

Alan Weberman, pro se  
318 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue  
Number 520  
New York, New York  
10010

Telephone: 917-374-7024  
For Debtor

**IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

STEVEN RAMBAM aka STEVEN ROMBOM                      CASE NO SC092414  
JUDGMENT DEBTORS ACTION FOR EQUITABLE  
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

Plaintiff

vs.

ENOM, INC, A Nevada Corporation  
Demand Media, In A Delaware Corporation  
AJ Weberman and Does 1 to 10 inclusive  
Defendants

Now comes the Judgment Debtor, AJ Weberman, and asked his court to deny the Judgment Creditor the injunction that would freeze the ownership and seize the html content of the URLs in question, <http://jdo.org>, <http://dylanology.com>, <http://garbology.com> and <http://dennisking.org>, and <http://jdo.org> and <http://steverombom.com> and to dismiss the suit that would lead to the seizure of these URLs and websites for the following reasons:

**A. THE JUDGMENT CREDITORS PLEADINGS ARE PRIMA FACIA ABSURD**

1. The Declaration of Gary Kurtz asserts. "The web sites at issue have value because of their age and unusual content. The requested order will not likely stop the defamation, but will capitalize on it to the benefit of the victim of the defamation. Obviously, the

defamatory information will be purged from the websites before they are sold....the process, which starts with a creditors action and injunctive relief, and then moves to the appointment of a receiver to sell the web pages and terminate the lawsuit..." Here, either the Judgment Creditor or the Receiver (it is unclear which) is going to take possession of the web pages and purge the information found to be offensive then the Receiver is going to sell the web pages to someone (perhaps the judgment creditor? Perhaps Nazis who wish to use the name JDO?) who will assume the identity of the Jewish Defense Organization, Dennis King, etc. on the Internet. This makes no sense. If the *New York Times* lost a libel lawsuit would the judgment creditor be allowed to seize the URL <http://nytimes.com>? If an author lost a libel suit could the judgment creditor obtain the copyright and rights to the book and become the author or just get a percentage of the royalties? Could he edit the book to his own satisfaction then put it back on the market? But what is more absurd is that Kurtz thinks that taking possession of the URL's is the same as taking possession of the actual web pages. The company's Kurtz names in his pleadings, ENOM and DEMAND MEDIA, merely provide a service where a name like "acidtrip" is translated into a Unique Resource Locator, essentially a long number, that can be accessed anywhere on the net. The content (html) of JDO is found on the servers of 1 & 1 Internet Inc in Chesterbrook, Pennsylvania. Acidtrip and the others are done through Negril Web Services in Jamaica, West Indies. All that can be illegally seized from ENOM and DEMAND MEDIA are the names of the websites. I have enclosed samples of the bills I receive from these two separate entities as DEBTORS EXHIBIT ONE AND TWO.

## **B. THE WEBPAGES AND URL'S ARE TOOLS OF AJ WEBERMAN'S TRADE AND ARE EXEMPT FROM SEIZURE OR LEAN**

1. The Judgment Debtor, AJ Weberman, is the author of three books, *My Life In Garbology*, *The Dylan to English Dictionary* and *Coup D'Etat in America* and the subject of an award winning British documentary. He is a writer not only in the English Language; but also in HTML, hypertext markup language, which he taught himself and so he is adept at creating websites and graphics. As stated in attached EXHIBITS THREE, FOUR AND FIVE, Weberman is employed by the JDO to run, update, write for etc the website <http://jdo.org> and by Dennis King to run the website, <http://dennisking.org> and by Irvin Dana Beal of the Yippie Museum to maintain the website <http://yippiemuseum.org> among others such as <http://abbiehoffman.com>. He was paid a lump sum of money to create these sites and gets reimbursed for the time he works on the websites on an irregular basis. He uses a HP Pavilion 6355 to do this. Part of his work creating these websites involves obtaining and maintaining the URLs for them. This is why the bills for these web addresses go to Alan Weberman, not to the JDO or Dennis King, as Gary Kurtz, the attorney for Rombom has so well documented.

Just as my computer is a tool of my trade and exempt from seizure so are the URLs that I registered on behalf of my clients the URLs are tools of my trade and I wish to be granted a Claim of Outright Seizure Exemption: A procedure by which a "judgment debtor" can claim that, under federal and/or California law, certain of his money or other property is exempt from outright seizure efforts to satisfy a debt.

The California Civil law states;

487.020. Except as provided in paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 3439.07 of the California Code of Civil Procedure, the following property is exempt from attachment:

- (a) All property exempt from enforcement of a money judgment.
- (b) Property which is necessary for the support of a defendant who is a natural person or the family of such defendant supported in whole or in part by the defendant.
- (c) "Earnings" as defined by Section 706.011.
- (d) All property not subject to attachment pursuant to Section 487.010.

<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=ccp&group=00001-01000&file=487.010-487.030>

**CCP also states,**

704.060. (a) Tools, implements, instruments, materials, uniforms, furnishings, books, equipment, one commercial motor vehicle, one vessel, and other personal property are exempt to the extent that the aggregate equity therein does not exceed:

(1) Six thousand seventy-five dollars \$6,075, if reasonably necessary to and actually used by the judgment debtor in the exercise of the trade, business, or profession by which the judgment debtor earns a livelihood.

<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=ccp&group=00001-01000&file=704.010-704.210>

**THE WEBSITES PROVIDE A SOURCE OF EARNINGS FOR AJ WEBERMAN AND ARE SUBJECT TO GARNISHMENT NOT SEIZURE**

1. The other websites that I run for my own income include <http://garbology.com> which

provides me with income as I sell my garbology book there and <http://dylanology.com> where I sell my *Dylan to English Dictionary* as I also do on <http://acidtrip.com>. This website includes some sponsors and advertisers. The website <http://steverambam.com> leads to a page in acidtrip opinion and editorial about Rombom.

2. As stated Rambam proposes to turn these website names over to a receiver for sale to satisfy a judgment debt along with their content. The website addresses have no intrinsic value as would a website with the name bargains.com or doctor.com. What is someone going to do with a website called acidtrip.com? Sell LSD over the internet? What about garbology.com? Would they sell famous people's trash? These URLs have no financial value other than to AJ Weberman who invented the words *garbology* and *dylanology*. The content of the web pages also generate earnings for AJ Weberman. The California Code of Civil Procedure states,

704.070. (a) As used in this section:

(1) "Earnings withholding order" means an earnings withholding order under Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 706.010) (Wage Garnishment Law).

(2) "Paid earnings" means earnings as defined in Section 706.011 that were paid to the employee during the 30-day period ending on the date of the levy. For the purposes of this paragraph, where earnings that have been paid to the employee are sought to be subjected to the enforcement of a money judgment other than by a levy, the date of levy is deemed to be the date the earnings were otherwise subjected to the enforcement of the judgment.

(3) "Earnings assignment order for support" means an earnings assignment order for support as defined in Section 706.011.

706.011. As used in this chapter:

(a) "Earnings" means compensation payable by an employer to an employee for personal services performed by such employee, whether denominated as wages, salary, commission, bonus, or otherwise.

706.050. Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, the amount of earnings of a judgment debtor exempt from the levy of an earnings withholding order shall be that amount that may not be withheld from the judgment debtor's earnings under federal law in Section 1673(a) of Title 15 of the United States Code:

## § 302 Definitions

For the purposes of this title:

(a) The term "earnings" means compensation paid or payable for personal services, whether denominated as wages, salary, commission, bonus, or otherwise, and includes periodic payments pursuant to a pension or retirement program.

(b) The term "disposable earnings" means that part of the earnings of any individual remaining after the deduction from those earnings of any amounts required by law to be withheld.

(c) The term "garnishment" means any legal or equitable procedure through which the earnings of any individual are required to be withheld for payment of any debt.

### **§ 303. Restriction on garnishment**

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) and in section 305, the maximum part of the aggregate disposable earnings of an individual for any workweek which is subjected to garnishment may not exceed

(1) 25 per centum of his disposable earnings for that week, or

(2) the amount by which his disposable earnings for that week exceed thirty times the Federal minimum hourly wage prescribed by section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in effect at the time the earnings are payable, whichever is less. In the case of earnings for any pay period other than a week, the Secretary of Labor shall by regulation prescribe a multiple of the Federal minimum hourly wage equivalent in effect to that set forth in paragraph (2).

[http://www.osha.gov/pls/epub/wageindex.download?p\\_file=F21659/wh1280.pdf](http://www.osha.gov/pls/epub/wageindex.download?p_file=F21659/wh1280.pdf)

3. In another case against this Judgment Debtor in The Superior Court of the State of California For The County of Los Angeles Case # BS 081799 brought by Rambam it was determined that Rambam was only entitled to 25% of any money Weberman received for the film *The Ballad of AJ Weberman*, rather than the entire amount as proposed by his attorney Gary Kurtz. On a previous occasion Rambam and his attorney Gary Kurtz convinced Commissioner Murray Gross to turn over any and all money in the paypal account of AJ Weberman, again money that was purely income rather than an asset. This Judgment Debtor is petitioning Commissioner Gross and asked him to overturn this attempted illegal seizure of my funds and reduce the amount I must pay to 10% to conform with the New York law regarding garnishment as California deducts 25% or a percentage set by a Commissioner.

The CCP states,

(b) Paid earnings **that can be traced into deposit accounts** or in the form of cash or

its equivalent as provided in Section 703.080 are exempt in the following amounts:

(1) All of the paid earnings are exempt if prior to payment to the employee they were subject to an earnings withholding order or an earnings assignment order for support.

(2) **Seventy-five percent of the paid earnings that are levied upon or otherwise sought to be subjected to the enforcement of a money judgment are exempt** if prior to payment to the employee they were not subject to an earnings withholding order or an earnings assignment order for support.

## **C. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES, FREEDOM OF PRESS, FREEDOM OF SPEECH, FREEDOM OF POLITICAL ASSOCIATION**

1. What we are witnessing here is a round about play to suppress opinion and editorial Rambam finds offensive. Kurtz states, "For example, the acidtrip.com website accuses Mr. Rambam of being a child molester, among other false accusations." Kurtz says the JDO website accuses "Mr. Rambam of being a terrorist, a criminal and other false offensive terms." What Kurtz is referring to here are court documents about Rambam's terrorism conviction, his arrest for impersonating an FBI agent and other public source information. He is using a judgment not to collect money but to violate my constitutional rights of freedom of press and freedom of speech. He is also violating the public's right to public information.

If the URL were turned over to the Judgment Creditor the rights of the Jewish Defense Organization to freedom of political association would be violated. The Jewish Defense Organization is not to be confused with the Jewish Defense League. The JDO runs an electronic newspaper announcing various demonstrations such as one held a few weeks ago in Monsey, New York, against a group of Jews who met with the President of Iran at a holocaust denial conference in Tehran. A visit to the JDO website at [http://jdo.org/neturei\\_karta](http://jdo.org/neturei_karta) will show the worldwide attention this JDO demonstration got. The website is truly an anti-Nazi electronic newspaper and blog, which has editorials and JDO's opinion on the news and is protected under the First Amendment.

## **JURISDICTION**

The attorney for the Creditors claim of jurisdiction is contradictory. He asserts that ENOM is a Nevada Corporation and DEMAND MEDIA is a Delaware Corporation "qualified to do business in California" that has an office in that state whereas ENOM is a Nevada Corporation located in Washington State. It is ENOM that is the name server and resolves the websites. The California Courts have no jurisdiction over a company



doing business in Washington.

The question arises, "Why resolve this issue in California?" Weberman and Rombom are both residents of New York State and this was where the judgment was issued. After Rombom's arrest for impersonating an FBI Agent, the FBI determined Rombom rented a room close to his parents apartment in Brooklyn. See EXHIBIT SIX attached. Rombom got a Sister Judgment in California when this Judgment Debtor has no assets there. He did so for three reasons – he went judgment shopping to get the highest percentage, to make it more difficult for the Judgment Debtor and the JDO to defend itself due to the cost of traveling to LA for Hearings and because Gary Kurtz, a low cost attorney works out of L.A. This is not the only time Kurtz has pursued an action in which the court had no jurisdiction. The Superior Court of California had found that Lubomyr Prytulak had defamed Gary Kurtz, an American lawyer on Prytulak's Nazi website and in letters to several judges. When Kurtz sought to have the judgment registered in B.C. Supreme Court, which would allow him to collect a default judgment, Prytulak applied to have the registration set aside. On the second day of the hearing, B.C. Supreme Court Chief Justice Donald Brenner agreed with Prytulak's arguments that the California court did not have the proper jurisdiction.

Kurtz cites a related case in his pleadings in the action, LC073703, in which Prytulak lost his URL as a result of the above-mentioned judgment by default since he only filed one motion in the case according to the docket sheet. The documents concerning this case are not available from the court on-line so they are on order from Kurtz and from the courthouse.

For these reasons and other not yet formulated I am asking this Court to dismiss the motion to seize the aforementioned URLs and Web pages as they are tools of the trade that provide income to this judgment debtor are have a value of about \$170. I am also asking that you don't allow a dangerous precedent to be set in this case that allows Judgment Creditors to violate other's constitutional rights, using a debt as a workaround the libel laws.

AJ Weberman

pro se

Tuesday, January 23, 2007