## EXHIBITS

A-6 to Z-6

A Based on my knowledge listening to experts. We had an individual come here from the Federal Reserve that said these types of trading programs do not exist.

Q Isn't it true that the Federal Reserve expert also said that no debenture programs are stock-based?

A I'm not sure if he said that.
Q Well, I -- all right. Government Exhibit 1, then, is that your criteria for determining whether or not we made an investment which matched Government Exhibit No. 1?

A If the criteria was whether it matched Government Exhibit No. 1, then yes. The criteria that it would match Government Exhibit 1 would be that criteria.

Q All right. So in other words, you're saying that if it did not match Government Exhibit No. 1, it was not counted as an investment in this program?

A In that particular type of program. I mean, money was placed in many different places, hundreds of different places.

Q But in order to get to the basis for the criminal charges in this case, I'm trying to determine from you if you did not count any of the investments if they didn't match Government Exhibit No. 1?

A I'm not sure, didn't count any of the investments. I traced the money to a thousand different locations, and some of them went to the Bahamas, some of them went to Las Vegas,

SUPPLEMENTAL DICTATION BY DET 0108020126
Job \#4113

## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

On 8/14/2001 at 2 PM I did go to the residence of $\square$ and to them at their home at $\square$ and interview with them. Upon speak they had retained attorney $\square$ of Hudsonville to repab $-1,2$ them. They did advise me that they did wish to speak to me bin c $-1,2$ they did not feel it would be correct to do so without their attorney being present and advised me to speak to him in order to set up an interview. Upon speaking to $\mathrm{Mr} . \square$ and explaining the complaint to him he indicated that his clients would be available to be interviewed at his office on 8/31/2001 at 2:15 PM.


On 8/31/2001 I did meet with $\square$ and their attorney $\square$ wished Eo speak to her in regards to the embezzlement complaint and Eurther wished to go through with her several checks that I had received from the victim to get an explanation from her of what they were for. I first asked her to relate to me some employment history with Access Financial. She indicates that she had known Jan Marcusse for several years and began employment with her she felt in July of 1998. She states that at that time she was the only one working for them and that Jan was in partnership withó $-1,2$ She states at that time until December cbic -1,2 1990 Sne Delieves, she was paid $\$ 300$ a week and was written a check from either Jan or $\square$ for that amount. She states that in what she believes to be August of 1999 she moved to a house on Port Sheldon St. in Georgetown twp. at which time Jan requested that the office be moved to her house. She states that the agreement that she and Jan had at that time was that she was supposed to deal with the clients for Access Financial and that Jan would tell her what to tell them and that Jan would handle the investment of the money which was coming in. She states the office was now in her house and when she tried to talk to Jan about establishing a pay system Jan indicated to her that she could pay herself whatever she wanted to since the business would be run out of her house. She states further that Jan had told her that she had turned the company over to her to deal with and that if she needed money just take it out and cut a check for cash. She stated that this is the process in which all monies were paid to employees and also to Jan with either in the form of a business check, not a navyoll check, or a check made out to cash which was cashed by and TOT to whomever in the form of cash. She states that at no time was there a payroll account established. I asked her if she ever had any type of employment agreement, any negotiated wage, or if there was any type of written policies, procedures, or guidelines for the business to which she stated that there was no employment agreement. She tried numerous times to talk to Jan about wages for herself, but the
answer that she would get all the time would be "take what you need". She states that there were no written guidelines, policies, or anything of that nature even though they had been asked for. She states, and her husband agreed, that for a time period when he was employed by the company he was paid an agreed upon $\$ 7,500$ a month for several months as were several other people who were working the phones.
$\square$ states that in April of 2001 the office equipment was moverbsc -2 Irom the house on Byron Road to the address on 44 th Street. They were taken off the accounts and they were done working for the company.

how much she had made in 1998-1999 for the company. then showed me two W-2 forms, one for 1998 showing a gross income of $\$ 180,00,0$ and one for 1999 showing a gross income of $\$ 240,000$. $\square$ then explained that these were $W-2$ forms made up by Jan Marcusse so that she; $\square$, could go to the bank to get a loan for a house in Allegan for Jan Marcusse. She states that Jan was bankrupt and has poor credit and that the house loan, the house, and the utilities at that time were all put in $\square$ name. She states that Jan had been secondary on the title for the house and they had done a quick claim deed several months ago and now Jbe $-1,2$ owns the house, they believe, yet $\square$ is primary on the loan anbic -1,2 that Jan was making the payments on the loan. She states that all utilities are currently in her, that being $\square$ name. They then showed me a 1998 tax form they had filed and she stated that she had been given a secondary W-2 form for the correct amount which She had paid taxes on and that was $\$ 8,996$. She states that the fake $\mathrm{W}-2$ forms were strictly used in an attempt to show greater income than what she had in order to facilitate the loan. I asked her to explain to me how the business worked. Both $\square$ and $\square$ said that since they have meet with and a tax attorney whom $\square$ had set them up with they now understand that what they had done appears to be illegal and that they did not realize it at the time. They then stated that based on the information they received it appears to be some type of a "PONCI SCHEME". I again asked them to explain to me how the business operated.

| Access Financial, in which $\square$ and , who were |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| on the account; and the second beinc Sanctuer |  |  |
| stated that people would come to them and they would not in -2 |  |  |
| solicit. She states that clients would come and sign papers bic -2 |  |  |
| stating that they were not solicited. She states that they would |  |  |
| then take their money, promise them a $10 \%$ return per month or a |  |  |
| 120\% return per year, they would give them the choice of placing |  |  |
| the money into the Sanctuary Ministries account, which they state |  |  |
| would make it tax deductible, or the Access Financial account. She states that all money eventually would go to the Access Financial |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| account and may first go through Sanctuary Ministries and then be |  |  |

MOORE: THIS IS SPECIAL AGENT SAMUEL J, MOORE, TODAY'S DATE IS JULY 6, 2001. MY TIME IS CURRENTLY 1:56 P.M. FOLLOWING THIS PREAMBLE WILL BE A CONVERSATION BETWEEN A COOPERATIVE WITNESS AND WES AND DIANE BOSS. DO YOU CONSENT AT THIS TIME TO HAVING YOUR CONVERSATION RECORDED?

CW: YES I DO.
(BACKGROUND NOISE) (DOOR OPENING, BEEPING NOISE, DOOR SHUTTING, VEHICLE STARTING, VEHICLE MOVING (VEHICLE STOPRED, BACKGROUND NOISES, DOOR OPENING, SHUTMING, WALKING NOISES, DOOR OPENING)
(SEVERAI MINUTES PASS)
JAGER: MARY CAULED.
CW: MARX ISN'T COMING?
JAGER: YEAH.
CW: HOW COME, DID SHE SAY?
JAGER: HUH?
CW: HOW COME, DID SHE SAY?
JAGER: SHE COULDN'T GET RWAY.
(PAUSE) (WATER NOISES)
(TV IN BACKGROUND)
JAGER: TOO BAD SHE DIDN'T CALL EARLIER WHILE WE WERE THERE IN LOWELL ABOUT THOSE FIREWORKS. (U) WAS GOING ON (U) GONE OVER THERE TONIGHT,
(U) (BACKGROUND NOISE)

CW: YEA, WES AND DIANE SHOULD BE COMING PRETTY QUXCK NOW. THEY'RE NOT HERE YET.
(TV IN BACKGROUND)
CW: WELL YOU CAN ALWAYS CHANGE YOUR MIND ABOUT GOING
Marcusse: Corcoran Supp. Decl. Exhibit A

0
0

#  <br> WESTERN 

In the Matter of the Search of

- (Name. addess or briel desenption of person, property $\alpha$ crerises to be searched)

Access Financial Group
a/k/a-Access Financial and/or Access Group
0-151-44th Street, Suite A2
Grandville, MI 49418

that on the person of or on the property or premises known as (name, desciption ander (lccation)
Access Financial Group, a/k/a Access Financial and/or Access Group, located at 0-151-44th Streel, Suite A2, Grandville, Michigan. Further described as a business office. (See atlached photographs)
in the $\qquad$ District of Michigan there is now concealed a certain person or property, namely (describe the person or property to be seized) See Attachment A.

Which is (state one or more bases for search and seizure sel forth under Rule 41 (b) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure) Property that constitutes evidence of the commission of a criminal offense; Property designed or intended for usa or which is or has been used as the means of commitling a criminal offense.
concerning a violation of Title $\qquad$ United Slates code, Section(s) $\qquad$ . The facts to support a finding of Probable Cause are as follows: See atlached affidavit on the attached sheet and made a part herecf.



Sworn to ceifore me, and subscribed in my presence
$\frac{12-18-2001}{\text { Oate }}$

Honorable HUGHW. ERENNEMAN, JR.
Name and Tive of Juticial Officer
This form was ejectroncally produced by Ento Federal Forms, bin.


Marcusse-200 EXHIBIT D-6
31. $\square$ stated to Detective $\square$ that she was also an investor and that she had been instructed to set up an account with herself as a church(508(C) corporation), it was called the Wings of Angels. $\square$ indicated to Detective $\square$ that she wishes that she could get her money back. $\square$ states that approximately 120 churches (508(C) corporations) were set up and that she was involved in helping them get set up.
32. $\square$ stated to Detective $\square$ that at no point were $W-2$ forms ever filed and there was no specific payroll account. $\square$ stated that on one instance when the health insurance company required some type of specific proof that there were actual employees at Access Financial, Marcusse instructed to use a computer program to make up fake $\mathrm{W}-2$ 's.
33. In their Auqust 14,2001 interview with Detective
$\square$ both acknowledged that they now

5e - 2,7 b?c-. 7 realize that it appears that they had been involved in some type of Ponzi scheme.
34. Prosecutor's office, acknowledges that his clients will be charged with some criminal offense and refers to Access Financial as a Ponzi scheme of 'the first order. He also points to Jan Marcusse as the creator of all this loss to the 500 approximate investors.
35. $\square$ states in this same letter that his clients informed him that the Access Financial's computer hard drives are set up to be erased with a couple of keystrokes in the event of signs of a police investigation.
36. $\square$ told Source 2 that he had enough dirt on Janet Marcusse to send her to prison for life. This comment was made by ; shortly after he discovered that the July, 2001 newsletter had been distributed to investors and had accused him and $\square$ of embezzling over one million dollars from Access

## BAHAMAS CD PROGRAM (SSBT) Stock Trading Program

DATE

| 10-21-98 | 250,000 | FCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12-2-98 | 30,000 | FCR |
| 12-2-98 | 170,000 | Access |
| 12-11-98 | 40,000 | FCR |
| 12-18-98 | 70,000 | Access |
| 2-12-99 | 300,000 | Access |
| 4-6-99 | 85,000 | Sanctuary |
| 4-26-99 | 100,000 | Access |
| 4-27-99 | 100,000 | Sanctuary |
| 5-18-99 | 125,000 | Access |
| 6-1-99 | 25,000 | Access |
| 6-25-99 | 100,000 | Access |
| 6-25-99 | 100,000 | Sanctuary |
| 7-1-99 | 490,000 | Sanctuary |
| 7-13-99 | 300,000 | Sanctuary |
| 7-15-99 | 400,000 | Sanctuary |
| 7-16-99 | 100,000 | Sanctuary |
| 7-20-99 | 75,000 | Sanctuary |
| 7-20-99 | 75,000 | Access |
| 8-3-99 | 150,000 | Access |
| 8-12-99 | 100,000 | Sanctuary |
| 9-7-99 | 150,000 | Sanctuary |
| 9-10-99 | 100,000 | Access* |
| 9-15-99 | 155,000 | Access |
| 9-22-99 | 75,000 | Access* |
| 10-22-99 | 42,000 | Access |
| 10-22-99 | 150,000 | Access |
| 11-2-99 | 42,000 | Access |
| 11-15-99 | 75,000 | Access |
| 11-16-99 | 42,000 | Access |
| 11-19-99 | 85,000 | Access |
| 11-30-99 | 100,000 | Access |
| 12-7-99 | 25,000 | Sanctuary |
|  |  |  |
| TOTAL | \$4,226,000 |  |

* Sent to Florida and Tugboat but credited to the program

A That is the listing of dates and amounts and from which account the money was sent.

Q Okay. And that's something you prepared; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q All right. And earlier before the break I mistakenly indicated the government had prepared it; is that right?

A Yes, this is something I --
Q The government did not prepare that?
A No.
Q All right. What records did you use in order to prepare that exhibit?

A I used the bulk exhibits from the statements from Access and the statements from Sanctuary Ministries and the statements from Freedom Church of Revelation, and each one of these will have a corresponding wire transfer on the same date from the account listed.

Q So that would essentially be a summary exhibit of the actual accounts?

A Yes.
MR. KACZOR: Okay. I'd move for its admission, Your Honor.

MR. SCHIPPER: Objection, Your Honor. There is no payee on there whatsoever. Additionally, Your Honor, it does not come -- he points to these boxes. It did not come from
these boxes. She listed several other -- Revelation Ministries and several other things that aren't a part of this that she then used to put that together. I'd object. There's not a foundation of authenticity to have that admitted, Your Honor.

THE COURT: She indicated she prepared it and it represents her work product. It appears, then, that it's relevant and material. The objection goes to the weight that may be given to it. It will be received subject to the weight to be given to it.

MR. KACZOR: Thank you, Your Honor.
BY MR. KACZOR:
Q Can you tell us, then, over what period of time how much -- over what period of time what amount of money was invested into the Bahamas CD Program?

A Once we became more comfortable with the program, the information coming in and all of that, we put it in based on what was coming in into the program from our side and then based on the returns that we were getting from the Bahamas side. So ultimately by the end of 1999 or about a year and three months' worth of sending funds over there, we determined that the thing was self-sufficient enough to continue to roll with the returns that we were getting to more than adequately cover what was coming in as far as new deposits as long as it didn't get over a certain amount. And I'm sure that was just

A All right. That was into 0529467490.
Q Same account, right?
A Yes.
Q Now, you see an address on Bulk Exhibit 219?
A Yes.
Q Address of account?
A That --
Q You -- let me just ask the question.
A I'm sorry.
Q Do you see an address on Bulk Exhibit 219?
A Yes.
Q Whose address or what is that address? Is that an office or what is it that?

A The first address on there, 3168 Bellaire Drive, Las Vegas, Nevada, was the address of Mr. Winfield Moon.

Q Okay. And the second address, the Sub II account address?

A Was my address in Michigan.
Q Okay. I just want to show you, this has not been marked, but I'd just ask if you can identify what these are.

A The first one is one of two pages of a business account application for Worldwide Capital, LLC, with the Bellaire Drive, Mr. Moon's address on it, stating limited liability company along with my signature. I don't know where Page 2 is. Then there are some statement copies from Worldwide

E-Capital. This one is dated ending date March 31, and it covers the month of -- basically it starts at February -Q Let me just ask you, basically we've got Bulk Exhibit 219 for this particular account?

A Yes.
Q What I've handed you are statements from this account that come from the bulk exhibit; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q So these were already introduced into evidence through the government, right?

A Yes, I believe so.

MR. SCHIPPER: Excuse me, Youx Honor. I would
object to that. There are certain documents within this 219 bulk that were made copies of Mr. Kaczor gave me last night Bulk Exhibit 219 with the attachments, and there are several pages that aren't from our records, that are slipped in here that are not from our records at all. So this is not a copy of Bulk Exhibit 219 and the attached documents.

MR. KACZOR: Your Honor, it's my understanding it was and that the account numbers match, but I'm more than willing to put this to the side and during the break perhaps Mr. Schipper and I can talk about it because he didn't raise this this morning at all.

MR. SCHIPPER: We mentioned it to him last night. When Ms. Goeman looked at these, she immediately, and so did

Mr. Flink, said these are not part of our records. These are not part of 219. But we can discuss it at break.

MR. KACZOR: All right. Thank you.
THE COURT: You've got them portioned out, those that are and those that aren't?

MR. SCHIPPER: Yes, I do, Your Honor. They're tabbed.

THE COURT: Let's take them up later, then. BY MR. KACZOR:

Q All right. Ultimately you invest, then, you indicated a little less than $\$ 2$ million?

A Yes.
Q Okay. When is that sent and how? I mean, what is the procedure? Talk to me about that, or testify, excuse me.

A How was that invested?
Q Again, I'm trying to chronologically take you through it. Now, you've indicated what the program is. You've indicated that I think Sanctuary Ministries has invested a little less than $\$ 2$ million, correct?

A Yes.
Q When was that invested and in what increments?
A All right. In February and March of 2001 the funds were brought, wire transferred from Access and Sanctuary Ministries to the Las Vegas account, the Worldwide E-Capital. There was also another -- I believe there was about a million and a half
that came into the Worldwide E-Capital account, and then there was another $\$ 660,000$ that came from Sanctuary in Grand Rapids to Sanctuary Ministries' account in Las Vegas.

Q Okay. Let me stop you there. Could we go to 95? We talked about this a little bit yesterday. You're specifically talking about -- is it this $\$ 600,000$ that wire transfers to worldwide E-Capttal?

A Yes. There were some funds that were wire transferred from Access or Sanctuary, without having the bank records in front of me I don't recall which, to my personal account and then wire transferred to the Worldwide E-Capital, LLC account. Q All right. Once this money, this particular $\$ 600,000$, gets to the Worldwide E-Capital account, what is done with it? A What was done with it is it was placed into Mr. Moon's investment product. And if you were to look at the bank records, you would find that that is what did happen to the funds.

Q Okay. So you didn't use this to buy cars or houses? A on, no.

Q Or use it for your own personal good?
A No, it was invested with Mr. Moon's investment.
Q And this is part of the larger investment, correct?
A The $\$ 600,000$ is, yes.
Q Part of -- because you said it was just less than $\$ 2$ million?

WELLS FARGO BANK NEVADA. N.A.
Page $1 \quad 692$
P.O. BOX 0995
PORTLAND OR 97228-6995

Statement Date
March 31, 2001
的

052-9467490

```
WORLDWIDE E CAPITAL, LLC
SUB-II ACCOUNT
3838 118TH AVE
ALLEGAN MI 49010-9448
```

If you have any questions about this statement or your accounts, call: 800-225-5935 (1-800-CALL-WELLS).


Continued on next page

NQTICE: see revirse side for important information.


[^0]NOTIEE; sae reverse side for important information.

```
WORLDWIDE E CAPITAL, LLC
3838 118TH AVE
ALLEGAN MI 49010-9448
```

MI 49010-9448

Fixin
MARCH 12,2001

0529467490

1

For Ouestions or Address Corrections, Please Contoct Your Store or Account Offic

Transactions Description
Debit

## Credit

$\$ 200,000.00$
1I: 0312G10G850C00064203121434FTO1

C: D/O529467490 TRN: 010312-032896
LUUE DATE: 03/12/01 CURRENCY CODE: USD
IME: $13: 32: 37.89$ CURRENCY RATE:
G: JANET MARCUSSE
4128 BYRON RD
HUDSNYILLE MI
OM: NATIONAL CITY BANK OF ABA/072000915
!B: O10312005029
II: FFCS
SUB II ACCT


## Wire Transfer Confirmation



For Questions ar Andress Corrections, Please Contact Your Srore ar Account Of

## Transactions Description

$0314 G 10 G 850 C 00025503141109 F T 01$
1/C: D/D529467490 TRN: O10314-011929
TALUE DATE: 03/14/01 CURRENCY CODE: USD
「IME, 10:07:13.84 CURRENCY RATE;
JRG: JANET MARCUSSE
4128 BYRON RD
HUDSONVILLE MI
:ROM: NATIONAL CITY BANX OF ABA/072000915
iFB: 010314002485

|  | SUMMARY OF WIRES: |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| TYPE |  |  |
| DEBITS | NUBER |  |
| CREDITS | 0 | TOTAL |
|  | 1 | $\$ 500,000.00$ |

## Business Account Application



Coveigic:Brion: Under parvoltiey of perjury. d certily that:

1. The nurnber shown on this lorm ls my correct Taxpayer identificatian Number. and



 MriA). and mavments othce thant inemest and dividumais.l



argumentative and asked and answered.
THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained.
BY DEFENDANT MARCUSSE:
Q Do you recall testifying in front of the grand jury trying to explain why I had gotten so little money?

A I could have, yes.
Q All right. Was, then, the 6 -- at the time do you recall that was around $\$ 371,000$ that you were explaining to the grand jury that I had gotten?

A Could have been, yes.
Q Over four or five years?
A Yes.
Q After that, then, is this when you added the $\$ 600,000$ to my total?

A I don't know when exactly we made up this particular chart, but we were trying to determine where the investors' funds went, and since that went into your personal account, we attributed that $\$ 600,000$ to you.

Q Is an LLC a personal account? A limited liability corporation, is that a personal account?

A The $\$ 600,000$ went into your Janet Marcusse personal account at National City Bank.

Q Isn't it also your testimony that it then went into Worldwide E-Capital, LIC?

A Some of the money was transferred into an account you
of Sanctuary Ministries or any of its subsidiaries?
A No.
Q Do you believe that you were always using your best
efforts in placing the numerous investments that you talked
about?

A Yes.
Q Up to the time that you were arrested for this, have you ever been arrested before?

A No.
MR, KACZOR: Thank you. I have no further questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well. We'll take a break at this time, ladies and gentlemen. (Jury out at 10:40 a.m.)

THE COURT: The two of you will go over these exhibits that are at odds here during the little break here and then we'll proceed on from there.

MR. SCHIPPER: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Very well.
(Proceedings recessed at 10:41 a.m.; reconvened at 10:58 a.m.)
MR. KACZOR: I just wanted to report. You had asked us to meet during the break and talk about the exhibits. 219 is a bulk exhibit and I had some documents that appeared not to come from that bulk exhibit, so I've deleted those. I only have exhibits that come from bulk 219.

203 is another bulk exhibit, and I have two documents that are Mrs. Marcusse's copy of the same documents that are in 203. It's my understanding the government doesn't object to that, but you do want it known that they're her copies; is that correct?

MR. SCHIPPER: Well, I don't think they can come in as part of Bulk Exhibit 203 because they're not part of Bulk Exhibit 203.

THE COURT: Well, I'm only concerned because there were a couple exhibits here that I did not receive, like a 2 . There was $Z, Z$ was marked, but $I$ don't think it was ever received because of some objections. And I guess the question on those is are they in or are they out or where are they?

MR. KACZOR: I think there were several that were not received and there were several that I marked and did not introduce, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, there were two that you introduced that were objected to and you agreed you'd work on them, and apparently you have sanitized them or whatever is necessary to get them in?

MR. SCHIPPER: Yes. The only -- he took out the ones that weren't part of 219. Now, 203 he has two documents that can't come in as part of 203 because they're not -- I mean, 203 is what it is. It's a summary of the documents that were used to create that summary. He's got two documents that
he says are her records which are parallel to two of the records within 203. I don't have a problem with that. They come in on their own, not as part of 203.

THE COURT: Okay. So they come in on Exhibit -what exhibit would that be?

MR. KACZOR: Your Honor, I don't know that we gave it an exhibit number because I had thought it was part of the bulk that was already introduced, and so I think we have to give it an exhibit number of $M-B B$, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. That's received, then.
MR. KACZOR: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Anything else?
MR. KACZOR: I believe that's it.
MR. SCHIPPER: Nothing further, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Let's bring the jury in and we'll proceed with cross-examination first from the government. (Jury in at 11:02 a.m.)

THE COURT: You may be seated.
You may proceed with cross-examination in this matter, Mr. Schipper.

MR. SCHIPPER: Thank you, Your Honor.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. SCHIPPER:
Q Ms. Marcusse, you've testified now for about five hours telling your story of Access in a chronological fashion, and
A. The sub account to the parent, Worldwide E-Capital -THE COURT: ExCuse me. Yes or no. THE WITNESS: I was the sole signatory. THE COURT: That's a yes or no.

BY MR. SCHIPPER:
Q That's a yes?
A.Yes.

Q So when money came into that account with your name on it, you alone, you could do whatever you wanted with that money, couldn't you?

A It was invested. Why send it there? I would have left it in my own account.

Q Well, you did send it there. You admitted there was 600:-

A To invest it Why else would I send it there?
Q To invest it. That wasn't a gift. That wasn't a gift to you while you were in Las Vegas to spend from the church?

A Did I testify that it was? I testified that I invested it.

Q No, I'm asking.
A And you're keeping out part of the bank records that show that.

THE COURT: We'll take a break at this time, ladies and gentlemen, and we'll continue at $1: 15$. See you at 1:15. (Jury out at 11:57 a.m.)

THE COURT: Mr. Schipper, much too much commentary on your behalf that's unsolicited and really unnecessary.

You're hurting your case by arguing with the counsel. If it's a yes or no, ma'am, give him a yes or no. Anything more hurts you in front of this jury.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: So just answer the questions and be on with it.

Mr. Schipper, no more of this. Take a breath of fresh air, walk around along bit, get some perspective, come back here and ask some more direct questions. We'll see you all at 1:15.

MR. KACZOR: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Proceedings recessed at 11:58 a.m.; reconvened at 1:25 p.m.)
MR. KACZOR: Could I say one thing, Your Honor, or ask one thing? When Mrs. Marcusse has completed all of her testimony, I will be resting my case and at that time I'd like to renew my Rule 29 motion, and I don't know if you want me to do it then or just do it at some later date and preserve it for then.

THE COURT: Yes, it will be deemed preserved until we get to the end of the day or sometime like that. Then just give me a signal and we'll take it up then.

MR. KACZOR: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Let's bring the jury in, and
$Q$ You have no idea if Jan took that money, that two, three hundred thousand dollars in vegas and had a huge party, do you?

A I have no idea.
Q Now, didn't you in fact at one point in time wire money in the summer of 2001 to Jan and/or to Billy Flynn in Luxembourg in Europe?

A That was done on the money orders. I've already testified to that. It was done through Western Union, so it had to be done on a personal basis.

Q Okay. I'll show you what's been marked as Government Exhibit 395. These are records from Western Union of those six transfers, six wire transfers. Do you see that?

A Okay.
Q And those are the wires that you wired to either Jan Marcusse or William Flynn in the summer of 2001, July of 2001; is that correct?

A Yes.
MR. KACZOR: Was that 395 ?
MR. SCHIPPER: It's 395.
MR. KACZOR: Thank you. Has this already been
admitted?
MR. SCHIPPER: No, it has not. would you like to see this?

MR. KACZOR: Do we have one?


# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN 

```
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )
    ) Case Number: 1:04-cr-165
    v.
    )
    ) ROBERT HOLMES BELL
: Janet Mavis: Marcusse, Sui Juris )
```

MINISTRATIVE CLAIM TO CHALLENGE GOVERNMENT'S PROPOSED
SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTION NO. 1, CHURCH, FOR TAX PURPOSES, DEFINED, AS INACCURATE AND MISLEADING

Section 501 (c) (3) accurately states "List of exempt organizations ... Corporations, and any community chest, fund or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, testing for public safety, literary, or educational purposes, or to foster

## COURT'S INSTRUCTION NO.

$\qquad$
PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTION NO. 1

## Church, For Tax Purposes, Defined

The question of what constitutes a "church" for spiritual purposes in not before you. However, the question of what constitutes a "church" for federal tax purposes may be.

You have heard evidence that the defendants claimed that their income was exempt from federal incorne tax laws because they called themselves a church or church auxiliary.

One cannot exempt their income from fedcral income tax laws by simply declaring oneself to be a church or a church auxiliary.

The law requires that to be a "church" or "auxiliary church" for federal tax purposes certain rules apply.

Under the law, one cannot be an exempt church organization unless it is organized and operated exclusively for religious purposes and no part of its net earnings inure to the benefit of any inđ̉ividual.

Source: 26 U.S.C.A. §§ 501(c)(3).
the conspiracy on appropriate tax returns.
"Gross income" means all income from whatever source it is derived, including wages and compensation for services, tips, compensation in the form of personal expenses paid for by the defendant's organization.

The defendant -- the law requires an individual to make and file a federal income tax return if that individual had gross income of more than a certain amount, depending on their filing status, whether or not such person owed any tax. Anyone with a gross income of more than $\$ 13,400$ was required by law to file an income tax return in years 1997 through 2001.

The filing of a federal income tax return is not voluntary. An individual with gross income amounts charged in the indictment is required by law to follow -- to file an income tax return.

The question of what constitutes a "church" for spiritual purposes is not before you. However, the question of what constitutes a "church" for federal tax purposes may be. You have heard evidence that the defendants claimed their income was exempt from income tax laws because they called themselves a church or a church auxiliary. One cannot exempt their income from federal income tax laws by simply declaring oneself to be a church or a church auxiliary. The law requires that to be a church or church -- or auxiliary church
for federal tax purposes, certain rules apply.
Under the law, one cannot be an exempt church organization unless it is organized and operated exclusively for religious purposes, no part of its earnings inuring to the benefit of any one individual.

You have heard reference to an "exempt 508 church." Section 508 is an implementation section providing special rules for Section $501(\mathbf{c})(3)$ organizations. Section 508 does not provide for an independent tax exempt organization.

As I have previously instructed, a defendant's good faith belief that their actions complied with the law negates an intent to defraud the United States, even if that good faith is not reasonable. You may consider the reasonableness of the belief in determining whether or not the defendant actually held that belief.

It is not a good faith misunderstanding if the defendant knows what the law is and disagrees with it, every citizen's duty being to obey the law whether they agree with it or not.

Now I will give you some instructions that apply to all three conspiracy charges.

With regard to the first element, a criminal agreement, the government must prove that two or more persons conspired or agreed to cooperate with each other to commit the crimes of conspiracy to commit mail fraud, conspiracy to
that all the overt acts in furtherance of a conspiracy need not be alleged in the indictment." United States v. Henson, 848 F.2d 1374, 1385 (6th Cir. 1988). Indeed, the failure to file tax returns more than qualifies as a sufficient "overt act" in furtherance of a Klein conspiracy to frustrate or defeat the function of the IRS where, as it was argued and proved here, the act or omission was for the purpose of and part of a broader scheme to defeat the lawful functions of the IRS by dishonest means, executed in conjunction with a money laundering operation, in which honest filings with the IRS might have disclosed the mail fraud (Ponzi) scheme the laundering was intended to hide. Cf. United States v. Williams, 649 F.Supp. 1290, 1293-96 (M.D. Fla. 1986) (finding that failure to report income was part of larger scheme to evade taxes and avoid detection of profit skimming scheme) (citing United States v. Enstam, 622 F. 2 d 857 (5th Cir. 1980)). See also United States v. Shermetaro, 625 F.2d 104 (6th Cir. 1980) (finding a Klein conspiracy to frustrate IRS as part of effort to conceal Medicare kickback scheme). In light of the broad "failure to disclose" allegations in Count 42 and the related money laundering and mail fraud conduct specifically incorporated by reference into that Count, Marcusse cannot demonstrate prejudice to a substantial right warranting collateral relief.

## R. Ground Twenty-Two: Argument (1)

Marcusse alleges the circumstances surrounding her pre-sentence report ("PSR") violated her right to Due Process. (Dkt. No. 34, at 245-48.) Specifically, Marcusse argues that the PSR was unreliable because it was not based on trial testimony (id. at 246), and that

THE COURT: $Z$ as in zebra?
MR. KACZOR: I believe it's $Z$, isn't it?
THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. We're missing the third page with the total.

MR. SCHIPPER: Your Honor, I'm going to object. I saw this document for the first time yesterday. This is -she's trying to introduce this as a summary document as we've done in the past with summary documents. Now, for summary documents, you have to have all of the documentation to back the summary.

THE COURT: I agree. Where's --
MR. SCHIPPER: So if somebody wants to review all of that, they can.

THE COURT: Where's the underlying?
MR. KACZOR: Your Honor, that's what I was trying to ask her, whether it came from what the government presented to us or whether it came from additional sources.

MR. SCHIPPER: She testified that a small portion did. I've reviewed the --

THE WITNESS: NO, a large portion of it --
THE COURT: Excuse me.
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
MR. SCHIPPER: There are some of those documents -some of those numbers come from our documents, but about -- I haven't seen it again, but at least half of them come from we
don't know where. I mean, she just created the document.
THE COURT: Well, in order to introduce a summary exhibit, you have to proffer the underlying documents. So until they're proffered, I don't think it can be legally received.

MR. KACZOR: I understand that, Your Honor. BY MR. KACZOR:
$Q \quad$ Can $I$ just ask you if this is the third page of this? A Yes, it is.

Q Okay. Let me ask you this. Do you have an understanding, and keep in mind I don't want any hearsay or from documents, but do you have an understanding of how much Sanctuary Ministries invested in the Crawford Project?

A Yes. It was $\$ 4,186,700$.
Q Four million how much?
A $\quad$ 186,700.
Q Okay. And from what -- during what period of time was this investment made?

A That was over four -- three to four years.
Q Okay. Give me the date, beginning date and end date.
A Roughly October of ' 98 to midi-2001, thereabouts.
Q Okay. Again, the question is did anything come from that? Did you ever receive investment money or a check or -A We received a check in I believe it was March of 2001 which was deposited into a Wells Fargo bank account.
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## Aceount Sunnmary Information

| Statement Period $\quad 03 / 01 / 01$ through $03 / 31 / 01$ |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Number of Depositu/Credits | 6 |
| Number of Withrawals/Debita | 6 |
| Number of Deposited Items | 0 |
| Number of Encloaures | 0 |
| Number of Dayu in Cycle | 31 |

## Depoutite and Credits

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 03/26 | 100,000.00 | Wire Type:Fed IN Date:010326 Time:0855 | 904003269002906 |
|  |  | Fed Rot:000003 Seq:010326002906 |  |
|  |  | Orig:Robert Weidenhamer Pmat Dat:American Heritage |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Lealle Welch - Vice Pre Eerding Bank:No Cntry Mani |  |
| 03/26 | 45,000.00 | Wire Type:Ped IN Date:010326 Time:1333 | 804003269012510 |
|  |  | Fed Ref003855 Seq:010326012610 |  |
|  |  | Orig:Magy Minimtries Gre Pmt Det:Sanctuary Minimar |  |
|  |  | Iem None Given Ac-4772189048 Bbimbank Of America L |  |
|  |  | Am Vegar NV Branch Seading Bank:Welle Fargo MN |  |
| 033/27 | $\begin{array}{r} 13,500.00 \\ 300,000.00 \end{array}$ | Counter Credit | $\mathbf{8 1 3 0 0 2 1 5 0 4 6 3 7 1 5}$$\mathbf{9 0 4 0 0 3 2 7 9 0 0 3 4 2 5}$ |
|  |  | Wire Type:Fed IN Date:010327 Time:0927 |  |
|  |  | Fed Refoc0171 Seq:010327003425 |  |
|  |  | Orig:Access Financial Gr Pmt Det:Sanctuary Ministr |  |
|  |  | Ien Ac-4772189048 Bbi $=$ credjt To Account Sending Ba |  |
|  |  | Nk:Nat] City Kal |  |
| 03/27 | 100,000.00 | Wire Type:Fed IN Date:010327 Time:0900 | 904003279002833 |
|  |  | Fed ReE000121 Saq:010327002833 |  |
|  |  | Orig:Senctuary Minimbrie Pmt Det:Sanctuary Minimtr |  |
|  |  | lee Ac-4772185048 Ebi $=$ credit To Account Sending Ba |  |

## AHC SANCTUARY MINISTRIES DBA

 AHERICAN HERITAGE CHURCHPage 2 of 2
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## Meneare Contex

Thank you for banking with Bank of America.
know how to get -- you don't respond to each other. You just rise and say, I have an objection. My objection is we didn't provide it. You don't go back and forth with each other. MR. SCHIPPER: He said it and started walking up to the witness.

THE COURT: You had the ability to object and you didn't, so that's the way we do things. You guys know that.

MR. KACZOR: I understand that. I apologize, Your Honor.

THE COURT: No, I'm not blaming you. I'm blaming more the government in this case.

MR. KACZOR: I didn't anticipate a problem with this, and maybe I'm a hundred percent incorrect. I have - -

THE COURT: Why don't you discuss it for a little while and we'll come back in about ten minutes and continue with this.
(Proceedings recessed at 2:54; reconvened at 3:17 p.m.)
MR. GEZON: Your Honor, may we address a matter before the jury comes back in?

THE COURT: Just a minute.
MR. GEZON: Your Honor, it has to do with the last issue that you heard before we took a break. The record should reflect that in this investigation it has been testified to that we've been seeking the records of Access Financial and Sanctuary Ministries since the beginning of this
investigation. We executed a search warrant in December of 2001 and found an empty office. We subpoenaed the records that we saw at Mr. Visser's office and they were never produced. We've subpoenaed Ms. Marcusse and asked her to bring those records to the grand jury and they were never produced.

During the course of pretrial discovery we offered all the government exhibits that we had been able to gather and they've been available. But Ms. Marcusse, Mr. Visser, and the other defendants pro se refused to look at those because they did not want to share their exhibits with us.

In the last couple, three days Mr. Kaczor has been giving us handfuls of purported documents that he wishes to introduce, and we have no idea what these are, where they're coming from, whether they're legitimate, so we have to take these one at a time as they come in. Much of this stuff we think is irrelevant. Some of it has no authenticity. It claims to be bank records from the Bahamas. We brought in the bankers to show that these were legitimate records. We would expect the same of the defense in this case. So from time to time we have to make a point that these records being produced now are not anything that the government ever saw before or had in the course of the investigation.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. KACZOR: Your Honor, my response is honestly,

I'm trying to do the best that I can, and I meet with Mrs. Marcusse and she gives me reams --

THE COURT: I'm not accusing you of anything. I just wondered if you wanted to --

MR. KACZOR: I've been trying to provide them everything that could possibly be an exhibit, and this exhibit I understood came from them, but I understand that it doesn't now and I'm willing to tell the jury that. I've narrowed it down to exhibits that I think could be admitted. I've weeded out all the ones that $I$ as an officer of the court believe cannot be admitted.

THE COURT: Yes, all right. And the government has the ability to voir dire and object just as the defense does on the government's.

MR. KACZOR: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Let's bring the jury in and continue. (Jury in at 3:20 p.m.)

THE COURT: You may be seated.
Continuing with the direct examination of Ms.
Marcusse.
MR. KACZOR: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You may continue.
BY MR. KACZOR:
Q Mrs. Marcusse, you explained the Bahamas CD Program and I don't know that everyone's understood it, so I wonder if you
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MR. DEBOER: Not any more than the ones we've already called, Your Honor.

MR. DUNN: And for the record, Your Honor, my client rests also, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. And Mr. Visser I understand has no witnesses to call?

MR. GARTHE: That's correct.
THE CCURT: Okay. So is it my understanding that other than one question of Ms. Marcusse, there will be no further evidence offered by the defendants?

DEFENDANT MARCUSSE: I just wanted -- excuse me. May I speak? I just wanted to put a verbal motion on the record. I filed some evidence packs yesterday that I would like given to the jury.

THE COURT: Evidence --
defendant marcusse: Packs.
THE COURT: Packs?
DEFENDANT MARCUSSE: Yes, for lack of a better term.
MR. KACZOR: Your Honor, if I could describe,
basically she has -- she's given me some documents that she wanted admitted into evidence. One $I$ attempted to admit into evidence, which was the liquidation report from the Suisse Bank and \& Trust. The other documents, I don't think the rules of evidence would allow their admission and I've explained that to her, and what she's attempted to do is by
filing them with the Court downstairs, she believes that because they've been filed, they're certified copies that should be allowed into evidence, and $I$ was trying to explain to her that's not the -- just not the proper rule of evidence. It's not the way to get them in. But she did want the record to reflect that she had the additional evidence that wasn't able to be admitted.

THE COURT: Okay. You know, I haven't seen them, so I really can't rule on them. I'll take the question under advisement until after I've received a copy of them to see what they are so $I$ can rule on them. But until I see them, I'm really not in a position to rule on them.

MR. KACZOR: She has them here and I can show them to you. But like $I$ said, they're documents of questionable -I don't think questionable origin, but newspaper articles, that kind of thing, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Gezon, have you seen these?
MR. GEZON: We have not, Your Honor. We have no knowledge of this.

THE COURT: Okay. I can't inteliigently rule on them until I see them.

Okay. Rebuttal testimony that you'll be --
MR. GEZON: Your Honor, I guess I think in view of the fact he wants to ask one more question and in view of the difficulty of getting Ms. Marcusse to limit herself to
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account, none that was shown or gathered up by these, the hundreds -- or the 50 to 70 bank accounts that these fellows examined had that deposited anywhere in it. And if you look at her exhibits, you won't find any bank records showing that money deposited. Just her attempt to wave around a check to claim that she had $\$ 25$ million one day.

What else do we have? The Bahamas Program, the flagship program. Take a look at her stack of papers. See if there's one single bank statement in there. There's nothing. There's a bank brochure, a glossy thing you can pick up in a bank in the Bahamas, and one thing that's not signed by anybody and it says, "Dear Client." It doesn't have her name on it, doesn't have an account number on it, doesn't have anybody's name on it. Something she could have gotten off the Internet.

Winfield Moon. She takes the last, the last $\$ 1.8$ million of the investors' funds and she gives it to this Worldwide -- or she sets up this account called worldwide E-Cap and Winfield Moon, and by her own admission she sends it over to Europe, runs it through a couple of bank accounts over there. It comes back in 2002 at a time in 2002 when the investors are screaming, the place has folded. She takes it and puts it in her next get-rich-quick scheme. She gives it to Michael Carney to make a down payment on this land. Now, does that sound like something that you do to protect

## Suisse Security Bank \& Trust The Offshore Leader

As a client of Suisse Security Bank \& Trust, you can now have complete confidence in the strength of our organization and in the safery of your account. Whether you are an individual or corporate client, we'll help you establish the rype of account that matches your needs.

## Protection for All SSBT Accounts

SSBT clients enjoy superior account protection for two reasons:
(1) All of SSBT's client deposits are held with its conespondent Tucker Anthony.
(2) All accounts held with Tucker Anthony carry the standard SIPC insurance and also enjoy substantial third party protection.

Tucker Anthony is a member of the Securities Investors Protection Corporation (SIPC) and under the Securities Protection Act, SIPC provides for its members up to US $\$ 500,000$ of protection per customer. All Tucker Anthony client accounts are protected over and above the standard industry coverage provided from SIPC. Unlike many excess coverage policies, this additional protection (ksown as "Net Equity" excess SIPC coverage) cover the total amount of fully paid securities and cash balances without limit, thus providing total protection for each customer's assets.

The additional coverage is underwritten by Asset Guaranty Insurance Company, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Enhance Financial Services group, Inc. which has a market capitalization of over 750 million US dollars. This excess coverage is triggeted by the same terms and conditions as standard SIPC protection. Accordingly all securities and cash balances held in a client's account would be distributed to a client in the unlikely event of a SIPC liquidation. Securities purchased on margin, if any, would be distributed on a pro-rata basis after calculation of any debit balances.

## "We offer all our

 clients the
## confidence and

 protection of
## unlimited account

protection."


Effective As
OR Jaruary 11,1999 Serbject to chrunge whithoot aotice

## Cuch Bhangmment Shendacd Feres

| Wirs trantuer | 1.0\% (minimum US5 38) | Coshier's cheek | 9.0\% (min. US5 38) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Retulned statements | USS 20 per month | Bank guaraittees | Negotable |
| Fex conirmmetions | UST 25 | Fax statoments | US\$ 25 per statement |
| Account retaremes | USS 100 | Transfor investigation | USS 100 |
| Chack cancelation | US\$ $50{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{per}$ request | Transfor cancatation | USS 50 per request |
| Choek deponitie | FREE |  |  |
| Cheek collmetions | FREE (except for any core | dent charges) |  |
| Bounced ehack | 1/4\% on check amount (mi | m charge of USS 100) |  |
| Casin withdrawals | 1.5\% (minimum USS 38) for 20\% (minimum USS 50) for | 0 withdrawals |  |


| Cast Amenunta | Irpe 1 | Jos 2 | Irpe 3 | Type 4 | Tyoe 5 | Ivoe 6 | Type 7 | Troe 8: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Monthly account fee: | \$2.00 | \$5.00 | 518.75 | \$7.50 | \$12.50 | \$16.25 | \$21.25 | \$25.00 |
| Annual interest rate: | 0\% | 2\% | 1\% | 3\% | 4\% | 5\% | 6\% | Varies |
| Monthly service charge: | \$10 | \$40 | \$45 | 555 | 580 | \$70 | $\$ 90$ | 550 |
| Minimum baianee to avoid sarvice charge: (* per curteray) | \$500 | \$4K | \$5K | \$15K | S35K | \$75K | \$150K | \$9K |
| Checking Acrounta | Type 30 |  | Type 31 |  | Type 32 |  | Irpe 33 |  |
| Monthly account fee: | 55 |  | \$12.50 |  | \$15.00 |  | \$16.25 |  |
| Annual interest rate: | 0\% |  | 1\% |  | 2\% |  | 3\% |  |
| Montuly service charge: | 515 |  | 530 |  | 540 |  | 550 |  |
| Minimum balanee to avoid service charge: | \$2K |  | 55K |  | \$15K |  | \$25K |  |
| Free checks par month: | 3 |  | 5 |  | 10 |  | 20 |  |
| Per check charge for additional checks: | $\$ 1.50$ |  | \$1.50 |  | \$1.50 |  | \$1.50 |  |
| mincestef Oxardict Rates | interest |  | Querdrat |  |  |  |  |  |
| United States Dollar | Varies |  | 98\% p.a. |  |  |  |  |  |
| German Mark | 1.75\% p. |  | 18\% p.a. |  | Call for information on all other currencies. |  |  |  |
| French Frane | 1.75\%p.a |  | 18\% р.а. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Britist Pound | 2.00\% p.a |  | 18\% p.a. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Canadian Dollar | 1.75\% p.a |  | 18\% p.a. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Swiss Franc | 0\% p.a. |  | 18\% p.a. |  |  |  |  |  |

## Le.c. hacproarations

Authorized share capltal of up to USS 50,000
Authorized share capital of over US 50,000
Shipping chargea vie U.P.S. (U.S. E Canada)
Shipping charges via U.P.S. (Everywhere else)

Incomoration Fer Annual tee per lec
US\$ 529 US\$ 250
US\$ $1,380 \quad$ US\$ 1,000
USS 39 per company
US\$ 49 per company

## Corcorate Mangement Standred Foed

| Volor Mall Box | US 59.95 par month |
| :---: | :---: |
| Fax on demand box | US\$ 14.95 per month |
| Fax calls to U.S. | US\$ 1.95 per minute |
| Fax malle (non-U.S.) | Varies |
| Adminlatrative work | US\$ 45 per hour |
| Apostife | US\$ 260 per item |
| Photocopies | US\$ 0.25 per page |
| Cllent ietter request (custom) | US\$ 25 |
| Resolution of subseriber copy | USS 25 |
| Additional share certitheate | USS 10/25 |
| Change of registered agent | USS 100 |

Fax mall box US\$ 12.95 per month
Phone calls to U.S. USS 1.95 per minute
Phone calls (non-U.s.) Varies
Hold mail USS 8.95 per month

Notarize USS 200 per Hem
Legal advise Varies
Nominee director USS 100 per month
Certined SSET latter USS 50
Memo. \& Arte. copy USS $25 / 50$
Cert. of good standing USS 50
E-mall account FREE

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

 FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIAJANET MAVIS MARCUSSE, Plaintiff, v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, et al,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 12-01025 (CKK)

## MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE A PARTIAL DISPOSITIVE MOTION FOR DEFENDANT INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Defendant, Internal Revenue Service ("IRS"), by and through undersigned counsel, respectfully moves this Court pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1) for an enlargement to, and including, February 1, 2013 to file a dispositive motion addressing all claims made against the IRS in this action. The Defendant's motion is currently due on October 26, 2012. Plaintiff is an incarcerated prisoner and therefore Defendant did not confer with her regarding this extension motion pursuant to Rule $7(\mathrm{~m})$ of the Rules of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. There is good cause to grant this motion.

This case arises, in part, out of Plaintiff's requests to the IRS pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA"), 5 U.S.C. § 552 for records relating to her criminal case. Plaintiff filed FOIA three requests with the IRS between May 12, 2009 and October 19, 2010, and the IRS responded, advising her that it did not have any documents responsive to her request. On October 12, 2012, IRS counsel learned that staff in its Criminal Investigation Division in Grand Rapids, Michigan had located more than 60 boxes of material that may be responsive to

Plaintiff's requests. All of the potentially responsive information was obtained or gathered during the course of a grand jury investigation, and thus is grand jury material subject to the confidentiality provisions of Rule 6(e) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. Some of the grand jury material was made a part of the public record at trial, however, and is no longer subject to Rule $6(\mathrm{e})$. IRS counsel estimates that there are approximately 120,000 pages of material and that approximately 9,000 pages may be released to the Plaintiff.

On October 19, 2012, undersigned counsel sent the Plaintiff a letter asking her to clarify the scope of her request, indicate whether she is interested in receiving all or part of the 9,000 pages of public material, and specify the format in which she would like to receive it. See Exhibit A. The IRS respectfully requests this enlargement of time so that it may confer with the Plaintiff about this newly-discovered material, separate the public information from the information that must be kept confidential pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 6(e), format and duplicate any material sought by the Plaintiff, and release it to her in the format of her choice. The IRS proposes to process and release the material to the Plaintiff by December 31, 2012 and file its dispositive brief by February 1, 2013. The $\operatorname{RRS}$ believes that the additional time is necessary in order to fully process Plaintiff's request and ensure that the case is ripe for judicial review.

This motion represents Defendants' first request for an enlargement of time to file a partial dispositive motion regarding the claims against the IRS. This enlargement of time would impact the Plaintiff's deadline for filing an opposition to the motion and defendant's reply thereto. There are no other pending deadlines or court dates that this request for enlargement would affect. For the foregoing reasons, Defendant respectfully requests that it be afforded to, and including, February 1, 2013 to file a dispositive motion addressing the claims made against the IRS.

Respectfully submitted,
RONALD C. MACHEN JR., D.C. Bar \#447889
United States Attorney
for the District of Columbia
DANIEL F. VAN HORN, D.C. Bar \#924092 Civil Chief

By: /s/ Jenny Knopinski JENNY KNOPINSKI
Special Assistant United States Attorney 555 4th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20530
Tel: (202) 616-3285 Fax: (202) 514-8780
Jenny.knopinski@usdoj.gov
6. IRS Memorandum of Interview "MOIs".

In addition, with respect to this request, you sought all documents, reports, pictures, exhibits, memorandums, letters, summaries, handwritten notes, recordings, and all other information concerning the subject.

In your October 18, 2010 FOIA request, you sought, in connection with the above-referenced criminal case, copies of wire transfer statements, cancelled checks and other bank records with respect to accounts at National City Bank, Wells Fargo Bank, Royal Bank of Scotland, and various other banks and financial institutions.

On October 12, 2012, IRS counsel learned that approximately sixty (60) boxes of documents currently located in Grand Rapids, Michigan may be responsive to your requests. All of the potentially responsive information was obtained or gathered during the course of a grand jury investigation using the grand jury process, and thus is grand jury material subject to the confidentiality provisions of Rule 6(e) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

Grand jury material that is made a part of the public record at trial, however, is no longer subject to Rule 6(e) and may be provided to you. Attached is a list of all the exhibits that were introduced in the public record in the above-referenced criminal case. We can provide you with any of this public information as well as the underlying bulk bank records upon which the relevant summary charts are based. The combination of public record documents and their underlying bank records total approximately 9,000 pages.

Please let me know whether you would like copies of all public record information from the criminal trial as well as the underlying bulk bank records, or copies of those exhibits from the trial that you specify by exhibit number. In addition, please let me know the format in which you would like to receive the documents, paper or electronic (.pdf format on a CD/DVD), and if there are any special procedures that must be followed in sending this information to you.

Sincerely,
RONALD C. MACHEN JR., D.C. Bar \#447889
United States Attorney
for the District of Columbia

By: /s/Jenny Knopinski
JENNY KNOPINSKI
Special Assistant United States Attorney 555 4th Street, N.W.


[^0]:    Thank you for banking with Wells Fargo.

[^1]:    

