

ROLAND HINKSON

100 8th Avenue, Box 5
Phone (970) 325-4522
Fax (970) 325-7262
roland@ouraynet.com

April 5, 2005

U.S. Deputy Marshall David Meyer
Boise, Idaho, District Headquarters
550 West Fort-MSC 010,
Boise, Idaho 83724
(208-334-1298)

Dear Deputy Marshall Meyer:

During the Evidentiary Hearing on December 7, 2004, for my son, David Roland Hinkson, currently being held as a Federal inmate at ADA County Jail in Boise, Idaho, you were called to the witness-stand to testify. You stated that in your opinion David was a serious security risk and needed a higher level of guarding. You testified that other detention facilities within the State of Idaho were inadequate to protect the public from potential threats by David or his "so-called-followers." Also you said that there is a shortage of deputy marshals. Therefore, David should be tried, not by his peers, but by others outside of his home area. Change of venue must be denied. The biggest excuse (probably the only rational excuse) was the cost to the Federal Government to hold the forthcoming trial outside of Boise. Of course the cost seems to be non-consequential in the light of how much of the tax-payers money has already been spent.

Upon cross examination, I heard you admit that you had no personal knowledge nor had anyone within the Government spoken to you about any of their personal knowledge indicating that David was or had been a threat. You obviously relied solely upon hearsay information from other persons, who had never sworn an oath or given an affirmation. If I am mistaken, please clarify for me any misconception.

As you recall, while walking away from the Court Room, I approached you. I expressed to you my desire to talk with you, that I had a few questions. I told you that I had called your office leaving messages three times without any response from you. I told you I had called to set up an appointment for December 8, 2004, while I would be in Boise. You failed to respond. You said you never got the messages.

I said that "I've been often lied to by Federal agents and that I've observed extensive fraud within the System." You acknowledged that 4:00 p.m., the same day, in your office would be acceptable. I arrived a few minutes early and brought along an associate, Mr. Gregory Towerton (a former U.S. Air Force investigator and personal body guard of President Ronald Reagan).

I came right to the point: "Are you the person who made the decision to deny my son the right to use his own computer in assisting in his own defense? Or was the decision made by a superior and you only followed instructions?" You responded by asking me, "Who wants to know?" "I Want to know! David is being denied the opportunity to defend himself, I said." You stated that you would not talk to me about it, that you'd only speak with David's attorney.

Mr. Towerton then brought up the case of Sammy Hussein, who was housed in the same facility with David. Sammy had been charged as a terrorist-supporter using his computer as a tool on the Internet to commit anti-American acts in support of terrorism. Even though Sammy was acquitted, the fact remains that he was given his computer for use in his own self-defense. You said, "That was a special case."

Then I asked you if you had anything to do with the tampering of phones in David's compound ("Tank"). You said you hadn't. I've later confirmed that you had nothing to do with the numerous times David had his service cut off so that he couldn't reach his attorneys. I got to the bottom of the problem -- it was somewhat a comedy of errors. However, probably because of the ruckus I made, the ADA Jail authorities have now turned over to you control of

David's phone access. After that question, you told me that you have no further comment. I said, "Am I to assume that you did make the decision?" Your response was, "Assume anything you like." At that point I said, "Thank you," and we got up and left.

I have learned from officials at the ADA County Jail that it was, in fact, you who was responsible. The ADA County Jail authorities informed me that they try to work with the Federal authorities but that they would not themselves deny David use of his computer. "That decision was made by David Meyer." Also I learned from David's attorney, Wes Hoyt, that you told him you were responsible.

It's absolutely critical that David be given every chance to show his innocence. Yet so far, we have seen nothing to show any intent by the Government to honor David's rights under the *Constitution*. David has been placed in your custody. You are the link between the Federal System and David. Your testimony, authority, and influence dominates.

David has been psychologically analyzed by a competent psychologist, Dr. Jerry Doke. He concluded that the type of abuse, constant interruption of his daily routine and denial of any meaningful chance to prove that he is innocent of any of the accusation and charges against him, can, over time, cause David to lose his competency. Without access to his computer, Dr. Doke thinks that David's level of frustration will only increase.

Take any normal, innocent citizen off the street and subject him to what David has endured, and hardly any such person would have held up as well as David has done. Because of the uncivil torment heaped upon him, it is amazing how he has stood up. The Stockholm Syndrome technique has so far failed. Media coverage saturated Idaho with a picture of the most vile individual in recent history, David Roland Hinkson. He was thrown on the floor, cuffed and transported to jail, apparently moved under your authority, placed in a solitary cell in Moscow with a sign saying "KILLER" hanging on the cell door for guards and inmates to see. He was moved to ADA County Jail where rumors were circulated that he was a Cho Mo (child molester). He was taken to maximum security, housed with violent inmates, denied his doctor prescribed diet, had visitation rights from his wife and mother denied, even though they had traveled thousands of miles to see him. The list goes on and on, but you better than anyone would be aware.

Granted, there is a lot at stake for the Government in this case. Careers will be affected and hopefully justice will yet be served. What can you do to mitigate the damages that you and your callously, indifferent associates have perpetrated upon an innocent victim? Frankly, I don't know. Vindictiveness of all the perpetrators will surely give rise to retaliation -- probably ever so subtly as not to be apparent. Considering the hundreds of thousands of tax-payers dollars spent in this boondoggle, what has the public received? Will whistleblowers of government corruption more likely be deterred. Or will the contrary be the net result?

If you honestly think that the "evidence" is meritorious and that there has not been a foreordained conclusion for conviction, please let me know the specifics. However, I anticipate no response. I would be pleasantly surprised. What I do anticipate is that you will try to get as much support from your superiors as possible to cover-up or justify your actions.

Best wishes for a Merry Christmas.

Sincerely,

Roland Hinkson