

Johnson County Chief Judge & District Judge Under Criminal Claims inside Kids Custody Cases, KS Dad Restoring Justice

The father wrongfully separated from his little girls has seemingly uprooted Misconduct from the Johnson county district and placed several judges into the Kansas high court.

U.S. District Court

DISTRICT OF KANSAS

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered on
12/9/2023 at 5:01 AM CST and filed on
12/9/2023

Case Name: Escalante v. Burmaster
Case Number: [2:23-cv-02471-JWB-TJJ](#)
Filer: Matthew Aaron Escalante
Document Number: [40](#)

Docket Text:

MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION by Plaintiff
Matthew Aaron Escalante re [38] **MOTION to
Dismiss *PLAINTIFF FATHERS MEMORANDUM
OF LAW IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT
JUDGE'S MOTION TO DISMISS BECAUSE A
CRIME IS SHOWING*** (Attachments: # (1)
Defendants Exhibit B, # (2) Defendants Exhibit
C, # (3) Plaintiffs Exhibit D 10-18-23 Case
Record Transcript 18CV03813, # (4) Plaintiff's
Exhibit E 08-10-23 Insufficient Order)(Escalante,
Matthew)

**2:23-cv-02471-JWB-TJJ Notice has
been electronically mailed to:**

Kansas City, Kansas Dec 12, 2023 ([IssueWire.com](https://www.IssueWire.com)) - A Kansas father representing himself as attorney has filed criminal allegations against the Chief Judge of the Johnson County District Court, Charles Droege, and the District Family Court Judge Paul Will Burmaster in the Kansas Federal Court through civil rights lawsuits. The lawsuits allege that simulations of legal processes are being committed to deceive the father, the Court, and the County in violation of KSA 21-5907, which prohibits simulating legal process. In Kansas, KSA 21-5907. Simulating legal process. (a) Simulating legal process is: (1) Distributing to another any document which simulates or purports to be, or is designed to cause others to believe it to be, a summons, petition, complaint or other legal process, with the intent to mislead the recipient and cause the recipient to take action in reliance thereon; or (2) printing or distributing any such document, knowing that it shall be so used. (b) Simulating legal process is a class A nonperson misdemeanor.

In Escalante v. Burmaster, Case No. 2:23CV02471 in the United States District Court in the District of Kansas, plaintiff pro se father Matthew Aaron Escalante alleges that on October 18, 2023, District Judge Paul Will Burmaster simulated serving a Kansas protective order in an unlawful manner. The complaint and accompanying transcripts from a civil custody hearing show the district judge acknowledging a previously served protective order to Mr. Escalante was missing an attachment from Protective Order Case No. 22-CV03391. The judge then attempted to remedy the deficiency of 22CV03391 on October 18, but did so in the unrelated civil custody case 18CV03813, which had no legal effect on the deficient protective order. The plaintiff argues this left a void protective order over the father and the judge is not immune then from suit due to the alleged criminal conduct.

The other federal lawsuit, Escalante v. Droege, Case No. 2:23-CV02536, also alleges a violation of KSA 21-5907 by the Chief Judge of the district court. The pro se complaint and facts in the county docket of 18-CV03813 show the Chief Judge noted on November 16, 2023, that the civil custody case was "Transferred to an Out of County Judge," but entries after that date clearly show the case was not transferred and remained active in Johnson County, allegedly constituting fraud by simulating a chief judge order when none exists.

These are serious allegations that have been brought against the two judges through summonses by a Kansas father representing himself pro se without a law license. The plaintiff alleges in all complaints that the judiciary wrongfully removed his title of "Dad" when the district judge Burmaster removed custody in an initial protection order without merit in July 2022. And he says he never saw his daughter again. The plaintiff has boldly stood up in the Kansas high court and now bears the title of "Attorney" as he moves to hold judges accountable and bring them to justice.

The father states his motivation and mentor has been Issac Wright Jr. Isaac Wright Jr. was wrongfully convicted on drug charges in New Jersey, 3 decades ago and was sentenced to life in prison in 1991 under New Jersey's drug kingpin laws. While incarcerated, he worked as a paralegal while in prison, and learned the Law and helped to overturn the wrongful convictions of twenty of his fellow inmates, before finally proving his own innocence and ultimately placing the judge and police who wrongfully convicted him into their own jail cells.

Case 2:23-cv-02536-TC-ADM Document 5 Filed 10/10/23 Page 1 of 6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

District of Kansas

MATTHEW ESCALANTE

et al S.J.E. a minor child

& S.G.E. a minor child

Plaintiff

CHARLES DROEGE

in his official capacity as

Chief Judge of the Johnson Co. District Court

Defendant

Case No. 2:23-CV-02536

BENCH TRIAL DEMAND

☒ Yes ☐ No

AMENDED COMPLAINT AGAINST THE CHIEF JUDGE OF THE JOHNSON COUNTY DT. CT. FOR VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW DEPRIVATIONS OF CONST AMDT 6&5, 14 S1,5,5,2 & 14S1,5,8,1 THAT NO STATE SHALL ABRIDGE WHILE COMMITTING A CRIME OF RSA 11-5907

NOTICE

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 5.2 addresses the privacy and security concerns resulting from public access to electronic court files. Under this rule, papers filed with the court should not contain an individual's full social security number or full birth date; the full name of a person known to be a minor; or a complete financial account number. A filing may include only: the last four digits of a social security number; the year of an individual's birth; a minor's initials; and the last four digits of a financial account number.

Except as noted in this form, plaintiff need not send exhibits, affidavits, grievances or witness statements, or any other materials to the Clerk's Office with this complaint.

In order for your complaint to be filed, it must be accompanied by the filing fee or an application to proceed in forma pauperis.

Case 2:23-cv-02471-JWB-TJJ Document 15 Filed 11/11/23 Page 1 of 8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

District of Kansas

Matthew Aaron Escalante

Plaintiff

Paul William Burnasser

Judge of the 10th District division 14

Defendant

Case No. 2:23-CV-02471

Jury Trial: (check one)

☐ Yes ☒ No

COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS

NOTICE

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 5.2 addresses the privacy and security concerns resulting from public access to electronic court files. Under this rule, papers filed with the court should not contain an individual's full social security number or full birth date; the full name of a person known to be a minor; or a complete financial account number. A filing may include only: the last four digits of a social security number; the year of an individual's birth; a minor's initials; and the last four digits of a financial account number.

Except as noted in this form, plaintiff need not send exhibits, affidavits, grievances or witness statements, or any other materials to the Clerk's Office with this complaint.

In order for your complaint to be filed, it must be accompanied by the filing fee or an application to proceed in forma pauperis.

Case 2:23-cv-02536-TC-ADM Document 5 Filed 10/10/23 Page 4 of 6

III. Statement of Claims

A. Where did the events giving rise to your claim(s) occur?

Johnson County District Court - Olathe courthouse
150 W Santa Fe St.
Olathe Kansas 64660

B. What date and approximate time did the events giving rise to your claim(s) occur?

Defendant manipulated civil docket by filing a Chief Judge Order and putting that text in the docket intending to deceive:
11/16/2023 4:00PM Bench Name *****
BY ORDER OF THE CHIEF JUDGE THIS CASE IS TRANSFERRED TO AN OUT OF COUNTY JUDGE FOR THE PURPOSE OF DOCKET AND CASELOAD MANAGEMENT (JUDGE DROEGE)
11/16/2023 Judge OUT OF COUNTY JUDGE assigned to case
Shown in both cases of Escalante v Escalante 18CV00813 and 23CV00813

C. What are the facts underlying your claim(s)?

The Defendant action outline above in the Johnson county docket are false, they're fraud events by the Chief Judge. This constitutes a crime of RSA 11-5907 Simulating Legal Process, as there is no Chief Judge Order in existence, not even was. An attorney appointed by the Court Edward Riggs notified on Nov 28, 2023, stating "This Case is NOT mentioned out of county" and another witness Carol Roberts the court transcripter is also available to give witness testimony as the Docketed in Johnson county 18CV00813 on Dec 05, 2023. That cannot be if the case is in another county under another judge preside over the Defendant Droegge. And the civil attorney obviously has knowledge of Droegge's discipline regarding 18CV00813 and 23CV00813. The Plaintiff also appeared in the Johnson county 12-06-23, and the docket was unable to remove from the Clerk the "Chief Judge Order" of transfer. That's because it doesn't exist but chief says he ordered it.

The civil case ARE still in Johnson County. The chief judge is just not letting one of the representing parties, Pro Se Plaintiff, practice law inside his own cases.

The Chief Judge on November 16, 2023 unilaterally issuing a Chief Judge Order that intended to deceive and fool the Plaintiff to cause him to believe that he has no civil cases to litigate in JoCo.

RSA 21-5907: Simulating legal process. (a) Simulating legal process is (1) transmitting to another any document which simulates or purports to be, or is designed to cause others to believe it to be, a summons, petition, complaint or other legal process, with the intent to mislead the recipient and cause the recipient to take action in reliance thereon; or (2) printing or disseminating any such document, knowing that it shall be so used.

(b) Simulating legal process is a class A misdemeanor misdemeanor.

(c) Any person guilty of the printing or dissemination of false items of legal documents intended for actual use in judicial proceedings.

Hawaii J., 2001 Ch. 136, § 132-1, 2012, ch. 150, § 21, July 2.

All the facts present and witness testimonies available show the Chief Judge has actually NOT transferred 18CV00813 nor 23CV00813 constituting a Crime of RSA 11-5907 against the 3 plaintiffs as custody proceedings are being unlawfully blocked by the Chief Judge's actions. The Chief unilaterally simulated an instance of a false "Chief Judge Order" under also Rule 12 of local rules falsely designed to cause Plaintiff father to believe intended and then to cause the Plaintiff to take an action in reliance to this falsity of "order". So the Plaintiff now take federal action.

Media Contact

JudicialWatch Inc.

editorial.inboxwciz@gmail.com

Source : https://newsbreakapp.onelink.me/2115408369?pid=mp_1805938&msource=mp_1805938&dclid=0qC6fAaj&af_dp=newsbreak%3A%2F%2Fopendoc%3Fdocid%3D0qC6fAaj&af_web_dp=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.newsbreak.com%2Faf-landing%3Fdocid%3D0qC6fAaj

[See on IssueWire](#)