

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, DAMAGES, AND INVESTIGATIVE REFERRAL.....	pg. 1
I. JURISDICTION AND VENUE.....	pg. 2
II. PARTIES.....	pg. 3-5
III. INTRODUCTION.....	pg. 5-6
IV. FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND CLAIMS.....	pg. 6-22
V. DEFENDANTS AND SERVICE ADDRESSES.....	pg. 22–24
VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF.....	pg. 24-25
VII. ADA NOTICE.....	pg. 25
VERIFICATION / DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY.....	pg. 26
EXHIBIT A – Letter to Counsel Referenced by District Attorney Spitzer (June 27, 2025).....	pg. 27–33

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

U.S. Supreme Court Cases

<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009)	33
<i>Bailey v. Glover</i> , 88 U.S. (21 Wall.) 342 (1874)	25
<i>Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007)	33
<i>Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.</i> , 556 U.S. 868 (2009)	24
<i>Connally v. Georgia</i> , 429 U.S. 245 (1977)	24
<i>Dennis v. Sparks</i> , 449 U.S. 24 (1980)	22
<i>Egbert v. Boule</i> , 143 S. Ct. 1793 (2023)	33
<i>Gonzaga Univ. v. Doe</i> , 536 U.S. 273 (2002)	22
<i>Hafer v. Melo</i> , 502 U.S. 21 (1991)	33
<i>Holmberg v. Armbrrecht</i> , 327 U.S. 392 (1946)	25
<i>Marshall v. Jerrico, Inc.</i> , 446 U.S. 238 (1980)	24
<i>Oyler v. Boles</i> , 368 U.S. 448 (1962)	35
<i>Throckmorton, United States v.</i> , 98 U.S. 61 (1878)	13,20,32
<i>Tumey v. Ohio</i> , 273 U.S. 510 (1927)	24
<i>United States v. Armstrong</i> , 517 U.S. 456 (1996)	20
<i>United States v. Beggerly</i> , 524 U.S. 38 (1998)	27
<i>United States v. Price</i> , 383 U.S. 787 (1966)	20,22,32
<i>Ward v. Monroeville</i> , 409 U.S. 57 (1972)	24
<i>Yick Wo v. Hopkins</i> , 118 U.S. 356 (1886)	20,32,35
<i>Garcetti v. Ceballos</i> , 547 U.S. 410 (2006).....	10
<i>Kissinger v. Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press</i> , 445 U.S. 136 (1980)...	17

State Cases

<i>Tucker v. County of Orange</i> , Case No. 30-2021-01183413-CU-OE-CJC (Cal. Super. Ct. filed 2021)	10
<i>Powers v. Bank of New York Mellon (BONYM)</i>	8
<i>County of Orange District Attorney Real Estate Fraud Unit Report</i> , Aug. 24, 2021 ...	7

Federal Cases

<i>Armstrong v. Executive Office of the President</i> , 1 F.3d 1274 (D.C. Cir. 1993)...	17
<i>Jones v. City of Los Angeles</i> , 444 F.3d 1118 (9th Cir. 2006)	17

<i>Project on Government Oversight v. Trump et al.</i> , No. 1:25-cv-00527 (D.D.C. filed Feb. 21, 2025)	17
<i>Whitaker v. Garcetti</i> , 486 F.3d 572 (9th Cir. 2007)	17
<i>United States v. Armstrong</i> , 517 U.S. 456 (1996).....	17
<i>United States v. Soria</i> , No. 2:19-cr-00150 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 2, 2021)	20
<i>People v. Patrick Joseph Soria</i> (Case No. 8:21-CR-00214-DSF).....	9, 20, 22
<i>Nationstar Mortgage LLC v. Patrick Joseph Soria</i> , 2:18-cv-03041-DSF-RAO (C.D. Cal. April 11, 2018).....	21
<i>Nationstar Mortgage LLC v. Soria</i> , No. 18-55728 (9th Cir. Feb. 15, 2019).....	21

Federal Statutes and Authorities

28 U.S.C. § 1331	1
28 U.S.C. § 1343	1
28 U.S.C. §§ 2201–2202	1
28 U.S.C. § 1391(e)	1
28 U.S.C. § 1651	16
42 U.S.C. § 1983	Section II, 37
42 U.S.C. § 1985(2)-(3)	37
42 U.S.C. § 1988	Section IV-G
42 U.S.C. § 12101	37
18 U.S.C. § 1001	20, 34
18 U.S.C. § 1341	20, 34
18 U.S.C. § 1343	20, 34
18 U.S.C. § 1512	22, 34
18 U.S.C. § 1956	20, 34
18 U.S.C. § 1961 et seq.	34, 37
18 U.S.C. § 514	20
5 U.S.C. § 552	17
5 U.S.C. §§ 701 et seq.	17
44 U.S.C. § 3101 et seq.	17
44 U.S.C. § 2201 et seq.....	17

Other Authorities

Northwest Ordinance of 1787	Section I-2
California Government Code § 12560	34
California Government Code § 13931	34 Federal

Housing Finance Agency, Final Suspension Order – In re: Patrick Joseph Soria (Oct. 4, 2022) – Bar from business with regulated entities after federal sentencing.21

***Plaintiff respectfully asserts this filing has been prepared in good faith and to the best of her ability. Due to documented disabilities under the ADA, any citation errors, omissions, or format irregularities are not intentional. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend or correct the record as necessary, and respectfully requests the Court's reasonable accommodation.*

Powers, Billie Rene' Frances Lillian

P.O. Box 1501

Newport Beach, CA 92659

powersbillie@yahoo.com

Plaintiff, Pro Per

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

Powers, Billie Rene' Frances Lillian, individually and on behalf of similarly situated victims and whistleblowers nationwide,

Plaintiff In Propria Persona (Pro Per)

V.

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY – COUNTY OF ORANGE, TODD

ALLAN SPITZER, in his official and individual capacities, **COUNTIES OF SAN DIEGO, LOS ANGELES, ORANGE, AND RIVERSIDE**, and their respective **BOARD MEMBERS**, in both their official and individual capacities, as owners and operators of the 'S.E.C.U.R.E.' recordation and case management software systems, and **JOHN DOES 1–50**,

Defendants.

Case No.:

**COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, DAMAGES,
AND INVESTIGATIVE REFERRAL**

I. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question), 28 U.S.C. § 1343 (civil rights), and 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201–2202 (declaratory and injunctive relief).
Plaintiff also invokes the Court’s equitable authority under constitutional and public trust doctrines. Venue is proper in the District of Columbia under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) as the acts and omissions alleged involve federal interests and officials, span multiple states, and implicate national patterns of harm. Jurisdiction is not proper in the Central District of California due to demonstrated conflicts of interest, past judicial entanglements, and the systemic concealment of fraud by court and prosecutorial officers. Accordingly, this action is properly brought in the District of Columbia where federal oversight is available and where extraordinary national interest warrants central review.
2. Plaintiff also invokes the enduring guarantees of due process and land title protection articulated in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, incorporated into federal common law and applicable to all U.S. jurisdictions.
3. Venue is proper in this Court because Plaintiff’s claims arise under federal law and implicate widespread injuries spanning multiple jurisdictions, with core misconduct centered in the Central District of California but affecting victims nationwide through interlinked, government-operated software systems.

II. PARTIES

Plaintiff: Billie Rene’ Frances Lillian Powers is a U.S. citizen and a victim of systemic land and judicial fraud. She appears *pro per* and under duress. Plaintiff also brings this action on behalf of similarly situated victims and whistleblowers nationwide whose rights have been impacted by the misconduct alleged herein.

Defendant: Office of the District Attorney – County of Orange is a public entity charged with investigating and prosecuting criminal conduct and upholding public integrity within Orange County. This office is named as a defendant based on repeated and well-documented failures to act upon credible, substantiated, and often sworn evidence of serious crimes—including forgery, land theft, insurance fraud, and public corruption—submitted by Plaintiff and similarly situated victims over several years. Despite receiving this evidence through proper channels, the OCDA demonstrably failed to investigate, respond, or engage in good faith, resulting in ongoing harm, obstruction of justice, and suppression of victim rights. Internal misconduct, including strategic gatekeeping, suppression of records, and retaliation against whistleblowers, contributed to a systemic collapse of prosecutorial integrity. In fact, portions of the whistleblower evidence originally submitted by Plaintiff and others were later relied upon or mirrored in the prosecution of *United States v. Patrick Joseph Soria*, confirming the credibility and utility of the victims’ evidence. However, the victims who submitted this evidence were never contacted, protected, or served—nor were their foundational claims addressed—thereby compounding the injury and denying rightful legal remedies. The OCDA's failure to protect these victims while profiting from or leveraging their submissions reflects a breach of public trust, a denial of equal protection, and actionable

misconduct under civil rights and constitutional law. These sustained failures and obstructions rise well beyond negligence and reflect a deliberate breach of duties owed to the public under the United States and California Constitutions, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and related statutory and equitable authorities.

Defendant: Todd Allan Spitzer: The elected District Attorney for Orange County, sued in both his official and individual capacities. Allegations include failure to act on whistleblower evidence, public misrepresentations, and systemic concealment within his office.

Defendant – Counties of Orange, Los Angeles, San Diego, and Riverside:

These public entities are named not only as governing bodies, but as owners, operators, and financial beneficiaries of the proprietary software system known as S.E.C.U.R.E.. These counties hold equitable and administrative interests in the platform, which they have licensed and deployed across multiple jurisdictions to manage land record and case filings. Rather than serving the public interest, the system has been used to conceal judicial proceedings, enable forged document recordings, and bypass due process protections. The counties' dual role—as both adjudicators and beneficiaries—creates a direct conflict of interest and systemic harm to property owners and victims. Through their oversight and control, these counties have failed to ensure transparency, accountability, or equitable use of the system, instead allowing its misuse to result in widespread fraud, concealment of crimes, and irreparable injury to Plaintiff and similarly situated individuals.

Defendant – Board Members and Contract Agents of the S.E.C.U.R.E. System, in their official and individual capacities:

These individuals include elected officials, administrative directors, and private contractors responsible for designing, deploying, or maintaining the S.E.C.U.R.E. software system. They are directly tied to its operational control and financial structure and are named for their active roles in facilitating, concealing, or profiting from a platform that has been used to violate property rights, obscure judicial records, and perpetuate systemic fraud. Their conduct, whether by commission or omission, contributed to the deprivation of Plaintiff's and others' constitutional and statutory rights under color of law.

Defendants: John Does 1–50: Unknown individuals or entities involved in acts of concealment, retaliation, suppression of evidence, or the manipulation of judicial and land record systems under color of law. Their identities will be determined through discovery.

III. INTRODUCTION

4. Plaintiff brings this action in response to long-standing and widespread harm caused by fraudulent judicial and land record practices enabled through proprietary case and record management systems owned and operated by government entities and associated private interests. These systems, including the software platform known as 'S.E.C.U.R.E.' are designed to conceal shadow dockets, unauthorized filings, and off-record actions that bypass the rights of victims.

5. Plaintiff proceeds under duress, as a disabled individual under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and requests that all proceedings and communications accommodate her documented impairments, including limitations affecting communication and digital access.
6. Plaintiff also brings this claim on behalf of her heirs in succession, whose rights to lawful inheritance were unlawfully divested through acts of fraud, suppression, and governmental nonfeasance.

IV. FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND CLAIMS

7. From 2017 through 2025, Plaintiff and aligned victims repeatedly submitted evidence, complaints, and criminal referrals concerning forged deeds, falsified court filings, counterfeit powers of attorney, and systemic perjury used to defraud homeowners and seize assets through manipulated proceedings. These documents were acknowledged but ultimately buried by actors within the Orange County District Attorney's office, with criminal investigations abandoned with explanation of "nothing to see here" all the while the Patrick Soria case mirrored the claims in where he was convicted.
8. Plaintiff's personal case—*Powers v. Bank of New York Mellon et al.*, Case No. 8:17-cv-01234-DOC (C.D. Cal. filed August 2017)—was heard in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California before Judge David O. Carter, self nicknamed during hearings as "The Sledgehammer". In open court, Judge Carter explicitly referred to the matter as "compensable" and acknowledged that if Plaintiff could prove fraud, he would refer the case to the United States Attorney General for further investigation and potential action. Despite Plaintiff providing documented evidence of forgery, perjury, and

counterfeit instruments used in the seizure of her property, the case was later diverted, and dismantled without formal adjudication on the merits.

9. Evidence destroyed in Plaintiff's case included verified proof of forged documents, false claims by attorneys, and perjured testimony presented in court without consequence. Efforts to join other victims through civil joinder of criminal actions were blocked or ignored and later destroyed through spoliation. The subsequent prosecution in *People v. Soria* functioned as a shadow case, mirroring the factual pattern and evidence originally developed in *Powers v. Bank of New York Mellon* and submitted through a criminal investigation opened by DA Investigator John Minn. That investigation, which included whistleblower testimony and forensic documentation, was ultimately buried—yet the State used its findings to pursue Soria, omitting the victims who had uncovered the scheme. The *Soria* case thus validated the credibility of Plaintiff's evidence while simultaneously excluding the original complainants, obstructing justice, and shielding culpable public actors from scrutiny. It is Plaintiff's determination that prosecutors within the District Attorney's office leveraged *Powers v. BONYM* and the underlying whistleblower evidence not to protect victims, but to shield the counties' financial and administrative interests in the S.E.C.U.R.E. software system—of which their offices were stakeholders. By repurposing the facts into a controlled prosecution, while concealing the system's role in enabling document fraud, the DA's office effectively used Plaintiff's case to divert scrutiny from their own institutional liability and preserve the profitability and secrecy of a platform their counties owned and operated.
10. In 2021, Orange County District Attorney Investigator Damon Tucker filed a civil lawsuit against the County of Orange and DA Todd Spitzer in *Tucker v. County of Orange*, Case

No. 30-2021-01183413-CU-OE-CJC. Tucker alleged that DA Spitzer operated a “pay-for-play” office that engaged in political favoritism, retaliated against whistleblowers, and targeted adversaries using prosecutorial powers. These allegations reflect the type of retaliatory conduct addressed in *Garcetti v. Ceballos*, 547 U.S. 410 (2006), where the U.S. Supreme Court clarified that public employees may suffer unconstitutional retaliation when disciplined for exposing official misconduct within a prosecutorial office. It was claimed by Tucker that Spitzer labeled him a dirty cop. A March 5, 2021 *Orange County Register* article independently reported on these allegations, quoting Tucker’s claims of a “corrupt culture” inside the DA’s office. Tucker asserted that he was fired for refusing to carry out unlawful or unethical orders. In justifying Tucker’s termination, DA Spitzer publicly referred to him as a “dirty cop,” a characterization Tucker contended was both false and retaliatory. This label was part of the DA’s office’s narrative to discredit Tucker after he reported internal misconduct and refused to carry out unethical directives. The “dirty cop” claim was a central issue in the civil suit and arbitration proceedings, which ultimately led to Tucker’s reinstatement, indicating that the allegation lacked evidentiary support and was improperly used to terminate a whistleblower. He was ultimately reinstated through arbitration, lending credence to the merit of his claims.

11. In a separate matter, Tucker is reported to have filed false criminal charges against a homeowner, nearly leading to her unlawful incarceration. The case unraveled only after outside exposure revealed the truth, raising additional concern about the misuse of prosecutorial discretion by DA personnel.

12. In June 2025, DA Todd Spitzer claimed to have “no knowledge” of Plaintiff’s eight years of documented submissions, investigations, and whistleblower reports—despite clear evidence that his office had received, reviewed, and internally processed them. This statement raises a compelling inference of deliberate concealment, obstruction, or internal sabotage. Taken together, these incidents establish a consistent pattern of institutional misconduct within the DA’s office, including retaliation, selective enforcement, and willful neglect of duty. The Plaintiff’s experience is not an anomaly but part of a broader pattern of administrative corruption and constitutional violations against victims and whistleblowers.
13. Plaintiff invokes the legal principle that fraud vitiates everything. See *United States v. Throckmorton*, 98 U.S. 61 (1878). Forged, falsified, and counterfeited records do not enjoy lawful protections and toll any applicable limitations statutes. As such, this action is not barred by time.
14. Further, Plaintiff asserts that ownership and equity interests in the S.E.C.U.R.E. software recording system created an impermissible conflict of interest. Public officials benefitting from platforms that conceal judicial activity cannot fairly adjudicate or prosecute crimes arising from that same concealment. This conflict was not disclosed, and its systemic effects have resulted in harm to thousands.
15. Plaintiff’s efforts, under the ongoing Toll and Roll™ mission, have united victims across multiple states whose claims reflect the same factual pattern: land theft, family dissolution, guardianship abuse, court fraud, and denial of redress. These harms are not incidental, but symptomatic of software-based systems designed for opacity and extraction.

16. Federal intervention is not only warranted but imperative due to the extraordinary breadth of verified, corroborated evidence submitted by Plaintiff and aligned victims. This includes: (1) the Petition of Remonstrance, (2) a comprehensive Amicus Brief, and (3) coordinated legislative outreach now spanning over 40 state legislatures, as well as formal submissions to the United States Congress, the White House, Department of Justice, U.S. Attorney General's Office, and Federal Bureau of Investigation. Additionally, the evidence has been formally reviewed with the Department of Government Efficiency ("DOGE"), confirming the DOJ's internal assessment of its significance. These submissions contain sworn declarations, forensic analyses, and documentary evidence revealing systemic fraud, deprivation of rights under color of law, and judicial concealment across multiple jurisdictions and inter-county systems. The filing materials are available upon request or by court order and establish first impression standing under the All Writs Act (28 U.S.C. § 1651), the public trust doctrine, and federal civil rights law.
17. Further reinforcing the national significance of these claims, Plaintiff references the civil complaint *Project on Government Oversight v. Trump et al.*, Case No. 1:25-cv-00527 (D.D.C., filed Feb. 21, 2025), in which the misconduct challenged involved violations of the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. § 552), the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. §§ 701 et seq.), the Federal Records Act (44 U.S.C. § 3101 et seq.), and the Presidential Records Act (44 U.S.C. § 2201 et seq.), which mirror the concealment and record-tampering issues alleged herein. As confirmed in *Kissinger v. Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press*, 445 U.S. 136 (1980), FOIA applies only to records under the control of a federal agency. That principle has been used to evade transparency, both in

the DOGE context and in similar schemes involving the S.E.C.U.R.E. platform. That complaint alleges the improper classification of federal agency records as presidential materials to evade FOIA, raising constitutional and administrative concerns nearly identical to those now exposed through the S.E.C.U.R.E. platform. Like DOGE, the counties and defendants in this action operated proprietary software systems to obstruct transparency, conceal criminal proceedings, and strip victims of rightful access to public records. The POGO case thus underscores the emergent national pattern of software-enabled concealment and validates Plaintiff's assertion that this matter warrants central venue and oversight in the District of Columbia, where DOGE-related misconduct is already under judicial review. Similarly, in *Armstrong v. Executive Office of the President*, 1 F.3d 1274 (D.C. Cir. 1993), the D.C. Circuit confirmed that government records cannot be disguised as presidential to avoid lawful disclosure. Additional precedent, including *Whitaker v. Garcetti*, 486 F.3d 572 (9th Cir. 2007), and *Jones v. City of Los Angeles*, 444 F.3d 1118 (9th Cir. 2006), reinforces that municipal liability attaches where a pattern of retaliation and obstruction is shown. These cases collectively support venue in the District of Columbia and justify Plaintiff's demand for federal oversight, investigation, and relief.

18. Plaintiffs and their aligned parties nationwide have presented verifiable claims of judicial misconduct, case manipulation, and retaliatory abuse stemming from their engagement with public offices and court systems enabled by S.E.C.U.R.E. software and its derivatives.

19. Key whistleblower evidence was intentionally omitted from record by court staff and ignored by DA personnel despite multiple attempts by Plaintiffs and other victims to submit it in admissible formats.
20. Judge Carter publicly referred to the Powers case as “compensable,” and noted that if fraud could be proven, he would refer the matter to the United States Attorney General. Despite extensive evidence of fraud—including forged documents, perjury, and concealed filings—the matter was dismantled without adjudication. The dismantling of Plaintiff’s case directly coincided with the rise of *People v. Patrick Joseph Soria*, a federal prosecution in the Central District of California (Case No. 8:21-CR-00214-DSF), based on identical factual patterns—including counterfeit grant deeds, sham corporate entities, falsified assignments of security interests, and interstate wire fraud. Patrick Joseph Soria was sentenced to 152 months in federal prison for his role in this scheme, which included wire fraud and contempt of court due to the unauthorized recording of fraudulent documents in county land records across California and other states. Interestingly, despite the breadth of the fraud, Soria was not held accountable for the fraudulent filings themselves—each of which constituted potential violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1341 (mail fraud), 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (wire fraud), 18 U.S.C. § 1001 (false statements), and 18 U.S.C. § 1956 (money laundering). His conviction notably avoided charging him for the actual recordation of fraudulent instruments, which—under 18 U.S.C. § 514 (false or fictitious instruments)—could have resulted in additional decades of incarceration and massive financial penalties. Plaintiff asserts that this strategic limitation in charges raises substantial questions as to selective prosecution and whether nefarious deals were arranged to shield the true culpability of the counties and their

software systems that enabled the filings, particularly the proprietary "S.E.C.U.R.E." platform. The Supreme Court has long held that selective enforcement or discriminatory prosecution violates the Equal Protection Clause. See *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356 (1886); *United States v. Armstrong*, 517 U.S. 456 (1996). Moreover, concealment of systemic abuse by government actors—particularly when tied to profit, equity interests, or conflicts of interest—warrants heightened scrutiny and falls within the purview of the federal government under *United States v. Price*, 383 U.S. 787 (1966), where the Court affirmed that "private persons jointly engaged with state officials in prohibited action are acting under color of law." Finally, under *United States v. Throckmorton*, 98 U.S. 61 (1878), fraud upon the court—including concealment of crimes—vitiates every part of the proceeding, and no time limit or procedural closure excuses it. The absence of charges directly linked to Soria's fraudulent recordations, despite thousands of affected filings and parties, must be viewed in this light. Plaintiff therefore reserves the right to seek full discovery and investigatory referral to uncover whether software vendors, public officials, or county executives received indemnity, immunity, or informal protection from liability in exchange for limited prosecution. [dockets.justia.com+5](#).

21. Parallel civil litigation in *Nationstar Mortgage LLC v. Patrick Joseph Soria*, 2:18-cv-03041-DSF-RAO (C.D. Cal. April 11, 2018), invoked RICO statutes based on Soria's racketeering activities—fraudulently transferring title and exploiting land-record systems to deprive homeowners of their homes. [dockets.justia.com+1justice.gov+1](#).
22. These civil and criminal cases corroborate the same software-enabled record-tampering and fraudulent activity at the heart of Plaintiff's case. Their existence confirms that the actions of the Orange County District Attorney's Office—including diversion of the

Powers claim—occurred amid ongoing federal and civil enforcement relating to the same pattern of misconduct. Such diversion may constitute unlawful obstruction under 18 U.S.C. § 1512 (tampering with a witness, victim, or informant), especially where coordinated schemes prevent victims from obtaining redress. In *United States v. Price*, 383 U.S. 787 (1966), the Supreme Court affirmed that both public and private actors engaged in conspiracies that undermine civil rights can be prosecuted under federal authority. In *Gonzaga Univ. v. Doe*, 536 U.S. 273 (2002), the Court reinforced that individuals have a right to enforce federally protected entitlements when state processes are obstructed. Further, *Dennis v. Sparks*, 449 U.S. 24 (1980) confirms that judges or public officials acting in bad faith or collusion with private actors are not immune from suit. Therefore, the parallel prosecutions in *People v. Soria* and related federal actions are not isolated but part of a documented pattern of systemic abuse, affirming Plaintiff's allegations of case diversion, judicial concealment, and prosecutorial omission.

23. The existence of proprietary systems like S.E.C.U.R.E. and their use in facilitating hidden transactions, undisclosed case files, and shadow proceedings places legal and equitable liability on counties and agents with equity or oversight interests in the platform.
24. The same counties that operate S.E.C.U.R.E. also hold adjudicatory authority in cases arising from the system's misuse, presenting a glaring conflict of interest under due process and impartiality standards. This dual role violates the constitutional guarantee of a fair and impartial tribunal under the Fourteenth Amendment. In *Tumey v. Ohio*, 273 U.S. 510 (1927), the U.S. Supreme Court held that it is a violation of due process for a judge or tribunal to have a "direct, personal, substantial pecuniary interest" in the outcome of a case. In *Ward v. Monroeville*, 409 U.S. 57 (1972), the Court extended this

reasoning, holding that even the appearance of a conflict where adjudicators help fund their own governmental entity through fines or fees presents an impermissible risk of bias. Moreover, in *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S. 868 (2009), the Court ruled that when the probability of actual bias on the part of the judge or tribunal is too high to be constitutionally tolerable, recusal is required—even absent proof of actual misconduct. These precedents collectively affirm that when counties adjudicate disputes stemming from their own proprietary software, especially where financial or institutional benefit is implicated, the threshold for unconstitutional bias is met. Plaintiff further asserts that the S.E.C.U.R.E. software platform—and others like it—create an institutional conflict of interest not only by concealing court and land record activity but also by structuring financial incentives that reward counties and their vendors based on document volume. Counties contracting for the use of S.E.C.U.R.E. reportedly pay per-document licensing or usage fees, while simultaneously charging the public substantial fees to record or retrieve official documents, effectively creating a profit motive for document inflation or fraudulent filings. This dual-revenue model incentivizes both governmental entities and private contractors to facilitate, ignore, or conceal excessive and potentially unlawful filings. Such arrangements run afoul of constitutional protections under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and conflict with public trust principles governing judicial and land record integrity. The U.S. Supreme Court has held that systems which financially reward adjudicators or officers of the court based on the volume or outcome of cases undermine impartiality and violate due process. See *Tumey v. Ohio*, 273 U.S. 510 (1927); *Connally v. Georgia*, 429 U.S. 245 (1977) (invalidating a payment system where a judge’s compensation varied with issuance of

warrants); and *Marshall v. Jerrico, Inc.*, 446 U.S. 238 (1980) (noting even administrative adjudications require neutrality where revenue incentives exist). Plaintiff contends that the per-document compensation structure embedded within the S.E.C.U.R.E. contracts and similar proprietary systems functionally aligns the interests of county officials with private profiteers, rendering them institutionally biased and incapable of providing constitutionally compliant forums.

25. On June 24, 2025, during a public Board of Supervisors meeting, Plaintiff initially approached Orange County District Attorney Todd Spitzer to greet him and share the DOGE meeting due to his office's lack of follow through with investigations. Plaintiff requested acknowledgment of her years of attempts to S.E.C.U.R.E. a meeting, submit evidence, and alert the DA's office to systemic fraud and record tampering. Mr. Spitzer appeared genuinely confused and indicated he had no knowledge of the extensive documentation, whistleblower complaints, or investigations tied to Plaintiff's matter. Later, before leaving the meeting, Mr. Spitzer voluntarily and with urgency approached Plaintiff again while she was seated in the audience, expressing concern and directing her to call his office, get on his calendar, and stating he would ensure staff recognized her name. This dual exchange constitutes material new evidence of fraudulent concealment and obstruction within the DA's office. Under *Holmberg v. Armbricht*, 327 U.S. 392, 397 (1946), the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed that where a victim is kept ignorant of fraud through no fault of their own, "the bar of the statute [of limitations] does not begin to run until the fraud is discovered." See also *Bailey v. Glover*, 88 U.S. (21 Wall.) 342 (1874); *Cortez v. County of Los Angeles*, 294 F.3d 1186 (9th Cir. 2002). Plaintiff asserts this public interaction demonstrates that gatekeepers and internal actors deliberately

obstructed information from reaching the DA, and as such, any statute of limitations defense is tolled under doctrines of fraudulent concealment, continuing violations, and equitable estoppel. This newly documented evidence justifies the reopening of Plaintiff's and other victims claims and affirms their legal right to proceed in pursuit of redress.

26. On June 26, 2025, Plaintiff returned to the Orange County District Attorney's office to follow up on the prior day's phone call that was not returned. At that time Plaintiff waited 45 minutes on a bench in the DA courtyard. Plaintiff was subsequently approached by and spoke directly with Senior Investigator Michael Kendrick in the public courtyard of the DA's office. Investigator Kendrick confirmed that Mr. Spitzer had not been informed of Plaintiff's arrival, nor had Spitzer directed or authorized the interview. Kendrick promised to review the matter and follow up by Wednesday, July 2, 2025, but failed to do so. Plaintiff had requested all follow-up be sent via email due to the absence of voicemail and safety concerns. No email or contact was received. These events confirm that Plaintiff has exhausted non-litigation options in good faith and is now proceeding under duress and in fear for her safety, given the pattern of obstruction, retaliation, and delay. *A contemporaneous written account of this meeting and the continued failure of Spitzer's staff to follow his public directive was sent by Plaintiff on June 27, 2025, to Liebert Cassidy Whitmore, a law firm referenced by Mr. Spitzer during the June 24 Board of Supervisors meeting as having represented the County. This correspondence is attached as Exhibit A.*

27. The legal principle that fraud vitiates everything applies in the instant matter. Where government actors engage in deception, courts are required to unwind such actions regardless of lapse in time. See *United States v. Beggerly*, 524 U.S. 38 (1998).

28. Plaintiff provided direct evidence of forged title claims, backdated documents, false statements from attorneys such as Steven Dailey, who admitted error yet was not sanctioned, and obstruction by the judiciary under color of law.
29. Powers' property rights were unlawfully stripped through falsified legal instruments never addressed on the merits. The counter-allegations that surfaced in place of the actual investigation were contrived to cover systemic failure and obstruction.
30. The actions of Judge Carter, although initially promising review, ultimately shielded bad actors and derailed what should have been a straightforward referral to the US AG, which he had acknowledged would occur upon proof of fraud.
31. Plaintiff and the aligned class of victims delivered the Petition of Remonstrance and an Amicus Brief to more than 40 state legislatures, Congress, the White House, and federal agencies. These filings reflect the broader public harm and unify the injured parties under first impression standing in this matter. Their evidence and sworn accounts support a unified call for justice and redress across all jurisdictions affected by these concealed systems.
32. Plaintiff explicitly demands a coordinated investigation by the United States Attorney General, the Department of Justice Civil Rights Division, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This request is made under constitutional, civil rights, and public trust doctrines, reinforced by case law affirming that when local enforcement and prosecutorial structures collapse or are compromised, the federal government must intervene. See *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356 (1886); *United States v. Price*, 383 U.S. 787 (1966); *United States v. Throckmorton*, 98 U.S. 61 (1878). These authorities support both Plaintiff's standing and the national necessity for a non-judicial law enforcement inquiry.

33. Plaintiff seeks declaratory discovery to ascertain the full identities and equity interests of any individual board members, contractors, or private parties who derived profit or concealed misconduct related to these systems. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend this complaint accordingly, and invokes the discovery doctrines applicable under *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662 (2009), and *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544 (2007), to support the right to proceed against as-yet unnamed but identifiable wrongdoers upon proper factual showing. Plaintiff further asserts that the ownership and proprietary interest in S.E.C.U.R.E. and related software platforms created substantial conflicts of interest that undermined impartial adjudication in both court and land record systems. These dual interests, operating under color of law, warrant full inquiry into whether systemic fraud and concealment toll any perceived limitations period and support both civil liability and criminal referral. See *Hafer v. Melo*, 502 U.S. 21 (1991), clarifying that officials sued in their personal capacity are not entitled to sovereign immunity when constitutional rights are violated. And, *Egbert v. Boule*, 143 S. Ct. 1793 (2023) Clarifies limits on Bivens suits against federal officials, emphasizing that such suits are exceptional and must align with congressional intent — but doesn't foreclose suits against state-level officers acting under color of law.
34. Plaintiff states that as California Attorney General, Kamala Harris, and most other State AG's, participated in the multi-state National Mortgage Settlement of February 9, 2012, which required participating states to monitor servicer compliance but did not grant her oversight authority over judicial recordation systems like 'SECURE.' Separately, under the S.E.C.U.R.E. Charter and compliance enforcement authority, Harris was empowered under President Obama with the oversight of the software platform to fully investigate

any allegations of fraud or problems with the system. It was after whistleblower evidence—such as that provided by the “California 18”—revealed concealed land-record manipulation it became evident Harris was violating her responsibilities. Despite documented claims and sworn affidavits referencing the SECURE system, no meaningful investigation or enforcement action occurred, marking a failure of public trust and dereliction of duty. These unaddressed allegations implicate due process and public-trust violations under California law, including *California Government Code § 12560 et seq.* (False Claims Act enforcement) and *§ 13931* (real estate fraud provisions), both of which authorize the AG to prosecute fraudulent conveyances and title theft. Plaintiff claims that Harris’s failure to act in the face of credible evidence undermines state enforcement mechanisms, further justifying this federal intervention and establishing a pattern of concealment and non-enforcement that crosses jurisdictional lines. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants engaged in a pattern of racketeering activity in violation of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO), 18 U.S.C. § 1961 et seq. This pattern includes predicate acts of mail and wire fraud (18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1343), tampering with witnesses and victims (18 U.S.C. § 1512), false statements (18 U.S.C. § 1001), money laundering (18 U.S.C. § 1956), and document fraud (18 U.S.C. § 514). The coordinated efforts by government officials, attorneys, and private actors to obstruct justice, conceal records, and retaliate against whistleblowers constitute an ongoing criminal enterprise affecting interstate commerce.

35. Plaintiff contends that upon verified information and contends, all four counties named herein—Orange, Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Diego—have been subject to multiple high-profile criminal investigations, internal audits, and civil claims for prosecutorial or

law enforcement misconduct in the past decade. These include Orange County's scandals involving jailhouse informant abuse and political corruption linked to County Supervisor Andrew Do; Los Angeles County's appointment of special prosecutors to investigate police misconduct under DA Hochman in 2025; Riverside County's 2024 federal bribery prosecutions; and San Diego County's role in concealing prosecutorial abuses exposed in cross-county litigation. Despite these precedents, no comparable investigatory action has been directed toward the systemic fraud enabled by inter-county software platforms like S.E.C.U.R.E.. Plaintiff asserts that the People—victims of forgeries, fraudulent court filings, and judicial concealment—are equally entitled to federal investigation and relief. The persistence of these schemes, despite years of external probes, evidences the need for outside intervention and underscores Plaintiff's demand for full accountability. See *Oyler v. Boles*, 368 U.S. 448 (1962); *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356 (1886).

36. Plaintiff has exhausted every reasonable avenue to resolve these matters outside of litigation. Over the course of eight years, she has submitted verified complaints, contacted officials at every level of government, participated in public forums, and made direct outreach to district attorneys, investigators, legislators, and agency personnel. Plaintiff's intent has always been to prevent harm, secure redress, and end the systemic judicial warfare occurring through the use of concealed software platforms. However, her good faith efforts have been met with gatekeeping, document suppression, and obstruction—forcing her to seek judicial relief. This Complaint is filed as a last resort and under lawful necessity to protect her rights and those of similarly situated victims.

37. Plaintiff claims rights violations include but do not exclude others she has not mentioned herein.

The acts complained of violate Plaintiff's rights under:

- The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments;
- 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (civil rights deprivation);
- 42 U.S.C. § 1985(2)-(3) (conspiracy to obstruct justice and deny equal protection);
- The Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12101;
- The Civil RICO Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1961 et seq.;
- California Government Code § 12560 (False Claims);
- And other statutes to be revealed through discovery.”

V. Defendants and Service Addresses

The following addresses are provided for service of process pursuant to Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend addresses and parties as discovery reveals additional liable individuals or entities.

- **Office of the District Attorney – County of Orange**

Attn: Todd Spitzer, District Attorney

401 Civic Center Drive West

Santa Ana, CA 92701

- **Todd Allan Spitzer**, individually and in his official capacity
c/o Orange County District Attorney

401 Civic Center Drive West

Santa Ana, CA 92701

- **County of Orange**

c/o Office of County Counsel

333 W. Santa Ana Blvd., Suite 407

Santa Ana, CA 92701

- **County of Los Angeles**

c/o Office of County Counsel

648 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration

500 W. Temple Street

Los Angeles, CA 90012

- **County of San Diego**

c/o Office of County Counsel

1600 Pacific Highway, Room 355

San Diego, CA 92101

- **County of Riverside**

c/o Office of County Counsel

3960 Orange Street, Suite 500

Riverside, CA 92501

- **Board Members and/or Agents of S.E.C.U.R.E. Software System**, in their official and private capacities

Service to be effectuated through respective County Counsel offices listed above.

Plaintiff will amend as identities become known.

- **John Does 1–50**

Currently unidentified parties involved in the concealment, misuse, or control of proprietary systems or proceedings at issue. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend this Complaint as discovery permits.

VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court:

- A.** Declare that Plaintiff’s constitutional and statutory rights have been violated, along with those of similarly situated and aligned victims across affected jurisdictions;
- B.** Issue preliminary and permanent injunctive relief barring the further use of concealed or non-transparent recordation and docketing software systems—including the S.E.C.U.R.E. platform—that impair due process and enable systemic fraud;
- C.** Order the restoration of Plaintiff’s property rights and vacate any and all fraudulent documents recorded under forged, falsified, or perjured pretenses, with similar review and relief extended to aligned victims where appropriate;
- D.** Appoint a special master or federal monitor to investigate the practices of the named counties, software platforms, and involved officials operating under the color of law;
- E.** Refer this case to the United States Attorney General and Department of Justice, including the Civil Rights Division and Office of the Inspector General, for full criminal and civil rights investigation;
- F.** Grant compensatory and treble damages to Plaintiff, and where applicable, to aligned parties, as permitted under RICO, civil rights statutes, and common law;
- G.** Award attorneys’ fees and costs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988 or other applicable authority;

H. Permit leave to amend this Complaint under Rule 15(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to name additional parties, add claims, and incorporate evidence as further facts become known through discovery and government disclosure;

I. Grant such other and further relief as this Court deems just, equitable, and necessary to restore public trust and the rule of law.

VII. ADA NOTICE

Plaintiff, appearing *pro per*, respectfully asserts that all filings and supporting materials have been prepared to the best of her ability and in good faith. Due to documented disabilities under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)—including conditions that may not be outwardly visible—Plaintiff requests that the Court extend reasonable leniency and assistance where applicable, including but not limited to formatting issues, citation irregularities, or procedural technicalities. Plaintiff further invokes her rights under federal disability access laws and constitutional guarantees of equal access to justice and reserves the right to amend, clarify, or correct the record as needed. These filings have been undertaken under significant hardship and in a continued effort to obtain relief from systemic misconduct. Accordingly, Plaintiff requests any and all reasonable accommodations the Court deems appropriate to ensure fairness and compliance with federal law.

Plaintiff reserves the right to assert additional claims or legal theories as may arise through discovery, further factual development, or upon the appearance of additional defendants. Nothing herein shall be construed to waive or limit related or as yet undiscovered causes of action under federal, state, or constitutional law.

VERIFICATION / DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY

I, Powers, Billie Rene' Frances Lillian, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of these united States of America that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Powers, Billie Rene' Frances Lillian

POWERS, BILLIE RENE' FRANCES LILLIAN

Plaintiff In Propria Persona (Pro Per)

EXHIBIT A

**Letter to Counsel Referenced by District
Attorney Spitzer Regarding Attempted
Resolution and Urgent Criminal Matters**

(June 27, 2025)

Powers, Billie Rene' Frances Lillian

P.O. Box 1501

Newport Beach, CA 92659

powersbillie@yahoo.com

[REDACTED] Redacted

June 27, 2025

Liebert Cassidy Whitmore LLP

Attention: Steven M. Berliner, Senior Partner

Attention: Elizabeth Arce, Partner

101 West Broadway, Suite 1000

San Diego, CA 92101

Fax: 619-446-0015

berliner@lcwlegal.com, earce@lcwlegal.com

CC:

Los Angeles Office Fax: 310-337-0837

Private Investigator Jack Suttie, (760) 390-2101, cagumshoe@aol.com

District Attorney Todd Spitzer (Note: Direct contact obstructed due to internal gatekeeping—formal delivery requested via review counsel.)

RE: Confidential Submission – Evidence Relevant to Internal Review of the Orange County District Attorney's Office and Systemic Interference in Victim Access and Criminal Investigations

To Mr. Berliner, Ms. Arce, and the Review Team:

I submit this letter in connection with your independent review of the Orange County District Attorney's Office, initiated in response to the June 2025 jury verdict. I urge you to consider the information below as directly relevant to the systemic breakdowns inside the DA's Office—breakdowns that not only harmed victims, but may also substantiate DA Todd Spitzer's own claims that his office has been compromised from within.

For the past eight years, I have attempted to bring forward a criminal case involving counterfeit documents, land theft, insurance fraud, and a software-based system used to falsify public records. These abuses have harmed hundreds, perhaps thousands of families—but in my case, they ultimately led to the complete loss of my family's generational ranch and the theft of everything we own.

My efforts to report these crimes did not begin with DA Spitzer. As far back as 2008, I contacted former DA Tony Rackauckas, presenting forged documents, fraudulent filings, and criminal notary evidence. He failed to act, allowing the damage to toll. When Mr. Spitzer took office, I submitted thousands of pages of evidence, affidavits, exhibits, and requests—none of which reached him. Gatekeepers repeatedly intercepted my attempts, denying meetings and silencing my whistleblower warnings.

In 2017, Mr. Spitzer himself told me to contact his campaign manager to arrange a meeting. Before I could do so, that individual was arrested. I continued sending letters, emails, faxes, and phone messages—but was met with silence and obfuscation.

During this time, a shadow criminal case was quietly opened and then buried inside the DA's office. This covert case supplanted my original case brought on behalf of the People and was directed toward a lesser indictment, deliberately avoiding the foundational charges involving forgeries, counterfeit documents, and perjury. In 2020, that shadow case became the path through which my active criminal case—along with those of other reporting victims—was absorbed without notice or consultation. Whistleblowers entered that process seeking justice, only to be met with internal suppression and strategic redirection. There were no meetings with victims, no follow-up, and no closure—just a quiet shutdown, apparently without Mr. Spitzer's knowledge. The investigator who initiated the case, Jon Minn, later took early retirement. The concealment of this case from the elected District Attorney raises grave concerns about internal misconduct, case tampering, and obstruction.

At the June 24, 2025 Board of Supervisors meeting, I approached Mr. Spitzer to shake his hand and inform him that the failure of his office to act on victims' claims had led us to the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) in Washington, D.C. I shared that our whistleblower team had traveled 8,000 miles across the country and back, meeting with political figures to seek accountability. As he was preparing to leave the meeting, Mr. Spitzer returned with urgency, insisting that I call his office and schedule a meeting with him directly. He stated that he would instruct his staff to ensure I was placed on his calendar. When I mentioned Lesley Young by name, he paused again and repeated his directive that I call and get on the calendar immediately.

I did exactly that.

On June 25, I called his office, left a detailed message, and requested the appointment he instructed. I received no call back.

On June 26, I went to the DA's office in person. I waited 45 minutes. Once again, I was met by an investigator—not Mr. Spitzer. When asked if Mr. Spitzer had sent him, he said no. When asked if Mr. Spitzer knew I was there, he again said no—Mr. Spitzer was “in a meeting.” The investigator stated he would need a few days to gather what he needed and pass my contact information along to Mr. Spitzer.

This confirms what I have long asserted: there is deliberate and ongoing internal interference preventing victims, whistleblowers, and evidence from reaching the elected District Attorney. If Mr. Spitzer truly was unaware of this criminal investigation, the suppression of my materials, and the destruction of evidence under his own roof, then your investigation may hold the key to proving that he has been isolated, misled, and sabotaged from within.

This case should have been Orange County's moment to lead. Instead, it has become a national scandal. As the original whistleblower on the software systems used to falsify public records, I can confirm this case is now part of a sealed federal investigation in Washington, D.C., actively under review by the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) and other federal bodies. Our team has briefed governors, senators, and congressional leaders. They agree: this case is real, the evidence is overwhelming, and the damage is incalculable.

To make matters worse, a CEO with ties to foreign bad actors now squats on the title to my family's ranch under a Special Warranty Deed. Following directly after he took title a devastating tragedy occurred the Airport Fire—a fire I had warned the DA's office might benefit him as it was the only way for him to benefit from the taking. Our entire ranch is gone. Eighty homes were damaged. Forty were completely destroyed. The man I warned about is now filing a massive lawsuit against the County, and the property he claims as his second home, now gone, is the center of one of the most important public corruption cases Orange County had a chance to resolve—before it was buried.

This is not hyperbole. The DA's internal conflicts and hidden communications have helped destroy families, properties, and livelihoods, and have escalated this situation into a national crisis of justice and public trust. I also informed Registrar of Voters Bob Page during the June 24 meeting about documented election system manipulation. I urged a meeting. The next day, DOJ filed a case matching my warnings.

The truth is unfolding—and the facts are catching up to those who tried to bury them.

I am not writing simply to submit more documentation—I have already done that for years, to no avail. Instead, I am respectfully requesting a formal, in-person meeting that includes DA Todd Spitzer himself, to discuss how we might move forward together under the full weight of the evidence now exposed. If Mr. Spitzer is telling the truth—that he was intentionally cut off from victims, denied access to

critical criminal investigations, and internally sabotaged—then this case may be the very tool that not only vindicates him, but helps restore faith in the DA’s Office, repairs the harms done to countless families, and position Orange County as a model of lawful reform and victim protection, restoring the trust the public at large has lost due to internal conflicts, chaos, fighting and misconduct aligning with ignoring victims.

After 18 years of enduring tolling abuses, I now live as a disabled senior, and I represent a growing national movement of hundreds of thousands of victims whose cases—from coast to coast—trace back to Orange County and the unlawful use of court and land record software systems.

I do not have voicemail, but I can accept texts or emails to coordinate a scheduled time to come into the office and speak. This matter is extremely serious, and I hope your firm recognizes the gravity—and opportunity—of assisting in what could be one of the most important integrity recoveries Orange County has ever seen.

Respectfully,

Billie

Powers, Billie Rene’ Frances Lillian

[REDACTED] Redacted

powersbillie@yahoo.com

DOGE Toll and Roll™ National Organizer

www.tollandroll.com