

SYSTEMIC OPPRESSION AND RACIAL INJUSTICE WITHIN AMERICA'S CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM (CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS)

(CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS)

The United States Constitution protects all persons within its territories and jurisdiction irrespective of their race, gender or religion. All persons should benefit from the equal protection of the law and the Court can only function based on public trust in the Courts.

1. In March 2020, the Congress of the United States passed the CARES Act and directed Attorney General Barr to direct the Bureau of Prisons to transfer medically vulnerable inmates to home confinement. Medically vulnerable inmates with conditions such as diabetes, hypertension and high cholesterol that puts them at a heightened risk from the coronavirus as highlighted by the CDC - Center for Disease Control and Prevention were supposed to be transferred to home confinement. To-date, the Bureau of Prisons has refused to do so while selectively offering high profile inmates with powerful connections, such as Paul Manafort, the protection of the CARES Act as they deprive other vulnerable inmates the benefit of the CARES Act. The warden of FCI Allenwood Low, where Raheem is incarcerated, refused Raheem's request to transfer him to home confinement while acknowledging that Raheem has diabetes, hypertension, and high cholesterol. This is clearly a Fifth Amendment violation where the Bureau of Prisons and warden of Allenwood deprive Raheem and all other medically vulnerable inmates the equal protection of the CARES Act. The Courts have also failed to act to protect the Constitutional Rights of inmates such as Raheem.
2. In America, how can a federal Judge - Judge Lewis A. Kaplan ignore the federal rule and Google Raheem, realize that he is a black man (and the Chairman and CEO for Blacksands Pacific one of the very few black-owned oil and gas business in the United States) and then decide to not afford Raheem equal protection of the law and hold him in contempt even though Raheem was not involved with any underlying case? In 2006, the U.S. Court of Appeal for the Second Circuit actually told Judge Kaplan directly that he could not hold someone that was/is not involved in a civil case in contempt, however in 2016 Judge Kaplan ignored that law, held Raheem in contempt, then persuaded the prosecutors - Assistant United States Attorneys Robert Benjamin Sobelman and Nicolas Tyler Landsman-Roos to prosecute Raheem criminally for contempt. The prosecutors then ignored the law to prosecute Raheem and during trial they inappropriately told the jury that Judge Kaplan had already held Raheem in contempt but ignored to tell the jury that it was in error and against the law. One of the jurors named Gordon told the media - Law 360 after trial that the jury were swayed to find Raheem guilty when they were told that Judge Kaplan had already held Raheem in contempt. Even though the Manhattan Federal Appeals Court stated directly to Judge Kaplan in 2006 that he could not hold someone such as Raheem in contempt, when Raheem highlighted the error by Judge Kaplan on appeal, the Court ignored Raheem and refused to correct the error, demonstrating that the Court does not apply the law equally to everyone.
3. Manhattan U.S. Attorney and the prosecutors - Assistant United States Attorney Robert Benjamin Sobelman and Nicolas Tyler Landsman-Roos deprived Raheem liberty by prosecuting him for fraud even after deliberately refusing to collect or review the transaction underwriting files which

document the basis and reasons for approving a bridge finance. What information was relied upon to independently confirm whether there was any fraud? Even when the prosecution witness confirmed during trial that the underwriting files were in London and that the prosecution never requested or reviewed it, the prosecution still refused to collect or review it. Instead the entire trial relied solely on the words of the prosecution witness, Julian Madgett that fraud occurred while Raheem was deprived the opportunity to present the complete record to the jury at trial. How can anyone be deprived of their liberty where the prosecution deliberately decides not to review the evidence? Raheem remains incarcerated even though the prosecution has never obtained or reviewed the pertinent transaction underwriting files.

4. Under the U.S. Constitution, the trial judge has an obligation to protect the Constitutional rights of a criminal defendant however what is seriously wrong in this situation is that prior to trial when Raheem asked the Court (Judge Richard J. Sullivan) to exclude the testimony from Julian Madgett on behalf of ICBC London at trial because he had been unable to compel ICBC London to provide him with the underwriting files which he needed to challenge any inaccurate words from the prosecution witness, Julian Madgett, Judge Sullivan denied his request. During trial after the prosecution witness, Julian Madgett, testified to the existence of the underwriting file in the bank's file in London, Judge Sullivan again refused Raheem's request for the files while confirming that Julian Madgett had testified that the files were with the bank in London. How can any criminal defendant defend themselves against charges from the prosecution without evidence? The U.S. Sixth Amendment affords all criminal defendants the right to compel for evidence in their favor and the Constitutional right to present a complete defense however Raheem was deprived of these rights. Even though Raheem pointed this out to the Manhattan Federal Appeals Court, the Court simply ignored him then made an inaccurate statement that "the only indication that the evidence (ICBC files) are extant comes from Brennerman's bare assertion" even though the trial transcripts at 551-554 clearly show that the prosecution witness, Julian Madgett, confirmed during trial that the evidence (ICBC files) exists and Judge Sullivan at trial transcript 617 acknowledged the same. Yet the Manhattan Federal Appeals Court refused to correct these errors depriving Raheem of his Constitutional rights. Please ask them to show us the evidence (ICBC files) if they truly believe there is fraud. There is no need to continually hide the evidence or deny Raheem access to the evidence.
5. Judge Richard J. Sullivan then allowed Raheem to be convicted for bank fraud based on an account he opened with an institution (Morgan Stanley Smith Barney, LLC) which is not a bank and for a single conversation he had with an individual who worked at an institution (Morgan Stanley Institutional Securities division) which is not a bank, against the law which states that to be convicted for bank fraud the interaction must be with a bank which is FDIC insured. At trial the FDIC commissioner confirmed that the FDIC certificate of one subsidiary/division does not cover another subsidiary/division, each subsidiary/division will have to be covered by its own FDIC certificate. So Raheem's conviction for bank fraud is illegal and in violation of the law. However when Raheem presented evidence to highlight this at document no. 167, Judge Sullivan deliberately ignored evidence and the Manhattan Federal Appeals Court is now ignoring the evidence and law to keep Raheem unjustly imprisoned.
6. Judge Richard J. Sullivan also allowed the prosecutors to change the basis for convicting Raheem for bank fraud. The prosecution charged Raheem with "obtaining or attempting to obtain financing

through fraud," then changed the basis for the bank fraud conviction arguing that Raheem received "perks" like fancy credit card and lower interest rates from an account he opened for three weeks in 2013 with an institution (Morgan Stanley Smith Barney, LLC) which is not a bank. The fancy credit card was closed with zero balance and the account was not even opened long enough for Raheem to receive any perks. So even though the account was not with a bank to satisfy the law to convict Raheem and even though Raheem was not charged with receiving perks for account he opened for three weeks, Judge Sullivan allowed Raheem to be convicted. When Raheem highlighted the error to the Manhattan Federal Appeals Court, the Court said he spoke with an individual at an institution about financing however that individual worked at an institution which is not FDIC insured and when Raheem highlighted this fact to the Court the Manhattan Federal Appeal court simply ignored him.

No one is above the law. Yet here Judge Lewis A. Kaplan ignored the federal rule to Google Raheem, realized that he is a black man and decided not to afford him the protection of the law and held him in contempt in violation of the law then persuaded the Manhattan Federal prosecutors to prosecute him criminally. On April 19, 2017, Raheem was arrested at his home even though there were no pending charges against him. Then within weeks the Manhattan Federal prosecutors indicted Raheem for fraud even though they deliberately refused to obtain or review the pertinent transaction underwriting file which is the core evidence for any investigation prior to commencing any prosecution. The prosecutors deliberately refused to obtain or review the files, so that they would not have to turn it over to Raheem for his defense. Judge Sullivan denied Raheem access to the files so he would not have it to defend himself and the Manhattan Federal Appeals Court, in an endeavor to protect both Judge Kaplan and Judge Sullivan, refused to correct these errors and even made an inaccurate statement that "the only indication that the evidence (ICBC files) are extant comes from Brennerman's bare assertion" in contrast to the trial transcript at 551-554 so that Raheem will remain incarcerated. The prosecutors and Judges are acting above the law.

READ MORE ABOUT OUR STORY AT www.freerjbrennerman.com