function of this office to usurp the functions of the courts, making determinations of law or fact in underlying matters. Nor is this office an alternate forum in which to litigate a case, or appeal or contest any findings that may eventually be made by an agency or court.

Further, we understand your assertion that there is a criminal conspiracy between the court and the individuals appointed by it for your mother's guardianship, which alleged conspiracy also includes your sister. If you believe that you have evidence of such a criminal conspiracy, you should provide such evidence to criminal law enforcement authorities for review and determination.

You should consult with counsel of your choice with regard to how to proceed in court with respect to your concerns. In the event that, in doing so, you obtain a finding by a court that Mr. Jaskowiak or Mr. Fenstermacher engaged in some form of improper conduct in relation to your concerns, please contact us, referring to the finding or adjudication of the court. We will evaluate the matter in light of the finding of the court.

Similarly, if either Mr. Jaskowiak or Mr. Fenstermacher are convicted of a crime relating to the matters to which you refer, please contact this office. We will evaluate the matter at that time in light of the criminal conviction.

12.

Arthur Herring, III
Page Three
November 27, 2023

We do not at this time have a basis to conduct further disciplinary inquiry, and have dismissed the complaints as set forth above.

With few exceptions, the attorney disciplinary system is confidential and remains so unless and until formal disciplinary charges are filed by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel against the respondent-attorney with the Disciplinary Board and the respondent-attorney has had the opportunity to answer those charges. The complaints remain confidential.

Very truly yours,



Samuel F. Napoli
Disciplinary Counsel

SFN/dg