

19-6630

No.

Supreme Court, U.S.

FILED

SEP 26 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF  
THE UNITED STATES**

DANNEZ HUNTER an Individual, and Administrator  
Petitioner-Appellant

**vs.**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; KEITH RUPERT MURDOCH,  
JAMES RUPERT MURDOCH; LACHLAN K. MURDOCH,  
COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA; TWENTIETH CENTURY FOX FILM  
CORPORATION, FOX BROADCASTING COMPANY, MURDOCH FAMILY  
TRUST, AT&T INC., TIME WARNER INC., JEFF BEWKES;  
PAUL CAPPuccio; WARNER BROS. ENTERTAINMENT INC.; THE  
WALT DISNEY COMPANY; ERIC HOLDER; TERRELL MCSWEENEY,  
THOMAS O. BARNETT; MEGAN GERKING, JAMES R. DEAN;  
COVINGTON & BURLING LLP; DEAN N. PANOS; JENNER & BLOCK  
LLP, BILL CLINTON, HILLARY CLINTON, THE WILLIAM J.  
CLINTON FOUNDATION *et. al.*

Respondent - Appellees

No. 19-2293

No. 19-cv-00590 NEB-DTS

The Judge Nancy E. Brasel

Magistrate David T. Schultz

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

**Dannez W. Hunter**

1275 Lincoln Ave., St#1

St. Paul, MN 55105

Plaintiff-Appellant

*IN Propria Persona*

**ORIGINAL**

### Questions Presented

Whether to establish 1866 Civil Rights Act, Title 42 U.S.C. § 1981(a) against high-ranking government officials and officers of the court for dismantling RICO laws to the detriment of black nationals, while operating in concert to interfere with interstate and foreign commerce by the unlawful collection of debt in the amount of \$305,000 plus six-years interest using a Department of Justice email?

Whether Judge Nancy E. Brasel violated 18 U.S.C. § 1962(b), and my civil rights under the color of law by sanctioning Petitioner for adhering to Judge Terry J. Hatter's "Order" to state 20 detailed points for predicate acts of RICO in the case of Sophia Stewart vs. Warner Bros. Entertainment, Inc., 20th Century Fox Productions, James Cameron, et. al., No.: 2:03-cv-2873-MMM-VBK, Docket 4?

Whether Judge Nancy E. Brasel abused her authority by taking a bribe and directing 5 U.S. Marshals, 3 Court Deputies to block my entryway into the US District Court of Minnesota, while 4 St. Paul Police Officers observed, thus violated Chapter 73 Title 18 U.S.C. § 1509; in order to interfere with the enforcement of a \$3,500,000,000.00 UCC Lien against Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc. and Twenty-First Century Fox, Inc?

Whether the Judge Nancy Brasel, abused her authority illegally "immunizing" Fox and Warner Bros. for using "instrumentalities" of State and Executive Branch to steal a copyright in violation of 17 U.S.C. § 511(a)(b)?

Parties To The Proceedings

And Rule 29.6 Statement

Petitioner Dannez Westbrook Hunter is the plaintiff-appellant below.

Respondents are Keith Rupert Murdoch, James Murdoch, Lachlan K. Murdoch, The United States of America, Commonwealth of Australia, Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation, Fox Entertainment Group, LL, Twenty-First Century Fox, Inc., Fox Broadcasting Company, Murdoch Family Trust, Time Warner Inc., Jeff Bewkes, William P. Barr, Paul Cappuccio, Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc., Warner Media, LLC, Gary L. Ginsberg, Jessica Einhorn, Kate Chilton, Paul Watcher AT&T Inc., The Walt Disney Company, Hillary Clinton, Former Secretary of the United States, William J. Clinton, The William J. Clinton Foundation, a/k/a Bill, Hillary & Chelsea Clinton Foundation, Eric Holder, Former Attorney General, Covington & Burling, LLP, Terrell McSweeney, Andrew A. Ruffino, Thomas O. Barnett, Anne Y. Lee, James Dean, Megan Gerking, United States Department of Justice, Kathryn Ruemmler, Latham & Watkins, LLP, Tony West, Democratic National Committee, The Republican National Committee, James COMEY, Christopher Wray, Federal Bureau Of Investigation, U.S. Federal TRADE Commission, Joseph J. Simons, Mike Pompeo, U.S. Secretary Of State, U.S. House Of Representatives, Assistant United States Attorney Minneapolis, State OF Minnesota, Lori Swanson, Attorney General's Office For The State

OF Minnesota, Jonathan Moler, Barbara Dacy, Kathleen Brennan, Douglas Turner, Hanbery & Turner, P.A., Leah Janus, Fredrikson & Byron, P.A., John Duffy, Jeff Von Feldt, Jenel Sauber, Jane Anderson, Pondview Townhomes Of Woodbury Limited Partnership, Kevin Lindsey, Commissioner, Minnesota Department OF Human Rights, City Of Saint Paul, Washington County CDA, Dean N. Panos, Jason M. Bradford, Anthony M. Basich, Jenner & Block, LLP, CNN America, INC. and John Does 1 through 10

#### **OPINIONS BELOW**

On **September 4, 2019**, the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals took a bribe and rendered a fraudulent ruling based strictly to criminally shield their political parties. The Court will find the opinion of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Minnesota. The United States District Court refused to allow the United States Department of Justice to perform its mandatory oversight functions from the OCGS Department as required inside the D.O.J. RICO Manual. The Court is not allowed to dismiss RICO complaint without authorization from the OCGS.

#### **JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT**

This court has subject matter jurisdiction to examine the unlawful collection of debt prohibited under Title 18 U.S.C. 1962(a), making it a crime to "use or invest" any income derived from "a pattern of racketeering activity" or through "collection of an unlawful debt" to establish, acquire an interest in, or operate "any

enterprise" engaged in or affecting interstate commerce. **"Jurisdiction Power"** for the U.S. Constitution, 1866 Civil Rights Act<sup>1</sup>, 42 U.S.C. § 1981(a) "to make and enforce contracts," to sue for interference with the enforcement of a UCC Lien, be parties, and give evidence, to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real and personal property, and to full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of person and property, as is enjoyed by white citizens.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION

"The U.S. Supreme Court has supplemental jurisdiction for under title 18 U.S.C. 1962(c) whereby a 'pattern of racketeering activity' which requires proof of two or more predicate acts, to satisfy RICO's 'collection of unlawful debt' definition the government need only demonstrate a single collection.")

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISION FOR VULNERABLE ADULT

The Due Process Clause and Equal Protection Clause of the U.S. Constitution Fourteenth Amendment for black nationals provides: "No person shall . . . be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law, citing section 1. Vindictive

---

<sup>1</sup><https://www.fjc.gov/history/timeline/civil-rights-act-1866>

law enforcement to "punish a person because he has done what the law plainly allows . . . is a due process violation of the most basic sort. United States v. Goodwin, 457 U.S. 368, 372 (1982).

#### STATUTORY BACKGROUND

"The US antitrust statute specific to monopolies is Section 2 of the Sherman Act, 15 USC Section 2. It provides that '[e]very person who shall monopolize, or attempt to monopolize, or combine or conspire with any other person, law firm or persons, to monopolize any part of the trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, shall be deemed guilty of a felony'. US law recognises three separate violations that arise under this statute:"

- i) "a monopolization, which requires monopoly power, and anticompetitive conduct that helps to obtain or maintain that power;"
- ii) "attempted monopolization, which requires a dangerous probability of achieving monopoly power, anticompetitive conduct that threatens to help achieve that power and a specific intent to monopolize; and,"
- iii) "conspiracy to monopolize, which requires a conspiracy, a specific intent to monopolize and an overt act in furtherance of that conspiracy."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup><https://thelawreviews.co.uk/edition/the-dominance-and-monopolies-review-edition-7/1195771/united-states>


## THE COURT HAS STANDING

The Court has standing to remedy relief against violations of the Second Cause of Action for the civil complaint under 18 U.S.C. 1962(a), (b), and (c) setting forth the substantive prohibited activities making it unlawful to operate in concert to commit any such prohibited activities for the collection of unlawful debt under the color of law from a Vulnerable Adult. Each of the prohibited activities included an inurement scheme for any activities affecting or interfering with interstate and foreign commerce by means of organized extortion while attempting to defeat the enforcement of UCC lien in the amount of \$3,500,000,000.00. The necessary elements, proof of a pattern of racketeering activity" or "collection of unlawful debt" in the amount of \$305,000.00 over a 10 year window is obvious in this case. The Court has Standing to remedy relief for the "Second Cause of Action," because exhibits 73, 74 are irrefutable documentary evidence proving a pattern to "illegally collect unlawful debt" on 4 occasions in 10 years.

The Court has standing to remedy relief against violations of the Fourth Cause of Action for the civil complaint under 1866 Civil Rights Act 42 U.S.C. § 1981(a) due to interference with a UCC Lien. The Court has standing to remedy relief against violations of the Seventh Cause of Action for Mandatory

Restitution. The Court has standing to remedy relief against violations of the Eighth Cause of Action under 28 U.S.C. § 1605A(c)(1)(4)(d), because the injury occurred on American soil.

The Supreme Court is mandated under the law to remedy the Tenth Cause of Action for Defamation, because Lori Swanson, Jonathan Moler, Barbara Dacy and Kathleen Brennan used an FBI official complaint with Harvey Weinstein's name in the caption, as Barbara Dacy "framed" me as a black man for a false crime with a "Protection Order," with the aid of Law School Classmate Judge Mary Hannon. Harvey Weinstein settled for \$44,000,000.00<sup>3</sup> by September 20, 2019.



#### STATEMENT OF CASE

Over the period of 9-years, Petitioner asserts Eric Holder, Terrell McSweeney, Thomas O. Barnett, Covington

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.msn.com/en-us/movies/celebrity/harvey-weinstein-settles-sexual-assault-civil-suits-intentative-dollar44m-deal-reports/vi-AAHxWSD?ocid=spartandhp>



& Burling LLP, operated in concert stalking me and my family in violation of 18 U.S.C. 2261(A)(i)(i). Over the period of 9-years in preparation of the acquisitions, Petitioner avers Eric Holder, Terrell McSweeney, Thomas O. Barnett, Megan Gerking concocted an inurement scheme with the common objective to defeat Chapter 11 Bankruptcy proceeding, while simultaneously attempting to collect unlawful debt in the amount of \$305,000.00 under the color of law in contravention to prohibitions outlined in the Premier RICO Guidelines, Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations dated April 2019 citing title 18 U.S.C. 1962(b). The U.S. Federal Courts cannot have it both ways. The Supreme Court is not allowed to exceed its statutory authority to violate the Supervisory role of the OCGS, and fail to comply with ethics rules while Eric Holder as the former Attorney General used lonnie.bryan@usdoj.gov email; in order to collect \$305,000.00 in violation of Title 18 U.S.C. 1962(b). In the current case, the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals and the U.S. District Court of Minnesota dismantled both the RICO laws and the Antitrust in the United States due racial hatred against blacks and stole property exactly like the Nazi's in Nuremberg, of which, precipitated The United States of America vs. Josef Altstötter, et al., Military Tribunal III, Council Law No. 10, 1946-1949, Vol. III (1951).

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Questions Presented.....	i
Parties To The Proceedings	
Rule 29.6 Statement.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	ix
Table of Authorities.....	viii
Cases.....	xi
Petition For Writ of Certiorari.....	1
Argument.....	1
Opinions Below.....	iii
Jurisdiction Statement.....	iii
Supplemental Jurisdiction.....	iv
Constitutional and Statutory Provision Involved For Vulnerable Adult..	iv
Statutory Background.....	iv
The Court Has Standing.....	vi
Statement of Case.....	vi, vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	xi
I.    STATEMENT OF FACTS.....	2
A.    Conspiracy to obstruct Justice...	3
B.    Bribing Judges to cover up perjury.....	3
C.    Abuse of the Judicial and Penal Process...	3

D.	Subversive Foreign Terrorists Rupert Murdoch, James Murdoch, Lachlan Murdoch and James Cameron's Bribery of Federal Judges.....	6
E.	Adjudicated Facts.....	13
F.	Foreign Terrorists File Three Terrorist Liens in Three Federal Courts.....	14
G.	Pattern of RICO Conspiracy And Shared Criminal Purpose	
H.	Manner And Means To "Employ" Intimidation Tactics Against the U.S. Department of Justice.....	33
I.	Pattern of RICO Conspiracy And Common Scheme.....	37
I.	CONCLUSION.....	39
II.	PRAYER FOR RELIEF.....	40
	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
<b>UNITED STATES COPYRIGHT OFFICE</b>	
<b>REGISTRATION:</b>	
Stewart, Sophia <i>"The Third Eyes,"</i>	
United States Copyright Registration:	
TXU 117-610, May 1,	
1981.....	106
<b>UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE:</b>	
UCC Lien File Number: 09-7206985753,	
dated 09/09/09.....	1
 UCC Amended Lien File Number: 11-	
7276091145, dated July 8,	
2011,.....	1
<b>FEDERAL CASES:</b>	
<i>Sophia Stewart vs. Jonathan Lubell et.</i>	
<i>al.</i> , (No.:2:07-CV-552-DB-EJF),	
Docket 288.....	3, 13, 24
<i>Sophia Stewart vs. Jonathan Lubell et.</i>	
<i>al.</i> , (No.:2:07-CV-552-DB-EJF),	
Docket 283, page 4.....	14, 18
United States v. Goodwin, 457 U.S. 368,	
372 (1982).....	iv
United States vs. Got, 910 F.2d 1184,	
1194 (4th Cir. 1990).....	19

The United States of America vs. Josef Altstötter, et al., Military Tribunal III, Council Law No. 10, 1946-1949, Vol. III (1951).. <viii< td=""><td></td></viii<>	
The United States of America vs. The Walt Disney Company, Twenty-First Century Fox Inc., No.: 1:18-cv- 05800-CM, Docket 21 , page 11 of 18.....	22
United States v. Vogt, 910 F.2d 1184, 1194(4th Cir. 1990).....	19
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONAL LAW:	
U.S. Constitution Fourteenth Amendment.....	4
1866 Civil Rights Act.....	i, iii, vi
FEDERAL LAWS:	
United States Sentencing Commission RICO Guidelines, Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations dated April 2019.....	3
United States Sentencing Commission RICO Guidelines, Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations dated May 2018.....	41
CRIMINAL RICO: 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968, A Manual For Federal Prosecutors.....	2
Antitrust Civil Processing Act 1938.....	19
Clayton Act.....	22

The Hatch Act.....34

The Hobbs Act.....36

**UNITED STATES CODES:**

15 U.S.C. § 1.....3

15 U.S.C. § 15.....22

15 U.S.C. § 1311(e).....20

15 U.S.C. § 1311(J).....20

15 U.S.C. § 1122.....39

17 U.S.C. § 511(a) (b).....39, 40

18 U.S.C. § 2(b).....28

18 U.S.C. § 3.....34, 38

18 U.S.C. § 152(7).....7, 28

18 U.S.C. § 152(8).....28

18 U.S.C. § 201(2) (A) (B) (C).....7, 35

18 U.S.C. § 249(a) (1) (A).....39

18 U.S.C. § 371.....39

18 U.S.C. § 607(a) (1).....7, 35

18 U.S.C. § 792.....28

18 U.S.C. § 983(D) (iii).....8, 36

18 U.S.C. § 983(D) (iv).....34, 35

18 U.S.C. § 1030.....18

18 U.S.C. § 1341.....37

18 U.S.C. § 1342.....10

18 U.S.C. § 1343.....37

18 U.S.C. § 1505.....7, 35

18 U.S.C. § 1506.....36

18 U.S.C. § 1509.....1, 5, 28

18 U.S.C. § 1510(a).....38

18 U.S.C. § 1512 (g) (1) (2) .....	36
18 U.S.C. § 1512 (b) (3) .....	7
18 U.S.C. § 1513 (b) (1) .....	9
18 U.S.C. § 1519 .....	28
18 U.S.C. § 1621 .....	36
18 U.S.C. § 1622 .....	28, 36
18 U.S.C. § 1623 (a) .....	36
18 U.S.C. § 1951 (b) (1) .....	36
18 U.S.C. § 1951 (b) (2) .....	36
18 U.S.C. § 1951 (b) (1) (2) .....	34
18 U.S.C. § 1956 (2) (A) (B) .....	28
18 U.S.C. § 1956 (7) (A) (iv) .....	38, 39
18 U.S.C. § 1956 (7) (A) (B) .....	28
18 U.S.C. § 1956 (7) (B) (ii) (iv) .....	28
18 U.S.C. § 1957 (f) (2) .....	38
18 U.S.C. § 1961 (1) (B) .....	7, 32, 36
18 U.S.C. § 1962 (a) .....	6, 18, 19
18 U.S.C. § 1962 (b) .....	i, vii
18 U.S.C. § 1962 (c) .....	28
18 U.S.C. § 2331 (5) (B) (i) (ii) ....	34, 36
18 U.S.C. § 3501 (d) .....	28, 32
18 U.S.C. § 3501 (e) .....	32, 36
28 U.S.C. § 144 .....	13
28 U.S.C. § 455 (5) (ii) .....	13
42 U.S.C. § 1981 .....	i, vi
50 U.S.C. § 1708 (2) (A) (B) (i) .....	32
50 U.S.C. § 3021 (h) .....	32, 34
52 U.S.C. Section § 152 (5) (6) .....	25

**UNITED STATES SENTENCING GUIDELINES:**

USSG § 2X1.1.....	7
USSG § 2B1.1(18).....	7
USSG §2B1.1(8)(c), Subsec.(b)(9)(A) ..	41

**COMMERCE FEDERAL REGULATION:**

28 CFR 36.206(b).....	36
28 CFR 36.206(c)(3).....	3, 34

**MINNESOTA STATUTES:**

Minn. Stat. § 609.05, Subd. 1.....	28
Minn. Stat. § 609.749, Subd. 2(1) ..	41

**NO IMMUNITY:**

15 U.S.C. § 1122.....	39
17 U.S.C. § 511(a)(b).....	39, 40
28 U.S.C. § 1346(b).....	
28 C.F.R. § 35.178.....	

**MISCELLANEOUS:**

Police Report complaint 18176874.....

**MISCELLANEOUS**

N.R.S. § 199.520(1)(2).....	28, 32
N.R.S. § 199.520(2).....	32, 35
Article 20, § 14.115.....	7
Article 20, § 14.118.4.....	36



## **PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

COMES NOW, DANNEZ HUNTER PETITIONER brings forth this Notice and Petition for a Writ of Certiorari against the United States of America as its officers, and agents who operated in concert to affect and interfere with interstate and foreign commerce by means of organized extortion, unlawful collection of debt under the color of law, while framing the victim for false crimes; in order to usher through acquisitions by AT&T Inc. of Time Warner and The Walt Disney Company of Twentieth Century Fox Inc.; in order to defeat the collection and enforcement of a Sacramento, Uniform Commercial Code Lien File Number: 09-7206985753, dated 09/09/09 in the amount of \$3,500,000,000.00, and the UCC Amended Lien File Number: 11-7276091145, thus constituting obstruction of justice in violation of Chapter 73, Title 18 U.S.C. § 1509:

### **Argument:**

"Whoever, by threats or force, willfully prevents, obstructs, impedes, or interferes with, or willfully attempts to prevent, obstruct, impede, or interfere with, the due exercise of rights or the performance of duties under any order, judgment, or decree of a court of the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"No injunctive or other civil relief against the conduct made criminal by this section shall be denied on the ground that such conduct is a crime."

# **I. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

To date the United States of America has allowed its Government high-ranking officials, officers, from the Antitrust Division of the D.O.J. to carried out organized extortion, intimidation under the color of law with the objective to interfere and defeat collection by Sophia Stewart, as well as, restrain her lawful rights of ownership for the Terminator and Matrix franchises. To date, Sophia Stewart has been obstructed from bringing to market "Matrix 4: The Evolution Cracking the Genetic Codes," Registration Number: Pau003478780 dated July 20, 2010., and Terminator 5(The Hologram Clones), PAu003654515 dated May 08, 2013.

In the case now before the Court Political Operatives Judges Nancy Brasel and David Schultz, absent statutory authority injured me by stripping me of all my inalienable rights, and engaged in a campaign of intimidation after taking bribes from Keith Rupert Murdoch, David Ellison, AT&T Inc. Time Warner Inc., Twenty-First Century Fox Inc. or threatening me as the Administrator of Sophia Stewart's \$3,500,000,000.000 UCC Lien because I assisted or encouraging an individual who owns federal intangible copyright owner and is entitled to claim her rights after obtaining a Final Judgement granted or protected by the Act or this part to exercise those

rights in violation of 36 CFR  
28.206(c)(3).

**A. Conspiracy to obstruct Justice:**

In the case now before the Court Political Operatives Nancy Brasel and David Schultz, absent statutory authority injured me by stripping me of all my inalienable rights, due process rights as a citizen to redress complaints to U.S. Federal Courts and enabled intimidation or threatening any person, because that person is assisting or encouraging an individual or group entitled to claim the rights granted or protected by the Act in violation of the 1866 Civil Rights Act.

**B. Bribing Judges to cover up perjury:**

Petitioner asserts the United States of America became liable for allowing its officers of the court to operate in concert to commit fraud in contravention of *Sophia Stewart vs. Jonathan Lubell, et. al*, 2:07-cv-552 DB-EJF, Docket 288 being a Final Judgment Order, thus invoking violations of USSG § 2B1.1(8)(c).

**C. Abuse of the Judicial and Penal Process:**

In this case now before the Court, the United States of America allowed it's officers of the court to commit fraud in contravention of an existing Final Judgment Order and interfered with interstate commerce to prevent Sophia Stewart from exercising exclusive rights to control her intellectual property and restrained her ability to trade and bring new work

product into the market in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1.

On **August 20, 2019**, in the case of *Sophia Stewart v. James Cameron, et. al.* No.: 2:18-cv-02351-GMN-EJY, Docket 50, entitled: "Judgement in the Case," Petitioner asserts foreign terrorists Keith R. Murdoch, and David Ellison bribed Chief Judge Gloria M. Navarro to omit the Section 2(b) of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act ("APPA") or "Tunney Act") outlined in the "Competitive Impact Statement" in the case of the *United States of America v. The Walt Disney Company, Twenty-First Century Fox, Inc. et. al.* No.: 1:18-cv-05800-CM, Docket 21 page 10.

On August 20, 2019, in the case of *Sophia Stewart v. James Cameron, et. al.* No.: 2:18-cv-02351-GMN-EJY, **Docket 50**, entitled: "Order," Petitioner asserts foreign terrorist Keith R. Murdoch, and David Ellison bribed Chief Judge Gloria M. Navarro

On **August 20, 2019**, in the case of *Sophia Stewart v. James Cameron, et. al.* No.: 2:18-cv-02351-GMN-EJY, **Docket 49**, entitled: "Judgement in Civil Action," Petitioner asserts foreign terrorist Keith R. Murdoch, and David Ellison bribed Political Operative Chief Judge Gloria M. Navarro to dismantle and lie about the preponderance of evidence and "Proposed Final Judgment" in the case of the *United States of America v. The Walt Disney Company, Twenty-First Century Fox, Inc. et. al.* No.: 1:18-cv-05800-CM, **Docket 3-1** page 16 that states:

### **"XIII. ENFORCEMENT OF FINAL JUDGEMENT"**

"A. The United States retains and reserves all rights to enforce the provisions of this Final Judgment, including its right to seek an order of contempt from this Court. Defendants agree that in any civil contempt action, any motion to show cause, or any similar action brought by the United States regarding an alleged violation of this Final Judgment, the United States may establish a violation of the decree and the appropriateness of any remedy therefor by a preponderance of the evidence, and they waive any argument that a different standard of proof should apply."

On or about **May 21, 2019**, Petitioner asserts that Seditious Political Operative Nancy Brasel took a bribe and operated in concert affecting and interfering with interstate and foreign commerce by framing me for a fictitious crime of a "trespass order" in violation of Minn. Stat. 626.557, Subd. 6. The Seditious Political Operatives Lori Swanson, Jonathan Moler, Kathleen Brennan, and Barbara Dacy weaponized law enforcement while directing 3 Court Deputies, 5 U.S. Marshals to block the entry of a taxpayer funded U.S. District courthouse, absent statutory authority while 4 St. Paul Police Officers stood on the side, thus constituting obstruction of justice in violation of Chapter 73, Title 18 U.S.C. § 1509.

On **May 1, 2019**, in the case of *Sophia Stewart vs. James Cameron, et. al.* No.: 2:18-cv-02351-GMN-GWF, **Docket**

46, page 6 of 24, line 7, the respondents Andy Wachowski and Larry Wachowski again committed perjury while making asinine demands to be called under the fictitious names Lilly Wachowski and Lana Wachowski and simultaneously attempted to collect **\$300,000.00** in "attorney's fees" for all of the defendants, while concealing **Docket 288**, thus constituting violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1962(a):

"It also ordered her to pay Defendants more than **\$300,000** in attorneys' fees for many of the same reasons Defendants seek to have her declared vexatious - i.e., because Stewart persists in pursuing the same factually unsupported claims."

**D. Subversive Foreign Terrorists  
Rupert Murdoch, James Murdoch,  
Lachlan Murdoch and James  
Cameron's Bribery of Federal  
Judges:**

On **March 21, 2019**, David T. Schultz accepted bribes from Subversive Foreign Terrorists in the case of *Dannez W. Hunter vs. Rupert Murdoch, James Murdoch, Lachlan Murdoch, Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation* (No.:19-cv-00590-NEB-DTS), Docket 6 and rendered a *Report and Recommendation* calling the claims "Non-frivolous" in one breath and "fantastic allegations" in another while lying about the preponderance of documentary evidence standard in a RICO case and the chronological timeline.

On **March 21, 2019**, Seditious Conspirator Schultz took a bribe to aid

Foreign Terrorists Rupert Murdoch, James Murdoch, Lachlan Murdoch and James Cameron and rendered a "Report and Recommendation" to dismiss a Racketeering Case, that mandates a "Jury Trial" for already Adjudicated Facts, while having "two sworn Affidavits" from the U.S.D.O.J Honorable Assistant Attorney Makan Delrahim, Antitrust Division and Honorable Deputy Attorney Andrew Finch that explains in detail and with specificity "threats of personal attacks" lobbed against any career attorney in the D.O.J., by Mafia Attorney Paul T. Cappuccio in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961(1)(B), citing section 1505, 1512(b)(3).

On **March 21, 2019**, Political Operative Schultz knew upon examination of Honorable Makan Delrahim and Honorable Andrew Finch's affidavits that Paul Cappuccio, Jeff Bewkes had engaged in predicate acts for the solicitation of a "Bribe" while physically standing inside the D.O.J. in violation of Title 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961(1)(B), citing 607(a)(1):

**Honorable Andrew Finch:**

"6. During the meeting, the Time Warner representative "attempted"<sup>1</sup> to "persuade"<sup>2</sup> "us" that the Antitrust Division "should not challenge"<sup>3</sup> the "Transaction"<sup>4</sup> and should "INSTEAD" enter a "**CONSENT<sup>5</sup> DECREE<sup>6</sup>**" that would

---

<sup>1</sup> USSG § 2X1.1

<sup>2</sup> USSG § 2B1.1(18)

<sup>3</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 201(2)(A)(B)(C)

<sup>4</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 607(A)(1)

<sup>5</sup> Docket 3, Docket 3-1; 18 U.S.C. 152(7)

<sup>6</sup> Docket 3-2, Article 20, 14.115

include only behavioral relief (and not any divestiture). Toward the end of the meeting, Mr. Cappuccio "STABBED"<sup>7</sup> his finger in the AIR at AAG Delrahim and said: "If you do this, it's going to be a Sh\*t show. It's going to be like Jimmy Hoffa and Jim Comey."

Mob Attorney Cappuccio being emboldened then threatened all the career attorneys inside the D.O.J., specifically AAG Makan Delrahim and Andrew Finch and told the Antitrust Chief to file "**Consent Decrees**" in the Federal Courts, while Attorney General William Barr was sitting at the same table, thus constituting solicitation of a bribe under 18 U.S.C. § 607(a)(1).

Deep State Political Operative Schultz took a bribe and moved to strip me of all my Civil, and U.S. Constitution, Fourteenth Amendment rights to Due Process and Equal Protection under the law within 15 business days of receipt of AAG Delrahim and Deputy Attorney Finch's affidavits, thus constituting Judicial Terrorism with an aversion for the truth, because he knew that William Barr is the current Attorney General and anyone in the D.O.J. would be under his subordination.

Plaintiff avers Foreign Terrorist Rupert Murdoch, James Murdoch after paying **\$5,000,000.00** to the William Clinton Foundation Charity fraud then bribed Political Operative David Schultz to knowingly retaliate against the Plaintiff for attaching Honorable

---

<sup>7</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 983(D)(iii)



Makan Delrahim and Andrew Finch's Affidavits as "confessions" exposing the solicitation of bribery, thus the Seditious Terrorist conspired with intent to retaliate, taking any action harmful to any person, by stripping me of my rights, as a direct result of communicating with and providing pay-to-play documentary evidence to the IRS including law enforcement officers for truthful information relating to the commission of theft of intangible intellectual property, money laundering, and espionage, while lying about collection of unlawful debt, which mandates a fine including imprisonment not more than 10 years, or both for David Schultz in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1513(b)(1).

Deep State Political Operative Schultz knew after reading both affidavits that it was "illegal" for him to personally commit a "Judicial Bias Crime" to "determine" the "Outcome" of a Racketeering lawsuit while having in his possession two "affidavits with "Admissions" and/or "Confessions" from the D.O.J., that articulate how the Seditious Terrorist bragged about "personal attacks" inside a conference room against career U.S. Attorneys while having possession of a UCC Lien.

In addition, Deep State Operative Schultz knew by reading the affidavits that it was a Felony act for Jeff Bewkes, Paul Cappuccio, and William Barr to physically be in a conference room of the D.O.J., after I personally served Warner Bros. Studios with a UCC Lien for **\$3,500,000,000.00**. Seditious

Conspirator Schultz also knew that it's illegal to be in a conference room to "warn" ~~Conspirators~~ about ~~Antitrust~~ Litigation, of which is a predicate felony act of R.I.C.O. Plaintiff alleges Ku Klux Klan Operative Schultz took a bribe, overstepped his constitutional mandated authority and LIED about Documentary Evidence, including the application of the law to dismiss a RICO claim filed by a Vulnerable Adult, and he enabled the opportunity for the commission of "Fraud and theft of Property".

Specifically, a R.I.C.O. complaint structured in a "chronological descending date order" cannot be dismissed for articulating sophisticated claims detailed within a 10-year window. The complaint cites 12 Claims for a "continuation of violent crimes," and enhancing the operations of a RICO Enterprise, crimes against the administration of justice, bribery of federal judges, Systemic Institutional Lying to aid the Clinton Donors with stealing Federal registered property, and Document fraud in violation of Title 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961(1)(B), citing section 225, 1959(b)(2).

On **March 19, 2019**, in the case of *Sophia Stewart vs. James Cameron, et. al.* No.: 2:18-cv-02351-GMN-GWF, **Docket 41**, pages 14, 15 of 21, the seditious respondents Andy Wachowski, and Larry Wachowski made asinine demands to be addressed under the fictitious names of Lilly Wachowski and Lana Wachowski,

thus constituting perjury and document fraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1342.

---

On **March 19, 2019**, in the case of *Sophia Stewart vs. James Cameron, et. al.* No.: 2:18-cv-02351-GMN-GWF, **Docket 40**, pages 15, 16 of 22 the defendants committed "Fraud Upon the Court" by filing a Verified Petition For Permission To Practice In the Case Only By Attorney Not Admitted to the Bar of this Court and Designation of the Local Counsel" in the amount of \$250.00, without being licensed to practice law in the state of Nevada and while his clients used the fictitious names Lilly Wachowski and Lana Wachowski.

On **March 9, 2018**, Plaintiff asserts that LORI SWANSON, KEVIN LINDSEY, and BARBARA DACY operated in concert and abused the use of an "FBI Amended Complaint Email" in retaliation by filing in 90 days a Protection Order; whereby the respondents stalked my immediate family member and concocted a scheme to create false crimes as pretext to usher through acquisitions by AT&T Inc. of Time Warner Inc. and The Walt Disney Company of Twenty-First Century Fox Film Inc.

On **March 9, 2019**, Lori Swanson, Jonathon Moler, Barbara Dacy, Kevin Lindsey and Kathleen Brennan knew that is was illegal to use HARVEY WEINSTEIN'S<sup>8</sup> name, and THE WEINSTEIN COMPANY "WTC" to frame me for a "Protection Order," while concealing

---

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.avclub.com/harvey-weinstein-made-death-threats-demanded-full-front-1821263502>

HARVEY WEINSTEIN having more than 85 sexual assault victims, 12 alleged rape victims, thus constituting a pattern and practice to frame me a black man with false crimes in violence of Minn. Stat. 609.175, Subd. 1. Petitioner asserts the seditious terrorist were provided escorts in the courtroom and in the bathrooms while concealing payments from the State of Minnesota to Covington & Burling in the amount of **\$90,000,000.00**. The Seditious Terrorist Lori Swanson, Jonathan Moler, Kathleen Brennan, and Barbara Dacy played crass, and carried out a black-ops stalking campaign exactly like devils, **as** payments flowed from Eric Holder's Law Firm Covington & Burling to Leah Janus, Fredrikson & Byron P.A. under the color of law in violation of Minn. Stat. § 609.749, Subd. 2(1). The Seditious Traitors Eric Holder, Thomas O. Barnett, Megan Gerking, Terrell McSweeney wickedly bribed Nancy Brasel and David Schulz to retain patronage and privileges for Covington & Burling LLP. The Federal Court system abandoned all basic ethics rules because the law firm stalking me is Covington & Burling LLP with Eric Holder, Terrell McSweeney, Thomas O. Barnett, and Megan Gerking being former high-ranking officials from the Antitrust Division of the D.O.J.

Plaintiff asserts the perpetrators caused serious mental harm to me, by stalking my mother.

Petitioner avers Seditious Political Operative Gloria Navarro M.

Navarro took a bribe, because she knew that she would not be prosecuted by Time Warner Board of Director / Attorney General William P. Barr who was sitting at the table when Mafia Attorney Paul Cappuccio made stabbing gestures at Honorable Attorney Makan Delrahim on November 6, 2017. Petitioner avers Gloria M. Navarro became the Attorney for James Cameron, Andy Wachowski, Larry Wachowski, Warner Bros. and Twentieth Century Fox Production in violation of Title 28 U.S.C. § 144; 28 U.S.C. § 455(b)(1)(5)(ii) .

On **September 29, 2014**, in the case of *Sophia Stewart v. Jonathan Lubell*, No.: 2:07-cv-552 DB-EJF, **Docket 288**, Chief Judge Dee Benson rendered a Final Judgment in her case. Ultimately, Nancy Brasel and David Schultz did not want to believe that black woman Sophia Stewart is the Owner of the Terminator and Matrix movie franchise copyrights.

**E. Adjudicated Facts:**

On **September 29, 2014**, in the case of *Sophia Stewart vs. Michael Stoller*, (No. 2:07-cv-552), **Docket 287**, Foreign Surveillance Act Judge Dee Benson rendered an "Order Adopting Report and Recommendation" that became a "Finalized Adjudicated Fact" that was not challenged or appealed within **30 days**, and/or anytime thereafter, thus becoming a "Crystalized Issue".

On **September 16, 2014**, in the case of *Sophia Stewart v. Jonathan Lubell*, No.: 2:07-cv-552 DB-EJF, **Docket 285**, James Cameron, Twenty-First Century Fox

Film Inc., Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc., Bruce Isaac, Andy Wachowski and Larry Wachowski filed a felony terrorist lien, thus constituting fraud in contravention of a Final Judgment Order citing violations of USSG 2B1.1(9)(c).

**F. Foreign Terrorists File Three Terrorist Liens in Three Federal Courts:**

On **September 10, 2014**, P. Matthew Cox (#9879), Matthew Cox, SNOW CHRISTENSEN & MARTINEAU 10 Exchange Place, Eleventh Floor Salt Lake City, Utah 84111 filed a "**Terrorist Lien**," **Docket 285** on behalf of "Subversive Foreign Terrorists" Rupert Murdoch, James Murdoch, Lachlan Murdoch, Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation, James Cameron, thus constituting a third "predicate Felony Act," involving mail fraud, wire fraud in violence of Article § 20, 14.115. The Subversive Foreign Terrorists filed the same Terrorist Liens in U.S. District Court of California, and Nevada under the citation of *Sophia Stewart v. Andy Wachowski*, (No. 2:03-cv-02873-MMM-VBK, U.S. Cal. Dist. 07/12/04), including U.S. District Court of Utah, (NO: 2:-07-cv-00552-DB), and Nevada, thus constituting 3 separate felonies while Eric Holder concealed being Lead Counsel.

On **August 11, 2014**, in the case of *Sophia Stewart v. Jonathan Lubell*, No.: 2:07-cv-552 DB-EJF, **Docket 283**, page 4, Judge Evelyn J. Furse rendered the:

"Report and Recommendation Regarding Default of Judgment against Jonathan Lubell."

In the case of the United States of America vs. the Walt Disney Company, Twenty-First Century Fox, Inc., et. al., No.: 1:18-cv-05800, **Docket 21**, page 14, **entitled:** "Competitive Impact Statement," it states:

"With respect to the adequacy of the relief secured by the decree, "[t]he Court's function is not to determine whether the proposed [d]ecree results in the balance of rights and liabilities that is the one that will best serve society, but only to ensure that the resulting settlement is within the reaches of the public interest. Morgan Stanley, 881 F. Supp. 2d at 567 (quoting Alex. Brown & Sons, 963 F. Supp. at 238) (internal quotations omitted) (emphasis in original)" In making this determination, "the [c]ourt is **not permitted to reject the proposed remedies merely because the court believes other remedies are preferable.** [Rather], the relevant inquiry is whether there is a factual foundation for the government's decision such that its conclusions regarding the proposed settlement are reasonable." Morgan Stanley, 881 F. Supp. 2d at 563 (quoting United States v. Abitibi Consolidated Inc., 584 F. Supp. 2d 162, 165 (D.D.C. 2008)); see also United States v. Apple.

9

---

<sup>9</sup> United States of America vs. The Walt Disney Company, Twenty-First Century Fox, Inc. No. 1:18-cv-05800, Docket 21, Page

In the "Violent Crimes in Aid of Racketeering, 18 U.S.C. § 1959, A Manual for Federal Prosecutors, dated **December 2006**, the Department of Justice stated on page 122:

"court refused to dismiss a RICO<sup>10</sup> sub-predicated racketeering act charging extortion, bribery, mail fraud and receipt of a gratuity arising from the same conduct where any duplicity problem could be solved by use of a special verdict form and adequate jury instructions")."

In the case of the *United States of America vs. the Walt Disney Company, Twenty-First Century Fox, Inc. et. al.* No.: 1:18-cv-05800, **Docket 21**, page 16, entitled: "Competitive Impact Statement" the provisions state:

"Moreover, the court's role under the APPA is limited to reviewing the "remedy in relationship" to the violations that the United States has alleged in its Complaint, and "does not authorize the court to **"construct<sup>11</sup> [its] own hypothetical<sup>12</sup> case"**<sup>13</sup> and then "evaluate the decree against that case." ("A court must limit its review to the "issues in the complaint" and 'give due respect to the [Government's]

---

14;<https://www.justice.gov/atr/case-document/file/1085951/download>

<sup>10</sup><https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/usam/legacy/2014/10/17/vcar.pdf>

<sup>11</sup> *Dannez Hunter vs. Keith R. Murdoch*, No.: 19-cv-00590-NEB-DTS, Docket 6, page 3

<sup>12</sup> *Dannez Hunter vs. Keith R. Murdoch*, No.: 19-cv-00590-NEB-DTS, Docket 30

<sup>13</sup> *Rosenstiel v. Rosenstiel*, 278 F. Supp. 794, S.D.N.Y. 1967)



perception of. . . its case.") Because the "court's authority to review the decree depends entirely on the government's exercising its prosecutorial discretion by bringing a case in the first place," it follows that "the court is "only authorized to review the decree itself," and not to "effectively redraft the complaint" to inquire into other matters that the United States did not pursue."

In **April 2019**, the "*United States Sentencing Commission*," entitled *Primer, RICO Guideline (Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations*,"<sup>14</sup> prepared by the Office of General Counsel, the government published on page 6 the following statements throughout the universe:

"The prohibition on the "collection of unlawful debt" under RICO encompasses efforts to collect on a usurious loan without distinguishing whether the collection was for cash or collateral. Unlike the requirement that a "pattern<sup>15</sup> of racketeering" consist of at least "two racketeering acts,"<sup>16</sup> the element of the "collection of an unlawful debt" can be predicated on a single occurrence, such as the

---

<sup>14</sup> Exh. 2019

<sup>15</sup> Exh. 400

<sup>16</sup> Exh. 401

collection of a single "unlawful"<sup>17</sup> debt".<sup>18</sup>

In **May 2018**, Petitioner assert the Nancy Brasel was "aware," knew or should have known that the *United States Sentencing Commission*, published a "standard to impute guilt against a target inside the "PRIMER, RICO Guidelines, Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organization Act," page 2 whereby it states, "a single collection"<sup>19</sup> of an "unlawful debt"<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup>[https://www.ussc.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/training/primers/2019\\_Primer\\_RICO.pdf](https://www.ussc.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/training/primers/2019_Primer_RICO.pdf)  
[https://www.ussc.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/training/primers/2018\\_Primer\\_RICO.pdf](https://www.ussc.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/training/primers/2018_Primer_RICO.pdf)

<sup>18</sup> *United States v. Weiner*, 3 F.3d 17, 24 (1st Cir. 1993) (citations omitted) (holding that "a single collection of an unlawful debt satisfies section 1962(c)'s 'collection of unlawful debt' requirement"); *United States v. Giovanelli*, 945 F.2d 479, 490 (2d Cir. 1991) ("Unlike a 'pattern of racketeering activity' which requires proof of two or more predicate acts, to satisfy RICO's 'collection of unlawful debt' definition the government need only demonstrate a single collection."); *United States v. Vastola*, 899 F.2d 211, 228 n.21 (3d Cir.), vacated and remanded on other grounds, 497 U.S. 1001 (1990); *United States v. Pepe*, 747 F.2d 632, 645 (11th Cir. 1984). See also *H.J. Inc.*, 492 U.S. at 232 (stating that "[e]ach prohibited activity is defined in 18 U.S.C. § 1962 to include, as one necessary element, proof either of 'a pattern of racketeering activity' or of 'collection of an unlawful debt'")."

<sup>19</sup> Exh. 403

<sup>20</sup> Exh. 404

satisfies section § 1962(c),"<sup>21</sup>  
"collection of unlawful debt"<sup>22</sup>:

"18 U.S.C. § 1962(a):"<sup>23</sup>

"Under section § 1962(a), it is a crime to "use or invest" any income derived from "a pattern of racketeering activity" or through "collection of an unlawful debt" to establish, acquire an interest in, or operate "any enterprise" engaged in or affecting interstate commerce.<sup>24</sup> To establish an offense under section § 1962(a), the government must show that the defendant had derived income from a pattern of racketeering or collection of unlawful debt, and then used or invested some part of that income in the establishment and operation of an enterprise, which was engaged in or its activities affected commerce.<sup>25</sup> An example of a violation of section § 1962(a) is a drug dealer using the proceeds of a pattern of narcotic crimes to invest in or operate a legitimate business."<sup>26</sup>

The Department of Justice Antitrust Division cannot wake up one day on a whim and say, they'd like to change the provisions inside a binding Competitive Impact Statement that was signed under

---

<sup>21</sup> Sophia Stewart v. Jonathan Lubell, No.:  
2:07-cv-552-DB-EJF, Docket 283,  
page 4

<sup>22</sup> Exh. 402

<sup>23</sup> <https://www.justice.gov/atr/case-document/file/1085951/download>

<sup>24</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1962(a)

<sup>25</sup> United States v. Vogt, 910 F.2d 1184,  
1194(4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990)

<sup>26</sup> United States vs. Got, 910 F.2d 1184,  
1194 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990)

the Antitrust Civil Processing Act, subsequently after they lost a case against The Walt Disney Company, because the D.O.J. can only alter the "Competitive Impact Statement" or "Hold Separate Stipulation Order" against Twenty-First Century Fox Inc in the "event of a breach" occurring, or someone like myself has filed a "Motion to Show Cause for Criminal Contempt," of which, has occurred in the case of *Dannez Hunter vs. Keith Rupert Murdoch, et. al.* No. 19-2293:<sup>27</sup>

Petitioner avers inside the CRIMINAL RICO: 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968, A Manual For Federal Prosecutors it states:

**"USAM § 9-110.101 provides that:"**

"No RICO criminal indictment or information or civil complaint shall be filed, and no civil investigative demand shall be issued, without the prior approval of the Criminal Division. See RICO Guidelines at USAM 9-110.200."<sup>28</sup>

"Pursuant to USAM § 9-110.010, such approval<sup>29</sup> and "coordination authority"<sup>30</sup> has been delegated to the Organized Crime and Gang Section ("OCGS") of the Criminal Division."

---

<sup>27</sup> Exh. A

<sup>28</sup> <https://www.brownstonelaw.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Federal-Department-of-Justice-RICO-manual.pdf>

<sup>29</sup> 15 U.S.C. § 1311(e)

<sup>30</sup> 15 U.S.C. § 1311(J)

"Accordingly, the following procedures "MUST BE FOLLOWED in all RICO prosecutions brought by the United States":

"(3) No RICO charge shall be dismissed, in whole or in part, without prior approval of OCGS."<sup>31</sup>

"(4) In any criminal RICO prosecution, any adverse decision on an issue involving an interpretation of the RICO statute from any District Court or any Circuit Court of Appeals shall be timely reported to OCGS, in addition to reporting to the Solicitor General's Office and the appropriate Appellate Section of the Criminal Division or other Division, to enable OCGS to submit a recommendation to the Solicitor General's Office whether to seek further review of the decision."

"§                    **0.179a                    Enforcement**  
**responsibilities."**

"(a) Matters involving charges of obstruction of justice, perjury, fraud or false statement, as described in Section 0.179, shall be under the supervisory jurisdiction of the Division having responsibility for the case or matter in which the alleged obstruction occurred. "The Assistant Attorney General in charge of each Division shall have full authority" to conduct prosecution of such charges, including authority to "appoint special attorneys to present evidence" to grand

---

<sup>31</sup><https://www.justice.gov/usam/file/870856/download>

juries. However, such enforcement shall be preceded by "consultation with the Assistant Attorney General"<sup>32</sup> in charge of the "Criminal Division," to determine the appropriate supervisory jurisdiction. (See 38 C.F.R. 0.55(p).)"

33

"(b) In the event the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Division having responsibility for the case or matter does not wish to assume supervisory jurisdiction he shall refer the matter to the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division for handling by that Division."

In the case of *The United States of America vs. The Walt Disney Company, Twenty-First Century Fox Inc.*, No.: 1:18-cv-05800-CM, Docket 21 page 11 of 18:

**"IV. REMEDIES AVAILABLE TO POTENTIAL PRIVATE LITIGANTS:"**

"Section 4 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 15, provides that "any<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Minn. Stat. § 15C.08(a)

<sup>33</sup> U.S. Department of Justice Tax Division Criminal Tax Manual 2012, updated January 2018, by Caroline D. Ciraolo, Acting Assistant Attorney General Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney Tax Division, Editor-in-Chief, Frank P. Cihlar, Chief, pg.11

<sup>34</sup> Exh. 400

person<sup>35</sup> who<sup>36</sup> has<sup>37</sup> been<sup>38</sup> injured<sup>39</sup> as a result<sup>40</sup> of conduct<sup>41</sup> prohibited<sup>42</sup> by the antitrust<sup>43</sup> laws<sup>44</sup> may bring<sup>45</sup> suit<sup>46</sup> in federal court to recover three times the damages the person has suffered, as well as costs and reasonable attorneys' fees."

In the case of *The United States of America vs. The Walt Disney Company, Twenty-First Century Fox Inc.*, No.: 1:18-cv-05800-CM, **Docket 21**, page 10 of 18, dated August 7, 2018, Petitioner asserts Docket 50, and Docket 49, the court lied with impunity and "lied" to cover-up "binding contractual agreement provisions" under the *Antitrust Procedure and Penalties Act* ("APPA" or "Tunney Act"):

**U.S. ATTORNEY, LOWELL R. STERN:**

"Under the terms of this paragraph, Defendants have agreed that in any civil contempt action, any motion to show cause, or any similar action brought by the United States regarding an alleged violation of the Final Judgment, the United States may establish the violation and the appropriateness of any remedy by a preponderance of the evidence, and Defendants have waived

---

<sup>35</sup> Exh. 403

<sup>36</sup> Exh. 401

<sup>37</sup> Exh. 402

<sup>38</sup> Exh. 100611

<sup>39</sup> Exh. 403

<sup>40</sup> Exh. 400

<sup>41</sup> Exh. 107, 108, 109, 110, 111

<sup>42</sup> Exh. 36

<sup>43</sup> Exh. 23

<sup>44</sup> Exh. 1212

<sup>45</sup> Exh. 21

<sup>46</sup> Exh. 1

any argument that a different standard of proof should apply. This provision aligns the standard for compliance obligations with the standard of proof that applies to the underlying offense that the compliance commitments address."

In the *United States of America vs. AT&T Inc., DirectTV Group Holding, LLC, and Time Warner Inc.* No. 1:17-cv-02511-RJL, Docket 87, line 14 entitled: Joint Statement on the Burden of Proof At Trial:

"Establishing Competitive Harm:

"14. Consistent with the Supreme Court's admonition that "all [mergers] must be tested by the same standard, whether they are classified as horizontal, vertical, conglomerate or other," *Procter & Gamble Co.*, 386 U.S. at 577, there is no one single way the government must establish an appreciable danger of anticompetitive effects."

In the *United States of America vs. The Walt Disney Company, Twenty-First Century Fox, Inc.* No.: 1:18-cv-05800, Docket 3-1, page 16 of 17:

"B. The Final Judgment should be interpreted to give full effect to the procompetitive purposes of the antitrust laws and to restore all competition harmed by the challenged conduct. Defendants agree that they may be held in contempt of, and that the Court may enforce, any provision of this Final Judgment that, as interpreted by the Court in light of these procompetitive principles and applying ordinary tools of interpretation, is



stated specifically and in reasonable detail, whether or not it is clear and unambiguous on its face."

After **September 29, 2014**, in the case of *Sophia Stewart vs. Jonathan Lubell*, (No. 07-cv-00552), Docket 288, Plaintiff asserts the Seditious Terrorists Eric Holder COO and Chief Deputy Assistant Intergovernmental Relations, Domestic Competition Policy Advisor Antitrust Division D.O.J. to the President and Vice President, Terrell McSweeny ""operated in concert" to act in the United States as "unregistered" Hostile Foreign Agents," specifically for the Commonwealth of Australia, thus violating IRM 25.1.2.5(2).

Plaintiff alleged the Foreign Terrorist KEITH RUPERT MURDOCH directed his son Co-conspirator James Murdoch<sup>47</sup> to insulate Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation by making a "commingling bribery payment" of **\$5,000,000.00** disguised under the cloak of a "Political Slush Fund" to Hillary Clinton Bill Clinton, and the William J. Clinton charity fraud, thus constituting interference with interstate and foreign commerce by means of coercion, bribery and retaliation prohibited under 52 U.S.C. Section § 152(5)(6):<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup><https://www.clintonfoundation.org/contributors?category=%241%2C000%2C001%20to%20%245%2C000%2C000&page=1>

<sup>48</sup><https://www.clintonfoundation.org/contributors?category=%241%2C000%2C001%20to%20%245%2C000%2C000&page=1>

.....

## Donation Amount

\$1,000,001 to \$5,000,000



49

.....

**James R. Murdoch**

Their generosity makes our work possible and we thank them.

.....

## Donation Amount

\$500,001 to \$1,000,000



.....

<b>Freedom of Information Act Request</b> <sup>50</sup>		<b>CHAI'S<sup>51</sup>2017, 990 form</b> <sup>52</sup>
---	--	--

<sup>49</sup><https://www.clintonfoundation.org/contributors?category=%24500%2C001%20to%20%241%2C000%2C000&page=1>

<sup>50</sup><https://www.clintonfoundation.org/about/annual-financial-reports>

<sup>51</sup><https://clintonhealthaccess.org/chai-990-forms/>

<sup>52</sup><https://clintonhealthaccess.org/content/uploads/2017/11/CHAI-Public-Disclosure-990-2017.pdf>

Clinton Foundation Tax Return 2018 <sup>53</sup>		CHAI'S 2016, 990 form <sup>54</sup>
Clinton Foundation Tax Return 2017 <sup>55</sup>		CHAI'S 2015, 990 form <sup>56</sup>
Clinton Foundation Tax Return 2016 <sup>57</sup>		CHAI'S 2014, 990 form <sup>58</sup>
Clinton Foundation Tax Return 2015 <sup>59</sup>		CHAI'S 2013, 990 form <sup>60</sup>
		CHAI'S 2012, 990 form <sup>61</sup>
		CHAI'S 2012, 990 form

62

<sup>53</sup>[https://www.clintonfoundation.org/sites/default/files/clinton\\_foundation\\_report\\_public\\_2017.pdf](https://www.clintonfoundation.org/sites/default/files/clinton_foundation_report_public_2017.pdf)

<sup>54</sup><https://clintonhealthaccess.org/content/uploads/2017/11/CHAI-PUBLIC-DISCLOSURE-990.pdf>

<sup>55</sup>[https://www.clintonfoundation.org/sites/default/files/clinton\\_foundation\\_report\\_public\\_2016.pdf](https://www.clintonfoundation.org/sites/default/files/clinton_foundation_report_public_2016.pdf)

<sup>56</sup><https://clintonhealthaccess.org/content/uploads/2016/11/CHAI-2015-990-Public-Disclosure.pdf>

<sup>57</sup>[https://www.clintonfoundation.org/sites/default/files/clinton\\_foundation\\_report\\_public\\_2014.pdf](https://www.clintonfoundation.org/sites/default/files/clinton_foundation_report_public_2014.pdf)

<sup>58</sup><https://clintonhealthaccess.org/content/uploads/2015/11/CHAI-2014-990.pdf>

<sup>59</sup>[https://www.clintonfoundation.org/sites/default/files/clinton\\_foundation\\_report\\_public\\_2014.pdf](https://www.clintonfoundation.org/sites/default/files/clinton_foundation_report_public_2014.pdf)

<sup>60</sup><https://clintonhealthaccess.org/content/uploads/2015/11/CHAI-AMENDED-2013-990.pdf>

<sup>61</sup><https://clintonhealthaccess.org/content/uploads/2015/11/CHAI-AMENDED-2012.pdf>

<sup>62</sup>[https://www.clintonfoundation.org/sites/default/files/clinton\\_foundation\\_report\\_public\\_2017.pdf](https://www.clintonfoundation.org/sites/default/files/clinton_foundation_report_public_2017.pdf)

FORM 990 PART III LINE 4C

THE CLINTON GIUSTRA ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP ("CGEP") BUILDS SOCIAL  
BUSINESSES TO GENERATE SOCIAL IMPACT AND FINANCIAL RETURNS BY  
ADDRESSING MARKET GAPS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES' SUPPLY OR DISTRIBUTION  
CHAINS. THROUGH THESE MODELS, CGEP SEEKS TO HELP PEOPLE WORK THEMSELVES  
OUT OF POVERTY. CGEP'S SUCCESSFUL PILOT PROGRAMS ARE INCORPORATED TO  
FORM FOR-PROFIT ENTERPRISE ENTITIES IN WHICH THE CLINTON FOUNDATION  
TYPICALLY HOLDS A SIGNIFICANT OWNERSHIP POSITION. IN 2017, THE CLINTON  
GIUSTRA ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP (CGEP) JOINED AN EFFORT TO ACCELERATE  
THE PROGRESS OF THE UN'S SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS, ALONG WITH  
CONTINUING TO BUILD AND MANAGE BUSINESSES THAT EMPOWER FARMERS AND  
ENTREPRENEURS WORLDWIDE.

"12/11/14 email - "Hillary cover up"<sup>63</sup>  
operation"<sup>64</sup> "work ticket"<sup>65</sup> archive  
"cleanup."<sup>66</sup>  
"-probably related to change to 60 day  
"email retention policy/backup..."<sup>67</sup>  
"doesn't "recall"<sup>68</sup> "prior policy."<sup>69</sup>  
[Redacted] advised<sup>70</sup> [redacted] "not to  
answer<sup>71</sup> questions"<sup>72</sup> related to conv

<sup>63</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1956(2)(A)(B); Exh. HRC1476

<sup>64</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1956(7)(A)(B)(ii)(iv)2;  
Exh. HRC1476

<sup>65</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 2(b)

<sup>66</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1519

<sup>67</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1509

<sup>68</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1622

<sup>69</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1030

<sup>70</sup> Minn. Stat. § 609.05, Subd. 1

<sup>71</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 792

<sup>72</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1622

[conversation] w/DK [David Kendall]<sup>73</sup>  
document 49 - based on 5th amendment."<sup>74</sup>

**FBI:**

"Its all part<sup>75</sup> of the Hilary<sup>76</sup> coverup<sup>77</sup>  
operation<sup>78</sup> ☺ I'll have to tell you<sup>79</sup>  
about it<sup>80</sup> at the **party**."<sup>81</sup>

Intelligence Community Inspector General:

"From: [Redacted]

Sent: Saturday, June 27, 2015 2:46 PM

To: Grafeld, Margaret P [Peggy]

**G. Pattern of RICO Conspiracy And  
Shared Criminal Purpose**

On **November 10, 2016** Eric Holder  
"Ringleader" at Covington & Burling,  
LLP made a commingling bribery payment  
of **\$2700.00**<sup>82</sup> Transaction ID:  
**C15920639** to Hillary for America, thus  
invoking violations of the Espionage  
Act (1917)

On **September 29, 2016** Terrell  
McSweeney Partner at Covington &  
Burling, LLP made a commingling bribery  
payment of **\$10.00**<sup>83</sup> Transaction ID:  
**C11587127** to Hillary for America, thus  
invoking violations Subversive  
Activities Act (**1950**)

---

<sup>73</sup> N.R.S. § 199.520(1)(2)

<sup>74</sup> *Judicial Watch v. U.S. Department of Justice*  
(No. 1:16-cv-02046); Exh. HRC1519; HRC1520

<sup>75</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 3501(d); Exh. A, Exh. HRC1519

<sup>76</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1962(c); Exh. HRC1519

<sup>77</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1956(7)(B)(ii)(iv); Exh. HRC1519

<sup>78</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 152(7); Exh. HRC1519

<sup>79</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1519

<sup>80</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 152(8); Exh. HRC1519

<sup>81</sup> *Judicial Watch v. U.S. Department of Justice*  
(Nos. 1:16-cv-02046), pages 199 through 205,

<sup>82</sup> Exh. 15920639

<sup>83</sup> Exh. 11587127

On **August 29, 2016** Terrell McSweeney Partner at Covington & Burling, LLP made a commingling bribery payment of **\$10.00**<sup>84</sup>Transaction ID: **C9707043** to Hillary for America, thus invoking violations under Espionage Act (1917).

On **July 29, 2016** Terrell McSweeney Partner at Covington & Burling, LLP made a commingling bribery payment of **\$10.00**<sup>85</sup>Transaction ID: **C7991113** to Hillary for America, thus invoking violations under 28 CFR § 36.208(c)(2).

On **July 11, 2016** Terrell McSweeney Partner at Covington & Burling, LLP made a commingling bribery payment of **\$10.00**<sup>86</sup>Transaction ID: **C7455223** to Hillary for America, thus invoking violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1951(b)(3).

On **June 29, 2016** Terrell McSweeney Partner at Covington & Burling, LLP made a commingling bribery payment of **\$10.00**<sup>87</sup>Transaction ID: **C6322537** to Hillary for America, thus invoking violations 18 U.S.C. § 1956(7)(A)(iv).

On **May 29, 2016** Terrell McSweeney Partner at Covington & Burling, LLP made a commingling bribery payment of **\$10.00**<sup>88</sup>Transaction ID: **C5298299** to Hillary for America, thus invoking violations under 10 U.S.C. § 894(A)(2), Article 94.

---

<sup>84</sup> Exh. 9707043

<sup>85</sup> Exh. 7991113

<sup>86</sup> Exh. 7455223

<sup>87</sup> Exh. 6322537

<sup>88</sup> Exh. 5298299

On **April 6, 2016** Anne Lee, Partner at Covington & Burling LLP made a commingling bribery payment of **\$550.00**<sup>89</sup>Transaction ID: **C408939** to Hillary for America, thus imputing guilt for money laundering, organized extortion, false pretense, conspiracy under the color of law and deception in violence of 18 U.S.C. § 1963(m)(5).

On **April 6, 2016** Anne Lee, Partner at Covington & Burling LLP made a commingling bribery payment of **\$450.00**<sup>90</sup>Transaction ID: **C4038526** to Hillary for America, thus imputing guilt for money laundering, conspiracy, organized extortion, false pretense, under the color of law and deception in violence of 18 U.S.C. § 1961(9).

On **February 29, 2016** Anne Lee, Partner at Covington & Burling LLP made a commingling bribery payment of **\$500.00**<sup>91</sup>Transaction ID: **C2941256** to Hillary for America, thus constituting organized extortion under the color of deception 18 U.S.C. § 1956(7)(A)(iv).

On **February 10, 2016** Anne Lee, Partner at Covington & Burling LLP made a commingling bribery payment of **\$500.00**<sup>92</sup>Transaction ID: **C1925033** to Hillary for America, thus imputing guilt for money laundering, organized extortion, under the color of law and deception in violence of 18 U.S.C. § 1962(a).

On **January 5, 2016** Anne Lee, Partner at Covington & Burling LLP made

---

<sup>89</sup> Exh. 408939

<sup>90</sup> Exh. 4038526

<sup>91</sup> Exh. 2941256

<sup>92</sup> Exh. 1925033

a commingling bribery payment of **\$500.00**<sup>93</sup>Transaction ID: **C2534892** to Hillary for America, thus imputing guilt for money laundering, organized extortion, under the color of law and deception in violence of 18 U.S.C. § 1962(c).

On **December 30, 2015** Anne Lee, Partner at Covington & Burling LLP made a commingling bribery payment of **\$500.00**<sup>94</sup>Transaction ID: **C1857956** to Hillary for America, thus imputing guilt for money laundering, organized extortion, under the color of law and deception in violence of 18 U.S.C. § 1963(m) (5).

On **April 29, 2016** Terrell McSweeney Partner at Jenner & Block, LLP made a commingling bribery payment of **\$10.00**<sup>95</sup>Transaction ID: **C4510711** to Hillary for America, thus imputing guilt for money laundering, organized extortion, under the color of law and deception in violence of 18 U.S.C. § 1956(7) (A) (iv).

**"DAN PETROCELLI, Lead Attorney AT&T and TIME WARNER":**

"If it turns out that there was ummm some **"influence"**<sup>96</sup> that was **"widely"**<sup>97</sup> **speculated"**<sup>98</sup> I suggest that it will

---

<sup>93</sup> Exh. 2534892

<sup>94</sup> Exh.1857956

<sup>95</sup> Exh. 4510711

<sup>96</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1961 (1)(B), citing 201

<sup>97</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 3501(d)

<sup>98</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1961 (1)(B), citing 1956(a)(1)(B)(i)



"come out"<sup>99</sup> and it won't "vote well"<sup>100</sup>  
for the "government."<sup>101</sup>

"I've been involved<sup>102</sup> is this for the  
"better part of the year,"<sup>103</sup> and have  
"sat through<sup>104</sup> the "entire  
investigation"<sup>105</sup> "that the D.O.J.  
conducted".<sup>106</sup> And "I can tell you, ah  
ah, that they turned this thing upside  
down. And there is no credible proof  
that consumers are going to get "charged  
more"<sup>107</sup> money on their tv bill or that  
the "continent is going to be  
restricted".<sup>108</sup> It doesn't make any  
sense. I mean you wouldn't be working  
for this network if it turned out that  
this show was only going to be  
distributed to Directv subscribers  
instead of full distributed across this  
country. Talent is the life blood<sup>109</sup> of  
continent."

**H. Manner And Means To "Employ"  
Intimidation Tactics Against the  
U.S. Department of Justice**

---

<sup>99</sup> 50 U.S.C. § 3021(h)

<sup>100</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 3501(e)

<sup>101</sup> 50 U.S.C. § 1708(2)(A)(B)(i)

<sup>102</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 3501(d)

<sup>103</sup> N.R.S. § 199.520(1)(2)

<sup>104</sup> N.R.S. § 199.520(2)

<sup>105</sup> N.R.S. § 199.520(1)(2)

<sup>106</sup> N.R.S. § 199.520(1)(2)

<sup>107</sup> [https://motherboard.vice.com/en\\_us/article/eve8k/j/atandt-jacks-up-tv-prices-again-after-merger-despite-promising-that-wouldnt-happen](https://motherboard.vice.com/en_us/article/eve8k/j/atandt-jacks-up-tv-prices-again-after-merger-despite-promising-that-wouldnt-happen)

<sup>108</sup> <https://abovethelaw.com/2019/03/copyright-litigation-now-more-expensive-and-with-more-delay-than-ever-before/>

<sup>109</sup> Article 20, 14.115

On **February 15, 2018**, Plaintiff asserts Honorable Assistant Attorney General Makan Delrahim confessed inside an affidavit that Mafia Attorney Paul Cappuccio entered a federal building, on federal soil, and lobbed threats against Antitrust Division career Attorneys that the Seditions Conspirators would **"employ personal attacks"**<sup>110</sup> to prevent any "divestitures" involving the acquisition between AT&T Inc., and Time Warner Inc., thus invoking violations of 18 U.S.C. 1961(9) cross-referencing §§ 1956(7) (A) (iv):

**ASSISTANT ATTORNEY MAKAN DELRAHIM:**<sup>111</sup>

"15. At the end of our meeting, Mr. Cappuccio stood up from his seat at the conference table, wagged his finger at me, and said that if the Antitrust Division goes through with this, the case will be a "a sh\*tshow<sup>112</sup> like you've "never seen,"<sup>113</sup> and that it would be like "Jimmy Hoffa"<sup>114</sup> and the firing of "Jim<sup>115</sup> Comey".<sup>116</sup> "I interpreted Mr. Cappuccio's comments<sup>117</sup> to mean that if we brought this enforcement action,

---

<sup>110</sup><https://www.twincities.com/2019/04/17/st-thomas-bomb-threat-st-paul-mcneely-hall/>

<sup>111</sup> Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 702

<sup>112</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1951(b) (1) (2)

<sup>113</sup> 15 U.S.C. § 3

<sup>114</sup> The Hatch Act

<sup>115</sup> United States Sentencing Commission  
RICO Guidelines, Racketeer  
Influenced and Corrupt  
Organizations dated April 2019

<sup>116</sup> Exh. A

<sup>117</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 2331(5) (B) (i) (ii)

defendants would **employ**<sup>118</sup> **personal**<sup>119</sup> **attacks**<sup>120</sup> to denigrate the integrity of the Antitrust Division and myself."

"16. Political influence has no place in the Antitrust Division's decisions regarding the Transaction."<sup>121</sup>

"Delrahim's deputy, Andrew Finch,<sup>122</sup> filed an affidavit with a nearly identical recollection."<sup>123</sup>

On **February 16, 2018**, Plaintiff asserts Honorable Assistant Deputy Attorney Andrew Finch "confessed"<sup>124</sup> inside an affidavit that Mafia Attorney Paul Cappuccio entered a federal building, on federal soil, and lobbed threats against Antitrust Division career Attorneys that the Seditions Conspirators would "**employ personal attacks**"<sup>125</sup> to prevent any future "divestitures" all while covering up Seditious Terrorists Eric Holder, Terrell McSweeney as Silent Partners Covington & Burling, LLP "operated in concert" with Jenner & Block LLP to stalk me; in order to, extinguish a **\$3,500,000,000.00** UCC Lien against

---

<sup>118</sup> Article 20, § 14.118.4

<sup>119</sup> 28 CFR § 36.206(c)(3)

<sup>120</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 983(D)(iv)

<sup>121</sup> 50 U.S.C. § 3021(h)

<sup>122</sup> Exh. B

<sup>123</sup><https://www.reuters.com/article/us-time-warner-m-a-at-t/u-s-justice-official-says-lawyer-vowed-personal-attacks-over-att-deal-idUSKCN1ML359>

<sup>124</sup> Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 702

<sup>125</sup><https://www.twincities.com/2019/04/17/st-thomas-bomb-threat-st-paul-mcneely-hall/>

their clients, thus violating 18 U.S.C.  
§ 607(a)(1):

**DEPUTY U.S. ANDREW FINCH:**

"6. During the meeting, the Time Warner representative attempted to **"PERSUADE"**<sup>126</sup> us that the Antitrust Division should "not challenge" the Transaction and should **"instead enter into"**<sup>127</sup> a **"consent"**<sup>128</sup> **decree"**<sup>129</sup> that would include only behavioral relief (and not any divestitures).

Toward the end of the meeting, Mr. Cappuccio<sup>130</sup> **"stabbed"**<sup>131</sup> **his finger"**<sup>132</sup> in the air at AAG Delrahim and said: "IF you do this, it's going to be a "sh\*t show"<sup>133</sup>. It's going to be like Jimmy<sup>134</sup> Hoffa and Jim Comey."<sup>135</sup>

"Mr. Cappuccio did not<sup>136</sup> stand up<sup>137</sup> and **"wag his finger"** at Mr. Delrahim and I do not recall<sup>138</sup> any references to either **"James Comey"**<sup>139</sup> or **"Jimmy"**<sup>140</sup> **Hoffa"**.<sup>141</sup>

---

<sup>126</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 607(a)(1)

<sup>127</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 201(2)(A)(B)(C)

<sup>128</sup> N.R.S. § 199.520

<sup>129</sup> Exh. L

<sup>130</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1505

<sup>131</sup> Minn. Stat. § 609.748, Subd. 1(a)(1)

<sup>132</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 983(D)(iv)

<sup>133</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1512(g)(1)(2)

<sup>134</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1961(1)(B)

<sup>135</sup> Exh. B

<sup>136</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1623(a)

<sup>137</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1621

<sup>138</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1622

<sup>139</sup> The Hobbs Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1951(b)(1)

<sup>140</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1962(a)

<sup>141</sup> The Hobbs Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1951(b)(2)

No reasonable person could have attributed Mr. Cappuccio's comments as a **"threat"**<sup>142</sup> that the **"companies would personally attack"**<sup>143</sup> Mr. Delrahim or **"anyone"**<sup>144</sup> else<sup>145</sup> "in the event of litigation,"<sup>146</sup> Barr<sup>147</sup> said."<sup>148</sup>

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - The U.S. Justice Department's top antitrust lawyer said Time Warner's general counsel threatened to **"employ personal attacks"**<sup>149</sup> if the agency tried to block the company's \$85.4 billion merger with AT&T Inc, according to a court filing made public on Thursday.<sup>150</sup>

#### **I. Pattern of RICO Conspiracy And Common Scheme**

On **September 28, 2016** Berlow Clifford, Partner at Jenner & Block, LLP made a commingling bribery payment of **\$2700.00**<sup>151</sup> Transaction ID: **C12102186** to Hillary for America, thus imputing guilt for money laundering, organized extortion, under the color of law, and conspiracy in violence of the Title 18 U.S.C. §§ 1963(m)(5) cross-referencing 371.

---

<sup>142</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1512(g)(1)(2)

<sup>143</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 2331(5)(B)(i)(ii)

<sup>144</sup> 28 CFR § 36.206(b)

<sup>145</sup> Article 20, § 14.118.4

<sup>146</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 983(D)(iii)

<sup>147</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1506

<sup>148</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 3501(e)

<sup>149</sup> Exh. A

<sup>150</sup> <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-time-warner-m-a-at-t/u-s-justice-official-says-lawyer-vowed-personal-attacks-over-att-deal-idUSKCN1ML359>

<sup>151</sup> Exh. 12102186

On **September 27, 2016** Levin, H. Debra, Partner at Jenner & Block, LLP made a commingling bribery payment of **\$2700.00**<sup>152</sup>Transaction ID: **C12075288** to Hillary for America, thus imputing guilt for mail fraud, money laundering, and organized extortion, under the color of law in violence of 18 U.S.C. § 1341.

On **September 27, 2016** Lyerla, Brad. P., Partner at Jenner & Block, LLP made a commingling bribery payment of **\$2700.00**<sup>153</sup>Transaction ID: **C12047326** to Hillary for America, thus imputing guilt for money laundering, organized extortion, wire fraud, under the color of law, and in violence of Title 18 U.S.C. § 1343.

On **September 27, 2016** Lyerla, Brad. P., Partner at Jenner & Block, LLP made a commingling bribery payment of **\$2700.00**<sup>154</sup>Transaction ID: **C1498086** to Hillary for America, thus imputing guilt for money laundering, organized extortion, under the color of law, and bribery of a public official in violence of 18 U.S.C. § 1510(a).

On **September 14, 2016** Martin, Craig, Christopher, Partner at Jenner & Block, LLP made a commingling bribery payment of **\$2700.00**<sup>155</sup>Transaction ID: **C11856676** to Hillary for America, thus imputing guilt for money laundering, organized extortion under the color of law in violence of 18 U.S.C. § 1956(7)(A)(iv).

---

<sup>152</sup> Exh.12075288

<sup>153</sup> Exh. 12047326

<sup>154</sup> Exh. 1498086

<sup>155</sup> Exh. 11856676

On **November 23, 2015** Matt Brasil, Partner at Jenner & Block, LLP made a commingling bribery payment of **\$2700.00**<sup>156</sup>Transaction ID: **C1590893** to Hillary for America, thus imputing guilt for an "accessory after the fact" citing violations of 18 U.S.C. § 3.

On **November 06, 2015** Geoffrey Davis, Partner at Jenner & Block, LLP made a commingling bribery payment of **\$2700.00**,<sup>157</sup>Transaction ID: **C1569464** to Hillary for America, thus imputing guilt for "an overt act in aid of" money laundering, organized extortion under the color of law in violence of 18 U.S.C. § 1957(f)(2).

**CONCLUSION:**

Petitioner avers Political Operatives Judge Nancy E. Brasel, and David Schultz took bribes from AT&T Inc., The Walt Disney Company, Time Warner Inc., Twenty-First Century Fox Film Inc., dismantled both RICO Laws, Antitrust laws, and the U.S. Constitution Eleventh Amendment, while lying and "immunized" political allies for theft of a copyright in contempt of court citing 17 U.S.C. § 511(a)(b). The bribery and fraudulent "immunization" by Nancy Brasel extended to her instrumentalities for theft of Trademark: "*Enter the Matrix*" in contempt of court citing 15 U.S.C. § 1122(a)(b). Plaintiff seeks relief for remedies both at law and in equity, for actual damages, and profits for such a violation of Copyright Remedy

---

<sup>156</sup> Exh. 1590893

<sup>157</sup> Exh. 1569464

Clarification Act citing 17 U.S.C. § 511(a)(b) and to vacate the Judgment.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF:**

Petitioner requests that this case be vacate the judgment and remanded the case to the U.S. District Court of Minnesota to impanel a Grand Jury against Respondents, and serve the Targets with the Summons and Complaint by the U.S. Marshals due to fraud in contravention of a Final Judgment Order USSG § 2B1.1(8)(c), Subsec.(b)(9)(A). Petitioner requests that the Supreme Court rule that the U.S. District Court exceeded its statutory authority and interfered with the U.S. Department of Justice OCGS to have a Supervisory role that does not allow the dismissal of a RICO complaint with obvious claims for the collection of unlawful debt. Petitioner requests that the Court restore all of my rights as mandated under United States Sentencing Commission RICO Guidelines, Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations dated **May 2018**. Petitioner request that the U.S. Supreme Court issue Court Order declaring that Eric Holder's Law Covington & Burling LLP stalked me over 9 years directly or indirectly through third-party Fredrikson & Byron P.A. and manifested a purpose or intent to injure me and family with the common objective to usher through the acquisition by The Walt Disney Company of Twenty-First Century Fox Inc. in violation of Minn. Stat. § 609.749, Subd. 2(1).

Dated: 11/08/19

Submitted by,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'JD' followed by a flourish, is written over a horizontal line.