Dear Judge Ernest G. Sullivan:

Assistant U.S. Attorney Joseph Bottini and a host of other criminal bureaucrats cooked up a bunch of phony charges against Joie Davis for being a drug trafficker. They even went to the trouble of planting a drug deal right in front of the courthouse and then, to seal the deal, they actually added some fake evidence to the story. In the end, they got Joie Davis arrested, tried, convicted, and sentenced to prison.

Davis has now served three years in prison, and it's time for her to get her life back. Her crimes were the result of circumstances beyond her control. She was caught up in a web of lies and deception, and she was the victim of a system that failed her. Now it's time for her to move on with her life.

Please consider this request carefully and take the necessary steps to free Joie Davis so that she can get on with her life and move forward.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

---

Mr. Schuette's distinguished showmanship is plain to see in a way that makes the whole thing laughable. He avoided all inquiry into the inconvenient facts of the case, and his skillfully understated the issues of relevance and justice. He deftly sidestepped all related political questions, instead choosing to focus on the issue of who made the smallest federal commitment. Mr. Schuette has not only chosen to avoid answering the questions himself, but he has also added to the mire of his political questions. He has made an effort to obfuscate the issues at hand, and the result is a confusing and confusing mess.

If the prosecution was not only blowing off your orders, but was in fact squared to you by providing the very sort of crassness and corruption you were seeking then, for you would not have been truly happy. This may have been what you wanted to do to Joie Davis, but what you said was that it was a giant hot-potato, you went in and dissolved the court by opposing the motion. Then you stumped VHO over the "reorganized" stamp and mailed it back to me with a chicken scratch note on the front telling me that the case was closed. Of course it's closed, that's what a 60(a) motion is for. If you had some reason to deny the motion, then you should have denied it on the record so that I could appeal it, and so that the reason and your reasoning would be open and accessible to the people. But that's what you didn't do.

You're not a Federal Judge, so I don't have magical powers to look into a man's heart, know what's in there, and condemn him. I have to go off of evidence. But right now the evidence makes it look like you were more than happy to let my Senator get reassigned by the courts on your watch. After the only--after the prosecution's crimes started to get attention in the media, you let him up on his high horse and start wagging his finger. Was all that--Was there a pattern? Was there a pattern? Was there a pattern you gave them a sideways wink and a nod? It sure looks like it. After all, the best way to block a real investigation is with a fake one. We all know how that works.

If you're a politician pretending to be a judge, we need to figure it out somehow rather than later. Especially with you sitting on the Judicial Watch trial. Barring someone from Service News lawsuit over late innards' "draft" emails. There's a pattern here: Someone's being kept from doing political hit jobs, you could call the investigations "bureaucrat shenanigans," eventually nothing happens, you close the case.

Politics is a complex economy of eccentric personalities. If I could get the key to the way things lock isn't always the way they are, and that's that by necessity. I know we all have to find ways to get by and I'm not blaming you for that. But if you're involved in policy investigations of government thugs who get gung-ho and get caught before you nip it in its bud, it's starting to look bad.

You're colluding with reckless criminals and it is very shortsighted.