

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO  
Civil Action No. 09-CV-00309 MSK-KMT

SUZANNE SHELL  
Plaintiff

v.

AMERICAN FAMILY RIGHTS ASSOCIATION, et. al.  
Defendants

---

**DEFENDANT HENDERSON'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S Doc #234**

---

**I swear before God all I say is true and factual.**

**COMES NOW** Defendant Leonard Henderson (hereafter "I", "me", or "my"), concerned about the limits of the court's patience with the adversarial bantering, which concern the Plaintiff obviously does not share.

I believe it is a canon that a claim unrebutted becomes a fact. If Plaintiff Shell has a "trademark" character trait, it is to "have the last word". Which unfortunately obligates those she carelessly accuses to REBUT those statements over and over again.

Shell again claims that the defendants have filed "*scandalous, immaterial, irrelevant content and false accusations*" against her. Indeed, the evidence the defendants have presented is scandalous, which Shell's behavior certainly has been since at least 2004.

Far from "*immaterial*" and "*irrelevant*" the EVIDENCE the defendants have put forth, in many cases the evidence is HER OWN WORDS, can hardly be construed as "*false allegations*". The evidence I have submitted to this court remains Undisputed Fact, in spite of Shell's attempt to minimize it with disparaging name-calling.

As for "collaborative effort", Shell herself assembled us together as Defendants. Shell's allegation that our "*effort to drown out any factual arguments on the relevant issues and law with irrelevant and scandalous rhetoric*" **begs** the court to note that Shell has put forth NO "*factual arguments*" and her "*relevant issues*" are complete fabrications- for which the only antidote is TRUTH.

As Attorney Slater pointed out, Shell is “*an experienced litigator*”. Indeed, Shell has quoted massive piles of law to add the sound of lawyering authority to her fabrications. Slater drubbed her stories as “*conclusory allegations*”.

Shell has proved absolutely no sufficiency to her claims, and in fact the evidence presented by the defendants have PUT THE LIE to every one of her claims. Shell has not disputed the facts that I have put forth.

For the court's reference, here's the email Shell cites in her paragraph 3. The missing words Shell erroneously guessed are in bold.

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Talked with the court in Colorado, Deputy Clerk and here is what she said to do  
From: Wm Tower <wmtower@yahoo.com>  
Date: Wed, February 25, 2009 12:57 pm  
To: undisclosed recipients: ;

Ok, I have called the Clerk's office and spoke with the Deputy Clerk there. She stated that we all need to write to the Judge on the case and explain what is going on.

We need to explain the abuse (and do not minimize it) ie. The postings on the internet she is making, and the **threats and insults she is making to all** of us. If you have a copy of this, attach it as an exhibit for the judge to review. And she states that the judge **will handle it. as for the service by** email, the only thing we have to be concerned with is the copy with the courts stamp on it.

The Judge on this case is: The Honorable Judge Krieger, at the address below.

In addition, Yes, Sue the information is correct and thank you for it.

and Yes Leonard, you need to send it snail Mail to the Judge.

Clerk's Office  
Alfred A. Arraj United States Courthouse, Room A105  
901 19th Street  
Denver, Colorado 80294-3589  
Civil Division: (303) 844-3433  
Criminal Division: (303) 844-2115  
CVB/Petty Offense: (303) 844-5475

Greg Langham  
Clerk of Court  
US District Court of Colorado  
Greg\_Langham@cod.uscourts.gov

In fact, what this was about was our complaints about Shell's spamming us by malware emails, one of which Shell purported to be an “updated” version of her Complaint. When I started writing my Reply (Doc #95) I was concerned whether I was wasting my time replying to the one she had properly served. Shell NEVER DID file her “updated” email version with the court.

The defendants had no interest whatsoever in communicating with Shell by email, due to the fact that she had terrorized us for YEARS through that medium, and in fact is what gave rise to Shell's filing of her "Complaint". Shell seemed to delight in believing she would FORCE us to endure her email abuse again. Several defendants blocked her emails and none of us replied to her.

In response to our non-replies she sent another email demanding we unplug our computers and wait for her tech guy to come to our houses and download our hard drives.

Due to this abuse by Plaintiff Shell, several defendants did send messages to the court, mine being on 3/27/2009, Doc #23 titled "REQUEST for Order Not to Use E-Mail for Service".

Based on the evidence the defendants submitted of Shell's abuse, the court ordered Shell to use only the US Mail in the future to correspond with the defendants.

In reference to Shell's statement that we are "defaming" her, we are merely allowing Shell to defame herself. Henderson observes that the definition of who is the "tortfeasors" (sic) is her own. The evidence is great that Shell herself is the tortfeasor, evidenced by her websites.

AFRA has no corresponding website pages naming Shell or her sycophants.

By definition, the defendants are here to DEFEND ourselves against Shell's allegations. It is unfortunate for her that our undisputed EVIDENCE shows Shell's claims and allegations to be untrue.

As for the defendants "making Motions" after the court had ordered on 5/21/2009 in Doc #159-

**"ORDERED:** No discovery and no further motions will be allowed pending ruling on all motions to dismiss"

The defendants have obeyed the court.

Shell states in paragraph 5, *"At the scheduling conference, the court attempted to regain some semblance of control over this case in by firmly stating that no more motions like this will be filed, and if they were, they would be stricken."*

Henderson finds this to be a curious statement, as I understood the courts' admonition to be directed foremost at Shell, who was physically present in the court at that time, after being scolded for her insolent comments written on a filing made by Dee Contreras .

However, since 5-21-2009, Shell has filed-

1. **165 MOTION** to Vacate;
2. **175 MOTION** for Service by Publication as to defendant Randy Blair;
3. **182 MOTION** For Extension of Time to Serve Defendants and for Determination on Service;
4. **204 Emergency MOTION** for Protective Order to Protect Confidential or Proprietary or Trade Secret content;
5. **220 MOTION** for Order to Conduct Limited Discovery;
6. **225 MOTION** for Reconsideration re 222 Order on Motion for Protective Order, Order on Motion to Seal.

Shell's reference to *"rabid gang vitriol and abject absence of objective reason or coherent logic"* refers to her own imagination, and here refers to **our production of EVIDENCE of TRUTH**, which remain as undisputed facts.

In reference to Shell's paragraph 6, it may be time for Shell to understand the definition of the word "advertisements". I, Henderson have NEVER "advertised" anything about Shell since the day she demanded all of her materials and links to her materials removed from the AFRA website.

Having produced absolutely NO "advertisements", let alone about her, I certainly have not produced any such thing as "false advertisements".

Shell goes so far as to characterize ANSWERS to this court and the TRUTH in EVIDENCE submitted to this court- much of which are Shell's own words- as "false advertisements".

In reference to Shell's paragraph 8, the defendants do have the right to demand EVIDENCE of Shell's allegations, which fail to meet any burden of proof. Her allegations are not the EVIDENCE. Nor do her allegations accompanied by law cites meet any burden of proof.

In reference to paragraph 9, could the court clarify how the defendants mustering a DEFENSE becomes a conspiracy?

In reference to paragraph 10, the first sentence perfectly describes what Shell has done to us.

Any *"infringement, misappropriation, and violations"* is purely in Shell's imagination. Henderson has never committed any wrong against Shell whatsoever.

Shell states in paragraph 10:

*"To the best of my knowledge, there are no legal theories or authorities which permit any person to commit wrongs against another in return for feeling they've been unfairly excluded or subjectively "abused."*

Henderson finds this to be an extremely curious statement, considering that Shell deliberately excluded herself from the Family Rights movement she helped start.

Ever since, Shell has been committing abuse, gross wrongs, PUBLISHING slander, libel, and now- frivolous and vexatious litigation against those she has excluded herself from.

**All statements herein are truthful, sworn testimony, before God, as stated.**

Respectfully submitted July 21, 2009



---

James Leonard Henderson, Sui Juris  
4773 Salmon River Hwy  
Otis, OR 97368

## Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that on the 21st day of July, 2009, I served a true and correct copy of this **DEFENDANT HENDERSON'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S Doc #234**

AFRA – via e-mail to William O. Tower	Anne and William O. Tower – via e-mail
Dee Contreras -via email	Susan Adams Jackson – via e-mail
Cletus Kiefer – PO Box 52, St. Charles, MO 63301	Families at Risk Defense Alliance – via United States Mail to PO Box 52, St. Charles, MO 63301
Francine Renee Cygan – 329 Cornell Ave., Apt. D, Villa Park, IL 60181	Mark Cygan – 329 Cornell Ave., Apt. D, Villa Park, IL 60181
Illinois Family Advocacy Coalition – c/o Renee Cygan	Dorothy Kernaghan-Baez – via e-mail
Georgia Family Rights, Inc. – via e-mail	Dennis Hinger – via e-mail
National Association of Family Advocates via e-mail	Aimee Dutkiewicz – 40 Landry St., #2, Bristol, CT 06010
Thomas Dutkiewicz – by e-mail	Connecticut DCF Watch – by e-mail
William Wiseman – via e-mail	Wiseman Studios – via e-mail
Ann Durand – via e-mail	Brenda Swallow – via e-mail
Kathy Tilley – 800 Gibson Dr., #322, Roseville, CA 95676	Randall Blair – via e-mail
Lloyd Phillips – 14220 SW 29 Court, Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33330	Ringo Kamens – via e-mail
Cheryl Barnes – via e-mail to Daniel Slater, Esq.	CPS Watch, Inc. – via e-mail
Desere' Clabo aka Howard – via e-mail to Daniel Slater, Esq.	Sarah Thompson – via e-mail to Daniel Slater, Esq.

and upon the Plaintiff, Suzanne Shell, via U.S. Mail

Suzanne Shell  
14053 Eastonville Rd.  
Elbert, CO 80106

Dated: July 21, 2009



---

Leonard Henderson, Sui Juris  
4773 Salmon River Hwy  
Otis, OR 97368