

**JON EARDLEY, Esq.**

ATTORNEY AT LAW

LAW OFFICES OF JON EARDLEY

16020 PUERTA DEL SOL  
WHITTIER, CALIFORNIA 90603

(TELE.) 902.947.2008

January 28, 2008

**PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL**

Britney Spears  
12094 Summit Circle  
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

**BY FEDEX**

Dear Britney:

I had not been paying much attention to your case, until the LAPD and your ex-husband's lawyer conspired to have you falsely arrested and thrown into a 72 hour involuntary lock-down detention at Cedars. You may not be aware of the fact that your civil rights were violated pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 et al., as a result of these actions and the significant implications of those actions with respect to your custody case. In a way, what happened to you may be a blessing in disguise with respect to delivering a knock out punch to your ex-husband's legal team (i.e. Kaplan) and winning your custody case immediately and unconditionally.

I have developed a legal strategy for you that I am confident will turn everything around, and ultimately garner you full custody of your children within approximately 30 to 60 days. I am a father of two girls, ages 3 and a half and one and can only imagine the heartbreak you are going through. These orders that Scott Gordon has handed down are media driven, and designed to facilitate their economic motivations in denying you even the most basic custody rights, particularly at a time when toddler boys and girls need to develop a strong and consistent bond with their mother. After having practiced law for years in Los Angeles, I find myself, at many times sickened by the corruption of the downtown court system. However, your case is the worst I have ever seen because they are unabated in the

EXHIBIT A

10-1-2008

*(Faint handwritten notes at the bottom of the page)*

Think about this for a second: in the last few days, you have been followed everywhere, nearly run off the road, and otherwise interfered with by tabloid journalists. Yesterday, I saw a recent report that questions whether you can be safe just driving to a store. Do you think Commissioner Gordon is going to be inclined to return the boys to you under these circumstances, even if all of the scurrilous tabloid coverage were wiped clean from the slate and particularly when you know other things are being

communicated behind the scenes? Not unless you have a legal strategy in place that aggressively confronts the due process, equal protection, fair trial, and other Constitutional violations that predominate in your case. The first step is in disqualifying Kaplan from further representation of your ex-husband. I need to discuss in detail with you the events surrounding the raid on your house.

Please believe me when I tell you that a conventional approach in the family law court, through the conventional emissaries of "star" family law lawyers, will not work. Your case will continue to spiral until they have denied you your freedom, your children and your assets. By then, it will be too late. (Sorrell is an excellent attorney; however, your current posture in the case is primarily defensive. You need an immediate offensive strategy to pound your ex-husband's lawyer into the ground and bring this circus to an end. My proposal is that we integrate innovative legal arguments into the matrix of your custody case to supplement and back up standard Family Law Code litigation that involves child custody issues, providing you with significantly more control over the situation. There is also the nuclear option: the filing of a lawsuit, the specifics of which I will discuss with you privately.)

I have some of the largest class-action cases in the nation pending in the downtown courts against some of the largest corporations in the world. I have affiliate offices in New York and Washington, D.C. None of the "standard" family law lawyers in this country will be able to obtain for you what you need more than anything: a devastating offensive strike against the court system, and your ex-husband's lawyers, all of whom are using you to promote their personal financial and other agendas. I will help you any way I can.

I will explain to you what needs to be done and why it will have the intended results. I will also help you completely overcome any anxieties about testifying in court or showing up at court. I am willing to take you to court and see to it that you get into the courtroom and are able to speak without any anxiety.

All I want is to see you win. I do not want anything in return and am willing to volunteer my time with you to see to it that you are successful in this custody case. I am not interested in publicity, money, or anything other than seeing you obtain full custody of your children.

Please recognize that aside from some anxiety and depression, which are totally normal under these circumstances, there is nothing wrong with you, but that the court system routinely engages in character assassination to conceal its internal bias and to break you down. You are a strong and beautiful woman who has been working all your life, and I know you can do this. They are all intensely jealous of you. It is my opinion that Kaplan and your ex-husband had this raid on your house planned well in advance, and had been waiting for an opportunity to spring it on you. What they ultimately want is to get you into a conservatorship; at that point, your freedom will be denied, giving them the full opportunity to steal all of your money and to deny you any access to your children. (This is why they keep pushing the mental illness, multiple personality issue.) You definitely do not want this to happen.

The court's order requiring you to submit to an Evidence Code § 730 evaluation can be satisfied by an out-patient evaluation pursuant to Evidence Code § 733. Evidence Code § 733 clearly states:

"Nothing contained in this article shall be deemed or construed to prevent any party to any action from producing *other expert evidence on the same fact or matter mentioned in Section 730*; but, where other expert witnesses are called by a party to the action, their fees shall be paid by the party calling them and only ordinary witness fees shall be taxed as costs in the action."

You have a right to provide your own private evaluation in lieu of submitting to a § 730 examination. Before now and the next scheduled hearing in February, it is my opinion that you should map out an evaluation plan that is consistent with § 733. As soon as you have this in place, an *ex parte* motion for reconsideration could be heard before the Commissioner. There are two advantages to this: 1) it demonstrates to the court that you are complying with the Evidence Code; and 2) it allows the court to see you. The Commissioner "noted" your absence from the last hearing. Most importantly, however, it allows you to establish a record in the event he denies your request. With a record of the proceedings, a ruling not in your favor could be reviewed by the Second District Court of Appeal through a petition for a writ of mandate. This would also provide you with the opportunity to raise other important issues. In practical effect, it would also help in your being afforded a degree of fairness at the next scheduled

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

hearing in February, particularly if the Commissioner knows that you intend to seek appellate relief as to every unfavorable order he issues from this point forward.

Between now and your next scheduled custody case hearing in February, there are some vitally important things that need to be done as soon as possible. There are many things I would like to discuss with you, including a strategy to disqualify Gordon from your case. Time is very much of the essence in your case.

I am in LA right now. Everything we discuss will be absolutely confidential. Call me as soon as you read this, anytime, night or day. My number is 562-947-2006; my cell is 562-298-8385. If I do not pick up, leave a number where you can be reached. My personal email is [jjeardley@aol.com](mailto:jjeardley@aol.com).

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,



Jon Eardley, Esq.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LA County Superior Court Case No.: BP108870

JS-6

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

**\*\*CORRECTED\*\***

Case No. CV 08-1021 PSG (RCx) Date Feb. 26, 2008

Title In re the Conservatorship of the Person and Estate of Britney Jean Spears

Present: The Honorable Philip S. Gutierrez, United States District Judge

<u>Wendy K. Hernandez</u>	<u>Not Present</u>	<u>n/a</u>
<u>Deputy Clerk</u>	<u>Court Reporter</u>	<u>Tape No.</u>

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff(s):  
Not Present

Attorneys Present for Defendant(s):  
Not Present

Proceedings: **(In Chambers) Corrected Order on the Conservator's Motion to Remand**

Before this Court is the Conservator's Motion to Remand. The Court finds this motion appropriate for decision without oral argument. Fed. R. Civ. P. 78; Local R. 7-15.

**I. BACKGROUND**

On February 14, 2008, attorney Jon J. Eardley ("Mr. Eardley") filed a notice of removal for the conservatorship proceedings of Britney Jean Spears ("Ms. Spears") from Los Angeles Superior Court ("Probate Court") to this federal district court. Mr. Eardley claims authority to act on behalf of Ms. Spears despite the Probate Court's orders to the contrary. On February 1, 2008, the Probate Court appointed Samuel D. Ingham III ("Mr. Ingham") as Ms. Spear's attorney. Also on that date, the Probate Court appointed Mr. Spears (Ms. Spears' father) as temporary conservator of Ms. Spears' person and estate. On February 4, 2008, the Probate Court extended the conservatorship over Ms. Spears until February 14, 2008 making the explicit finding that "Ms. Spears does not have the capacity to retain counsel." Then on February 14, 2008, the Probate Court again extended the conservatorship until March 10, 2008. At no time during the conservatorship did the Probate Court find that Ms. Spears had the capacity to retain counsel.

On February 19, 2008, this Court issued an Order to Show Cause to the removing party ordering the party to explain why this action should not be remanded due to the Court's lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Also on that date, Mr. Spears filed the current motion, in which Mr. Ingham joined, to remand the case to the Probate Court. Mr. Spears also requested an award of attorney's fees and sanctions against the removing attorney.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JS-6

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

**\*\*CORRECTED\*\***

Case No. CV 08-1021 PSG (RCx) Date Feb. 26, 2008  
Title In re the Conservatorship of the Person and Estate of Britney Jean Spears

For the following reasons, this Court grants Mr. Spear's motion to remand. Also, the Court declines to award attorney's fees.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

While 28 U.S.C. § 1441 provides that some actions filed in state court may be removed to federal district court, "[t]he removal statute is strictly construed against removal jurisdiction, and the burden of establishing federal jurisdiction falls to the party invoking the statute." *California ex rel. Lockyer v. Dynegy, Inc.*, 375 F.3d 831, 838 (9th Cir. 2004), *amended*, 387 F.3d 966 (9th Cir. 2004), *cert. denied*, 544 U.S. 974 (2005) (citation omitted). The Ninth Circuit applies a "strong presumption" against removal jurisdiction." *Gaus v. Miles, Inc.*, 980 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992) (citation omitted). Furthermore, "[f]ederal jurisdiction must be rejected if there is any doubt as to the right of removal in the first instance." *Id.* (citation omitted).

III. DISCUSSION

A. Mr. Eardley's Standing to Remove the State Court Case

The conservator and Ms. Spears' court-appointed attorney make a simple argument for remand: Mr. Eardley is not Ms. Spears' attorney and acted improperly by removing her conservatorship proceeding to federal court. While Mr. Eardley argues that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the case because Ms. Spears' due process rights were violated in the conservatorship proceeding, Mr. Eardley fails to explain why he can bring this claim for her in the first instance. He cannot.

The federal removal statute clearly allows only a defendant to remove a case to federal court. Section 1441(a) states that, under the proper circumstances, "any civil action brought in a State court ... may be removed by the defendant or the defendants." 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a). Several courts have considered the issue and have been uniform in determining that non-parties do not have a right to remove cases to federal court. *See, e.g., Newman and Cahn, LLP v. Sharp*, 388 F. Supp. 2d 115, 117 (E.D.N.Y. 2005) (Both a non-party and an individual claiming to be a real party in interest have "no authority to seek removal."); *Geiger v. Arctco Enterprises, Inc.*, 910 F. Supp. 130, 131 (S.D.N.Y. 1996) ("It is clear beyond peradventure of a doubt that the right of removal is vested exclusively in defendants."); *Kane v. Republica De Cuba*, 211 F. Supp. 855, 856-58 (D.P.R. 1962) (a non-party who has not formally intervened may not remove a case from state court).

2008-02-26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JS-6

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL  
\*\*CORRECTED\*\*

Case No. CV 08-1021 PSG (RCx) Date Feb. 26, 2008  
Title In re the Conservatorship of the Person and Estate of Britney Jean Spears

Here, Mr. Eardley had no authority to remove the case from state court. He is neither a defendant nor a party. While he claims to be Ms. Spears' attorney, the Probate Court appointed Mr. Ingham as her attorney and found that she was incapable of retaining her own counsel. Mr. Eardley did not challenge the Probate Court's appointment of Mr. Ingham and has not attempted to intervene in the conservatorship proceeding on her behalf. Instead, Mr. Eardley caused the case to be removed to federal court while clearly lacking the authority to do so.

B. Attorney's Fees Award

The Court finds that it is inappropriate to award attorney's fees in this case.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court REMANDS this case to the Probate Court.