

# Exhibit #6

**From:** Judith  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 07, 2004 2:07 PM  
**To:** sheriffsteve@justice.com  
**Subject:** FW: Doc's Angermanagement Issues - and preparation for the April 8th Hearing  
Dear Steve,

Doc sent this to you last night and this morning it came back with delivery problems. I realized that originally "sheriff" was misspelled, "sherriff." Would you let me know if you receive this important email from Doc?

Thanks,

Judith

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

**From:** Judith [mailto:juphillips@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 06, 2004 9:21 AM  
**To:** 'sherriffsteve@justice.com'  
**Subject:** RE: Doc's Angermanagement Issues - and preparation for the April 8th Hearing

Maha Guru Sifu STEVE DOUGLAS GARTIN: I am available by telephone today. I mailed Marlene's response to your home on Decatur Street over a week ago. I have appointments in Denver at noon, 3:00 p.m. and a dinner visit with my sons Wednesday evening. The opportunity to work together to prepare for your hearing remains open, but it is inherently affected by time. As I have stated, there is no attorney/client privilege, nor a work product privilege, with your postings of my emails, and your extraneous comments, on the internet. While I work for you as my client, I also have a responsibility to you and to the court to conduct my efforts in a manner in which I feel confident your rights will not be further jeopardized, as they have been already. To my knowledge, there are no bugs in my office, or telephone taps on my phone lines. In any event those conversations are protected by attorney/client confidentiality. It is Tuesday at 9:23 a.m., and the lines are open. One witness, who I have interviewed, plans to appear at your hearing. Review of his testimony, in light of your recollections, would be advisable. Should you be asked to testify, I would want to prepare your direct examination. Absent your communication, I will have to revise any strategy to deal with the belligerence you deny, or your now palpable distrust. I'm glad you feel better about our "communication." I wish it could be more effective in terms of your legal needs. DOC

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

**From:** Steve Gartin [mailto:gartin@intergate.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 05, 2004 8:05 PM  
**To:** Judith  
**Cc:** Frank  
**Subject:** Re: Doc's Angermanagement Issues - and preparation for the April 8th Hearing

Good Evening Doc,

I'm glad to finally hear from you! You have caused me deep concern and trepidation by the messages that have been relayed to me, but I feel better now. I know how easy it is to communicate by email and it has disturbed me that you are so unwilling to talk with me by such a common method of communication. It was your comments about CYA letters that propelled me to including others in my efforts to communicate with you. I have nothing to hide Doc, nothing in my life has not been intricately inspected by the vast resources available to the opposition - email security presents no concern to me. You are well aware that my phone is continually tapped, and I have been tracked all over this town by telephone by Estep, Carr, Stadterman, Whitus and Clyman ~ so telephone is no option. Fortunately, those cops are illiterate and of diminutive intellect, so email is our best bet.

I'm only in fear for my life based upon Estep and Clyman's continuing animus against me and the strange events that seem far too conspicuous to be co-incidence - especially when their prime

informant shows up in front of my house and you deem it a trivial issue that pales in importance to your pursuit of quality time with your Cookie.

Sure, I understand that there is need of preparatory time for this hearing and I am certainly willing to schedule a meeting with you.

First, it would be most appropriate for you to bring me up to speed on what has been done; like providing me with a copy of the motion that is going to be heard, AND the reply to that motion . . . especially in light of the fact that you were so adamant about providing that motion to the opposition a month before the hearing. I'm relatively certain that Marlene has made a reply by now and that would certainly be an issue that we should take time to discuss, although I'm fairly confident that you have considered any opposing theories and have developed a strategy to defeat them, as any good lawyer would.

I'm not at all worried about this hearing. Nothing is at stake except "my life" and that is becoming old hat. You have had several months to prepare for this hearing, so I should have confidence that you have the situation well under control. You know what colours to choose and how to manipulate them into an artistic production! This is not a house painting project.

Unfortunately, I just now received this message and it is after 7:00PM, so there is no advantage in trying to contact you until after noon tomorrow. If you would do me the honor of emailing me all the information that needs to be discussed, I will do due diligence and endeavor to prepare for a meeting tomorrow before 6:00PM, which should provide us sufficient personal contact to prepare for Thursday. My day closes down early, so an overnight is not an option until after this hearing. Since travel presents a clear and present danger, I will have to make arrangements for transport with Frank - so let me know as soon as you can, you know his schedule.

It would have been preferable for you to have responded to my plaintive cries for communication last month, but you know that I can read and assimilate material quickly and form a response in a timely fashion, so the quicker you provide me with the information concerning this hearing, the better prepared I will be for our meeting. My normal internet connection is not working predictably, so please direct your replies to [sheriffsteve@justice.com](mailto:sheriffsteve@justice.com) and I will make it a primary mission to check mail as often as possible so as to maintain a working communication with you during this critical period.

Please have no concern for my state of mind. I am not bewildered, emotional, angry, frightened nor belligerent. This is not the first time that my life and freedom has been in terrible danger at the hands of these very individuals that we must face on Thursday. I am aware of the imminent threat that they represent and do not take this meeting lightly. Ease my mind by giving me full disclosure of the elements of their threats at your earliest convenience. You well know and understand that I can deal with the facts . . . just give it to me straight Doc - and please do it soon.

Have an enjoyable evening,  
Steve

----- Original Message -----  
From: [Judith](#)  
To: '[Steve Gartin](#)'

**Sent:** Monday, April 05, 2004 5:49 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Doc's Angermanagement Issues

Maha Guru Sifu STEVE DOUGLAS GARTIN: Please contact me by telephone or in person. I do not have faith in attorney/client confidentiality over the internet. Your e-mails report to many others. I am worried that you are in exile AND not assisting me for your hearing. We have prepared many times in the past. Relax. Let's work together, roll up our shirt sleeves, and put on your evidence. Many clients become bewildered, emotional, angry, frightened, or belligerent before a hearing. It is not the first time I have appeared on your behalf. I would like to read the law with you. But, time is short. Exercise your strong self-control and religious strength. My telephone line is open to you until 7:00 p.m., seven days a week. I will meet with you at my home or my office. Twenty-four hour answering is provided at 303.484.8229. You have my cell phone number of 720.422.6502. If we have to work late to prepare, you are welcome to stay at my home. I will feed you, provide a bed, and listen, and work with you. If you are afraid of a police raid, I can only recommend that you step back and look at your case, and your life's work, more positively. DOC.

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

**From:** Steve Gartin [mailto:gartin@intergate.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 05, 2004 11:21 AM  
**To:** Doc Miller; Judith; Frank  
**Cc:** Chas Clements; Caroline M. Stapleton; Pamela Hadas  
**Subject:** Doc's Angermanagement Issues

Good morning Doc,

Chas relayed your message of 9:15 AM 4.5.04

"doc miller calls, incensed at Gartin's last e-mail of Sunday."

I suppose that would be this message:

---

Doc Miller,

Your refusal to read or communicate with me is creating difficulty in your competent representation of my case and my interests. You have requested information REPEATEDLY that is contained in the Supreme Court Brief. Please simply READ and quit asking me the same questions over and over.

The BIG BLACK wall of NONcommunication is creating problems. I would like you to please take advantage of my long, arduous and continuing effort to communicate with you and to make you available for communication from your other clients.

Turning on your FAX machine is a small thing to ask Doc.

With fond regards,

Steve Douglas, Gartin (your client)

Saturday, March 13, 2004

---

Good Evening Mr. Miller,

Sunday, April 04, 2004

I realize that it is Sunday evening and that you will not see this communiqué until afternoon tomorrow when you and "Cookie" awaken, but I have not heard from you in recent history and I hope to be in line for your attention when you decide to consider

**your professional obligations to your clients.** After the untold hours of teaching you to communicate on line and the great expense I have carried to make sure that you have email and websites, it seem that the only means of communication I can prod from you is the FAX machine, so I will endeavor one more time to get your attention by FAX at the risk of being accused of felony FAXing again.

As you are aware, **your agreement with Marlene Langfield that I will not file any lawsuits expires in less than a week.** I don't know what all agreements you intend to "welsh" on, besides the one that Chas retained you to pursue, so during this period of constructive confinement I want to prepare the VanDusen suit, whether or not you intend to participate as you have promised. I have asked you several questions concerning when Renita O'Ferrill was charged, when she was convicted, or plead; and what the charges were against her and what her sentence was, but you have not yet responded to several email requests. I understand that you have lost the first 35 pages of the discovery provided by Joe Gilmore in 01CR3011, which was recently dismissed against me; but I still need that information to prepare the Van Dusen suit. I would appreciate it if you would provide that information VIA email to me, or VIA FAX or phone to Chas or Frank – they are both email literate and can pass that information along to me if you would even be so kind as to call them with the information. I have requested information concerning pending matters, but have received no response from you what-so-ever. **I trust that you will take time to email me the information I have requested concerning current and on-going cases.** If you have somehow lost my emails or FAXes, ask Chas or Frank to send you copies or to read them over the phone.

Sincerely yours,  
 Steve Gartin (your client)  
[sheriffsteve@justice.com](mailto:sheriffsteve@justice.com)

CC: Chas Clements  
 Frank Pugliese  
 Caroline Stapleton

[www.kuntaosilat.net](http://www.kuntaosilat.net)  
[www.kuntaosilat.com](http://www.kuntaosilat.com)  
[www.thunderrock.net](http://www.thunderrock.net)

---

"Doing his case harm."

Actually Mr. Miller, I assumed that this case was well in your control. I am concerned to know which matters you are "welching" on so that I can make preparations to proceed without you. You have assured me that you have the April 8th issues under control.

"Going after Frank for unprofessional conduct- contacting judge directly; aspects of case revealed; attorney-client relationship"

I fail to see what Frank has revealed that is not true, correct and germane to the issues before the Court. I think Judge Leland Anderson would be interested to know about the concerted conspiracy to prevent me from seeking redress of grievance from the terrible

persecution I have been subject to.

"stop saying Gartins' life depends on it."

Mr. Miller, those were your exact words. You have informed me that Marlene Langfield and Gary Clyman are "out to get me" and even more adamant about "getting Chas." Have things changed?

"withdrawing from Gartin's case- not a slave or a combat soldier; attorney decisions on behalf of client interests"

Are you withdrawing BEFORE the final curtain call?

"incensed about being called 'welshing' "

That was your term Mr. Miller, spoken in the presence of a Welshman who had paid you a retainer to proceed in suit against government servants who had grossly violated his constitutionally secured civil rights, when you told him that you were NOT going to do what he had paid you to do. Now, I understand that you are also renegeing on my case for which the STATE has paid you quite handsomely. Perhaps another term would be more appropriate?

"reminded him that I am Welsh; ethnic slur"

"Refuses to go forward with Van Duesen or Paladin henceforth; 'paying clients' who take counsel (as opposed to Gartin and Chas)"

That was my question Mr. Miller. Please IMMEDIATELY return all associated files so that I can begin to prepare to go forward without your assistance. No need to get angry about it. I can handle the details. I'm very disappointed with you, but I'm not mad at you. Since you committed Pamela to the drug rehab center, you have not had much of a legal practice to rely on. It is difficult to proceed in a library science profession when you refuse to read anything except fiction novels. Without Pamela's skills there is little assistance that you can offer, and it now appears even less that you are willing to. "refuses to use e-mail; bite you in your ass. Too easy to write ill-considered sentences that come back to bite you in the ass."

Well Mr. Miller, you must recall that I told you that when you attempted to squeeze another \$5000 out of Harold Brown by wire transfer before you would agree to meet with him and Kevin to discuss the case they had paid you to consummate. I told you then that it was a bad idea to email that communiqué - and it did indeed cause a problem for you.

"threatens Gartin with Conviction on 8th for disseminating information"

It occurs to me that you have threatened all of your clients with jail, I'm not sure that is ethical behaviour Mr. Miller.

"contempt of court"

You are not the only one who knows the respect I have for the Honorable Leland Paul Anderson. I'm a bit surprised that you would make such a statement, but then again,

you have threatened many of your client with similar thinly veiled comments. If Judge Anderson finds offense with anything I have done, I will be anxious to offer him an apology in open court.

"could have won a week ago, but Gartin has damaged his case with copying in people on e-mails and Doc can no longer represent Gartin"

Well Mr. Miller, you are the one who asked me to gather a crowd for you. As a matter of fact, you said something along the line of "your case will go 6 times better with 60 people in the gallery than with 10 and your life depends on it." I have simply complied with your demands as best I could under the threat that you relayed to me. Estep and Clyman have spent years investigating every aspect of my life . . . right up to present. I have nothing to hide from anyone, anywhere and certainly nothing to hide from Judge Leland Anderson. I fail to understand what information you take exception to. Would it be asking to much that you explain, with specificity, what you are referring to?

I am yet unclear as to \*when\* you intend to "welsh" on this current case. Do you plan to be there on the 8th, or are you "welshing" today?

Since you have decided to "welsh" on the Paladin case and the Van Dusen case, please return the entire case files, records and any notes, communications and etc. immediately and do NOT set them out on the curb to be recycled as you did the records of the active case which is at issue on the 8th of April and still before the Supreme Court on several original jurisdiction writs. You can deliver them to Chas in lieu of destroying or disseminating them at random.

Please also provide me with your communications and all information on the Flagstaff case and the restraining order case at your earliest convenience.

I understand that you have some very serious anger management issues Mr. Miller, but there is no need to be vitriolic and vituperative with Chas. He has no control or influence over my behaviour and it seems inappropriate to expose an attorney/client relationship to outside parties.

It is unfortunate that you have decided to refuse to communicate by email, especially when I have no other means to communicate at present. You have long known and been fully aware that I do not have a postal address, and for the next few days I cannot communicate by phone; but I'm sure you notice the time stamps on all of the communications you have relayed to me through Chas and Frank. I can and will respond to any of your communications IMMEDIATELY via email. I trust that you will rise to minimal standards of professional performance and communicate with me directly, rather than to relay messages through third parties. At least Frank is still my court appointed Private Investigator and as such has a vested interest in relaying your phone messages. Chas has his own life to consider and is not a party to this case. The cases to which he would have been party are the ones that you have already "welshed" on during our meeting at Chas' house on 4 March 2004, and it is appropriate ethics to speak of those cases in his presence, particularly in light of the fact that he paid you to proceed on those cases.

If you see fit to continue to refuse to communicate with me by email concerning the court appearance on the 8th, please relay that information through Frank, you have his

number and email.

Once again, I must ask for your submissions to the court and any replies that Marlene Langfield may have made by now. It appears from this email from Chas that you are withdrawing from this case immediately and I must make preparations to continue unrepresented only two days from now. I will expect that information immediately.

I sincerely hope you can manage your anger and proceed in a professional manner to resolve these active issues with some slight modicum of integrity.

Truly,

Steve Gartin  
[sheriffsteve@justice.com](mailto:sheriffsteve@justice.com)

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

**From:** Steve Gartin [mailto:gartin@intergate.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 05, 2004 11:21 AM  
**To:** Doc Miller; Judith; Frank  
**Cc:** Chas Clements; Caroline M. Stapleton; Pamela Hadas  
**Subject:** Doc's Angermanagement Issues

Good morning Doc,

Chas relayed your message of 9:15 AM 4.5.04

"doc miller calls, incensed at Gartin's last e-mail of Sunday."

I suppose that would be this message:

---

Doc Miller,

Your refusal to read or communicate with me is creating difficulty in your competent representation of my case and my interests. You have requested information REPEATEDLY that is contained in the Supreme Court Brief. Please simply READ and quit asking me the same questions over and over.

The BIG BLACK wall of NONcommunication is creating problems. I would like you to please take advantage of my long, arduous and continuing effort to communicate with you and to make you available for communication from your other clients.

Turning on your FAX machine is a small thing to ask Doc.

With fond regards,

Steve Douglas, Gartin (your client)

Saturday, March 13, 2004

---



---

Good Evening Mr. Miller,

Sunday, April 04, 2004

I realize that it is Sunday evening and that you will not see this communiqué until afternoon tomorrow when you and "Cookie" awaken, but I have not heard from you in recent history and I hope to be in line for your attention when you decide to consider your professional obligations to your clients. After the untold hours of teaching you to communicate on line and the great expense I have carried to make sure that you have email and websites, it seem that the only means of communication I can prod from you is the FAX machine, so I will endeavor one more time to get your attention by FAX at the risk of being accused of felony FAXing again.

As you are aware, your agreement with Marlene Langfield that I will not file any lawsuits expires in less than a week. I don't know what all agreements you intend to "welsh" on, besides the one that Chas retained you to pursue, so during this period of constructive confinement I want to prepare the VanDusen suit, whether or not you intend to participate as you have promised. I have asked you several questions concerning when Renita O'Ferrill was charged, when she was convicted, or plead; and what the charges were against her and what her sentence was, but you have not yet responded to several email requests. I understand that you have lost the first 35 pages of the discovery provided by Joe Gilmore in 01CR3011, which was recently dismissed against me; but I still need that information to prepare the Van Dusen suit. I would appreciate it if you would provide that information VIA email to me, or VIA FAX or phone to Chas or Frank – they are both email literate and can pass that information along to me if you would even be so kind as to call them with the information. I have requested information concerning pending matters, but have received no response from you what-so-ever. I trust that you will take time to email me the information I have requested concerning current and on-going cases. If you have somehow lost my emails or FAXes, ask Chas or Frank to send you copies or to read them over the phone.

Sincerely yours,  
 Steve Gartin (your client)  
[sheriffsteve@justice.com](mailto:sheriffsteve@justice.com)

CC: Chas Clements  
 Frank Pugliese  
 Caroline Stapleton

[www.kuntaosilat.net](http://www.kuntaosilat.net)  
[www.kuntaosilat.com](http://www.kuntaosilat.com)  
[www.thunderrock.net](http://www.thunderrock.net)

---

"Doing his case harm."

Actually Mr. Miller, I assumed that this case was well in your control. I am concerned to know which matters you are "welching" on so that I can make preparations to proceed without you. You have assured me that you have the April 8th issues under control.

"Going after Frank for unprofessional conduct- contacting judge directly; aspects of

case revealed; attorney-client relationship"

I fail to see what Frank has revealed that is not true, correct and germane to the issues before the Court. I think Judge Leland Anderson would be interested to know about the concerted conspiracy to prevent me from seeking redress of grievance from the terrible persecution I have been subject to.

"stop saying Gartins' life depends on it."

Mr. Miller, those were your exact words. You have informed me that Marlene Langfield and Gary Clyman are "out to get me" and even more adamant about "getting Chas." Have things changed?

"withdrawing from Gartin's case- not a slave or a combat soldier; attorney decisions on behalf of client interests"

Are you withdrawing BEFORE the final curtain call?

"incensed about being called 'welshing' "

That was your term Mr. Miller, spoken in the presence of a Welshman who had paid you a retainer to proceed in suit against government servants who had grossly violated his constitutionally secured civil rights, when you told him that you were NOT going to do what he had paid you to do. Now, I understand that you are also renegeing on my case for which the STATE has paid you quite handsomely. Perhaps another term would be more appropriate?

"reminded him that I am Welsh; ethnic slur"

"Refuses to go forward with Van Duesen or Paladin henceforth; 'paying clients' who take counsel (as opposed to Gartin and Chas)"

That was my question Mr. Miller. Please IMMEDIATELY return all associated files so that I can begin to prepare to go forward without your assistance. No need to get angry about it. I can handle the details. I'm very disappointed with you, but I'm not mad at you. Since you committed Pamela to the drug rehab center, you have not had much of a legal practice to rely on. It is difficult to proceed in a library science profession when you refuse to read anything except fiction novels. Without Pamela's skills there is little assistance that you can offer, and it now appears even less that you are willing to.

"refuses to use e-mail; bite you in your ass. Too easy to write ill-considered sentences that come back to bite you in the ass."

Well Mr. Miller, you must recall that I told you that when you attempted to squeeze another \$5000 out of Harold Brown by wire transfer before you would agree to meet with him and Kevin to discuss the case they had paid you to consummate. I told you then that it was a bad idea to email that communiqué - and it did indeed cause a problem for you.

"threatens Gartin with Conviction on 8th for disseminating information"

It occurs to me that you have threatened all of your clients with jail, I'm not sure that is ethical behaviour Mr. Miller.

"contempt of court"

You are not the only one who knows the respect I have for the Honorable Leland Paul Anderson. I'm a bit surprised that you would make such a statement, but then again, you have threatened many of your client with similar thinly veiled comments. If Judge Anderson finds offense with anything I have done, I will be anxious to offer him an apology in open court.

"could have won a week ago, but Gartin has damaged his case with copying in people on e-mails and Doc can no longer represent Gartin"

Well Mr. Miller, you are the one who asked me to gather a crowd for you. As a matter of fact, you said something along the line of "your case will go 6 times better with 60 people in the gallery than with 10 and your life depends on it." I have simply complied with your demands as best I could under the threat that you relayed to me. Estep and Clyman have spent years investigating every aspect of my life . . . right up to present. I have nothing to hide from anyone, anywhere and certainly nothing to hide from Judge Leland Anderson. I fail to understand what information you take exception to. Would it be asking to much that you explain, with specificity, what you are referring to?

I am yet unclear as to \*when\* you intend to "welsh" on this current case. Do you plan to be there on the 8th, or are you "welshing" today?

Since you have decided to "welsh" on the Paladin case and the Van Dusen case, please return the entire case files, records and any notes, communications and etc. immediately and do NOT set them out on the curb to be recycled as you did the records of the active case which is at issue on the 8th of April and still before the Supreme Court on several original jurisdiction writs. You can deliver them to Chas in lieu of destroying or disseminating them at random.

Please also provide me with your communications and all information on the Flagstaff case and the restraining order case at your earliest convenience.

I understand that you have some very serious anger management issues Mr. Miller, but there is no need to be vitriolic and vituperative with Chas. He has no control or influence over my behaviour and it seems inappropriate to expose an attorney/client relationship to outside parties.

It is unfortunate that you have decided to refuse to communicate by email, especially when I have no other means to communicate at present. You have long known and been fully aware that I do not have a postal address, and for the next few days I cannot communicate by phone; but I'm sure you notice the time stamps on all of the communications you have relayed to me through Chas and Frank. I can and will respond to any of your communications IMMEDIATELY via email. I trust that you will rise to minimal standards of professional performance and communicate with me directly, rather than to relay messages through third parties. At least Frank is still my court appointed Private Investigator and as such has a vested interest in relaying your phone messages. Chas has his own life to consider and is not a party to this case. The cases to which he would have been party are the ones that you have already "welshed" on during our meeting at Chas' house on 4 March 2004, and it is appropriate ethics to

speak of those cases in his presence, particularly in light of the fact that he paid you to proceed on those cases.

If you see fit to continue to refuse to communicate with me by email concerning the court appearance on the 8th, please relay that information through Frank, you have his number and email.

Once again, I must ask for your submissions to the court and any replies that Marlene Langfield may have made by now. It appears from this email from Chas that you are withdrawing from this case immediately and I must make preparations to continue unrepresented only two days from now. I will expect that information immediately.

I sincerely hope you can manage your anger and proceed in a professional manner to resolve these active issues with some slight modicum of integrity.

Truly,

Steve Gartin  
[sheriffsteve@justice.com](mailto:sheriffsteve@justice.com)

Note:

This was the last communication received from Attorney Miller.

No copy of the Motion for Forgiveness was ever provided by Mr. Miller

Attorney Miller's Threats were relayed through his conversation with Chas Clements - those comments are denoted by " " quotation marks.

Attorney Miller was provided many copies of the Supreme Court Brief relevant to case 00CR3371, in which he was the official legal counsel of record and was provided a complete case record.

Attorney Miller was well aware of the fact that Case #97M811 was under appeal.

Attorney Miller was requested repeatedly to provide a copy of the Motion for Forgiveness and consistently refused to provide any copy or information relative to that motion.

Attorney Miller was very angry at Investigator Pugliese for revealing the fact that Deputy State Attorney General Marleen Langfield and Attorney Miller had agreed to a probation stipulation that Steve Gartin would not file any new litigation nor continue any active litigation against the STATE, County or Public Officials.