

From: [Salina Amey](#)
To: [*CI-StPaul_LegislativeHearings](#)
Cc: [#CI-StPaul_Ward7](#); [*CI-StPaul_CC-Ward6](#); [#CI-StPaul_Ward5](#); [#CI-StPaul_Ward4](#); [#CI-StPaul_Ward3](#); [#CI-StPaul_Ward2](#); [#CI-StPaul_Ward1](#); [Erick Kaardel](#); [Martin, Lisa \(CI-StPaul\)](#); [Hesse, Daniel \(CI-StPaul\)](#); [Ekobena, Richard \(CI-StPaul\)](#); [Miller, Jeremy \(CI-StPaul\)](#); [Zimny, Joanna \(CI-StPaul\)](#); [Tierney, Rachel \(CI-StPaul\)](#); [Upper Midwest Law Center](#); [Harrington, Stephanie \(CI-StPaul\)](#); [Jeff Meitrodt](#); [Albornoz, Carlos \(CI-StPaul\)](#); [Her, Kaohly \(CI-StPaul\)](#); [Xiong, ThaoMee \(CI-StPaul\)](#); [Erick Kaardel](#); [Scott McKown](#); [Tom Gray](#); [Salina Amey](#)
Subject: Appeal of Condemnation and Order to Vacate RLH VO 21-34, letter dated 8/29/2021
Date: Sunday, August 29, 2021 4:49:33 PM
Attachments: [Appeal of Condemnation and Order to Vacate RLH VO 21-34.docx](#)

Think Before You Click: This email originated **outside** our organization.

Dear Legislative Hearing Staff, City Council Members, and all others,

Please consider the attached letter in my appeal of the decision of Marcia Moermond to recommend the condemnation of my home and the retroactive order to vacate my home by Friday, August 27, 2021.

Sincerely,

Salina Amey

Salina Amey
283 Curtice St E
St Paul, MN 55107
651-310-0923

August 29, 2021

St Paul City Council Members
Legislative Hearing Office
St Paul City Hall, Suite 210
15 W. Kellogg Blvd.
St Paul, MN 55107

Re: Appeal of Condemnation and Order to Vacate RLH VO 21-34

Dear St Paul City Council Members,

“Procedural due process” under the U.S. Constitution requires (1) adequate notice; (2) a fair opportunity to be heard; and (3) an impartial tribunal.

Ms. Moermond has failed to act in an impartial manner, but has rather taken on a prosecutorial demeanor and set of actions which constitute Abuse of Office, in her agenda of rushing a quasi-judicial process to protect the Abuse of Office of her colleague and close associate, Building Official Steve Ubl, such that my right to due process has been violated.

Although Ms. Moermond is supposed to be a “neutral”, she instead has stacked the deck in her administrative hearings such that she chose who the witnesses were with fore-knowledge of who would go along with her agenda, and refused me the opportunity to call witnesses who had evidence to support the truth. Ms. Moermond also rushed the process so fast, that it was not possible for me to get the documents required to show the truth, such as the letter that I heard Steve Ubl wrote on behalf of contractor Robert Brandtjen. Steve Ubl and his subordinates have a pattern and practice of writing letters containing falsehoods and misinformation for the purposes of influencing people in positions of power, to suit their agendas.

Ms. Moermond refused to allow me adequate time to prepare a defense against this serious situation she was mandated to handle in a fair and neutral manner.

The separation of powers clause of the Constitution divides government responsibilities into distinct branches in order to prevent the concentration of power and provide for checks and balances. What is happening in St Paul is the concentration of power into the Executive Branch of Government, such that employees of the Department of Safety and Inspections and Ms. Moermond, the Legislative Hearing Official are not conducting actions in a legal manner. Instead, they are conspiring together to rush a process of recommendations to the St Paul City Council that gives them inappropriate power such that they have opportunity to compile evidence to support their agendas of getting the result they want – in my case, to unjustly condemn my house, order it vacated, and then move on to setting in place the laws in MN that pertain to vacant buildings, which creates a situation where it is easy for corrupt officials to do enormous harm to an individual such as myself, by getting a search warrant, making a trumped up list of housing ordinance violations that must be corrected, then demanding that all of the violations be corrected in a very short period of time and subject to the approval of the very individual who has been engaging in corrupt practices against me since the Fall of 2011, Steve Ubl.

St. Paul local ordinances require the payment of a vacant building registration fee of \$2,127.00 within 30 days of a building being vacant, even when ordered by code enforcement officials (Steve Ubl) and facilitated by Legislative Hearing Officer Marcia Moermond acting as a prosecutor and judge on behalf of her fellow Executive Branch of Government of St Paul officials.

St Paul ordinances also require that a property owner such as myself, then pay a Vacant Building \$5,000.00 Performance Deposit, which must be paid prior to the City of St Paul Dept. of Safety and Inspections (under Steve Ubl), issuing any permits to do any of the work that is required in order to address the long list of code violations that DSI, under Steve Ubl, has decreed must be fixed, up to their standards.

St Paul ordinances also require “All structures to be inspected must be thoroughly cleaned out and sanitary, leaving no clutter and all areas must be accessible. Noncompliance will result in the imposition of re-inspection fees”.

This means that my home would have to be emptied of all belongings, at my cost, and all of the contents of my home put in storage”.

There is a fee for a Code Compliance Residential Fee of \$493.00 and a Code Compliance Base Fee of \$469.00 that would have to be paid, as well.

It is my understanding that Marcia Moermond has held her position for well over ten years, so she must have full knowledge of what Steve Ubl set into motion when he ordered that my home be condemned, and yet despite the seriousness of this situation, she has rushed the process and denied me my Constitutional rights to a fair judicial process.

Ms. Marcia Moermond received letters and testimony from me stating that I have been subjected to harassment and reprisal from Steve Ubl since the Fall of 2011, and yet she did not give me an opportunity to share this evidence in the hearings, and she rushed the process such that it is obvious she is not an impartial hearing officer, but instead is conspiring with Steve Ubl to defraud me of my constitutional rights and to set in motion a set of procedural hurdles that have cost many homeowners and building owners everything that they own.

Why is Marcia Moermond acting in such a way as to facilitate the actions and agenda of a corrupt official, rather than following the letter of the law?

St Paul has guidelines which Ms. Moermond is required to follow in carrying out her official responsibilities. Following is the pertinent stated policy of St Paul “If a building is immediately dangerous to public health and safety, the City can condemn it on an emergency basis. A building that is hazardous, but has not reached the status of dangerous may or may not be condemned as being unfit for human habitation”.

Ms. Moermond ignored my prima facie defense which is based upon and establishes all of the following points which should have resulted in her recommending that I have more time to gather facts to support my defense and allegations of violations of my rights along with a recommendation that the City Council vote to deny the condemnation order that Steve Ubl initiated:

1. No evidence exists that my home is “immediately dangerous to public health and safety”
2. The Fourth Amendment of the Constitution grants citizens, including myself, the right “to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures.”
3. It is within my Constitutional rights to refuse unreasonable demands to voluntarily acquiesce to demands that I forfeit my Constitutional rights without penalty.
4. Steve Ubl intervened on behalf of a contractor, by sending a letter stating that I had refused to allow the contractor to enter my house, without doing any investigation to determine if what the contractor stated was true.
5. St Paul does not have an established practice or right to demand citizens permit sewer department officials inspect their private sewer lines via video camera.
6. It violates Constitutional Law “search and seizure” procedures to penalize and individual for asserting their rights.
7. It is an unconscionable for city employees to initiate and/or support condemnation proceedings against an individual on such flimsy pretext especially given there is NO evidence of a lack of code compliance and NO right to demand that I willingly submit to have my property searched when it is not the policy of the Sewer Department to inspect the private sewer lines of St Paul residents, even when they are in the process of having their sewer lines replaced.
8. Ms. Moermond, herself, has been violating the scope of her role as a Legislative Hearing Officer, by altering the appeal deadline process, as stipulated in online documents. For example, inspector Daniel Hesse, the Property Code Enforcement employee who posted the Condemnation and Order to Vacate placard on my house, told me I had to go to City Hall immediately to appeal the proceedings. As a result of being told this, I went to City Hall in person, on Thursday August 12, 2021 to do so. It was only after I handed the appeal to the clerk that I was told that by law I had ten days to file the appeal. Daniel Hesse told me that I could not re-enter my home until after I filed the appeal. When I learned that I had more time to prepare for the appeal, I asked for my appeal to be handed back to me, but the staff refused. They then told me that my appeal

would be heard on the following Tuesday morning, which was less than five days away.

9. According to St Paul's website, "appeal hearings are scheduled one to four weeks after the application is submitted." The fact that Ms. Moermond altered the written appeal guidelines such that I had less than five days to prepare for the initial hearing appears to be a flagrant indication of her bias against me, and her obvious effort to undermine my ability to defend myself for unjust proceedings.
10. The city legislative hearing appeal website states "Once an appeal has been scheduled, it may not be rescheduled more than once." This indicates that the normal procedure is to permit an individual to have at minimum one hearing rescheduled by request. My request for the hearing to be rescheduled due to my mother moving from the hospital into hospice was reasonable, and denied. This decision on the part of Marcia Moermond clearly illustrates bias against me, as it is a violation of published departmental guidelines. It also suggests that Marcia Moermond was actively participating in conspiratorial efforts to interfere with my ability to defend myself and to explain that Steve Ubl has motive to prevent the truth to emerge with regards to how he has instructed his employees to handle code enforcement issues at my residence and how he himself has intervened in those issues by protecting contractors from any repercussions for violating building codes and ordinances, and doing the same for the absentee landlord who owns the property immediately adjacent and west of mine.
11. St Paul participates in fair housing planning, as is required of communities that receive certain funds from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Non-discrimination is a requirement of the Fair Housing Implementation Council (FHIC), of which St Paul is a member and thus required to follow agreed upon policies. These policies include non-discrimination on the basis of any of the covered classes. In St Paul, according to the Human Rights Statement published on the website, discrimination on the basis of Status with regard to Public Assistance, Sex and Disability are all forbidden. It is reasonable to assume that discrimination on the combined and each separate covered classes has been directed at me by Steve Ubl and those who work under him, and this violates my protected human rights under local, state, and federal law. The Housing Justice Center has recently completed a report

to the Fair Housing Implementation Council concerning housing displacement prevention while maintaining quality and affordable housing. The report covers the preservation of the affordability of NOAH (naturally occurring affordable housing). By using a frivolous basis to deny my ability to continue to afford to live in my home, Marcia Moermond has attempted to facilitate unlawful discrimination, retaliation, reprisal, and harassment to continue and escalate in a manner which conspires with the corrupt administration of his duties by St Paul Building Official Steve Ubl.

By conspiring with Steve Ubl to defraud me of my Constitutional Rights using administrative authority granted to her as a member of the legislative branch of government, Marcia Moermond violated the separation of powers clause of both our federal and state Constitutions. Article III, section 1 of the Minnesota Constitution reads: "The powers of government shall be divided into three distinct departments: legislative, executive and judicial. No person or persons belonging to or constituting one of these departments shall exercise any of the powers properly belonging to either of the others except in the instances expressly provided in this constitution."

Marcia Moermond is acting as an administrator, a judge, and a prosecutor. She has shown extreme bias in the manner she has rushed this process initiated against me by Steve Ubl, and is therefore not impartial. She has taken it upon herself to usurp her authority and create a kangaroo court system that has failed to provide me with the following:

- The right to be involved in, and to control, my own defense
- The right to examine all the "evidence" being used against me
- The right to omit "evidence" that is irrelevant or inadmissible
- The right to cross-examine or summon witnesses
- The right not to incriminate myself
- The right to be provided enough time and resources to prepare a proper defense to charges
- The right to introduce evidence that supports my allegations of a decade long pattern of harassment by Building Official Steve Ubl
- The right to be treated fairly under the law

The Doctrine of Dirty Hands requires that the hands of the plaintiff (Steve Ubl) be clean. When I went to the administrative hearing office to drop off my appeal and pay the \$25.00 appeal charge, I told the staff that Steve Ubl was corrupt in the manner he had acted and failed to act with regards to contracts and events at my residence.

At all three hearings administered by Marcia Moermond, I also clearly stated this pattern of abuse of power inflicted upon me by Steve Ubl. Marcia Moermond had an obligation to permit me time to present evidence of corruption by staff at St Paul DSI, but she did not do so. On the contrary, it is obvious that she has elected to aid and abet Steve Ubl such that my ability to prove his "dirty hands" is hampered by constraints of time and by the constraint of ordering me to vacate my home. Marcia Moermond has thus proven that she, too, has dirty hands. Due to the paucity of both the reasonableness of and ethics of their actions, the recommendations of both Steve Ubl and Marcia Moermond must be regarded as coming about due to bad faith.

It is clear, that in her illegitimate assumption of judicial power that she is not entitled to under the Constitution, Marcia Moermond has engaged in the obstruction of justice against me, and has sought to prevent my attempts to seek justice by having ample time and opportunity to prove my allegations of the obstruction of justice by both herself, Steve Ubl, and the staff who currently and previously worked beneath him.

I have more than ten years of records that all told create a damning portrayal of the illegal harassment that I've been subjected to. Steve Ubl ordered my house to be condemned because he has a persistent pattern of abuse of power and corruption directed at me, and conversely, Steve Ubl has a persistent pattern of corruptly refusing to hold contractors responsible to follow building codes.

Steve Ubl is well aware that there are employees of the State of MN, in various departments, who are aware that something is amiss in how he runs his department. Steve Ubl is also aware that there are current situations involving him and his employees, that are proof of his corruptness. He does not want this information to be outed, and that is why he wants me out of my home. My home contains evidence of his malfeasance and corruption, and the terrible

consequences of his using the power of his authority in a corrupt manner, and to run his department in a manner that permits, allows, or directs his employees to do the same.

Steve Ubl is a bully, and he has conspired with the absentee landlord of the house next to me to allow my neighbor to bully me. I've been subjected to almost ten years of ugly spite fences, that are nowhere near code requirements, and which have all been put illegally on my side of the property line.

The current residents of this house have lived there for five years, and for that entire period of time have subjected me to bullying, likely asked of them by their landlord. This has involved acts of vandalism, verbal abuse, screaming and pounding on my door, and defaming my character by claiming to neighbors that I am harassing them. Never have I discussed any contracts that I have or had with any contractors with them. For over ten years, property codes at this property have been ignored by code enforcement staff, and I very rarely have asked that they be enforced, due to the fact that I was threatened with criminal prosecution and told my code enforcement personnel they would have me charged with harassment if I asked that they be enforced.

Before Robert Brandtjen, the sewer contractor that I have a contract with, hit my water line and walked off the job he told me that my neighbors told him that I have a history of taking advantage of contractors and refusing to pay them. They and their landlord have done the same with other people who worked at my home.

How is it that the neighbors renting the house next door are so aware of the fact that they are permitted by staff under Steve Ubl to harass me with chronic violations of property codes that nobody else is permitted to violate? And how is it that they seem to have knowledge of the ways in which Steve Ubl has been bullying me for nearly a decade?

How is it that Robert Brandtjen was given a letter written by Steve Ubl, to present to his insurance company, that stated Robert Brandtjen was not permitted in my home in order to do the contracted work? This is yet another instance of obstruction of justice. I'm grateful that I was told about this letter, and that my insurance claim with Robert Brandtjen's insurance company was processed despite it.

Why is it that there are no permits posted at my house? Robert Brandtjen was required to take out a plumbing permit, a sewer repair permit, and a building permit for replacement of my porch footings. None of those permits were taken out, despite the fact that many city personnel know that Robert did this kind of work and was required to take out permits for this work.

How is it, that once again, Steve Ubl is protecting a contractor from having to follow the law, refusing to enforce code requirements on the contractor, and is harassing me. The actions Steve Ubl has set into motion, if affirmed by the City Council, would cost an extraordinary amount of money that I do not have, and set the stage for him to deprive me of my home and possessions via eminent domain. And, rather than performing her role as a "neutral", Marcia Moermond is obviously doing everything possible to thwart my opportunity to defend my Constitutional rights and to speak truth to power about the bullying I've been

The way Steve Ubl's department has handled the code violations at the house next door is a violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Constitution, which states that "no person or class of persons shall be denied the same protection of the laws that is enjoyed by other persons or other classes in like circumstances in their lives, liberty, property, and pursuit of happiness."

I have many photographs to prove this, but getting them together in such a short period of time is a hardship for me.

Last year, I filed a complaint against Viking Exteriors with the MN Department of Labor and Industry. This complaint was completely ignored, and when I called to inquire about it, I was told by an employee to pay the contractor. It seems likely to me that Steve Ubl obstructed my seeking justice through this application for assistance with either a letter and/or a phone call, defaming my character.

I have scanned documents which illustrate the failure of Steve Ubl's department to take appropriate enforcement action against this company, and will send them to this legislative hearing file. There are other similar situations where my life was adversely affected by the failures to grant me equal protection under the law by St Paul's Department of Safety and Inspections under Steve Ubl.

It is my First Amendment right under the Constitution to petition the government for redress of a wrong. Essentially, I did this, when I told Marcia Moermond that Steve Ubl was acting out of reprisal and a long pattern of abuse and the covering

up of abuse when he ordered that my house be condemned. Rather than granting me reasonable time to present my history of abusive and neglectful incidents with DSI under Ubl, Marcia Moermond has conspired to shorten my period of time to prepare for the City Council meeting, and to hamper me by ordering me to leave my home prior to the City Council having time to decide whether or not to affirm her recommendation. This is an unconscionable and heinous violation of my rights under the law.

It is a crime for a public official to commit acts of malfeasance, misfeasance, and/or nonfeasance, if they were done with corrupt intent. Both Steve Ubl and Marcia Moermond are officials who should be carefully examined for their compliance with the following MN statute:

MN Stat's. 609.43 MISCONDUCT OF PUBLIC OFFICER OR EMPLOYEE

A public officer or employee who does any of the following, for which no other sentence is specifically provided by law, may be sentenced to imprisonment for not more than one year or to payment of a fine of not more than \$3,000, or both:

- (1) intentionally fails or refuses to perform a known mandatory, nondiscretionary, ministerial duty of the office or employment within the time or in the manner required by law; or
- (2) in the capacity of such officer or employee, does an act knowing it is in excess of lawful authority or knowing it is forbidden by law to be done in that capacity; or
- (3) under pretense or color of official authority intentionally and unlawfully injures another in the other's person, property, or rights; or
- (4) in the capacity of such officer or employee, makes a return, certificate, official report, or other like document having knowledge it is false in any material respect.

The First Amendment protects the right to be free from government abridgment of speech. By rushing the administrative procedures that she is tasked with, when I had submitted evidence in writing prior to the first hearing that indicates the order to condemn my house was based upon reprisal, Marcia Moermond violated my right to criticize a public official. This was a violation of Section 1983 of 42 U.S.C., and an illicit order depriving me of my right to stay in my home as retaliation for speaking out about DSI abuses under Building Official Steve Ubl.

MN State Building Code further provides that before a municipality can order that a building be vacated, the city must follow the statutory procedure set forth in Minn. Stat. §§463.15 to 463.26. Minn. Stat. §463.17 provides:

Subdivision 1. Contents. The order shall be in writing; recite the grounds therefor; specify the necessary repairs, if any, and provide a reasonable time for compliance; and shall state that a motion for summary enforcement of the order will be made to the district court of the county in which the hazardous building or property is situated unless corrective action is taken ...”

Subdivision 2. Service. The order shall be served upon the owner of record, or the owner's agent if an agent is in charge of the building or property, and upon the occupying tenant, if there is one, and upon all lien holders of record, in the manner provided for service of a summons in a civil action. If the owner cannot be found, the order shall be served upon the owner by posting it at the main entrance to the building or, if there is no building, in a conspicuous place on the property, and by four weeks' publication in the official newspaper of the municipality if it has one, otherwise in a legal newspaper in the county.

Subdivision 3. Filing. A copy of the order with proof of service shall be filed with the court administrator of district court of the county in which the hazardous building or property is located not less than five days prior to the filing of a motion pursuant to section 463.19 to enforce the order. At the time of filing such order the municipality shall file for record with the county recorder or registrar of titles a notice of the pendency of the proceeding, describing with reasonable certainty the lands affected and the nature of the order. If the proceeding be abandoned the municipality shall within ten days thereafter file with the county recorder a notice to that effect.

The Saint Paul Legislative Code, Chapter 43, §43.02 defines a vacant building as a building or portion of a building which is:

- a. Unoccupied and unsecured;
- b. Unoccupied and secured by other than normal means;
- c. Unoccupied and a dangerous structure;
- d. Unoccupied and condemned;
- e. Unoccupied and has multiple housing or building code violations;

- f. Condemned and illegally occupied; or
- g. Unoccupied for a period of time over three hundred sixty-five (365) days and during which time the enforcement officer has issued an order to correct nuisance conditions.

The City Code is substantially different than the State Code. First, the definition of a vacant building under the City Code allows the City to register a property as vacant that would not be classified as vacant under the State Building Code.

Second, the City Code requires the property owner to bring the property into full compliance with all “current codes and laws”. That provision is in direct conflict with the State Building Code. (“Finally, the State Building Code regulates the post-construction use of buildings by specifically allowing the occupancy of an existing building to continue without complying with current code requirements (nonconforming use) unless a code provision is “specifically applicable to existing buildings.” City of Morris, supra, 749 N.W.2d @ 9).

Third, the State Building Code requires the municipality to follow a procedure designed to assure that the owner of the property, and any subsequent purchaser, has received due process. Specifically, the State Code requires that “... the municipality ... file for record with the county recorder or registrar of titles a notice of the pendency of the proceeding, describing with reasonable certainty the lands affected and the nature of the order. If the proceeding be abandoned the municipality shall within ten days thereafter file with the county recorder a notice to that effect.” Minn. Stat. §463.17, Subd. 3.

City of Morris v. Sax Investments, Inc. 749 N.W.2d 1 (Minn.2008) does not allow the City to classify property as vacant without following the State Building Code. The City Code is substantially different than the State Code. City of Morris v. Sax prohibits officials from a city from entering a person’s home, inspecting the home, and forcing a person to vacate that home, without meeting the substantive and procedural requirements of the MN State Building Code.

2. The City Code, as implemented by the City, allows for an unconstitutional taking of property.

The City Code does not authorize the City to register property as vacant property. Section 43.02 (7) allows an owner to voluntarily register his property as a vacant building (“The owner shall register ...”). By classifying this property as vacant, without the consent or permission of the owner, the City has acted beyond the authority of both the State Code and the City Code.

The City can only cause property to be classified as vacant by following the State Code, which requires a showing that the property is “...dangerous to life, health, or safety of the occupant” and which requires the City to follow the due process requirements mandated by Minnesota Statutes.

The fact that Building Official Steve Ubl is responsible for administering the following MN Dept. of Labor and Industry rules for the laying down of sewer pipes, and yet failed to do so, while at the same time harassing me, is appalling.

According to MN State Code, “DLI licensed plumbing contractors may design and perform the installation of plumbing systems (interior plumbing as well as building sewer and water services). The licensed plumber preparing plumbing plans and specifications must be the installer for the construction project. All plans must be submitted to DLI, or cities with formal plan review agreements, for approval and inspection permits prior to installation of any portion of the plumbing system. 5. DLI registered and bonded pipe laying contractors may perform installation of sewer and water services outside of buildings. DLI registered pipe laying contractors are not authorized to design plumbing systems including designs of building sewer and water services within the property line. Pipe laying contractors must ensure all sewer and water service plans are submitted to DLI or to cities with formal plan review agreements with DLI for approval and inspection permit prior to installation of sewer and water services.”

Robert Brandtjen does not have a license to work listed with MN DLI, but works under the license of Greg Ryan, who does. Neither of them procured the required permit before doing work, and neither of them attempted to make a site plan to be submitted for approval before Robert Brandtjen began work on the sewer pipe. This is why the water pipe was hit. Robert Brandtjen had no idea where it was, because he dug up my yard when I was not at home, having never asked to enter my house to look to see where the water pipe was.

Had Robert Brandtjen and/or his business partner Greg Ryan of Ryan Plumbing and Heating, taken the time to look in the basement and figure out where the water pipe was coming out of my basement wall, my copper water line would not have been hit and broken.

It is extremely unlikely that Building Official Steve Ubl is unaware of the code requirements for this work. How is it then, that Steve Ubl has written a letter on behalf of Robert Brandtjen, not taken any enforcement actions against Robert Brandtjen, and yet has asked the City Council to approve his request to have my house condemned and me to be ordered to vacate? This is unconscionable, and because Steve Ubl is aware of my economic status, was done with malice and with the intent of crippling me with fines and fees near impossible for someone on SSI disability to come up with. And in order to ensure that he would have a high likelihood of success, a purported “neutral”, Marcia Moermond, has done everything conceivable to thwart my ability to receive a just outcome.

Public corruption is defined as a breach of public trust or an abuse of power enacted by public officials. Clearly, the abusive use of condemnation proceedings initiated against me by Steve Ubl fits this definition on the basis of the limited evidence I’ve had time to present in this document, with the rush I’m in to present evidence to the St Paul City Council by the time they meet in less than three days, to decide my fate. When they do so, it would be prudent of them to be mindful of Title 18, U.S.C. Section 241: “If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; ... They shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years”.

It is highly unlikely that it is a coincidence that John Meyer served legal papers on me the day following the posting of a condemnation notice on my house. I will share documents that illustrate the ugly impact that St Paul DLI has had on my life with regards to my contract with John Meyer, owner of Viking Aluminum, Inc., and the downstream impact of dereliction of duty combined with harassment and reprisal. When a building official protects the malfeasance of contractors and bully’s innocent homeowners, the behavior fits the definition of corruption. This is

true of what I've suffered as a homeowner cursed with being under the authority of Steve Ubl, since his true colors first manifested in my life in the Spring of 2011.

I've spent the entire day working on this letter, in the hopes that it will save me from the fate of those who have lost their homes, businesses, or churches due to unconstitutional condemnation procedures initiated by Building Official Steve Ubl, and facilitated by Legislative Hearing Officer Marcia Moermond. I would have preferred to spend the day with my dying mother, who is in hospice, but Marcia Moermond refused to grant my request for a delayed hearing, and she rushed my being scheduled for the City Council meeting, forcing me to choose between saving my home and all the contents within it or spending time with my mother while she is still alive.

Now that I am done with this letter, I must respond to the legal papers served on me by John Meyer. He, too, is attempting to take my home via unconscionable legal action, and the deadline for me to respond is by Wednesday, Sept. 1st, the same day as the City Council meeting. It is unlikely that this is a coincidence.

Forgive me for not having time to edit this letter.

Sincerely,

Salina Amey