

PRIME MOVERS OF A SYSTEM OF FRAUD CAN BE IDENTIFIED BY WATCHING FOR WHO CONSISTENTLY BENEFITS FROM FRAUDULENT ACTIONS

A system of fraud is designed to hide and disguise the prime movers who are driving the fraud. If fraud is detected the system is designed to focus the blame on various levels of decoys and to take various fall back positions.

One way to see past the disguises and fall back positions is to record and examine who consistently benefited from individual acts by Dulberg’s retained attorneys.

TABLE 16: INDIVIDUAL ACTS BY DULBERG’S RETAINED ATTORNEYS COMPARED TO WHO BENEFITED FROM THE ACTS

| INDIVIDUAL ACTIONS OF DULBERG’S RETAINED ATTORNEYS  | DID ALLSTATE BENEFIT? | DID DULBERG BENEFIT? |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Popovich and Mast redirected medical lien liability from the Defendants to Plaintiff  | Yes                   | No                   |
| Popovich and Mast forged documents and destroyed evidence (at least 15 examples)  | Yes                   | No                   |
| Popovich and Mast corrupted the interrogatory and document production process to sabotage client’s case and to benefit defendants (in collaboration with opposing attorneys)  | Yes                   | No                   |
| Popovich and Mast suppressed information on mental health issues related to Dulberg’s injury  | Yes                   | No                   |
| Popovich and Mast corrupted the deposition process to sabotage client’s case and to benefit defendants in collaboration with opposing attorneys (9 out of 10 depositions have no valid certification pages)   | Yes                   | No                   |
| Popovich and Mast knew Defendant Gagnon effectively admitted to negligence for Dulberg’s injury   | Yes                   | No                   |
| Popovich and Mast knew Defendant Gagnon committed perjury   | Yes                   | No                   |
| Popovich and Mast knew Defendant Carolyn McGuire committed perjury  | Yes                   | No                   |
| Popovich and Mast committed settlement fraud  | Yes                   | No                   |
| Popovich and Mast violated federal bankruptcy laws  | Yes                   | No                   |
| Balke contracted with Dulberg (who Balke knew had no standing as plaintiff) and not with the Bankruptcy Trustee (who had standing as plaintiff)   | Yes                   | No                   |
| Balke told Dulberg (about 11 weeks later) he would withdraw counsel if Dulberg does not settle with Allstate for \$50,000   | Yes                   | No                   |
| The Baudins contracted with Dulberg (who Baudins knew had no standing as plaintiff) instead of with the Bankruptcy Trustee (who had standing as plaintiff)  | Yes                   | No                   |
| The Baudins knew or should have known Defendant Gagnon effectively admitted to negligence for Dulberg’s injury as early as March, 2013  | Yes                   | No                   |
| The Baudins moved to cap the value of PI case 12LA178 (with defendants Allstate alone)  | Yes                   | No                   |
| The Baudins closed the deal with an upper cap of \$300,000 (in violation of the automatic stay)   | Yes                   | No                   |
| The Baudins coerced Dulberg to agree and misinformed him of where the ‘upper cap’ came from   | Yes                   | No                   |
| The Baudins moved to contract with Bankruptcy Trustee only after capping value of 12LA178   | Yes                   | No                   |
| The Baudins misled Bankruptcy Judge that Dulberg wanted Binding Mediation (about 11 weeks after the deal was closed)  | Yes                   | No                   |
| Gooch-Walczyk and Clinton-Williams concealed key evidence in collaboration with each other (Tilschner v Spangler certified slip ruling)   | Yes                   | No                   |
| Gooch-Walczyk and Clinton-Williams concealed the admission of negligence by Defendant Gagnon for Dulberg’s injury in underlying case 12LA178 in collaboration with each other   | Yes                   | No                   |
| Gooch-Walczyk and Clinton-Williams concealed Bankruptcy and Violations of Federal Bankruptcy Laws (automatic stay, loss of standing to pursue claim, capping value of assets in BK estate, etc) in collaboration with each other  | Yes                   | No                   |
| Gooch-Walczyk and Clinton-Williams concealed true sources of \$300,000 upper cap on the value of the PI claim in collaboration with each other  | Yes                   | No                   |
| Clinton-Williams concealed Dulberg’s bankruptcy (from the 17LA377 Common Law Record and Reports of Proceedings)   | Yes                   | No                   |
| Clinton-Williams suppressed emails from Saul Ferris   | Yes                   | No                   |
| Suppress key evidence (Tilschner v Spangler certified slip ruling)  | Yes                   | No                   |
| Clinton-Williams suppressed large numbers of emails from Brad Balke   | Yes                   | No                   |
| Clinton-Williams collaborated with opposing attorney to flood Dulberg with over 6,000 documents just before Clinton-Williams withdrew as Dulberg’s counsel  | Yes                   | No                   |
| Clinton-Williams suppressed all information on what the Baudins did to Dulberg  | Yes                   | No                   |
| Clinton-Williams suppressed evidence that Defendant Gagnon effectively admitted negligence for Dulberg’s injury as early as March, 2013.  | Yes                   | No                   |
| Clinton-Williams collaborated with opposing counsel to suppress Barch documents before Dulberg’s deposition   | Yes                   | No                   |
| Clinton-Williams collaborated with opposing counsel to weaken verification pages of discovery production  | Yes                   | No                   |
| Clinton-Williams collaborated with opposing counsel during the deposition of Hans Mast and after. Cannot introduce evidence of fraud on the court in 12LA178 and 17LA377 to Judge (even though it is critical to know in order to make an accurate decision)  | Yes                   | No                   |
| Talarico did not introduce evidence of fraud on the court in 12LA178 and 17LA377 or of Clinton-Williams sophisticated system of document and information suppression or of Clinton-Williams collaboration with opposing counsel to any presiding Judge (even though it is critical to know in order to make an accurate decision) | Yes                   | No                   |
| Talarico allowed defendants to be dismissed on 2 year statute of limitations grounds while never raising evidence of Clinton-Williams sophisticated system of document and information suppression or Clinton-Williams collaboration with opposong counsel to any presiding Judge   | Yes                   | No                   |
| Talarico played ‘hoaxes’ on Dulberg and planted ‘time-bombs’ in Dulberg’s efforts to appeal   | Yes                   | No                   |
| In the 2nd Appellate Court:<br><br>Dulberg lost the right to know if Judges or the clerk grant or deny an order   | Yes                   | No                   |
| Dulberg lost the right to know which Judges are involved in granting or denying an order (if any) so Dulberg lost the right to ask for recusal of any Judge   | Yes                   | No                   |
| Dulberg lost the right to supplement the record with Meyer recusal information  | Yes                   | No                   |
| Dulberg lost the right to supplement the record with bankruptcy information   | Yes                   | No                   |
| Dulberg lost the right to appeal multiple issues listed in the appeal application   | Yes                   | No                   |
| Dulberg lost the right to file an appeal  | Yes                   | No                   |

One would never know actions listed in the first column were of Dulberg’s retained attorneys by looking at who benefited from the actions. The bias Dulberg’s retained attorneys showed toward the opposing counsel instead of their own client is shown to be absurdly disproportionate in Table 16. One interpretation which is consistent with the mappings, fraud charts, evidence and Table 16 above is as follows:

- Allstate as the common point of corruption and prime mover.
- The attorneys in the light blue region effectively act as ‘moles’ or ‘spies’ (and effectively act as agents or employees) of Allstate.
- The attorneys in the light yellow region effectively act as ‘moles’ or ‘spies’ (and effectively act as agents or employees) of Allstate.
- Allstate ‘walks on water’ through the legal system.

A system-based approach shows that the light blue region works in a way that consistently benefits Allstate and the light yellow region also works in a way that consistently benefits Allstate. This remains true irrespective of which attorney or law firm Dulberg retained.