

# Exhibit

# 3

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF FULTON COUNTY  
STATE OF GEORGIA

WILLIAM M. WINDSOR,  
Plaintiff

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO.

Christopher Huber, Sally Quillian Yates, William S. )  
Duffey, Thomas Woodrow Thrash, Orinda D. Evans, Julie ) 2011CV202457  
E. Carnes, Steve C. Jones, Timothy C. Batten, Clarence )  
Cooper, J. Owen Forrester, Willis B. Hunt, Harold L. )  
Murphy, William C. O'Kelley, Charles A. Pannell, Marvin )  
H. Shoob, Richard W. Story, G. Ernest Tidwell, Amy )  
Totenberg, Robert L. Vining, Horace T. Ward, Janet F. )  
King, Susan S. Cole, Alan J. Baverman, Gerrilyn G. Brill, )  
C. Christopher Hagy, Linda T. Walker, Walter E. Johnson, )  
E. Clayton Scofield, Russell G. Vineyard, James N. )  
Hatten, Anniva Sanders, Joyce White, Beverly Gutting, )  
Margaret Callier, Douglas J. Mincher, B. Grutby, Jessica )  
Birnbbaum, Vicki Hanna, John Ley, Joel F. Dubina, Ed )  
Carnes, Rosemary Barkett, Frank M. Hull, James Larry )  
Edmondson, Stanley Marcus, William H. Pryor, Gerald )  
Bard Tjoflat, Susan H. Black, Charles R. Wilson, James C. )  
Hill, Beverly B. Martin, Peter T. Fay, Phyllis A. Kravitch, )  
R. Lanier Anderson, Emmett Ripley Cox, Paul Howard, )  
Jr., Neeli Ben-David, John A. Horn, and Unknown Does, )  
Defendants. )

**TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER**  
**REGARDING FILINGS WITH THE CLERK**

This Civil Action is currently before this Court on Plaintiff's MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER REGARDING FILINGS WITH THE CLERK.

The Plaintiff's MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER REGARDING FILINGS WITH THE CLERK having been read and considered, it appears that the motion should be granted.

The Plaintiff is a party to several actions in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia and the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit.

The Plaintiff has raised serious issues about racketeering, corruption, and violations of the Georgia RICO Act by Defendants. The interests of justice require that these issues be considered by the Fulton County Superior Court.

The Plaintiff has raised serious issues that people with the titles of "judges" commit criminal acts routinely.

The Plaintiff has raised serious issues that the staff of judges and the offices of the clerks of the court are part of the racketeering.

The Plaintiff has raised serious issues that employees of the U.S. Attorney's Office and the Fulton County District Attorney participate in the racketeering and/or facilitate the racketeering through their actions and inactions.

The Plaintiff has raised serious issues that Defendants manipulate the judicial system to deprive parties such as Windsor of their legal and Constitutional rights.

The Plaintiff has raised serious issues that his only recourse is with the state of Georgia. Windsor submits that this Court and a jury of Fulton County citizens must protect Windsor; it is an obligation mandated by the Georgia Constitution, the laws of Georgia, and federal statutes as well.

The Plaintiff has raised serious issues that Defendants will do anything to protect their racketeering enterprise and further this illegal activity.

The Plaintiff has raised serious issues that the Defendants have conspired to block Windsor from protection and recourse at every turn. He alleges that most recently, illegal NOTICES OF REMOVAL were allegedly filed by some of the Defendants to block three Fulton County Superior Court actions filed by Windsor. This action removed the cases to the N.D.Ga where the Plaintiff says Thomas Woodrow Thrash, ignored his valid duties and obligations, and wrongfully damaged Windsor. In one case, *Windsor v. Thrash, et al*, Thomas Woodrow Thrash is presiding as judge in a case in which he, Thomas Woodrow Thrash, is the lead defendant.

The Plaintiff has raised serious questions that the Defendants will probably

try to do this again, so one of the most important reasons for this Court to issue an immediate TRO is to stop this from happening.

The Plaintiff has raised serious issues that some Defendants have committed massive perjury.

Plaintiff has made a showing that without an Emergency Order granting a Temporary Restraining Order or Preliminary Injunction, Plaintiff will be irreparably harmed. Further, Plaintiff's Petition is Verified; all of the Plaintiff's motions have had sworn verifications under penalty of perjury; and the Plaintiff has provided a sworn verification with the Motion for TRO.

"A motion for interlocutory injunction or a TRO is an extraordinary motion, which is time sensitive, unlike other motions, because it seeks to preserve the status quo until a full hearing can be held to avoid irreparable harm." (*Focus Entertainment International, Inc., v. Partridge Greene, Inc.* (253 Ga. App. 121) (558 SE2d 440) (2001).)

O.C.G.A. §9-11-65 allows the Court to grant such Orders without notice to opposition in certain circumstances, such as this. The Plaintiff has shown that not one, not twice, but three times, Defendants have circumvented the Plaintiff's opportunity to have a TRO Hearing by filing what Windsor says are defective and illegal notices of removal.

"... the trial court has no jurisdiction to issue, ex parte, a temporary restraining order before notice can be given unless it is clearly shown " 'that immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result to the applicant.' " *Mar-Pak Michigan, Inc. v. Pointer*, 226 Ga. 189 (173 SE2d

206) (1970). However, the records in these cases support the conclusion that all of the above statutory requirements were complied with. The fact that appellants were not properly served with the complaints in these cases until four days after the trial court issued the temporary restraining orders did not divest the trial court of jurisdiction to enter these orders. (*STEWART et al. v. MCLEAN* (252 Ga. 455, 314 SE2d 439) (1984).)

(See *STEWART et al. v. BROWN et al.* (253 Ga. 480) (321 SE2d 738) (1984); *WALLACE v. LEWIS* (253 Ga. App. 268) (558 SE2d 810) (2002); *ALEXANDER v. CHAPMAN et al.*; *EBON FOUNDATION, INC. v. OATMAN et al.* (269 Ga. 340) (498 SE2d 728) (1998); *WILLIAMS et al. v. TRITT et al.* (262 Ga. 173) (415 SE2d 285) (1992); *BELL v. KING, PHIPPS & ASSOCIATES, P.C. et al.* 337 (176 Ga. App. 702) (337 SE2d 364) (1985); *UNITED FOOD & COMMERCIAL WORKERS UNION et al. v. AMBERJACK, LTD. et al.* (253 Ga. 438) (321 SE2d 736) (1984); *Mar-Pak Michigan, Inc. v. Pointer*, 226 Ga. 189 (173 SE2d 206) (1970).) (See also *Strickland v. Griffin*, 70 Ga. 541.)

The Plaintiff has presented sufficient facts to satisfy the Court that a Temporary Restraining Order should be issued.

- a. IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Windsor's ex parte request for a Temporary Restraining Order be GRANTED and be in effect until a hearing can be held on the Motions for Temporary Restraining Order following notice to the Defendants;
- b. IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that the Motions for Temporary Restraining Order be GRANTED;
- c. IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants be temporarily RESTRAINED and preliminarily and permanently

enjoined from filing anything in this court without proof that they have been served with the Summons and Complaint;

- d. IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants be temporarily RESTRAINED and preliminarily and permanently enjoined from filing anything in this court without an appearance either pro se or by an attorney with a sworn affidavit authorizing the attorney to appear for them, and without an order of approval for each filing issued by this Court;
- e. IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants be temporarily RESTRAINED and preliminarily and permanently enjoined from filing anything in this court without submitting a Request for Specific Approval to File. Statutes and case law must be detailed to establish the basis for any filing. Parties and attorneys must always tell the truth and must always comply with the Rules and the Georgia Rules of Professional Conduct.
- f. IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants be temporarily RESTRAINED and preliminarily and permanently enjoined from filing anything in this court, whether by defendants

themselves or attorneys on their behalf without signing under oath under penalty of perjury before a notary;

- g. IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants be temporarily RESTRAINED and preliminarily and permanently enjoined from filing any notice of removal unless this proceeding is pending, which requires that all parties must have been served. Defendants must not file a notice of removal unless this proceeding is pending and every Defendant joins in the notice of removal and signs it;
- h. IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants be temporarily RESTRAINED and preliminarily and permanently enjoined from filing any notice of removal unless Georgia law and federal statutes are all complied with and a memorandum of law details compliance;
- i. IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants be temporarily RESTRAINED and preliminarily and permanently enjoined from issuing Writs of Execution in Georgia without proper issuance and notice of judgments;

- j. IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants be temporarily RESTRAINED and preliminarily and permanently enjoined from further actions in the N.D.Ga or 11<sup>th</sup> Cir. involving Windsor that violate the law and Windsor's rights, pending further order of the Court;
- k. IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that the Defendants be temporarily RESTRAINED and preliminarily and permanently enjoined from prohibiting any access to the courts by William M. Windsor or anyone working with him or on his behalf;
- l. IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that all Defendants be hereby temporarily RESTRAINED and preliminarily and permanently enjoined from destroying any evidence or erasing or modifying any information on any computers relevant in any way to Windsor, Alcatraz Media, LLC, Alcatraz Media, Inc., or any of the Defendants related to Civil Action No. 1:06-CV-0714-ODE, Civil Action No. 1:09-CV-01543-WSD, Civil Action No. 1:09-CV-02027-WSD, Civil Action No. 1:11-CV-01922-TWT, Civil Action No. 1:11-CV-01923-TWT, and Civil Action No. 1:11-CV-2027-TWT, in the United States

District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, pending further order of the Court;

- m. IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that the Defendants shall be prohibited from engaging in any enterprise in violation of O.C.G.A. § 16-14-4;
- n. IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that a preliminary injunction hearing will be scheduled within 30 days of the issuance of the order on this Motion;
- o. IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that Windsor may immediately conduct depositions and discovery prior to the preliminary injunction hearing;
- p. IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants are compelled to produce to the Plaintiff, within 5 days, all Notices of Electronic Filing (“NEFs”) in Civil Action No. 1:06-CV-0714-ODE, Civil Action No. 1:09-CV-01543-WSD, Civil Action No. 1:09-CV-02027-WSD, Civil Action No. 1:11-CV-1922-TWT, Civil Action No. 1:11-CV-1923-TWT, and Civil Action No. 1:11-CV-02027-TWT in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia or

related appeals in the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit;

- q. IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants are compelled to produce to the Plaintiff, within 3 business days, the documents filed as Docket #168 in Civil Action No. 1:06-CV-0714-ODE;
- r. IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that the Defendants shall be prohibited from engaging in any plans to have Windsor killed and that a Protective Order will be issued to provide protection to Windsor from bodily harm by any of the Defendants or people acting in their behalf; and
- s. IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that Windsor will be given law enforcement protection whenever he must visit the Fulton County Courthouse or the federal courthouses and federal buildings in Fulton County, Georgia.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that a Preliminary Injunction Hearing will be scheduled by this Court on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2011 at \_\_\_\_\_.

SO ORDERED this \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_, 2011 at \_\_\_\_\_.

---

**Judge Craig L. Schwall, Sr.**

**Fulton County Superior Court**