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	) February 26, 2020
vs.	)
6	) JURY TRIAL - DAY 14
(1) ANTHONY T. WILLIAMS,	)
7	)
Defendant.	)
8	)

9

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

11

APPEARANCES:

12

For the Government:	KENNETH M. SORENSON, AUSA
13	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 I N D E X

2 CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX OF WITNESSES

3

4 DEFENDANT'S WITNESS PAGE

5

6 **ANTHONY WILLIAM (Resumed the Stand)**
Cross-Examination Resumed By Mr. Sorenson 3
7 Redirect Examination By Mr. Isaacson 91

8 GOVERNMENT'S REBUTTAL WITNESSES PAGE

9

JAMES ANTHONY SPOTA
10 Direct Examination By Mr. Sorenson 173
Cross-Examination By the Defendant 179
11

LAURICE OTSUKA
12 Direct Examination By Mr. Yates 187
Cross-Examination By the Defendant 196
13

14 I N D E X

15 E X H I B I T S

16

NO. PAGE
17

18 9-21 126
25-33 126
19 801 137
821 139
20 822 140
868 75
21 872 66
873 65
22 2028 142
2038 161
23 2232 91
2233 91
24 2234 91

25

1 WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2020 8:51 A.M.
2 (Open court in 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 14.
7 Counsel, please make your appearances for the record.
8 MR. SORENSON: Your Honor, good morning.
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: Good morning to all of you.
13 And good morning, Mr. Williams.
14 THE DEFENDANT: Private attorney general Anthony
15 Williams appearing sui juris.
16 THE COURT: All right. Good morning.
17 MR. ISAACSON: Good morning, Your Honor.
18 Lars Isaacson with Ms. Beecher at counsel table.
19 THE COURT: Good morning to both of you.
20 Mr. Sorenson, your witness.
21 MR. SORENSON: Thank you, Your Honor.
22 THE COURT: You're still under oath, Mr. Williams.
23 **ANTHONY WILLIAM, PREVIOUSLY SWORN, RESUMED THE STAND**
24 CROSS-EXAMINATION RESUMED
25 BY MR. SORENSON:

1 Q Mr. Williams, when we broke yesterday, we had just
2 started to look at a document, Exhibit 201.
3 Your Honor, this is in evidence. May I publish?
4 THE COURT: You may.
5 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) Okay. Sir, do you see 201 --
6 A Yes, I do.
7 Q -- there on the screen? You recognize this as one
8 of the financing statements that you had filed or you filed
9 for -- what? -- nearly over a hundred Hawaii homeowners?
10 A Actually over 300.
11 Q Over 300 homeowners?
12 A Yes.
13 Q Okay. Is this representative of the type of work
14 that you did for these individuals, these UCC financing
15 statements?
16 A Well, this is actually the mortgage, 201.
17 MR. SORENSON: Oh, I'm sorry. Let's go to 2 -- Your
18 Honor, give me a moment. I think that's 200. Yeah, 200, Your
19 Honor. May we publish 200?
20 THE COURT: You may.
21 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) Okay. Is this the type of
22 financing statement that you would file for Hawaii homeowners?
23 A Yes, I was.
24 Q And I think you testified earlier that you had done
25 this same type of document for I believe John Hicks over in

1 Illinois; is that correct?
2 A Yes, I did.
3 Q Okay. So looking at this document, sir, I just want
4 to direct your attention here to the -- this middle part, and
5 you've got the debtors listed here as Julieta Asuncion; is that
6 correct?
7 A That's correct.
8 Q And additional debtor as Miguel Asuncion, correct?
9 A That's correct.
10 Q And -- but you have them also listed as the
11 creditor; is that correct?
12 A That was standard.
13 Q Okay. And, I'm sorry, Mr. Williams, I get kind of
14 lost here. But is -- these are in all caps, all of these
15 names. If you could educate us again on -- on this straw
16 person thing and -- is this Julieta Asuncion, is this the
17 person or is this the flesh and blood person or the copyright
18 version of her?
19 A Well, if you look at Section No. 4 on there, there's
20 a security agreement because the Hawaii form would not let you
21 do the upper case/lower case. So in the security agreement, we
22 actually correct that. If you go down to No. 4, you'll see
23 there's a security agreement filed that actually makes that
24 distinction on that form. That's the reason why we had to do
25 the Texas UCC lien because it allowed you to do the upper case/

1 lower case which Hawaii did not allow you to do that.
2 Q And despite Hawaii not allowing you to do that, you
3 still filed this document with some type of, you say, security
4 agreement that did it?
5 A That's correct.
6 Q All right. And you heard our creditors rights
7 expert Simon Klevansky say that it's essentially nonsensical to
8 have the secured-party creditor, the creditor, to be the same
9 person as a debtor. Did you hear that?
10 A Well, he was wrong. I mean, just 'cause he don't
11 really know the UCC, he couldn't quote no UCC laws, so
12 obviously he's not a expert in UCC.
13 Q And so your contention here to this jury is that you
14 can be both a creditor and a debtor at the same time?
15 A Yes, you -- well, the debtor would be the straw man.
16 But you as the flesh and blood person is actually the creditor.
17 Q Okay. Let me get this right, I'm sorry. The
18 creditor is the flesh and blood person?
19 A That's correct.
20 Q And the debtor is who?
21 A Is the straw man.
22 Q The straw man?
23 A Yes, the legal fiction.
24 Q Okay. So the debtor is a fiction?
25 A It's a legal fiction.

1 Q Not a real person?
2 A No, it's not. Well, it's a person according to law.
3 In Black's Law Dictionary, which you should know cause you been
4 to law school, a person can be a corporation, association, law
5 firm, or any type of governmental entity.
6 Q So the debtor in this agreement is just a fiction,
7 is it fair to say?
8 A Well, it's a legal fiction.
9 Q A legal fiction?
10 A That's correct.
11 Q Okay. Let's go down to that paragraph 4 you're
12 talking about.
13 Okay. And this is the part of the agreement where
14 you state that all of the debtor's assets -- and that would be
15 the legal fiction debtor, correct?
16 A That's correct.
17 Q So if the debtor's a legal fiction, are assets then
18 a fiction also?
19 A Well, the assets under the legal fiction's name. If
20 you look at the homeowners, the mortgages, it's going -- their
21 name going to be in all capital letters. Any governmental ID
22 you get is going to be in all capital letters. So yes, that's
23 the debtor.
24 Q Okay. And as we look through here, you state
25 that -- that this agreement is embodied in a security

1 agreement; is that fair to say?
2 A That's correct. You all should have that 'cause you
3 all did a raid on my office, so you have a copy of the security
4 agreement. So you should be able to present that to the jury.
5 Q Sir, doesn't this particular paragraph indicate that
6 the debtors are the ones that have the security agreement?
7 A Well, the legal fiction has a security agreement
8 with the secure party, that's correct.
9 Q So the agreement says basically -- let's kind of
10 highlight this out. It gives a security agreement number; is
11 that correct?
12 A That's correct.
13 Q And tell the jury where does this number come from?
14 Is this something that's automatically generated by your
15 business or by the clerk's office? What's your contention
16 here?
17 A Well, it's the security agreement that I drafted on
18 behalf of the client. That's not only that security agreement,
19 but in that security agreement, which you all have a copy of
20 which you should provide to the jury, it also has a privacy
21 agreement contained in it, and also a whole harmless indemnity
22 agreement contained within that security agreement.
23 Q Sir, the fact is there is no security agreement
24 whatsoever, is there?
25 A Yes, it is. I mean, you all have it. You all

1 raided my offices. You have every client I have, you have all
2 the files.
3 Q Well, your testimony is that we have it --
4 A Yes, you do.
5 Q -- is that correct?
6 A Yes, you do.
7 Q And your testimony is is that you have not received
8 it in discovery from us; is that correct?
9 A You did not provide that.
10 Q Is it your contention then that there's some kind of
11 idea that we're going to keep the security agreements from you?
12 A That's what you do doing.
13 Q And why would that be?
14 A Because it was fully explained the legal fiction and
15 who the secured-party creditor in there.
16 Q Sir, you've received over a 100,000 pages of
17 documents from the United States in this case, have you not?
18 A Yes, I have, and I got more documents than that.
19 Q Right. And -- but your contention is is we're
20 holding back on these security agreements, right?
21 A Not only holding back on the security agreements,
22 but you're actually holding back on the law enforcement letter
23 certification that I got to get the sovereign peace officer
24 badge. Why don't you provide that one?
25 Q So your contention is we're holding that back too,

1 correct?
2 A Yes, you are.
3 Q All right. And as we look at this, this security
4 agreement number, sir, is it true that this number is simply
5 the dates of birth of these two parties that you've got here,
6 these legal fictions?
7 A Well, that's how I generated the security agreement.
8 Q Oh, it is?
9 A Yes. And that JFA, that's their actual initial.
10 Q That's right.
11 A Yes. That's how I generated for each client.
12 Q Right. And your contention is that they had a copy
13 of the security agreement?
14 A Yes, they did. They had a copy of all of this.
15 Q And you heard them testify under oath in here that
16 they did not have any documents like this?
17 A Well, you made them lie under oath and I proved that
18 they lied.
19 Q Oh, the government made them lie under oath?
20 A Yes, they did. And just like your witness Madamba
21 said she never came by your office which you had to call a
22 sidebar and let us know that she actually did, correct?
23 Q You mean Ms. Madamba who was confused on the stand
24 about --
25 A She was --

1 Q -- when she came in?
2 A She was confused.
3 THE COURT: Okay. You have to wait for him to
4 finish the question, all right, Mr. Williams?
5 Okay. Mr. Sorenson, what's the next question?
6 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) Okay. And down at the bottom
7 this is kind of the money part of this UCC agreement and it
8 states, "This mortgage will be discharged in accordance with
9 the UCC," correct?
10 A That's correct.
11 Q And your contention here is that the filing of this
12 financing statement eradicates any prior interest that anybody
13 would have in this property, correct?
14 A In law it should.
15 Q And so anybody who is legitimately loaned, for
16 instance, the Asuncions, money and has some type of interest in
17 property of theirs, your contention is you can get rid of that
18 simply by filing this financing statement?
19 A No. My contention is that the bank never actually
20 loaned them any money; that's the point. That's why you had
21 the CPB representative here and I questioned him did he ever
22 see any money and he said no, or a statement.
23 Q No, we can get to that part in a few moments, but
24 I'm asking about other interests. Your contention is that by
25 merely filing this document and putting yourself down as some

1 type of straw person debtor, that you can eradicate any
2 interests in your property whatsoever, correct?
3 A Not just by this document by itself, no. This not
4 just a 1-document -- it's not a 1-page process. I mean, you
5 know my process. I gave you all a 40-step outline of my
6 process.
7 Q Well, but your documents say this mortgage is null
8 and void, do they not?
9 A Well, the mortgage does. It -- actually after I
10 sent the QWR and the bank didn't validate the debt, it did null
11 and void the mortgage.
12 Q So your contention is then, sir, that it's the
13 mortgage that nullifies all prior interests in the property?
14 A Well, it's the bank's lack of validating and not
15 being able to validate that they actually loaned the client any
16 money that makes the prior mortgage null and void for fraud.
17 Q Well, this document says, "This mortgage will be
18 discharged." You're talking about the Asuncions' real
19 mortgage; is that correct?
20 A Well, the fraudulent mortgage that was filed by the
21 bank.
22 Q And what was the fraud in the Asuncions' mortgage,
23 if you could just tell the jury? What was the particular fraud
24 in their mortgage? I'm sure you did analysis; is that correct,
25 sir?

1 A I sent the mortgage company -- I can't remember
2 which one it was -- but I sent them a first demand for answers
3 and admissions. And in one of the questions I asked Did you
4 loan my client any lawful money? Their answer was no.
5 Q Okay. So -- and I think this is your contention
6 throughout that banks never actually loan money; is that
7 correct, sir?
8 A That's correct.
9 Q And so your entire argument about fraud in the
10 banking system rests on this one premise that banks aren't
11 actually loaning money; they're lying to people when they say
12 they're loaning the money?
13 A Exactly. And not only are they lying to people,
14 they're foreclosing on people's homes which they already got
15 paid for by converting the note that they signed into a
16 promissory note, making it into a negotiable instrument, and
17 then placing a stamp on it Paid to the Order of and crediting
18 their account instead of debiting their account.
19 Q Well -- and maybe you can help the jury out here --
20 they might be confused -- if you could. When you buy a piece
21 of property, you're loaned money to do it, right?
22 A Well, that's how it's supposed to go, but that's not
23 how it actually is.
24 Q Let me finish. Then you have to pay the seller of
25 your property money, correct?

1 A Okay. Who's paying the seller?
2 Q Well, a seller -- when you buy a house from
3 somebody, there's a seller, correct?
4 A Yes.
5 Q And money usually goes into an escrow, right?
6 A Right.
7 Q And then the seller is paid out of escrow, right?
8 A Right.
9 Q And then they typically pay off their mortgage,
10 right?
11 A Right.
12 Q Okay. So why is it the seller then somehow gets
13 money to pay off their mortgage or to simply have for selling
14 their house? Where'd that money come from?
15 A Okay. Now, let me explain it to you from the
16 beginning. Now, when the homeowner files -- signs the
17 paperwork for the mortgage and the note -- I showed you
18 before -- what's his name? Mr. Klevansky? He said he never
19 saw that on a note, the paid to the order stamp. Remember
20 that? Said he never seen that before.
21 Q No, let me ask you this, though.
22 A Let me answer it.
23 Q Yeah. While you're on that, let me ask you though.
24 Mr. Klevansky corrected you --
25 MR. ISAACSON: Objection. He should be allowed to

1 finish his answer.
2 THE COURT: So let him finish his answer.
3 Okay. What's the finish of your answer?
4 THE WITNESS: So when they put the paid to the order
5 stamp on that, if you look -- if you read the UCC, if you knew
6 the UCC, once someone put a stamp, a paid to the order of on a
7 note, it becomes a negotiable instrument. So whatever amount
8 of money that they listed on that note, that's the amount of
9 money now Bank of America gets paid or Wells Fargo or whoever,
10 Chase, whatever. Now, they just gained $520,000. They didn't
11 deduct $520,000. They just gained $520,000. So that money
12 goes to whoever they -- the seller was. So the bank never took
13 a valuable consideration, they never took a loss, and that's
14 the fraud that they're making the homeowners think that they
15 actually loaned them $520,000 from the bank and they didn't
16 loan them a dime.
17 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) Where did the money come from
18 that went to the sellers?
19 A It's -- the promissory note. It's a negotiable
20 instrument. It's money. That's why they put paid to the order
21 of. You seen the check before, it says Paid to the Order,
22 right? You seen money order Paid to the Order. That's money,
23 that's a negotiable instrument.
24 Q Okay. I'm sorry. I'm hopelessly confused, but
25 let's move on.

1 A Well, let's look at the UCC. Can we bring up the
2 UCC so I can show him?
3 THE COURT: He's going to go ask you a question and
4 you're going to give him an answer.
5 MR. SORENSON: Let's look at the next page --
6 actually, let's go to the mortgage now.
7 Your Honor, may we publish 201?
8 THE COURT: You may.
9 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) Okay. And this is -- again,
10 this is one of your standard mortgages, correct?
11 A Yes, it is.
12 Q And you did these mortgages for all of your mortgage
13 reduction clients, correct?
14 A In eight states.
15 Q In eight states?
16 A Yes, sir.
17 Q And your mortgage reduction clients here in Hawaii,
18 they all got one of these; is that correct?
19 A Yes, all my clients that I signed up, yes.
20 Q Right. And the mortgage reduction clients that you
21 had, these were all the clients that you've promised them you
22 would take over their mortgage and they would only have to pay
23 up one-half the mortgage for one-half of the term, correct?
24 A No. That was actually only one person that
25 came -- that was the Lafortezas. Everybody else was in

1 foreclosure.
2 Q Okay. But whether they were in foreclosure or not,
3 sir, let's not mix words. You signed up hundreds of people for
4 your mortgage reduction program, over a hundred here in Hawaii,
5 correct?
6 A No, I did not. If you read the MEI application, if
7 you read the homeowner service agreement, if we can pull that
8 up. You have the exhibit, right? Let's pull up the
9 application and see who the guarantee is for. You got the
10 exhibit? Let's pull up the exhibit.
11 Q Sir, what we've seen is that a great number of
12 people making monthly payments to you, one-half monthly
13 payments to you on the mortgage reduction program, correct?
14 A No. That's actually for the foreclosure. The
15 foreclosure payment is also half of whatever your mortgage
16 payment was.
17 Q So the one-half of their mortgage payments that they
18 were making to you coincidently was the same amount of money
19 you were charging them for foreclosure service?
20 A That's correct. So if you had a $500 mortgage, then
21 I would represent you for $250 a month. If you had a $1,000
22 mortgage payment, I would represent you for 500. The reason
23 why I set that, so it could be uniform to all the clients. No
24 client would get a better deal than anybody else. It was
25 uniform.

1 Q Well, but, sir --
2 A 'Cause I'm not an attorney so I don't overcharge
3 people 'cause I'm not a crook.
4 Q You've represented to people, though, that they are
5 paying one-half of their mortgage payment. Didn't you hear
6 their testimony here in court?
7 A Yes, they are paying a half of their mortgage
8 payment. But if they're in foreclosure, their foreclosure
9 payment is still half of what their mortgage payment was.
10 Q Well, you heard --
11 A That was my service fees.
12 Q You heard them testify, a vast number of them
13 testify they weren't in foreclosure. Do you remember that?
14 A They lied. We got the documentation to show that
15 they were.
16 Q Well, the documentation said they were in default;
17 isn't that correct?
18 A No, that was the Subias. They was in default in
19 2011 and they went into foreclosure.
20 Q So then you're -- I guess your testimony on that
21 front is they were simply lying; is that correct?
22 A Yes, they was, just like Henry Malinay said he
23 wasn't in foreclosure. We have the documentation here to show
24 that he was in foreclosure in 2012 and he never paid me a dime,
25 which he lied on the stand and said he paid me. He never paid

1 me. Neither did Anabel Cabebe pay me a dime.
2 Q Once again, Mr. Williams, everybody else has a
3 different version than you do, correct?
4 A Well, no. The -- actually the clients that you
5 called, she did a interview with all these clients. You all
6 won't let her report of investigation come in because those
7 same clients that you all called -- if you remember, she
8 did -- she showed up at the house unannounced and she tried to
9 get them to say something bad about me and they didn't.
10 So in her report they said I did nothing wrong; the
11 actual people that scammed them were Henry, Anabel, and Edna
12 Franco, and not me. But after they talked to you, now somehow
13 I didn't do nothing for them.
14 Q And just so the record's clear, when you start
15 pointing and saying "she," are you referencing FBI Special
16 Agent Megan Crawley?
17 A That's correct. She went around to the Hawaii
18 clients unannounced. They didn't file a complaint with her. I
19 asked every client that you put up here did they file a
20 complaint with the FBI; they said no; did they file a complaint
21 with the DCCA; they said no. They still haven't file a
22 complaint. But you induced them or coerced them to come and
23 testify and change their testimony even though some of the
24 clients had gave me affidavits five years ago.
25 Q Affidavits that you wrote for them, correct?

1 A Yeah. Don't attorneys do that? When you do a
2 declaration affidavit for a client, you type up the affidavit
3 and make sure --
4 Q Once again --
5 A Let me finish my answer.
6 Q -- I'll ask the questions.
7 A Now --
8 THE COURT: Wait, wait, wait. Stop. Ask the
9 question, give an answer.
10 All right. What's your next question?
11 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) Okay. So let's look at this
12 bogus mortgage document.
13 A It's not bogus.
14 Q Well, a court found that it was bogus, didn't it?
15 A No, it did not. There was no court found that these
16 mortgages is bogus.
17 Q That's never happened then, correct?
18 A No. No court actually found that none of these was
19 bogus.
20 Q I'm going to direct your attention -- we'll divert
21 over to Exhibit 209.
22 Your Honor, may we publish?
23 THE COURT: Is it in evidence?
24 MR. SORENSON: It is.
25 THE COURT: Okay. Yes, you may.

1 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) Okay. Sir, this is the -- this
2 is an order from the United States Bankruptcy Court here in
3 Honolulu. I'm going to ask you to look at it and ask you some
4 questions about it.
5 A Great, 'cause this is the document I definitely
6 wanted you to bring up.
7 Q Okay. Good. Well, we're going to look at the first
8 page here first off. In this action defendants are listed as
9 your company, Mortgage Enterprise Investments, correct?
10 A Right, and it should not be.
11 Q Okay. But it is, right?
12 A Right. Wrongfully. But it shouldn't be.
13 Q And so when you testified that no court has found
14 your mortgages to be bogus, were you also including the order
15 from the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of
16 Hawaii?
17 A Yes, because this is not -- it's not a valid order
18 'cause they didn't find them bogus.
19 Q Okay. But it says "Mortgage Enterprise
20 Investments," right, sir?
21 A Yes, it does.
22 Q And we've seen the documentation. This is your
23 company, right?
24 A Yeah, Mortgage Enterprise Investments is my company.
25 Q Yes, it is.

1 A But Mortgage Enterprise is not.
2 Q All right. I'm going to direct your attention first
3 off over to page 7. Go up to page 6 first off and paragraph E
4 which relates to MEI. "Cabebe and her agents" -- on page 5 of
5 8 -- "Cabebe and her agents, successors, and assigns, and ME
6 and MEI" -- that's your company, right?
7 A They included MEI wrongfully 'cause I had nothing to
8 do with ME or Anabel Cabebe at that time.
9 Q -- "and the owners, agents, or representatives" --
10 that you would be you, sir?
11 A Not in reference to Cabebe, no.
12 Q -- "together with anyone acting in concert with MEI
13 or ME or otherwise participating with MEI or ME in any conduct,
14 business, or activity pertaining to mortgage assistance, relief
15 services, or otherwise fail -- falls within the scope of either
16 Hawaii Revised Statutes Chapter 480E or the Mortgage Assistance
17 Relief Services Rule are permanently enjoined from" -- and we
18 go over to page -- next page -- "E, engaging in any and all
19 activity that involves distressed property defined in Hawaii
20 Revised Statutes 480E-2 as being any real property in which the
21 real property, 1, is in foreclosure, or" -- as we go down --
22 "is at risk."
23 Correct, sir?
24 A That's what's in her bankruptcy.
25 Q Right. And the --

1 A Did that to her.
2 Q The injunction also MEI from promoting any "debt
3 elimination service" -- on the next page, correct, at
4 subparagraph H? Do you see that? -- "promoting any debt
5 elimination service"?
6 A Well, that's for her, not for me.
7 Q You're MEI, aren't you?
8 A Well, not according to this. This they're saying
9 her ME and MEI. She was not a part of my company Mortgage
10 Enterprise Investment. So what the problem was is she was
11 misrepresenting that she was part of MEI, and so MEI should
12 never even been included in this bankruptcy.
13 Q Well, you heard the Office of Consumer Protection
14 attorney James Evers say very clearly, sir, that this order
15 directly related to you?
16 A It actually didn't. That's why I had that whole
17 stack of all the complaints. None of them was against me. But
18 you all didn't want the jury to see all those. There's not one
19 complaint against me.
20 Q This was a federal order, sir, that involves MEI, is
21 it not?
22 A Well, no, this is a bankruptcy that involves my
23 company illegally and unlawfully 'cause my company had nothing
24 to do with the victims.
25 Now, let's go to the victims page. Let's go to the

1 victims page, the name of the victims.
2 Q Bankruptcy is not a federal court? Is that what
3 you're saying to the jury now?
4 A No. It's a bankruptcy court.
5 Q Okay. Is that not a federal court?
6 A It wasn't my bankruptcy court. That's not my
7 bankruptcy. That's Anabel Cabebe's bankruptcy, not mine. Now
8 do you have one where I have a bankruptcy court order against
9 me personally? No, you do not.
10 Q Hold up, Mr. Williams. I'll ask the questions.
11 Also, sir, you're enjoined from claiming to have the
12 ability to eliminate debt, correct?
13 A That's not to me. That's to Anabel Cabebe.
14 Q And that's what you did in this case, right? You
15 told all these poor Hawaii homeowners that you could -- you
16 could get rid of their date -- or their debt, null and void
17 their debt and get them out of any obligations whatsoever to
18 their lenders; isn't that what you told them?
19 A Let me ask you something.
20 Q No, no. Answer the question.
21 A Well, I'm going to ask you --
22 THE COURT: No, no, no. You need to answer the
23 question and then you'll have an opportunity to have
24 Mr. Isaacson ask you questions on redirect. Do you understand
25 the question?

1 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I do.
2 THE COURT: And are you able to answer it?
3 THE WITNESS: Do you suffer from mental illness,
4 Mr. Sorenson?
5 THE COURT: So, Mr. Williams -- so the jury is
6 instructed to disregard the last statement by Mr. Williams.
7 Mr. Williams, if you can't answer the question, just let
8 him know, and then he'll ask you another question.
9 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) After this case probably so,
10 Mr. Williams. But let's just move on, okay?
11 A Okay. Now you have my MEI application, correct?
12 THE COURT: All right. Again, he's going to ask you
13 a question, so you need to respond to the question.
14 THE WITNESS: Okay.
15 THE COURT: And the question's too difficult or you
16 don't understand it, then you don't have to -- just let him
17 know and then he'll need to ask the question.
18 So the question he asked you before all of this is, "And
19 that's what you did in this case, right? You told all these
20 poor Hawaii homeowners that you could get rid of their debt,
21 null and void their debt and get them out of any obligations
22 whatsoever to their lenders; isn't that what you told them?"
23 And your answer is?
24 THE WITNESS: Well, the answer is what I told the
25 clients is exactly what's in the MEI application. If you look

1 at the MEI application and you look at the foreclosure
2 disclosure terms and condition, it specifically states that if
3 you in foreclosure, that you do not have a guarantee that your
4 debt can be eliminated, that I can guarantee that we can cut
5 your mortgage in half. But what we will do the best of our
6 ability to fight your foreclosure.
7 Now, that's actually in the foreclosure disclosure that
8 you all had and that you withheld from the grand jury so they
9 never actually got to saw that part of the MEI application.
10 What you actually showed them was the homeowner service
11 agreement and then you didn't show them the actual foreclosure
12 disclosure which was very deceptive.
13 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) And now I'm going to direct your
14 attention over to page 8, paragraph 10, where it states, "All
15 MEI financing statements, all MEI mortgages, all ME financing
16 statements recorded in the Bureau are declared unenforceable at
17 law or in equity and are further declared void and released."
18 Do you see that?
19 A I see, but that's erroneous.
20 Q Of course that's your contention, sir, because as
21 you've told this jury -- isn't this correct? -- no court has
22 any authority over you, right?
23 A No, not if they're violating the Constitution they
24 do not. Now, if they're in harmony with the Constitution, of
25 course.

1 Q So -- and you choose, right? You choose when
2 they're in harmony with the Constitution and when they're not,
3 right?
4 A No, I choose when they -- when they break the law.
5 I know what the law is, I know the Constitution, I know what
6 the Uniform Commercial Code says, I know what the United States
7 Code says, I know -- I know what the Code of Federal
8 Regulations says. So, yes, I do know what the law says. So if
9 a judge is out of harmony with the law, then I'm going to hold
10 them accountable just like I will hold you accountable.
11 Q And so the court has found here that all of your UCC
12 financing statements and all of your bogus mortgages truly are
13 bogus; isn't that correct?
14 A No, that's not correct, because if you go back to
15 the victims page, if you go back up, none of the victims are
16 any of these people that they claim to void the mortgage. None
17 of the victims have MEI mortgage or UCC lien 'cause these are
18 victims of ME and Anabel Cabebe and Henry Malinay, not Mortgage
19 Enterprise Investments and Anthony Williams.
20 Now, you have 47 victims. All these are the names
21 of the 47 victims on this and that's why I wanted you to bring
22 this page up. Now, none of these victims are the people that
23 you erroneously tried to void their mortgages which we had some
24 of my clients here which was Ms. Robbin Krakauer. She didn't
25 give them authority to void it. Dr. Leonard Horowitz and

1 Sherri Kane did not give them authority. So no, it's still
2 enforceable and it's still on the record.
3 Q Okay. Well, I mean, but Krakauer, she was your
4 client, right? You testified to that.
5 A Yes, she was.
6 Q And so this voids that one because it was obtained
7 through fraud, correct?
8 A No, it's not.
9 Q And I think you also indicated -- what was it? --
10 Dr. Horowitz, the dentist, right?
11 A Dr. Leonard Horowitz.
12 Q His -- his mortgage and UCC financing statement are
13 voided here, correct?
14 A No. That's what it states, but it's actually not.
15 It's still on there.
16 Q Well, no, it states that that's void. It's no
17 longer valid, correct?
18 A So -- so what you're saying is that as long as
19 something is stated in a document, that has effect of law?
20 Q Well, yes, it is a federal court order, sir. That
21 has the effect of law; isn't that correct?
22 A No, it's not.
23 Q Okay. And as we move on, we also see that voided
24 are any other mortgages that may have been created in favor of
25 MEI and filed with the Bureau, and that's over on page 11. Do

1 you see that, sir?
2 A Yeah, I see that those are just words from a judge
3 who actually didn't understand UCC law.
4 Q And then specifically talking about your UCC
5 financing statements with your straw people and all that stuff
6 and legal fictions, down there at the bottom, Y, "Any financing
7 statement that may have been recorded at the Bureau by or on
8 behalf of MEI that identified a consumer as created -- as
9 creating a lien in favor of the same consumer or a family
10 member of that consumer and which purports to discharge any
11 other liens recorded against the consumer's property, including
12 but not limited to, those financing statements recorded against
13 Cabebe's properties," all of your UCC financing statements,
14 sir, they've all been voided here, haven't they?
15 A Actually they haven't been voided because if you
16 understood UCC law, the only way you can void a UCC lien is the
17 person that actually filed the lien can void it, or it has to
18 go through a trial by jury. Now, was there a trial by jury in
19 this bankruptcy case? No, it was not. So therefore, it's
20 not -- it's void -- null and void, and I will present evidence
21 today by exhibits why someone actually tried to do this. An
22 attorney at law tried to void out one of our mortgages for one
23 of our clients that we placed on the law firm and the judge
24 denied their motion to remove the UCC because you cannot remove
25 the UCC except for the person that actually filed it, or you

1 have to go to a trial by jury.
2 Q Okay. Sir, so let's now go back to your bogus
3 mortgage document, okay?
4 A There's nothing bogus about the mortgage.
5 Q This is --
6 MR. ISAACSON: Objection to argumentative, the word
7 "bogus."
8 MR. SORENSON: I think there's factual basis for
9 that in the record now, Your Honor.
10 THE COURT: All right. Sustained. Don't refer to
11 it as a bogus mortgage.
12 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) Let's go back to your fraudulent
13 mortgage.
14 A It's not fraudulent.
15 MR. ISAACSON: Same objection, Your Honor.
16 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) I think the court's been clear
17 about that in the order; isn't that true?
18 A No, it's not.
19 MR. ISAACSON: Your Honor --
20 THE COURT: All right. So the objection is
21 sustained. Don't refer to it as a fraudulent mortgage. That's
22 what you have to prove.
23 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) Okay. Mr. Williams, let's look
24 at your mortgage document, okay? And as we look at this
25 document, it states, "The servicer" -- well, first off, it

1 talks in terms of the Asuncions being borrowers; is that
2 correct?
3 A Well, the legal fiction.
4 Q And I think you've indicated you never loan any
5 money; is that correct, sir?
6 A No, never presented that -- represented that, never
7 will.
8 Q And the truth of the fact is here the Asuncions
9 never borrowed money from anybody, did they?
10 A Well, the legal fiction.
11 Q The legal fiction?
12 A The legal fiction.
13 Q So a fake person, a fiction person, went and
14 borrowed money? Is that what your testimony is?
15 A Well, they -- if you read the whole mortgage, I
16 mean, if you go through the whole mortgage, it shows that the
17 borrower had valid consideration of however much the actual
18 loan was from the bank is in favor of the secure-party
19 creditor, which is the homeowner. That's the reason why I had
20 the mortgage drafted this way so the homeowner could have
21 superior lien and have the superior claim to their property.
22 Q But fair to say nobody borrowed any money from
23 anybody, right?
24 A Just like in a mortgage transaction from the bank.
25 Q Because no money changes hands there either?

1 A No. Well, through the note, through the note.
2 That's why I had the client sign it also, their own note.
3 Q And you're listed here as a mortgage servicer; is
4 that correct?
5 A That's correct.
6 Q And you're the servicer of this particular mortgage;
7 is that fair to say?
8 A That's correct.
9 Q And we see here you've got your fake company Federal
10 Mortgage American Trust --
11 A It's not fake.
12 Q Do you see that?
13 A It's nothing fake about Mortgage Enterprise
14 Investments.
15 Q And the secured-party creditors and the
16 beneficiaries are the Asuncions, right?
17 A That's correct.
18 Q But here we have -- is this the lower case version
19 of the Asuncions?
20 A They're the secure party. That's the flesh and
21 blood man and woman.
22 Q Okay. The flesh and blood version is going to owe
23 money to the legal fiction version?
24 A No. The legal fiction is the debtor. They're the
25 ones that owe the Asuncions.

1 Q Thank you. And down here at the bottom we see,
2 "This mortgage replaces and makes null and void the original
3 mortgage instrument."
4 Do you see that?
5 A That's correct.
6 Q And when you say "original mortgage instrument,"
7 you're talking about their real mortgage, aren't you?
8 A Well, we talking about the mortgage that was
9 fraudulently filed by the bank.
10 Q Okay. And so your contention is that that mortgage
11 by the filing of this document is just gone, correct?
12 A No, not just by the filing of this documents. Based
13 on the prior communication with the bank, sending them a RESPA
14 request, sending them a qualified written request, sending them
15 a validation of debt, sending them a litigation notice, then
16 filing the mortgage because they failed to respond and failed
17 to validate that they actually loaned the client any money.
18 Q But this says, "This mortgage makes null and void
19 the original mortgage."
20 Do you see that?
21 A No. It says, "This mortgage replaces and make null
22 and void."
23 Q Okay. So, I mean, does that matter? Is there a
24 distinction there, sir? You're saying this mortgage makes null
25 and void the original mortgage instrument, are you not?

1 A Yes, it is.
2 Q So this document itself makes their prior mortgage
3 null and void?
4 A Yes.
5 Q And that's your contention?
6 A Yes, in law it does.
7 Q And that's the contention that was rejected by the
8 bankruptcy court, correct?
9 A No, it was not rejected by the bankruptcy court.
10 Q Okay. Here it indicates, "The borrower owes the
11 secured-party creditors," and these are the borrowers owing
12 themselves as creditors the sum of $436,000; is that correct?
13 A That's correct.
14 Q Okay. And -- but I guess you're pretty clear that
15 nobody borrowed money from anybody here?
16 A That's correct, exactly. It's a negotiable
17 instrument.
18 Q So this document misrepresents the fact that there's
19 been some kind of loan that occurred; isn't that correct?
20 A No, it doesn't. What it does, the note -- you
21 didn't pull up the note that the client signed. The note which
22 is a promissory note which is a negotiable instrument
23 represents that amount of the money that's in the mortgage just
24 like the mortgage company. But in here the homeowner actually
25 owns the mortgage and the note, whereas on the mortgage that's

1 filed by the bank. They're just a tenant.
2 Q Well, okay. You brought up the note, so let's go
3 there. And this is essentially a document that has them
4 promising to pay you $436,000, correct?
5 A No, that's not correct.
6 Q No, excuse me. You're right. Promising to pay you
7 $218,000 right?
8 A That's not correct.
9 Q Okay. I'm sorry. Let's just look at this then.
10 Maybe you can help me. The original note amount is 436,000
11 bucks and change. "In return for valuable consideration that I
12 have received under the 50 percent mortgage service payment
13 reduction program" --
14 THE COURT: Did you want this published?
15 MR. SORENSON: Yes, Your Honor, if I could.
16 THE COURT: All right. You may publish.
17 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) Okay. Saying, you know, "The
18 original note amount, $436,000, in return for valuable
19 consideration that I have received" --
20 THE COURT: Okay. Slow down a little bit. Sorry.
21 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) -- "under the 50 percent mortgage
22 service payment reduction program."
23 Do you see that?
24 A Yes.
25 Q So these people are clearly in the 50 percent

1 mortgage service payment reduction program; fair to say?
2 A Well, no. They actually paying 50 percent of
3 whatever their mortgage was.
4 Q But you're saying here they're in the mortgage
5 service payment reduction program, aren't you?
6 A Mortgage service payment, not mortgage payment.
7 Mortgage service payment. Difference.
8 Q Mortgage service payment reduction program?
9 A Yes.
10 Q So this is the 50 percent deal that you give to
11 everybody, a 50 percent of your mortgage service payment to me,
12 correct?
13 A Well, it's --
14 Q And I'll make your mortgage go away?
15 A No, no. That not -- these people were in
16 foreclosure, but I still have to file the mortgage and the note
17 to protect their property interest.
18 Q Well, you've clearly said here, sir, they're in the
19 mortgage reduction program. Really?
20 A Yes. That -- everybody is in it, whether you in
21 foreclosure or whether you're not in foreclosure, you still
22 going to be half payment. That's the rate that I charged.
23 Q Only one person's in it? Everybody's in it?
24 A No, in --
25 Q Make up your mind, Mr. --

1 A No, in Hawaii there was only one person.
2 THE COURT: Don't talk over each other.
3 What's your question, Mr. Sorenson?
4 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) You've testified that only one
5 person's in it. Now you're telling the jury everybody's in it.
6 Which one is it?
7 A No, only one person had the guarantee. That's why
8 if you look at the application, if you're in foreclosure, you
9 don't get the guarantee even though your payment is still going
10 to be half payment whether you're in foreclosure or not. But
11 if you in foreclosure, you do not have the guarantee. That's
12 why the foreclosure disclosure term and conditions is in that
13 application.
14 Q So now your testimony is you just don't get the
15 guarantee, but you're still in the program, right?
16 A No. You still -- your payment is still half of
17 whatever your mortgage is. So if your mortgage is a $100, then
18 I'd still represent you for $50 a month. Doesn't matter how
19 much your payment is, it's just half. That's why you see a lot
20 of my Tennessee clients, 'cause the houses aren't as expensive
21 as here, so you have clients in Tennessee that have $300
22 payment, they pay $150 to fight their foreclosure, which I did.
23 Q All right. And then we go down here and you have
24 them promising to pay you $218,089, called the principal, to
25 the order of the mortgagee. The mortgagee is Mortgage

1 Enterprise Investments. Do you see that?
2 A And read on.
3 Q Yeah. And I see you also have Miguel and Juliet
4 Asuncion as the mortgagees as well, correct?
5 A Exactly.
6 Q And so does that somehow null and void out their
7 obligation to pay you $218,000, sir?
8 A Of course. They're not going to pay me $218,000.
9 Q Well, it says here they're obligated to, doesn't it?
10 A Well, that's what the note states, but they knew
11 they were not going to pay $218,000 because they were in
12 foreclosure.
13 Q Okay.
14 A But they knew their payment was half of whatever
15 their monthly payment was for the mortgage.
16 Q Well, you heard their testimony and they believed
17 they had this obligation to you; isn't that correct, sir?
18 A They knew that was not correct.
19 Q Because you've said that to them out on the side and
20 it's not in the agreement?
21 A No. If they felt that way, then they probably would
22 have made a complaint against me, wouldn't you agree? So none
23 of the complaints were filed against me in Hawaii, not one.
24 You still don't have one complaint against any of the clients,
25 even the ones you coerced into coming and testify.

1 Q Sir, did you hear their testimony in this case?
2 THE COURT: All right. Wait. Only one of you can
3 speak at a time. So what's your question?
4 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) Did you hear their testimony in
5 this case?
6 A Yes, I did.
7 Q And they sure seemed to have a complaint with you,
8 didn't they?
9 A No, they did not because several of them said that I
10 did absolutely nothing for them until I showed them all the
11 documents that I filed on their behalf to fight their
12 foreclosure and I showed that to be a lie.
13 Q All right. And down under Payments, you've got them
14 promising to pay to you each month $839. Do you see that?
15 A That's correct.
16 Q And you have them stating, "I will make payments on
17 the first day of each month beginning June 1st, 2013, for
18 259.94 months or 21.66 years until paid in full."
19 Do you see that?
20 A That's correct.
21 Q And this is their promise to pay you over $200,000
22 over the course of the next 21 years; fair to say?
23 A And themselves. You forgot to put -- you forgot to
24 mention that, and themselves.
25 Q Well, but there's an obligation to pay you this

1 money, is there not?
2 A Well, no, they wasn't really obligated 'cause half
3 of them didn't pay it and I still fight their foreclosure.
4 Q You took their money, though, didn't you, sir?
5 A Well, I did the work.
6 Q You took their money, didn't you?
7 A No, I didn't take their money. I worked for that
8 money.
9 Q You took their money?
10 A They hired me.
11 Q Okay. So when you were meeting with the Asuncions
12 and you were telling them about the program, did you show them
13 your fake badge at that time?
14 A I never took my badge off. My badge always stayed
15 on my hip with my handcuffs.
16 Q Is this something you displayed to people or showed
17 people or people saw?
18 A Everybody saw that. You saw it, Megan Crawley saw
19 that. She took a picture of me at the airport with that on my
20 side. I wore that everywhere proudly.
21 Q And this is something you used in the context of
22 convincing people to sign up for your program, right?
23 A No, I did not. That had nothing to do with them
24 signing up with the mortgage or the foreclosure. That had
25 nothing to do with it. Being a sovereign peace officer has

1 nothing to do with MEI.
2 Q Yet you still wore this when you were selling your
3 program?
4 A I wore it everywhere. I wore it everywhere. I wore
5 it to the FBI office. I wore it to the U.S. Marshals, wore it
6 to sheriff's department, wore it to it police station and still
7 haven't been charged for wearing a fake badge as you think it
8 is. You know it's not.
9 Q You don't agree this is a fake badge?
10 A No, it's not. You know it's not.
11 Q Mr. Williams, if the flight attendant on a Hawaiian
12 Airlines flight gives you a little set of wings when you get
13 off the plane, is that going to make you a pilot?
14 A If she do what?
15 Q If a flight attendant on a Hawaiian Airlines flight
16 gives you a little set of wings, is that going to make you a
17 pilot?
18 A Does it make you a pilot?
19 Q Is that going to make you a pilot?
20 A That has nothing to do with my sovereign peace
21 officer badge. I have a oath of office sign and I also sent it
22 to the law enforcement agencies that you know you have the
23 actual receipt for that they sent. They made that badge and
24 sent to it me.
25 Q Your oath of office, sir, was signed by you.

1 A Yes, it was.
2 Q Not by anybody else.
3 A Nobody. So the judge has oath of office. Her oath
4 of office is signed by her, not nobody else. Your oath of
5 office is signed by you and not nobody else.
6 Q Is that what you think?
7 A I know that for a fact.
8 Q You do?
9 A Yes.
10 Q You've seen my oath of office?
11 A Well, I seen a copy of what you all have to sign.
12 Q Will we see that in evidence here today?
13 A Well, I hope we do so they can see that you don't
14 have a license.
15 Q You mean a driver's license or --
16 A No. You don't have a license to practice law, sir.
17 Q Oh, I don't?
18 A No, you do not. You're a member of a private
19 association called the Hawaii Bar Association.
20 Q Well, according to to your own testimony, you are
21 too, are you not?
22 A No, I'm not.
23 Q Well, you told a judge in state court that you
24 were -- you had a certificate as to be part of the Hawaii Bar
25 Association, right?

1 A No, I said you have a certificate of admission. I
2 didn't say I have. That's a misprint. I said you have a
3 certificate of admission to the bar association, that the bar
4 association's a private corporation.
5 Q All right. Let's change gears a little bit. I just
6 want to talk about Ms. Pillos over on Maui. You remember her?
7 A Yes, I do very well, that she was scammed by Anabel
8 Cabebe and Henry Malinay, not me.
9 Q I want to nail down your testimony here is under
10 oath, is it?
11 A Yes, it is. I tell the truth, always tell the
12 truth.
13 Q You're testifying under oath that you never received
14 payments from her; is that correct?
15 A Ms. Pillos paid I think one payment in 2015 after
16 I -- after I won my case and came back.
17 Q To you?
18 A But prior to that -- no, to Mortgage Enterprise
19 Investment, to my company.
20 Q Okay.
21 A Prior to that.
22 Q Okay. It's your testimony then she never made any
23 other payments to you?
24 A She did not.
25 Q And you heard her testimony that she made her

1 payments to you, correct, sir?
2 A She made one payment.
3 Q Right.
4 A She made initial after -- which I didn't know that
5 she had the prior payments that she made to Anabel and Henry, I
6 didn't know that, and prior to that.
7 Q Okay. Are you saying that the payments that she
8 made to Mortgage Enterprise Investments actually went to them?
9 A Well, the first -- well, she testified that Anabel
10 flew over to Maui and charged her $1,500 cash and then another
11 $1,000 cash. I had no knowledge of that. I didn't know she
12 had did that.
13 Q Well, I'm talking about the payments she made to you
14 in the mortgage reduction --
15 A Well --
16 Q -- payment program.
17 A Well, in 2015 she made a initial payment. I did the
18 paperwork for her foreclosure and that's it. She never paid
19 nothing else.
20 Q Okay. And so your testimony here under oath is you
21 never received any money from her; is that correct, other than
22 that?
23 A That payment, that was it.
24 Q Okay. All right. Next I want to go into a matter
25 you've talked about a little bit here on direct examination,

1 John Edward Hicks. You remember Mr. Hicks?
2 A Yes, I do. He's a Chicago police officer.
3 Q And you've indicated that you helped Mr. Hicks; is
4 that correct?
5 A Yes, I did.
6 MR. SORENSON: Your Honor, I'm going to ask to have
7 Exhibit 2080 pulled up, page 12, and published. It's in
8 evidence.
9 THE COURT: Yes, you may publish.
10 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) Okay. Sir, as it comes up here,
11 page 12, okay, so you did a UCC financing statement for
12 Mr. Hicks; is that correct?
13 A Yes, I did.
14 Q And your testimony was this is similar or exact to
15 the ones you did over in Hawaii?
16 A Standard.
17 Q Correct?
18 THE COURT: Wait. Sorry. What's in evidence?
19 THE COURTROOM MANAGER: In evidence right now I'm
20 showing page 91 through -- 91, 62 to 64.
21 MR. SORENSON: I thought -- I thought the whole
22 thing came in. I believe the whole exhibit --
23 THE COURTROOM MANAGER: Yesterday was Monday. Thank
24 you.
25 MR. SORENSON: Whole exhibit's in, right?

1 THE COURT: All right.
2 MR. SORENSON: Whole big fat 200 and something page?
3 THE COURT: Okay. Sorry. Thank you for pausing.
4 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) Okay. So this is another one of
5 your UCC financing statements, right, sir?
6 A That's correct.
7 Q And this one's a little different though, isn't it?
8 A Yes, it is.
9 Q First off, you've got Mortgage Enterprise
10 Investments listed as a secured party here, correct?
11 A That's correct.
12 Q And you've also got John Hicks here in the lower
13 case version of him, right?
14 A That's correct.
15 Q And if I remember this correctly, this is the person
16 who's a real person, correct?
17 A As a secure party.
18 Q As the secured party. And we have kind of the same
19 thing going on here with this where you've got -- or at least
20 you contend there's a security agreement, right?
21 A That's correct.
22 Q And as we look at the bottom of this document,
23 you've indicated of course no money ever gets loaned, right?
24 A Right.
25 Q So on this -- on the public record here, sir, you

1 have -- well, we got to get in sync, don't we?
2 THE COURT: You want that removed?
3 MR. SORENSON: Yeah. Thank you.
4 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) Down here I just want to show
5 you this 'cause it is kind of interesting. All right. "Debtor
6 owes secure party $10 billion -- 10 billion U.S. dollars"?
7 A Yes.
8 Q "And secured party is -- and the secured party is
9 creditor and has a superior lien above and beyond any and all
10 liens preexisting or arising hereafter."
11 Do you see that?
12 A Yes, I do.
13 Q Did anybody loan somebody $10 billion here?
14 A The legal fiction owes the secure-party creditor.
15 He can put a price tag on his legal fiction how much he want
16 to. That's the amount he wanted to put on there, so I put that
17 on there.
18 Q All right. And so here I guess you've indicated
19 that John Hicks, the legal fiction, owes you, Mortgage
20 Enterprise Investments, $10 billion, correct?
21 A No. He owes himself -- well, his flesh and blood
22 man $10 billion.
23 Q Well, but it also has you up here, Mortgage
24 Enterprise Investments.
25 A Yes, it does.

1 Q So you're also a creditor here that's owed
2 $10 billion, aren't you?
3 A No, I'm not. That's why if you read the security
4 agreement -- and you all have that so I don't know why you
5 don't publish it -- but it states that the Mortgage Enterprise
6 Investments being on here is only for legal purposes in order
7 to defend his property interests. So if I have to go in court,
8 I can show this document that hey, I am a secure party, my
9 company is a secure party, so you can't say I cannot speak on
10 behalf of my client in court. 'Cause that's what we was
11 meeting opposition for where I was not on the UCC lien as a
12 secure-party creditor and some of the judges wouldn't let me
13 come in and argue with them. So I started putting Mortgage
14 Enterprise Investments as one of the secure party so they
15 couldn't do that to me again.
16 Q Well, the fact is, sir, this is just another one of
17 your mechanizations to try to get rid of Mr. Hick's mortgage or
18 at least tell him you're getting rid of his mortgage, correct?
19 A No, that's part of the mortgage process. That's one
20 of the process in it.
21 Q Right. And as part of this process, I think you've
22 indicated also, sir, that you had some success on this one,
23 correct?
24 A Yes, I did. Had it deleted off his mortgage, off
25 his credit bureau. You saw the credit report.

1 Q Uh-huh. And when you had it deleted, you mean that
2 the mortgage was -- was gone?
3 A Well, it was deleted completely. He didn't have to
4 pay Bank of America no more. Now, they tried to --
5 subsequently tried to come back, but we got rid of that too.
6 They tried to file a lis pendens or something like that.
7 Q Hold up just a moment. Can we look at page 92 of
8 this exhibit?
9 All right, sir, we're going to look at the deed of
10 truss here. This is a document you drafted, correct?
11 A Yes, it is.
12 Q Now, have you put a State Farm Insurance stamp up
13 there at the top left?
14 A No, I did not.
15 Q Why is that on here?
16 A 'Cause it went through the Anti-Predatory Lending
17 Database. They're the one put that and they also put the
18 FHA/VA number on there. That's not mine. That's after it went
19 through the Anti-Predatory Lending Database and we were issued
20 a certificate of exception showing that there's nothing
21 fraudulent about my company or the mortgage.
22 Q And you think that's the position of the State of
23 Illinois, that there's nothing fraudulent about MEI or CLOA?
24 A Yes, it is.
25 Q So let's look at this deed of trust while we're

1 here. First off, sir, this is your standard deed of trust
2 you've got. In this instance, though, you've got Mortgage
3 Enterprise Investments listed as the trustee, not your company
4 Federal Mortgage American Trust, correct?
5 A Correct.
6 Q Is this before you had a chance to invent that
7 company? Is that what's going on here?
8 A No. What's going on is that different states have
9 different filing requirements. Like, if you were to allow my
10 video of me in Orange County, California, where we tried to
11 file the mortgage just like this in this format, they rejected
12 it and said no, you can't file it like this. You got to have
13 the servicer, 'cause the original mortgage actually had the
14 homeowner as the servicer, the trustee, the secure party, and
15 the borrower. I had the homeowner on everything.
16 But some counties wouldn't have filed it like that.
17 So we had to conform to whatever they said to file it, and so
18 that's why this one is a little different. Because in Illinois
19 it's different than when you file in California or Hawaii or
20 Tennessee. That's why theirs is a little different.
21 Q Okay. So if we look at the bottom here, it states,
22 "This deed of trust replaces and makes null and void the
23 original deed of trust and instrument" -- and there's a number
24 there?
25 A That's correct.

1 Q -- "any other instrument preceding this document."
2 Do you see that?
3 A That's correct.
4 Q And this is consistent with what you told Mr. Hicks
5 here, that you were getting rid of his mortgage; is that
6 correct?
7 A That's correct. And he's a Chicago police officer.
8 Q And indeed, you did tell him you were getting rid of
9 his mortgage, correct?
10 A Well, after we finished all the process, yes.
11 Q All right. And on the next page you have the
12 representation that the amount of $200,953 owed to; is that
13 correct?
14 A Yes. And who is it owed to?
15 Q And you referenced the repayment of a debt, correct?
16 A Yes.
17 Q But again, on this filed document no money was
18 actually loaned, correct?
19 A Well, not the way you see money loaned, but they did
20 a promissory note just like all my other clients, and they're
21 actually the secured-party creditor on here. You don't see
22 Mortgage Enterprise Investments on here because that's how I
23 initially did it. But we met a lot of conflict with some of
24 the other county recorders. They wanted to have a mortgage
25 company or servicer there, that's the reason we had to revise

1 it in some of the states.
2 Q Now, if we can go to page 2 of 2080. You've
3 offered, sir, this TransUnion credit report as proof that the
4 bank loan has been satisfied; is that fair to say?
5 A Well, it's been deleted. I mean, there was nothing
6 to satisfy because they never -- Bank of America never loaned
7 them any money, nothing to be satisfied.
8 So what I did, I sent them not only the mortgage,
9 the UCC that was apostilled actually by the secretary of state,
10 the credit dispute letter. You see Exhibit 2080-148? I sent
11 the credit dispute letter stating he's disputing the validity
12 of the debt. Once they did their verification and saw that
13 Bank of America did not validate the debt, then they was
14 obligated to delete the mortgage off his credit report. And
15 that's the fax that he sent me and he circled and it said,
16 "Wow, I never knew that could be done."
17 Q So this document's dated December 12, 2012; is that
18 correct?
19 A That's correct.
20 Q And creditor is listed here as BAC Home Loan
21 Servicing; is that correct?
22 A That's correct.
23 Q But that's not Bank of America, is it?
24 A That was -- I think that was Bank of America.
25 Q So you believe this is Bank of America and you

1 believe this is proof that your system worked and that they
2 backed off and they -- that lien was no longer valid on the
3 property?
4 A No, it wasn't. That's why it was deleted.
5 Q And your contention to this jury, I guess what
6 you've told them, is that that is proof that your system works,
7 right?
8 A Well, that's not all the proof. You all don't
9 provide the rest of the proof. There's more than that. I got
10 proof from the Department of Housing Urban Development where
11 they actually sent the payments back to my client after I sent
12 them the documentation to show that the bank committed fraud.
13 Matter of fact, HUD sent us back a letter stating they didn't
14 want to have anything to do with the fraud that's been
15 perpetrated against my client and that they would receive no
16 more payments and sent all of my client's payments back. But
17 you all have that in the discovery, but you didn't provide that
18 to me.
19 Q Okay. So I want to direct your attention to an
20 exhibit that you haven't highlighted for the jury in the same
21 big pile of stuff in 2080. This is Document 33. All right.
22 So, sir, what you haven't told the jury is is that
23 you're fully aware that this note was actually -- and mortgage
24 was actually assigned over to Bank of America from BAC Home
25 Loans; is that correct?

1 A Well, like I said, most of the companies they
2 fraudulently assigned the mortgages, fraudulently, because they
3 try to circumvent the actual National Banking Act which says
4 that no mortgage company can hold a mortgage longer than
5 five years. So just because they assigned it, they didn't
6 assign it properly because they didn't have no interest in it,
7 and I think one of them actually tried to file a notice of lis
8 pendens to try to take the home, but they could not do it.
9 MR. SORENSON: Your Honor, could we publish this
10 document? I think 2080 is already up. If we can go to
11 page 33?
12 THE COURT: It is published. It is published.
13 MR. SORENSON: Okay. Thank you. I'm looking at the
14 wrong screen.
15 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) All right. So, sir, if we can,
16 let's look at the top here. First off, this is addressed to
17 you, Common Law Office of America, correct?
18 A That's correct.
19 Q And it looks like you've -- you've been able to fool
20 them into believing you're an attorney because they've written
21 this to you, "Anthony Williams, Esquire," correct?
22 A Right. And that's incorrect.
23 Q Right, because they believed you were an attorney
24 because you were sending them correspondence on your letterhead
25 indicating you were an attorney; isn't that correct?

1 A Well, private attorney general. You seen all of my
2 letterheads. I address myself as private attorney general,
3 attorney in law, or counselor in law, not an attorney at law.
4 Now, if they misunderstood that, they should be more
5 intelligent than that, being attorneys.
6 Q Uh-huh. And the fact is this is their notification
7 to you, as we look down, "This firm represents Bank of America
8 NA as successor by merger to BAC Home Loans Servicing."
9 Do you see that?
10 A Yes, I do.
11 Q With regard to the loan, correct?
12 A That's correct.
13 Q So this loan is still very much and this mortgage
14 are still very much active and in play and still an encumbrance
15 on this property, aren't they?
16 A No, it's not, actually. That's the reason why BAC
17 tried to merge -- give it to Bank of America, because after the
18 documents I filed, they see they couldn't get another payment
19 from the client because I had their mortgage deleted off their
20 credit file and made void. So I guess they tried to think they
21 can assign it to another company to collect on the debt, which
22 was foolish.
23 Q Well, what actually happened is TransUnion deleted
24 the BAC Home Loans's mortgage because the mortgage had been
25 assigned over to Bank of America. Isn't that the case?

1 A No, it's not. If you look at the assignment,
2 what -- you see the date that is?
3 Q I do.
4 A Yeah. It's February 25th, 2013, correct? Now, look
5 at the date of the TransUnion report.
6 Q Right.
7 A What date is that?
8 Q And that is in December of 2012?
9 A Right.
10 Q And so over two months later you're being notified
11 that this debt is still fully in play on this property?
12 A No, it's not. What I'm being notified is that BAC
13 Home Loans new they had no interest, and now they trying to
14 assign it to somebody else to see if somebody else can try to
15 take it, which they could not. My client, they end up having
16 to sell their home 'cause him and his wife end up divorcing.
17 So they end up selling their home.
18 Q Well, what happened is their home was actually
19 foreclosed upon by Bank of America, was it not?
20 A No. Bank of America actually tried, but they
21 couldn't. I did the same thing to them that I did to BAC Home
22 Loans.
23 Q Sir, the Hicks home was sold in a foreclosure
24 action. Are you aware of that?
25 A No, I was not. They actually sold the home. They

1 actually was getting divorced. So if you see the letter --
2 well, we have the letter here -- I be able to show the jury the
3 letter that I actually sent them after we did that. Also got
4 them a new car loan from the credit union, got rid of their
5 debt, and also got their bankruptcy dismissed, and they ceased
6 to make any more payments.
7 And so we sent them a letter about all the things we
8 did for them; if they was going through hardship, that we would
9 cut their payment down to $400 a month. They started sending
10 collection for $400 a month. Those checks started bouncing, so
11 we had sent a letter, courtesy letter, We did all this work for
12 you, we cut down your mortgage payment down to $400 for a
13 hardship, and then they still was bouncing checks, so we had to
14 send a letter to them.
15 MR. SORENSON: Okay. So, Your Honor, if we could,
16 I'm going to pull up Exhibit 871 -- it's not in evidence -- and
17 ask --
18 MR. ISAACSON: Your Honor?
19 THE COURT: Yes.
20 MR. ISAACSON: I would request a brief time for me
21 to discuss a matter with Mr. Williams about this exhibit.
22 MR. SORENSON: He's in cross-examination, Your
23 Honor.
24 THE COURT: To discuss the substance of the --
25 MR. ISAACSON: The exhibit itself. I'm here as

1 standby counsel, but I think in regard to this exhibit, I would
2 like to have just a brief talk with -- not -- just about this
3 one exhibit. That's the only thing, judge.
4 THE COURT: Well, he's in the middle of being
5 examined about this exhibit, so I think it's highly improper.
6 MR. ISAACSON: It would be, Judge. I'm -- I'm
7 standby counsel. I'm not trying -- I'm trying not to object as
8 much as I can.
9 THE COURT: Right.
10 MR. ISAACSON: This is a new exhibit that's here.
11 I'm not sure if Mr. Williams is going to object to this or not
12 and that's the only -- Judge, if he wanted to talk to me about
13 possible objections, I would be willing to do so, if he wanted
14 to talk to me. Does that sound right?
15 THE COURT: That sounds right.
16 MR. ISAACSON: I don't know if you want to talk to
17 me, Mr. Williams, or not.
18 THE WITNESS: I'll hear what you got to say.
19 THE COURT: All right. So not the substance of his
20 testimony.
21 MR. ISAACSON: No, just this one exhibit.
22 THE COURT: Mr. Williams, get back on the stand.
23 You're not to go anywhere until I tell you that you can leave
24 the stand. All right? Do you understand?
25 THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

1 THE COURT: All right. So, ladies and gentlemen of
2 the jury, we're going to take a recess at this time. Please
3 leave your notebooks and iPads behind. Of course, don't
4 discuss the case with anyone or allow anyone to discuss it with
5 you.
6 Please rise for the jury. We're in probably a 20-minute
7 recess. All right. We're in recess as well.
8 (A recess was taken.)
9 (Open court out of the presence of the jury.)
10 THE COURT: All right. The record will reflect that
11 the jury is not present. Present are counsel and Mr. Williams.
12 Mr. Williams, I understand you have an issue that we need
13 to take up before the jury is brought back into the court.
14 MR. ISAACSON: Let me preface quickly.
15 THE COURT: Yes, you may, Mr. Isaacson.
16 MR. ISAACSON: Judge, the 871, I asked for a brief
17 time. Mr. Williams said he wanted to talk to me. So this
18 is -- I have presented him and now I believe he wants to talk
19 about 871.
20 THE DEFENDANT: 873.
21 THE COURT: Oh, 873? Not 871?
22 THE DEFENDANT: It's the same document, but it's a
23 different exhibit. But they just gave me 873 with a certified
24 copy of 871.
25 THE COURT: I see 871 on the screen but --

1 MR. SORENSON: Your Honor, we just got 873 delivered
2 to us and so we've put the sticker on 873. 871 was a kind of a
3 placeholder for cross-examination purposes, but now we have the
4 certified copy.
5 THE COURT: Okay. All right. So let's talk about
6 873, which I'll identify for the record as a Notice of
7 Foreclosure Lis Pendens in case number 15-CH-12, and this is
8 the certified copy from Will County, Illinois.
9 So, Mr. Williams, your issue with regard to this document,
10 which is three pages?
11 THE DEFENDANT: It's several issues. The first
12 issue is I have the issue with the violation of discovery
13 rules. They had three or four years to put this in discovery
14 so I could have it prepared for this.
15 Second, I have a issue with that it was issued today's
16 date from Illinois, and I'm trying to figure out how did it
17 just get signed today and delivered to them today from
18 Illinois?
19 THE COURT: All right. This refers to a client,
20 John E. Hicks, that you testified about in direct; is that
21 correct?
22 THE DEFENDANT: Correct.
23 THE COURT: All right. And so your objection is you
24 believe that this is a violation of the discovery rules --
25 THE DEFENDANT: Right.

1 THE COURT: -- being produced in trial?
2 THE DEFENDANT: Right, because all the files on
3 Mr. Hicks they provided, I never got that. That was from them,
4 so this should have been provided also --
5 THE COURT: Okay.
6 THE DEFENDANT: -- since this is a 5-year-old
7 document.
8 THE COURT: Okay. Understood. What's your next
9 objection?
10 THE DEFENDANT: The date. Like they're saying, this
11 was actually just signed by the Will County recorders today.
12 THE COURT: Well, that's a certification that this
13 is a true and accurate copy.
14 THE DEFENDANT: Right.
15 THE COURT: Not that it was created today.
16 THE DEFENDANT: No, no, I'm saying like it was just
17 signed that it's a certified copy today and they got it today.
18 THE COURT: Okay.
19 THE DEFENDANT: And I don't see where it was mailed
20 or faxed. Like, how did they get today right like --
21 THE COURT: Okay. So you're questioning how it was
22 transferred, right?
23 THE DEFENDANT: Right.
24 THE COURT: Anything else? Any other objections?
25 THE DEFENDANT: And it's not relevant to any of the

1 charges.
2 THE COURT: All right. But it is relevant to your
3 direct examination because you brought up Mr. Hicks and you
4 said that the property had not been foreclosed on, correct?
5 THE DEFENDANT: Right -- well, I said -- well, I had
6 got their mortgage deleted off the credit report and
7 that's -- I got that from the discovery that they provided me,
8 which I did. I got it deleted off of there.
9 THE COURT: Right. And I believe your testimony
10 also was that he and his wife ended up selling the property.
11 THE DEFENDANT: Right.
12 THE COURT: 'Cause they were getting divorced.
13 THE DEFENDANT: Correct.
14 THE COURT: So they voluntarily sold the property.
15 THE DEFENDANT: Correct.
16 THE COURT: All right. So -- so this is, I
17 believe -- and I'll let Mr. Sorenson address this -- in
18 response to your direct testimony about Mr. and Mrs. Hicks and
19 their real estate.
20 So any other objections that you want to state for the
21 record? And then I'm going to have Mr. Sorenson respond.
22 THE DEFENDANT: That's my objection.
23 THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.
24 Mr. Sorenson?
25 MR. SORENSON: Well, Your Honor, as to the discovery

1 objection, that's patently ridiculous. We just heard him
2 testify. He just put the Hickses into play in this case during
3 his direct exam when he testified, you know, that they were
4 kind of the centerpiece of why his system works. And he
5 proffered that TransUnion credit union report indicating that
6 he had gotten their mortgage somehow satisfied or was gone and
7 he had circled, "Wow," as if he had -- his system had actually
8 worked.
9 This is certainly proper impeachment. Since all of those
10 documents came into evidence, Your Honor, we're going to ask
11 that this goes into evidence also to fill out the story and
12 also to impeach the defendant's testimony that he actually
13 got -- he did something with their mortgage when in truth and
14 fact he did not.
15 THE COURT: All right. So I'll give you the last
16 word, Mr. Williams, before I rule.
17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. In fact, I did get the
18 mortgage deleted off, and once I did, they tried to circumvent
19 the law to change it over. But this is only a notice. This is
20 not actually a foreclosure judgment. This has no bearing on
21 them actually selling they home because they did sell their
22 home. There's a letter in the discovery that they did provide
23 me that we sent to the Hicks regarding them having to sell
24 their home because of their divorce. That letter is also in
25 that same 2080 exhibit.

1 But this is just a notice. This has no bearing on the
2 fact that they actually did sell their house.
3 THE COURT: All right. So the court -- it is
4 relevant. It was raised in your direct examination.
5 While Mr. Williams is correct in pointing out that this is
6 merely a notice of foreclosure as opposed to an order
7 declaring -- or granting foreclosure, it is relevant, though,
8 to Mr. Williams's direct testimony with regard to Mr. Hicks's
9 property, which I believe was in the record that it was not
10 ever foreclosed on.
11 Now, whether or not the foreclosure was completed, clearly
12 this document doesn't directly speak to that, but it does have
13 relevance, and under 403 that relevant evidence outweighs any
14 prejudicial effect, that is, the potential for misleading the
15 jury. Though I will direct, Mr. Sorenson, that you do need to
16 point out, and I'm sure Mr. Williams will also point out in his
17 answers, that this is a notice of foreclosure and not an order
18 of foreclosure.
19 Further, the court's going to receive it, finding that
20 it's an exception to the rule against hearsay Rule 803 in that
21 it's a public record. Clearly it's been filed in the Circuit
22 Court of the 12th Judicial Circuit, Jolliette, Will County,
23 Illinois, relating to John E. Hicks, also known as John Edward
24 Hicks, and Katerekia T. Hicks, and it has a indication that
25 it's been certified by the Will County recorder.

1 So the 3-page document identified as Exhibit 873 is
2 received over Mr. Williams's objections.
3 Mr. Williams?
4 (Exhibit 873 received into evidence.)
5 THE DEFENDANT: Well, I would ask can I have Mr. and
6 Mrs. Hicks subpoenaed so I can have them actually testify
7 actually what they did to the house?
8 THE COURT: You can, but I don't believe they'd be
9 able to be located and brought to court before we conclude this
10 trial. If there's other documents that you wish to seek to
11 have brought in on redirect that has to do with the Hicks's
12 matter, I'll certainly take it up at that time.
13 Mr. Isaacson, do you have something?
14 MR. ISAACSON: Your Honor, there is one other new
15 document that -- I want to give Mr. Williams a chance. It's
16 872. It's Illinois Anti-Predatory Lending Database program.
17 I'm not sure if we haven't seen this before, but I did want to
18 at least have Mr. Williams have a chance. I don't know if this
19 is already in evidence.
20 MR. SORENSON: We're not going to go into that.
21 It's already in it.
22 MR. ISAACSON: Yeah, I just want to make sure while
23 he's here --
24 MR. SORENSON: He's got a certified copy.
25 MR. ISAACSON: Yeah. Okay. Mr. Williams, you've

1 heard what Mr. Sorenson said. I just wanted to make sure if
2 wanted to say something to Judge Kobayashi.
3 THE DEFENDANT: Well, I would like to enter it in as
4 a certified copy instead of a regular copy, that this is
5 certified from the Anti-Predatory Lending Database.
6 MR. SORENSON: No objection.
7 THE COURT: All right. It's received. 872 is
8 received into evidence as well. This is a --
9 MR. SORENSON: I think it has the mortgage on the
10 back, Your Honor, so it's a little beefier.
11 THE COURT: It's a 7-page document. First page is
12 entitled Illinois Anti-Predatory Lending Database Program
13 Certificate of Exception and it contains a certified seal of
14 the Will County recorder and it's been received as Exhibit 872.
15 And the execution date on the document is 10-15-2012.
16 (Exhibit 872 received into evidence.)
17 THE COURT: All right. So we ready to have the jury
18 brought in or are there any other matters we need --
19 MR. ISAACSON: Well, Judge, Ms. Beecher said that's
20 the only new stuff we have, no more new exhibits, so --
21 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
22 Mr. Williams, if you would take the stand, and,
23 Ms. Elkington, if you would get the jury. Thank you very much.
24 We're in recess.
25 (A recess was taken.)

1 (Open court in the presence of the jury.)
2 THE COURT: The record will reflect the presence of
3 the ladies and gentlemen of the jury, counsel, and
4 Mr. Williams.
5 Mr. Sorenson, your witness.
6 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) Mr. Williams, you held out John
7 Hicks and his wife Catrekia as the shining star as to how your
8 system works; is that fair to say?
9 A No. They're one of the people that I was able to
10 get their mortgage deleted off their --
11 Q And you told this jury that that's a success story
12 for you; is that fair to say?
13 A Yes, it is a success story.
14 Q And you've seen some documents here, sir. I think
15 you introduced the TransUnion credit report, correct?
16 A That's correct.
17 Q That had deleted the BAC Home Loan's credit?
18 A Yes. You see the exhibit.
19 Q And then you also saw that in truth and fact, the
20 mortgage had been assigned over to Bank of America; is that
21 correct?
22 A Well, they tried to assign it.
23 Q You're saying that it was fraudulently assigned?
24 A Yes. They tried to assign it.
25 Q Doesn't the document, though, the letter to you

1 indicate that there wasn't an assignment; it was actually just
2 a merger between those two entities?
3 A Well, it actually says that they -- Bank of
4 America's taking over, I -- the merger, but they got rid of the
5 BAC and that was just an attempt to circumvent what I had
6 previously did as far as nullifying the mortgage and voiding it
7 out and getting it deleted off their credit report.
8 Q I see. So what you're telling this jury now is that
9 BAC Home Loans and Bank of America merged together to thwart
10 your efforts in this case; is that correct?
11 A Yes. If you look at the dates and when the merger
12 happened, it happened after I got the mortgage deleted off of
13 it. Look at the dates.
14 Q So they merged to try to beat you out, huh?
15 A Well, tried to circumvent what I did, but it still
16 didn't work.
17 Q Okay. But your contention to the jury is that what
18 you did did work, right?
19 A Yes, it did.
20 Q And then there would have been no reason for a
21 foreclosure to occur on that property, correct?
22 A Well, they tried to circumvent it by filing a notice
23 of lis pendens, that is a notice, but they never got a judgment
24 because they couldn't. And if you notice on there, they
25 actually sued my company because I did have the superior lien

1 along with the Hicks on the property, so they were not able to
2 foreclose on it.
3 Q But you've told this jury under oath, sir, that the
4 BAC Home Loan's mortgage had been deleted and was no longer
5 functional; isn't that correct?
6 A It did. You will not see BOC[*sic*] on his credit
7 report nowhere. That's the reason why they had to bring in
8 Bank of America, a totally different company, to try to reissue
9 a foreclosure, but it still didn't work.
10 Q Okay. And so I want to direct your attention, now,
11 sir, to Exhibit 873. You had a moment -- I think you asked for
12 some time to look at this document; is that correct, sir?
13 A Yes. I've looked at the document.
14 Q And did you confer with Mr. Isaacson about this
15 document?
16 A Yes, I did.
17 Q Did you talk to him about it?
18 A Yes. I told him I don't think -- this document is
19 just a notice.
20 MR. ISAACSON: Objection --
21 THE COURT: Wait. I'm sorry. We're having a
22 problem with the document.
23 THE COURTROOM MANAGER: Which system are you using?
24 The docucam? Thank you.
25 THE LAW CLERK: Not all the way up. That's why

1 it's -- I think it's pointing the wrong direction.
2 THE COURT: Yeah, we're seeing the host. Okay. So
3 before we publish that, you have an objection, Mr. Isaacson?
4 MR. ISAACSON: Object as eliciting a conversation
5 Mr. Williams and I may have had as to privilege and relevance,
6 Judge.
7 THE COURT: Okay. So the fact -- don't go into any
8 specifics about what you folks discussed.
9 THE WITNESS: Okay.
10 THE COURT: Okay. 'Cause that's protected by the
11 attorney-client privilege.
12 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) Mr. Isaacson is not your
13 attorney though, is he?
14 A He's standby counsel.
15 Q He's not your attorney, though. He's not
16 representing you, right?
17 A Right. He's standby counsel.
18 Q So you and Mr. Isaacson had an opportunity to look
19 at this document together, right?
20 A Yes. I looked at it when it was up here by myself.
21 THE COURT: Do you want it published? It's not
22 published. Did you want it published?
23 MR. SORENSON: It's not in evidence yet, Your Honor.
24 THE COURT: 873?
25 MR. SORENSON: It's not.

1 THE COURT: No, I received it.
2 MR. SORENSON: Oh, you did?
3 THE COURT: I did receive it during the break, yeah.
4 MR. SORENSON: All right.
5 THE COURT: Yeah.
6 MR. SORENSON: In that case I don't have to move it.
7 You're always ahead of me. All right. In that case, Your
8 Honor, we ask to publish it?
9 THE COURT: All right. You may.
10 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) Sir, when you look at this, you
11 see that this is actually a notice of foreclosure, isn't it?
12 A Exactly. It's a notice and that's all it is.
13 Q But if you got rid of the lien, how is it that the
14 bank is foreclosing on this property?
15 A Well, if you look at the top, who it says doing the
16 notice? Bank of America, correct?
17 Q Uh-huh.
18 A The loan was with BOC[*sic*], correct? Yeah. See the
19 loan -- so that one's already done. What they tried to do is
20 merge with Bank of America thinking they can circumvent what I
21 did, but they still didn't. But look at my company is actually
22 one of the defendants, Mortgage Enterprise Investments, because
23 they knew the Anti-Predatory Lending Database that I got the
24 certificate of exception was valid, so they couldn't do
25 something. So they basically tried to sue my company to get

1 the mortgage off, which they could not do.
2 Q And these two big companies decided hey, we better
3 merge because Anthony Williams, he's out there and he's going
4 to be hard to contend with?
5 A Of course.
6 Q Of course?
7 A That's why they didn't get the foreclosure. That's
8 why they only got to that stage is as a notice and that's it.
9 Q Now, you've indicated, sir, that -- that as far as
10 Illinois goes, they had indicated that you were -- your
11 business was good to go; is that correct?
12 A Yes, the Anti-Predatory Lending Database, that's
13 correct.
14 Q And that you had conducted a lawful business in
15 Illinois and that you would receive their stamp of approval; is
16 that fair to say?
17 A Well, the Anti-Predatory Lending Database, what they
18 did is they scrutinized my mortgage and my mortgage company.
19 And before you can file a mortgage in Will County, they have to
20 scrutinize not only the mortgage documents, they have to
21 scrutinize your company to make sure there's nothing fraudulent
22 that would be predatory or anything that would be fraudulent
23 against the homeowner. Once they do that and find out there is
24 nothing fraudulent, then they issue this certificate of
25 exception, which I have got issued for my company, and then

1 they were able to file the mortgage.
2 Q Mr. Williams, but the fact is that back in November,
3 I believe, of 2014, didn't the State of Illinois issue to you
4 an order to cease and desist from unlawful residential mortgage
5 activities?
6 A Yes, they did. And will you bring up that letter,
7 please, so the jury can see that?
8 Q Okay. So you agree that they issued this, correct?
9 A Yes, they did, and I would like the jury to see
10 that.
11 MR. SORENSON: Okay. Your Honor, I'd like to first
12 off pull up Exhibit 869 -- or excuse me -- I think it's 868 and
13 have you look at it.
14 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) Mr. Williams, you recognize
15 this, correct?
16 A It's not on the screen yet.
17 Q Oh, I think it's our database. Hold on.
18 THE COURTROOM MANAGER: I can hand it to him. 868?
19 MR. SORENSON: Oh, Your Honor. I'll just use the
20 display.
21 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) I'm going to show this to you,
22 okay, Mr. Williams?
23 A Okay. And I have no objection to it coming in.
24 MR. SORENSON: I understand. I just want you to
25 identify it first off, okay?

1 THE COURT: Wait --
2 THE COURTROOM MANAGER: 868 or 869 is not in
3 evidence.
4 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Your --
5 MR. SORENSON: We've got it in here.
6 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) Okay. Sir, so you've indicated
7 that Illinois had given you the thumbs up that your business
8 was good to go in Illinois; is that fair to say?
9 A That the Anti-Predatory Lending Database approved my
10 mortgages to be filed.
11 Q And -- but subsequent to that time, after some
12 investigation into you, the State of Illinois basically said
13 Hey, you're running an unlawful business, didn't they?
14 A No. If you actually look at the document -- let's
15 pull up the document so the jury can actually see what actually
16 happened and then we can explain what happened and why this
17 letter was generated.
18 THE COURT: All right. So just answer the question.
19 You'll have an opportunity to go over whatever documents you
20 want --
21 THE DEFENDANT: Well, after --
22 THE COURT: -- on redirect that are within the
23 cross. So wait for the question.
24 All right. Mr. Sorenson.
25 MR. SORENSON: Thanks, Your Honor.

1 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) So we're looking at Exhibit 868,
2 correct?
3 A That's correct.
4 MR. SORENSON: And, Your Honor, we move this in at
5 this time.
6 THE COURT: All right. Any objection?
7 THE DEFENDANT: I have no objection.
8 THE COURT: All right. Received. Do you wish to
9 publish?
10 MR. SORENSON: I do, Your Honor. Thank you.
11 THE COURT: You may.
12 (Exhibit 868 received into evidence.)
13 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) All right. Let's bounce up in
14 this thing. Okay. First off, Mr. Williams, you recognize this
15 document?
16 A Yes, I do.
17 Q Okay. And this is issued against your company,
18 Mortgage Enterprise Investments, correct?
19 A Yes, it was.
20 Q And this was a document that -- that was after some
21 notice to you, right, that they were going after you for this?
22 A Well, no, that's not correct. This was generated
23 because your office and some of the Hawaii attorneys actually
24 called the Illinois Department of Financial because you saw
25 that I had a office in Illinois also. So Hawaii is the one

1 that actually called them to have them generate this letter
2 even though to this day I still never had a complaint from any
3 of my Illinois customers. This was a conspiracy between Hawaii
4 to do this, and that's why when you look down on the -- on the
5 document, it'll say they got a call from the State of Hawaii.
6 Q All right. We'll get down there. But first off, I
7 just want to confirm with you, sir, that this is a document
8 that you're aware of and that you received notice of it back in
9 November of 2014 --
10 A Yes, I did.
11 Q -- correct?
12 And so you'd been told at least by the State of
13 Illinois and the State of Hawaii at that juncture that you were
14 running an illegal business, correct?
15 A It was not a illegal business. No, they never said
16 that.
17 Q Okay. Well, let's look here. It states that, "This
18 is the matter of Mortgage Enterprise Investments." That's you,
19 right?
20 A Uh-huh.
21 Q And the order is to cease and desist from unlawful
22 residential mortgage activities. Did you see that?
23 A Yes, I do.
24 Q And so this isn't a letter, sir. This is actually
25 an order, is it not?

1 A Well, it's an order. It's an unlawful order based
2 on Hawaii being in conspiracy not wanting me to assist
3 homeowners, and if Hawaii would not never called, then this
4 letter would have never been generated because I already got
5 the Anti-Predatory Lending Database to approve my mortgage and
6 my mortgage company.
7 Q So the Anti-Predatory Lending Database you believe
8 trumps the order of Illinois finding that you're running --
9 A Yes, it does.
10 THE COURT: Okay. You just have to wait till he
11 finishes the question.
12 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) -- finding that you're running a
13 fraudulent business, correct?
14 A They didn't find I was running a fraudulent
15 business. If you read the letter, they said I didn't have a
16 mortgage license in Illinois. So they was trying to fine me
17 for not having a license in their state, which I told them I
18 didn't need a license because I'm not a mortgage lender, I'm
19 not a mortgage refinancer, I'm not a mortgage loan company, so
20 I don't fall under their statutes. That's why I continue to
21 help the people in Illinois and I still have zero complaints
22 from any customers in Illinois.
23 Q And they found that you had committed violations of
24 the Residential Mortgage License Act, correct?
25 A No, they could not have found that because I haven't

1 had any complaints, so how do they find that?
2 Q Okay. Well, let's look here. The Department of
3 Financial and Professional Regulation, Division of Banking,
4 having conducted an investigation into you, sir, and having
5 found violations of the Residential Mortgage License Act and
6 the Mortgage Rescue Fraud Act, hereby issues this order to
7 cease and desist from unlawful residential mortgage activity
8 and assessing fine, correct?
9 A And let's read the rest of it.
10 Q We will, but I'm asking you is that correct? Is
11 that what it says?
12 A Well, that's what it says.
13 Q Okay. And this is an order issued by the State of
14 Illinois, correct?
15 A Department of Financial and Professional Regulation.
16 Q Division of Banking?
17 A Yes.
18 Q Okay. And as you pointed out, sir, the State of
19 Hawaii, who you'd indicated had received no complaints,
20 apparently let Illinois know what you were up to here; is that
21 fair to say?
22 A Well, they, if you read it, said that they were
23 contacted by an investigator from the State of Hawaii, Division
24 of Financial Institutions concerning investigation of my Common
25 Law Office and that I had a Illinois presence. So prior to

1 this they knew I had a Illinois presence because the
2 Anti-Predatory Lending Database approved my company.
3 So after speaking with Hawaii, which I had a lawsuit
4 against, now they're saying I'm not authorized to assist people
5 in Illinois. It's kind of funny, don't you think?
6 Q Okay. And so I guess your position is is that the
7 State of Hawaii should not have notified Illinois about the
8 fraudulent complaints that they'd had against you here?
9 A There was no fraudulent complaints against me here.
10 All the complaints were against Anabel, Henry Malinay, and
11 Mortgage Enterprise. Now you still haven't presented one
12 complaint against Mortgage Enterprise[*sic*] yet because there is
13 none.
14 Q Okay. And this order states under factual findings
15 that in August 28, 2013, correct?
16 A That's correct.
17 Q And this is early on in your scheme here; is that
18 correct?
19 A It's not a scheme.
20 Q The department was contacted by an investigator from
21 the State of Hawaii, Division of Financial Institutions. Do
22 you see that?
23 A Exactly.
24 Q And they found that you'd been advertising -- Common
25 Law Office of America had been advertising on its website that

1 the company has an Illinois presence?
2 A Yes.
3 Q And the investigator also indicated that the Common
4 Law Office is affiliated with MEI. Do you see that?
5 A That's correct.
6 Q And so Common Law Office is not affiliated with
7 Mortgage Enterprises, right?
8 A I own both companies. Yes, it is. I own both
9 companies.
10 Q Are you admitting that you own Mortgage Enterprise
11 as well as Mortgage Enterprise Investments?
12 A I own Mortgage Enterprise Investments and Common Law
13 Office of America. I own those two companies.
14 Q All right. So -- but the complaint they're talking
15 about is Common Law Office of America, and that's a company
16 that is associated just with you, right?
17 A Yeah, there's no complaint in here. They're not
18 talking about any complaints. When you read down, there was no
19 complaint against me by anybody in Illinois and still no
20 complaint.
21 So this was generated based on Hawaii calling them
22 and say, Hey, make sure you all sanction this guy for not
23 having a mortgage license, which I don't have a mortgage
24 license, I would never get a mortgage license because I'm not a
25 mortgage loan originator.

1 Q But, sir, isn't it a fact that at this juncture,
2 August 28, 2013, you didn't even know about Mortgage
3 Enterprises, did you?
4 A No, I did not Mortgage Enterprise. This is not
5 Mortgage Enterprise. This is Mortgage Enterprise Investments.
6 Q Right. But you're saying --
7 A This is my company.
8 Q You're saying the State of Hawaii was complaining to
9 Illinois about the activities really of Mortgage Enterprises,
10 not of Mortgage Enterprises, Inc.?
11 A Exactly. Didn't know at the time about Mortgage
12 Enterprise, no, I did not. But you all did because you all
13 sent their letters.
14 Q But at this juncture, sir, Mortgage Enterprises had
15 not even gotten up and going, had it?
16 A Yes, it has. Do we need to bring up the documents
17 where they open the bank account on August 7, 2013?
18 Q Well, all they did was open a bank account --
19 A No, they didn't. They was writing --
20 THE COURT: Wait until he finishes the question.
21 What's your question?
22 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) And so your testimony is is that
23 they opened a bank account and then within three weeks there
24 were complaints that were being generated about them, and then
25 Hawaii notified Illinois about them, but you somehow got

1 confused in there?
2 A No, no, no. What Hawaii -- when Hawaii called
3 them -- 'cause if you notice the date, it's August 28, 2013. I
4 was incarcerated almost two weeks later for false rape and
5 child molestation charges. This is after I went to the
6 attorney general's office. So you all had this letter -- or
7 someone from the Division of Financial Institution called them
8 concerning what I was doing here. I didn't have any
9 complaints. There was no complaints here against me yet.
10 Q Okay.
11 A Still not.
12 Q We understand that's what you've been telling the
13 jury, sir.
14 A Well, that's a fact.
15 Q Okay. I'm going to look at paragraph 10 now. The
16 Department's investigation found MEI, you, were not licensed by
17 the Department to act as a residential mortgage licensee,
18 correct?
19 A And I'm not licensed in Hawaii either. I'm
20 registered.
21 Q And you would admit that, correct?
22 A Yes, I admit that.
23 Q You admit you circumvented the licensing process to
24 evade going through the application?
25 A No, I didn't, 'cause if you see the email that I

1 sent to the DCCA and tried to get my company licensed, but they
2 said there is no provision to license a company like mine
3 because my company's a foreign sovereign entity. That's the
4 reason why they couldn't license it because they don't have no
5 category for it. So I didn't circumvent anything.
6 Q Sir, isn't it true that had nothing to do with the
7 licensing, that had to do with registration of the name --
8 A No, it didn't. I already --
9 THE COURT: Wait. Let him finish the question.
10 What's your question?
11 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) The fact is, sir, that had
12 nothing to do with licensing; that had to do with the
13 registration of the name Mortgage Enterprise Investments,
14 correct?
15 A No, it did not. I had already had the name
16 registered and I was trying to get the licensing, but they said
17 there is no category for mortgage and foreclosure assistance.
18 Because I told them I don't do loans, don't do no financing, no
19 refinancing, no HELOCs, anything like that, and I'm not loaning
20 any customers money. I'm actually assisting them in getting
21 out of the fraudulent mortgage or assisting them in fighting
22 illegal foreclosure. That's what my company's for, that's what
23 I got it registered for, and you have no licensing for it.
24 Q Mr. Williams, you heard the testimony of Iris Ikeda
25 who clearly testified that you were running a business that was

1 completely subject to regulations as a licensee for your
2 mortgage reduction business?
3 A No, she didn't, because if you remember the
4 testimony, I referred her to the actual statute that said in no
5 statute did it say foreclosure assistance, mortgage assistance.
6 It says mortgage loans, modification, refinancing, and I don't
7 do anything any of those things. So how could I have a license
8 for something that I'm not offering? Now that would be fraud
9 for me to get a license for something I know I'm not doing.
10 Now that would be fraud.
11 Q Sir, her testimony was quite clear that you were
12 subject to a regulation, correct?
13 A Well, the regulation was very clear that I wasn't.
14 Q Okay. I understand you're testifying to this jury
15 you don't agree, but her testimony was clear that your business
16 is subject or was subject to the regulation of the Department
17 of Financial Institutions, correct?
18 A No, because when I questioned her, she said there
19 was no provision in the statute that said that it was a
20 licensing for my type of company, if you remember.
21 Q And the next paragraph states, "The Department's
22 investigation found MEI advertised that it only works with
23 Common Law Office customers," correct?
24 A That's correct.
25 Q And the investigation found that "Common Law Office

1 and MEI advertised to offer mortgage reduction services and
2 foreclosure assistance." You see that?
3 A That's correct.
4 Q And the Department also found that your website
5 indicated that you charge customers 500 to $1,000 as an initial
6 set-up fee, correct?
7 A That's correct.
8 Q And you understand that that is viewed to be a
9 violation of law, correct?
10 A No, it's not a violation.
11 Q All right. Well, let's look down here. The legal
12 conclusions, sir, state that your company, without a license,
13 through its agents solicited, advertised, and offered loan
14 modification services.
15 Do you see that?
16 A I did not offer loan modification service. My
17 company is not a loan modification company, so that's wrong.
18 Next?
19 Q But this is the finding in the record from Illinois,
20 correct?
21 A Well, of course it's erroneous because I'm not a
22 loan modification company. My company was setting up for loan
23 modification, so how could you find me in violation of
24 something I'm not doing?
25 Q And this is a state that you told this jury earlier

1 before we discovered this document that had given you the
2 thumbs up that your business was A-okay with Illinois, correct?
3 A Well, we got the document. You got a certified
4 copy. This is your certified copy, remember? This is your
5 exhibit.
6 Q What you're holding up is the Predatory Database for
7 the one property, correct?
8 A Yes.
9 Q Okay. That's what you're holding up, right?
10 A This certified copy you got. This is your exhibit,
11 not mine.
12 Q And that's something you believe trumps the findings
13 of the Illinois State finding that you had a fraudulent
14 company?
15 A Well, this is the Illinois State. This is State of
16 Illinois Anti-Predatory Lending Database.
17 Q What's the date on that?
18 A This is the -- November 26, 2012.
19 Q 2012?
20 A Yes.
21 Q And so this order coming out two years later clearly
22 has a very different view of your business, doesn't it?
23 A Well, of course, because you, Hawaii, called them.
24 But why would they issue this knowing that my company is not a
25 modification company, knowing they still have no complaints?

1 When you read on down, where are the complaints where they got
2 complaints of any of the homeowners? It's not on there.
3 Q Count 2 of the legal conclusion states, "Mortgage
4 Enterprise Investments charge an upfront payment before
5 performing loan modification services." They found that to be
6 in violation of Section 2, 4AA of the Act and Section 50A1 of
7 the MRFA.
8 Do you see that?
9 A Okay. Again, is my company a loan modification
10 company? No, it's not. They know it's not. So I don't fall
11 under this statute because I'm not modifying nobody's loan.
12 Q What we understand, sir, is that your company is
13 modified by you whenever it looks like you're getting nailed
14 down for whatever they've down. Isn't that the case?
15 A No, that's not the case. My company is not
16 modifying anything. My service is mortgage reduction and
17 foreclosure assistance, meaning that all the mortgages that we
18 know that come from the bank are fraudulent, and what I'm doing
19 is exposing the fraud. If they're not in foreclosure, then I
20 guarantee it. If I can't do it, then they get they refund back
21 fully refunded. If they in foreclosure, then they don't get
22 that guarantee. The guarantee they get is that I will fight
23 for them to the best of my ability and as hard as possible and
24 that's the guarantee they sign. That's the guarantee in my MEI
25 application.

1 Q Well, the fact is, sir, you tell people that you're
2 assuming their mortgage, don't you?
3 A No, the MEI mortgage -- the MEI --
4 Q No. You are assuming their real mortgage, don't
5 you?
6 A No, no, no. What we telling people after we do the
7 proper paperwork that the fraudulent mortgage that was filed by
8 the bank is now null and void.
9 Q Okay. So your testimony here under oath is that you
10 would never tell any prospective client that you were modifying
11 their loan or you were assuming their loan; is that correct?
12 A No, we don't do no modification. No, what we're
13 doing is exposing the fraud and making sure that they
14 understand the fraud that's been committed against them and get
15 them out their fraudulent mortgage payment with their bank.
16 But if they're in foreclosure, I can't guarantee that.
17 Q And just to be clear, the fraud you're talking about
18 is the fraud where they didn't get any money because the bank
19 didn't loan anything, right?
20 A Well, that's just one of the fraud. That's not all
21 of it. That's just one aspect of it.
22 Q All right. So this order concludes that, "Mortgage
23 Enterprise Investments, an unlicensed entity, shall cease and
24 desist by and through it's principals and agents from
25 soliciting, advertising, or offering to modify residential

1 mortgage loans and engaging in any other unlicensable
2 activities under the Act pursuant to Section 13D of the Act."
3 Do you see that?
4 A Yeah. Doesn't apply to my company. My company is
5 not a loan modification company.
6 Q Right. And then you were ordered to pay a fine of
7 $25,000; is that correct?
8 A I never paid that, never will pay that.
9 Q Okay. So your testimony is you did not pay this
10 fine, correct?
11 A No. Never will pay it.
12 MR. SORENSON: All right. Your Honor, that's all
13 the questions I have.
14 THE COURT: All right.
15 MR. SORENSON: Now, just a moment. I think we're
16 going to take our computer back so we can --
17 THE COURT: You may.
18 MR. SORENSON: -- rehook it up.
19 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to
20 take an early recess. I have some matters to take up with the
21 attorneys and Mr. Williams. So if you would leave your iPads
22 and your notebooks behind, and of course, don't do research or
23 Google or investigate any of the witnesses or issues.
24 So this is -- it's going to be probably closer to
25 30 minutes because we have to take up some legal matters. So

1 enjoy and have a cup of coffee or what have you, and we'll see
2 you in approximately 30 minutes.
3 Please rise for the jury. They're in recess.
4 (Open court out of the presence of the jury.)
5 THE COURT: And the record will reflect the jury's
6 no longer present. Present are Mr. Williams and counsel.
7 All right. So we're going to recess.
8 Mr. Isaacson and Mr. Williams, you'll have the courtroom
9 so you can discuss the exhibits and so forth that you wish to
10 use in your redirect. Of course, I remind you that the
11 redirect is in the same areas covered in cross-examination and
12 at -- in approximately 20 minutes I'll have Ms. Elkington check
13 with you if you folks had sufficient time. And then the plan
14 would be to bring back the jury in about 30 minutes. All
15 right?
16 So, Ms. Elkington, in about 20 minutes if you could check
17 with Mr. Isaacson and Mr. Williams if they've had sufficient
18 time to confer with regard to the exhibits they want to use in
19 redirect.
20 All right. Thank you very much. We're in recess.
21 (A recess was taken.)
22 (Open court out of the presence of the jury.)
23 THE COURT: The record will reflect the presence of
24 Mr. Williams and counsel. Are we ready for the jury?
25 MR. SORENSON: We are, Your Honor.

1 MR. ISAACSON: Yes, Your Honor.
2 THE COURT: All right. Very good. We're in recess
3 and Ms. Elkington will get the jury.
4 (Open court in the presence of the jury.)
5 THE COURT: And the record will reflect the presence
6 of the ladies and gentlemen of the jury, counsel, and
7 Mr. Williams is on the stand.
8 Mr. Isaacson, redirect.
9 MR. ISAACSON: Thank you.
10 THE COURT: And before you redirect, the court will
11 note that it's receiving the following exhibits into evidence
12 by agreement: Exhibit 2232, Exhibit -- is it 2243?
13 MR. ISAACSON: No. They're all in order, Your
14 Honor.
15 THE COURT: I'm sorry. I misread my handwriting.
16 Exhibit 2232, 2233, and 2234.
17 MR. ISAACSON: Yes, Your Honor.
18 THE COURT: All right. Those are received.
19 (Exhibits received into evidence.)
20 MR. ISAACSON: Could we have exhibit 2087, please?
21 REDIRECT EXAMINATION
22 BY MR. ISAACSON:
23 Q Mr. Williams, do you have Exhibit 2087 in front of
24 you?
25 A Yes, I do.

1 Q Without revealing the contents of it, can you
2 describe what it is?
3 A This is a document that's actually from the
4 government.
5 Q Okay. But what is it?
6 A It's a National Archives of Records Administration
7 document regarding the IRS.
8 Q Okay. How do you know that?
9 A It has the seal on the front page for the National
10 Archives and Records Administration, and it's signed by the
11 regional administrator.
12 Q So in 2087 what are you referring to certain pages
13 in that exhibit or the whole document?
14 A Probably be the whole document.
15 Q Okay. Now, how is it relevant to this case, sir?
16 A Regarding the government asserting me not paying
17 federal taxes, this is relevant, and this is -- explains why I
18 don't pay federal taxes.
19 Q Okay. Would you like me to move it into evidence?
20 A Yes.
21 MR. ISAACSON: Your Honor, on Mr. Williams's behalf,
22 I move into evidence Defense 2087 in its entirety.
23 MR. SORENSON: Was this one we agreed on?
24 THE COURT: No.
25 MR. ISAACSON: No.

1 THE COURT: 2087.
2 MR. SORENSON: I'm sorry, Your Honor. Could I just
3 have a moment?
4 THE COURT: Of course.
5 MR. SORENSON: I thought we were going over the ones
6 we agreed to.
7 THE COURT: Yes. This appears to have -- it's made
8 up of several different documents that are not related to one
9 another. So why don't we go around this area and give them an
10 opportunity to take a look at --
11 MR. ISAACSON: Okay.
12 THE COURT: -- 'cause you want the entirety of the
13 document in which is approximately --
14 MR. ISAACSON: I'll come back to it.
15 THE COURT: Okay.
16 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Let's go to the documents that
17 just were admitted.
18 Sir -- if we could pull up Defense 2232, if that
19 could be provided to him. I know it's admitted, but -- Your
20 Honor, I believe it's admitted. Request to publish it to the
21 jury?
22 THE COURT: You may.
23 MR. ISAACSON: Thank you.
24 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Okay. Mr. Williams, this is
25 Exhibit 2232. Can you explain what is this document, sir?

1 A This is a letter that I sent to the United States
2 Marshal Service headquarters in Washington, D.C.
3 Q What date, sir?
4 A September 11, 2015.
5 Q Okay. And what is -- what was the purpose of
6 sending this document?
7 A The purpose of sending this document was to notify
8 the U.S. Marshals headquarters about me forming the United
9 States Office of the Private Attorney General with other
10 private attorney generals, also sovereign peace officers, that
11 we had commission that took a oath and I'm basically letting
12 them know that we was setting up this de jure federal agency
13 and giving them an opportunity to either agree with what we
14 were doing or to disagree and show us the law where we could
15 not do this.
16 Q Okay. And so why would you go to the trouble of
17 doing this?
18 A 'Cause I want to make sure everything I'm doing is
19 lawful and according to the law.
20 Q Is there any other part of this document, other
21 pages you'd like the jury to look at?
22 A Yes. We want to just go through the document so I
23 can kind of show the jury my thinking and what I -- you know,
24 how I'm very extensively explaining to them what the law is and
25 for them to research it themselves if they didn't know, to let

1 them know what I was doing, that I'm not hiding, that I've
2 already been certified as a sovereign peace officer and private
3 attorney general, but that I was being met with opposition --
4 not everybody -- but some states I would go to, some counties,
5 I would be met with opposition, some I wouldn't.
6 So I -- this letter is basically so they can issue
7 just kind of like a nationwide letter to the different counties
8 and law enforcement agencies that I -- that we're having a
9 problem with so we don't have a problem when we go into the
10 different states.
11 Q And, Mr. Williams, it's already in evidence. We
12 don't need to go through it. But do you cite various parts of
13 the law regarding your view of de facto versus de jure?
14 A Yes.
15 Q Why is it important? Or can you please describe to
16 the jury what the difference is or why it's important to this
17 case?
18 A Because he's charging -- well, they're alleging --
19 they haven't charged me with it -- but they're alleging I don't
20 have authority to have my own ID, own badge, and things like
21 that. So I showed them that under the de jure government that
22 we could have our own ID, have our own badges, and the
23 definition between de jure and de facto is totally different.
24 Now, the de facto government is actually the
25 government that's in operation right now which are the U.S.

1 Attorney's Office, FBI, but it's not lawful.
2 If you look in Black's Law Dictionaries it's defined
3 that de facto is not the government that's following the
4 Constitution, but the de jure government is the government of
5 lawful right that's supposed to follow the Constitution, but
6 that the people right now don't actually obey because they
7 don't know that it's actually functional. And so that's when I
8 did my private attorney general ID. I did it under the de jure
9 federal agency, and that's why I named the office United States
10 Office of the Private Attorney General is under the de jure
11 federal agency and that's the reason why they couldn't charge
12 me, you know, impersonating a police officer or federal agent
13 or using the U.S. symbol because under the de jure federal
14 agency I'm allowed to use that symbol because that's actually
15 the lawful government.
16 Q Mr. Williams, the government in this case talks
17 about you doing a scheme. Was this letter -- did you just make
18 this all up out of somewhere just 'cause you don't believe it,
19 but you're trying to trick people?
20 A No. If you look at the -- on the last sentence on
21 the first page where it talks about the civil rights statutes
22 that rely on the private attorney generals, the first case was
23 actually one of the -- first case was *Newman v. Piggie Park*,
24 was one of the earliest ones that they cited where the U.S.
25 Supreme Court had ruled that when a plaintiff brings an action,

1 he can -- he cannot recover damages. If he obtains an
2 injunction, he does so not for himself alone, but also as a
3 private attorney general.
4 And so this is what I was doing as far as, you know,
5 helping the people exposed to the fraudulent foreclosures and
6 the mortgages, and the judicial corruption that I had
7 discovered throughout the states.
8 Q So, Mr. Williams, see if I understand this. You
9 sent this letter to the U. S. Marshals in the District of
10 Columbia?
11 A That's correct.
12 Q Telling them what you were doing?
13 A Yes, I was.
14 Q Citing all this law, have you read these statutes
15 you refer to?
16 A Yes, I have, very extensively.
17 Q And do you believe sincerely in what you write?
18 A Yes, I do, 'cause it's the law.
19 Q Is there anything else in this document you'd like
20 to refer the jury to?
21 A To page 3 of the document.
22 Q Mr. Williams, what about on page 3 is important for
23 the jury to see?
24 A The second paragraph where I'm explaining that
25 citizens have a common law right to actually form our own grand

1 juries. But you don't have to use the grand juries that are
2 used by the U.S. Attorney's Office or the State. You can
3 actually form your own grand jury, have to have at least 25
4 people that live in your area, and you can actually form your
5 own grand jury. And if you see where a police officer, a
6 public official, judge, anyone that's violating the law, you
7 all can actually indict them. You can actually indict them
8 under this U.S. Supreme Court case *United States v. Williams*
9 where the Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia stated that
10 American citizens have their own unbridled right to empanel
11 their own grand juries and issue their own indictment.
12 Q Why is that provision of the law important to this
13 letter and to your case here?
14 A Well, what I started doing, I started forming my own
15 grand juries in some of the other states. The two states I
16 formed them in were Florida and California. What I would do,
17 if my client had a foreclosure case, I would bring in the 25
18 grand jurors and I would have them stand up and introduce
19 themselves before the proceeding would start. And when they
20 would introduce themselves, it seemed to frighten the judge.
21 So what the judge would do, the judge would halt the proceeding
22 and transfer it to another court.
23 So we would go -- we would have to be transferred to
24 another court. We go to that judge's court, we did the same
25 thing. The grand jury stand up, introduce themselves. The

1 judge like, "No, no, no, no. I'm not having this in my court,"
2 he send me to another court. So we go to another judge court,
3 do the same thing, "Oh, no, no, no, no, no. We're not having
4 this in my courtroom." He send us to the last judge. I said,
5 "Judge, you're the last judge in the building. We can't go to
6 nobody else." They would completely just get rid of the
7 hearing because they didn't want to do these proceedings in
8 front of a grand jury that they know could violate them if they
9 violated their oath of office.
10 And so after I sent this letter -- this letter was
11 sent September 11, 2015, less than a month -- that's when I was
12 charged with unlicensed practice of law and that's when I was
13 locked up from that time basically to this one after I sent
14 this letter.
15 Q Is there anything else in this document you wish to
16 refer to, Mr. Williams?
17 A That the documents that I had requested to be
18 judicially noticed, which is their oath of office, the
19 officer's affidavit, and I cited the --
20 Q I'm sorry, sir. Is that on the screen or is that
21 some other place?
22 A Yes. It says, "Documents required to be judicially
23 noticed."
24 Q Yes, sir. Go ahead.
25 A What I was requesting is that for whoever is the

1 director or the employees of the U.S. Marshals, that according
2 to Title 5, U.S.C. 3331-3332, they have to provide us their
3 oath of office that they filed a actual oath to uphold the
4 Constitution. But they never would send it and they have to by
5 law.
6 Q All right. So anything else in this document?
7 A No, sir.
8 Q Okay. Mr. Williams, let me see if I understand what
9 you just said, though. Is this from Washington you did the
10 thing with the grand juries convening of your own, or is that
11 some other place?
12 A That was in Florida, and then I got one formed in
13 California.
14 Q Mr. Williams, are you saying you have the audacity
15 to walk into a courtroom like this or different than this --
16 A Yes.
17 Q -- and try to bring citizens to try to convene your
18 own grand jury?
19 A Yes, I did.
20 Q Did you do that for some kind of publicity stunt or
21 did you think that was really what the law required?
22 A Well, that's what the law says, U.S. Supreme Court
23 *United States v. Williams*.
24 Q Sir, if I could refer you to -- I could have him be
25 handed Defense Exhibit 2232.

1 A Yeah, that's the one I have. That's 2232.
2 THE COURTROOM MANAGER: He has it in his hand.
3 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Oh, you have it?
4 A Yeah, this the one -- the U.S. Marshals letter.
5 Q Oh, 2233. Did I say the wrong one?
6 A Yeah, you said the wrong one.
7 MR. ISAACSON: Your Honor, may I publish?
8 THE COURT: You may.
9 MR. ISAACSON: Thank you.
10 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Mr. Williams, what is 2233 -- or
11 at least the first page of it?
12 A This is part of the sentencing and trial transcript
13 for my unlawful conviction of theft -- grand theft and unlawful
14 filing of documents in Florida.
15 Q All right. So, Mr. Williams, you're not contesting
16 you were convicted of those crimes?
17 A No, I'm not contesting that.
18 Q And indeed, you have, I believe -- Judge, could we
19 look at government -- sorry. Let me -- can I back away from
20 this for one moment, Your Honor -- well, let's go do this.
21 Sorry, sorry.
22 Mr. Williams, 2333, what is it again?
23 A This is the trial transcript from my Florida case.
24 Q All right. It says Sentencing at the bottom?
25 A Right.

1 Q Is this the sentencing proceeding?
2 A Well, it's part of the sentencing and part of the
3 actual testimony in -- from one of the agents that was -- Agent
4 Lavelle who testified at the Florida that was actually a agent
5 here.
6 Q Okay. So -- and that was the one -- what's that
7 you're speaking of?
8 A This is the grand theft and unlawful filing of
9 documents.
10 Q You admit you were convicted of that?
11 A Unlawfully, yes.
12 Q What portion of this transcript would you like me to
13 refer the jury to?
14 A Page 14 first.
15 Q All right, sir, page -- bottom corner, bottom of
16 page 14?
17 A Yes.
18 MR. ISAACSON: May I publish that? I'm going to --
19 THE COURT: Yes. This document --
20 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Mr. Williams, what part of this
21 page do you want to focus the Court -- the jury's attention to?
22 A Starting from paragraph 6.
23 Q Okay. And what is this portion of the trial?
24 A This portion I was questioning the bank
25 representative. I think it was the attorney for Bank of

1 America because the premise of this fraudulent case that was
2 filed against me was that I somehow grand theft the property of
3 Bank of America, which is actually not a charge. You can't
4 grand theft a house. But that's what I was charged with,
5 stealing a house. I don't know how you steal a house on
6 concrete foundation, but that's what they charged me with.
7 I'm questioning the attorney for the bank because he
8 said that because of the documents I filed, you know, my
9 mortgage and UCC lien, that it prevented them from getting a
10 title to the property.
11 Q All right. What portion of this page would you like
12 the jury to look at?
13 A Number 6, the paragraph 6 where he say -- he
14 testified that it took two years for them to get the title
15 because of the documents that were filed.
16 Q Okay. And coupled with other filings, is
17 that -- and why is that -- those two lines, 6 to 10, why are
18 they important to this case?
19 A Because they had already had the title to the
20 property before I even got involved. So when the client had
21 actually contacted me, Bank of America already had title. So
22 they lied under oath as if the mortgage and the note that I
23 filed somehow prevented them from getting the title and it
24 didn't.
25 Q Okay. And how is that relevant to this particular

1 case?
2 A The mortgage and the note is the same type of
3 mortgage and note that I would file for clients here, the same
4 thing, but they didn't charge me with mortgage fraud or mail
5 fraud or wire fraud. They basically said that I filed a
6 mortgage and the UCC lien to actually grand theft the house
7 from Bank of America.
8 Q Okay. Is there anything else on this page you'd
9 like the jury to refer to?
10 A No. But the next page, page 15.
11 Q Going to 15?
12 A Yes.
13 Q Sir, this is 15. What part of this page would you
14 like the jury to refer to?
15 A Starting from line 7.
16 Q Okay.
17 A To about 21.
18 Q Okay. In this, the Bank of America indicates that
19 they weren't sure about Bank of America making a complaint; is
20 that correct?
21 A Yeah. I had questioned the bank attorney and I
22 directly asked him, I said, "Well, did Bank of America make a
23 complaint against me for grand theft of property?"
24 And he's like, "Well, I'm not sure."
25 And so I questioned him again, "Well, you was the

1 personal attorney for Bank of America."
2 He's like, "Yes." He said, well, he's not involved.
3 I said, "Well, did you make a complaint to
4 Detective John Calabro that I tried to grand theft or steal the
5 house at, you know, 3816 NW 83rd?"
6 He said, "No, I didn't make a complaint."
7 And so I questioned him, and there was another
8 representative from the bank and I questioned him.
9 I said, "Well, did you all make a complaint to the
10 sheriff, to the FBI, anybody, that I tried to steal or grand
11 theft the house?"
12 He was like, "No, we didn't make a complaint 'cause
13 it was a foreclosure." They say, "We was just fighting you to
14 get the property from the client that you had through the
15 foreclosure."
16 So this was a foreclosure action, so there was never
17 a complaint against me for stealing the house. It was
18 basically retaliation by Detective Calabro who had previously
19 filed 20 -- about 25 charges against me that I end up getting
20 dismissed or dropped. And so he filed these grand theft
21 charges against me on his own without any complaint from the
22 bank or the homeowner and he refused to testify at this trial
23 because he knew I would be able to bring out all the other
24 fraudulent charges he tried to charge me with.
25 So the state refused to call him as a witness, which

1 I objected to, but the judge said I couldn't force the state to
2 make the detective testify. But if he's the investigating
3 detective, I've never heard a case where a detective arrest you
4 and supposedly did the investigation didn't come and testify
5 against you, but he refused to testify.
6 Q Is there anything else on this page that you would
7 like the jury to refer to?
8 A No. Go to page 21.
9 Q And what line, sir, would you like the jury to look
10 at?
11 A It's I guess from 2 all the way down to 21. And I'm
12 questioning the attorney for Bank of America in regarding to
13 them auctioning the property because they're asserting that
14 Bank of America owned the property. And so I'm questioning
15 them saying, "Okay, sir. If Bank of America owns the property,
16 why would they have to show up to the auction and bid on
17 something they own? If they own the property, why would they
18 have to issue a bid for something you own?"
19 So I gave them an analogy. I said, "Sir, if I'm
20 selling a car and I'm selling a car at auction, I don't go to
21 the car auction and bid on my own car 'cause I'm the one
22 selling." I said, "So why would Bank of America have to bid
23 for the house that they already own?"
24 And so this is the conversation. And if you look at
25 line 13, he said, "Well, this is the way the bidding process

1 works," and he said he didn't have a specific answer to why it
2 is, but that's how it is.
3 So I asked him, I said, "Well, this is" -- this is a
4 $700,000 house that we're talking about that was foreclosed on
5 at the auction. I said, "Well, What was the highest bid for
6 this house at auction? $700,000 house?"
7 His answer was, "I believe it was $300."
8 So I'm questioning him, I'm saying, "So you telling
9 me Bank of America got a $700,000 house for $300 at auction?"
10 He says, "At the auction." He said, "But if you
11 recall by way of the original mortgage, they had already
12 purchased the home when they lent the money to Mr. Uri Angel
13 for him to possess it."
14 And go to page 22.
15 Q Okay.
16 A And so I'm questioning him, I'm saying, "Well,
17 there's a certificate of a sale and a title for the property,"
18 and I told him, I said, "Well, if someone had came there on the
19 certificate of title, the certificate of sale, it says the
20 highest and best bid was $300 cash."
21 And so I told him, I said, "Well, if I came there
22 and I had $301, so you mean to tell me I would have been able
23 to get this $700,000 house for $300?"
24 He's like, "That's not correct."
25 So I'm saying, "Well, I'm not understanding. So,

1 sir, you just said at the auction that the highest and best bid
2 was $300 for a $700,000 house. So if I would have came there
3 and outbid Bank of America for $301, why wouldn't I get the
4 house?"
5 And he's saying, "Well, that's not how it works."
6 "Well, please explain to me how does it work."
7 And this was what I was exposing that this what the
8 banks were doing. They would foreclose on people's house, show
9 up at the auction, pay -- one client I had, their house was
10 sold for $110. This client house was sold for $300. And --
11 but they're saying it's not fraud, but they own the house, but
12 they just paid for it at the auction for $300.
13 Q So, Mr. Williams, some of the issues that say -- so
14 an owner of a home, let's say half million dollar home, and you
15 owed 250,000 to Bank of America, under your scenario here, if
16 they bought it for $250,300, you would lose all your equity?
17 A Right.
18 Q Is that -- so the bank would own the house and all
19 your equity and these are the things that concerned you is
20 that --
21 A Exactly, and this is what I was exposing.
22 Q Okay. Very well. What's the next document?
23 A Page 35.
24 Q Okay. What line on this, sir?
25 A Let's see. Start at 14.

1 Q And what is the importance of this provision?
2 A This is actually the affidavit from the president of
3 Bank of America that we were able -- that actually the state
4 had put in as an exhibit from Bank of America. In the
5 affidavit, the president of Bank of America never made a
6 complaint against me, never made a complaint against the
7 homeowner that was actually living in the house for like
8 eight years.
9 And so I was questioning, "Well, if the Bank of
10 attorney -- the bank attorney for Bank of America never made a
11 complaint to the FBI or the Broward County sheriff about me,
12 about me filing the documents to keep this client in the home,
13 if the president of Bank of America filed an affidavit, didn't
14 make a complaint against me, how am I sitting here at trial for
15 grand theft of a house where the property owner and the bank
16 never filed a complaint?" And that's why I was questioning how
17 could I be here. And they basically didn't let me call any
18 witnesses. I was prevented from calling any witnesses, so I
19 didn't have no witnesses at my trial to testify.
20 But the affidavit shows that the president never
21 made a complaint, nobody never made a complaint, but I was
22 unlawfully convicted of grand theft of a house which is not
23 even a charge in Florida, but it's still on appeal right now.
24 Q Okay. Anything else on this page, sir, you wish the
25 jury to refer to?

1 A Page -- no. Page 45.
2 Q All right. What provision, sir?
3 A Where it says Joseph Dennis Lavelle.
4 Q All right.
5 A This is the FBI agent that also testified at this
6 case.
7 Q Okay. So this is a transcript of Agent Lavelle who
8 testified?
9 A Yes.
10 Q Okay. Do you want to continue past this?
11 A Yes, go to the next page. I think it's
12 page -- page 5 where he says -- well, paragraph 5 where he says
13 it's --
14 Q The next page. I'm sorry.
15 A Yeah, the next page, 46, on paragraph 4 or 5 where I
16 asked him, "Where you employed?"
17 He says he's employed by the FBI as a Special Agent.
18 Q Okay. And how's that important or relevant to this
19 case?
20 A Because when we go through it, you will see that he
21 referenced the mail and wire fraud counts that I had end up
22 being charged while I was still going through this trial right
23 here.
24 Q Okay. So --
25 A That he was in contact with Agent Crawley and the

1 U.S. Attorney's Office about these fraudulent charges they had
2 already filed even before the conclusion of this trial.
3 Q All right. So this trial, the charges against you
4 were filed in this case in 2017?
5 A That's correct.
6 Q And so this is what time -- what is the date of this
7 transcript or --
8 A This was --
9 Q June --
10 A June 23rd, 2017.
11 Q Okay. So the time -- around the time of this case,
12 you were indicted near this time?
13 A Yes. I was indicted February of 2017. So as I was
14 going through this case, that's when the U.S. Attorney's Office
15 filed a detainer for me which prevented me from getting a bond
16 in this case so I couldn't fight this case on the outside. So
17 I had to fight this on the inside being incarcerated, and
18 that's what actually prevented me from getting the witnesses on
19 my behalf because the subpoenas I had filed, the clerk never
20 filed them, so none of my witnesses was able to come to
21 actually testify, including the homeowner.
22 Q Okay. Going back to this document, is there
23 anything else on this page you'd like the jury to look at?
24 A Not on this page. Go to I think page 50.
25 Q 5-0?

1 A Yes.
2 Q Okay. Here's page -- what line would you like to
3 look at?
4 A I'm just questioning him about whether he saw my
5 video that I made in Tennessee when I confronted the FBI agent,
6 Joe Craig, in Tennessee. The court was basically objecting,
7 saying that it was irrelevant about the YouTube video of me
8 confronting the FBI agent who was lying on me, telling people
9 that I was a crook, I'm not a real minister, I change my number
10 every 30 days. And I feel like it was relevant because it was
11 a FBI agent that was fabricating lies and stories about me.
12 But the judge didn't feel like it was relevant.
13 So if you go to --
14 Q And how is this relevant to this case here?
15 A Because that's what -- they're basically the same
16 agency. The same agent is the one that testified in this case
17 based on the events that happened in this case in Florida.
18 Q Okay. Is there anything else about this page you'd
19 like to look at?
20 A No. To page 51.
21 Q What would you like to point the jury's attention to
22 on this page?
23 A Where he -- page 3 -- line 3 through 12.
24 Q Okay. And is there discussion about the affidavit?
25 Is that correct?

1 A Yes. I was questioning him about -- 'cause what
2 they did, I was in Florida, I was in Miramar. I was in my
3 Lexus and I was traveling. And of course, you know, I travel
4 without state tags, I travel without driver's license. So one
5 of the Miramar police officers got behind me, and so I looked
6 in my rear-view mirror and so, well, he kind of passed me, and
7 then he kind of went back and got behind me. And so I know he
8 was reading my tags. I'm looking at him like he's getting
9 ready to stop me, so he ended up putting his lights on. He
10 stops me, pulls me over. He said, "Mr. Williams, I pulled you
11 over."
12 I said, "Well, sir, why'd you pull me over?"
13 He said, "Well, I pulled you over 'cause" --
14 MR. SORENSON: Your Honor, I'm going to object at
15 this point on relevance and beyond the scope. I don't know
16 where this is going, but it's outside of our scope.
17 THE COURT: Okay.
18 THE DEFENDANT: Goes to the probable cause.
19 THE COURT: Well, I'm sorry. Any -- are
20 you -- you're doing the questioning, so you have to --
21 MR. ISAACSON: Yes. Mr. Williams has said he's
22 explained the relevance so far, and I have nothing to add to
23 what he just said.
24 THE COURT: So sustained.
25 All right. So ask another question.

1 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Is there anything else about
2 this transcript, sir, that is relevant to the case that we have
3 here today you'd like the jury to see?
4 A Well, go to page 52.
5 Q Okay.
6 A Well, you actually have to start at the bottom of
7 51, then come to 52.
8 Q Okay.
9 A Where I'm asking him what will constitute probable
10 cause. Like I was asking him, "What type of criminal activity
11 did -- are you alleging that you viewed me doing in order to
12 get a search warrant to search my Lexus and to get my contents,
13 my bag out the car?"
14 So when you turn onto the next page to 52, and his
15 answer was that he had probable cause for a wire fraud, mail
16 fraud, bank fraud, and money laundering. This is Agent Joseph
17 Lavelle, the FBI in Miami, and this is what he's saying that
18 they had probable cause.
19 Q Okay.
20 A And then he goes on to explain that in Hawaii
21 there's a 30-count indictment against me, so he had already
22 conferred with the Hawaii FBI office to file these
23 charges -- these current charges against me while I was going
24 through these fraudulent charges.
25 Q And why is that important to your case here?

1 A Because this is the agent that investigated my
2 Mortgage Enterprise Investments business, my Common Law Office
3 of America business not only in Florida, but he went to
4 Washington, D.C., went to New York, Tennessee, Texas, Illinois,
5 California, North Carolina, of course they coordinated with the
6 ones here. And they could not find one client that made a
7 complaint against me.
8 And so he actually testified in here that he
9 had -- he confiscated a bag that was in my car, but he never
10 outlined how he had probable cause that I had committed those
11 crimes.
12 But after they took my bag, took my computers and
13 all that and did the search, his supervisor, they declined
14 prosecution because they couldn't find no evidence of mail
15 fraud, wire fraud, bank fraud, or money laundering. And this
16 is the actual -- the information and the probable cause and the
17 search and seizure that Miami got and the content they got,
18 they sent it to FBI Hawaii, and this is what I'm being charged
19 with by the contents that was confiscated by the Miami FBI, not
20 something that they confiscated, but Miami FBI sent them the
21 things that they had seized from me and they sent it to the FBI
22 here. And they're the ones that charged me with the wire fraud
23 and the mail fraud, even though she got a bank -- got a search
24 warrant for bank fraud and money laundering, they dropped the
25 bank fraud and money laundering 'cause they went through all my

1 bank account, saw there was nothing fraudulent, they saw I
2 didn't make no money, they saw the money I made I put it back
3 into helping clients, so I never made a profit.
4 Q Mr. Williams, let me just -- so earlier in the trial
5 there was testimony from Agent Crawley and the Florida agent
6 you talked about that Florida -- the U.S. Attorneys declined
7 the case?
8 A That's correct.
9 Q Is that -- does this fit in to your -- this
10 transcript somehow?
11 A Yes. This is -- if you go to page 54, go to -- no,
12 actually, go to page 53.
13 Q 53, yes, sir.
14 A And where Agent Lavelle testified in this case, that
15 if you look at page 5, he said that they had got many witnesses
16 in this case against me, you know, when they got the search
17 warrant for mail and wire fraud, bank fraud, and money
18 laundering. He said they had many witnesses in the case
19 against me in Florida, the federal case against me in Florida.
20 And so I started questioning him, and I asked him, I
21 said, "Well, you got a search warrant for my vehicle. I'm
22 asking who in Florida" -- I asked him directly, "Well, who in
23 Florida notified your office that I was committing fraud
24 against them?"
25 And so when you go to page 54, he says, "I'm not

1 authorized to talk about that. It's an ongoing investigation."
2 So I asked him, I said, "You're not authorized?" I
3 said, "Because there is no complaints."
4 Q Hang on one second, Mr. Williams. I seem to
5 have -- what'd I do? There you go.
6 THE COURT: Very good.
7 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Sorry, Mr. Williams. Continue.
8 You're saying?
9 A Yeah. I was telling them he's saying he wasn't
10 authorized to talk about it.
11 I said, "No, you're not authorized" -- I said,
12 "You're authorized to talk about it, but there's no
13 complaints."
14 So I had asked him like seven questions, yes or no
15 questions. And so I asked him, "Do you have one complaint that
16 was filed in the FBI against me for filing fraudulent documents
17 against a homeowner in Florida?"
18 And his answer on line 18 was, "I am not authorized
19 to answer that question."
20 Q Okay. And how is that relevant to your case here?
21 A Because in this case, he stated here that there was
22 several people that -- he actually said there was two people
23 that made a complaint, which they never did. But here he say
24 he's not authorized to answer whether there were any complaints
25 against me because he knew there was none.

1 Q Is any other part of this document you'd like the
2 jury to review?
3 A Yes, page 55.
4 Q Mr. Williams, what part of this document would you
5 like the jury to refer to?
6 A From paragraph 2 on to like 18.
7 Q So line 2, go ahead.
8 A So I had questioned him, "So you investigating me in
9 Hawaii too?"
10 And he was like, "No, sir."
11 So I had asked him, "Well, how long have you been
12 investigating me?"
13 And he was saying since the end of 2014 is what he
14 said, and the beginning of 2015.
15 And I asked him, "Do you know about any other FBI
16 offices that had me under investigation? 'Cause I'm in, you
17 know, eight states."
18 And the prosecutor objected saying, "That's
19 irrelevant."
20 But I said, "He's communicating with Hawaii. He
21 just said previously that there was 30 counts of mail and wire
22 fraud that's already been filed against me in Hawaii, so, yes,
23 he's been communicating with other offices. So I want to know
24 what he's been communicating with these other offices."
25 Q Okay. Is there anything else about this page you'd

1 like to refer to?
2 A No. Go to page 56.
3 MR. SORENSON: Your Honor, I'm just going to object
4 at this point. I mean, obviously, Lavelle testified in our
5 direct case and he was also direct examined by the defendant
6 and he certainly could have commented on all this during his
7 direct examination.
8 At this juncture we are far afield. I didn't go into
9 Special Agent Lavelle's testimony at all on cross-examination,
10 Your Honor, and I think we've explored this area. It's just
11 not relevant.
12 THE COURT: All right. So I'm going to overrule the
13 objection 'cause you did go into -- Mr. Sorenson did go into
14 his Florida conviction. However, it's getting cumulative at
15 this point, so this is the last question unless you can point
16 out a different area that I'm going to allow in on the
17 transcript.
18 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Mr. Williams, is there any
19 portion of this transcript you'd like the jury to review?
20 A Just line 20 through 22.
21 Q On this page, sir?
22 A Yes, on page 56.
23 Q Okay.
24 A What I'm questioning about how did he get probable
25 cause 'cause that's where this whole case got generated from,

1 the contents they took out of my car at this unlawful stop.
2 So I'm asking him, "What gave you probable cause?"
3 I said, "On a traffic stop is that what gave you probable
4 cause, on a traffic stop?"
5 He said No, that didn't give him probable cause. So
6 he never gave what the probable cause was 'cause I never
7 committed any type of crime. And that's when he sent it to his
8 supervisor. They declined prosecution 'cause they couldn't
9 find any evidence or any wrongdoing of mail fraud, wire fraud,
10 bank fraud, or money laundering, and that's when they sent the
11 contents that they had confiscated to the FBI here, and they're
12 the ones that file these bogus mail and wire fraud charges
13 against me based on what they confiscated in Florida.
14 Q Is there anything else in this document you'd like
15 to --
16 A No, sir.
17 Q Okay. Sir if you could -- could we publish -- could
18 we give Mr. Williams a copy of 2234?
19 Your Honor, I believe it's already in evidence?
20 THE COURT: Right, it is. You may publish if you
21 wish.
22 MR. ISAACSON: May I publish?
23 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Mr. Williams, 2234, is that the
24 first page of it?
25 A Yes, it is.

1 Q What is this document?
2 A This is a federal lawsuit that I had filed against a
3 judge in Florida on behalf of one of my clients where the judge
4 had committed fraud in the foreclosure case because my
5 client -- I had submitted extensive documented evidence of
6 fraud that the bank actually forged her signature to try to
7 foreclose on her home. We actually got a handwriting
8 expert -- actually she hired four handwriting experts to show
9 that the documents was not signed by her and that the bank used
10 these fraudulently-signed documents to try to foreclose on her
11 home.
12 And we submitted this to the judge, showed her, had
13 the expert witness come and testify, and she just totally
14 disregarded all the evidence we presented. So I end up filing
15 a federal suit against the judge for not following her oath of
16 office and protecting the rights of my clients.
17 And after filing this, within seven months that's
18 when I was charged with unlicensed practice of law in Florida.
19 Q All right. So briefly, so is this Ms. Marquez?
20 A Yes.
21 Q So you're saying something's wrong with her
22 mortgage?
23 A Yes. She was in foreclosure.
24 Q Who forged what?
25 A Actually, the bank's attorneys. They had forged her

1 signature on like some assignments and things like that. So
2 she hired actually four handwriting experts to scrutinize the
3 signature, and they concluded that it was not her signature,
4 that it was forged documents.
5 Q So this was in a foreclosure action against
6 Ms. Marquez?
7 A Yes, it is.
8 Q And you helped her?
9 A Yes, I did.
10 Q And you filed these documents with the court?
11 A Yes, I did.
12 Q Judge didn't grant you relief; is that correct?
13 A No, she did not.
14 Q And this document is you decided or the decision was
15 made to sue this judge?
16 A Yes.
17 Q Judge Butchko?
18 A Yes. This actually made Channel 7News in Miami
19 about the lawsuit that I filed against this judge. Channel
20 7News came to my house, interviewed me about why I was doing
21 this for the people, what gave me authority to be a private
22 attorney general, and so I showed them all the statutes around
23 the laws and the reason why I can do what I do.
24 Q Okay. In this document do you refer to yourself as
25 an attorney at law?

1 A No, private attorney general.
2 Q Is there any part of this document you'd like the
3 jury to look at?
4 A No, sir.
5 Q You filed this suit against the judge?
6 A Yes.
7 Q Mr. Williams, so let me see if I understand this.
8 You had a mortgage, you helped this gal out the best of your
9 ability, you didn't get you what wanted, so you took a step to
10 sue a judge?
11 A Yes. And I had --
12 Q Why would you do such a thing?
13 A Well, 'cause the judge clearly didn't follow her
14 oath to protect the client's constitutional rights. I mean, we
15 clearly proved the fraud. I mean, we showed the handwriting
16 experts and they actually testified at the hearing that those
17 were not her signatures, that they actually were forged
18 signatures, and the judge still disregarded it.
19 Q Mr. Williams, have you ever heard the expression,
20 "Sometimes I don't take no for an answer"?
21 A I'm not -- not unless if it's right, then I take no
22 for an answer. But if it's wrong, I'm not going to take no for
23 an answer.
24 Q This the kind of representation you give people that
25 come to you for help?

1 A Yes, it is.
2 Q Go this far to sue a judge?
3 A Yes.
4 Q 'Cause you thought it was the right thing to do?
5 A Yes, it was.
6 Q Okay. Could we go to I guess 2087, go back there,
7 if we could. Do you have it in front of you, Mr. Williams?
8 A You had it on the screen.
9 THE COURT: Which exhibit are you looking for?
10 MR. ISAACSON: 2087, Judge, the one we started with.
11 THE COURT: Are you prepared, Mr. Sorenson, to
12 address it? They want to introduce the entire document.
13 MR. SORENSON: I am, Your Honor. I have objections
14 to certain portions of it.
15 THE COURT: Uh-huh.
16 MR. SORENSON: What I will say is, Your Honor, pages
17 9 through 11 we have no objection to.
18 Page 12 is a notice of levy we have no objection to.
19 Page 13 through 21 appear to relate to Ms. Krakauer. We
20 have no objection to that.
21 Pages 22 through 24 appear to have personal number
22 information in handwritten form that may be information the
23 Court -- I don't think it has any relevance and probably
24 doesn't need to be in the court record.
25 Pages 25 through 33 are fine with the United States.

1 Pages 1 through 10, however, completely lack relevance and
2 if they had any marginal relevance, I believe there would be a
3 confusion of the issues under Rule 403, Your Honor, and waste
4 of time because this document appears to be litigation between
5 Diversified Metal Products, Inc., and T-Bow Company Trust in
6 Boise, Idaho. There is an answer from the United States
7 related to a tax lien, Your Honor. So again, we don't see any
8 relevance to this whatsoever. Mr. Williams did testify as to
9 why he doesn't believe he owes taxes or has any tax liability,
10 but not through this document.
11 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Isaacson? So they're
12 agreeing to, without objection I think, pages 9 through 33.
13 But 1 -- I'm sorry -- 9 through 21 and then 25 to 33.
14 But they're objecting 1 through 8 and 22 to 24, and I'm
15 inclined to agree with them. I don't -- 22 to 24 seems --
16 MR. SORENSON: 22 through 24, Your Honor, you can
17 look at that.
18 THE COURT: Yeah.
19 MR. SORENSON: We're not really objecting. I think
20 the Court should be --
21 THE COURT: No, it's a waste of time. But 1 through
22 8 I think they have a point. There's no relevance and --
23 MR. SORENSON: More specifically, Your Honor, 2
24 through 8. 1 appears to be a certificate of some form.
25 MR. ISAACSON: If I could just inquire of

1 Mr. Williams on this one point on why it's relevant?
2 THE WITNESS: Yes.
3 MR. ISAACSON: Pages 2 through 8?
4 THE COURT: Okay. So I'm going to rule:
5 2 through 8's not coming in.
6 22 through 24's not coming in.
7 1 you can try to lay a foundation with regard to it. I'm
8 not quite sure what relevance there is. But --
9 And then 9 through 11, 12, 13 through 21, 25 to 33 is
10 received.
11 (Exhibits received into evidence.)
12 MR. ISAACSON: 9 through 21 and --
13 THE COURT: 9 through 11, 12, 13 through 21, 25 to
14 33.
15 MR. ISAACSON: Thank you, Your Honor.
16 Mr. Williams -- Your Honor, so I would move those in, Your
17 Honor, as you have.
18 THE COURT: Right. It's received, yes.
19 MR. ISAACSON: Thank you. May I publish, Your
20 Honor, these pages?
21 THE COURT: Yes. 1's not in. Are you going to put
22 1 in?
23 MR. ISAACSON: No, Judge. It relates to the
24 documents --
25 THE WITNESS: We need to put 1 in.

1 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) You want, Mr. Williams?
2 A Yes, because this is from the National Archives and
3 Records Administration and this is what I rely on why I don't
4 pay taxes.
5 MR. SORENSON: Well, I think 1 relates to the pages
6 we object to, Your Honor. So 1 through 9 -- or 1 through 8
7 would be objectionable. The rest of them do not relate to
8 page 1 at all.
9 THE DEFENDANT: And he misrepresented --
10 THE COURT: So wait. Mr. Isaacson you wanted --
11 instead of testifying in a narrative with a time limit, you
12 wanted to have him ask you questions, so he's handling the
13 objections as well.
14 All right. So 1 through 8 are not coming in then --
15 MR. ISAACSON: Very well.
16 THE COURT: -- if they have to do with 2 through 8.
17 It doesn't make sense. Okay. So the rest of it's coming in
18 which I've indicated.
19 So what's your questions with regard to this exhibit?
20 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Mr. Williams, you don't pay
21 taxes, right?
22 A No, I don't, not federal taxes.
23 Q Not federal taxes?
24 A No, I do not.
25 Q Why don't you pay federal taxes without -- we're

1 into hearsay. What is your understanding as to why you're not
2 paying taxes?
3 A Well, because I wrote the FBI -- I mean, the IRS
4 personally and sent them a copy of this National Archives
5 document that was filed against them. This is a federal court
6 case that was filed against the IRS where the IRS admits on the
7 record that they are not an agency of the federal government;
8 they're a private corporation.
9 Q Let me just -- so you're aware of a federal case you
10 have read?
11 A Yes.
12 Q That -- what are you aware of in that document?
13 A That the IRS admits on the record that they are not
14 an agency of the United States Government.
15 Q And why is that important?
16 A Because they're making American citizens think
17 they're a governmental agency that the American people have to
18 pay and obey and they do not.
19 And so I sent this and a letter to the U.S. -- to
20 the IRS, and one of the letters is similar to the letter that's
21 on page 13.
22 Q Okay. That's in, I think.
23 A Yes.
24 Q All right. If we could publish page 13. I think
25 that's my job. Okay. Sorry, Your Honor. All out of order.

1 Okay. Mr. Williams, on page 13 -- can we publish
2 this, please?
3 THE COURT: Yes, you may.
4 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Okay. Mr. Williams, is this the
5 document you're talking about?
6 A Yes, it is.
7 Q What is important about this document?
8 A This document is actually one of the type of
9 documents I would send to the IRS if I have a client that's
10 either their funds have been confiscated by the IRS or if the
11 IRS sent them a letter stating they're going to confiscate
12 their funds, I will send a letter like this demanding that the
13 IRS show us the law requiring Americans to pay mandatory taxes
14 on their income, the regulatory authority and the delegated
15 authority to address them as a debtor, the law which made the
16 IRS a part of the Constitution. I ask for the agent's oath of
17 office. I ask for the contract with the both signatures of the
18 IRS agent and my client.
19 I also put that if the Federal Reserve notes
20 properly discharge a debt that go to civil are not the only way
21 to properly discharge a debt, according to Constitution; that
22 the IRS is a true governmental agency and that the IRS has a
23 superior claim to the property, and that's the reason why I
24 would send a copy of the IRS actually admitting they're not
25 with this letter.

1 Q Okay. And that's the pleading or document from a
2 federal case you've read?
3 A That's correct.
4 Q Okay. Mr. Williams, the government seems to say in
5 this case here, their theory, that you didn't pay taxes 'cause
6 you're trying to hide the proceeds from MEI.
7 A No.
8 Q That is correct?
9 A No, that's not correct.
10 Q Why do you say that?
11 A Because my business is transparent. I'm constantly
12 in the FBI's face. I'm constantly going to the U.S. Marshals
13 office. They knew about Mortgage Enterprise Investments. They
14 knew about Common Law Office of America. They've looked
15 through all my bank accounts, they see I have made no money,
16 they see I have made no profit. They see I'm basically
17 operating just on funds just to be able to operate the office
18 and go to court and help people. I'm not making a profit doing
19 this.
20 Q Okay. So but you're not paying taxes, is that
21 related to your research as to what you believe the law is?
22 A That's correct.
23 Q Or is it some overseas trust account you got in the
24 Bahamas and you're trying some shell game --
25 MR. SORENSON: Objection to the leading, Your Honor.

1 THE WITNESS: No, I do not.
2 THE COURT: Sustained.
3 MR. ISAACSON: Oh, I'm sorry. All right.
4 THE WITNESS: No, I do not have --
5 THE COURT: Don't answer. It's been sustained.
6 MR. ISAACSON: Withdraw.
7 THE COURT: Ask the next question.
8 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Is there anything else in this
9 document that's been admitted that you'd like the Court -- the
10 jury to refer to?
11 A Yes. Notice that it's stamped --
12 Q Same page? Same page?
13 A Same page -- that it's stamped by the Internal
14 Revenue Service. Date is February 26, 2013. That has been
15 received.
16 Q Okay.
17 A And in here I'm actually quoting the UCC --
18 Q Mr. Williams, I'm sorry to interrupt you, sir. You
19 saying that stamp right there in the middle?
20 A Yes.
21 Q Where it says Field Internal Revenue Service; is
22 that correct?
23 A That's correct.
24 Q Okay. Hard to -- okay. And -- okay. So you mailed
25 it to the IRS?

1 A Yes.
2 Q So continue, sir. I'm sorry. Didn't mean to
3 interrupt you.
4 A So this shows when I sent them this letter, I put in
5 the UCC codes. If you really know the UCC, under 3-603 it has
6 the tender of payment statute in there.
7 Now, under the tender of payment statute, it states
8 that any type of form of payment that you send, if they reject
9 it, then the debt is discharged. So I'm putting those statutes
10 in there. If you look at like three or four down -- lines
11 down, I quote the UCC laws regarding the tender of payment
12 statutes.
13 And also that under Article I Section 10 in the
14 Constitution, that only gold and silver is the lawful money to
15 pay debt. So I'm listing the actual laws. I'm actually
16 listing House Joint Resolution 182 which give the right to
17 American people to discharge their debt dollar for dollar where
18 they don't have to use Federal Reserve notes to actually
19 discharge debt.
20 So if you look at the second page -- well, page 14,
21 the next page, where I quote some of the U.S. Supreme Court
22 rulings that it says, "As of October 27, 1977, legal tender for
23 discharge of debt is no longer required," meaning you don't
24 actually have to pay someone a Federal Reserve note to
25 discharge a debt. You could actually do a promissory note or

1 do a tender of payment under UCC3-603B.
2 Q Okay. Is there anything else on this page you'd
3 like the jury to refer to?
4 A The second to the last paragraph -- but I would
5 encourage the jury to actually read the whole document -- but
6 the paragraph that starts with Legislator.
7 Q Yes?
8 A This is actually a case law where it says the
9 legislator cannot name something to be a taxable privilege
10 unless it's a privilege. So unless it's a privilege, it can't
11 be taxed. If it's a right -- if it's a right, it can't be
12 taxed. If it's a privilege, then it can be taxed.
13 Q That's your understanding of the law?
14 A Yes.
15 Q Okay. Is there anything else on this page?
16 A No.
17 Q Okay. Anything else in this document you'd like the
18 jury to refer to you haven't done already?
19 A Yes. Page 32 and 33.
20 MR. ISAACSON: May I? Your Honor, can we make
21 sure -- is that in? Okay. May we publish that, Your Honor?
22 THE COURT: You may.
23 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Okay. Mr. Williams, what is
24 2087-32? What is that document?
25 A This is a check that I wrote on behalf of my clients

1 paying their tax debt for $26,150.13.
2 Q Okay. And is that your check you wrote?
3 A Yes.
4 Q Why did you write it?
5 A Because under the UCC 3-603(b), the tender of
6 payment, you can discharge your debt using a check on a closed
7 account. This account -- this actually not a open account.
8 This is actually a closed account. But you can only discharge
9 debt using that account. You can't, like, go to Walmart or
10 Marshalls and write a check and pay for something. It's only
11 for discharging of debt only.
12 And so if you see where the IRS stamped that they
13 received it and they actually put their stamp on it, Pay to the
14 Order of, they put their U.S. -- United States Treasury stamp
15 on it.
16 And if you look on the second page where I put "Is
17 not for deposit. For discharge, set-off, adjustment in EFT
18 only."
19 Q Okay. So -- so -- I'm sorry, Mr. Williams. So "Not
20 for deposit," what we're looking at right here, EET -- EFT, is
21 that what it says?
22 A Correct.
23 Q And that means what?
24 A That's a electric funds transfer from the account.
25 If you look at on the front page, I put account number and I

1 put SSN502 -- well, you know, the rest of the -- it's blocked
2 out.
3 Q Go back to the previous page, sorry. Yes,
4 Mr. Williams?
5 A That account, every American citizen, every American
6 national that has a social security number, you have an account
7 at the Department of Treasury. Now, you can't use this account
8 to take the money out and go purchase things, but you can use
9 it to discharge debt. And so this is what I used, a check to
10 discharge one of my client's tax debt.
11 Q Is that Ms. Krakauer you talked about before?
12 A Yes, that appeared as a witness.
13 Q Is there anything else in this document you'd like
14 to refer to?
15 A No, sir.
16 MR. ISAACSON: Okay. Could we look at Government
17 Exhibit 801, please? Could we pull up 801?
18 Oh, is it? Okay. I don't see it on my screen.
19 THE COURT: We just have to switch over.
20 MR. ISAACSON: Oh, thank you. Is this in now?
21 THE COURTROOM MANAGER: It is not.
22 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Mr. Williams, do you have in
23 front of you on the screen Government Exhibit 801?
24 A Yes, I do.
25 Q And what is -- without revealing the contents of it,

1 what is it?
2 A Well, this is a exhibit that the U.S. Attorney's
3 Office obtained from the IRS.
4 Q Okay. But what is it?
5 A It's a certification for the lack of record.
6 Q Okay. Have you seen that before?
7 A Yes, I have.
8 Q How have you seen it before?
9 A They mailed it to me. They mailed a copy of it to
10 me and they sent it to me on disc also.
11 Q You know the person's name on it? Don't reveal it.
12 Do you recognize that person's name?
13 A Yes, as being a person that works for the IRS.
14 Q And the signature -- okay. And is it addressed to
15 you?
16 A Uhm, it has my name on there.
17 Q Okay. And so this is -- okay. So did you request
18 records from the IRS?
19 A No. The U.S. Attorney's Office did.
20 Q Okay. So but you received -- your name is on this
21 document?
22 A Yes.
23 Q Okay. How's it relevant to your case here?
24 THE COURT: Well, it's not in evidence.
25 MR. ISAACSON: No. Do you want me to move it in,

1 Mr. Williams?
2 THE WITNESS: Yes.
3 MR. ISAACSON: Your Honor -- I'm sorry -- on
4 Mr. Williams's behalf, I'd move in 801.
5 MR. SORENSON: No objection, Your Honor.
6 THE COURT: Received. Do you wish to publish?
7 MR. ISAACSON: Yes, please, Your Honor.
8 THE COURT: You may publish.
9 (Exhibit 801 received into evidence.)
10 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Mr. Williams, so you talked
11 about certification of lack of record?
12 A Yes.
13 Q What would you like the jury to look at in regard to
14 this exhibit?
15 A Well, this is a certification from I guess the
16 disclosure specialist from the IRS that the U.S. Attorney -- I
17 guess their attempt to try to make it like I evaded taxes or
18 something, I guess, to try to get them to file some charges
19 against me, whatever. But they sent that there's no record of
20 me filing any taxes since 2012, I believe.
21 Q Okay. And how is that relevant to the case here
22 today?
23 A Well, he -- I mean, I admit that I don't pay federal
24 taxes and that's proof that I don't pay them, but it's not just
25 from 2012. It's actually since 2005. And the IRS would never

1 come after me because of the letter that I sent them with the
2 federal case that they know they basically disavow that they're
3 a agency of the government.
4 So I've never had a problem with the IRS myself or
5 with any clients that come to me. Actually, IRS is probably
6 the easiest one to fight.
7 Q Okay. Is there anything else about this document
8 you'd like to refer to the jury?
9 A No, sir.
10 MR. ISAACSON: Okay. If we could go to Government's
11 Exhibit 821, please? I don't think it's in. Could we have
12 Mr. Williams take a look at it, please?
13 THE COURT: Did you want to offer this into
14 evidence?
15 MR. ISAACSON: Not quite yet, Judge. I'd like him
16 to look at it first.
17 MR. SORENSON: We'll stipulate it in if he wants to.
18 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Mr. Williams, do you recognize
19 this document?
20 A Yes, I do.
21 Q And without doing the contents, what is it?
22 THE COURT: Well, do you want it in evidence?
23 THE WITNESS: Yes.
24 MR. ISAACSON: One more question, Your Honor.
25 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Mr. Williams --

1 THE COURT: Well, he -- he would like it in evidence
2 and they've stipulated to it. Let's just move along. Going to
3 ask him questions to lay the foundation.
4 MR. ISAACSON: Yes. You wish to move it into
5 evidence?
6 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
7 MR. ISAACSON: Your Honor, Mr. Williams requests 821
8 be admitted.
9 THE WITNESS: Yes, it's received. You may publish.
10 MR. ISAACSON: Yes, if you could publish.
11 (Exhibit 821 received into evidence.)
12 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Mr. Williams, what is this
13 document to the best of your knowledge?
14 A This is the judgment for my unlawful conviction for
15 the unlicensed practice of law and false official statement.
16 Q Okay. This is -- when was it entered, do you
17 recall?
18 A This was February 2016, 24th day of February 2016.
19 Q And what about this document you'd like the jury to
20 refer to?
21 A Well, it's just that I did have the conviction for
22 unlicensed practice of law. I spent I think 1 -- they charged
23 me 110 days in jail which was time served 'cause they didn't
24 let me get a bond. So, but he end up giving me 22 years'
25 probation, which was illegal, you know. There's no probation

1 for unlicensed practice of law. It's actually a civil case.
2 But they charged me criminally for something that's not on the
3 Board of Criminal Punishment Code which is also on appeal right
4 now which should get overturned shortly here.
5 Q Is there anything else about this document you'd
6 like the jury to know about or refer you to -- refer them to?
7 A No, sir.
8 Q Okay. And if we could pull up Government
9 Exhibit 822.
10 Mr. Williams, is it your request to have Exhibit 822
11 entered into evidence?
12 A Yes.
13 THE COURT: Any objection?
14 MR. SORENSON: Not from us, Your Honor.
15 THE COURT: All right. Received. Do you wish to
16 publish?
17 MR. ISAACSON: Yes, Your Honor.
18 THE COURT: You may.
19 (Exhibit 822 received into evidence.)
20 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Mr. Williams, what is this
21 document?
22 A This is the other judgment against me that Agent
23 Lavelle testified in the grand theft and the unlawful filing of
24 documents that they had before that case concluded before they
25 charged these charges against me.

1 Q Okay. When was this judgment entered, Mr. Williams?
2 A June 2017.
3 Q Okay. Is there anything else about -- or anything
4 about this document you'd like the jury to know about?
5 A No. There's actually no -- there's no statute for
6 grand theft of a house. If you read the statute, it has
7 nothing to do with stealing a house. But this is what they
8 charged me with.
9 Q Okay. Mr. Williams, all right, let's -- if we could
10 go to 2028, please?
11 Mr. Williams, you have in front of you Defense
12 Exhibit 2028?
13 A That's correct.
14 Q Without revealing the contents of it, can you
15 describe what it is?
16 A This is a federal court document. It's actually a
17 lawsuit that was filed in the United States Bankruptcy Court on
18 behalf of one of my clients that testified for the government.
19 Q Okay. All right. And did you create this?
20 A Actually, my other private attorney general, PJ
21 Stewart, was the one that actually signed it.
22 Q Okay.
23 A She worked out of my Democrat office with Anabel.
24 Q Okay. And is one of the plaintiff in this case --
25 one of the witnesses in this case?

1 A Yes.
2 Q How is this document relevant to your case here?
3 A This is actually one of the clients here that the
4 government induced to testifying against me. We filed this
5 case in their bankruptcy to fight not only the bankruptcy, but
6 also the foreclosure. If you notice that she signs as a
7 private attorney general, but they didn't charge her with
8 practicing law without a license basically because she's
9 Caucasian.
10 Q Would you like me to move this into evidence for
11 you, Mr. Williams?
12 A Yes.
13 THE COURT: Any objection?
14 MR. SORENSON: Yes, Your Honor, on the basis of
15 relevance and also the lack of personal knowledge and hearsay.
16 This was not filed by him and it appears to relate to the
17 Lafortezas' bankruptcy which we did not go into on
18 cross-examination.
19 THE COURT: All right. Over the objection of the
20 government, it's received. It's a public document.
21 Do you wish to publish?
22 MR. ISAACSON: Yes, Your Honor.
23 THE COURT: All right. You may.
24 (Exhibit 2028 received into evidence.)
25 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Mr. Williams -- may I publish,

1 Judge?
2 THE COURT: You may.
3 MR. ISAACSON: Oh, sorry. Yeah. That's fine. I
4 didn't see it on the screen.
5 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) 2028, the first page is on the
6 screen, Mr. Williams. What -- is there any part of the front
7 page you wish the jury to review?
8 A Yes. Can you highlight this portion and blow this
9 portion up?
10 Q Okay. Okay. And what is the relevance of this,
11 sir?
12 A This is the actual case law that shows that
13 litigants can be assisted by unlicensed laymen during jury
14 proceedings, and I had her put that on there because of the
15 opposition we was having here in Hawaii. Like in Tennessee I
16 didn't have this opposition, California didn't have this
17 opposition. Really the only opposition I had was here in
18 Hawaii and only one county which was Broward County in Florida.
19 The other counties I could file anything I want, go to court,
20 and I had no problem. It was just Broward County, Florida, and
21 then several circuit courts here in Hawaii.
22 Q Okay. Anything else about this page or other parts
23 of 2028 you wish the jury to refer to?
24 A Well, we actually sued a lot of the officers of the
25 court, the commissioner, Michael Hirakawa, Central Pacific

1 Bank, some of the judges that were sitting on this case. If
2 you notice, it's an averment. So on the second page, you will
3 see where they have the actual case law that states that no
4 state can license the practice of law. That's actually *Schware*
5 *v. Board of Examiners*, U.S. Supreme Court case, and that the
6 practice of law is actually a occupation of common rights so
7 you can't license it, and that's the case law to validate that.
8 Q Okay. And does this -- wasn't written by you, but
9 did you work on this law, provide this law, or --
10 A Yes, I worked with her to, you know, draft it, and
11 then once everything was completed, I approved it to be filed.
12 Q Okay. Is this anything else about -- or any other
13 pages you wish the jury to refer to?
14 A The page 6.
15 Q What on page 6 would you like the jury to refer to?
16 A This is the oath of admission that attorneys have to
17 file what Mr. Sorenson alluded to earlier. It only has one
18 place for his signature. No one else has to sign the oath but
19 him or an attorney.
20 And so she put on there to let them know she's not
21 an attorney and that average citizens are private attorney
22 generals, and she put the little statement there to show in the
23 42 U.S.C. 1988, and she signs as a whistleblower, private
24 attorney general, or average citizen, which that's what a
25 private attorney general is.

1 Q These Lafortezas is the same folks who testified in
2 this case?
3 A That's correct.
4 Q All right.
5 A And PJ Stewart was never charged with mortgage
6 fraud, mail fraud, wire fraud, even though she work out of the
7 same office that me and Ms. Cabebe, but she was never charged.
8 Q Mr. Williams, let me just I think talk a little-- I
9 don't think too much -- but in any pleading that you filed, did
10 you ever identify yourself as a attorney at law?
11 A Every pleading I wrote I always identify myself as
12 Private Attorney General Anthony Williams.
13 Q Okay. Is there anything else about this document
14 you'd like to refer to?
15 A Page 7.
16 Q Okay. And what about this page, sir?
17 A This is the verification of fraud in a criminal
18 enterprise or RICO. This is what we would file on behalf of
19 clients either in a bankruptcy case or in a foreclosure case
20 proving the fraud that's being committed against the clients.
21 You will see the plethora of case law that we provide and also
22 the United States Codes and the other laws, including the
23 Constitution, which give us the right to assist people and the
24 fraud that we're exposing.
25 Q Okay. Anything else about this page, sir?

1 A No, sir.
2 Q Anything else in this document?
3 A No, sir. Page 10.
4 Q Yes, sir. What about page 10 is relevant for the
5 Court?
6 A This is a warrant for arrest that we had drafted for
7 the public servants that weren't following law, that actually
8 broke their oath of office, and we would actually send this to
9 the U.S. Marshals or whoever the sheriff was to execute it,
10 which they denied executing even though we showed the fraud
11 that each one of them committed. You will see the exhibits.
12 Go to --
13 Q Mr. Williams, why did you -- so you prepared a
14 warrant for arrest for Mr. Stanford?
15 A Him and among other people.
16 Q Okay. Why did you do that?
17 A Well, he was aiding, abetting fraud in a courtroom,
18 and so we listed not only him, but all the people that was
19 involved: the foreclosure commissioner, the judge, the
20 attorneys for the bank. We listed everybody that was a part of
21 the RICO action.
22 Q Okay. All right. Is there anything else about this
23 document, sir?
24 A Page 12 where Ms. Stewart, she signed as a private
25 attorney general.

1 Q Hang on one second. So, okay. You see the
2 signature there?
3 A Yes.
4 Q What is important about that?
5 A That she -- you know, she signs as a private
6 attorney general, but she's an average citizen and not a bar
7 member.
8 Q Okay.
9 A Want to make sure people understood that.
10 Q So there she writes down "Not a bar member"?
11 A Correct.
12 Q All right. Anything else about this document, sir?
13 A Page 13. It's actually part of the warrant for
14 arrest for one of the judges, Lloyd King, for basically the
15 same actions, doing the same thing, violating his oath, not
16 allowing the evidence that we presented. A lot of times he
17 would actually strike the evidence that we showed of fraud. He
18 would actually strike the motion where they couldn't even be
19 put on the record, which is illegal.
20 Q Now, all this is based upon foreclosure action
21 against the Lafortezas?
22 A That's correct.
23 Q And this is what you've done in response to that?
24 A That's correct.
25 Q All right. Is there anything else about this

1 document, sir?
2 A Yes, page 21.
3 Q Okay. And what is important about page 21, sir?
4 A This is showing how the judges that were sitting on
5 the foreclosure cases -- normal people have mortgages for
6 30 years. We had one of the government -- was it Klevansky? --
7 that he'd never seen a mortgage over -- you know, that was not
8 30 years or in rare cases 15 years. He say he never seen one
9 that was one year or two year.
10 Well, we actually exposed that these judges in
11 Hawaii are getting mortgages and having them satisfied in one
12 or two months. If you look at his Bank of Hawaii mortgage, the
13 trust company was Bank of New York Trust. It was satisfied in
14 three months.
15 Q Okay.
16 A Takes out a mortgage and then it's released in three
17 months.
18 Q And how is -- how is that information relevant to
19 your case here?
20 A This is some of the fraud that I was exposing and
21 this is why I would have these arrest warrants issued. Because
22 average people, when they get a mortgage, they have to pay for
23 30 years. But these judges that are sitting on the foreclosure
24 case for these banks and ruling for the banks, they get their
25 mortgage satisfied in 1, 2, 3 months.

1 Q Is there anything else in this document you'd like
2 to refer to?
3 A No, sir. Page 23.
4 Q Sir, what is this document? What is the relevance
5 of it?
6 A This is actually a email that was sent by my
7 employee, PJ Stewart, the other private attorney general, to
8 the Hawaii courts here regarding the private attorney general
9 or whistleblower and the foreclosure settlement by a attorney
10 named Lynn Szymoniak who won a $46.5 million foreclosure
11 settlement for exposing the same corruption that I've been
12 exposing.
13 Q And how is that relevant to this case?
14 A Well, I was basically targeted for doing the same
15 thing that she's doing. She was exposing the fraud. She goes
16 on to show how the robo-signers that I had spoke about earlier,
17 that they was using robo-signings to foreclose on people's
18 homes and the bank was enriching themselves based on fraud and
19 that the banks didn't actually own the note or the mortgage. A
20 lot of them was claiming they lost the note and was still
21 foreclosing on it -- on the homes without even having the note
22 or the mortgage.
23 Q If we turn to page 24, Mr. Williams, let me point
24 your attention to the middle of the page. Could
25 we -- where -- right -- you see where it says "As an attorney

1 specializing in white collar crime"? Can you see that on that
2 page toward the bottom of this screen? Right above -- yeah,
3 right there?
4 A Okay.
5 Q Can we get that a little bit bigger?
6 Okay. What does that say, Mr. Williams?
7 A It says, "An attorney specializing in white collar
8 crime, the 63-year-old Floridian was well-placed to spot an
9 apparent forgery on one of the documents in her foreclosure
10 case, one she saw repeated in dozens of others she examined
11 later."
12 Q Okay. So earlier today, quite a while ago, you
13 talked about a forgery on a document you saw.
14 A That's correct.
15 Q Okay. Is that similar -- is it -- is this kind of
16 what you're talking about, the same thing here?
17 A Yes, exactly.
18 Q Okay. So this attorney in Florida saw a forgery on
19 some of the documents, I guess, in other things?
20 A Correct.
21 Q Okay.
22 A And she filed a suit and won. But she didn't get
23 targeted, she didn't get retaliated for filing a suit like I
24 have.
25 Q Is this kind of where -- I mean not where you get

1 your ideas from -- but is this relevant to you making your
2 decisions when you see things like this?
3 A Yes, 'cause this is not the only case. I mean, this
4 is just one case. I mean, I can give you many cases like this
5 where the forgery and the fraud has been exposed. But since
6 they're attorneys, they don't get retaliated against like I do
7 for exposing the same thing.
8 Q Is there anything else about this document you'd
9 like to refer to?
10 A No, sir. No, that's it.
11 Q Okay.
12 A On page 27.
13 Q Oh, okay, sir. What is page 27?
14 A This is an email that a private attorney general, PJ
15 Stewart, sent also to the Hawaii courts here giving them the
16 actual law what a private attorney general is. She actually
17 just copied and pasted from *Wikipedia Encyclopedia* and copied
18 and pasted and sent it to the Hawaii court so they can educate
19 the judges and attorneys here on what a private attorney
20 general is because some of them have the erroneous sentiment,
21 like Sorenson, that that's a made-up name, that I just made it
22 up, it doesn't exist, that Congress didn't make that up. So
23 she had that sent to the court so they can actually look up the
24 laws themselves.
25 Q Okay. If we go to the first line, if we could blow

1 up some examples of the application on the page? It's at the
2 bottom, little further down on the screen, the first couple
3 lines. If you could get those up a little bit?
4 THE COURT: All right. So this is from *Wikipedia*;
5 is that correct? So he can testify what his basis is, but
6 we're not going through *Wikipedia*.
7 MR. ISAACSON: Okay. Well, thank you.
8 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Is there anything else about
9 this email, Mr. Williams?
10 A No, sir, but I would have liked to go through it
11 like he went through all my documents to show the jury the
12 actual laws 'cause that's what she put in here --
13 THE COURT: So, Mr. Williams, there's no question
14 pending. So what else do you want to go through with these six
15 documents? I'm not going to let you go through *Wikipedia*. You
16 can testify and you already have on your understanding of a
17 private attorney general.
18 MR. ISAACSON: Okay.
19 THE COURT: But *Wikipedia* --
20 MR. SORENSON: Your Honor, also --
21 THE COURT: -- is not going to be discussed.
22 MR. SORENSON: -- I think this *Wikipedia* is actually
23 an exhibit. If we could have that stricken from the exhibit,
24 we think it's inappropriate.
25 THE COURT: No, I'm not going to strike it. I'm

1 just not going to have him read in *Wikipedia* which anyone can
2 put anything on *Wikipedia*; it's self-edited. So people can put
3 things in on *Wikipedia*.
4 He can testify, which he has extensively already, so we
5 need to move on.
6 MR. ISAACSON: Yes. Okay.
7 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Anything else in regard to this
8 document, Mr. Williams?
9 A That's it.
10 MR. ISAACSON: All right. If we could pull up
11 Exhibit 2101, please?
12 THE COURT: All right. What's the proffer with
13 regard to this exhibit?
14 MR. ISAACSON: One moment, Your Honor.
15 THE COURT: Sure.
16 THE WITNESS: Only page 3 through 11 that is
17 relevant.
18 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Okay. Mr. Williams, you only
19 interested in pages 4 to 12; is that correct?
20 A 3 to 12.
21 Q 3 to 12?
22 A Right.
23 Q All right. Page 3 --
24 THE COURT: What's the proffer for it, though? What
25 does it have to do with anything in the cross? We're not going

1 through a whole direct. This is a redirect, so it's limited to
2 what Mr. Sorenson covered.
3 MR. ISAACSON: Uhm, if I can let Mr. Williams
4 explain why it's relevant?
5 THE COURT: No. He's chosen that he doesn't want to
6 have a time limit for his narrative, that you're going to ask
7 questions and make the objections. So what's the proffer with
8 regard -- if you don't have one, then let's go to the next one.
9 MR. ISAACSON: I do not for page 3, Judge.
10 THE WITNESS: It's driver's license.
11 MR. ISAACSON: Your Honor, for the remainder, I
12 would have to ask Mr. Williams.
13 THE COURT: All right. Well, then, I'm not going to
14 let you go into that area. Go to the next one.
15 MR. ISAACSON: Okay.
16 THE COURT: We gave you folks like 30 minutes to go
17 over what you wanted to do with regard to any of your exhibits
18 and I'm not going to spend more time with regard to that now.
19 MR. ISAACSON: Yes, Your Honor. Could we go to
20 Exhibit 2138?
21 THE COURT: Pages 20 and 21 have been received into
22 evidence.
23 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Mr. Williams, do you want to
24 refer to page 20 and 21?
25 A Well, 16 through 19 and then 22 'cause I want those

1 in.

2 Q All right. Mr. Williams, are you asking to admit 16

3 to 19?

4 A Yes.

5 THE COURT: All right.

6 MR. ISAACSON: Move to admit.

7 THE COURT: It's denied. It's not relevant.

8 What's next?

9 MR. ISAACSON: Okay.

10 THE WITNESS: Page 20 and 21.

11 MR. ISAACSON: That's already --

12 THE COURT: 20 and 21 have been admitted.

13 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Do you wish to refer to this,

14 Mr. Williams, to publish this?

15 A Yes.

16 MR. ISAACSON: May I have Exhibit 20?

17 THE COURT: Page 20?

18 MR. ISAACSON: Yes, sorry.

19 THE COURT: All right. What about this document?

20 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Mr. Williams, this is

21 Mrs. Madamba's affidavit of truth, already been admitted into

22 evidence. What do you wish the government -- the jury to

23 get -- review from this document?

24 A Well, that five years ago she was willing to testify

25 in court that Edna, Henry, and Rowena was the one that, you

1 know, scammed her, but after talking to the prosecutor's
2 office, now she changed her story, that I somehow scammed her.
3 Q Okay.
4 A You know. And then when I questioned her had she
5 ever went to the prosecutor's office, she lied and said no, and
6 then Mr. Sorenson had to call a sidebar to notify that she had
7 and that's why I asked her, "Well, are you lying or the
8 prosecutor lying? Because you just said you never went to his
9 office and never talked to him."
10 MR. ISAACSON: Okay. And with regard to 21, may I
11 publish that, Your Honor?
12 THE COURT: You may.
13 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) This affidavit of truth by
14 Nelson Madamba, how is that -- what would you like to point the
15 jury's attention to?
16 A The same thing. Five years ago he wanted to testify
17 in court about the people that actually scammed him, but after
18 talking to the prosecution, now I'm the one that scammed him.
19 THE COURT: All right. What's the next area that
20 you want to cover?
21 MR. ISAACSON: Is there anything else in this
22 document, Mr. Williams?
23 THE WITNESS: No.
24 MR. ISAACSON: Okay. If we could pull up
25 Exhibit 2149, please.

1 THE COURTROOM MANAGER: It's been admitted, Your
2 Honor.
3 MR. ISAACSON: May I publish, Your Honor?
4 THE COURT: You may.
5 MR. SORENSON: Your Honor, I'm just going to object.
6 This is outside of the scope. We didn't go into Nelson or into
7 Melvyn Ventura at all, and this is all asked and answered.
8 He's been over the Melvyn Ventura affidavit before.
9 THE COURT: All right. Sustained.
10 All right. What's the next area?
11 MR. ISAACSON: Your Honor, we were gonna go into
12 2150 and also 2150 also regarding -- I'm not sure they've
13 been --
14 MR. SORENSON: We would have the same objection on
15 Melvyn Ventura, Your Honor.
16 THE COURT: 21 --
17 MR. ISAACSON: I think -- have they been admitted?
18 THE COURT: Oh, here. Yeah, it's in evidence,
19 but --
20 THE COURTROOM MANAGER: 2150 is not.
21 THE COURT: It's already in. It's a letter from
22 Melvyn Ventura. He didn't go into the area. Sustained.
23 What's the next area that you want to go into?
24 THE COURTROOM MANAGER: 2150 is not in evidence.
25 THE COURT: Okay. It's not in evidence, but he

1 didn't go into Melvyn Ventura, so it's beyond the scope.
2 What's the next area that you want to go into?
3 MR. ISAACSON: Yes, Your Honor, if we go to 2101.
4 THE WITNESS: That's the one you just did.
5 THE COURTROOM MANAGER: I don't have a 2101.
6 THE WITNESS: He already did it. He already did it.
7 He already did that one. Said I can't put it in.
8 MR. ISAACSON: Oh, Judge, hold on.
9 THE COURT: Yes.
10 MR. ISAACSON: Sorry, Judge. Made a mistake on
11 that, I apologize.
12 THE COURT: All right. What's next?
13 MR. ISAACSON: 2102.
14 THE COURT: All right. I'm not going to allow you
15 to go into the area of 2102. That has to do with his
16 automobile license citation.
17 MR. ISAACSON: Okay.
18 THE COURT: State of Hawaii.
19 MR. ISAACSON: I'll just ask a question, if I --
20 THE COURT: Sure.
21 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Mr. Williams, let's talk about
22 your driver's license or your license on your car, your tag.
23 Do you have a tag? Is it -- what kind of tag you have on your
24 car?
25 A I had a tag that I made. It's a United States

1 Private Attorney General tag.

2 Q And what authority did you make that tag for?

3 A Under *City of Dayton v. The Pro Se*, also Title 18

4 U.S.C. 31, paragraph 6 and 10, which defines a motor vehicle.

5 It states this: "A motor vehicle is if you're traveling on the

6 highways and charging people a fare rate or fee in connection

7 with the business and is used for commercial purposes."

8 Under *The City of Dayton v. The Pro Se*, it states --

9 MR. SORENSON: Your Honor, objection. Beyond the

10 scope.

11 THE COURT: Well, you asked him about, that he

12 thought he was above the law, that he didn't have to have a

13 license plate and so forth, so overruled.

14 All right. That's his answer. I'm not going to let him

15 spew off a whole bunch of cases. It's just taking up time,

16 it's cumulative.

17 What's the next question?

18 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Yes. Mr. Williams, you did this

19 tag? You made it yourself?

20 A Yes, I did.

21 Q Private attorney general?

22 A Yes.

23 Q You didn't do it 'cause you're a member of a bar

24 association, right?

25 A No.

1 Q Your belief you're a private attorney general allows
2 you to do this, correct?
3 A Well, not just the private attorney general, the
4 actual case law, U.S. Supreme Court cases *Shapiro v. Thompson*,
5 *Christy v. Elliot* --
6 THE COURT: All right. I'm not going to have yu
7 list a whole bunch of cases. Let's go.
8 What's the next question?
9 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Exhibit -- let me make sure I
10 have it -- 2038.
11 Mr. Williams, you have 2038 in front of you?
12 A Yes, I do.
13 Q Without describing the contents, what is this
14 document?
15 THE COURT: Any objection to it being received?
16 MR. SORENSON: Well, yes, Your Honor. Again, we do
17 believe this is beyond the scope and it's nonrelevant. Piros?
18 This is a Deutsch Bank action against Ray T. Piros.
19 THE WITNESS: It's a client in Hawaii.
20 THE COURT: All right. Over the objection of the
21 government, I'll receive it in evidence.
22 Do you wish to publish?
23 MR. ISAACSON: Yes, Your Honor.
24 THE COURT: All right. What's your question about
25 this document?

1 (Exhibit 2038 received into evidence.)
2 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Mr. Williams, what is the
3 relevance of this document to this case?
4 A This is one of the motions or notice that I would
5 file against the banks. A lot of the banks was filing
6 foreclosure --
7 THE COURT: All right. So that's his answer, this
8 is what he files on behalf of his clients. Mr. --
9 THE WITNESS: I hadn't finished.
10 THE COURT: No, I'm not going to let you go into all
11 the stuff that you did because what -- the underlying act of it
12 and information is not relevant. It's -- Mr. Sorenson had
13 asked you questions of what kind of work you did for it. This
14 is in evidence.
15 What do you want to ask next?
16 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Mr. Williams, just -- this is a
17 notice of removal. Is that the kind of things you would file?
18 A Yes. If --
19 Q Why would you file that?
20 A If they -- if the bank was a corporation from out of
21 state, they would actually have to file a federal lawsuit and
22 not in state court. So I would bring a notice of removal to
23 the district court so it can be filed in the proper
24 jurisdiction.
25 Q You filed this on numerous cases here?

1 A Yes, I have.
2 Q Is this one of the things you do to help your
3 clients?
4 A Yes, it is.
5 Q For the foreclosure folks?
6 A Yes, it is. Also page 20.
7 THE COURT: Listen, there's no question pending.
8 What's the nest question?
9 MR. ISAACSON: Could we have Government Exhibit 209?
10 THE COURT: All right. You got 10 more minutes for
11 redirect 'cause we're not -- we're plowing old ground. You
12 have nothing new to say, then he can testify with regard to
13 anything else, but we're just going through the same documents
14 over and over again and it's getting cumulative. You got
15 10 minutes.
16 MR. ISAACSON: All right.
17 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) Mr. Williams, I'm going to ask
18 you some questions. I'm not going to refer you to this
19 document, I'm just going to ask you some questions since we
20 have 10 minutes left.
21 The government's asked you a lot of questions about
22 Mr. Hicks.
23 A Correct.
24 Q Right? And I guess there was some notice of
25 foreclosure. Does that change in any way your belief of the

1 work you did for Mr. Hicks?
2 A No, it doesn't, because he wasn't foreclosed on.
3 Q Why doesn't it change it? I mean, did you feel like
4 you did the right thing in his case still?
5 A Yes, I did.
6 Q Why do you say that?
7 A I mean, they still kept their home. They was able
8 to sell their home because they got a divorce. This notice of
9 foreclosure did not go to no judgment because they couldn't.
10 If you look at the notice, they actually had my
11 company, Mortgage Enterprise Investments, on there. They tried
12 to sue me for the lien and the mortgage, which they couldn't,
13 and I would not release it, so they couldn't go through with
14 the foreclosure.
15 Q Mr. Williams, there have been a lot of discussion
16 here about orders and judgments done in bankruptcy court and
17 other courts that seem to say you shouldn't be practicing law.
18 How does that affect what you did in this case?
19 A It doesn't affect anything what I did in this case
20 because the U.S. Supreme Court and the U.S. Constitution gives
21 me the right to assist people in court. So just because
22 someone had a bankruptcy judge put an injunction against
23 somebody else that already made a complaint against and none of
24 the victims are actually my victims, that has no bearing on
25 whether I'ma still help people or not.

1 Q Mr. Williams, you know, it seems to me somebody who
2 might get a judgment or a judge tell you Be careful, don't do
3 it, they would stop. Why did you continue to do what you did?
4 A Because I know I was right. I know it was according
5 to the law, that I had a lawful authority to continue to help
6 people and assist people, and I been doing this in eight
7 states.
8 Q Okay. Is anything that we've talked about, the
9 government's discussion, all these things, your address in DC,
10 were they part of a giant plan you had to rip people off?
11 A No. I've never had any intent to rip people off.
12 That's the reason why I still have zero complaints and I still
13 have a A-plus Better Business Bureau credit rating.
14 Q Mr. Williams, discussion about the Georgia, you
15 know, case, right? And you beat that case?
16 A Yes, I did.
17 Q Mr. Williams, when you were in Georgia, you were
18 released, correct?
19 A Yes, I was.
20 Q You could have stayed away from Hawaii, couldn't
21 you?
22 A Yes, I could have.
23 Q You could have gone to any other state?
24 A That is correct.
25 MR. SORENSON: Objection. Leading.

1 THE COURT: Sustained. The last answer will be
2 stricken. The jury's --
3 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) After you left --
4 THE COURT: -- directed to disregard it.
5 Go ahead.
6 MR. ISAACSON: Thank you.
7 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) After you were released from
8 Georgia, where could you have gone?
9 A I could have gone anywhere in the United States I
10 wanted to.
11 Q Right. Free to go anywhere?
12 A Yes.
13 Q Why did you return to Hawaii?
14 A Because there was still people that was in
15 foreclosure and I didn't get to finish what I started, so I had
16 to come back to help those people.
17 Q And you came back?
18 A Yes, I did.
19 Q You've heard -- let me make sure, just one moment --
20 little bit about the D.C. office.
21 A Uh-huh.
22 Q Been a lot of discussion about that?
23 A Correct.
24 Q Did you pay anybody for the use of that rental
25 space?

1 A Yes, I did.
2 Q Who'd you pay?
3 A Dorita Dixon.
4 Q That document's in evidence, isn't it?
5 A Yes, it is.
6 MR. ISAACSON: Just moment or two, Your Honor, if I
7 can.
8 Q (BY MR. ISAACSON:) There's been discussion, a video
9 about identifying yourself as an attorney?
10 A Uh-huh.
11 Q In terms of the documents that you file --
12 A Yes.
13 Q -- do you ever refer to yourself as an attorney as
14 licensed Hawaii?
15 A No. Every document I file I list myself either as
16 attorney in fact, attorney in law, counselor in law, or a
17 private attorney general, never an attorney at law.
18 Q Your ID that you have, the 501, I believe, what does
19 it say on there identifying yourself?
20 A It says Private Attorney General and gives the 42
21 U.S.C. 1988 statute.
22 Q Does it say attorney at law anywhere on that
23 document?
24 A No, it does not.
25 Q Mr. Williams, at any point anything you did in this

1 case, was it or was it not part of any type of fraud you
2 intended to do?
3 A No, it was not. That's why I have no complaints
4 against any clients.
5 MR. ISAACSON: I have no further questions, Your
6 Honor.
7 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Is the defense
8 going to call any other witnesses?
9 MR. ISAACSON: I would have to speak
10 to -- Mr. Williams, have you made a decision on that?
11 THE WITNESS: No more witnesses unless they gonna
12 let me --
13 THE COURT: Defense rests?
14 THE DEFENDANT: Unless you gonna let me call some of
15 my mainland witnesses.
16 THE COURT: Do you have any witnesses out there who
17 are ready to come and testify?
18 THE DEFENDANT: No.
19 THE COURT: Do you rest? Does the defense rest?
20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, 'cause I have no more.
21 THE COURT: We're going to take a 15-minute recess.
22 Our poor court reporter has been a hero. So we're going to
23 give her a rest.
24 And then I believe the government has two witnesses? Then
25 we'll do that in the remaining half hour.

1 So please leave your notebooks and iPads behind, and of
2 course, don't discuss the case with anyone or each other or
3 allow anyone to discuss it with you.
4 Please stand for the jury. They're on a 15-minute recess.
5 And, Mr. Sorenson or Mr. Yates, if you could get your
6 witnesses ready.
7 All right. We're in recess.
8 (A recess was taken.)
9 (Open court out of the presence of the jury.)
10 THE COURT: The record will reflect that the jury's
11 not present. Present are Mr. Williams and counsel.
12 Is there an issue we need to address before we bring in
13 the jury, Mr. Williams?
14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I have to put this on the
15 record because I object to the cross-examination that he gave.
16 He mentioned my taxes, he mentioned my driver's license. But
17 on redirect, you wouldn't let me put the actual documents in
18 that proves why I don't believe I have to pay IRS taxes. This
19 is a government document. It's filed in a court proceeding and
20 the jury needs to be able to see what I'm basing my ideology on
21 as far as why I don't pay for those taxes, 'cause now it's like
22 they just gone speculate that I made up this court case, that I
23 made up the fact that the IRS admit they're not a U.S.
24 governmental agency, and this is one of the documents I
25 actually sent with that letter. And so --

1 THE COURT: All right. You had an opportunity to
2 testify at length with regard to that. The documents that you
3 sought were hearsay and cumulative. So on that basis, the
4 court denied it.
5 It's also redirect as opposed to your direct, and you
6 spent an extensive part of your redirect basically giving a
7 closing argument and commenting on other witnesses' testimony
8 and so forth. So the court exercised its discretion and
9 required you to show relevant information that was pertinent to
10 the cross-examination.
11 Anything else that you want to put on the record?
12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. On the cross-examination he
13 brought up my driver's license, that why I don't have a
14 driver's license. You didn't allow me to put the actual court
15 document that dismissed the driving on a suspended license
16 because I never had a license and they charged me driving on a
17 suspended license. When I submitted the U.S. Supreme Court
18 cases, they dismissed it to show that I don't have to have a
19 license. So the jury not able to see that court document that
20 it's dismissed.
21 THE COURT: Again, you had an ample and extensive
22 opportunity to testify regarding the same. The evidence that
23 you submitted was hearsay, but you were permitted to testify
24 extensively for the basis and so forth.
25 All right. Anything else you need to put on the record?

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I object to the way the
2 prosecution was able to go through their document line by line
3 and question me and I wasn't allowed to be questioned line by
4 line on my documents. Like, that's unfair.
5 THE COURT: All right. So the court's ruling stands
6 with regard to that. You were confronted with your own filings
7 and impeachment and they questioned you with regard to that.
8 Anything else?
9 THE DEFENDANT: That's all.
10 THE COURT: Okay. Now, your rebuttal case, who are
11 you seeking to call and testimony, and what's the basis that it
12 should be permitted with regard to a rebuttal case?
13 MR. SORENSON: Yeah. We have James Spota starting
14 out, Your Honor. He's a TSA training officer and he's going to
15 testify to rebut the inferences that Mr. Williams's credentials
16 were accepted by TSA because they were valid.
17 THE COURT: Okay.
18 MR. SORENSON: And then Laurice Otsuka simply to
19 testify on financial matters relating to Mr. Williams's
20 testimony to rebut some of his testimony about specifically
21 refunds being paid, and I think -- Ms. Pillos? -- and
22 Ms. Pillos and checks being paid to Ms. Pillos.
23 THE COURT: All right. Refunds to the clients.
24 MR. SORENSON: Yes. We expect we're going to be
25 pretty prompt.

1 THE COURT: Mr. Williams?
2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I object to this rebuttal
3 witness 'cause, No. 1, unless this was one of the people that I
4 went through the airport with that allowed and approved my
5 document, he's not a fact witness in this case. I don't -- I
6 don't never heard of this person.
7 I've been going through the TSA now for the last -- well,
8 since 2011 with that ID. First time I got rejected, but then
9 when the state did their checking, I didn't have no problem
10 going through the TSA.
11 So this person's testimony would be very prejudicial, it
12 would confuse the jury, and they would make the jury think that
13 I actually went through this person's TSA and they denied my
14 ID, which they did not. And it's clear on the videos that I
15 been through multiple airports and never got denied and my ID
16 was verified on plenty occasions. They had to actually take my
17 ID to the back to the supervisor in order to --
18 THE COURT: Okay. You testified at length with
19 regard to this, also that you got denied at Kona and you had to
20 drive to Hilo or vice versa. So over your objection, the TSA
21 witness will be permitted to testify, but no more than
22 10 minutes on direct and I'll give you 5 minutes on cross.
23 What about any objection to Ms. Otsuka testifying?
24 THE DEFENDANT: Who is Ms. Otsuka?
25 THE COURT: She's their witness who is going to

1 testify with regard to the fact there's no evidence, I guess,
2 of any refund being given to Ms. Pillos.
3 MR. SORENSON: Our forensic accountant.
4 THE COURT: She's the forensic accountant. She did
5 the summary charts.
6 THE DEFENDANT: I didn't say Ms. Pillos had a
7 refund.
8 THE COURT: Okay. All right. So we're going to get
9 the jury and then you're going to first start with the TSA
10 expert or witness?
11 MR. SORENSON: Yes, Your Honor.
12 THE COURT: All right. We're in recess.
13 (A recess was taken.)
14 (Open court in the presence of the jury.)
15 THE COURT: All right. The record will reflect the
16 presence of the ladies and gentlemen of the jury, counsel, and
17 Mr. Williams.
18 The government is being permitted to call two witnesses in
19 what's called a rebuttal, and this would be witnesses who will
20 testify in rebuttal of certain testimony given in the defense
21 case.
22 And so, Mr. Sorenson, your first witness.
23 MR. SORENSON: Thank you, Your Honor. That is
24 correct.
25 THE COURT: We have to put him under oath. I'm

1 sorry. I know you're hurrying 'cause I gave you a time limit,
2 but let's first swear him.
3 MR. SORENSON: Put a minute back on the clock?
4 THE COURT: Yes.
5 **JAMES ANTHONY SPOTA, GOVERNMENT'S WITNESS, WAS SWORN**
6 THE COURTROOM MANAGER: Thank you.
7 If you could state your name and spell your last name for
8 the record.
9 THE WITNESS: Certainly. My names is James Anthony
10 Spota. Spelling of the last name is S, capital P -- excuse
11 me -- S-p, as in Paul, -o-t, as in Tom, -a.
12 DIRECT EXAMINATION
13 BY MR. SORENSON:
14 Q Hello, Mr. Spota.
15 A Hello.
16 Q You work for the Transportation Security
17 Administration?
18 A I do, sir.
19 Q That's also known as TSA; is that correct?
20 A Correct.
21 Q What are your duties?
22 A I'm the training manager for the 12 airports of the
23 Pacific.
24 Q And how long have you been so employed?
25 A I been employed at TSA for 12 -- for 7 years.

1 Q And are you trained in the types of identity
2 documents that are accepted by TSA screeners at airports?
3 A I am.
4 Q And do you conduct training on the particular
5 requirements for those identity documents?
6 A Can I ask you to repeat that, Mr. Sorenson? Excuse
7 me.
8 Q Do you conduct training on those particular types of
9 identity documents that TSA accepts?
10 A I did at one point. Now what happens is that I have
11 people that work for me that do the actual training, but I make
12 sure they're trained properly before they administer it.
13 Q What's the purpose of checking identity documents by
14 TSA officers?
15 A We need to make certain that the person who is in a
16 federal -- either has a document that says this is who it is is
17 this person versus what the ticket says to make sure it's a
18 matched up situation so that we have the right people that are
19 flying on the airline.
20 Q Okay. And just so that we're all clear, these TSA
21 officers that we're talking about, are they at airports?
22 A They are, yes, sir.
23 Q And are they at TSA screening locations at airports?
24 A Yes. We call them checkpoint, which is one area,
25 but they're particularly at what we call TDC or Travel Document

1 Checker location.
2 Q And so you're familiar with the requirements of what
3 these identity documents need to display; is that correct?
4 A Yes, sir.
5 Q You have in front of you there, sir, an exhibit
6 marked as 501. You see it?
7 A Yes, sir, I do.
8 Q Okay. And do you recognize -- does that appear to
9 be some type of identity document?
10 A It is some type of identity document, yes.
11 Q Okay. Have you seen that before?
12 A Yes, I have.
13 Q Have you had a chance to inspect it?
14 A I have, yes, sir.
15 MR. SORENSON: Your Honor, I'm going to ask to
16 publish Exhibit 865 which is a photocopy of that particular
17 document.
18 THE COURT: Yes, you may.
19 MR. SORENSON: And it's in evidence.
20 THE COURT: Yes, it is. You may publish.
21 MR. SORENSON: We can maybe publish?
22 THE COURT: Yeah.
23 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) All right. First off, is this
24 the document you have there in font of you, the credential,
25 501?

1 A Yes, sir.
2 Q Okay. So you've seen this before, correct?
3 A I have, yes, sir.
4 Q Is this a valid identity document?
5 A It is not.
6 Q And why is it not?
7 A Well, there's a number of things. Basically an
8 acceptable document must come from a government, whether it's
9 state, federal, or federal -- excuse me -- state, federal, or
10 foreign. This gives the appearance it came from a federal
11 agency, but this is not a federal agency.
12 Q Okay. So the first thing you see here, sir, is a
13 photograph; is that correct?
14 A That is correct, yes.
15 Q And are photographs necessary for identity
16 documents?
17 A Absolutely, yes, sir.
18 Q And you also see down here where it says "United
19 States Office of the Private Attorney General"? Do you see
20 that?
21 A I do.
22 Q Okay. And if one of your screeners accepted this
23 particular item as it was attempted to be used in an airport,
24 is this something that that person might have been influenced
25 by?

1 A Yes. There are a number of things on here they
2 might have been influenced on.
3 THE DEFENDANT: Objection as speculation.
4 THE COURT: All right. Overruled. He's laid a
5 foundation that he trains with regard to that.
6 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) Okay. And what are those?
7 A Can you repeat the question? I apologize.
8 Q Yeah. If a TSA inspector relied upon this and
9 believed to be a true document, are there things about this
10 particular identity document that might fool an agent?
11 A Yes, there are. Would you like me to go through
12 those?
13 Q Yes, sir.
14 A Start with, you can take the fact that there is a
15 flag and eagle in the background. Very common from a federal
16 agency that they're going to have a flag or an eagle. They see
17 that, they get persuaded that it might be a federal document.
18 They see the beginning parts where it says United
19 States Office. Well, that's a common phrase that will be used
20 on a federal agency document.
21 And lastly, you see the Great Seal of the United
22 States. This is all on the front page, the front copy of this
23 particular ID.
24 All of those things in conjunction, it's very
25 possible in this case -- it's possible what happened is the

1 agent made a mistake and thought it was a federal agency and
2 it's not.
3 THE DEFENDANT: Objection. That's speculation.
4 THE COURT: Overruled.
5 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) At this juncture I'm going to
6 ask you to look at the backside of the exhibit.
7 A Yes, sir.
8 MR. SORENSON: Your Honor, I'm going to ask to
9 publish 866 which is the backside of this.
10 THE COURT: You may.
11 Q (BY MR. SORENSON:) All right. Sir, looking at the
12 backside here, do you see anything on here that might be
13 problematic for a TSA screener as far as thinking this was
14 valid?
15 A Thinking it was valid, you see the FBI number?
16 Q Yes.
17 A That number itself would make you feel particularly
18 good, like, oh, it must be a legitimate document. You also see
19 it's also given an address like there is actually a federal
20 agency there at this particular address. So again --
21 Q Are you talking about down here at the bottom?
22 A Yes, sir. U.S. Office of the Private Attorney
23 General which says 6230 3rd Street, Suite 5, Washington, D.C.
24 You see the actual address. So those two items on the back
25 particularly would make you feel comfortable that you are

1 looking at a federal agency document and should be accepted.
2 Q Is it common that these documents also have an
3 identity number and perhaps a barcode of some type?
4 A A lot of them do. Not all, but a lot of them do,
5 yes, sir.
6 Q Would this be something else it could fool a
7 screener?
8 A It could absolutely. It's the combination of all of
9 those things that takes the screener that if they'd only looked
10 at one item, they would never probably be convinced to accept
11 the document like this. But to look at the totality of all of
12 them, they can be convinced that it must be legitimate even
13 though it's obviously not.
14 MR. SORENSON: Your Honor, that's all the questions
15 I have. Thank you.
16 THE COURT: All right. Very good.
17 Cross-examination, Mr. Williams.
18 CROSS-EXAMINATION
19 BY THE DEFENDANT:
20 Q Mr. Spota, have you ever met me?
21 A No, sir.
22 Q Have you ever met me in an airport?
23 A No, sir.
24 Q Have you ever seen me go through a airport?
25 A No, sir.

1 Q Have you ever seen any of my videos going through
2 the airport?
3 A No, sir. Oh, I have. I saw one on Friday, first
4 time I saw you, which they say was you, but actually all I
5 could see was you showing this to a Transportation Security
6 Officer, so assume it was you.
7 Q So you only saw one video?
8 A I saw one video, yes, sir.
9 Q You didn't see the other plethora of videos I have
10 of me going through TSA?
11 A If you turned those in as evidence, I did not see
12 those, no. I saw one.
13 Q So you said you train screeners; is that correct?
14 A That is correct.
15 Q And so when you train screeners, you said if they
16 saw this ID, they would reject it, correct?
17 A No. I said they're trained to reject it. I'm not
18 saying they can't make a mistake, and that's what happened
19 here, but they're trained to reject an ID like this, yes, sir.
20 Q Okay. So would you say that 30 screeners would make
21 that mistake?
22 A Oh, I couldn't give you an actual number. There are
23 2-and-a-half million people that fly through the airports of
24 the United States every single day and are human errors going
25 to happen? Absolutely. But they are trained that this is not

1 an acceptable form of ID.
2 Q And did the TSA have a website?
3 A They do have a website, yes, sir.
4 Q And do you know what it states on the website?
5 A I do not know every single thing that's stated on
6 the website, no, sir.
7 Q Do you know what it states on the website about IDs
8 that you don't recognize?
9 A I know -- I do not know what it states on there. I
10 know what they're trained to do.
11 Q So you was a trainer?
12 A Yes, sir.
13 Q But you don't know what it says on your own website
14 regarding IDs that you don't recognize?
15 A I assume it says exactly what we train and that is
16 that -- would you like me to tell you exactly what they are
17 trained?
18 Q Yes, please, tell me what you all train.
19 A Absolutely. If you do not recognize this ID to be a
20 legitimate ID and not a fake, you must call your supervisor and
21 STSO, as we would describe, which is a Supervisory
22 Transportation Security Officer. By them not doing that in the
23 video I saw, what it meant was they thought it was real, but
24 they were wrong.
25 Q Okay. Now, so you made that assumption, correct?

1 A I didn't make that assumption. This is -- this is
2 not a legitimate ID.
3 Q No, I'm saying you made the assumption that that was
4 the first time that I've ever handed that to that agent?
5 A I saw one videotape. You handed it to one agent.
6 That's what I saw.
7 Q Okay. Now, you don't know that I had already had to
8 talk to a supervisor prior to that video, do you?
9 A I do not know what happened before the video or
10 after the video. I can only testify to what happened at the
11 video, yes, sir.
12 Q Okay. Now, so if I went through the airport, which
13 I have --
14 A Yes, sir.
15 Q -- and was stopped by the screeners 'cause they
16 didn't recognize that and they did exactly what you said and
17 they sent it to it a supervisor --
18 A Yes, sir.
19 Q -- and then the supervisor had to do the
20 verification --
21 A Correct. And -- go ahead, sir.
22 Q -- so when the supervisor does a verification, now,
23 is the -- would the supervisor be mistaken whether this is fake
24 or not?
25 A They can be, and in this case if you're telling me

1 you before or after had talked to a supervisor and they
2 approved this, there is no way because it is a fake. There is
3 no question about it.
4 You've got the Great Seal of the United
5 States -- the Great Seal of the United States on here.
6 Title 18 U.S.C., Section 713 states it is illegal to take the
7 Great Seal of the United States and put it on another document.
8 You're not allowed to do that unless it's with an actual
9 federal agency.
10 So would they be conned? Would they be influenced
11 to think that was a legitimate document? They would. If
12 you're saying I know an officer saw this, if you say a
13 supervisor saw it and they let it go through, then they made a
14 mistake also and they should have gone to someone above them.
15 Q So --
16 THE COURT: You have two more minutes. Go ahead.
17 THE DEFENDANT: Two minutes?
18 THE COURT: Yeah. You had five.
19 Q (BY THE DEFENDANT:) So you're saying that it's
20 against the law to have that seal on there, right?
21 A It's against the law to take the seal, Title 18
22 U.S.C., Section 713, to take the Great Seal of the United
23 States, put it on another document, particularly to convey that
24 that is part of a federal agency. It's punishable by fine and
25 6 months' imprisonment.

1 Q So I been using this document, this, for 9 years.
2 Why don't -- why do you think I have never been charged with
3 that statute?
4 A Sir, I don't know if you've been using it for
5 9 years, and if 9 years you've been able to convince people
6 that this fake document is allowed to board a plane, you did a
7 really good job of making them believe that. But it's not
8 acceptable to go on a plane.
9 Q So is that a *de facto* agency you talking about or a
10 *de jure* federal agency?
11 A I'm talking about just a federal agency.
12 Q There's a difference, sir. Do you know the
13 difference between a *de jure* and *de facto*?
14 A I do not, sir.
15 Q Okay. Well, that's a *de jure* federal agency ID.
16 A Well, I can --
17 Q Megan Crawley works for the FBI. Now, do you know
18 that the FBI has approved that ID? Did you know that?
19 A I did not know that, and if that's the case, then
20 please have a FBI agent come on up here to talk about that.
21 I'm talking about TSA.
22 Q And do you know --
23 A And I'm saying as an acceptable form of ID, it must
24 be from a federal agency, not a *de facto*, not anything else.
25 It can be the state government, can be a foreign country, but

1 from a federal agency. I know --
2 THE COURT: All right. You got 30 more --
3 THE WITNESS: -- the rules and regulation and that's
4 what it is.
5 THE COURT: All right. You got 30 more seconds.
6 Q (BY THE DEFENDANT:) So then why did all your
7 supervisor in like 30 airports agree that this was a valid ID,
8 sir?
9 A You know what? If they made a mistake, bad on us.
10 We shouldn't allow that to happen. I guarantee you if I was
11 there, we wouldn't have made that mistake, and the majority of
12 TSA agents and TSA supervisors would not make the mistake.
13 But it doesn't change the fact that that is not
14 issued by a federal agency and should not have been approved by
15 any single TSA agent and they should have stopped you.
16 Q So the mere fact that they didn't shows you that it
17 was valid, that it's not fake?
18 A Absolutely not. It shows that they made a mistake
19 and they should have been trained better.
20 Q So you're saying --
21 THE COURT: This is your last question.
22 Q (BY THE DEFENDANT:) So you're saying that all your
23 TSA supervisor are incompetent and stupid?
24 A You can use all -- but you're talking about all,
25 you're talking about thousands of supervisors around the

1 country.

2 You're telling me that potentially one saw it?

3 You're telling me that one could have made a mistake?

4 Absolutely. We have thousands of supervisors around the United

5 States at over 400 airports. If one let this through, they

6 made a mistake. We should have trained them better or they

7 should have known procedures, 'cause this is not a legitimate

8 federal agency ID.

9 Q According to you, not according to the law, correct?

10 A No, according to me and according to TSA.

11 THE COURT: All right. Stop. That's it. Your

12 time's over. No redirect.

13 Thank you very much. You're excused as a witness.

14 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

15 THE COURT: Wish you a good day. Please don't

16 discuss your testimony with anyone until the conclusion of this

17 trial.

18 All right. Mr. Yates, who you calling next?

19 MR. YATES: The government will be calling Laurice

20 Otsuka.

21 May I approach and hand the --

22 THE COURT: You may. You got 10 minutes, unless you

23 want to beat Mr. Sorenson who did his in 6.

24 MR. YATES: I consider that a challenge, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: Okay.

1 **LAURICE OTSUKA, GOVERNMENT'S WITNESS, WAS SWORN**

2 THE COURTROOM MANAGER: Thank you.

3 If you could state your name and spell your last name for

4 the record.

5 THE WITNESS: Sure. Good afternoon. My name is

6 Laurice Otsuka. It's O-t-s-u-k-a.

7 THE COURT: All right. Your witness.

8 MR. YATES: Your Honor, may I publish Exhibit 904

9 which has been admitted into evidence?

10 THE COURT: You may.

11 DIRECT EXAMINATION

12 BY MR. YATES:

13 Q Ms. Otsuka, I believe that you testified in the

14 case-in-chief regarding Exhibit 904, correct?

15 A Yes, that's correct.

16 Q And this is a chart that you had created?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Can you please remind the jury what you based this

19 chart upon?

20 A So this chart was prepared based on eight bank

21 accounts at four different banks, and these are all Mortgage

22 Enterprise Investments' clients in Hawaii.

23 Q Okay. And so the entity was Mortgage Enterprise

24 Investments, correct?

25 A Correct, only -- yeah, only MEI.

1 Q And who are the signatories on these bank accounts?
2 A Mr. Anthony Williams and Ms. Barbara Williams.
3 Q Okay. And no one else, correct?
4 A Correct.
5 Q Okay. Now, let's talk about refunds. How many
6 clients submitted checks to MEI from Hawaii?
7 A So from Hawaii a total of 224 deposits.
8 Q Deposits. And so how many clients were those?
9 A 112 clients.
10 Q Okay. And then you said from those 112 clients,
11 there were 200 -- how many deposits?
12 A 224 deposits.
13 Q Okay. And when you say deposits, what do you mean?
14 A So that included mostly checks, but there were some
15 money orders that were sent in.
16 Q Okay. And did any of the checks that came into the
17 MEI accounts come from an escrow account or an escrow company?
18 A No.
19 Q They all came from individuals, correct?
20 A Individual checking accounts or money orders.
21 Q So if MEI were to give out refunds to clients, what
22 evidence would there be in the MEI bank accounts that you
23 reviewed?
24 A For refunds back to mortgage clients, so what I
25 would look for is that the person actually gave MEI money and

1 that if they -- and there was only one that I found was -- it
2 was a cashier's check remitted back to the client.
3 Q Okay. So you would look for checks that a person
4 had sent to MEI, and then you would see if there were any
5 checks that were sent back to that person, correct?
6 A Correct -- or money orders.
7 Q Or money orders, okay. And how many checks did you
8 see go out to MEI clients that had previously given money to
9 MEI?
10 A I only found one.
11 Q Okay.
12 A Hawaii. Hawaii.
13 Q From Hawaii. And who was that person?
14 A Rosy Thomas.
15 Q Does that also -- does that person also go by the
16 name Rosy Esprecion Thomas or Rosy Esprecion?
17 A Only saw Rosy Thomas.
18 Q And how much was that one check that MEI had sent
19 back to Rosy Thomas in the amount of?
20 A So it was a cashier's check and it was in the amount
21 of $1,122.
22 Q Okay. And how much money had Rosy Thomas paid MEI
23 at that point?
24 A So Rosy Thomas was actually one of those that issued
25 money orders, so she had issued five $500 money orders for a

1 total of 2500. So she gave 2500 and she got 1,122 back.
2 Q So if you could look in your folder in front of you,
3 there is -- there are a number of exhibits, and I'd like to
4 direct your attention to Exhibit No. 2184.
5 And, Your Honor, Exhibit 2184 has already been
6 admitted into evidence.
7 THE COURT: All right. You wish to publish?
8 MR. YATES: Yes. Could we get 2184?
9 Q (BY MR. YATES:) Now, do you recognize Exhibit 2184?
10 A Yes. I've seen this before.
11 Q Okay. And Exhibit 2184 represents checks from
12 Extraco, correct?
13 A Correct. It's a cashier's check.
14 Q Okay. These are -- 2184, they're all checks from
15 the MEI account at Extraco Bank?
16 A Let me just make sure. Yes, all Extraco.
17 Q Okay. And from your review -- your previous review
18 of Exhibit 2184, can you confirm that these were all checks
19 that were -- checks that MEI had sent out to its clients or to
20 people?
21 A Yes.
22 Q Okay. Now, having reviewed 2184, how many
23 individuals that are listed in 2184 received a check from MEI
24 that had previously sent a check to MEI?
25 A Uhm, having looked at this --

1 Q Who are from Hawaii, I should note.
2 A From Hawaii? So I believe there are three of them.
3 Q Okay.
4 A Let me find the right page. So it was Rosy Thomas,
5 that's the 1,122.
6 Q Right. And she had previously given a check to MEI,
7 correct?
8 A Five money orders.
9 Q Five money orders?
10 A Yes.
11 Q And she received 1122 back, correct?
12 A Correct.
13 Q You said there are two other names. Did those two
14 more names involve people who had sent money to MEI at some
15 point?
16 A No.
17 Q They only sent money to MEI?
18 A The only reason I knew they were from Hawaii because
19 when the check is endorsed from the back, they were deposited
20 into Hawaii accounts.
21 THE COURT: You have 4 more minutes.
22 MR. YATES: Okay. Your Honor, may I publish
23 Exhibit 853 which has been admitted?
24 THE COURT: You may.
25 Q (BY MR. YATES:) So, Ms. Otsuka?

1 A Yes.
2 Q You mentioned that there were two other names other
3 than Rosy Thomas who received checks from MEI, although these
4 individuals did not pay checks to MEI, correct?
5 A Correct.
6 Q Okay. So pointing to Exhibit 853, on the left-hand
7 side of the Common Law Office of America letterhead, there's a
8 name Mel Horner. Is that one of the individuals who received
9 money from MEI?
10 A Yes.
11 Q And Mel Horner never paid money to MEI, correct?
12 A No.
13 Q How much money did --
14 THE DEFENDANT: Objection. That's speculation.
15 THE COURT: All right. Overruled. She's basing it
16 on her review of the documents.
17 Q (BY MR. YATES:) How much money did MEI pay to Mel
18 Horner?
19 A Uhm, I don't recall offhand. I would have to see
20 the check.
21 Q Okay.
22 A $500.
23 Q Okay. And there was one other name you had
24 mentioned that MEI had paid other than Rosy Thomas and Mel
25 Horner, correct?

1 A Correct.
2 Q And that was Sautia Tapani or otherwise named Sam
3 Tapani?
4 A Yeah, Sam Tapani.
5 Q And how much money did MEI pay to Sam Tapani?
6 A $300.
7 Q Okay. So now, Ms. Otsuka, you have in your binder
8 in front of you a number of exhibits and there are exhibit
9 numbers 854 through 859. Can you review those documents and
10 when you're comfortable, please indicate so.
11 THE COURT: Two more minutes.
12 THE WITNESS: Okay. Okay.
13 MR. YATES: All right. So, Your Honor, 854 through
14 859 have not been --
15 A Yes.
16 Q They have not been introduced into evidence.
17 So, Ms. Otsuka, are 854 through 859 checks that you
18 reviewed as a part of your analysis in this investigation?
19 A Yes.
20 Q Were they checks that were received by the FBI
21 pursuant to subpoenas in connection with this investigation?
22 A Yes.
23 Q And these were checks that you relied upon in part
24 to create Exhibit 904, correct?
25 A Correct.

1 MR. YATES: Your Honor, I would like to introduce
2 into evidence Exhibits 854 through 859.
3 THE COURT: Any objections?
4 MR. ISAACSON: Hang on a minute, Your Honor.
5 Q (BY MR. YATES:) Ms. Otsuka --
6 THE COURT: Wait. I'm asking if he has any
7 objections. I'll add on the time.
8 Okay. Yes. I thought you stood up 'cause you were going
9 to make --
10 MR. ISAACSON: Oh, no.
11 MR. SORENSON: I am, Your Honor. I'm willing to
12 donate four of my minutes to Mr. Yates.
13 THE DEFENDANT: I have no objection.
14 THE COURT: All right. They're received. You wish
15 to publish?
16 MR. YATES: Yes, Your Honor.
17 THE COURT: All right.
18 MR. YATES: Starting with 854.
19 Q (BY MR. YATES:) Now --
20 A I don't know what you're asking. Sorry.
21 MR. YATES: The screen.
22 Q (BY MR. YATES:) Ms. Otsuka, these are all checks
23 that MEI received from Danilo and Macrina Pillos, correct?
24 A Danilo Pillos, yes.
25 Q Okay. These were all checks received from the

1 Pilloses, correct?
2 A Correct.
3 Q And going through these, the first of these checks
4 is dated October 15, 2014; is that right?
5 A Correct.
6 MR. YATES: Okay. Your Honor, I'm going to publish
7 these one at a time. Is that all right?
8 THE COURT: That's fine.
9 Q (BY MR. YATES:) Ms. Otsuka, so the second of these
10 checks is from Ms. Pillos -- excuse me -- from Mr. Pillos to
11 MEI November 28, 2014; is that correct?
12 A Correct.
13 Q Okay. The third of these checks was sent from
14 Mr. Pillos to MEI on December 15, 2014; is that correct?
15 A Correct.
16 Q The next check went from Mr. Pillos to MEI on
17 April 15, 2015; is that correct?
18 A April 25th, 20- --
19 Q April 25th. Thank you for the correction.
20 A Yes.
21 Q Next check was sent from Pillos to MEI on May 8th,
22 2015, correct?
23 A I think that's June 8th, yeah.
24 Q Thank you for that correction.
25 And then finally the last check was sent from Danilo

1 Pillos to MEI on July 1st, 2015, correct?
2 A Correct.
3 Q Now, Ms. Otsuka, are you aware of the circumstances
4 under which the Pilloses and their grandson had experienced or
5 -- I take that back.
6 Are you aware of what happened to the Pilloses that
7 caused the Pilloses to stop sending checks to MEI in 2015,
8 after July 2015?
9 A No.
10 MR. YATES: No further questions on direct, Your
11 Honor.
12 THE COURT: All right. Very good, within your time.
13 Okay. Cross-examination, Mr. Williams. I'll give you
14 five minutes.
15 CROSS-EXAMINATION
16 BY THE DEFENDANT:
17 Q Ms. Otsuka?
18 A Yes.
19 Q Did you do an analysis on the fraudulent Mortgage
20 Enterprise account?
21 A ME?
22 Q Yeah.
23 A No.
24 Q They told you not to do one on theirs?
25 A Uhm, because you're not a signator on that account,

1 so it wasn't relevant.
2 Q But they were still scamming people, but so you
3 didn't analyze their account?
4 A No.
5 Q Okay. Did you analyze any of the ME accounts in
6 Tennessee?
7 A No.
8 Q Did you analyze any of the ME accounts in Florida?
9 A No.
10 Q Did you analyze any of the MEI accounts in
11 California?
12 A MEI?
13 Q Yeah.
14 A So the accounts that I looked at were at Wells
15 Fargo, Bank of America, Extraco, and First Hawaiian Bank.
16 Q Okay. Was any of those in California?
17 A I believe Wells Fargo has a presence in California
18 and Bank of America has a presence in California. First
19 Hawaiian Bank would be here and Extraco I believe is in Texas.
20 Q Right. So I'm saying so did you analyze my Mortgage
21 Enterprise Investments accounts in California? Was that part
22 of your report?
23 A Are you saying a bank in California?
24 Q Yes, I have a bank account. I have a Mortgage
25 Enterprise Investments bank account in California 'cause I have

1 a office in California. So did you analyze that bank account?
2 A I guess I don't know what you're asking. Is it a
3 Wells Fargo or --
4 Q Yes, it's a Wells Fargo account.
5 A Okay. Then, yes.
6 Q Okay. So where is that reported?
7 A Uhm, it's included in the Mortgage Enterprise
8 Investments Hawaii. Like you can go back to 904 exhibit and
9 those clients. If you deposited Hawaii customer clients in
10 that account, it would be in there.
11 Q But you didn't give me the Mortgage Enterprise
12 Investment account from California. What you gave me is the
13 Extraco account. That's the only account --
14 A Oh, no, no, no. What makes you think that it's only
15 Extraco?
16 Q That's the only thing they provided.
17 A No. If you look at the top of Exhibit 904, I have
18 the bank accounts listed.
19 THE DEFENDANT: Can you pull up 904?
20 THE WITNESS: I think I do.
21 THE COURT: Okay. We'll see. 904 is --
22 THE WITNESS: Yeah. Either that or 903.
23 THE COURT: Before you is 904.
24 THE WITNESS: Okay. I apologize. I do not have it
25 on 904.

1 THE COURT: Okay. Do you want 903?
2 THE WITNESS: Let's look in 903. I didn't put it on
3 903. Sorry. I had another exhibit with the bank accounts and
4 I think we didn't use it.
5 Yeah. So that's the one. These were the eight bank
6 accounts.
7 Q (BY THE DEFENDANT:) Okay. So where is -- what
8 state is the Wells Fargo bank account?
9 A I don't know exactly which state.
10 Q What about Bank of America?
11 A I don't know exactly which state, but they're all
12 Mortgage Enterprise Investments.
13 Q Right.
14 A And you're a signer.
15 Q Right. So I got multiple states that I have bank
16 accounts. So you didn't do the Florida account at all?
17 A Do you have more Hawaii clients in that Florida
18 account?
19 Q Yes. I had -- I use --
20 A So there are more clients than the 112 Hawaii
21 clients --
22 Q Yes.
23 A -- that we identified?
24 Q Yes. I got over 400 clients here.
25 A Okay.

1 THE COURT: Okay. You guys have to not talk over
2 each other.
3 What's your question? You got two more minutes.
4 Q (BY THE DEFENDANT:) So you've never analyzed the
5 Florida Mortgage Enterprise Investments account?
6 A Is it a Wells Fargo or Bank of America? I mean,
7 these are the accounts that I analyzed. I don't know which
8 state they were in.
9 Q So --
10 A 'Cause --
11 Q -- 'cause I'm in eight states, ma'am. That's why
12 I'm saying you couldn't have analyzed all my accounts or you
13 would have saw some of the Hawaii payments in the other
14 accounts and some of the other refunds --
15 MR. YATES: Objection. He's giving testimony.
16 THE DEFENDANT: -- some of the payments.
17 THE COURT: Overruled. You got one more minute.
18 Q (BY THE DEFENDANT:) In their account it says Danilo
19 Pillos on the check, correct?
20 A I'm sorry?
21 Q He just showed you where it said Danilo --
22 A Danilo Pillos.
23 Q Right. But I didn't see Macrina Pillos. Did you
24 see Macrina Pillos in the check anywhere in there?
25 A I did not.

1 Q And so did you have any statements where any of the
2 clients on that list actually requested a refund here in
3 Hawaii?
4 A I -- that would not be a bank transaction.
5 Q Well, no, I'm saying like did they show you anything
6 where any of those clients on that list requested a refund to
7 be issued, a refund from the MEI account for Hawaii? Did they
8 show you any affidavits from any of the Hawaii people that
9 actually requested a refund?
10 A I didn't see anything.
11 Q Okay. So you didn't analyze the MEI accounts, the
12 Mortgage Enterprise accounts, and they only had you do an
13 analysis of just my accounts that I'm the signer on, correct?
14 A Correct.
15 Q Okay. So but the other ones he just pulled up, the
16 2184, you did see the refunds with the other clients and the
17 other states on that MEI account, correct?
18 A I don't know if they were refunds, but I saw the
19 cashier's checks.
20 THE DEFENDANT: Pull up the 2184, please. 2184.
21 THE COURT: All right. That's -- okay. You want it
22 published?
23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
24 THE COURT: All right. May be published.
25 Q (BY THE DEFENDANT:) Okay. You see those names on

1 there?
2 A Yes.
3 Q Now, aren't those names some of my clients on the
4 original analysis that you did on the big -- the one that had
5 307,000?
6 A Some of them, yes.
7 Q So those are the clients, some on there, correct?
8 So those are refunds issued to clients that asked for a refund,
9 correct, but they were clients?
10 A It doesn't say refund on it.
11 Q Well, they were clients and then that's a refund
12 payment. You see the amount is 500?
13 A They're payments back to them, yes.
14 Q Right, exactly.
15 A Yeah.
16 Q So but you don't really know the other accounts that
17 were refunded -- that clients were refunded from, though, do
18 you? You don't know the other accounts that I had other than
19 just these ones that you got?
20 A The eight.
21 Q Right.
22 A Other than the eight, correct.
23 Q You don't know about the other ones?
24 A You're correct.
25 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. No more questions.

1 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You're excused
2 as a witness. Please don't discuss your testimony with anyone
3 until the conclusion of the trial.
4 Mr. Sorenson, does the government rest?
5 MR. SORENSON: Government rests it's rebuttal case,
6 Your Honor.
7 THE COURT: All right. Very good.
8 All right. So, ladies and gentlemen, we kept you over
9 about 4 minutes. I apologize. I have an important question to
10 pose to you and if you want to discuss it among yourselves.
11 Okay. So the option is we can do closing argument
12 tomorrow, and then you will get the case and begin deliberating
13 and I would excuse -- if all of you show up tomorrow, then I
14 would excuse our alternates and let them know that they
15 shouldn't talk to anybody about the case because should they be
16 called to replace anyone during the deliberations, then they
17 shouldn't look at outside, you know, information.
18 Or you come back Monday and we close. But that means our
19 two alternates would have to come back of course on Monday and
20 then be excused at that time after closing arguments are given.
21 So do you have any preference between option one and
22 option two, closing and begin deliberation Thursday? The
23 difference is you'd begin deliberation after closing arguments,
24 which I anticipate will take up the morning. And then you'd
25 begin deliberating from lunchtime on to the end of the day, the

1 average work day, which would be like 4:30.
2 Then you would not come in on Friday 'cause I've already
3 told you there's no trial on Friday, and you would come back
4 Monday and deliberate. So there'd be a day in between you
5 hearing closing and beginning your deliberations.
6 Or you can wait to hear closing on Monday and then you
7 would continue to deliberate Monday through Friday, you know,
8 8:00, 9 o'clock in the morning till 4:00, 5 o'clock in the
9 afternoon until you reach a verdict.
10 All right. So do you want to take a day off in between
11 hearing closing and deliberating? So talk amongst yourselves.
12 I just wanted to consult with you folks. Do you have a
13 preference?
14 THE JUROR: I think the consensus is we take a day
15 off.
16 THE COURT: Okay. So you want to have closing on
17 Monday?
18 THE JUROR: On Monday.
19 THE COURT: And then hear the whole thing and then
20 start deliberating and not stop deliberating until you
21 stop -- until you reach a verdict, and that would be Monday
22 through Friday or however long it takes you to reach a verdict?
23 THE JUROR: Yes, ma'am.
24 THE COURT: Is that what the majority of people
25 would like?

1 THE JUROR: Could we take a vote?
2 THE COURT: Yes. How many want to hear closing
3 tomorrow and take Friday off? Okay.
4 How many want to hear closing on Monday?
5 Okay. All right. So majority rules. We're going -- I'm
6 going to excuse you so you'll have a long weekend, and I will
7 see you then Monday morning. We will -- if you could be here
8 about 8:45 and we'll begin at 9 o'clock, and then we will
9 hopefully complete in time so that you can have lunch, go to
10 deliberations and then decide when to have lunch.
11 Then I'm going to meet with the attorneys and we're going
12 to get the rules down in terms of time limits for closing and
13 the jury instructions. All right?
14 So thank you very much for your kind attention and your
15 patience with us today. Of course, leave your notebooks and
16 iPads behind. Don't discuss the case with anyone or allow
17 anyone to discuss it with you. Don't research, Google, or
18 investigate any of the witnesses or issues. Of course, don't
19 engage in social media regarding the trial, and don't listen
20 to, watch, or read any media accounts, should there be any.
21 I will see you Monday morning back here at court. I wish
22 you a very good weekend on behalf of Mr. Williams and all the
23 attorneys and court staff. Thank you so much.
24 Please rise for the jury. They're excused until Monday
25 morning at 9:00 A.M.

1 (Open court out of the presence of the jury.)
2 THE COURT: The record will reflect the jury's no
3 longer present. Present are Mr. Williams and counsel. You may
4 be seated.
5 All right. So everyone's rested. We've already settled
6 the jury instructions. I'm going to have it put in -- wait.
7 Has it been put in final form and emailed to the counsel?
8 THE LAW CLERK: Well, it's been emailed to them,
9 last check.
10 THE COURT: So the final has been emailed to you
11 folks so you can check, and if there are any typographical
12 errors or what have you, then please advise by tomorrow so that
13 we can finalize it for Monday.
14 The same with the jury verdict form. That's been
15 finalized and I believe given to you folks. So if you could
16 let us know by noon tomorrow if you have any objections.
17 Do you need a hard copy, Mr. Isaacson and Mr. Williams?
18 MR. ISAACSON: I have a hard copy of the -- what you
19 have emailed us.
20 THE COURT: So you could discuss it with him.
21 MR. ISAACSON: I have a question about the verdict
22 form if you'd like me to raise that now.
23 THE COURT: Oh, yes.
24 MR. ISAACSON: I've seen -- so I have the original
25 government verdict form guilty or not guilty, not guilty and

1 all that kind of thing, then we have the redacted indictment.
2 THE COURT: Indictment.
3 MR. ISAACSON: Is it just to be stapled together
4 given? Is that your --
5 THE COURT: Yes.
6 MR. ISAACSON: Okay.
7 THE COURT: Okay. Anything else we need to take up,
8 Mr. Sorenson?
9 MR. SORENSON: Well, Your Honor, probably for
10 closing argument I think we probably should tell the Court how
11 long we'll need.
12 THE COURT: Yes.
13 MR. SORENSON: And kind of cover those housekeeping
14 details.
15 THE COURT: Right.
16 MR. SORENSON: I think the government is going to
17 ask for hour-and-a-half total, hour-fifteen for our principal
18 argument and then we would like to reserve 15 minutes for
19 rebuttal.
20 THE COURT: Okay. And Mr. Williams, for your
21 closing?
22 THE DEFENDANT: Same amount of time. I mean, aren't
23 we supposed to get the exact same amount of time?
24 THE COURT: No, I'm just asking -- you aren't
25 required to do it for an hour and 30 minutes -- or an hour and

1 15 I guess is their closing, 15 minutes for their rebuttal.
2 You don't get a rebuttal. But whatever amount -- I mean, you
3 don't have to go that long. But you'd like hour-and-a-half?
4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I mean --
5 THE COURT: No, I'm just asking how much you want.
6 Okay.
7 MR. SORENSON: And, Your Honor, I think you've
8 indicated the Court's practice is to instruct first?
9 THE COURT: Yes.
10 MR. SORENSON: And so we can -- if we have a
11 PowerPoint, we can include some of those instructions or an
12 instruction into those so we'll know what's given?
13 THE COURT: Yes.
14 MR. SORENSON: All right.
15 THE COURT: Do you have a question, Mr. Williams?
16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Also on the -- I had sent
17 Mr. Isaacson some U.S. Supreme Court case law on the duty of a
18 standby and what a standby is actually allowed to do in a *pro*
19 *se* case.
20 One of the things was what he was allowed to do was
21 cross-examine me, you know, object -- objection. Another thing
22 was actually he could actually close if I choose him to close.
23 So I was debating on could I split my closing with him?
24 THE COURT: No. You're either representing yourself
25 or Mr. Isaacson is representing you.

1 THE DEFENDANT: Well, 'cause I mean the way the U.S.
2 Supreme Court says that at any point I can just say, "Hey, I
3 want him to take over," and then he can take over.
4 THE COURT: Absolutely, yeah. But then you can't
5 represent yourself. So you can't do the closing.
6 THE DEFENDANT: I'm saying even during closing the
7 U.S. Supreme Court said during the middle of closing I say,
8 "No, I want him to do it," then I have the authority to just
9 relinquish it up to him.
10 THE COURT: So you need to make a decision before
11 closing starts if you're going to have Mr. Isaacson take over
12 the trial for you.
13 THE DEFENDANT: I'm saying but --
14 THE COURT: So he either does the closing or you do
15 the closing, but it's not going to be hybrid of both of you
16 doing the closing.
17 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Well, I'm just going to put
18 on the record I object because of what the U.S. Supreme Court
19 state.
20 THE COURT: All right. It's on the record.
21 Okay. So we would convene at 9 o'clock. I will instruct
22 them. I think that's going to take at least 20 minutes.
23 And then, Mr. Sorenson, you're up first. We're not going
24 to take a recess, we'll go right into you. We'll take a recess
25 after you finish, and then we'll have the defense's, whoever's

1 going to give the closing.
2 Once that's completed -- and that's not going to exceed an
3 hour-and-a-half -- then I'll check with the court reporter if
4 she needs a recess; otherwise, then it's the rebuttal of 15
5 minutes, and then the jury will have the case. So they'll
6 probably get the case by about 1 o'clock.
7 Donna, is that early enough for them to go to the
8 cafeteria? Okay. So we'll order lunch for them because they
9 won't be able to go to the cafeteria if they choose to break
10 for lunch.
11 MR. SORENSON: Your Honor, typically with a longer
12 case like this, I have a photograph taken of our witnesses when
13 they conclude their testimony and I include those in our
14 PowerPoint presentation so the jury can kind of remember back
15 to our case. I just want to alert the Court to that. I've
16 done it many times in other cases, but I haven't done a trial
17 with you yet, Your Honor, so I just want to let you know that's
18 our practice.
19 THE COURT: Are these complimentary photos? They're
20 not candid? Just kidding.
21 MR. SORENSON: Some of the witnesses have been
22 crying so --
23 THE COURT: Any objection?
24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I object to that because
25 there's no rule that I know of in federal rules that allows you

1 to take a picture of a witness and then have that picture
2 submitted as an evidence -- as an exhibit. It's utterly
3 ridiculous.
4 MR. SORENSON: It's not an exhibit, Your Honor.
5 THE COURT: Exactly, it's not a exhibit. It's
6 demonstrative aid in closing argument. So, you know, if you
7 have the photos, if you could show them to Mr. Isaacson,
8 Mr. Williams, just so that they're not -- draw an objection --
9 MR. SORENSON: Give them a copy?
10 THE COURT: Yeah -- that they're somehow
11 inflammatory or outrageous.
12 MR. SORENSON: Yes.
13 THE COURT: But conceptually, I have no problem with
14 you using that as demonstrative aid, particularly since there
15 were several witnesses who were called in this case.
16 MR. SORENSON: Thank you.
17 MR. ISAACSON: Your Honor, may I address the Court?
18 If we could get copies if I end up doing closing possibly?
19 THE COURT: You might want to use it too.
20 MR. ISAACSON: Your Honor, so Ms. Beecher has done
21 a -- (applauds) -- by the way, thank you, Ms. Beecher.
22 THE COURT: Yes. She's terrific. Thank you.
23 MR. ISAACSON: So she needs to get with everybody to
24 figure out -- I understand the sets that are going back to the
25 jury. When would you -- she may leave tomorrow night. So is

1 there a way that that could be done tomorrow with your staff?
2 THE COURT: I'll leave that to Ms. Elkington and to
3 scheduling something with you folks.
4 MR. ISAACSON: Okay.
5 THE COURT: So I'm sure we can accommodate her.
6 MR. ISAACSON: But I want to say -- can I on the
7 record -- how much Ms. Beecher has been a great -- no, she
8 really has been.
9 THE COURT: Yes. No, I appreciate that. I
10 encourage you to do so, she has been --
11 MR. ISAACSON: She's done a wonderful job and also
12 Ivy, Ms. Yeung, have done. I thank them very much. They
13 really helped me out a tremendous amount. I know Mr. Williams
14 appreciates them.
15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
16 MR. ISAACSON: So she won't be here for closing, I
17 don't think she's staying, but I want thank you.
18 THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. The
19 court really appreciates your assistance. You made things go
20 very smoothly.
21 MR. SORENSON: And so do we.
22 THE COURT: Okay. If there's nothing further, then
23 we are in recess.
24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
25 MR. ISAACSON: I'm sorry.

1 THE DEFENDANT: I have -- I'm going to submit my
2 actual motion for judgment of acquittal. You will have it
3 either by tomorrow or Friday.
4 THE COURT: All right. Very good. If you want to
5 just state on the record that you're re-
6 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. I'm reissuing me raising my
7 motion for judgment of acquittal.
8 THE COURT: Which will be set forth more fully in
9 your motion.
10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
11 THE COURT: That's fine. So by 12:00 noon tomorrow
12 if there are any typo changes or what have you to the special
13 verdict -- not special -- jury verdict form, redacted
14 indictment, and the jury instructions, all right, you need to
15 send that to my chambers.
16 MR. ISAACSON: Can Mr. Williams remain?
17 THE COURT: Yes, he can stay for 15 to 20 minutes,
18 all right?
19 All right. Thank you. I wish all of you a very good
20 afternoon and I will see you if not before then, Monday
21 morning. Have a nice weekend.
22 (Proceedings adjourned at 2:19 P.M. P.M.,
23 until Monday, March 2, 2020, at 9:00 A.M.)
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 9. 2020.

/s/ Debra Read

DEBRA READ, CSR CRR RMR RDR