

IN THE STATE OF MISSOURI
JACKSON COUNTY DISTRICT COURT
AT INDEPENDENCE,
MISSOURI

SAMUEL K. LIPARI)
(Assignee of Dissolved)
Medical Supply Chain, Inc.))
Plaintiff)
vs.)
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY,)
GENERAL ELECTRIC CAPITAL)
BUSINESS ASSET FUNDING CORP.,)
GE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS)
GLOBAL SIGNALING, L.L.C.)
Defendants)

**NOTICE OF SERVICE OF PRODUCTION
OF DOCUMENTS REQUEST**

Case No. 0616-cv07421

NOTICE OF SERVICE OF PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS REQUEST

Comes now the petitioner, Samuel K. Lipari ("plaintiff") appearing pro se and makes the following notice of service of Production of document requests on opposing counsel representing General Electric Company, General Electric Capital Business Asset Funding Corporation and GE Transportation Systems Global Signaling, LLC (the "defendants").

1. On November 12 2006, the plaintiff served See Exb. 1

2. The defendants served the plaintiff a Rule 26 disclosure that merely listed a subset of persons previously identified by the plaintiff and was unaccompanied by any evidentiary documents. See Exb. 2

3. Nothing in the defendants counsel's Rule 26 disclosure exhibited any sign of having been contributed by any defendant officer, employee, agent or representative.

4. The plaintiff has now served the following document production requests:

a. Request for Production of Documents. See Exb. 3.

b. Request for Insurance Documents. See Exb. 4.

c. Request for Attorney Client Privilege Documents. See Exb. 5

5. The plaintiff has suffered hardship from the defendants' repeated misrepresentations prejudicing and obstructing the plaintiff's attempts to seek redress since being financially destroyed in June 2003.

6. The local rules providing for a swift resolution of the plaintiff's contract based claims were circumvented by the defendants' fraudulent removal to federal court.

7. The record in the plaintiff's federal motions for remand and a brief for a remand hearing clearly establishes that the defendants' counsel made misrepresentations of federal jurisdiction and omitted pages of this court's document clearly exhibiting the facial lack of federal jurisdiction for the purpose of committing fraud on this court and the Western District of Missouri.

8. The plaintiff was further injured financially by this fraud and resultant delay and expense causing him a great hardship in prosecuting his claims and specifically in obtaining discovery through more costly means including third party practice, depositions in the cities where the defendants' met to coordinate and accomplish their injury of the plaintiff.

9. The plaintiff has also begun to observe patterns in the defendants representation revealing a strong likelihood General Electric is not fully aware, knowingly participating in or approving the tactics being used to represent its corporate interests in this court, the Western District of Missouri, the Kansas District Court, the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals, the Northern District of Illinois and the Seventh Circuit.

10. The conduct of the defendants' representation seemingly outside of the knowledge of the defendant parties places an impossible

to overcome hardship on the plaintiff in discovering relevant evidence he is entitled to that originated in the offices of the defendants' legal representatives as outside defense counsel committed acts to further the defendants scheme that first led to the plaintiff's injuries because much of that evidence is not discoverable from defendant parties who have little or no knowledge but instead can only be obtained from the defendants' attorney's law firms.

11. The evidence sought from the defendants' legal representatives that is otherwise privileged has been served as a separate production request allowing the defendants' counsel to address any issues they may identify more effectively.

12. The plaintiff does not seek documents that are traditionally privileged as theory of the defense or the work product of attorneys researching the application of law but instead letters, meeting, call log and funds transfer evidence that would normally be evidence of activity by defendant parties to accomplish the complained of injuries but in this case appears to have largely been outsourced to law firms resembling the activity of Kansas City law firm Shook Hardy & Bacon LLP in defending tobacco companies:

"1. On September 2, 2005, The Kansas City Business Journal published an article about the racketeering conduct of Shughart Thomson & Kilroy's nearest Kansas City competitor Shook, Hardy and Bacon LLP. See Exb. 1

2. The Notre Dame law School Professor G. Robert Blakey was interviewed and stated it was wrong for the law firm not to be made a defendant in the civil RICO action against the tobacco companies. See Exb. 1, pg. 1

3. On August 15, 2005, the US Justice Department filed a post trial proposed finding of fact in the civil racketeering case against tobacco companies mentioning at least 15 Shook Hardy lawyers by name and referring to the firm more than 250 times. See Exb. 1, pg. 1, Exb 2 generally.

4. On August 24, 2005, the US Justice Department filed a post trial brief arguing with controlling legal authority that the law firm Shook, Hardy and Bacon LLP had the requisite intent to be liable as a RICO person. See Exb 3 generally."

Plaintiff's memorandum for partial summary judgment at pg. 1-2 in *Medical Supply Chain, Inc. v. Novation et al.* KS. Dist. Court Case No. Case No. 05-2299-KHV.

13. The plaintiff believes the above is an adequate showing to warrant production of the defendants' law firms documents regarding conduct of activities that violated law and injured the plaintiff.

Respectively submitted,

Samuel K. Lipari
Pro se

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing instrument was served on this 19th day of January, 2007, by hand delivery to:

John K. Power, Esq.
Husch & Eppenberger, LLC
1700 One
Kansas City Place
1200 Main Street
Kansas City, MO
64105-2122

Samuel K. Lipari
297 NE Bayview
Lee's Summit, MO 64064
816-365-1306
saml@medicalsupplychain.com
Pro se