

Dear Ms. Walos,

I have received Mr. Hoch's response and your request. After reading Mr. Hoch's response, I can only assume that my grievance was unclear because Mr. Hoch focused on slandering me with attacks that were misstated or complete fabrications. If my grievance was that unclear, I apologize sincerely. My initial grievance was filed because Mr. Hoch "scrubbed" all evidence concerning a hard drive from my evidence box before it was transferred to my appellate attorney. To respond to your request, I'll need to refer to this evidence, so I will explain what it contains in a following paragraph.

Due to Mr. Hoch's willingness to lie to protect himself, I am forced to withhold certain information regarding current issues that Mr. Hoch may have to testify to in the future. As these issues Mr. Hoch raises are absolutely irrelevant to this grievance, I hope this isn't seen as refusal to cooperate with your investigation.

My initial grievance is centered around 5 issues concerning a single piece of evidence:

1. Mr. Hoch specifically told me that he was going to call forensic computer experts to present the evidence in question, yet failed to do so and did not discuss this with me.
2. Mr. Hoch told me that he would introduce the hard drive evidence, yet failed to do so.
3. Mr. Hoch told me that he would introduce an O.S.B.I. report on this hard drive, yet failed to do so.
4. Mr. Hoch removed the desktop copy of this hard drive from the evidence box before it was transferred to indigent defense attorney O.I.D.S.
5. Mr. Hoch removed the O.S.B.I. forensic computer report data disk from the evidence box before it was transferred to O.I.D.S.
6. Mr. Hoch removed the OSBI forensic computer written report from the evidence box before it was transferred to O.I.D.S.

I have sent some of this evidence to you. If I resend any, I apologize. I wish to label it to clarify for you. Forensic computer expert Marvin Dutton was not called. (BAR#)

2.

witness # 16). O.S.B.I. agent Donald Rains is not on any witness list. He and Marvin Dutton did forensic examinations of my wifes hard drive (BAR#1 exhibit 11). Agent Rains examination was done after my first trial and produced a data disk (Copy can be provided upon request), as well as a written report (BAR #2).

Information contained on hard drive

A. The hard drive contains exculpatory evidence that proves my wifes computer, which I had no access to in over a year, was used to do internet searches concerning reporting sexual abuse and custody (BAR # 3); getting parental rights back, and Oklahoma parental rights (BAR # 2 page 8). These were done up to 9 days prior to my wifes claim that she learned of sexual abuse of our daughter (BAR # 3 + BAR # 2 page 11). It proves that the computer was used to view pornography during the exact timeframe the searches were made (BAR # 2 page 11). My daughter had a forensic interview where she described sexual acts on Jan 12. The report clearly shows pornographic movies were viewed 4 times over an 8 hour period just one day prior to this interview. 45% of all pornographic website accesses were done on this day BAR # 2 page 5. To link my wife to these views, my wife sent my girlfriend, Amanda Monsalve, an email laughing at us and wishing me luck because I would need it, on Jan 11 (BAR # 1 Exhibit 4); Valerics computer was used to search "Amanda Monsalve" on this day, within minutes of pornography being viewed (BAR # 2 pages 11 + 5). Additionally, pornographic pictures were downloaded (BAR # 2 page 4)

Response to Mr. Hoch

I had no intention to digress from the professional issues at hand and turn this into a back and forth slander of character. I am disgusted by Mr. Hochs lies and diversions from the issues in his reply. I do not wish to reply to these issues that

3.

serve no other purpose than to assassinate my character. However, you requested that I respond to "any areas of agreement or disagreement" I may have. Therefore, I am obligated to do so. For simplification, I've provided a copy of Mr. Hoch's reply, numbered by paragraph. I will address each paragraph with numbered paragraphs of my own that correspond.

1. Mr. Hoch begins by saying I'm not "pro se". I agree. Never did I say I was, so I don't understand why this is brought up. My grievance states "I wrote a pro se appeal and sent it to my attorney to give him ideas". Robert Jackson of OIDS (Witness A) will confirm this. Mr. Hoch obviously misread what I wrote and is confused.

2. Mr. Hoch is confused about the evidence. The FBI acquired an external hard drive of mine without a warrant, permission, or reason. It had projects I was working on, my criminal case evidence, and personal information on it. I authorized Mr. Hoch to obtain it from Agent Western and give it to my family. I did not authorize anything to be taken from my evidence box; especially (BAR #1 Exhibit II) because they already had a copy of it. Mr. Hoch then states that the evidence box contained "everything else" when given to OIDS. Witness A will say differently, I presume. Finally, Mr. Hoch says it was my family's responsibility to provide evidence to OIDS. Why is it their responsibility and not my attorney's? He had the evidence in the evidence box; my family didn't have the box. Included is an affidavit from my previous attorney, acknowledging receipt of the evidence Mr. Hoch removed (BAR #4). A stranger off the street had the same access and right to my evidence as anyone in my family. I was the client, not them.

3. I agree

4 .

4. Mr. Hoch appears to have more knowledge than I. After 8 hours of deliberation, one juror was "brow beat" into saying guilty and then refused to say guilty. This is my knowledge of events.

5. My house was burned by arson 3 days before trial. 2 secretaries from my law firm asked if I would allow them to treat me for a night out, before trial. I was not out "drinking" as I was the designated driver nor did I have sex with them. I did however, have sushi and good conversation that is as ridiculously irrelevant to this grievance as Mr. Hoch's asinine statement. I did flee the jurisdiction. My wife's brother was seen by law enforcement with a gun at the courthouse during my first trial, her father pointed a gun at my girlfriend and I and was convicted, my house was burned to the ground by arson and I was told that FBI agents were seen burning it, and the court denied a one week continuance even though I owned no clothes to go to court in. I wrote a letter to my attorney, Judge Enos, and Chanel 7 news explaining that I was in fear of my life and leaving. I also stated that I would be back within 90 days unless I were dead. This email is included (BAR # 5)

6. I can't reply to Mr. Hoch being hired after stating he was over-tasked. This is the first I've heard of.

7. I generally agree and many political groups were discussing FBI involvement in a state case, not just "militia clans".

8. I generally agree. I was reluctant as well, but Hoch said he would be negligent to advise me against mistrial. Deputy Powell, Stephens Co. Sheriff can confirm me discussing this with him.

9. I agree

10. I was offered a 2.5 year plea bargain, yes. No one demanded that I not take the plea bargain and Mr. Hoch has absolutely no way of knowing what was discussed as he was not present. Affidavits can be produced, other than my own to confirm this. I proceeded to trial of my own free will and because I refused to admit to something I didn't do. Mr. Hoch never advised me to take a plea agreement. He agreed there was plenty of evidence to support my defense and show the lies concerning disclosure and police reports 5 days later. I never knew the plea agreement was 2.5 years until told in the judges chambers. I asked a few questions and then refused. Transcripts of this are on record at the Stephens Co. Court house. I am not complaining about the consequences of my decision because if granted a new trial, I will refuse any plea bargain offered. I am complaining about Mr. Hoch lying and not presenting evidence and then removing it from my evidence box so it wouldn't be brought up on appeal.

11. I agree that propositions chosen by OIDS counsel are ~~erroneous~~

12. The victims testimony is not only contradicted by multiple witnesses, it is contradictory to her mothers testimony, and is inconsistent and unclear as to what sexual abuse happened or when. The states forensic examiner, Jessica Taylor, even stated the victim was unclear and Mrs. Taylor is unsure of what abuse may have happened. This is a direct reflection of how clueless Mr. Hoch was throughout the entire trial. His dates and facts were incorrect multiple times and he allowed lies and misstatements to be told uncorrected on several occasions. As an example, Jessica Taylor testified that the victim described specifics about my penis in the video interview which was a complete lie, but Mr. Hoch never objected, corrected, or had the prosecutor correct this, even upon my demands.

Mr. Hoch seemed confused in regards to previous testimony from past trials as well as testimony given during trials he participated in.

13. The "proposed evidence" does in fact explain the "vivid descriptions" of the criminal acts as previously explained in paragraph A. It is not shocking that Mr. Hoch is unaware of this evidence as he made minimal effort to become familiar with the case and no effort to discuss the evidence with me. Any time I spoke of evidence such as this, he replied with acknowledgements such as "We'll get that in there". And Mr. Hoch's personal views of the physical evidence was a stark contrast to what he wrote in his reply. Before and during trial, he never made these comments. He adamantly agreed that the physical evidence, in the doctor's own testimony, was not even definitive that sexual abuse happened; let alone that I was the author if it had. The mother claims to have seen physical damage, yet waited 5 days to report it and 10 days to seek a medical exam. Mr. Hoch now changes his stance because he considers this as a personal feud now, which is blatantly apparent in his baseless and irrelevant personal attacks throughout his reply. If he would have expressed these views before trial, he would not have been retained and would not have been my attorney at trial.

14. I agree

15. I did indeed end jail conversations with "Fuck you Jason Hicks" multiple times. Mr. Hoch presents no evidence or even specifics of what he is talking about. I challenge him to do so. And as far as my hatred toward Jason Hicks, I have ended hundreds of calls with the phrase "Fuck you Jason Hicks" before Mr. Hoch was even my attorney and before my first trial. Doing so has never allowed otherwise unallowed evidence to be presented. I challenge Mr. Hoch to explain this as he never took the time to explain it before. As far as speaking about the case on the phone, I asked Mr. Hoch to allow me to see and hear

7.

numerous pieces of evidence every time I saw him and every time he claimed he forgot to bring them. Still to this day I haven't had access to a single thing I requested which included multiple recorded conversations, multiple pictures, and access to the FBI data disk information. If my family tried to inform me of goings on, I'm sure I didn't stop them if Mr. Hoch didn't tell me not to talk about it. With Mr. Hoch's conduct, I felt I was entering trial completely blind. Mr. Hoch also assured me that he would go over questions I may be asked by he or the prosecutor but never had time on a single visit to the jail.

16. This paragraph confuses me. He claims that my family insured that the DA was made aware of what witnesses would say, which allowed the DA to investigate the witnesses and, this is where I'm confused, confirm they would not say what my family claimed. Does my family's comments alter the truth? If a witness is to testify to something, what does others' assumptions of the testimony have to do with anything? If my family was incorrect on their assumptions, did this alter witnesses testimony? This paragraph makes no sense to me and this isn't a subject Mr. Hoch ever breached to me. However, if I am to believe his reply in full, there are many things he should have discussed with me and utterly failed to do so. I challenge Mr. Hoch to present specifics and not be so vague.

17. Mr. Hoch failed to call upwards of 6 witnesses that testified at the first trial. I have no clue of what witnesses could be impeached or what the "Dyer family" wasn't candid about as once again, this is the first I've heard of it. If previously used witnesses were lying about something, was this not important for a defendant to know? I challenge Mr. Hoch to present specifics.

18. I'm unsure what door with my girlfriend could be opened. No interview was ever

given with the FBI concerning additional molestation. One interview was given, not by law enforcement, and it was confirmed that no sexual abuse had occurred. Once again, I challenge Mr. Hoch to present evidence as this is the first I've heard of it.

19. Mr. Hoch's lack of awareness that I do not have an ex-wife is indicative of his knowledge of this case. Mr. Hoch only showed a fraction of lies told by Valerie Dyer, my current wife. And to say the physical evidence was "impossible" to overcome is absolutely preposterous as it WAS overcome at the first trial by David Hammond (800) 252-9033. What is impossible, is for a defendant to receive a fair trial when an attorney fails to share case information with him, lies about what information will be presented, fails to allow access to - evidence supposedly against him, fails to allow a defendant any decision making capacity in his own case, and fails to prepare his client.

20. The alleged victim already testified, by way of forensic interview (BAR# 1 Exhibit 2), that she never saw me do anything inappropriate with my girlfriend's daughter and she did testify to molestation in a tent on pages 99 and 100 of her testimony. And Mr. Hoch forgets that he asked the child, on page 102 of cross, about the incident in the tent. The alleged victim testified that she never said anything to anyone about a tent for 3 years after the supposed incident until one day before her testimony on the third trial while being interviewed by the ADA. This conveniently tied up a hole in the prosecution's case. Once again, Mr. Hoch is either lying to you or confused about the case.

21. Mr. Hoch is clearly lying here and I challenge him to produce evidence. I know what Mr. Hoch is referring to and it is not a jail call nor is it allowable in court because of the source of the conversation and the fact that it is multiple conversations spliced to appear like one. Mr. Hoch denied me access to this very recording for about 5 months before trial. To this day, he still hasn't presented it, regardless of his repeatedly telling me I could hear it next time he came.

22. Mr. Hoch knows the call he refers to in 21 was not a "jailhouse call" nor was it allowable in court. There were no additional complaints of sexual abuse.

23. Mr. Hoch is lying once again as paragraph A clearly demonstrates relevance. And nothing on the computer contained any information concerning "additional allegations of molestation" or "attempts to conceal evidence" and I challenge Mr. Hoch to produce evidence otherwise.

Also nothing on the computer opened evidence of membership in a militia or gun charges as the hard drive was presented at the first trial and none of this was mentioned. And Mr. Hoch claims that the "Dyer family" fails to tell you that Mr. Hoch was successful in getting the weapons charges severed from the trial. They did not tell you because it is both irrelevant to the initial grievance and a lie. I present (BAR # 6) to you that clearly shows the motion to sever, filed over a year before Mr. Hoch was hired by me. This motion was granted and severed on the first trial. Additionally (BAR # 7) shows the judge ruled all previous motions in effect from the first trial, April 2011 on page 7 lines 10-14.

So, mentioning this as some great achievement my family failed to mention is just sad and a desperate attempt to give a facade of effectiveness. Beyond these clear misstatements of facts, I also am not nor ever have I been a member of a militia. I had plans of volunteering training to militia members but was arrested before doing so. Beyond this, I provided tactical training to airsoft teams in southern California.

24. To my knowledge, the "Dyer family" never attempted to produce evidence from individuals affiliated with the militia to support a conspiracy theory. If it was asked, it was done without my knowledge and I challenge Mr. Hoch to present proof of this.

25. Mr. Hoch is again vague and I'm unable to respond as no specifics or proof is presented.

10.

26. I know that information was leaked to the "Hinkey Report" Hinkey meter by my supporters. They had no information that my family didn't give them. Mr. Hoch is too vague and presents no proof for me to respond to.

27. Mr. Hoch claims that doors would have permitted videos of me to be presented to the jury of me holding high powered weapons and stating anti-government rhetoric while declaring myself to be "the July 4th Patriot". Mr. Hoch lies again and further shows his unwillingness to confirm things he reads or hears. The lie is the statement of weapons and rhetoric. Not once have I held high powered weapons and stated anti-government rhetoric. There is one video about 3 minutes long with me and 2 friends demonstrating a contact drill and no other videos with me holding rifles. Other videos of me training airsoft teams, I am holding a toy rifle and never speak anti-government rhetoric while holding one. The "anti-government rhetoric" are political rallies or videos of me quoting founding fathers or altering founding father quotes to present day use. I served 8 years in the Marine corp and 1 year on a sheriff's dept. I am anything but anti-government. I am anti-corruption. If Mr. Hoch believes repeating speeches of our founding fathers, quoting them, or speaking about the constitution is "anti-government" then I'll wear it as a badge of honor, but I refute his claims altogether. In regards to me declaring myself "the July 4th Patriot", Mr. Hoch is simply ignorant of the truth but of no fault of his own. July 4 Patriot is simply my youtube account name. When I didn't use my real name, people called me by my youtube name. This account is still active to confirm and investigate Mr. Hoch's claims. I've never "declared" myself "the July 4th Patriot". Additionally, I have never made threats or encouraged violence and these videos were up prior to the first trial and never came close to being admitted into evidence as I am simply a political speaker and what I've said is as irrelevant to my case as this paragraph is to my grievance.

28. The "Dyer family's legal strategies" are irrelevant as the their opinion has nothing to do with me or my strategic decisions. My legal strategy was to present the evidence that did not result in a conviction and further it with the evidence in paragraph A. As explained in 27, my political views are irrelevant and were not allowed in the first trial. The judge didn't even allow the prosecutor to ask if I or my family are NRA members. Mr. Hoch agreed to my strategy and did the opposite without ever consulting me.

29. I cannot confirm Mr. Hoch's claims. Mr. Hoch informed me that the manhunt was done without DOJ approval and began 2 days before I even missed my court date and was therefore illegal. He also said the prosecution didn't want to mention the Flight Instruction because the evidence in paragraph 5 clearly proved fear and not guilt and opened doors the prosecution didn't want to open. Mr. Hoch's tactical decisions did not keep evidence of weapons and militia out of the trial. My proof is that none of it came out during the first trial and further, I challenge Mr. Hoch to show specifics of how the hard drive would open doors to these issues. Finally, Mr. Hoch is flatly lying about "hate crime evidence" as none exists and if it does, he decided not to present it to me or even notify me of it. I challenge Mr. Hoch to present it.

30. Indeed, I did tell Mr. Hoch to "ignore her" because I was his client, not my mother or anyone else. This is my life, my case, and my business. Trial decisions are not up to my mother or Mr. Hoch but are for my final decision. Mr. Hoch is under the impression that by hiring him, he "owns" my case and can do what he pleases and not include me whatsoever. *Grant v. State, 2004 OK Cr. 24, 85 P. 3d 178, 182* refutes this and *Lott v. State, 2004 OK Cr. 27, 164, 98 P. 3d 318, 357* confirms my right to be involved in my case as it affects my life.

31. To my knowledge, the "Dyer family" did not want the militia to play any role in my trial. And as he clearly acknowledges, I didn't either, which is the only opinion that matters so this paragraph is completely irrelevant. I challenge Mr. Hoch to present specifics of his once again vague statements. Mr. Hoch's statement that "militia members" made themselves obvious through distinctive armbands while "hovering" around the courthouse at my first trial is a complete and brazen lie to the Oklahoma BAR in a shameless attempt to say the militia was involved in my trial. Not one militia member, or non-militia member for that fact, hovered around the courthouse nor wore armbands of any kind. No militia members at all, to my knowledge, attended any part of my trial either inside nor outside of the courthouse. On the last day of trial, Rick Light arrived after dark and stayed in the parking lot across the street until jury deliberation was over. Upon Request, I can provide affidavits from Rick Light, Robin Starsky, Jan Dyer, Amy Dark, Larry Dark, David Hammond, Amanda Masalve, and Monica Freeman to confirm this as they were all present. Rick Light was the only militia member to ever come to any of my trials. The only time "the militia" came to the courthouse was for a court hearing that was not for me. And what relevance is it for anything that people used the internet between my trials? I'm sure millions of people "internet" daily, so what? This statement leaves me dumbfounded.

32. Once again Mr. Hoch is vague about "information" that could be introduced. I challenge him to provide specifics and proof. Also, I challenge Mr. Hoch to provide proof of threats. I will acknowledge the threat against Mr. Hoch by a Cecil Medina, who is not a "militia member" and is actually anti-militia, and will label it (BAR # 32). I challenge Mr. Hoch to present proof how any of this could be linked to me. I am not a member of a militia, I was unaware any threats had even been made, I'm positive that no one I know made threats because they work closely with law enforcement, and none of this has anything to do with me or my case. To suggest this could be brought up is preposterous.

33. What is the relevance of surveillance of "militia people" by law enforcement? The only "militia person" that came to my trial, even, was Rick Light. If SWAT were mounted on the roof and heavy surveillance was present over one man, nearly 60 years old, it would be an amusing overkill of manpower. Once again, I challenge Mr. Hoch to present evidence and I offer the previously mentioned witnesses at my trials and additionally will add Nancy Genovese and Lisa Rize for affidavits on this issue upon request.

34. I agree

35. I cannot comment on Mr. Hoch being "drinking buddies" with the DA. If he is, he never mentioned it to me that I can recall. In regards to the "dating relationship", my words were poorly chosen and were not meant as a personal attack. Mr. Hoch did certainly tell me that he had a relationship outside of work with someone in the DA's office and I was fortunate that she couldn't be used in the case as it was a conflict of interest. If I am incorrect in my details, I gladly submit to Mr. Hoch's clarification, but if it is said that this conversation never happened, it's a lie as he mentioned it a couple of times. To investigate this, Mr. Hoch logged in when he visited me at Stephens Co. Jail. Simply review my calls to (580) 252-7266 on or the next couple of days after his log in date. Details of these conversations are on those calls. The only reason I brought this up in the grievance was because it struck me as a possible reason to throw my case and remove evidence to ensure failure of direct appeal.

36 (Flaw)

BT I have no knowledge of Mr. Hoch's drinking habits. However, since he denies drinking, I have included (BAR #9) concerning Mr. Hoch drinking alcohol during my trial, diabetic or not.

38. I know nothing of this.

39. Mr. Hoch shoulders no fault that the polygraph was stopped. Mr. Hoch is blameless in this and truly attempted to have a polygraph done. Though, I'm unsure why this is mentioned.

40. I know nothing of this. Any evidence that surfaces will be labeled (BAR #10)

41. I know nothing of this. Any evidence confirming or denying it will be labeled (BAR #11)

42. To say that everything was done to provide effective defense is laughable, were this not such a serious matter. I have already presented my case and evidence on the contrary and presented evidence that Mr. Hoch has, in the past, called multiple people liars concerning events including a pastor. I know Mr. Hoch will lie to protect himself, and have presented proof of not only this but that he lied to you in an ill thought out attempt to paint a seriously inaccurate picture of me. He provides no proof of a single thing he stated in his reply and remained overly vague throughout it all.

43. There were no other "minor child" alleged victims. There was no "hate crime" evidence. The weapons charges were already severed, Mr. Hoch refers to phone calls that never happened, and he never allowed me access to these calls in order to tell him what and where these calls originated from.

44. The "vivid testimony" of the victim is very uncertain and contradicted, partially explained in paragraph 12. The "corroboration" Mr. Hoch refers to is not "corroboration" and it should frighten any client of his to know Mr. Hoch can't even distinguish what corroboration is. Corroborating evidence is "supplementary evidence which tends to connect the defendant with the commission of the crime charged". There were not multiple "physicians" as Mr. Hoch claims.

There was only one and by his own testimony, it's not even definitive that sexual abuse even occurred, let alone that I were the author if it had. On base of this paragraph, perhaps Mr. Hoch is correct that No lawyer could keep this evidence out. To say one way or the other would be speculation on my part. Mr. Hammond was unable as well.

45. "Part of me kicks myself in the ass for not taking that 2.5 year plea bargain." Show me a man that receives a 30 year sentence, when he could be home next Christmas, and says he doesn't see 2.5 years as a lesser of two evils in hindsight, and I'll show you a man that's a liar. "in the words of the infamous Charles Dyer" Mr. Hoch childishly shows his levity to this grievance as much as he did my trial. This is nothing but a lack of professionalism at its finest. I did not listen to my family and did not fail to follow any of Mr. Hoch's advice. The simple facts are that Mr. Hoch didn't give "advice" but rather accepted stacks of papers I wrote him without ever reading them, never presented evidence to me, greeted my ideas and strategy with a smile and nodding head, agreed to represent me as I asked, and agreed to present the evidence already presented at my first trial; and then without doing even a fraction of what he promised and with over 10 witnesses uncalled, I hear "The defense rests". I was infuriated and the only answer I got was that he got the evidence in that we needed. When I threatened to disrupt the court and tell the judge we weren't resting, Mr. Hoch told me to calm down and if it didn't work, I could bring it up on appeal. I expressed my anger at Mr. Hoch on the pre trial sentencing statement, just days later (BAR #12) if available.

Mr. Hoch's completely removing me from the decisions of my case, placating me with everything I presented to him, being totally unfamiliar with my case, withholding evidence from me, not allowing access to evidence I requested, and hijacking my case as if he owned it, effectively allowed me to jump from a plane after he shredded my parachute to pieces.

46. I have reviewed the documents that Mr. Hoch sent. I have numbered them 1-4 and returned them with my reply.

1. This is a letter to Rick Light. I do not understand the evidentiary value of this.

2. This is some random website I know nothing about with a blog posted by a Drake, whom I don't know, announcing a radio show Rick Light and my mother did 4 months after conviction. He incorrectly wrote my name as "the July 4th Patriot" which explains why Mr. Hoch also stated this. He obviously got his information from random websites of which are often riddled with incorrect information.

3. This is a blog posted by a Walter Hughby, whom I've no idea who he is, on a website I've never heard of. It contains a question and answer segment I wrote online about three years ago in response to a flood of interrogatives from people. Once again, I fail to see the relevance to anything concerning my case or grievance.

4. This is a blog by a Terry Banzio, whom I'm told walks across the country for military veterans, on a website I've never heard of. Of these 15 pages, 3 concern me. Of these three, none contain anything I wrote or said. He did get my youtube name closer than the other "July 4 Patriot". Of these 3 pages, only 1 has anything on it linked to something I did; on page 3, the bottom picture is a still shot I took and posted online four years ago.

Of these 30 pages only 6 even contain anything I wrote and these were done years before Hoch was hired, except the letter. I'm at a loss to understanding what any of this is relevant to. At least no more relevant than if I referred to Mr. Hoch as "the horrible attorney" on a website CircusClowns.com and then tried to claim he is a circus clown that declares himself "the horrible attorney." It's all just as ridiculous and irrelevant to any issue whatever. And with such horrible representation and acts by the "justice" system, does Mr. Hoch not expect my family and I to complain to "anyone that will listen"?

In my initial grievance, I did not discuss even a minute amount of the information Mr. Hoch elicited by his reply. Mr. Hoch is a Marine and I did not wish to slander him in any way. My family and I had been unable to reach him or have mail replied to and it is not unreasonable to want to find out why Mr. Hoch removed evidence before it was given to OIDS. I would not have gone outside of this realm due to our mutual brotherhood. However, Mr. Hoch has acted dishonorably by lying and misstating multiple issues. As this conduct is unethical, I now wish to increase the scope of my complaint to include the following:

1. Mr. Hoch's lie to the BAR that he advised me to take a plea deal (paragraph 10)
2. That Mr. Hoch provided untrue information to the BAR in regards to paragraph 16 unless he is able to provide and prove specifics.
3. Mr. Hoch provided untrue information to the BAR in regards to paragraph 17 unless he is able to provide and prove specifics.
4. Mr. Hoch provided untrue information to the BAR in regards to FBI interviews concerning additional molestation unless he can provide proof. (paragraph 18)
5. Mr. Hoch lied about the victim possibly testifying to molestation of my girlfriends daughter and keeping testimony about a tent from being presented to the jury, in his BAR reply (paragraph 20)
6. Mr. Hoch provided untrue information to the BAR about a "jail call" that does not exist, unless he can produce it. (paragraph 21)
7. Mr. Hoch lied about the relevance of evidence in regards to the hard drive, in his reply to the BAR in paragraph 23.
8. Mr. Hoch provided untrue information to the BAR concerning additional allegations of molestation unless he can produce evidence. (paragraph 23)
9. Mr. Hoch provided untrue information to the BAR concerning my "attempts to conceal evidence" unless he can produce evidence. (paragraph 23)
10. Mr. Hoch provided untrue information to the BAR concerning the "Dyer family"

- attempting to produce evidence from the militia to support a conspiracy theory.
(paragraph 24.)
11. Mr. Hoch lied to the BAR by stating that videos exist of me holding high powered weapons and he kept these from being seen by the jury. (paragraph 27)
 12. Mr. Hoch lied to the BAR about the hard drive evidence opening doors to mentioning the militia in paragraph 29.
 13. Mr. Hoch provided untrue statements to the BAR concerning his tactical decisions keeping out evidence of weapons unless he provides proof. (paragraph 29)
 14. Mr. Hoch lied about "Hate crime" evidence to the BAR. This evidence doesn't exist. (paragraph 29.)
 15. Mr. Hoch lied to the BAR in regards to militia members "hovering" around the courthouse while wearing arm bands during my first trial (paragraph 31)
 16. I am suspicious that Mr. Hoch is being untruthful about threats to the judges, and prosecutors and proof should be presented. (paragraph 32)
 17. I am suspicious that Mr. Hoch is being untruthful about "information" the FBI presented him and proof should be presented. (paragraph 32)
 18. Mr. Hoch provided untrue statements to the BAR by saying prospective jury members were threatened, unless he provides proof. (paragraph 32)
 19. Mr. Hoch provided untrue statements to the BAR by suggesting any threats could have been linked to me, when he knows otherwise. (paragraph 32)
 20. Mr. Hoch's statement to the BAR in paragraph 33 is untrue unless he can provide proof.
 21. Mr. Hoch lied to the BAR about never drinking alcoholic beverages. (paragraph 37)
 22. Mr. Hoch provided untrue statements to the BAR about being responsible for the severing of the weapons charges in paragraph 23.
 23. Mr. Hoch did not "fully inform" me of the evidence and facts in violation of of ABA part V standard 4-5.1(a).

24. Mr. Hoch came nowhere near being thorough and prepared for my case, in violation of O.S. Title 5 Ch. 1, App 3-A Rule 1.1
25. If Mr. Hoch's decisions were that of strategy, it should have been explained to me. This is a violation of O.S. Title 5 Ch. 1, App 3-A Rule 1.4(b) and discussed in comments [1] and [5]
26. Mr. Hoch hijacked my defense as explained in paragraph 30.
27. Mr. Hoch did not maintain communication with me concerning representation as he was always too busy to give me specifics of anything the DA claimed concerning new evidence, violating O.S. Title 5 Ch. 1, App 3-A.
28. Mr. Hoch did not act with diligence in representing me, violating O.S. Title 5 Ch. 1, App 3-A Rule 1.3.
29. Mr. Hoch did not keep me informed, violating ABA part V Standard 4-3.8(a) and O.S. Title 5 Ch. 1, App 3-A Rule 1.2(a), 1.4(a)(1) and 1.4(a)(2).

I thank you greatly for your time and assistance, Ms. Walas. If you need any transcript of the trials (minus judges chambers), follow up evidence, or anything else that may assist you, please call (580) 252-7266 or email missguilt42@yahoo.com and every measure will be made to assist.

Sincerely,

Charles A. De

~~Senior ID~~