

From: [Rhonda Reyna](#)
To: [Tanya Beat](#)
Cc: [Susan Bassi](#); [Ren CMDM](#); [Robert Hansen](#); [Sylvie Sturm](#); [news@ksbw.com](#); [info@epochtimes.com](#); [info@judicialwatch.org](#); [info@centerforjudicialexcellence.org](#)
Subject: Point of Order - October 10, 2024 DV Council Meeting
Date: Tuesday, October 8, 2024 5:44:44 AM

Point of Order Domestic Violence Council Meetings RE: Public Comment Time Limit

We the People of California are requiring restoration of our 2 minute public comment that had been allocated to us at the Domestic Violence Council Meetings as evidenced in the Agendas for the January, April and July meetings, prior to the sudden and unexpected change instigated by Supervisor Noelia Corzo.

It was only when real domestic violence survivors began attending these meetings and giving their testimony that County Supervisor Noelia Corzo (234k annual salary), Elisa Kuhl the San Mateo County Victim Program Services Manager (245k annual salary) and Tanya Beat (163k annual salary) The San Mateo County Domestic Violence Council Liason, began censoring survivor public comment by limiting it to an appalling short one minute, in a bad faith effort to conceal truth as well as refusing to let people participate via telephone and on the zoom link.

All of the above civil servants are paid for by taxpayer money and therefore work for We the People. We the People require all of you to restore our 2 minute public comment at these meetings.

Furthermore, as a Point of Order, Alisa Kuhl who gatekeeps the telephone and zoom participation, has failed to give instructions for raising a hand on-line, then providing sufficient time for participants to do so. I myself was censored on the telephone, and other mothers shared with me they were censored on zoom, Therefore, We the People require Alisa or other monitoring personnel to explain to people on the telephone to press *6 to raise hand or if on zoom to click the raise hand icon, and We require to see these people up on the zoom as if they were in the room so that we can see their hands raised for public comment. Many other domestic violence commissions provide this as an ordinary pattern of practice.

It is shameful that our public servants have been attempting to silence San Mateo County Domestic Violence survivors, whom this Council purports to serve and is described in the mission statement.

From: rhondarevna27@gmail.com
To: [Tanya Beat](#)
Cc: [Ren CMDM](#); [Susan Bassi](#); [Sylvie Sturm](#); [Jody Biehl](#); [Noelia Corzo](#)
Subject: Point of Order: Re Public comment and DV Survivor Safety
Date: Tuesday, October 8, 2024 6:57:43 PM
Attachments: [image0.png](#)
[image1.png](#)

Dear San Mateo County Domestic Violence Council,

Point of Order:

As someone who has first hand experience as well as DV Counselor Training knows, many DV Survivors cannot safely identify themselves to give Public Comment. They are in fact in grave danger should their abusers track them.

The Brown Act does not require it and even considers the 1st Amendment Protectios to freedom of anonymous speech.

The Instructions on the meeting agenda should therefore be changed to remove self identification using personal names, under Public Comment Section 3., and as a solution can suggest that participants use a handle so they may be called upon.

 T-Mobile LTE

6:43 PM

82% 

Brown Act Comment Name Requirement

Based on the provided search results, it appears that **the Brown Act does not explicitly require individuals to state their name before speaking during public comment periods.** While some local agencies may have signs or requests asking for speakers to identify themselves, this is not mandated by the Brown Act itself.

In fact, the California Government Code section 54953.3 states that a member of the public cannot be required to register his or her name as a condition of attendance at a meeting, but **does**

not address the specific requirement of stating one's name during public comment.

Additionally, the First Amendment Coalition's guidance suggests that **requiring individuals to state their name and address before speaking during public comment may violate First Amendment principles**, as it could be seen as an attempt to restrict anonymous speech.

Therefore, **it is not a requirement under the Brown Act to give your name during public comment.** However, it's possible that some local

search.brave.com

📶 T-Mobile LTE 6:48 PM 83% 🔋

Amendment principles, as it could be seen as an attempt to restrict anonymous speech.

Therefore, **it is not a requirement under the Brown Act to give your name during public comment.** However, it's possible that some local agencies may have their own policies or procedures that require identification, which would need to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Key points:

- **The Brown Act does not explicitly require individuals to state their name during public comment.**
- California Government Code section 54953.3 prohibits requiring registration of name as a condition of attendance at a meeting.
- Requiring identification during public comment may potentially violate First Amendment principles.
- Local agencies may have their own policies or procedures regarding identification, which would need to be evaluated separately.

 aclunc.org

 [firstamendmen...](#)

 [firstame](#)

Know Your Rights

Can ID Be Require

A&A: Can It

search.brave.com

Sent from my iPhone

We the People look forward to this timely update on the instructions.

Regards,
Rhonda Reyna

From: [Rhonda Reyna](#)
To: [Tanya Beat](#); [Ren CMDM](#); [Susan Bassi](#); [Robert Hansen](#); [Sylvie Sturm](#); news@ksbw.com; info@epochtimes.com; info@judicialwatch.org; info@centerforjudicialexcellence.org; womenscoalition@substack.com; [Stew Peters](#); newsletter@epochtimes.com
Subject: Public Opinion October 10, 2024 Domestic Violence Council Meeting
Date: Tuesday, October 8, 2024 6:07:40 AM

Public Comment October 10, 2024 San Mateo County Domestic Violence Council Meeting

The SMDVC mission statement claims it's goal is to end DV in SMC. Thus, We the People of California, are raising the alarm that there exists a child trafficking criminal cartel of organized crime calling itself family court, that is identifying-targeting-and exploiting children for power-profit-and control.

10k DV cases each year, primarily in the middle to upper income classes where stay at home mothers in relationships with dangerous psychopaths have been targeted by this cartel to traffic, kidnap and abuse their children for satanic ritualistic abuse, makes it clear the SMDVC is failing to meet its stated objectives. Furthermore, the assets of these mothers are being stolen and siphoned off in racketeering and extortion schemes that are well documented with evidence in high profile cases exploding here and across the country.

We the People require, all of you, our civil servants, to shut down the criminal cartel of organized crime calling itself the family court, that has been operating under fraud and deception and are factually administrative, contract hearings with no Due Process or juries. Fraud vitiates all contracts and any one enforcing a void order is a trespasser.

I am presenting two petitions, in my case alone, that have collectively been signed and commented on by over 417 people in support of a just outcome.

<https://www.change.org/p/they-court-napped-my-daughter-if-not-stopped-they-ll-steal-yours>

<https://www.thepetitionsite.com/takeaction/189/437/403/?cid=headerClickC2>

Investigative reporters Robert Hansen and Susan Bassi exposed Ruth Patrick of Women SV in Palo Alto as selling out domestic violence survivors. I am one of Ruth's victims. Are all so called domestic violence agencies selling out victims under the guise of "helping"?

It is incumbent upon everyone in this council to carefully read all links and comments. Anyone who aids and abets, facilitates, perpetrates or conceals the continued wrong doing by this criminal cartel, will equally be considered a co-conspirator and brought to justice. The consequences for kidnapping under color of law are clear and severe. Make your choice wisely. This case has been referred to the lawful adjudicating body and the Court of Public Opinion, which is the highest Court in the Land.

Rhonda Reyna- Domestic Violence Survivor/Advocate