

Exhibit D

Date: 02/24/2020

Time: 11:01 AM

Facility: DC

Federal Bureau of Prisons

TRULINCS

Message

Sensitive But Unclassified

Message

FROM: 57005177 RANIERE, KEITH ALAN

TO: "Marianna [REDACTED]"

SUBJECT: 903-2

DATE: 09/03/2019 01:41 PM

Sent 1:39pm, Tuesday 9/3/19. I thought I might share the endings of the three articles I have written: a potential Op. Ed., about the Sorority, and about the absurdity of some of the charges of my case.

I hope you enjoy! I suspect they are more powerful in context but here goes (I need to type these for, as you know, there is no copy-paste functionality). Tell me if you like them once you read them...

Here are the ending paragraphs:

1. Op. Ed. (note: much is explained before this ending. It is nationalistic (mainly for USA) and quotes the end of our pledge of allegiance all children recite each day.

As a metaphor, I find myself a non-violent soldier on a battlefield: my sole weapon is my character. I am not the lowest ranking foot soldier, but certainly not a high-ranking officer. Our ranks represent our contribution to team humanity, and our earned right to lead that team. The battle we are fighting is for virtuous justice, and our opponent: hate. In particular, this battle is waged over the conduct of the Sovereign: Is it dedicated to truth (virtuous) or to winning (hateful)? Are the accused upheld (virtuous) or is punishment and damage inflicted upon the accused, his or her loved ones, friends, associates businesses (hateful)? In short, is our Sovereign virtuous or hateful? There is no gray area, in-between, or part-time!

Here I stand in the middle of this massive conflict which affects so many people and the very notion of freedom. Suddenly, I find myself alone, in a fortuitous clearing, where I can potentially make a global difference. I don't know why I've been granted this visibility or potential power, but here I am. Yes, I can, and should, potentially reverse my trial verdict, but just as importantly--even more so--something good can be done!

As I am caught amidst a swirling miasma of prejudicial hate, much of which is flat-out untrue, but none of which related, or even should relate, to the law of my case, will this hate win? Will the prejudice infect justice so the law is ignored and innocence not upheld?

I need at least one experienced, vociferous, unrelenting justice advocate to join this effort, bring meaning and social value to this dark time, and turn the monologue of hate about my case into a dialogue--a conversation--about truth. Although my personal situation is wrongful and inhumane, it has even greater consequences for anyone who is affected by our justice system--hopefully all people under the sun who have recited the pledge, "for liberty and justice for all"!

For me, as a chance, nationally visible figure, immersed in an amplified, hateful, injustice: I am innocent, but can I be free?

2. The sorority:

I believe the sorority is good--not just good and even noble, but great--and vitally important for women and humanity. It is tragic the current organization has been stymied by a few envious men abusing position of power in government, media, and film; some women who didn't live up to their sacred honor and vows; and people in general who just feel threatened by this idea. The missing part of our society, found in a secret group of women like this, aches to be embraced; we should deeply mourn it's possible loss. It is a living thing, a precious thing, and an essential thing to complete the human story: groups that are different are not necessarily bad, and ways of journeying through our lives, only for the few, and too intense for the many, are foundationally important for all of us. This sorority is such a thing: living, precious, intense, and some would say even sacred. If the current group of committed women, for whatever reason, do not carry his considerable body of knowledge, practices, and skills forward, some other group of brave courageous, women should--even must--somehow, somewhere. It's here, waiting for the right women, right now. Who will carry forth this burning torch of light?

3. Some of my absurd charges:

The prosecution claims the "victims" cry they are "scared for their lives". As a non-violent, peace movement leader, with no violence--not even yelling--reported in the sorority, the assertion, "I am scared for my life" is disingenuous at best: I, Keith Raniere, would rather risk my life than threaten another's.

Date: 02/24/2020

Time: 11:01 AM

Facility: DC

Federal Bureau of Prisons

TRULINCS

Message

Sensitive But Unclassified

Even starting before my kidnapping, this situation has been a purely political, envy-driven, money-powered lie to destroy a community, and keep me either incarcerated for life or otherwise "disposed of". This lie is perpetrated by certain politicians, prosecutors, lobbyist, agents, judges, and people of influence, who likely received great benefits of recognition, social capital, favors, and maybe even money: it should all be closely examined.

An immediate family member of a powerful multi-billionaire, overtly against me, stated that this billionaire flew to New York, and stayed for over a week to work with, and carefully influence, authorities. This billionaire has stated he will do anything in his power to put me in jail for life--and money is not object. He also owns, and controls, one of the largest media conglomerates in South America. He is considered ruthless, very powerful, and dangerous. It is no surprise my case is so publicized, exaggerated, and untrue. It is also no surprise the men, dressed as Mexican Federal Officers, who kidnapped me were complete strangers to the few bona fide Mexican officials I did see. One of them, who had worked at his post for more than 12 years, was scared and said repeatedly, "I've never seen these men before."

There are many arguments which could attempt to show I was given due process, and a fair trial. No matter how detailed, definitive, incisive--or even persuasive--the argument, I know it is false, and absolutely wrongful. One might ask how I can be so sure? The answer is simple: I was found guilty through this process, and a trial by jury, but...

I am innocent.

Date: 02/24/2020

Facility: DC

Time: 10:55 AM

Federal Bureau of Prisons
TRULINCS
Message
Sensitive But Unclassified

Message
Message
Message

FROM: 57005177 RANIERE, KEITH ALAN
TO: "Nicki Clyne" [REDACTED] >
SUBJECT: Sorority (part 2)
DATE: 11/07/2019 07:25 PM

The meaningfulness of surety is difficult to assess because the collateral underlying it is relative: \$10,000 is different for a waitress than for a millionaire, nude pictures are different for a nun than for a porn star. The objective was as strong and complete a pledge of surety as possible.

Surety is always pledged and received with the intention it will never be forfeited, therefore it needs to be personally meaningful, and needs to at all times, match or exceed the value of that which it collateralizes. Problems soon arose with keeping pledged surety safe and current (If a woman pledges access to an account she later closes, that surety is no longer current.) Additionally I, as the structural creator, wanted to be certain, as the sorority grew, there were not corruptions of the power bestowed upon each master through these earnest, life-serious, vows. A series of eight endeavors and structures were undertaken to provide healthy, safe, growth:

1. The 8 founding sisters started to develop areas specialization: one specialization was ethics to ensure morality, consistency, and safety;
2. Circles were codified: groups of sisters, normally with the same master, working together and with each other. This inspired camaraderie and also fostered a mutually helping environment;
3. The beginnings of a grand master system wherein each sister had an additional higher, or non-lineage, grand master as a resource and sounding board;
4. Some of the lawyers within the sorority (and some not in the sorority) were consulted to formalize the relationships, consequences, rights, and safeties;
5. The group responsible for the safety, sufficiency, and integrity of pledged surety began creating methods for securing, updating, maintaining, and standardizing it;
6. One of the founding sisters was the first to formally try a "switch" of master and slave wherein the slave became the master and the master became the slave for a time. This gave a wonderful perceptual shift and an experiential sense of the responsibilities, and difficulties, of each role. I suggested this should be a mainstay process throughout the organization;
7. Two help lines were being developed: one through which a sister could personally raise issues to the ethics committee, and the second an anonymous system for emergency abuses which could be used without fear of identification; and
8. I had created a secret society of men which now would interface with the sorority. Initially, having male members within the sorority was considered--everything from husbands to friends--it was ultimately thought best to keep men separate in general. An ethics/resources committee was created consisting of three founding members of the partner men's group (the group had already grown to 60 in number), and three founding members from the sorority, through which both organizations could benefit from the insights of the other.

Although I was, through life vows, "master" to the 8 founding sisters of the sorority, I did not want to lead, nor was I in, the sorority. I did however lead the fraternity. As with SOP (The Society of Protectors--the non-secret men's group), in the fraternity I had ultimate power, balanced by the other founding member's ability to, as a group, veto my orders. I also had the ultimate veto power of any initiative the board created. Initially, in SOP, the high counsel (which I led) gave me ultimate, unchecked

Date: 02/24/2020

Facility: DC

Time: 10:55 AM

Federal Bureau of Prisons
TRULINCS
Message

Sensitive But Unclassified

power. I considered this for literally 24 hours, once it was given, and decided to set up the check and balance system because I was concerned of my personal flaws, blindness, errors, and even the potential I might someday lose my faculties.

Thus, I led the fraternity (the secret men's organization) with balanced power, and had final veto power over both it and the sorority. Within the sorority, my influence was even further limited by my own beliefs: For example, one lineage head refused to adopt some of the more edgy (but optional for each participant) BDSM-type practices desired by several of the other lineages. I felt it was not my place to attempt to interfere, although I believed it was a vital option for all lineages.

I did design a number of therapeutic procedures for the sorority-- things we called, "sourcings" in the companies I created-- that were feminine by construction and, I feel, some of the most extraordinary work I have done. There were also a number of specialized, optional, sub-groups planned wherein women learned skills of interest within the sorority community and these women would become resources for the rest of the sisterhood. Note: The primary witness in my sex trafficking charge initially helped design her own personal vulnerability challenge. After this challenge, she aspired to be one of the heads of the specialized group that provided sisters with both emotional and physical challenges. This included outward bound activities, any of the alternative sexual activities, vulnerability challenges, and self-defense/fighting competence. Her personal challenge was used against me as the centerpiece of the sex trafficking charge.

The sorority was to be a "no holds barred" organization, going boldly where no other organization had yet gone--so women could have access to many unique things without the structures or permissions of men. I certainly did not want to limit these freedoms with any involvement I might have!

While I was in Mexico, the hate and untruth towards myself and the sorority raged; I was further distanced and completely apart from the functioning of this group. The day of my arrest had been scheduled to be a restarting; a more mature, wise, reforming of the group. What happened with it after my arrest is uncertain as of this writing. I believe there are still a strong number of women committed.

I believe the sorority is good--not just good and even noble, but great--and vitally important for women and humanity. It is tragic the current organization has been stymied by a few envious men abusing positions of power in government, media, and film; some women who didn't live up to their sacred honor and vows; and people in general who just feel threatened by this idea. The missing part of our society, found in a secret group of women like this, aches to be embraced; we should deeply mourn it's possible loss. It is a living thing, a precious thing, and an essential thing to complete the human story: groups that are different are not necessarily bad, and ways of journeying through our lives, only for the few, and too intense for the many, are foundationally important for all of us. This sorority is such a thing: living, precious, intense, and some would say even sacred. If the current group of committed women, for whatever reason, do not carry this considerable body of knowledge, practices, and skills forward, some other group of brave, courageous, women should--even must--somehow, somewhere. It's here, waiting for the right women, right now. Who will carry forth this burning torch of light?

Message

FROM: 57005177 RANIERE, KEITH ALAN
TO: "Nicki Clyne" [REDACTED] >
SUBJECT: Sorority
DATE: 11/07/2019 07:25 PM

The sorority, also known as DOS or "The Vow", was still undergoing formation pains when it became the subject of world discussion. The initial group of members were all life-committed (the highest level of commitment) although many lesser commitment levels were planned. At the time it reached international prominence, and infamy, the average age of the sorority sisters was just under 40 (I think the youngest was 24) and consisted of single women, married women, mothers, and even grandmothers. Many were professional, even world influential: a daughter of a past head of a country, a leader of a key national think tank, a daughter of a multi-billionaire and media mogul (this particular father is one of the key motivators behind the actions against the sorority), the wife of the CEO of a major corporation, third generation royalty, call girls, lawyers, doctors, research scientists, Emmy nominated performers, peace movement leaders, many nationalities and races (African, Mexican, U.S. American, Chinese, Arabic, Canadian, European), many religions and beliefs (Christian, Jewish, Agnostic, Islamic, Catholic, Spiritualist), and from 7 countries.

Date: 02/24/2020

Facility: DC

Time: 10:55 AM

Federal Bureau of Prisons
TRULINCS
Message
Sensitive But Unclassified

Was it bad? No. It was great. Was it well defined? No. It was forming and changing daily. Were there problems? Yes, many. But earnest people were creating solutions every day. Was it sinister? No. The intent was to help women and humanity through a woman's organization unlike any that existed. Could there be an "old girl's" network as powerful as the "old boy's" network? Could there be a woman's worldwide secret society, based on personal growth, with a no-glass-ceilings, no nets, no excuses, environment wherein women are "women of their word"?

The sorority was a group of women with a four-fold desire to: 1. Be part of a close, intimate, sisterhood, where it is safe and supportive to have total disclosure (they were invited by a woman they respected, normally their best friend); 2. Be brave and courageous, taking full risk to overcome limitations, with specific disciplines, practices, and skills, taking away excuses and the cultural female "net" of social safety, in ways not available in the outside world; 3. Build power and influence for themselves; and 4. Be part of completely trusted, secret network of women dedicated to obtaining power and influence to be used to forward the compassionate feminine principle in society.

Some of the sisters questioned if many women could really keep the faith, taking secrets to the grave no matter what, and live up to these conditions and aspirations.

The initial sisters of the sorority were set to be the most trusted of friends to the women already in the sisterhood. This was a temporary recruitment allowance: select women were permitted to join directly as a life-committed member (a dramatic shortcut compared to the future, multi-year process of trust-building, tests, and commitment needed to assure qualified "lifers"). In the future, most of the women within the sorority would likely not want to be "lifers", but would find a lesser commitment level more suitable for their lives. Analogous to the Church, not all members want to be clergy.

The seminal notions of the sorority had been in my thoughts for decades. It is part of my life-work to create new social structures and organs of society. Several persistent, independent, thought-clusters and questions informed the creation of the sorority:

1. What are the advantages and disadvantages of good intentioned, compared to bad intentioned, people? How can the advantages of being good be amplified so, combined with the inextricable disadvantages, a group can be stronger than the damage of bad intentioned people? (Since a bad intentioned person is willing to do anything, he or she has more options.)
2. What is the nature, and possible need for, secret societies in the pursuit of a better civilization? Many bad actions utilize the tool of secrecy. How can this tool best be used for the good by having a secret group? Is it necessary, or does it give an advantage, in our current world?
3. Why were secret societies male oriented and the secret societies of the world almost completely of male membership? This leaves a void in civilization. What good would it do to fill this void? What in the behavior of women caused this void? Could women form a secret society without this behavioral weakness getting in the way? Would it be good to do so?
4. Could one build a society based on self-determined penance and collateral, instead of based on outwardly imposed, punishment and rules, backed by violence? Penance and collateral move a society away from violence used to enforce rules, and towards conscience upholding ethics. Hopefully, by using practices of penance and collateral, one moves from fear-based, external authority, to conscience-based, internal authority.

Collateral is anything of value. In this case, it is pledged as surety by placement with the sorority for safe keeping, or bonded through agreement allowing it to be possessed if necessary.

Conscience-driven people see pledged surety as merely an effect upholding, valuing, and representing, their word. Such people keep their word because it has an independent, internal value to them, from their own internal authority. The pledged surety is a proud demonstration of that value (as the signers of the U.S. Declaration of Independence who proudly pledged surety of their words with their lives, fortunes, and sacred honors). Conscience-driven women within the sorority world not fear losing their pledged surety because they know they will keep their vow, and their pledged surety is a proud representation of their vow's strength.

Fear-driven people, not using their conscience, reluctantly keep their word because of the pledged surety. They make the pledged surety the source, and their word an effect of it, believing they keep their word to avoid losing their pledged surety.

Date: 02/24/2020

Facility: DC

Time: 10:55 AM

Federal Bureau of Prisons
TRULINCS
Message

Sensitive But Unclassified

They value their word, in the moment, by what it can get them, and only keep it if they fear negative consequences enforced by an external authority. Such people often break their word if they are assured, or perceive, there will not be negative consequences. This gives them positive reinforcement for not seeing, or caring about, consequences, thereby inspiring a lack of conscience and conscience building. People who indulge this pattern, break their word when convenient, do not develop a deep conscience, and regard only obvious effects in their decisions.

There were three, non-defendant, sorority sisters who testified for the prosecution at my trial. Each of them had broken vows in multiple ways--one admitted to seemingly outright criminal behavior outside of the sorority--each admitted to fear-driven behavior. Their motivation to cause a conviction was intensified by the promise of money. They are all represented by the same civil(!) attorney who has stated he is putting together a class-action lawsuit: the heiress in this case is worth an estimated \$200 million, and other defendants have considerable assets.

What is the likely outcome when one of these apostate sorority sisters testifies directly protected by the prosecution (including her identity), for the prosecution? Would she tell the truth if it went against the prosecution's narrative and eliminated the chance of financial reward? Would she be charged with perjury if she lied to support the prosecution's story? (Answer: no.) In such a situation, can the defense charge her with perjury? (Answer: no.) It seems like this prosecutorial witnesses is pretty motivated and safe lying!

Additionally, one of my partners, a founding sister, testified for the prosecution in order to reduce her sentence. This is sad and a betrayal, but complicated: At her age, 40, not only is a prison sentence very scary, it might preclude her from having children which she strongly desires. She also has a mother who is gravely ill, and she did not want to be incarcerated during her mother's, potentially, final days. Her cooperation is compassionately understandable, but very bad morally: Even if she felt I was guilty--and even bad--supporting a hate-type campaign in any way is wrongful. It is also a profound betrayal and breaking of both her vows to the sorority and me.

Note: I am unmarried and have a number of long-term, life-committed, relationships simultaneously. Their durations: 42 years, 30 years (deceased), 23 years (deceased), 22 years, and a number more of 15+ years. This generates a tremendous number of questions, and a lot of hate, in this country.

This is how the sorority "started": At one point, for deeply personal yet independent reasons, three of my long-term partners decided to have a deeper, more total, commitment by making life-vows to me; one of them because of a personal crisis. They wanted me to hold them to the highest of standards, "pull no punches", and tell them all of my preferences, so they could be as intimate and close with me as possible. It is not my way to voice my preferences, or push for my wants, so I thought doing so was an important practice for me. Additionally, they pledged collateral as surety to prove their earnestness, although I did not hold it.

The benefits of this commitment were palpable to them almost immediately, and two of these women felt a few of my other partners should be added (and at least 2 women who were not my partners). Within a short time, there were a total of seven women who took life-commitment vows to me; one of them had no sexual involvement with me and never did. She was the person I chose to hold, and keep track of, everyone's pledged surety.

After the first seven women had taken life-vows, although the one in crisis remained apart from the group, the remaining six felt the vow and program would benefit some of their closest friends. At this point, the decision was made to create a sorority--apart from my life-vows with them--yet built with the same principles and benefits. I was to "train" these founding women as they, the leadership circle, were to "train" the rest of the organization. My longest-term partners did not fit the spirit of the group; it did not apply to their personality types or their goals in life. So they were never invited into the sorority and never knew about it. An additional one of my partners was added much later as a founder. She was good for the group (and the group for her) but was not added initially because some of the other founding sisters simply did not trust her and felt unsafe with her.

Ultimately, each of the eight founding women created a lineage. Over the coming months, as the group grew to over 150 women, many challenges were addressed and contemplated which helped form the organization. The first hurdle out of the gate was how to determine an invited friend was truly worthy and committed to such a life-trust? This was a secret organization that, for purposes of privacy and freedom, needed to remain secret. How would the group know they could trust a woman that much?

Date: 02/24/2020

Facility: DC

Time: 10:55 AM

Federal Bureau of Prisons
TRULINCS
Message

Sensitive But Unclassified

To start, there was a two-step initiation process: First, the candidate was told of a secret group. In order to find out about it she needed to pledge surety to back-up her word, convince the group of her trustworthiness, and guarantee she would keep the secret to the grave. This would give every member confidence intimate secrets would remain safe.

A good percentage of "best friends" provided this to find out about the group. What each woman learned were the four basic tenets of initiation verified in court: 1. The relationship was one of total, unqualified, obedience for life (this renders the forced labor charge a virtual impossibility, especially if it's for such minor tasks as reading articles or getting coffee); 2. The Master/Slave terminology would be used within the relationship to affirm this; 3. She would be required to be branded with an undisclosed symbol; and 4. She would be required to wear a permanent piece of jewelry to visibly show this bond. At this point, some women were interested, some not.

The second stage, if the qualified applicant desired to go forward, involved pledging as much meaningful surety as possible to affirm life-time loyalty and commitment. This surety was evaluated by the group, and the group decided if the applicant was committed enough to uphold the obedience and fidelity for life. There is a joy in affirming one's word through pledging surety-also a genuine desire to show one is serious and one's word is good (Remember the signers of the US Declaration of Independence). With some applicants, this was evident. If this second collection of pledged surety was deemed sufficient, the applicant was accepted, as a sister, into the group's life-time vow of obedience and loyalty.

Sensitive But Unclassified

Message

FROM: 57005177 RANIERE, KEITH ALAN

Message

TO: "Eduardo Asunsolo" <[REDACTED]>

Date: 02/24/2020

Facility: DC

Time: 10:09 AM

Federal Bureau of Prisons
TRULINCS

SUBJECT: RE: Contest feedback
DATE: 01/07/2020 01:54 PM

Read 1:46pm, Tuesday 1/7/20. I would need to understand the parameters: costs, timing etc. We do not want so much filtering that nobody signs up (and we need to get started right away). I would rather have 100,000 lookers than filter out all people who will not guarantee to look at it 100 hours and end up with 2. So there is a balance. One way I was thinking of doing it is to have them sign up by a certain date for segment 1 (\$25,000 plus other prizes of Sex trafficking etc) then need to "give up" by a certain date to get to segment 2 (\$25,000 for the next charge plus even more prizes -- maybe being eligible to receive \$100\$250 per provable malicious error within Eastern District press releases. Mine has at least one!). This way you can say we had 100,000 try and admit failure. Not sure if we should do this approach or just let them sign up. What do you think? ----
Asunsolo, Eduardo on 1/7/2020 1:03 PM wrote:

>

Hey there.

Some people have have feedback that it might be good to have a PR firm linked to the contest. It can filter people who'd just want attention and not to seriously analyze the case. And help in general with the contest. What do you think?

RECORDING: 57005177_Mar_12_2020_12_36_38_PM

DATE: March 12, 2020

TIME: 12:36:38 PM

PARTICIPANTS: Keith Ranieri [RANIERE]
Suneel Chakravorty [CHAKRAVORTY]

CHAKRAVORTY: Hey, Keith.

RANIERE: Hey, what's going on?

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh, good, you sound clear.

RANIERE: That's good! Hey!

CHAKRAVORTY: [Laughs]

RANIERE: So, I tried calling a little earlier, two times, you didn't get it or...

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah, uh, it, it rang once and then just dropped.

RANIERE: Huh, interesting. So, anything new since I last spoke to you?

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh, yeah. Uh, two things that are new. One is that Eduardo's been in touch with David Fritz...

RANIERE: Yeah.

CHAKRAVORTY: ...and he is pretty direct, uh, pretty, uh, not mean, but I think pretty strong with him, he was like, "Look, you know, you're going to help us or not?"

RANIERE: Right.

CHAKRAVORTY: And then he gave us the truth of Jason Flom and, and he's been texting with David on, on... I think he's on a plane right now...

RANIERE: Yeah.

CHAKRAVORTY: ...uh, to get him to the point where he'll set up the call with Jason. He knows him enough that it will be kind of a strong stance with him and, and I think we can get on a call with Jason with, uh...

RANIERE: With Nicki [Clyne]?

CHAKRAVORTY: With Nicki to talk to.

RANIERE: Suneel...

CHAKRAVORTY: I think Nicki will be the main person that would be...

RANIERE: ...you know who else might be interesting?

CHAKRAVORTY: Who?

RANIERE: Have Nicki and Michelle on.

CHAKRAVORTY: Aahhh!

RANIERE: Both of them...

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: ...both of them [U/I] are branded, they're different lines, one's right next to... Michelle, you know, side by side with [Nicole] or whatever. Michelle is also very articulate.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: Ask Nicki. Let Nicki be the lead on how she feels about that.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: But having... two, two of the women, and I think... I don't know how many women actually did the branding ceremony. Something like 15 to 20.

CHAKRAVORTY: Hmm.

RANIERE: You know, out of 150.

[Voices overlap]

CHAKRAVORTY: That's not many at all.

RANIERE: No. [Laughs]. And, you know, most of them were First, First Line people, but, so, yeah I have to count them up, but it's from... I, I imagine, I'm... I think it's like 20 total, maybe less.

CHAKRAVORTY: Hmm.

RANIERE: And I don't know.

CHAKRAVORTY: [U/I].

RANIERE: Do I know? At this point I know all of them, I think.

CHAKRAVORTY: Hmm.

RANIERE: So. So do you know of the top three things I should talk about are?

CHAKRAVORTY: I do. I have the top three, uh, so the top three I have, uh, from a bunch of people, are why, why multiple partners?

RANIERE: Why what?

CHAKRAVORTY: Why multiple partners with polyamory.

RANIERE: Uh-huh.

CHAKRAVORTY: Um, the collateral and the brand and the specific themes with that are, um, the, you know, your partners were helpless victims, were manipulated, people were forced or coerced to have sex with you.

[Voices overlap]

RANIERE: Uh-huh.

CHAKRAVORTY: And DOS, ESP, etc, was used to get women to have sex with you? And, uh, I guess...

RANIERE: Wow.

CHAKRAVORTY: ..uh, in general. Sorry, I don't...

RANIERE: Yeah, I know...

CHAKRAVORTY: ...I'm just trying to tell you that. [Laughs]

RANIERE: Yeah, no, I'm just trying to figure out, so "the room" doesn't show up there.

CHAKRAVORTY: And only one person mentioned the room, but I think it is important, I think just most people that, that I'm in touch with, um, and I think the sex stuff if more out for people, but I think our community knows like, this is crazy and they know the family, so I think that is also...

RANIERE: Is it what family?

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh, that people know the family, so the.. uh, uh, these people are, you know, community and then...

[Voices overlap]

RANIERE: Yeah, but I can, I can talk...

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: ...about the.. I can talk about like branding the room, and my sex polyamory type thing.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: Something like that.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah, I think a lot of people intend, uh, think it's bad intended or whatever and they just don't understand, so, I think this would be good.

RANIERE: Oh, okay, uh... yeah, let's see, anything, uh, yeah...

CHAKRAVORTY: [U/I] business, so...

RANIERE: ...I, I won't, I won't talk about the, the Vow or things like that... I think I'll just talk about those three. Uh...

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay.

RANIERE: Yeah. Like Farouk has a really intense emotional

reaction to the Vow and all that type of thing.

[Laughter]

CHAKRAVORTY: Maybe he should take the Vow. [Laughs]

RANIERE: No, but I do understand why.

CHAKRAVORTY: Oh, okay.

[Voices overlap]

RANIERE: Uh, I mean, there is, you know, there is a vested reason why... a few, actually [U/I].

CHAKRAVORTY: Um, maybe, maybe because of Li... maybe because of Lyvia.

RANIERE: Yeah... of course.

CHAKRAVORTY: Hmm, interesting.

RANIERE: So.

CHAKRAVORTY: [Laughs]

RANIERE: Why, why? Who, who? What... does that make sense?

[Voices overlap]

CHAKRAVORTY: You know what I mean, it, it makes, it makes sense, but it also doesn't make sense because...

RANIERE: What doesn't make sense?

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh, I mean, I, I don't know if that would be... I mean, I, I get why that would be upsetting, given like [clears throat] like the macho Mexican culture and stuff.

RANIERE: Uh-huh.

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh, like, you know, I guess, uh, and Indian, Indian culture is similar, but less like overt, uh...

RANIERE: Uh-huh.

CHAKRAVORTY: ...uh, but I mean, that's someone who knows you for probably 15, 20 years and also, uh, ideally knows the people involved in knows this is a conscientious thing..

RANIERE: Yeah.

CHAKRAVORTY: ... but I guess, intellect [U/I] is different.

RANIERE: Yeah, that's true. And also, you know, different people have different struggles. Ultimately some people like to be able to do what... whatever they like, or comfort or whatever, you know, so the thought of that, an absolute vow is like..

CHAKRAVORTY: Very uncomfortable.

RANIERE: Yeah, so, all right, um, yeah, I think I'd talk to about what... uh, branding, uh, my polyamory and the room, so the branding, the room, polyamory, something like that.

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay.

RANIERE: Okay.

CHAKRAVORTY: I will give you the count then.

RANIERE: Okay.

CHAKRAVORTY: Three, two, one, go.

RANIERE: So I'm going to mention three subjects, three quick things which I'll obviously going into more depth at a, a later point, but these are three things that I think upset people a lot. There is the branding, there is the room and there is polyamory.

The first thing I'm going to talk about is the branding, you know, it's, it's interesting, if you follow the media, if you listen to a lot of the media, from what I understand, and then I understand this from lawyers and people like that, that I am seen as having branded women against their will and often they think of it as like something with a coat hanger or a cattle branding sort of a thing. Now, a little bit before I get into what the truth of it is, you know, when I went to college, there were a few different fraternities that did branding and they actually did them with like, you know, metal things made out of hangers and stuff like that and there is a, a major, uh, fraternity, uh, the Omegas, and you'll often see like an Olympic athlete, you'll see an Omega on the skin or whatever, but, uh, very much, they do very large brands of that symbol. Multiple places sometimes you can look up that fraternity, uh, it's an African-American fraternity. It is extremely influential, there are a lot of people who are, you know, chancellors of colleges and, uh, political people and things like that.

As a matter of fact, uh, we have one person that is in the Nxivm/ESP community and he, uh, he was actually the first African-American Supreme

Court, State Supreme Court Justice of Arkansas and he's extremely influential and he, uh, you know, works with Bill Clinton on the Clinton campaign, all these different things and when it was first brought to his attention that this news and this stuff came out about this branding, he said, "I'm branded," you know, because he's in the Omega Fraternity.

So what is, what is the truth here? Yeah, women were branded, there... when a woman gets into the sorority and this was testified to in court, one of the conditions they have to agree to, to get into the sorority is they will have a brand on their hip, it's a small thing, um, and they agree to that ahead of time and then ultimately the brand, uh, they were going to put a tattoo over it and things like that, etc. Out of 150 women or so in the sorority, I think there might be more, I think there might have been more, I estimate 20 of them, maybe, got the brand. Um, the brand is something that the initial 8 women, uh, decided they wanted and, uh, I think a guy from, I won't say what state to keep his anonymity, came and did the branding with them and taught them, uh, about it and how to do it and things like that, and then there was a woman in the sorority who is a doctor, who... it's a, a type of a light cauterizing pen, they use it in surgeries, um, and she was experienced with that and that's what was used. So, and what was going on? Women were branded, I did not have anything to do with it. I didn't brand them, I wasn't there. I wasn't even there when my partners were branded. There have been, uh, at least two men involved in the branding. The, uh, man who branded the first eight women gave them that symbol, uh, and then another man, I think who did a few other women to demonstrate how to do it, uh, and then, uh, the rest were done by a doctor with [chuckles] a surgical instrument. It's always been a surgical instrument, so there are no hot irons, no coat hangers, no putting them in a fireplace, getting, uh, you know, white hot or anything like that. It's done with a doctor, with a surgical type of instrument. Uh, a type of, uh, almost like a light pen type of a thing, and it was agreed to ahead of time.

They are not held down, it is not involuntary and there is a small number of women in upstate New York that did it.

Now, branding, if you were to go look on the Internet relating to things like scarification and stuff like that, is becoming the new tattoo and there are a lot of people who do them. They do them all over. They do them on their heads, they do them on their bodies. There is a famous guy who is a ballet dancer who did like tiger brands across his body, uh, so this is becoming a type of self-ornamentation. And I don't know, whether it's a tattoo, or a brand or who knows what different people do. Some people do it with like cutting, doing stuff like that, uh, you know, it's up to a person what sort of ornamentation they want to do in their body. There are people who do piercing. You know, there is some people who actually, they pierce their ear. They go through, they pierce their ear... they put a hole right through the thing, you know, well, we know that commonly. So, this sort of body, you know, ornamenting the body, uh, designing the, the body, you know, using the body as a manifold for different things in a voluntary way, done with a doctor, with a safe instrument, you know, that's... it's not, it's a, a far cry from, you know, my chasing after a woman, pinning her down and branding her with like some sort of, uh, I don't know what. So, I wanted to clear some of the factual information and stuff that was brought out in court about this branding thing. So, yeah, some people did, uh, brand themselves, uh, and they have, uh, it's a small thing on their hip. Maybe, I don't know, uh, uh, two inches by two inches or an inch by inch, I, I don't even know exactly how big it is.

Then there is the second issue, which is the infamous room. Here is a woman that if, if you listen to the news, a woman that was confined to a room against her, her will, although she pled and pled to get out and was in the room for 22 months. Well, a little bit of background with respect to this woman, this woman was someone

who within her family and within her community in the past, from the time she was young, had many, many problems that I won't go into them here, it's maybe not even my place to talk about them. There was a point in her life that she turned 12 or 13, she had so many problems, she, uh, uh, from what I understand, didn't want to go to school, didn't want to relate with people, and would lock herself in her room, apparently sometimes for weeks at a time, I don't know, but what happened with this woman? The truth is she was in a room in her parents' house with her family taking care of her, the room was unlocked, she was able to leave anytime she wanted.

If she wanted to leave and rejoin the community, I think her visa had run out at that point. She would have to either do go back to Mexico or she had to explain to people how she was going to stop from all the stealing and the other things that she was doing. She also had to finish a book report. She had a number of different book reports she was supposed to do and she was seen as being very prideful about it and no matter what, she would do anything, you know, say anything, but never just sit down and simply finish the book report.

Uh, so, the initial hope was, she would go into her room, the room would be unlocked, she gets whatever sort of food she wanted, her family is taking care of her, all this sort of a thing and that she would really think about, "Okay, I've done enough of this pattern, I've done enough of the stealing, I've stolen from people, I've stolen from NXIVM, I've stolen from the stores, I've stolen sometimes, you know, \$5,000 of cash, things like that. Um, how am I going to stop, how am I going to conduct myself and will I get this one book report done that they've been trying to have me do for a year, and I keep on making excuses and doing all sorts of things?"

The hope was that she would be in there, a day, a day, maybe a weekend and then produce the

report, produce this plan. But it became a battle of wills and she stayed in the room for 22 months. She was sneaking out at night doing all sorts of things like that, you know, uh, she ended up stealing computers and all sorts of stuff, but this was this was someone who, [laughs] threw like, what would be a massive sort of a tantrum and it became a battle of wills and finally she just decided, "Okay, I want to leave," and when she wanted to leave, her father drove her to the border and arranged for one of his employees to pick her up on the other side of the border when she crossed and that was it, so this is her family, this is her dad, her dad was there doing this.

[Pause]

CHAKRAVORTY: Hello. [Clears throat]

RANIERE: It's about to cut off. So, good bye.

[END OF CALL]

RECORDING: 57005177_Apr_06_2020_13_32_30_PM

DATE: April 6, 2020

TIME: 13:32:30 PM

PARTICIPANTS: Keith Ranieri [RANIERE]
Suneel Chakravorty [CHAKRAVORTY]

CHAKRAVORTY: Hey, Keith.

RANIERE: Hey, how is it going?

CHAKRAVORTY: It's good, how are you?

RANIERE: Okay. Did I wake you? [Laughs]

CHAKRAVORTY: [Laughs] No, no.

RANIERE: So, uh, anything new on your side?

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh, yeah. So the judges, uh, we have, uh, more calls this week. Uh, David Williams is helping me figure out, um, you know, what kind of... uh, what compensation options, like what's the value of ads on iHeart, maybe that would be attractive to some of the judges.

RANIERE: Uh-huh.

CHAKRAVORTY: The, the one thing with judges that we're kind of a little bit hitting up against the wall is that a lot of them seem to get the impression that it's like a lot of time and effort, and you know...

RANIERE: Uh-huh.

CHAKRAVORTY: ...it's [U/I] how do we get them to see this is so bogus and, so, uh, one thing we are going to try is to have them take the challenge or look at the challenge like not from the brief, but...

RANIERE: Okay.

CHAKRAVORTY: ...as a participant, um...

RANIERE: Or you can also have triage people. In other words, you guys can look if you have a bunch of applications, uh, if they can't... if they don't meet certain basic standards, the judges don't have to read them.

CHAKRAVORTY: Got it.

RANIERE: And judges can set those standards, so that they can say, "Well, that we set these standards," if you know, if, if you know, if there is no intrastate commerce, period, gone, you know.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: So they'll have people working for them to do this.

CHAKRAVORTY: Understood. Um, cool. Uh, I also had on the podcast that, uh, on monetization we've been trying to get a hold of Fritz [ph] but he responded once, but he thinks he can help, but then he disappeared again, so we'll have to hunt him down and, and get... but, um, David says that iHeart, um, that there is another show that it's like similarly a hated person, maybe, maybe not as, as big as you...

RANIERE: Yeah.

CHAKRAVORTY: ...but, uh, they, their ad networks weren't interested, so he ended up doing like, uh, selling vitamins and monetizing that way, so just the thought of that, maybe if we can merchandise or something else as, as an option.

RANIERE: Uh-huh. Sell, sell T-shirts.

CHAKRAVORTY: [Laughs] Oh, yeah, or like, you know, make your

own like brand, like a tattoo, you know.

RANIERE: Yeah, yeah.

CHAKRAVORTY: Something. [Laughs] Uh, and then, uh, I, I remember that [U/I] a while ago, uh, you told me some stuff about the hard drive location and I took some notes.

RANIERE: Right.

[Voices overlap]

CHAKRAVORTY: So I talked to the, uh, there were like very specific notes that you get... you know, told me a while back, so...

RANIERE: Right, right, [U/I].

CHAKRAVORTY: Anything else that you want me to send there?

RANIERE: The pages and all that, yeah.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: Good, excellent. Uh, also I have, uh, you know, I haven't been able to speak to the attorneys at all.

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh-huh.

RANIERE: And then, you know, I mean, some of this stuff, like, I, I would like... and I don't know if you can take permissions over the phone, but I would like you guys to be able to get to my phone and get data off of it. They have a mirror of the phone, I believe, from uh, you know, a security agency that did the custody, so, you should be able to go on the phone and take off my WhatsApp chats, my Telegram chats, things like that. Um, so, I, I give you guys, you, you know, Nicki, uh, permission to do that. And I want them to enable you to do that because some of the things on those chats show, you know, that I, I wasn't not using the phone, you know, and things along those lines.

CHAKRAVORTY: Got it.

RANIERE: Um, also, I, I was trying to figure out for the, uh, uh, the affidavit...

CHAKRAVORTY: Mhmm.

RANIERE: ...if there is any problem, I want you and Nicki also to be able to get like my visa records and passport stuff.

CHAKRAVORTY: Got it.

RANIERE: Because that will go in one of the, the things, and also the, uh, if Marc has a thing of the prosecutorial abuse, a draft of it, I also give my permission for you guys to see that.

CHAKRAVORTY: Got it.

RANIERE: Um, and also, you know, if they... if you could get all the curriculum videos like the Jness downloads and things like that where I do the downloads, uh, you know, I know they, they're trying to work a thing with my medical

condition.

I have this asthmatic cough, that I've never talk to anyone per se about, because I, you know, I didn't want to treat it that way, but it is a dangerous thing for me and I'm coughing all over the place in these things. So you may, you may want to [chuckles] make a cough compendium, uh, and also if you could get the computer guy to get a summary to me, and also, please, tell Marc and Paul, it is vitally important as far as I'm concerned to get a mirror, the, the mirrored data from that drive. We have to get more granular. This report isn't granular enough. There are so many things that can't be seen, and there are pictures on that, that backup that were never... backed up. There's pictures of like a tree and things like that. I think that even came off the phone, not necessarily the SD card. Uh, it's, this seems so outlandish, so tampered with this disk, this, uh, drive, you know?

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah, absolutely.

RANIERE: I would also like to know from Marc how, how long until that new motion is ready to go, even if he doesn't file it, I want to know when it's ready. I would love to see it if I could and then, of course, there's the jurisdictional motion and, uh, a, a motion for new evidence, which I think this motion that he's doing now might open the door for that and I wanted to know, because I don't speak to him, so I'm gonna, I guess I have to speak to him through you.

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay. Is it okay if I, I just share this recording with, with Paul, Marc and Teny?

RANIERE: Yeah, yeah.

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay.

RANIERE: At least it's part of it.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: With my, my permissions, my hearty permissions.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah, of course.

RANIERE: So, um, anything else needed, let's say, for podcast and stuff like that?

CHAKRAVORTY: Um, I, I don't... uh, I don't think so, for this, uh, um, yes, actually there is, uh... I don't think we need it, but right now we're, we're putting together the, the better, ideally better first episode and, uh, there, we have it as you with the social repugnance intro, where you say "be prepared."

RANIERE: Yeah.

CHAKRAVORTY: And then going and, and some scripts and then going into your talking about the challenge and then we're trying to figure out a way to end it. We have a couple of options, uh, the appeal to reason, uh, also Lady Justice being blind. Uh, we have a few things like that.

RANIERE: Yeah.

CHAKRAVORTY: I don't know if there is another option, or way that you want to end the first episode that, um, could be interesting, but, uh, nothing else comes to mind right now.

RANIERE: Uh, I'll have to think about that. Maybe for next time if I can call you.

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay.

RANIERE: Um, yeah, you know, uh, uh, you... you... how many of these 10 points do you have now documented and done, you know, here's the evidence?

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh, six out of ten that, the things are collected. Today I'm going to put those together so it's documented and done.

RANIERE: Done, done... yeah.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah. Uh, and then you...

RANIERE: And where you have some, but not enou... not...

CHAKRAVORTY: So, for two of them is, uh, Marc's motion.

RANIERE: His new motion or his old one?

CHAKRAVORTY: The new motion, like the wit... how witnesses were handled and stuff like that.

RANIERE: Oh, I see, yeah.

CHAKRAVORTY: So that would us to eight and then, uh, the fear for your life and uh, the flight risk... I'm tracking down those documents and, and using some videos from [U/I], uh, Diego and, uh, some people coming up with videos of like the peace movement, the peace statement, V-week and stuff like that.

RANIERE: As far as... I've done, I've done that in Forums too, you know. There are Forums, if they have them by key words that can find stuff with non-violence and...

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: So, yeah, it's interesting, the whole fear for my life is such a lie.

CHAKRAVORTY: It's [U/I], it's like the most absurd lie if they actually knew you.

RANIERE: Uh, Sahajo actually has some experience with that, Sahajo's ex-boyfriend...

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh-huh.

RANIERE: ...um, he said at one point, he said, uh, you know, "I'm scared for my life," and then he did an arbitration with Nancy and that basically turned out to be just nothing, he was just saying that. [Laughs] You know, [U/I], you get her testimonial that he did that. So, you know, this whole drumming of "I'm scared for my life, I'm scared for my life, I'm scared for my life" is crazy.

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay, I'll, I'll follow up with her.

RANIERE: Yeah, at some point, I was thinking of addressing also the Cami, uh, charges without going too far, without splitting up her family, without hurting appeal, without, because, you know, no matter how I address it, it, uh... you know, [chuckles]. It, it doesn't... they... no one will believe me, but that's not the issue, the issue is, it actually doesn't matter as... uh, you know, it's just like if I were a murderer and I'm being charged with arson, you can say "he's a murderer, he's a murderer, he's a murderer" all you want and even prove that, but if I'm not charged with it, it's not relevant, you know.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: And the prosecution loves this, and then in the press release they try to say, you know, they say somehow showed I had sex with her and I didn't, it's just not, you know.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: So, but then, uh, you know, when it comes down to the technical things, the absurdity of a computer that isn't yours, being backed-up on a drive you could never access and that you wouldn't even know about, that wasn't yours, and that somehow gets possession. It's crazy, because to possess something, you have to be able to control it, [U/I] access it, you have to at least know where it is, you know.

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh, yeah, it's insane. So, uh, do you, do you have any sense of how much longer your modified lockdown is going to be or...

RANIERE: Um, at least another, uh, eight days.

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay.

RANIERE: It's a 14-day thing.

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay.

[Voices overlap]

RANIERE: So, yeah, did, did you get, did you get to speak to the computer guy about those, uh, notes that I've given you, anytime...

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh.

RANIERE: ...did he have them when he wrote this report or...?

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh, he didn't have them, I, I forgot that I, I had those notes, those specific ones...

RANIERE: Oh.

CHAKRAVORTY: ...but I'm gonna, uh, but I'm gonna speak with him today and, uh, and, uh, give, give those to him.

RANIERE: Yeah, okay, because hopefully he can look through, because there is... uh, if I remember, they are based on the report that I had written on while I was in the middle of trial and I had to, you know, I only had it for a few minutes and the, uh, the judge didn't want me, and uh, nor did my team want me looking through the voluminous report, so I, you know, sort of thumbed through it quickly to try to grab some things.

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh-hum. He said he had an..

RANIERE: What?

CHAKRAVORTY: ...[U/I], no, he said he had an, an email that Paul wrote, I think, maybe it's like a written version of those notes and not the originals, so I'll ask, uh, I'll ask him.

RANIERE: Oh, okay.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: All right, yeah, the important things are, of course, the rotated picture or pictures and the things...

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh-huh.

RANIERE: ...that are in the wrong directories.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah... Got it.

RANIERE: So, and wrong directories. And also pictures that shouldn't even be anywhere, like pictures of me in someone's directory, pictures of a tree or, you know... stuff like that.

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh-huh. Got it.

RANIERE: All right, uh, I can't think of anything else at the, the moment. Anything else on your... because we only have a few minutes left.

CHAKRAVORTY: Um, it's just the update on, on your health stuff, uh, we're looking into um, apparently a, a doctor that you've seen, [U/I] 2003, uh, I guess the, the term is called cardiomegaly, I don't know if that's the term, but so Brandon told me, so we're trying to find those records. Uh, no luck on, on, uh, anything to do with the asthmatic stuff yet, but the pharma... you know, but the pharmacy...

[Voices overlap]

RANIERE: [U/I] is all over pharmacies...

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: [U/I] or Clifton Park, but it's also possible there is a place in Watervliet we got it, I don't know, but I think it was just Clifton Park or Latham, probably Latham at that time period.

CHAKRAVORTY: So we called all the ones in Latham and Clifton Park and, uh, CVS and Rite Aid don't keep records past two years, but CDPHP didn't have

it, so, um, maybe they don't.

RANIERE: Is there another HMO besides CDPHP in the Albany area?

CHAKRAVORTY: I'm not sure, but I'll, I'll ask them and find out, I'll speak with Brandon and Danielle.

RANIERE: Okay.

CHAKRAVORTY: [U/I].

RANIERE: All right, well, hopefully we figure it out at some point. Ay.

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh.

RANIERE: ...uh, you know, because I don't carry my ailments with me, as a suffering thing, now I get hurt for it. [Laughs]

CHAKRAVORTY: [Laughs]

RANIERE: If I [U/I] I suffered all my life, it would have been...

CHAKRAVORTY: It would have been different.

RANIERE: Yeah.

CHAKRAVORTY: I mean, I, I, I, I guess, well, [U/I].

RANIERE: Yeah.

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh, um...

RANIERE: I wonder if my childhood physicians, probably not alive or whatever, if they would have any... I don't think he diagnosed it as an asthmatic cough back then, though.

CHAKRAVORTY: Huh.

RANIERE: But I definitely had a hard cough.

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh-hum.

RANIERE: He was, he was a guy in Rockland County named Dr. Demarco.
D-e-m-a-r-c-o.

CHAKRAVORTY: Do you remember his first name... or not?

RANIERE: No.

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay.

RANIERE: But he was in Suffern, Suffern, New York.

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay.

RANIERE: So.. all right, yeah, I don't know, if they would just have that I have this, these coughs and these high fevers and sinus infections probably.

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh-huh. Okay, we'll try to run down that lead as well.

RANIERE: Yeah, and I think it was a Dr. Shore [ph] in Brooklyn when I was a little, little kid, but that was like, you know, 55 years ago or something, so.

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh-huh.

RANIERE: All right, well, we only have about 15 seconds left, so say hello to everyone for me [chuckles] I guess I'll speak to you guys Wednesday or something.

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay, be well, I will.

RANIERE: Yeah, yeah, and then try to move on these things, if possible, I know it's hard.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah, we will, we will, we'll do our best.

RANIERE: Okay, all right.

[END OF CALL]

RECORDING: 57005177_Apr_08_2020_09_19_51_AM

DATE: April 8, 2020

TIME: 09:19:51 AM

PARTICIPANTS: Keith Ranieri [RANIERE]
Suneel Chakravorty [CHAKRAVORTY]

RANIERE: Hello.

CHAKRAVORTY: Hello.

RANIERE: Hey, what's going on?

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh, uh, not, not much. Uh, how are you?

RANIERE: Uh, okay, there is a rumor this is going to go on for another 14 days. From here.

CHAKRAVORTY: What? Okay. Damn!

RANIERE: So.

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay.

RANIERE: I'm not sure, but it sounds like it.

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay, that's not, that's not good.

RANIERE: No, it's not. What's, what's new on your end?

CHAKRAVORTY: So new on our end here, uh, for the affidavit, uh, I have a bunch of, uh, stuff from the lawyers on different, uh, motions, so they can compile that today.

[Voices overlap]

RANIERE: Hold on, hold on.

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh, getting...

RANIERE: Okay, I'm sorry about that... Go on.

CHAKRAVORTY: Oh, okay, uh, as far as getting your cell phone, uh, apparently that's, that's considered contraband, um . . .

RANIERE: Yeah, I just read an email from Marc. I wasn't able to respond to any of them because since I have to do this so quickly...

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay.

RANIERE: ...uh, tell him I just... You can tell him I just got his email this morning. I was not able to respond, uh, but did read through them quickly.

Uh, I think the phone is still my property. That was... I don't think it was ever even subpoenaed.

CHAKRAVORTY: Oh, okay.

RANIERE: Um, so, you know and I... as, as far as pictures... there is nothing there, I believe is considered... I don't know, I mean, I guess they can try to say certain pictures were considered illegal or something like that, but, um, you know, uh, uh, see what, see what he can do because that phone has not been subpoenaed.

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay, and I, I just need like screenshots of the different messages during that specific date range...

RANIERE: Right.

CHAKRAVORTY: ...so.

RANIERE: Right.

RANIERE: So, and it's on WhatsApp and Telegram. There are things...

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: ...with respect to Sylvie that could be like... um, in something else, but, uh, the Telegram and the WhatsApp are the big... WhatsApp in particular, uh, but also Telegram. I think I...

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay.

RANIERE: ...dealt with like Sean Bergeron in WhatsApp and a few other people like that. Not a lot, but you know.

CHAKRAVORTY: Got it.

RANIERE: It's definitely I used it... so.

CHAKRAVORTY: Got it.

RANIERE: And the government knows it.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah, hmm, yeah, I guess, uh, the other difficulty is just them getting to the hard drive. Because [U/I] Marc is saying he may not be able to because I, I guess the office is closed or some... something like, so that, uh...

RANIERE: Push as hard as they can.

CHAKRAVORTY: [U/I]. Yeah.

RANIERE: You know what I mean?

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay.

RANIERE: Keep on pushing.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: Don't stop.

CHAKRAVORTY: I won't, yeah, I, I'll... okay.

RANIERE: Yeah. Sorry about that, but...

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah. No, no, it's necessary, and I, I appreciate it. Uh...

RANIERE: Anything else from judges?

CHAKRAVORTY: Judges, we're speaking to to, uh, Ashley McMahan, she is a part of The Law Ladies today.

RANIERE: Uh-huh.

CHAKRAVORTY: I, I think it's the first call with her beyond, uh, Marc's like introductory [U/I] call.

RANIERE: Uh-huh.

CHAKRAVORTY: So we'll see how... where we're at with that, um, in a couple of hours.

RANIERE: Uh-huh. I, I also read from Marc that the, uh, judge responded to the Motion 33, as, as we expected, saying that "Well, I guess the witnesses lied, the government, the government didn't know about it, and the evidence was so overwhelming."

CHAKRAVORTY: Wow. Wow.

RANIERE: Yeah, what do you expect? This judge wants me away forever. Either he's been... he just wants it from his opinion or has been told that, you know, I, I lean towards he's being corrupt, but I don't know.

CHAKRAVORTY: It looks that way.

RANIERE: Yeah.

CHAKRAVORTY: [U/I].

RANIERE: Yeah, I mean, it's, it's absurd, the major witnesses all lied. [Laughs] And they, they don't prove any of the points of the basic charges. Most, uh, uh, you know, not most of them. [Laughs] And yet, you know.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: It's, uh... How is Marc's attitude? Do you think, do you think he's riled up to...?

[Voices overlap]

CHAKRAVORTY: I don't think so. That's not my impression. My impression is, uh, more, more of the same, like intellectually upset, but, you know, more committed to working within the system and accepting this is how it is and...

RANIERE: How?

CHAKRAVORTY: [U/I]. That's my feeling, I don't... it's not based on a lot of data. It's just our interactions, and how, how he speaks, how we speak, um, he doesn't seem amped up to really

push. But I mean, I could be wrong.

RANIERE: Well, maybe he needs to hear that every once in a while, so you know, you sound just so mild-mannered and uh, you know, that seems, you seem intellectually upset, but really not emotionally behind this. Like a beaten puppy.

CHAKRAVORTY: You know, it, it, it seems like that, and uh, I think Nicki spoke with him last weekend and conveyed that, and I think he got upset, so I've, I've been trying to like not...

RANIERE: No.

CHAKRAVORTY: ...push too many buttons, but...

RANIERE: No.

CHAKRAVORTY: ...uh, maybe [U/I].

RANIERE: Maybe she is the one that has to deliver that. You you are the good cop. She's the bad cop, I don't know.

CHAKRAVORTY: [Laughs] I, I don't, I don't even think I'm seen as the good cop, I'm just the okay cop, but...

RANIERE: Yeah.

CHAKRAVORTY: ...but uh, I hope we'll balance it between us and keep on pushing as much as we can.

RANIERE: Okay.

CHAKRAVORTY: Um, as, as far as the other stuff, um, the podcast, we're moving forward with. It's taking a little longer than I thought, but I think we'll end up with something good within a few

days with the teaser, and then hopefully over the weekend, for the first, first episode...

RANIERE: Uh-huh.

CHAKRAVORTY: ...and I guess iHeart to get, get like, uh, first [U/I] to help us with monetization. He has ideas, he's working over some of the correspondence, which you've done so far.

RANIERE: Yeah.

CHAKRAVORTY: I think, I think there is more, um, stuff missing there.

RANIERE: Uh, Fritz has actually been spoken with?

CHAKRAVORTY: He's been spoken with, texted with, [U/I] emails yesterday. [U/I], now it's like, uh, the danger zone of the follow-up, so I will, will keep on him for that.

RANIERE: The danger zone of what?

CHAKRAVORTY: Of the follow-up. [U/I].

RANIERE: Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah. [Laughs] Yeah, by the way, be sure to send everyone my regards because I, I have such limited communication.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah, I, I do and I, I will. I will.

RANIERE: Yeah, I was, I was contemplating doing for a podcast, something on the Cami thing, but I have to tread because of appeal, because of love, because of prejudice and because of her family. So...

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: I don't know, at, at, at some point I think I will. I might, you know.

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay.

RANIERE: But, you know, the, the thing is, and one of the things I mentioned is anything I say about my innocence won't be believed.

CHAKRAVORTY: Right.

RANIERE: So I may as well not try to protest, because then it sounds like, "Oh, he's protesting too much," or you know, then they'll try to criticize it, they are going to criticize what I say anyway, but at least try to separate the prejudice away from the, the law, you know.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah, I know, that, that's the key point that people don't get. Even like lawyers don't get.

[Voices overlap]

RANIERE: Yeah, it's, it's, it's amazing and like for example, this judge saying the evidence is overwhelming. I mean, first of all I know the truth, so I know the evidence isn't overwhelming because it's untrue. But second of all I, I know what I've seen of the law and we... even with my... if you will, esteemed team has said and the evidence isn't overwhelming at all. It, it's just not. It's massively prejudicial.

CHAKRAVORTY: It's non, it's non-existent.

RANIERE: What?

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah. It's non-existent.

RANIERE: So, yeah, it's, it's crazy. Yeah, I feel like...

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: ...I'm definitely in an upside-down world.

CHAKRAVORTY: You are in a, a, a Kafka "The Trial" or something. [Laughs]

RANIERE: Yeah, could you find out from Marc when he's anticipating filing this next motion too, this broader one?

CHAKRAVORTY: Yes, I will. I, I'll talk to him today on that.

RANIERE: And also the jurisdic... the two other motions I would... you know, the narrow jurisdictional motion. Um, and the wisdom of filing that, which I believe there's not much downside. And then the broader issue of, um, does this new motion he's going to file, open the door for the new evidence motion?

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay, I'll, I'll ask him those questions today.

RANIERE: Yeah, all three of those things.

CHAKRAVORTY: Oh, uh, okay, yes, yes there were three. [Chuckles]

RANIERE: Yeah, so, I, um, yeah, I don't know what to say, you know, it just feels like no matter what we say, ha, he, he will defend... I mean that the prosecution didn't know about it is an absurdity.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah, I think that's why the affidavit is really important for this. I wanted to ask you like on a timing stuff, like what should we be thinking timing-wise because some of these things are uncertain.

RANIERE: Well, first of all, we get this all done, we get this ready to go. Okay, so it's ready to go out the door, including the podcast, including the affidavit, including the challenge, you know..

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay.

RANIERE: ...and then we decide to strategically release them depending on how the media and all is. We do also want to get some media signatures on the petition.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: Because first, first we get the affidavit, [U/I] the petition and then we go..

[Voices overlap]

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: ...with the follow up.

CHAKRAVORTY: Understood.

RANIERE: So, Okay, uh, I'm... trying to think if there is anything else right now. What else do you know?

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh, I think that, that was it from, that was it from, from my end. Uh, I guess there was one, one thought just, uh, on how we can communicate better, like that the challenge is just [U/I]

the prosecution case [U/I].

RANIERE: The challenge is what? I can't hear you, I think you're walking.

CHAKRAVORTY: Oh, no, I, I, I, uh...

RANIERE: You're what?

CHAKRAVORTY: ...I [U/I] a little bit. Oh, no, I was just saying that with, with judges, one, one thing that they, uh, uh, seem not to get is that this is just checking the prosecutor's homework, like they can't wrap their mind around it yet, so I don't know if you have [U/I] metaphor or any way that we can [U/I] better, [U/I] think about it. Uh, we [U/I] definitely, that's, that's the [U/I] for them to grasp.

RANIERE: Okay. I'm having a lot of trouble hearing you because there seems to be a, a lot of interference and it almost sounds like you're either walking or there is wind or something, I don't know.

CHAKRAVORTY: There was a little wind because I just got out of the car, but now, is it better?

RANIERE: Oh, yeah, much.

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay, sorry.

RANIERE: It's like everything is clear. So what's the thing they, they can't get? That they're checking the prosecutor's homework, so to speak?

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah, they think, is that like, like that concept is, is a very narrow challenge, but they think they have this big really hard thing that's going to take a lot of time, and that

thing is just checking the argument itself,
[U/I]

RANIERE: Or maybe...

CHAKRAVORTY: ...it's been done and...

RANIERE: ...well maybe asking them that. So, you know, here is the, here is the problem that you, you may be able to help with. Some people are potential judges, even lawyers of esteem, you know, see, this is a massive problem when it's actually checking the prosecution's homework. I like that phrase very much... you know?

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay.

RANIERE: And really, it's much more narrow than that because this is so absurd. You know this is, this is like checking a, you know, a murder case that doesn't have a body, doesn't have a weapon, you know, and they established the motive that's shown to be false.

CHAKRAVORTY: Got it, okay... Okay, we, we will, uh, try that today.

RANIERE: And there, there is certain things... What?

CHAKRAVORTY: I said, we'll, we'll try that today with, with Ashley, potentially.

RANIERE: Yeah, yeah, good, because, uh, yeah, I'd like to get some of these people ready and, and they should know that they'll have help too. So in other words, if there is the... the more mundane eliminations that can be done, which... of people that actually, uh, feel they've solved it, which it's hard to imagine they would. Um, if, you know, they're going to have very few that, uh,

actually come up to them.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yep.

RANIERE: You know, some... you'll even have some people say, "Well, it's interesting because she's, uh, she travelled from Brooklyn to Albany." Well, that's not true. I mean, it's, it's... that's true, but that doesn't make it interstate.

CHAKRAVORTY: Right, yeah. [Chuckles] We're on the same page.

RANIERE: You know, or, uh, it's interstate because when she was young, she lived in Arizona. That doesn't make it interstate either, you know.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: So, yeah, it is, it is disturbing about the Motion 33, even though it's exactly what we expected... to see, to see such a big splat-out is crazy.

CHAKRAVORTY: Exactly. I didn't know that, that things were like this in actuality, you know, because it's like a movie, but it's, way worse, because it was real.

RANIERE: Yeah.

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh...

RANIERE: Yeah, and I'm, and I'm looking, you know, I'll be in here for the rest of my life if we don't do something. Or... and the rest of my life might not be that long considering the way things are in here, you know. Once I get to a, a destination point, because I'll go to a pen.

CHAKRAVORTY: Huh.

RANIERE: So.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: So we gotta get... we, what we have to do also is get scrutiny on this judge, get some pundit who is willing to speak out about what this judge is saying, which is crazy, and the judge needs to know he's being watched...

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: ..by someone who is wise.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: So. Now we gotta figure out the next step with Dershowitz.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yes, okay.

RANIERE: All right, but we have left, we have five seconds, so, I guess I will, uh, speak to you Friday.

CHAKRAVORTY: Okay.

RANIERE: Okay, bye.

RECORDING: 57005177_Apr_24_2020_13_28_02_PM

DATE: April 24, 2020

TIME: 1:28 P.M.

PARTICIPANTS: Keith Ranieri [RANIERE]
Suneel Chakravorty [CHAKRAVORTY]

CHAKRAVORTY: Hey Keith

RANIERE: Hey, that's the third call.

CHAKRAVORTY: Oh, this is the third one? The first one I got but I was on another call and I tried to switch to you, and by the time I switched you were gone.

RANIERE: Ah. Yeah, no it rolls over to answering and then there's a pattern like that. I sort of think it blocks you from picking up.

CHAKRAVORTY: Oh. Sorry about that.

RANIERE: So, how are things?

CHAKRAVORTY: Things are... uh, things are good, I think. Um, on the podcast, there we have a teaser out to one, one person that David was going to get feedback on today. The producer?

RANIERE: Yeah.

CHAKRAVORTY: And then if that's good, [U/I] send to iHeart and start that process.

RANIERE: I, I have a terrible thing about the teaser.

CHAKRAVORTY: O.K.

RANIERE: I might have a better way even to do it.

CHAKRAVORTY: [Laughs] O.K.

RANIERE: Here's what I imagined. And a lot of my ideas are either ridiculous, over the top, not usable.

So, you'd run the idea by before, but it would be pretty easy to produce. Pretty much the same way. You know how you start with... you know, uh, the stuff you had said at one point. You guys were going to start with like newscasts and stuff? Are you still doing that sort of a collage of like newscast stuff?

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah, we have some clips of that. Yeah.

RANIERE: O.K. So if you have that sort of a thing and either right after that or maybe having the woman's voice in there, then have another collage of news-seeming type things. But now it's all the things, like, um, you might have me saying "This is untrue and a fabrication." And then it says, "The media has gone crazy" and then someone else says "Over 10 million dollars has been placed to, against him. The judge says all of the witnesses have lied. Because of all these different, uh, things about what happened. You know in the middle of key witness testimony, she was just dismissed. You know, all different newscasters saying like the crazy stuff, including some of the crazy conditions that I lived in here.

CHAKRAVORTY: Hmm.

RANIERE: So, it sounds like something awful from a third world country which is exactly what it's like, and then, you know, maybe it even stops with the like sound of a gavel, or something like that. And then I say, I've been convicted of crimes I didn't commit and I'm innocent. You know, something like that.

CHAKRAVORTY: That's awesome. The second collage, do those exist or those are ones you create?

RANIERE: No, I think you'd have to create them, but use factual things. Including, for example, the judge in his, uh, response to Marc's last motion

said the witness has lied.

CHAKRAVORTY: Wow.

RANIERE: So, what does that mean. The judge did say that all the major witnesses in Mr. Ranieri's case lied.

CHAKRAVORTY: Wow. I love it. I think it's also...we just need to see some voiceover people do [U/I] that kind of stuff. I think it's perfect.

RANIERE: Yeah. Well, ask David. You know, you guys have a better feel, so you bring about all this controversy about me, then you bring up what happened. Including, you know, here it is, there's no power and no heat. Right? And it's actually. I'm in the cell that the wind hits directly. There's the heavy winds. Wind chill factor of 40 below zero. The two coldest times, the polar vortex or whatever. The two coldest days. We had no power and no heat. Uh, you know water was freezing in my room and in the toilets. You know.

CHAKRAVORTY: Hmm.

RANIERE: There's the, but even comments like that. And one comment would be, and I think it should be some of the controversial stuff you know. Richard Donoghue, head of the Eastern District of New York, lied to the press today saying there were forced abortions.

CHAKRAVORTY: Wow.

RANIERE: Right?

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah.

RANIERE: And another voice says, uh, the prosecution tampered with evidence. Take some of the stuff off the affidavit.

CHAKRAVORTY: Wow. O.K. I will convey, I will convey that... I was thinking about...

RANIERE: So that's, uh, that's just one of my crazy thoughts.

CHAKRAVORTY: It's definitely, it's definitely crazy, in a good way. So, I'll ask for the... see I know, I know David doesn't like the, the things that are like more "woe is me," like you're badly treated, but people should care but apparently people, you know... but I think everything else.

RANIERE: Well, it's not, it's not "woe is me", it's just the craziness of even what happened. Unfortunately, well fortunately David wasn't here. But, uh, no, I mean, uh, people could know that within the prison of the United States, you know, this sort of thing could happen. It doesn't mean you have to put those in. But the purpose of those things is not "woe is me". The purpose of those things is to illustrate conditions that people wouldn't believe. That are...

CHAKRAVORTY: Right.

RANIERE: And you can tell him that. That are... and you can tell him this. That are as fantastical as the story against me. And I use that word fantastical. You know what I mean? It's much harder to deflate a story with the banal, boring truth. But if you take the crazy aspects of the truth. People wanna... "Oh, my God that's even crazier, you mean all that stuff is not true?." "This is what's true! Oh, my God". You know what I mean?

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah. Yeah.

RANIERE: So, creating that effect might help. Maybe not.

CHAKRAVORTY: O.K. Cool.

RANIERE: So, uh, I had another potential podcast thing I tried to [U/I]. Do you have anything on your side?

CHAKRAVORTY: Um, on the podcast? Uh, not, uh, no.

RANIERE: Judges? Anything?

CHAKRAVORTY: Oh, uh, judges, we're speaking with Ashley today at 5:00, Marty [U/I], who was a formerly wrongfully-convicted lawyer tomorrow, ah, [U/I] just responded to me by email that she has some personal and professional tragedies right now and she'll write soon more...so I'll...

RANIERE: She what? What did she say? Some personal tragic...

CHAKRAVORTY: She's been dealing with that and sorry for not responding and she'll write soon, she'll write more soon. And then, we'll see. After that.

RANIERE: Alright, alright, so it sounds like she's still open.

CHAKRAVORTY: Sounds like she's still open and she said that she would need income, though, so we can maybe figure that out with her.

RANIERE: Ah, O.K. Alright.

CHAKRAVORTY: And we're going to try to meet with Nicole sooner than, what we initially scheduled for a follow up.

RANIERE: Good.

CHAKRAVORTY: So that's all... that's all I'm...

RANIERE: Well, we got, we have to have an urgency

CHAKRAVORTY: Yes, absolutely.

RANIERE: So. Alright, um, should I do a little podcast?

CHAKRAVORTY: Absolutely. I'll give you the countdown. 3-2-1. Go.

RANIERE: This next part talks about fear and the "like me" disease. There's a system that's currently in and actually compromises...comprises most of our justice system. And that is the system of judges, prosecutors and defense attorneys. Often we've seen on T.V., you know, two attorneys are going at it in court, you know, one against the other, and then, afterwards, they go out and, you know, play tennis or have, you know, 18 rounds of golf or whatever it is together, 18 holes, and, uh, you know, they're friends. And that is actually a wonderful demonstration that in a game, in a contest, you can be really opponents, going after each other the best you can within that contest and yet still be friends. And this is very, very important.

But that can be perverted, that can be abused. When you're playing a game with someone, or in some sort of professional contest, and the person does something that is immoral. The person does something that demonstrates not their character within the game as being aggressive or strategic or whatever but

literally their morality about the game. For example, if you're playing some sort of a game, say you're having a chess match with someone and you see that they cheat and there's actually a lot on the line. Maybe even, you either put up money, or there's, I don't know, it's a big tournament and this person has illustrated to you that they're willing to sacrifice the honor of the game, just to win. That, by moral necessity, should change the way you treat them in the outside world. So, if there are two attorneys in a court of law and one attorney does something that is immoral that doesn't mean that outside of the court of law they're automatically friends and it's as if nothing had happened.

Because if you're in a contest with someone and you're both acting morally and you're both uphold..., and you're both upholding principles, that upholds the humanity and the connection between you. I mean, for example if I have, you know, an opponent that's doing incredible things and really decimating me, you know, and strategically maybe duping me and doing all these things, but it's all within the way the game works, all within the rules, then I admire them more. And afterwards, it's fantastic, I'll just be in awe of them. But by the same thing, the same token, if that opponent is doing things that are immoral, that are just really base, then after the game I...I don't really want to associate with them anymore.

But in the system of defense attorneys, prosecutors and judges, you know they go to conferences together. They often have parties together, Christmas parties together and things like that. And there is a "like me" disease. And it's interesting with, between prosecutors and defense attorneys, often defense attorneys were prosecutors and they have a type of horse-trading that goes on. In other words, if the defense attorney, if they have a client that's guilty and going to plea, they help that client, they make the whole thing go easier that makes the prosecution like them more, so that when

they need another favor down the road, they can get that favor. This is because they start trading favors, and when you listen to them speak, when you listen... even defense attorneys speak, sometimes your mouth just drops open. When you start looking at, they're talking about favors, they're talking about horse trading, they're talking about having the prosecution like them, or upsetting the prosecution or things like that and the truth of the matter is the prosecution should not have emotions about the case. And there should be no fear of upsetting the prosecution.

Likewise, with the judge. Unfortunately, in our society now, judges, judges are seldom criticized, you seldom see them criticized in the media, people seldom talk about their errors and things like that. They are held in a position that is above even the President's type of power. It has very little check and balance, except for the appeals process. But it's interesting. There's a person, Preet Bharara, who was head of the Southern District at one point. He even said that there are corrupt judges. Some judges are corrupt. And some of the consultants we have had, had, said things along the lines that, it doesn't matter, we don't have to be able get to any judge.

The thing that people do that is dishonest is they get the case in front of a judge that they have positioned within each of the circuits. So, there are some judges that are corrupt, within the circuits, including in the appeals courts, and they just make sure that cases go in front of those judges. Those judges that are moveable or those judges that are even in some cases buyable and things like that and judges are never questioned.

Now if a judge is, I mean, if you look the way a judge is elected you know they're elected, they look at their backgrounds and things like that but there's not rigorous psychological testing done, moral testing, things along those lines.

And especially... let's suppose you have a judge who's a very nice person, but very immature. When that judge gets on the bench 20 years later, they could become a little tyrant. And some judges are. My judge in particular shows a lot of emotion on the stand. And some people might say, "well, I don't know. That's maybe good." But think about it. A judge should be completely stoic. If there's a piece of evidence that comes up, and the judge, like in my case, with my judge shows the disgust, it almost looks like the judge is about to retch, what does that say to the jury? And that's not in the transcript, that's not anything that anyone measures at this point.

It should be that every single court case is videoed, it doesn't cost a lot right now and judges need to be evaluated. Because a judge is put in their seat, and it's a lifetime appointment, and they can really go astray. And some judges really have. So, we need to question judges and we need to stop the social nature between prosecutors, defense attorneys and judges and turn that into more of a moral interaction.

CHAKRAVORTY: Hello?

RANIERE: Hello? So, I was a little bit on a soapbox there, but then I realized we were running out of time.

So, we have less than a minute. So I hope...I could go on about that subject; that's the social club of defense attorneys, prosecutors and judges.

I might have called them prostitutes by accident [Laughs]. Prostitutes! Well, yes, they are. So. Thirty seconds. Anything else?

Did you get... did you get through to Marc?

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh, nothing... yes. So I got through to Marc. He's going to send me a motion he said today. He asked about the sentencing memo. I told him your [U/I] situation...

RANIERE: Right. We have 10 seconds. You may want to somehow become his client, so you'll have attorney client privilege. But I mentioned that in an email to him just a few minutes ago.

CHAKRAVORTY: Roger that.

RANIERE: Alright. Goodbye.

[END OF CALL]

RECORDING: 57005177_Apr_27_2020_10_07_26_AM
DATE: April 27, 2020
TIME: 10:07:26 A.M.
PARTICIPANTS: Keith Ranieri [RANIERE]
Suneel Chakravorty [CHAKRAVORTY]

CHAKRAVORTY: Hey, Keith.

RANIERE: Hey, what's going on?

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh, uh not much. Just, uh, getting started with a few things. How are you?

RANIERE: Well, O.K. Not much? What do you mean "not much"?

CHAKRAVORTY: Oh, I mean, I don't know, I just, uh, maybe it's like a bad phrase. I was, I was writing a little bit of code actually.

RANIERE: Oh, O.K. That's for your business. Yes?

CHAKRAVORTY: That's just for my business. Pay, pay some of the rent. I guess that's what I meant by not much. Yes on the [U/I]

[Voices overlap]

RANIERE: What does your business do exactly?

CHAKRAVORTY: Um, right now I'm just doing some consulting. So I'm consulting on some data science projects, and getting a better, uh, R & B or like prototyping for, uh, for some software products. Like, uh...

RANIERE: Do you do mainly software consultant type stuff, or is it more generally mathematical type consulting? [U/I]

CHAKRAVORTY: 70/30. It's 70 software, 30 math and stuff.

RANIERE: Uh, huh. O.K. Do you do operations research type

stuff and things?

CHAKRAVORTY: Um, no, it's, it's mainly like product development, so, uh, I'll... like in this case I'm looking at some data sets, doing, uh, building some predictive models and seeing if it hits the you know enough accuracy and then, if it does, productionize it and put it up in the cloud.

RANIERE: I see. I had an idea. You know, there's the trailer. Does the trailer... 'cause, I haven't heard this. Does it have the challenge in it?

CHAKRAVORTY: [Clears throat] Currently it does not. I, um...

RANIERE: I, I think there should have a separate trailer for the challenge. And you know, instead of, uhm, you know, maybe have a collage of, what you might call testimonials. But they're more reactions to the data. Finding out about what people will find out about when they do the challenge. You know, "when I did the challenge and then when I saw the additional data", blah, blah, blah, blah. "I read...", "I couldn't believe...", "I was totally sure", you know, "if this is true, this is unbelievable." You know, you know, just, a whole bunch of things like that.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah, O.K. that's cool. Yeah, definitely.

RANIERE: Can you really resist knowing? You know, that sort of a thing?

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah, cool.

RANIERE: Forbidden knowledge. You know?

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah, I... that's awesome. Um, cool and it sort of parallels the current [U/I] too in some ways. Like what you think but like what it really is.

Cause it's like, you know...

RANIERE: Oh, it's. O.K. Yeah, yeah, because those are the things that draw people, the difference like that. Oh my God, they show some sort of late night commercial or something. You know, just a bunch of people going, "Oh. Oh, my goodness I can't believe... "No, you're kidding". You know, come and see what they're all talking about. So they [U/I] and if it's, you know, it's an infomercial for a tricycle, or something.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yes. Are you're thinking of this as an audio trailer or potentially a video trailer?

RANIERE: Oh, I don't know. I mean you guys decide I think it has to be done quickly, so I have no idea.

CHAKRAVORTY: O.K. O.K. Got it.

RANIERE: So what else? Other news on judges, things like that.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yes, I can give you...I got a rundown ready for you. So, judges, um, no word from Sima yet. I emailed her on Friday. I'll call up again today. Um, Ashley, uh, Marc E. is calling over today. She hadn't responded. She had like a family sickness so she might just be out for that. This weekend she was. Um, we have a call with Lisa who's an attorney this afternoon at 3:00. And Mary hasn't responded to any of the last couple of attempts so I'm going to speak with Marc and see what we can try or what, what an option is, but, uhm, and then Nicole she was going to read through that stuff yesterday so today Marc going to touch base and schedule, uhm, a follow up, sooner than Thursday ideally.

RANIERE: I wonder if Mary's somehow not getting the communication or something. 'Cause I mean, you would think she'd at least say, stop calling me.

CHAKRAVORTY: Yeah, hmm. You know, we could call or try from a different email or something. Yeah.

RANIERE: Or say, you know what, please, just tell us to stop. I, I have a joke about attorney classes that they have to take and excel at. And the number one. One is the response class. They have to learn to not respond. So like you have a class of students and the teacher asks a simple question. Someone raises their hand and they immediately are punished and disciplined. No, you can't respond. The very final exam is, you know, the whole side of the classroom is blown out with a bomb and they just have to be just like something happened. So what it is... Yes, unresponsiveness.

CHAKRAVORTY: It is impressive, I haven't encountered that in the software world at all. People are you the opposite, they response like within minutes. That's the way it is.

RANIERE: What's it? What? Who responds within minutes?

CHAKRAVORTY: Like in the tech startup world people respond very quickly. You know, I found it to be the opposite of, like, the lawyer situation.

RANIERE: In which world? I'm not hearing.

CHAKRAVORTY: Oh, sorry in the tech startup world.

RANIERE: Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah. And then there's another one about derrière osculation.

CHAKRAVORTY: Derrière osculation?

RANIERE: Derrière osculation. Butt-kissing.

CHAKRAVORTY: [Laughs]. Yeah, I was. I got the derrière.

RANIERE: So, yeah, uh, osculation is the general term for kissing.

CHAKRAVORTY: Oh, O.K.

RANIERE: You walk into that class and it has one of these CPR type dummies except it's just that part. And it's like someone with a clipboard there and they're doing like, you know, uh, some sort of skills evaluation test. You know things like that. And then there's another one, they are... there's a whole bunch of little chicks in a box and they all have to watch the chicks and then eventually each of them get a chick of their own that they have to study and you know, do a complete chick study. And be like the chick and understand the chick. You know?

CHAKRAVORTY: [Laughs]

RANIERE: Study of being a chicken. And then there's another one where there's a limbo pole and they're doing what looks like limbo, and it's groveling.

CHAKRAVORTY: I was thinking finalist or something. But yeah,

RANIERE: Yeah, so. So, the legal studies.

CHAKRAVORTY: Uh, huh. Got it.

RANIERE: So, um, yeah, I was also going to do a continuation of the last one, with the prosecutors, judge, uh, defense attorney system. I'm going to talk more about the judge. Cause I think...you know, I think part of the, the thing when someone gets into... takes the challenge and then gets into our world where they get the

additional data that was never allowed in court, goes through the judge's decisions and they can vote on them. You know what I mean? So in other words they can read the data, the decision. Maybe even some of the basis, like when it's a hearsay thing or something, what the hearsay rules are so they can actually, um, learn about that and then, you know, take... look at the decision and say, was this a good decision or a bad decision. Do they think the judge, you know, a good judge, a bad judge, a corrupt judge. You know what I mean? So.

CHAKRAVORTY: You want to do the countdown? Sorry.

RANIERE: What? Do the countdown whenever.

CHAKRAVORTY: 3-2-1 go.

RANIERE: In our society judges are held out in a very special way. As they should be. I believe it was around the turn of the century judges were actually exempt from taxation, because it was believed if they were part of the taxation system it would impart a type of bias to them. In a sense judges have to be impervious to politics, to all sorts of different things so that they can stay in a very stoic and pristine state to be able to execute justice and be the voice of the law.

But sadly it is impossible to have that sort of a pristine state, especially in the age of global media, social media, the politics that go on and the intense nature of what some of the decisions mean. Some of these decisions literally weigh on world businesses and do all sorts of things. If you look at the Arthur Anderson business that is 85,000 people that were, essentially, displaced because of legal things, because of criminal things that just weren't true.

So there needs to be an evaluation of judges. Judges tend not to be evaluated in media, and it's interesting even apparently in social situations, you know, when people are speaking to a judge, there's all these different concerns. As there should be. You know, you don't want to influence a judge, you don't to be seen as trying to influence a judge, even accidentally.

Uh, in some ways maybe judges shouldn't be in social circumstances like that. Should a judge be able to socialize? Should a judge have these things? Well, if you want a human judge, there needs to be a way to allow, not only judges to do these things, but to evaluate the judge. There needs to be a judgement of the judges, beyond the appeal court.

One of the things that can happen, what I learned from my trial. If I were a judge now I could go and sway a verdict. If I were corrupt or if I were biased from the beginning, I could sway in the jury selection, because I would knock out certain jury members. I would also sway, throughout the whole thing, my reaction to the evidence, my reaction to the different, the prosecutors, my reaction to the defense attorney my reaction to even the defendant. By making that evidence I impart a bias upon the jury and in my particular case, my judge is a very... people call him a mercurial judge, he switches, he has these emotional reactions, rolling his eyes which affect the jury. And, yes, a judge can affect the jury. Somedays there may be an AI that either aids with the judge or replaces the judge that really helps with these things. But the scariest thing that was every told to me and has been told to me and has been told to me several times over the past 20 years is, not only the fate of what will happen to me and the fate was always they will create public outrage in the media and it will be untrue but it

doesn't matter, that public outrage will cause political pressure which will cause pressure on the justice system. They will indict you, they will convict you, they will put you in prison for life and in prison it's possible you will reach, have a very bad demise. And it's pretty awful some of the things that were told to me.

And some of the things that happened that showed that to be true and showed that we don't have what we think of as a justice system. There's a whole... a lot of people do have a certain degree of justice in the justice system. But there is a channel where the whole justice system can be circumvented, perverted and used. And it appears that is true. You know, what I was told is that these people who are the political pushers of judges and media, they don't need to be able to influence a particular judge. All they have to do is influence the judge assigned to the case. So if they have a certain number of judges that are under their control in the Second Circuit, all they have to do is make sure that your case gets in front of one of those judges. And when those judges make bad decisions all they have to do is make sure that your case gets in front of the appropriate appeal board. And they don't have to affect all of the judges. At all. And that's one of the difficult things. So, if I were the sort of a judge who made all of these faces and I had all sorts of reactions, and I influenced the decision, if you looked at my transcript it would look completely legitimate from an appeals perspective. It would look very legitimate because you wouldn't see the intonations. You wouldn't see the faces and things like that, that I..I did.

CHAKRAVORTY: Hello?

RANIERE: Hey, so we only have a few seconds or a half of minute so I stopped. Alright, anything else that's important? I'll probably call on Wednesday from what it seems like. Monday, Wednesday, Friday.

CHAKRAVORTY: Sounds good, I'll follow up with the trailer and then he's trying to sort through legal logistics and what we can post in the challenge, what transcripts.

[END OF CALL]