

Darryl Dinsmore  
AD 6237 C3A-132  
Po Box 32200  
Stockton Ca 95213

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY  
COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF  
NEW YORK

Darryl Dinsmore  
Plaintiff  
v


Case # 09-50026 (REG)

EMERGENCY

GMC Et al  
Defendants

Objections To  
Sept 23, 2015  
Correspondence  
Doc 13466

Plaintiff (This Plaintiff objects to all  
contention of Defendants assertions on  
this court for whole sale judgement against  
all plaintiffs particularly this one.



loff

This plaintiff's case is not barred by the Sale order and that even if it were Defendants faulted such protection when it failed to produce exculpatory evidence that is constitutionally mandated and aligned its self with (old GMC) and began to conceal and Destroy said evidence in violation of Penal Code of California 133, 134, 135

Plaintiff's Complaint Directly attacks the Present Conduct of (New GMC) as accessories Penal Code 32 to the (old GMC) conduct *Dunsmore v GMC* et al Case # PCS045638 Solano Superior Court

After plaintiff sought constitutionally mandated Discovery from the Defendants (NEW GMC) in which they inherited in the 363 sale. In Plaintiff's writ of Habeas 001193 GPC-PCI plaintiff sought exculpatory Discovery concerning his actual innocence claims at which time (New GMC) began to conceal through erroneous Application of Court Motion to bar plaintiff's Discovery such as the correspondence plaintiff here complains of and in their imputation argument and by willful refusal to even

attempt to provide exculpatory or Discovery to plaintiff which forced him to seek Judicial authority in the Superior Court of Solano for the procurement of said Exculpatory Discovery

In fact contrary to their assertions of separate actors from (old GMC) they promptly hired alternative Counsel Bowmer and LLP (David Shay) 970 west 190th st ste 700 Torrance Ca 90502 Phone 310-768-3068 to attempt to manipulate the Superior Court into summary judgment and undermine this Courts Jurisdiction over all ignition switch litigants

The defendants actions speak contrary to their imputation arguments Doc 13482 Page 2 # 8 (a)(b)(c) The Defendants (New GMC) state (there is no particularized showing of independent claim against (New GMC)) (a claim on New GMC conduct) (a)(b) (alleged knowledge of)

Plaintiffs claims make exactly this claim contrary to Defendants arguments plaintiff attacks (New GMC) conduct

2: page 8 by (New GMC)

Defendants as of This date have not Disclosed any Discovery in plaintiffs writ of habeas in Federal District Court of Southern California Case 001193 GPC (Pe 1)

Plaintiff contends his requests for Constitutionally Mandated Discovery concerning actual innocence trump all other proceedings and must occur

Because The liberty of one possibly actually innocent is at stake Defendants admit knowledge of The Syculatory Discovery Responsible employee etc and Declare they are exempt Due to The sale order

This would be true if Defendant had promptly cooperated with plaintiffs Discovery request however This was not (New GMC) action but The opposite occurred a Violation of Penal Code 133 134 135 of California!

Defendants have forfeited their protection under The sale order

Defendants argument under 5 page 10 That they had no Duty to plaintiffs Claims concerning old GMC conduct is to

deny The Constitution of the United States

and all State or local laws

The Defendants are Declaring Themselves above this courts Jurisdiction and or any Court

Conclusion

This Court should invoke its full Jurisdiction and powers to protect this Plaintiff and Defendants to produce Exemptory Discovery which is constitutionally Mandated and reject all arguments such as here which declare Defendants have no Duty to the laws of The United State of America or to any one for that matter other than themselves


It is exactly this immoral, unethical thought process that was pervasive in the (old GMC) and was apparently inherited in the 367 sale along with the Discovery in question

Furthermore this plaintiff is grateful for any relief this court may find appropriate in this matter since plaintiff is entrained in assertion of the law for appropriate Relief

I Declare under penalty The foregoing is True

10/11/15 D-JD-

AD6237 CSA-132  
PO Box 32200  
Stockton Ca 95213



UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY  
COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF  
NEW YORK

Darryl Dunsmore Plaintiff	Case# 09-50026 (REG)
v	EMERGENCY
GMC et al Defendants	

Memorandum of Points  
and Authorities in  
support of objection

Brady v Maryland (1963) 373 US 83 87  
10 Fed 2d 215 83 Sct 1194 see Penal Code 1054(e)  
(Discovery required by United States Constitution  
must occur) Itazaga v Superior Court (1991)  
54 C3d 356 378 285 CR 231

10/11/15 D-AD- 1071





PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )  
 ) SS  
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO )

[C.C.P. §§ 446, 2015.5; 28 U.S.C. §1746]

I, David Bell, am a resident of the State of California and am over the age of eighteen years and am not a party to the above-entitled action. My address is listed below.

On 10/11/15, I served the following documents:  
objection to Correspondence

by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with First Class postage thereon fully prepaid in the United States Mail by delivering to prison officials for processing through the Institution's internal legal mail system at ~~San Diego~~ California, addressed as follows::

King & Spalding LLP  
1185 Avenue of The Americas  
New York New York 10036-4003

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in the County of ~~San Diego~~, California on 10/11/15

David Bell

P.O. Box 32200  
~~San Diego, CA 92179-900~~  
Stockton Ca 95213

Pursuant to the holding of the United States Supreme Court in Houston v. Lack 108 S. Ct. 2379, 487 U.S. 266, 101 L.Ed.2d 245 (1988) and FRAP, Rule 4 (c) inmate legal documents are deemed filed on the date they are delivered to prison staff for processing and mailing via the Institution's internal legal mail procedures.