



# The Due Process Advocate

*"No Person shall be . . . deprived of life, liberty, or property without the due process of law"  
- Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution*

Vol. 15 No. 2

[www.dueprocessadvocate.com](http://www.dueprocessadvocate.com)

November 2017 - FREE

## COURT TRANSCRIPT IN THE WOODMANSEE CASE REVEALS THE UGLY TRUTH ABOUT THE SO-CALLED "RULE OF LAW" IN NEW HAMPSHIRE FORECLOSURE PROCEEDINGS

Earlier this year, in April, The Due Process Advocate (Vol. 15, No. 1) published the first article about the plight of Sanford Woodmansee and Betty Woodmansee (the "Woodmansees") entitled, NEW HAMPSHIRE COURT "DOUBLES-DOWN" ON ITS RUTHLESS POST-FORECLOSURE POLICY TO ALLOW THE SEIZURE AND DESTRUCTION OF PERSONAL PROPERTY. The article was precipitated by the Woodmansees' desire to expose the court-endorsed corruption of foreclosure mills and recover from the extraordinary losses they've incurred because they "dared to fight" a wrongful foreclosure, a wrongful eviction, and the wrongful seizure of personal property from their Epping, NH home.

This follow-up article focuses on the transcript of a status hearing that was held at the Rockingham Superior Court on July 15, 2014. With the advantage of hind-sight, this hearing set the stage for the ruthless foreclosure and eviction proceeding that followed; as well as the seizure and destruction of the Woodmansees' personal property.

The Woodmansees were not even present at the July 15, 2014 status hearing as, apparently, there was some confusion as to (a) whether or not the Woodmansees even got notice of the hearing, and (b) whether or not the hearing was still "on" due to the fact that the case was still on appeal to the New Hampshire Supreme Court at the time of the hearing.

Nevertheless, the hearing proceeded with only Attorney Andrea V. Lasker of Harmon Law Offices, P.C. being present. At the hearing, Judge Delker made it clear that the appeal process in the Woodmansees' case was not yet completed and the injunction against foreclosure would remain in place for at least 10 days; pending the Woodmansees' right to file their motion for reconsideration of the recent order rendered by the New Hampshire Supreme Court and further orders, if any, from the New Hampshire Supreme Court.

Attorney Lasker, however, represented (a) that she never received the Woodmansees' objection to her motion to vacate the injunction, (b) that the Supreme Court denied the Woodmansees' appeal as an interlocutory appeal, and (c) that "the sale is tomorrow" and should go forward.

Imagine losing your home, and your personal property, as a result of this conversation that was captured for all to read by this transcript! Then imagine that the decision (allowing the foreclosure of your home to proceed the next day) that was rendered after hearing (that you didn't even know had occurred) was mailed to you and you didn't receive it until AFTER the foreclosure of your home!

*The actual transcript of the hearing is reproduced in its entirety following this article. You be the judge as to whether this hearing exemplifies a fair legal proceeding. It is shown verbatim and exactly as transcribed.*

Woodmansee alleges (notwithstanding the unclear, confusing, incomprehensible, hard to follow, and disjointed nature of some of Attorney Lasker's statements and arguments) that Attorney Lasker's misrepresentations, acts and conduct at the July 15, 2014 hearing were fraudulent, unfair and deceptive, and resulted in the fraudulent recording of a foreclosure deed; all causing irreparable harm and extraordinary damages to Woodmansee.

At the conclusion of our previous article (Vol. 15, No. 1), Sandy Woodmansee was quoted as saying the matter "is anything but over." He's made good on his word as he has just sued Attorney Lasker and plans to file as many formal complaints with state and federal authorities as are necessary to help stop the proliferation of arbitrary rule that has taken the court system by storm.

*DISCLOSURES, DISCLAIMER & COPYRIGHT NOTICE: The Due Process Advocate is published weekly to expose and stop the proliferation of actions and policies designed to remove individual due process rights in America. It is available online via free email subscription. Nothing contained in this publication is intended to be, or should be construed as, legal advice or any other advice which requires state or federal professional licensing of any kind. ©2017 by Edward H. Smith, Publisher, The Due Process Advocate, 497 Hooksett Rd. #395, Manchester NH 03104. All Rights Reserved.*

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

ROCKINGHAM COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT

BETTY J. WOODMANSEE, et al., )  
 )  
 ) Plaintiffs, )  
 )  
 vs. )  
 )  
 ) Superior Court Case No.  
 ) 2014-0511  
 )  
 ) Superior Court Case No.  
 ) 218-2014-CV-00313  
 )  
 )  
 )  
 )  
 FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE )  
 ASSOCIATION, )  
 )  
 ) Brentwood, New Hampshire  
 ) July 15, 2014  
 ) 9:15 a.m.  
 )  
 Defendant. )  
 )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

STATUS CONFERENCE  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE N. WILLIAM DELKER  
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

APPEARANCES:

Pro Se Plaintiffs: Non-appearance

For the Defendant: Andrea V. Lasker, Esq.  
HARMON LAW OFFICES, P.C.  
150 California Street  
Newton, MA 02458

Audio Operator: Electronically Recorded  
by Gail M. Richards

TRANSCRIPTION COMPANY: AVTranz  
845 North 3rd Avenue  
Phoenix, AZ 85003  
(800) 257-0885  
www.avtranz.com

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript produced by court-approved transcription service.

I N D E X

WITNESS (ES)

DIRECT   CROSS   REDIRECT   RECROSS

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:

None

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

None

MISCELLANEOUS

PAGE

Taken under advisement

7

EXHIBITS

ID

EVD

None

1 (Proceedings commence at 9:15 a.m.)

2 THE COURT: And if you want to approach -- I don't  
3 see either of the Woodmansees here today, and I believe the  
4 bailiff has checked out in the hallway. You haven't had any  
5 contact with them, I take it?

6 MS. LASKER: Well, except for the multitude of  
7 filings that they've --

8 THE COURT: The pleadings, yeah.

9 MS. LASKER: Yeah. Yesterday I got notice that the  
10 Supreme Court did deny their appeal as an improper  
11 interlocutory appeal.

12 THE COURT: Yes, I got that. And so I guess they  
13 have technically ten days to file a motion to reconsider, so.

14 MS. LASKER: Well, just so -- I mean, the only issue  
15 that they were appealing was your order for the monthly  
16 payments.

17 THE COURT: Right.

18 MS. LASKER: So I did file a motion to vacate.

19 THE COURT: Right.

20 MS. LASKER: I gave them enough time so that they  
21 would have been able to respond by today.

22 THE COURT: Yep.

23 MS. LASKER: Which they didn't.

24 THE COURT: I did actually get an objection from  
25 them.

1 MS. LASKER: Oh. I didn't.

2 THE COURT: That came in on -- I can't quite read the  
3 date. Maybe the 14th. And basically the objection, in a  
4 nutshell --

5 MS. LASKER: I didn't get it.

6 THE COURT: -- says that the case is on appeal and so  
7 this Court -- the Superior Court doesn't have jurisdiction  
8 until the Supreme Court decides it. So that's why I said, I  
9 think that -- I got the order from the Supreme Court denying  
10 the interlocutory appeal, and I think under the rule they have  
11 ten days to file a motion to reconsider. So if --

12 MS. LASKER: I thought though they had to file --  
13 because they're -- what they were appealing was something that  
14 they hadn't -- they had not requested in this Court, that they  
15 had to get permission from this -- or, they had to -- I mean,  
16 that --

17 THE COURT: Well, I guess there's two ways --

18 MS. LASKER: So I'm not sure how --

19 THE COURT: -- to do it. They could get permission  
20 from this Court or they could file an interlocutory appeal  
21 without ruling. I mean, without approval from the --

22 MS. LASKER: Uh-huh.

23 THE COURT: -- trial court. They didn't ask for  
24 permission here for an interlocutory appeal, so in any event,  
25 I'm going to give them the ten days to reconsider -- I mean, to

1 file a motion to reconsider with the Supreme Court. And if  
2 they don't, if the Supreme Court doesn't take action in those  
3 ten days, then I will vacate the injunction.

4 MS. LASKER: The sale is tomorrow.

5 THE COURT: Oh, there is -- it's scheduled for  
6 tomorrow?

7 MS. LASKER: Yeah.

8 And they haven't paid the -- they paid one -- they  
9 made one of the payments. And I --

10 THE COURT: Right, right. I saw your pleading on  
11 that.

12 MS. LASKER: You know, I went through this -- their  
13 whole history. This has been going on since 2006. They filed  
14 two bankruptcies which were dismissed for their failure to make  
15 the payments under the plan, and -- so there's been a lot of  
16 litigation involved in this, so -- I don't know --

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 MS. LASKER: I realize -- I understand, you know,  
19 your position regarding giving them an opportunity to do  
20 whatever, and I haven't seen the objection, but --

21 THE COURT: Well, I mean, it does -- the objection is  
22 basically grounded on the interlocutory appeal.

23 MS. LASKER: The appeal is only regarding your order  
24 --

25 THE COURT: Right. To file the --

1 MS. LASKER: Right.

2 THE COURT: I mean, to submit the monthly payments,  
3 as --

4 MS. LASKER: And it just seems to me that that isn't  
5 stayed by filing an appeal. Is that -- am I correct? Because  
6 I know other order -- usually with --

7 THE COURT: Yeah.

8 MS. LASKER: -- the orders still stand when -- and  
9 they didn't file a motion to reconsider your order. They filed  
10 other motions but not to reconsider that order.

11 THE COURT: Well, I think they -- I think we've had  
12 argument on that a couple of times before they -- as I recall  
13 -- let's see, motion -- yeah, they had filed some motions for  
14 clarification and -- so I had entered the original order back  
15 in April, and then they had filed a motion to clarify, and --

16 MS. LASKER: For rehearing.

17 THE COURT: -- a motion to rehear, and -- so they  
18 tried several times here to get me to reconsider that.

19 MS. LASKER: But it was -- what I would say to myself  
20 is, if you reconsidered your order, you basically would be  
21 denying the injunction. They didn't ask you to -- do you see  
22 what I'm saying? And maybe -- maybe I'm just --

23 THE COURT: Well --

24 MS. LASKER: -- semantics, but --

25 THE COURT: I'm not going to -- I don't intend to



1 reconsider the issue of the security.

2 MS. LASKER: No, I understand.

3 THE COURT: I think that that needs to stand, unless  
4 the Supreme Court says otherwise. And my only hesitation is  
5 whether under the rules of the Supreme Court -- I just have to  
6 look at the rule again, I guess, on interlocutory appeals  
7 without ruling from the Superior Court to see what effect that  
8 has. So let me do that, and then I'll issue a ruling --

9 MS. LASKER: Okay.

10 THE COURT: -- after I look at that rule.

11 MS. LASKER: Just so we know before tomorrow.

12 THE COURT: I'll try -- I'll do that today.

13 MS. LASKER: Great. Thank you so much.

14 THE COURT: Sure. Okay.

15 (Proceedings concluded at 9:20 a.m.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE

I, DIANNA ALDOM, CET\*\*236, a court approved proofreader, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter, to the best of my professional skills and abilities.

TRANSCRIPTIONIST(S): KAREN NEVINS, CET\*\*746

DIANNA ALDOM, CET\*\*236  
Proofreader

October 28, 2014