

#3



**Robert J. Peernock**

**Serving Life Sentence Without Parole**

**WINDOW # 2**

**133 Pages**

(#2)

ONGOING CORRUPTION AND KICK BACKS ON STATE CONTRACTS  
COSTING THE TAXPAYERS MANY BILLIONS EACH YEAR

THIS "ONGOING" CORRUPTION WAS PROVED DURING ROBERT PEERNOCK'S LAWSUITS AGAINST THE RETALIATION FOR "BLOWING THE WHISTLE," AND A FALSE CLAIMS AND RICO LAWSUIT WAS FILED.

THIS GROUP OF DOCUMENTS SHOWS THAT THIS IS ONGOING CORRUPTION BY CALIFORNIA STATE OFFICIALS AND INVOLVES BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL FUNDS--WHICH HAS BEEN GOING ON FOR THE LAST OVER 40 YEARS. THE DOCUMENTS SHOW THAT CALIFORNIA--WHICH HAS THE LARGEST BUDGET--IS THE MOST CORRUPT STATE WHICH HAS NO MONEY FOR SCHOOLS BECAUSE OF THIS "ONGOING" CORRUPTION.

ALL KINDS OF RETALIATION WAS TAKEN AGAINST ROBERT PEERNOCK AND HIS FAMILY FOR "EXPOSING" THIS CORRUPTION, AND FOR ORGANIZING A UNION IN ATTEMPTS TO STOP THIS CORRUPTION BY HIGH LEVEL STATE OFFICIALS.

129

P.E.R.B. CASE LA-CE-16S, PROVING THE MASSIVE  
RACKETEERING ON STATE CONTRACTS AND THE SIX  
MURDER ATTEMPTS AGAINST R. PEERNOCK FOR  
EXPOSING THIS ORGANIZED CRIME

---

This "Opening Argument" is one of the series of cases (LA-CE-16S, et seq.) during which the organized racketeering on State contracts was proved. Also proved was the repeated murder attempts against R. Peernock in retaliation for "Blowing the Whistle" on this organized crime, which was costing the taxpayers billions

Because of the extent of this organized crime by the LAPD and involving Judges like Schwab, Major, Rimerman, etc., the Court Clerks and Judges have been trying to block this evidence from being part of the record. Portions of these transcripts have been included as EXHIBITS with R. Peernock's submittals in the Federal Courts, both at the District Court and the Ninth Circuit, but all sorts of attempts have been made to block these transcripts from being in the record--in on-going obstruction of justice and to cover-up this organized crime.

EXHIBIT "O"

140.

Page 1 of 6

2.

PERB OPENING Argument

92

VOL. 2

CASE NO LA-CE-16S

JUDGE NAIMAN

1 construed that way.

2 HEARING OFFICER: Right. Well, maybe it would be best to  
3 wait, then.

4 MR. GATIEN: Because they have to do with words  
5 description used and they have to do with his view of what  
6 his function was and so on. I think that our questions are  
7 basically adversary in nature and I think it would be better  
8 to wait until our general cross-examination.

9 JUDGE STEPHEN NAIMAN

HEARING OFFICER: That's why -- Okay. Fine.

10 Then if there is nothing further in a general nature,  
11 I take it that -- let me just conclude with this.

12  
13 EXAMINATION (continued)

14 Q (By Hearing Officer) I take it that some time in 1979  
15 you were terminated by the Department?

16 A That's correct.

17 Q And thereafter you were given a hearing before the State  
18 Personnel Board regarding that termination; is that correct?

19 A That's correct.

20 Q And that was approximately in 1980 --

21 A Correct. The hearing was broken.

22 Q -- September --

23 A I went to two sections. The first hearing was June and  
24 July in 1980. The second portion of the hearing was  
25 September and October 1980.

26 HEARING OFFICER: Okay. And I think that's all I have in  
27 general.

28 Anything other than that, Gentlemen?

263

7. 221

3.



OPENING STATEMENT AT THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD IN CASE LA-CE-16S. DURING THIS CASE ROBERT PEERNOCK "PROVED" THE ORGANIZED CRIME ON CONTRACTS BY HIGH LEVEL STATE OFFICIALS, THE "6 MURDER ATTEMPTS" AGAINST PEERNOCK FOR "BLOWING THE WHISTLE" ON THIS ONGOING ORGANIZED CRIME ON CONTRACTS, AND THE MANY DEATH THREATS AGAINST WITNESSES IN ATTEMPTS BY THE CORRUPT STATE OFFICIALS TO TERRORIZE AND DISCOURAGE THEIR TESTIMONY ON THIS ORGANIZED CRIME AND RACKETEERING COSTING THE TAXPAYERS BILLIONS EACH YEAR.

(Pause.)

HEARING OFFICER: If not, then we will now ask Mr. Mintz  
if he has an introductory statement for his case in chief.

MR. MINTZ: Yes. Thank you.

Mr. Hearing Officer, Mr. Gatien, Mr. Peernock, and to  
whoever reads this record: I make my opening statement brief  
and to the point.

Mr. Peernock, when he was first appointed as an employee  
of the State of California, had been working in the private  
sector. He had been a good worker, diligent, intelligent and  
well-trained, and he took with him concerns about the dangers,  
the deaths and the maiming and the injuries that might befall  
people because of crooked contractors who didn't meet  
specifications.

He was assigned to Sacramento, where he was trained. He  
did his job well. He was assigned an inspection task which  
he performed diligently; and up until that time he had no  
problems whatever. Then he began to do his job in such a way  
as to demonstrate that he could not be corrupted. He was  
approached by the contractors. He was asked to play ball. He  
wouldn't do it. He was pressured by his own department. He  
was asked to play ball. He was asked to go along. He'd get  
power. He'd share in the profits. He'd have benefits. They  
offered him a carrot. He wouldn't do it.

The carrot didn't work so they tried a stick. Said,  
"We'll blacklist you. We'll get rid of you. We'll injure  
you. We'll hurt you. Don't fool with us. The Mafia is  
involved. This and that." Threats wouldn't faze him, either.

8. 222

264 5- 70-5

1 He went to his supervisor. He complained. He conjoled.  
2 He did everything in his power. His supervisor went along  
3 with him and they got rid of his supervisor and they sent  
4 somebody else down. They sent down a Mr. Neff to take care of  
5 this problem, this Inspector that was too honest. This person  
6 who couldn't be bought.

7 The threats were carried out. First he was injured.  
8 That didn't work. Then they started to build charges against  
9 him. That didn't work, either.

10 Mr. Peernock wouldn't take this sitting still. He  
11 decided to do something about it. He filed grievances. He  
12 joined a Union. He saw too many people injured on the job  
13 because the contractors didn't meet specifications.

14 They tried to "bury" him somewhere, but that didn't stop  
15 him because of the employment organization, the State Employees'  
16 Trade Council finally, the Charging Party in this case.

17 He wrote more than a hundred grievances and suffered  
18 constant reprisals and harassment during the few years  
19 preceding his termination. Charges were built that were so  
20 flimsy that they couldn't even be used, and we have copies of  
21 those charges.

22 Finally, they sent around word that anybody who could  
23 build charges against Mr. Peernock would be rewarded.

24 First the contractors tried and they failed. Then they  
25 got employees to try to fabricate a case against him.

26 Finally, through a conspiracy, collusion, call it what  
27 you will, they set him up. They couldn't get him any other  
28 way so they created an incident in which a Don Andrews, his

subordinate, whom he had filed a grievance against and who had some motive to get back at him, approached Mr. Peernock one day when he came in. Mr. Peernock at this time had been injured severely by having equipment dropped on him and auto accidents under suspicious circumstances. He was in a back brace; he was under medication. He was under weight -- lifting restrictions. He had a 45 percent worker's comp disability. Mr. Andrews was perfect for the part because he was a small guy. He looked skinny and harmless. Went over to Peernock and began kicking him. Kicking him at the sensitive parts of his body, in the groin.

Fortunately for Mr. Peernock two employees walked in at that time; they wanted to see Mr. Peernock on Union matters, and they witnessed Andrews kicking him. They witnessed the entire incident, from beginning to end, but the Department was so powerful that it didn't care about these witnesses.

Immediately after the incident the superior, Mr. Waff, who has been transferred since, said, "Give me your keys and go home. You're through." Just like that!

Everything that followed was merely form over substance. The Skelly hearing at which time he was supposed to be confronted with the evidence against him was a farce and a sham.

The State Personnel Board hearing at which he presented substantial evidence not only of his factual innocence but of the incredible effort that was made to fabricate charges against him. And the threats that he recorded some of them, that he was going to be "gotten rid of one way or the other,





























































































































































































































































































