YEAR OF JUBILE
P.O. BOX 2088
FORNEY, TX 75126

SPECIAL MAIL

LEGAL MAIL

ELEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT
OF APPEALS

Anthony Williams,
Petitioner,

v.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
Respondent.

Case No. 25-10695-F
Lower Court No. 0:23-cv-61212-KMW

INITIAL BRIEF OF APPELLANT
ANTHONY WILLIAMS

Anthony Williams
Anthony Williams
Private Attorney General
Suwannee C.I. #I50147
5964 US Hwy 90
Live Oak, FL 32060

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA
FOURTH DISTRICT

CASE NO. 17-1674

Anthony Williams
Appellant,

vs.

STATE OF FLORIDA
Appellee.

ON APPEAL FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SEVENTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, IN AND FOR BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA
CRIMINAL DIVISION
CASE NO. 17-74CF10A
JUDGE ANDREW SIEGEL

INITIAL BRIEF OF APPELLANT, Anthony Williams

Anthony Williams #05963-122
~~[illegible]~~
~~[illegible]~~
FDC - ~~[illegible]~~ Honolulu
P.O. Box ~~[illegible]~~ 30080
~~[illegible]~~
Honolulu, HI 96820

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CITATIONS

FLORIDA RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Appellant was unlawfully tried past the alloted time to try Appellant within the time frame for a speedy trial demand. Appellant filed a Speedy Trial demand on January 6, 2017 and the fifty (50) day period expired on February 25, 2017.

In this brief, the symbol "R" will be used to denote the record on appeal. The symbol "T" will be used to denote the trial transcript.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS

Procedural History

Appellant was unlawfully charged with Grand Theft and two (2) counts of unlawful filing of documents. Appellant was given an excessive bond of $300,000 with Nebbia requirements and unreasonable bond conditions which amounted to no bond at all. The three (3) charges arise from one incident and violate double jeopardy principles. Appellant was denied the opportunity to place into evidence material that was relevant to his defense and admissible according to the Florida Evidence Code. The state failed to call the arresting officer to the stand which violated Appellant's Sixth Amendment right to face his accusers.

Facts

Appellant represented his own case at trial.
The State's case stemmed from a civil foreclosure wherein they falsely accused Appellant and his client of stealing a house Appellant's client had been lawfully living in since 2008 and was fighting foreclosure proceedings.

ARGUMENT
POINT 1

DEFENDANT IS ENTITLED TO APPELLATE REVIEW BECAUSE ALL OF HIS CLAIMS WERE PRESERVED AND BASED ON THE RECORD AND THE RECORD SHOWS DEFENDANT WAS PLACED IN DOUBLE JEOPARDY BY BEING CHARGED THREE COUNTS FOR ONE ACTION

The defendant was charged with Grand Theft and two counts of unlawful filing of documents arising out of the same act. The grand theft charge arises out of the two documents defendant's employee filed on behalf of his client who was the tenant on the property for eight (8) years from October 2008 until September 2016, when client was evicted off the property. The State asserted at trial that the UCC lien and mortgage were used to commit grand theft. No property was ever taken, stolen or title transferred and therefore defendant should have been charged only with unlawful filing of documents not as a separate count of grand theft. This violates double jeopardy principles. The Second District Court of Appeals (2nd D.C.A.) has ruled on this subject when it stated "Defendant was improperly convicted of both grand theft and dealing in stolen property, where both offenses were in connection with one scheme or course of conduct. Shepard v. State, App. 2 Dist., 659 So. 2d 399 (1995)" "Defendant could not be convicted and sentenced for grand theft and dealing in stolen property where same stolen property involved in scheme or course of conduct was subject of both counts." Huffman v. State, App. 2 Dist., 642 So. 2d 40 (1994)." Defendants convictions for filing a false and fraudulent insurance claim and grand theft of the proceeds of that claim violated double jeopardy principles, as the offenses arose from a single act of criminal fraud involving the core offense of theft, thus requiring a reversal of sentence and conviction for filing a false and fraudulent insurance claim. Hays v. State, App. 2 Dist., 844 So. 2d 705 (2003)

POINT 2

THE COURT ERRED IN OMITTING GOOD FAITH DEFENSE IN THE JURY INSTRUCTIONS WHICH IS PART OF THE STANDARD JURY INSTRUCTIONS FOR GRAND THEFT

The defendant requested that the jury instructions include the good faith defense which was already a standard jury instruction for grand theft. However, the court unlawfully had the good faith defense deleted and omitted out of the jury instructions to unlawfully deprive defendant of his only defense. Defendant had a contract with his client to protect him from foreclosure and documents filed by defendant's employee was to that end. The 4th D.C.A. has ruled, "Contracts that defendant signed with alleged victims constituted evidence of his good faith belief that he was entitled to property in question, and therefore, trial court should have given defendant's requested jury instructions on his "good faith defense" in grand theft trial." Verdult v. State, App. 4 Dist., 645 So. 2d 530 (1994). It is also a fundamental error to give an inaccurate and misleading instruction where the effect of that instruction is to negate a defendant's only defense. Sigler v. State, 590 So. 2d 18, 20 (Fla. 4th D.C.A. 1991) It is a "Fundamental error" to fail to give a complete or accurate instruction in a criminal case if it relates to an element of the charged offense. Sigler v. State, supra. (See Exhibit 27)

POINT 3

THE COURT ERRED IN FAILING TO GIVE JURY INSTRUCTIONS PROHIBITING JURY FROM CONVICTING DEFENDANT OF BOTH GRAND THEFT AND UNLAWFUL FILING OF DOCUMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH ONE SCHEME OR COURSE OF CONDUCT

The Court erred in not giving the jury instructions on prohibiting them from convicting defendant of both grand Jury and unlawful filing of documents when the charges stem from one scheme or course of conduct. Defendant's employee filed two documents, a UCC lien and a mortgage to protect defendant's client from foreclosure. The jury should have been instructed that they could convict on one or the other offenses and not both. "Trial courts failure to give defendant's requested instruction, prohibiting jury from convicting defendant of both dealing in stolen property and theft in connection with one scheme or course of conduct, was prejudicial error, such that defendant was entitled to new trial; jury returned verdict convicting defendant of both offenses, and although trial court thereafter dismissed the lesser grand theft conviction, had the trial court granted defendant's request, the jury could have acquitted defendant of the greater offense while convicting him of the lesser grand theft offense." Williams v. State, 121 So.3d 524 (2013)

POINT 4

COURT ERRED IN DENYING DEFENDANT THE RIGHT TO PLACE MATERIAL INTO EVIDENCE THAT PROVED HIS INNOCENCE AND THAT PROVED THE ROUTINE PRACTICE OF HIS BUSINESS

Defendant on numerous occasions tried to enter into evidence material that was admissible and relevant to the crime charged and was denied by the court, stating the material was irrelevant. When defendant notified the court that the Florida Evidence Code 90.406 under Routine Practice states "Evidence of the routine practice of an organization, whether corroborated or not and regardless of the presence of eyewitnesses, is admissible to prove that the conduct of the organization on a particular occasion was in conformity with the routine practice," the court still denied the defendant the right to place the material into evidence.

POINT 5

THE COURT ERRED IN NOT JUDICIALLY NOTICING THE PUBLIC RECORDS AND ACTS OF OTHER STATES DEFENDANT HAS BUSINESSES IN

The defendant requested that the court take judicial notice of the documents filed in the public records of other states to show the same documents were scrutinized by district and county attorneys and approved for filing and the court did not instruct the jury that they can be judicially noticed nor did the court allow these documents to be placed into evidence. This was prejudicial error preventing jury from seeing the documents that were the same documents defendant's employee filed in other counties in Florida and other states and defendant was not charged with grand theft nor unlawful filing of documents. This violated Florida Evidence Code 90.201 and 90.202, and also violated 90.954 and 90.955. Had this evidence been admitted the jury would have reached a different verdict because they would have had documented proof that documents Appellant's employee filed on behalf of a client was approved and authorized by district attorneys, county attorneys and other authorizing governmental agencies. It would have also shown that the same documents were filed in adjacent counties and Appellant has never been charged with a crime. (See Exhibit 1)

The Certificate of Exemption that was issued to defendant's company by the governmental agency Anti-Predatory Lending Database after they scrutinized defendant's company documents and deemed that nothing was illegal or fraudulent about the documents and were approved for

Filing should have been judicially noticed and allowed to be placed into evidence which was unlawfully denied by the court. (See Exhibit 1A)

POINT 6

COURT ERRED IN THE JUDGE NOT RECUSING HIMSELF

Defendant filed numerous legally sufficient Motions To Disqualify Judge because defendant knew he couldn't receive a fair trial from Judge Siegel who presided over defendants previous trials last year and showed extreme prejudice and racial bias against defendant and would not recuse himself also in last year trials. Defendant subsequently filed a federal lawsuit against Siegel on June 28, 2016 in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia which was transferred to the District of Hawaii under Civil No. 16-00411 LEK RLP. After being notified that a federal lawsuit had been filed against him and his wife, Siegel still refused to recuse himself and displayed even more prejudicial behavior and racism against defendant as evidenced by the record and the illegal and unlawful sentence of 15 years in prison and 15 years probation given to defendant as a means of retaliation against defendant for having a federal lawsuit filed against him. Pursuant to Rule 3.230 of the Fla. R. Crim. P. once the legally sufficient Motion To Disqualify Judge was filed, Siegel had an obligation and duty to recuse himself. Even more so once he was notified defendant filed a federal suit against him because of his prejudice and racial bias, he was also obligated to recuse himself pursuant to Judicial Administrative Rules, Rule 2.330. (See Exhibits 2, 3, 4 and 5)

POINT 7

COURT LACKED JURISDICTION TO TRY THE CASE

Defendant filed a demand for speedy trial on January 6, 2017. A hearing was held on January 10, 2017 in which the court violated defendants due process rights by giving the defendant an Ultimatum to withdraw his speedy trial demand or he would not receive any discovery information. Defendant was unlawfully forced to withdraw his speedy trial demand in order to receive his discovery information. The court had no authority to demand defendant to withdraw his speedy trial demand in order to receive the discovery information he is entitled to by law. The defendant asserts that the unlawful forcing of defendant to withdraw his demand is contrary to established law and therefore defendants speedy trial demand was still in force which would have mandated the trial to be commenced by February 25, 2017. Since the Court did not try defendant within the time limitations for a speedy trial demand, the court lacked jurisdiction to try the case Four months later, Defendant filed a Motion To Discharge which was unlawfully denied by the court without an order in conjunction with the denial outlining the reasons in law for the denial. (See Exhibit 6)

The defendant filed a Notice to the Court officially Challenging the jurisdiction of the court and the court nor the Plaintiff proved on the record that they had Subject matter or personam jurisdiction. (See Exhibit 25)

"Until the Plaintiff submits uncontroversial evidence of subject-matter jurisdiction to the court that the court has subject-matter jurisdiction, the court is proceeding without subject-matter jurisdiction." Loos v. American Energy Savers, Inc., 168 ILL App. 3d, 558, 522 N.E. 2d 84 (1988)

"In a Court of limited jurisdiction, whenever a party denies that the Court has subject-matter jurisdiction, it becomes the duty and the burden of the party claiming that the court has subject matter jurisdiction to provide evidence from the record of the case that the court holds subject-matter jurisdiction." Bindell v. City of Harvey, 212 Ill. App. 3d 1042, 571 N.E. 2d 1017 (1st Dist. 1991) ("the burden of proving jurisdiction rests upon the party asserting it.") The State never proved jurisdiction to re-try a civil foreclosure that had already been litigated and closed and convert it to a criminal case three (3) months after the civil case was resolved. Case was a civil case and the state had no jurisdiction and thus the court never had jurisdiction to hear a civil case that had already been resolved.

POINT 8

COURT ERRED IN DENYING DEFENDANT OPPORTUNITY TO DEPOSE WITNESSES

Defendant Filed a Motion To Set Date For Deposition of State and Defense witnesses on March 7, 2017 for the witnesses to be deposed on March 27, 2017 in the building where the trial will be pursuant to Fla. R. Crim. P. 3.220(H) (See Exhibit 8) and was specifically denied by Judge Siegel to do so. Defendant sent a letter to the clerk of Court dated March 8, 2017 requesting the clerk to sign the blank subpoenas so that defendant could serve the subpoenas on the witnesses. Defendant did not hear (See Exhibit 9) back from the Clerk until June 4, 2017 with a letter dated June 2, 2017 stating that defendant had to submit original subpoenas with the date witnesses are to be deposed. This prevented defendant from being able to subpoena or depose any witnesses because the trial was commenced on June 19, 2017 which did not allow defendant time to send out all the subpoenas and have the witnesses deposed. Defendant's due process rights were violated by the clerk taking almost three (3) months to send Defendant instructions regarding the subpoena. Prior to this defendant sent a letter to his stand by Counsel Kristie Cohen on 1-13-2017 asking her to depose defendant's witnesses and the State's witnesses because of his inability to do so because of his incarceration. Defendant had sent Kristie Cohen all the questions to ask the witnesses in the deposition and at the status hearing Kristie Cohen stated on the record that she was not defendant's gopher and she was not going to do the depositions. I requested that the court order her to do defendant's deposition and the judge stated that she didn't have to. Defendant then submitted the U.S. Supreme Court rulings U.S. vs. Coupez, 603 F. 2d 1347 and U.S. vs. Gigax, 605 F. 2d 507 which specifically outlined that standby counsel's duty to assist a defendant includes deposing witnesses on behalf of the self-represented defendant. Even after submitting these U.S. Supreme Court rulings, the court denied defendant's request and standby counsel Kristie Cohen did not depose any witnesses on behalf of the defendant. This violated defendant's due process rights and equal protection under the law rights. (See Exhibit 9)

Defendant then filed a Motion To Remove Kristie Cohen As Standby Counsel and Appoint Stefanie Moon as Standby on Present case which was denied by the court with no justifiable reason stated. Stefanie Moon is standby Counsel on defendant's other case and petitioned to have her take position as standby on present case because she was properly assisting defendant as required of standby counsel. (See Exhibit 9A)

POINT 9

COURT ERRED IN ALLOWING THE STATE TO STRIKE ALL AFRICAN-AMERICAN JURORS

During Jury selection defendant noticed that the state intentionally struck all African-American jurors for no other reason because of the color of their skin. The reason the state gave for striking the first African-American (AA) juror was that he said he had a brother that was arrested, which is not a ground to disqualify a potential juror. However, the state accepted a white female juror who stated that she had a sister that had been arrested, which was the reason the state gave as cause to strike the AA juror but did not strike the white juror for the same reason. The State then struck an AA female for not reason other than the color of her skin. Defendant objected and told the court that it is evident and apparent that the state intends to strike all AA jurors in order to empanel an all white jury. The Court did not intervene and allowed the state to strike all AA jurors which is racially discriminatory and violates defendant's due process rights and equal protection under the law rights. While peremptory challenges by their nature do not require a showing of cause, such challenges may not be used to systematically exclude a certain class of people from sitting on the jury panel. The Supreme Court has held in Batson v. Kentucky, 15 that jurors cannot systematically be excluded by the prosecution on the basis of race. In Baston, the Court held that once the defense establishes a prima facie case of purposeful discrimination the prosecutor must come forward with race neutral reasons for excluding the jurors.

POINT 10

COURT ERRED BY DENYING DEFENDANT THE RIGHT TO FACE HIS ACCUSERS

The instant case was generated by Detective John Calabro who filed the warrant for arrest against the defendant for Grand Theft and Unlawful Filing of documents. Detective John Calabro was the only one of the state's witnesses who accused Defendant of the offenses charged. The former homeowner Youry Angel, Bank of America representative Sandra Priestia and the attorney for Bank of America (BOA) Matthew Ciccio all stated that they never made a complaint against defendant for the offenses charged. BOA President Paul Donofrio did an affidavit, but no where in the affidavit did he accuse the defendant of any wrong doing nor expressed that he filed a complaint or desired to file a complaint. Detective Calabro and County Clerk Barbara Brown, were the only two witnesses the State provided in their discovery that was accusing defendant and his co-defendant of violating the law. The letter that defendant sent to his standby counsel Kristie Cohen had specific questions for Detective Calabro and Barbara Brown. Defendant's motion that he filed was to be able to depose Detective Calabro and Barbara Brown, which defendant was denied. Defendant believes standby counsel Kristie Cohen notified the State of the questions defendant intended to ask Calabro and Brown and as a result, this is the reason the State did not call the only two witnesses who actually accused the defendant of the offenses charged, thereby denying the defendant the only opportunity to face his accusers as mandated by the Sixth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The state strategically withheld these witnesses from testifying because it prevented the defendant from submitting evidence that these charges like all the other charges filed against defendant are the result of a personal vendetta against the defendant by Detective Calabro. This detective has filed approximately fourteen (14) other charges against the defendant that were dropped or dismissed which shows the disposition of detective Calabro to be engaged in actively attempting to "Fish" for evidence to charge and incarcerate the defendant, even though no crime has been committed. This violated defendants Florida Constitutional rights under Article I section 23 which guarantees every man has the right to be let alone and free from governmental intrusion into the man's private life, (See Exhibit 10) and this violated the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constition.

POINT II

COURT ERRED IN FAILING TO INSTRUCT THE JURY TO JUDICIALLY NOTICE MATTERS WHICH MUST BE JUDICIALLY NOTICED

Defendant requested that the court take judicial notice of the public records and acts of other states pursuant to Florida Evidence Code 90.201 and 90.202 and was denied by the court. This was a fundamental error because the code specifically mandated that the court take judicial notice and instruct the jury of the same. Failure of the court to instruct the jury on the matters defendant requested to be judicially noticed was a fundamental error and jury should have been instructed pursuant to Florida Evidence Code 90.206.

POINT 12

COURT ERRED IN NOT ALLOWING CO-DEFENDANTS SWORN STATEMENT TO BE ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE WHEN HE BECAME A WITNESS FOR THE STATE

Defendants was charged with Grand Theft and two (2) counts of unlawful filing of documents and had a Co-defendant, William Hatchett who was charged with the same charges and Eight (8) additional felony charges. The State presented the Co-defendant with a deal that was unstated but understood that if he testified against the defendant, then the door was open to all possibilities. Co-Defendant was deposed on May 30, 2017 and gave sworn statements as to his acquaintance with the defendant and made statements that were untrue. When defendant questioned and cross-examined Co-defendant he caught him in several lies. When the defendant requested that the court enter Co-defendant's sworn testimony into evidence the court denied the sworn statement into evidence stating that his sworn testimony was hearsay. This violated defendant's due process rights and was a fundamental prejudicial error on the part of the court. Florida Evidence Code 90.608 outlines who may impeach: Any party, including the party calling the witness, may attack the credibility of a witness by: 1) Introducing statements of the witness which are inconsistent with the witness's present testimony. 2) Showing that the witness is biased. 3) Attacking the character of the witness in accordance with the provisions of S. 90.609 or S. 90.610. 4) Showing a defect of capacity, ability, or opportunity in the witness to observe, remember, or recount the matters about which the witness testified. 5) Proof by other witnesses that material facts are not as testified to by the witness being impeached. The prior

Statement of Co-Defendant should have been admitted into evidence when co-defendant as witness made an inconsistent statement and was shown the prior statement and denied he made the statement in the deposition and Appellant requested to have the sworn statement entered into evidence which was denied by the court in violation of Florida Evidence Code 90.614: Prior statement of witnesses which states in paragraph 2, Extrinsic evidence of a prior inconsistent statement by a witness is inadmissible unless the witness is first afforded an opportunity to explain or deny the prior statement and the opposing party is afforded an opportunity to interrogate the witness on it, or the interest of justice otherwise require. If a witness denies making or does not distinctly admit making the prior inconsistent statement, extrinsic evidence of such statement is admissible. This subsection is not applicable to admissions of a party-opponent as defined in S. 90.803(18). (emphasis added)

POINT 13

COURT ERRED IN DENYING DEFENDANTS REQUEST FOR COMPUTER WITH INTERNET ACCESS FOR JURY TO VIEW VIDEO EVIDENCE

Defendant Filed a Motion For Computer with Internet Access To Be Provided At The Expense of the State To Present Relevant Evidence on June 2, 2017 So that the jury could be provided with physical evidence of the same documents defendant ~~was~~ charged with were approved by district attorneys and county attorneys for filing and that there was nothing fraudulent about the documents and the video would prove the routine practice of defendant's business. The court unlawfully denied defendant's motion without stating a reason for it's denial. This was prejudicial error and violated defendant's due process rights. Under Florida Evidence Code 90.951 and 90.952 Appellants youtube recordings should have been admitted into evidence to show the jury the same documents being filed and approved for recording by the district and county attorneys and that nothing in the document was fraudulent, Dippolito v. State, 143 So. 3d 1080 (4th D.C.A. 2014). "A trial court's decision on the admissibility of evidence is reviewed under an abuse of discretion standard; but the trial court's discretion is limited by the rules of evidence." Roundtree v. State, 145 So. 3d 963 (4th D.C.A. 2014) (See Exhibits 11, 12, 13 and 13A)

POINT 14

COURT ERRED IN TRYING CASE THAT WAS NOT PROPERLY INDICTED BY A GRAND JURY

Defendant was unlawfully charged and indicted without the mandatory indictment by a grand jury which is a protected guaranteed federal right under the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Defendant never waived this right orally or in writing and thus Defendants due process rights were violated under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. Although Fla. R. Crim. P. Rule 3.140 (a)(2) authorizes prosecution by indictment or information, no state law can contravene or abrogate a guaranteed federal right. "The courts must indulge every reasonable presumption against waiver of fundamental constitutional rights." Emspak v. United States, 349 US 190 (1955). The State of Florida is an inseparable part of the United States of America, and the United States Constitution is the supreme law of the land. (Florida Const., Art. 3, Sec. 1). "The assertion of federal rights, when plainly and reasonably made, is not to be defeated under the name of local practice." Davis v. Wechsler, 263 US 22, 24. "Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule or law making or legislation which would abrogate or abolish them." Miranda v. Arizona, 384 US 436 (1966). "If the constitution prescribes one rule and the statute another in a different rule, it is the duty of the courts to declare that the Constitution and not the statute governs in cases before them for judgment." 16 Am. Jur. 2d., Const. Law Sec. 155.

POINT 15

COURT ERRED IN ALLOWING A CIVIL FORECLOSURE TO BE CONVERTED TO A CRIMINAL CASE

The Defendant and his client and co-Defendant William Hatchett were charged unlawfully with Grand Theft and Unlawful Filing of documents for fighting a foreclosure to keep Defendant's client from being kicked out on to the streets. The contract between Defendant's company Mortgage Enterprise Investments and William Hatchett were for foreclosure assistance. Defendant's employee filed on behalf of William Hatchett documents whose authorization have been pre-approved for filing by the Anti-Predatory Lending Database and county and district attorneys in several other states. The documents did not affect the title nor were they used to somehow "steal" a house. Defendant's client was ultimately evicted while Defendant was unlawfully incarcerated and Defendant was charged with Grand Theft and Two counts of unlawful filing of documents three (3) months after client was evicted which is prima facie evidence that no Grand theft occured and that the case in fact was a foreclosure. All documents filed were the normal customary practice of Defendant's company to fight foreclosures and no intentions of "stealing" a house. Defendant was initially not charged with Co-defendant but was later added and charged and indicted with Co-defendant. (See Exhibits 14 and 15).

The Public Corruption Unit Report drafted by Detective John Calabro alleges Defendant tried to steal the residence located at 3816 N.W. 33 Terrace, Cooper City, Florida when there is no such address. The two documents which were the mortgage and UCC lien was filed by the employee of Mortgage Enterprise Investments, Donna Hickenbottom and the UCC was filed by William Hatchett who was tenant residing at the property since 2008. Calabro references twice in his report that this was regarding a foreclosure which is prima facie evidence that this case was already resolved through civil proceedings and should have never been converted to a criminal case three (3) months after the foreclosure proceedings were done. (See Exhibit 31)

POINT 16

COURT ERRED IN GRANTING THE STATE'S MOTION IN LIMINE

The State submitted a Motion In Limine that in essence proposed to deny any and all rights of the defendant to present evidence that proved his innocence and the lawful operation of his business for 15 years in other states. The Court erred by granting five (5) of the provisions in the Motion In Limine which prohibited the defendant from presenting evidence that 1) No other states have never prosecuted defendant for the same business actions; 2) that defendant filed same documents in other states and counties in Florida and has never been prosecuted; 3) the charges violate double jeopardy principles; 4) other jurisdiction and governmental agencies approved and sanctioned filings; 5) there are civil actions pending elsewhere for same charges. (See Exhibits 16 and 17)

POINT 17

COURT ERRED IN DISMISSING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS AND JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL WITHOUT ANY FINDINGS OF FACTS OR CONCLUSIONS OF LAW SPECIFICALLY OUTLINING THE LAWFUL REASONS FOR DENIAL

Defendant filed a legally and lawfully sufficient Motion To Dismiss which outlined with specificity and particularity stating the grounds and supporting evidence and case law which substantiated a dismissal of the case. The State filed a Traverse which was legally insufficient which made denials without any supporting evidence or case law to support its 33 denials of Defendant's Motion To Dismiss. The state made empty denials citing factual basis but never stated what the factual basis was or any supporting authority to substantiate its denial. The state did not meet the requisite in Fla. R. Crim. P. Rule 3.190(d) because it failed to state factual matters with specificity and merely offered empty unsubstantiated denials. (See Exhibits 18, 19, 20 + 21)

Defendant by the undersigned moved the court for a (JOA) judgment of acquittal based on the facts outlined in his Motion To Dismiss and the fact that not one of the State's witnesses accused the defendant of the crimes charged and stated they never filed a criminal complaint against the Defendant. The JOA was denied on the record by the court without giving any grounds or reasons for the denial. (See Exhibit 22)

POINT 18

COURT ERRED IN DENYING DEFENDANTS SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM

Defendant filed a Motion for Subpoena Duces Tecum to be issued to the Broward Sheriff's Office (BSO) to obtain the records of detective John Calabro and was unlawfully denied by the court without any justifiable reason and failed to outline it's reason for denial through a finding of facts and conclusion of law. This was prejudicial error against the defendant which prevented him from obtaining records from BSO that was imperative to his defense. (See Exhibit 23)

The denial of the court to have the clerk issue the subpoenas is in violation of Fla. R. Crim. P. Rule 3.361 (a)(b)(c).

POINT 19

COURT ERRED IN NOT ALLOWING UCC REMOVAL MOTION TO REBUT ATTORNEY OF BANK OF AMERICA CLAIM THAT DEFENDANT'S COMPANY UCC CLOUDED THE TITLE

The attorney for Bank of America, Matthew Ciccio, claimed that defendant's company documents clouded them obtaining the title. Upon cross examination, Appellant proved Ciccio's claim was false when Appellant demonstrated by showing Bank of America already had clear title BEFORE defendant's documents were even filed. After this revelation, Ciccio changed his story and stated because of the documents they were unable to clear the title after defendant's company documents were filed. Appellant challenged this claim and submitted UCC Removal motion example which shows the proper procedure in unclouding a title that has been clouded by a UCC. The court refused to allow this court document into evidence which was prejudicial error and would have proven that the title was never clouded and Appellant's company did not file any documents affecting title or that would effectuate "stealing" a house. Bank of America never filed a UCC removal because the UCC nor mortgage affected their title and they subsequently evicted Appellant's client in September 2016, which is three (3) months BEFORE Appellant and his client were charged with Grand Theft of a house. (See Exhibit 28)

The UCC lien that defendant's employee Donna Hickenbottom filed on behalf of Mortgage Enterprise Investments and William Hatchett affected only the legal person WILLIAM HATCHETT and not Youry Angel nor Bank of America. (see Exhibit 29)

POINT 20

COURT ERRED IN NOT RECOGNIZING DEFENDANT'S UNREBUTTED AFFIDAVIT AS TRUTH

Defendant filed an affidavit stating the facts of the case on May 26, 2017 and the State failed to rebut the affidavit. The court failed in not recognizing the affidavit as fact and erred in not dismissing the case when the state failed to rebut the sworn affidavit. "Indeed, no more than (affidavits) is necessary to make the prima facie case." United States v. Kis, 658 F. 2d, 526, 536 (7th Cir. 1981); Cert. Denied, 50 U.S. L.W. 2169; S.Ct. March 22, 1982. (See Exhibit 24)

POINT 21

COURT ERRED IN NOT DISMISSING THE CASE OR REMOVING THE CASE TO ANOTHER COURT WHEN DEFENDENT NOTICED THE COURT HE WAS AWARE CASE WAS BEING SABOTAGED BY THE COURT AND THE PROSECUTORS OFFICE

Defendant Filed a Notice of Sabotage By The Court and Prosecutors office on June 12, 2017 notifying the Court and State Attorney's office that he was aware of all the attempts made by them to sabotage his case. The facts outlined in the Notice are undisputed and the court Should have exercised jurisprudence and sound discretion and removed defendant's case to another courtroom and prosecutor that could be fair and impartial and who didn't already have a malicious vendetta or agenda against the defendant because of a previous case, and because of the defendant's civil rights activism. (See Exhibit 26)

POINT 22

COURT ERRED IN ALLOWING CO-DEFENDANT TO TESTIFY AS A STATE WITNESS WHEN HE WAS LISTED AS A WITNESS FOR THE DEFENSE

Defendant filed a Notice of Witness List on March 8, 2017 and listed Co-defendant William Hatchett as a witness in his case. However, approximately 2 1/2 weeks before the trial, the State coerced Co-defendant to testify against defendant in order to get out of jail. This gave Co-defendant incentive to lie and say anything he needed to in order to get the deal the State was offering. Consequently co-defendant received only a 5 year probation sentence for 11 felony charges and defendant received 15 years in prison and 15 years probation for 3 felony charges. The court erred in allowing the State to make a deal with the co-defendant to fabricate his testimony against defendant to get an unlawful conviction. In the Co-Defendant's deposition his attorney told him that if the State liked what he said then anything is possible which is a vague statement with an obvious meaning that Co-defendant would in fact get the deal that he ultimately was given. (See Exhibit 30)

POINT 23

COURT ERRED IN DENYING TWO MOTIONS THAT ARE MANDATORY BY RULE

Appellant filed a Motion For Statement of Particulars pursuant to Rule 3.140(n) to compel the state to show the exact date and location of the crime which was not specifically stated in the indictment. The state alleges the grand theft took place between January 1, 2015 and September 18, 2016 in which Grand Theft is not a continuing offense as outlined in O'Malley, supra. This deprived the defendant of being able to offer an alibi defense to the alleged Grand Theft. The Motion was denied by the Court with no justifiable reasons to do so other than to hinder the defendant's defense. (See Exhibits 32 and 32A)

Appellate also filed a Subpoena Duces Tecum pursuant to Rule 3.361 of the Fla. R. Crim. P. and was denied by Judge Siegel which prevented defendant from obtaining pertinent records which were vital to his defense. This was prejudicial error in light of the fact that this same subpoena was granted by this same judge in a previous case[1] defendant filed a subpoena duces tecum to get the pertinent records to prepare his defense. This violated defendant's due process rights and prevented defendant from having a fair trial. (See Exhibits 33 and 33a).

[1] Case No. 15-14566CF10A

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, based on the foregoing arguments and the authorities cited therein, Appellant respectfully moves this court to overturn Appellant's unlawful conviction and unlawful sentence.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anthony Williams

Anthony Williams #05963-122
FDC Honolulu
P.O. Box 30080
Honolulu, HI 96820

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was mailed to: Attorney General, 1515 N. Flagler Drive, Suite 900, West Palm Beach, FL 33401 and the Clerk, 4th DCA, 1525 Palm Beach Lakes Blvd, West Palm Beach, FL 33401 on the 29th day of August 2017, placed in the hands of Officer N. Segui.

Anthony Williams

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was furnished by US mail to the following recipient:

Attorney General's Office
107 W. Gaines Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399

this 2nd day of ~~March~~ APRIL 2025.

Anthony Williams

17-1674

APPENDIX

Exhibit	1	Certificate of Exemption
Exhibit	1A	Demand For Matters To Be Judicially Noticed
Exhibit	2	Motion For Disqualification of Judge
Exhibit	3	Order Denying Motion For Disqualification of Judge
Exhibit	4	Order Denying Motion For Disqualification of Judge
Exhibit	5	Notice of Filing Lawsuit
Exhibit	6	Order Withdrawing Speedy Trial Demand
Exhibit	7	Letter From Clerk Brenda D. Forman
Exhibit	7A	Letter From Mr. Williams to Clerk
Exhibit	8	Motion To Set Date For Deposition of State and Defense Witnesses
Exhibit	9	Letter To Ms. Cohen and Deposition questions
Exhibit	9A	Motion To Remove Kristie Cohen as Standby Counsel
Exhibit	10	State's Discovery Witness List
Exhibit	11	Order on Defendant's Various Motions
Exhibit	12	Motion To Discharge
Exhibit	13	Motion For Computer With Internet Access
Exhibit	13A	Notice of Filing Youtube Videos of PAG Anthony Williams
Exhibit	14	Warrant to Arrest - William Burl Hatchett
Exhibit	15	Information Indictment Against Anthony Williams & William Hatchett
Exhibit	16	State's Motion In Limine
Exhibit	17	Order Granting 1-5 of State's Motion In Limine
Exhibit	18	Defendant's Sworn Motion To Dismiss
Exhibit	19	State's Motion To Strike and Sworn Traverse
Exhibit	20	Defendant's Motion To Strike State's Motion To Strike
Exhibit	21	Order dismissing Defendant's Motion To Dismiss
Exhibit	22	Order denying Judgment of Acquittal
Exhibit	23	Order Denying Subpoena Duces Tecum
Exhibit	24	Notice of Filing Affidavit / Affidavit
Exhibit	25	Notice To The Court
Exhibit	26	Notice of Sabotage By The Court and Prosecutors Office
Exhibit	27	Good Faith Defense Jury Instructions For Grand Theft
Exhibit	28	Motion For Removal of Filing of UCC
Exhibit	29	UCC Lien - MEI and William Hatchett

Exhibit 30	Notice of Witness List
Exhibit 31	Public Corruption Unit Report
Exhibit 32	Motion For Statement of Particulars
Exhibit 32A	ORDER Denying Motion For Statement of Particulars
Exhibit 33	Subpoena Duces Tecum
Exhibit 33A	ORDER Denying Subpoena Duces Tecum

Exhibit 1

Illinois Anti-Predatory Lending Database Program

Certificate of Exemption

R2012131533
Receipt # T20120133891
Karen A. Stukel Will County Recorder 7P
CK Date 11/26/2012 Time 09:12:29
Recording Fees: $27.75
IL Rental Hsng. Support Program: $10.00

Report Mortgage Fraud
800-532-8785

The property identified as: **PIN:** 20-21-19-107-011-0000

Address:
Street: 813 Barton Ln.
Street line 2:
City: Peotone **State:** IL **ZIP Code:** 60468

Lender: MORTGAGE ENTERPRISE INVESTMENTS

Borrower: JOHN E. & CATREKIA T. HICKS

Loan / Mortgage Amount: $213,953.00

This property is located within the program area and the transaction is exempt from the requirements of 765 ILCS 77/70 et seq. because the application was taken by an exempt entity.

Certificate number: D0347E65-2963-4D6B-9D4F-5CB3A598E4D0 **Execution date:** 10/15/2012

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE
17th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR
BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

Exhibit 1A

STATE OF FLORIDA CASE NO. 17-74CF10A

v.

ANTHONY WILLIAMS

DEMAND FOR MATTERS TO BE JUDICALLY NOTICED

Defendant demands for the following matters to be judicially noticed pursuant to Fla. R. of Evidence 90.201, 90.202, 90.203 and 90.206.

1) Florida Rules of Evidence Code
2) U.S. Constitution
3) Florida Constitution
4) Title 12 USC 95(a)(2)
5) National Banking Act, Section 28
6) Public Records of the other 49 states
7) Florida Evidence Code 90.406

Executed this 7th day of March 2017.

Righteously Submitted,
Anthony Williams
Anthony Williams, PAG
P.O. Box 9356
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33310

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the forgoing was delivered to the Clerk of Court, SAO and Judge Siegel on March 8, 2017.

Anthony Williams

Exhibit 2

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 17TH, JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, IN AND FOR BROWARD COUNTY, STATE OF FLORIDA

STATE OF FLORIDA,

PLAINTIFF,

VS.

ANTHONY WILLIAMS
DEFENDANT/ APPELLANT,

_______________________/

CRIMINAL DIVISION

CASE NO. (S) 17-74CF10A

JUDGE: Andrew Siegel

MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE

COMES NOW, Anthony Williams, By attached affidavits, hereby moves under section 38.10, Florida Statutes, and rule 3.230, Florida Rules of Criminal procedures, to disqualify the Honorable Judge Andrew Siegel Circuit Judge, from proceeding further in this action, and as grounds thereof, says:

1.) The Defendant believes and fears that the presiding Judge is prejudiced against him and in favor of the adverse party. The facts and reasons for the defendant belief are set forth in attached affidavits.

2.) The Defendant believes that the presiding judge will not hear further proceeding with an open mind, but already has made an adverse to the Defendant.

3.) The Defendant certifies that this motion is made in good faith.

WHEREFORE, THE defendant prays that this Honorable Court grant this motion so that the issues mentioned might be resolved upon the merits and in the defendant's presence before or on the next scheduled court appearance.

Exhibit 2 cont'd

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Anthony Williams, the defendant do hereby certify that the information Prescribed to here in the foregoing Motion before the Court is true and correct, to the best of my Knowledge, understanding and belief and that a true copy is being forwarded to the Clerk of the Courts For the 17th Judicial Circuit, at 201 S.E. 6th Street, Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301, to the SAO, the Office of the Public Defender, and to the Honorable Judge Andrew Siegel, Presiding: on this 6th day of April, 2017.

By: Anthony Williams
Defendant, [redacted] Common Law Counsel
Arrest No. 301602094
P.O. Box 9356
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33310-9356

NOTARY CERTIFICATION

Sworn to and subscribed be me the undersigned authority by the Defendant in this Cause, who is personally known to me and/or who has taken an oath; on this ________ day of ______________________, 201_.

____
NOTARY PUBLIC SIGNATURE

____

____
Stamp / Seal

Exhibit 2 cont'd

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 17TH, JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, IN AND FOR BROWARD COUNTY, STATE OF FLORIDA

STATE OF FLORIDA,]
SS.
COUNTY OF BROWARD]

CRIMINAL DIVISION

CASE NO. (S) 17-74 CF10A

AFFIDAVIT

I, Anthony Williams, and having knowledge of the above case state the following information in support of the **MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE:**

1.) It is my belief that ANTHONY WILLIAMS the Defendant in this case will not receive fair and impartial judgment with the Honorable Judge Andrew Siegal Presiding. For some reason the judge is bias towards the Defendant, Mr. ANTHONY WILLIAMS.

2.) My beliefs are based on:
Denial of basic constitutional rights.
Racial discrimination displayed by magistrate.
Federal lawsuit Filed against Magistrate.
Failure of Magistrate to follow the law and uphold Judicial canons.

VERIFICATION

Anthony Williams, being first duly sworn under oath says: That he has knowledge of the above case and knows the content of the complaint; that it is true to his knowledge, except as to those matters that are stated in it on his information and belief, and as to those matters he believes them to be true.

NOTARY CERTIFICATION

Sworn to and subscribed be me the undersigned authority by the Defendant in this Cause, who is personally known to me and/or who has taken an oath; on this ________ day of

________________________, 2017.

NOTARY PUBLIC SIGNATURE

Stamp / Seal

Exhibit 3

**** FILED: BROWARD COUNTY, FL Brenda D. Forman, CLERK 3/14/2017 4:39:27 PM.****

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR BROWARD COUNTY FLORIDA

FILED IN OPEN COURT
CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT/COUNTY COURT
ON MAR 14 2017
BY

STATE OF FLORIDA,
PLAINTIFF,

vs.

ANTHONY WILLIAMS,
DEFENDANT.
______________________/

CASE NO.: 17-00074 CF10 A
JUDGE: ANDREW L. SIEGEL

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE

THIS CAUSE, having come before the Court, upon the Defendant's pro se oral, Motion for Disqualification of Judge pursuant to Rule 2.330 of the Florida Rules of Judicial Administration on March 14, 2017.

The Defendant's Motion for Disqualification of Judge is DENIED.

DONE AND ORDERED at Ft. Lauderdale, Broward County Florida this 14th day of March, 2017.

ANDREW L. SIEGEL
CIRCUIT JUDGE

cc:

Anthony Williams, Defendant
Kathy Heaven, Esq., Atty for the State

Exhibit 4

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR BROWARD COUNTY FLORIDA

STATE OF FLORIDA,
PLAINTIFF,

vs.

ANTHONY WILLIAMS,
DEFENDANT.
_______________________________/

CASE NO.: 17- 00074 CF10 A
JUDGE: ANDREW L. SIEGEL

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE

THIS CAUSE, having come before the Court, upon the Defendant's pro se oral, Motion for Disqualification of Judge pursuant to Rule 2.330 of the Florida Rules of Judicial Administration on June 12, 2017.

The Defendant's Motion for Disqualification of Judge is DENIED.

DONE AND ORDERED at Ft. Lauderdale, Broward County Florida this 12th day of June, 2017.

JUDGE ANDREW L. SIEGEL
A TRUE COPY

____
ANDREW L. SIEGEL
CIRCUIT JUDGE

cc:

Anthony Williams, Defendant
Kathy Heaven, Esq., Atty for the State

Exhibit 5

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 17th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

STATE OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 17-74CF10A

vs.

Anthony Williams

AFFIDAVIT

NOTICE OF FILING LAWSUIT

COMES NOW, Anthony Williams, Private Attorney General, who is a servant of the Most High Yahweh Elohim and Yahshua the Messiah and submits this Notice of Filing Lawsuit to inform the court that a federal lawsuit has been filed against Andrew Siegel, Catherine A. Maus and John Calabro. Done this 12th day of January 2017.

Righteously submitted,
Anthony Williams
Private Attorney General
PAG #12-6799
P.O. Box 9356
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy was hand-delivered or mailed to: SAO, 201 S.E. 6th Street, Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301, Clerk of Court, Judge Andrew Siegel and John Calabro on the 12th day of January 12 2017.

Exhibit 5 cont.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

District of Hawaii

Anthony T. Williams

Plaintiff

v.

State of Hawaii, David Ige, State of Georgia Attorney General, State of Florida, Neil Abercrombie et al

Defendant

Civil Action No. CIV NO. 16-00411 LEK-RLP

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: *(Defendant's name and address)* State of Hawaii, David Ige, State of Georgia Attorney General, State of Florida, Neil Abercrombie, Nathan Deal, Richard Perkins, Shan Tsutsui, Bureau of Conveyance, Francis Sequeria, Megan Crawley, Joseph Lavelle, Paul Howard, David M. Louie, Robert McBarney, Theodore Jackson, Carmel Cafiero, Andrew L. Seigel, Catherine A. Maus, Gayle M. Siegel, Christopher Killoran, Scott Israel, John Calabroso, James Hoy, Timothy Lettieri, John Calabro, Mary Calabro, Barbara Brown, Jacquelyn Plassner Needelman

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are: Anthony T. Williams

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

SUE BEITIA
CLERK OF COURT

Date: 09/06/2016

/S/ SUE BEITIA by: EPS
Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Exhibit 6

[ ] 17th Judicial Circuit in and for Broward County
[ ] In the County Court in and for Broward County

DIVISION:
[ ] Criminal
[ ] Traffic
[ ] Other

ORDER

THE STATE OF FLORIDA VS.

CASE NUMBER NUMBER 17-74 CF10A

Anthony Williams DEFENDANT

CHARGE II Grand Theft in the 1st
III Unlic Mort Broker over 50,000
IV-V Unlaw Filing False Documents

THE Defendant announced he is withdrawing his previously filed Demand for Speedy Trial so he can participate with discovery

On

DONE AND ORDERED THIS 10 DAY OF January 20 17, IN BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.

JUDGE

COPIES: BSO - SAO

112-62 BLANK ORDER

On any further court dates.

6

Exhibit 7

BRENDA D. FORMAN

CLERK OF CIRCUIT AND COUNTY COURT

17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

201 SOUTHEAST 6TH STREET
BROWARD COUNTY
COURTHOUSE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301

Date: June 2, 2016

To: TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN
From: Felony Division
Re: Correspondence Request: Anthony Williams

We are writing to acknowledge receipt of your letter. However, we must return your letter for the following reason(s):

______ The transmittal letter does not indicate the correct case number.

______ We need the original signature.

______ Please provide the date of birth for the person in question.

______ We are unable to locate a felony record.

______ Please state what document you need from the file.

______ This is not a Broward County felony case.

______ The file has been sent to the judge for review.

XXX We are unable to process your request for the subpoena. The subpoena must be an original document and you may Want to speak with your attorney to assist you with the Details needed to process the subpoena.

Brenda D. Forman, Clerk
Circuit and County Court

Deputy Clerk

Exhibit 7A[redacted]

Dear Clerk,

March 8, 2017

I need 10 copies of the enclosed subpoena signed by you so I can issue these subpoena's to the witnesses in my case. Thanks in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Anthony Williams

Anthony Williams
#501602094
P.O. Box 9356
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33310

Exhibit 74 Cont'd

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SEVENTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

CASE NO. 17-74CF10A

SUBPOENA

THE STATE OF FLORIDA:

TO ....:

YOU ARE COMMANDED to appear before the Honorable ...., Judge of the Court, at the Broward County Courthouse in __________________, Florida, on ______________________, at ________ m., to testify in this action. If you fail to appear, you may be in contempt of court.

You are subpoenaed to appear by the following attorney, and unless excused from this subpoena by this attorney or the court, you shall respond to this subpoena as directed.

DATED on______________

(Name of Clerk)

As Clerk of the Court

By ________________________________

As Deputy Clerk

Anthony Williams
(Printed Name)
Pro Se
(Address) P.O. Box 9356
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33310

Any minor subpoenaed for testimony shall have the right to be accompanied by a parent or guardian at all times during the taking of testimony notwithstanding the invocation of the rule of sequestration of section 90.616, Florida Statutes, except upon a showing that the presence of a parent or guardian is likely to have a material, negative impact on the credibility or accuracy of the minor's testimony, or that the interests of the parent or guardian are in actual or potential conflict with the interests of the minor.

If you are a person with a disability who needs any accommodation in order to participate in this proceeding, you are entitled, at no cost to you, to the provision of certain assistance. Please contact [identify applicable court personnel by name, address, and telephone number] within 2 working days of your receipt of this subpoena; if you are hearing or voice impaired, call 711.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE
17th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR
BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

EXHIBIT 8

STATE OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 17-74CF10A

v.

ANTHONY WILLIAMS

MOTION TO SET DATE FOR DEPOSITION
OF STATE AND DEFENSE WITNESSES

Defendant, by and through his common law counsel Private Attorney General Anthony Williams, who is a servant of the Most High Yahweh Elohim and Yahshua the Messiah and submits this Motion To set Date For Deposition of State and Defense witnesses, particularly John Calabro, Barbara Brown, Youry Angel, Paul Donofrio, Donna Hickenbottom, William Hatchett, Marisel Descalzo, Stefanie Moon and Senait Beiene on March 27, 2017 or a date the court deem proper to have the witnesses deposed in the building where the trial will be pursuant to your Fla. R. Crim. P. 3.220(h)(3). Executed this 7th day of March 2017.

Righteously Submitted,

Anthony Williams

Anthony Williams, PAG
P.O. Box 9356
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33310

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was delivered by U.S. Mail to the Clerk of Court, SAO and Judge Siegel at 201 S.E. 6th Street, Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33310 on March 8, 2017.

Anthony Williams

Exhibit 9

Dear Ms. Cohen, January 13, 2017

I received your letter today that you have been appointed my standby counsel. I must inform you that I am not your typical defendant. I am a Private Attorney General and have been executing, perfecting (not practicing) law for almost 15 years now. I was falsely accused of aggravated rape and child molestation in 2013 and represented myself and got the case dismissed. I have a plethora of Client cases that I have won from Civil to criminal cases. My approach to law is very different than what your law school inculcations have convinced you on how to prepare and execute a criminal defense. Due to my unlawful incarceration I am unable to obtain the documents, make phone calls, depose witnesses and do proper research and therefore this is where I would need your assistance unless I am released and then I can do those things myself.

I am enclosing in this letter a list of some necessary things that I need accomplished. These are time sensitive and I need them done ASAP because I intend to file my demand for speedy trial once I get the State's discovery information. This case is another malicious prosecution initiated by pseudo detective John Calabro who is a liar and a racist. He has continued to try and find something to charge me with criminally to keep me incarcerated unlawfully. I will also include a list of the charges he has pursued against me but failed to get the offenses officially charged against me or if he charged me with the offense it later got dropped. He has a personal vendetta against me and knows full well I haven't broken any laws but he is upset that my girlfriend was caucasian whom he made

Ex. 9 cont'd

a sexual advance at. She and I have since broken up because of the threats made to her by him and she is afraid that they are going to try to do something to her because of me. I totally understand her fear and do not fault her.

My case is high profile because I have been fighting Corruption in this judicial system and this is their means of retaliating against me.

I need to see you once a week in order to make sure that we are moving forward in the things I need to get done to win my case. The basis of my case is that they are charging me Grand theft and Unlawful Filing of False Documents for protecting a Clients home from foreclosure in which they conveniently foreclosed on his home during my incarceration which they knew they couldn't have done had I been free to respond to the banks motion.

There are a few people that I need you to keep informed about what's going on in my case and they are my mother Barbara Williams (254) 702-9308, and my Friend Senait (pronounced Suh Nite) 305-491-1559, you have my permission to divulge everything regarding me to them. Also I need your email address because there are some documents that I need them to email to you that are vital to my case.

Thanks in advance for your Cooperation and assistance in this most exigent matter.

Sincerely,

Anthony Williams
Anthony Williams
Private Attorney General
PAG# 12-6299

P.S. Please make a copy of this letter and the enclosed documents and send the copies to me for my records. Thanks.

Ex. 9 Cont'd

People I Need To Depose

BSO Detective	County Clerk	
1. John Calabro	2. Barbara Brown	3. Marissel Descalzo
201 S.E. 6th Street	201 S.E. 6th Street	100 S.E. Second Street, Suite 4200
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301	Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301	Miami, FL 33131
		(305) 530-0050
		mdescalzo@cfjblaw.com

Questions For: John Calabro

1. How many charges other than the current ones have you charged or tried to charge Anthony Williams with?
2. When you charged Anthony Williams with Unlicensed Practice of Law (UPL) did you intentionally wait to charge him with Grand Theft after the resolution of his UPL case?
3. When you charged him with the UPL you had no idea that you were going to charge him with another charge?
4. When did you discover that he allegedly committed grand theft?
5. Did Youry Angel file a complaint against Anthony Williams for Grand Theft?
6. Did Bank of America file a complaint against him for grand theft.
7. Did the FBI notify you that Anthony Williams was committing crimes such as mortgage fraud and money laundering?
8. If so, how long ago was that?
9. Have the FBI ever charged him with those crimes?
10. Did you witness Mr. Williams commit any of the crimes you charged him with?
11. Is there a witness that made a complaint that said they saw

Ex. 9 cont'd

Mr. Williams commit these crimes?

12. Do you have video evidence of Mr. Williams committing these crimes?
13. Do you have any physical evidence linking Mr. Williams to these crimes?
14. Do you Know Donna Hickenbottom?
15. What color is she?
16. Did you have her under investigation along with Mr. Williams for being a so-called sovereign Citizen?
17. Have you ever charged her with any crimes?
18. In the trial for UPL against Mr. Williams didn't she testify that she was the one who filed her own documents and not Mr. Williams?
19. How many homeowners have you filed grand theft charges against for fighting the foreclosure of their home?
20. How many people have you filed grand theft charges against for assisting others from being evicted from their homes by a foreclosure proceeding?
21. What is the name of the person from Bank of America that called you and told you or made a complaint that Mr. Williams committed grand theft and stole or attempted to steal a $700,000 house in a gated community?
22. Exactly how do you grand theft a house?
23. When Mr. Williams allegedly stole the house did he move the house off of its foundation to another location that Bank of America couldn't find the house?
24. While Mr. Williams was incarcerated was the homeowner evicted from the house you are claiming he grand theft and stole?
25. Is Donna Hickenbottom in foreclosure? *note* (If he says no or I don't know then ask him #25a)

Ex. 9 Cont'd

25a. Then how are you claiming you don't know when you charged Mr. Williams for UPL for representing her in a foreclosure case?

26. Have she filed some of the same documents to protect her property as were filed on Mr. William Hatchetts house?
27. Why haven't you charged her with grand theft or unlawful filing of false documents?
28. Could it be because she is white and not black?
29. How else can you explain why you haven't charged her with the same crime when you know she has filed the same documents?
30. Do you understand the difference between someone stealing a house and someone litigating against a foreclosure?
31. What's the difference?
32. Are you planning to file more bogus charges against Mr. Williams once this case is resolved?
33. Did you lie under oath in a previous case involving Mr. Williams for UPL?
34. Did you ask Mr. Williams previous attorney why she was helping him?

Questions For Barbara Brown

1. Is it your office policy to call the police when someone files a document that you are not familiar with?
2. Did you call Detective Calabro and tell him Mr. Williams filed some fraudulent mortgage documents?
3. How can you tell if a document is fraudulent or not before you file it?
4. Is it the Clerks job to determine if a document is fraudulent before its filed.
5. Do you have any MERS mortgages filed in your office?
6. Have you seen Donna Hickenbottom file documents in your office?
7. Have you seen Mr. Williams file documents in your office?
8. Have you seen William Hatchett file documents in your office?
9. Have you ever seen a homeowner who was fighting the foreclosure of their home be charged with grand theft for doing so?
10. How are documents searched in your system?
11. Can a document be search by words that are in the document or does it have to be searched by the name of the document or the parties involved?
12. Did you call Detective Calabro and tell him that William Hatchett filed some fraudulent mortgage documents?
13. Did you tell the truth in Mr. Williams first & second trial for UPL?
14. Why did your testimony change from one month to the next?

Ex. 9 Cont'd

Questions For Marissel

1. Are you an attorney at law?
2. Are you a member of the bar association?
3. Did you temporarily represent Mr. Williams in his UPL case?
4. Were the offenses a 3rd degree felony and misdemeanor?
5. Do you remember how much the bond was?
6. Was there a Nebbia placed on the bond also?
7. Have you seen such a high bond for a misdemeanor + 3rd degree felony which was not of a violent or drug nature?
8. Would you say that the bond was excessive?
9. Did Detective Calabro make a comment to you to the effect of why are you helping him?
10. Is the U.S. Constitution the Supreme Law of the land as it states in Article 6?
11. Can a state statute override a constitutional guarantee?
12. Do the states have to follow federal law?
13. Is the law suppose to be consistent throughout the state?
14. So if someone commits an offense and gets charged, if someone else commits the same offense should they also get charged?
15. If you came across two scenarios such as those and the person who was charged was black and the one who wasn't charged was white, would you be inclined to say the charge was racially motivated?
16. Was Mr. Williams subjected to a mental evaluation?
17. Did the pyschologist state that he thought Mr. Williams was brilliant?
18. Were you surprised to find out that in the 1st trial that Mr. Williams represented himself, the jury found him not guilty by a 5 to 1 count?
19. Did you know Mr. Willams was retried and found guilty the second trial?
20. Doesn't the 5th Amendment state you can't be tried twice for the same crime?

Documents that I Need Subpoena For

1. Subpoena Records for Dept. of Commerce and Consumer Affairs (DCCA) in hawaii regarding letters I sent to them about mortgage fraud.
2. Subpoena Records for FBI in Washington, D.C. regarding letters and faxes I sent regarding mortgage fraud, private Attorney general and whether what I am doing is lawful or unlawful. The fax number that I faxed from was 202-370-7177, from 2012 to 2016.
3. Subpoena Records from Broward Sheriff's office regarding all incident reports written about me regarding charges I was never charged with.
4. Subpoena Personell Records for John Calabro, pseudo ~~[illegible]~~ Detective, BSO
5. Subpoena Records from BSO regarding letters or faxes I sent regarding protecting the property from foreclosure and any and all letters I sent to Scott Israel, from Common Law Office of America or me.
6. Subpoena Records from the Anti-Predatory Lending Database in Illinois regarding a Certificate of Exemption given to my Company Mortgage Enterprise Investments (MEI), approving the filing of our mortgages and that there was nothing fraudulent about the document.
7. Subpoena Records from the Homeowners Association for Estada for the property located at 3816 N.W. 88th terrace, Hollywood, FL 33024 regarding how long William Hatchett was a resident.
8. Subpoena Records from FBI in Hawaii regarding the complaint I filed against former employees who defrauded me and my clients and the complaint against the mortgage company and companies that have committed fraud against millions of homeowners.
9. Subpoena Records from FBI in Miramar, FL regarding the complaint I filed for fraud by mortgage companies against homeowners.

Ex. 9 Cont'd

Documents That I Need Printed

1. Every page on the www.usacommonlaw.com, www.usopag-gov.org and www.mortgageenterpriseinvestments.com websites.
2. Better Business Bureau printout of the rating of my company COMMON LAW OFFICE OF AMERICA and MORTGAGE ENTERPRISE INVESTMENTS (MEI), and how many complaints filed against them.
3. DCCA printout for the registration of MEI that is active until 2018.
4. National Banking Act, Section 28
5. Fla. Stat. 709.08
6. Printout of the case docket for this case
7. Fla. stat. 812.014(1)(a), 812.014(1)(b), 812.014(2)(a)(1)
8. Fla. stat. 817.535(2)(a)
9. Case law for Grand Theft and the elements of Grand theft
10. Case law for Unlawful Filing of Documents and the elements thereof
11. Case law for officers filing charges they know to be false
12. Procedures on how to file and commence perjury proceedings against a witness that lied under oath
13. Kristen Bain v. Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. (U.S. Supreme Court Ruling)
14. U.S. Attorney General $25 Billion dollar suit against the 5 major banks for fraud and predatory lending

OFFENSES CHARGED AGAINST ME BY CALABRO THAT WERE DROPPED

1) Fraudulently Simulate Legal Process 2) Eaves Dropping 3) Impersonating Police Officer
4) Presenting Fake ID 5) Money Laundering 6) Unlicensed Mortgage Broker
7) Disturbing Court Proceeding 8) Fleeing Arrest From Court Room 9) Resisting Arrest
10) Mortgage Fraud

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE
17th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR
BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

Exhibit 9A

STATE OF FLORIDA CASE NO. 17-74CF10A

v.

ANTHONY WILLIAMS

MOTION TO REMOVE KRISTIE COHEN AS
STANDBY COUNSEL AND APPOINT STEFANIE
MOON AS STANDBY ON PRESENT CASE

Defendant, by his undersigned common law counsel submits this Motion To Remove Kristie Cohen as standby counsel and appoint Stefanie Moon as Standby on Present Case for the following reasons:

1. Kristie Cohen has not made any contact via visit nor answering phone calls from the undersigned.
2. Kristie Cohen has made it clear on the record she intends to do absolutely nothing to assist the undersigned and haven't done anything to assist.
3. Stefanie Moon is standby counsel on Defendant's appeal and has shown that she is reliable, professional and assists the undersigned with the things he needs assistance with.
4. Stefanie Moon has visited the undersigned on several occasions to keep the undersigned informed and to make herself available in the event the undersigned needs assistance.
5. Having one standby counsel would greatly benefit the undersigned having to communicate with only one counsel and ensure the case is progressing in a timely manner and would be essential in maintaining courtroom decorum.

Executed this 7th day of March 2019.

Righteously Submitted,
Anthony Williams
P.O. Box 9356
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 333..

Exhibit 10

Anthony Williams – Defendant
Broward County Jail
BCCN 847889
Arrest # 501602094

PRINTED: 1/30/2017

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SEVENTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

CASE NO: 17000074CF10A
JUDGE: ANDREW SIEGEL

STATE OF FLORIDA
Plaintiff

v.

ANTHONY TROY WILLIAMS
Defendant

STATE'S DISCOVERY EXHIBIT

CO-DEFENDANTS
Name: WILLIAM B HATCHETT   Case No: 16015008CF10A

COMES NOW the State of Florida, by and through the undersigned Assistant State Attorney, and pursuant to the provisions of Rule 3.220, Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure and in recognition of the Defendant's election to participate in discovery, submits the following information:

1. The names and addresses of all persons presently known to the prosecutor to have information that may be relevant to any offense charged, or any defense thereto are:

A	=> ANGEL, YOUREY	1351 GARDEN ROAD WESTON, FL 33326
A	=> BROWN, BARBARA	BROWARD COUNTY CLERK OF COURT 201 SE 6TH ST., ROOM 230 FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301
A	=> BROWN, BARBARA	CLERK OF COURT 201 SE 6 ST., 2ND FLOOR FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301
A	=> CALABRO, JOHN	2601 WEST BROWARD BLVD. FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33311
A	=> DANOFRIO, PAUL	BANK OF AMERICA PO BOX 15047 WILMINGTON, DE 19850
A	=> FERNANDEZ, MARIA	2601 WEST BROWARD BLVD. FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33311
A	=> FORBES, BEATRIZ	CLERK OF COURT 201 SE 6 ST., 2ND FLOOR FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301
A	=> FORMAN, HOWARD	CLERK OF COURTS 201 SE 6 STREET FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301
A	=> GRAHAM, SONYA	CLERK OF COURT 201 SE 6 ST., 2ND FLOOR FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301
A	=> HALES, KIM	CLERK OF COURT 201 SE 6 ST., 2ND FLOOR FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301
A	=> HIGGENBOTTOM, DONNA	10821 MORNINGSTAR DRIVE COOPER CITY, FL 33026

The State incorporates by reference any individual(s) listed in the police report(s), any witness statement(s) and depositions(s) relevant to the offenses charged herein.