

1 4. At the settlement hearing Judge Seeborg informed plaintiff that he was not allowed in
2 the courtroom for a settlement hearing and that he could not discuss the case ex-parte. Plaintiff
3 left the courtroom without discussion and later sent an email to Judge Seeborg. Email requested
4 what was needed for ECF access and plaintiff's reasons for the TRO. At the time the email was
5 sent, plaintiff believed his email was more procedural than specific to the case and would not be
6 considered ex-parte. Plaintiff was also unaware that Magistrate Judges are not eligible to rule on
7 TROs.

8 5. Plaintiff apologizes for not properly researching court procedures. Plaintiff is
9 confident that similar mistakes will not occur in the future. Plaintiff has contacted numerous
10 attorneys about representation. Large firms either had conflicts of interest or were looking for
11 cases with potential awards of \$10 million or more to justify their expense. Small firms were
12 either not experienced with all causes of action or did not have the resources and time to dedicate
13 to such a complex case. It is evident from plaintiff's research that the defendants intend to bury
14 the plaintiff in paperwork. Plaintiff will continue to interview law firms for representation, but
15 does not want this case to be delayed for the good of public policy.

16 6. Plaintiff is a 2nd generation mortgage and real estate broker with over 20 years of
17 experience. Plaintiff alleges that the defendants have destroyed or at least illegally exploited the
18 American Dream of Homeownership for their own self-dealings. Plaintiff does not understand
19 how so many laws and regulations could have been violated and our entire financial system put
20 at risk. Plaintiff is dedicated to take this case to the Supreme Court if necessary.

21 7. Plaintiff has been writing local legislators, regulators and numerous other officials for
22 years. Plaintiff alleges that the only reason the bay area has not experienced the same record
23 number of foreclosures as Stockton, Sacramento and the Central Valley of California is because
24 we have experienced more appreciation and thus have had more access to debt. Unfortunately
25 our record appreciation could also cause us to decline the most. Affordability in Santa Clara

1 County is one of the lowest in the nation. Plaintiff is a volunteer for a Presidential candidate
2 who recognizes the severity of this pandemic. We are already at a 37 year highs for foreclosures.
3 Interest rates are still at record lows and the Option ARMs have yet to start recasting. Unless the
4 court finds reason to object, the Plaintiff will begin posting a video documentary of the plaintiff's
5 case as it makes its way through the judicial process and system. Plaintiff is confident and
6 hopeful that media attention will bring about the necessary enforcement of existing laws, the
7 elimination or needed changes to Option ARMs, 100% financing and no income verification
8 loans. Plaintiff believes that law firms will be willing to commit their resources as the media
9 provides more attention to this issue.

10
11
12 Dated September 10, 2007

s/Michael Blomquist
Michael Blomquist
pro se