

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE TWENTIETH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR LEE COUNTY, FLORIDA

FREDERIC A. BLUM,

Petitioner,

vs.

Case No. 15-DR-31538

RANDY ALLEN SCOTT,

Respondent.

PETITION BY AFFIDAVIT FOR ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR A VIOLATION OF
FINAL JUDGMENT OF INJUNCTION FOR PROTECTION AGAINST STALKING

NOW COMES Petitioner, FREDERIC A. BLUM, by and through his attorney Andrew J. Banyai of AIKEN, O'HALLORAN & BANYAI, and being sworn, certifies that he has actual knowledge of the following facts as set forth and the following statements are true.

1. The Court previously issued a Final Judgment of Injunction for Protection Against Stalking in this case on July 27, 2015.
2. The Final Judgment of Injunction for Protection was served on Respondent on July 27, 2015.
3. This matter revolves around Respondent Randy Allen Scott's efforts to publicize allegations regarding Petitioner Frederic Blum.

Mr. Scott is convinced, for reasons unknown to Petitioner and which Respondent is unable to coherently articulate, that Petitioner is the primary organizer of a conspiracy designed to marginalize Respondent and his competing association in the professional process serving community.

Respondent responds to these perceived (though wholly nonexistent) attacks by disseminating through all available electronic means, including and particularly the use of

email and social media, allegations regarding what he asserts are criminal conspiracies designed to further marginalize Respondent and his business. This has included posting and disseminating emails, multiple websites and Youtube videos (previously admitted to the record in this cause) depicting webs of association between purported criminal conspiracy members, information relating to the status of Petitioner's son as a registered sex offender, references to Petitioner's wife and daughter, depictions of Rabbis in the midst of religious services, references to an Ayatollah, and various permutations of the assertion that the Petitioner is a criminal.

For example, Petitioner is President of the Jewish Genealogical Society in Philadelphia and assists the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, D.C. in locating Holocaust survivors and their descendants. Respondent incorporates these activities into the web of conspiracy he alleges, referring to National Association of Professional Process Servers as a cult.

When repeatedly questioned by this Honorable Court regarding why he is disseminating these allegations to the 2200-person National Association of Professional Process Servers (NAPPS) email group and creating multiple internet postings on different URLs regarding these allegations -- essentially, what Respondent's "beef" is, Respondent eventually offered the following explanation:

"Because, you know, Your Honor, I graduated with a non-profit management degree and then I became a process server. I had President Bush speak at my commencement address and he -- and so I was moved to move forward what he said, and that is to go out there and be the light of the world and do what you can in order to bring about justice for everyone."

(Hearing transcript, pp. 16-17.)

4. The Court granted Petitioner's petition. Counsel for Petitioner enquired of the Court "Will the petition [sic] deal with the removal of any of the old posts?" to which the Court responded "I'm done. I granted the petition." (Hearing transcript, p. 88.)

Petitioner's Petition requested on its face:

- A. Immediately restraining the respondent from committing any acts of stalking,
 - B. Restraining the respondent from committing any acts of stalking,
 - C. Providing any terms the court deems necessary for the protection of a victim of stalking, including any injunctions or directives to law enforcement agencies,
 - D. Removal of cyberstalking posts from www.pstrade.us; www.processserverposse.com; www.aforps.com; www.facebook.com (Profile of American Federation of Responsible Process Servers; www.nappswatcher.com; www.serve-not.com; and www.youtube.com, the www.twitter.com feed on the American Federation of Responsible Process Servers,
 - E. Sending emails to the 2200 NAPPS members concerning Respondent,
 - F. Enjoinment from posting further YouTube videos regarding Petitioner and his family, and
 - G. Posting further Facebook posts about Petitioner.
5. Immediately following the issuance of the injunction in this cause many of the posts and websites were removed and the torrent of personal messages from concerned and/or curious members of NAPPS subsided. Respondent has willfully violated the injunction by resurrecting many of these sites, including and particularly dueprocessday.com, pstrade.com, and processserverposse.com. The following passage comes from the very

top of the resurrected dueprocessday.com and is representative of the new tenor of Mr. Scott's approach. All grammatical errors are *sic*.

"The final order enjoin respondent from contacting the petitioner. This never occurred. So you are not authorized to forward any of this to the petitioner. Specifically Mike Compton, Gina Sharbowski, Andy Estin, and James lowery all forwarded to the petitioner his exhibits. You are not authorized to be here and no one is authorized to forward any thing here to petitioner."

Should any person viewing Respondent's resurrected websites be unfamiliar with the matter or the identity of the petitioner Respondent is referencing, Respondent has added (below a picture of three trained and suited monkeys hearing, seeing and speaking no evil) the Case Docket of the present cause to his website, listing Respondent by name. Respondent has also posted a link to an audio recording of the hearing before this Honorable Court. Respondent has additionally resumed posts on the Facebook page Process Server Big Blue Tent, from a relatively innocuous (though annoying) blog post regarding Florida Stalking Injunctions, to the far more problematic "For those who are blocked from accessing www.pstrade.us or processserverposse.com or dueprocessday.com it's not directed at you. It is about the process serving industry. Duh"

6. Respondent has taken his argument that these posts, emails, and other disseminations are not directed at Petitioner to the Florida Court of Appeals for the Second District. It is possible they may ultimately agree with Respondent's arguments, or they may reject them. However, Respondent is clearly functionally unable to await that eventual determination. The fact of the matter is that this Honorable Court enjoined Respondent from further posts directed at Petitioner. When Respondent states "it's not directed at you" this is, ironically, a statement which is absolutely directed at Petitioner. When Respondent incorporates this present case docket into a website which is a vehicle for

peddling the nonsense that seems to be Respondent's primary stock-in-trade, he is asserting that this Court and its judgment are part of the nefarious criminal conspiracy working to silence his efforts to be the light of the world.

7. Respondent acted to impair, interfere with, delay, hinder, lessen the authority of, dignity of, and embarrass the cause of justice in a manner contemptuous of this Court.

WHEREFORE the Petitioner, by and through his counsel, respectfully requests that this Honorable Court issue an Order to Show Cause, requiring Respondent to appear before the Court to show cause why Respondent should not be held in contempt of court for failure to abide by the terms and conditions of the Final Judgment of Injunction for Protection.

I understand that by filing this affidavit, I am asking the court to hold a hearing, that both Respondent and I will be notified of the hearing, and that I must appear at the hearing. In addition to my own testimony, I understand that I can bring proof of the violation such as, for example, people who saw Respondent violate the order, pictures, medical records, police reports, or anything which might help show the judge how Respondent violated the Final Judgment of Injunction for Protection.

I have read every statement made in this affidavit and each statement is true and correct. I understand that the statements made in this affidavit are being made under penalty of perjury, punishable as provided in Section 837.02, Florida Statutes and that the punishment for knowingly making a false statement includes fines and/or imprisonment.

Dated: _____

10/20/15



Signature of Petitioner

STATE OF Pennsylvania
COUNTY OF Philadelphia

Sworn to or affirmed and signed before me on 10/19/2015 by _____.

Melissa H. Kaplan
NOTARY PUBLIC or DEPUTY CLERK

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
NOTARIAL SEAL
MELISSA H. KAPLAN, Notary Public
City of Philadelphia, Phila. County

[Print, type, or stamp name and commission expiration date of notary or clerk.]

Personally known
 Produced identification
Type of identification produced _____

I certify that a copy of this document was (x) ^{emailed} ~~mailed~~ () faxed and mailed () hand delivered to the person(s) listed below on October 22, 2015.

Other party or his/her attorney:

Name: Randy Allen Scott
Address: 343 Hazelwood Avenue S.
City, State, Zip: Lehigh Acres, Florida 33936
Fax ^{Email} Number: randy@randyscott-us