

EXHIBIT
"FIRST ARTICLE BOB"
(TEXT ONLY)

- **THE WILD WEST**
- **LIT PRESS**
- **LIT LIST**
 - **CFPB**
 - **Debt Collector**
 - **Deed of Trust**
 - **Fake Documents**
 - **Foreclosures**
 - **Federal Law**
 - **Justice Seekers**
 - **Jurisdiction**
 - **Lawyers Misconduct**
 - **Mortgage Servicers**
 - **Texas**
- **WANTED**
- **GALLOWES**
 - **Texas Courts**
 - **Texas Supreme Court**
 - **Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit**
 - **Texas Federal Courts**
 - **E.D. Tex.**
 - **N.D. Tex.**
 - **S.D. Tex.**
 - **W.D. Tex.**
 - **Appellate Circuit**
 - **Fifth Circuit (CA5)**
 - **CA5 Recent Opinions**
 - **Eleventh Circuit (CA11)**
 - **First Circuit (CA1)**
 - **Second Circuit (CA2)**
 - **Third Circuit (CA3)**
 - **Fourth Circuit (CA4)**
 - **Sixth Circuit (CA6)**
 - **Seventh Circuit (CA7)**
 - **Eighth Circuit (CA8)**
 - **Ninth Circuit (CA9)**
 - **Tenth Circuit (CA10)**
 - **US Supreme Court**
- **OUTLAWS**
 - **State Judges**
 - **Harris County District Court Judges**
 - **Federal Judges**
 - **Meet the Judges of the Southern District of Texas (Houston)**
 - **Data 2022: Random Assignments SDTX (Jan-Jun)**
 - **Data 2022: Random Assignments SDTX (Jan-Mar)**
 - **Appellate Judges**
 - **Meet the Judges of the 5th Cir.**

- **Fifth Circuit Judicial Complaints**
 - **Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit Judicial Council**
 - **Meet the Judges of the 11th Cir.**
- **Supreme Justices**
 - **Meet the Justices of the Supreme Court of Texas**
- **Texas Senators**
- **BANDITS**
 - **Bandit Debt Collecting Law Firms**
 - **Criminals Thievin' Homes**
 - **Trackin' the Foreclosure Scam Squads in Texas**
 - **Bandit Lawyers Sal Momin and Kamelia Namazi**
 - **Brian Brewer**
 - **Christian Consultants of Texas**
 - **Jerry Hofrock of Capital Capitol**
 - **Mike Minuto, MTM Accelerated Holdings, LLC**
 - **Rogue Lawyer Erick DeLaRue**
 - **Rogue Lawyer James Minerve**
 - **Rogue Lawyer Mark Hopkins**
 - **Rogue Lawyer Shelley Hopkins**
 - **Rogue Lawyer Jason Leboeuf**
 - **Rogue Lawyer Robert C. Vilt**
 - **Rogue Lawyer James Rivera and Wife**
 - **Rogue Lawyer Stephen Casey**
 - **Sandra Forsythe**
 - **Big Law**
 - **BakerHostetler**
 - **Boies Schiller Flexner LLP**
 - **Gibson Dunn**
 - **Allyson Ho**
 - **Orin Snyder**
 - **Goodwin Law's Hall of Shame**
 - **Who is Catalina Azuero?**
 - **Who is Lawyer Alexis Susan Coll-Very?**
 - **Who is Laura Stock Craven?**
 - **Who is Thomas M. Hefferon?**
 - **Who is Matthew S. Sheldon?**
 - **Who is Sabrina Rose-Smith?**
 - **Who is Laura A. Stoll?**
 - **Bounty Hunters**
 - **Special Report on Michael F. Hord, Jr. of Hirsch Westheimer**
- **ROBBERS**
 - **CA5 and CA11 Whiteout Opinions**
 - **ClerkGate Corruption Scandal**
 - **CA11 Intervenor Appeal**
 - **Outlaws In Robes**
 - **Outlaws In Robes (FL) and (GA)**
 - **Outlaws In Robes (TX)**
 - **Is Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton a Criminal?**

- **SALOONS**
 - **DC Bar**
 - **Florida Bar**
 - **Texas Bar**
 - **Texas Bar Journal 2021**
 - **Texas Bar Journal 2020**
 - **Virginia State Bar**
- **MOVIES**
- **CRUSADERS**
 - **GUNSLINGERS**
- **DONATE**
- **ADS**
- **CONTACT**

Laws In Texas

- **THE WILD WEST**
- **LIT PRESS**
 - **Financial Crimes: High-Powered Lawyers and Federal Judges Collude to Silence Uninvited Intervenor**
 - **Financial Crimes: Millions in Attorney Fees Approved by Bent Federal Chief Judge for Not-So-Secret Legal Lover**
 - **Pro Se Texas Homeowners Reached a Jury Trial, But Only One Question Decided their Fate**
 - **The Greatest Theft: Ocwen PHH Mortgage Premeditated Long-Term Scheme to Steal Citizens Homes**
 - **Judge Tamika Craft In Private Practice: LIT Reviews Past Case Involving Fallacious Quitclaim Deeds**
- **LIT LIST**
 - **CFPB**
 - **Debt Collector**
 - **Deed of Trust**
 - **Fake Documents**
 - **Foreclosures**
 - **Federal Law**
 - **Justice Seekers**
 - **Jurisdiction**
 - **Lawyers Misconduct**
 - **Mortgage Servicers**
 - **Texas**
- **WANTED**
- **GALLOWS**
 - **Texas Courts**
 - **Texas Supreme Court**
 - **Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit**
 - **Texas Federal Courts**
 - **E.D. Tex.**
 - **N.D. Tex.**
 - **S.D. Tex.**

- **W.D. Tex.**
- **Appellate Circuit**
 - **Fifth Circuit (CA5)**
 - **CA5 Recent Opinions**
 - **Eleventh Circuit (CA11)**
 - **First Circuit (CA1)**
 - **Second Circuit (CA2)**
 - **Third Circuit (CA3)**
 - **Fourth Circuit (CA4)**
 - **Sixth Circuit (CA6)**
 - **Seventh Circuit (CA7)**
 - **Eighth Circuit (CA8)**
 - **Ninth Circuit (CA9)**
 - **Tenth Circuit (CA10)**
- **US Supreme Court**
- **OUTLAWS**
 - **State Judges**
 - **Harris County District Court Judges**
 - **Federal Judges**
 - **Meet the Judges of the Southern District of Texas (Houston)**
 - **Data 2022: Random Assignments SDTX (Jan-Jun)**
 - **Data 2022: Random Assignments SDTX (Jan-Mar)**
 - **Appellate Judges**
 - **Meet the Judges of the 5th Cir.**
 - **Fifth Circuit Judicial Complaints**
 - **Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit Judicial Council**
 - **Meet the Judges of the 11th Cir.**
 - **Supreme Justices**
 - **Meet the Justices of the Supreme Court of Texas**
 - **Texas Senators**
- **BANDITS**
 - **Bandit Debt Collecting Law Firms**
 - **Criminals Thievin' Homes**
 - **Trackin' the Foreclosure Scam Squads in Texas**
 - **Bandit Lawyers Sal Momin and Kamelia Namazi**
 - **Brian Brewer**
 - **Christian Consultants of Texas**
 - **Jerry Hofrock of Capital Capitol**
 - **Mike Minuto, MTM Accelerated Holdings, LLC**
 - **Rogue Lawyer Erick DeLaRue**
 - **Rogue Lawyer James Minerve**
 - **Rogue Lawyer Mark Hopkins**
 - **Rogue Lawyer Shelley Hopkins**
 - **Rogue Lawyer Jason Leboeuf**
 - **Rogue Lawyer Robert C. Vilt**
 - **Rogue Lawyer James Rivera and Wife**
 - **Rogue Lawyer Stephen Casey**
 - **Sandra Forsythe**

- **Big Law**
 - **BakerHostetler**
 - **Boies Schiller Flexner LLP**
 - **Gibson Dunn**
 - **Allyson Ho**
 - **Orin Snyder**
 - **Goodwin Law's Hall of Shame**
 - **Who is Catalina Azuero?**
 - **Who is Lawyer Alexis Susan Coll-Very?**
 - **Who is Laura Stock Craven?**
 - **Who is Thomas M. Hefferon?**
 - **Who is Matthew S. Sheldon?**
 - **Who is Sabrina Rose-Smith?**
 - **Who is Laura A. Stoll?**
- **Bounty Hunters**
 - **Special Report on Michael F. Hord, Jr. of Hirsch Westheimer**
- **ROBBERS**
 - **CA5 and CA11 Whiteout Opinions**
 - **ClerkGate Corruption Scandal**
 - **CA11 Intervenor Appeal**
 - **Outlaws In Robes**
 - **Outlaws In Robes (FL) and (GA)**
 - **Outlaws In Robes (TX)**
 - **Is Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton a Criminal?**
- **SALOONS**
 - **DC Bar**
 - **Florida Bar**
 - **Texas Bar**
 - **Texas Bar Journal 2021**
 - **Texas Bar Journal 2020**
 - **Virginia State Bar**
- **MOVIES**
- **CRUSADERS**
 - **GUNSLINGERS**
- **DONATE**
- **ADS**
- **CONTACT**

Debt Collector Cowboy Lawyer Robert J. Kruckemeyer of The Kruckemeyer Law Firm Violate Texas Laws

Lawyer Robert J Kruckemeyer has held a Texas Bar license for nearly 40 years. He is unlawfully filing for garnishment, and approved by judge.

By **justicefortexas**

Posted on June 22, 2022

Share

Tweet

Share

Share

Email

Comments

LIT UPDATE OCT 12, 23 25 2023

This LIT published article has become an active lawsuit in Harris County District Court. We're providing an update on the untimely dismissal of the original Harris County District Court debt collection lawsuit, along with relevant snippets from the ongoing litigation pertaining to this article.

The Crux of this Case

Sec. 392.304 [of the Texas Finance Code] prohibits debt collectors from engaging in fraudulent, deceptive, or misleading practices, including the use of a name other than their true business or professional name while conducting debt collection activities.

Bob's unincorporated business was not registered until May 11, 2023, and prior to that date, it did not legally exist.

However, Bob has promoted this unincorporated entity's name on his website and in Harris County Court Civil Action proceedings related to his admitted debt collection activities.

The original article on LIT, which Bob is complaining about, was published on Jun. 22, 2022.

Based on these indisputable facts alone, Bob's lawsuit should be dismissed with prejudice. His continuous presentation of fraudulent, deceptive, or misleading representations to the court and defendants further supports this stance, as evident in the legal precedent of Ponce v. Comm'n For Lawyer Discipline, No. 04-20-00267-CV.

Bob's attempt to rectify the situation through his May 11, 2023 application for a DBA (Doing Business As) does not absolve him of the fraud, deception, and misleading representations he has made. Even filing an amended petition would not address these issues, as established in United States ex rel. Solomon v. Lockheed Martin Corp., Civil Action No. 3:12-CV-4495-D.

Given these decisive facts, the complaint should be dismissed with prejudice, safeguarding the integrity of the legal process and upholding the principles of justice.

Protecting Free Speech Rights of Texas Citizens and Media Defendants

Extract from litigation 202311266 – KRUCKEMEYER, ROBERT J vs. BLOGGER INC D/B/A LAWIN TEXAS.COM [sic] (Court 189, Judge Tami Craft aka Tamika Craft-Demming);

Plaintiff Robert Kruckemeyer of The Kruckemeyer Law Firm ("Bob") alleges violations of free speech, but his claims fail to hold up under scrutiny.

Firstly, a similar claim by HCA Healthcare, its lawyers, and family members was defeated earlier this year by Mark Burke. In that case, the law firm of Serpe Andrews, PLLC attempted to disguise their defamation claim as harassment, stalking, and tortious interference with contracts. See; Original Counterclaim and Application for Temporary Injunction and Permanent Injunction, Image No. 105260883, 11/23/2022 and Plaintiffs Plea in Abatement, Image No. 105473353, 12/08/2022. However, the court recognized that Mark Burke's actions, which involved republishing content on the gripe site KingwoodDr.com, were protected under the constitutional right to free speech.

This precedent should apply to the current case, wherein Bob also seeks injunctive relief. Therefore, the arguments and case citations related to free speech rights under both state and federal constitutions are incorporated herein. See; 202268307 – BURKE, MARK vs. KPH-CONSOLIDATION INC (DBA HCA HOUSTON HEALTHCARE (Court 234), including ORDER SIGNED DENYING TEMPORARY INJUNCTION, Image No. 105941882, docketed Jan. 10, 2023. This court may take judicial notice of this case, see; Goad v. Goad, 768 S.W.2d 356, 359 (Tex. App. 1989).

Secondly, Bob's lawsuit appears to be a Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Participation (SLAPP), aimed at punishing a private citizen and media defendant (Blogger Inc.) for engaging in protected speech. Such punitive litigation goes against the spirit of the Texas Citizens Participation Act (TCPA), Civil Practice & Remedies Code chapter 27, which was enacted to prevent these types of cases. As per State v. Valerie Saxion, Inc., 450 S.W.3d 602, 610 (Tex. App. 2014), Bob's case is a quintessential example of a SLAPP suit.

Thirdly, Bob's dissatisfaction with the media defendant's published article on LawsInTexas.com concerns a matter of public concern, as established in Better Business Bureau of Metro. Dall., Inc. v. Ward, 401 S.W.3d 440, 444 (Tex. App. 2013). However, Bob has not presented clear and specific evidence to establish a prima facie case for each essential element of his claims, as required by Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem.Code Ann. § 27.005(c). Consequently, his claims in this regard are unfounded.

Fourthly, the article on LIT, which is the subject of this civil proceeding (202151467A – ASSOCIATED ENERGY GROUP, LLC vs. MASTERCARD TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, Court 189), is related to a previous case (202151467 – ASSOCIATED ENERGY GROUP LLC vs. CONGO AIRWAYS, Court 189). Evidence and federal case law presented on LIT indicate that the original lawsuit by AEG, represented by Bob, may have obtained a judgment against Congo Airways, a foreign entity, without proper jurisdiction. See; Associated Energy Group, LLC v. Air Cargo Germany GMBH (4:13-cv-02019), District Court, S.D. Texas, Doc. 31, Jun. 4, 2014.

In conclusion, Bob's attacks on free speech rights in this case are baseless and meritless. The earlier case involving Mark Burke provides a precedent for the protection of free speech, and Bob's lawsuit appears to be a SLAPP suit, contravening the Texas Citizens Participation Act. Additionally, his claims regarding the media defendant's article lack sufficient evidence. Moreover, related cases raise concerns about the jurisdiction of Bob's previous representation. Therefore, these arguments and case citations collectively demonstrate the invalidity of Bob's claims concerning free speech rights of Texas citizens and media defendants.

Addressing Indiscriminate Dismissals for Want of Prosecution ("DWOP")

It is essential to highlight the concerning disparity in the treatment of case 202151467A, which was listed as 'active' for over 15 months despite being dormant since the letter from Lorraine Bunting, docketed on Jun 6, 2022. The letter clarifies that Bob's attempt to garnish a third-party payment processor, Mastercard, is legally untenable since Mastercard is not a bank where the debtor's money is held. This contrasts with another Garnishment After Judgment case before this court, 202252461A – KNIGHTSBRIDGE FUNDING LLC vs. GOLDEN BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION (Court 189).

In the Knightsbridge garnishment proceeding, the case was DISMISSED FOR WANT OF PROSECUTION ("DWOP'd") on Jul. 7, 2023, after remaining dormant for 9 months since the 'rush' service of citation was docketed on Sep. 30, 2022. The court's decision to dismiss the case is in

accordance with the principle established in Walker v. Harrison, 597 S.W.2d 913, 915 (Tex. 1980), wherein it was ruled that the time limits provided in rule 165a are mandatory and jurisdictional. Additionally, GANTT v. GETZ, No. 14-10-00003-CV (Tex. App. May 12, 2011), supports the notion that adherence to these time limits is crucial.

However, Bob's case, despite remaining dormant for over 15 months, has not been subjected to similar action. Only after Defendants notice in an earlier filing on this docket would this case be dismissed for want of prosecution on Sep. 26, 2023, image no. 110466918, in an order signed by Judge Tami Craft.

This inconsistency is perplexing, especially considering that the defendant, Mastercard, cannot be legally garnished. The situation seems absurd, as the case has been inactive and lacks a valid legal basis for continuing against Mastercard.

It is imperative for the court to address this discrepancy promptly and take appropriate action in line with the principles of fairness and justice. Bob's case should be treated consistently with the Knightsbridge case and be subjected to the same procedural rules and time limits. Any case which remains dormant for an extended period, particularly when pursuing an unattainable legal action, should not be allowed to continue indefinitely. To maintain the integrity of the judicial system and protect the rights of all parties involved, indiscriminate dismissals for want of prosecution should be applied consistently and diligently. This did not occur in the aforementioned Associated Energy Group proceeding.

Settings Screenshot 10/25/2023 (8:14 am)

The Court Rejected Bob's New Filing (Oct 24)

Email to Clerks of Court 189 (Oct. 24/25, 2023)

SETTINGS RE 202311266 – KRUCKEMEYER, ROBERT J vs. BLOGGER INC D/B/A LAWIN TEXAS.COM

Good morning,

MOTION TO STRIKE

I have reviewed the online settings tab/page for the above case and note that my Motion to Strike Plaintiffs First Amended Petition which included a Proposed Order (image no. 109076997) , has not been scheduled for Oct 31, 2023 oral hearing with a line comment "PASSED – NO ORDER ON FILE 10/18" which is clearly an error.

Please advise why it was shown as passed when there is clearly a [proposed] order on file and in compliance with <https://www.justex.net/section/1447>

"Motions: ALL Motions and Responses filed with the Court must have a Proposed Order filed with the Court before the hearing or the hearing will automatically be passed."

MOTION TO TRANSFER-COMplete

Still on the settings page, there is a note on hearing reset dated Oct. 24 that this was reset per notice on Sep. 29, but now it shows "re-set N/A" and there is no setting time for Oct. 31 hearing and no Order or notice updating the Sep. 29 notice. What's the position of the court?

TEMPORARY INJUNCTION

On the settings page, the hearing time appears to have been unilaterally changed from 10.40 am to 10.05 am, is that correct? Plaintiff's notice (image no. 110723498) states 10.40 am and there is no notice otherwise on the docket?

VERIFIED MOTION TO DISMISS [TCPA]

Do you have an oral hearing date within the 60 days, per my Motion request for an emergency hearing (image no. 110937593)?

Cheers, Mark Burke
Blogger Inc.

Tue 10/24/2023 9:12 AM

Good morning Mr. Burke,

I reviewed the case filing and see the order filed 7/10/2023. In between the original date you filed and now the court did have to change the oral hearing date which is now October 31st, 2023 . You will need to file an amended notice for this motion to be heard.

In the notice please include what will be heard which should only be what was previously filed, the date the motion was filed, and the zoom link.

October 31st, 2023 at 10:25 a.m.

<https://justex.zoom.us/j/87080423085>

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://justex.zoom.us/j/87080423085>

Meeting ID: 870 804 23085

One tap mobile

+13462487799,
870 804 23085# US (Houston)

Dial by your location
+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

Meeting ID: 870 804 23085

Thank you,

Tue 10/24/2023 9:20 AM

Good morning Ms. Lopez,

Thank you for the response.

Are you referring to the Motion to Strike?

What about the other motions and questions I raised, does the court wish to answer those, namely; MOTION TO TRANSFER-COMPLETE; TEMPORARY INJUNCTION and VERIFIED MOTION TO DISMISS [TCPA]?

Cheers
Mark Burke

Tue 10/24/2023 10.11 AM

Mr. Burke,

I am going over the docket for the 189th including October 31st, 2023 due to the Lead Clerk being out for 2 weeks.

And yes, you are correct the date of opposing counsel's notice of hearing says 10:40 am in which I will reach out to them to ask them to amended their notice.

The court had to make time changes for all cases set. But the T.I. will start at 10:05 am. If no notice is filed prior then the T.I. will not get heard.

As for the other the recently filed Motion to Dismiss did you want to set this for submission or oral docket?

Thank you,

Tue 10/24/2023 10:19 AM

Re MTD [emergency] hearing: Oral within 60 days please Ms. Lopez as it's TCPA (statutory timeline). Thanks.

Tue 10/24/2023 10.53 AM

December 12th, 2023 at 9am.

The time will change as the hearing date gets closer which we will notify you and all other parties of any changes.

Also, Mr. Burke do you still get emails for **** ? I am asking because since you are emailing the court staff with a different email we will need both to be on file. Ms. Mosley had previously emailed all parties on 9/29/2023 stating that the court had to reset all case hearings that was set today from 10/24 to 10/31 with no response from you.

Thank you,

Tue 10/24/2023 11:07 AM

Understood re time change for upcoming MTD e.g. I don't need to file a notice of this hearing until you advise the zoom link etc nearer the time.

Can the court please confirm that this terminates all but the anticipated TI hearing on Oct. 31, 2023, e.g. until TCPA MTD is heard per statute?

I utilize both emails, that is correct. Adding both would be beneficial. Thanks,

Mark Burke

Tue 10/24/2023 11:17 AM

Oh no sir, you will need to file a notice with the December 12, 2023 date at 9 am via zoom with the zoom link also to reserve that date as it is a first come, first serve basis for our hearing dates.

But once we give you an updated time which will be prior to the hearing date then you will file an amended notice with the new time.

Also, I am unsure what the hearing will terminate as I am not a lawyer and do not practice law to know exactly what you are referring to. I believe you can ask the Judge that on Tuesday at your hearing but that's up to her.

Thank you,

Tue 10/24/2023 11:20 AM

I would like to reserve a zoom link for the Dec 12, 2023 date you provided. Please advise.

Tue 10/24/2023 12:13 PM

If you haven't done so already please file notice of hearing for that date.

Thank you,

Tue 10/24/2023 3:10 PM

Yes, I have. Can I receive the zoom details now please?

Tue 10/25/2023 8:25 AM

Good morning Ms Lopez,

Can you explain why N/A is present as a comment on the 3 entries on the settings page, which I assume means "not applicable".

What is "not applicable" about the submission and the 2 motion hearings?

See **link to screenshot** with marked entries for your perusal and comment.

Thanks,
Mark Burke

Settings Update Screenshot 10/24/2023
Docket Update Screenshot 10/23/2023
Sep 26, 2023, FINALLY DWOP'd
DISMISSED FOR WANT OF PROSECUTION
Docket Update Screenshot 10/12/2023

MESSAGE TO BOB: GAG ORDERS

"If they think they have such a solid case, let them bring it to the court and go to a trial now, instead of trying to short circuit the process by shutting the website down first then holding a trial at their convenience only." <https://t.co/YrAHyu8znF>

— lawsinusa (@lawsinusa) **October 23, 2023**

Prior Restraint Texas judge denies 2nd request for injunction against blog APR 21, 2011 |
Republished: Oct 23, 2023

A Dallas judge found earlier this week that a plaintiff who tried to silence a blogger through a temporary injunction in a defamation suit did not meet the burden for the injunction.

Judge Mark Greenberg of Dallas County Court at Law #5 denied on Wednesday the request of Fernando Rosales, who filed a defamation suit against Avi Adelman and his blog BarkingDogs.org in December. Rosales, the owner of a Dallas bar called Lost Society, filed a request in March for a temporary injunction against the website asking that the judge shut down the blog and prevent Adelman from printing anything about Rosales in future posts.

It also called for Adelman to remove content discussing the restaurant or Rosales, who alleges that Adelman made false statements about the bar on the blog and claimed that the statements have resulted in "damages and loss of business dealings."

In the **plaintiff's brief in support** of the application for injunction, Rosales' attorney notes: "Movant requests a[n] evidentiary hearing to allow the court to determine whether these statements published [sic] by Defendant are defamatory and whether [sic] to issue a limited temporary [sic] injunction, that includes a time, place and manner, ordering only defendants not to repeat these defamatory statements."

In a brief opposing the plaintiff's order, the defense said granting the request "would constitute a prior restraint on speech, which is unconstitutional under the Texas and United States Constitutions."

In Wednesday's ruling, the judge noted in his decision that "[a]fter considering the parties' briefs and arguments of counsel, the Court finds that Plaintiffs have not sustained their burden of establishing entitlement to a temporary injunction." He did not elaborate.

The decision marked Rosales' second failed attempt to have the posts removed. In December, his attorney filed a request for a temporary restraining order on the blog. That request said: "The Court should order that the Defendants, Avia Aderman [sic] and Barkingdog.org [sic] be restrained from publishing defamatory statements concerning plaintiffs, Fernando [sic] Rosales, Lost Society and Initiative [sic] Partners, LLC."

Adelman noted that Rosales is simply trying to shut down the website before going to trial.

"This was the second attempt by the plaintiff Fernando Rosales to close down my website, remove previously published content, and place a prior restraint on future posts he believes are defamatory," Adelman said in an email message.

"If they think they have such a solid case, let them bring it to the court and go to a trial now, instead of trying to short circuit the process by shutting the website down first then holding a trial at their convenience only."

Adelman added that this second failed attempt by the plaintiff should make Rosales reconsider his efforts: "And instead of taking me to court, he should change the business practices at the so-called neighborhood bar he owns in order to stop drawing the attention of the local authorities, neighborhood residents and my blog."

Credit: Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press

202151467A ASSOCIATED ENERGY GROUP, LLC vs. MASTERCARD TECHNOLOGIES, LLC (Court 189, JUDGE SCOT DOLLINGER) APR 28, 2022 | REPUBLISHED BY LIT: JUN 22, 2022

Another Rogue Debt Collection Law Firm in Houston, Texas

The Lawyer **filed** for the Writ of Garnishment on Apr. 28, 2022, and the very next day, **Judge Scot Dollinger Granted** that request, but the near 4 decade 'business' attorney has requested the writ from Mastercard, who confirmed **by letter to the court**, y'all cannot garnish any money – as they are not a bank.

Seriously, you only get this type of comedy on LIT.

Bickerstaff Law Firm Chasing Home Improvement Loan Debt Unlawfully for their Utah Banking Client

Medallion Bank specializes in providing consumer loans for recreational vehicles, boats, home improvements, and offering loan origination.

Read more

Zions Bancorporation Retains Known Rogue Debt Collecting Lawyer to Pursue Expedited Foreclosure

Zions Bancorporation is retaining lawyers and law firms who do not have an active debt collecting surety bond on file with the State of TX.

Read more

Yellowfin's Debt Collection Fraud: Chasing Unsecured Loans in Texas from Financial Crisis-Era Loans Breaking Precedent: Texas First Court of Appeals Backs Yellowfin Judgments Amidst Contentious and Jaw-dropping Legal Reasoning.

Read more

No Bull. Just Real News and Facts.

GET LIT NEWS DELIVERED DIRECT

CLICK HERE TO SUBSCRIBE IN LESS THAN 10 SECONDS

Help Make a Difference

Cowboy Lawyer Robert J. Kruckemeyer of The Kruckemeyer Law Firm Violate Texas Laws

Related Items:**affidavit, Application for Writs of Garnishment after Judgment,**

ASSOCIATED ENERGY GROUP LLC, attorney fees, Bob Kruckemeyer, congo airways,

cowboy law firms in texas, garnish, garnishee, garnishments, garnishor, harris county,

harris county courts, harris county district clerk, JUDGE SCOT DOLLINGER, law firm,

MASTERCARD TECHNOLOGIES LLC, motion for default judgment granted, Robert J.

Kruckemeyer, rogue debt collectors, satisfaction of the judgment, secretary of state for

texas, SOS, state bar of texas, statebartx.com, supersedeas bond, surety bond, texas

bar, texas debt collection laws, Texas Lawyer Robert J. Kruckemeyer, Texas Lawyer

Robert J. Kruckemeyer of The Kruckemeyer Law Firm, texas rules of appellate

procedure, The Kruckemeyer Law Firm, unlicensed debt collectors in the state of texas,

writ of garnishment

Share
Tweet
Share
Share
Email

Recommended for you

- **Financial Crimes: Millions in Attorney Fees Approved by Bent Federal Chief Judge for Not-So-Secret Legal Lover**
- **Judge Tamika Craft In Private Practice: LIT Reviews Past Case Involving Fallacious Quitclaim Deeds**
- **Title Deed Fraud: Alvin Man Sentenced to 40 Years in Texas State Prison But Lawyers Remain Free**

5 Comments

5 Comments

1. *Robert Kruckemeyer*

August 24, 2022 at 11:12 am

This is Robert Kruckemeyer. I am not required by the Texas Finance Code Section 392.101 et seq. to file a surety bond. Accordingly, your suggestion that I must do so, and that I am in violation of the law for not doing so, is factually incorrect. The Mastercard entity that was garnished answered that it is not in possession of any funds belonging to the debtor. The basis for its answer was not that "it is not a bank." It is not necessary that the entity being garnished be a bank, it is only necessary that the garnishee have funds belonging to the debtor. Your article is defamatory in 2 respects: 1) It states that I violate Texas laws and then cites to a Debt Collector database in which I am not found leaving the reader with the impression that I am required to register as a debt collector and have failed to do so in violation of the law; and 2) It states that I "unlawfully" filed for a garnishment without a factual basis for making the claim. Please retract this article. This email is sent pursuant to Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code Section 73.055.

Reply

2. *justicefortexas*

August 24, 2022 at 11:53 am

This is LIT. We refer to your comment above. The facts are true and you are a debt collector subject to Texas Finance Code laws.

In relation to your false claim of defamation, we respond to your points as follows:

1. You are violatin' Texas laws as you do not hold on file an active surety bond with the Texas Secretary of State, and you are operating as a debt collector;
2. You did unlawfully file for garnishment as you are in violation of 1.

Furthermore, if you read the mastercard letter referenced and linked in our article, it is clear from Mastercard's own words, you garnished the wrong entity.

A review of Harris County Court’s historical archives confirms you have been actively collecting debts unlawfully for years.

We suggest you start redirecting your efforts to acting lawfully and obtain a surety bond and file it with the Secretary of State.

Reply

3. *Mr. Robert Kruckemeyer*

August 28, 2022 at 2:54 pm

I invite you to read the definitions contained in Texas Finance Code Section 392.001. I am not a “Credit bureau.” I am not a “Third-party debt collector.” Accordingly, I am not required by Finance Code Section 392.101 to post a surety bond. As I am not required to post a surety bond, I am not in violation of Texas law for the failure to post a surety bond and accordingly, I am not in violation of Texas law in filing the garnishment action you reference. Garnishing the wrong entity is not a violation of Texas law. I note that you claim to not be attorneys. I suggest you consult an attorney. Failure to do so will be used as evidence of your actual malice. I reiterate my demand that you retract the defamatory statements pursuant to Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code Section 73.055.

Reply

4. *justicefortexas*

September 8, 2022 at 2:37 pm

We invite you to type “garnishment” in the search box on this website and reconsider your own flawed legal stance. We will not retract the truth and this thread ends here. Laws In Texas – No BS. Just the Truth.

Reply

5. *Mr. Robert Kruckemeyer*

February 21, 2023 at 5:01 pm

You have been sued. Cause No. 2023-11266; Robert J. Kruckemeyer v. Blogger Inc. d/b/a LawIn Texas; In the 189th Judicial District Court of Harris County, Texas.

Reply

Leave a Reply **Cancel reply**

Your email address will not be published. Required fields are marked *

Comment *

Name *

Email *

Website

Yes, add me to your mailing list

△

Unifin Inc is an Out of State Debt Collector Who Adheres to Texas Debt Collection Laws Harvard Trained Creditor Rights Lawyer James E. Cuellar Violates Texas Debt Collection Laws

Laws In Texas first started as an independent investigative blog about the Financial Crisis and how the Banks and Government are colluding against the citizens and homeowners of the State of Texas, relying upon a system of #FakeDocs and post-crisis legal precedents, specially created by the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit to foreclose on homeowners around this great State. We are not lawyers. We do not offer legal advice. That stated, LIT's Blog has grown tremendously during the three or so years it has been operating and our reach is now nationwide as we expand via our micro-blogs in various states. Join us as we strive to bring back justice and honor to our Judiciary and Government employees, paid for by Citizens.

•

Subscribe to Our Newsletter

Please leave this field empty

First name

Email *

We keep your data private and share your data only with third parties that make this service possible. See our Privacy Policy for more information.

Check your inbox or spam folder to confirm your subscription.

- **THE WILD WEST**
- **LIT Press**
- **Privacy**
- **Terms**
- **Fair Use**
- **GUNSLINGERS**
- **Ads**
- **Laws In Texas**

© 2020-2023 LawInTexas com is an online trading name which is wholly owned by Blogger Inc., a nonprofit 501(c)(3) registered in Delaware. | All Rights Reserved.

To Top