

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION 8

Stanislav Arbit,)
Plaintiff and Appellant,) Court of Appeal Case: B340261
v.)
Mark Zuckerberg,)
Defendant and Respondent.)

Notice of Motion and Motion Re: Augmentation; Memorandum of Points and Authorities in
Support; [Proposed] Order;
[Supporting Declaration of Stanislav Arbit *filed separately*]

Appeal From a Judgment
Of The Superior Court, Los Angeles County, No. 23TRCP00474
Southwest District, Torrance Courthouse
Honorable Douglas W. Stern
Honorable Gary Y. Tanaka

Stanislav Arbit
440 North Barranca Avenue Unit 7377
Telephone: (480) 818-4418
Email: stan@securepower.io
Appellant
Self-Represented

1 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR RESPECTIVE ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

2 On January 21, 2025, Appellant-Plaintiff, Stanislav Arbit, will move the court for an
3 order granting augmentation of the Clerk’s Transcript to include Exhibits “A”–“G” that are
4 attached to this motion. This motion is made pursuant to Second District Court of Appeal
5 Local Rule, rule 2(c).

6 This motion is further based upon this notice, the attached Memorandum of Points
7 and Authorities, the Declaration of Stanislav Arbit; upon the records and files in this action;
8 and upon such further evidence and argument as may be presented prior to or at the time of
9 hearing on the motion.

10
11 Respectfully submitted,

12 

13
14 January 20, 2025

15 By: Stanislav Arbit, Appellant

16 440 N. Barranca Ave. #7377

17 Covina, CA 91723

18 Phone: (480) 818-4418

19 Email: stan@securepower.io
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES
2 IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION TO AUGMENT THE RECORD ON APPEAL
3 (Second District Court of Appeal, Local Rule 2(c))

4 I.

5 INTRODUCTION

6 The trial court judge leveraged the fact that the appeal process starts in his courtroom
7 by manufacturing delays and erroneously rejecting documents in an attempt to manipulate
8 Appellant-Plaintiff into violating a court order and persuade Appellant-Plaintiff to no longer
9 pursue an appeal. Judge Stern was attempting to cover up his corruption.

10 Appellant-Plaintiff submitted his Notice of Appeal the day after the Judgment,
11 08/06/2024, and as all previous e-filed submissions it was reviewed the same day (and
12 accepted). The law requires that a Notice Designating Record on Appeal be submitted
13 within 10 days. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.121(a).)

14 The next day, Appellant-Plaintiff submitted a Notice Designating Record on Appeal.
15 This document was not reviewed the same day or the next. However, the Proof of Service
16 filed with it was reviewed and accepted the next day. Because of prior improprieties
17 perpetrated by the presiding Judge, Douglas W. Stern, Appellant-Plaintiff felt implored to
18 follow up on his suspicions that the papers he filed were being purposefully unprocessed.
19 Appellant-Plaintiff called the clerks' office and was told that electronically filed documents
20 are handled by unnamed individuals without any contact information and that a wait time of
21 several months is a possibility.

22 Facing a 10-day deadline to file a Notice Designating Record on Appeal, Appellant-
23 Plaintiff emailed the court. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.121(a).) The first email was to the
24 department's email address. It did not contain any attachments and was simply a forward of
25 a receipt of an e-file submission with two documents listed in the body of the email and
26 asking for confirmation of receipt. The first email was sent on the 08/09/2024. No response
27 was provided. Several days later, on 08/12/2024, with four days left, Appellant-Plaintiff
28

1 emailed the department again and added Judge Stern to the email chain (still no
2 attachments, just asking if the submitted documents were received).

3 While no response was ever provided to Appellant-Plaintiff's inquiry sent to
4 tordeptb@lacourt.org, Appellant-Plaintiff did receive an email from said email address. The
5 body of the email contained a disclaimer that this was sent from an unmonitored account
6 (contrary to information provided by the court's assistance while Appellant-Plaintiff was
7 present in court). The email included a copy of an order filed by the court on that date. (CT
8 144.)

9 The order called out Appellant-Plaintiff's two emails as improper and considered ex
10 parte communications. (CT 144.) The court demanded that "NO" further emails be sent by
11 any person in this case to Judge Stern or the Court's email resource account. (*Ibid.*)
12 Appellant-Plaintiff believes this was an attempt to bait Appellant-Plaintiff into responding
13 by email thereby violating a court order. Appellant-Plaintiff's intention, in addition to filing
14 this appeal, was to have a record of Judge Stern's malfeasance for Appellant-Plaintiff's
15 related case against Judge Stern.

16 Also, on 08/12/2024, Appellant-Plaintiff contacted his e-file service provider and
17 was informed that the court did not fully reject the submitted Notice Designating Record on
18 Appeal. Rejection requires a two-step process before it can be sent back to the e-file service
19 provider and updated in their system. The first step is to approve or reject. The second step
20 is to provide a reason. Without both of those two steps completed, the filer is not updated
21 with any new information beyond the initial submission. This is a continuation of Judge
22 Stern's, and the Defendant's, pattern of willful incompetence designed to obstruct justice
23 and deny Plaintiff access to California's courts.

24 Appellant-Plaintiff's e-file provider reached out to the court for additional
25 information and was able to get an update that night, 08/12/2024, around 10:00 pm for the
26 Notice submitted on 08/07/2024.
27
28

1 After noticing an error, Appellant-Plaintiff submitted another copy of the Notice
2 Designating Record on Appeal on 08/12/24 around 4:30 pm. It was rejected 24 hours later.
3 It was rejected because Appellant-Plaintiff was unaware that the Unlimited Civil cases are
4 not recorded like limited civil cases are, and without a court reporter (which is unattainable
5 for a person on a fee waiver) there was no official record. The court also added, “Please do
6 not attach file stamped documents (FW-003).”

7 Form FW-003 is a fee waiver. It was included with Appellant’s Notice Designating
8 Record on Appeal, optional form APP-003, because § 1(a)(2)(a) was checked requesting the
9 clerk’s transcripts at no cost under rules Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.50–3.58. Section 1(a)
10 (2) of APP-003, states that, “I have submitted the following document with this notice
11 designating the record (check (a) or (b)).” The Judicial Council of California approved this
12 form and included the specific language requiring the inclusion of FW-003 for a request of
13 the clerk’s transcripts and a request for the clerk’s transcript is required to commence an
14 appeal.

15 Given the context, the previous rejection note was added to provide additional
16 friction in Appellant-Plaintiff’s efforts to appeal the final judgment in this case. Judge
17 Stern’s court would build on this previous rejection by rejecting a Notice Designating
18 Record on Appeal that was submitted on 08/15/2024 at 10:24 AM PDT. The reason given
19 for this rejection was: “Respondent selected also was selected as having a fee waiver. Our
20 records indicate that Mark Zuckerberg does not have a fee waiver on file. The system will
21 not allow processing of the document unless the correction is made.” This rejection was
22 made on 08/22/2024 at 11:00 AM PDT, a week later and well past the 10-day deadline for
23 filing the Notice Designating Record on Appeal.

24 A proof of service was submitted on 08/15/2024 at 09:52 AM, it was sent using form
25 APP-009, a “Form Approved for Optional Use Judicial Council of California APP-009
26 [Rev. January 1, 2017].” The court denied it with the reason stated being: “Must submit in
27 proper court format.” Even though this was submitted about 30 minutes before the Notice in
28

1 the previous paragraph, it was reviewed the same day (08/15/2024 03:39 PM PDT) and not
2 a week later. Judge Stern was running down the clock knowing that Notice Designating
3 Record on Appeal had an error. This was another attempt to goad Appellant-Plaintiff into
4 emailing the court thereby violating Judge Stern's order.

5 Finally, critical declarations requested by Appellant were excluded from the Clerk's
6 Transcript. (Declaration ¶ 3.)

7 II.

8 AUGMENTATION OF THE CLERK'S RECORDS IS AUTHORIZED

9 Ct. App., Second Dis., rule 2(c) authorizes motions for augmentation of the clerk's
10 transcript with files that were filed or lodged with the trial court. As required by Local Rule
11 2(c) the documents are attached to this motion and a supporting declaration states the
12 attachments were filed in the trial court record (Declaration ¶ 2).

13 III.

14 APPELLANT IS REQUESTING RECORDS INCLUDED IN THE NOTICE
15 DESIGNATING RECORD ON APPEAL BUT WERE EXCLUDED FROM THE
16 CLERK'S TRANSCRIPT

17 Exhibits "B"–"F" are part of the Superior Court record (Declaration ¶ 2) and were
18 requested in the Notice Designating Record on Appeal (CT 145) but were excluded in the
19 Clerk's Transcript filed in this appeal on 12/13/2024. (Declaration ¶ 3.)

20 Based on the evidence, Appellant does *not* believe that the requested documents in
21 the Notice Designating Record on Appeal (Exhibits "B"–"F") were omitted inadvertently.
22 (Declaration ¶¶ 4–15.)

23 IV.

24 APPELLANT IS REQUESTING ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS TO PROVIDE MORE
25 FACTS TO HIS OPENING BRIEF

1 Exhibits "A" and "G" were not included in the Notice Designating Record on Appeal
2 (CT 145) but are referenced in Appellant's Opening Brief and are part of the Superior Court
3 record. (Declaration ¶ 2.)

4 V.

5 THE EXHIBITS

6 The attached files are copies of the Superior Court record (SC file): (Exhibit "A") SC
7 file 02/16/2024 Declaration Of Stanislav Arbit Restraining Order Hearing; (Exhibit "B") SC
8 file 03/05/2024 Declaration of Stanislav Arbit; Filed by: Stanislav Arbit (Petitioner);
9 (Exhibit "C") (SC file 03/18/2024 Declaration (of Stanislav Arbit)); (Exhibit "D") (SC file
10 03/21/2024 Declaration (of Stanislav Arbit)); (Exhibit "E") (SC file 04/15/2024 Declaration
11 of Stanislav Arbit); (Exhibit "F") (SC File 04/25/2024 Declaration in Support of Ex Parte
12 Application); and (Exhibit "G") SC file 12/18/2023 Stalking Conspiracy & Defamation
13 Conspiracy Compliant for Injunction and Damages Filed by Stanislav Arbit (Petitioner).
14 (Declaration ¶ 2.)
15

16 Respectfully submitted,

17 

18 January 19, 2025

19 By: Stanislav Arbit, Appellant

20 440 N. Barranca Ave. #7377

21 Covina, CA 91723

22 Phone: (480) 818-4418

23 Email: stan@securepower.io
24
25
26
27
28

Exhibit Index: Motion for Augmentation

Exhibit “A”page 9

(SC file 02/16/2024 Declaration Of Stanislav Arbit Restraining Order Hearing)

Declaration of Stanislav Arbit: Restraining Order Hearing

Exhibit “B”page 13

(SC file 03/05/2024 Declaration of Stanislav Arbit; Filed by: Stanislav Arbit (Petitioner))

Arbit v. Zuckerberg Alternative Service Declaration

Exhibit “C”page 18

(SC file 03/18/2024 Declaration (of Stanislav Arbit))

Arbit v. Zuckerberg Alternative Service Declaration

Exhibit “D”page 23

(SC file 03/21/2024 Declaration (of Stanislav Arbit))

Arbit v. Zuckerberg Alternative Service Declaration

Exhibit “E”page 26

(SC file 04/15/2024 Declaration of Stanislav Arbit)

Arbit v. Zuckerberg Alternative Service Declaration

Exhibit “F”page 31

(SC File 04/25/2024 Declaration in Support of Ex Parte Application)

Declaration of Stanislav Arbit Re: Disqualification of Judge Stern (the “Statement”)

Exhibit “G”page 36

(SC file 12/18/2023 Stalking Conspiracy & Defamation Conspiracy Compliant for

Injunction and Damages Filed by Stanislav Arbit (Petitioner))

Original Complaint

1 Stanislav Arbit
2 440 N Barranca Ave #7377
3 Covina, CA 91723
4 Phone: 480-818-4418
5 Email: stan@securepower.io
6 Petitioner

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
2/16/2024 12:36 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By P. Perez, Deputy Clerk

7
8 THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
9 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
10

11)
12) Case: 23TRCP00474
13)
14) **Petitioner**) **DECLARATION OF STANISLAV**
15) **ARBIT**
16) **v.**)
17) **RESTRAINING ORDER HEARING**
18) **Mark Elliot Zuckerberg,**)
19) **Respondent.**)
20)
21) Judge: Hon. Douglas W. Stern
22)
23)
24)
25)
26)
27)
28)

1 Stanislav Arbit, declare as follows:

2 1. I am representing myself and this declaration is submitted in support of Plaintiff's
3 Application for a Restraining Order. The following facts are within my personal
4 knowledge and, if called as a witness herein, I can and will competently testify thereto.

5 2. Threats of violence have been, and continue to be, an element of Mark Zuckerberg's,
6 and his co-conspirators', constant campaign to terrorize Plaintiff, Stanislav Arbit.

7 3. The pattern of stalking and harassment started at Facebook's Menlo Park, CA campus
8 in 2017, where I was a data center infrastructure management engineer.

9 4. Some incidents of stalking and harassment involve people that I encountered while
10 working at Facebook's main campus in Menlo Park, CA. I only know one of these people's
11 names—her name is Alex Grunwald. Alex Grunwald has shown up at my home in Santa
12 Monica around July 2021, and my home in downtown Los Angeles, around January 2022.

13 5. An unknown Facebook employee stalked me in San Francisco after my Facebook
14 contract ended, and another unknown Facebook employee stalked me in New York City in
15 2019.

16 6. Since I left Facebook in 2017, representatives from Facebook have contacted me for
17 odd, non-employment-related reasons.

18 7. An example of a recent operation started shortly after I filed a civil complaint against
19 Mark Zuckerberg for stalking and defamation (*case: 23TRCP00474, Los Angeles County,*
20 *12/18/23*). For about a week, I started encountering people on crutches and casts at a
21 significantly higher occurrence than I have in my previous 41 years. All of these people
22 acknowledged me.

23 8. After the indirect threats described in paragraph 7, I have been the victim of numerous
24 counts of attempted vehicular homicide. After one near-miss, the driver acted like he
25 missed out on a bonus payment.

26 9. The most recent count of attempted vehicular homicide occurred on February 14,
27 2024, at approximately 11:45 AM as I was driving North on the 405. The attempt involved
28 at least three cars, two of which acted as distractions while a third attempted to sideswipe

- 1 me while it was traveling 15-20 MPH faster than other traffic. I took emergency evasive
2 maneuvers to narrowly avoid contact.
- 3 10. People have also started to run at me, sometimes pretending to be distracted and
4 running directly at me even after I move out of their way.
- 5 11. A different operation involves cars taking fast right turns while overtaking a car in the
6 lane closest to the sidewalk—as I’m walking by. This type of threat started in January of
7 this year. A recent occurrence was on 1/19/24 around 8:10 AM.
- 8 12. The last few weeks people have been assaulting me and pretending it was an accident.
9 For instance, at the grocery store, people have been bumping me with their shopping carts.
10 At first, it was just one cart. Then it was multiple carts running into me one after the other.
- 11 13. After the episodes with the carts, at the same grocery store, a person put their hand on
12 me to physically restrain my movement.
- 13 14. About two weeks ago, a person flung their backup at me while I was in my gym’s
14 locker room.
- 15 15. Another violent threat at the gym also occurred in February when a person stood next
16 to me in the locker room as I was getting dressed and punched the air near my head.
- 17 16. On Feb. 10, I was walking down the path I usually walk for exercise and a person in a
18 truck stopped in front of me with the windows down and, while driving off, loudly asked
19 me what gang I was in and inquired if I was a Crip or a Blood. The next day, while taking
20 the same walk, I found an ammunition casing at approximately the same location.
- 21 17. My phone was hacked. One recent indicator of this occurred on 02/02/24 at 11:15 AM
22 while I was preparing a message to Fox News Corp. to let them know about the stalking
23 and harassment lawsuit I filed against Mark Elliot Zuckerberg. While I was considering
24 what the body of the message should include—and purposefully not touching any part of
25 the screen—I saw the letter “y” appear. I didn’t move, and I double-checked to make sure
26 nothing was touching the screen. This behavior is consistent with other signs of hacking.
- 27 18. The examples listed above are just some examples of the daily, constant harassment
28 orchestrated by Mark Zuckerberg.
19. If Defendant is not restrained, Plaintiff fears great bodily injury will result.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

20. Defendant will suffer negligible or no harm if the restraining order is granted, in that we are separated geographically, and no good reason exists for Mark Zuckerberg, or his agents, assigns, employees, partners, and all those acting in concert with Mark Zuckerberg to be interacting with me directly or indirectly outside of our court proceedings.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the aforementioned is true and correct.

Respectfully submitted,

02/16/24



By: Stanislav Arbit
440 N Barranca Ave #7377
Covina, CA 91723
Email: stan@securepower.io

1 Stanislav Arbit
2 440 N Barranca Ave #7377
3 Covina, CA 91723
4 Phone: 480-818-4418
5 Email: stan@securepower.io
6 Plaintiff

8 THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
9 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

10
11) Case: 23TRCP00474
12)
13 **Stanislav Arbit,**)
14 **Plaintiff**) DECLARATION OF STANISLAV ARBIT
15)
16 **v.**) DEPARTMENT B
17) TORRANCE COURTHOUSE
18)
19 **Mark Elliot Zuckerberg,**)
20 **Defendant.**) Hearing: March 6, 2024
21) 8:30 AM, Judge: Hon. Douglas W. Stern
22)
23)
24)
25)
26)
27)
28)

1 I, Stanislav Arbit, hereby declare as follows:
2

- 3 1. I notified Defendant, Mark Zuckerberg, of this ex parte application for alternative service,
4 scheduled for 03/06/24 at 8:30 a.m., on 2/29/24.
- 5 2. I informed Mark Zuckerberg that the hearing will be in Dept. B at the Torrance
6 Courthouse, located at 825 Maple Ave, Torrance, CA 90503.
- 7 3. I asked Mark Zuckerberg if he intended to appear to oppose the ex parte application.
- 8 4. The notice was emailed to the following three email addresses: zuck@fb.com,
9 mark.zuckerberg@fb.com, and zuck@fb.com.
- 10 5. Mark Zuckerberg has not responded.
- 11 6. I emailed the moving papers to Mark Zuckerberg before 10:00 a.m. on 03/05/24.
- 12 7. Table 1 is true and accurate.
- 13 8. Plaintiff is authorized to proceed in forma pauperis.
- 14 9. Exhibits 1–7, attached herewith, are true and accurate.
- 15 10. Exhibit 1 was received by mail on February 21, 2024, and March 1, 2024.
- 16 11. Exhibit 2 was received by mail on February 06, 2024.
- 17 12. Exhibit 3 was received by email on February 26, 2024.
- 18
19

20 **Table 1**

Date	Plaintiff	Sheriff	Defendants	Documents attached
12/31/23	Notice of Lawsuit Email to Mark Zuckerberg. Summons & complaint package is attached.	-	Defendant did not respond. Defendant's email server accepted 2/3 emails for delivery.	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

01/09/24	Request to serve Summons and complaint package. Summons and Complaint and SER001 Attached as requested.	No response	-	Exhibit 4 (SER001)
01/17/24	Request to Serve Notice of Case Reassignment	Requested Fee Waiver	-	Exhibit 5 (SER001)
01/17/24	Sent copy of fee waiver		-	
01/19/24		Responded to Notice of Case Reassignment Request with an acknowledgment	-	
02/22/24	Requested status update for summons and complaint service. Attached corresponding SER001 and service packet			
02/26/24		Responded with: "The service was unsuccessful"		
02/26/24	Requested a copy of POS for summons and complaint	Responded with POF for Notice of Case Reassignment		


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

02/26/24	Requested status update for summons and complaint service. Attached corresponding SER001 and service packet			
02/27/24		Asked when the request for service of summons and complaint was submitted to the sheriff's office.		
02/27/24	Answered sheriff's question, that the request was submitted on Jan 9.	Responded saying service was not attempted because a fee waiver is missing		
02/27/24	Requested confirmation that service was not attempted for summons and complaint and attached the fee waiver.	No response as of 03/04/24		

I declare under penalty of perjury that the aforementioned is true and correct.

Respectfully submitted,

03/05/24



By: Stanislav Arbit

440 N Barranca Ave #7377

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Covina, CA 91723

Email: stan@securepower.io

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Stanislav Arbit
440 N Barranca Ave #7377
Covina, CA 91723
Phone: 480-818-4418
Email: stan@securepower.io

Plaintiff

Stanislav Arbit,
Plaintiff

v.

Mark Elliot Zuckerberg,
Defendant.

) Case: 23TRCP00474
)
) DECLARATION OF STANISLAV ARBIT
)
) DEPARTMENT B
) TORRANCE COURTHOUSE
)
) Hearing: March 19, 2024 at 8:30 AM
) Judge: Hon. Douglas W. Stern
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

1 THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
2 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
3

4 I, Stanislav Arbit, hereby declare as follows:

- 5 1. Plaintiff incorporates declarations filed on 03/05/24 and 02/16/24 by reference.
6
7 2. I notified Defendant, Mark Zuckerberg, of this ex parte application for alternative service,
8 scheduled for 03/19/24 at 8:30 a.m., on 03/15/24.
9
10 3. I informed Mark Zuckerberg that the hearing will be in Dept. B at the Torrance
11 Courthouse, located at 825 Maple Ave, Torrance, CA 90503.
12
13 4. I asked Mark Zuckerberg if he intended to appear to oppose the ex parte application.
14
15 5. The notice was emailed to the following email addresses: zuck@fb.com,
16 mark.zuckerberg@fb.com, zuck@fb.com, zuck@meta.com, mzuckerberg@meta.com, and
17 mark.zuckerberg@meta.com
18
19 6. Mark Zuckerberg has not responded.
20
21 7. I emailed the moving papers to Mark Zuckerberg before 10:00 a.m. on 03/18/24.
22
23 8. On 03/06/24, I submitted a request to the San Mateo Sheriff's Office (SMSO) for
24 substitutive service.
25
26 9. On 03/08/24 they responded with "We currently have an open service for these
27 documents."
28

- 1 10. On 03/13/24 at 06:42 a.m., I asked SMSO for a status update for case 23TRCP00474 after
2 informing the SMSO that “The crimes are ongoing and the damages continue to accrue.
3 Please consider this matter urgent”.
4
- 5 11. On Thursday, 03/14/24 at 01:30 p.m., after not getting a response to the status update
6 request submitted on 03/13/24, I called the San Mateo Sheriff’s Office. After a short
7 automated message, I was routed to the Civil Unit Team. The call lasted for 13 minutes
8 while they researched the case and confirmed my identity. The call concluded with a
9 promise that my request for substituted service would be honored, but would be delayed
10 due to limited staff.
11
- 12 12. This request is made ex parte because of the immediate and irreparable danger that has
13 occurred and continues to occur.
14
- 15 13. It has become crystal clear to me that my computer has been hacked. I do not have
16 reliable access to the internet which is not compromised.
17
- 18 14. I am under constant physical surveillance.
19
- 20 15. On, or around 03/12/24, two people were waiting for me outside of a building, where I
21 usually exist, and initiated an approach with the intent of physically engaging me—or
22 intimidating me with the possibility of a physical altercation.
23
- 24 16. I have reason to believe that I am regularly getting mildly poisoned with a significant
25 dose administered on 03/13/24 which caused a notable increase in discomfort, pain, and
26 loss of sleep.
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

17. The building automation system in the building where I work often “fails” and either locks me out of the building or locks me in, or holds me in the elevator for an extended amount of time after arriving at a floor.

18. As a food delivery driver, I have to navigate around coordinated “accident” setups. The most recent event occurred on 03/17/24 around 2:45 p.m. on PCH.

19. On, or around, 03/14/24 and 03/15/24, at two different parking lots that I typically can be found in, I survived an attempted vehicular battery while walking.

20. On, or around 03/11/24, my right front car window was completely smashed.

21. On 03/14/24 around 07:30 p.m., a man threatened me with a knife in the locker room of the gym that I frequent Monday through Friday.

22. Mark Zuckerberg first received actual notice of this lawsuit last year.

23. The Sheriff’s Office has attempted personal service at least six times.

24. Publication of this lawsuit is likely, and an order for publication can advance us to discovery where I, Stanislav Arbit, Plaintiff, believe I can uncover a preponderance of evidence to prevail in this lawsuit.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the aforementioned is true and correct.

Respectfully submitted,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Sealbit 03-18-24

By: Stanislav Arbit
440 N Barranca Ave #7377
Covina, CA 91723
Email: stan@securepower.io
480-818-4418

1 Stanislav Arbit
2 440 N Barranca Ave #7377
3 Covina, CA 91723
4 Phone: 480-818-4418
5 Email: stan@securepower.io
6 Plaintiff

7
8 THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
9 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

10
11) Case: 23TRCP00474
12)
13 **Stanislav Arbit,**)
14 **Plaintiff**) DECLARATION OF STANISLAV ARBIT
15)
16 **v.**) DEPARTMENT B
17) TORRANCE COURTHOUSE
18 **Mark Elliot Zuckerberg,**)
19 **Defendant.**) Hearing: March 26, 2024 at 8:30 AM
20) Judge: Hon. Douglas W. Stern
21)
22)
23)
24)
25)
26)
27)
28)

1 I, Stanislav Arbit, hereby declare as follows:

2 1. Plaintiff incorporates declarations filed on 03/18/24, 03/05/24, and 02/16/24 by reference.

3
4 2. I notified Defendant, Mark Zuckerberg, of this ex parte application for alternative service,
5 scheduled for 03/26/24 at 8:30 a.m., on 03/19/24.

6
7 3. I informed Mark Zuckerberg that the hearing will be in Dept. B at the Torrance
8 Courthouse, 825 Maple Ave, Torrance, CA 90503.

9 4. I asked Mark Zuckerberg if he intended to appear to oppose the ex parte application.

10
11 5. The notice was emailed to the following email addresses: zuck@fb.com,
12 mark.zuckerberg@fb.com, mzuckerberg@fb.com, zuck@meta.com,
13 mzuckerberg@meta.com, and mark.zuckerberg@meta.com

14
15 6. Mark Zuckerberg has not responded.

16 7. I emailed the moving papers to Mark Zuckerberg before 10:00 a.m. on 03/25/24.

17
18 8. As stated in the declaration filed on 03/05/24, the **first request to serve the summons**
19 **and complaint was submitted on 01/09/24.**

20
21 9. Based on a phone call with the San Mateo Sheriff's Office (SMSO) on 03/19/24, their **first**
22 **attempt to serve the summons and complaint was on 2/29/24** and **another attempt was**
23 **made on 03/14/24.** SMSO told me that security denied them entrance and they did not
24 leave a copy of the summons and complaint (i.e., **substitutive service was not an option**).

25
26 10. Service for other papers has failed four times—not including the attempts mentioned in
27 the previous paragraph.

28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

11. This request is made ex parte because of the immediate and irreparable danger that has occurred and continues to occur.

12. I believe that the vandalism described in § 20 of the declaration filed on 3/18/24 was not a random occurrence. A police report was filed with El Segundo PD. The case number is 0456.

13. I believe that the presiding Judge—Douglas W. Stern— has an **undisclosed conflict of interest**, one that precludes him from faithfully executing his judicial duties.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the aforementioned is true and correct.

Respectfully submitted,



03/21/24

By: Stanislav Arbit
440 N Barranca Ave #7377
Covina, CA 91723
Email: stan@securepower.io
424-398-2547

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Stanislav Arbit
440 N Barranca Ave #7377
Covina, CA 91723
Phone: 480-818-4418
Email: stan@securepower.io
Plaintiff

Stanislav Arbit,
Plaintiff

v.

Mark Elliot Zuckerberg,
Defendant.

) Case: 23TRCP00474
)
) DECLARATION OF STANISLAV ARBIT
)
) DEPARTMENT B
) TORRANCE COURTHOUSE
)
) Hearing: April 16, 2024 at 8:30 AM
) Judge: Hon. Douglas W. Stern
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

1 THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
2 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
3

4 I, Stanislav Arbit, hereby declare as follows:

- 5 1. I notified Defendant, Mark Zuckerberg, of this ex parte application for alternative service,
6 scheduled for 04/16/24 at 8:30 a.m., on 04/12/24.
7
- 8 2. I informed Mark Zuckerberg that the hearing will be in Dept. B at the Torrance
9 Courthouse, located at 825 Maple Ave, Torrance, CA 90503.
10
- 11 3. I asked Mark Zuckerberg if he intended to appear to oppose the ex parte application.
12
- 13 4. The notice was emailed to the following email addresses: zuck@fb.com,
14 mark.zuckerberg@fb.com, mzuckerberg@fb.com, zuck@meta.com,
15 mzuckerberg@meta.com, and mark.zuckerberg@meta.com.
16
- 17 5. Mark Zuckerberg has not responded.
18
- 19 6. I emailed the moving papers to Mark Zuckerberg before 10:00 a.m. on 04/15/24.
20
- 21 7. The first SER-001, "Request for Sheriff to Serve Court Papers," for service of summons
22 was submitted by Plaintiff to San Mateo Sheriff's Office (SMSO) on 01/09/24.
23
- 24 8. The SMSO made their first attempt to serve the summons and complaint on 02/29/24 and
25 another attempt was made on 03/14/24. (*Filed on 04/08/24*)
26
- 27 9. On 03/06/24, I submitted a request to the SMSO for substitutive service.
28
10. On 03/08/24 they responded with "We currently have an open service for these
documents."

- 1 11. On 03/13/24 at 06:42 a.m., I asked SMSO for a status update for case 23TRCP00474 after
2 informing the SMSO that “The crimes are ongoing and the damages continue to accrue.
3 Please consider this matter urgent.”
4
- 5 12. On Thursday, 03/14/24 at 01:30 p.m., after not getting a response to the status update
6 request submitted on 03/13/24, I called the San Mateo Sheriff’s Office. After a short
7 automated message, I was routed to the Civil Unit Team. The call lasted for 13 minutes
8 while they researched the case and confirmed my identity. The call concluded with a
9 promise that my request for substituted service would be honored, but would be delayed
10 due to limited staff.
11
- 12 13. On 04/05/24, I submitted the second SER-001 requesting substitutive service.
13
- 14 14. On 04/11/24, I contacted SMSO for a status update. I didn’t receive a response.
15
- 16 15. On 04/12/24, I sent a second request to SMSO (including Sheriff Corpus,
17 ccorpus@smcgov.org) for a status update on the request for substitutive service. They
18 responded with “An attempt was made, however the service was unsuccessful and a card
19 was left. The documents are still out for service.”
20
- 21 16. On 04/12/24, I contacted Sheriff Corpus directly, asking why they have been unable or
22 unwilling to execute the service request. Lt. Dan Reynolds responded, saying that they are
23 working on it without providing any details.
24
- 25 17. This request is made ex parte because of immediate danger and irreparable harm.
26
27
28

1 18. My computer and phone have been hacked. I do not have reliable access to the internet
2 which is not compromised—effectively confining me as a virtual slave, unable to obtain
3 employment, manage my business, or receive essential, life-sustaining governmental
4 services.
5

6 19. I am under constant physical surveillance.
7

8 20. I am under a constant threat of physical violence.

9 21. I have reason to believe that I am regularly getting mildly poisoned with a significant
10 dose administered on 03/13/24 which caused a notable increase in discomfort, pain, and
11 loss of sleep.
12

13 22. I have reason to believe that I am a victim of targeted biological warfare. The most recent
14 occurrence was on, or around, 04/10/24.
15

16 23. The building automation system in the building where I work often “fails” and either
17 locks me out of the building or locks me in, or holds me in the elevator for an extended
18 amount of time after arriving at a floor. The last occurrence was on April 12, 2024.
19

20 24. I have to navigate around coordinated car accident setups. The most recent event occurred
21 on 04/13/24 around 11:00 AM on La Tijera Boulevard.
22

23 25. Publication of this lawsuit is likely, and an order for publication can advance us to
24 discovery where I, Stanislav Arbit, Plaintiff, believe I can uncover a preponderance of
25 evidence to prevail in this lawsuit.
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

I declare under penalty of perjury that the aforementioned is true and correct.

Respectfully submitted,



By: Stanislav Arbit
440 N Barranca Ave #7377
Covina, CA 91723
Email: stan@securepower.io
424-398-2547
04/14/24

1 Stanislav Arbit
2 440 N Barranca Ave #7377
3 Covina, CA 91723
4 Phone: 480-818-4418
5 Email: stan@securepower.io

6 Plaintiff

8 THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

9 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

11) Case: 23TRCP00474
12)
13) DECLARATION OF STANISLAV ARBIT
14)
15) DEPARTMENT B
16)
16) TORRANCE COURTHOUSE
17)
18)
18) Hearing: April 26, 2024 at 8:30 AM
19)
19) Judge: Douglas W. Stern
20)
21)
22)
23)
24)
25)
26)
27)
28)

12 **Stanislav Arbit,**

14 **Plaintiff**

16 **v.**

18 **Mark Elliot Zuckerberg,**

19 **Defendant.**

1 I, Stanislav Arbit, hereby declare as follows:

2 1. Plaintiff incorporates declarations filed on 04/15/24, 03/21/24, 03/18/24 and 03/05/24 by
3 reference.

4
5 2. I notified Defendant, Mark Zuckerberg, of this ex parte application for alternative service,
6 scheduled for 04/26/24 at 8:30 a.m., on 04/25/24 before 10:00 a.m.

7
8 3. I informed Mark Zuckerberg that the hearing will be in Dept. B at the Torrance
9 Courthouse, located at 825 Maple Ave, Torrance, CA 90503.

10 4. I asked Mark Zuckerberg if he intended to appear to oppose the ex parte application.

11
12 5. The notice was emailed to the following email addresses: zuck@fb.com,
13 mark.zuckerberg@fb.com, mzuckerberg@fb.com, zuck@meta.com,
14 mzuckerberg@meta.com, and mark.zuckerberg@meta.com.

15
16 6. I emailed the moving papers to Mark Zuckerberg before 10:00 a.m. on 04/25/24.

17 7. This request is made ex parte because of immediate danger and irreparable harm.

18
19 8. At the first hearing with Judge Douglas W. Stern (03/06/24), after appearances, Mr. Stern
20 told me, Stanislav Arbit, the Plaintiff, that he does not care about this case, he believes that
21 I don't care, and he made it known that he strongly disapproves of how the complaint was
22 titled.

23
24 9. At the next hearing (3/19/24), Judge Stern demonstrated his proclaimed disinterest by
25 exhibiting a willful lack of understanding of the motion before him. I stated that he is not
26 reading what I am submitting and I reiterated the gravity of the situation and asked if it
27

28

1 would be helpful if I came back the next day so that Mr. Stern could have more time to
2 familiarize himself with the motion. Mr. Stern declined the suggestion and denied the
3 motion.
4

5 10. In the declaration that I filed on 3/21/24, I stated the following: “I believe that the
6 presiding Judge—Douglas W. Stern—has an undisclosed conflict of interest, one that
7 precludes him from faithfully executing his judicial duties.”
8

9 11. The hearing after being told by Plaintiff that he is not reading or understanding the
10 documents being submitted, Douglas W. Stern’s courtroom had a sheriff’s deputy present.
11 Right before Plaintiff’s case was called the deputy positioned himself at the door leading to
12 Plaintiff’s desk. Plaintiff stated his name with an armed deputy next to him—both of the
13 deputy’s hands could reach Plaintiff without having to adjust his stance.
14
15

16 12. After appearances, Douglas W. Stern asked Plaintiff about what exactly Mr. Stern was not
17 understanding. Plaintiff told him that everything he wanted Mr. Stern to understand was in
18 the filed documents. This hearing occurred on 3/26/24 and included the declaration (filed
19 on 3/21) that accused Mr. Stern of having an undisclosed conflict of interest. Mr. Stern then
20 stated he is once again denying the motion. Plaintiff left the courtroom immediately and
21 was followed to the elevator by the deputy. Before the elevator’s doors closed the armed
22 deputy made a showing of stretching his arms.
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

13. Before leaving the Torrance Courthouse, Plaintiff stopped by the library to do legal research. While conducting the research, various deputies would poke their heads in and make a comment before leaving.

14. On 03/28/24, I emailed a litigation hold to Dept. B, addressed to Mr. Stern. It was emailed to tordeptb@lacourt.org at 9:14 a.m. as an attachment (Exhibit 1).

15. On 04/13/24, I emailed a copy of a cease and desist letter addressed to Mr. Stern and sent it to tordeptb@lacourt.org on 04/13/24 (Exhibit 2).

16. On 04/16/24, Mr. Stern ruled, without calling the matter for hearing against an Ex Parte Application.

17. While I believe the aforementioned facts are enough for Mr. Stern to have recused himself, I am now also stating explicitly that I believe Mr. Stern has conspired with Defendant, either directly or indirectly, to manipulate the proceedings in a way that unfairly harms the plaintiff.

18. Exhibits 1 and 2 are true and accurate.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the aforementioned is true and correct.

Respectfully submitted,



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

By: Stanislav Arbit
440 N Barranca Ave #7377
Covina, CA 91723
Email: stan@securepower.io
424-398-2547
04/25/24

DEC 18 2023

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court
By: M. Horan, Deputy

1 Stanislav Arbit
2 440 N Barranca Ave #7377
3 Covina, CA 91723
4 Phone: 480-818-4418
5 Email: stan@securepower.io
6 Plaintiff

8 THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
9 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

) **23TRCP00474**
) Case:
)
) **STALKING CONSPIRACY &**
) **DEFAMATION CONSPIRACY**
) (Civ. Code, §§ 1708.7 and 44-47)
)
) **COMPLAINT FOR:**
) **INJUNCTION AND DAMAGES**
)
) **JURY DEMAND**
)
) Complaint Filed:
)
)
)

Stanislav Arbit,
Plaintiff

v.

Mark Elliot Zuckerberg,
Defendant.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

I. PARTIES, JURISDICTION, AND VENUE

1. This court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant, Mark Elliot Zuckerberg, because his primary residence is in California.

2. Stanislav Arbit’s primary residence is in California.

3. The Superior Court of California has subject-matter jurisdiction for Civil Code § 1708.7 and §§ 44–47.

4. The venue is proper because all of the causes of action and most of the events occurred in Los Angeles County.

II. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

5. It is within my belief and knowledge that the defendant is a principal in a fifth-column network that conspires to target Americans, who do not have utility to them, to remove them from society by any available means, including murder.

6. Plaintiff is a former contingent worker at Facebook, Inc. Facebook, Inc. is operated by the defendant. Plaintiff believes he was targeted because of this relationship.

7. Defendant’s program can be described as Full Cycle Human Resource Management (FCHRM). FCHRM is analogous to a washing machine cycle. FCHRM’s cycle is approximately one year. And much like a washing machine, most of the time is spent in the agitation phase. During the agitation phase, the Defendant has tried to agitate, frighten, confuse, and mobilize the plaintiff.

- 1 8. Around the one-year mark, they force the victim, or in this case, they forced me
2 out of housing and employment. This is the drain and spin phase. At this point, you
3 are on the run and exhaust your resources. If you are able to settle back into housing
4 and gain income the cycle will start again.
- 5
- 6 9. The goal, and eventual result, is to have the victim's savings drained, all credit
7 exhausted, and for the victim's resume to have a long gap in employment. At this
8 point, the victim is essentially boxed in.
- 9
- 10 10. Defendant uses patterns as his criminal signature—employing various motifs to
11 string individual events together.
- 12
- 13 11. Most days contain multiple events, and it is rare for a day to go by without an
14 event.
- 15
- 16 12. Defendant spies on the plaintiff and reflects gathered intelligence in his
17 choreographed field performances and direct inauthentic interactions with Plaintiff.
- 18
- 19 13. While permanent removal of the victim is the primary goal, the secondary goal
20 is complete isolation from society, and the tertiary goal is being blocked from
21 housing and employment. But any inconvenience, insult, manipulation, or scam, no
22 matter how slight, is an achievement to the defendant and his network of
23 coconspirators.
- 24
- 25 14. The scheme is highly organized, resource intensive, and typically coupled with
26 plausible deniability, and whenever possible, blame is shifted through
27
28

1 misinformation. The underlying mechanics of this novel setup are, by design,
2 difficult to express. The sheer complexity of their over-engineered system serves as
3 a cover for their criminal enterprise.
4

5 15. Defendant maliciously defamed Plaintiff with the goal of precluding him from
6 gaining employment in any field or industry.
7

8 16. Defendant maliciously defamed Plaintiff with the goal of critically damaging his
9 business.
10

11 17. Defendant has made credible threats and Plaintiff believes Defendant has and
12 will continue to conspire to cause the plaintiff great bodily harm and death.
13

14 **III. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: STALKING**

15 **(Civ. Code, § 1708.7)**

16 18. The allegations in previous paragraphs are incorporated herein by reference.

17 19. Defendant, Mark Elliot Zuckerberg, is a principal in a conspiracy to stalk the
18 plaintiff, Stanislav Arbit.
19

20 20. The Stalking was planned and executed with Defendant's vast network.

21 Defendant is vicariously liable for all of the actions of the conspiracy because he
22 was an active participant who was involved in the planning of the stalking and
23 agreed with his network to commit acts of stalking and intended that stalking be
24 committed.
25
26
27
28

1 21. The defendant engaged in a pattern of conduct the intent of which was to follow,
2 alarm, place under surveillance, and harass the plaintiff.

3
4 22. As a result of that pattern of conduct the plaintiff reasonably feared for his
5 safety, and for the safety of an immediate family member.

6 23. The plaintiff suffered substantial emotional distress, and the pattern of conduct
7 would cause a reasonable person to suffer substantial emotional distress.

8
9 24. The defendant, as a part of the pattern of conduct specified in Section II, made a
10 credible threat with the intent to place the plaintiff in reasonable fear for his safety.

11
12 25. The defendant, as a part of the pattern of conduct specified in Section II, has
13 acted with reckless disregard for the safety of the plaintiff.

14
15 26. In response to the threat in paragraph 24, Plaintiff applied for two TROs.
16 Defendant had knowledge of these applications.

17
18 **IV. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: DEFAMATION**

19 **(Civ. Code, §§ 44–47)**

20
21 27. The allegations in previous paragraphs are incorporated herein by reference.

22 28. Defendant, Mark Elliot Zuckerberg, is a principal in a conspiracy to defame the
23 plaintiff, Stanislav Arbit.

24
25 29. The defamation was planned and executed with Defendant's vast network.

26 Defendant is vicariously liable for all of the actions of the conspiracy because he
27 was an active participant who was involved in the planning of the defamation and
28

1 agreed with his network to commit acts of defamation and intended that defamation
2 be committed.

3
4 30. Because of the Defamation Plaintiff was harmed in his business and profession.

5 31. Defendant acted with malice, oppression, and fraud.

6 **V. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

7
8 32. Plaintiff requests general damages according to proof.

9 33. Plaintiff requests punitive damages in an amount to be determined by the Court
10 according to proof.

11
12 34. Plaintiff requests any and all other relief the Court deems just and proper.

13 35. Plaintiff also requests reasonable attorney fees and interest on all damages.

14 **VI. JURY TRIAL DEMAND**

15
16 36. Plaintiff respectfully demands a trial by jury on all claims and issues so triable.

17
18
19 Respectfully submitted,

20
21 

22
23 By: Stanislav Arbit

24 440 N Barranca Ave #7377

25 Covina, CA 91723

26
27 Email: stan@securepower.io

28

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT**

DIVISION 8

2DCA-05

**Stanislav Arbit,
Plaintiff and Appellant,**

VS.

**Mark Zuckerberg,
Defendant and Respondent.**

2d No. B340261

(Super. Ct. No. 23TRCP00474)

**[Proposed] ORDER
Re: AUGMENTATION**

Appellant's motion to augment the record on appeal is granted. The record on appeal is ordered augmented with:

document(s) filed with the motion to augment as [exhibit(s)] _____

trial court exhibit(s) _____;

the superior court file;

the transcripts described below.

The clerk of the superior court is ordered to have prepared (an) augmented reporter's transcript(s) as set forth below. The moving party is to deposit with the civil appeals section within **10 days** of this order the approximate cost of the transcript(s), or to submit a waiver of deposit signed by the reporter(s).

	REPORTER'S NAME	DEPT.	DATE	NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS
1.				
2.				
3.				<input type="checkbox"/> see additional page(s)

The clerk of the superior court is ordered to prepare an augmented clerk's transcript consisting of the following:

	DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION
1.		
2.		
3.		<input type="checkbox"/> see additional page(s)

An original and _____ copies of the above transcripts are to be prepared within 30 days of this order. No requests for extensions of time will be granted. **THE ORIGINAL AND ALL COPIES OF SEALED PROCEEDINGS ARE TO BE SENT TO THE COURT OF APPEAL ONLY.** Otherwise, the original is to be delivered to the Court of Appeal and one copy to each party listed below:

_____ is to be filed within _____ days of the filing of the augmented record.

This Order continues on _____ additional page(s). _____/_____/_____

Presiding Justice