

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Complainant

vs.

JAMES DEWEY PITTMAN,

Respondent.

Docket Number CG S&R 04-0615

CG Case No. 2233513

DECISION AND ORDER

Issued: January 6, 2006

Issued by: Peter A. Fitzpatrick, Administrative Law Judge

APPEARANCES

FOR THE COAST GUARD

LT Edgardo Cruz
ENS Brian Dudley
Marine Safety Office Jacksonville
7800 Arlington Expressway, Suite 400
Jacksonville, FL 32210

FOR THE RESPONDENT

James Dewey Pittman, *Pro Se*

I.
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

This case began on November 10, 2004 when the Coast Guard filed a Complaint (Exhibit 1) against the Respondent, James Dewey Pittman, under the statutory authority contained in 46 USC 7704(b) and 46 CFR 5.35 (Count 1) and 46 USC 7703 and 18 USC 1001 (Count 2).¹ On July 21, 2005 an Amended Complaint was served, and the Coast Guard moved to substitute that Complaint for the original. (Exhibit 20, Transcript (Tr.) 14-17). The presiding Administrative Law Judge at the hearing granted the motion finding “. . . that the Amended Complaint is substantially the same of the Original Complaint in the matter.”² (Tr. 16-17). The Respondent’s Answer to the Original Complaint was signed on January 12, 2005 and he admitted the Jurisdictional Allegations. (Exhibit 5). The Factual Allegations in Count 1 (Conviction for a Dangerous Drug Law Violation) and Count 2 (False Official Statements) were Answered by checking the option “Insufficient Information to Answer.” Mr. Pittman also marked the box “I wish to be heard on the proposed sanction” on the Answer form. At the hearing, Mr. Pittman indicated that his Answer to the Amended Complaint is the same as that set out in his Answer to the Original Complaint. Namely, that he has “insufficient knowledge to admit or deny the factual allegations.” (Tr. 17-18).

At the hearing, the Investigating Officers and the Respondent were present. The Coast Guard presented 20 exhibits which were admitted on the record. They are described in Attachment B. No witnesses were presented by the Coast Guard.³ Mr. Pittman testified in his

¹ The specific factual allegations of the original complaint are set out in Attachment A.

² The Administrative Law Judge initially assigned to the case who presided at the hearing was unable to continue due to the devastation wrought by Hurricane Katrina. Judge Massey is the Coast Guard Administrative Law Judge stationed at New Orleans who suffered dramatic personal losses as a result of the hurricane.

³ Exhibit Nos. 17, 18 and 19 are sworn statement of E. Grebe, J. Janzen, and J. Joy, employees of the Coast Guard Regional Examination Center at Honolulu, HI. The Investigating Officer scheduled their testimony by telephone from Honolulu during the afternoon session but the presiding judge’s schedule did not allow for that eventuality. She stated that if the Investigating Officer felt “strongly about it” he could request that the evidentiary record remain

defense. He did not sponsor any witnesses or offer any exhibits. At the conclusion of the proceeding, the presiding judge requested that the Investigating Officer contact Mr. Joy at the Coast Guard Regional Examination Center at Honolulu by e-mail and ask him “to think back again about Mr. Pittman’s application process and ask him if his best recollection is that he never spoke to him (Pittman) by phone.” (Tr. 72). The response would be treated as a post hearing submission. (Tr. 73). The Judge also requested Mr. Pittman “. . . to find out if in fact, there is a warrant out for you in Georgia. . .” The Judge explained that she needed some written documentation from the State of Georgia as to whether there is an active warrant “out for you or no, there’s not, okay.” (Tr. 74).

Both sides filed the requested documentation. On August 31, 2005 the Coast Guard filed a Motion for Acceptance of Additional Evidence, a 16 page submission which included: (1) South Carolina State Statutes, Section 44-53-370 Prohibited Acts A: Penalties (SC ST SEC 44-53-470) and (2) an e-mail communication to Judge Massey from LT Cruz dated August 31, 2005 containing the questionnaire from LT Cruz to Mr. George Joy and his response dated August 2, 2005. That entire post hearing submission is assigned Exhibit No. 21 and is admitted on this record.

On August 12, 2005 Mr. Pittman submitted a letter to Judge Massey with two attachments. The first attachment is a two page document from the Clerk of the Court, Lowndes County, Georgia showing that Mr. James Dewey Pittman was arrested on February 14, 1998 for the offense “VGSCA Possession of Marijuana.” The court disposition date was April 7, 1998 and bond in the amount of \$495.00 was forfeited. Warrant No. CW16456 was satisfied by the forfeiture. The second attachment is an eight page record of Mr. Pittman’s cell phone calls from

open and that a supplemental hearing be scheduled. (Tr. 39-40). No such request was made by the Investigating Officer at the conclusion of the Coast Guard’s case in chief. (Tr. 39-40).

May 19 – June 18, 2004 with an invoice date of June 19, 2004. Some of the calls, as described by the Respondent, were to Mr. Joy at the Coast Guard Regional Examination Center, Honolulu. Those documents are admitted on the record as Exhibit 22.

After the hearing at Jacksonville, Florida on July 21, 2005, the Judge returned to the New Orleans area. Hurricane Katrina struck shortly thereafter and her office was closed and her residence was flooded. On September 1, the Chief Administrative Law Judge ordered that Judge Massey was unavailable and could not perform the duties described under 33 CFR 20.202. See 33 CFR 20.203. Accordingly, the undersigned was assigned as successor Administrative Law Judge. A second order entitled “Notice of Errata and Amended Notice of Assignment” was issued on November 15, 2005 indicating that the hearing was held at Jacksonville, Florida on July 21, 2005 and that the entire record, including the original case file, transcript, exhibits, and all documents were recovered from the Judge’s New Orleans office and delivered to the undersigned.

On November 21, 2005 an order was issued by the undersigned notifying the parties that the rules of practice governing this proceeding, codified at 33 CFR 20.203 empowered this Administrative Law Judge to recall any witness whose testimony is material and disputed and who is available to testify again without undue burden. Also, that other witnesses could be recalled. Finally, the order directed the parties to submit written requests for further hearing by December 5, 2005. Also, requests for other relief were to be filed by that date.

No responses to that order have been submitted by either party. The transcript, exhibits, original case file, and all documents submitted have been carefully reviewed by the undersigned. The entire record of the case has been recovered and made available to this Judge. The case is now ripe for decision without further hearing.

II. **FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. James Dewey Pittman was issued a Merchant Mariner's Document by the Coast Guard on March 30, 2002. (Exhibit 7, Tr. 34, 61-62). That document authorized him to sail as a merchant seaman aboard U.S. vessels.

2. On January 28, 2004 Mr. Pittman filed an Application for License as an Officer, Staff Officer, or Operator and for Merchant Mariner's Document (CG Form 719B) seeking a raise in grade to Able Seaman and for other endorsements. (Exhibit 7). On that application he answered "No" to the following two questions:

Have you ever been convicted of violating a dangerous drug law of the United States, District of Columbia, or any state, or territory of the United States? (This includes marijuana). (If yes, attach statement)

Have you ever been a user of/or addicted to a dangerous drug, including marijuana? (If yes, attach statement)

The third question on the application to which he answered "Yes" was as follows:

Have you ever been convicted by any court – including military court – for an offense other than a minor traffic violation? Conviction means found guilty by judgement or by plea and includes cases of deferred adjudication (NOLO CONTENDERE, adjudication withheld, etc.) or where the court required you to attend classes, make contribution of time or money, receive treatment, submit to any manner of probation or supervision, or forgo appeal of a trial court finding? Expunged convictions must be reported unless the expungement was based upon a showing that the court's earlier conviction was in error. (If yes, attach statement)

Mr. Pittman explained his "Yes" answer on an attachment to the application which stated that in March 1997 he was arrested and charged with possession of marijuana. He was found guilty by the court but released on his own recognizance and was not incarcerated and placed on

probation. Neither the court nor the State in which the proceeding took place were identified.

Both the application and the attached explanation were signed by Mr. Pittman. The Respondent too signed the following acknowledgement on the application:

I have attached a statement of explanation for all areas marked “yes” above. I signed this section with full understanding that a false statement is grounds for denial of the application as well as criminal prosecution and financial penalty. I understand that failure to answer every question will delay my application.

Also, Mr. Pittman signed the following certification on that same form:

I do solemnly swear or affirm that I will faithfully and honestly, according to my best skill and judgment, and without concealment and reservation, perform all the duties of me by the laws of the United States. I will faithfully and honestly carry out the lawful orders of my superior officers aboard a vessel.

3. On June 4, 2002, Mr. Pitman was arrested for Single Possession of Marijuana in Ridgeland, South Carolina. A single marijuana “blunt” was found in the car he was driving when he was stopped by the Ridgeland police for speeding⁴. Mr. Pittman admitted to the officer that the marijuana was his. (Exhibit 13, p. 2). He was required to post bond in the amount of \$450 which was forfeited when he failed to appear at the hearing before the Ridgeland Municipal Court on June 24, 2002. (Exhibit 13).

4. On March 27, 1998 James Dewey Pittman entered a plea of guilty to the offense “Possession of Over 20 Grams of Cannabis” in the Circuit Court of Duval County, Florida (Case Number 98-2910CF CR-E). (Exhibit 14). He was placed on probation for one day and “adjudication of guilt” was withheld. He was required to meet certain general and special conditions of probation. The presiding judge of the Circuit Court of Duval County, Florida signed the Order of Probation on March 27, 1998. (Exhibit 14).

5. On February 14, 1998, one and one half months earlier, Mr. Pittman was arrested for

⁴ The term “blunt” appears to refer to a marijuana cigarette.

“Possession of Marijuana” in Lowndes County, Georgia. He was fined \$498 and forfeited that amount when the case was concluded before the State Court, Lowndes County, Georgia, on April 7, 1998. (Docket No. 98 SC 4326, Disposed of #9908-TT). (Exhibit 15).

III. **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

1. The Respondent and the subject matter of this proceeding are subject to the jurisdiction of the Coast Guard under 46 USC 7701-7704.
2. The Respondent was convicted of a dangerous drug law violation in the State of South Carolina in accord with the provisions of 46 USC 7704(b). The Respondent was also convicted of two other dangerous drug law violations in the States of Georgia and Florida. In view of his criminal record, the Respondent’s Coast Guard issued Merchant Mariner’s Document and all other Coast Guard issued credentials are **REVOKED**.
3. The Respondent submitted a fraudulent application (CG Form 719B) for a raise in grade to the Coast Guard Regional Examination Center Honolulu, HI on January 28, 2004. At that time he was acting under the authority of his previously issued Merchant Mariner’s Document and knowingly failed to identify his criminal convictions for possession of marijuana (cannabis). That act deprived the Coast Guard of the ability to access the character of the applicant and his suitability to serve aboard a U.S. merchant vessel. His Coast Guard credentials are **REVOKED** too for filing that fraudulent application.

IV. **DISCUSSION**

1. The Amended Complaint contains one alleged offense under the heading “Conviction of Dangerous Drug Law Violation” and two offenses under the charge “Misconduct.” The conviction allegation will be discussed first.

The charge Conviction for a Dangerous Drug Law Violation is founded at 46 CFR 5.35 and 46 USC 7704.⁵ Where the proceeding is based exclusively on the provisions of 46 USC 7704, as with this first charge, the Complaint must allege jurisdiction by stating the elements as required by 46 USC 7704 and the appropriate time and place of the offense. 46 USC 7704(b) reads, in pertinent part, that if it is shown at a hearing that the holder of a Merchant Mariner's Document within 10 years before the beginning of the proceeding, has been convicted of violating a dangerous drug law of a State, the document shall be suspended or revoked.

The evidence in this case shows that Mr. Pittman was issued his original Merchant Mariner's Document by the Coast Guard on March 30, 2002. (Findings of Fact, No. 1, *infra*). That document was valid for five years and would expire on March 30, 2007. (Exhibit 11). Approximately three months later, Mr. Pittman was arrested while driving an automobile in Ridgeland, SC. A search of the vehicle was performed and a single marijuana "blunt" cigarette was uncovered. Mr. Pittman acknowledged to the police officer that the blunt was his. (Exhibit 13). He was arrested and taken to the Jasper County jail where he was booked on the charge "Simple Possession of Marijuana" as a violation of South Carolina Statute 79901B2. The case was set for hearing on June 24, 2002 and Pittman forfeited the fine of \$425.00. He was found guilty of the offense. (Exhibit 13).

The term "dangerous drug" in 46 USC 7704 is defined at 46 USC 2101(8a), as pertinent here, as a narcotic drug or a controlled substance. In turn, "controlled substance" is defined at 21 USC 802(6) as a drug or other substance included in Schedule I through V of Part B of that subchapter. Marijuana is listed as a Schedule I Controlled Substance at 21 USA 812. Under South Carolina law a controlled substance is defined as ". . . a drug substance or immediate

⁵ The charge here is phrased as "conviction of" rather than "conviction for a" as required by 46 USC 5.35. That departure from the regulation is minor and the Factual Allegation clearly describes the conviction involved.

precursor in Schedule I through V in Sections . . . 44-53-190.” (South Carolina Statute 44-53-110). Marijuana is included as a Controlled Substance on Schedule I at South Carolina Statute 44-53-190.

Thus, Mr. Pittman’s arrest and conviction for Simple Possession of Marijuana constitutes a conviction for a dangerous drug law violation under 46 USC 7704.

2. The last two offenses charged in this case involve the filing of an application for a raise in grade of Mr. Pittman’s Merchant Mariner’s Document (Form CG-719B) on January 28, 2004 at the Coast Guard Regional Examination Center in Honolulu, HI. The first of these alleged offenses is that Mr. Pittman committed Misconduct by wrongfully filing a fraudulent application because he answered “No” to the following two questions:

Have you ever been convicted of violating a dangerous drug law of the United States, District of Columbia, or any state, or territory of the United States? (This includes marijuana). (If yes, attach statement)

Have you ever been a user of/or addicted to a dangerous drug, including marijuana? (If yes, attach statement)

Misconduct is defined in the Coast Guard regulations as “. . . human behavior which violates some formal, duly established rule . . . It is an act which is forbidden or the failure to do that which is required.” (46 CFR 5.27). The statutory basis for that rule is 46 USC 7703 which requires that it must be shown that the act of Misconduct was committed when the Respondent was acting under the authority of his Coast Guard issued credentials. The Coast Guard regulations codified at 46 CFR 5 are entitled “Marine Investigation Regulations - Personnel Action” and establish polices for administrative actions against mariners’ licenses, certificates and documents issued by the Coast Guard. One of those rules is entitled “Acting under authority of license, certificate or documents” and reads in pertinent part as follows (46 CFR 5.57):

(b) A person is considered to be acting under the authority of the license, certificate or document while engaged in official matters regarding the license, certificate or document. This includes, but is not limited to, such acts as applying for renewal of a license, taking examinations for upgrading or endorsements, requesting duplicate or replacement licenses, certificates or documents, or when appearing at a hearing under this part.

The Amended Complaint here asserts that Mr. Pittman was acting under the authority of his Merchant Mariners' Document on January 28, 2004 when he filed that application to the Coast Guard. The evidence reveals that Mr. Pittman was issued his original Merchant Mariners' Document on March 30, 2002. (Exhibit 7). Thus, when he filed the next application about two years later seeking an upgrade of the document to Able Bodied Seaman, he already held a Merchant Mariner's Document. 46 CFR 5.57(b) makes it clear that a mariner is considered to be acting under the authority of his document when he or she files an application for an upgrade of a Coast Guard issued credential. Clearly, that is the case here and Mr. Pittman was acting under his original Merchant Mariner's Document on January 28, 2004. Thus, the Coast Guard has jurisdiction under 46 USC 7703.

The evidence in this case is that Mr. Pittman was convicted of the charge Simple Possession of Marijuana by the Ridgeland SC Municipal Court. He was fined \$425.00 on June 24, 2002 and a finding of guilty was entered, as discussed above. (Exhibit 13). Also, on March 27, 1998 Mr. Pittman entered a guilty plea to the offense Possession of Over 20 Grams of Cannabis before the Circuit Court of Duval County, Florida (Case Number 98-2910CF CR-E). Adjudication was withheld and the Respondent was placed on probation for one day. (Exhibit 14).

The fact that the Duval County Circuit withheld adjudication and placed Mr. Pittman on probation after he pled guilty to the charge above does not alter the fact that, for purposes

of this suspension and revocation hearing, he is considered to have been convicted of a dangerous drug law violation. That Cannabis or Marijuana is a Schedule I dangerous drug is clear. The Coast Guard regulations governing this proceeding state that “[I]f the Respondent participates in the scheme of a State for the expungement of convictions, and if he pleads guilty or no contest, or by order of the trial court, has to attend classes, contribute time or money, receive treatment, submit to any manner of probation or supervision etc., the Coast Guard regards him for purposes of 46 USC 7703 as having received a conviction.” (33 CFR 20.1307). The Coast Guard does not consider the conviction expunged without proof that the expungement is due to the fact that the conviction was in error. (*Id.*). Clearly, Mr. Pittman did not disclose this conviction on the Coast Guard application he filed on January 28, 2004. The answer to Question No. 1 in Section III of that application should have been “Yes,” not “No” as Mr. Pittman indicated.⁶

Mr. Pittman also forfeited a bond in the amount of \$495.00 in connection with his arrest on February 14, 1998 in Lowndes County, Georgia for the charge Possession of Marijuana - Docket 98 SC 4326. (Exhibit 14). The case was “disposed of” the State Court for Lowndes County, Georgia on April 7, 1998 and the bond was forfeited. This conviction too which involved possession of marijuana should have been revealed by Mr. Pittman on his January 28, 2004 application to the Coast Guard. Yet Mr. Pittman denied that he had ever been convicted of violating a dangerous drug law of the United States or any State.

Reviewing all of this evidence it is clear that Mr. Pittman did not reveal these convictions of violations of dangerous drug laws in the States of South Carolina, Florida, and Georgia when

⁶ Have you ever been convicted of violating a dangerous drug law of the United States, District of Columbia, or any state or territory of the United States? (This includes marijuana). (If yes, attach statement).

he answered “No” to Question No. 1 in Section III of the application seeking a raise in grade before the Coast Guard Regional Examination Center in Honolulu, HI on January 28, 2004.

3. The final alleged offense in this case is nearly identical to the Misconduct offense discussed above. It differs only to the extent that the Coast Guard alleges at No. 7 that the Respondent “. . . wrongfully failed to provide full disclosure of his conviction record” vis-à-vis “wrongfully submitted a fraudulent application” as in the first Misconduct offense. Otherwise the factual allegations set out are identical in both alleged offenses. It is well established that the offense of filing an application with false information is a lesser included offense to the more serious offense of filing a fraudulent application. When a fraudulent application is involved, revocation of the seaman’s credentials is required. Appeal Decision 2613 (SLACK.) See also, Appeal Decisions 2570 (HARRIS); 2346 (WILLIAMS); 2205 (ROBLES) 2569 (TAYLOR). In view of the fact that there can be no doubt that Mr. Pittman knew of these criminal convictions for dangerous drug law violations when the application of January 28, 2004 was filed, that application was a fraudulent one.

In a similar case to that here, the Coast Guard Chief Judge stated in (United States Coast Guard v. Mark Glen Wain, Docket No. CG S&R 03-0586 May 4, 2004, p 15):

When an application is made for Coast Guard credentials, the Coast Guard must rely on the applicant to supply information that is both accurate and truthful in order to effectively evaluate the applicant’s character to serve on board a vessel. The fact that Respondent’s explanation to the questions in Section III did not include all of his convictions potentially deprived the Coast Guard of its ability to accurately evaluate Respondent’s fitness to serve on board a vessel.

The Respondent’s application here also deprived the Coast Guard of making an informed determination of his suitability to serve on board U.S. vessels. He wrongfully concealed his record of criminal convictions for the use of dangerous drugs and obtained his

upgraded Merchant Mariner's Document through fraud. Clearly, this case does not involve the lesser offense of submitting false information on an application. The Second Misconduct Offense set out on the Amended Complaint is subsumed into the First Misconduct Offense.

4. Mr. Pittman's claim that he spoke by telephone with an official at the Coast Guard Regional Examination Center in Honolulu and told him that he had been convicted of a dangerous drug law violation is not supported by the evidence. First, that fact is denied by the official allegedly involved (Mr. Joy) who responded that he never spoke with Mr. Pittman or had any communication with him during the time the mariner sought an upgrade to his Merchant Mariner's Document. See Exhibit 21. Moreover, the phone records submitted by the Respondent apparently reflect some calls by him to the Regional Examination Center but there is no evidence beyond the testimony of the Respondent himself that he ever spoke to Mr. Joy or any other official there. Respondent's self-serving claims in this regard are not credible and are rejected.

V. ORDER

46 USC 7704(b), as recently amended August 9, 2004, Coast Guard Maritime Transportation Act of 2004, Pub. L. No. 108-293, § 402, 118 Stat. 1043 (2004), requires that a Mariner's Coast Guard credentials be suspended or revoked upon proof that he or she has been convicted of violating a dangerous drug law of the United States or a State. The Coast Guard regulations at 46 CFR 5.59(b) make it mandatory for the Administrative Law Judge to revoke a mariner's Coast Guard credentials where he has been convicted for a dangerous drug law as here. That provision however pre-dates the amendment to 46 USC 7704(b) which affords the Judge greater discretion to suspend as well as revoke Coast Guard issued credentials. In view of that recent Congressional mandate and absent any recent interpretation in its regulations by the Coast

Guard, in light of the new statute, suspension as well as revocation must be considered. In addition to the conviction for a dangerous drug law violation in South Carolina, Mr. Pittman was convicted of possession of marijuana on two other recent occasions in two other States. These convictions support the conclusion that the Respondent is a user of that illicit drug. The multiple convictions on this record make it mandatory that Mr. Pittman's Merchant Mariner's Document and all other Coast Guard credentials issued to him be **REVOKED**.

Furthermore, as a separate ground for this Order of Revocation, it has been proved on this record that Mr. Pittman submitted a fraudulent application to the Coast Guard on January 28, 2004 when he knowingly failed to identify his criminal convictions for dangerous drug law violations in three States. His Merchant Mariner's Document and all other Coast Guard issued credentials are **HEREBY REVOKED** on that basis too.

Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED THAT** all Merchant Mariner's Documents and all duplicates and renewals of these documents issued by the Coast Guard to James Dewey Pittman are **HEREBY REVOKED**. You must immediately surrender your credentials to the U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Jacksonville, FL. If you knowingly use your credentials you will be subject to criminal prosecution.

PETER A. FITZPATRICK
Administrative Law Judge
United States Coast Guard

Done and Dated on January 6, 2005 at
Norfolk, Virginia

ATTACHMENT A

1st Count

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

The Coast Guard alleges that: "Subject was issued entry level MMD from Baltimore REC 04 /30/02.. Subject made application for raise in grade on 1/28/04 and received new MMD from Honolulu REC 6/15/04. On 9/3/04 FBI background check was received by REC Honolulu. It revealed that the applicant failed to disclose all convictions including a conviction for possession of a dangerous drug in 6/4/2002 after he had been issued his original MMD.

2nd Count

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

Subject was issued entry level MMD from Baltimore REC on 4/30/02.. Subject made application for raise in grade on 1/28/04 and received new MMD from Honolulu REC 6/15/04. On 9/3/04 FBI background check was received by REC Honolulu. It revealed that the applicant failed to disclose all convictions including a conviction for possession of a dangerous drug in 6/4/2002 after he had been issued his original MMD.

ATTACHMENT B – Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – Original Complaint

Exhibit 2 – Return receipt for service of Complaint

Exhibit 3 – Conversation record form

Exhibit 4 – Letter from CPO Thompson to Docketing Center

Exhibit 5 – Answer Sheet

Exhibit 6 – Letter from Mr. Pittman to Docketing Center

Exhibit 7 – CG Form 719B submitted by Mr. Pittman

Exhibit 8 – Statement for Section III, question no. 3 in CG Form 719B from Mr. Pittman

Exhibit 9 – Free receipt for Mr. Pittman’s application for rise in grade

Exhibit 10 – FBI background check received September 3, 2004

Exhibit 11 – Pittman’s 2002 MMD

Exhibit 12 – Pittman’s 2004 MMD

Exhibit 13 – Pittman’s South Carolina conviction record

Exhibit 14 – Pittman’s Florida conviction record and Order of Probation

Exhibit 15 – Pittman’s Georgia conviction record

Exhibit 16 – Pittman’s passport

Exhibit 17 – Erika Grebe’s statements/written testimony

Exhibit 18 – Jacob Janzen’s statements/written testimony

Exhibit 19 – Gregory Joy’s statements/written testimony

Exhibit 20 – Amended Complaint

Exhibit 21 – Motion for Acceptance of Additional Evidence, Section 44-53-370. Prohibited acts A: penalties. [SC ST SEC 44-53-370]

Exhibit 22 – Letter from James Pittman to Judge Massey, letter from Georgia State Court, cell phone bill from 5/18/04 to 7/18/04

[REDACTED]