

FILED
04-15-2019
CIRCUIT COURT
DANE COUNTY, WI
2018CV003122

STATE OF WISCONSIN

CIRCUIT COURT

DANE COUNTY

LEONARD POZNER,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CASE TYPE: DEFAMATION

RESPONSE TO MOTION
FOR PATERNITY TEST

JAMES FETZER,
MIKE PALECEK,
and WRONGS WITHOUT WREMEDIES, LLC,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2018-CV-003122

I, James Fetzer, representing myself pro se, respond to Plaintiff's Motion for Paternity Test with the following objections as follow:

1. There is no chain of custody for the DNA samples of the "real" Noah Pozner, so the test lacks any scientific control. Without knowing the origin of the sample, the test does not advance a legally-admissible finding.
2. It's highly irregular that a DNA sample would be taken by a government entity of a six-year-old child in the absence of any legal proceeding—such as a paternity suit or a child victim of a sex crime—which would have required the sample prior to the time that the child's body was allegedly interred.
3. The book, *Nobody Died at Sandy Hook* (2015; 2nd ed., 2016), does not deny that Plaintiff has fathered children. The Complaint disputes the denial of authenticity of the death certificate that Plaintiff gave to Kelley Watt.


4. Defendant has learned and has verified that one Jake Morphonios, who identifies himself with an entity called “Blackstone Intelligence Network”, already posted a video on 12 April 2019—the same day Defendant submitted his Response to the Motion for Paternity Test—where Defendant is attacked for having opposed paternity testing, “because it would expose [Defendant] as a fraud” (www.youtube.com/watch?v=CCzRJvG9ECs, discussion beginning at 1:24:06), which is deliberately misleading but which has prompted Defendant to consider how DNA testing could be make a constructive contribution to this case.

5. Defendant believes that DNA testing could potentially contribute to several aspects of this case, were it to be expanded to include DNA testing for (a) Leonard Pozner, (b) Noah Samuel Pozner, (c) Reuben Vabner, (d) Michael Vabner, and (e) Veronique de la Rosa.

6. For good and sufficient reason, therefore, Defendant hereby modifies Defendant’s Response to Motion for Paternity Testing provide it includes DNA testing for the five parties cited in No. 5 above, especially insofar as Defendant maintains that “Noah Pozner” is a fiction created out of photographs of Michael Vabner and that “Leonard Pozner” is a false name for Rueben Vabner, who is the father of Michael Vabner, which expanded DNA testing could help to confirm or disconfirm.

7. Otherwise, Plaintiff’s Motion for Paternity Test appears to be no more than a public-relations stunt by the Plaintiff to gain sympathy and to impugn Defendant’s integrity without advancing the legal argument and therefore ought to be denied by the Court.

Date: 14 April 2019

Signed: 

James Fetzer