

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
Hillsborough County Superior Court, Northern District  
300 Chestnut Street  
Manchester, NH 03101-2490  
603-669-7410

State

V.

Gerard Beloin  
05-S-1305

MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGEMENT and DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE  
ACCORDING TO RSA: SECTION 507:15

According to the law:

**TITLE LII**  
**ACTIONS, PROCESS, AND SERVICE OF**  
**PROCESS**  
**CHAPTER 507**  
**ACTIONS**  
**Frivolous Lawsuits and Punitive Damages**  
**Section 507:15**

**507:15 Penalties for Frivolous Actions.** – If, upon the hearing of any contract or tort action, it clearly appears to the court that the action or any defense is frivolous or intended to harass or intimidate the prevailing party, then the court, upon motion of the prevailing party or on its own motion, may order summary judgment against the party who brought such action or raised such defense, and award the amount of costs and attorneys' fees incurred by the prevailing party plus \$1,000 to be paid to the prevailing party, provided such costs and fees are reasonable. The trial judge shall also report such conduct to the NH Supreme Court Committee on Professional Conduct.

**Source.** 1986, 227:3, eff. July 1, 1986. 1996, 2:2, eff. July 1, 1996.

Since the recordings clearly state that it is agents for the State of NH and their “**personal messengers**” that are harassing this Defendant by threatening to kill this Defendant at the hands of police gunfire, dismember my dead body, grind it up into little pieces (“chumming”) and dispose of my dead body in the Atlantic Ocean off of a “**100 ft. f\*\*\*king fishing boat**”, it is clear that the State is exempting agents for the State of NH from the laws that it is legally required to enforce and to prosecute. **(EXHIBIT A)**

Since the recordings were made in a public place, (15 Factory St. Goffstown, NH) they are perfectly legal. Even a NH Supreme Court Order claims that the recordings are legal. **(EXHIBIT B)**

Since the death threats are being made by agents for the State of NH and their “**personal messengers**”, this defendant had no choice but to take the actions necessary to protect his life, his limb and his family from rogue agents for the State of NH who are sworn to serve and to protect him. The actions by the State violate Articles 1, 2, 2-a, 4, 10 and 22 of the NH Constitution. **(EXHIBIT C)**

After listening to the gruesome recordings of the detailed death threats, two mental health professional Doctors have declared this Defendant to be “of sound mind” and “competent”. **(EXHIBIT D)**

Republican and Democrat NH State Representatives are now writing letters to the NH AGs Office on my behalf and wondering why there is no response. **(EXHIBIT E)**

Since it is clear the action by the State is frivolous and intended to harass or intimidate the Defendant, then the court has no choice but to order a summary judgment against the State and award the amount of costs and attorneys' fees incurred by the Defendant plus \$1,000 to be paid to the Defendant, provided such costs and fees are reasonable and the court report this conduct to the NH Supreme Court Committee on Professional Conduct.

For all other causes that may be fair and just.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Gerard Beloin". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Gerard Beloin  
P.O. Box 304  
New Boston, NH 03070  
Date: April 24, 2008

**CERTIFICATION OF COPIES**

State v Gerard M. Beloin

NO. 05-S-1305

I/We hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGEMENT and DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE ACCORDING TO RSA: SECTION 507:15 has been forwarded to all complainants, respondents, and counsel for complainants and respondents listed below, and that I/we have included a copy of all attachments or enclosures submitted with it.

Name  
Attorney Marianne P. Ouellet  
Attorney for the State

Address  
4 Court Street  
Concord, NH 03301

Date: 4-24-2008



\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

P.O. Box 304  
New Boston, NH 03070 - 304  
603-487-5419

**(EXHIBIT A)**

**TRANSCRIPTS OF RECORDINGS DESCRIBING HOW GOFFSTOWN OFFICIALS AND THEIR AGENTS GET RID OF THEIR DEAD BODIES BY DISMEMBERING THEM, CHOPPING THEM UP INTO LITTLE PIECES AND FEEDING THEM TO THE FISH IN THE OCEAN.**

**Informant:** "He's talking about he's got a buddy out in the f\*\*\*in boat in Gloucester. He's got a big 100 ft. f\*\*\*ing fishing boat. He's talking about chumming people. He don't give a f\*\*k. He's just the guy to do it man. I know his family. They're all crazy and they all want a shot at whatever is going on so."

**GB:** "Why did he run in the first place?"

**Informant:** "He knows. Something happened. He knows something. And. Basically he's being threatened."

**GB:** "Threatened to kill him."

**Informant:** "He went somewhere to Jersey, I guess, to see some family members. He said, I guess they're politicians and they're, they're Italian. They basically said. Somebody bothers you, we have people that take care of that."

**GB:** "They're politicians??"

**Informant:** "Go back home. Go back home. You let us know what happens. Spread the word that" .....

The informant then goes on to name the politicians.

# Under surveillance: Who will watch the watchers?

Monday, Jun. 26, 2006

**THE FOURTH** Amendment is the source of Americans' right to privacy but while the home is sacrosanct **the courts have said that a citizen in a public place has no reasonable expectation of privacy.**

Thanks to the spreading use of surveillance cameras, a citizen now has no expectation, reasonable or otherwise, of any privacy at all in a public space. An average American now appears on a surveillance camera between 10 and 100 times a day.

In "Under Surveillance," her examination of the use of these all-seeing eyes, Scripps Howard News Service reporter Lisa Hoffman writes that there are an estimated 5 million surveillance cameras in the U.S. today and their number is expected to double in five years.

—*Scripps Howard News*

ATTORNEY GENERAL  
STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
33 CAPITOL STREET  
CONCORD NEW HAMPSHIRE 03301-6397

PHILIP T. MCLAUGHLIN  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

STEVEN M. HOURAN  
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL



May 9, 2000

Robert E. Ducharme  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Portsmouth  
Municipal Complex  
1 Junkins Avenue  
Portsmouth, NH 03801

Re: [REDACTED] Attorney Paula Werme


Dear Bob:

I am writing in response to your letter dated April 26, 2000. In that letter, you forwarded an audiotape that you received from Attorney Werme, as well as the complete file of the criminal charges that had been brought against [REDACTED] for stealing evidence from the court. In my subsequent telephone conversation with you, you indicated that you understood that the audiotape was recorded by [REDACTED] at the direction of Attorney Werme. You indicated that it was your understanding that Ms. [REDACTED] had the tape recorder in her purse while she visited the Brentwood Family Court. Ms. [REDACTED] recorded the conversation that she had with the court clerk while standing at the counter in the clerk's office.

After reviewing the audiotape and the circumstances surrounding the recording and analyzing the wiretapping and eavesdropping statute, RSA 570-A, I have determined that neither Ms. [REDACTED] nor Attorney Werme have committed a criminal offense. RSA 570-A:2 prohibits the interception of an "oral communication" without the consent of all parties to the conversation. RSA 570-A:1 defines "oral communication" to mean "any oral communication uttered by a person exhibiting an expectation that such communication is not subject to interception under circumstances justifying such expectation." Because it appears that Ms. [REDACTED] recorded the conversation while standing in a public place at the courthouse, the circumstances do not justify the clerk's expectations that her conversation would not be recorded by Ms. [REDACTED] or anyone else. [REDACTED] it does not meet the statutory requirements for prosecution.

Thank you for referring this matter to our office. If I can be of further assistance, do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "N. William Delker". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal flourish at the end.

N. William Delker  
Assistant Attorney General



Click Here to Receive Our Daily Headlines

# Seacoastonline

The Source for the Seacoast



Portsmouth, NH Wednesday, August 9, 2000



BE C.O.C.  
Search new and used cars on the Seacoast is here!!!

The largest searchable database of new and used cars on the Seacoast is here!!!

## Port. Herald

- [Today's News](#)
- [Editorials](#)
- [Sports](#)
- [Business](#)
- [Spotlight](#)
- [Archives](#)
- [Classifieds](#)
- [Photographers](#)
- [Cartoons](#)
- [Crossword](#)
- [Lottery](#)
- [Weather](#)



## Portsmouth Herald

### Secret taping upheld by state

By Karen Dandurant, Portsmouth Herald Staff Writer

PORTSMOUTH — N.H. Assistant Attorney General N. William Delker called the action "reprehensible," but he upheld Boscawen attorney Paula Werme's right to tape conversations as part of her defense of her clients.

A complaint made in April by Portsmouth City Prosecutor Robert Ducharme is not the first made against Werme for taping conversations secretly, but she says she will continue doing what she does in order to protect her clients' interests.

Ducharme was prosecuting a case of the theft of a piece of evidence taken from a file in Portsmouth District Court. The evidence was allegedly stolen by Werme's client out of a folder in the family division of the court. It related to a juvenile case.

Werme's main practice involves child abuse cases. She said she works with the New Hampshire Division of Children, Youth and Families (DCYF), and believes that her clients should get everything on tape.

"Everything happens in closed meetings. A record is vital," said Werme. "As to the item taken from court, the case was in the final disposition phase and I say she had a right to take what she needed."

Werme did not represent the young woman in the child abuse case, but is representing her on the criminal charge.

The taping occurred because there was a question about whether an evidence list had been submitted in the juvenile case. Werme said she was told there was one, but couldn't get access to it.

She sent the woman to the Rockingham County Superior Court to get on tape from the clerk that no list existed.

"That judge lied, and I have seen him do it before," said Werme. "If necessary, I will not even be the defense attorney, I will testify to that."

Werme sent the young woman to the court armed with a hidden tape recorder that she supplied. The woman asked a clerk specific questions about the evidence list relating to her child's case. She was told there was none, and the taped conversation was sent to Ducharme as part of Werme's objection to a motion filed against her client by the prosecutor.

## Public Records

- [Obituaries](#)
- [Police Logs](#)
- [Dist. Court](#)

## Weeklies

- [Hampton Union](#)
- [Rock. News](#)
- [Exeter](#)
- [News-Letter](#)

## Entertainment

- [Features](#)
- [Nightlife](#)
- [Concerts](#)
- [Theatre](#)
- [Exhibits](#)
- [Dining](#)
- [Menu Guide](#)
- [Music](#)
- [Movie Times](#)
- [TV Times](#)
- [Datemaker](#)

## Tourism

- [Summer Events](#)
- [Attractions](#)
- [Parks/Beaches](#)
- [Photo Gallery](#)

## Local Resources

- [Yellow Pages](#)
- [Churches](#)
- [Towns](#)
- [Local Links](#)
- [Event Calendar](#)
- [Homes Plus](#)

Post for only \$1  
Special B resume da access

Seacoast Date .com

Post for only \$1  
Special B resume da access

Seacoast Date .com

Post for only \$1  
Special B resume da access

[Shopping](#)  
[Shop for a Car](#)

#### About Us

[Site Index](#)  
[Site Search](#)  
[Contact Info](#)  
[Logos/Link](#)  
[Mem. Services](#)  
[Advertising](#)

#### Market Basket

[Newspaper Del.](#)  
[Place An Ad](#)  
[Comm. Printing](#)

"It is my belief that secretly taping someone violates the law," said Ducharme, "so I wrote to the Attorney General's office for their opinion. In the meantime, I had to dismiss the criminal stealing charge because of the conflict of interest involved in having attorney Werme as the woman's defense lawyer."

**"I told him (Ducharme) I was sending the tape to him," said Werme. "I think his report on my actions is the world's funniest police report."**

Ducharme said because the clerk did not know she was being taped, it was wrong. He said people have a right to privacy.

But Werme said that, in this case, it isn't so. She said the clerk was a governmental employee, and the conversation took place in a public building. She said taping conversations in those situations are perfectly legal.

**"I have my clients tape people on a daily basis," said Werme. "I do it because the DCYF lies. They really hate being taped."**

If what she did is "reprehensible," Werme says she wonders why it was OK for police to wire the teen-age girl who helped bring about the conviction of Pame Smart in one of the state's most notorious murder trials.

"If it's wrong for me to tape someone in a public building, why is it right for them to tape a private citizen in a private place?" asked Werme.

"My action was no different than a police officer or other person who records a citizen in order to get a suspect to discuss a crime on tape. I want to get statements on tape in order to challenge statements made in court," she said.

Since the letter received from Delker said "no crime had been committed", Ducharme has reinstated the charges against Werme's client and she has turned herself into police.

Ducharme said the case is in the system, and she may be in court some time this month.

**Werme did not let the assistant attorney general's critical statement pass. She wrote to him berating him for the "offhand remark," and promising that any further such comments made by him or any other person in the Attorney General's office, would result in legal action.**

In her letter, Werme told Delker that his statement was disingenuous.

**"You cannot possibly intend to take the position that what is legal and ethical for the government to do in the prosecution of a criminal matter is unethical for a defense attorney to do in defense of one," wrote Werme. "I personally take the position that the Constitution being a limitation on the conduct of government, it necessarily follows that what is legal to do unto the citizens is legal for the citizens to do unto the government."**

*[Click here for more news](#)*

*[Click here to send this article to a friend](#)*

Seacoast Online is owned and operated by Seacoast Newspapers.  
Copyright © 2000 Seacoast Online. All rights reserved. [Please read our Copyright Notice and Terms of Use.](#) Seacoast Newspapers is a subsidiary of [Ottaway Newspapers, Inc.](#), a [Dow Jones](#) Company.

# The Walkerville Weekly Reader



Walkerville, VA Monday, February 6, 2006 [Carolyn Purcell](#), Editor

## **New Hampshire woman tapes public official**

*Attorney General bemoans lack of law to put woman in jail for taping a public official.*

**2000-08-20 15:26:47** A New Hampshire woman got away with taping a public official and was even allowed to present the tape as evidence in court, according to a ruling by New Hampshire Assistant Attorney General N. William Delker.

Delker called the woman's actions "reprehensible. All citizens should fully trust their public officials. We never lie, even in court." However, he continued that, "unfortunately, there is no law to put this woman in jail. I recommend that the state legislature take this up immediately."

The woman is attempting to restore her children to her custody from the New Hampshire Division of Children, Youth, and Family, and said that her attorney had encouraged her to tape the Division's clerk. The woman's attorney, Paula Werme, says that she often encourages her clients to tape officials of the Division, "because the Division lies and there's no other way to prove it."

**Other public officials were incredulous. "The ramifications of this ruling are astounding," said**

**Portsmouth Police Prosecutor Robert Ducharme. “Police and other public officials have long enjoyed a constitutional right to lie and then deny those lies in court. But such a right means nothing if civilians are allowed to tape public officials willy-nilly.”**

---

## **Responses:**

### **Paula Werme loves being reprehensible -**

I found your site doing a search on my own name. I laughed my head off at your story on NH taping from August, 2000. Portsmouth prosecutor Bob Ducharme left for “better opportunity” in the private sector shortly after the taping story broke in NH. And NH Atty General Delker really *did* say that my behavior was “reprehensible.” I love being reprehensible!

*I was saddened to learn of your beheading following your reading of the article. However, the Walkerville Weekly Reader cannot bear any responsibility for your laughing your head off. We merely report the news. Any legal responsibility for the loss of your head must be born by the public officials whose actions were so ludicrous as to cause your head to laugh off.*

## **For More Information:**

### **N.H. attorney general rules taping of clerk was OK**

Woman tapes Division of Children, Youth, and Family clerk while trying to get her children back.

[http://www.boston.com/dailyglobe2/229/metro/N\\_H\\_attorney\\_general\\_rules\\_taping\\_of\\_clerk\\_was\\_OK+.shtml](http://www.boston.com/dailyglobe2/229/metro/N_H_attorney_general_rules_taping_of_clerk_was_OK+.shtml) **Portland NORML News - Sunday, August 2, 1998**

Federal officials ask Los Angeles police to lie in court.

<http://www.pdxnorml.org/980802.html>

**THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**SUPREME COURT**

**In Case No. 2005-0481, Kerry P. Steckowych v. Gerard Beloin, the court on October 20, 2005, issued the following order:**

On September 8, 2005, the defendant was ordered to show cause why this appeal should not be dismissed, because the Hillsborough County Superior Court – North had filed a copy of a notice of decision in this matter, which indicated that the plaintiff’s motion for voluntary non-suit was granted on August 26, 2005. In response, the defendant stated that he seeks to appeal the order of the Hillsborough County Superior Court “that the tapes could not be used in any court of law.” The order attached to the notice of appeal, however, denied the plaintiff’s request for temporary injunctive relief. Hence the order does not specifically enjoin the defendant from taking any action whatsoever.

Consequently, because the underlying matter has been concluded by the non-suit and because the issue purportedly raised by the defendant is not before us in this matter, the appeal is dismissed.

Appeal dismissed.

This order is entered by a single justice (Galway, J.). See Rule 21(7).

**Eileen Fox,  
Clerk**

Distribution:

Clerk, Hillsborough County Superior Court North 05-E-0111

Honorable Philip P. Mangones

Mr. Gerard Beloin

Steven M. Gordon, Esquire

Irene Dalbec, Supreme Court

File

**ESTABLISHED OCTOBER 31, 1783 TO TAKE EFFECT JUNE 2, 1784 AS  
SUBSEQUENTLY AMENDED AND IN FORCE DECEMBER 1990  
BILL OF RIGHTS**

**Article 1. [Equality of Men; Origin and Object of Government.]** All men are born equally free and independent; therefore, all government of right originates from the people, is founded in consent, and instituted for the general good.

**[Art.] 2. [Natural Rights.]** All men have certain natural, essential, and inherent rights - among which are, the enjoying and defending life and liberty; acquiring, possessing, and protecting, property; and, in a word, of seeking and obtaining happiness. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by this state on account of race, creed, color, sex or national origin.

**[Art.] 2-a. [The Bearing of Arms.]** All persons have the right to keep and bear arms in defense of themselves, their families, their property and the state.  
**(GB's note) In the case of State V Beloin, Defendant Beloin used a tape recorder instead of a firearm to defend himself against agents for the state who clearly have every intention of killing him if he did not stop exercising his 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment rights under the US Constitution and his 22<sup>nd</sup> Amendment rights under the NH Constitution. This was reasonable and much more effective than using a gun. It was the right thing to do.**

**[Art.] 4. [Rights of Conscience Unalienable.]** Among the natural rights, some are, in their very nature unalienable, because no equivalent can be given or received for them. Of this kind are the Rights of Conscience.

**[Art.] 10. [Right of Revolution.]** Government being instituted for the common benefit, protection, and security, of the whole community, and not for the private interest or emolument of any one man, family, or class of men; therefore, whenever the ends of government are perverted, and public liberty manifestly endangered, and all other means of redress are ineffectual, the people may, and of right ought to reform the old, or establish a new government. The doctrine of nonresistance against arbitrary power, and oppression, is absurd, slavish, and destructive of the good and happiness of mankind.

**[Art.] 22. [Free Speech; Liberty of the Press.]** Free speech and liberty of the press are essential to the security of freedom in a state: They ought, therefore, to be inviolably preserved.



**New England Center for Comprehensive  
Counseling Services, LLC**

EXHIBIT D

4 Bud Way, Suite 9  
Nashua, NH 03063  
Phone: (603) 886-5565

Janice Bauer, PhD  
Cindy Coraccio, LICSW  
Priscilla Cusi, MD  
Herbert Derumin, PhD  
Bruce Guinard, LICSW  
Mary Warren, ARNP

January 29, 2008

To whom it may concern:

I am writing this letter at the request of Mr. Gerard Beloin, a client that presented himself to my practice on January 28, 2008 for an initial psychiatric appointment. Mr. Beloin states that a Judge Barry recently ordered that he receive a psychiatric evaluation (at the department of corrections) to assess his competency to present himself appropriately and adequately in legal forums regarding allegations he is making against a local attorney. Mr. Beloin asked for a second opinion from this writer regarding his competency, in lieu of the evaluation he is going to this Friday.

Upon hearing Mr. Beloin's allegations regarding said attorney, one might readily assume that he is experiencing paranoid thoughts of a conspiratorial nature. However, Mr. Beloin presents compelling, concrete evidence that suggests there may be a strong basis to his allegations. In addition, he presents in an organized and coherent fashion, his thoughts seem logical and rational based on the evidence he offers, he is not emotionally labile or apparently irrational, he is oriented to person, time, and place, does not appear to be impulsive or to show poor judgements. He is articulate and apparently possesses an above average intelligence.

Although no one's competency or sanity can be adequately or accurately evaluated in a single hour, nor on a subjective basis (a battery of psychological exams should be utilized), it is my professional opinion that Mr. Beloin is of sound mind and is capable of presenting himself in a court of law.

Respectfully,

Herbert S. Demmin, Ph.D.  
Licensed Clinical Psychologist



DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS  
STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
Office of the Forensic Examiner  
State Office Park South  
105 Pleasant Street, Room 124-C, PO Box 1806  
Concord, New Hampshire 03301  
(603) 271-7457  
Fax: 271-7458

JOHN LYNCH  
GOVERNOR

William Wrenn  
COMMISSIONER

February 29, 2008

John Safford, Clerk  
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT  
Northern District  
300 Chestnut Street  
Manchester, NH 03101

**Competency Evaluation of GERARD BELOIN**  
**Docket # 05-S-1305**  
**February 28, 2008**

**CIRCUMSTANCES OF EVALUATION**

I evaluated Gerard Beloin pursuant to the order of Hillsborough County Superior Court, State of New Hampshire. The order, dated November 8, 2007, was to evaluate the defendant for competency to stand trial on a charge of misdemeanor eavesdropping alleged on March 1, 2005 with the victim being a John Janigan. It was alleged that the defendant recorded conversations between he and Mr. Janigan. I had the opportunity to listen to recordings of conversations which are also transcribed, at least in part, in the discovery provided by the County Attorney's Office. Of substantial import in assessing the defendant pursuant to RSA 135:c is the nature of the content of those recordings. The content includes what might be construed as threats being made against the defendant by the alleged victim or, at least, the "carrying the message" regarding such threats along with an apparent effort to coerce the defendant to sign a document protective of a third party.

Attorney Larsen acted without the defendant's consent leading to breakdown the attorney/client relationship.

I concede that the defendant's notion of self-defense seems legally naive. I can see that a theory of competing harms might be more viable approach to a defense. The defendant himself does not agree with that, placing a great weight on his own opinions. It appears to me that this process represents an instance of the old saying "A man who represents himself in court has a fool for a client." In short, it seems not terribly prudent but does not constitute grounds for a finding of incompetence to stand trial.

**Opinion regarding competency to stand trial**

I conclude that this defendant is currently competent to stand trial. It appears to me that the defendant has an adequate rational and factual understanding of the legal process that he faces and has the ability to assist an attorney with a reasonable degree of rational understanding. This opinion is not meant to suggest that the defendant can represent himself "well" and it is certainly not meant to suggest that the defendant could be construed by any means as a "competent attorney." I do not believe he is.

At the conclusion of my interview with the defendant he indicated to me that he may move forward to obtain psychological testing. If he does so, I will certainly review any documents regarding such testing and reconsider my opinion in the light of such information.

Respectfully,

James J. Adams, M.D.  
Chief Forensic Examiner

JJA/ab

cc: Gerard Beloin, Pro Se  
PO Box 304  
New Boston, NH 03070

John Weld, Esquire  
4 Court Street  
Concord, NH 03301

Marianne Oullet, Esquire  
4 Court Street  
Concord, NH 03301

EXHIBIT E

**From:** mbaldasaro@comcast.net  
**Subject:** GERARD BELOIN  
**Date:** February 27, 2008 10:08:27 AM EST  
**To:** bluestone25@comcast.net

---

To Whom it may concern,  
I have met Gerard Beloin about a year ago at the state house where he testified on a Video Tape/sound Legislation that I sponsored to protect private property owners. I have been in touch with Gerard and I have sat down with him to discuss his situation with the court system.

Although I am not a Doctor but I find him to be very reliable and I have no reason to question his integrity.

I believe that something is not right and that Gerard needs to have his day in court or dismiss his case.

If you should have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate in calling me at 603-858-3535.

Thank You,

AL Baldasaro  
State Representative  
Rockingham  
District 3 (Auburn & Londonderry)

---

**From:** Rep. Mike Kaelin [mailto:mike.kaelin@leg.state.nh.us]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 31, 2008 11:21 AM  
**To:** 'paul.brodeur@doj.nh.gov'  
**Cc:** 'Baldasaro, Al'  
**Subject:** Gerard Beloin

Hi Attorney Brodeur,

I've attached my notes from an interview with Mr. Beloin from last February. I have copies of items mentioned in the interview, including audio recordings, letters sent back and forth, and some of the court orders. I haven't kept up with it too much over the last year, so anything that's happened since then is not included in this interview. I do know that Mr. Beloin was recently required to take a competency hearing, and was deemed competent by a court-ordered doctor.

Here is a link to a document that is more or less a history of Gerard Beloin's case. It has links to just about everything that's related to this case. This is located on Mr. Beloin's website.

<http://www.bluestonepremiumroofingsystemsinc.com/2007-12-28%20-%20REVOKED%20-%20No%20trial%20by%20a%20jury%20of%20my%20peers.htm>

Given the perceived threats, Mr. Beloin's wife has concerns for the safety of her family and friends. The harassment by law enforcement officials and lack of action regarding the threats has clearly taken a toll on the family's sense of security and Mr. Beloin's business. I appreciate your help in resolving this matter. I am copying Rep. Baldasaro because he has also taken an interest in Mr. Beloin's case.

Thanks,  
Rep. Mike Kaelin.

**Hon. Mike Kaelin**  
**NH House of Representatives**

**From:** "AL Baldasaro" <mbaldasaro@comcast.net>  
**Subject:** **RE: Organized crime in NH law enforcement**  
**Date:** April 1, 2008 10:43:26 AM EDT  
**To:** "Gerard Beloin" <bluestone25@comcast.net>, "Kelly Ayotte Attorney" <kelly.ayotte@doj.nh.gov>  
**Cc:** "Mike Kaelin" <mike@kaelin.net>, "Howard Wilson" <stoneanarch@tds.net>, "John Babiarz" <jbabiarz@endor.com>

---

Attorney General,

I would like to re-enforce Gerard's accusation's towards the below mention people.

I have listened to some of Gerard tapes, viewed many of his documents and I believe that something is not right here and would request your office look into this situation ASAP.

There are conversations about murder, intimidation, arsonist, poisoning and potential of kidnapping from NH to NJ.

I am not a lawyer but feel that if all is true and verified, your office needs to look into these allegations before someone gets hurt.

Thank You,

AL Baldasaro  
State Representative  
Rockingham  
District 3 (Auburn & Londonderry)  
(603) 425-6997

-----Original Message-----

From: Gerard Beloin [mailto:bluestone25@comcast.net]  
Sent: Thursday, March 27, 2008 12:40 AM  
To: Kelly Ayotte Attorney  
Cc: Mike Kaelin; Al Baldasaro; Howard Wilson; John Babiarz  
Subject: Organized crime in NH law enforcement

Dear Attorney Ayotte,

It was recommended to me by NH State Representatives Mike Kaelin and Al Baldasaro that I forward these recordings to you

<<http://www.bluestonepremiumroofingsystemsinc.com/RECORDINGS.htm>> . I'm available for an interview and so are some of my informants as soon as you start making arrests. Mr. Janigan and Prosecutor Steckowych would be a good place to start.

Keep in mind that these are all agents for the state that we are talking about.

Gerard Beloin

**Hon. Mike Kaelin**  
**NH House of Representatives**  
**Mike.Kaelin@leg.state.nh.us**  
**Hillsborough District 4**  
**Science, Technology, and Energy Committee**

**From:** Rep. Mike Kaelin [mailto:mike.kaelin@leg.state.nh.us]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 09, 2008 4:43 PM  
**To:** 'paul.brodeur@doj.nh.gov'  
**Cc:** 'Baldasaro, Al'  
**Subject:** RE: Gerard Beloin

---

Hi Attorney Brodeur,

Have you had a chance to review any of Mr. Beloin's case? Rep. Baldasaro and I would like to meet with you when you have a chance. I understand that Mr. Beloin can't be present because of ongoing legal proceedings, but we would both like to review his case with you.

Thanks,  
Rep. Mike Kaelin.

**Hon. Mike Kaelin**  
**NH House of Representatives**  
**Mike.Kaelin@leg.state.nh.us**  
**Hillsborough District 4**

**From:** "Rep. Mike Kaelin" <mike.kaelin@leg.state.nh.us>  
**Subject:** **FW: Gerard Beloin**  
**Date:** April 25, 2008 2:20:15 PM EDT  
**To:** "'Gerard Beloin'" <bluestone25@comcast.net>  
**Reply-To:** <Mike.Kaelin@leg.state.nh.us>

---

FYI

**Hon. Mike Kaelin**  
**NH House of Representatives**  
**Mike.Kaelin@leg.state.nh.us**  
**Hillsborough District 4**  
**Science, Technology, and Energy Committee**

---

**From:** Rep. Mike Kaelin [mailto:mike.kaelin@leg.state.nh.us]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 25, 2008 10:57 AM  
**To:** 'paul.brodeur@doj.nh.gov'  
**Cc:** 'Baldasaro, Al'; 'kelly.ayotte@doj.nh.gov'  
**Subject:** RE: Gerard Beloin

Hi Attorney Brodeur,

It's been almost a month since I contacted you regarding Mr. Beloin's case. When can we set up a meeting to discuss this? If you're not the right person to set this up, who should I contact?

Thanks,  
Representative Michael Kaelin.