

Scott William Faul
Reg. No. 04564-059
Federal Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 1000
Milan, MI 48160



↔04564-059↔

Rudy Davis
PO BOX 2088
Forney, TX 75126
United States

Metroplex MI 480 ZIP
FRI 07 MAR 2025 AM

Scott William Faul
Reg. No. 04564-059
F.C.I. Milan
P.O. Box 1000
Milan, MI 48160

March 6, 2025

Rudy Davis
P.O. Box 2088
Forney, TX 75126

Re: Documents

Dear Rudy,

I pray that you are all well and blessed. As discussed last evening, I am enclosing some copies of documents that I submitted to the Parole Commission: my 7-page January 17, 2025 "Parole Hearing Representation For Weaponization Investigation," and my 1-page January 23, 2025 letter "Re: President Trump's Weaponization Directive," which were both delivered in person to the parole hearing examiner on January 23, 2025. That is all okay for public viewing.

Those documents are loaded with information, questions, and ideas that are relevant to the open letter I will soon be sending to President Trump, Vice President J. D. Vance, Attorney General Bondi, FBI Director Patel, and FBI Deputy Director Bongino. Shortly after I send that 1-page letter to those recipients, I will send a copy of it to you also, with examples of suggested inquiries or comments to those recipients. That will all likewise be okay for public viewing.

As you read over the documents I am today enclosing, I think that many questions for the upcoming recipients will pop right out at you. Likewise, I believe, that will occur for anyone else reading that same information. It is damning for the damned of the DOJ and their complicit judiciary. They have not been our Father's children. As to you, on the other hand, may you continue to be blessed.

Sincerely,



Scott William Faul

enc: 8 pages
cc: File

PAROLE HEARING REPRESENTATION
FOR WEAPONIZATION INVESTIGATION

Scott William Faul
Reg. No. 04564-059
F.C.I. Milan
P.O. Box 1000
Milan, MI 48160

January 17, 2025

Chair Cushwa, and Staff
U.S. Parole Commission
90 K Street NE, 3rd Floor
Washington, DC 20530

Re: Scott William Faul
Reg. No. 04564-059
Representative

Chair Cushwa, and all Parole Commission Staff:

At the request of those involved in assisting and encouraging the investigation of the weaponization of the DOJ against the public, I have compiled for Scott William Faul's upcoming hearing before the United States Parole Commission (Commission) what I believe to be some relevant facts, circumstances, and questions that require an answer by the Commission. This compilation is for the use of whoever becomes a representative for Mr. Faul at his upcoming hearing, or for the use of Mr. Faul himself at his upcoming hearing, whichever is most beneficial for the purpose of assisting said investigation into the DOJ's weaponization practices. Quite a number of documents are implicated in this investigation, calling into question the validity of Mr. Faul's conviction, exposing the baseless and irrational nature of the Commission's result-oriented "decisions," and accentuating the low meanness of the DOJ's rogue agents involved in this case. All of the following facts and questions have been or will be made available to President Donald J. Trump and Attorney General Pamela Bondi for their consideration, are assumed to be considered relevant by them, and require an answer by the Commission.

First, from the undisputed facts in Mr. Faul's July 16, 2018 Parole Appeal, Deputy Marshal John Pascucci (Pascucci) revealed in the book he co-authored with Cameron Stauth, *The Manhunter*, that the marshals' mindset during the Reagan era was murderous. Because the DOJ attorneys insist that all of their officers "are presumed to act with honesty and integrity," Pascucci's account should not be disputed by them. Specifically, Pascucci stated that during the years surrounding 1983, U.S. Marshals would cause confrontations with "fugitives" they were hunting so that they could shoot them - could murder them. It was in 1983 when the "marshal service" deemed Gordon Kahl to be a fugitive. It was in 1983 that rogue agents of the DOJ murdered Gordon Kahl and unlawfully assaulted Mr. Faul. When the DOJ agents found others than their "fugitive" in the proximity, they had a duty to call off their assault or to not involve those others. Instead, they did not call off their assault, and they did involve others. They committed an assault against Mr. Faul. For 42 years he has been unlawfully imprisoned. This we cannot allow the DOJ to perpetrate. Their weaponization against American Patriots cannot be rewarded. The DOJ murdered Gordon Kahl and Sheriff Gene Mathews, and they are slowly murdering Scott Faul and Yorie Kahl.

Second, from the undisputed facts in Mr. Faul's habeas corpus petition filed as 22-cv-2993 in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota, in a lawmen's report titled "Affidavit Of Criminal

PAROLE HEARING REPRESENTATION
FOR WEAPONIZATION INVESTIGATION

Justice Professionals (The Gordon W. Kahl Case)" attached as Reply Exhibit B-001 through B-023, a rather sobering admission is made. In a totally separate investigation by law enforcement people, culminating in a March 29, 1995 lawmen's report, it was concluded that the marshals instigated a confrontation and were at fault for the mayhem of February 13, 1983 and the subsequent murder of the patriot Gordon Kahl.

Third, in his dissent in United States v. Faul, 748 F. 2d 1204, 1223 (8th Cir. 1984), the Honorable Chief Judge Donald Lay of the Eighth Circuit stated that Scott Faul did not receive a fair trial.

Lastly, a document found to be quite instructive is Mr. Faul's 15-page January 13, 2022 letter to Chair Cushwa at the Commission, and it seems particularly curious that the Commission has remained so silent in regard thereto. Regarding that letter, the following observations are pertinent. On page 3, Mr. Faul explained that there must be a rational basis in the record for the Commission's conclusions embodied in its statement of reasons, and that a factually incorrect or nonspecific reason cannot constitute that rational basis required for its decision. With that caveat, which is unquestionably correct, Mr. Faul included "a fair rendering of the facts which should be considered to enable an assessment of culpability or lack thereof." Mr. Faul's 15-page letter is sworn to under penalty of perjury. The DOJ has no similar narrative of sworn facts. The DOJ did not dispute anything asserted in that January 13, 2022 letter. This investigation must determine whether the Commission disputes anything whatsoever that Mr. Faul stated in his 15-page January 13, 2022 letter. I respectfully request that you identify by page, paragraph, and line any dispute and clearly state your source of dispute by trial transcript volume, page, and line. Baseless rhetoric and innuendo will not suffice. At this point, until any disputes are clearly identified, all of Mr. Faul's factual assertions are presumed correct; otherwise the Commission would have dutifully suggested corrections.

* * * * *

With that premise, Mr. Faul's stated facts, along with some of the Commission's other documents, appear to indicate these following questions and comments:

- (1) On February 13, 1983, Mr. Faul was getting a ride home with friends from a community meeting when he was assailed by plain-clothed officers. On that day:
 - (a) Was there an arrest warrant for Mr. Faul?
 - (b) Had he done anything unlawful in their presence?
 - (c) Did he attack them, or was it they who attacked him?
 - (d) Did Mr. Faul initiate gunfire, or did he only RETURN fire AFTER being fired upon?
 - (e) Aren't those facts consistent with self defense?
- (2) Deputy Marshal James Hopson testified that he followed instructions of his fellow Deputy Marshal Robert Cheshire and put his badge in his pocket to hide his identity. The Commission, when needing to drum up justification for a decision, states their boilerplate that they find something "concerning."
 - (a) Does the Commission seriously believe that something is not awfully "concerning" here with their purposeful hiding of their identity?
- (3) In agreement with Pascucci's admission, the conclusion announced in the lawmen's report, and Honorable Chief Judge Lay's opinion, the DOJ attacked Mr. Faul on February 13, 1983 without cause. Is that "concerning"?
- (4) Before trial even began, the DOJ prevented a constitutionally sound trial for Mr. Faul when they obstructed his effective assistance of counsel by attacking his counsel of choice and driving him out of

PAROLE HEARING REPRESENTATION
FOR WEAPONIZATION INVESTIGATION

the state in fear for his life. Is that "concerning"?

(5) The DOJ prevented a constitutionally sound trial for Mr. Faul by covering for juror August Pankow's association with the prosecutor. Is that "concerning"?

(6) The DOJ prevented a constitutionally sound trial for Mr. Faul by coaching, rehearsing, and prompting the testimony of witness Vernon Wegner with participation of the trial judge on the eve of the day of his testimony. Is that "concerning"?

(7) Regarding Mr. Faul's "trial" in 1983, the late Honorable Chief Judge Donald Lay of the Eighth Circuit in his dissent, in part, said: "The record amply demonstrates the defendants did not and could not receive a fair trial in the District of North Dakota." Is that "concerning"?

(8) Mr. Faul is presently imprisoned for aiding and abetting second degree murder. For Mr. Faul to be guilty of aiding and abetting second degree murder, he would have to have had knowledge of the actual killer's intent to kill another person.

- (a) Was Mr. Faul's jury instructed on that?
- (b) Have you asked the U.S. Attorney to show you in the trial transcript where that instruction was given?
- (c) Does the fact that Mr. Faul has not been found guilty of aiding and abetting second degree murder not "concern" the Commission?
- (d) Doesn't that amount to kidnapping?
- (e) Why do you think that you should keep one imprisoned who has not been found guilty of every element of the offense?
- (f) Do you think that you are above the law, and does that make you a rogue?

(9) At Mr. Faul's initial hearing on December 30, 2002, Hearing Examiner Samuel Robertson said: "But, um, ... there's still a lot of opposition out there to paroling any of you guys involved in this, um, you know, those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources and law enforcement and those kinds of people."

- (a) Would you, Chair Cushwa, explain to me, what are "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources" supposed to mean?
- (b) Where in the parole statutes are the parole decisions supposed to be dictated or tainted by "those kinds of prosecutor kinds of sources" or by "law enforcement and those kinds of people"?
- (c) Are "those kinds of people" referring to the biased mindset "kinds of people"?
- (d) Would polygraphs for examiners and commissioners be in order for this case?

(10) Addressing Mr. Faul in 2023, you wrote these words on a government document: "You were part of a violent anti-government group." No evidence suggests that. Honorable Chief Judge Lay of the Eighth Circuit pointed out the error of that fake-news-media mindset. Placing false information on a government document; isn't that a crime?

(11) Again addressing Mr. Faul, you wrote that "you see no issues with your history of violence and have no intention of improving your thoughts and behaviors." You give no hint of what his thoughts were or are, and define no particularized behavior of HIS. Of course you cannot do so. Unsupported allegations do not supply the evidentiary basis for rationality. Was that simply your needed boilerplate?

(12) You wrote that Mr. Faul was involved in "offense conduct which involved radical anti-government actions," but you fail to identify a single action of his to fit that baseless rhetoric.

- (a) What specific action of HIS was radical and anti-government?

PAROLE HEARING REPRESENTATION
FOR WEAPONIZATION INVESTIGATION

(13) You claim that Mr. Faul denied "the legitimacy of the U.S. Government, the court system, and law enforcement officers" involved in his case.

- (a) Did he deny the legitimacy of those who were acting within the law, or only of those who were acting unlawfully?

(14) You said that Mr. Faul's words were the reason for denying his presumptively mandatory 30-year release on parole.

- (a) Do you claim that his 2020 words were the reason for his 1983 actions of RETURNING fire after being unlawfully attacked?
- (b) Is that rational; or, rather, simply the Commission's result-oriented theory of necessity?
- (c) Do you claim that his 2020 words can be used against him in 2013?
- (d) Isn't that just plainly capricious and irrational thinking?

(15) You claim that Mr. Faul continues to deny his crimes and doubt that the evidence presented at his trial "was truly sufficient to convict" him.

- (a) Where has Mr. Faul ever raised an issue regarding sufficiency of evidence?
- (b) Why does the Commission feel compelled to remake Mr. Faul's claims into ones that they can more easily argue against?
- (c) Are Mr. Faul's actual claims unassailable?

(16) In Mr. Faul's parole file, the Commission has a letter written by one of the jurors in the case. Juror Verna Gleason, in her September 26, 2002 letter, stated: "We KNOW that he did not kill anyone or do any violence. I thought he would get 3 or 4 years maximum, I know of rapists and murderers who spend less than ten."

- (a) Will the Commission please explain why they never utter even so much as a peep regarding this juror's culpability assessment in favor of Mr. Faul's release?
- (b) Why does the Commission credit a DOJ attorney's biased rant when that attorney has never met Mr. Faul, but gives no credit to the attorney's master who sat face to face with Mr. Faul for three weeks and heard his testimony and the testimony of others regarding the facts?

(17) In a great show of benevolent concern, you addressed Mr. Faul toward a future hearing to "have an opportunity at this hearing, hopefully, to expressly disavow your past criminal conduct, ... [and] address your criminal behavior" to convince the Commission that you would abide by the conditions of parole if released. You do not identify any "past criminal conduct" or any "criminal behavior." You merely set up the strawman to knock him down.

- (a) What statute, regulation, or rule makes abiding by parole conditions one of the criteria for mandatory RELEASE?

(18) You say that there is a reasonable probability that Mr. Faul will commit a crime if he is released.

- (a) What specific kind of crime will Mr. Faul commit?
- (b) Do you have any evidence of such a baseless claim?

(19) Mr. Faul's recidivism risk is near zero under both the Commission's Salient Factor Score system and the BOP's Risk Assessment calculations.

- (a) How can any programming lower his non-existent recidivism risk?
- (b) Is a near zero recidivism risk similar to a reasonable probability of recidivism?
- (c) Did the Commission simply invent a false scenario that Mr. Faul has a recidivism risk to backfill their pre-determined denial of release?
- (d) Is that not a bit "concerning" to you?

PAROLE HEARING REPRESENTATION
FOR WEAPONIZATION INVESTIGATION

(20) You listed some of Mr. Faul's "words" that you claim will be the cause for him to commit some future federal, state, or local crime.

- (a) Mr. Faul calling individuals in the Commission and BOP "dregs" will lead to what crime?
- (b) Mr. Faul's label of individuals in the Commission as "biased scum" will lead to what crime?
- (c) Mr. Faul calling them part of the deep state swamp will cause what crime?
- (d) Stating his belief that they make promises of favoritism to their Lucifer-worshipping cohorts will cause what crime?
- (e) Mr. Faul's claim that he was attacked by murderous thugs goes to what crime?
- (f) Mr. Faul's claim that there are sham judges causes what crime?
- (g) Mr. Faul's accusation that there are sham judges under the favor-promising thrall of satan is the cause of what crime?
- (h) Mr. Faul called the Parole Commission "biased scum." Does that cause Mr. Faul to want to rob a bank, start using drugs, burglarize people, what does it cause?
- (i) Whether the United States Attorney's office is, or is not, correctly termed by Mr. Faul as "favor-accepting scum," which crime will that make him commit?
- (j) Because Mr. Faul called the U.S. a corporation, will he then commit corporate fraud? Did it also cause the Supreme Court to do so when they held that the United States is a corporation?
- (k) And the last straw, Mr. Faul called the U.S. a "shameful creature": surely a dead ringer to cause cruelty to animals, NO?

(21) There were many "words" derogatorily uttered by Mr. Faul against some DOJ and judiciary members. Regardless of whether Mr. Faul uttered those words rightly or wrongly, whether in earnest or jest, whether with concern or disdain, or whether those words were earned or undeserved; the main and only relevant question with them is whether they define a future crime, or go toward such behavior.

- (a) Are there any of those "words" that constitute evidence that Mr. Faul will commit a crime?
- (b) Please identify any descriptive "word" that evinces any future criminal act, and identify the particular criminal act that it implicates.

(22) It is tacitly admitted by the Commission that none of Mr. Faul's "words" go toward defining a crime or go toward him committing a crime. The fact that you used Mr. Faul's non-crime-implicating "words" as the reason to keep him unlawfully imprisoned must surely implicate the First Amendment, NO?

(23) You had a number of so-called "victims" at the unauthorized, waived mandatory release hearing you perpetrated against Mr. Faul on January 25, 2023. None of them had any EVIDENCE pertaining to any institutional violations, or that Mr. Faul will commit any crime when released. "Victim" complaints are not factors or considerations for mandatory release.

- (a) Why did the Commission feel the need for "victim" participation?
- (b) Was it to taint the hearing against Mr. Faul?
- (c) Could you pass a polygraph answering that question that way?

(24) You utilized letters opposing parole without furnishing the information to Mr. Faul. I want to see copies of the 3-23-2020 Drew Wrigley letter, the 8-24-2021 Nicholas W. Chase letter, the 9-28-2020 "Melanie" letter, the 9-26-2020 Laurie Muir-Riley letter; and all others. To be blunt, and without any uncertainty, for my investigation of the Commission, I want copies of every communication, written, oral, or electronic, that has ever been submitted to the Commission in opposition to Mr. Faul's release.

(25) The DOJ insists on individual two-thirds/thirty-year calculations for each count of Mr. Faul's single sentence, causing release in 2013 by operation of law from his life term to his consecutive "15."

- (a) What is the BOP's calculation for a release from that "15" if it began on February 14, 2013?

PAROLE HEARING REPRESENTATION
FOR WEAPONIZATION INVESTIGATION

(26) You said that Mr. Faul's "failure to respect or even acknowledge the authority" of you or your entities "is concerning and provides sufficient reason to deny parole."

(a) What statute, rule, or regulation states that Mr. Faul must "respect" any of you to be released?

(27) You find nonissues to be "concerning" to mostly your ego, but you do not mention really egregious constitutional violations to be "concerning."

(a) Do you not find a totally served sentence "concerning"?

(b) Is kidnapping "concerning"?

(c) Or is the bias so righteous, being this is a "cop killer" case, that criminal behavior of rogue agents is to be overlooked?

(d) Doesn't that seem like it should be "concerning"?

(e) Why was it not even "concerning" enough to merit any consideration by the DOJ?

(28) Under the mandatory release of 18 U.S.C. Section 4206(d), release is presumed "after having served two-thirds of each consecutive term or terms, or after serving thirty years of each consecutive term or terms of more than forty-five years including any life term, whichever is earlier...." To carry out that two-thirds/thirty-year mandatory RELEASE, you insist that the prisoner must serve two-thirds or thirty years of each count, and then you will add up all of those subtotals for a grand total. You say that Mr. Faul is still serving his life count; i.e., that he has not paroled from it to his consecutive "15."

(a) Being the statute says "after having served two-thirds" of the consecutive terms, with Mr. Faul still serving his life count as you claim, how then could it ever be said that he will have served the two-thirds of his "15"?

(b) Under your misreading of the statute that Mr. Faul will have to have served two-thirds or thirty years of each count, when will he have served the required portion of his "15"?

(29) To get over the hurdle caused by your choice to administer the statute as described in 28 above, to ever "grant" mandatory parole you would have to tacitly declare that Mr. Faul is paroled from his life term to his consecutive "15" nunc pro tunc to a date 10 years prior, otherwise he will not have SERVED the required two-thirds of it as you claim is required. At that instant, it will be triggered that the BOP will have to enter a "10 years prior" Date Computation Began for the consecutive "15," and it will be inescapable that, inclusive of Statutory Good Time and Extra Good Time, Mr. Faul will have to have been released many years ago.

(a) Is that not "concerning" for those of you at the Commission who pretend to have so much "concern" and who are "presumed to act with honesty and integrity"?

(30) So that we may see how the mandatory release of Section 4206(d) was initially administered, I ask from the Commission to produce to me the Commission's first "Manual" after the Parole Commission and Reorganization Act of 1976 was passed.

* * * * *

To recap, Judge Lay's words should be given great import. Even though he was not privy to the lode of DOJ-damning evidence that surfaced after Mr. Faul's appeal was long concluded, nevertheless, he very astutely sensed the impropriety surrounding this case. With no uncertainty, he immediately made his dissent clear and decisive with his very first words: "I respectfully dissent. The record amply demonstrates the defendants did not and could not receive a fair trial in the District of North Dakota." Judge Lay then applied the correct legal principles and considerations to the circumstances of the case, and subsequently wrote, "I find it impossible to conclude that the defendants could have received a fair trial in the District of North Dakota." Regarding the fact that Mr. Faul did not receive a constitutionally sound

PAROLE HEARING REPRESENTATION
FOR WEAPONIZATION INVESTIGATION

trial due to fake news, Judge Lay wrote: "Many news articles focused on Gordon Kahl's association with the radical Posse Comitatus, and left an impression that all the defendants were involved with the Posse Comitatus." After quoting a long string of segments of prejudicial fake-news articles, Judge Lay then concluded: "The origin of and responsibility for the February 13 armed confrontation was a significant issue in the case." At that point, Judge Lay brought out the facts that a husband and wife who drove through Medina, North Dakota on February 13, 1983 "testified that a police officer pulled them over and told them 'there was going to be a shootout and this time the police were in the wrong.' Transcript of Proceedings, Volume XIII, at 66, 85." Judge Lay further wrote that another witness "verified that a law officer told him, 'there is a tax evader up there and now they are going to shoot him.' Transcript of Proceedings, Volume IX, at 212-13." The skepticisms reached from those observations were made by Judge Lay without benefit of Deputy Marshal Pascucci's confession of the marshals' murderous mindset during that crucial period when Mr. Faul was needlessly attacked during their misguided onslaught, and without benefit of the March 29, 1995 lawmen's report which squarely laid blame for their February 13, 1983 mayhem upon the officers' misbehavior.

Closely related to his reasoning that responsibility for that day's actions were yet in flux, Judge Lay's reading of the news articles caused him to write that he believed the jury's "findings were tainted by prejudice that prevented the defendants from receiving a fair trial in the emotion-charged District of North Dakota." Does that not bother you? Why is the Commission so comfortable with such a bogus conviction, comfortable enough to allow Mr. Faul to stay for more than a decade beyond the 30-year maximum? Perhaps it is because, as the Commission said in 2002, this is an "institutional thing." What do you mean by that? Do you think you are justified to simply refuse parole because law enforcement officers died? What if, as it relates to Mr. Faul, it was their fault? Did Mr. Faul attack them, or did they attack Mr. Faul? Was there a warrant for his arrest? Had he done something in their presence?

In conclusion, the facts submitted by Mr. Faul are sworn to under penalty of perjury. Information provided by DOJ attorneys is merely unsworn rhetoric and innuendo. Why do you credit their diatribe as factual? Being unsworn, it does not even constitute evidence. What is going on here in this case? You should have listened to juror Verna Gleason who advised that Mr. Faul should have gotten only 3 or 4 years. What IS going on here in this case? You should have listened to Deputy Marshal John Pascucci when he told you that they started confrontations for their murderous intentions during the years they considered Gordon Kahl to be a fugitive worthy of being shot. You should have listened to trial witness Vernon Wegner describe DOJ attorneys as colluding with the trial "judge" in witness tampering. To sum it up, you should not have pretended that you are presumed to act with honesty and integrity. Instead, you should actually do so, letting the undisputed facts, rather than the institutional thing's bias, form your decision.

Sincerely,

Scott William Faul

Scott William Faul

cc: File

President Donald J. Trump
Attorney General Pamela Bondi
Monitors and Media

Scott William Faul
Reg. No. 04564-059
F.C.I. Milan
P.O. Box 1000
Milan, MI 48160

January 23, 2025

Chair Cushwa, and Staff
U.S. Parole Commission
90 K Street NE, 3rd Floor
Washington, DC 20530

Re: President Trump's Weaponization Directive

Chair Cushwa, and all Parole Commission Staff:

The United States Parole Commission (Commission) has a very limited agenda available to them to end their weaponization of the DOJ against Scott William Faul. It is very simple to reach that end result.

First, you of the Commission should produce your original "Manual" that was generated immediately after the Parole Commission and Reorganization Act of 1976 (PCRA) was passed. Also produce the first Bureau of Prisons (BOP) Program Statement regarding the implementation of 18 U.S.C. Section 4206(d) (4206(d)) after the PCRA was passed.

Second, you of the Commission should read and apply what was intended by those promulgations in accord with the PCRA itself. You will find that, because the Commission did not make any preventative finding, Mr. Faul was by operation of law released on February 14, 2013 either from his single aggregate sentence, or he was released from his life count of his single sentence, whichever way the Commission wants to equivocate on that issue.

Third, the end result is for the Commission to issue a parole certificate, either for release from his single aggregate sentence, or from his life count to the consecutive "15" as described in their manual's "APPENDIX 1 - STANDARD WORDING ON ORDERS [EXAMPLES]" which therein states: "The following conditions, among others, may be added: ... '... to a (concurrent) (consecutive) sentence.'" The parole certificate should be issued nunc pro tunc to February 14, 2013 pursuant to 4206(d) because no finding was made by the Commission in 2013 to prevent Mr. Faul's presumptive mandatory release.

Fourth, the Commission should stop pretending that they have to do something more than recognize that Mr. Faul's presumptive mandatory release occurred by operation of law when the Commission in 2013 chose to not affirmatively rebut the presumption of mandatory parole by making a finding of either one or both of two factors to overcome the presumption: i.e., (1) that Mr. Faul has frequently or seriously violated institution rules; or (2) that there is a reasonable probability that Mr. Faul will commit any federal, state, or local crimes.

Finally, the Commission should also stop pretending that they can continue their obstinate behavior just because they are "presumed to act with honesty and integrity." Instead, they should actually exhibit some. Mr. Faul suggests they do so by carefully examining 4206(d), the legislative intent surrounding 4206(d), their initial Manual as stated above, the BOP's first Program Statement regarding 4206(d), and the memos surrounding 4206(d)'s implementation; and, to request from the new Attorney General an answer as to what went awry at the Commission to cause their misapplication of 4206(d) in these recent years by abandoning the fact that the phrase "term or terms" in that statute means "sentence."

Sincerely,

Scott William Faul

Scott William Faul

cc: File
President Donald J. Trump
Attorney General Pamela Bondi
Monitors and Media