

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII

3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) CR 17-00101 LEK
 4)
 Plaintiff,) Honolulu, Hawaii
 5) March 2, 2020
 vs.)
 6) JURY TRIAL - DAY 15
 (1) ANTHONY T. WILLIAMS,)
 7)
 Defendant.)
 8 _____)

9
 10 TRANSCRIPT OF TRIAL PROCEEDINGS
 BEFORE THE HONORABLE LESLIE E. KOBAYASHI
 11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

12 APPEARANCES:

13 For the Government: KENNETH M. SORENSON, AUSA
 GREGG PARIS YATES, AUSA
 Office of the United States Attorney
 14 300 Ala Moana Boulevard, Suite 6100
 Honolulu, Hawaii 96850

15 Also Present: MEGAN CRAWLEY, FBI Special Agent

16 For the Defendant (1) ANTHONY T. WILLIAMS, *Pro Se*
 17 Anthony T. Williams: 05963-122
 Federal Detention Center Honolulu
 18 Inmate Mail/Parcels
 P.O. Box 30080
 19 Honolulu, Hawaii 96820

20 Standby Counsel: LARS ROBERT ISAACSON, ESQ.
 1100 Alakea Street, 20th Floor
 21 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

22 Official Court Reporter: Debra Read, RDR
 United States District Court
 23 300 Ala Moana Boulevard
 Honolulu, Hawaii 96850

24 Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript
 25 produced with computer-aided transcription (CAT).

1 MONDAY, MARCH 2, 2020 9:05 a.m.

2 (Open court out of the presence of the jury.)

3 THE COURTROOM MANAGER: Criminal No. 17-00101 LEK, United
4 States of America versus Anthony T. Williams.

5 This case has been called for a further jury trial, day
6 15.

7 Counsel, please make your appearances for the record.

8 MR. SORENSON: Good morning, Your Honor.

9 Assistant U.S. Attorneys Ken Sorenson and Gregg Yates here
10 for the United States. We have FBI Special Agent Megan Crawley
11 with us.

12 THE COURT: All right. Good morning to all of you.
13 Mr. Williams.

14 THE DEFENDANT: Private attorney general Anthony
15 Williams appearing sui juris.

16 THE COURT: Good morning to you.
17 Mr. Isaacson.

18 MR. ISAACSON: Good morning, Your Honor.

19 Lars Isaacson, standby counsel, with Ivy Yeung assisting
20 today.

21 THE COURT: All right. Good morning to all of you.
22 And the record will reflect the jury's not present.

23 Mr. Williams, you have a matter to take up.

24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. On this PowerPoint they have a
25 lot of things on here that are false and that they're alleging,

1 like my sovereign peace officer oath they got "false" written
2 across it which it's not. They got the "engineered to deceive"
3 on the back of the private attorney general ID, saying that the
4 letterhead was deceptive. I have the deceptive trade practice
5 fraud which is not -- never been charged with that.

6 And they got Henry, he pled guilty to conspiracy to commit
7 wire fraud with me, which he did not. I'm -- he's not my
8 co-conspirator.

9 THE COURT: Anything else?

10 THE DEFENDANT: I think that was it.

11 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Sorenson, or Mr. Yates,
12 who will be responding to Mr. Williams --

13 MR. SORENSON: I will, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: -- Mr. Williams's objection?
15 Mr. Sorenson.

16 MR. SORENSON: Well, I'm sure, as the Court is about
17 to tell Mr. Williams, this is argument, this is our evidence,
18 this is how we view the evidence in the case. The Court's
19 going to instruct the jury that what the attorney, in this case
20 me, says is not evidence. And I think the Court is also going
21 to instruct that what Mr. Williams says is not evidence.

22 But it's our argument of course, as you know.

23 THE COURT: Yes. So, Mr. Williams, your objections
24 are noted for the record. It is argument at this point as
25 opposed to opening statement, and I am going to instruct the

1 jurors that anything that the attorneys say is not evidence.
2 They're to rely on their recollection of the evidence that was
3 admitted and testified to in evidence.

4 Anything else that you need to raise for the record before
5 we bring in the jury?

6 THE DEFENDANT: That'll be all.

7 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

8 Then we're ready to bring in the jury and we'll go into
9 recess and have Ms. Elkington bring the jury. Thank you.

10 (A recess was taken.)

11 (Open court in the presence of the jury.)

12 THE COURTROOM MANAGER: This is Criminal
13 No. 17-00101 LEK, United States of America versus Anthony T.
14 Williams.

15 This case has been called for further jury trial, day 15.
16 Counsel, please make your appearances for the record.

17 MR. SORENSON: Good morning, Your Honor.

18 Assistant U.S. Attorneys Ken Sorenson and Gregg Yates here
19 for the United States. We have FBI Special Agent Megan Crawley
20 with us.

21 THE COURT: All right. Good morning to all of you.
22 Mr. Williams.

23 THE DEFENDANT: Good morning.

24 Private attorney general Anthony Williams appearing sui
25 juris.

1 THE COURT: Good morning.

2 Mr. Isaacson.

3 MR. ISAACSON: Good morning, Your Honor.

4 Lars Isaacson with Ivy Yeung assisting at counsel table.

5 THE COURT: Good morning to both of you.

6 And good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome back.

7 You may be seated.

8 All right. Today we are here for closing arguments. What
9 the attorneys and Mr. Williams say are -- will not be evidence
10 and you are not bound by their interpretation or recollection
11 of the evidence. The actual evidence you must consider will
12 come from the witnesses' testimony and any exhibits that were
13 admitted into evidence. You are responsible to rely on your
14 own collective recollection of the evidence in reaching your
15 decision in this case.

16 I will now read through the jury instructions for you and
17 I will go over the special verdict form that you will be
18 required to deliberate on and make a decision. So you have
19 copies of the jury instructions with you on your seats and you
20 can follow along or merely listen to me, whichever is easiest
21 for you.

22 Members of the jury, you have now heard all the evidence
23 in the case and you will soon hear the final arguments of the
24 lawyers from the parties.

25 It becomes my duty, therefore, to instruct you on the

1 rules of law that you must follow and apply in arriving at your
2 decision in the case.

3 In any jury trial there are, in effect, two judges. I am
4 one of the judges; the other is the jury. It has been my duty
5 to preside over the trial and to determine what testimony and
6 evidence is relevant under the law for your consideration. It
7 is now my duty to instruct you on the law applicable to the
8 case.

9 You, as jurors, are the judges of the facts. But in
10 determining what happened in this case -- that is, in reaching
11 your decision as to the facts -- it is your sworn duty to
12 follow the law I am now defining for you.

13 You must follow all of my instructions as a whole. You
14 have no right to disregard or give special attention to any one
15 instruction, or to question the wisdom or correctness of any
16 rule that I state to you. That is, you must not substitute or
17 follow your own notion or opinion as to what the law is or
18 ought to be. It is your duty to apply the law as I give it to
19 you, regardless of the consequences.

20 It is also your duty to base your verdict solely upon the
21 testimony and evidence in the case, without prejudice or
22 sympathy. That was the promise you made and the oath you took
23 before being accepted by the parties as jurors in this case,
24 and they have the right to expect nothing less.

25 The indictment or formal charge against a defendant is not

1 evidence. The defendant is presumed to be innocent and does
2 not have to present any evidence to prove innocence. The
3 government has the burden of proving every element of the
4 charge beyond a reasonable doubt. If it fails to do so, you
5 must return a not guilty verdict.

6 While the government's burden of proof is a strict or
7 heavy burden, it is not necessary that the defendant's guilt be
8 proved beyond all possible doubt. It is only required that the
9 government's proof exclude any "reasonable doubt" concerning
10 the defendant's guilt.

11 A reasonable doubt is a doubt based upon reason and common
12 sense, and may arise from a careful and impartial consideration
13 of all the evidence, or from lack of evidence. Proof beyond a
14 reasonable doubt is proof that leaves you firmly convinced that
15 the defendant is guilty.

16 If after a careful and impartial consideration with your
17 fellow jurors of all the evidence, you are not convinced beyond
18 a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty, it is your
19 duty to find the defendant not guilty. On the other hand, if
20 after a careful and impartial consideration with your fellow
21 jurors of all the evidence, you are convinced beyond a
22 reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty, it is your duty
23 to find the defendant guilty.

24 As stated earlier, it is your duty to determine the facts,
25 and in doing so, you must consider only the evidence I have

1 admitted in the case. The term "evidence "includes the sworn
2 testimony of the witnesses and the exhibits admitted in the
3 record.

4 Remember that any statements, objections, or arguments
5 made by the attorneys and Anthony Williams while representing
6 himself are not evidence in the case. The function of the
7 attorneys and Anthony Williams while representing himself is to
8 point out things that are most significant or most helpful to
9 their side of the case, and in doing so, to call your attention
10 to certain facts or inferences that might otherwise escape your
11 notice.

12 In the final analysis, however, it is your own
13 recollection and interpretation of the evidence that controls
14 in this case. What the attorneys and Anthony Williams while
15 representing himself say are not binding upon you.

16 Rules of evidence control what can be received into
17 evidence. During the course of trial, when a party asked a
18 question or offered an exhibit into evidence and a party on the
19 other side thought that it was not permitted by the rules of
20 evidence, that party may have objected. If I overruled an
21 objection, the question was answered or the exhibit received.
22 If I sustained an objection, the question was not answered and
23 the exhibit was not received.

24 Whenever I sustained an objection to a question, you must
25 not speculate as to what the answer might have been or as to

1 the reason for the objection. You must not consider for any
2 purpose any offer of evidence that was rejected, or any
3 evidence that was stricken from the record; such matter is to
4 be treated as though you had never known of it.

5 During the course of trial I may occasionally made
6 comments to the parties, or asked questions of a witness, or
7 admonished a witness concerning the manner in which he or she
8 should respond to the question. Do not assume from anything I
9 said that I have any opinion concerning any of the issues in
10 this case. Except for my instructions to you on the law, you
11 should disregard anything I said during the trial in arriving
12 at your own findings as to the facts.

13 In this case, the parties have agreed, or stipulated, as
14 to certain facts. This means that they agree that these facts
15 are true. You should therefore treat these facts as having
16 been conclusively proved.

17 Evidence may be direct or circumstantial. Direct evidence
18 is direct proof of a fact, such as the testimony of an
19 eyewitness. Circumstantial evidence is indirect evidence, that
20 is, proof of a chain of facts from which you could find that
21 another fact exists, even though it has not been proved
22 directly.

23 So, while you should consider only the evidence in the
24 case, you are permitted to draw such reasonable inferences from
25 the testimony and exhibits as you feel are justified in the

1 light of common experience. In other words, you may make
2 deductions and reach conclusions which reason and common sense
3 lead you to draw from the testimony and evidence in the case.

4 You are to consider both direct and circumstantial
5 evidence. The law permits you to give equal weight to both,
6 but it is for you to decide how much weight to give any
7 evidence.

8 Now, I have said that you must consider all of the
9 evidence. This does not mean, however, that you must accept
10 all of the evidence as true and accurate -- or accurate.

11 You are the sole judges of the credibility or
12 "believability" of each witness and the weight to be given to
13 his or her testimony. In evaluating the testimony of a
14 witness, you may consider:

15 (1) the opportunity and ability of the witness to see or
16 hear or know the things testified to;

17 (2) the witness's memory;

18 (3) the witness's manner while testifying;

19 (4) the witness's interest in the outcome of the case, if
20 any;

21 (5) the witness's bias or prejudice, if any;

22 (6) whether other evidence contradicted the witness's
23 testimony;

24 (7) the reasonableness of the witness's testimony in light
25 of all the evidence; and

1 (8) any other factors that bear on believability. You may
2 accept or reject the testimony of any witness in whole or in
3 part. That is, you may believe everything a witness says, or
4 part of it, or none of it.

5 Also, the weight of evidence is not necessarily determined
6 by the number of witnesses testifying as to the existence or
7 non-existence of any fact. You may find that the testimony of
8 a smaller number of witnesses as to any fact is more credible
9 than the testimony of a larger number of witnesses to the
10 contrary.

11 The defendant has testified. You should treat this
12 testimony just as you would the testimony of any other witness.

13 The rules of evidence provide that if scientific,
14 technical, or other specialized knowledge might assist the jury
15 in understanding the evidence or in determining a fact in
16 issue, a witness qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill,
17 experience, training, or education may testify and state his
18 own or her own opinion concerning such matters.

19 You should consider each expert opinion received in
20 evidence in this case and give it such weight as you may think
21 it deserves. If you decide that the opinion of an expert
22 witness is not based upon sufficient education and/or
23 experience, or if you conclude that the reasons given in
24 support of the opinion are not sound, or if you conclude that
25 the opinion is outweighed by other evidence, then you may

1 disregard the opinion entirely.

2 A witness may be discredited or impeached by contradictory
3 evidence by showing that:

4 (1) the witness testified falsely concerning a material
5 matter; or

6 (2) at some other time, the witness said or did something
7 that is inconsistent with the witness's present testimony; or

8 (3) at some other time, the witness failed to say or do
9 something that would be consistent with the present testimony
10 had it been said or done.

11 If you believe any witness has been so impeached, then it
12 is for you alone to decide how much credibility or weight, if
13 any, to give to the testimony of that witness.

14 A witness may also be discredited or impeached by the
15 evidence that the general reputation of the witness for truth
16 and veracity is bad in the community where the witness now
17 resides, or recently resided.

18 If you believe any witness has been so impeached, then it
19 is for you alone to decide how much credibility or weight to
20 give the testimony of that witness.

21 Evidence of the defendant's previous conviction in the
22 State of Florida for Unauthorized Practice of Law is to be
23 considered by you only as it may affect the credibility of that
24 witness -- of that defendant as a witness, and must never be
25 considered as evidence of guilt of the crime for which the

1 defendant is on trial.

2 You have heard testimony from Henry Malinay and Anabel
3 Cabebe, witnesses who have pled guilty to crimes arising out of
4 the same events for which the defendant is on trial. These
5 guilty pleas are not evidence against the defendant, and you
6 may consider them only in determining these witnesses'
7 believability. You should consider these witnesses' testimony
8 with greater caution than that of other witnesses.

9 The testimony of a law enforcement officer should be
10 weighed and considered, and credibility determined, in the same
11 way as any other witness. A law enforcement officer's
12 testimony is not entitled to any greater weight, nor should you
13 consider it more credible, than any other witness's testimony
14 simply because it was given by a law enforcement officer.

15 Certain charts and summaries have been admitted in
16 evidence. Charts and summaries are only as good as the
17 underlying supporting material. You should, therefore, give
18 them only such weight as you think the underlying material
19 deserves.

20 The defendant is charged in Counts 1 through 15 of the
21 Superseding Indictment with wire fraud in violation of
22 Section 1343 of Title 10[sic] of the United States Code. In
23 order for a defendant to be found guilty of that charge, the
24 government must prove each of the following elements beyond a
25 reasonable doubt:

1 First, the defendant knowingly participated in, or devised
2 a scheme or plan to defraud, or a scheme or plan for obtaining
3 money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses,
4 representations, or promises. Deceitful statements of
5 half-truths may constitute false or fraudulent representations;

6 Second, the statements made or facts omitted as part of
7 the scheme were material; that is, they had a natural tendency
8 to influence, or were capable of influencing, a person to part
9 with money or property;

10 Third, the defendant acted with the intent to defraud,
11 that is, the intent to deceive or cheat; and

12 Fourth the defendant used or caused to be used, an
13 interstate wire communication to carry out or attempt to carry
14 out an essential part of the scheme.

15 In determining whether a scheme to defraud exists, you may
16 consider not only the defendant's words and statements, but
17 also the circumstances in which they are used as a whole.

18 A wiring is caused when one knows that a wire will be used
19 in the ordinary course of business or when one can reasonably
20 foresee such use.

21 It need not have been reasonably foreseeable to the
22 defendant that the wire communication would be interstate in
23 nature. Rather, it must be reasonably foreseeable to the
24 defendant that some wire communication would occur in
25 furtherance of the scheme, and an interstate wire communication

1 must have actually occurred in furtherance of the scheme.

2 In determining whether a scheme to defraud exists, you are
3 entitled to consider not only the defendant's words and
4 statements, but also the circumstances in which they are used
5 as a whole.

6 A defendant's actions can constitute a scheme to defraud
7 even if there are no specific false statements involved. The
8 deception need not be premised upon words or statements
9 standing alone. The arrangement of the words or the
10 circumstances in which they are used may create an appearance
11 which is false or deceptive, even if the words themselves fall
12 short of this. Thus, even if statements as part of the scheme
13 are not literally false, you may consider whether the
14 statements taken as a whole were misleading and deceptive.
15 Evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that a scheme was reasonably
16 calculated to deceive is sufficient to establish a scheme to
17 defraud.

18 The defendant is charged in Counts 16 through 32 of the
19 Superseding Indictment with mail fraud in violation of
20 Section 1341 of Title 18 of the United States Code. In order
21 for the defendant to be found guilty of that charge, the
22 government must prove each of the following elements as to each
23 defendant beyond a reasonable doubt:

24 First, the defendant knowingly participated in or devised
25 a scheme or plan to to fraud -- or plan to defraud, or a scheme

1 or plan for obtaining money or property by means of false or
2 fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises. Deceitful
3 statements of half-truths may constitute false or fraudulent
4 representations.

5 Second, the statements made or facts omitted as part of
6 the scheme were material; that is, they had a natural tendency
7 to influence, or were capable of influencing, a person to part
8 with money or property;

9 Third, the defendant acted with the intent to defraud,
10 that is, the intent to deceive or cheat; and

11 Fourth, the defendant used, or caused to be used, the
12 mails to carry out or attempt to carry out an essential part of
13 the scheme.

14 In determining whether a scheme to defraud exists, you may
15 consider not only the defendant's words and statements, but
16 also the circumstances in which they are used as a whole.

17 A mailing is caused when one knows that the mails will be
18 used in the ordinary course of business or when one can
19 reasonably foresee such use. It does not matter whether the
20 material mailed was itself false or deceptive as long as the
21 mail was used as part of the scheme, nor does it matter whether
22 the scheme or plan was successful or that any money or property
23 was obtained.

24 You may determine whether a defendant had an honest, good
25 faith belief in the truth of the specific misrepresentations

1 alleged in the indictment in determining whether or not the
2 defendant acted with intent to defraud. However, a defendant's
3 belief that the victims of the fraud will be paid in the future
4 or will sustain no economic loss is no defense to the crime.

5 A defendant may be found guilty of mail fraud or wire
6 fraud even if the defendant personally did not commit the acts
7 constituting the crime but aided and abetted in its commission.
8 To "aid and abet" means intentionally to help someone else
9 commit a crime. To prove a defendant guilty of aiding and
10 abetting, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt:

11 First, someone else committed the charged mail fraud or
12 wire fraud;

13 Second, the defendant aided, counseled, commanded,
14 induced, or procured that person with respect to at least one
15 element of mail fraud or wire fraud, with all of you agreeing
16 on the element and the individual charge;

17 Third, the defendant acted with intent to facilitate the
18 wire fraud offenses charged in Counts 1 through 15 and/or the
19 mail fraud offenses charged in Counts 16 through 32 of the
20 Superseding Indictment; and

21 Fourth, the defendant acted before the crime was
22 completed.

23 It is not enough that a defendant merely associated with
24 the person committing the crime, or unknowingly or
25 intentionally -- unintentionally did things that were helpful

1 to that person, or was present at the scene of the crime. The
2 evidence must show beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant
3 acted with the knowledge and intention of helping that person
4 commit mail fraud or wire fraud as charged in Counts 1 through
5 32.

6 A defendant acts with the intent to facilitate the crime
7 when a defendant actively participates in a criminal venture
8 with advance notice -- let me say that again -- with advance
9 knowledge of the crime and having acquired that knowledge when
10 the defendant still had a realistic opportunity to withdraw
11 from the crime.

12 The government is not required to prove precisely which
13 defendant actually committed the crime and which defendant
14 aided and abetted.

15 You will note that the defendant -- the indictment charges
16 that the offenses were committed "on or about" certain dates.
17 The evidence need not establish with certainty the exact date
18 of the alleged offense. It is sufficient if the evidence in
19 the case establishes beyond a reasonable doubt that an offense
20 was committed on a date reasonably near the date alleged.

21 The word "knowingly," as that term has been used in these
22 instructions, means that the act was done voluntarily and
23 intentionally and not because of mistake or accident.

24 A separate crime or offense is charged in each count of
25 the indictment. Each charge and the evidence pertaining to it

1 should be considered separately. The fact that you may find
2 the defendant guilty or not guilty as to one of the offenses
3 charged should not control your verdict as to any other offense
4 charged.

5 I caution you, members of the jury, that you are here to
6 determine whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty from
7 the evidence in this case. The defendant is not on trial for
8 any act or conduct or offense not alleged in the indictment.
9 Nor are you called upon to return a verdict as to the guilt of
10 any other person or persons not on trial as a defendant in this
11 case.

12 Also, the punishment provided by law for the offenses
13 charged in the indictment is a matter exclusively within the
14 province of the judge, and should never be considered by the
15 jury in any way in arriving at an impartial verdict.

16 Some of you took notes during the trial. Whether or not
17 you took notes, you should rely on your own memory of what was
18 said. Notes are only to assist your memory. You should not be
19 overly influenced by your notes or those of other jurors.

20 Remember that even during your deliberations, my mandate
21 to you still applies that you not read any news stories or
22 articles, listen to any radio, or watch any television reports
23 about the case or about anyone who has anything to do with it.
24 Do not do any research, such as consulting dictionaries,
25 searching the internet, or using other reference materials, and

1 do not make any investigation about the case on your own. And
2 do not discuss the case in any manner with others, directly or
3 through social media. You may only discuss the case with your
4 fellow jurors during your deliberations, with all twelve of you
5 present.

6 Your verdict must represent the considered judgment of
7 each juror. In order to return a verdict, it is necessary that
8 each juror agree thereto. In other words, your verdict must be
9 unanimous.

10 It is your duty as jurors to consult with one another, and
11 to deliberate in an effort to reach agreement if you can do so
12 without violence to individual judgment. Each of you must
13 decide the case for yourself, but only after an impartial
14 consideration of the evidence in the case with your fellow
15 jurors. In the course of your deliberations, do not hesitate
16 to re-examine your own views and change your opinion if
17 convinced it is erroneous. But do not surrender your honest
18 conviction as to the weight or effect of the evidence solely
19 because of the opinion of your fellow jurors, or for the mere
20 purpose of returning a verdict.

21 Remember at all times, you are not partisans. You are
22 judges -- judges of the facts. Your sole interest is to seek
23 the truth from the evidence in the case.

24 Upon retiring to the jury room, you should first select
25 one of your number to act as your foreperson who will preside

1 over your deliberations and will be your spokesperson here in
2 court. A verdict form has been prepared for your convenience.

3 If you would look up at the screen, we'll go over the
4 verdict form very briefly. Now, with the verdict form, there's
5 also going to be a redacted Indictment, and Ms. Odani will show
6 you what the Indictment -- the front page looks like.

7 So that's the redacted Indictment.

8 And then if you could go to the first page of the redacted
9 Indictment, and then the second page. So it gives you
10 information about the charges. And why am I pointing this out
11 to you, because you need to have this information in order to
12 make sure that you understand how you're supposed to fill out
13 the verdict form. I won't go through the entire Indictment,
14 but that's the verbiage in the Indictment and you'll be given a
15 copy for your deliberations.

16 Now, if we could go to the first page of the verdict form.
17 So the verdict form is 13 pages.

18 The first page of the verdict form goes through your
19 instructions that you should read the entire verdict form
20 before you start deliberating, that you should answer them in
21 sequence and not jump around, and so forth. It gives you the
22 instructions on how to go through the verdict form. And once
23 you've reached a decision that's unanimous, that all of you
24 agree, all 12, then the foreperson should sign and date it and
25 notify the bailiff that you have reached a verdict.

1 So if we turn to the first page, it goes through each of
2 the counts. So as you see, it starts out with Count 1, which
3 is wire fraud count, and it says, "As to the offense of wire
4 fraud as charged in Count 1 of the Superseding Indictment, We,
5 the jury, find the defendant, Anthony T. Williams," and then
6 you're given the two options which you will place an X or a
7 checkmark as to what all 12 of you agree on with regard to
8 that.

9 Now, if we could go back to the -- I think it's the third
10 page of the Indictment. So the verdict form just goes
11 numerically through Counts 1 through 32. For you to understand
12 what Count 1 is, you need to look at the Indictment, and then
13 it goes through each of the counts with regard to the dates and
14 so forth of the specifics of it.

15 All right. So you would discuss the evidence and take a
16 vote as to each of the counts that are listed in the special
17 verdict form. And to assist you into understanding which count
18 it's referring to so you can search your recollection of the
19 testimony and evidence, you can look at the redacted
20 Indictment. All right?

21 Also, you'll be provided a part of all of the exhibits
22 that were received in evidence, so you will have those physical
23 copies with you in the deliberation room.

24 All right. Thank you, Ms. Odani.

25 So you will take the verdict form to the jury room and

1 when you have reached a unanimous agreement as to your verdict,
2 you will have your foreperson fill it in, date and sign it, and
3 then return to the courtroom.

4 If, during your deliberations, you desire to communicate
5 with the court, please put your message or question in a note
6 and have the foreperson sign the note, and pass the note to the
7 marshal who will bring it to my attention. I will then respond
8 as promptly as possible, either in writing or having you return
9 to the courtroom so I can address you orally. I caution you,
10 however, that you should never state or specify your numerical
11 division at any time. For example, you never should state that
12 "X" number of jurors are leaning or voting one way and "X"
13 number of jurors are leaning or voting another way.

14 All right. So that's the end of the jury instructions.

15 Any objections as to the jury instructions given by the
16 court, Mr. Sorenson?

17 MR. SORENSON: Not from the United States, Your
18 Honor.

19 THE COURT: Mr. Williams?

20 THE DEFENDANT: I think you have my objections
21 already noted.

22 THE COURT: Yes. Other than the previous
23 objections?

24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

25 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

1 All right. So ladies and gentlemen, now sit back and
2 relax. We're going to have the closing arguments given. So
3 we'll first start with the government, and as I indicated to
4 you, the government has an opportunity to address you twice and
5 Mr. Williams only once, and that's because the government has
6 the burden of proving its case beyond a reasonable doubt. They
7 have time limits and Ms. Elkington will be keeping track of the
8 time.

9 Mr. Sorenson.

10 MR. SORENSON: Your Honor, if I could just have a
11 moment to hook up my electronics here?

12 THE COURT: You may.

13 MR. SORENSON: I don't look too silly, do I?

14 Okay. So there you have it, the story of a fake attorney
15 with a fake law firm, a fake badge, a fake set of credentials
16 selling a fake debt elimination scheme to the most naive, the
17 most desperate, and, yes, the most vulnerable of our Hawaii
18 community, an immigrant Filipino community that clearly, in
19 this instance, the particular individuals had a very difficult
20 time understanding him, understanding what was going on. They
21 were targeted perfectly by him. And I'll tell you why as we
22 move through this closing argument.

23 It's interesting, though. You know, don't know that I've
24 seen this before, but this scam actually continued right
25 through the trial, didn't it? "Private attorney general

1 Anthony Williams appearing sui juris." How about that?

2 You know, the scam is the same, but guess what? The
3 targets are different. You're the targets. You're the ones
4 he's selling this debt elimination scheme to now. You're the
5 one he's selling his legitimacy to now. The problem for him is
6 that you've seen the evidence in the case. The problem is
7 you're an astute American jury. Each of you has paid
8 attention, almost unbelievably at times, to the rigorous grind
9 this trial has been, the documents, the documents.

10 Now, I apologize. I'm you going to have to go through
11 some of those documents. I'll do it as painlessly as possible,
12 but this summation's going to require that we go through quite
13 a few of them.

14 The message I have for you is don't be fooled like they
15 were. Pay attention to the evidence -- I know that you
16 have -- and give Mr. Williams, of course, every benefit you can
17 as he makes his argument as well. But remember, what
18 Mr. Williams is saying now, just like his opening statement,
19 not evidence. Not evidence. What I'm saying isn't evidence.
20 But I don't need you to believe what I say is evidence because
21 you've seen the evidence in the case, right?

22 All right. Let's go through that now.

23 Now, one of the things I think that's going to be helpful
24 to you in a fraud scheme -- you've heard the instructions,
25 right? You guys have that down, I'm sure. But I want to

1 highlight the wire fraud instruction. One thing to remember,
2 I'm not going to spend any time on mail fraud. Wire fraud and
3 mail fraud are the same pretty much, same elements. All you
4 have to do is find that scheme to defraud. The difference is
5 you have to find it interstate wire that's used in furtherance
6 of the scheme. That's what you have for wire fraud.

7 For mail fraud, guess what? You need that mailing.
8 Doesn't have to be interstate, just you need that mailing. I'm
9 going to talk about that in a few moments. But those are the
10 differences.

11 When you find a scheme to defraud in this case, I submit
12 to you that it's going to work for the wire fraud, it's going
13 to work for the mail fraud, and at that point you're going to
14 go to the individual counts, look at those exhibits, and I
15 submit to you you're going to find those emails and those
16 mailings all were done in the context of the MEI business.
17 They all were an essential part of the scheme. That's how the
18 money got to his mom over there in Texas, the emails that came
19 from him, the communications, and also the wire of money from
20 time to time.

21 All right. Wire fraud elements -- you've heard these.
22 I'm not going to go through it completely, but I'm going to
23 highlight a little bit. Remember, "deceitful statements of
24 half truth may constitute false or fraudulent representations."
25 We're going to have some of that here, aren't we? You saw

1 that, half truths, a lot of times.

2 "The statements made or the facts omitted as part of the
3 scheme." Remember, "facts omitted." Omissions can be
4 fraudulent, failure to disclose can be fraudulent.

5 "Omitted as part of the scheme or material" -- gotta find
6 that they really meant something. And we asked the witnesses
7 when they asked, "Did you -- did it matter to you when he said
8 he was an attorney? Did you rely on that?"

9 And what did they say? "Heck, yeah. I thought he was an
10 attorney, said he was."

11 Okay. Judge Kobayashi gave you this instruction and it's
12 a good one for fraud schemes because it helps you dial in your
13 understanding. Remember, "the circumstances of the
14 representations as a whole have to be considered." And here
15 that's going to make a difference to you.

16 "The arrangement of the words or the circumstances in
17 which they are used may create an appearance which is false or
18 deceptive." Boy, there's a lot of that here, isn't there?
19 We're going to get into this, but first I want to lay this
20 skeletal framework for you so you understand when you see these
21 factors coming up here in a few moments, you're going to have
22 the skeleton right there, you're going to say, "Okay. That's
23 where that is. I see where that goes." These -- "The
24 arrangement of these words may create an appearance which is
25 false or deceptive even if the words themselves fall short of

1 this."

2 All right. Let's start digging into our case a little
3 bit. Fun part about this for you all, I know, is that you have
4 seen these documents so many times, and so it's like old home
5 week, isn't it, going back? Oh, it's good to see the Tennessee
6 affidavit again. We missed that.

7 All right. So Mr. Williams, I submit to you, adorned
8 himself with a set of self-proclaimed super powers. Those
9 self-proclaimed super powers exempted him from law, made him a
10 judge, a police chief, a fire chief, made him everything in the
11 world he possibly ever had to be.

12 Let's look at them. First, he had that official badge.
13 Remember that? If you don't, I've got it right here, official
14 badge with higher authority than all law enforcement. Remember
15 that? Higher than all law enforcement. Kind of plays into
16 what Henry Malinay said. Remember when Williams was first
17 trying to get Henry to come into the scheme so that Henry could
18 access him to the immigrant Filipino community, he said, "I'm
19 an attorney. I'm higher than all of them. I'm appointed by
20 the governor." Any police officer, judge, or government
21 employee must produce their signed oath of office to him. He
22 proclaims himself to be his own police chief, sheriff, and
23 judge. Remember that?

24 And here's where the hypocrisy starts to seep in, and
25 we're going to talk about this from time to time. He says he's

1 not a citizen of the United States, right? Not bound by state,
2 federal laws. But down there below, he just says, Hey, but I'm
3 going to retain all the benefits afforded to U.S. citizens. In
4 other words, I don't have to pay attention to any laws. I
5 don't have to pay taxes. I don't have to worry about anything
6 and I get all the benefits because I'm a nonresident alien.
7 Remember that one?

8 And of course at the bottom, as I just alluded to, he's a
9 foreigner; he's exempt from taxation. I think he told you
10 under oath, this was his evidence, he hasn't paid taxes since
11 2005.

12 Okay. Another touchstone, if you will, of his super
13 powers is this document. Remember this? The House of
14 Representatives. There's the seal of the House of
15 Representatives up there. He's good at using these seals,
16 isn't he? Gives him legitimacy. He adorns himself in the
17 wardrobe of legitimacy time and time again, and you're going to
18 see that because he's a fake and he's a fraud and he's selling
19 a bill of goods by adorning himself in those things that people
20 trust and believe in.

21 All right. Of course he's been commissioned by Nancy
22 Pelosi herself to be a private attorney general. That's what
23 he's selling here. When he shows this document to immigrant
24 Filipinos, do you think they know that this is a fake? Heck,
25 they might not even know who Nancy Pelosi is. But we do. This

1 is a fake document.

2 All right. Remember this, the apostille? This was his
3 argument, that the Secretary of State of Tennessee had
4 appointed him to be a sovereign peace officer. This was the
5 second page of that exhibit and he's got his oath here. Sure
6 enough, this is something Anthony would write, correct? And he
7 signed it at the bottom. And once again, he's got the United
8 States Seal up there, the Great Seal of the United States of
9 America. He's also got the Seal of the State of Tennessee.

10 Problem is, while he argues to you and asserts to you that
11 some law enforcement agencies -- I think it was the Davidson
12 County Sheriff's Department, swore him in as a sovereign peace
13 officer, I submit to you that is patently incredible, patently
14 hard to believe.

15 What's easy to believe is that they would do anything
16 probably to get rid of him. And whatever they had to say, I'm
17 sure they did it to get rid of him, but I submit to you it's
18 highly doubtful that they would swear in an individual to be a
19 peace officer, to carry a badge and handcuffs. Certainly
20 wouldn't be responsible. And so I submit to you that's false
21 as well.

22 And remember this? This is an IRS form that he attached
23 to this document. And in this IRS form he asserts that he's a
24 nonresident alien who at no time during the year engaged in a
25 trade or business in the United States. This was under oath.

1 This was Mr. Williams saying things in documents in attempting
2 to get something signed by somebody that would give him, again,
3 that wardrobe of legitimacy. In this case it looks like it's
4 all designed to try to get him some plausible explanation for
5 saying he's a peace officer, some plausible explanation for
6 walking around with this baby on his belt.

7 Okay. The credential. I think the credential is critical
8 to this case and it's interesting to me, very interesting,
9 because the credential is this case in so many ways. The
10 credential is Anthony Williams in so many ways because it has
11 that appearance of legitimacy. It is a shining example of
12 fraud. Look at it. There is so many things on here that make
13 you trust it. But like Mr. Williams, when you scratch below
14 the veneer, you see that it's a load. I'm not going to tell
15 you what it's a load of, but it's a load.

16 Okay. So let's look at this. And you remember James
17 Spota, TSA? We brought him in on rebuttal because we heard so
18 much from Anthony, right? Never been stopped with my TSA
19 creds. These are legitimate. Why would TSA ever accept these
20 if they weren't legitimate? That was Anthony's argument as to
21 why these were authentic -- not that they were issued by a real
22 government agency, but that TSA had accepted them.

23 But I submit to you that what Mr. Spota said was correct.
24 He fooled TSA. This is a dang good fake, and that's what it
25 is.

1 First off, we see the American flag backdrop, right? We
2 also see something that's critical, the United States Office of
3 the Private Attorney General. What private entities couch
4 their names in such away? United States Office of Shell Gas
5 Station? No. United States Office of means it's a United
6 States office: United States Office of the United States
7 Attorney, United States Office of the Federal Bureau of
8 Investigation. You know that these agencies are U.S.
9 government agencies.

10 So when you put this on your credential, I submit to you
11 you are going to fool people into believing that there really
12 is a -- an office of the private attorney general. Heck, most
13 people just think he's an attorney general, he's with the
14 United States Attorney General. I'm sure he wouldn't do
15 anything to disabuse anybody of that notion if they bid on it.

16 And also equally troublesome, the Great Seal of the United
17 States of America. That's right. He's adorned himself with
18 the Great Seal of the United States of America. Now, we heard
19 from James Spota that, my gosh, it's a violation of law just to
20 use that on a credential, giving the impression that you are
21 somehow affiliated with the United States Government, and,
22 albeit I'll point out, giving the false impression. And when
23 we start talking about false, we start talking about deception.
24 We're talking about fraud. Fraud. And we have fraud rampantly
25 through this case. There's so much of it.

1 He talks about being an attorney and being really an
2 attorney. The fact is his representations of being an attorney
3 were nice. They're certainly fraudulent. The fact is there's
4 so much other fraud in this case, he could actually be an
5 attorney and be equally guilty of every count in this
6 indictment. Because what attorney would tell people that he
7 could eliminate their mortgages with the filing of a bogus UCC
8 financing statement or an MEI mortgage and take the kind of
9 money that he was expecting to get? Any attorney that did
10 that, by gosh, they're just as guilty of mail and wire fraud as
11 Anthony Williams is.

12 So the hypocrisy here as we look at this: We've got the
13 Great Seal, we've got -- I pulled up part of his Tennessee
14 affidavit here only because it's interesting. It's the irony
15 and hypocrisy alert here. He's not a U.S. citizen, by his own
16 statement. He seems to have renounced that. But, boy, he does
17 love being part of the United States, doesn't he? He spouts
18 off the United States Constitution, he's throwing the Great
19 Seal up on everything he does, and he's with the United States
20 Office of the Private Attorney General. Hypocrisy.

21 But when it suits his needs, right? When it suits his
22 needs, he's going to use it. And by the way, he's not going to
23 pay any taxes.

24 Okay. Let's look at the rear end of this credential
25 because it's an equal opportunity fraud alert in my view.

1 First off, the law doesn't apply to him. We already know that.
2 He said that under oath many times in this case, right? But
3 that becomes dangerous, doesn't it? Because when the law
4 doesn't apply to you, you can do just about anything you want,
5 and that appears to be how Anthony Williams has lived his life
6 for the last several years, doing anything he liked, arguing of
7 anybody that got in his way that he was a private attorney
8 general, that he'd been appointed by Nancy Pelosi, that he was
9 a sovereign peace officer sworn to by the Secretary of State,
10 and that's the interesting thing here.

11 When you look at the Secretary of State, he doesn't tell
12 you that it's the Secretary of State of Tennessee, does he? I
13 mean, that's a fraudulent document anyway, but if he's going to
14 to be honest about it, at least say the Secretary of State of
15 Tennessee. Maybe you could put the Tennessee seal down there.
16 But no, Mr. Williams, here's his apostille from Tennessee, and
17 he said the Secretary of State and he's got the Great Seal of
18 the United States of America once again.

19 Once again, duplicity, hypocrisy, but it suits his needs.
20 Now I'm with the Secretary of State, here's the Great Seal of
21 the United States, and I've been adorned with my status by the
22 Secretary of State. I think he mixes his metaphors up a little
23 bit here because -- I've got a slide coming up or something
24 coming up in a minute, but I do want to get into it here
25 because it makes sense.

1 Remember he says that the -- that he's gotten his power
2 here, the sovereign immunity, as apostilled by the Secretary of
3 State. But I think like most fraudsters, he's probably getting
4 mixed up in his own web of deceit and lies because what he
5 testified to here was that it was the apostille that made him a
6 sovereign peace officer, nothing to do with the private
7 attorney general. That looks like it's more related to Nancy
8 Pelosi and his statement that anybody could be a private
9 attorney general.

10 But here on the back of his credentials, Anthony's mixed
11 up. He's got so much duplicity going that he can't keep up
12 with it. Here all of a sudden it's the Secretary of State of
13 Tennessee that's made him a private attorney general, but when
14 we look at the apostille -- right? -- we don't see anything
15 about private attorney general. Actually, we don't really see
16 anything about sovereign peace officer either.

17 Okay. So, "Do not detain. Do not arrest," remember that
18 one? That's great. You can't arrest me, you can't detain me.
19 And he cites to you the reason for this is his actual criminal
20 rap sheet, remember that? That that's what my rap sheet says.
21 The problem is is he doesn't tell you on the back of this
22 credential that "Do not detain. Do not arrest" relates to him
23 being on a terrorist watch list, and the advisement to law
24 enforcement says "unless there is a violation of local, state,
25 or federal law," right? So he doesn't put that on here, does

1 he? He just puts "Do not detain. Do not arrest" because these
2 words fit into his world and he has some kind of plausible
3 deniability. He's got a reason he can use them.

4 Also, another bit of engineering that happens here, the
5 FBI number, right? He doesn't tell anybody that this is
6 actually his FBI NCIC criminal number. He just says he has an
7 FBI number. No explanation, right? Well, you can't make that
8 explanation because this is meant to give the impression that
9 he's somehow affiliated with the Federal Bureau of
10 Investigation. Fraud once again.

11 A few other things. Down at the bottom we see U.S. Office
12 of the Washington -- U.S. Office of the Private Attorney
13 General with a Washington, D.C., address which is where you
14 would expect a U.S. government agency to be housed. We also
15 see an expiration date. As James Spota told you, credentials
16 come with expiration dates. This is a good fake. It's even
17 got a barcode. No idea where this barcode comes back to.
18 Might come back to a loaf of bread at Costco. I have no idea.
19 But I submit to you it's not a valid barcode just like
20 everything else on this credential. It's fake.

21 The term "engineered to deceive" is what I would tell you
22 that not only this credential is designed to do, Mr. Williams
23 himself, he is engineered to deceive. He's draped himself in
24 the accoutrements, the wardrobe of legitimacy, to do his
25 scheme. He uses the United States Constitution, he uses the

1 United States Code, he uses the argument or the assertion that
2 he's an attorney to fool people, to lie to people, and to get
3 people's money.

4 So Anthony Williams with his super powers comes to Hawaii.
5 We're not exactly sure when. I think we heard '12, but
6 certainly by 2013 he's up and running and marketing his scheme
7 here, isn't he? And we all know what that scheme is, right?
8 We've heard it many times.

9 This is from his PowerPoint. Basically he's telling
10 people, Hey, we've got a rock solid guarantee. Sign up with
11 us. If we can't reduce your mortgage service payment to half
12 of what your current alleged mortgage payment is, we'll
13 completely refund your set-up fee.

14 To get more down with what we've got going on here in
15 Hawaii, there's this document, and this is the document that
16 everybody signed. All of these victims signed this document.
17 This was their application, and this is the operative paragraph
18 where the promise is made, right? Let's kind of look at what's
19 said here.

20 And remember, Mr. Williams wants to tell you that only one
21 person in Hawaii signed up for the mortgage reduction program.
22 I don't know if he loses track of what the evidence is in a
23 case, but just about everybody was signing up and signing this
24 document and what they -- the expectation they had and the
25 testimony you heard in this case was that their mortgage would

1 be reduced by half, right, for half the term. And they
2 believed him because they thought he was legitimate. They
3 thought he was an attorney. They thought he'd been appointed
4 by the governor. They thought he was law enforcement. One
5 even said they thought he was with the FBI.

6 (Reading:) "MEI guarantees to secure for the homeowner a
7 mortgage service fee that is half of what my current mortgage
8 payment is. I understand that on average it takes one-half of
9 my current payoff time obligation to pay off my mortgage
10 service payment."

11 Okay. So that tells you the deal from him, right? That's
12 what it is. But once again, I just want to give you a little
13 hypocrisy irony alert because the fact is Mr. Williams wants to
14 tell you that he wasn't doing mortgage service, right? "No, I
15 wasn't doing mortgage service. I was doing foreclosure." But
16 his literature throughout says that he does mortgage servicing,
17 and here it's interesting because he says Your mortgage service
18 payment, we'll take that over.

19 But the fact is, isn't it true then that he was telling
20 people he was getting rid of their mortgage? So how is he
21 taking over their mortgage service payment? If they don't have
22 a mortgage any more, what are they paying? Interesting, but
23 also indicative once again of a man who loses track of his own
24 fraud.

25 The note. Remember this? And this is something that

1 everybody was signing. This is the promise they made, the
2 promise -- the promise he forced them to make in order to go
3 into his one-half and one-half deal, right? Now, this note to
4 me was very interesting and very revealing because Mr. Williams
5 will couch himself as an altruistic guy who's just out to help
6 people in their foreclosures. The fact is what matters to
7 Mr. Williams is money. That's pure, plain, and simple. He
8 wasn't here doing this for free. If you could get rid of
9 people's mortgages just by filing one of those silly UCC
10 financing statements or one of those mortgages, if you could do
11 that, if that's all it took, then why -- why in the world are
12 we seeing this kind of money being charged? \$400,000.
13 This -- the original note amount is \$800,000. (Reading:) "In
14 return for valuable consideration that I have received under
15 the 50 percent mortgage service payment reduction program, I
16 promise to pay \$400,000, no interest, to the order of the
17 mortgagee." And the mortgagee is Mortgage Enterprise
18 Investments.

19 Now, he's put in the names of Arnold Subia and Evelyn
20 Subia here; this is their note. But don't be confused by this.
21 His expectation was they were going to have to pay him \$400,000
22 over what? Let's look down here at the bottom, "I will pay
23 principal by making payments each month of 2,000" -- no --
24 "\$2100 on the first day of each month beginning June 1st, 2015,
25 for 190 months." That's the expectation he had. And when you

1 start adding up 400-, 200-, \$300,000 for each one of these
2 folks that signed up for his mortgage reduction plan, you're
3 starting to talk about real money. You're talking about real
4 money even if he only gets a tenth of it -- even if he only
5 gets a tenth of it.

6 Okay. As you read down to the note, I just found a couple
7 things I thought that would be interesting to us.

8 First off, don't be late, right? He cares about people.
9 But if you're late, I'm going to hit you with a late charge.

10 Also, if you don't pay me, I want you to agree to wage
11 garnishing. In other words, you consent to me garnishing your
12 wages if you don't pay me.

13 And most ironic and once again hypocrisy alert coming,
14 Mr. Williams demands attorney's fees. That's right. If he has
15 to hire a real attorney to come after you to enforce this note,
16 he wants to collect attorney's fees from you too. Interesting,
17 huh?

18 Okay. So we're going to talk about some of our victims, a
19 couple of them coming up. We just saw Evelyn Subia's note, so
20 let's talk about what she said here at trial. She believed
21 Anthony to be an attorney. He told her -- a lot of these
22 representations are just repetitive and I apologize, but it's
23 important because he told each one of these people a lot of
24 these same promises -- I can represent you in court. He could
25 eliminate her mortgage, told her notably to stop making

1 mortgage payments, signed one of those bogus MEI mortgages,
2 signed a note to pay Anthony \$400,000, as we just saw.

3 Remember her husband -- I don't have a slide for him. I
4 don't mean to leave Arnold out, but his picture didn't come out
5 that great. Okay. Arnold said and testified under oath,
6 right, when Anthony pressed him on cross-examination, "We used
7 to call you attorney every time we came to see you," and that's
8 the kind of respect that Anthony picked up from the idea that
9 these people believed he was an attorney, a real attorney.

10 You think they know the difference between a private
11 attorney general and an attorney? Henry Malinay said he
12 thought that meant he was higher up. I submit to you that most
13 people probably believed that.

14 Evelyn Subia lost her home in a short sale. Remember the
15 Madambas? Not in foreclosure; they were making payments.
16 Anthony told them he was an attorney. They believed he was
17 also a law enforcement because of the badge and the creds, the
18 wardrobe of legitimacy, told them to stop making mortgage
19 payments and that he could take care of their mortgage, signed
20 one of those MEI mortgages. They signed a note promising to
21 pay Anthony \$203,000. They're in foreclosure and they're in
22 bankruptcy. These are hardworking folks, as they testified.
23 Mr. Madamba testified he's working seven days a week.
24 Ms. Madamba works as a hotel maid. They're doing everything
25 they can to stay in their house. This man has put them in

1 danger, in financial ruin, in bankruptcy.

2 Now, this attorney thing, I'm going to turn to that for a
3 few minutes and we'll go back to victims, but I think this is a
4 good time to segue into these attorney representations because
5 it is a very interesting part of the case. Remember Pat
6 Mau-Shimizu? Pat is the executive director of the Hawaii State
7 Bar Association. She testified Williams has never been a
8 licensed member of the Hawaii State Bar Association. You have
9 to be licensed to practice law in Hawaii. That's the law.

10 Now, as you heard from Simon Klevansky, going to law
11 school and passing the bar exam is one of the things you do to
12 become an attorney. It is a rigorous, draining, expensive
13 experience -- college, law school, bar exam, of course, bar
14 licensing. This is a rigorous regime to become an attorney at
15 law. Mr. Williams, he doesn't have a lot of respect for
16 attorneys at law. But isn't it again ironic, and hypocritical
17 I think, that he adorns himself with the name attorney because
18 he wants to -- he wants to get part of that credibility. He
19 needs that credibility and that's how he has perpetrated this
20 scheme in so many ways.

21 What about the letterhead? He's not only fake attorney,
22 he's got a fake law firm that he has created, Common Law
23 Office. What does that tell you? It's a law office.
24 Attorneys in law, what does that tell people that see this
25 correspondence? Well, this is a law firm. And certainly we've

1 seen that many people who correspond with him believe he's an
2 attorney. And why wouldn't they? He has a law office, he's
3 listed as an attorney in law. Private attorney general, you
4 think people know what that is? Here he's listed as the
5 litigation counselor. Oh, no, wait a minute, Hezekyah, right?
6 That's the litigation counselor. Anthony is the private
7 attorney general. So once again, you have that duplicity where
8 he's divided himself into two different people. He's Hezekyah
9 over here, senior litigation counsel, he's also listed as being
10 an attorney, two different people.

11 Now, he says Well, you know, now come on. Lots of people
12 have two names. You know, that's my religious name. Great.
13 But you don't list yourself like you're two different people.
14 You simply say Anthony Williams, also known as. But again,
15 deception. Deception. This is small deception. But, you
16 know, think about things like this is little lies, little lies,
17 little lies are such big evidence of big lies, aren't they? I
18 found that sometimes the best lies ever were 80 and 90 percent
19 true. Not in this case, though. The lies here, they're lies.
20 He's not two different people; he's one person.

21 We see it again here on one of his pamphlets. He's listed
22 at the top there. See him, Anthony Williams? And then Yoseph
23 Hezekyah down at the bottom? Anybody seeing this, they're
24 thinking this is two people, right? Okay. So this is one of
25 his letterheads, Common Law Office of America. I point this

1 out -- I don't want to belabor this. You see down there he
2 lists "attorneys and support staff of MEI." We saw a lot of
3 these in evidence, not going to go over them too much. It is
4 what it is, right? I mean, there's no explanation that he's a
5 private attorney general and he's appointed by some obscure
6 statute that he asserts to you gives him the power to be an
7 attorney without getting licensed. I submit to you that the
8 evidence we'll see as we go through here in a few moments
9 completely refutes that preposterous presumption.

10 Now, I want to diverge for just a second because there's
11 some interesting stuff here and it's simply that to have your
12 mortgage serviced by the company of your choice. So here he's
13 telling people, "Hey, your mortgage, I am going to service that
14 mortgage for you and I'm taking over that and all you have to
15 do is pay me half. I'll deal with them, but your mortgage
16 service payment comes to me now." Now, people are going to
17 believe that they still have their mortgage, but somehow
18 there's been some negotiation or whatever to bust it down to
19 one-half. Who knows? But the fact of the matter is he's
20 telling people out of the other side of his mouth that, "I'm
21 going to eliminate your mortgage. I'll make it null and void."
22 And if you make a mortgage null and void, how in the world do
23 you have, once again, a mortgage service payment? Can't keep
24 up with his own lies.

25 Down here, "Your mortgage will be serviced by our

1 company." Doesn't get any more clearer than that, does it?

2 "Your mortgage will be serviced by us."

3 It's very uncommon for a mortgage company, and he's
4 calling himself MEI, a mortgage company here, to reduce the
5 amount of -- amount owed and the time remaining on an existing
6 mortgage, but because we're so unique, we can do that. So he's
7 a mortgage company and he's a mortgage service company, and
8 this makes sense when you start talking about Iris Ikeda in the
9 regulatory process for doing what he did when he came here to
10 Hawaii. Folks, really? Comes down to these truths: Anthony
11 Williams is not an attorney. Anthony Williams could not
12 represent people in court or file pleadings on their behalf.
13 Multiple courts and state bars have told him so. Yet he
14 continued to misrepresent to people that he could handle their
15 stuff in court, he could represent them as an attorney in
16 court, he could represent them by filing pleadings in court.
17 Those are all big no-nos.

18 Remember this particular exhibit? The first one is
19 Judge Mollway's order. Ironically, right across the hallway
20 here, a federal judge back in 2013 in the early part of this
21 scheme shut him down, told him, "You're not an attorney. You
22 can't represent people. You can't show up in our courtroom and
23 attempt to argue on their behalf or file documents on their
24 behalf." Also, the State of Hawaii, they issued an injunction
25 and they said, "You can't represent people." He got cease and

1 desist letters from the North Carolina bar, apparently from the
2 California bar too.

3 Let's spend a little time looking at Judge Mollway's order
4 because it's so interesting and I submit to you it's
5 interesting because not only it occurred right across the
6 hallway and it's a federal judge order that has the effect of
7 law, but that he is told point blank, "You can't do this." And
8 what did Anthony Williams say? What did he say when I asked
9 him about this? He said, "Yeah, I disagreed with it. She's
10 wrong. Therefore, I'll continue to do it." He's above the
11 law, remember?

12 So in this order, Judge Mollway states, "Hawaii has a
13 statute prohibiting the unauthorized practice of law. Any
14 violation of that statute is a crime. It's a misdemeanor.
15 Williams may not use a power of attorney to skirt this
16 prohibition. The Hawaii Supreme Court has recognized that
17 there are -- that statutes were enacted," these unauthorized
18 practice of law statutes, "to protect the public against
19 incompetence" -- and what? -- "improper activity." And we have
20 a lot of that going on in this case, don't we?

21 She goes on, "Williams's pleadings certainly do not
22 demonstrate competence to represent the Malinays. For example,
23 he cites to certain provisions of the Uniform Commercial Code
24 after his signature that appear inapplicable to his case." And
25 I submit to you that's what he has done with the Uniform

1 Commercial Code throughout his fraud is to simply cite passages
2 as if they have the force of law and that they support whatever
3 fraudulent premise he is trying to sell to whoever is reading
4 it.

5 Down here, "Anyone who has taken an oath" -- and this is a
6 quote from Anthony and in his response to Judge Mollway when
7 she said you can't appear -- "Anyone who has taken an oath to
8 become a member of the bar is a traitor to the American people
9 and should be tried and convicted of treason against the United
10 States of America." Well, those are high words coming from a
11 man who says he's not even a citizen of the United States.

12 Judge Mollway continues, "Williams is ordered to
13 immediately stop representing the Malinays in this matter. If
14 Williams continues to do so, the court will issue an order to
15 show cause why he should not be personally sanctioned. The
16 court will also strike any future document filed by him on
17 behalf of the Malinays. Williams should also be aware that the
18 unauthorized practice of law is a misdemeanor. If the Malinays
19 have paid any money to him, he ought to give it back. Signed
20 Susan Oki Mollway, August 14th, 2013."

21 This scheme ran through 2015, remember? He kept on doing
22 it.

23 Okay. The State of Hawaii came out with their injunction
24 in 2014, and it was because Williams was showing up in state
25 court. Remember we saw the transcript where one of the state

1 judges told him, "You're not a member of the bar. You can't
2 appear here," and he made his arguments? He misrepresented
3 that he was somehow certified by the bar. Remember that? And
4 then he said the transcript must be wrong; it was his exhibit.

5 And then the judge allowed him to continue because
6 opposing counsel didn't object. The problem was is that the
7 State AG got wind of this and they started this action to
8 enjoin him to cease and desist from representing that he was an
9 attorney and that he could represent people in court.

10 And there's some interesting language in this injunction,
11 "Hawaii prohibits the unauthorized practice of law as has been
12 conducted by the defendant." And it quotes the statute, says,
13 "Hey, it's against the law to attempt to engage in the practice
14 of law without a license. Representing homeowners in court
15 foreclosure actions while being engaged in the unauthorized
16 practice of law is an unfair and deceptive trade practice."
17 Telling people you're an attorney, that you can represent them
18 in court in these mortgage foreclosure actions, Hawaii State
19 Court says that is a deceptive trade practice. And again, when
20 you see deception, you think fraud, and that's exactly what's
21 going on here, the deceptive trade practice of telling people
22 he can represent them when in truth and fact, he cannot.

23 Okay. April 9, 2014, that's the date of the order. Down
24 there at the bottom it simply says, Hey, don't do this any
25 more.

1 All right. Let's talk victims again. Remember Macrina
2 Pillos? She was a lady that was recruited by Henry Malinay and
3 Anabel Cabebe. And Williams made a big point of arguing that
4 these were actually Mortgage Enterprise clients, the Pillos,
5 not him. And he stated under oath that he never got any money
6 from Ms. Pillos. That turned out to be a lie. That wasn't
7 true. He got money from Ms. Pillos. She did sign up with him.
8 He did talk to her.

9 What she testified to is that she retired shortly before
10 signing on with MEI. She wasn't in foreclosure. She was
11 making payments. Cabebe told her MEI would take over her
12 mortgage. Cabebe was Anthony Williams's co-conspirator and
13 also his partner in this scheme to defraud at this point. She
14 pled guilty, remember? She got up here and testified; he
15 called her to the stand. She lit him up, didn't she? He
16 called her to the stand and she said, "Hey, I pled guilty. I
17 accepted what I did. I pled guilty to wire fraud, conspiracy
18 to commit wire fraud with you."

19 She signed one of the mortgages, was told to stop making
20 mortgage payments. She went into foreclosure for nonpayment.
21 Williams told her that he can represent her in her foreclosure,
22 and of course like everybody else, she believed he was an
23 attorney.

24 The end result was a disaster for Ms. Pillos, and you saw
25 the raw emotion from her on the stand and it was -- it was a

1 hard moment. It truly was. She lost her home, she was evicted
2 with her autistic grandson.

3 Henry Malinay, remember, worked for Williams selling his
4 mortgage reduction program. Henry pled guilty just like Anabel
5 with conspiracy to commit wire fraud with Anthony Williams.
6 But before he jumped into the scheme, Henry was a client and he
7 got representations just like everybody else. Williams told
8 him he was an attorney, but higher up and appointed by the
9 governor. Williams told him he could represent people in
10 court. Of course, Henry signed up for the program like so
11 many, and he had one of the best lines of the trial when he was
12 pressed by Williams about the ME scandal, and he said, "Hey, my
13 scam was your scam. They were one and the same."

14 Sure, Henry himself, he went out and branched out and
15 started defrauding people himself. He did. But in no way does
16 the Mortgage Enterprise's separate little wing off of Mortgage
17 Enterprise Investments change the fact that what MEI was doing
18 was fraudulent. MEI was a much slicker operation with a much
19 slicker pilot steering the ship. I submit to you Henry Malinay
20 probably wasn't the sharpest knife in the drawer as far as
21 running a fraudulent company and his efforts crashed pretty
22 quickly. My scam, your scam. He learned everything he knew
23 from Anthony Williams. He also lost his home in foreclosure.

24 Mary Jane Laforteza had ten people living in her home, not
25 in foreclosure. She was making payments, believed Anthony to

1 be an attorney, told her he was with the FBI, told her MEI
2 would take over her mortgage. That makes perfect sense,
3 doesn't it? Stop making mortgage payments. Pay me. Signed a
4 bogus mortgage to MEI, went into foreclosure. She hired a
5 licensed attorney, remember. In fact, I think one of
6 the -- one of the wire fraud counts is Anthony's email to her
7 telling her to do this, "Fire your attorney. I'm representing
8 you."

9 She was evicted from her home, lost her home in
10 foreclosure.

11 Now, Damon Stanford, remember him? Central Pacific Bank?
12 He got on the stand and Stanford said, Hey, if the LaFortezas
13 were in trouble, they could have saved their home if they
14 talked directly to the bank. Problematically though, they went
15 to Williams and they weren't going to talk to this guy. He
16 wasn't an attorney. They recognized that this charlatan was
17 not a person who was standing up for the LaFortezas. They
18 recognized that they would deal with Ms. LaForteza on her
19 mortgage, that she was not represented.

20 Lorraine Troxel, caregiver to three elderly patients in
21 her home, not in foreclosure, making payments. Anthony told
22 her that MEI would take over her mortgage, stop making mortgage
23 payments. This is all getting to be very familiar, I know.
24 Recorded one of the UCC liens and those were done in all these
25 cases along with the mortgage. She's currently in foreclosure

1 and unable to sell her home.

2 Melvyn Ventura, he was an interesting witness because he
3 was actually a guy who just couldn't stop believing in Anthony
4 Williams. And it had to be tempting to believe in him, right?
5 When somebody tells you that they're going to ditch your
6 mortgage and they're going to protect you and they are an
7 attorney and that this is a real program, boy, you wanted to
8 believe that, especially when you're a desperate immigrant
9 who's having a hard time making those payments. It is very,
10 very tempting to believe and to continue to believe in this
11 instance in Anthony Williams. But those who did believe in him
12 did so at their detriment, didn't they?

13 Melvyn Ventura finally came to the conclusion that, hey,
14 Anthony Williams is not looking out for me. Anthony Williams
15 is telling me to do something that I don't think is right.
16 He's telling me to not pay my mortgage company. So that's why
17 Melvin testified. He testified because ultimately he came to
18 the conclusion that this whole thing was a scam. Not in
19 foreclosure, making payments, believed no difference between
20 private attorney general or lawyer. He believed -- he may
21 still believe -- that Anthony is an attorney. Told him MEI
22 would take over his mortgage, stop making payments, recorded
23 the liens, of course, and Melvin's in foreclosure.

24 Juliet Asuncion, not in foreclosure, making payments.
25 Anthony told her he was with the FBI. Believed him to be a

1 lawyer also, told her MEI would take over her mortgage, stop
2 making mortgage payments, signed one of those MEI mortgages, of
3 course, with the note that promises to pay Lord knows how much
4 over the course of time to him. Well, \$218,000. She was
5 forced into a loan modification. Now she's paying a thousand
6 dollars more per month.

7 Anabel. Anabel testified. Anthony called her to the
8 stand, not sure exactly why, but he put her on the stand and
9 she told him, Hey, I got into this thing with you. At first I
10 was a believer, at first I thought you were legit. I came to
11 the conclusion you weren't. Unfortunately, I kept working with
12 you because I thought you could help me.

13 She hosted MEI clients at her Democrat Street house for
14 Williams. Remember, she also housed Williams when he came into
15 town and he conducted a lot of his business at her place. She
16 was a notary for him. She would witness Williams, of course,
17 showing his badge and his ID and his handcuffs to clients,
18 telling people he had the power to arrest. Williams didn't
19 believe that the laws applied to him, she stated. And one of
20 those other great quotes, "What program?" On cross-examination
21 he asked her about his program. "What program? Program is all
22 lies."

23 She was also a victim ultimately. She wasn't in
24 foreclosure when she met him. She believed he was an attorney.
25 He told her to stop making payments to her lenders. She lost

1 two homes in foreclosure, and she's also been convicted, by the
2 way, of a felony.

3 Okay. So we're going to look at these documents. Aren't
4 going to spend a lot of time on these because they really are
5 completely bogus. Remember Simon Klevansky testified? Now he
6 is an expert. He's a creditor/debtor law expert, 35 years, a
7 trained attorney, and he testified that these UCC financing
8 statements, well, they were nonsensical. You can't be the
9 debtor and the creditor at the same time. They have nothing to
10 do -- these financing statements under the law have nothing to
11 do with interest in real estate which is what mortgages affect.
12 UCC financing statements affect things like personal property,
13 commercial goods, not real estate.

14 UCC financing statements cannot release a mortgage or
15 affect any kind of interest in property. The other thing
16 that's interesting is that the UCC, the Uniform Commercial
17 Code, Simon Klevansky testified, isn't even a law. It's a
18 model statute that states can adopt or not adopt. And when a
19 state adopts, it isn't called a UCC. In Hawaii it would be
20 Hawaii Revised Statutes and it would be a cite, but it wouldn't
21 be the Uniform Commercial Code. You don't cite the Uniform
22 Commercial Code as law. It's simply a model statute that
23 states can adopt. And that's what Mr. Klevansky told you.
24 Down at the bottom, you can see -- excuse me -- down at the
25 bottom you can see, "This mortgage will be discharged in

1 accordance with UCC 120139 and 1301308."

2 The mortgages, remember these? First off, these mortgages
3 talk about in terms of a borrower, but as we found, there was
4 no borrower. There's no borrower because there's no lender.
5 There's no mortgagee. You can't have a mortgage when you don't
6 lend money. You lend money, you have a borrower, the borrower
7 takes the money, the lender gives it, the lender becomes a
8 mortgagee, the borrower grants the mortgagee an interest in the
9 property, called a mortgage, and that gets recorded to the
10 Bureau of Conveyances. This is completely bogus. You can't be
11 the creditor and the debtor at the same time. You can't be a
12 borrower when you haven't borrowed money and you certainly
13 can't be a lender when you haven't lent money.

14 And also we have the Federal Mortgage American Trust, and
15 again, I spent some time in this in trial only because, like I
16 said before, the little lies. The little lies are indicative
17 that there are a lot of big lies and this is one of those
18 little lies that shows up in every document telling people that
19 there's a legitimate Federal Mortgage American Trust. That
20 sounds like a real company doesn't it? Sounds legitimate.
21 Once again draping himself in the wardrobe of legitimacy,
22 Federal Mortgage American Trust. And we know that that is a
23 fake company because Special Agent Oleski from FBI went to
24 investigate it and he took this picture, and this is actually
25 the address where this particular outfit was supposed to be

1 located. There is Special Agent Bryce Oleski. And he found
2 that when he went there, that this company wasn't there and had
3 never been there. And he also did checks in every indices that
4 he could think of as a FBI investigator and could find no
5 evidence whatsoever that Federal Mortgage American Trust ever
6 even existed. Anthony Williams testified under oath, Well,
7 yes, of course it existed; it was just at a different address.
8 Really?

9 Well, if it was at a different address, it still would be
10 a registered company, right? I asked him, "Does it have
11 bylaws? Articles of incorporation? Does it have insurance?
12 What is it?

13 Well, yeah, but you all took it all. Remember that
14 refrain? We heard that about just on everything that he
15 couldn't produce. Anthony's nothing if he is not quick and
16 very slick.

17 And down at the bottom, there is the misrepresentation
18 that this nonsensical filing renders the Asuncions' mortgage
19 null and void. Again, he was telling people that he was going
20 to service their mortgage, but here he's telling them that it's
21 null and void. Which is it? Well, we don't know because
22 really it doesn't have to make sense to him. All that makes
23 sense is that he's able to make money by fooling people with
24 all of this slick talk.

25 Now, remember during trial I referred to these liens,

1 these mortgages as bogus? Drew a little bit of an objection
2 from the defense when I would call it bogus. But I did that
3 for a reason and I did that with legitimacy because they are
4 bogus and I knew they were bogus because a federal court had
5 found that they were bogus. Remember the order from the United
6 States Bankruptcy Court right here in the District of Hawaii,
7 again a federal court order? "All MEI financing statements,
8 mortgages recorded in the Bureau of Conveyances are declared
9 unenforceable at law or in equities and are further declared
10 void and released." Every one of them blown up with this one
11 order because of the underlying fraud involved and the
12 nonsensical fraud involved in each one of these documents.

13 Also, this is a document -- remember we talked about the
14 convictions, and at some point I think it came up that Anthony
15 had been convicted of grand theft related to his operation of
16 this scheme down in Florida. And we stopped there. We didn't
17 put the underlying conviction in when we put evidence in or
18 solicited evidence on this point. Mr. Williams, though, put
19 this judgment of conviction in. And I can't help but take
20 advantage of the last page of this because I think the most
21 telling thing about this conviction isn't so much that grand
22 theft; it's the filing of the false documents. Because once
23 again, you have a court finding that these financing
24 statements, these mortgages, are simply a mechanism of fraud.
25 And the charge right here that, "Anthony T. Williams did then

1 and there file or direct a filer to file with the intent to
2 defraud or harass another, an instrument, to wit, a lien
3 containing materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent
4 statements or representations that purport to affect the
5 interest of an owner, to wit, Bank of America." He was
6 convicted of this crime in Florida, same thing as he did here.

7 The other little note to take out of this is, you know, we
8 think in terms of the homeowners who got booted out of their
9 house and they lost money being his victims, and it's hard to
10 be sympathetic to banks, I know, but the banks are victims too.
11 And when the banks aren't getting paid, I submit to you that's
12 not a good thing. That's not a good thing for people to want
13 to borrow money from the banks. In this instance we heard from
14 Damon Stanford, didn't we? And he talked about this. Damon
15 Stanford told you of Central Pacific Bank, that they lost
16 \$99,000 on the Laforteza loan because of Mr. Williams.

17 There were losers down in Florida. Mr. Williams was
18 convicted of filing false documents that affected a financial
19 institution, the Bank of America, doing the same thing here,
20 doing exactly the same thing here.

21 Okay. So regulatory part. This may be a little less
22 exciting, but, hey, you know what? One of the things when
23 you're a fraudster is the last thing you want to do is make
24 disclosures, right? The light of day is always a bad thing for
25 a fraudster, and when you have to step into an office, fill out

1 an application form and represent what you're doing, then
2 you're making disclosures. And fraudsters don't like to do
3 that. Iris Ikeda told you any business offering mortgages or
4 offering debt relief requires a license from the DCCA, that
5 this licensing requirement was enacted to prevent mortgage
6 abuses and to prevent fraud.

7 Now, there's an application process where you got to
8 disclose things, right? And there's also a background
9 investigation. And I can assure you that Mr. Williams did not
10 want a background investigation. Businesses using questionable
11 business practices, she testified, sometimes do not seek a
12 license to avoid the scrutiny that comes with the application
13 process. And then she said under no uncertain terms MEI was a
14 company that required a license. And we know also from the
15 evidence in the case that while Mr. Williams touted the fact
16 that the state of Illinois loved him and approved what he did,
17 the fact is, the state of Illinois didn't love him. The State
18 of Illinois issued an injunction with legal conclusions, along
19 with a fine, that Mortgage Enterprise Investments without a
20 license through its agents solicited, advertised, and offered
21 loan modification services, and they also charged an upfront
22 fee. That's familiar, isn't it? Can't do that. And it was
23 ordered that this unlicensed entity cease and desist from doing
24 what he does, and they also hit him with a \$25,000 fine.

25 Okay. Now, material omissions, we'll go into this just a

1 little bit because it makes some sense. I'm going to come up
2 with a few of them, but I think that what you'll find is you
3 might remember a few more. Failure to disclose can be just as
4 important as fraudulent representations. Disclosures are
5 critical, especially when you're dealing with regulated
6 businesses like mortgage companies, and we just saw that from
7 the Iris Ikeda testimony.

8 What doesn't Anthony Williams tell people? Well, he
9 doesn't tell them he's not a licensed business. He doesn't
10 tell them he's not a real attorney. Doesn't tell them that
11 he's not qualified legally or professionally to represent them.
12 He doesn't tell them that he's not a government employee
13 despite the fact that he walks around with the credentials and
14 badges. You think hey, okay, people might be fooled from this,
15 maybe I should disclose I'm just playing like a government
16 employee, I'm just playing like I'm a sovereign peace officer,
17 maybe I'm just playing like a lawyer. Doesn't tell them that.

18 He doesn't tell people that Federal Mortgage American
19 Trust is a fake company. And he doesn't tell them that these
20 filings aren't going to help them one bit. He's neither
21 servicing their mortgage nor eliminating it. Doesn't tell them
22 that.

23 Okay. So during the trial -- and we talked about this
24 theme of the fraud continuing with the private attorney general
25 back here, every day getting up, identifying himself as a

1 private attorney general and then selling his program to you as
2 if it's legitimate, as if it's real. These are just a few
3 things that came up in the context of trial. Again, your
4 memories might be better than mine. Maybe something -- there's
5 something else you could throw in here. Certainly not an
6 exhaustive list.

7 He told you under oath that Macrina Pillos was never a
8 client of MEI, later swore she only made one payment to MEI.
9 Reality check: Pillos paid at least five checks to Anthony
10 Williams. We put those in evidence and Laurice Otsuka
11 testified to that.

12 He told you under oath that only one client was signed up
13 for the mortgage reduction program. Patently ridiculous. All
14 of these people were signing up for this program. They all
15 wanted to cut their mortgage payment in half.

16 Told you under oath that everyone was in foreclosure.
17 Well, of the people we had testify, at least eight said that
18 they were not in foreclosure at the time they met him. They
19 may have been in trouble, they may have been in default, but
20 they were not in foreclosure.

21 And this is his agreement that everybody signed. This has
22 the one-half and the one-half demonstrating that this was his
23 expectation, that everybody was signing up for this part of the
24 program.

25 He also testified under oath that the Davidson County

1 Sheriff's Department administered the oath. We've already
2 talked about this. But since he did it in the context of
3 trial, I submit to you that -- that on cross when he stated
4 that he ordered his badge on the internet, that was completely
5 contrary to what he told you on direct examination under oath,
6 that they issued him a badge. Little lies.

7 Testified he had eliminated John Hicks's mortgage in 2012,
8 didn't he? We found out that was completely false. He knew
9 the mortgage wasn't eliminated, that the property ultimately
10 fell into foreclosure, and we know that because, remember, it
11 was a letter. There was a letter that -- the TransUnion credit
12 report that he showed you that said deleted to the BAC Home
13 Loan that he says is -- "Well, see, they deleted the mortgage.
14 It's gone. My system works."

15 Fact is, that mortgage got assigned to Bank of America and
16 Bank of America then came after the Hicks family for the
17 property and they corresponded with Mr. Williams in February
18 and said hey, we've taken over this mortgage. Doesn't sound
19 like the mortgage is deleted, does it? They then filed a
20 foreclosure action against him.

21 He claimed during opening statement that his fake
22 government credential was always accepted by TSA and therefore
23 valid, and we heard this so many times and we heard it on
24 opening statement. Reality check on this. He drafted a suit
25 against TSA claiming that they had discriminated against him

1 racially for not -- by not accepting his credential. So you
2 got that duplicity, right? Until he gets confronted with the
3 truth, he's going to tell you, hey, they always accepted it.
4 But when he got hit with the truth, hey, didn't you file a
5 suit -- or didn't you draft a suit against them?

6 The suit is interesting. Here it is: United States
7 Office of the Private Attorney General is kicking this suit
8 off, folks, and it's against TSA. And the allegations are
9 here. This factual statement I think is interesting: "On
10 August 9th, 2013, at approximately 8:30, I and my party was
11 illegally and unlawfully detained by TSA agents that stated
12 that my private attorney general ID and my military veteran's
13 ID were no good and that they were fake IDs. These the same
14 IDs that I showed at the Honolulu Airport two days prior with
15 no incident. I then showed them my sovereign peace officer ID
16 and two credit cards with my name on it. The TSA agents still
17 refused to accept my ID." He was traveling with, remember,
18 Dr. Horowitz, his buddy. I'm not going to say much about
19 Dr. Horowitz, but suffice it to say Horowitz is a good friend
20 of Anthony's.

21 Okay. He swore under oath that he never told people he
22 was an attorney, always a private attorney general. And this
23 was interesting because I was very direct with him: "You never
24 have told anybody that you were just an attorney?"

25 "Oh, no, always explain that I'm a private attorney

1 general."

2 Well, but then we ran across a little inconvenience for
3 Mr. Williams because on his own exhibit, remember those
4 audio-video exhibits of him going in and confronting people in
5 Hawaii offices?

6 Rose, play it. Aga, play it.

7 (Video played, not reported.)

8 MR. SORENSON: "I'm an attorney, ma'am."
9 Interesting thing about this exhibit.

10 THE COURTROOM MANAGER: Two more minutes.

11 MR. SORENSON: The interesting thing about this
12 particular exhibit is that it's Anthony being caught
13 red-handed, red-handed, because this is the only thing we have
14 of how he really was, right? Otherwise we just have what
15 people say, what he says he said. This is him just telling
16 people, "I'm an attorney, ma'am."

17 Okay. Laurice Otsuka, she testified that she analyzed the
18 deposits of MEI. There were 112 victims. MEI collected
19 \$218,000 from those victims. More than 300,000 in total income
20 included cash and other deposits, and of course we know that he
21 didn't report any income.

22 She also testified that only one refund check was actually
23 paid and that was to his friend Rosy Thomas who was Williams's
24 own employee. Right there's her name on the letterhead.

25 Now, I just want to talk about the counts in the

1 indictment. Counts 1 through 15, wire fraud, "Fourth, the
2 defendant used or caused to be used an interstate wire
3 communication to carry out or attempt to carry out an essential
4 part of the scheme." We've talked about this a little bit.
5 All the charged wires are emails or money wires. And those are
6 in Exhibits 2 through 13, if you want to make note of it. I
7 asked when we went through this, Ms. -- "Special Agent Crawley,
8 what's the exhibit that relates to this count?" I don't know
9 if you took notes on that, but if you didn't, maybe this will
10 help you.

11 Also in the mail fraud, "The defendant used or caused to
12 be used the mails to carry out or attempt to carry out the
13 scheme." All the mailings were money going back to Texas
14 except for one. One was his -- remember his fake postage?

15 Okay. I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that when
16 you look at all the evidence in this case, you're going to have
17 no problem coming to a very quick conclusion that there is a
18 scheme to defraud going on here in that the wire frauds, that
19 the wires and the mailings, all were an essential part of the
20 scheme to defraud.

21 Thank you so much. Appreciate your time.

22 THE COURT: All right. We're going to take a recess
23 of about 20 minutes, so if you leave your notes and your iPads
24 behind. And, of course, don't discuss the case with anyone or
25 allow anyone to discuss it with you. We're in a 20-minute

1 recess. Please rise for the jury.

2 (A recess was taken.)

3 (Open court in the presence of the jury.)

4 THE COURT: The record will reflect the presence of
5 the ladies and gentlemen of the jury, counsel, and
6 Mr. Williams.

7 Mr. Williams, are you ready to give your closing argument?

8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.

9 THE COURT: All right. You have an hour-and-a-half.

10 THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

11 MR. SORENSON: Your Honor?

12 THE COURT: Yes.

13 MR. SORENSON: Just -- this chart that he has on the
14 screen has a lot of facts that aren't in evidence.

15 THE COURT: So you have an objection to that?

16 MR. SORENSON: I do, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: All right. So your objection's
18 overruled. It's argument.

19 And I'll just instruct the ladies and gentlemen, again, of
20 the jury, that what they present to you, unless it's actually,
21 you know, an exhibit that I've received in evidence, it's
22 merely argument and it's not evidence itself. All right?

23 Go ahead, Mr. Williams.

24 THE DEFENDANT: Good morning.

25 That was the most unremarkable, fabricated-riddled

1 arguments that I have ever had to endure. Now, I'm going to
2 bring you all back to what this case is really about and give
3 the facts that's actually in evidence that he conveniently left
4 out.

5 MEI was started in Georgia in 2002. It's been existing
6 since 2002. No charges for mail fraud, wire fraud, bank fraud
7 money laundering ever in no county in Georgia.

8 Opened up the office in 2009 in Tennessee where I was
9 investigated by the FBI for possible mortgage fraud. But after
10 doing an investigation into my company and to my practices,
11 never filed any charges since 2009, doing the exact same thing
12 that I was doing there that I'm doing here.

13 Opened up an office in Illinois. He talked about
14 Illinois. Illinois wouldn't never even did that sanction. If
15 you look at the document, they was called by Hawaii -- not that
16 I had any clients that made any complaints because all my
17 clients were satisfied. I did exactly what I said I was going
18 to do with every client. Matter of fact, the evidence that
19 you're going to see here today, the client, Mr. Hicks, was
20 actually a Chicago police officer. So prosecutor wants you to
21 believe that a Chicago police officer was that asinine that
22 didn't understand that he was being scammed. That's what the
23 prosecutor wants to you believe. But the evidence is going to
24 show you otherwise.

25 Opened up a office in 2012 also in Arkansas. Still

1 haven't had any charges filed against my Arkansas office, me or
2 any of my employees in Arkansas, doing the exact same business,
3 filing the exact same mortgages, filing the exact same UCC
4 liens.

5 Opened up a office in Hawaii. The only reason why anyone
6 even lost their home in Hawaii because the FBI faked my
7 fingerprints to try to falsely put me in prison for 40 years
8 for rape and child molestation. I was able to prove my case
9 being *pro se* with no assistance from any attorney, got my case
10 dismissed in 2014. After my case was dismissed, I came back to
11 Hawaii to assist all the clients here.

12 Opened up a office in Texas in 2013 because the FBI
13 actually went to First Hawaiian Bank, told First Hawaiian Bank
14 to close down my MEI bank account without any charges being
15 filed against me, without having any bank fraud or any money
16 laundering whatsoever through the account. They closed my
17 account, blackballed me where I couldn't up no account in
18 Hawaii, so I was forced to open up an account in Texas so my
19 mother could oversee it.

20 Opened up a office in California 2014. As of to date
21 still no charges from the California Attorney General's office,
22 no charges from the FBI in California for conducting the exact
23 same business, the exact same mortgages, the exact same UCC
24 filings. It's unfortunate that you don't get to see the actual
25 video of me going to the County Recorder's office in California

1 with the exact mortgage that he's claiming is bogus which they
2 denied filing until it went to the county attorneys. The
3 district attorney had to scrutinize this mortgage and the UCC
4 lien before it would be filed. Did their scrutinization in
5 seven days, called me back, "Mr. Williams, there's nothing
6 fraudulent about your company. We researched you and your
7 company and the documents. You can file the mortgage." That
8 is on video, Orange County Confrontation Part 2 The Triumph.
9 When you get a chance, you can look that up on YouTube.

10 Opened up a office in New York 2015. I know one of the
11 people had a concern about my office in New York. You don't
12 have to worry about New York. New York is doing exactly what I
13 been doing. They've been exposing the fraud, they've been
14 assisting the people and keeping their homes out of
15 foreclosure.

16 These are all the charges that I have been falsely accused
17 of by the FBI and Broward County Sheriff Office in order to try
18 to continue to keep me unlawfully incarcerated. I was
19 fortunate to be able to get all of these charges dropped or
20 dismissed, but unfortunately they was able to get the bogus
21 unlicensed practice of law charge in Florida and the grand
22 theft and I will deal with those in a minute.

23 My company has existed from 2002 without incident. It
24 wasn't until I removed some judges and filed a lawsuit against
25 Florida.

1 Can you pull up 2119, please?

2 This is a lawsuit that I had filed against the State of
3 Hawaii and other defendants for the corruption I had exposed
4 with the mortgage and the foreclosure industry here in Florida
5 and -- here in Hawaii and Florida. Ten months after I filed
6 the lawsuit against Judge Beatrice Butchko, I was filed with
7 unlicensed practice of law. Before that filing of the lawsuit,
8 I had never been filed any charges.

9 Pull up Exhibit 2134, please, and 2136. Can you go down a
10 couple of pages? Yeah, right there.

11 This is a lawsuit. If you look on page -- line 107 and
12 109, you will see Agent Megan Crawley's name as a defendant in
13 my lawsuit. After I filed this lawsuit, eight months later I'm
14 being charged with mail and wire fraud in Hawaii, not because I
15 committed mail and wire fraud, because it was retaliation of my
16 lawsuit, to circumvent my lawsuit, to get me from being able to
17 go forward with the lawsuit against the FBI, Megan Crawley,
18 State of Hawaii, and other states that targeted me for what I
19 was doing and putting the videos on YouTube.

20 Go back to the docucam, please.

21 The only two states that ever filed charges against me are
22 the two states that I had to file lawsuits against which was
23 the State of Florida and the State of Hawaii. State of New
24 York no charges because I never had to sue a judge because they
25 followed the law. State of Tennessee, no charges, never had to

1 file a lawsuit against a judge or attorney because they
2 followed law. No charges in the State of California because I
3 never had to file a lawsuit against them. So the only two
4 states that filed any charges ever was the State of Florida and
5 the State of Hawaii because of the lawsuits that I filed
6 against them. It's clearly retaliation and malicious
7 prosecution.

8 Now, he had mentioned that I had got convicted in Florida
9 for the unlicensed practice of law. But what he didn't tell
10 you is that there were two trials. The first trial I won, 5 to
11 1. The jury found me not guilty 5 to 1. The judge declared it
12 a mistrial, tried me 24 days later, refused to allow me to call
13 the same witnesses I called in the first trial, refused to put
14 the same evidence that I put in the first trial, did not allow
15 me to put it in, denied me that right to put the same evidence
16 24 days later. The jury convicted me in 45 minutes because
17 they did not have the same evidence that I was able to put in
18 in the first trial.

19 The grand theft charge. Can you pull up 2232, please? I
20 think it's 2233, I'm sorry. Can you go to page 15, please?
21 Okay.

22 This is actually some of the trial transcripts of that
23 foreclosure case. Now, you heard Agent Lavelle testify that
24 this case was about the mortgage reduction scheme. This case
25 had nothing to do with the mortgage reduction. This case was

1 about a client that I had that was in foreclosure who had been
2 in his house since 2008. The Bank of America was trying to
3 evict him, so I filed the mortgage, a UCC lien to keep him in
4 his home. Had nothing to do with no mortgage reduction. They
5 claimed that I grand theft the house off a concrete foundation
6 which grand theft of a house is not a charge in Florida. But
7 this is what I was charged with.

8 The judge did not allow me to subpoena any of my clients
9 as witnesses, did not allow me to put any evidence to the
10 contrary. This jury also convened for about 45 minutes, found
11 me guilty of grand theft of a house which is not even
12 charged -- it's not even possible to grand theft a house, but
13 this is what I was charged with in Florida.

14 I'ma take you to a little bit of the dialog so you can
15 kind of see what happened. If you see on page line, it said,
16 "Did your client, Bank of America, make a complaint against me
17 for grand theft of their property?"

18 This is the bank's attorney. This is Bank of America
19 attorney, this is his answer, "I'm not sure."

20 I said, "That's your client, sir."

21 "Sir, I represent Bank of America in this case. Bank of
22 America has many attorneys. I am not involved in a case -- a
23 case they have."

24 I said, "So you personally as their personal attorney
25 don't know of any complaint that Bank of America made against

1 me or my company for grand theft?"

2 "I am not involved in any of these."

3 But this is the bank attorney, but he say he's not
4 involved in anything. But you on the stand testifying that you
5 the Bank of America attorney, but you don't know about any
6 complaints that were filed against me.

7 He says -- I said, "Did you make a complaint to
8 Detective Calabro that I or my client tried to steal the home
9 at 3816 NW 88?"

10 "I did not make a complaint," because there was no
11 complaint. The complaint was Detective Calabro. That list I
12 showed you those charges? All those charges was by
13 Detective Calabro. 29 charges that he tried to charge me with.
14 29. Also in complicity with Megan Crawley to file those
15 charges against me because of the YouTube videos that I put up
16 of me removing the judges for the foreclosure fraud that they
17 were committing against homeowners.

18 Now, go to page 16, please.

19 I said, "Based on" -- I said, "Well, if he never had a
20 mortgage with Bank of America and having him have another
21 mortgage with another company" --

22 THE COURT: You have to slow down.

23 THE DEFENDANT: Sorry. "Well, if he never had a
24 mortgage with Bank of America, and him having another mortgage
25 with another company had nothing to do with your mortgage in

1 regards to him because he never had a contract with your
2 client, correct?"

3 His answer was, "Based upon the language of that mortgage
4 that we just looked at between MEI and the other party, I would
5 disagree that they had no -- that they had no effect as to my
6 client's interest and mortgage."

7 Now, he's saying that the UCC lien did not have an effect
8 on their mortgage but they had to try to remove it in order to
9 evict them. You heard Agent[sic] Klevansky said the UCC lien
10 doesn't do anything to the property, but they couldn't take it
11 unless it had to be removed. If it didn't have no effect in
12 law, why would they have to go to the pains of try to have it
13 removed if it has no legal effect? They knew it had a legal
14 effect, and that's the reason why they wanted to have these UCC
15 liens moved because you cannot foreclose on with a valid lien
16 on the property and I knew that and that's the reason why I
17 filed UCC liens on all of my clients to protect their property.

18 Go to page 21, please.

19 I said, "So someone would have to pay \$200 to Bank of
20 America?"

21 This is the attorney's answer, "They would have paid it to
22 the court. And it would have went to the court's registry
23 after the sale and that money would go to Bank of America."

24 My question was, "Why would Bank of America want to
25 purchase it? If they are the owner of the property, if they

1 owned it, why would they have to purchase it? They should not
2 have to purchase something that they owned. I never seen
3 someone buy back something that they owned."

4 Now his answer is, "It is the way the bidding process
5 works."

6 I say, "It is the way the bidding process works?"

7 He said, "I don't have a specific answer why it is, but
8 that's how it is."

9 So I asked him, I say, "So what was the highest and the
10 best bid that was submitted at auction?"

11 Now, mind you, this is the \$700,000 property that they're
12 supposed to be buying from a auction. So I'm asking him,
13 "What's the highest and the best bid that you bid -- Bank of
14 America bid at auction?"

15 This is his answer, "I believe it was \$300."

16 I say, "So Bank of America got a \$700,000 house for \$300?"

17 He said, "At the auction. But if you recall, by way of
18 the original mortgage, they had already purchased the home when
19 they lent the money to Mr. Uri Angel for him to possess it."

20 Go to page 22, please.

21 "So they paid money back when mortgage was originally be
22 given so you could account for that as well. And just because
23 they paid 300 at the auction does not mean they would have been
24 willing to expend a lot more."

25 So my question was, "We have a certificate of sale and

1 title for this property. If someone else would have come there
2 on a certificate of title, the certificate of sale, it says,
3 'Highest and best bid for \$300 cash.' So if I were to come
4 there with \$301, I would have been able to purchase a \$700,000
5 that would be a higher and better bid?"

6 And his answer was, "That's not correct."

7 Now, ladies and gentlemen, if you go to an auction and
8 someone bids \$300 for a property of any type of item and you
9 come and bid 301, don't you win that property because you had a
10 higher bid? But his answer is that if I would have come there
11 with a \$301 bid, I wouldn't have got the house. But Bank of
12 America was able to purchase a \$700,000 house for \$300. That's
13 fraud to the highest level and this is what I was exposing what
14 they were doing.

15 Go to page 24, please.

16 I say, "Now -- now is that standard for your clients?"

17 He said, "This is standard mortgage used throughout the
18 country and certainly throughout Florida. This is the
19 language."

20 And I said, "Yes, I have been dealing with foreclosures
21 for 15 years, this standard in the mortgage industry.
22 Therefore, the homeowner or borrowers are paying mortgage
23 insurance with their mortgage payment."

24 If you remember earlier in my dissertation last week, I
25 explained to you about what mortgage insurance is, that in

1 every mortgage they have that little clause in there. It's
2 going to either be the letter M or usually No. 10. It states
3 that mortgage insurance is insurance placed on the loan by the
4 lender in case the homeowner defaults. So once you default,
5 they get paid the insurance money for the home. Now they
6 already got paid twice 'cause remember I told about the
7 mortgage note that they put the Paid to the Order stamp, they
8 get paid once there. Now they get the mortgage insurance they
9 get paid again. Now they evict you out the home, resell it,
10 get paid again. That's also fraud to the highest level.

11 Go to page 28, please.

12 This is when I had him to read the Constitution and he's
13 reading a section of the Constitution where it says, "No state
14 shall enter into a treaty, alliance, or confederation; grant
15 letters of marque of reprisal; coin money; emit bills of
16 credit; make any thing but gold and silver coin a tender of
17 payment of debts; pass any bill of attainder, ex post facto
18 law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts, or grant any
19 title of."

20 And I said, "Okay. According to the Constitution that you
21 just read, what is the lawful money in the United States?"

22 His answer, "I still don't know."

23 Now, this is an attorney. Now, he just read that the
24 lawful money, according to the Constitution, is gold and silver
25 coin. When I asked him what is lawful money according to the

1 Constitution he say he still doesn't know. This is fraud to
2 the highest level.

3 Go to page 32, please.

4 Now, quoting this, I had him quote that, "This
5 Constitution, and laws of the United States" --

6 THE COURT REPORTER: Slow down.

7 THE DEFENDANT: That, "This Constitution, and laws
8 of the United States, shall be made pursuant thereof; and all
9 treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of
10 the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and
11 the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, and anything
12 in the Constitution of the law of any state to the contrary
13 withstanding[as read]."

14 And I asked him, "Do you disagree?"

15 His answer, "The section you read speaks for itself, sir."

16 My question, "Do you agree with that? Yes or no?"

17 "I agree that it reads that way."

18 Now, this is an attorney that has swore to an oath to
19 uphold the Constitution of the United States and he won't admit
20 that he agrees with the United States Constitution being the
21 supreme law of the land.

22 Go to page 35, please.

23 Now, I say, "Okay. Now, Mr. Hatchett has been a tenant on
24 the property since 2008, so wouldn't he have been protected by
25 the Federal Protected Tenant In Foreclosure Act in 2009?

1 His answer, "I believe it was amended and repealed in
2 2012, so at that point of judgment, no,."

3 "I have no appeal Mr. Hatchett, did he grand theft the
4 property or was he rightfully the tenant in paragraph 6 of your
5 client's affidavit?"

6 He says, "I need to see the affidavit."

7 "This is the Bank of America's president affidavit, page
8 6."

9 "Yes. Mr. Hatchett was a tenant at the subject property."

10 "And since you are the attorney for the Bank of America,
11 are you familiar with the affidavit that your client
12 presented?"

13 "Yes, I am."

14 "Now, in the affidavit your client never alluded to or
15 stated that the mortgage or the UCC that was filed on behalf of
16 Mr. Hatchett was fraudulent or that it was filed" -- I'll go to
17 page 36, please -- "to steal any property or anything like that
18 in his affidavit. Would you like to see it?"

19 "Can your client produce the original note mortgage to
20 verify that they were the true holders of the mortgage?"

21 "They already did. That's in evidence in the courthouse."

22 "They presented the original or a copy?"

23 "They presented as far as I am concerned the original note
24 from my review of the documents. Do you have a copy of that
25 circuit court documents?"

1 "The foreclosure. The only thing was a copy, not
2 the original."

3 Now, I was convicted of grand theft for a foreclosure for
4 saving someone from being kicked out of their home by Bank of
5 America. Detective John Calabro filed grand theft charges
6 against me, and you going to see on the grand theft that you're
7 going to have in evidence the charges, the grand theft of a
8 house from preventing Bank of America from evicting a client
9 that's been in that house since 2008.

10 Go to page 60 -- no, excuse me -- page 45.

11 Now, you remember Agent Joseph Lavelle, he also testified
12 here today. He also testified at this trial in Florida.

13 Go to page 40 -- excuse me -- 54.

14 Now, I questioned him -- go to 53, please, so I can get
15 the continuity.

16 I say, "He said that he got a search warrant for my
17 vehicle for illegal activity. I would be asking who here in
18 Florida notified your office that I was committing illegal acts
19 here?"

20 Next page, please.

21 This was the witness, "I am not authorized to talk about
22 that. It's an ongoing investigation." This is Agent Joseph
23 Lavelle.

24 I say, "Your Honor, it says -- it's a yes or no question."

25 He said, "He just answered. He's not authorized."

1 And I'm saying, "How is he not authorized to say?"

2 Go to page 55, please.

3 My question to Agent Lavelle, "So you investigated me in
4 Hawaii too, right?"

5 His answer, "No, sir. It is a complicated answer. We
6 have an office in Hawaii."

7 "How long has the FBI been investigating me?"

8 "Since the end of 2014 and beginning 2015."

9 "This office? This FBI? The FBI office of Miami?"

10 "Miami.

11 "Do you know about any other offices that has me under?

12 'Cause I'm in eight states. I have an office in eight states."

13 I go on to state that this is what this case is about,
14 "This is the Federal Bureau" --

15 Go to page 56, please.

16 -- "of Investigation. That means their jurisdiction is
17 all 50 states. That's what they are calling as a witness."

18 Go page 58, please.

19 And I said, "Do you recall me and Donna Hickenbottom
20 coming to your Miami office and filing a complaint?"

21 His answer, "I was not present for the complaint, but I am
22 aware you visited the FBI office in Miami."

23 "Were you privy to why we were there to come to the FBI
24 office to make a complaint and what the complaint was about?"

25 "I don't recall. I don't have the interview notes, what

1 were your complaint was, sir."

2 "How long would you say you have been an FBI agent?"

3 Said, "Seven years."

4 "So in seven years as an agent, FBI agent, when someone is
5 doing illegal activity, is it normal procedure for them to go
6 to the FBI and send the FBI their files?"

7 I had to ask the question.

8 He said, "You mean coming to the FBI office to get a
9 statement?"

10 Go to page 59, please.

11 Go to 60, please.

12 I say, "In your investigation of Florida, I'm pretty sure
13 if you have investigated me since 2014, you know that I have
14 clients in other counties in Florida, correct?"

15 "Yes, sir."

16 "And in those counties, have any of the State Attorney's
17 Office filed grand theft charges against me, unlawful filing of
18 documents charges against me, or unlicensed practice of law in
19 other counties that I'm in Florida?"

20 "I'm not aware of it sir, no," because Broward's the only
21 county that ever charged me with any crimes, even though I had
22 more clients in Duvall County in Florida, more clients in
23 Miami-Dade County in Florida, and more clients in West Palm
24 Beach County in Florida, doing the exact same business, filing
25 the exact same documents, going to court for those clients

1 also, but never charged in none of the other counties of
2 Florida.

3 Go to page 62, please.

4 Say -- and I -- "The use of the Postal Service Mail
5 usually across state lines to do the same thing as defraud a
6 entity.

7 "So your FBI office here in Florida have complaints from
8 clients that I committed wire fraud and mail fraud against
9 that."

10 He said, "We covered that, sir. We are not authorized to
11 discuss what any individuals" --

12 My question, "I am not asking names. So I'm asking did
13 anybody file charges against me here?"

14 "I am not authorized to discuss that."

15 The agent did not want to answer whether I had any
16 complaints filed against me in Florida because he knew I had
17 zero, none. So he didn't want to state that on the record so
18 his answer was, "I'm not authorized to answer that."

19 Go to page 63, please.

20 63 is my Common Law Office of America my Better Business
21 Bureau rating.

22 Please go to the next page, please.

23 I have a A-plus Better Business Bureau rating, still to
24 this date, because I still have zero complaints from any
25 clients in any state as of yet and I don't plan to have any

1 because I do what I say I'm going to do. I never
2 misrepresented to anybody what I was going to do. They knew
3 exactly what I was going to do.

4 Now, there's been a lot of talk about I'm not being a real
5 private attorney general, that I'm a fake attorney. Those are
6 the words that he used, "He's a fake attorney. No one
7 recognizes him as a private attorney general."

8 Well, can you pull up Exhibit 2127, please?

9 And I want to bring your attention to that if you notice,
10 his whole closing was basically dealing with my ID, my private
11 attorney general ID, and my sovereign peace officer badge. He
12 did not deal with any of the actual charges of mail and wire
13 fraud. You know why? 'Cause he can't prove it. He know there
14 was none, so he's trying to confuse you, "Oh, look at this fake
15 ID, look at the fake sovereign peace officer badge, look at the
16 oath he filed."

17 But last time I checked, I never been charged with having
18 a fake ID. FBI had all the opportunity to charge me. Know why
19 they declined? Because they were the one that actually ID --
20 gave the ID its validity. That's the reason why I would go to
21 the TSA airport if they denied me entrance, the first thing I
22 would tell them, "Call the FBI." Now someone that's scamming
23 somebody not going to tell you, "Hey, what I'm doing is lawful.
24 I need you to call the FBI to verify what I'm doing." Because
25 if I'm a scam, I'm going to run away from any law enforcement

1 officer. I don't want law enforcement to know what I'm doing.
2 But constantly time after time I always say, "No, call the FBI,
3 see if my ID's fake."

4 Now, you have on the screen there this is from the Supreme
5 Court of Florida. The date is this year, January 8, 2020.
6 This is addressed to me from the Supreme Court of Florida as
7 Private Attorney General Anthony Williams. Now, the prosecutor
8 wants you to think that the Supreme Court Justice in Florida
9 don't know that I'm not a private attorney general, that they
10 just label me something that they don't understand who they're
11 addressing. Now you think the Supreme Court Justice don't know
12 that who they're addressing is not a private attorney general?

13 Go to the next exhibit, 2128.

14 This is the City of Honolulu, Honolulu Fire Department
15 addressed to me while I'm still incarcerated at the Federal
16 Detention Center. It's addressed to me as Anthony Williams,
17 Private Attorney General. This is last year, 2009[sic].

18 But according to Mr. Sorenson, I'm not a private attorney
19 general. It's a made-up name, it's a fake name, it's a fake
20 attorney. That's what he wants you to believe.

21 But clearly, the governmental agencies, they're
22 recognizing me as a private attorney general because that's
23 what I am, because that's what I have a oath of office filed to
24 be, and I got it approved by these agencies before I started
25 doing it. He conveniently left that out, that before I even

1 filed the oath, I had sent this to the FBI office, sent it to
2 the House of Congress asking them, "If there's any reason why
3 me doing this is against the law, please, please notify me in
4 writing to let me know 'cause I want to make sure I'm in
5 compliance with the law," because according to Mr. Sorenson, I
6 don't believe you have to follow the law. On the contrary, I
7 do believe you have to follow the law, but you have to follow
8 the law that's according to the Constitution, and I'm going to
9 give you an example.

10 In this country, this country, we had a federal law, we
11 had state laws that said you could own property, that you could
12 have people as your slaves. That was a federal law. That was
13 a state law. But was it right? No, it was not right. Even
14 though it's a law, but just 'cause it's codified don't make it
15 right.

16 And eventually smarter people came about and abolished
17 slavery. Why? Because it was a bad law, 'cause no one can own
18 someone because we all have inalienable rights from our
19 Creator. We're all created equal. Nobody's superior or
20 inferior to someone else. We all have the same Creator, all
21 have the same Heavenly Father. But that was a bad law.

22 Another law that was bad: Women couldn't vote. That was
23 a law that is on the books that was a state law, that was a
24 federal law. But is it a good law? No, it wasn't. So we had
25 women's suffrage 1920.

1 Me as an African-American, Hispanics, Samoans, Chinese in
2 America couldn't vote till 1965. It was a law on the books.
3 We couldn't vote if we was a minority. Only Caucasians could
4 vote at that time. But was it a good law? No, it was not. It
5 was a bad law. But eventually it was changed.

6 The same thing here. There's a lot of bad laws. The
7 Hawaii Revised Statute where he quoted about the mortgage fraud
8 rescue scheme, that's a unlawful law because it violates the
9 Constitution for someone to actually have a choice in who they
10 want to represent their property interest. And this is what I
11 was fighting.

12 See, they don't like that I challenge the legality of what
13 they're doing. If it's not constitutional, no, ladies and
14 gentlemen, I'm not going to obey it, I don't care what law it
15 is. If it doesn't go according to and harmony with the
16 Constitution and the Bible, no, I will not, I will not honor
17 it, I will not obey it. I will protest it, and that's what
18 I've done. If you got to see any of my videos, you will see
19 that that's what I do.

20 Go to the next, 2129, please.

21 Now, this is headquarters. This is Agent Megan Crawley's
22 employer. This is headquarters Department of Justice, the FBI,
23 addressing me because of a complaint I had wrote to them about
24 their agents here harassing some of my friends' loved ones in
25 regards to them not contacting them about their cases. So when

1 the FBI headquarters wrote me back, they addressed me as
2 Anthony Williams, Private Attorney General. This is just April
3 of last year. But Mr. Sorenson wants you to think that that's
4 a made-up name, that just a made-up ID, it's fake, nothing on
5 the ID is real, it was done to deceive. It was done to -- to
6 be some type of deceptive means, which clearly it's not.

7 Now, in no state that I'm in, all the offices that I'm in
8 in eight states have I ever been charged with having a fake ID,
9 never been charged with having a fake sovereign peace officer
10 badge, never been charged with filing a false oath. Even here,
11 what'd they charge me with? They charged me with mail and wire
12 fraud. But they haven't charged me with unlicensed practice of
13 law here in Hawaii, haven't charged me with having a fake ID,
14 haven't charged me with having a fake badge.

15 She followed to me to the airport, took a picture of me
16 with my sovereign peace officer badge and my ID. She saw me
17 get on the plane. She saw me go through TSA. As a matter of
18 fact, she actually had to see them go in the back and verify
19 the ID. They're trying to think like the agents that's getting
20 the ID, that they don't never give to it their supervisor and
21 check.

22 Plenty of times when I go to a airport for the first time,
23 the agent that I give the ID to would not accept it 'cause
24 they've never seen it. What they do, they have to take the ID
25 to the back to their supervisor. The supervisor has to get on

1 the phone and call the FBI to verify the ID. Now, after the
2 FBI -- after they get off the phone with the FBI, they come
3 hand me my private attorney general ID, "Mr. Williams,
4 everything checked out. The FBI said it is valid. You can get
5 on the plane." But Mr. Sorenson wants to you think that it's
6 fake, that I had no authority to have this ID because it wasn't
7 presented by the government.

8 And he also mentioned that United States Office of the
9 Private Attorney General, that that's not a real company, that
10 it's a fake company. It's actually a *de jure* federal agency
11 that I set up with other private attorney generals.

12 Now, can you give me Exhibit 2232?

13 And I'm fid'na to show you a letter that I sent to the
14 U.S. Marshals regarding my private attorney general ID and my
15 sovereign peace officer ID. Now, it's addressed to the U.S.
16 Marshals, the head of the U.S. Marshals, Edwin Sloan, and this
17 is the letter that I wrote to him, 'cause Mr. Sorenson seems to
18 try to assert that I'm being deceptive, I don't let people know
19 what I'm doing, you know, it's very deceptive what he's doing.

20 Well, this is a letter to the U.S. Marshals. Scam artists
21 don't write the police. Scam artists don't let U.S. Marshals
22 and the FBI know what they're doing, not scam artists; they run
23 from the police.

24 Let's take a look at the letter. It says, (Reading:)

25 "My missive is in regard to the national recognition for

1 private attorney generals de jure, U.S. Marshals, and sovereign
2 peace officers. As you should know, Congress codified the
3 private attorney general principal into law with the enactment
4 of the Civil Rights Attorney's Fees Award Act of 1976 under
5 Senate Report No. 94-1101 and also Title 42 U.S.C.,
6 Section 1988. While I have personally been recognized as a
7 true private attorney general in several states, there is still
8 a lot of confusion and misconception concerning the lawfulness
9 of the private attorney general position. I am reaching out to
10 your office to acknowledge the congressional act and federal
11 law in order that we may eradicate the opposition we are met
12 with in some of the states because of their lack of knowledge
13 or understanding of the above-mentioned act.

14 "If you are denying the act is valid or that the federal
15 law cited above is obsolete or have been repealed, please
16 provide to me in writing the congressional act or order that
17 repealed the above act and the federal law that nullifies
18 Title 42 U.S.C. 1988.

19 "To help you gain a better understanding of what the
20 private attorney general is, the following are case law that
21 gives details on the lawfulness of the private attorney
22 generals and their actions and duty to the public. Many civil
23 rights statutes rely on private attorney generals for their
24 enforcement. In *Newman v. Piggie Part Enterprises*, 390 U.S.
25 400 (1968), 88 S. Ct. 964; 19 L. Ed. 2d Edition 1263, one of

1 the earliest cases construing the Civil Rights Act" --

2 Next page, please.

3 -- "the United States Supreme Court ruled that a public
4 accommodation suit is thus private in form only when a
5 plaintiff brings an action. He cannot recover damages. If he
6 obtains an injunction, he does so not for himself alone, but
7 also as a private attorney general, vindicating a policy that
8 Congress consider of the highest priority.

9 "The United States Congress has also passed laws with
10 private attorney general provisions that provide for the
11 enforcement of laws prohibiting employment discrimination,
12 police brutality, and water pollution. The earliest known use
13 of the private attorney general by a court in the United States
14 is by Judge Frank in *Associated Industries of New York State,*
15 *Inc. vs. Ickes*. Private attorney general provision such as
16 Title 18 U.S.C. 1964 are in part designed to fill prosecutorial
17 gaps. This purpose would be largely defeated and the need for
18 treble damages as an incentive to litigate unjustified if
19 private suits could be maintained only against those already
20 brought to justice."

21 Now I go on down to say, "If you are not familiar with
22 what a de jure governmental agency is, here is the definition
23 from Black's Law Dictionary 4th Edition, page 825, defined de
24 jure government as" -- I think I had explained to you all
25 before now, I'm quoting -- this is the actual quote from the

1 Black's Law Dictionary -- "A government of right; the true and
2 lawful government; a government established according to the
3 constitution of the state, and lawfully entitled to recognition
4 and supremacy and the administration of the state, but which is
5 actually cut off from power or control. A government deemed
6 lawful, or deemed rightful or just, which nevertheless, has
7 been supplanted or displaced; that is to say, which received
8 not presently (although it received formerly) habitual
9 obedience from the bulk of the community."

10 On the previous page 824 it defines *de facto* government
11 as, "A government of fact. A government actually exercising
12 power and control in the state, as opposed to the true and
13 lawful government; a government not established according to
14 the constitution of the state, or not lawfully entitled to
15 recognition or supremacy, but which has nevertheless supplanted
16 or displaced the government *de jure*. A government deemed
17 unlawful, or deemed wrongful or unjust, which, nevertheless,
18 receives presently habitual obedience from the bulk of the
19 community."

20 That's what they are, *de facto*. What my United States
21 Office of the Private Attorney General is *de jure*. That's why
22 I sent them this letter, to let them know what my company is,
23 that United States Office of the Private Attorney General is
24 not a *de facto* agency, it is a *de jure* agency, and that's why I
25 got the federal ID which is a *de jure* private attorney general

1 ID.

2 Down further I said, "All of our private attorney
3 generals, U.S. Marshals, and sovereign peace officers have a *de*
4 *jure* oath filed and apostilled by the secretary of state of
5 their respective states that are in and are held to the highest
6 standards of honesty, integrity, and adherence to the organic
7 Constitution of the United States of America. Most of our
8 staff are military veterans or former law enforcement officers
9 and disciplined accordingly and we expect to be treated with
10 the utmost respect for our honorable service to our country,
11 and we also require that we have the same courtesy as any *de*
12 *facto* law enforcement agency receives from your office.

13 "In conclusion, within 21 days of the receipt of this
14 letter, we are asking a letter from your office acknowledging
15 receipt of this letter and also within the letter whether you
16 agree or disagree with the Constitution and case law cited
17 herein. Failure to respond will be considered acquiescence
18 that you fully recognize and give full faith and credit to our
19 *de jure* agency as you give to any and any other *de facto*
20 agencies. Please note that we are not applying or making a
21 request for your office to validate our existence because that
22 has already been done. We are simply requesting a letter from
23 your office hopefully acquiescing to the facts stated herein to
24 alleviate some of the misunderstanding and the misunderstanding
25 we have had with a few of the *de facto* agencies."

1 This is a letter I sent to the U.S. Marshals. Hardly
2 sounds like someone that's trying to hide what they're doing.

3 Now, Agent Crawley -- now Agent Crawley, if you remember
4 her testimony, she admitted that no homeowners in Hawaii filed
5 a complaint against me, zero, came to her office, or made a
6 call to her, or sent her an email or a fax, zero.

7 She also admitted that she interviewed the clients, she
8 went to their house. What you won't see in evidence is any of
9 her interviews. What you should ask yourself is why? Why did
10 she go around to all my clients, she went house to house,
11 numerous clients, get interviews, FBI reports, not one of them
12 in evidence? Know why? Because every client, even the one
13 that they had up testifying that they called, all them said,
14 "No, Mr. Williams didn't do anything wrong. Mr. Williams
15 fought for us. Mr. Williams never lied to us." But the
16 government, the prosecutors coerced -- what? -- five people to
17 lie what they already testified with her? That's what they
18 did.

19 But these people never made a complaint. That's why each
20 one of them, if you notice, when they got up there I said, "Did
21 you file a complaint with the FBI against me?"

22 "No."

23 "Did you ask for a refund?"

24 "No."

25 You know why? Because I did what I said I was gonna do.

1 These people knew they weren't in a mortgage reduction program
2 because he conveniently left out the foreclosure disclosure
3 form on the MEI application, conveniently left that out in his
4 closing because that would show -- that would get rid of his
5 whole argument they were deceived into believing something that
6 was not. They knew they were in foreclosure. They knew they
7 didn't have the guarantee. The only guarantee is the one
8 that's stated in that foreclosure disclosure, that I would do
9 everything in my power to protect your house from foreclosure
10 to keep you in that house as long as possible and I did that.
11 That's the reason why I still have no complaints.

12 Now, Agent Crawley said that she had received a call from
13 the DFI investigator, if you remember, and if you remember I
14 questioned her, I said, "Well what was the name of the DFI
15 investigator?"

16 She couldn't remember.

17 I said, "Okay. So you don't remember the name, but did
18 you -- did the DFI send you a complaint?"

19 "No."

20 "Did they fax you a complaint?"

21 "No."

22 "Did they email you a complaint of what they said on the
23 phone?"

24 "No."

25 So she don't know the name of the DFI investigator that

1 talked with her, never received a complaint from the DFI that
2 called and said that complaints were about me, and then after
3 receiving this call from this ghost DFI investigator,
4 Ms. Crawley didn't file her own complaint about the complaints.

5 What you won't see in evidence is one complaint filed by
6 her or any of the clients, not one in evidence. What you will
7 find in evidence is complaints against Henry Malinay, Anabel
8 Cabebe. Do you remember that big stack I had of all the
9 complaints from the DCCA they wouldn't allow go into evidence,
10 they only let one? All those 44 complaints, not one of them
11 against me, all of them against Henry Malinay, Anabel Cabebe,
12 and Edna Franco. Still no complaints against me. But they
13 didn't want that in evidence because it would show who the real
14 culprits were.

15 Now, Agent Joseph Lavelle. Now, he admitted that he was
16 out of the Miami office and we had showed that the Miami office
17 actually declined prosecution after confiscating my laptop, my
18 desktop, all my client files, which they had my client files
19 from Florida, Hawaii, and other states 'cause I carry a bag
20 that has a copy of my clients' files just in case if I'm
21 traveling, I can always pull up any clients' files. If I need
22 to make an emergency motion or whatever, I have the files.

23 So but Miami had all these files, sent to their mortgage
24 fraud scheme department for prosecution, sent it to the U.S.
25 Attorney's Office for prosecution. They declined. They

1 declined to file mail and wire fraud charges based on the same
2 evidence that they sent to the FBI here. The evidence that
3 they had actually came from Miami. The evidence they have
4 didn't come from here. The evidence they had actually came
5 from Miami investigation.

6 So Miami declined prosecution for mail and wire fraud
7 because there was none. They declined prosecution for money
8 laundering and bank fraud because there was none. But Agent
9 Lavelle testified that he didn't have no complaints in Florida,
10 but yet I'm still running a mortgage fraud scheme but they
11 never charged me with that.

12 Now, if you remember, I directly asked Agent Lavelle, "Is
13 it a crime for a citizen to wear handcuffs on a plane?"

14 He said, "No."

15 I said, "Is it a crime for a citizen to have their own
16 sovereign peace officer badge and be admitted on a plane?"

17 He said, "No."

18 I asked him directly, "Did the Broward County Sheriff's
19 Office file charges against me for having a fake ID and fake
20 badge?"

21 "No."

22 "Did the FBI file charges against me for having fake ID
23 and badge?"

24 "No."

25 But their whole argument has been on my ID and my badge

1 which is not even part of the indictment, one of the charges.
2 If you notice, this whole trial they focus on my ID and my
3 badge and the oath of office that I filed. They didn't focus
4 on the actual indictment charges, the mail and wire fraud.
5 They never focused on that because it would be frivolous, kind
6 of be silly, because they couldn't find nothing that was
7 fraudulent or false in the emails or the mail. So they got to
8 try to make something appear to be false which they know is not
9 false so to try to confuse you to think, well, if the ID is
10 false, if the badge is false, then the emails have to be false.
11 He's reaching.

12 He mentioned Bryce Oleski. Now this is the FBI agent from
13 Washington, D.C. Now, you won't have this in evidence because
14 they didn't want it in evidence, but I wanted in evidence --
15 but he said he researched the building that I had a office at.
16 He said he researched it. But what he didn't tell you is that
17 he just researched it last month, January. The company been
18 gone. I been locked up for four years. But he didn't research
19 it back in 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, when I had a office up.
20 Didn't research it then.

21 But then he also said he interviewed Ms. Dorita Dixon.
22 Ms. Dixon said, "I don't know Anthony Williams, never met him,
23 never talked to the guy." I showed by their own exhibit that
24 yes, I did know Dorita Dixon. I sent her the money for that
25 office for the mailing address, but Agent Oleski never went to

1 the office in Washington, D.C. He knew the address.

2 Matter of fact, can you go back to the front page of this
3 exhibit?

4 The address -- he knew that address, that 1717
5 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 2015. That's where the actual
6 physical address is. Agent Oleski knew that. If he did an
7 investigation, he knew that. But he didn't want to go there to
8 interview the employees in Washington, D.C. He didn't want you
9 to realize that fact that I did have a physical office, but
10 that the 6230 was just a mailing address, not the actual
11 physical address. And somehow that's against the law to have a
12 separate mailing address from your actual physical address,
13 which I'm housed at the FDC. We have a mailing address PO
14 Box 380, but the physical address is 351 Elliot Street. So I
15 guess the FDC are committing fraud by having a mailing address
16 but also having a different physical address from the address.

17 Agent Oleski, after I showed him the MoneyGram that I
18 actually had to send to Ms. Dorita Dixon, then he had to admit
19 after redirect examination from Mr. Yates that, well, it's
20 possible that she lied that she didn't know Mr. Williams.

21 This whole case I've caught the FBI agents in lies. I
22 caught the actual clients that they called up in lies, and I'm a
23 go through those.

24 Now, he mentioned Mr. Klevansky who's supposed be to the
25 expert in the UCC law. You all remember him? Now, I asked him

1 a few questions about the UCC. Now, if you a expert in
2 something, you should be able to know at least one or two laws
3 of something that you claim to be an expert.

4 Now, I questioned Mr. Klevansky, "Mr. Klevansky, do you
5 know what UCC 1-103.6?"

6 And I'm talking about anybody that knows the UCC knows
7 what that is 'cause that's basic.

8 Didn't know, don't know what it states.

9 "Okay. Mr. Klevansky, what does UCC 1-308 states?"

10 "I don't know."

11 "Okay. Mr. Klevansky, what does UCC 3-603 Section B
12 states?"

13 "I don't know."

14 "Okay. Mr. Klevansky, you an expert with UCC law, right?
15 Well, what article in the UCC deals with negotiable instruments
16 and notes?"

17 "I'm not sure. I don't have it before me."

18 But you an expert, supposed to be offering expert
19 testimony but have no idea what the UCC is about, can't even
20 tell me what article deals with negotiable instrument which is
21 Article 3 and Article 9. That's what deal with negotiable
22 instruments. But he didn't know. But he wants to tell you
23 that the UCC has no bearing, has no legal effect on the
24 property. If it don't, why would it have to be removed in
25 order for the bank to foreclose? It has no legal effect. They

1 know it does and they know that was a remedy to keep my clients
2 in their houses.

3 Now, let's get to the actual clients that they got and
4 they coerced to lie. Let's start with Ms. Troxel. Now, if you
5 remember, Ms. Troxel said, "Mr. Williams, you never did nothing
6 for me. You never did nothing. You filed nothing for me."

7 I showed her the exhibits of all the motions I filed on
8 her behalf.

9 Then she also said, "Well, you never explained them to me.
10 Mr. Williams, you never explained nothing. You didn't explain
11 nothing to me."

12 I said, "Well, Ms. Troxel, do you remember about what time
13 you came to my office?"

14 She said, "About 8 o'clock."

15 "That's P.M., right?"

16 "Yeah, P.M."

17 I said, "Ms. Troxel, do you remember how long you stayed
18 at my office?"

19 "Hmm, about four or five hours."

20 I said, "Four or five hours." I said, "Ms. Troxel, what
21 were you and I doing for four and five hours in my office after
22 8 o'clock at night?"

23 "Well, you know, I had a bunch of questions, I had a lot
24 of questions, and you had to answer all my questions."

25 "So I did explain everything to your satisfaction then?"

1 But you just testified when he questioned you that I explained
2 nothing." That's what she testified, but I showed that's
3 completely false.

4 Ms. Laforteza, she also stated on the stand that I didn't
5 do anything for her. I never filed nothing for her. Now, she
6 had to hire an attorney, Keone Agard, if you all remember the
7 exhibit. She had to hire -- she had an attorney before me to
8 try to assist her in the foreclosure. That was before I got
9 involved. She already hired an other attorney, and I showed
10 you the letter where she wrote her attorney and said, "We want
11 our money back. You haven't done nothing for us. We paid you
12 \$2,500, you haven't filed anything to help us fight our
13 foreclosure."

14 And so when she emailed me, I said, "Ms. Laforteza, I
15 cannot do anything if you still have this attorney as attorney
16 of record. I can't file any documents because the court is
17 going to reject it." And that's the truth. "So in order for
18 me to assist you with your foreclosure that your former
19 attorney has not done, you gonna have to remove him." And I
20 told her, "Listen, the law is very specific. When you hire an
21 attorney, their first duty is to the court, not to you as a
22 client." And I sent her a little link where she can click on
23 and see that that's actually what the attorneys have taken a
24 oath to. Their oath is first to the court, not to you as a
25 client, and I disagree with that. If a client hires me, my

1 loyalty is to that person to protect their interest, not to
2 protect the interest of the court. But this is what attorneys
3 at law do.

4 Now, Ms. Laforteza lied and said that I said I was a
5 licensed attorney. Now, anybody that knows me know I would
6 never say nothing like that because I never want to be a
7 licensed attorney because there is no such thing as a license,
8 and we went into that with Mr. Horowitz who actually did the
9 research to show that's one of the biggest fraud being
10 perpetrated on the American people. They have no license.
11 They have certificate of admission. That's not a license.

12 All the license is filed in the state. When this trial is
13 over with, I want you all to call the Department of Vocation
14 and Licensing Division, and I want you to ask them this
15 question. Say, "Does doctors have licenses filed in your
16 office?"

17 They gonna say, "Yes."

18 "Do dentists have licenses filed in your state office?"

19 "Yes."

20 "Do electricians?"

21 "Yes."

22 "Do plumbers?"

23 "Yes."

24 "Attorneys at law?"

25 "No. No, no, no, no, no attorney have no license."

1 But I thought this the office that all the professionals
2 have to have the licenses filed.

3 You heard Ms. Mau-Shimizu say that the bar association is
4 not a state agency; it's private 501(c)(6) IRS agency, private.
5 But it names itself Hawaii State Bar. Why? It makes you think
6 that it's a part of the Hawaii state government and it's not.
7 That's fraud, people, to the highest level.

8 Ms. Subia, now I know you can't forget Ms. Subia because
9 she brought an interpreter as if she can't speak, read, or
10 write English. So I asked Ms. Subia, "Ms. Subia, when you came
11 to my office you didn't have to have an interpreter." So she's
12 speaking to the Court and making her answers through an
13 interpreter. She didn't have -- she could speak very good
14 English. That's the reason why I subpoenaed her husband.

15 If you remember his testimony, I asked him, I said,
16 "Mr. Subia, did you go to school in the Philippines?"

17 "Yes."

18 "Did you graduate?"

19 "Yes."

20 "Is it the normal curriculum for Filipino children when
21 they go school they learn to read, write, and speak English?"

22 "Yes."

23 "Did your wife go to Filipino school?"

24 "Yes."

25 "So did she learn to read, write, and speak English?"

1 "Yes."

2 "So, Mr. Subia, why did your wife come in here with an
3 interpreter?"

4 "I don't know."

5 You know who told her to bring that interpreter in to make
6 it look like she was a victim of mine, that she really didn't
7 understand what I was saying? The prosecutors, 'cause they
8 had -- they the one talked to them before they came to
9 testify --

10 MR. SORENSON: Your Honor, there's no evidence of
11 that and it's completely untrue.

12 THE COURT: All right. The objection's overruled.
13 The jury is reminded again that anything that the attorneys or
14 Mr. Williams says when he's representing himself is not
15 evidence and it's their time to argue their case.

16 All right. Mr. Williams.

17 THE DEFENDANT: Well, we'll get to that in a minute.

18 Macrina Pillos, the one that admitted that Anabel and
19 Henry was the one that signed her up while I was incarcerated,
20 had no idea about Ms. Pillos until 2015. She was already in
21 foreclosure when I met her. Henry and Anabel had already
22 scammed her.

23 Now, she admitted that she didn't know that they didn't
24 work for me. She didn't know that they had set up this
25 fraudulent company, Mortgage Enterprise. They told her they

1 still worked for me. That's what they told a lot of people and
2 that's where all the complaints generated from, not that they
3 worked for me; they had their own company, but made people
4 think they was working for Mortgage Enterprise Investments.
5 They had people go on the internet, look up the website, look
6 up my Better Business Bureau rating, see the A-plus. They
7 trusted them because they thought they was a part of my company
8 when they was not and they knew they was not.

9 Now, if you remember me questioning Ms. Pillos about the
10 application that she filed, and I had to put a cover page on
11 the application, and the reason why I had to put the cover page
12 because of the things that Henry Malinay and Anabel Cabebe had
13 done. So I put a cover page on the application to let clients
14 know that, listen, if someone charges you anything other than
15 this, call my 800 number immediately and talk to me personally
16 because you're not supposed to be charged anything that's not
17 stated in this application.

18 Now, she said she didn't know my number. She said Anabel
19 told her, "No, I -- you talk to me and I'll call. I'll call
20 Mr. Williams."

21 But I said, "Ms. Pillos, didn't you have my number?"

22 "No."

23 I said, "Well, look at your signature. Look above your
24 signature. There's my 800 number. It says 'Call Anthony if
25 you have any questions, if anybody's charging you anything over

1 that.'"

2 "Well, I didn't see your number."

3 It's right there clearly on the form. She lied about
4 that.

5 Now, the performance that she gave was worthy of an Oscar
6 or a Academy Award, because after she did all that crying and
7 you all were ushered out, she looked at the prosecutor and
8 smiled. Looked at them and smiled to show that was all an act.
9 It's all a fraud.

10 Nelson Mandela -- Madamba. Now, if you remember, I
11 questioned -- this is Ms. Mariethez's husband. I questioned
12 him, "Mr. Madamba, do you remember doing an affidavit in 2015
13 about Edna, Henry, and Anabel, Rowena scamming you?"

14 "I don't. I don't remember doing affidavit."

15 Can you pull up Exhibit 2138, please? It's page 21, I
16 believe it is.

17 Okay. Now, this is the affidavit that Nelson Madamba did
18 on the first day of April 2015, five years ago. And if you
19 notice, he says that, "The affiant called Edna Franco, Henry
20 Malinay, or Rowena Valdez on numerous occasions and no one ever
21 answered the calls nor returned calls, texts, or emails; that
22 affiant was promised by Edna Franco, Henry Malinay, or Rowena
23 Valdez that they could save my home from foreclosure and get my
24 home free and clear in three months. The affiant is a victim
25 of a scam and mortgage relief fraud scheme operated by Edna

1 Franco, Henry Malinay, and Rowena Valdez; that affiant was
2 unaware that Edna Franco had already been sanctioned by the
3 State of Hawaii of mortgage fraud and scamming homeowners out
4 of thousands of dollars; that affiant is willing to testify in
5 court of law that the foregoing facts are true and correct and
6 that affiant is seeking civil damages from the perpetrators of
7 this fraud against me and believe that criminal charges should
8 be filed against these perpetrators to have them arrested to
9 prevent homeowners from being victimized by their scheme."

10 Nelson Madamba, one of the government's witnesses, had
11 already given a sworn statement actually who scammed them. But
12 five years later, no, "Mr. Williams scammed me" five years
13 later.

14 Page 20.

15 This is his wife, Ms. Mariethez. Now, you remember
16 Ms. Mariethez. I directly asked her, "Ms. Mariethez, have you
17 gone to the prosecutor's office, talked to the prosecutor
18 before you came here today?"

19 "No, no, never -- never went to prosecutor's office, never
20 went to the main office."

21 I said, "Ms. Madamba, are you sure? Sure you never seen
22 these two gentlemen before? Never went to their office?"

23 "No, I did not."

24 Mr. Sorenson called a sidebar. At the sidebar, "Yes, Your
25 Honor, this witness has come to my office two times, so I want

1 to put that on the record that she has come by the office."

2 So when I come back out of the sidebar, I said,
3 "Ms. Madamba, prosecutor said that you have been by their
4 office at least twice. Now, are you lying or are they lying?"

5 Oh, now she magically remembers, "Oh, yeah, I did go by
6 the office, yeah, few times, I did."

7 Why would you have to lie? If you have -- you don't have
8 to lie if you telling the truth. But who told her to do that?

9 Henry Malinay. Pull up 2188, please.

10 Now, Mr. Malinay was clearly coerced to make these crazy
11 statements that he made as if he was with me scamming, which
12 definitely I did not condone his behavior. But this is one of
13 the 44 complaints of that stack that they didn't let me put the
14 whole stack in. This is just one of the complaints.

15 Go to the next page, please. Next page. Next page. Next
16 page. Next page.

17 Now, this is her statement. She said, "I was referred by
18 my co-worker, Zenaida Magbual, to see Henry Malinay to reduce
19 my mortgage by one-half for the monthly payments from the
20 principal balance on 8-18-13. I met Henry -- "

21 THE COURT: Slow down. If you're going to read from
22 it, slow down.

23 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. "I met Henry at the Ray Cel
24 office in Kahului along with Rowena Valdez. I saw Zenaida
25 Magbual there too. I know Zenaida well because we work

1 together at the hospital. I gave Henry my first check number
2 5966 paid to cash, as Henry instructed, for 450 for a research
3 fee. When I got the check from my bank, I noticed that Rogelio
4 Magbual, who was Zenaida's husband, signed the back. The
5 number 03737335 is written under her signature. I gave Henry
6 my second check on 8-18-13 paid to cash, as he instructed me,
7 for 1,000 for the service fee."

8 I'ma just go on down. It says, "Anabel told me she was
9 giving me my check to Edna Franco. Henry, Rowena, Anabel,
10 Zenaida all told me that Edna was the head of Mortgage
11 Enterprise. I gave Anabel my fifth check number dated 2-16-14
12 paid to cash \$400. Anabel told me that money was to mail
13 letters to help with my mortgage for me."

14 Go on down, it says, "At the time I met and paid Henry, I
15 was making my mortgage payments and was not late, but I wanted
16 to have more money to spend. I had good credit. Henry asked
17 me, 'Do you want more money?'" Of course I said 'Yes.'

18 "Henry instructed me to call each of my credit cards to
19 increase my limit. He helped me to do this. And they all said
20 yes, and raised my limits. I had three credit cards then.
21 Then Henry instructed me to open new credit cards. Each time I
22 got a credit card offer, I would open a new credit card. Henry
23 told me to spend to the limit on all the credit cards and then
24 he would help me to eliminate the debt. Henry explained that
25 this works and he would help me, but he kept telling me I had

1 to run all the credit cards to the limits before I could
2 qualify to eliminate the debt. I did this with help from
3 Henry's associate. I went to one time to Sears with Rowena
4 Valdez and Zenaida Magbual, and they loaded up the shopping
5 carts with purchases and the amount was about 2500. Later
6 these same ladies took me to Kmart and did the same thing.
7 Again the amount was 2500. I opened many other credit cards.
8 I cannot count how many. On 10-20-13 Henry, my friend Violeta
9 Natividad and her husband Eli and me went to Baron & Leeds at
10 Wailea. Henry picked out a Rolex watch to max out my credit
11 card. Henry told me, "No worry. I will delete all the
12 credit."

13 Violeta and I both paid one-half each on our own
14 contribution to pay the \$12,716.19 for the Rolex watch. Later
15 I sent texts many times to Henry to ask him to return the Rolex
16 watch. Henry never answered any of my texts or calls."

17 This is what I found out after I got out of jail. And
18 this is why I went to the FBI office and made a complaint
19 against Henry, Anabel, Edna Franco, and Rowena Valdez for the
20 fraud they was committing people, knowing they had no
21 intentions of helping nobody, knowing they didn't have the
22 knowledge to fight no foreclosure to help anybody.

23 Anabel Cabebe, she's another one. She testified so she
24 wouldn't receive any jail time. Anabel Cabebe did not pay me a
25 dime. Now, you had the FBI agent that analyzed all the bank

1 accounts. You all going to have a copy of it. See if you see
2 a check in there for Anabel Cabebe. See if you see a check in
3 there from Henry Malinay to Mortgage Enterprise Investment.
4 It's not there because I worked for them for free. They never
5 paid me a dime. When I met them, they both were in
6 foreclosure. I was fighting their foreclosure.

7 Now, Anabel initially lied about her involvement in the
8 fraudulent company Mortgage Enterprise which I didn't know till
9 really recently that she actually was a signer on the account.
10 But they set up this scheme before I even went to jail, so this
11 was going on before I went to jail. And hearing her made it
12 appear as if after I went to jail, "Oh, we want to help these
13 people because you weren't here." No, you did this before I
14 was incarcerated. So you knew what you was doing. Your whole
15 plan was collect as much money as you possibly could, get away
16 with it, name the company after mine so when the complaints
17 start coming, it would try to direct it to me, and that's what
18 they did.

19 Mary Jean Castillo, she testified for the government, but
20 she didn't have a negative opinion of me. She told you, "No,
21 this man showed me proof of what he did," 'cause I showed her
22 all the clients that I deleted their mortgages in the mainland.
23 I showed her the letters from HUD, the letters from the FBI. I
24 showed her all those letters from the district attorney. I
25 showed her all the proof, the credit reports. She saw all

1 that. That's the reason why she knew what I did worked.

2 She saw me work till 2:00 or 3:00 in the morning on
3 clients' cases. She knew what I did was helping these people
4 stay in their homes. She had no uncertainties about that.
5 That's the reason why when I asked her, "Do you still think I'm
6 a man of integrity, a man of honesty, and a man of faith?"

7 "Yes."

8 This is their witness. Yes, because she know what type of
9 man I am. She know how hard I work for these people and I
10 would never do nothing to defraud anybody. That's the reason
11 why I've been transparent with my whole operation.

12 Melvyn Ventura. Please pull up Exhibit 2149, please.

13 Now, Mr. Ventura, before he was going to be my witness,
14 but after talking to the prosecutors, he wanted to back out.
15 Sent me an email, "I'm backing out from testifying. I don't
16 want to testify for Mr. Williams now after speaking with the
17 prosecutor." But they don't deem that witness tampering.

18 Ladies and gentlemen, if I'da done the same thing, if I'da
19 called any one of they witnesses and made any one of they
20 witnesses not testify for them, I'd be charged with witness
21 tampering. But because the prosecutors that did it, that's not
22 witness tampering. But it's clearly witness tampering.
23 According to Title 18 U.S.C. 1503 and 1512, that's witnesses
24 tampering.

25 But what did Mr. Ventura testify? That he already

1 knew about the straw man, did his research. So he knew what I
2 was talking about. He did. But he was already in foreclosure,
3 already in debt. He was trying to find a remedy.

4 So look at this affidavit. Now, he did this affidavit
5 based on the fraudulent emails that they're charging me, saying
6 the emails was fraudulent, that he sent a fraudulent email to
7 me and then I sent a fraudulent email in response to him.

8 Now, he's signed a sworn affidavit that none of the emails
9 was fraudulent, nothing I said to him was fraudulent or
10 misleading, none of the payments that he made was fraudulent or
11 misleading.

12 Let's see what he has to say. Number 5, said, "There was
13 nothing fraudulent about the email affiant sent to Anthony
14 Williams regarding the December payment on November 23rd, 2014.

15 "6, there was nothing fraudulent about the email sent to
16 affiant from Anthony Williams regarding payments to Texas by
17 mail on November 27, 2014.

18 "There was nothing fraudulent about the email sent from
19 affiant to Anthony Williams on November 27, 2014, regarding
20 late mailing of payment.

21 "There was nothing fraudulent about the response email on
22 November 27, 2014, sent from Anthony Williams to affiant
23 regarding late payment.

24 "Affiant supports Anthony Williams in his fights to expose
25 governmental corruption and has always believed in his just

1 cause."

2 This is a sworn affidavit that was signed a year ago. But
3 talk to the prosecutors, he didn't want to testify any more.

4 But when he got on the stand, I questioned him, I said,
5 "Mr. Ventura, do you still think I'm a man of integrity?"

6 "Yes."

7 "Still think I'm a man of honesty?"

8 "Yes."

9 "Still think I'm a man of faith?"

10 "Yes."

11 "Do you still believe in me?"

12 "Yes."

13 "Do you still trust me?"

14 "Yes."

15 This is the government witness that they tampered with.

16 Now, pull up Exhibit 2080, please.

17 Now, this is Mr. John Hicks that he mentioned, that he
18 said that they went into foreclosure. But Mr. Hicks didn't go
19 into foreclosure. After I deleted --

20 Go to the next page, please.

21 This is the -- this is his fax to me. This is not my
22 document. This is his fax to me after I got his mortgage
23 deleted. So he circles this and says, "Wow," because I told
24 him as long as I get it before foreclosure, I could do this.
25 Now, if once you in foreclosure, I can't guarantee this. But

1 if you before foreclosure, I can guarantee you I could do this
2 or I'ma give you your money back.

3 Now, this is a Chicago police officer, not someone that
4 you would want to try to scam. If you doing a scam, you want
5 to avoid them at all costs. But this is a government employee.
6 It's a police officer.

7 Go to next page, please. Next page. Next page. Next
8 page. Next page. Next page. Next page. Next page. Next
9 page. Go down. Next page. Next page. Next page.

10 This is the affidavit of truth that I actually sent with
11 the other documentation to the TransUnion to get his mortgage
12 deleted. So you really want to read that page and how I was
13 able to get the mortgage deleted because I sent this affidavit
14 of truth along with the other documents which include the UCC
15 and the apostille documents.

16 Next page, please. Next page. Next page. Next page.

17 Now, this is a qualified written request that I would send
18 that the bank never answered properly, which is another one of
19 the reasons how I was able to get his mortgage deleted.

20 Next page, next page, next page, next page, next page,
21 next page, next page, next page, next page, next page.

22 Now, this is the certificate of redemption that I got for
23 filing his mortgage. Before we could file the mortgage we had
24 to get this exemption. So the Anti-Predatory Lending Database
25 in Illinois scrutinized the document, said there's nothing

1 fraudulent about it.

2 He claims that borrower cannot be the secure-party
3 creditor. Well, they scrutinized it, saw that Mr. Hicks was
4 the borrower and the creditor, saw that, saw that this makes
5 null and void the previous mortgage, but still approved it for
6 filing. That's not -- nothing fraudulent about the mortgage.
7 This is a government agency. Nothing fraudulent about it or
8 they wouldn't have filed it because they have to scrutinize it.

9 Next page, please.

10 Now, this is a letter after I did all this work for
11 Mr. Hicks, and I'ma just read this letter to you, "This missive
12 is in regards to communication that you sent to Mr. Williams
13 via text that you and your wife are divorcing and that you have
14 decided to let the house go. It is unfortunate that you and
15 your wife cannot resolve your matter of issues, but it does not
16 nullify the obligations you have to Mortgage Enterprise
17 Investments to continue to make your monthly payments.

18 "Your mortgage payment was reduced from 1789 to 890 a
19 month. You all had a bankruptcy issue that was resolved by
20 Mr. Williams at his own expense at no additional cost to you.
21 Your car was on the verge of being repossessed and our office
22 sent a letter on your behalf, and HealthCare Associates Credit
23 Union was willing to restructure the loan. You expressed that
24 you and you're wife were experiencing a hardship and you were
25 approved for a hardship reduction and your payment was reduced

1 to \$400 a month. You all were able to purchase two new
2 automobiles because of the services you received from my
3 office.

4 "We successfully secured your home and had it deleted off
5 of your credit report as we guaranteed. We have assisted you
6 above and beyond what we are contracted to do, free of charge,
7 in order to show good faith and to build your confidence in our
8 program so that you could show others in order that we may
9 assist them as we have assisted you:

10 "If you do not want to continue to make the payments as
11 you are under contract to do, then we have several options that
12 are available to you in order to resolve this issue. Since you
13 have expressed a desire to let the house go, then we can put
14 this house up for sale and deduct the amount you owe and refund
15 to you the difference. You can catch up your back payments and
16 pay the return check fee and continue to make your monthly
17 service payments.

18 "However, the hardship adjustment is no longer valid due
19 to your check being returned and your continued late payments.
20 You will now have to make your mortgage service payment of 890
21 a month to continue to participate in this program.

22 "We feel that we have done everything possible to be
23 accommodating to your situation and feel that you haven't
24 reciprocated the same. Mr. Williams was the initial
25 representative handling your account but turned over to me to

1 handle your account going forward. Currently you have a check
2 returned last month for 450 that needs to be paid along with a
3 \$30 return check fee.

4 "You are currently late on this month's payment and I
5 encourage you to bring it current before it becomes further
6 past due. We will allow you one more month of the hardship
7 payment for April and beginning in May and return to the
8 original 890 a month payment.

9 "We are trying to keep you as a satisfied customer and are
10 doing everything in our power to make sure that we will be able
11 to continue to be of service to you and your family without
12 having to seek legal remedies through the courts. We need your
13 full cooperation in this matter in order to resolve this
14 amicably.

15 "If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free
16 to call me at 877-714-1233 extension 104."

17 Now, this was to a client that I not only got his mortgage
18 deleted, but I got his bankruptcy taken off and I got him two
19 new cars and had his loan restructured, didn't charge him a
20 dime for it. And he still refused -- he stopped paying after I
21 did all this work. This was the only letter we sent them. I
22 didn't send him no more letters to collect on it. I feel like
23 if you're a person of integrity, then you know what your
24 obligation is. You don't need me sending more letters. Now
25 this is one of my clients in Chicago, Illinois.

1 Now give me Exhibit 2093.

2 Now, Mr. Sorenson made it appear that I prey on the weak,
3 I prey on immigrants that can't really understand, they don't
4 understand English, the immigrants, they don't -- they're not
5 that smart. Well, this is a client. This is Mr. Richard Lee.
6 He's a former Hawaii family judge. After interviewing seven
7 attorneys, he deemed after interviewing me that I was way more
8 competent and more knowledgeable in law to assist him in
9 defending his civil case.

10 Now, this is a judge that hired me to fight his civil
11 case. Now, you don't think I could trick a judge that I don't
12 know what I really know? It's a judge, Hawaii judge.

13 Can you go down, please? Go down some more. Go down some
14 more, please. Go down. Go down. Go down. Go down. Go down.
15 Go down. Next page. Next page.

16 MR. SORENSON: Your Honor, just for the record, this
17 exhibit's not in the record.

18 THE COURT: Correct.

19 THE DEFENDANT: Next page.

20 THE COURT: Argument.

21 THE DEFENDANT: 2293? It should be. Should be an
22 exhibit.

23 THE COURT: No, it's only pages 25 through 62 is in
24 evidence.

25 THE DEFENDANT: Right, right. Go down.

1 THE COURT: You're referring to things that are not
2 in evidence.

3 THE DEFENDANT: It's 25 through 62, right?

4 THE COURT: Correct.

5 THE DEFENDANT: Right. That's what I'm going
6 through right now.

7 Next page, please. Next page. Next page. Next page.
8 Next page. Next page. Next page.

9 Okay. Okay. Now, this is the affidavit of this Hawaii
10 family law judge.

11 Go to next page, please.

12 And he's telling you what his credentials are, "Number 1,
13 my name is Richard Lee. I was born on 2-26-1947, raised in
14 Hawaii, educated at Iolani School 10 years, Punahou School '65,
15 Stanford University '69, BA economics, University of California
16 Hastings Law School '73, and University of Hawaii MBA program
17 1970.

18 "My hobbies include baseball, marital arts,
19 self-improvement books, natural healing. I served in the Army
20 Reserves from 1969 to 1975 in 322nd Civil Affairs Unit.

21 "My experience includes Star Bulletin paperboy,
22 Interisland Resorts and Tradewind Tours, janitor, accounting
23 for Hawaii resorts." He goes on to say, "Attorney for the Law
24 Offices of Richard Lee, Hawaii Family Court Judge."

25 Now, Mr. Sorenson wants you to think that I was somehow

1 able to trick a actual law judge that what I know is not real,
2 that I was able to trick him that I was a real attorney and
3 that I could assist him. Mr. Lee knew I was not a licensed
4 attorney 'cause we talked extensively of why I'm not a licensed
5 attorney, why I never will be a member of the bar, and he
6 concluded that my knowledge in law was far superior than any of
7 the attorneys that he had ever met before that time. That's
8 why he hired me. That's why on the front page it has Anthony
9 Williams, Private Attorney General, Common Law Office of
10 America.

11 Go on down, please. Next page. Next page. Next page.
12 Next page. Next page. Next page. Next page. Next page.
13 Next page. Next page. Next page. Next page. Next page.
14 Next page.

15 See, it says, "Anthony Williams and Richard Lee, *pro se*,
16 demand for trial by jury." Now, this judge had so much
17 confidence in me that he allowed me to draft the motions on his
18 behalf. He went to law school; I didn't, but he understood how
19 much research I've done and that I was very competent in law.

20 Now, I'm going to get to my witnesses. If you remember
21 Ms. Milagro Castro, she testified, "Mr. Williams never
22 misrepresented that he was an attorney at law. He always told
23 us he's a private attorney general." Everybody that she saw
24 that she knew that came to the office when she was there, I
25 told them the same thing: I'm not a member of the bar, not a

1 bar attorney, not licensed, because they're not licensed. I'm
2 a private attorney general, and I explain that extensively and
3 would refer to them to my website that goes into detail the
4 difference between what I am and what an attorney at law is.

5

6 THE COURT: You have five more minutes.

7 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Man, hour-and-a-half that
8 quick?

9 You heard what Mr. -- Dr. Horowitz. He understood that
10 these charges against me are fraudulent, it's a sham, it's
11 retaliation for what I do. 'Cause he was with me a lot of the
12 times in the courts when I would represent people. He would
13 actually video him and his significant other. Like she said,
14 she was actually assaulted by one of the sheriff's deputies for
15 her videotaping me assisting a client in court, actually was
16 physically assaulted by a sheriff.

17 But he understands because he did the research of
18 everything that I told him. 'Cause remember his testimony, "I
19 didn't believe you at first when you told you was a private
20 attorney general." Never heard of it before until he did his
21 research and realized that whoa, this guy's telling the truth.

22 Now, all these laws, all these case law, all the Supreme
23 Court rulings that give me the authority to do what I do, these
24 aren't just sham pleadings. These are actually according to
25 the law and you will see. That's what you going to see from

1 evidence.

2 Now, what you not going to see in evidence, this is what's
3 not in evidence when you go back to deliberate. This is what
4 you're not going to see: No complaints to the FBI from
5 homeowners here in Hawaii or any other states. You not going
6 to see that in evidence.

7 No complaints from the DCCA from any homeowners in Hawaii
8 or any other states;

9 No criminal charges in Hawaii or any other states against
10 me, MEI, or CLOA;

11 No criminal charges for me having a fake ID or sovereign
12 peace officer badge in Hawaii or any other states;

13 No criminal charge in Hawaii or any other state for
14 mortgage fraud;

15 No criminal charges in Hawaii or any other states for bank
16 fraud;

17 No charge -- criminal charge in Hawaii or any other state
18 for money laundering. You won't see that in evidence;

19 No criminal charges for filing UCCs or mortgages in Hawaii
20 or any other states;

21 No criminal charges for the unlicensed practice of law in
22 the State of Hawaii.

23 Now, the real reason these charges -- can you give me
24 Exhibit 2119, please, and 21 -- 2134? 2134.

25 And I encourage you to please read these lawsuits that I

1 filed and then you will understand why I was retaliated
2 against. This lawsuit actually named Megan Crawley personally
3 and it was filed on June 28, 2016. So eight months later, then
4 I get charged with these charges and that's what this was
5 about, retaliation against me for filing a federal lawsuit
6 against her for what they was doing to me in complicity with
7 the FBI in Florida.

8 THE COURT: You have two minutes.

9 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Exhibit 2184, please.

10 Now, it says one of the elements is intent to defraud.
11 People that defraud people don't do things for free. People
12 that's scamming people don't give people refunds. You gonna be
13 able to look at my account, my Mortgage Enterprise Investments
14 accounts. You gonna see all the refunds that were refunded.
15 You gonna see all the affidavits from the people that I
16 refunded. You gonna see all the lists.

17 Go to 901, please, Exhibit 901.

18 You see all this list, they got 156 clients that I had
19 here in Hawaii. But they was only able to coerce five into
20 filing a complaint against me. What happened to the other 151?
21 Where's their complaints? But where's the five people
22 complaints? Where's the complaint at? You won't see that in
23 evidence.

24 Only thing you gonna have is what he says,
25 attorneys -- his comments. You won't have no evidence of me

1 defrauding anybody. You will have evidence to the contrary,
2 that I fought for these people and I will continue to fight for
3 these people.

4 Ms. Thomas is in the audience right now. I'm still
5 fighting her foreclosure from jail. I got calluses on my hand
6 from handwriting the mortgage -- the motions to keep her and
7 her mom in her home. That's what I've done while I'm in jail,
8 haven't charged her a dime. She testified that and I'm going
9 to continue to keep her in her home. I been keeping her in her
10 home for seven years now, and I will you continue to fight for
11 her and the rest of the clients that send me their paperwork.
12 I will keep fighting for them and keep them in their home.

13 There was no intent to defraud. When you go through the
14 emails and the mail, you won't find anything fraudulent. You
15 will see that all I did was make sure that I took care of these
16 clients. You won't find any evidence back when you go back of
17 any intent to deceive because I am a man of faith and I truly
18 believe in that Bible. Because I do understand that one day we
19 have to give an account for what we do and I would never do
20 anything to defraud anyone.

21 Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. I rest.

22 THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we're
23 going to take our 15-minute recess, and then Mr. Sorenson will
24 do his rebuttal and you'll be given the case after that for
25 deliberation.

1 Please rise for the jury. They're in 15-minute recess.

2 (A recess was taken.)

3 (Open court in the presence of the jury.)

4 THE COURT: The record will reflect the presence of
5 the ladies and gentlemen of the jury, counsel, and
6 Mr. Williams.

7 Mr. Sorenson, your rebuttal please.

8 MR. SORENSON: Thank you again, Your Honor.

9 Hello again. Only 15 more minutes of listening to
10 somebody like me yak.

11 So I'll get right into it because Mr. Williams, you know,
12 he's sort of like one of those car commercials. I've got to
13 talk really fast to try to keep up with everything that was
14 said.

15 But it is interesting, isn't it, in listening to him?
16 That is one smooth-talking con man. When he talks, it flows
17 off his lips and you can -- you can just feel what the people
18 that were defrauded by him felt because that's how he is. He
19 is so sure of himself and he presents himself in such a
20 confident manner that you're going to buy into it.

21 Remember, he has placed the wardrobe of legitimacy upon
22 himself with this whole attorney thing, and don't buy this
23 private attorney general garbage that you hear from him. You
24 have to be an attorney to practice in court. That is without a
25 doubt in this case. We have federal court orders that tell him

1 that. We have state court injunctions that tell him that. We
2 have multiple cease and desist letters that tell him that.

3 He chooses not to buy into that. He chooses to disregard
4 that because it's not economically expedient for him to believe
5 that. But the fact is it's true; he cannot practice without a
6 license, end of sentence.

7 And one other thing. Remember the duty to disclose? Fact
8 is, even if he truly believed that, let's say he did, truly
9 believes it. You know what? Having received Judge Mollway's
10 order, having seen that state court injunction, knowing that
11 controversy that's surrounding this argument that he can appear
12 in front of people in court and represent them without being an
13 attorney, he has a duty to disclose. That is a critical
14 omission. It's, Hey, you know, by the way, I'm going to try to
15 represent you in court, but I think I have to tell you that
16 multiple courts have told me right here in Hawaii that I can't
17 do this. So before you give me all your money, let me just
18 disclose to you that I'm sort of out here on the edge, on the
19 periphery of legality. I may not be able to do what I tell you
20 I could do.

21 That's an omission. That's a material omission. I don't
22 think you have to go that far because clearly there's a
23 misrepresentation here. He's told multiple times he can't
24 represent people; he continues to tell people that he can.

25 Now, Mr. Williams went into so much, and again, the theme

1 continues, the fraud continues, the scam continues. He went
2 into so many documents, some of which are not even in the
3 record in this case, they're not in evidence. I don't really
4 know how to fairly respond to those.

5 Generally speaking, I know what the evidence is. At this
6 juncture I wasn't quite sure on some of the exhibits he was
7 reading from. I knew they weren't in evidence. I didn't know
8 how to respond. This whole Judge Lee thing, for instance. I
9 will say this, and I think I can fairly respond: Judge Lee is
10 a disgraced attorney. He's a disbarred attorney. He's someone
11 that hooked up with Mr. Williams at some point apparently. But
12 I don't know how to respond. We didn't see him testify. We
13 didn't get to cross-examine him, so I can't really tell you his
14 motivations. And any motivations that you hear about of
15 Judge Lee's, they come from him; they come from Anthony
16 Williams.

17 In fact, he testified up here again. He wanted to testify
18 to facts that are not in the record of this case. Again, very
19 hard for us to rebut those. We've got our evidence. We know
20 what we put into the record of this case and it proves beyond a
21 reasonable doubt that he operated a scheme to defraud. It
22 proves that he lied to people. It proves that he failed to
23 disclose material facts that would have affected whether they
24 gave him money or not.

25 Now, just a couple whoppers that I heard while I was up

1 here. Remember one of the things he said was no complaints in
2 Florida. Special Agent Lavelle testified there were no
3 complaints in Florida. Well, we had to run back and get the
4 transcript, frankly, because facts flow off of Anthony like
5 water off of a duck's back. They just keep coming. It's hard
6 to keep up with him. What's true? What isn't? Where's the
7 lies? What's the truth? Where are the half truths?

8 Well, he told you that there were no complaints in
9 Florida. He told you that Special Agent Lavelle testified
10 there were no complaints in Florida.

11 Aga, if we can -- okay.

12 This is the transcript of Special Agent Lavelle's
13 testimony. I'm not going to spend a lot of time on this, but
14 down here, the question from Mr. Williams, (Reading:)

15 "When you visited them, did they make a complaint after
16 you visited them and say, 'Hey, this guy wronged us; he did
17 something fraudulent,' or, 'He didn't do what he promised to
18 do -- what he promised he said he was going to do for us'? Did
19 any of them make that statement to you?"

20 "Yes, sir."

21 "Which one made that statement to you?"

22 "Hmm, the homeowners that come to mind are Shirley
23 Callington and Consuelo Garcia are the two that come to mind."

24 Special Agent Lavelle testified that two people complained
25 about Anthony Williams, that he knew of, in Florida. Again, a

1 blatant misrepresentation of what occurred in the case.

2 This document Mr. Williams threw up here in front of you,
3 offering it to demonstrate somehow that his Florida conviction
4 was overturned, the fact is this is an action filed by Anthony
5 Williams that gets dismissed by the Florida Supreme Court. His
6 convictions were affirmed. He is convicted just as we proved.

7 Shamefully, he got up here and told you that Macrina
8 Pillos was faking. Did that look fake to you? She came off of
9 that stand, he testified, under oath, walked by us and smiled
10 like I'm in on the joke. We fooled him, didn't we? We got
11 that jury going, thinking I'm really sad.

12 Never happened. Completely untrue and a complete disgrace
13 to say that. Having done what he did to that lady, having done
14 what he did to all the witnesses in this case and to get up
15 here and say that, it's just downright disrespectful and wrong.

16 And also kind of the mocking their accents, completely
17 wrong. These are people that are not native English speakers.
18 These are people that have an accent. These are people that
19 maybe don't understand everything. And to go after Ms. Subia
20 for having a translator so she could be certain that what she
21 said was correct and what she heard was correct is not
22 something that he should be criticizing for.

23 Now, Mr. Williams told you when he got up here -- remember
24 he showed that chart? MEI's been in business since 2002.
25 Remember that? We can go to -- we have to look this up

1 actually.

2 Do we have the -- oh, what the heck. Let's go old school.
3 Feel like I've got a puppet.

4 Okay. I just want to show you this. Look at this
5 document here. Remember he said he's been in business since
6 2002. Well, in 2011 he's swearing that he doesn't have a trade
7 or business. At the same time he's swearing that he's a
8 nonresident alien. He doesn't care about the truth. He says
9 what it takes to get him by. He says what it takes to evade
10 taxes. Doesn't have a trade or business, 2011. He just told
11 you -- he just told you that he's a liar.

12 Also, the private attorney general thing, remember that
13 long letter from the Marshals Service where he had all the
14 explanation of private attorney general? We can all do this;
15 anybody can be a private attorney general? Two courts, as I've
16 indicated, have told him You cannot do this. There is no doubt
17 whatsoever that he cannot appear. And if he wanted to float
18 this novel legal theory to you, the proper way might have
19 been -- and he has no burden to produce evidence, by the way,
20 none whatsoever. He could sit there and not produce any
21 evidence. He did put some evidence on the stand. He did
22 subpoena people, didn't he? Some worked out maybe better than
23 others.

24 But we didn't hear from anybody who could legally support
25 this novel legal theory from him, nobody, no experts, nobody on

1 that front whatsoever. Again, he doesn't have that duty, but
2 if he's gonna go there, we've put our orders in from court
3 here, federal court order saying You can't do this.

4 If he wants to argue that the Constitution permits him to
5 do this, there was a way to do this. There was a way to
6 factually prove that to you. There was no evidence in the
7 record whatsoever of that.

8 Remember the Marshals Service letter, the one he threw up,
9 saying, "Hey, I'm telling people what I'm doing. Look at that
10 letter"? I mean, first off, I submit to you when the Marshals
11 Service in Washington, D.C., gets a letter like this, it
12 probably goes into the garbage with a number of other nutcake
13 letters they get probably every day on one front or another.

14 But reading that letter is not something -- if you look at
15 it, it's not something that's going to concern you. It's going
16 to be Oh, what the heck? Private attorney -- U.S. Office of
17 the Private Attorney General? Who are they and why do we care
18 and why is he asking the Marshals Service? We're in charge of
19 prisoner transport and looking for fugitives. Why is he
20 sending this to us? Ridiculous.

21 Mr. Williams also said, "Remember the stack of stuff I had
22 here? The stack of complaints? None of them were about me."
23 Well, we didn't see that stack, so we really don't know. And
24 if we only have his word, I assure you if we only have his word
25 for something, look for something else, look for corroboration.

1 But Jim Evers, who he was questioning at the time, said,
2 "Mr. Williams, a lot of the complaints about you and all of
3 them related to your operation of this same scam, this mortgage
4 reduction scam. Whether Malinay's doing it, whether Cabebe's
5 doing it, or whether you're doing it, it's the same thing.
6 That's what they're complaining about. You can't do what
7 you're telling people you can do. That's fraud, that's a lie,
8 and that's why we're getting complaints."

9 Now, there's a series of what I would say highly
10 questionable statements made by Mr. Williams, kind of difficult
11 statements to swallow or understand. Remember the banks
12 merged? BAC merged with Bank of America just because of him?
13 That was one thing he stated. Banks don't loan money, that's a
14 fiction. Banks don't loan money. I don't know how people are
15 buying houses if banks don't loan money, but that's what he
16 told you.

17 THE COURT: You have two minutes.

18 MR. SORENSON: Thanks, Your Honor.

19 This whole straw purchaser, all caps thing, I submit to
20 you completely ridiculous. Only the most gullible are going to
21 fall for that. This idea of straw purchaser, legal fiction,
22 I'm going to be the all caps person today, tomorrow I'll be the
23 small caps person and then I can release my mortgage. Really?

24 And even if you believe it, again, the duty to disclose,
25 right? The omission in disclosure, Hey, this view is way out

1 there, but, you know, just understand that this is way out
2 there. I'm going to do it for you, but it's probably not going
3 to work. Never. Never heard that from him.

4 The whole idea that the charges were brought because
5 Special Agent Crawley was doing an investigation and somehow
6 Mr. Williams filed a suit against her and that's why we're
7 here. Really? The Florida thing, what was it he said in
8 Florida? He was charged because he went after some judges.

9 No, Mr. Williams, I'm here to tell you, you're here
10 because you're a fraudster. You're here because you defrauded
11 people. That's why you're here. You heard the testimony, sir.
12 You heard them. They got up on the stand under oath and said
13 what you did. They told the world what you did.

14 And, ladies and gentlemen, I'm here to tell you, based on
15 the evidence in this case, Mr. Williams is guilty of every
16 count beyond a reasonable doubt.

17 Remember another thing he said that wasn't true, that each
18 of these documents has to be fraudulent. No. He knows that.
19 Each one of the charged counts has to be in furtherance of the
20 crime, doesn't have to be untruthful. It doesn't have to be
21 wrong in its own right. It just has to facilitate the scheme
22 that this man pulled.

23 Thank you so much. Appreciate your patience.

24 THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, to
25 assist you in performing your duties, you'll be provided with a

1 verdict form. Ms. Elkington has already placed that in the
2 jury deliberation room.

3 You will also have with you the exhibits that were
4 admitted into evidence. Again, Ms. Elkington has already
5 placed that in the jury deliberation room.

6 And you each have a copy of the jury instructions that
7 I've given you.

8 At this time we'll call the bailiff forward and have --

9 MR. ISAACSON: Your Honor?

10 THE COURT: Yes.

11 MR. ISAACSON: May I -- I'm talking to Mr. Williams.
12 A brief sidebar on evidentiary issue very briefly?

13 THE COURT: We can take it up after we charge the
14 jury. I need to go over some stipulations with you folks.

15 All right. So --

16 THE COURTROOM MANAGER: The bailiff?

17 THE COURT: -- come forward, and we'll have the
18 bailiff sworn in by Ms. Elkington.

19 (Bailiffs sworn.)

20 THE COURTROOM MANAGER: Thank you.

21 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

22 So, ladies and gentlemen, your first task will be to elect
23 one of your members as a foreperson. That person will preside
24 over your deliberations. Take as much time as you need to
25 deliberate on this case. Do not ever indicate on any note that

1 you write to me how you stand -- so many people voting "X," so
2 many people voting "Y."

3 If you do need to write a note to me and have a question,
4 you're welcome to do so. It does take me some time to get back
5 to you and that's because I have to share the question and my
6 proposed response to the attorneys and Mr. Williams. So I'm
7 not going to get back to you in 10 or 15 minutes. It takes a
8 while for us to put it on the record and so forth. So I just
9 want to let you know.

10 You will choose what time you wish to break for lunch, at
11 what time you want to conclude deliberations for the day, and
12 what time you want to return to court for further
13 deliberations. I just ask that you return for further
14 deliberations no later than 9:30 A.M. in order to give you a
15 full day to have your deliberations during that day.

16 Also, you have to notify the bailiff when you break for
17 lunch and the bailiff will escort you to the federal cafeteria.
18 Once you return a verdict, you're not going to get lunch at the
19 federal cafeteria. I just have to let you know 'cause I had
20 one jury that was so nervous about it, they came back with a
21 verdict and then wanted to have lunch, and it's like you're not
22 a jury any more because -- so anyway, just keep that in mind.

23 So yeah, so that's on the lunch. And then you notify the
24 bailiff when you're going to be leaving for the day. And now
25 that you're deliberating, you'll be deliberating Monday through

1 Friday until you reach a verdict in the case.

2 So, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, this case is now in
3 your hands. You are the sole judges of the facts and I
4 instruct you to begin your deliberations.

5 Please rise for the jury as they leave for their jury
6 deliberation.

7 Oh, yes. And as to the alternates, I'm so sorry, I got so
8 involved with that. Thank you so much for your service. I do
9 need to ask you -- I'm not discharging you at this time because
10 if, God forbid, something happens to one of the jurors during
11 their deliberations, we'll actually call you up and have you
12 come back to court and participate and they will start their
13 deliberations all over from the beginning.

14 Okay. So don't talk to anybody or read anything about the
15 case or do any research or investigate anyone.

16 Once a verdict is reached, we will contact you and let you
17 know and that you're released, what the verdict was and you're
18 released, and then you can talk to people. But until then you
19 need to keep yourself separated from anything. All right?

20 So thank you so much. You are excused. You can go to the
21 jury pool lounge after the jury goes to their deliberation
22 room. We really appreciate your service and patience.

23 All right. Please rise for the jury.

24 (Jury retires to commence deliberations.)

25 (Open court out of the presence of the jury.)

1 THE COURT: The record will reflect the jury's no
2 longer present. We're going to take a brief recess 'cause
3 she's going to go get the hearing device from that juror 'cause
4 I don't want her accidentally hearing what we're discussing. So
5 once -- so we'll take a brief recess, so we'll wait for
6 Ms. Elkington to come back.

7 (A recess was taken.)

8 (Open court out of the presence of the jury.)

9 THE COURT: All right. We're going to go back on
10 the record. All right. So the record will reflect the jury's
11 no longer present. Present are counsel and Mr. Williams.

12 Do the parties stipulate to the bailiff taking the jury
13 out to lunch without the necessity or formality of reconvening
14 court?

15 For the government?

16 MR. SORENSON: Absolutely, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: Mr. Williams, you're in agreement?

18 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

19 THE COURT: May we have a stipulation that
20 Ms. Elkington will inform you either by email or conveying a
21 message through the marshals to Mr. Williams when the jury
22 leaves every -- every day after deliberation and when they
23 return to deliberate in the morning?

24 Agreed, Mr. Sorenson?

25 MR. SORENSON: Yes, Your Honor, we do.

1 THE COURT: Agreed, Mr. Williams? Yes?

2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

3 THE COURT: Okay. And so may we have a stipulation
4 that if the jury does not reach a verdict by the close of
5 business, the bailiff may excuse them with the warning not to
6 discuss the case, and have them return to the jury room to
7 resume deliberations on the case no later than 9:30 in the
8 morning?

9 Mr. Sorenson?

10 MR. SORENSON: Yes, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Agreed, Mr. Williams?

12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

13 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Now, you had
14 something that you wanted to bring up?

15 MR. ISAACSON: Yes, with your permission?

16 Your Honor, I think in regard to the testimony, the
17 description of Mr. Lee's lawsuit, my understanding of 2093 is
18 pages 25 to 62 were admitted and I believe that's what -- that
19 was what was referred to. And it's in the little letters that
20 we put on our exhibits, but I believe -- I think it was in
21 evidence is my -- my belief.

22 THE COURT: There's lots of things that he showed
23 them that wasn't in evidence. So what's the problem?

24 MR. ISAACSON: Oh, well, it was commented upon that
25 he showed them something that wasn't in evidence when I just

1 thought maybe a correction can be made if it was in evidence?

2 THE COURT: Well, if it was in evidence, it'll be
3 back there in the jury deliberation room.

4 MR. ISAACSON: Well, it was used as a argument why
5 his credibility should be less, and then that's why I
6 thought --

7 MR. SORENSON: Well, but he spent -- I mean,
8 90 percent of what he said about Judge Lee was outside of the
9 record of this case, Your Honor. So --

10 THE DEFENDANT: No, it was not. It was actually the
11 evidence. Page 25 to 62 is what I was referring to. That's
12 everything I referred to is actually in those pages.

13 THE COURT: Well, if it is in the pages, it's in
14 evidence and they can look at it. So I don't know what you
15 folks are asking.

16 THE DEFENDANT: Well, because he made it appear like
17 I was presenting things that's actually not in evidence, so
18 they won't know that that was a misstatement, that what I was
19 actually showing them is actually in evidence. So I think they
20 need to be advised that, yes, what I went through with
21 Judge Lee is in evidence.

22 THE COURT: Well, I've already instructed them that
23 both of you, whatever you say is not evidence. So if
24 Mr. Sorenson argued that that wasn't in evidence, that's not
25 evidence itself. What's in evidence is what's actually in the

1 evidence cart that's now with the jury.

2 So if they want to look at that exhibit, they can look at
3 the exhibit and they can see that Richard Lee's affidavit is
4 attached to it and it was as you depicted during your argument.

5 So I'm not going to give them an additional jury
6 instruction that something was in evidence or wasn't in
7 evidence. They have everything that's in evidence. So if they
8 want to look it up and they think, Wow, Mr. Sorenson said XYZ
9 in his argument. The judge instructed us whatever Mr. Sorenson
10 says is not evidence and we're not compelled to follow it,
11 Well, let's look at that exhibit. Well, here's the exhibit and
12 this is what the affidavit of Richard Lee says.

13 THE DEFENDANT: But they don't know what he was
14 referring to, though. Like he said, I made many statements
15 that was not in evidence. Like he say, I brought many
16 exhibits. I didn't bring up no exhibit that's not in evidence.
17 Every exhibit I brought up is actually in evidence.

18 So he made this comment like, "He brought up some things
19 that is not in evidence," and there was nothing I brought up
20 that's not in evidence. So they gonna be expecting that
21 something that they not seeing was actually not in evidence
22 that I brought up and they not going to realize that it's not
23 true.

24 THE COURT: Again, whatever Mr. Sorenson says is
25 argument. It's not evidence. He can say that the moon is blue

1 or that you created the moon or that you're responsible for the
2 moon. But if it's not in evidence, then they can't rely on
3 that in making determinations of the things that they're
4 supposed to respond to on the jury verdict form.

5 If it's in evidence, they have all of the exhibits and
6 they can look for that if they want to. They have a whole list
7 of the exhibit list that identifies each of the exhibits that
8 are in evidence.

9 So if they want to, they can take a look at this and they
10 may say, Oh, well, Mr. Sorenson was wrong or right, but I have
11 already instructed them that anything that you said during
12 closing and anything Mr. Sorenson said in closing is not
13 evidence; it's argument and they are not compelled to follow
14 it.

15 And, in fact, they can't rely on your arguments as
16 evidence. They have to look at the testimony presented, their
17 recollection of the testimony, and the evidence that are
18 received. So to the extent -- I don't know what you want me to
19 do about it, but to the extent you're asking for an additional
20 jury instruction, I decline to do so because there's no basis.
21 The jury instructions given are clear that anything you and
22 Mr. Sorenson said during closing argument is not controlling on
23 the jury, that it's merely argument, not evidence, and that
24 they have all of the evidence that -- or exhibits that have
25 been received in evidence in the jury deliberation room, along

1 with a exhibit list that details all of the exhibits received.

2 So if they wish to look at that exhibit and see what
3 Richard Lee filed, they can do so.

4 All right. Anything else that we need to take up on
5 behalf of the government, Mr. Sorenson?

6 MR. SORENSON: Not from us, Your Honor. Thank you
7 very much.

8 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Williams?

9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. The issue of me -- 'cause we
10 don't know how long they going to deliberate. So having to
11 come over here and just sit in the cell, you know, is there
12 some way I could just still, say, stay at the FDC, and once
13 they get a verdict I be brought over?

14 THE COURT: You're not -- I can't compel you to come
15 every day to court, and if you choose not to, that's fine.

16 Mr. Isaacson, however, I will order to come to court every
17 day. Should the court need his presence with regard to any
18 communications from the jury or if a verdict is received, then
19 what -- normally what I have is I make sure that the attorneys
20 are within 10 to 15 minutes' travel of the courthouse.

21 If you don't choose to come to court, though, it will take
22 an extended time to receive the verdict, and that would pose a
23 problem for the jury. You're right, we can't anticipate it.

24 I'm sorry, Mr. Sorenson, is there something you wanted to
25 weigh in? I didn't --

1 MR. SORENSON: Oh.

2 THE COURT: I saw you from the corner of my eye. I
3 wasn't sure --

4 MR. SORENSON: I think we're trying to figure. I
5 don't know that Mr. Isaacson -- because he's not Mr. Williams's
6 attorney, I don't know that he can appear for him or that the
7 appearance can be waived.

8 And again, I think the Court raises a really good point.
9 If the jury comes back with a verdict, it's not going to be
10 right to have them sit around for a few hours while we wait for
11 Mr. Williams to show up.

12 THE COURT: Right.

13 MR. SORENSON: Maybe at least for the first several
14 days we'll see where we go.

15 THE COURT: Well, here's the thing is that I need
16 Mr. Isaacson to come to court because if there's any
17 communication from the jury, what I will do is I will send it
18 out to you folks so that you have it and along with a proposed
19 response by the court. And then I will either convene you in
20 the courtroom on the record or by telephone.

21 Now, if Mr. Williams is here in the holding cell, then
22 he'll be brought up and we'll have it in court because that
23 would be the most efficient way of handling that rather than
24 requiring the marshals to put him on a phone or something like
25 that.

1 So I think my thought -- and I'll hear you folks weigh
2 in -- today is Monday, the first day of the week and the first
3 day of their deliberations, so I would say that you do need to
4 be brought to court Tuesday and Wednesday.

5 By the end of the day Wednesday, let's -- if we don't have
6 a verdict, then let's talk about what we're going to do for the
7 rest of the week, what makes sense. But by Wednesday then
8 we'll have 2-and-a-half days of whether or not we get
9 communications, how often they are, and we'll have an
10 understanding of how responsive we need to be to the jury.

11 And, you know, we'll convene again. We'll carve out time
12 Wednesday afternoon. I think I have a hearing at 10:00, and
13 then we could do something in the afternoon, like 1:30, to meet
14 again to talk about how we're going to proceed for the
15 remainder of the week.

16 THE DEFENDANT: Well, the reason why I brought up
17 the issue is because I don't eat breakfast that they serve
18 'cause it's horrible. I don't eat peanut butter and jelly that
19 they give these 3-week old sandwiches, so I'ma be here all day
20 without food.

21 Also, I got my appeal that I'm still doing and I have
22 to -- you know, I got things I have to do this week, you know,
23 I got to answer, and so I can't do it here 'cause there's no
24 computer provided for me here unless he can bring his computer
25 and I could, you know, draft up my stuff in the -- I guess the

1 attorney room and he can bring my discovery thing and I can,
2 you know, look at that while I'm waiting.

3 But just to be sitting idle here for eight hours for every
4 day it's really, you know, strenuous as far as I got deadlines
5 I gotta meet and then I'm just stuck here and can't do
6 anything.

7 THE COURT: Understood. But we're all waiting for
8 the jury. So I'm not saying you're going to be brought in for
9 the next two weeks. What I'm saying is that certainly for
10 today, Tuesday, and Wednesday, that'll be the situation.

11 We'll revisit it Wednesday. If it looks like it's going
12 to be longer than that, what we're going to do -- I'm open to
13 suggestions -- but at this point you'll be brought in tomorrow,
14 Tuesday, and Wednesday.

15 THE DEFENDANT: Well, can I have some lunch brought
16 for me, like --

17 THE COURT: They are providing you with lunch, I
18 understand, and you can -- you and Mr. Isaacson can talk to the
19 marshals, you know, with regard to that if you have a allergy
20 or something like that. But I'm not going to order them to do
21 anything out of the ordinary that they -- that they don't do
22 for every other person who's brought over from FDC Honolulu.

23 Okay. So anything else that we need to take up,
24 Mr. Sorenson?

25 MR. SORENSON: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

1 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Isaacson, on behalf of
2 Mr. Williams?

3 Mr. Williams, anything else?

4 THE DEFENDANT: No.

5 THE COURT: All right. So, Mr. Williams, you're
6 remanded back to the custody of the U. S. Marshals. Should we
7 be contacted with a note or other communication from the jury,
8 we will notify you or Ms. Elkington will notify you most likely
9 by email, and then we'll notify the marshals who can notify
10 Mr. Williams, and then we'll reconvene in court.

11 All right. I wish you a very good afternoon and we're in
12 recess.

13 MR. SORENSON: Thank you.

14 (Proceedings adjourned at 1:40 P.M. until
15 Tuesday, March 3, 2020, at 8:30 A.M.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, DEBRA READ, Official Court Reporter, United States District Court, District of Hawaii, do hereby certify that pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §753 the foregoing is a complete, true, and correct transcript of the stenographically reported proceedings held in the above-entitled matter and that the transcript page format is in conformance with the regulations of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

DATED at Honolulu, Hawaii, April 11, 2020.

/s/ Debra Read

DEBRA READ, CSR CRR RMR RDR