

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO  
 DEPARTMENT NO. 8                      BEFORE HON. JAY M. BLOOM, JUDGE

_____	)	
CHARLES KNUFF,	)	
	)	
PLAINTIFF,	)	
	)	
VS	)	CASE NO.
	)	37-2011-00088438-CU-EN-CTL
GARY S. GEVISSER,	)	
	)	
DEFENDANT.	)	MOTION
_____	)	

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT

APRIL 26, 2012

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:	BIRD MARELLA
	BY: JESSICA S. CHEN
	(TELEPHONIC APPEARANCE)
	1875 CENTURY PARK EAST, 23rd FLOOR
	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067

FOR THE DEFENDANT:	IN PROPRIA PERSONA
--------------------	--------------------

NONA L. MAESTAS, CSR 9279  
 OFFICIAL REPORTER

**SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA; THURSDAY, APRIL 26, 2012; 2:34 P.M.**

THE COURT: Knuff versus Gevisser -- Gevisser.

Anybody on the phone?

THE CLERK: Yes, Your Honor.

MS. CHEN: Your Honor --

THE CLERK: Just one moment.

THE COURT: Hang on a second.

(The Court and the clerk confer off the record)

THE COURT: Hello. This is Judge Bloom.

MS. CHEN: Good morning, Your Honor.

This is Jessica Chen appearing for Plaintiff  
Charles Knuff.

THE COURT: We'll go ahead and call the case on the  
record then. This is the matter of Knuff versus Gevisser.

And can I have your appearance now, please.

MS. CHEN: Yes. This is Jessica Chen appearing on  
behalf of Plaintiff Charles Knuff.

THE COURT: And you're appearing by phone.

Okay. Sir, can I have your name.

MR. GEVISSER: Gary Gevisser.

THE COURT: All right. And it's here before the  
Court today for a motion to reconsider and also for a motion  
to quash.

The tentatives are both against you, so I'll hear  
any argument you have, sir.

MR. GEVISSER: First of all, Your Honor, I have new  
evidence of the plaintiff Knuff and his lawyers trying to

1       manipulate the key defendant, Mr. Tucker -- who just handed me  
2       now a document, a settlement agreement, dealing with the issue  
3       of jurisdiction, which is the -- the basis of this entire  
4       case.

5               THE COURT: You mean with regard to the Texas case?

6               MR. GEVISSER: The Texas case.

7               THE COURT: I think it was explained to you earlier  
8       by the other judges that we have no control over the Texas  
9       case. If it's a valid case, we have to accept it. If you  
10      have an issue of how it was conducted, you have to deal with  
11      the Texas courts.

12              MR. GEVISSER: It wasn't a valid case. The  
13      jurisdiction was wrong. And this -- this settlement agreement  
14      where they are trying to get Mr. Tucker -- he's never been --  
15      tried -- trying to get him to leave. Essentially, they're  
16      saying Tucker agrees to consent and submit to the personal  
17      jurisdiction of the court in the lawsuit in Texas.

18              All the parties are here in California. Nobody's  
19      in Texas. So the Texas jurisdiction is -- was wrong to begin  
20      with. And we've tried to fight that in Texas. They've never  
21      allowed the arguments to be heard. And they just strike the  
22      pleadings.

23              THE COURT: Okay. But what I'm trying to say to  
24      you -- even if I agreed with you 100 percent, I have no  
25      authority to do anything with the Texas judgment. I can't do  
26      anything. I'm not allowed to.

27              MR. GEVISSER: Even when the jurisdiction is wrong?

28              THE COURT: I have nothing -- all I can do is

1 enforce the judgment. If it's a valid judgment, I enforce it.  
2 If there's some validity issue, you have to go back to Texas  
3 and deal with it there. I have no authority to do anything.  
4 It's against the law, almost, for me to do anything because  
5 you have to give full faith and credit to judgments of other  
6 states.

7 MR. GEVISSER: But the judge has said there's no  
8 evidence against me of defamation. You have those  
9 transcripts. The judge begins the proceedings by saying, how  
10 can I defend myself. "Defenses to what?" Because he says, "I  
11 don't know what this lawsuit is about. Mr. Gevisser may know  
12 what this lawsuit is about. You may know, Mr. Loewinsoh, what  
13 this lawsuit is about, but I don't know what this lawsuit is  
14 about." So the judge is giving me my very best defense.

15 And then the next thing is he hands me a \$4,000,000  
16 judgment. He denies -- Plaintiff Knuff never had to prove  
17 damages because there was no defamation. So how does he come  
18 up with even \$4,000,000? I mean, did they look at the date?  
19 They had to make it big enough to intimidate not just any  
20 lawyer but give the appearance of truth. And we -- we know  
21 from Hitler, Your Honor, that the bigger the lie, the more  
22 likely the masses will believe it. And so, you know, the end  
23 result is that I had to have done something wrong.

24 So the facts support everything. I had the  
25 citation of law that there was no way that Texas had  
26 jurisdiction. The only jurisdiction possible -- that's even  
27 if they could come up with a shred of evidence -- they never  
28 came up with one shred of evidence. And the most heinous

1 crime is defamation. Not a shred of evidence. The  
2 transcripts -- the short transcripts describe it. The  
3 transcripts describe it.

4 And on top of it, Your Honor, they have never once  
5 asked to retract the statements because the statements don't  
6 exist. They are nonexistent. So if they were to ask me  
7 specifically to remove the statements, it would incriminate  
8 them. How can you have a trial, how can you have such a large  
9 judgment, no evidence, and then they making out that this is  
10 an attack on somebody's reputation and then they don't ask for  
11 retraction? There's never been one request because there are  
12 no statements I've made.

13 There's never been a case like this in the history  
14 of the world, Your Honor, let alone in the history of the  
15 United States.

16 I happen to be the most credible person Knuff or  
17 any of these lawyers have come across. I have the impeccable  
18 reputation. And I'm the one that's having my murder -- I'm --  
19 my reputation is being murdered. And I can't find a single  
20 jurisdiction in the United States to hear the truth and to  
21 give me my justice.

22 Mr. Knuff has never had to -- how could somebody  
23 bring such a heinous charge of defamation and not have to  
24 present a shred of evidence? 700 pages of exhibits. And the  
25 judge is looking at this. It's all put on. The whole thing  
26 is playacting.

27 The judge received -- while the lawyer was on  
28 retainer to Mr. Knuff, he received two payments three days

1       apart of a thousand dollars. I thought the courts are  
2       supposed to have the appearance of -- of justice, the  
3       appearance of doing the right thing. And here you have in  
4       Texas \$2,000 being paid -- one on June the 29th of 2009 and  
5       the other on July 2nd of 2009 of a thousand dollars from  
6       Loewinsoh to this judge.

7               And the judge also says, "To top it off, I may be  
8       trampling on Mr. Gevisser's constitutional rights."

9               You want to know why I'm angry, Your Honor?  
10       This is -- this is outrageous. There's never been a case like  
11       this in the history of the world.

12              And every judge is saying, "I -- I'm restricted on  
13       what I could do. It would be illegal for me to rule against  
14       this injustice in Texas." Yeah, it should have been in  
15       federal court to begin with. It was diversity of the entity.

16              We made all the pleadings. Mr. Knuff never  
17       responded to one single inquiry from me -- one of my  
18       interrogatories. And he was given a free pass from beginning  
19       to end because it was a fraud. The entire case, Your Honor,  
20       was fabricated. Every single lawyer we have been to has  
21       looked at this and said the exact same thing. And those that  
22       are honest have said, "We don't want to touch this because we  
23       have to appear before a court and a judge can easily just  
24       dismiss us."

25              And second of all, those that have taken our money  
26       have just taken our money. They look at the 4,000,000, and  
27       they want to know how much money does my wife have in her IRA.  
28       They say, "Go. Go. F the truth." The truth is not important

1 to them. They just want to know.

2 And now they're coming after my wife. They come  
3 after our landlady. I mean, they say to our landlady -- this  
4 is the most extraordinary thing -- that they believe -- they  
5 have information and belief that she's hiding my assets.

6 You're supposed to -- the first thing one learns at  
7 law school, I thought, was you ask the questions: who knew  
8 what, when, how, where. How did they come up with this  
9 information that my landlady is -- is hiding my assets? What  
10 assets?

11 Just intimidation. This is Nazism. You will never  
12 find a more clear-cut case of police-state intimidation.

13 I come from South Africa, Your Honor. There is no  
14 family that opposed the apartheid regime and stood taller than  
15 my family. My history is all on the web site that they want  
16 shut down. But they can't be specific because it's the truth.  
17 The truth is irrefutable. I come from the family that stood  
18 the tallest. Of course, those that stood taller are not here  
19 today. My history is on that web site. I'm an open book,  
20 Your Honor, because I have nothing to hide.

21 Mr. Knuff is hiding. They are using the courts and  
22 they are defaming -- as I said in my statement, they're  
23 defaming the justice system. They're making a farce. And  
24 they want -- basically they're going from this position to  
25 essentially making us criminals and then incarcerating us. I  
26 mean, everybody -- everybody can see where this is going here.

27 And I've stood tall. I stayed in this country. I  
28 haven't gone running to Israel or England or China or back to

1 South Africa. I could have left a long time ago.

2 You do have discretion, Your Honor. You have  
3 discretion because you have common sense. You have truth.  
4 You -- you can see a fraud when it's before your eyes.

5 I have just one last thing that I'd like to say  
6 since Your Honor -- before going into the fact -- the evidence  
7 is that all these assets belong to my wife that they're trying  
8 to now attack -- prior to our marriage.

9 And so since this may be my last opportunity to get  
10 my justice in a California state court, I should be allowed to  
11 question on the record how it is possible that these crooks  
12 can be allowed to terrorize us and yet they're afforded the  
13 dignity of honorable men? I don't see why my wife needs to go  
14 through a debtor's examination since it is very clear that her  
15 house, her cabin, and assets belonged to her prior to our  
16 marriage.

17 The assets that my wife -- that my now wife, Marie  
18 Dion, had prior to our marriage, which are mainly her cabin in  
19 Pine Valley, which was bought in 2002 prior to our marriage on  
20 April 23rd, 2003. Her IRA that she has not yet touched. And  
21 she had a house in Barbados that she bought in the mid-1990s  
22 after her divorce from her first husband, which is what she  
23 lived on. And her element -- these assets were mainly kept in  
24 the Wells Fargo and Bank of America, separate account of hers,  
25 that has been levied.

26 She took physical possession of her IRA when gold  
27 started to go up so to minimize the tax liability. I don't  
28 see how that makes me a part of her assets. The fact that I



1 was her business consultant and financial advisor does not  
2 make her assets common property. Was she to divorce me, I  
3 would have no claim on her assets.

4 Knuff, Mr. Chan and company have come at us with  
5 the latest debtors examination of my wife and our landlady --  
6 as they insult her with the misspelling of her last name. And  
7 calling this, on top of everything, lady a landlord. They say  
8 they have information and belief that our landlady is hiding  
9 assets of mine without bringing this information to the light.  
10 It is no different to the innuendos at the Texas trial when  
11 not a shred of evidence was ever presented.

12 It is mind-boggling, so much that they don't even  
13 ask for a retraction of the statements claimed to be  
14 defamatory. Maybe because they are not. And maybe that would  
15 be too incriminating for them since from the start they have  
16 not been clear about these statements, as Judge Lowy made it  
17 clear in his first statements.

18 This Court should put to an end -- to put an end to  
19 this flagrant abuse of the justice system. People do  
20 understand evidence. The better the evidence, the better the  
21 proof, which they lack. They have no evidence which is  
22 crucial in a law-abiding society.

23 Again, just like what Texas Judge Lowy stated in  
24 his first recorded statements, "Defenses to what?" And  
25 somehow that got lost quickly as it gave way to the appearance  
26 of propriety that was so well -- so veiled thin and full of  
27 threats. It is not retrying the case given how Texas was the  
28 wrong jurisdiction. How can a judge ignore and fail to

1 question the wrong jurisdiction? Instead Judge Lowy begins  
2 the coverup by jumping in -- jumping in with focusing on the  
3 lack of evidence. Again, all to dismiss the wrong  
4 jurisdiction.

5 So alarming are his words: "You may know what this  
6 lawsuit is about. Gevisser may know, but I sure don't" -- was  
7 like an actor reading from a carefully written script. For  
8 Judge Lowy to then proceed and continue to give an air of  
9 propriety to his 4,000,000 judgment. And when every lawyer we  
10 go to says, "F the truth," it gives very little faith in any  
11 of this lawless system and who represents it.

12 How can anyone associate such ungodly, such  
13 untruthfulness, such flagrant disregard for the truth with the  
14 word "God"?

15 Ask for 4,000,000 and not even give us the courtesy  
16 of stating what the defamation is. Maybe you, Judge, are  
17 curious enough to ask Mr. Chan.

18 And since -- or now it is his wife or lady with the  
19 same name, and since he's going to hide under "I'm only  
20 collecting," maybe his law firm could give -- give us this  
21 courtesy, since they have refused everything we've asked for:  
22 proof of Knuff's neurological disabilities now that he's  
23 receiving all sorts of medical treatment; our request for jury  
24 trial proving up his financial losses; and again and again,  
25 jurisdiction.

26 What would you think if you were in my shoes? Does  
27 it sound honest? Lack of integrity is flagrant throughout  
28 this. It is everywhere. How come Mr. Chan is not -- not

1 even -- not even be ashamed. Thank God for God. If they  
2 could have handed these debtors examination orders to us on  
3 our wedding anniversary this past Sunday, they would have.

4 Yes, that we have information and belief; we think  
5 we have reason to believe. Because somehow Mr. Chan is more  
6 credible than we are because he is a lawyer. Who knew what,  
7 when, and how is common sense, again, Your Honor. How and  
8 what information does Mr. Chan have?

9 This vagueness not only suits the crooks, but it is  
10 able to convict someone more credible than any other  
11 United States citizen who is explaining the history that has  
12 never been revealed in its entirety and so succinctly. And to  
13 top it off, I am the one labeled in that case. What sick  
14 person would do this, let alone be allowed to create such a  
15 defamation on the justice system?

16 How much of a threat to a corrupt society must I be  
17 that the courts have so far been unwilling to come down hard  
18 on such thugs who are simply using the court system to steal  
19 property that they otherwise couldn't earn in a free and fair  
20 marketplace.

21 Again, still they have not asked for specific  
22 statements to be retracted because they don't know where to  
23 begin at all. Because there are none to be retracted. The  
24 truth is the best defense against defamation. It would prove  
25 this whole proceeding to be a farce if they were to ask for  
26 specific statements that they couldn't present during the  
27 trial.

28 The courts are supposed to have the appearance of

1 impartiality and to be so, in fact. And yet, there were these  
2 huge and open money bribes paid by Knuff, Loewinsoh to Judge  
3 Lowy and just days apart. But instead of calling them bribes,  
4 they give a name: political contributions.

5 This is straightforward fear and intimidation  
6 tactics. It is unconscionable. It begins with instilling  
7 fear into the hearts and minds of those who have no voice  
8 because they are kept economically poor and poor of knowledge.

9 It is about who I am. And the fact that I have the  
10 irrefutable facts of the chicanery that begins a long way from  
11 the official borders of the United States. You do away with  
12 me as you first allow these thugs to impoverish my wife and I  
13 before jailing us under false charges. All the while, these  
14 thugs operate with impunity. And the next murder becomes that  
15 much easier. Again, Nazi Germany revisited.

16 There has to be shame. Otherwise it is the rule of  
17 the violent anarchists that the lazy prefer over competing on  
18 a merit-basis system.

19 This trial should have ended before it began by not  
20 being allowed into court. A ten-year old would understand  
21 what is going on here amongst all this appearance of  
22 propriety. It is again mind-boggling. And maybe these crooks  
23 will get their justice before they die.

24 Last but not least, again is Adam Tucker here.  
25 First time he's ever been in a courtroom to face by the  
26 telephone the opposition.

27 MS. DION GEVISSER: They severed him.

28 MR. GEVISSER: They severed him. They severed

1 Mr. Tucker right as they're handing me this \$4,000,000  
2 judgment.

3 I've never met Mr. Knuff, the plaintiff. I've  
4 never communicated with him. The only person that's met,  
5 communicated with him is Mr. Tucker.

6 And now, Your Honor, he has a trial date set for  
7 June the 4th in Texas. And they're asking him for 60 days'  
8 extension because they want us to be buried first.  
9 Bankrupted. He -- they know he doesn't have the funds to get  
10 to Texas and play this game.

11 THE COURT: Anything else, sir?

12 MR. GEVISSER: What if Mr. Tucker was found  
13 innocent again? Would that make me innocent, Your Honor?

14 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

15 I'll hear from the other side.

16 MS. CHEN: Yes, Your Honor. With regard to the  
17 motion for reconsideration, we agree with your tentative  
18 ruling, Your Honor. It -- it's clear that the judgment in  
19 Texas court has been final. Defendant has already tried  
20 appealing to the Texas appeals board and that appeal has been  
21 denied. So the judgment is final. There are no valid grounds  
22 to set aside judgment. And we agree this Court does not have  
23 jurisdiction to set aside the Texas court judgment.

24 And, yeah -- and even procedurally on a motion of  
25 reconsideration, Defendant is required to bring up new or  
26 different facts, circumstances, or law that could not have  
27 been brought at a previous hearing. And Defendant has not  
28 established that by any means.

1 MR. GEVISSER: I've got --

2 THE COURT: Shhh. Quiet.

3 MS. CHEN: It --

4 THE COURT: Wait till she's done.

5 Anything else?

6 MS. CHEN: And with respect to the motion to quash  
7 the levy, again, we agree with your tentative ruling. We  
8 would note that Defendant has the burden of proof to basically  
9 prove up that these funds are exempt from levy.

10 Defendant has -- aside from providing a  
11 declaration -- merely stating the fact that all the funds in  
12 the bank account are separate property. Aside from that,  
13 Defendant has not provided any documentary evidence to prove  
14 that this is separate property. And he clearly has not met  
15 his burden of proof.

16 And, in addition, Defendant has indicated in his  
17 reply that right after his judgment debtor's examination, he  
18 promptly closed his joint account with his spouse. This  
19 really indicates to us that Defendant is playing games. He's  
20 attempting to hide his assets. And he's once again trying to  
21 evade enforcement of a judgment that has been validly entered  
22 in Texas state court and also in this court.

23 And, again, we agree with your tentative ruling,  
24 Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

26 I'll give you the last word, sir.

27 MR. GEVISSER: Your Honor --

28 MS. DION GEVISSER: Those are my personal accounts.

1           MR. GEVISSER: First of all, they levied my wife's  
2 personal account. All her property is separate. The cabin is  
3 in her -- her name.

4           MS. DION GEVISSER: My ex --

5           THE COURT: One at a time.

6           MR. GEVISSER: It's got -- it's still in -- it's  
7 not in my name. None of -- none of her assets have ever been  
8 put in my name. This is her ex-husband's name still, her  
9 married name. Her IRA is in her name. She -- when she got  
10 together with me, she was just divorced and wary. She had two  
11 young children. She wasn't handing over assets to me. This  
12 is all her separate and sole property that they are now going  
13 after.

14           And what was in -- we -- we had small sum of money  
15 in a joint account that paid off expenses. There was a few  
16 hundred dollars. We used that money, rather than go to this  
17 crook Knuff.

18           But my wife's separate property has always been her  
19 separate property. They levied a -- a account -- I did not  
20 have signatory authority on it. This is all her private  
21 property.

22           THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, do you have a response  
23 to that?

24           MS. CHEN: Your Honor, in addition to his reply  
25 where he indicated that he closed his joint account  
26 immediately after the judgment debtor's examination, Defendant  
27 also, during his examination, said he and his wife freely draw  
28 upon their various accounts --

1 MR. GEVISSER: That's not true.

2 MS. CHEN: -- Texas --

3 THE COURT: Shhh. Quiet.

4 MS. CHEN: -- demonstrating that funds are  
5 commingled.

6 THE COURT: Well, what about her IRA? That would  
7 be separate.

8 MS. CHEN: The IRA? We didn't actually levy --  
9 well, to be clear, we levied on the bank accounts that are  
10 held in either the defendant's name and/or his wife's name in  
11 Wells Fargo and Bank of America. So these are just deposit  
12 accounts, Your Honor. Not -- didn't try to levy on any IRA  
13 accounts.

14 MR. GEVISSER: Your Honor, here --

15 THE COURT: Shhh. Quiet. When she's done, I'll  
16 hear from you.

17 Go ahead, ma'am.

18 MS. CHEN: In addition, Defendant is required to  
19 trace the funds in his bank account to any separate property  
20 that he's claiming is the source of these funds. Defendant  
21 has not done that, besides from his mere assertion that these  
22 are separate property --

23 THE COURT: Well, I think an IRA, per se, would be  
24 her separate property.

25 MS. CHEN: But the IRA account -- we didn't levy on  
26 that. That's not at issue here. But the issues here are the  
27 funds in his deposit account or his wife's deposit account in  
28 Wells Fargo and Bank of America. The IRA account is not an



1 account that we levied upon.

2 MR. GEVISSER: (Motioning)

3 MS. CHEN: We didn't attempt to levy on it and --

4 THE COURT: Show it to the bailiff.

5 He's got some documents where it would apparently  
6 show --

7 MR. GEVISSER: You're lying. That's what it shows,  
8 Your Honor.

9 MS. DION GEVISSER: You're --

10 THE COURT: Hang on. Don't talk until I ask you to  
11 talk, please.

12 Let me see what this is.

13 MS. DION GEVISSER: My IRA --

14 MR. GEVISSER: They're going for a debtor's --

15 THE COURT: Quiet.

16 MR. GEVISSER: Oh, sorry, Your Honor.

17 MS. DION GEVISSER: Without even waiting for the  
18 judgment.

19 THE COURT: Wait, wait, please.

20 THE BAILIFF: Miss, you have to --

21 THE COURT: Don't talk until I ask you to talk,  
22 please. The reporter is trying to take this down. And she  
23 can't take down multiple voices. So hang on one second.  
24 Okay?

25 Okay. Well, this is just a request that you appear  
26 for a JDX.

27 MR. GEVISSER: Right, before, Your Honor --

28 THE COURT: Okay. Wait, wait.

1 All right. Counsel on the phone, anything else you  
2 wanted to add?

3 MS. CHEN: (No response)

4 THE COURT: Counsel, are you there?

5 MS. CHEN: Yes. I'm sorry. What was that, Your  
6 Honor?

7 THE COURT: Anything else you wanted to add?

8 MS. CHEN: No, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: All right. Okay.

10 MR. GEVISSER: Your Honor, even before she heard  
11 your ruling today, heard your voice for the very first time,  
12 they submitted that debtor's examination to my wife this past  
13 Monday, calling upon the IRA and calling upon her -- her  
14 cabin, calling upon all her assets.

15 So here she's making out like this -- she's --  
16 she's doing everything right and proper, following the court  
17 rules and procedures, and -- and abiding by -- by your  
18 standing. In the meantime, then she's saying to you, "No,  
19 we've never tried to go after his IRA."

20 You've got a lawyer now in court lying through  
21 their teeth. We have it in all their documents, Your Honor,  
22 of these lawyers lying from beginning to end. She has -- she  
23 has lied. She's perjured herself.

24 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Go ahead, ma'am.

25 MS. CHEN: Yes, Your Honor. What Defendant's  
26 referring to is an order to -- for a third-party examination.  
27 We -- we applied to this Court for an examination order for  
28 Ms. Gevisser. And this Court properly issued an order for

1 examination.

2 THE COURT: Right. I have that.

3 MS. CHEN: Apart -- I'm sorry. Attached with the  
4 examination order, we included a number of document requests.  
5 One of those document requests includes information about her  
6 IRA account. So this is not per se an attempt to levy on that  
7 account. It is an attempt to get information about  
8 Mr. Gevisser's assets, which we are allowed to do under --

9 THE COURT: Okay.

10 MR. GEVISSER: Your Honor, the IRA is none of their  
11 business.

12 MS. CHEN: And --

13 THE COURT: Hang on.

14 MS. CHEN: -- depending on the information we get  
15 through the examination and from the documents we've requested  
16 from Mr. Gevisser, we will then proceed accordingly. This  
17 examination order of itself is not an order to levy upon any  
18 account. It is certainly not at issue in this motion to quash  
19 or motion for reconsideration.

20 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

21 MR. GEVISSER: It's a big issue to us.

22 THE COURT: We're done. We're done, sir.

23 As to the motion to reconsider, the Court will deny  
24 the motion on several grounds. One, that it's untimely. Two,  
25 there's no new or different facts or circumstances of law.  
26 And, three, on the merits.

27 MS. CHEN: Your Honor --

28 THE COURT: Wait, wait.

1 MS. CHEN: I'm having trouble hearing you.

2 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'm denying the motion on  
3 the grounds it was untimely. There's no new or different  
4 facts. And, three, as I've indicated, this Court has no  
5 jurisdiction to reconsider a Texas judgment. It has to give  
6 full faith and credit to a valid judgment from Texas. If  
7 there's a problem, it needs to be considered in Texas, not  
8 here.

9 As to the motion to quash, that is also denied.  
10 However, the Court will note in the record that the wife has a  
11 right to have her separate property not levied upon. And if  
12 she has an IRA and/or any real or personal property that is  
13 totally in her name, that is not to be subject to any levy.

14 And that will be the order of the Court.

15 Thank you.

16 MR. GEVISSER: What -- Your Honor, what about our  
17 money?

18 THE COURT: We're done.

19 Thank you, sir.

20 MR. GEVISSER: So I never get the money, Your  
21 Honor, from the -- they've taken this money from the --

22 THE BAILIFF: Sir, we're done.

23 (Proceedings concluded at 3:04 p.m.)

24 \* \* \*

25

26

27

28

**CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER**

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA )**

**)**

**COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO )**

I, Nona L. Maestas, CSR Certificate No. 9279, an official reporter in the Superior Court of the State of California, in and for the County of San Diego, hereby certify that I made a shorthand record of the proceedings had in the within matter of Knuff versus Gevisser, held on April 26, 2012, before Judge Bloom in Department 8, and that the foregoing transcript is a full, true, and correct transcription of the proceedings ordered in this case.

Dated this 22nd day of May, 2012.

NONA L. MAESTAS,

CSR NO. 9279