

Date : 7/12/2023 8:04:52 AM
From : "Paul Dulberg"
To : "Tom Kost" , "Alphonse Talarico"
BCc : "Paul Dulberg"
Subject : Generic argument on legal disability

Argument: The Gaslighting Tactics of Attorney "X" (a fiduciary) and the Legal Disability of the client "Dulberg"

Honorable members of the court, today I stand before you to present the compelling case of "Dulberg", who has fallen victim to the insidious tactics of Attorney "X" (a fiduciary). "Dulberg", in a position of vulnerability and trust, has been subjected to a calculated form of psychological abuse known as gaslighting. This gaslighting has undeniably created a false perception within "Dulberg", leading to a detrimental and legally binding decision.

Gaslighting, as recognized by mental health professionals, is a manipulative technique employed by individuals to distort reality, undermine the victim's confidence, and cloud their judgment. In this case, Attorney "X" (a fiduciary), being in a position of trust, knowingly and deliberately employed these tactics, causing "Dulberg" to doubt his own perceptions and memory.

Attorney "X"(a fiduciary) took advantage of their professional authority and systematically implanted false information and deceptive narratives into the mind of "Dulberg". By skillfully distorting facts, subtly altering details, and sowing seeds of doubt, Attorney "X" (a fiduciary) carefully crafted a false perception of reality within "Dulberg"'s psyche. This false perception subsequently influenced "Dulberg"'s decision-making process, leading them astray from what would have otherwise been a sound and rational choice.

The consequences of Attorney "X's" (a fiduciary) gaslighting tactics cannot be overstated. "Dulberg", robbed of his ability to make an informed decision based on accurate information, found themselves navigating treacherous legal waters with a distorted compass. The decisions Dulberg made, which he believed to be well-founded, was in fact built upon a foundation of deception.

We argue that this gaslighting-induced decision constitutes a 'legal disability' for "Dulberg". The term "disability" in this context should not be confined to physical impairments alone but rather extended to include psychological harm inflicted by others. The emotional distress, self-doubt, and confusion experienced by "Dulberg" as a result of Attorney "X's" (a fiduciary) manipulative actions unquestionably hindered his capacity to make sound judgments and exercise his legal rights.

It is crucial, therefore, that we recognize and address the debilitating impact of gaslighting within the legal framework. "Dulberg"'s compromised decision-making process must be acknowledged as a direct consequence of Attorney "X's" (a fiduciary) intentional and malicious actions. Justice demands that we rectify this situation and ensure that those responsible for such psychological abuse are held accountable for the harm they have inflicted.

In conclusion, the evidence is clear: Attorney "X's" (a fiduciary) gaslighting tactics created a false perception within "Dulberg", leading to a legally binding decisions that is fundamentally flawed. "Dulberg"'s decision-making process was compromised, amounting to a 'legal disability' caused by the manipulative actions of Attorney "X" (a fiduciary). The court must recognize the gravity of this situation and take appropriate measures to rectify the injustice done to "Dulberg".