CASE# MS-2020-00+0060

GARFIELD HTS MUNI CT
FILED
2025 DEC -2 PM 12:29
ALEXANDER F. GRGAT
CLERK OF COURT

ross m delia, beneficiary

on behalf of ROSS M DELIA

22 Leonard Avenue

Northfield, Ohio 44067

December 1, 2025

TANIA GALONSKI
2025 DEC -2 PM 3:00
SUMMIT COUNTY
CLERK OF COURTS

alexander f grgat

Garfield Heights Municipal Court

5555 Turney Road

Garfield Heights, Ohio 44125

In Re: 11/10/25 pretrial hearing notice

To the man or woman who sometimes act as public official:

It is my sincere desire to eliminate this controversy and peacefully return all man and woman involved in this situation to honor. This correspondence shall in no way be construed as consent to contract. Any prior presumed/perceived contract(s) between myself and any of the agents or agencies involved in the controversy being discussed herein, was engaged in under duress, and without full disclosure. Those prior presumed agreements are therefore of no valuable consideration to both sides, and, so, are deemed null and void from here forward.

Correspondence received on November 15, 2025, purportedly authored by "Garfield Heights Clerk of Courts" stated that the matter had "come before the Court on the Defendant's request for hearing" (see attached). This is a purposefully manipulative, *GROSS* misinterpretation, of the language and intent of the correspondence authored by i, which was hand delivered to michael gervase on November 2, 2025 clearly noted as ***Court Hearing Requirement***. Said misrepresentation by the man, alexander grgat, of lawful language is designed to force subjugation of i, the man, in my lawful standing and rights to due process, is a malicious violation of the Constitutional Oath and surety bond restricting the professional responsibilities and limitations of the office of Clerk of Courts.

Further statements by alexander grgat in "PREPARATION INFORMATION" section of the response to my requirement for hearing notice do instruct the recipient to "review (sic) Supreme Court decision(s)" for "challenging the constitutionality or enforceability of the traffic camera statutes or Village ordinances"; Emphasis is made here that the supreme court citation loosely referred to in your response is a ruling made in 2017. The new law, HB54, that came about due to the acknowledgement of the representative legislators after lengthy public outcry that unmanned traffic cameras were being utilized as