

October 24, 2005

United States Attorney Todd Graves
U.S. Attorney's Office
Room 5510
400 East 9th Street
Kansas City, MO 64106

Dear Mr. Graves:

This is your blackmail letter from the Bumble Bee!

While posting this letter is a constitutionally protected activity elsewhere in our Nation, it constitutes "blackmail" if mailed in Johnson County Kansas.

On May 18, 2005 I outlined to AUSA Dan Stewart my repeated serious allegations that I remain in the midst of a vicious obstruction of justice, cover-up, and retaliation conspiracy in state and federal courts and a conspiracy to deny my familial relationship with my sons Aaron, Jesse, and Adam while in state and federal custody involving, but not limited to, your office.

Since that letter I am now a convicted Johnson County blackmailer and because I refuse to stop exercising rights safeguarded by our Constitution I face a harsh sentence from Kansas authorities on October 31, 2005 at 1:30 p.m. in Olathe, Kansas.

Activities that your office has determined are constitutionally protected are, at the same time and in the same sense, considered criminal in Kansas. (See attached letter from U.S. Postal Inspector T. A. Rebottaro.) Only in the Johnson County Kansas Courthouse by order of Judge John Anderson, III and only under the direction of Johnson County Prosecutor Paul Morrison are my activities turned from a civil matter into a criminal matter. Since I refuse to stop this protected activity, this public policy in Kansas has turned me into The Johnson County Serial Blackmailer!

"To punish a person because he has done what the law plainly allows him to do is a due process violation of the most basic sort." United States v. Goodwin, 457 U.S. 368, 472.

"When a defendant exercises constitutional or statutory rights in the course of criminal proceedings, the government may not punish him for such exercise without violating due process guaranteed by the federal Constitution." U.S. v. Raymer, 941 F.2d 1031, 1040 (10th Circuit, 1991), see also United States v. Goodwin, 457 U.S. 368, 374, 376, 380-81, 384 n. 19, 102 S. Ct. 2485, 73 L. Ed. 2nd 74 (1982).

The test for vindictive prosecution is "whether as a practical matter, there is a realistic or reasonable likelihood of prosecutorial conduct that would not have occurred *but for* hostility or punitive animus towards the defendant because he exercised his specific legal right." Raymer, 941 F.2d at 1042.

While unlawfully imprisoned in Kansas my business, Gold Standard Corporation, collapsed. In the fall of 1993 the Johnson County Prosecutors Office entered into a federal perjury, cover-up, obstruction of justice and retaliation conspiracy with the City of Leawood Police Department, your office and certain individuals with testimony that I repeatedly violated a no contact court order for the purpose to deny me bond in federal court. Leawood Police Records Sergeant Sam Tucker testified that he entered "all of the pertinent reports . . . that had anything to do with the Braun situation" into the record. Exculpatory police reports of a failed sting operation using my 9-year-old-son as bait in joint and concerted action with sole complaining witnesses in K-67315 former wife, Donna K. Braun (Kirk) and brother-in-law William Copeland was deliberately omitted at trial to gain false convictions in Kansas and were again concealed in federal court for the purpose to deny me bond.

Johnson County Assistant District Attorneys' Thomas Bath and Lynn Stemm along with my former wife's attorney Jon S. Willard testified that I repeatedly violated a "no contact" court order when they knew there was no such court order.

The Johnson County Prosecutor's Office then went on to conceal this evidence and lied to federal Probation Officer Larry Revella causing him to create a false criminal history.

This evidence was again deliberately concealed at my federal sentencing causing my federal sentence to be sharply enhanced under the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 by a criminal history that the Johnson County Prosecutor's Office knew was false and that your office knew or should have known was false.

Further, in the fall of 1993 my son, Aaron Braun, was reported truant from your office and was subsequently suspended from Shawnee Mission East High School for his truthful testimony in federal court. Later, AUSA Linda Parker bragged to my court appointed counsel Susan Hunt that she waited until after Aaron's testimony so she could not be accused of witness tampering, apparently not realizing that retaliation against a federal witness is also a felony.

Also, attached is a copy of an August 9, 1994 letter from court appointed attorney Susan M. Hunt conveying threats to me from your office that if I continued to write my sons and file lawsuits (two constitutionally protected activities), things would go hard on me at sentencing. Pursuant to my duty as per Title 18 USC 4 I reported the threats to the presiding judge. The presiding judge did nothing and went on to sentence me harshly based on a criminal history that the state of Kansas and your office knew or should have known was false.

Finally, the record will show that while in federal custody it became evident to me that the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 is apparently not in the public archives as is required by Title 1 USC 4(a) calling into serious question whether this Act was ever enacted by the United States Congress at all. In her response in April 1997 AUSA Linda Parker argued I needed to prove the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 is not in the public archives,

a logical impossibility, and a legal impossibility known as *impossibillium nulla obligation est*. "There is no obligation to do impossible things." Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition.

While in federal custody I raised this issue in several jurisdictions simultaneously on behalf of other prisoners and received a plethora of often-conflicting responses leading to my final draft presented at my revocation hearing in 2000. Judge Nanette Laughery denied the motion and Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals failed to address the issue on its merits. This opinion is now cited as evidence by the State of Kansas that I am not amendable for probation for the "crime" of exercising a constitutional right.

Truly my case is one which I clearly enunciated my own wrongdoing, accepted responsibility, and continue to this day to seek to make my own wrongdoing right. And yet, under law that perhaps was never enacted by Congress, I had no means available to make my wrongs right as the executive branch has usurped powers previously reserved for the judiciary by circumventing the only branch able to regulate these powers, our legislative branch.

Today this letter is a willful act by me to compel you to act against your will and end the unlawful public policy of your office to retaliate against defense witnesses for testimony in federal court and to end the policy to threaten prisoners with retaliation for exercising their right to familial relationships and to petition the government through filing lawsuits, if this has not already been corrected. I do not really think it is a policy of your office, but it did happen at my trial and appropriate safeguards must be instituted so it never happens again.

Mr. Graves, I realize your administration did not originate this ridiculous situation and I also am encouraged by the position of your office regarding my "blackmailing" activities. Only the truth will set the players in this unnecessary drama free.

Best Regards,



THE BUMBLE BEE
Conrad J. Braun
3940 Hancock Street, Suite 208
San Diego, CA 92110
(Mailed from Johnson County Kansas)

cc: Honorable Judge Stephen Tatum



UNITED STATES POSTAL INSPECTION SERVICE

MIDWEST DIVISION

April 29, 2003

R. Tucker Kirk
Donna K. Kirk
1050 NE 27th Terrace
Pompano Beach, FL 33062

Re: Harassing letters

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Kirk:

This letter will acknowledge your previous correspondence regarding the alleged posting of objectionable mail by Conrad Braun. It is unfortunate that the mails are being used in this manner. However, careful examination of the mail and discussions with an Assistant United States Attorney led to the conclusion that there has been no violation of federal statutes.

As information, the Postal Service is prohibited from censoring or infringing upon the Constitutional guarantee of freedom of expression. Although this mail is objectionable to you, it does not constitute a prosecutable violation under federal statutes. Therefore, there is no action we can properly take on your behalf.

You may wish to discuss this matter with your own attorney to determine if it can be resolved through civil proceedings. You may also wish to consider filing harassment charges with local authorities.

Sincerely,

T. A. Rebottaro
U. S. Postal Inspector

Cc: Conrad Braun

Copy

6201 COLLEGE BOULEVARD SUITE 400
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66211-2435
TELEPHONE: 913-266-2400
FAX: 913-266-2490

SUSAN M. HUNT
ATTORNEY AT LAW
1711 WESTPORT ROAD
KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI 64111

(816) 756-3737

FAX (816) 756-1364

August 9, 1994

Conrad Braun
CCA
100 Highway Terrace
Leavenworth, Ks. 66044

ATTORNEY CLIENT CORRESPONDENCE OPEN IN PRESENCE OF INMATE ONLY

Dear Conrad:

Enclosed please find a copy of Dr. Sternberg's report. As you can see this report will be helpful at sentencing to argue for mitigation of your sentence. By the time you receive this I assume the government will have sent its doctor to examine you. I will send you a copy of that report as soon as I receive it.

Presently, your sentencing is set for September 6, 1994. I have been notified by the government that you have continued to write your sons and file lawsuits. I have advised you against doing that but you have never listened to my advice. That information will in all likelihood be provided to the court at sentencing and may in fact impact negatively on your sentence.

Regarding your prior convictions, at one time the law was that any sentence under appeal or subject to collateral attack through a habeas proceeding may not be used to calculate criminal history. However, just recently the United States Supreme Court rejected that argument and held that all priors, whether the subject of a habeas or not, are properly used for calculating your criminal history. I will make the argument that your criminal history category overrepresents your criminal history, as all convictions stem from the same incident.

If you have any questions please feel free to call me. I know you have been calling, but I have been out of town on a case and have not been in the office.

Very truly yours
Susan M. Hunt
Susan M. Hunt

Exhibit "F"