

FROM: 54001048
TO: Taubenhau, Marsha R
SUBJECT: BRENNERMAN REPRESENTATION SUMMARY (ADDENDUM - I)
DATE: 12/09/2023 09:28:56 AM

PART ONE

CLIENT REPRESENTATION SUMMARY

Hello Attorney Taubenhau:

I am writing to you with the additional suggested issues to include in the letter to the British Government, to accentuate the miscarriage of justice concerns with my criminal cases/convictions. The letter needs to address the injustices with both the civil and criminal contempt of court as well as the fraud conviction.

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

(a.) JUDGE KAPLAN IMPROPERLY/ILLEGALLY PIERCED THROUGH THE CORPORATE VEIL OF THE CORPORATION - THE BLACKSANDS PACIFIC GROUP, INC. ("BLACKSANDS PACIFIC"), TO HOLD MR. RAHEEM J. BRENNERMAN ("BRENNERMAN") IN CIVIL CONTEMPT OF COURT:

The pertinent section of the Second Circuit case law in "Am. Fuel Corp. v. Utah Energy Dev. Co., 122 F. 3d 130, 134 (2d Cir. 1997) ("Typically, piercing analysis is used to hold individuals liable for the actions of a corporation they control")" reads:

New York law requires the party seeking to pierce a corporate veil to make a two part showing: (i.) that the owner exercised complete domination over the corporation with respect to the transaction at issue; and (ii.) that such domination was used to commit a fraud or wrong that injured the party seeking to pierce the veil. *Morris v. New York Stat Dep't of Taxation & Fin.*, 82 N.Y. 2d 135, 623 N.E. 2d 1157, 1160-61, 603 N.Y.S. 2d 807 (N.Y. 1993) (citing cases). "While complete domination of the corporation is the key to piercing the corporate veil....such domination, standing alone, is not enough, some showing of a wrongful or unjust act toward [the party seeking piercing] is required." 623 N.E. 2d at 1181 (citing *Walkovszky v. Carlton*, 18 N.Y. 2d 414, 223 N.E.2d 6, 8, 276 N.Y.S. 2d 585 (N.Y. 1966); *Guptill Holding Corp v. State*, 33 A.D.2d 362, 307 N.Y.S. 2d 970, 972-73 (App. Div. 1970), *aff'd*, 31 N.Y.2d 897, 292 N.E. 2d 782, 340 N.Y.S. 2d 628 (N.Y. 1972)

In *Passalacqua*, 933 F.2d 131, the Second Circuit court enunciated a list of factors that tend to identify a dominated corporation: (1) whether corporate formalities are observed; (2) whether the capitalization is adequate; (3) whether funds are put in and taken out of the corporation for personal rather than corporate purposes; (4) whether there is overlap in ownership, officers, directors, and personnel; (5) whether the corporate entities share common office space, address and telephone numbers; (6) the amount of business discretion displayed by the allegedly dominated corporation; (7) whether the alleged dominator deals with the dominated corporation at arms length; (8) whether the corporation is treated as an independent profit center; (9) whether others pay or guarantee debts of the dominated corporation; and (10) whether the corporation in question had property that was used by the alleged dominator as if it were the dominator's own. *Id* at 139.

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 1:15-cv-0070 (LAK), EFC Nos. 127-128, the corporation, Blacksands Pacific, submitted its corporate shareholding structure to Judge Kaplan, which highlighted that Brennerman was not a direct shareholder of the corporation. However, Judge Kaplan ignored the submission. Furthermore, Judge Kaplan made no inquiries or fact-findings other than the proffer by ICBC (London) plc prior to illegally/improperly piercing through the corporate veil of Blacksands Pacific to hold Brennerman in civil contempt

It also highlighted that The Blacksands Pacific Group, Inc., was no longer operating in the United States as of the end of 2016, hence both the Court and prosecution were aware at the time of trial that The Blacksands Pacific Group, Inc., maintained no assets or operation in the United States despite their statements during trial. Furthermore, the Court denied Brennerman's request during trial to present assets owned by Blacksands Pacific International Limited, outside of the United States.

NOTE: WE BELIEVE THIS ILLEGAL/IMPROPER CONDUCT BY JUDGE KAPLAN WAS ONE OF THE REASONS FOR THE PROSECUTION BELATEDLY ALLEGING FRAUD WITH THE CORPORATION SO AS TO JUSTIFY JUDGE KAPLAN'S CONDUCT.

(b.) THE ARREST WARRANT ISSUE:

The issue of the arrest warrant at 1:17-cr-0155 (LAK), EFC No. 12 Ex. 3. The entire issue is contained within the one page arrest warrant. Whether it was properly issued and if its issuance violated Brennerman's Fourth and Fifth amendment rights.

The arrest warrant, while it bore the civil case no. 15-cv-0070 (LAK) from the antecedent case between ICBC (London) plc and The Blacksands Pacific Group, Inc., the caption on the arrest warrant is 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 was pertinent to 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 Fed R. Crim. P. 42 by the prosecution. In fact, the petition was not issued and signed until 5 months later in August 2017 after Brennerman's arrest.

The question here is: Whether the arrest warrant was fabricated and did its issuance violate Brennerman's fourth and fifth amendment right? 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 Brennerman, so there was no probable cause basis for its issuance, hence why the judge had to cross-out and write 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.

(c.) 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] IN THE CRIMINAL CONTEMPT OF COURT CASE:

Prior to trial, government prosecutors made request of 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 Brennerman required to present his complete defense at trial.

To prepare for trial, Brennerman made requests to the government for the missing ICBC files however they refused to obtain or review those files from ICBC. ICBC also refused Brennerman's direct request for the files and Judge Kaplan denied Brennerman's request for subpoena to compel for the missing ICBC files. Thus, at trial, 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 mind 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 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), EFC No. 12 Ex. 10, however, Linklaters LLP (attorney for ICBC) and Attorney Paul S. Hessler, withheld and hid the missing ICBC files from 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 Brennerman nor Blacksands Pacific willfully or defiantly disobeyed the court order (s) directed at the company.

(d.) PRESENTMENT OF THE ERRONEOUSLY ADJUDGED CIVIL CONTEMPT ORDER TO THE JURY DURING THE CRIMINAL CONTEMPT TRIAL:

Judge Lewis A. Kaplan erroneously adjudged the civil contempt order against Brennerman by ignoring the holding in "OSRecovery" and the rules and law for compelling non-parties to produce for discovery. So after Judge Kaplan improperly held Brennerman in civil contempt in the antecedent civil case at: 1:15-cv-0070 (LAK), EFC Nos. 139-140.

During trial for the criminal contempt 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).

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 court judge whose contempt order the Second Circuit Court found inappropriate in OSRecovery) held 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. 2015) at EFC No. 139-140. No court order, subpoena, or motion to compel were ever directed at 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 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: 1:17-cr-0337 (RJS), EFC No. 236 Ex 3 at 17). The question of whether the civil contempt order was improperly adjudged against Brennerman goes beyond a simple analysis of Rules 403 and 404(b) of the Federal Rules of Evidence. 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 at the Second Circuit Court in the motion for rehearing en banc at appeal no. 18-1033(L), EFC No. 314 and at the Supreme Court in the petition for writ of certiorari at docket no. 20-6895. Both Courts declined review to correct the error.

NOTE: POINTS (C.) AND (D.) ABOVE HIGHLIGHTS HOW BRENNERMAN WAS IMPROPERLY CONVICTED OF CRIMINAL CONTEMPT OF COURT.

2.) MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE CONCERNS IN THE FRAUD CASE:

We want to include the issues below in addition to the articulation already contained within the letter.

a.) JUDGE SULLIVAN CONTINUES TO IGNORE NOTIFICATION OF HIS FACTUALLY AND LEGALLY FLAWED RULING(S) WHICH WRONGLY CONVICTED AND IMPRISONED BRENNERMAN, THEREBY CAUSING BRENNERMAN TO REMAIN UNJUSTLY IMPRISONED.

Judge Sullivan was advised numerous times of his factually and legally flawed rulings to wrongly convict and imprison Brennerman, however he chose to ignore them including refusing to even docket some of the submissions. See court record at: 1:17-cr-0337 (RJS), ECF Nos. 269, 270, 272, 274, 290, 298, 303.

b.) JUDGE SULLIVAN INTENTIONALLY MISREPRESENTED EVIDENCE TO FALSELY SATISFY THE LAW AND STATUTE TO WRONGLY CONVICT AND IMPRISON BRENNERMAN

Judge Sullivan made contrasting promulgation(s) in his rulings about the evidence, which highlights that Judge Sullivan intentionally misrepresented evidence to falsely satisfy the law and statute to wrongly convict and imprison Brennerman when he denied Brennerman's Rule 29 motion and sentenced him. Brennerman presented this to Judge Sullivan in his submission at: 1:17-cr-0337 (RJS), ECF No. 298, however Judge Sullivan ignored Brennerman's submission. This issue is also submitted at Appeal No. 23-6180, Doc. No. 28

Contd.

FROM: 54001048

TO: Taubenhause, Marsha R

SUBJECT: BRENNERMAN REPRESENTATION SUMMARY (ADDENDUM - II)

DATE: 12/09/2023 09:29:02 AM

PART TWO

3.) CONTINUED DENIAL OF MR BRENNERMAN'S EFFORT TO OBTAIN DISCOVERY - THE MISSING ICBC (LONDON) PLC ("ICBC") FILES INCLUDING THE UNDERWRITING FILE AND SETTLEMENT DISCUSSION NOTES, MEETING MINUTES, E-MAILS, IN BOTH CRIMINAL CONTEMPT OF COURT AND FRAUD CASES.

Brennerman filed supplemental motion with his collateral attack petition in both the fraud and criminal contempt of court cases, requesting for subpoena to ICBC's New York based counsel, Linklaters LLP for evidence - missing ICBC files including the underwriting file and settlement discussion notes, e-mails and meeting minutes pursuant to Rules 6 and 7 governing 2255 motion in the U.S. District Court.

Among others, Brennerman argued that his trial counsel were ineffective because they failed to subpoena ICBC New York based counsel, Linklaters LLP for the missing ICBC files which he required at trial to present his complete defense, confront witnesses against him and to demonstrate that ICBC deceived him and Blacksands Pacific to fraudulently enrich itself by falsely assuring that the 90-days \$20m bridge finance will be rolled into a 5-yr. \$70m revolver credit facility (RCF), precipitating Blacksands Pacific to pay in-excess of \$1.1m in fees and interest to ICBC. Brennerman argued that, prior to trial government prosecutors made requests of ICBC's New York based counsel, Linklaters LLP to obtain in-excess of 5,000 pages of discovery, however, missing from the discovery production were the pertinent ICBC documents including the underwriting file and settlement discussion meeting minutes, notes and e-mails, which the prosecution refused to obtain or review.

Brennerman further notified both Judge Kaplan and Judge Sullivan in the supplemental motion to the collateral attack petition that on March 17, 2022, Linklaters LLP wrote to him to advise that they are in possession of the missing ICBC files including the underwriting file and settlement discussion meeting minutes, notes, e-mails etc., however that as a law firm, they require either consent from their client, ICBC, or an order from the Court prior to providing the missing ICBC files to Brennerman. However, both Judges Kaplan and Sullivan ignored him.

This issue was presented in the collateral attack petition at: 22-cv-0996 (LAK), ECF Nos. 17, 31 and at case no. 17 CR. 155 (LAK), ECF Nos. 227, 241. And in the fraud case collateral attack petition at: 17 CR. 337 (RJS), ECF No. 274.

4.) MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE SUMMATION:

(i.) Judge Lewis A. Kaplan ignored the law to vigorously pursue Brennerman, a non-party, for civil and criminal contempt of court and improperly convicted and imprisoned him (Brennerman) for criminal contempt of court.

(ii.) Judge Richard J. Sullivan made factually and legally flawed ruling(s) by intentionally misrepresenting the evidence to wrongly convict and imprison Brennerman for bank fraud and its related conspiracy.

(iii.) Even though the missing ICBC files were glaringly obvious, both Judge Kaplan and Judge Sullivan denied Brennerman's request to compel the prosecutors to obtain, review and present the missing ICBC files including the transaction underwriting file and settlement discussion meeting minutes, notes and e-mails, which Brennerman required to present his complete defense and confront witnesses against him during trial of the criminal contempt of court and fraud case, thereby depriving Brennerman of his Sixth Amendment right to present his complete defense. This was even though they were aware that the prosecution had previously obtained in-excess of 5,000 pages of discovery from ICBC's New York based counsel, Linklaters LLP and Attorney Paul S. Hessler, however that those files were missing from their production.

During trial, prosecution witness, Mr. Julian Madgett, testified as to the contents of the missing ICBC files, knowing that Brennerman had been deprived access to those files, thus would be unable to meaningfully cross-examine him (Mr. Madgett) as to substance and credibility on the issue, thereby depriving Brennerman of his Sixth Amendment right to a fair trial.

SUMMARY ON DEPRIVING BRENNERMAN OF THE MISSING ICBC FILES:

The prosecution commenced their investigation by making requests to 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 and ICBC on the one part and Brennerman and ICBC on the other part. However, glaringly obvious from the

document production are 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 Brennerman's electronic devices so they may prove that those communications provided by Attorney Hessler were sent from Brennerman.

Prior to trial, Brennerman through his trial counsel 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 Brennerman's requests to compel for the missing ICBC files.

During trial of the fraud case, the prosecution's sole witness from ICBC, Mr. Julian Madgett, testified in open Court before the Court and prosecutors that the missing ICBC files including the underwriting file were provided by ICBC to their counsel, Linklaters 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 representations or alleged misrepresentations were MATERIAL to the bank in approving the bridge finance. See 1:17-cr-0337 (RJS), trial tr. 551-554

During trial following Mr. Madgett's testimony, Brennerman again requested that the Court (Judge Sullivan) compel the prosecution to obtain the missing ICBC file and present it to him (Brennerman) for his complete defense. See 1:17-cr-0337 (RJS), ECF No. 71, however, Judge Sullivan denied Brennerman's request while permitting Mr. Madgett to testify as to the content of the missing ICBC underwriting file knowing that 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 issues. Mr. Madgett made misleading statements to the jury, however, Brennerman was deprived of the ability to rebut his statements. That violated Brennerman's right to a fair trial by depriving him of his right to present his complete defense and to confront witnesses against him. See 1:17-cr-0337 (RJS), ECF No. 96 (trial tr. at. 617-623).

That was not inadvertent but a deliberate endeavor by the prosecution and Courts (Judges Kaplan and Sullivan) to deprive Brennerman of his right 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 rather than compelling Linklaters LLP itself for the ICBC files.

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

IMPORTANT NOTE:

(a.) Mr. Brennerman's mother passed away while waiting for him to clear his name and return to care for her including donating one of his kidneys to save her life. His plea to Judge Sullivan about the FDIC issue and to obtain the missing ICBC file so he could clear his name was submitted at: 1:17-cr-0337 (RJS), ECF No. 188.

(b.) Lobbying on Mr. Brennerman's behalf will also include the erroneously adjudged civil contempt order as the coercive sanction/fine for the civil contempt since December 2016 is now in-excess of \$250 million at \$100,000 per day, so the civil contempt order at: 1:15-cv-0070 (LAK), EFC No. 139 will need to be abrogated.

QUESTIONS:

(a.) Under what circumstance would the Second Circuit Court, reconsider the motion for rehearing en banc at 18-3546(L), Dkt. No. 190 (for the fraud case) and 18-1033(L), Dkt. No. 314 (for the criminal contempt of court case) which they previously declined review. Or recall the mandate to correct their erroneous adjudication of the direct appeal.

(b.) Under what circumstance would the Supreme Court of the United States, reconsider grant of certiorari at 20-6895 (Criminal contempt of court case) and at 20-6638 (Fraud case) which they previously declined review.

The criminal contempt case presents significant issue due to the disparity between the Court's prior promulgation and law with respect to non-parties and discovery request and Brennerman's conviction. The panel Court in the fraud case misapprehended key facts and evidence in their adjudication of that case thereby causing Brennerman to be wrongly convicted and imprisoned.

=====

THE UPDATED LETTER AND EXHIBIT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO THESE THREE PEOPLE:
=====

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. Gregg HANDS 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, NY 10017

b.) Ambassador Karen PIERCE, Ambassador of the United Kingdom to the United States, EMBASSY OF THE UNITED KINGDOM, 3100 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20008

c.) Ambassador Dame Barbara WOODWARD, United Kingdom Ambassador to the United Nations, UNITED KINGDOM MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS, One Dag Hammarskjold Plz, 885 Second Avenue, New York, NY 10017

d.) 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

e.) Ambassador Linda Thomas-GREENFIELD, United States Ambassador to the United Nations, UNITED STATES MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS, 799 United Nations Plaza, New York, NY 10017

=====

A.) E-MAIL ADDRESSES TO E-MAIL THE LETTER AND EXHIBIT (IN A 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

TRULINCS 54001048 - BRENNERMAN, RAHEEM J - Unit: ALF-U-B

8.) ohchr-civilsociety@un.org

9.) congressmanjeffries08@gmail.com

10.) rena.diamond@mail.house.gov

11.) mike_iannelli@schumer.senate.gov

12.) david.davis.mp@parliament.uk

13.) iain.duncansmith.mp@parliament.uk

14.) angela.rayner.mp@parliament.uk

15.) sct@amnesty.org.uk

16.) sacha.deshmukh@amnesty.org.uk

17.) kerry.moscogiuri@amnesty.org.uk

18.) admin@centreforsocialjustice.org.uk

19.) chairman@conservatives.com

=====

B.) INFORMATION TO SEND THE LETTER AND EXHIBITS VIA COURIER/CERTIFIED MAIL:

=====

i.) Please send copy of the updated letter and exhibits, to the parties whom the letter is addressed and cc'ed. There are total of 8 parties.

ii.) Please send copy of the (1.) update letter to the British Government with exhibits; and (2.) update letter to the British Government without exhibits to me at: rjbrennerman@gmail.com

iii.) Also please send copy of the updated letter to the British Government with exhibits to me at:

Raheem J. Brennerman

Reg. No. 54001-048

LEGAL MAIL - OPEN ONLY IN PRESCENCE OF INMATE

FCI Allenwood Low

Federal Correctional Institution

P. O. Box 1000

White Deer, Pa. 17887-1000

Thank you so much

Raheem J. Brennerman

E: rjbrennerman@gmail.com

W: <https://freeraheem.org>