

MARSHA R. TAUBENHAUS

Attorney at Law

1632 1st Ave. #21040
New York, New York 10028
tel: (917) 426-4880

124 North Fifth Street
Saint Peter, MN 56082
tel: (507) 317-1614

email: taubenhauslawoffice@gmail.com

April 27, 2024

The Rt. Hon. David Cameron MP
United Kingdom Foreign Secretary
Foreign Commonwealth & Development Office
King Charles Street
London, SW1A 2AH
United Kingdom

The Rt. Hon. David Rutley, MP
Minister for Americas and the Caribbean
Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office
King Charles Street
London, SW1A 2AH
United Kingdom

The Rt. Hon. Greg Hands MP
Member of Parliament for Chelsea and Fulham
Chairman of the Conservative Party
House of Commons
London, SW1A 0AA
United Kingdom

re: Raheem Jefferson Brennerman
FCDO Reference No. CON-340635

Dear Sirs:

I am writing on behalf of my client, Raheem Brennerman, regarding the serious flaws inherent in his two related criminal convictions in the United States. These flaws resulted in a clear miscarriage of justice. The American judicial system has failed to correct that injustice, so he is relying on your help. This letter summarizes the most significant errors; more details regarding those cases can be found in my previous letter, dated September 1, 2023.

The Fraud Case: *United States v. Brennerman*, 17-cr-337 (S.D.N.Y.)

a. Failure to Provide Critical Evidence

When the prosecution began to investigate whether Mr. Brennerman's relationship with the London Branch of the Industrial Commercial Bank of China (ICBC) involved fraud, it sought relevant documents from the bank's New York-based counsel, Paul S. Hessler. Hessler provided documents involving communications between the bank and Mr. Brennerman, along with communications between the bank and Blacksands Pacific (the oil and gas company Mr. Brennerman founded). However, he did *not* provide internal ICBC documents underlying the bank's decision to provide Blacksands a loan. Conspicuously absent was the transaction underwriting file, which would have supported or disproved the allegation that Brennerman had misled the bank when he applied for the loan on behalf of Blacksands. Significantly, those documents would also indicate which statements made by Mr. Brennerman to ICBC were material to the bank's decision to go ahead with a loan.¹ Also absent were notes made by Julian Madgett, the ICBC banker who dealt with Brennerman, and was the prosecution's key witness at trial.

Defense counsel attempted to serve Mr. Hessler with a subpoena, requesting, *inter alia*, “[a]ll documents relating to any application by Blacksands to ICBC for financing including loan applications” (*United States v. Blacksands Pacific Group, Inc.*, 15-cv-70, Doc. #165-1). Hessler refused to accept the subpoena, and “emphasized that ICBC (London) is a ‘foreign bank’ and so may not be otherwise subject to service” (*Id.*, Doc. 164 at p. 3).

Accordingly, the defense moved for an order to show cause, arguing that such a court ruling was “the only means by which to obtain the documents necessary to respond to the government’s claims” (Doc. 164 at p.4). The trial court denied the defense motion (*Id.*, Doc. 174).

The defense also sought the prosecution’s help in obtaining the missing documents. The prosecution failed to obtain or review the missing ICBC files.

At the fraud trial, Mr. Madgett testified that contained within the underwriting file there “would be a credit application document which is where the case for making the loan has been summarized, and that is the credit application document which then goes to credit committee for approval or decline” (*United States v. Brennerman*, 17- cr-337, trial transcript at 553). In response to his testimony, the defense renewed its request that the court compel the prosecution to obtain the missing ICBC files (*Id.*, Doc. 71). The court denied Mr. Brennerman’s request (*Id.*, trial transcript at 617-623).

¹ Whether or not statements made by Mr. Brennerman were material was essential to determining whether he was guilty of the crimes charged. As the judge instructed the jury, an essential element of the fraud charges was that “the scheme or artifice or the false and fraudulent statements or representations concerned material facts” (*United States v. Brennerman*, 17- cr-337, trial transcript at pp. 1620, 1622).

The requested documents would have established that, contrary to Madgett's testimony, Brennerman had made no material misrepresentations influencing the bank's decision to make the loan. Since Mr. Brennerman was denied of this critical evidence, which was vital to support his defense, his convictions were clear miscarriages of justice.

b. The fatal variance between the allegations in the indictment and the evidence at trial

The gravamen of the Brennerman indictment was that he obtained a loan from ICBC through fraud. The only other allegation of financial fraud was a generic claim that he "made similar misrepresentations" to other, unnamed financial institutions in order to obtain financing for Blacksands.

However, faced with the reality that its allegations about the ICBC loan would not support a bank fraud conviction since ICBC was not FDIC-insured, as required by the relevant statute, the prosecution pivoted at trial and argued that Mr. Brennerman's guilt was established by his dealings with Morgan Stanley, where he opened an account which came with "special perks, things like fancy credit cards and lower rates" (*United States v. Brennerman*, 17-cr-337, prosecutor's summation, trial transcript at 1430).

When, as here, the prosecution, through its argument, broadens the bases of conviction beyond those charged in the indictment, a prejudicial variance occurs. This fatal variance violated Mr. Brennerman's Fifth Amendment right to be indicted by a grand jury. It also violated his right to be informed of what he is accused of doing so that he could prepare his defense.

Moreover, even had the indictment included the Morgan Stanley "banking perks" theory, that evidence could not legitimately establish Mr. Brennerman's guilt of bank fraud because the entity that gave him those 'perks' was not FDIC-insured either. Nonetheless, the judge allowed the case to go to the jury on that theory, confusing that entity (Morgan Stanley's Wealth Management subsidiary, a non-FDIC-insured entity) with its FDIC-insured affiliate, and denied Mr. Brennerman's motion for a new trial or judgment of acquittal. The judge's ruling was fatally flawed as a matter of fact and law. As a matter of fact, the conviction could not stand because the government failed to prove that the subsidiary was a federally insured bank. As a matter of law, without evidence that it was a bank under the applicable statute, Mr. Brennerman's conviction could not stand.

The Criminal Contempt Case: *United States v. Brennerman*, 17-cr-155 (S.D.N.Y.)

a. Failure to Provide Critical Evidence

In 2014, ICBC instituted a civil suit against Blacksands to recoup the monies it had loaned to the company's subsidiary, and the district judge granted the bank's motion for summary judgment. As part of a post-judgment effort to locate the company's assets, ICBC served discovery requests on Blacksands. At the same time, Blacksands and ICBC were actively engaged in settlement negotiations, and Blacksands' attorney informed the court that it had agreed to pay the monetary judgment pending appeal.

The parties failed to reach a settlement and Blacksands failed to comply with the discovery request. The district court held Blacksands in civil contempt.

Mr. Brennerman was not a party to that case; nonetheless, the district judge held him in civil contempt for failure to comply with discovery requests. The judge subsequently referred the contempt matter to the prosecutor's office and recommended that the government pursue criminal contempt charges.

In preparation for trial and in support of his defense that he did not willfully disobey the court's order but rather was negotiating a settlement with the bank, Mr. Brennerman subpoenaed ICBC for all documents related to Blacksands, as well as any communications between ICBC and the Department of Justice. When ICBC did not comply, Mr. Brennerman filed a motion to compel discovery, contending that there were exculpatory materials which were not provided to him and were otherwise unavailable to him. His motion was denied, *inter alia*, on the ground that the subpoena was unenforceable against a foreign bank.

Because Mr. Brennerman was effectively barred from obtaining relevant evidence, he was denied his constitutional right to present a complete defense.

b. Improper Admission of the Civil Contempt Order at the Criminal Contempt Trial

At Mr. Brennerman's criminal trial, the trial judge allowed the prosecution to introduce the civil contempt order into evidence. Since the civil contempt order should never have been imposed in the first place, it was highly improper, and extremely prejudicial, to compound that error by introducing it as evidence against him in the criminal trial.

Mr. Brennerman was not a party to the civil case at the time he was held in contempt. The law is clear that the only way a non-party can be impelled to produce requested materials in a federal court is through a subpoena duces tecum. But Mr. Brennerman was never served with a subpoena in that case. Thus, he had no obligation to provide information and should not have been held in contempt for failing to do so. And the district court judge must have been well aware of that fact, since in a case involving the same judge, the appeals court vacated a civil contempt order, holding that it was "fundamentally unfair" to hold a non-party in contempt. *OSRecovery, Inc. v. One Groupe Int'l, Inc.*, 462 F.3d 87, 94 (2d Cir. 2006).

Not only was it clearly improper to have held Mr. Brennerman in civil contempt, introducing the contempt order in the criminal case had a devastating impact. In fact, after Brennerman's conviction, a juror told a journalist that "the jury was swayed most strongly by Judge Kaplan's civil contempt orders against Brennerman. One juror was initially unsure of whether he was fully aware of the consequences, but the judge's [other] contempt order was very clear, [the juror] said." Jack Newsham, *Oil Exec Accused of Lying to Banks Is Convicted of Contempt*, LAW 360 (Sept. 12, 2017), available at <https://www.law360.com/articles/963329/oil-exec-accused-of-lying-to-banks-is-convicted-of-contempt>.

The erroneous admission of the civil contempt order was more than an evidentiary error; it was a violation of clearly settled law, a violation which determined the outcome of the trial.

MARSHA R. TAUBENHAUS, ESQ.

Since Mr. Brennerman's convictions were obtained in violation of his constitutional rights to present a fulsome defense and to a fair trial, we hope you will advocate on his behalf to correct what we believe are miscarriages of justice.

In regard to your query as to my experience: I have worked as a criminal defense attorney since I graduated from law school in 1978. I became an appellate specialist in 1985, and, since 1996, I have limited my practice to federal criminal appeals. I am admitted to practice law in the United States Supreme Court, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, and the State of New York.

Respectfully submitted,



Marsha R. Taubenhaus
Attorney for Raheem Brennerman

cc: Ms. Kaddy Bojang
Hon. Volker Turk
Rep. Hakeem Jeffries
Sen. Charles Schumer

FROM: 54001048
TO: Taubenhaus, Marsha R
SUBJECT: BRENNERMAN REPRESENTATION SUMMARY (ADDENDUM - I)
DATE: 03/25/2024 06:14:18 AM

PART ONE

CLIENT REPRESENTATION SUMMARY

Hello Attorney Taubenhaus,

I am writing to you after conferring with U.K. counsels and the British Government. Below are the issues to include in an addendum letter to the British Government, to accentuate the miscarriage of justice concerns with my criminal cases and convictions. The addendum letter needs to address the injustices with both the antecedent civil case from which the criminal cases arose, the criminal contempt of court conviction and the fraud conviction.

SUMMARY ON THE MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE CONCERNS WITH MR. BRENNERMAN'S CRIMINAL CASES AND CONVICTIONS

1.) MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE CONCERNS IN THE FRAUD CASE

(a.) MR. BRENNERMAN WAS DEPRIVED OF THE PERTINENT EVIDENCE [ICBC UNDERWRITING FILE] WHICH HE REQUIRED TO SUPPORT HIS DEFENSE AND ALSO CONFRONT WITNESSES AGAINST HIM.

Following referral of Mr. Brennerman for criminal prosecution by Judge Lewis A. Kaplan, the prosecution commenced their investigation by making requests of ICBC's New York based counsel, Linklaters LLP through Attorney Paul S. Hessler for the pertinent ICBC documents. Mr. Hessler provided the prosecution with communications between Blacksands Pacific and ICBC on the one part and Mr. Brennerman and ICBC on the other part. However, glaringly obvious from the document production were the missing pertinent ICBC documents - there was no transaction underwriting file, no ICBC internal documents or minutes and no settlement discussion notes, meeting minutes or emails.

The prosecution then proceeded to obtain a search warrant upon Judge Kaplan insisting on them enforcing his arrest warrant, to obtain Mr. Brennerman's electronic devices so they may prove that those communications provided by Attorney Hessler was from Mr. Brennerman.

Prior to trial, Mr. Brennerman through his counsel at Thompson Hine LLP notified the prosecution of the missing ICBC documents which he (Brennerman) required for his defense. The prosecution refused to obtain or review those missing ICBC files and the Courts - both Judges Kaplan and Sullivan denied Mr. Brennerman's request to compel for the missing ICBC files.

During trial of the fraud case, the prosecution's sole witness from ICBC, Mr. Julian R. Madgett, testified in open Court before the Court and prosecution that the missing ICBC files including the underwriting file were provided by ICBC to their counsel, Linklaters LLP and that their counsel had communicated with the U.S. Attorney office. He also testified that the missing ICBC underwriting file, documents the basis for the bank, ICBC, approving the bridge finance thus would highlight which representation or alleged misrepresentation were MATERIAL to the bank in approving the bridge finance. See 17 CR. 337 (RJS), trial tr. 551-554.

During trial following Mr. Madgett's testimony, Mr. Brennerman again requested that the Court (Judge Sullivan) compel the prosecutors to obtain the missing ICBC file and present it to him (Brennerman) for his complete defense or in the alternative for ICBC to provide the missing ICBC file to him for his complete defense. See 17 CR. 337 (RJS), ECF No. 71, however, Judge Sullivan denied Mr. Brennerman's request while permitting Mr. Madgett to testify as to the contents of the missing ICBC underwriting file knowing that Mr. Brennerman was already deprived of the evidence (ICBC underwriting file) and would be unable to meaningfully cross-examine Mr. Madgett as to substance and credibility on the issue. Mr. Madgett made misleading statements to the jury, however, Mr. Brennerman was deprived of the ability to rebut his statements. That violated Mr. Brennerman's right to a fair trial by depriving him of his rights to present his complete defense and to confront witnesses against him. See 17 CR. 337 (RJS), ECF No. 96 (trial tr. 617-623)

That was not inadvertent but a deliberate endeavor by the prosecution and Courts (Judges Kaplan and Sullivan) to deprive Mr. Brennerman of his rights to a fair trial particularly given that the Courts asked Mr. Hessler, who was no longer employed at

Linklaters LLP at the time of the trials to confirm whether all ICBC evidence with Linklaters LLP had been turned over to the defense rather than simply compelling Linklaters LLP itself for the ICBC files.

During Mr. Brennerman's direct appeal, the Second Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals incorrectly stated that: "[t]he only indication that the document (ICBC file) is extant comes from Brennerman's bare assertion" in contrast with the trial records.

(b.) MR. BRENNERMAN WAS CONVICTED BASED UPON A THEORY WHICH BEARS NO RESEMBLANCE TO THE THEORY PROPOUNDED IN THE CHARGING DOCUMENT AND THE COURT (JUDGE RICHARD J. SULLIVAN) MADE FACTUALLY AND LEGALLY FLAWED RULINGS TO WRONGLY CONVICT AND IMPRISON HIM.

Mr. Brennerman was charged with "obtaining financing through fraud for purported business ventures" however during trial when the evidence and testimony did not support that theory, the prosecution pivoted to argue that Mr. Brennerman became entitled to banking perks including sky miles, free checking account and lower interest rate worth \$6,500 which was never charged in the charging document.

However, to convict Mr. Brennerman for bank fraud, the institution where he received the alleged banking perks had to be federally insured (FDIC insured). Judge Richard J. Sullivan then surreptitiously supplanted a non-FDIC insured (not federally insured) institution, Morgan Stanley Smith Barney, LLC (MSSB) where Mr. Brennerman opened his wealth management account based on all evidence adduced at trial, with a FDIC-insured (federally insured) institution, Morgan Stanley Private Bank (MSPB), so as to falsely satisfy the law and statute which requires that the institution be FDIC insured (federally insured) to wrongly convict and imprison Mr. Brennerman. This deprived Mr. Brennerman of his human and Constitutional rights to a fair trial and liberty.

Judge Sullivan has been advised numerous times of his factually and legally flawed rulings to wrongly convict and imprison Mr. Brennerman, however, he has chosen to ignore them including refusing to even docket some of the submissions.

Demonstrable Evidence:

(i.) Petition for Panel Rehearing/Rehearing En banc at the U.S. Court of appeals for the Second Circuit at Appeal No. 18-3546, Doc. No. 190 and in the Petition for writ of Certiorari at the U.S. Supreme Court at Doc. No. 20-6638

(ii.) Notification of violation to Court submission at U.S. District Court, S.D.N.Y. at case no. 17 CR. 337 (RJS), ECF No. 298

(iii.) motion at U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit at Appeal No. 23-6180, Doc. No. 28

(iv.) Collateral attack Petition submission at U.S. District Court, S.D.N.Y. at case no. 17 CR. 337 (RJS), ECF Nos. 269, 270, 272, 274, 290, 298, 303.

2.) MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE CONCERNS IN THE CRIMINAL CONTEMPT OF COURT CASE

(a.) DENIAL OF MR. BRENNERMAN'S EFFORT TO OBTAIN DISCOVERY - THE MISSING ICBC (LONDON) PLC ("ICBC") FILES INCLUDING THE [UNDERWRITING FILE] AND SETTLEMENT DISCUSSION [MEETING MINUTES], [NOTES], AND [E-MAILS]

Prior to trial, government prosecutors made request to ICBC's New York based counsel, Linklaters LLP through Attorney Paul S. Hessler, to obtain in-excess of 5,000 pages of discovery, however missing from the discovery production were the pertinent ICBC files including the transaction [underwriting file] and settlement discussions [meeting minutes], [notes], [e-mails] which Mr. Brennerman required to present his complete defense at trial.

To prepare for trial, Mr. Brennerman made requests to the prosecution for the missing ICBC files, however they refused to obtain or review those files from ICBC. ICBC also refused Mr. Brennerman's direct request for the files and Judge Lewis A. Kaplan denied Mr. Brennerman's request for subpoena to compel for the missing ICBC files. Thus at trial, Mr. Brennerman was deprived of the very evidence, missing ICBC files, which he required to present his complete defense, thereby depriving him of his right to a fair trial.

The missing evidence - ICBC files would have cast significant reasonable doubt in the minds of the jurors, particularly given that the second order in September 2016, specifically stipulated for the "parties to either settle or produce for discovery" and agents of ICBC, recipient of the discovery, repeatedly and continually advised Mr. Brennerman and Blacksands Pacific that they did not want more discovery but rather preferred to negotiate settlement.

Agents of ICBC and Blacksands Pacific negotiated settlement resulting in the draft settlement agreement at 17 CR. 155 (LAK), ECF No. 12 Ex. 10, however, Linklaters LLP (attorney for ICBC) and Attorney Paul S. Hessler, withheld and hid the missing ICBC files from Mr. Brennerman so he would be unable to present it to the jury at trial and the prosecution refused to obtain or present them..

The evidence would have shown that neither Mr. Brennerman nor Blacksands Pacific willfully or defiantly disobeyed the court order(s) directed at the company.

(b.) MR. BRENNERMAN WAS SIGNIFICANTLY PREJUDICED THROUGH THE PRESENTMENT OF THE ERRONEOUSLY ADJUDGED CIVIL CONTEMPT ORDER TO THE JURY DURING THE CRIMINAL CONTEMPT OF COURT TRIAL.

Judge Lewis A. Kaplan erroneously adjudged the civil contempt order against Mr. Brennerman by ignoring the finding in "OSRecovery, Inc., v. One Groupe Int'l, Inc., 462 F.3d 87 (2d Cir. 2006)" and the rules and law for compelling non-parties to produce for discovery. So after Judge Kaplan improperly held Mr. Brennerman in civil contempt in the antecedent civil case at 15 CV. 70 (LAK), ECF Nos. 139-140, he referred him for criminal prosecution.

During trial for the criminal contempt of court case, having prevented the jury from considering the missing ICBC files, Judge Kaplan then permitted the prosecution to present the erroneously adjudged civil contempt order to the jury (See Trial Tr. at case no. 17 CR. 155 (LAK), Trial Tr. 3-7), which significantly prejudiced him.

In OSRecovery, the Second Circuit Court promulgated: "Moreover we think it is fundamentally unfair to hold [a non-party] in contempt as if he were a party without sufficient legal support for treating him, a non-party, as a party but only for the purpose of discovery." OSRecovery, Inc., 462 F.3d at 90. In OSRecovery, the Second Circuit Court had found that the district court abused its discretion by holding a person "in contempt as a party without sufficient explanation or citation to legal authority supporting the basis upon which the court relied in treating [him] as a party --- for discovery purposes only --- despite the fact that [he] was not actually a party." Id at 93

Here, Judge Kaplan (the same district judge whose contempt order the Second Circuit found inappropriate in OSRecovery) held Mr. Brennerman in civil contempt as a non-party and failed to provide any legal authority or present any particular theory for treating him as a party solely for the purpose of discovery. See ICBC (London) PLC v. The Blacksands Pacific Group, Inc., 15-CV-70 (LAK)(S.D.N.Y. 2016) at ECF Nos. 139-140. No court order, subpoena or motion to compel were ever directed at Mr. Brennerman personally nor was he present during the civil case's various proceedings.

The presentment of the erroneously adjudged civil contempt order swayed the jury to find Mr. Brennerman guilty of criminal contempt of court according to an interview given by one of the jurors (named Gordon) to the media. (See Law 360 article at 17 CR. 337 (RJS), ECF No. 236 Ex. 3 at 17). The questions of whether the civil contempt order was improperly adjudged against Mr. Brennerman goes beyond a simple analysis of Rules 403 and 404(b) of the Federal Rules of Evidence. Mr. Brennerman was a non-party in the civil lawsuit at the time of the civil order. Because the order was erroneously adjudged against him, its erroneous adjudication had more serious legal implications above and beyond an abuse of discretion analysis.

The erroneous adjudication of the civil contempt order was more than an evidentiary error. It violated the Court's instruction concerning contempt orders against non-parties.

This issue was presented in the Petition for Rehearing en banc at the Second Circuit Court at Appeal No. 18-1033, Doc. No. 314 and in the Petition for writ of certiorari at the U.S. Supreme Court at Doc. no. 20-6895

FROM: 54001048
TO: Taubenhaus, Marsha R
SUBJECT: BRENNERMAN REPRESENTATION SUMMARY (ADDENDUM - II)
DATE: 03/25/2024 06:14:22 AM

PART TWO

(c.) JUDGE KAPLAN IMPROPERLY PIERCED THROUGH THE CORPORATE VEIL OF THE CORPORATION, THE BLACKSANDS PACIFIC GROUP, INC ("BLACKSANDS PACIFIC") TO HOLD MR. BRENNERMAN IN CIVIL CONTEMPT OF COURT

In "OSRecovery" the Second Circuit Court rejected Judge Kaplan's statement that ".....because OSRecovery is nothing more than a front for Clare, who entirely dominates and controls it" Id. Thus, according to the Court, Clare is a party as OSRecovery's proxy id. 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15699 at "3-4"

At 15 CV. 70 (LAK), ECF Nos. 127-128, the corporation, Blacksands Pacific, submitted its corporate shareholding structure to Judge Kaplan, which highlighted that Mr. Brennerman was not a direct shareholder of the corporation. However, Judge Kaplan ignored the submission. Furthermore, Judge Kaplan made no inquiries or fact-finding other than the proffer of ICBC (London) plc prior to illegally and improperly piercing through the corporate veil of Blacksands Pacific to hold Mr. Brennerman in civil contempt.

(d.) MR BRENNERMAN WAS DEPRIVED OF HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS WHEN HE WAS ARRESTED BASED ON A DEFECTIVE ARREST WARRANT.

The issue of the arrest warrant at 17 CR. 155 (LAK), ECF No. 12 Ex. 3. The entire issue is contained within the one page arrest warrant. It was improperly issued and its issuance violated Mr. Brennerman's Fourth and Fifth Amendment rights.

The arrest warrant, while it bore the civil case no. 15 CV. 70 (LAK), from the antecedent case between ICBC (London) plc and The Blacksands Pacific Group, Inc., the caption on the arrest warrant was for the criminal case, United States v. Brennerman, even though it was issued at a time when the criminal case did not exist.

Additionally, because none of the offense conduct which the arrest warrant charged were pertinent to Mr. Brennerman, the judge crossed-out one of the check box and wrote-in "The Petition" even though no petition existed at the time, because the judge had failed to sign the draft order to show cause petition presented pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 42 by the prosecution. In fact, the petition was not issued and signed until 5 months later in August 2017 after Mr. Brennerman's arrest.

The question is: Whether the arrest warrant was fabricated and whether its issuance violated Mr. Brennerman's Fourth and Fifth amendment rights? No petition, information, indictment, order to show cause etc. existed at the time of its issuance. Judge Kaplan had failed to sign the order to show cause as it related to Mr. Brennerman, so there was no probable cause basis for the issuance, hence why the judge crossed-out and wrote-in his own offense conduct - "The Petition" which did not exist at the time plus the criminal case caption did not exist at the time of its issuance.

The addendum letter should be addressed to:

The Rt. Hon. David CAMERON MP
United Kingdom Foreign Secretary
FOREIGN, COMMONWEALTH & DEVELOPMENT OFFICE
King Charles Street
London. SW1A 2AH
UNITED KINGDOM

-and-

The Rt. Hon.. David RUTLEY MP
Minister for Americas and the Caribbean
FOREIGN, COMMONWEALTH & DEVELOPMENT OFFICE
King Charles Street

London. SW1A 2AH
UNITED KINGDOM

-and-

The Rt. Hon. Greg HANNS MP
Member of Parliament for Chelsea and Fulham |
Chairman of the conservative party
HOUSE OF COMMONS
London. SW1A 0AA
UNITED KINGDOM

At the bottom of the letter, the following should be copied (CC'ed on the letter)

- a.) Ms. Lisa STRATHDEE, Vice Consul, BRITISH CONSULATE GENERAL (New York), One Dag Hammarskjold Plz, 885 Second Avenue, New York, New York 10017. UNITED STATES.
- b.) Honorable Volker TURK, United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS (OHCHR), Palais Des Nations, CH-1211, Geneva 10. SWITZERLAND
- c.) Honorable Representative Hakeem JEFFRIES, House Minority Leader, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 2433 Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC 20515. UNITED STATES
- d.) Honorable Senator Charles SCHUMER, Senate Majority Leader, UNITED STATES SENATE, 322 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510. UNITED STATES
- e.) Honorable Merrick B. GARLAND, United States Attorney General, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20530-0001. UNITED STATES
- f.) Mr. Kenneth A. POLITE JR., Assistant Attorney-General for Criminal Division, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20530-0001. UNITED STATES
- g.) Honorable John ROBERTS, Chief Justice, SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, 1 First Street N.E. Washington, DC 20543

Note: Please send the letter and any exhibits by courier.

Also, please send an e-mail with the letter and any exhibits to the e-mail addresses highlighted below (in one single e-mail)

- 1.) rjbrennerman@gmail.com
- 2.) handsg@parliament.uk
- 3.) UKinNewYork@fcdo.gov.uk
- 4.) fcdo.correspondence@fcdo.gov.uk
- 5.) kaddy.bojang2@fcdo.gov.uk

- 6.) keir.starmer.mp@parliament.uk
- 7.) ohchr-infodesk@un.org
- 8.) ohchr-civilsociety@un.org
- 9.) congressmanjeffries08@gmail.com
- 10.) kate.beioley@ft.com
- 11.) joe.miller@ft.com

Thank you and best regards,

Written by Ms. Nikki
as instructed and on behalf of:
Mr. Raheem J. Brennerman
E: rjbrennerman@gmail.com
W: <https://freeraheem.org>