

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES

- I. WHETHER THE MOTIONS FOR JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL, OR THE MOTION TO VACATE, MADE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE TRIAL, SHOULD HAVE BEEN GRANTED? **Pg.67**

- II. WHETHER CHARGING MULTIPLE CONSPIRACIES IS BARRED BY DOUBLE JEOPARDY; THE COUNTS IN THE INDICTMENT ARE ALSO VOID FOR DUPLICITY? **Pg.86**

- III. WHETHER MISLEADING IRS SUMMARY EXHIBITS BASED ON THE SUPPRESSION OF ALL UNDERLYING BANK RECORDS HELD IN THE GOVERNMENT'S POSSESSION, AND THE INACCURATE APPLICATION OF TAX LAW RESULTED IN UNLAWFUL CONVICTIONS? **Pg.91**

- IV. WHETHER THE ACCUSED WERE DENIED A FAIR TRIAL BY THE COURT'S RULING THAT "ALLEGED INVESTMENTS" WERE "IRRELEVANT" TO A "PONZI SCHEME" CHARGE, WHICH PREVENTED ALL DIRECT WITNESSES TO INVESTMENTS AND BANK AND BUSINESS RECORDS AS EVIDENCE?
Pg.118

- V. WHETHER THE ACCUSED WERE PREJUDICED BY PRE-INDICTMENT DELAYS. THE RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL WAS PREVENTED BY VIOLATIONS OF THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT? **Pg.144**

- VI. WHETHER DUE PROCESS WAS DENIED AND THE ACCUSED WERE PREJUDICED BY A LAST MINUTE COURT ORDER DENYING THE RIGHT TO PROCEED PRO SE? **Pg.154**

- VII. WHETHER THE COURT PERMITTED PLEADINGS IN OPPOSITION TO THE GOVERNMENT'S CASE AS EVIDENCE OF GUILTY INTENT IMPROPERLY EXTENDING THE LENGTH OF THE ALLEGED "CONSPIRACY" AND PREJUDICING THE ACCUSED BY PROCEDURAL FLAWS CAUSING PRETRIAL DETENTION? **Pg.171**
- VIII. WHETHER IT WAS PREJUDICIAL TO THE ACCUSED AND REVERSIBLE ERROR FOR THE PROSECUTION TO ENGAGE IN HEARSAY AND BRUTON VIOLATIONS? **Pg.185**
- IX. WHETHER IT WAS PREJUDICIAL AND IMPROPER FOR THE ACCUSED TO BE JOINED WITH THE BOSSES, WHOM THE ACCUSED HAD REPORTED TO LAW ENFORCEMENT FOR EMBEZZLEMENT ON 8/2/01, THEREBY INITIATING A FEDERAL INVESTIGATION STARTED BY THE IRS? **Pg.190**
- X. WHETHER A RUSH TO JUDGMENT WAS MADE ABUSING NOTICE, LAWFUL CONDUCT, EX POST FACTO PROTECTIONS, ARBITRATION, AND THE RIGHT TO CONTRACT. THE PROSECUTION TEAM ENGAGED IN VINDICTIVE ABUSES OF CHARGING AUTHORITY, SELECTIVENESS, AND PREVENTED THE DEFENSES OF GOOD FAITH RELIANCE AND ENTRAPMENT BY ESTOPPEL? **Pg.207**
- XI. WHETHER THE JURY INSTRUCTIONS AND THE JUDGE'S SPECIAL VERDICT FORM IMPROPERLY REMOVED THE BURDEN OF PROOF FROM THE PROSECUTION. THE PRO SE ACCUSED WERE UNFAIRLY DENIED ATTENDANCE AT THE JURY INSTRUCTION CONFERENCE? **Pg.232**
- XII. WHETHER JUDICIAL BIAS FAVORING THE PROSECUTION PREVENTED A FAIR TRIAL AND CAUSED BOTH AN UNREASONABLE AND ILLEGAL SENTENCE? **Pg.245**