

AFFIDAVIT OF STEPHEN R. LILLEY

STATE OF OHIO, COUNTY OF WARREN

Personally appeared before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public for and in said county and state, the undersigned Stephen R. Lilley and duly authorized to execute this Affidavit, and states that affiant, to the best of his belief and personal knowledge that the following matters, facts and things set forth are true and correct to the best of his knowledge:

SCOPE OF AFFIDAVIT:

Affiant has brought fourth this Affidavit as a means to address issues, in legal matter, financial matters or any issues directly or indirectly derived from the misconduct of state and/or federal public officials under Color of Law.

Affiant has prepared the Affidavit to redress vicious in violation of his Natural and Legal Rights as a citizen of the United States, and to address Deprivation of Rights protected under the Constitution and Laws of the United States.

Affiant has attempted to address each and ever issue that has risen from this miscarriage of justice; Affiant will take a step by step look of the course of actions and how he and his wife had dealt with the various concerns and with their available resources. The affiant and his wife did not bury their heads in the sand but had attempted ever Legal Avenue available.

RELEVANT FACTS:

Pre-guardianship: Up until 1995 Stephen Lilley had a stable lifestyle, stable business, mortgage free home, savings in the bank, and working on a backup career as a commercial pilot.

Guardianship: In 1995 I became the victim of a judicial scam; involving conversion, fraud, and Civil Conspiracy that had spiraled out of control

Probate Period: January 10, 1997 was the beginning of

Civil lawsuits for redress: May 9, 1996, I filed a lawsuit against a judge and three lawyers for redress

FBI/DOJ runaround, July 2008 to Present:

ANALYSIS RELATED TO JUDICIAL AUBSE, DEFIMATION OF RIGHTS UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW, AND CONSPERICY AGAINST RIGHTS:

Attorneys are expected to represent their clients to the best of their abilities, using all reasonable, available, ethical, and legal means to achieve their clients' goals. Attorneys may not, however, engage in conduct that is illegal or violates and of the Disciplinary Rules.

THE GUARDIANSHIP PERIOD

ANALYSIS RELATED TO THE GUARDIANSHIP PERIOD:

To determine violations of due process by the Warren County Court of Common Pleas, it is first necessary to determine the actions and lay out the facts that led up to the violations.

1. **July 14, 1995**, Letter from Dunlap to Suttmann w/ Dunlap's Client time sheets, ([Exhibit E](#)); Dunlap asks Suttmann to pay ½ (\$4,407.24 out of \$8,814.48) of her clients' (Pamela Lilley) legal fees out of the guardianship account, stating, "It appears to me you are now up to speed". Dunlap was claiming it was for a deposition and investigation she had preformed for her client. Suttmann's timesheet illustrates that she had seven contacts with Dunlap and fourteen contacts with Dunlap's client (Pamela) during that time period.
2. **July 25, 1995**; Pamela A. Lilley (heir to the Estate of Marion G. Lilley) and Patricia A. Suttmann (Guardian of Marion G. Lilley) conspired to use illegal means to commit an illegal act, ([Exhibit E](#)). To deceitfully terminate Stephen R. Lilley's survivorship rights from CD 4591 and convert the survivorship account to the soul control of the Guardian Patricia A. Suttmann. Pamela had conspired with Suttmann to illicitly acquire CD-4591.

Memo: Pam to Suttmann, Conversion of CD 4591, 07/25/95; reads as follows;

Memo To: Patricia A. Suttmann
From: Pamela A. Lilley
Re: Upcoming Maturity of CDs at FNBWC

Trish,

As you know, CDs #4590 and #4591 are to mature on or about August 8, 1995. Since CD #4591 is registered as "Marion or Steve" and Steve holds the CD documents, I am concerned that he may attempt to cash it in before you can acquire it. [...] I know it is sometimes possible to cash in a CD the day prior (i.e. Aug. 7) because the banking day can begin at 1:00, 2:00, or 4:00 pm on the previous day; and that you can file a form with the bank called "Affidavit for Lost, Stolen or Destroyed Certificate of Deposit: (in your case, "lost" as you don't know where it is and attempts to acquire it have proved futile). But, Steve knows all this, too. [...]

- Request that the Bank not send a reminder of the two CDs' maturity to Steve (usually done about a week or 10 days prior to maturity) – perhaps a change of address will cover this. [...]
- Cash it in the second it matures, which could be when the banking day starts on the previous day.
- Consider taking out a loan against it a few days before it matures so that the Bank holds it as collateral against the loan. Then pay off the loan with the matured CD. The interest can't be that significant for only a few days – more like insurance. [...]

Expert Witness Report, RE: Stephen R. Lilley v. Jack C. McGowan, Case No. 07CV69890 – Phillips Law Firm, Inc, March 27, 2008 – Regarding CD-4591

Plaintiff and McGowan discovered documents indication that a \$100,000 Certificate of Deposit had been wrongfully misappropriated by the guardian for Plaintiff's mother, and Plaintiff's sister Pamela Lilley, (Doc. 4 at page 12, 39, 40, Exhibit 8). The documents discovered by the Plaintiff and McGowan are disturbing documents that set forth a plan between Pamela Lilley and Patricia Suttman to convert a \$100,000 Certificate of Deposit jointly owned by Plaintiff and his mother so that it would no longer be jointly owned by Plaintiff. The plan appears to have been hatched by Pamela Lilley, and involved conspiring with Patricia Suttman to file false documents with the First National Bank of Warren County. The purpose of the false document that was filed was to claim that the certificate of deposit had been lost, when in fact it was in the hands of the joint owner, Plaintiff. Patricia Suttman and Pamela Lilley were successful in their plan, and the Certificate of Deposit was converted out of Plaintiff's name.

Suttman and Dunlap claims that \$40,000 of the survivorship account CD-4591 was put into a checking account and used on Marion G. Lilley's personal care. The remaining \$60,000 was comingled with Marion G. Lilley's personal funds to purchase an annuity account in Marion G. Lilley's name only.

Complaint: Lilley v. Suttman, Case No. 07CV69736 – By F. Harrison Green, December 7, 2007

Defendants used the proceeds of the certificate of deposit to pay fees to Defendant Suttman as guardian, to pay fees due Defendant Dunlap, owed by Defendant Pamela Lilley and Defendant Suttman in the amount of approximately \$40,000.00.

On Suttman's Response to Exceptions, Page 2, 01/26/98;

Patricia Suttman stated;

Certificate of Deposit No. 4591, First National Bank of Warren County (FNWC), was not a joint and survivorship account. It was as much the property of Marion Lilley as it was Stephen R. Lilley. Either party could cash in this Certificate of Deposit.

3. **August 9, 1995, Memo from Pamela to Suttman:** Pamela also sent a similar memo to Suttman which states, the \$50,000 CD at the Cardinal State Bank is registered in the name of Marion G. Lilley or Christopher R. Lilley...

August 10, 1995, Suttman removed Christopher Lilley's name from the Joint Survivorship CD at the Cardinal State Bank registered in the name of Marion G. Lilley or Christopher R. Lilley; thus severing Christopher's survivorship rights and converting the CD to the sole ownership of Marion G. Lilley.

Upon maturity Suttman cashed in the CD account claiming it was not a survivorship account and comingled with guardianship funds. It was placed in an account where Christopher did not have access.

4. **Pamela's Survivorship Account (AKA Skandia Account):** Pamela also had a joint and survivorship account where she also acquired the funds with a fraudulent lost certificate in the same manner Suttman acquired CD-4591.

Suttman claimed she could not cash her survivorship account, quoting ORC §2111.50 and stating "A guardian cannot change the beneficiary designation..." (Suttman's Response to Exceptions, Page 2, 01/26/98). Although she did change the rights of survivorship of CD 4591 and Christopher's survivorship account.

5. **December 1, 1995, Civil Lawsuit:** (four months after the conversion of CD-4591); Brenda N. Dunlap (Pamela Lilley's private attorney) filed a bogus civil lawsuit (Pamela Lilley v. Stephen Lilley) as her client (Pamela Lilley) was the primary plaintiff and Marion G. Lilley's guardian (Patricia A. Suttman) as an additional plaintiff and attorney for the additional plaintiff to the suit, with no jury demand.

Suttman had no legal authority to be an additional plaintiff on Pamela's lawsuit; "§2111.17. Suits by guardians: **A guardian may sue in his own name, describing himself as guardian of the ward for whom he sues...**" The complaint was drafted by Dunlap in Pamela's name with Suttman as an additional plaintiff and not in the guardian's own name. Dunlap had signed for herself, Pamela's Co-attorney (James E. Baldwin) and Attorney for and Guardian (Patricia A. Suttman). There were never any facts from the civil case proven in the Probate Trial.

The frivolous lawsuit was full of conjectures, fabricated accusations, and twisted facts with no substantial evidence to back up her claims. It failed to meet the requirements elements of FRCP Rule 7 through 11 to be a legal complaint and §2111.17 to be a suit by a guardian.

Dunlap had taken the shotgun approach; Mr. Lilley's attorney called the lawsuit a witch-hunt. It appeared to be merely as a strategy conceived by Dunlap to run up her client's legal fees using the Guardianship to funnel the funds from the converted CDs and Marion G. Lilley through her client for personal gain.

6. **January 10, 1997, Marion G. Lilley passed away:**

Upon decease of Marion G Lilley, Patricia A. Suttman's Guardianship has terminated and no longer has any control over Marion's assets.

7. **January 11, 1997** (the very next day after Marion's death) Suttman's Telephone Conversion Notes between Suttman, Dunlap, and Pamela; ([Exhibit D](#)). The conversation reads as follows: t/c Brenda "Skandia¹--bird in hand for Pam--leverage", "Brenda time to settle----, Well weed though the crap—and come up with a recommended settlement offer..., Somehow agree to get all the attorneys off the top—including Columbus attorneys², Divvy up the rest..."

From this telephone conversion, it's apparent that Suttman and Dunlap were conspiring to give Pamela unfair leverage in any settlement offers and to give Christopher and Stephen an unfair

¹ Skandia; is the \$100,000 POD account Pamela set up with funds acquired using a fraudulent lost certificate.

² Columbus attorneys; were Pamela's unpaid private attorney fees in Columbus, Ohio from another case.

disadvantage. The scam was all about siphoning money out of the guardianship for personal gain.

8. **Complaint: Lilley v. Suttman, Case No. 07CV69736 – By F. Harrison Green, December 7, 2007**
Excerpts from Complaint; Lilley v. Suttman, Dunlap, and Lilley

SUMMARY OF THE ACTION AND THE UNLAWFUL PLAN AND SCHEME OF THE DEFENDANTS

This action is brought by plaintiff to redress the damage he has suffered damage as a result of defendants' conversion, and misappropriation of monies and properties by unlawful means; the unlawful plan, scheme, and conspiracy entered into by the defendants, which plan, scheme, conspiracy had as its principal objective to unlawfully convert, misappropriate, take, waste and divert monies and property from Plaintiff Stephen R. Lilley and Marion G. Lilley; by misleading and deceiving, regarding necessary transfers of properties causing Plaintiff Lilley to suffer significant damages to loss of property and expenses by reason of the conduct of the defendants; defendants have interfered with financial agreements causing injury to Plaintiff Lilley; the conduct of the defendants was intentional and was done to obtain the property of Plaintiff Lilley, the defendants through a plan to convert funds, unlawfully took funds of Plaintiff Lilley; defendants have full knowledge that their conduct would cause damage to Plaintiff Lilley; defendants have converted and misapplied funds received from Plaintiff Lilley.

THE CONSPIRACY IS FORMED TO DEFRAUD PLAINTIFF

The scheme of the defendants was such that they would receive through deceitful means payments that were to the detriment of Marion G. Lilley and her beneficiaries and to the detriment of Stephen R. Lilley.

Defendants through scheme, plan and artifice, converted funds to their own use for the purpose of depriving Stephen R. Lilley from his benefit.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Defendants caused the certificate of deposit to be cashed without the knowledge of Stephen R. Lilley.

Defendants used the proceeds of the certificate of deposit to pay fees to Defendant Suttman as guardian, to pay fees due Defendant Dunlap, owed by Defendant Pamela Lilley and Defendant Suttman in the amount of approximately \$40,000.00.

Defendants specifically sought to take the funds owned by Stephen R. Lilley, including his

future interest, to divert them into an account that would deprive him of his claim to these funds.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

(Tortious Interference with a right of expectancy)

Plaintiff maintains that as the survivorship beneficiary of the certificate of deposit with Marion G. Lilley, that defendants interfered with the same for the purpose of depriving him of this asset.

Plaintiff alleges that said Defendants intentionally and/or tortuously interfered with expectancy of inheritance from Marion G. Lilley, deceased, pursuant to the dictates espoused in Firestone v. Galbreath (1993), 67 Ohio St. 3d 87, 616 N.E.2d 202.

Said Defendants engaged in a common plan and/or design to avoid the dictates of the certificate of deposit, by preventing Stephen R. Lilley from recovering a survivorship interest from Marion G. Lilley.

Defendants intentionally committed tortuous conduct, of fraud, duress, coercion, and/or undue influence, all of which resulted in an interference with Stephen R. Lilley's expectancy.

As direct and proximate result of Defendants' tortuous conduct Stephen R. Lilley has suffered damages and subjected him to the loss of his expectancy, all to his detriment.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION:

(Common Law Fraud)

Defendants through the cashing of the certificate of deposit using a copy of the document, sought to convert the proceeds away from one its proper owners, Stephen R. Lilley, for their own personal gain.

Defendant began their conduct of transferring assets of with complete disregard for the governing language of the certificate of deposit that defendants' knowledge of these unauthorized actions can be inferred.

Defendants intentional misled the Plaintiff into relying upon the transaction that took place where in accordance with the operation of the law and in accordance with the wishes of Marion G. Lilley.

This reliance on the Defendants was the proximate cause of the severe financial injury suffered by Plaintiff Stephen R. Lilley.

**THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION:
(Conversion)**

During the representation of Marion G. Lilley by Defendants, through their conduct as guardian, attorney for the guardian, and daughter of the ward, Marion G. Lilley, converted to their own use the certificate of deposit of Marion G. Lilley and Stephen G. Lilley.

Plaintiff Stephen R. Lilley was deprived of this ownership rights, including control of the asset and has made demands for the money owed which have gone unanswered.

Defendants have converted the certificate of deposit for their own use, depriving Plaintiff of his funds.

CONCLUSION AND OPINIONS: The Guardianship Period

After reviewing available documents relevant to the Guardianship Period and personal knowledge of the matters, facts and things, the following is true and correct to the best of his knowledge.

- a) In case (1) above; Dunlap was asking Suttmann to pay for ½ (\$4,407.24 out of \$8,814.48) of her clients' fee statement for services rendered for her client. In other words; Dunlap was funneling assets of Marion G. Lilley, through her client for her own personal profit.

If Dunlap had rendered services for Suttmann, then there should have been an itemized account in Suttmann's name on what services were rendered and not an arbitrary number of Pamela's statement on a whim.

This is also a case where Dunlap and Suttmann had conspired to pay Pamela's legal fees from the assets of Marion G. Lilley in preferential treatment of Pamela's personal interest.

Dunlap was not performing services for Suttmann; Suttmann was in collusion with Dunlap and Pamela. [See case (2)]

- b) In case (2) above; Pamela and Suttmann had conspired through deceitful means in a scheme to defraud Stephen R. Lilley by acquiring and dissolving the survivorship account (CD-4591) in the name of Marion G. Lilley or Stephen R. Lilley for the purpose of depriving Stephen R. Lilley from his benefit.

Dunlap's client, Pamela had given Suttman, canning, step by step instructions, on how to illicitly acquire the \$100,000 Certificate of Deposit of which the Guardianship had no legal capacity of possessing. Marion G. Lilley only has survivorship interest; a guardian cannot acquirer an account that does not belong to Marion or change the beneficiary designation of survivorship interest. Stephen had been given custody to this account and many others for safekeeping and to maintain there beneficiary designation.

Pamela informed Suttmann that Stephen Lilley held the original CD document and instructed her on how to use a Lost Certificate Affidavit to acquire CD-4591. Pamela also instructed Suttmann of other various illicit means to acquire the \$100,000 CD.

Suttmann had acquired the CD-4591 with a Certificate of Lost as instructed by Pamela, according to Suttmann and Dunlap; Suttmann cashed in CD-4591; deposited \$40,000 of the non-guardianship funds into a Guardianship Checking Account and commingled the remaining \$60,000 of non-guardianship funds from CD-4591 with Guardianship assets to purchase an Annuity.

Suttmann had paid herself out of the guardianship checking account with non-guardianship funds acquired from CD-4591 for the illegal acts she had just committed.

c) In case (3) above; Suttmann and Dunlap's client, Pamela had also conspired in a similar act of fraud and deceit; in this case Suttmann removed Christopher's name from a non-guardianship Certificate of Deposit, leaving the CD in tact. Upon maturity, Suttmann cashed in the CD account claiming it was not a survivorship account and again, commingling the non-guardianship funds with guardianship funds.

d) In case (4) above; Dunlap's client, Pamela had acquired a \$100,000 Certificate of Deposit in the same fashion she had instruction Suttmann to acquire CD-4591 "Affidavit for Lost, Stolen or Destroyed Certificate of Deposit". She then purchased a Pay on Death, Annuity account (AKA Skandia Account) in the name of Marion or Pamela.

Suttmann did not cash in or remove Pamela's name from the Skandia Account; quoting ORC §2111.50 "A guardian cannot change the beneficiary designation...". In case (7) above; Dunlap had stated in Suttmann's telephone conversation notes, that they could use Pamela's Skandia Account as "Leverage".

e) In case (5) above; Dunlap filed a bogus, frivolous lawsuit in the names of her client, Pamela and Suttmann as Guardian; a guardian cannot take sides or be co-plaintiff on another litigants' lawsuit.

f) In case (6) above; January 10, 1997, Marion G. Lilley passed away; upon decease of Marion G Lilley, Patricia A. Suttmann's Guardianship has terminated and no longer has any control over Marion's assets. The Guardianship assets had now become Estate assets and moves to Probate

- Stephen Lilley was now the entitled soul owner of the original \$100,000 Certificate of Deposit, CD-4591; these non-probate assets were now in the possession of the Estate. Stephen was also to be Executor on his mothers' will.
- Christopher Lilley was now the entitled soul owner of the original \$50,000 Certificate of Deposit; these non-probate assets were now in the possession of the Estate.
- Pamela Lilley had obtained the Pay On Death, Skandia Account with Probate Assets now in the possession of Pamela A Lilley. She also owed her personal attorney, Dunlap a significant sum as a Co-conspirator.
- Suttmann has been paid a significant sum on time expenditure as a guardian and Co-conspirator.
- Dunlap was owed a significant sum from her client, Pamela for the representation as a Co-conspirator
-

Letter from Dunlap to Suttman to pay on her client's attorney fees owed.

Conspiracy to Conversion and Fraud of Stephen Lilley's \$100,000 joint CD.

Conspiracy to Conversion and Fraud of Christopher Lilley's \$50,000 joint CD.

Pamela's \$100,000 Skandia Account fraudulently acquired.

The bogus lawsuit four months after the conversion of \$150,000 in CDs.

Proceeds of the certificate of deposit to pay personal fees of approximately \$40,000.

Telephone conversation between Suttman and Dunlap, where Dunlap was orchestrating the settlement for Suttman's guardianship;

Skandia—bird in hand—leverage; \$100,000 POD to Pamela

Time to settle—will weed through crap

Pay all lawyers off the top—including Pamela's Columbus attorneys;

The \$150,000 of Stephen and Christopher had been converted and comingled with the guardianship assets.

Suttman had paid herself using the converted \$150,000.

Dunlap's plan fell through; Pamela owed her a significant sum; Dunlap wanted to pay herself using the converted \$150,000.

Pamela also owed her Columbus attorneys a significant sum; Dunlap wanted to pay Pamela's Columbus attorneys using the converted \$150,000.

Divvy up the rest

Dunlap wanted to divvy up the rest of the converted \$150,000 of personal property belonging to Stephen and Christopher?

We could find no documents where Suttman or Dunlap had any intentions of returning the \$100,000 and \$50,000 Certificate of Deposits back to the entitled owners (Stephen and Christopher).

Summary:

The standard of care for attorneys requires that an attorney represent his client competently and zealously in all matters. It is my opinion, within a reasonable degree of legal certainty, that attorney Jack McGowan fell below the standard of conduct required of attorneys when he did not pursue causes of action against Patricia Suttman and Pamela Lilley.

It is the opinion of this attorney that viable causes of action against Patricia Suttman and Pamela Lilley were available to Stephen Lilley. But for the failure of Jack McGowan to pursue those causes of action, Stephen Lilley was likely to succeed in one or more of the causes of action set forth above. In addition to the failure to pursue these viable claims, there appears to be a complete lack of effort in obtaining information on whether or not such causes of action were likely to succeed. There was no documentation presented in the form of discover requests or otherwise to indicate that Jack McGowan had put any effort into pursuing Stephen Lilley's causes of action against Patricia Suttman and Pamela Lilley. The failure to proceed against Patricia Suttman and Pamela Lilley constitutes violations of the Disciplinary Rules 6-101, 5-102, 6-103 and 7-101, and resulted in conduct below the minimum standards for an attorney.

THE PROBATE PERIOD

- a. Christopher Lilley was the entitled soul owner of the original Certificate of Deposit in the sum of \$50,000
- b. Stephen Lilley was the entitled soul owner of the original Certificate of Deposit CD-4591 in the sum of \$100,000
- c. Stephen Lilley was elected on Marion G. Lilley's will to be Executor of the Estate of Marion G. Lilley

THE CIVIL LAWSUIT PERIOD

Summary:

The standard of care for attorneys requires that an attorney represent his client competently and zealously in all matters. It is my opinion, within a reasonable degree of legal certainty, that attorney Jack McGowan fell below the standard of conduct required of attorneys when he did not pursue causes of action against Patricia Suttman and Pamela Lilley.

It is the opinion of this attorney that viable causes of action against Patricia Suttman and Pamela Lilley were available to Stephen Lilley. But for the failure of Jack McGowan to pursue those causes of action, Stephen Lilley was likely to succeed in one or more of the causes of action set forth above. In addition to the failure to pursue these viable claims, there appears to be a complete lack of effort in obtaining information on whether or not such causes of action were likely to succeed. There was no documentation presented in the form of discover requests or otherwise to indicate that Jack McGowan had put any effort into pursuing Stephen Lilley's causes of action against Patricia Suttman and Pamela

Lilley. The failure to proceed against Patricia Suttman and Pamela Lilley constitutes violations of the Disciplinary Rules 6-101, 5-102, 6-103 and 7-101, and resulted in conduct below the minimum standards for an attorney.

THE FBI/DOJ PERIOD

FBI took no action

Stephen R. Lilley

SWORN to subscribed before me, this _____ day of _____, 2011

Notary Public – State-at-Large

My commission expires: _____

Exhibit A – Memo: Pam to Suttman, Conversion of CD 4591, 07/25/95

07-25-1995 01:50PM

514 864 9217

P.03

Memo To: Patricia A. Suttman

July 25, 1995

From: Pamela A. Lilley

Re: Upcoming Maturity of CDs at FNBWC

Trish,

As you know, CDs #4590 and #4591 are to mature on or about August 8, 1995. Since CD #4591 is registered as "Marion or Steve" and Steve holds the CD document, I am concerned that he may attempt to cash it in before you can acquire it. Yes, it would be stupid for him to do so, but then his actions haven't exactly been brilliant and cooperative lately. I know it is sometimes possible to cash in a CD the day prior (i.e. Aug. 7) because the banking day can begin at 1:00, 2:00 or 4:00 pm on the previous day; and that you can file a form with the bank called "Affidavit for Lost, Stolen or Destroyed Certificate of Deposit" (in your case, "lost" as you don't know where it is and attempts to acquire it have proved futile). But Steve knows all this, too.

Because I know you are very busy, I thought that the following suggestions may assist you in staying a step ahead of Steve:

1. File a copy of the revocation of Steve's POA and your appointment as guardian with the First National Bank of Warren County as soon as possible.
2. Request that the Bank not send a reminder of the two CDs' maturity to Steve (usually done about a week to 10 days prior to maturity) — perhaps a change of address will cover this.
3. Notify Fern (but may be loyal to Steve?) or someone in authority at FNBWC of this CD situation.
4. Cash it in the second it matures, which could be when the banking day starts on the previous day.
5. Consider taking out a loan against it a few days before it matures so that the Bank holds it as collateral against the loan. Then pay off the loan with the matured CD. The interest can't be that significant for only a few days — more like insurance.

I know this seems like a drastic approach, but in view of the fact that Steve has been holding on to Mom's assets rather tenaciously, he may do likewise with these CDs.

I am also concerned that he may not have been technically/legally served with his revocation of POA (unless, of course, you've received the signed document from Jack Hedges). Based on the past and recent actions of Donna Burns, I wouldn't be surprised if Jack gave the POA Revocation to Donna to get Steve's signature and it "somehow" hasn't been completed — "Steve was sick"; "he was unavailable"; "Donna forgot"; whatever.

