

Hello Dr. D'Antonio,

As a fuller explanation to what I believe is Frank's continuing vulnerability, I want to reiterate the following:

Frank was misled by his criminal attorney. But for his disorder (delusional thinking, magical thinking, grandiosity--mania), a "reasonable person" would not pay \$1,000,000 to an attorney who convinced him to plead guilty and accept the maximum level of incarceration in sentencing.

A "reasonable person" would not have been fearful that such a huge retainer "would not cover a trial", and a reasonable person would not be overwhelmed by fear and panic once he was told this, resulting in an agreement to plead guilty.

A person without a bipolar disorder who is *educated as an attorney*, would not be misled by his attorney regarding sentencing concessions (lowering the level of the sentence). Such an attorney without bipolar disorder would not later be shocked to learn that without a written agreement to lessen the sentence, informal discussions would not bind the prosecutor.

There is an even more demonstrative example of Frank's vulnerability from the events and conduct surrounding the criminal tax case.

This example involves the knowledge of Frank's condition by the upper management, executives, lawyers, CPAs, and MBAs who worked closely with Frank on the Mirabilis project.

These professionals knew and understood Frank's illness, as it was disclosed to them prior to their joining the project.

They were aware of his illness and its symptoms while Frank himself, not uncommon for his condition, was often completely unaware of it.

To my personal knowledge, these professionals personally observed Frank's manic behavior, including grandiosity and clearly delusional statements. They discussed these observations among themselves and with me. When I had doubts as to how these professionals were taking measures to protect the project and Frank from these symptoms, I made phone calls and asked for meetings and sent emails to highlight this concern.

I frequently questioned the informal guardianship which had been intentionally set up to specifically protect both the project and Frank. This informal guardianship included a practicing psychiatrist who worked closely with Frank, and whose office was purposefully next door to Frank's.

The guardianship was set up to vet every financial strategy Frank proposed, vetting to be done by some of the country's most competent lawyers, CPAs, and MBAs in business consulting.

As we see now, these professionals were aware of and apparently manipulated Frank's vulnerability to their own financial advantage.

These educated professionals took personal financial advantage of Frank's magical thinking--of his delusionality--of his mental disorder.

And as we have seen from the results of coordinated and concerted manipulation, Frank, and he alone, has pled guilty to criminal responsibility for corporate duties which were not his. And, has freed those professionals from criminal or civil liability for their incompetence and from their coordinated manipulation. His alternative was to plead "advice of counsel", an accurate and complete litigation defense to the allegations.

The contractual duties of those professionals, attorneys, CPAs, MBAs, executives, Board of Director members were entirely whitewashed by Frank's ultimate guilty plea, serving a maximum sentence for tax fraud.

There may be no better factual example of what protections Frank needs in a legal guardianship than those cited above. Whatever available safeguards against this extraordinary example of personal self destruction happening again, should, clearly, be taken on Frank's behalf.

Although this memo can be taken as adversarial and as legal advocacy, it is neither.

My goal is to only argue that when drawing conclusions with respect to taking court protective measures for a mentally ill person, a significant past history of such a mentally impaired person being personally destroyed because of his reliance upon corrupt professionals is impossible to overstate.

Best regards,

Claire Holland

The foregoing is stated under penalty of perjury, and as an officer of the court, is stated with personal knowledge of the facts and events stated.

Claire Suzanne Holland State Bar of Georgia #361060
Mediation and Arbitration Supreme Court Certification Georgia, Florida, Alabama