

8/2/22

I THINK YOU MIGHT BE
INTERESTED IN THE ENCLOSED DOCUMENTS (4
GET TOTAL), AND FURTHER REVELATIONS INCLUDED
IN THIS LETTER.

FIRST, IT IS NECESSARY TO
INFORM YOU, I AM NOT JUST IN PRISON BUT
ON DEATH ROW.

I DO NOT HAVE PLANNING
TO BE A CRIMINAL, NOR AM I LOOKING FOR
SYMPATHY.

BUT, THE ALLEGATIONS AND REVELATIONS
I AM SPEAKING ON CAN BE SUBSTANTIATED...
(THEY ARE FACTUAL). SUPPORTED BY "MAJOR-ONE"-OR-
RELT AN EVIDENTIAL EVIDENCE.

I HAVE
NO DOUBT MY DRAWS CANNOT STAND UP UNDER
NO REAL TEST OF GRIEVANCE... (THE WHOLE GAME
TRINITY AND MAJOR PRACTICE OF LAW IS TO OBSCURE)
BUT, THE ABUSES ARE MUCH MORE UNDECIPHERED
THAN MY CASES... THE RAMPART SCANDAL OR THE
WIDOW STATE OF ABUSE COMING FORTH... ARE
MAJOR ABUSES, MAJOR-ONE OR MAJOR-TWO (L.B.D.P.
AN LAPD).

THE COURTROOMS ARE JUST AS DIRTY
AS CORRUPTION AS OFFICERS

7
CONVICTED OR FIRED...

THE LAW IS BEING "INTENTIONALLY DISREGARDED", TO MAINTAIN HIGH LEVELS OF CONVICTIONS AT INDIGENT INDIVIDUAL'S EXPENSE. THEY DO NOT HAVE A CHANCE INSIDE (ALOT) OF THOSE COURTROOMS.

I CAN GIVE YOU AT LEAST 10- ATTORNEYS (BY LAW) WHO SHOULD BE DISBARRED... SOME EVEN PROSECUTED! THATS JUST ON THE OFFENSE SIDE (DEALING WITH ME). NOT OTHERS I AM AWARE OF.

(I HAVE ALREADY STATED, I'M NO SAINT, BUT NEITHER AM I A PREDATOR)

THE LAW IS THE LAW, SO WHATEVER THEY MAY HAVE THOUGHT ABOUT ME... WHATEVER INSIDE OR OUTSIDE INFLUENCE THEY MAY HAVE HAD - IS - IRRELEVANT... IT'S IMPOSSIBLE FOR THOSE INVOLVED IN MY CASES TO GET AROUND THE FACT THEY DID NOT KNOW - THEY WERE VIOLATING THE RULE OF LAW (CRIME).

(WHEN I STATE, THOSE, THEM, THEIR OR THEM, I MEAN LAWYERS, OR AS AN JUDGES)

SO THERE CAN BE NO DOUBT TO MY CHARGES... NO CLAIM OF INNOCENCE... NO ROOM FOR THE WORD ABERRATION OR SENTENCE... NO DOUBT TO COLLUSION, COMPLETELY, INTENTIONAL [HIGHLIGHTED] CONSTITUTIONAL AND CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS (WHICH AMOUNTS TO KNOWLEDGEABLY AND (P.S.)

3[#]
INTENTIONALLY ENGAGED IN CRIMES! EMPHASIS
ADDED).

I would BE A COMPLETE IDIOT TO COME
TO THE MEDIA, KNOWING WHAT I AM ALLEGING
CANNOT BE SUBSTANTIATED.

I REALLY DID NOT WANT
TO USE THIS AVENUE [MEDIA], TO ADDRESS THE
"MASSIVE ABUSE" WITHIN THE COURTS... AND
I KNOW THEIR PRAYING I DO NOT APPROACH
YALL WITH MY STORIES.

BUT, MY CASES ARE SO
BAD - NOT TO EXCLUDE, IN CONSCIOUS OF THE
METHODS THEY ARE UTILIZING TO RAIL-ROAD IN-
DIVIDUALS INTO THE PENITENTIARY.. (GOD ONLY
KNOWS WHAT THEIR DOING IN DESPERATION)

THERE
ISN'T ONE THING THEY HAVE NOT ATTEMPTED TO
TAMPER WITH.. (I.D.L) THE DEPARTMENT OF COR-
RECTION IS FULLY IN COLLUSION WITH THEIR
CRIMES (EVEN AT THIS TIME).

I WISH TO PRO-
VIDE YOU WITH A FOUNDATION AND SCENARIOS.
HOPEFULLY, TO GIVE YOU A UNDERSTANDING AN
PICTURE OF THE ABUSE WITHIN THE COURTS...
ALSO, TO PREPARE ONE FOR ANY COUNTER NOTES
OR DIVERSIONS.

MY ARREST RECORD will show
A NUMBER OF ARRESTS... (THEY'RE DECEPTIVE, ON
PAPER.). MEANING, THE RECORDS would show, THAT

MOST OF THE CRIMES WERE DISMISSED WITH AN ATTORNEY... I USUALLY WAS BEHIND THE DISMISSAL BY ADVISING THE ATTORNEY(S) OF THE RULES OF LAW — THAN THERE TWO OR CONVICTIONS ON MY RECORD. 1 FOR SPORADIC ABUSE (A MISDEMEANOR) AND THE 2nd FOR MARIJUANA (WHICH IS THE SAME). I HAVE NO DOUBT THEY WILL BE EXPUNGED.

THEN YOU WILL SEE AND HEAR, IN '995" I WAS CHARGED WITH 2 COUNTS OF MURDER.. CASE # TA03345. I WAS ACCUSED OF ONE (1) COUNT OF MURDER AND ASSAULT — THE SECOND (2nd) MURDER, IT WAS A HUNG JURY 10-2 NO FAVOR.

THE JUDGE THEN DISMISSED THE SECOND MURDER... AS HE STATED TO THE D.A. "THERE CAN BE NO DOUBT THAT THE WITNESS HAD NOT WITNESSED THE CRIME!" (MEANING, THE D.A. TOOK ME TO TRIAL ON FALSE AND PERJURED EVIDENCE (TESTIFYING), INTENTIONALLY AND KNOWLEDGABLY)

THE D.A. MADE NO ATTEMPT TO CONTEST THAT DECLARATION — THAT HOW ONE KNOWS THE D.A. KNEW WHAT HE WAS DOING IS ILLEGAL

THIS IS THE SAME D.A. IN THIS CASE ^(2nd) THIS CASE IS JUST AS WORSE, BUT WORSE IN THE SENSE — THAT THE ATTORNEYS WERE MADE FORCED TO GO ALONG WITH THE

RS

- 5 -

PLEASE, START YOUR OWN INQUIRY AND INVESTIGATION.
HERE'S ONE MAIN SOURCE - THE LEAD DETECTIVE ON
THIS PRESENT CASE... LADY, HAMPTON DEPARTMENT
VENA.

NOT ONLY DID HE NOT INSTITUTE ANY ACTION
UPON THE THREE (3) INDIVIDUALS WHO HAD
GIVEN STATEMENTS - AND WERE ALLOWED TO "KINDA-
LY TESTIFY FALSELY"

THERE WAS NEVER NO DOUBT
THAT THE THREE INDIVIDUALS WHO WERE ALLOWED
TO TESTIFY - HAD NOT BEEN PRESENT DURING THE
SHOOTING.

ONE WOULD ONLY NEED TO FOLLOW THE
THE DATES OF THOSE STATEMENTS, THE POLICE REPORTS,
AND EVERYTHING THEY ALL READY KNEW.. THAT
WAS INTENTIONALLY SUPPRESSED OR MANIPULATED. THIS
IS A CLEAR CRIME!

BUT, WHAT WAS DONE TO ME,
IS DONE EVERYDAY, IN THREE COUNTIES... (IN JUST
CONNECTION TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND THE RULES AND LAWS
THAT FALLS INTO PLAY). I CAN ARTICULATE AND DEMONSTRATE
JUST HOW IT'S BEING DONE."

FOR EXAMPLE, LET USE
THE CASE I WENT HOME ON IN '95. ONE WOULD
THINK THE ATTORNEY ON THIS CASE - DID HIS JOB.
[THAT'S DECEPTIVE] ONE WOULD NEED TO UNDERSTAND
THE LAW, AND LOOK AT THE RECORDS TO KNOW
THAT A CRIME WAS COMMITTED. (BY ALLOWING THE
CASE TO GO TO TRIAL.). . BUT, PLAIN AND

Lawyer GENCE would tell me, that, the witness THEY ALLOWED IN THAT CASE '95" had not witnessed THE INCIDENT.

THE JUDGE DECLARATION TO THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY - THERE CAN BE NO DOUBT THE WITNESS HAD/DID NOT WITNESS THE CRIME. THE NO DOUBT - DIDN'T JUST APPEAR, IT WAS THERE FROM THE INITIATION OF THE PROCEEDING.

IT SHOULD BE STATED, THERE WAS TWO (2) ATTORNEYS ON THAT CASE. BUT, ONE DANE ON, IN PRETRIAL.

HER... MEANING, THE SECOND ATTORNEY, SHE would go along with the confrontation that had been allowed from the initiation of the case... OTHER THAN THAT, HER REPRESENTATION/PROTECTION would be 80% - TO THE ORIGINAL ATTORNEY ZERO!

THE INTRIGUES AND CONFRONTATION, STARTED FROM THE FIRST DAY AT COURT... THE COURT DOCKET would show THE INTELLIGENT N.I.F (NO CHARGES FILED)

THE COURTROOM OFFICIALLY CLOSE AT 5:00 - ABOUT 5:45 I AM BROUGHT INTO COURT... IN AN ATTEMPT TO MAKE A MUCKERY OF THE LAW, AND INTENDATE ME INTO GOING ALONG WITH IT.

TRYING TO ARRANGE ME ON A HAIL MARY TAKE REORDER.. SAME OTHERS ON AS TO THE SAME REAS-

AND TO PUT IT NEUTRAL - I LAUGHED IN THEIR FACE.

IT WOULD BE SEVERAL MORE DAYS BEFORE I AM ARRANGED. (WHICH WOULD BE ONE WEEK AFTER MY ARREST.)

AT THIS TIME, A LAWYER NAMED DONALD HERSTEIN, (THE FIRST LAWYER ON THE '95' CASE) APPROACHES ME - TELLS ME HE'S A PRIVATE ATTORNEY.., THAT THE COURT HAS CONTACTED HIM TO SEE IF HE WOULD TAKE MY CASE.

HERSTEIN, IS THE TYPE OF ATTORNEY THAT ARE COMPENSATED TO CONTROL/FIX THE LAW - BY GOING ALONG WITH CHARGES THAT HE'S NO MERIT. THEN INTENTIONALLY DRAWDING INDIVIDUALS INTO THE PENITENTIARY.

(I FILED A DISQUALIFICATION MOTION TO COVER MY CERO - AGAINST THE ATTORNEY I WAS FORCED TO ATTACK.

IN THE 1997 MOTION..., I USE THE WORDS - MASSIVE MISAPPROPRIATION OF TAX PAYERS FUNDS (I AM REFERRING TO DONALD HERSTEIN ALSO).

I THINK IF ONE PILLED THE CASE, HERSTEIN, HAS BEEN APPOINTED TO BY CONTRACT, ARE WHO BEEN ALLOWED TO PLACE HIS OWN CONTRACT IN FOR FINE (WHEN IT WAS ALLOWED) ONE WOULD BE ASTONISHED TO SEE HOWL-

MUCH MONEY HE HAS MADE. (START JUST FROM: 95-2000). SEE HOW MANY CASES HE HAS BEEN ALLOWED TO HANDLE AT ONE TIME (APPOINTED TO AT THAT). THE ATTORNEY(S) - ~~THE~~ - IT'S EX-LEISURE IN ALL REGARDS.

Also, I know it's not even logical to even consider it normal... because it's not... even though it's the normal status quo inside those courts. (It a reason behind those words).

Herstein, had the air of confidence about his side (posture)... obviously he thought because he stated.., he was a PRIVATE ATTORNEY. THAT HAD IMPRESSED ME. ... I IMMEDIATELY CONVENED TO QUESTIONING HIM, IN MY SUBTLE WAYS ABOUT THE LAW.

I THEN SUGGESTED, he do make some factual inquiries about the case, - then have the charge(s) DISPROVED.. they have nothing on me.

THE CONFIDENTEE STARTED TO DEFEND - AS HE STARTED LYING ABOUT THE LAW.

I THEN ~~said~~ EXPRESSED STATED TO HIM, I DON'T WANT YOU. THE MAN PANICKED.

He then rushed from the room. He would utilize a tactic that a lot of them think... now - to get him out of there.

To take a test - when it's a excessive amount
of time (unreasonable) or on bogus charges,
are participate in something the individual
is against.

(Involve ones family or girlfriend.
(Especially blacks). The majority is AGAIN
TO THE LAW... IT'S LIKE THE BLIND LEADING
THE BLIND."

IN MY CASE, THERE WAS A FEMALE
IN THE CARTOON who I was HAVING A
CIVIL RELATIONSHIP (NOT TENED). WITH.

HERSTEIN, HAD
CONVINCED HER - TO TRY TO CONVINCE ME
NOT TO CONTACT HIS REPRESENTATION, THAT HE
WAS A COMPETENT ATTORNEY AND HE WHO TRY-
ING TO HELP ME.

(THE JUDGE, EVEN ALLOWED HER
TO TAKE STEAK TO ME)

AS SOON AS I SEEN HER
APPROACHING - I KINDA SNIED AND STATED, "THE
OLD FEMALE TRICK..". SHE THEN STATED, WHY SHE
WAS ALLOWED TO TAKE STEAK TO ME.

THE WHOLE
ATTEMPT TO PERSONALLY VOUCH FOR HERSTEIN
CHARACTER. TO THE POINT - WHERE I HAD TO
GET HER OFF THE OFFENSIVE - INTO THE DE-
FENSIVE.

(SHE'S A VERY LOVELY AN INTELLIGENT WOMAN.
WITH SOME ~~UNIVERSITY~~ SCHOOLING AND SEVERAL

10
YEARS OLDER THAN I)

BUT, TO BE EXPLICIT AND USING IT IN THE TERMINOLOGY I USED (EXCLUDING THE EXPLETIVE LANGUAGE - BUT IT WAS A PSYCHOLOGICAL MOVE, I CONSCIOUSLY)

I STATED, LISTEN YOU STATED B... SHE WENT ON A "FULL" DEFENSE.. I JUST ENDED.

I WAS THEN ABLE TO ADVISE HER & WHAT SHE SHOULD'VE DID .. THEN STATED THE FACTS, SHE WASN'T ABLE TO VOUCH FOR HERSTEIN / CHARACTER - SHE KNEW NOTHING ABOUT THE MAN.... HOW WOULD SHE KNOW IF HE WAS TRYING TO HELP ME - SHE KNEW NOTHING ABOUT THE LAW!

SHE TRIED THE OLD "BUT" ALIAS OF TENSES, - I LET HER KNOW, THERE'S NO BUT. AS I THREW THE SAME FACTS IN HER FACE IN QUESTION FORM.

SHE ACKNOWLEDGED I WAS RIGHT - THEN APOLOGIZED TO ME. (THE SAME WOMAN IN THAT STAGE WHILE DOMINANT - SHE DIDN'T KNOW HOW OR WITH HERSTEIN, HAD BEEN GIVEN A LAW LICENSE ... THEY MUST JUST GIVE AWAY THESE (LICENSE) THINGS. I TELL HER DANNY SURE COULDN'T SEE WHERE HE HAD EARNED IT).

ONCE I HAD HER BACK IN CONTACT WITH REALITY. WE

(I HAD NO CHOICE BUT TO PROCEED, SINCE THEY
WERE MANIPULATING AND PLAYING WITH THE LAW.
PLUS, I HAD MY OWN STRATEGY.)"

ONCE THE WITNESS
LEFT THE ROOM - HERSTEIN CAME BACK IN.. I THEN
LAYED DOWN THE CONDITIONS I HAD ON ACCEPTING
AND NOT CONTESTING HIS REPRESENTATION:

1) IT WAS
NOT WAIVING ANY TIME (SPEEDY TRIAL), AND 2) TO
PROVIDE ME WITH THE MURDER BOOK.

HE AGREED;
BUT THOUGHT I SHOULD WAIVE AT LEAST ONE (1)
MONTH, SO HE COULD GO OVER THE CASE THOROUGHLY
THAT THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY DOESN'T FILE CHARGES
ON A CASE LIKE THIS - UNLESS THEY HAVE STRONG
EVIDENCE!! CASES LIKE THIS - TAKE A MINIMUM OF
TWO OR THREE YEARS TO GET TO TRIAL. (MY CASE WILL
TECHNICALLY BE OVER IN FIVE MONTHS).

WHEN WE
WENT INTO COURT - HERSTEIN STATED TO THE JUDGE,
HE HAD JUST RECEIVED THE CASE - I WASN'T
WAIVING NO TIME... (WHICH HE THOUGHT WAS
UNUSUAL). HE NEEDED THE MURDER BOOK IN THREE
DAYS. SO HE COULD BEGIN ON THE CASE.

(MANIPULATED)
BY STATUE - WHICH THEY ABSOLUTELY REFUSE TO
ABEY, ON THIS CASE (D.R.) WHEN I WAS PROTESTED.
IT WOULD BE ABOUT A MONTH WHEN IT DID GET
THEM - FULLY TRANTED! THEY WOULD CONTINUE TO -

TRANSFER WITH THE DOCUMENTS ONCE I HAD THEM IN MY PRESENCE).

HERZEN THEN STATED, HE HAD TO STILL PUT IN HIS CONTRACT FOR THE CASE. HE ESTIMATED THE CASE WOULD TAKE AT LEAST TWO (2) YEARS - AND ALL THE EXPERTS HE WOULD NEED.

(IN PRE-TRAIL - HE WOULD SERIOUSLY TRY TO CONVINCE ME, TO GET IN THE COUNTY JAIL FOR TWO (2) YEARS, THAT THE LAST PERSON WHO HAD PLED THAT - HE HAD GOTTEN THEM OUT... I TOLD THAT MAN, HE SOUNDED LIKE A COMPLETE IDIOT!).

WE WERE BACK IN COURT TWO WEEKS LATER FOR THE PRELIMINARY HEARING.. (IT WAS ANOTHER GHAN) THEY BROUGHT IN THIS OLD BLACK, GENTLE RETIRED JUDGE (ETERNALLY), TO DO THE HEARING.

(IT WAS MY BELIEVE THEN AS IT IS NOW.. THAT JUDGE WOULD BRING IT IN AS A SAFEGUARD - JUST ENCASE THE TREE FELL BACK ON SOMEBODY - HE COULD VOTE THROUGH THE RODES FOR BEING GENTLE).

"BUT THIS TREE (D.R.) IS WORSE - SO IS THE DAMAGE FROM THE DAY OF DEC, 13TH 1975. THESE THREE(S) WILL LEAD TO A LINE OF JUDGES.. THE LAST I WOULD EXPECT, IS THAT THEIR INVOLVED, BARRED AND FINED. THEY DID WHAT THE LAW CLEARLY STATES,

13

HERSTEIN KNEW AT THAT TIME - WITHOUT A DOUBT, THE WITNESSES THEY WOULD EVENTUALLY SEE HAD NOT WITNESSED THE SHOOTINGS.

"THE WITNESSES HAD GIVEN STATEMENTS THE NIGHT OF THE SHOOTINGS - IMPLICATING THEIR OWN FAMILY MEMBER... FREELY VOLUNTEERING WHERE THEY WERE, WHAT THEY WERE DOING.., WHAT THEY THOUGHT AND TRYING TO ACCUSE...

THEN AFTER MY ARREST THEY WERE SELECTED AND ALLOWED TO CHANGE THEIR STORY TO IMPLICATE ME..

TO TOP THAT - THE WITNESSES CAME FROM ONE FAMILY [IMMEDIATE]. I ASSUME IT WAS JUST AN STRANGE COINCIDENCE, THAT WHEN THE FAMILY RELATED THEIR STORIES, IT WAS IN A WAY THAT IT SEEMED THEM TO BE WITNESSES AT TWO DIFFERENT CRIME SCENES.. OF COURSE NOT.

PULLS STATEMENTS OF THE WITNESSES THEY NEED TO TESTIFY AGAINST ME - HAD TO AN ELLIO TOO.

IN THIS FREE [OR] THEY TRIED TO GET THE ELDEST ^{WITNESS} WALTON - TO BE A WITNESS... (THE UNBELIEVABLE BUT ITS TRUE). SHE TALKED THEM OUT OF HER HOUSE - THEN STATED IN FRONT OF A CROWD OF PEOPLE: SHE WASN'T GOING TO COME TO COURT AND LIE ON ME AGAIN! THAT TRUE ALSO!"

AS I STATED, THE PRE-LIMINARY HEARING WAS A SHAM. [I EARLY FRAMED]

LENITI MEANING, THE "115 HEAR SAY LAW" WAS INVOKED TO COVER THEIR IRONY.

THIS CASE (D.R.) IS WORSE... THEY HAD THEIR MAIN WITNESS AT COURT - BUT THE JUDGE STATED, IT WAS THE D.A. CHOICE TO USE THE HEAR SAY LAW.

(IF ONE WATCHED THE T.V. COMMERCIAL CONCERNING THE 115 HEAR SAY LAW..

, ONE WILL SEE THE REASON THE D.A. ALLEGED THIS (LOL) LAW WHO NEEDED ISN'T BEEN APPLIED AT ALL (REASON)..

WHEN I SAW THE COMMERCIAL ON T.V., I KNEW IT WAS NOTHING BUT, AS HOW. I COULD DO NOTHING BUT SHAKE MY HEAD IN PITY.)

OF COURSE I DISAGREE AND CONTENDED THE JUDGE DECISION, BUT, I WOULD SPECIFICALLY ATTACK THE 115 HEAR SAY LAW IN SUPERIOR COURT.

(THEY ARE UNETHICAL POLITICAL INDIVIDUALS WITH THESE BOGUS AN FRAUDULENT LAW. - ESPECIALLY THOSE WHO ARE INGENT.. THERE IS NO ACCOUNTABILITY TO WEED OUT GRANDJURY CHARGES).

NOT SAYING, THEY HAVEN'T BEEN PROFESSING INDIVIDUALS - (PERHAPS ONE KNOWS OTHERWISE) - IT'S JUST EASIER.)

AFTER THE RIBBON CUT AND SHOTDOWN - AT THREE TO NINE (P.S.)

15

Ball over for trial.

BY PRETRIAL, I HAD OPENED ALREADY AN INQUIRY FOR HERSTEIN. THE MAN WASN'T PRACTICING ANY SENSE OF PRINCIPLE OF LAW.

"UP TO THAT POINT, I HAD BEEN CONFIDENTLY AND SUCCESSIONALLY PLAYING ON HIS GREED... (THE MONEY HE WAS STEALING) BUT, I REALIZED THAT WAS A MISTAKE - BECAUSE HE WAS INDEBTED TO THE D.A. FOR THE FUNDS."

THE JUDGE INQUIRED,
WAS THE D.A. READY FOR TRIAL. I'M LOOKING, THE MAN STARTED, SHAKEN [TERRIFIED] THE MAN LOOKED DOWN,
SHAKED HIS FILE - SHAKEN HIS HEAD, SIDE TO SIDE. MAN STATED, I'M REALLY NOT READY FOR TRIAL.

WELL YOU BELIEVE HERSTEIN, JUNIOR-UP-THAN STATED TO THE L.A. IF YOU NEED MORE TIME I WILL GIVE IT TO YOU (THE TRUE)

I IMMEDIATELY INTERFERED, YOU'VE NOT GIVEN HIM A DAY - I'M NOT WAITING ANYTIME!.. THE MAN STAMPED BACK INTO HIS CHAIR (Herstein) INFURIATED - THE MAN COULD NOT EVEN LOOK AT ME. HE HAD THAT SERPENT LOOK
ON HIS FACE - THE LOOK OF BETRAYAL.

(MORE EVENTS
WILL PROVE FATAL)

THE D.A. KNEW, HERSTEIN HAD BEEN PLAYED ALONG WITH HENRY AND CONFRONTING

10

the law to the fullest.. but, I knew they did
not realize, I GRAPED [COMPREHENDED] THE FULL
MAGNITUDE of what they were doing. (PLAYING
WITH THE LAW).

THE D.A. HESITATED, knowing HE
WAS ABOUT TO COMMIT A MURKUT [CRIME]. THIS
IS THE SAME D.A. ON THIS PAGE — THIS PAGE
IS WROTE).

EVEN THOUGH THE D.A. would still go
through with his crime... THAT SPECIFIC DAY
would BE THE TURNING POINT.

EITHER BY FATE..
DIVINE INTERVENTION OR HAPPENSTANCE — THAT DAY
EVENTS would shoot HERSTEIN, THAT HE would
MAKE A CRAPTE MORE (DECISION). THAT HE
would quickly REGRET — THEN TRY TO RESCIND
IT, BUT IT would BE TO LATE. (BEYOND
HIS CONTROL) AND FATAL.

MEANING, HERSTEIN
WAS IN A STATE OF PANIC AS I LEFT THE
COURTROOM THAT DAY... HE HAD ALSO GRAPED
HIS WHITE HAND — HE HAD [NO] INTENTIONS
OF DEFENDING ME PERIOD!

HE knew, I DID
NOT WANT HIM FROM THE START — SO HE,
MOVED TO PASSIFY OR NEUTRALIZE ANY THREATS,
OR ATTEMPTED BY ME TO RETAIN OR GET A
NOTHER ATTORNEY.

#1
HELP OF THE SECOND ATTORNEY [IN IMMEDIATELY] WHO
WOULD COME ONTO THE CASE. "VALERIE MONROE".
(SHE'S A BLACK WOMAN - I'M NOT BIASSED OR
DECEIVED BY COLOR.. I AM WAY BEYOND THAT
CHILDISH STATE. . I JUDGE A PERSON BY THEIR
WORD, THE CONTENT AND QUALITY OF IT).

MRS. MONROE,
APPROACH WAS NONTHREATENING - NAMED BURKE. SHE
ADVISED ME OF WAY SHE WAS WORKING.. I IN-
QUIRED ABOUT SEVERAL ISSUES OF LAW - WHICH I
ALREADY KNEW]. IN THAT REGARD SHE WAS HONEST.

THE CONVERSATION BOILED DOWN TO, DID I
GIVE A STATEMENT. (GIVE UP MY RIGHTS).. MY
REPLY. YOU DO NOT EVER GIVE UP YOUR RIGHTS.
WHETHER YOU ARE INNOCENT OR GUILTY. IT'S SIMPLE.

"IN
THE '95" CASE THEY HAD ME ON (HIDDEN) AUDIO
AN VIDEO - NOT GIVEN UP MY RIGHTS.)

(ON THIS
CASE [D.R.], THE RECORDS WILL ALSO SHOW I DID
NOT GIVE UP MY RIGHTS.. BUT SEVEN(7) HOURS AFTER
I HAD BEEN TOLD NO CHARGES WERE BEING FILED,
AND I WAS FREE TO GO HOME.

THAN BEING CONT-
INUOUSLY-ILLEGALLY HELD, ALL OF A SUDDEN I FOR-
FEIT MY RIGHTS ON A MANUFACTURE GUN CASE.
IT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE!

WHAT ONE CAN FIND -
ANSWER

IS A PROPERTY FORM [FEDERAL!] THAT THE PEOPLE
USE FOR TRAINING EXERCISE - WITH THE NEBRASKA
CARD PRINTED ON TOP - WHAT YOU WILL SEE IS
THE JOHN PONDEREXTER - DRIVER NORTH ACT.. (WHICH
~~WASN'T~~ LEGAL AT ALL) I AM INTRIGUED THAT THEY,
WHEN THE PEOPLE REFUSED TO RESPECT MY
RIGHTS, AND LOSS THEIR ABILITY.. THIS INCLUDES
INDEMNITIZING THEMSELVES.

(THIS ALTERED IN
A ROOM WITH "HIDDEN" ALSO AN VETO).

BESIDE
THE OBVIOUS FAULT, ONE WILL NOT SEE ANYWHERE
WHERE I AGREED TO WAIVE OR GIVE UP ANY
RIGHTS.. THIS IS ANOTHER "EXPLICIT" EXAMPLE
OF COLLUSION.

THERE WAS NOT (ANY) LEGAL OR
LOGICAL WAY ONE COULD HAVE THOUGHT THAT FORM
WAS LEGALLY BINDING. (IN ANY FORM) OR FASHION.
IT WAS IMPOSSIBLE - PERIOD! (EMPHASIS ADDED).
THEY COULD NOT ACCORD - I BRAZED THE LAW
TO THE ABOVE MAGNITUDE!"

IN NOT DRAFTING
ALL MY ISSUES) ARE INDULGED.

MRS. NAPOLI
LEFT THE INITIAL VISIT WITH A LOOK OF
DOUBT ON HER FACE. (CONCERNING ME FOR-
FEETING MY RIGHTS).

SEVERAL DAYS LATER, SHE
RETURNED .. WITH A LETTER FROM THE STATE POLICE

STATING, THAT INDIVIDUALS WHO HAD CLAIMED
THEY HAD NOT MADE A STATEMENT - HAD.

THEIR
BRIEFLY ON VIDEO AN AUDIO (HIDDEN) TRYING TO
TALK THEIR WAY OUT OR INCRIMINATING THEIR
SELF.. WHETHER THEIR INNOCENT OR GUILTY - IT
DOES MORE HARM THAN GOOD.

MRS. MONROE AN HER
SELF, WENT OVER THE WITNESSES STATEMENTS -
SHE CONCURRED WITH MY ANALYSIS AND ACCES-
SMENT - THAT THERE WAS NO DOUBT, THE PEOPLE
THEY WERE CALLING WITNESSES HAD NOT BEEN
PRESENT OR WITNESS THE CRIME.

(I DID HAVE
WHAT IS CALLED THE MURDER BOOK... ALL SO-CALLED
WITNESSES HAD AUDIO AN VIDEO (HIDDEN) OF
THEIR STATEMENTS WHO TESTIFIED IN '95).

I AM
VERY CONSCIOUS AN INQUIRITIVE INDIVIDUAL.

I
WOULD MAKE SO MANY FACTUAL INQUIRIES INTO
THE LAW - THAT ONE DAY IN THE MIDDLE OF
MRS. MONROE ANSWERING SOME OF MY QUESTIONS,
SHE HERDLY STOPPED - THEN STATED, "YOU KNOW
SOMETHING, I JUST REALIZED YOU ASK A LOT OF
QUESTIONS - TO MANY... WHY DO YOU WANT TO
KNOW ALL THIS STUFF?"

I JUST SMILED - I WOULD
LET HER KNOW AT THE END OF THE CASE THOUGH.

FROM EXTENDING MY DEEPEST APPRECIATION TO MRS. MONROE, FOR EXTENDING HER PROTECTION TO ME DURING TRIAL.

TO MY ULTIMATE DISAPPOINTMENT - THAT I WAS ALLOWED TO BE PLACED IN JEOPARDY (.....) BY THE WITNESSES (WHO STATEMENTS) WAS ALLOWED TO GO, UNCHECKED - CHALLENGED) TO TESTIFY WHEN THERE WAS NO DOUBT THEY WERE FALSE.

AFTER MRS. MONROE, COMMENTS TO ME (WHICH WAS AT TRIAL STAGES) SHE STARTED AVOIDING ME.

BUT, OUR INITIAL MEETINGS WERE PLEASANT AND FRANK...

AT THAT SECOND MEETING, I HAD STATED, THAT THE ONLY REASON HERSTEIN HAD REQUESTED HER ASSISTANCE - BECAUSE HE THOUGHT SHE WOULD GO ALONG WITH HIS AGENDA (TO CUFF ME). MRS. MONROE, REPLIED - WELL HE HAS ANOTHER THING COMING...

MY WORDS QUICLLY PROVED FATAL.
WE WOULD GO THROUGH COURT PROCEEDINGS ONCE TOGETHER. ON THE SECOND ~~to~~^{BY} COURT - MRS. MONROE, HAD ME PULLED INTO THE ATTORNEY ROOM.... SHE THEN INFORMED ME. SHE WAS NO LONGER ON MY CASE.

THAT HERSTEIN AND THE COURT, HAD STATED THE CASE DID NOT REQUIRE TWO ATTORNEYS - THEY WOULD NOT PICK UP HER FEE (PAY HER).... TO TOP IT OFF, HERSTEIN

HER.

I GAVE HER A SCENARIO OF WHAT I THOUGHT HAD
ACCURRED IN A VACUUM [DARK]. SHE JUST SMILED.

I THEN ASSURED HER - SHE WOULD STAY ON THE CASE..,
EVEN, IF I HAD TO RETAIN HER MYSELF.... SO IN
THAT REGARD - WE QUICKLY NEGOTIATED A CONTRACT
AN FEE FOR HER TO CONCLUDE WITH THE CASE AT
THAT POINT.

BY COINCIDENCE OR FATE, I HAD HALF
THE MONEY IN THE COURTROOM THAT DAY.

IT'S IMPOR-
TANT TO STATE AT THIS POINT, AND TO PAINT OUT,,
THAT THROUGHOUT THE PROCEEDING IN THE "95"
CASE — ONE OF 'MY FOLK' (PEOPLE) WERE ALWAYS
IN THE COURTROOM AS A SPECTATOR.

(ON THIS PRESENT
CASE (D.R.) IT WAS THE SAME - BUT MORE SO... IN THE
SENSE, I USE TO (SAY MY ALIVE) TO WATCH THE
ATTORNEYS AND D.A. FROM THE TIME THEY WERE ON
THE CASE — WHAT SHE REPORTED TO ME ONLY RE-
INFORCED (WHAT THE RECORDS WILL SHOW) — WHAT I
STATED FOR THE RECORDS, AND WHAT I HAVE OUTLINED
IN DOCUMENTS.

HER PRESENCE WAS UNABATING... AT
THE INITIATION OF THE (PRETENSE) OF A TRIAL.. I RE-
QUESTED, THAT SHE BE IN COURT FROM THE TIME IT
OPEN- UNTIL IT CLOSED — TO WATCH THE JURORS AND
ATTORNEYS... SHE WAS WITHOUT FAIL. (OVER)

28

SHE HAD REPORTED TO ME ALSO - THAT THE ATTORNEYS
GAVE HER NASTY LOOKS INSIDE THE COURTROOM(S).

DOING
THE CHARGE OF PICKING AN IMPARIAL JURY... ONE OF
THE JURY MEMBERS [PRESPECTIVE] ANNOUNCED TO THE
COURT - THAT AS SHE WAS LEAVING COURT THE PRIOR
DAY. THAT A BLACK FEMALE (PROVIDING SPECIFIC
FEATURES). HEIGHT, LENGTH OF HAIR AND FIVE (5)
EARINGS IN THE RIGHT EAR).

HAD APPROACHED
HER SAYING, WE WERE INNOCENT..

THE ONLY PERSON
IN THE COURTROOM THAT MORNING WAS MY WIFE.
IT GOES WITHOUT SAYING - THE WOMAN WOULD HAVE
RECOGNIZED MY WIFE AS THE PERSON WHO HAD
APPROACHED HER IMMEDIATELY - BASED ON HER
COLORFUL AND POSITIVE IDENTIFICATION.

THE JUDGE,
THAN INQUIRED, DID SHE SEE THE PERSON IN THE
COURTROOM. (BUT, THE JUDGE ALL READY KNEW SHE
WAS NOT THE PERSON)... THE WOMAN IMMEDIATELY
STATED, NO!

THE JUDGE THAN STARTED PROBING AND
INSISTING, IS SHE FORESHURE - TAKE A CLOSER LOOK -
WALK OVER AND LOOK... THIS WOMAN THE ENTIRE TIME
IS REPETITION WITH HER NO'S!

SHE WOULD FINALLY
REPEAT THE FEATURES), AND WHY MY WIFE WAS
NOT THE PERSON TO NOT SEE HER (MOM)

#23

WAS TO CHARGE, AND SHE DID NOT HAVE FIVE (5")
EAR RINGS OR HOLES IN HER EAR.

THEY WERE CLEARLY
DISAPPOINTED... I HAD BEEN TELLING THE ATTORNEY
TO OBJECT - HE STATED, THERE WAS NO GROUNDS FOR
IT.

ONE WOULD THINK THE ISSUE WAS DEAD - BUT
IT AIN'T.

THAT JUROR MEMBER LEFT THE COURTROOM,
THE D.A. FOLLOWED - WITHIN FIVE MINUTES SHE
WAS BACK IN THE COURTROOM - STATING.. SHE HEARD
HER VOICE - SHE'S THE ONE.

(UNBELIEVABLE - BUT IT'S TRUE).
I HAD TO OBJECT (THE ATTORNEY HAD REFUSED) BASED
ON THE WOMAN POSITIVE IDENTIFICATION, HER REPETITION
ON NOO, AND THE SPECIFIC FEATURE(S) SHE HAD PRO-
VIDED.

THE JUDGE IMMEDIATELY SUBSTANTIATED THE CLAIM
AGAINST HER (TRIED TO DROWN OUT MY "SOUND OBJEC-
TION" AN ARGUMENT) THAN THREATEN AN EXPELLED HER
FROM THE COURT.

THE ATTORNEY(S) THAN SUPPORTED SHE
WAS THE ONE (INDIRECTLY).

AFTER THAT JUROR MEMBER
WAS EXPELLED - FIVE MINUTES LATER, THE WOMAN SHE
HAD DESCRIBED CAME INTO THE COURTROOM AND GOT
INTO THE STAND - THEY REFUSE TO PLACE IT ON THE
RECORD. ARE THE FIVE (5) EAR RINGS STICKING OUT OF
HER RIGHT EAR... HER NAME IS, ROCHELLE JOHNSON.

(NO KIN)... WAS THE GIRLFRIEND OF BETTER, WHO IS ALSO ON THIS CASE.

ON THEIR "SECOND DESPERATE MOVE" TO BUILD A CASE - THE D.A. OUTRIGHT FABRICATED A STATEMENT AGAINST ONE SPECTATOR - THAT HE KNEW AN UNKNOWN CANNOT BE SUBSTANTIATED.

I would object on the above ground... one) because I have a photographic memory, and 2) I still have the trial transcripts I was provided in '95. They're ~~to~~ (put up) on the streets... he cannot tamper with them.

THE ATTORNEY I ATTACKED would eventually state, (passively and lamely), that, "IT IS IMPORTANT TO MR. JOHNSON INFER, NOT TO, THINK HIS FRIEND SUPPORT IS BEING HARASSED."

THEY THAN INTENSIFIED THEIR ILLEGAL CONDUCT IN COURT... USING AND AN EVERY MEANS - IN ACTS OF DESPERATION, REQUIRING INVESTIGATORS TO PROVIDE I.D. WHO LAME INTO THE COURTROOM, AND TAKEN (WRITING) THIS INFORMATION down... USELESSLY IT TO HAVE CPD VIOLATE AND THREATEN VIOLATIONS, TO THOSE WHO LAME TO THE COURTROOM ON PAROLE. ARE IF THEY LAME BACK.

Also, it should be stated, that based on their contentious, obvious, and flagrant DISRESPECT AND DISREGARD FOR THE ... I know - trust them the same may occur.

18

-12-924-

TENNESSE).

BUT, GETTING BACK TO MRS. NORNROE, AND THEIR FUTILE ATTEMPT TO REMOVE HER FROM THE CASE.

AS WE'RE SITTING THERE (THE ATT. ROOM) I'M CONTENT PLATING MY AVENUES... I LOVE DIPLOMACY AND FINESSE.

I STATED TO MRS. NORNROE, THAT I FIRST WANTED TO SEE IF I COULD GET HERSTEIN TO RETAIN HER HERSELF. AND I THOUGHT I KNEW A WAY TO DO IT.

SHE SERIOUSLY DOUBTED IT, AND WANTED TO KNOW HOW.... I TOLD HER, "I'M GOING TO OFFER HIM A DEAL HE CANNOT REFUSE". (THAT'S VERBATIM).

SHE WAS PERPLEXED, AND THE DOUBT WAS OBVIOUS ON HER FACE.

I ASKED HER, TO GO ASK HERSTEIN, COULD HE COME SPEAK WITH ME.

HERSTEIN, CAME INTO THE ROOM AND SAT DOWN. (THE MAN HAD A SPARK ON HIS FACE - I KNEW I WAS ABOUT TO KNOCK IT OFF).

I STATED POINT BLANK, THAT I WANTED HIM TO RETAIN MRS. NORNROE HERSELF.. HIS REPLY, HE COULDN'T DO THAT - PLUS, HE DID NOT HAVE ANY MONEY FOR (HER) THAT.

I THEN TURNED OVER THE CARDS - FRANK AN EXPLOSIVE: (OVER)

26
I TOLD HIM, I WASN'T ASKING HIM - I WAS TELLING HIM.... AND REPEATED, THAT'S RIGHT - YOU HEARD WHAT I JUST SAID. I'M TELLING YOU!!

THE

MAN JUMPED UP TO LEAVE - SAYING.. HE DID NOT HAVE TO TAKE THAT TRAP OFF ME, AND HE DID NOT HAVE TO TOLERATE ME TALKING TO HIM LIKE I WAS.

I LET HIM KNOW, IF HE WALK OUT OF THE ROOM - TO KEEP WALKING RIGHT OUT THE COURTROOM DOOR... BECAUSE HE'S OFF MY CASE... I TOLD HIM.., NOW LEAVE IF YOU WANT.

HE STOOD STUCK TO THE WALL, AND MUMBLING AT THIS POINT.

I THEN TOLD HIM, TO SIT UP AND LISTEN - BEFORE WHAT I WAS ABOUT TO SAY - I WOULD GOING TO ONLY SAY IT ONCE.

I STATED, YOU'RE GOING TO RETAIN HER, AND I'LL TELL YOU WHY.. (CURIOSITY GOT HIM STUCK IN THAT ROOM) HE ASKED, WHY?

MY REPLY:

BECAUSE I KNOW YOU PUT IN A CONTRACT FOR THIS CASE... ESTIMATING, IT WAS GOING TO TAKE TWO OR THREE YEARS TO GET TO TRIAL. (THIS IS ONLY ABOUT 90 DAYS LATER)

ALL THE EXPERTS
YOU WOULD NEED - NONE OF THIS STUFF GOING ON. WE'RE ALL TOLD / STATED. ON (P.C.H.)

28

You HAVE A EXCESSIVE AMOUNT OF MONEY LEFT
THAT YOUR STEALING - THATS WITH IT!

AND, IF YOU DON'T,
I'LL RETAIN HER MYSELF - THEN YOUR GONE.. I
HAVE THE MONEY RIGHT NOW IN THE COURTROOM.

Now,
IF YOU THINK I'M BLUFFING - LET ME WALK
INTO THAT COURTROOM, AND SHE'S NOT RETAINED.
NOW GET OUTTA MY FACE. (IF LUCK COULD KILL, I
WOULDN'T BEEN DEAD).

THIS IS A ACCURATE STATEMENT
EXCLUDING THE "F***" EXPUGNE. HE WOULD DENY IT.
BUT, IT'S THE TRUTH.

HERSTEIN, LEFT THE ROOM - THAN
MRS. MONROE CAME BACK IN..

SHE INQUIRED ABOUT
THE CONVERSATION.... (BECAUSE, IMMEDIATELY UPON
HERSTEIN, RE-ENTERING THE COURTROOM HE HAD
RETAINED HER.). MY REPLY WAS SIMPLE, I TOLD
HER THE TRUTH.

ONCE IN THE COURTROOM - THE
JUDGE SEEMED PUZZLED. HE THOUGHT THERE SUPPOSE
TO BE ONLY ONE ATTORNEY ON THE CASE (THE
RECORDS SHOULD SHOW THESE WORDS) HERSTEIN
STATED, HE HAD ENOUGH MONEY IN HIS CONTRACT
TO RETAIN MRS. MONROE, HISSELF.

(I STATED ON
PAGES 4TH PARAGRAPH 6, AND APPENDIXES THAT THE
LAWYER HAS "SET" CONTRACTS Now.. I DOUBT THAT'S EVER

2
CORRECT... IN REFLECTING ON THE SOURCE OF THE INFORMATION... THIS ATTORNEY).

IN THE PAST I WOULD CONFESSION DEBATE WITH MYSELF, HAD I MADE THE RIGHT DECISION - NOT RETRAINING MRS. MONROE MYSELF AND RELEAVING HERSTEIN.

(1) BECAUSE AS I MENTIONED BEFORE, MRS. MONROE PROTECTION WASN'T ABSOLUTE... SO, I WONDERED IF SHE WOULD'VE CLOSED THE LOOP HOLE IN THE MISAPPLIATION = VIOLATION OF THE LAW THAT HAD BEEN ALLOWED.

(AS I MAKE THE ABOVE STATEMENT, I DO NOT HOLD HER TO BLAME - WHEN SHE CAME ONTO THE CASE PROCEDURAL CARE GUARDS (DUE PROCESS) HAD/WAS ALREADY BEING VIOLATED.

I KNEW, SHE KNEW, AGREED AND STATED - AS WELL AS VERY QUALIFIED PRIVATE ATTORNEYS, THAT THEY COULD OR COULD'VE HAD THE CHARGES DISMISSED FROM THE START ...

THE ANALOGY CONCERNING THIS PRESENT CASE (D.R.) IS THE SAME. BUT THIS CASE IS MUCH WORSE - IN EVERY SENSE OF THOSE WORDS.)"

AND 2) I KNEW HERSTEIN, WAS NOT TRYING TO HELP ME PERIOD (ZERO-PROTECTION) AND WOULD TRY TO SUBVERT THE TRIAL.

I DID EVENTUALLY CONCLUDE THAT I...

SEVERAL REASONS.

(I) IT LEFT FREE THE MONEY I HAD TO TAKE CARE OF OTHER THINGS.

(II) WHICH I REALIZED WAS MORE IMPORTANT:

IT PROVIDED ME THE EXPERIENCE AN OPPORTUNITY (FROM THE INSIDE) OF WATCHING THE CONSTITUTION PLAYED OUT IN ITS FULLEST.. IN THE WORKING OF CHANGES OF THE COURT (TRIAL).

BUT, GRAB THE DIMENSION, MAGNITUDE, AND FLAGRANT DISREGARD AN ABUSE OF THE LAW - THAT "INCH" INDIGENT DEFENDANTS FACE.

AND THE LEVEL OF PROTECTION ONE "SHOULD" HAVE.

BY HAVING TWO ATTORNEYS...

(1) ONE GROSSLY AN IRONNALLY NEGLECTIVE, AND EXTREMELY INCOMPETENT.

(2) THE 2ND, EXTREMELY INCOMPETENT AND EFFICIENT.

MRS. MONROE, BASICALLY TOOK CONTROL OF THE CASE ONCE BACK ON. (THE COURT OFFICALLY REAPPOINTED HER SOON AFTER). HERSTEIN, WOULD THEN PROMISE HER AN EXTRA \$5.000 AFTER THE CASE WAS OVER. - THOSE WERE HER WORDS TO ME...)

ME BEING UNDER THE ILLUSION THE D.A. WOULD (OVER)

30
DRAFTS THE CASE (RATHER THAN KNOWINGLY CON-
NIP A OUTRIGHT ERINCE), WAS IMMEDIATELY
DISCALVED BY THE MPRE TO GET RID OF MRS.
MONROE.

EXCEPT, FOR THE CONFRONTATION (OF THE
LAW) THAT HAD STARTED FROM THE INITIATION
OF THE CASE, AND WOULD BE ALLOWED TO
CONTINUE FOR THE D.A.

MRS. MONROE, would
BRING IN [NOT] OF THE RULES OF LAW BACK
INTO PLAY.

STRESSING (IMPLICITLY) HOW DIRTY A LOT OF THOSE
LAUREROOMS ARE.

HOW MUCH DANGER I HAD
BEEN IN WITH HERSTEIN - THAT HE HAD
BEEN WORKING AGAINST ME (ONLY REINFORCING
WHAT I HAD PREVIOUSLY STATED TO HER).

ONCE
TRIAL STARTED, I WAS IN FULL DISPUTE AGAINST
HERSTEIN REPRESENTATION. [DEFENSIVE PERIOD].

ALSO,
I would START TO SUPPLEMENT MY VERBAL
DISPUTES WITH A COUPLE OF WRITTEN ONES.

(I WISH TO NOTE: THE O.J. TRIAL WAS
GOING ON DURING MY TRIAL... I'LL NEVER
FORGET - I LEVELLED, THAT HERSTEIN AS A
ATTORNEY KNEW - WOULD CONVEY AN HIGH
LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE TO A M. STATE'S ATTORNEY)

3
CHOICE OF WORD(S) WERE SUBVERSIVE AND AGAINST
MY INTEREST.

ABOUT A WEEK OR SO LATER, I WOULD
SEE MARIA CLARK, LEVELLING MY IDENTICAL
WORD(S) TO CONTEST WORD(S) OF ONE OF O.J.'S
ATTORNEYS.

A CONSCIOUS, KEEN AND TRAINED MIND IN
THE USAGE OF WORD(S), CAN PICK UP ANY KINDA
MANIPULATION, DECEPTIVE, DEFITIVE, MISLEADING,
NOT DIRECTED, COUNTER PRODUCTIVE - WORD(S) ARE
PHASED!

HERSTEIN, WAS ON THE SAME SIDE AS
THE D.A. - IN FULL OPPOSITION AGAINST ME.
WITH CLEAR HATRED FOR ME... JUST AS STEVEN
HALBER, ON THIS PAGE D.R.)

THE DAY BEFORE
MY CLOSING ARGUMENT - MY INTUITION TOLD ME
TO CHECK ON HERSTEIN CLOSING ARGUMENT.
WHEN I CALLED AND INQUIRED TO WHAT HE WAS
GOING TO SAY.

HE REPLIED, THAT HE WAS GETTING
HIS ARGUMENT TOGETHER - THAT HE WAS GOING
TO PLEAD MY GUILTY TO THE ASSAULT ON THE
PAGE.... AND I WAS GOING TO LOVE HIS CLOSING
ARGUMENT. (ONE COULD HEAR AN FEEL THE DECEITFULNESS
AND HATRED COZING OUT HIS VOICE).

I REPLIED, I
KNOW I AM GONNA LOVE IT - I KNOW YOU'RE GOING
TO GET OFF (BLANG FOR GOOD). I HUNG UP KNOWING -

38

THAT IF HE GAVE ANY OF THOSE LING (SO CALLED)
WITNESSES, ANY KINDA CREDIBILITY ONE COULD
ARGUE THEIR WHOLE STORY WAS TRUE. (HE WAS DE-
TERMINED TO GET ME CONVICTED).

(I should note:
THAT ACTUALLY HOW THE ATTORNEYS ON THIS PRESENT
CASE FOR I WERE PROCEEDING... IT WAS ANOTHER
ONE OF THEIR DECEITFUL METHODS - IMPLIET AN
IMPLIED CREDIBILITY (WERE THERE WAS ABSOLUTELY
ZERO) GIVEN IN THE FORMS OF QUESTIONS - IGNING
AN ARGUMENT (REPITIVE PERSON)

EVERYTHING I
HAVE STATED CAN BE SUBSTANTIATED).

ONCE BACK
AT COURT, I ADDRESSED THE COURT - INFORMING
THE JUDGE OF THE PHONE CALL FROM THE PRE-
VIOUS EVENING.

STATING, I PLEADED INNOCENT
TO ALL CHARGES, FOR HERSTEIN TO PLEAD N/E
GUILTY TO ANYTHING - WOULD BE COUNTLESS PRO-
DUCTIVE, AND AGAINST MY INTERESTS. (VERBAL)

THE
JUDGE AGREED - THEN STERNLY ADMONISHED HER-
STEIN. THE MAN WAS INTENED!

MRS. MONROE,
MY ARGUMENT WAS EXCELLENT. (THE AGRE-
EMENT BETWEEN HER AND HERSTEIN, HAD BEEN SHE
DO HALF THE CASE - THE 1ST MURDER, AND HE
DO THE OTHER MURDER ON THE HOODLUM) (PART)

33

MRS. MONROE, TOUCHED ON CALL'S THE ISSUES IN THE CASE... ATTEMPTING TO BRING OUT ALL THE FACTS (THOROUGHLY). TECHNICALLY, SHREDDING, DISMEMBERING AND EXPOSING THE CASE FOR WHAT IT WAS (A CHAM).

HERSTEIN,
WAS [CLEARLY] INFURIATED AT THE DEPTH SHE HAD
VENTURED INTO CALL'S THE ISSUES... HE EVENTUALLY
INTERJECTED TO STOP HER.

MRS. MONROE, LET HIM KNOW
THAT SHE WAS JUST COVERING ALL BASES. (SHE
KNEW, AS I KNEW, HERSTEIN WAS UP TO NO GOOD).

I
INFORMED HERSTEIN, I WOULD PREFER ~~CJ~~ MRS. MONROE
TO DO THE ENTIRE CASE (Finisht). SHE AGREED. HE
ANGRILY REJECTED IT.

(MRS. MONROE, WENT BACK AND
SIMPLIFIED THE ISSUE(S) AND FACTS - THEN TURNED
THE CASE OVER TO HER.)

AS SOON AS HERSTEIN, STARTED
His CLOSING ARGUMENT - His FEATURES, BODY LANGUAGE,
AND WORDS SAID IT ALL.

THE HATRED IN HIS EYES
WAS OBVIOUS... HIS EYE CONTACT WAS 95% AND INTENSLY
DIRECTED AT THIS WHITE MALE, FROM THE CITY OF
TERRANCE (A KNOWN RACIST CITY IN LA COUNTY - I
DID NOT EVEN WANT THE MAN ON THE JURY).

HERSTEIN,
WORDS WERE SPKEN WITH NO COMMITMENT OR BELIEVE,
AND DID NOT HAVE ANYTYPE OF REAL SENSE... TO...

34

TOP THAT SPECTACLE, IN THE MIDDLE OF HIS NO
MORE THAN SEVEN MINUTES ARGUMENT - THE MAN
WENT COMPLETELY GIBBERISH.. FINISHING AN
STUPIDLY AWAY (APPARENTLY) HIGHLY UPSET.

I ~~wish~~
TO POINT OUT THAT DURING JURY SELECTION AN AT
THE END - MINUTES BEFORE WE WERE GOING TO
RECESS FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE DAY PLEASE,
THE FOLLOWING DAY BEFORE WE WOULD ACCEPT
THE JURY.

IT WAS OUR TURN TO EXCUSE A JUROR.
WEINSTEIN STATED, HE WAS GOING TO ACCEPT (THE JURY
AS IS.) HE DID NOT SEE NO ONE ELSE (THAT) HE
THOUGHT SHOULD BE REMOVED.

I WAS IMMEDIATELY
AGAINST ACCEPTING... MRS. MONROE, TOLD HIM TO
WAIT.

AT THAT MOMENT, I PAINTED, STATED OPENLY,
AN, CLEARLY - GET RID OF HIM! HE GOT TO GO!
[THE TERRIBLE GENTLE MAN] THE MAN WAS TRYING TO
BE INCOGNITO [LITERALLY].

I WAS TOLD HE WOULD BE
REMOVED - BUT, THE NEXT ROUND. WE RECESSED
FOR THAT DAY... THE FOLLOWING DAY, I WAS ASKED
TO ALLOW HIM TO STAY. FOR SEVERAL REASONS - I
WILL SPARE THE DETAILS AT THIS TIME.

BUT, THERE
SHOULD BE A LAW THAT AUTOMATICALLY BAR, ARE
MANUFACTURED RESTRICTED .. WHETHER IT'S PLASTIC, TAPERED, TAPER (PLA.18)

35

OR VICE VERSA. ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS INCLUDED.

PRESENT / PAST BIGOTRY OR RACISM, WHERE'S, AFFILIATION,
FRATERNITY, SORORITY, SO FORTH AND ETC.. INCLUDING,
JUDGES, DOCS, ATTORNEYS, POLICE AND OTHER PRO-
FESSIONALS. THIS IS THE TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL
RACISM THAT HAVE AN IC BEING PROTECTED...
[CONSCIOUSLY AND SUBCONSCIOUSLY]

I WILL USE THE WORDS
OF THIS WHITE GENTLEMAN [GENTLEMAN EMPHASIZED].
IN 1998, DURING JURY SELECTION IN THE FIRST /
TRIAL (WERE I INDUCED THE HUNG JURY) "METAPHOR."
THE ABOVE

GENTLEMAN CAME STRAIGHT OUT AND STATED TO THE JUDGE,
THAT HE SHOULD BE EXCLUDED - BECAUSE HE WAS A
RAPIST AND COULD NOT BE FAIR.

I WASN'T SURPRISED
OR SHOCKED BY THAT DECLARATION.. BECAUSE I AM
FULLY AWARE, THAT THERE IS A LOT OF INDIVIDUALS
WITHIN THIS COUNTRY [U.S.A] WHO HAVE AND DO SET ON
BLACKS JURYS WITH THAT SAME MENTALITY (QUOTELY).
NOTHING HAVE BEEN SAID ARE DONE ABOUT IT. (IT'S
A QUIET ACCEPTANCE, AND A SUBLIMINAL MESSAGE IN
THIS TYPE OF HYPOCRISY).

BUT, I WAS APPALLED BY THE
JUDGE RESPONSE; BUT SIR, DO YOU THINK YOU COULD
BE FAIR AND WEIGHT THE EVIDENCE.

THE GENTLEMAN,
EXPLAINED THAT HE THE MORE NURTURING PART AND ONE

THE JUDGE, AND EXPLAINING THE FACTS... "How could HE BE FAIR AN HE'S A BIGOT - I DO NOT LIKE BLACKS, AND I CANNOT BE FAIR TO THAT GENTLEMAN."

THE GENTLEMAN WAS THAN EXCUSE - BUT THE JUDGE FIRST RESPONDE, CLEARLY, DEMONSTRATED SOMETHING IS WRONG INSIDE THESE COURTROOMS.

I STATED TO THE MAN AS HE WAS LEAVING; THANK YOU FOR YOUR HONESTY SOR - WE NEED MORE UPSTANDING CITIZENS LIKE YOU.

HE SMILED, WINKED HIS EYE, NODDED HIS HEAD AT ME AND LEFT WALKING.)"

BUT, GETTING BACK TO THE TRIAL I WAS ORIGINALLY SPEAKING ABOUT.

THERE WAS ALSO, A 21ST CENTURY UNTIL TOM I DID NOT WANT ON THE JURY. HE WAS LEFT OUT FOR THE SAME REASON AS THE TORRANCE MAN, - MOST OLDER BLACK MALES THAT CONSIDER THEIRSELVES FULLY ASSIMILATED INTO THE SYSTEM, POSSE JUST AS MUCH OF A THREAT TO BLACK MALES - WHEN THEY ON A JURY.

I BELIEVE STATISTICS WOULD SUPPORT THE ABOVE STATEMENT. IT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH EVIDENCE EITHER).

AFTER HERSTEIN SAT DOWN... THE D.A. GOT HIS FRUSTRATING AND LAST WORDS IN. HIS ATTITUDE WAS THE (PG.19)

31
CAME AS HEROTEIN, WHILE HE WAS STANDING IN
FRONT OF THE JURY IN AGD.

THE JURY WAS INSTRUCTED,
THEN SENT INTO DELIBERATION.. THE TWO JURORS
I'VE SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED BECAME HOLE OUTS
FROM THE START.

THERE EVENTUALLY WAS, A REQUEST
FOR READ BACK - BECAUSE ONE OF THE HOLE OUTS
TRIED TO DUPE AN LIE TO THE REST OF THE
JURORS.

STATING; THERE HAD BEEN TESTIMONY GIVEN,
THAT MY FINGER PRINTS WERE TAKEN OFF A SHELL
CASING FROM ONE OF THE CRIME SCENE.

THE
JUDGE, WAS CLEARLY IRRITATED-- HE STATED, HE
DIDN'T KNOW WHAT TRIAL THEY HAD BEEN
LISTENING TO - BUT IT CLEARLY WASN'T MINE.

THEN
REPEATED, "THAT THERE WAS ABSOLUTELY NO PHYSICAL
EVIDENCE AGAINST ME (THIS CASE 'D.P.' IS worse).
JUST THE PEOPLE WHO TESTIFIED." (MUCH worse)!

SOON
AFTER, THE VERDICTS CAME IN... THE FIRST CRIME
SCENE MURDER - I WAS FOUND NOT GUILTY.

THE SECOND
CRIME SCENE MURDER - IT WAS A HUNG JURY (10-2
MY FAVOR). THE ASSAULT FALL UNDER THIS SECOND
CASE - I WAS ■■■■■ FOUND NOT GUILTY.

IT SHOULD

BE NOTED: THE ALLEGED ASSAULT HAD SUPPOSEDLY HAPPENED TO THE SAME PERSON, WHO CLAIMED TO HAVE WITNESSED THE SECOND MURDER - BUT AFTER THE SECOND MURDER HAD OCCURRED.

THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE MURDER AND THE ASSAULT ISN'T A TRIVIA ISSUE OR CONNECTION... NOR, THE REASON THE TWO (2) JURORS SPIT / WITHHELD THEIR VOTE THE WAY THEY DID... THEN WHEN ONE TAKE IN, THE TOTALITY OF THE WITNESS STORIES [EMPHASIS ADDED].. MAKES IT ESPECIALLY MORE PERPLEXING.

Also, RECALL I STATED, HERSTEIN'S INTENTION WAS TO PLEAD ME GUILTY TO THE ASSAULT. WHY WHEN IT WAS "OBVIOUS" THE WITNESS STORY WAS A LIE. [A HIDDEN AGENDA - JUST AS IN THIS CASE].

MRS. VAN ROE, SPOKE WITH THE TWO (2) JURORS AFTER THE TRIAL... SHE INFORMED ME, THAT THE JURORS STATED, THEY NEVER BELIEVED THE WITNESS STORY FROM THE START... THERE WAS NEVER NO DOUBT IT WAS A LIE. [THIS CASE IS WORSE].

80
WHY DID THE TWO (2) JURORS ~~HOLE OUT~~ ON THE SECOND MURDER. ESPECIALLY, WHEN THEY VOTED "NOT GUILTY" ON THE ASSAULT. (WHAT FACTOR PLAYED A PART). WAS IT HERSTEIN'S PRESENTATION THAT I WAS GUILTY, ARE HAD THE D.A. INITIATED SOME KINDA PRIVATE TACTIC PROBABLY BOTH... "AFTER THE VERDICT (ACON)

REC#
39

was announced. Herstein immediately jumped up (almost) running to the D.A... as soon as he started - whispering into the D.A. ear. I shouted, there's no deal!

My words stopped Herstein in his tracks... He stood, turned around - head, shoulder and back slumped... slowly walked an slumping back into his chair... injected on his face were all the convinced features, I had used to describe his demeanor at different stages an proceedings.. including new ones, hopelessness an defeat.

THE MAN would not even look at me... I remember thinking:

"Look at him - he look like a real live snake! I actually had a vision - the man head was no different than a rattle snake, and the snake tongue was curling outta his mouth. (THOSE ISN'T JUST CONVERSATIONAL WORDS EITHER)."

To conclude with the story, hopefully bringing over-all clarity to the picture/case, and the type of extreme abuse, that is "prevalent" throughout the Los Angeles cartoon(s).

(As I stated from the beginning of this letter, I wanted to provide one with a final and definitive about any (over)

40

COUNTER MOVES (DEFENSE), DIVERSIONS, ASSASSINATION ATTEMPTS AGAINST MY PRESENT CHARGES).

ONE ONLY NEED TO APPLY THE INFORMATION I HAVE PROVIDED, IN FACTUAL STATEMENTS AND QUESTIONING FORMS AGAINST ANYTHING THEY MAY COUNTER WITH... (IF, ONE SEEKING THE TRUTH)... THE LAW IS THE LAW — THEY HAVE DEFINITELY BROKEN IT!.

You GRP, I JUST GOT THE VERDICT BACK... BUT, THE CASE IS NOT OFFICIALLY OVER AT THIS STAGE. (THE HUNG JURY - MISTRIAL... ON ONE CHARGE).

AFTER THE JUDGE EXPLAINED AND RELEASED THE JURY... HE TURNED TO HERSTEIN AND STATED, I'M RELEASING YOU FROM THIS CASE. THERE'S BEEN A PROBLEM BETWEEN YOU AND MR. JOHNSON SINCE THE TRIAL STARTED.

AT SOME POINT, I MIGHT STEP IN, AND SAY ENOUGH IS ENOUGH... OTHERWISE, I WOULD BE NEGLECTING MY OBLIGATIONS AND DUTIES AS A JUDGE.

HERSTEIN, SHOT STRAIGHT UP FROM HIS SUNKEN POSITION TO CONTEST HIS REMOVAL (SPEAKING IN A WAY THAT TOTALLY SURPRISED ME - FORCE) SAYING THERE'S NO PROBLEM WITH HIM - THE PROBLEM LAY WITH ME.

THE JUDGE WAS CLEARLY DISTRESSED AND DEPRESSED, WITH TEARS IN

7
DO YOU MEAN THERE'S NO PROBLEM? THERE IS A SERIOUS PROBLEM!... YOU EVEN ASKED ME TO HAVE MR. FISHER (CONTINUE) WRAPPED IN CHAINS! (I JUST SHOOK MY HEAD)

HERSTEIN,

TURNED BEET RED AND SLUMPED BACK INTO HIS CHAIR. ALL ARGUMENTS GONE. (IT GOES WITHOUT SAYING, NO LAWYER WHO'S SINCERELY REPRESENTING AN HOLDING A INDIVIDUAL INTEREST AT HEART, IS GOING TO REQUEST THAT PERSON BE WRAPPED IN CHAINS.)

THE JUDGE DELIBERATION AND DECISION, SUBSTANTIATED AN IMPELLED - THAT HERSTEIN HAD BEEN WORKING TOTALLY AGAINST ME.

A COUPLE OF MONTHS LATER - THE JUDGE would STRONGLY LET THE D.A. KNOW ABOUT HIS WITNESS... THE D.A. SAID NOTHING IN DEFENSE OF THE WITNESS (I REPEAT AN EMPHASIS - THERE WAS NO DOUBT, THE WITNESSES) WAS LYING WHEN THEY DECIDED TO USE THEM!).

THIS CASE (D.R.) IS WORSE... THE SAME D.A. (CLEARLY A CONFLICT). BUT, THE D.A. SPECIFICALLY HAD, PICKED ONE OF THE ATTORNEYS (I HAVE STATED THE CONNECTION IN ONE OF MY COMPLAINT). THE SECOND ATTORNEY (THE ONE I "HAD" TO ATTACK) WAS ALSO HARD PRESSED. (THE Taint of the Connection is Traceable)

THIS IS WHERE THEIR PROBLEMS COME FROM; THEY DON'T GRASP OR APPRECIATE THAT I CAN'T OFF (OVER)

77

THE STREETS [WHAT'S - SOUTH CENTRAL] BEING CONSCIOUS
AN KNOWNLEDGEABLE TO THE CONSTITUTION, STRUCTURE,
AND WORKING MECHANISM OF THE LAW... IN THE
FORM I AM FASHION, I HAD AN WAS DEMONSTRATE
IN ONE COMPLAINT I USED THE WORD (OBSESSED)
TO DESCRIBE THE "LAUGH I HAD ATTACKED"-MIND
STATE... BUT IT WENT MUCH FURTHER THAN THAT.

THIS
IS/WAS CLEAR "TRINITYL PSYCHOSES AN DISSONANCE
OR COGNITIVE DISSONANCE". THEIR ENTIRE MENTAL
STATE BECAME DETACHED FROM REALITY, THE EVIDENCE
AN SIGNS... ALL THEIR LEGAL AN DEFETFUL METHODS,
FORMS OF MANIPULATION, OR ATTEMPTS TO DISOURAGE
ME FROM ASSERTING AN REPRESENTING MYSELF,
WITH LEGALLY CORRECT AN FACTUAL INFORMATION
WAS USELESS.

I HAD ONE LEGAL, UNCONFRONTING,
SOUND AN SIBBLE OBJECTIVE (SILENCE)... TO ENSURE
(UNDER "ANY" AND "ALL" CIRCUMSTANCES) THAT IT
WOULD BE CLEAR I IT - THEY KNEW, THEY WERE
ENGAGED AN COMMITTING A CRIME.

(OVER A DECADE
AGO) I HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO MEET THESE
PSYCHOLOGISTS HE STATED TO ME. (AFTER SEVERAL VISITS).
PEOPLE HAD TRIED TO MAKE HIM THINK I WAS
CRAZY... HE INQUIRED, HAD I EVER HEARD
THE SAYING - THAT 90% OF THE PEOPLE IN THE
WORLD GOES THROUGH LIFE NOT REALLY KNOWING,
OR SEEING ..WHAT GODS AN ANGELS ARE DOING.

I ANSWERED, NO. (IT WOULD BE THE FIRST TIME THAT I EVER HEARD THIS STATEMENT - BUT NOT MY LAST.)

HE REPLIED; WELL IT'S TRUE... THAN THERE'S THAT 10% - WHICH CONSCIENCE AN, ALL PART OF THEIR SURROUNDING, AND ALL THE THINGS GOING ON AROUND THEM. (STATING THAT I WAS ONE OF THE 10%).

REALITY IS A VERY COLD THING,
AND MOST PEOPLE CANNOT ACCEPT OR DEAL WITH
IT - BUT I DID. HE STATED. AND I CALLED THINGS
AS THEY ARE. AND THIS IS WHERE MY PROBLEMS
COME IN AT. BECAUSE I REFUSE TO ACCEPT
OTHERS DIVERSIONS FROM REALITY - BY DELATING,
PRETENDING, SAYING OR DOING THINGS, THAT
HAVE BEEN CREATED AS ESCAPE AND DEFENSE
MECHANISMS - JUST TO BE ACCEPTED, AND TO
GET BY. IGNORANCE... IT'S UNACCEPTABLE - SO THEY LABEL
YOU. HE CONCLUDED.

HE HAD ALSO STATED, I
WAS MORE ADVANCED [COMPREHENSION] THAN MY
AGE, IN BREAKING DOWN AN ADDRESSING
ISSUE. [50% ANGRY]

I WOULD HEAR FROM
ONE OF ~~THE~~ INDIVIDUAL(S) I ASSOCIATED
WITH - THAT I HAD A COLD WAY OF SPEAKEN
THE TRUTH... THAT MY WORDS HURT, OR TALKED
ONE HEART... THAT INDIVIDUALS WOULD REJECT ME
MANY. EVEN THOUGH ONE WOULD KNOW THEY'RE

44
TRUE BECAUSE MOST INDIVIDUALS DO NOT WANT TO ACCEPT THE TRUTH, DEAL WITH IT, OR JUST DO NOT CARE.

AS FAR AS MY KNOWLEDGE TOWARDS THE LAWS AND CONSTITUTION...

I TOOK IT UPON MYSELF TO LEARN ABOUT THE RULES OF LAW... I PLACED A SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNT OF TIME IN THE LAW BOOKS.

BUT, JUST READING OUTLINE OF WHAT ONE PROSES, AND OTHER PROCEDURAL ISSUES STATED - WAS JUST THE TOP OF THE ICEBERG...

I HAD THIS ENCOUNTER WITH THE POLITICAL SCIENCE TEACHER... WHO MADE SURE GOVERNMENT TO ME, (ESPECIALLY THE U.S.) HE DRILLED THE U.S CONSTITUTION AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS INTO ME.

BUT MOST IMPORTANTLY - HE MADE SURE I KNEW THAT GOVERNMENT WAS NOT TO BE TAKEN LIGHTLY... (NEITHER OTHER THINGS)

MOST OF THIS STUFF WOULD LAY DORMANT UNTIL 1996... WHEN ON DECEMBER, THE 17th, I WAS BROUGHT INTO THE COURTROOM AND SEEN THE APPARENT, INTENTIONAL AND TOTAL DISREGARD FOR MY CONSTITUTIONAL AND EQUAL RIGHTS WHICH DON'T COUNT IN - 1511.. 11/00/97

BS
THE MOMENT I WAS ALLOWED TO BE BROUGHT
INTO THE COURT HOUSE, LET ALONE THE COURT ROOM,
IT BECAME A UNREFUTABLE TRINITY [ENHANCED
ADDED]

MY SUBCONSCIOUS THOUGHT (GRASP THE
PERIODIC RISING AND THREAT) STARTED PUSHING
FORWARD THE INFORMATION THAT HAD BEEN
LAYING DORMANT.

AS IT BECAME NECESSARY,
FOR ME TO START SPEAKING FOR MYSELF
(REPRESENTING)... I RECALL THE DAY I TOOK
THE FIRST STEP. IT WAS UNDER HOSTILE,
AGGRESSIVE AND THREATENING CONDITIONS,
FROM THE JUDGE.

ON 2/19/97 THE JUDGE,
DECLARATION OF, ME ACTING OUT AN DIS-
RESPECTING THE -6-TO-7 GOOD ATTORNEY'S
I HAD BEEN GIVEN, AND, THAT I HAD
RAN OFF... THAT THEY HAD, WAYS TO MAKE
ME GO ALONG WITH THE PROGRAM, AND
~~DO~~ I UNDERSTAND. (AS THE JUDGE WAS
SPEAKING... I TRANSLATED THE REAL MEANING
BEHIND HIS WORDS).

I TOOK THIS AS MY
DUE TO RESPOND - BECAUSE MY EARLIER
REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE COURT HAD BEEN
DENIED.

I STOOD AND AFFIRMATIVELY STATED, NO!
I DON'T UNDERSTAND! BUT, WHAT I DO UNDERSTAND

stand is, my Constitutional and Civil Rights
was being intentional violated... that my
arrest was illegal (plus detention) that
everything being done to me was illegal...
and the rights I had - concerning any lawyer
who tried to get on the case ("meanwhile, I
could make factual inquiries into the law and
my case - and scrutinize the issues by the
law-utilizing Pacific Law (U.S. Supreme
Court) to support my position").

Once I started
speaking - one could see the transformation on
the judge face... than as we exchanged dia-
logue, it became more pronounced (features),
the judge voice became very civil, and his
demeanor said it all - he was shocked.

(I
have stated before, I really did not want
to represent myself - even though I was
without a doubt - that I had the ability,
an comprehension to do so if forced...
I would be forced).

I recall a second
judge, staring at me after speaking in
another proceeding, then leaning forward
and stating - You missed your calling, Card.
I remember just smiling - but thinking
to myself, this is my calling card - expecting
me to pull out a ruler when I sit down in court.

#51
I want you to know my comprehension is, based on tests... I must give thanks to the woman who took the test - but mostly to what she stated to me afterwards.

AS

THE CLASS WAS RELEASED - SHE CALLED OUT MY NAME AND ASKED ME TO STEP FORWARD... SHE THEN INQUIRED, HAD I DONE THE TEST (TO BE HONEST - I thought I had done very bad) I REPLIED, YEAH.

SHE THEN FAIRLY STATED THIS IS VERY GOOD - THIS IS EXCELLENT... IF YOU DID THIS TEST - YOU DON'T LET NO ONE TELL YOU THAT YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT YOUR TALKING ABOUT. ARE WHAT THEIR TALKING ABOUT... YOU UNDERSTAND EXACTLY WHAT THEY MEAN - YOUR MIND GRASP THINGS.

I REMEMBER, LOOKING DOWN STEROTYPING THIS WOMAN - THINKING, HERE ANOTHER WHITE PERSON WHO MUST THINK ALL BLACK PEOPLE ARE STUPID... I WAS REALLY INDIFFERENT TO HER.

(I like to state, I DO NOT BELIEVE IN SUPERSTITION - NEITHER DO I PROFESS TO FOLLOW ANY PARTICULAR RELIGION... BUT I DO BELIEVE IN FATE, INTUITION AND PREMONITION - I HAVE ANALYZED THOSE CERTAIN WORDS - OVER AND OVER AGAIN TO DESIRE AND ENTERTAIN...) IT WAS AS IF THE WOMAN (or a

Ao
HAD READ MY THOUGHTS - PLUES, SHE HAD A DUTY
TO DRIVE THIS MESSAGE INTO MY HEAD... I CAN
ONLY DESCRIBE THE URGENT ATTITUDE AT THIS
POINT WITH THE WORD - METAMORPHOSIS.

SHE SHOUTED FIRMLY, NO DAMMIT! LOOK AT ME!

I ANGRILY LOOKED UP (EYE CONTACT) THINKING;
WHAT'S WRONG WITH THIS BROAD - SHE MUST
BE CRAZY - WHO SHE THINK SHE'S TALKING
TO LIKE THAT! (BUT, SHE HAD MY UNDIVIDED
ATTENTION)

SHE CONTINUED, NO! YOU DON'T UNDER-
STAND! THESE DOCUMENTS DON'T LIE!... IF YOU
DO THIS TEST - YOU DON'T LET ANYONE, ANY
ONE, TELL YOU - YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE
TALKING ABOUT!

I DON'T GIVE A DAM WHO
THEY ARE! WHETHER THEIR JUDGES OR LAWYERS,
IT DOESN'T MATTER - YOU UNDERSTAND VERY WELL!
WHATEVER YOU READ YOU GRASP, AND YOU DON'T
MISS NOTHING - YOU CATCH ALL THE HIDDEN
CLUES, ~~PARTIES~~ AN LITTLE THINGS THAT THE
AVERAGE PERSON MISSES!

YOUR COMPREHENSION IS
EXCELLENT - AND DON'T LET ANYONE EVER TELL
YOU OTHERWISE... DO YOU UNDERSTAND ME!! I
REPLIED, YES!

HER ATTUNE ACT. L. + 100%)

29

NORMA... SHE LOOKED DOWN AT THE TEST AND REPEATED HER ORIGINAL WORDS - THIS IS VERY GOOD - THIS IS EXCELLENT... THEN TOLD ME I COULD LEAVE.

I LEFT THAT ROOM. I EXPLICITLY RECALL BEING PERPLEXED, THINKING AND QUESTIONING,

WHAT JUST ACCURRED IN THAT ROOM - WHY HAD SHE SPOKEN TO ME IN THE WAY SHE HAD - AND WHY DID SHE SPECIFICALLY MENTION JUDGES AND LAWYERS. WAS SHE HAVING A PREMONITION OF SOMETHING GOING TO HAPPEN IN THE FUTURE - WAS IT A WARNING!

AT THAT POINT I BECAME VERY IRRITATED - BECAUSE I KNEW AND TOLD MYSELF,

IF IT'S A PREMONITION - THAT MEANS SOMEWHERE DOWN THE ROAD IN MY LIFE... SOMEWHERE IN THE UNFORESEEABLE FUTURE - I'M IN SOME TYPE OF SERIOUS TROUBLE, AND I'M DEFENDING MYSELF AGAINST THOSE TYPES OF PEOPLE. I TRULY HOPE NOT, I STATED TO MYSELF...

(THEN THERE, ALSO THE OTHER SIDE OF THE EQUATION IN MY THOUGHTS) ARE THAT WOMAN IN THAT ROOM WAS STONE CRAZY... HAD A CERTAIN PROBLEM, AND NEEDED SOME SERIOUS HELP. IT'S ONE OR THE OTHER, I TOLD MYSELF.

(I SHOULD NOTE: THIS ENCOUNTER

160
HAPPENED OVER A DECADE AGO.

PLUS, MY VOCABULARY
WAS MUCH MORE EXTENSIVE AND FLUENT THAN NOW.
(THAT'S AN HONEST DESCRIPTION). BASICALLY, SINCE
I CHOOSE NOT TO PURSUE ANY FIELD TO MAIN-
TAIN AND ENHANCE IT - HALF THE WORDS IN MY
VOCABULARY would BECOME DORMANT OR DULL,
BECAUSE OF WHAT I BECOME AN INTENTIONAL SUPPRESSION!
Still, I would CONSCIOUSLY MAINTAIN MORE
THAN ENOUGH TO DEFEND MYSELF WITH CLEARITY
AGAINST ANYTHING AND ANYONE...

BUT, MY INFORMATION BANK
would BECOME MORE REFINED, DEFINED, AND
POLISHED - BUT LESS INTUITIVE... WITH ALL
THE RIGHT INFORMATION MY ATTACK AND DEFENSE
CAN BECOME UNHOLY...

I'M NOT BOASTING - NOR
AM I SPEAKING THROUGH VAGERY - BUT
THROUGH MODESTY AND THE TRUTH...

THE COURT
RECOGNIZED THIS TRUTH. IT'S ON RECORD THOSE
LAWYERS WERE TERRIFIED - THEY TRIED TO EN-
SURE MY WORDS WERE SUPPRESSED AT ANY AND
ALL COST - ACTS OF DESPERATION).

THE WOMAN
EVENTUALLY CALLED ME BACK TO TAKE THE
TEST AGAIN - AS THE CLASS WAS LEAVING,
SHE CALLED OUT - MR. JOHNSON REMEMBER
WHAT TO TELL YAH - AND I REPLIED - I DO...

5

AS I STEPPED AWAY FROM THAT ROOM - I TOLD
NEVER HAS I INTENDED THE IMPACT AN INFLUENCE,
THAT WOMAN AND HER WORDS WOULD MAKE A
DETAILED LATER.

IN THE COURSE OF THEM TRYING
TO DISOURAGE ME FROM REPRESENTING THIS
DEATH ROW D.P.G. CASE (FEELING THEIR ILLEGAL
CONDUCT) WITH ALL THEIR INTERFERENCES - AND
SIDE STEPPING AND DODGING PLAYING ALL THE OBVIOUS
FACTS AND ISSUES - (IRINE).

THAT WOMAN WORDS
WOULD FLASH INTO MY THOUGHTS, I WOULD TELL
MYSELF - THIS WHAT SHE MIGHT HAVE BEEN TALKING
ABOUT.. BUT MORE STRANGELY DURING TWO OF
THE MOST DESTROYING FEEDS IN THE COURT
ROOMS,

I ACTUALLY RECEIVED VIVID VERSIONS
OF THIS WOMAN SPEAKEN TO ME (NO FIG-
MENT OF MY IMAGINATION, NOR WAS I
HALLUCINATING - NEITHER WAS I THINKING
ABOUT THE WOMAN.. I WAS TOTALLY SURPRISED,

AS THEY INTENSIFIED THEIR LEGAL AND IRONIC
OBJECTIVE TO GET ME CONVICTED, AND TO DIS-
OURAGE ME FROM EXPOSING THE IRGE FOR
WHAT IT WAS - A SHAM!... WHEN THEY REALIZED
THAT WASN'T POSSIBLE - THEY KNEW THEY DID
NOT HAVE A REALED CHANCE OF WINNING A-
BRING ME IF WE WENT TO TRIAL (ESPECIALLY
IF I PURGE THEIR MESS). THEY MOVED TO

58

HAVE ME TOTALLY REMOVED.

THE REPORTS ARE
ABOUT I AM THE ONLY ONE MAKING ANY TYPE
OF SOUND CHALLENGES TO, THE MERIT OF
THE CHARGES. PERIOD!

I would ~~break~~
THE ABOVE, FAULT, AND THE FAULT THEY
WERE SPEAKING IN ONE (D) TONGUE. (AS A
TEAM)... IT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH
THE LAW - THERE WAS NO SUBSTANCE
BEYOND THEIR WORDS, OR SOUND LEGAL
PRACTICE THEY WERE FOLLOWING... IT WAS
LAW SERVICE. (PLAIN AND SIMPLE... I CAN
BREAK DOWN THEIR WORDS TO SUBSTANTIATE
MY CLAIMS - ENDLESS AND SO).

IT WAS SO
BAD THAT I TOLD MYSELF, THESE PEOPLE DONT
BE SERIOUS - BECAUSE WHAT THEIR DOING
THEIR NOT GOING TO BE ABLE TO COVER
IT UP.

IT WAS OBVIOUS TO ME [GARDNER],
THAT THERE WAS A LINE IN THE COURT ROOM.,
ONE SIDE WITH THE RULES OF LAW - WHICH
I WAS ADDRESSING...

ON THE OTHER SIDE OF
THE LINE WAS THE LAWYERS - WHERE NO LAW
WAS BEING FOLLOWED...

I STARTED TO REACT.

53

would be the first time that abnjan / instructed
FBI would appear telling me, MR JOHNSON
You know what you talking about - don't
second guess yourself.

THE SECOND TIME SHE
APPEAR - I'M ASKING MYSELF WHAT ARE THEY
TALKING ABOUT, IT DOESN'T EVEN MAKE SENSE!!!
WHAT LAW ARE THEY PRACTICING - THE LAW
CLEARLY STATES WHAT THEIR DOING IS ILLEGAL.
ARE HAVE I BEEN READING "DIFFERENT BOOK".
SHE APPEAR AGAIN SAYING, MR JOHNSON YOU
KNOW WHAT, THE HELL YOUR TALKING ABOUT,
DON'T LOOK BACK NO MORE!

I would go on
A FULL SCALE ATTACK AGAINST THE PROCEEDINGS
AN THE [REDACTED] LAWYERS - I would throw
EVERY word I have levelled in THESE LETTERS
AN MORE AT THE RECORD.

I INFORMED THE
SECOND INDIVIDUAL who in THIS CASE [DEFENDANT].
THEIR STATEMENTS ALOT OF WHAT IM SAYING,
SPELLED WORDS - THEIR, ERASING, DELETING ETC.
BUT, THERE'S ALSO THE SUBTLE THINGS THEIR
MISSING. (WHICH I CAN BREAK DOWN).

I
CONCLUDED THEY WEREN'T TO BRIGHT - EVEN,
WITH ALL THEIR MINDS WORKING TOGETHER
AGAINST ME (4 LAWYERS TOTAL) THEY WERE
STILL PENEATED MY COMPREHENSION... (over)

54

THERE IS TOO MUCH MEETING FROM THE TRANSCRIPTS... I HAVE 85% OF THE RECORDS FROM THE PROCEEDING I WAS PRESENT AT... THE 15% THEY REFUSED TO PROVIDE.

"THE TRIAL I WASN'T PRESENT AT IS TOTALLY IRRELEVANT... (TRANSCRIPTS)."

AS I START TO CONCLUDE, I WOULD LIKE TO STATE TWO THINGS...
1) THERE'S A LAWYER, WHO'S WILLING TO MAKE A DECLARATION AND TAKE A OATH - THAT UPON MEETING THE LAWYER THAT I HAD ATTACKED [HABER]... THE MAN STATED, THAT HE HAD BEEN ATTACKED - THAT PEOPLE WERE ADVISING HIM TO GET OFF MY FACE... HABER STATED, HE WASN'T ABOUT TO NEED UP HIS CAREER BY GETTING OFF MY FACE.

THE LAWYER WHO HABER MADE THE ABOVE STATEMENT TO - INFORMED ME THEIR THOUGHTS WERE... WHAW! THIS MAN [HABER] IS DANGEROUS - HE SHOULDN'T BE PRACTICING LAW!

IT SHOULD BE STATED, THAT THE ONLY WAY THAT MAN [HABER] WAS IN JEOPARDY, IS IF HE HAD COMMITTED A CRIME - WHICH HE HAS.

ALSO, I HAD CALLED L.A.P.D INTERNAL AFFAIRS, AND REPORTED THE MATTER ...

55

WITH THE COURT. "1998" NO RESPONSE...

AND 2) THERE
 CAN BE NO JUSTIFICATION FOR THE LOS ANGELES
 COURTRoomS - NOT TO BE EQUIPPED WITH AUDIO
 AND VIDEO...

THIS IS AN INTENTIONAL AND CONSCIOUS
 DECISION TO SHIELD THE ABUSED IN THE COURT-
 ROOMS - NOT JUST HOW THEIR CONDUCTING THEIR
 HEARINGS, BUT TO SHED A LOT OF THOSE JUDGE'S
 CHARACTERS ALSO...

AS I STATED FOR THE RECORD,
 THE TRANSCRIPTS won't show THE HOSTILITY AND
 AGGRESSION BEING DIRECTED AGAINST ME. (BY
 THE JUDGE)... AT ANOTHER TIME I STATED, THEY
 WERE TRYING TO PROVOKE ME INTO ACTS OF
 AGGRESSION (ALTERATION).

THIS IS AN EVIDENT
 PROBLEM INSIDE THOSE COURTRoomS.. AND A FORM
 OF INTENdATION... BUT, DON'T JUST TAKE MY
 WORD FOR IT...

THE COMMISSION OF JUDICIAL
 PERFORMANCE DECLARED; (IN THE FALL OF 1998),
 THAT THEY HAVE RETAINED A LOT OF EXPERTS
 AGAINST JUDGES, BECAUSE OF HOW THEIR (A LOT)
 TREATING WITNESSES, LAWYERS, AND DEFENDANTS.
 [THAT THEIR OUTTA TOUCH WITH THE TIME], THAT,
 THEIR STILL CLINGING TO THE OLD WAY THEY
 NEED (CONSIDER) SENSITIVE TRAINING COURSES...
 I'M IN TOTAL DISAGREEMENT - THE (OVER)

56

ABOVE STATEMENT SPEAK FOR ITSELF AN MORE.
THESE PEOPLE ARE PART OF THE OLD CANCER IN
SOCIETY — THEY NEED TO BE RENMOVED-PURGED!
PERIOD...

AS I END, I TRUST THIS LETTER IS ~~LEGIBLE~~.
THIS IS THE SECOND HARDEST LETTER I HAVE EVER
WRITTEN — NEXT TO THE ONE TO THE LA TIMES
JOURNALIST... (I'M ALSO ENCLOSED A COPY OF
THAT LETTER).

I HAVE TRIED TO PROVIDE A GENERAL
AN INDICATE PICTURE OF THE ATMOSPHERE AN PERIOD
THAT IS REALLY OCCURRING IN THE LA COURT-
ROOMS.

I HAVE USED MY FILES, WHICH IS THOUSANDS
OF PAGES OF DOCUMENTS — BUT WHEN BROKEN DOWN
~~DISSECTED~~ IT WILL APPEAR AN TURN OUT EXACTLY LIKE
I HAVE STATED... UTILIZING THE PRECISE WORDS
TO DESCRIBE THEIR CONDUIT, IRONIES AN MOST
METHODS.

I JUST ASK, IF THERE IS ANY INQUIRIES
MADE ON MY BEHALF — PLEASE! LET NO ONE SPEAK
FOR ME, BUT ME... ARE CALL ME THEIR CLIENT,
THAT WOULD BE PERPETUATING AN SANCTIONING
THEIR IRONIES. (THE TIME FOR A GENUINE CHANGE,
THOSE WHAT MY ISSUES WILL BEING!)!

I LEAVE
YOU WITH THE WORDS OF A LATE PRESIDENT:
FACTS ARE STUBBORN THINGS, AND WHATEVER
MAY BE OUR TROUBLE IT...

JP#
S

THE DICTATES OF OUR PASSIONS, THEY CANNOT ALTER
THE STATE OF FACTS AND EVIDENCE.

PRES. JOHN ADAMS...

THOSE CARTOONS ARE OUTTA CONTROL DOWN
THERE (LA!!)

MED 9/27/21

RESPECTFULLY
CEDRICK JOHNSON
Cedric Johnson...

P.S.

THE ORIGINAL DATE IS ON THE PREFACE
OF THIS LETTER. THIS IS THE ORIGINAL
LETTER (THE INK CAN VERIFY ITS OVER
2 YRS OLD). THE HAND COPIED LETTER
TURNED OUT TO BE 38 PAGES I AM
SENDING THIS AHEAD OF THAT LETTER,
WHICH IS MORE DETAILED.

ALSO, ENCLOSED IS THE OTHER DOCUMENT
(S) I MENTIONED IN THE LETTER,
ADDRESSING MY LEGAL MATERIAL⁽³⁾ WAS
BEING HELD. IT'S NOW '5" SET OF
DOCUMENT(S). I EXTEND MY APOLOGY
AGAIN FOR THE LONG DELAY. ALL
DATED ON DOCUMENTS SENT IS THE
cc. FACTUAL/ACTUAL DATES COMPLETED.

50
I WANT ONE TO KNOW, I AM UNDER NO ILLUSIONS, JAILS ARE A NECESSITY, AND HALF(½) OF THE INDIVIDUAL(S) IN THEM NEED TO BE THERE - THEIR PREDATORS.

NOR AM I CONTESTING THE DEATH PENALTY MY THOUGHTS ARE ALONG AN INDIFFERENT TO IT... THOUGH I DO BELIEVE THERE ARE INDIVIDUAL(S) WHO CRIME IS SO HIDEOUS, AND PREDATORY I CANNOT SEE NO OTHER JUST PUNISHMENT.

AS FAR AS A DETERRENT, THAT IS IN THE EYES OF THE BELIEVER. BUT I DO KNOW THIS,

THE MORNING AFTER THEY RESUMED EXECUTION IN CALIFORNIA, A YOUNG TEENAGER STATED TO ME, THEY KILLED THAT MAN (HARRIS) THIS MORNING, I'M NOT GOING TO EVER KILL, NOBODY. AND TO MY KNOWLEDGE IT/HE NEVER HAS... ALSO, INDIVIDUAL(S) IN THE CO. JAIL STATED, THAT'S WHY I DON'T DO NO SERIOUS CRIMES, I DON'T WANT THEM TRYING TO KILL ME (SO IT'S JUST HOW ONE SEE IT). SO DON'T/IT'S NOT MISUNDERSTOOD, THIS LETTER ISN'T A DIRECT CHALLENGE TO THE PRISON. NOR AM I CONTESTING THE D.P... THE ISSUE IS THE RULE OF LAW AND THE CONSTITUTION.

59.60

I WANT ONE TO KNOW, I AM UNDER NO ILLUSIONS, JAILS ARE A NECESSITY, AND HALF(YA) OF THE INDIVIDUAL(S) IN THEM NEED TO BE THERE - THEIR PREDATORS.

NOR AM I CONTESTING THE DEATH PENALTY. MY THOUGHTS ARE ALSO OF AN, INDIFFERENT; IT... THOUGH I DO BELIEVE THEIR ARE INDIVIDUAL(S) WHO CRIME IS SO VIDEO AND PREDATORY I CANNOT SEE NO OTHER JUST PUNISHMENT.

AS FAR AS A DETERRENT THAT IS IN THE EYES OF THE BELIEVER BUT I DO KNOW THIS,

THE MORNING AFTER THEY RESUMED EXECUTION IN CALIFORNIA A YOUNG TEENAGER STATED TO ME, THE KILL THAT MAN (HARRIS) THIS MORNING I'M NOT GOING TO EVER kill, NOBODY. AND TO MY KNOWLEDGE IT/HE NEVER HAS... ALSO, INDIVIDUAL(S) IN THE CO. JAIL STATED, THAT'S WHY I DON'T DO NO SERIOUS CRIMES, I DON'T WANT THEM TRYING TO kill ME (SO IT'S JUST HOW ONE SEE IT). SO DON'T /IT'S NOT MISUNDERSTOOD, THIS LETTER ISN'T A DIRECT CHALLENGE TO THE PRISON. NOR AM I CONTESTING THE D.P... THE ISSUE IS THE RULE OF LAW AND THE FAIRER PUNISHMENT WHICH

69
60

THE DICTATES OF OUR PASSIONS, THEY CANNOT ALTER
THE STATE OF FACTS AND EVIDENCE.

PRES. JOHN ADAMS

THOSE TALKERS ARE OUTTA CONTROL DOWN
THERE (LA!!)

DATED 7/27/21

PEACEFULLY,
TEDRII JOHNSON
Cedric Johnson...

P.S.

THE ORIGINAL DATE IS ON THE PREFACE
OF THIS LETTER. THIS IS THE ORIGINAL
LETTER (THE INFO CAN VERIFY ITS OVER
2 YRS OLD). THE HAND COPIED LETTER
TURNED OUT TO BE 88 PAGES. I AM
SENDING THIS AHEAD OF THAT LETTER,
WHICH IS MORE DETAILED.

ALSO, ENCLOSED IS THE OTHER DOCUMENT(S)
I MENTIONED IN THE LETTER,
ADDRESSING MY LEGAL MATERIAL(S), WAS
BEING HELD. IT'S NOW A "SET OF
DOCUMENTS". I EXTEND MY APOLOGY
AGAIN FOR THE LONG DELAY. ALL
DATES ON DOCUMENTS SENT IS THE
ce. FACTUAL / ACTUAL DATES. COMPLETED.