

## PAROLE HEARING ON LETTER TO LAWYERS

On April 2 2025. The parole department sent me a notice there would be a hearing with them to decide if I had violated my conditions of parole by sending out letters to lawyers looking for a lawyer to sue for my false arrest by the corrupt cop, Komatic, of the New Britain police department on 2 counts of harassment. Also included in that suit would be the corrupt lawyer, jaskowiak, who was a part of the false arrest. Cry baby jaskowiak was my late mother's "lawyer" and appointed by judge weilheimer. Cry baby's job, as her lawyer, was to protect and defend her in her guardianship scam started by my former sister, jsh. Jaskowiak was a major player in the guardian mafia.

My 2 page letter had most of the names of the guardian mafia, including judges, guardians, lawyers, etc. It explained the situations in fake guardianships and what the victims and their families go through. A lawyer must know all of the people involved in a lawsuit to avoid a conflict of interest. I was sending my letters to lawyers in various counties.

One of the lawyers who got my letter, Anderson, knew jaskowiak and sent him my letter. The word "CONFIDENTIAL" was written in 1 inch letters on the envelope. Did Anderson, a lawyer, know the definition of Confidential? Plus, there is the "priveledge rule" that basically says anything sent to a lawyer cannot be revealed to others unless the sender says it is OK to release that information. Did Anderson, a lawyer, know that rule, also?

The parole department did not care that some of the rules on the no contact list were extremely vague, including #8, which is the one they claimed I violated. They claimed I was in violation of that rule and another trial would be held. It is perfectly clear that I have or had no control over what one lawyer sent to another lawyer. I knew the parole department and the others, including the DA and the judge, Mchugh, would never admit their entire case of 2 counts of harassment was a lie just to do a favor for their good friend and lawyer, jaskowiak. He lives in Bucks County where the case was.

The trial was in may 2025 before mchugh. He found me guilty and put me back in prison for 6-12 months. I had to serve 8 before I was released. The rest of the parole ended in May 23 2026.

**IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
BUCKS COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA  
CRIMINAL DIVISION**

**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA** : No. CP-09-CR-0002262-2024

**VS** : Judge Raymond F. McHugh

**ARTHUR HERRING** : P.O. Shannon Griffin

☒ **PRAECIPE FOR TECHNICAL VIOLATION HEARING**

AND NOW, the Adult Probation Officer/District Attorney of Bucks County, requests the Honorable Court to schedule the above captioned matter for a probation/parole violation hearing. A technical violation has occurred, a Preliminary Violation (Gagnon I) Hearing conducted and the matter is now ripe for disposition.

☐ **PRAECIPE FOR VIOLATION HEARING AS A RESULT OF NEW CHARGES**


AND NOW, the Adult Probation Officer/District Attorney of Bucks County, requests the Honorable Court to schedule the above captioned matter for a probation/parole violation hearing. A violation has occurred as a result of the defendant being arrested on new charges. The new charges have been disposed of and the matter is now ripe for disposition.

☐ **PRAECIPE FOR CONTINUANCES**

AND NOW, the Adult Probation Officer/District Attorney of Bucks County, requests the Honorable Court to reschedule the above captioned matter for a probation/parole violation hearing. A praecipe was previously filed in this matter, subsequently scheduled for a hearing and continued.

**WARRANT TYPE: ADJ**

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bradley E. Halter

STICK  
ALSO

62-21-2-10-11

DE 1-1

**COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF BUCKS COUNTY**

**CRIMINAL DIVISION**

**GAGNON I HEARING**

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

vs.

**ARTHUR HERRING**

Bill No. CP-09-CR-0002262-2024

Judge Raymond F. McHugh

Date: April 2, 2025

---

**PRESENT:**

Defendant: ☒ Present ☐ Not Present ☐ Waived

Assigned Officer: Shannon Griffin

Attorney for Defendant: waived

Hearing Officer: Bradley E. Halter

APPD Representative: Shannon Griffin

---

**REASON FOR HEARING:**

Other: violation of the "No Victim Contact" order

STAMPED  
APR 2 2025  
DEAD

## DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE

- ☒ Appeared for Hearing
- ☐ Failed to Appear or Return Signed Waiver
- ☐ Waived Hearing
- ☒ Admits Alleged Violations Sending a letter disparaging the victim, maintaining a website disparaging the victim
- ☒ Denies Alleged Violations emailing the victim

Comments: The defendant appeared this date for an appointment. We had been unable to contact the defendant regarding the change of the appointment to a Gagnon I hearing. PO Griffin provided him with the notice and he was asked if he would like to move the matter to next week or if he would like to move forward with a Gagnon I hearing. He advised her that he would like to move forward with the hearing. SBEH met with the defendant and PO Griffin. SBEH again asked him if he would like to move the matter a week to allow him to obtain an attorney, he again stated that he wished to have the matter heard on this date. SBEH colloqued the defendant regarding the listed violation. SBEH advised the defendant that he was aware that the defendant had advised his PO that his email had been hacked and he had deleted that email address as a result. SBEH had reviewed the email send as a result of the "hack" and advised that defendant that he would agree that the defendant was likely hacked and that part would not be considered. The defendant did have various emailed to verify that others had received similar emails from the "hacked email" and verification that he had that account shut off. The defendant was then shown a copy of the letter that had been received disparaging the victim and also that the postmark was after his sentencing date. He reviewed the letter and admitted that he had sent that and "hundreds" or others out. He indicated that he was trying to obtain an attorney to take his case regarding the alleged impropriety of his mother's guardianship. SBEH advised him that there was an alternative way to make that request without disparaging the victim. The defendant became upset and argumentative that SBEH was say "victim" as he did not believe that the victim was a victim. He was reminded several times that in regards to this court case, there was a victim.

 SBEH also spoke to the defendant about his websites, which also disparaged the victim. The defendant again became argumentative and stated that was his "news site" and it was covered under free speech and covered under his constitutional rights. SBEH advised him that, again, there was a victim in the case and that this was inappropriate. SBEH read a copy of the "No victim Contact" form aloud to him and he was provided with a copy of the one he signed. The defendant kept trying to return to the guardianship case and SBEH had to remind him several times that we were only speaking about the instant offense. SBEH advised him several times that if he felt that a criminal offense had occurred that he needed to speak to the DA's Office. (This was due to the defendant making accusations against Police, and a Judge.) He also wanted to keep returning to the topic of the hacked email, after that had already been addressed. At this point, the defendant was advised that probable cause was established related to the violation of the "No Victim Contact" but SBEH would take some time to decide about the next course of action and he would receive an update from PO Griffin.

SBEH conferenced the matter with DC Harrison. SBEH decided that a Gagnon II hearing would need to be requested in this case.

## RESULT OF HEARING

- ☒ I certify that this filing complies with the provisions of the Public Access Policy of the Unified Judicial System of Pennsylvania: Case Records of the Appellate and Trial Courts that require filing confidential information and documents differently than non-confidential information and documents.

Sentencing Information checked  
Probable Cause Established:

☒ Yes  
☒ Yes

☐ No  
☐ No

As to: Victim Contact


☒ Violation Hearing requested. Sending a letter disparaging the victim, maintaining a website disparaging the victim

☐ Violation Hearing not requested at this time providing:

---

*Defendant's Address:*

258 N West End Blvd  
Quakertown, PA 18951

  
94  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bradley E. Halter, Hearing Officer

bch : 4/2/25

☒ I certify that this filing complies with the provisions of the *Public Access Policy of the Unified Judicial System of Pennsylvania: Case Records of the Appellate and Trial Courts* that require filing confidential information and documents differently than non-confidential information and documents.