

Rudy Davis

From: WILLIAMS ANTHONY TROY (05963122)
Sent Date: Monday, February 3, 2020 1:18 AM
To: ruddavis@yahoo.com
Subject: MOTION IN OPPOSITION TO KOBAYASHI'S RULING

1-30-20. Mr. Isaacson, please file this motion asap. Thanks

MOTION IN OPPOSITION TO TRIAL JUDGE KOBAYASHI'S RULING THAT THE FBI AGENT'S IN OTHER STATES TESTIMONY IS IRRELEVANT TO THIS CASE

Private Attorney General Anthony Williams, a servant of the Most High Yahweh Elohim Yahshua, submits this Motion In Opposition To Trial Judge Kobayashi's Ruling That FBI Agent's In Other States Testimony Is Irrelevant To This Case. In support of this motion the undersigned states the following.

1. The undersigned had a hearing on January 29, 2020 for a Motion To Continue the trial for 70 days due to the illegal and unlawful actions of the prosecutors Gregg Paris Yates and Kenneth M. Sorenson providing discovery a few weeks before trial that should have been submitted 2 years prior but strategically waited to hand over the discovery knowing that the undersigned being a self represented party would not have enough time to go through the voluminous amount of discovery they provided for trial.

2. At this said hearing the undersigned notified Judge Kobayashi (hereinafter "Kobayashi") that the undersigned what the FBI Agent Joseph Lavelle amongst other FBI agents in Florida and other states that unlawfully investigated the undersigned and his businesses.

3. Kobayashi stated on the record that she would not have Agents from Florida or any other state subpoenaed because their testimony would be irrelevant to this case in Hawaii.

4. The prosecutor Kenneth M. Sorenson then chimed in and notified Kobayashi that they have this FBI Agent as a witness and intended to call him as a witness in this case.

5. The undersigned then questioned Kobayashi as to how if the undersigned called this FBI Agent to testify that his testimony would be irrelevant to this case, but when the prosecution stated that they were going to call this agent, his testimony now is relevant to this case.

6. Kobayashi stated that the undersigned could cross examine the Agent if the agent is called to testify by the prosecution.

7. This exchange clearly shows unfair prejudice and bias against the undersigned who was denied the subpoena of a FBI Agent because his testimony was deemed irrelevant to the instant case, but when the prosecution wants to call this same agent, his testimony is now magically relevant.

8. It is this type of unfair, prejudicial and discriminatory conduct that the undersigned has been subjected to throughout this case.

9. The government asked for 8 continuances and Kobayashi granted them over the objection of the undersigned and allowed the prosecution to use co-defendants, (who are no longer co-defendants), to continue the trial at the detriment of the undersigned.

10. The undersigned requested a 70 day continuance based on the unlawful conduct of the prosecution dumping a plethora of discovery right before trial which does not give the undersigned enough time to peruse through the newly provided discovery to ascertain any material that may be relevant, exculpatory or need to be defended against if the prosecution decides to use it.

11. This is the ONLY time the undersigned requested a continuance and it was only based upon the actions of the prosecution that the continuance was needed and Kobayashi denied it.

Rudy Davis

11. This is clearly a violation of the undersigned's due process right in the denial of the continuance when it was the actions of the prosecution that forced the undersigned to have to ask for one in the first place.

12. The undersigned will not be able to peruse through all of the new discovery in the few days leading up to trial because the trial is scheduled to commence in four (4) days which is February 3, 2020.

13. The undersigned has filed this motion in order to preserve his appeal rights to this unfair ruling in the event an appeal is needed.

Executed this 30th day of January 2020.

Righteously submitted,

/s/ Anthony Williams

Private Attorney General

Counsel to the Poor (Psalms 14:6)

Common Law Counsel (28 USC 1654, First Judiciary Act of 1789, sec. 35)