

WEILHEIMER HATED ARTHUR BECAUSE HE WAS NOT PART OF THE MAFIA

Look how much weilheimer was against me because I was not going along with the mafia's scam. My ex lawyer had told her I would not live in the house with Mother if she came home. Weilheimer even refused that.

She also had the county IT person block my email address to ALL county agencies, DA, sheriff and board of commissioners so I could not use them to help Mother or get her home(many felonies), used anyone's lies (without facts or them in person) to drastically restrict/deny visits with my Mother, deny Mother a phone to call me or me to her, refused to let me take mother out of the nursing home for the day, put me into prison twice for exposing the scam on Mother, refused to let Mother ever come into court to speak for herself and at the guardianship petition hearing violating state law, refused to let Mother come to court to verify the letter she wrote to weilheimer wanting to go home was what Mother wanted, ignored the fact that camp's petition did not have one example of Mother having any problem where she needed a guardian, ignored the fact that their "expert" ledakis admitted, by my questioning, that NONE of his tests or his "evaluation" had any independent proof of accuracy, refused to let me use a cell phone to prove that I never got mother "agitated" as they claimed during my visits, she thought ledakis 2, 1 hour sessions with Mother was enough time to say she was incapacitated, took ledakis word for everything even though he never used any recording device (cell phone) to prove his claims about Mother when he had meetings with Mother.

Concise arguments of [unclear] 7/1/22 [unclear] 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