

Rev. 6/16/14

The Collinses sent Suit papers 9/28/04, the question that I supposedly asked and that caused me to lose my adverse possession claim was not in this complaint, answer to counterclaim, interrogatories or Mr. Myers deposition, which will all be reviewed on the website. It was also not known by my counsel. It was a made up question as the Collinses learned more about adverse possession. The Collinses wouldn't have needed to make up all these lies if I had actually asked the question, "can my fence follow the wall instead of the property line."

This whole lawsuit was ridiculous and absurd. They had nothing concrete to obtain their objective of a better water view and making me take my boat house down. This was an attempt at intimidation. They just threw things against the wall to see what would stick. The Collinses were allowed to drone on and on in trial court about things that either had nothing to do with anything, things that were insignificant or had already been resolved.

It's also very sad that an attorney would lower themselves to take such a bogus lawsuit!

STATEMENT OF FACTS AS ADDRESSED IN THE COMPLAINT:

Item #4 The Collins Property consists of approximately 29,425 square feet of land and includes one half of a boat ramp which straddles the party's properties within Norman Creek.

Senez: 341 Worton, my property is 17,100 square feet of land. The "now disputed" property is a pie shape sliver of 291 square feet. The Collins are on my property in the back by 347 square feet.

The Collins had their property surveyed on 6/25/04. They filed the lawsuit on 9/28/04 the boat ramp is clearly not "half" theirs, as they stated. The property line cuts thru the boat ramp leaving the Collins with about 18 inches at my bulkhead. It's a pie shaped sliver starting at about 2 inches, widening to 40 inches and down to 18 inches at my bulkhead.

If the boat ramp was the issue why didn't the Collins just file for adverse possession?

Item #7. That since moving into her home, Defendant has taken the following actions with regard to the Senez Property impacting the Collins Property:

Item #7a, Replaced the wood retaining wall on the Senez Property with a concrete block retaining wall at an elevation significantly higher than the original wood retaining wall thus blocking the water view previously enjoyed by Plaintiffs."

Collins Complaint Filed 9/28/04 - Rebuttal

Senez: This is my property! The upper level of my property is the same height as it was prior to replacing the old creosote railroad tie retaining wall. I can prove several different ways. There was no reason for me to make it any higher. Even if I did the wall is well within my property line, there's no regulation on the height and Baltimore County approved. There is no law in Maryland regarding your right to a view.

7a & 7c Are really the same. Interesting that the first thing the Collins mention is the work that was done from 12/20/03 and not the fence installed in November 2000 before I settled on the house.

Item #7b Installed a wood fence between the properties, which fence not only encroaches on the Collins Property but at the south end of the Collins Property also blocks access by Plaintiffs to that part of the Collins Property which includes the shared boat ramp.

Senez: Just curious, if the Collins think that the wall was placed where it was placed for a shared boat ramp why the property up to the wall wouldn't be shared on my side? The Collinses only have 18 inches of boat ramp at my bulkhead. This just goes to show their demented thinking.

The property line wall blocked the Collinses access to my side. Mr. Cook built the wall right down to the edge of his bulkhead and it was 24 – 28 inches high at that point. Mr. Cook didn't leave an opening. My wood fence followed the property line wall, no more no less.

The boat ramp was never shared with the under my ownership or Mr. Myers ownership, as Mr. Myers states in his deposition. I never would have bought a house with a shared boat ramp! That would be a legal nightmare.

The first fence was a wire fence on the boat ramp and was installed before I settled on the property. The second fence was a wooden fence and it was installed 7/14/02.

Mr. Myers Deposition pages:

55 No idea who constructed original wall, It was there when I got there included ramp
Myers built (so it wasn't a cooperative effort for a boat ramp)

23, 24, 37 and 55, The wall was there before Myers purchased the property, therefore not a cooperative effort for a co-owned boat ramp.

72 Myers didn't discuss with Collins why wall was built, (as the Collinses had said.)

23, 32, 38. Wall was there 20 years.

13 Myers put ramp there

14 put ramp in himself

37 I didn't know anything, cement launch ramp Myers put in

48 Myers responsible for putting in boat ramp

38 No complaints the ramp encroached onto 339's property

49 Mr. Cook never objected

61 Cooks never said to stop using
29, 47, 32. Maintained area the whole time
82 No knowledge where the exact line was
83 Myers built the ramp
89 Launched boats after first securing permission
38, 59, 60, 70, 71, 89, 90. Permissive use only
62, 71, 72, Collins didn't use boat ramp;
88 Myers didn't recall Collins ever launching a boat
72 Myers didn't discuss with why wall was built, (as the Collins had said.)
72, Mrs. Collins used the boat ramp. "I don't remember Mrs. Collins using the boat ramp."
71, Myers intention was that he was selling the boat ramp with the house.

The Collins built a ramp from an old ladder they got from Mr. Myers and the bottom scrapes from my wood fence in 2001-2002. I'll refer to it as a ladder ramp. They used the ladder ramp the whole time they have lived there, it's still there. In court the Collins said they built the ladder ramp after the peace order on 6/25/04, which is a lie. The Collins wouldn't have needed a ladder ramp if they had free access to my boat ramp and they certainly wouldn't have had to lie in court about when they built it. A picture of the ladder ramp is on the website, that picture was taken on 9/20/03 right after Hurricane Isabel. You can see the old railroad tie wall that was torn down on 12/20/03.

Item #7c Added a new retaining wall, deck and 36" railing to the front of Senez Property, further blocking the water view previously enjoyed by Plaintiffs.

Senez: 7a & 7c are really the same! There was no new retaining wall added.

This is my property! I replaced the old creosote railroad tie terrace /retaining wall damaged by Hurricane Isabel in September 18, 2003. The ground height is not higher. I replaced the wall Mr. Myers built to help stop the erosion when he purchased the property. Removing this wall would allow more runoff onto Collins property. The wall is five to six feet high and the fence is a safety issue. The Collins deck is two feet high and they have a railing.

The terrace / retaining wall is also 15 feet further from the water and further from the property line on the north side, I pulled both of those areas in towards the house. What right do the Collinses have to tell me I can't do something on my property? There is no law in Maryland for protection of a view.

Item #7d Installed flood lights and directed said lighting at the residence of Plaintiffs. One of these flood lights is on twenty-four hours a day while the others are on from dusk until dawn further disturbing the visual site of the waterfront previously enjoyed by Plaintiffs.

Senez: I had several lights installed when I first moved into the house in the winter 2000 - 2001. None of the lights are directed at the Collins property. What would be the purpose of lighting up Collins yard? Nothing changed since they were first installed. There is only one 100 watt coach light on the north side of my house; the side the Collinses are on.

Item#7e Installed security cameras and directed at the Collins property.

Senez: What would be the purpose of directing camera's at Collins yard? I want to protect my property not the Collins property! I work full time, own my own business. I took care of my elderly father for nine years who was sick. I was renovating my house inside and dealing with the damage after Hurricane Isabel. They're the ones retired with time on their hands. They're the ones with the agenda to have my boat house removed. I have better things to do than watch the Collins. The Collinses don't like the cameras because they can't vandalize my property anymore.

Item #7f Installed sump pump system, downspout and drain line on the property line between the Senez Property and Collins Property, which sump pump discharge and runoff expels all drainage onto the Collins Property thus causing erosion due to the unnatural flow of said water.

Senez: I replaced a sump pump in the basement that died during Hurricane Isabel. The downspout and drain line empty onto my property against a concrete wall about 12 inches inside my property line. Baltimore County inspected and said there was no problem. There was no evidence of damage from 2000 to 2004 when the Collins discovered the property lines crossed. There was no evidence of damage to Collins property from mine between 2004 to 2006 and this was all documented by Baltimore County throughout the course of our litigation, 2 and a half years. To this day there's no evidence of damage to the Collins property from mine.

The wall in the front fell on 6/27/06. The Collins removed the fallen wall November 2013 and slopped their property up to the height of my property. That proves the drainage was all a lie. Before there were only 10 weep holes now everything that runs on my side will run down to the Collins property. So there never was a drainage problem.

Item#7g The original boundary pin was removed by Senez during the during construction of new higher retaining wall.

Senez: I never knew what a boundary pin was until my property was surveyed in June 2004. To my knowledge there wasn't any boundary pin to remove. The construction the

Collins Complaint Filed 9/28/04 - Rebuttal

Collins are talking about was started on December 20, 2003. The Collins never had a boundary survey done until June 2004. I didn't remove any boundary pin and neither did anyone else. The terrace / retaining wall isn't any higher. I can prove it.

Item #7h Installed a "No Trespassing" signs on the Senez fence located on the Collins property.

Senez: The fence was installed before I settled on the house and moved in. I asked Mr. Myers the owner if I could put the fence up. The Collins never said anything to Mr. Myers who still lived in the house while my fence was being constructed or after the construction. Mr. Myers gave me the contractors name since I didn't know one in the area. They never said anything to the contractor. Collinses and Myers both said they were friendly while they lived there side by side.

The no trespassing sign was installed because the Collins wouldn't stay out of my yard after they discovered the property line wasn't the wall. That was sometime in April or May of 2004. The no trespassing sign was taken down June 26th, 2006 after I had to obtain a peace order against that was part of the peace order agreement. The Collins filed suit 9/28/04 and the sign was already down for three months. The sign shouldn't have been allowed to be discussed in court. Signs aren't illegal, vandalism is and that's why I obtained the peace order against them.

Item # 10 The Senez survey confirms that the old wall, fence, downspout and sump pump drain pipe all encroach upon the Collins property.

Senez: I assumed my property went to the old wall or property line wall just as the Collins did until April or May 2004. Collins discovered this when they came across an aerial picture from DEPRM. The old wall was there for 25 years the property really should be mine by adverse possession. However as the Collinses learned more about adverse possession the made up the question and said I asked permission.

The Collins had a boundary survey done in June 2004. If the Collins could read a survey they would know the downspout and sump pump drain are all on my property and don't encroach on the Collins property. The Collins said in court they knew were the property line was from the location surveys and plot plans they had when they bought their property. To this day they still have no idea where the property line is and they have a boundary survey. Examples are outlined elsewhere. Their location survey's and plot plan are on the website.

Collins Complaint Filed 9/28/04 - Rebuttal

Item #11 Plaintiffs have made repeated demands upon Senez to remove said fence, lower the new retaining wall and deck, remove or redirect her flood lights and security camera's, and redirect said down spouting, sump pump drainage system but she has refused to do so.

Senez: The wall was completed on 1/5/04. None of the accusations were true and they never said a word until they discovered the wall wasn't the property line, sometime in April or May of 2004. In addition the terrace / retaining wall they are talking about is on my property. The down spouting hasn't changed, I couldn't move my house. The sump pump drain is against a wall 12 inches inside my property line. The lights and cameras are not directed at the Collins, there would be no purpose in doing that. Directing the cameras at the Collins would be a waste of my time. The repeated demands are contradictory to the Collinses interrogatory answer #24.

COUNT 1 Trespass to Land

Item #12 Plaintiffs incorporated herein by reference the facts and allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs 1-11 of this Complaint, as if fully set forth herein.

Item #13 On or About Nov 1, 2003, Defendant Senez, through her contractors, did physically enter upon the property owned and possessed by Plaintiffs. The intrusion was unlawful, without the consent of Plaintiffs, and interfered with the possessory interest of Plaintiffs in the aforesaid Collins property.

Senez: The Collins state I did this all around "November 1, 2003." This was the time the construction of the replacement retaining wall started on my property. The wood fence was put up before I settled, in November 2000 along with the wire fence on the boat ramp. They never complained about either of those before May of 2004.

This case was never about the "now disputed property." The two properties are separated by a concrete block wall. The now disputed piece of property which is on my side of the wall starts out at 2 inches widens to about 40 inches and down to 18 inches at my bulkhead. See response below to #14.

Item #14 Collins repeated demands upon Senez to vacate Plaintiff's property but Defendant refused and instead proceeded and installed the new fence, sump pump drainage system, "no trespassing" signs, flood lights, security camera and the new retaining wall.

Senez: There were never any demands until they discovered the property lines were crossed. However they also never mention they are on my property in the back and they didn't file for adverse possession in the back until 26 months later.

Collins Complaint Filed 9/28/04 - Rebuttal

Ann Collins interrogatory answer to question #24 says: Taking “Plaintiff” to mean Ms. Senez, because we were trying to be good neighbors, we did not demand or request anyone to stay off our property until we asked Ms. Senez to remove her fence from our property. This contradicts her statements here in the complaint.

Steve Collins interrogatory answer to question #24 says: Taking once again “Plaintiff” to mean Ms. Senez, when her contractors came onto our property we never demanded they cease their passing, we considered ourselves to be good, non-complaining accommodating neighbors and ignorant to their deception at that time. This contradicts the complaint.

The wall construction was completed on 1/5/04. The Collins weren’t aware of the property lines crossing until sometime in April or May of 2004. The same is true with Steve Collins answer; they believed the wall was the property line just like I did, they never knew the actual property line.

The no trespassing sign was down in June 2004. The “new fence” is on top my retaining wall. The sump pump and drainage are all on my property and approved by Baltimore County. Trespassing signs aren’t illegal. There were no floodlights installed after November 2003. Security cameras aren’t illegal. The new retaining wall is a replacement wall on my property.

Item #15 As the result of Defendant’s trespass upon the Collin’s Property, Plaintiffs side yard, front yard and property value have been and continue to be seriously damaged.

Senez: No one went beyond the property line wall so no one was trespassing. There is no evidence of damage to the Collins property from mine. This is all clearly document by Baltimore County over the course of this litigation.

COUNT II Continuing trespass

Item #16 Plaintiffs incorporate herein by reference the facts and allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs 1 -15 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

Senez: It’s more likely that the Collins would be trespassing on my property, since their side is so narrow. It’s a pie shaped sliver starting at about 2 inches and widening to about 40 inches and narrowing down to 18 inches on the boat ramp at my bulkhead.

Item #17 Defendant Senez, through her subcontractors, installed a new deck separate from the house, toward the waterfront and into the buffer management area, less than 25 ft from Norman Creek

Senez: This is a matter for EPA, DEPRM or Baltimore County to review, not the Collins. Those offices didn't have and don't have any problems with my property. The new terrace / retaining wall is actually fifteen feet further from the water than the old creosote railroad tie wall was, I pulled it back and eliminated the slope that was in the front and also on the north side. I obtained a variance for the deck which was only required because of the Collins continuous protests. If the Collins are so worried about the buffer zone they should be happy I removed the toxic creosote railroad tie retaining wall. It's certainly a lot nicer looking than it was before. I never had any citations from EPA or DEPRM who visited my property because of the Collins complaints. There were no citations or violations issued.

Item #18 Defendant through her subcontractors, installed a new downspout, sump pump system which flows into Plaintiffs property. The intrusion was unlawful without the consent of Plaintiffs, and interfered with the possessory interest of Plaintiffs in the aforesaid property.

Senez: This is a matter for Baltimore County to review not the Collins. The downspout and sump pump do not flow on Collins property. The Collins had a survey done prior to filing the lawsuit they should have known that the downspout and sump pump do not flow on their property. This shouldn't have been allowed to be discussed in court since it's not on their property and Baltimore County didn't have any issues.

Item#19 Senez did not remove her new retaining wall, fence, deck, downspout and sump pump from both properties, resulting in significant damage to Collins property.

Senez: These are all on my property. They have been approved by Baltimore County. There is no evidence of damage to Collins property from mine as documented by my pictures and Baltimore County inspectors and their files over the course of this litigation.

Item #20 As a result of Senez's trespass and continuing trespass Collins upon the Collins property, Plaintiffs have suffered damages and injury

Senez: It would be more likely the Collins would have trespassed on my property since their property on my side of the property line wall is so narrow. The damages they suffered were self imposed.

If this really was a co-owned boat ramp, which it never was, why wouldn't the other property in the "now disputed area" also co-owned? The Collins say whatever is convenient for the moment.

COUNT III Private Action for Nuisance

Item #23 The unnatural water runoff from the sump pump system and downspout flowing directly onto the Collins Property, the “no trespassing” signs, security cameras and lighting. All these things have caused and will continue to constitute a nuisance resulting in substantial and unreasonable interference with Plaintiffs use and enjoyment of their residence located on the Collins Property.

Senez: Since none of the above is true there's no interference with the enjoyment of their residence. Nothing was directed at the Collins property. Collins property is twice as wide as mine so they have plenty of area for enjoyment. The Collins would rather hang around my fence.

Item #25 The interference with the Collins Property by the Defendant is substantially unreasonable in that Plaintiffs have suffered a diminution of use and value of their property,

Senez: There's no diminution of the use or value of their property and they were unable to document any in court. This is all a lie to have me take down my boat house which has been there since the 1930's.

COUNT IV Possession of Property

Item #28 Plaintiffs have been in possession of and are the owners of all that parcel of land in Baltimore County as contained within the legal description reflected on Exhibit I attached hereto, including one half of the blocked boat ramp

Senez: The boundary survey Collins had done in June 2004 clearly shows that they do not own one half of the boat ramp. This suit was filed after they had their survey completed, so I don't know why they keep saying that, except they can't read a survey. There is no reason for the Collins to think they own one half the boat ramp, or any part of the boat ramp, since the wall was there for 25 years, it's all a lie.

Item #30 Plaintiffs are entitled to immediate possession of the entire property exhibit 1

Senez: This property is really mine by adverse possession. I met all the elements of adverse possession except that the Collins lied and said I asked if my fence could follow the

wall instead of the property line. This was also result of my attorney's incompetency. Mr. Carney did not depose the Collins to know what they were going to say.

This would have been the dumbest question I could have asked. In addition that question wasn't in this Complaint, The Answer to the Counterclaim, Interrogatories or Mr. Myers deposition.

- 1- If the Collins came back and said "no," I would have to take the fence down, after I just put it up and paid to have it put up.
- 2- The Collins would then have full access to my entire yard and boat ramp, once they crossed the fence line. I didn't even know the Collins at the time.
- 3- I've had Labrador Retrievers for the last 30 years. I had two Labrador Retrievers at the time. I couldn't have people coming into my yard, wandering around whenever they felt like it. The Collins, their family, friends and pets coming over at all times of the day and night. There's no way the Collins could have stayed on just there pie shaped sliver.
- 4- That would be a huge liability issue. If I had known about the property line that would have been a deal breaker on buying the house. And I'm sure it would be for others as well.

In Addition:

- 5- The Collins never said anything to Mr. Myers about the fence or the contractor being on their property. This is evidenced by the fact that it wasn't in their complaint, interrogatories or Mr. Myers deposition.
- 6- Mr. Myers never said anything to me, he was still living there. He recommended the contractor.
- 7- Mr. Covahey and Ms. Judy Ensor, now Judge Ensor never knew about the question. It's not in any documentation.
- 8- Mr. Carney never told me about the supposed question and what it would mean to my case.
- 9- Why did the Collins make up so many other accusations if they knew the property line and I actually asked permission? Why didn't they say it earlier?

Item #31 As a result of Senez's conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered damages and injury.

Senez: What damages and injuries? The Collins weren't able to show any evidence of any damages or injury in court. The evidence introduced in court consisted of party decorations, lawn ornaments and signs as evidence of my conduct.

COUNT V Quiet Title

Collins Complaint Filed 9/28/04 - Rebuttal

Item #33 Defendant Senez did not request or obtain permission from Plaintiffs to install new retaining wall, fence, sump pump system, or deck all of which encroach on upon Collins property.

Senez: The Collins are delusional. The terrace / retaining wall, fence, sump pump system and deck are all on my property. I didn't need the Collins permission; none of them encroach on the Collins property. Baltimore County was on a fast track due to Hurricane Isabel. I followed the Baltimore County codes and guidelines at the time. I had the permits and filed for the variance four months prior to the Collins filing the lawsuit.

The only reason I had to file for the permits in May 2004 was because of the Collins continuous complaints. The only reason I had to file for the variance on the deck was because of the Collins continuous protests, even though it has no effect on them whatsoever. The County was uncomfortable signing off because of the constant nagging..

COUNT VI Invasion of Privacy

Item #37 The security Cameras' and flood lights directed at Collins residence have caused and will continue to constitute an unlawful intrusion into the privacy of Plaintiffs.

Senez: I've addressed this in 7e. I have better things to do than watch the Collins!

Item #38 Invasion of Privacy is substantially unreasonable in that Plaintiffs have suffered diminution of the use and value of their property.

Senez: This is just ridiculous and not true. The Collinses were unable to prove any of this in court. I'm way too busy to care what they are doing on their property. They obviously have a self inflated view of themselves to think someone would really want to watch them.

Item #39 Defendants conduct is intentional, is unreasonable, was done with malice and imposes an immediate, substantial and irreparable injury upon Plaintiffs. Such conduct was and will continue to be highly offensive to a reasonable person and has resulted in injury upon Plaintiffs.

Senez: I did nothing intentionally or unintentionally there wasn't any reason to do anything intentionally or unintentionally. I did however put up a few signs well over a year after the filed suit and had their attorney send me a letter on 4/5/05 stating basically that they were going to tell me how to live and that would "partially" settle the case.

I have better things to do than harass the Collins. What purpose would that serve? I'm not the one with the agenda! They want me to take down my boathouse that has been there since the 1930's.

COUNT VII (Permanent Injunction)

Item#41 Plaintiffs do not have an adequate remedy of law.

Senez: There is no law in Maryland for a right to a view, so they made up all this other stuff! This is about construction on my property. I thought I lived in America!

PRAYERS FOR RELIEF

- 1- Enjoin Senez from further construction on both the Senez Property and Collins Property which will further block the water view of the Plaintiffs;
- 2- Enjoin Senez from further trespass on Plaintiffs Property;
- 3- Enjoin Senez from further nuisance on Plaintiffs Property;
- 4- Order Senez to immediately remove new retaining wall, fencing, sump pump systems and other equipment from Plaintiffs property
- 5- In the Alternative , Order Senez to redirect the drainage and flood lights away from Plaintiffs Property;
- 6- Order Senez to immediately return Plaintiffs property to a condition substantially similar to the condition it was in prior to the installation of the new retaining wall, fence, deck, sump pump, and lighting and security camera's.
- 7- Order Senez to remove, deck, fence and retaining wall to provide Collins water view they enjoyed when they purchased the property.
- 8- Order Senez to remove fence to allow Collins access to shared boat ramp enjoyed when they purchased property.
- 9- Declare Plaintiffs as the absolute owners of that property shown on the survey attached as Exhibit 2.
- B- Appraisal for Collins damages
- C- Award Collins compensatory damages, punitive or exemplary damages
- D- Award Collins cost of this action and attorneys fees
- E- Grant Collins and such relief deemed by the court.

Senez:

#1 This is my property. I thought I lived in America. How can they ask that I be barred from further construction or any construction that the county laws allow?

#2 The boat ramp area that was in dispute is 18 inches wide at my bulkhead. It would be more likely that the Collins would be trespassing on my property then me on there's. They believed the property line was the wall just as I did when we purchased our properties.

#3 Not sure what the nuisance is referring to other than camera's and lights which aren't illegal and are not directed at the Collins. It would serve no purpose. The Collinses don't like the cameras because they can't vandalize by property anymore.

#4 This is the terrace / retaining wall that I had to replace after Hurricane Isabel damaged the existing creosote railroad tie wall that was there. This is on my property; the ground there is 5 to 6 feet higher than the surrounding area. This should never have been put in the law suit. It should have been taken off the table with a Motion for Summary Judgment. But my lawyer was incompetent.

#5 Nothing was directed at the Collins. What would be the purpose? The Collins are the ones with the agenda, not me. They want my boat house down because they want a better water view. They're like the people that buy a house near the airport and then want the airport to move.

#6 The now disputed property area and the Collins property weren't changed in any way. Everything mentioned here was on my property and legal.

#7 See my response to #4 above.

#8 There was never any shared access, I had a fence installed before I settled on the property and moved in. The property line retaining wall blocked the Collins access to the boat ramp. The wall was built by Collins predecessor Mr. George Cook and went right down to the end of their bulkhead. It was 24 – 28 inches high at that point. I wouldn't have bought a house with a shared boat ramp for many reasons including it could be a legal nightmare. And I'm sure other potential buyers would have felt the same way.

Myers Deposition pages:

23, 24, 37 and 55. The wall was there before Myers purchased the property, therefore it is not a cooperative effort for a co-owned boat ramp.

55, Mr. Myers has no idea who put the wall in.

13, 14, 48, 83 Myers put ramp there by himself

38, 59, 60, 70, 71, 89 and 90. The boat ramp was used with permissive use only.

37 I didn't know anything, cement launch ramp Myers put in

49 Mr. Cook never objected, not involved in any way.

82 No knowledge where the exact line was

38 no complaints the ramp encroached onto 339's property

71 Myers intention was that he was selling the boat ramp with the house.

55 Mr. Myers not aware of property line that's going through both properties

23, 32, 38. Wall was there 20 years.

25, 62, 67, the wall was for runoff and erosion, (not a boat ramp.)

72, Myers didn't discuss with Collins why wall was built, as the Collins had said.

62, 71, 72 and 88. Collins didn't use boat ramp;

72, Mrs. Collins using boat ramp, "I don't remember Mrs. Collins using the boat ramp."

Collins Complaint Filed 9/28/04 - Rebuttal

88 Myers didn't recall Collins ever launching a boat

I have obtained nine signed affidavits from individuals with personal knowledge of the property and the wall was there in the early mid 70's. It wasn't a cooperative effort for a co-owned boat ramp. Two of Mr. Cooks Children state their parents knew the wall wasn't on the property line in the mid 70's and decided to just leave it that way. The owner of the property on the other side of the Cooks/ Collins during that time stated they were never aware of any property line dispute. The wall on that side of the Collins is also not on the original property line. The Collins are liars!

The real crime here is that attorneys can write such a ridiculous, unfounded lawsuit to harass someone. There isn't and never was a drainage issue as further evidenced by the fact that the Collins replaced the fallen property wall by slopping their property up to the height of my property 30+ inches. The Collinses are liars as evidenced by all of the above and that I now have nine signed affidavits proving the same.