1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
2	OCALA DIVISION
3	Case No. 5:06-cr-22-Oc-10GRJ
4	January 16, 2008
5	Ocala, Florida
6	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
7	Plaintiff,
8	vs.
9	WESLEY TRENT SNIPES, EDDIE RAY KAHN and
10	DOUGLAS P. ROSILE,
11	Defendants.
12	/
13	
14	
15	TRANSCRIPT OF TRIAL PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE WM. TERRELL HODGES,
16	SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, and a Jury
17	
18	Appearances of Counsel:
19	For the Government:
20	Mr. Robert E. O'Neill Mr. M. Scotland Morris
21	Mr. Jeffrey A. McLellan
22	For Defendant Snipes:
23	Mr. Robert G. Bernhoft Mr. Robert E. Barnes
24	Ms. Linda G. Moreno
25	Mr. Daniel R. Meachum Ms. Kanan B. Henry

PROCEEDINGS

2 (Jury absent.)

THE COURT: Thank you and be seated.

Good morning, counsel.

Are we ready to proceed, Mr. O'Neill?

MR. O'NEILL: Yes, Your Honor, the government is.

THE COURT: Mr. Bernhoft?

MR. BERNHOFT: Yes, Judge, we are. Pursuant to the discussions that we had last afternoon, I wanted to address the issue of Mr. Meachum's reappearance pro hac vice.

The Court has made a determination that in order for Mr. Snipes to have Mr. Meachum reappear as counsel of record in this case at counsel table, that he must waive any ineffective assistance of counsel claim that he may have had or might have with respect to Mr. Meachum.

To the extent that Mr. Snipes needs to do that to have Mr. Meachum reappear and represent him at counsel table in this case, Mr. Snipes waives any such claim.

THE COURT: Mr. Snipes, I think I need to hear that from you. You have discussed this matter, I'm sure, with counsel over the evening?

DEFENDANT SNIPES: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. It's a moderately complex legal question, but you are obviously an exceptionally intelligent person. You think you have a grasp of what is

involved in this issue?

2.4

DEFENDANT SNIPES: To the best of my understanding,

yes, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Bernhoft says that you are willing to waive or give up now any claim that you earlier made or had in this case about ineffective assistance of counsel in order to have Mr. Meachum rejoin your defense team; is that correct?

DEFENDANT SNIPES: That's correct, Judge.

THE COURT: Thank you. You may be seated.

I will accept that. Mr. Meachum, you are admitted pro hac vice.

MR. MEACHUM: Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you very much.

MR. BERNHOFT: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Now, let's revisit then the matter of who is making opening statement on the defense side.

MR. BERNHOFT: Yes, Your Honor. We contemplate that Mr. Meachum will do an introductory opening statement, something on the order of ten minutes. And then Mr. Meachum will introduce me, and I will conclude the defense opening statement on behalf of Mr. Snipes. I cannot conceive that we would go more than 60 minutes in the aggregate.

THE COURT: That's perfectly acceptable.

All right. We will proceed. Marshal, seat the

1 jury, please. THE COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise. 2 3 (Jury present.) THE COURT: Thank you. Be seated, please, members 4 5 of the jury, and good morning to you. I appreciate your promptness. And as I said 6 yesterday, I think it was during one of the recesses or at the 7 8 end of the break, promptness during the course of this trial 9 is extremely important on the part of everybody involved 10 because each one of us is an essential link in the proceeding. 11 And, if you are not here, then at the very least it's going to cause a delay until we get it straightened out, 12 13 so I appreciate your attention to being prompt. And, 14 obviously, you have been and I am sure will continue to be, and I appreciate that. 15 16 Now, the first order of business, as I explained 17 yesterday, as we get started in the trial this morning, is for me to now ask the clerk to administer to you your oath as 18 jurors in this case so that you are formally impaneled under 19 2.0 the law and authorized to decide the matter. 21 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Will you please stand, raise your right hand. 22 23 (Jury sworn.) 24 THE COURT: Thank you. Be seated, please.

Members of the jury, you have now been sworn as the

25

jury to try this case. By your verdicts, you will decide the disputed issues of fact. I will decide on questions of law that arise during the course of the trial. And before you retire to deliberate together and decide the case at the end of the trial, I will instruct you again on the rules of law that you must follow and apply in reaching your decision.

Because you will be called upon to decide the facts of the case, you should give careful attention to the testimony and evidence presented for your consideration during the trial, but you should keep an open mind and should not form or state any opinion about the case, one way or the other, until you have heard all of the evidence and have had the benefits of the closing arguments of the lawyers, as well as my instructions to you on the applicable law.

During the trial, you must not discuss the case in any manner among yourselves or with anyone else, and you must not permit or attempt to -- permit anyone to attempt to discuss it with you or in your presence.

And in so far as the lawyers are concerned, as well as others whom you may come to recognize as having some connection with the case, you are instructed that, in order to avoid even the appearance of impropriety, you should have no conversation whatever with those persons while you are serving on the jury.

You must also avoid reading any newspaper articles

that might be published about the case now that the trial has begun, and you must also avoid listening to or observing any broadcasts, news program on either television or radio or on the Internet, because of the possibility that some mention might be made of the case during such a broadcast now that the trial is in progress.

The reasons for these cautions, of course, lies in the fact that it will be your duty to decide the case only on the basis of the testimony and evidence presented during the trial without consideration of any other matters whatever.

From time to time during the trial, I may be called upon to make rulings of law on motions or objections made by the lawyers. You should not infer or conclude from any ruling I might make or anything I might say that I have any opinions on the merits of this case, one way or the other.

And if I sustain an objection to a question that goes unanswered by the witness or if I sustain an objection that goes to an exhibit, you should not speculate on what the answer might have been or what the exhibit might have shown, nor should you draw any inferences or conclusions from the question or the exhibit.

During the trial it may be necessary for me to confer with the lawyers from time to time out of your hearing concerning questions of law or procedure that require consideration by the Court alone. On some occasions, you may

be excused from the courtroom as a convenience to you and to us while I discuss such matters with the lawyers.

I will try to limit such interruptions as much as possible, but you should remember at all times the importance of the matter you are here to determine and should be patient, even though the case may seem to go slowly. I will make every effort to expedite the trial whenever possible.

Now, in order that you might understand at the beginning of the case the nature of the decisions you will be asked to make and how you should go about making them, I would like to try to give you some preliminary instructions concerning some of the rules of law that will apply. Of course, the preliminary instructions I will give you now will not cover all of the rules of law applicable to this case.

As stated before, I will instruct you or explain to you fully the applicable law at the end of the trial, just before you retire to deliberate upon your verdicts, and will probably restate at that time some of the rules that I want to tell you about now. In any event, you should not single out any one instruction alone as stating the law, but should consider all of my instructions as a whole.

As you were told during the process of your selection, an indictment in a criminal case is merely the accusatory paper which states the charge or charges to be determined at the trial, but it is not evidence against the

defendant or anyone else.

2.0

Indeed, the defendant has entered a plea of not guilty and is presumed by the law to be innocent. The government has the burden of proving a defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt; and if it fails to do so, you must find that defendant not guilty.

Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof of such a convincing character that you would be willing to rely and act upon it without hesitation in the most important of your own affairs.

Because the government has the burden of proof, it will go forward and present its testimony and evidence first. After the government finishes or rests what we call its case-in-chief, the defendant may call witnesses and present evidence, if he wishes to do so.

However, you will remember that the law does not require a defendant to prove his innocence or produce any evidence at all, and no inference whatever may be drawn from the election of a defendant not to testify in the event he should elect.

As you listen to the testimony, you should remember that you will be the sole judges of the credibility or believability of each witness and the weight to be given to his or her testimony.

In deciding whether you believe or disbelieve any

witness, you should consider his or her relationship to the government or to the defendant; the interest, if any, of the witness in the outcome of the case; his or her manner of testifying; the opportunity of the witness to observe or acquire knowledge concerning the facts about which he or she testified; the candor, fairness and intelligence of the witness; and the extent to which the witness has been supported or contradicted by other credible evidence. You may, in short, accept or reject the testimony of any witness in whole or in part.

Now, you will notice that the court reporter is making a complete stenographic record of all that is said during the trial, including the testimony of the witnesses in case it should become necessary at a future date to prepare printed transcripts of any portion of the trial proceedings.

Such transcripts, however, will not be prepared, if at all, and will not be printed in sufficient time or appropriate form for your review during your deliberations and you should not expect to receive any transcripts. You will be required to rely upon your individual and collective memory concerning what the testimony was.

On the other hand, any papers and other tangible exhibits received in evidence during the trial will be available to you for study during your deliberations. Do not be concerned if an exhibit is not shown to you when it is

received in evidence because, as I said, you will get to see it and inspect at the end of the case all of the exhibits that are received in evidence.

Now, because transcripts will not be available, you will be permitted to take notes during the trial, if you want to do so. And the clerk will, if she hasn't already provided you, provide you with notebooks and pens or pencils for each of you. On the other hand, of course, you are not required to take notes, if you do not wish to do so. That will be left entirely up to you, individually.

If you do decide to take notes, be careful not to become so involved in note-taking that you become distracted from the ongoing proceedings. Don't try to summarize all of the testimony. Instead, limit your note-taking to specific items of information that might be difficult to remember later, such as dates, times, amounts, measurements, identities or relationships.

But remember that you must decide upon the credibility or believability of each witness and you must, therefore, observe the demeanor and the appearance of each witness while testifying. Note-taking must not distract you from that task.

Also, your notes should be used only as aids to your memory. And whether you take notes or not, you should rely upon your own independent recollection or memory of what the

testimony was and should not be unduly influenced by the notes of other jurors. Notes are not entitled to any greater weight than the recollection or impression of each juror as to what the testimony was.

2.0

Now, as you know from the explanation that I gave during the course of your selection, it is charged in this case in Count One of the indictment that the defendants engaged in an unlawful conspiracy to defraud the United States by impeding, impairing or obstructing the Internal Revenue Service in assessing and collecting the revenue.

Under the law, a conspiracy is a combination or agreement of two or more persons to join together in an attempt to accomplish some unlawful purpose. It's a kind of partnership in criminal purposes.

And willful participation in such a scheme or agreement, followed by the commission of an overt act by one of the conspirators is sufficient to complete the offense of conspiracy, even though the ultimate criminal object of the conspiracy is not accomplished or carried out.

In order to establish the offense of conspiracy as charged in Count One of the indictment, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt each of the following specific facts:

First, that two or more persons in some way or manner came to a mutual understanding to try to accomplish a

common and unlawful plan as charged in the indictment; secondly, that the defendant, knowing the unlawful purpose of the plan, willfully joined in it; third, that one of the conspirators during the existence of the conspiracy knowingly committed at least one of the methods or overt acts described in the indictment; and, four, that such overt act was knowingly committed at or about the time alleged in an effort to carry out or accomplish some object of the conspiracy.

In addition to the alleged conspiracy offense, the indictment also charges certain so-called substantive offenses; namely, in Count Two, the knowing and willful filing of a false or fraudulent claim against the government in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 287, and, in Counts Three through Eight against the Defendant Snipes alone, that the defendant willfully failed and refused to file income tax returns that he was required by law to file for the tax years 1999 through 2004, respectively.

In order to establish the offense charged in Count

Two, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt each

of the following specific facts:

First, that the defendant knowingly presented to an agency of the United States a false and fraudulent claim against the United States, as charged in the indictment; secondly, that the false or fraudulent aspect of the claim related to a material fact; and, third, that the defendant

acted willfully and with knowledge of the false and fraudulent nature of the claim.

2.0

In order to establish the offenses charged in Counts

Three through Eight, the government must prove beyond a

reasonable doubt each of the following essential elements:

First, that the defendant was required by law or regulation to make a return of his income for the taxable year charged; second, that the defendant failed to file a return at the time required by law; and, third, that the defendant's failure to file a return was willful.

The term "knowingly," as that term is used in the indictment and in these instructions, means that the act was done voluntarily and intentionally, and not because of mistake or accident.

The word "willfully," as that term is used in the indictment and in these instructions, means that the act was committed voluntarily and purposely with the specific intent to do something the law forbids. That is to say with bad purpose either to disobey or disregard the law.

Good faith is a complete defense to the charges in the indictment since good faith on the part of the defendant is inconsistent with intent to defraud or willfulness, which is an essential part of the charges.

The burden of proof is not on the defendant to prove good faith, of course, because the defendant has no burden to

prove anything. The government must establish beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant acted with specific intent to defraud or willfulness, as charged in the indictment.

So with respect to the issue of willfulness, a defendant would not be willfully doing wrong if, before taking any action with regard to the alleged offense, the defendant consulted in good faith an attorney whom the defendant considered competent; made a full and accurate report to that attorney of all material facts of which the defendant had the means of knowledge; and then acted strictly in accordance with the advice given by that attorney.

Whether the defendant acted in good faith for the purpose of seeking advice concerning questions about which the defendant was in doubt, and whether the defendant made a full and complete report to the attorney, and whether the defendant acted strictly in accordance with the advice received are all questions for you to determine.

Similarly, with regard to the issue of fraudulent intent, one who expresses an honestly held opinion or an honestly formed belief is not chargeable with fraudulent intent, even though the opinion is erroneous or the belief is mistaken. And, similarly, evidence which establishes only that a person made a mistake in judgment or an error in management or was careless does not establish fraudulent intent.

On the other hand, an honest belief on the part of a defendant that a particular transaction was sound and would ultimately succeed would not, in and of itself, constitute good faith as that term is used in these instructions, if, in carrying out that venture, the defendant knowingly made false and fraudulent representations to others with the specific intent to deceive them.

Now, we will begin the trial at this time by affording to the lawyers for each of the parties an opportunity to make opening statements to you in which they may explain the issues in the case and summarize the facts they expect the evidence will show.

After all the testimony and evidence has been presented, the lawyers will then be given another opportunity to address you at the end of the trial and to make their summations or final arguments in the case.

The statements that the lawyers make now, as well as the arguments they present to you at the end of the trial are not to be considered by you either as evidence in the case, which comes only from the witnesses and the exhibits, or as your instruction on the law, which will come only from me.

Nevertheless, these statements or arguments are intended to help you understand the evidence as it comes in, the issues or disputes that you will be called upon to decide, as well as the positions taken by both sides. So I ask, as I

know you will, that you now give to the lawyers your close attention as I recognize them in just a moment, each in turn, for the purpose of making an opening statement.

Now, you have already been provided by the clerk, as I mentioned before, note pads and writing instruments with which to take notes, if you choose to do so. We have also prepared for each of you --

Madam Clerk, do you have them available, the jury notebooks?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Yes, they are right here.

THE COURT: A notebook for each of you for reference during the course of the trial that includes, at least initially, a copy of the preliminary instructions on the law that I have just given to you, that you may wish to refer to to refresh your recollection concerning those matters, especially in the early part of the trial.

And also what we call a redacted or edited copy of the indictment is included in the notebook. The indictment contains certain allegations or statements that are not contained in the abbreviated copy that we have given you at this point, the purpose of the edited or abbreviated copy being to give you a frame of reference for the essential elements or the essential facts that the government must prove as to each count beyond a reasonable doubt before a defendant may be convicted of those particular counts, as explained in

my preliminary instructions.

2.0

2.4

It will be determined later, after the evidence has been presented, the extent to which other portions of the indictment will be included for your final perusal in determining the case.

And there is some notebook paper, in addition to the pads that you have already been given, to use in taking notes.

Now, I will ask, as these are distributed to you --

You can go ahead, if you will, Madam Clerk, and distribute the notebooks to the jurors.

While counsel are making their opening statements, members of the jury, please focus your attention upon their statements. Make notes if you wish to, but do not try to go back and read the instructions or the indictment at this time. You will have your opportunity during recesses or the like to do that, as you may wish.

At the moment, please give your attention, as I know you will, to counsel. All right. Thank you.

Are you ready to proceed, Mr. O'Neill?

MR. O'NEILL: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You may address the jury and make opening statement for the United States.

MR. O'NEILL: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And you may turn that lectern.

MR. O'NEILL: Thank you, sir.

May it please the Court, Judge Hodges, counsel, ladies and gentlemen of the jury.

Good morning. I would like to take this opportunity to reintroduce myself, knowing full well that Judge Hodges had done it earlier. My name is Robert O'Neill, and I am an assistant -- well, I'm with the U. S. Attorney's Office here in the Middle District of Florida. And together with Scot Morris and Jeff McLellan, we will be presenting the evidence in this case on behalf of the United States of America.

You know, I think you picked up already enough that trials come in parts and there is various segments to a trial. We have already gone through the first part, which was jury selection, and you saw firsthand how Judge Hodges methodically and painstakingly sought to ask questions to ensure that we have a fair and impartial jury, a jury that did not come in here with preconceived notions or preconceived prejudices or sympathies.

Instead, we wanted people with a clean slate that would judge this case absent prejudice, absent sympathy, and determine this case based on the facts that come out in the trial within the confines of these four walls.

His Honor has instructed you that the burden of proof is on the United States. Therefore, I have the honor and privilege of addressing you first. And it is true, the burden of proof is upon us.

And the burden of proof is a term of art, like many terms of art you are going to hear during the course of this trial. And it is not my province or balliwick to define those terms to you. That is for the Judge. We all have our own roles, and the Judge instructs you on the law. He has told you, though, that the burden of proof is on the government beyond a reasonable doubt. And he will instruct you on that meaning. He has done already to some degree.

I would merely state to you that it is not a proof beyond all doubt or to a mathematical certainty, which, of course, would be an impossible burden, and one the government could never sustain.

Because the proof beyond a reasonable doubt standard is the standard that applies in every courtroom on every level in the United States of America, whether it be Federal or State. It is the burden of proof that is required in order to find a defendant guilty. And, again, it is a term of art.

His Honor also mentioned to you another standard or bulwark within our constitutional jurisprudence, and that is the presumption of innocence.

As the defendants sit here, before you have heard any evidence, before the case starts, they are presumed innocent. And that innocence stays with them until the government proves beyond a reasonable doubt their guilt of the offenses charged.

It is sometimes thought of in various legal commentators and attorneys who use various analogies on the presumption of innocence, many times it's thought of as sort of a cloak that hangs over them. And it is incumbent upon the government, upon the United States to pull that cloak off.

2.4

How does the government do that? It is through the introduction of evidence, the evidence in this case.

Now, evidence comes in various forms, ladies and gentlemen, and I would just like to briefly explain what you are going to see and what you are going to hear.

Evidence will come first from witnesses. And many of you have seen this on television shows and heard about this, and, if you were a juror, you have seen this.

A witness comes into court, testifies in the witness chair and gives an oath. It's subject to direct examination and then it's subject to cross-examination. And you, as the judges of the fact, judge that person's credibility, believability, as His Honor has just told you.

You determine whether you believe that person, whether what they are saying makes sense to you, whether it squares with your common sense, whether it's believable, and whether it's credible. And you are the judges in that capacity, making that determination.

And that's the first general category of evidence.

The second general category of evidence would be

documentation. And in this case, I am afraid to tell you there is going to be a lot of documentation. There are going to be a lot of records, a lot of paper.

Now, one of the good things is we do have a computer system so whatever documents go into evidence, we will be able to show you. As His Honor instructed, don't be worried about seeing every piece of documentation because, once they go into evidence, they are part of the province of the jury and go back to the jury during your deliberative process. So you will have a chance to see them, but there will be a lot of documents.

And these are documents that were made during the times in question, during the course of this case. And you will get to see them.

What type of documents? Financial records, you will see a lot of financial records, specifically about the personal affairs of Defendant Snipes, moneys he made, income. There will be a lot of government documents, what we might call public documents under seal, documents that are kept by agencies such as the Internal Revenue Service; tax returns, indicating whether tax returns have been filed.

You will also have or see what we will call nondocuments. Kind of an odd way to say it, but where documents don't exist, sort of the non-file. And the IRS will keep that, as well. They have records when a tax return is

not filed. So you will see a lot of documents like that.

You will also hear about an entity, and we will talk about it in a second, called the American Rights Litigators or Guiding Light of God's Ministries, which is the name that it changed to.

And that was an organization that was run by the defendant, Eddie Kahn, and associated with the Defendant Douglas Rosile, and of which the Defendant Wesley Snipes became a member. And that's an organization that was located here in Lake County, which is why we are here today, ladies and gentlemen, in court in Ocala within the Middle District of Florida, because these activities occurred in Lake County.

And you will hear about this organization, and that this organization, its focus was to thwart the process of the IRS, to defraud the IRS, to come up with bogus tax returns for its members. That's what it is. You will see the documentation. You don't have to take my word for it. It will all come out during the trial.

And you will see a lot of that documentation because, as part of the government's investigation in this case, a search warrant was conducted of the premises. And a search warrant, as you will hear, is a duly authorized warrant by a sitting Federal judge, who authorizes investigators to go in and conduct a search of the buildings.

And once that is conducted by the agents, then we

get the documents and the documents will be here for you to see. And you will see what American Rights Litigators or Guiding Light of God Ministries was. And I am using both names because it changed its name during the term of this case from ARL to GAG.

2.0

But, again, Mr. Kahn, you will hear, was associated with that, Mr. Rosile was associated with that, and Mr. Snipes became a member of that.

And that is the second broad sort of category of documentation or evidence which is documentation. We call it documentary evidence.

The third and final sort of one is what we in the law would call "stipulations," but it is just simply agreements. If the government and the defense agrees on a certain matter, there is no need proving it to you. We will just agree to that. You might or might not see stipulations in this case. You just never know as the trial progresses.

But that is the broad sort of ranges of evidence that you are going to hear and see in this case.

Now, it is incumbent upon the United States to take that evidence that's going to be submitted to you and prove the charges in this case.

His Honor has told you there are eight charges in this case. Count One is a conspiracy, and it charges all three defendants: Defendant Snipes, Defendant Kahn and

Defendant Rosile.

And as he said -- and we will get into this during the evidence -- a conspiracy is sort of a partnership in crime. It is what's called an unlawful agreement.

And what, in essence, the agreement here was is that the Defendant Snipes, Kahn and Rosile unlawfully agreed to defraud the United States of the revenue that it was due by not filing taxes, by filing bogus and fraudulent documentation, by thwarting the process of collecting that revenue. That's Count One.

Count Two -- and we will talk about it -- is what is called a false claim against the United States. And it is a very specific -- the conspiracy count, you will see, will cover a great range of things.

Count Two is much more specific, and it occurs on a certain date when Mr. Kahn and Mr. Rosile, through the American Rights Litigators on behalf of Mr. Snipes, filed a false claim for back taxes.

You will hear Mr. Snipes had filed his 1997 tax return, but, years later, wanted back the money and taxes he had paid. And we will talk about that in a second. So that was filed with the IRS and it is what's called a false claim.

The Third through Eight counts are only as to the Defendant Snipes alone and do not involve the other defendants. And those are the failure to file for the tax

years 1999, 2000, 2001 and so on, because he did not file tax returns in those years.

And those are the charges. And so it's incumbent on the government to take the evidence in this case and prove those charges.

Let's turn to those cases. Well, let's turn to the facts of this case. And I would ask if we could put up on the board what we have presented as a timeline. And it is a sort of just a summary chart; not evidence. The evidence will, again, come from witnesses and documentation. But this is a summary to give you an idea of what the government will be proving.

And while you are looking at that, let me go backwards in time a little for you, which will bring us right up to that timeline.

I expect that the evidence will show that in the 1990s that Defendant Snipes was a taxpaying member of this government, of this country -- excuse me -- and he paid his taxes. He had hired tax professionals, a company you will hear called Starr & Company -- "Starr" has two r's -- out of New York City.

And these people provided tax advice to him, did his taxes, tax preparation, and eventually did even more for him; became a sort of an agent for him, paying his bills and the like.

And you will hear from individuals at Starr & Company. For instance, in 1993, 1994, 1995, all through the nineties, Mr. Snipes has them file his taxes. And we will show you those taxes. I fully expect them to be entered into evidence. This occurs through 1998.

Now, as you all know, your 1999 tax is always due -owing the next year, just like in a couple of months we will
all have to pay 2007.

Something happens in 2002 -- I mean in 2000, excuse me -- the year 2000, and that stops the payment of taxes. And you will see -- and I will try -- I have a copy here to look at. It might be very difficult for you to make out everything on that board.

But the very first box shows January 8th of '00, 2000, Snipes pays Kahn a 2,000-dollar consulting fee.

What's happened here is two things. While Defendant Snipes is joining Defendant Kahn, he is now not providing information to his tax advisors in New York. They are going to want to start putting together his 1999 tax return. And in order to do so, they need his personal information, just like everybody in this room.

Common sense tells you -- you know how to fill out your tax returns. You have got to get your information and provide it. They are not getting that information. Why?

Defendant Snipes is now joining this group.

And you will see in March or April, in the box,
March 2nd in 2000, Defendant Snipes joins Defendant Kahn's
American Rights Litigators here in Lake County, Florida.

And then shortly thereafter, Mr. Kahn has a conversation with the tax advisors in New York in which he tells them Mr. Snipes is not required to file taxes. Why? He asserts something called an 861 position.

You will hear more about this from witnesses, but it is a bizarre, gibberish kind of idea that people in America don't have to pay taxes on income derived in America. It only applies to certain foreign-based income.

That is going to be what he tells the people at Starr & Company. The Starr & Company professionals denounce that, say that doesn't make any sense. But that's the position of Defendant Kahn.

As a result of that, you will see in April of that year, as the tax return is due and owing, it is not filed. An extension is sought by Starr & Company because they are still trying, during this period of time, of figuring out whether tax is due, what Mr. Snipes is doing.

Then you will see right below it, Mr. Snipes at this point files a claim for a 1996 refund of four million dollars. He had filed his income taxes in 1996, as we said, through Starr & Company, had paid approximately four million dollars in taxes, and now wants that back. So he files an amended

return seeking that based on this 861 position. And this return is filed by or prepared at the American Rights Litigators.

Now we flip over to June. And you will see in June, the Defendant Kahn gives a private seminar for the Defendant Snipes in California.

And then there starts a series -- and you are going to see a lot of this documentation. The IRS sends the Defendant Snipes a warning that his previous filing is frivolous.

The Defendant Snipes writes to his tax advisors, claiming his income is not subject to Federal tax. The owner or proprietor of Starr & Company calls Defendant Snipes, and says, in June: Hey, hey, hey, you are going to have to pay your taxes. This 861 position doesn't make sense.

He doesn't get anywhere, he will tell you, with Defendant Snipes, so he terminates Defendant Snipes as a client, and writes a letter in the latter part of June 2000.

The extension goes up until October that year, but on that time, the Defendant Snipes fails to file his 1999 tax returns. Instead, in October of that year, he signs an affidavit of incompetency, claiming he does not understand the tax laws.

Again, these documents that he is filing with the IRS you are going to see, you are going to have an opportunity

to peruse and review.

2.4

And then what's he do? This is the first time you are going to hear of this type of document. In November, he sends a one-million-dollar Bill of Exchange to the secretary of the Treasury with an IRS payment voucher.

A "Bill of Exchange" is, again -- this document not worth the paper it's printed on. It looks like a check to some degree, but not really. And it looks like it might be payment or something -- you will get to see it -- but it's printed on a printer at the American Rights Litigators, and it is always accompanied with a payment voucher to the IRS, saying: Hey, we just paid you.

So in November of 2000, he sends this one-million-dollar Bill of Exchange, this nonsense document to the IRS.

I would like to go into 2001 at this point and tell you what transpires in 2001. In January then of 2001, he sends -- "he" being the Defendant Snipes, in case you can't read the chart very well -- sends a 12-million-dollar Bill of Exchange to the Secretary of Treasury, again with an IRS payment voucher, as though he has paid 12 million dollars. Again, it is a fraudulent, frivolous document that has no legal significance whatsoever.

In April of that year, he renews his ARL membership.

So, again, he is rejoining the American Rights Litigators, the

organization run by the Defendant Eddie Kahn.

And then on April 14th of that year, when your tax return is normally due, he files a claim for a 1997 refund of 7.3 million dollars, prepared at the American Rights Litigators by the Defendant Rosile.

Remember, the Starr & Company all through the nineties has prepared his taxes. And you will see those taxes. They have the usual, you know, going down, getting your income, your adjusted gross income, your deductions, your exemptions, going through the whole thing. You will get to see it all.

But in 1997, he paid a considerable amount of taxes, several million dollars. He now is filing something with the government, saying: I want that money back.

And that, ladies and gentlemen, is the genesis behind Count Two, that is the false claim against the United States asking for this, re-doing it. In essence, he is saying he had no income in that year, he has no income, he is not required to file, so he should get his money back.

And you will see on the 16th, just two days later, he fails to file his 2000 tax return.

Then we go into September, and there is an IRS letter to the Defendant Snipes and an attorney associated with American Rights Litigators, requesting his 1999 tax return that has not been filed.

And, again, in October there is an IRS letter to Defendant Snipes and the attorney associated with American Rights Litigators, requesting that 1999 tax return.

And then we go into 2002. And in March of that year, the Defendant Snipes renews his American Rights
Litigators membership. And then we have here, in April he fails to file his 2001 tax return now. Again, he is not filing his tax returns.

But at that time, he signs, in April of 2000, a ten million dollar plus movie agreement on a movie called "Blade II." Apparently, there was a trilogy and there were three separate ones; "Blade I," "Blade II," "Blade III." And I expect you will hear testimony about that.

In May of that year, an IRS special agent, Cameron Lalli, who was introduced to you, reads the Defendant Snipes his rights and he informs him he's the subject of a criminal investigation. No longer just trying to get back the money. He is now the subject of a criminal investigation for not filing his taxes.

And yet a couple of months later, the Defendant

Snipes sends a one-million-dollar Bill of Exchange again to

the Secretary of Treasury with an IRS payment voucher. Again,

this is just a false, frivolous document being filed on his

behalf to the Treasury.

Now we go to the year 2003. In March of that year,

he once again renews his ARL membership. We know this, again, from the search warrant. We have got all the documents. They will be introduced into evidence for you, I fully expect.

In April, he fails to file his 2002 tax return.

In September, he signs a ten million dollar plus agreement on "Blade III," the movie.

And in November of that year, he sends a letter to an IRS special agent, challenging that agent's authority to criminally investigate him, saying he has no authority to do that and he cannot investigate.

Then we go to 2004. At the beginning of that year, he sends yet another letter challenging the authority of the criminal agent to criminally investigate him concerning taxes.

And then in February of that year -- it's not on this timeline -- the search warrant is executed at the offices of what had been American Rights Litigators and is now Guiding Light of God Ministries.

And you will hear about that, and the agents who took part in that will testify as to the execution of the search warrant, as to what documents were seized, as well as both in paper form and also in electronic form. Because many times people have computers and the search is also conducted that way. And you will hear from the agent who conducted the search in that capacity.

In April, the Defendant Snipes fails to file his

2003 income tax return. Now, in May, he sends filing statements for 1999 and 2000 to the IRS; not tax returns, but filing statements. You will see them.

Again, what they are, what they mean, you will be the judges of that. You will have an opportunity to see. Of course, this is way after he knows he is the subject of a criminal investigation, and they espouse much antitax rhetoric, as you will see.

In July of that year, he sends multiple notices of entry of default documents to the IRS. Again, you will see them. You will be asking yourselves whether they are nonsense or not.

And at the end, in July, he sends -- Snipes sends a -- excuse me. The IRS sends to the Defendant Snipes frivolous correspondence response. They are telling him this stuff is frivolous.

In 2005, Mr. Snipes again fails to file his 2004 income tax return, and he sends a filing statement for tax year 2005 to the IRS in August. Again, you will have an opportunity to see it. It, obviously, is not a tax return. It is just some sort of statement by Mr. Snipes.

2006, you will see that the Defendant Snipes sends a legal notice of resignation of compelled Social Security trustee to the IRS. Again, we will show it to you. It has no legal significance.

And in December of that year, he sends a filing of amended return and tax statement to the IRS. Although the title seems to imply some sort of tax return, you will see for yourselves, ladies and gentlemen, it is not a tax return.

So you can see in all those years, Mr. Snipes did not file his income tax returns as required by law.

Now -- and this is what I am talking about applies to Counts Three through Eight for failing to file. I would like to show you his income briefly, and turn to 1999. And you will see that even though Mr. Snipes did not in those years file income tax returns, he did make income, which is something we are going to have to prove. And that's why we are showing it.

In 1999, for instance, he made -- total income to Mr. Snipes was in excess of ten million dollars. That was from some movies, some partnership incomes, interest incomes, dividend incomes, some capital gains. And that's why the financial documents have to go into evidence, to show that he needed to file, based on this income.

Now, you will hear the filing requirements and they vary. As you know in your own common experiences and daily life experiences, each year the IRS minimum requirement goes up a little. And so for some of these years, it starts at 7,200, and then it goes up a little. If you are single, if you're married, filing jointly, it is higher; if you are

married, filing separate, it is lower. And the witnesses will talk about that. Suffice to say, the amounts I am telling you are way in excess of the minimum filing requirements.

So in 1999, he makes in excess of ten dollars.

That's total income to Defendant Snipes.

In 2000, again, from a movie and from partnership income, interest income, dividend income, capital gains, he makes in excess of two million dollars; according to the chart, \$2,331,054.41. And he did not file an income tax return.

In 2001, there is a total from movies, royalties and residuals of over 17 million dollars. But of that, total income to Wesley Snipes \$1,462,762.23.

Go on to the year 2002, you will see here total income for Mr. Snipes at the bottom, \$5,806,740.98.

2003, total income just about 4,500,000 dollars.

2004, total income slightly over 13-and-a-half million dollars.

And, again, all of that will come through through the financial documents, which have been gone through, and that's how we determine these numbers.

And, finally, ladies and gentlemen, for these Counts III through Eight, I will show you a final chart, which shows the filing history for Mr. Snipes.

And you will see, as we go along the top part of the

chart, the years 1993 to 1998 are the years where he is utilizing a tax preparer. His taxes are being filed. And you will see on each, there's a column adjusted gross income, taxable income, tax liability, what he paid.

And you will see in '93, he paid 1.1 million. And 3 am just rounding it off here; 1994, 1.8 million; 1995

2.7 million; 1996, 4 million; 1997 7.3 million; 1998, no, but none were due. That was a tax return. You will see it. You can see at the top, he did not have any income that year.

And then you will notice in Counts Three through Eight, along the bottom, there is no tax return filed in '99, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, despite the incomes made as I have told you.

Ladies and gentlemen, that in very broad strokes is the what the United States intends to prove in this case.

Again, it is not through what the lawyers say and it's not through what you may hear outside this courtroom. It is within the four walls of this courtroom. It is the witnesses presented here, it is the documentation that comes in, and that the Judge rules is admissible evidence. And that's what you are going to see.

In judging this evidence -- and His Honor has told you you are judges, you are judges of the fact -- you use your common sense, your good judgment. Because the one thing that a jury brings to each trial is its common sense and its good

1 judgment. Some people think lawyers might not have that, but jurors clearly have the common sense. And that's how you judge this. Listen to the evidence, look at the documentation.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

At the end of this case, I will have an opportunity to speak to you again. And at that time, on behalf of the United States of America, I will ask you to find the Defendants Snipes, Kahn and Rosile guilty as charged. Thank you very much for your kind attention.

MR. BERNHOFT: Your Honor, may we have a brief recess so we can set up our items in the well?

THE COURT: All right. I think that's appropriate, counsel. In order to avoid interrupting other counsel, members of the jury -- we have been here some time -- let's pause for our morning break.

As I think I said yesterday and the day before during the process of jury selection, I do try to pause during the day at least once in the morning, once in the afternoon for a recess, and we will do that now. And you may withdraw to the jury room and we will take a 15-minute break.

(Short recess was taken.)

(Jury present.)

THE COURT: Thank you. Be seated, members of the jury, please.

MR. MEACHUM: May I, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Mr. Meachum, you may address the jury.

MR. MEACHUM: Thank you, Your Honor.

Judge Hodges, members of the court staff, members of the United States Attorney's Office.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I guess when I think about how we talk about what an opening statement is, I guess it would be a table of contents of a book. By the end of this trial, you'll know the title of that book. But in any table of contents it's supposed to tell you what you're going to read, what the chapter's about.

So before I start, I would like to just address the table of contents that my friend and brother at the Bar, Bobby O'Neill, told you about what the government will show.

There's a couple of things.

They will present evidence and testimony and paper; that's correct. And they will talk about ARL litigators or Guiding Light Ministries. That's correct. But what he didn't say and what the documents won't say and what the evidence won't prove is that Wesley Snipes was an officer, director, employee, accountant, or attorney for any accounting firm or law firm that he hired.

When I was listening to Bobby talk -- and that's no disrespect because he is my friend -- he used the term "fee." Fee. That's something that you pay. You pay a fee for something.

There's an old saying that I used to remember as a little boy from American Express: Never leave home without it. Commonsense and life experiences, I am imploring you, don't ever leave home without it while you are hearing this case.

There are a lot of documents. There are a lot of documents. They, once again, talk about ARL and Guiding Light Ministries. But of the thousands of documents that you will see, Wesley Snipes is one amongst thousands of clients -- let me say that again -- thousands of clients that they serviced.

Now, there's an old Southern saying -- I'm a

Southern boy -- every goodbye ain't going and every hello

ain't coming. So look at the evidence. Don't be overwhelmed

by the numbers. But look at the evidence.

I just want to talk to you a few moments about Wesley Snipes. Wesley Snipes has never had any intention to defraud the government. He has never been a conspirator. He has never, ever been a tax protester. And he's never, ever been a cheat.

I'll tell you what he is. Like all of us, he is an American citizen who asked questions. Why did he ask questions? Because he wanted to do the right thing. Even in the advice that he had been given, he wanted to make sure that he complied with the law. He has never, ever defrauded anyone.

I'd like to take a moment and talk to you about Wesley Snipes, the person, the human being. He's the grandson of the late, great Ruth May Dukes. He calls her Nana. He used to love to fish.

He's the son of Wesley Rudolph Snipes, a 30-year veteran of the Air Force, and the son of Maryann Long Snipes, a hardworking divorced parent.

He is the oldest child of three. He's Bridget's brother. He's Wesley's brother, yes. And I want to make sure that you understand that. His father's name is Wesley. His name is Wesley, and his brother's name is Wesley.

He is the husband of Nikki and a father, a devoted father, of five children.

Wesley and his family lived in New York City in

Lower Manhattan up until the tragedies of 9-11 that not only

destroyed his home but almost killed him.

You know, ladies and gentlemen, what I want to say to you this morning about Wesley Snipes is, he is the epitome of the American dream. He's the boy who went off and made good and started in humble beginnings. He is what America is all about.

Don't be fooled about what this case is about. Let me tell you what our evidence will show this case is about.

It's about breaches. It's about broken confidences. It's about unethical practices. It's about betrayal of trust,

betrayal of trust of those individuals that he paid a fee for to provide services, both financially and legally, a fee, a fee that the government used.

My colleague Bob Bernhoft will tell you about these breaches, but what I want to do is to make you aware of the person. You see, ladies and gentlemen, Wesley Snipes is more than a movie star. Wesley Snipes is more than a celebrity. He is a human being, born in your midst more than 45 years ago in Central Florida.

His mother, like many at that time, decided to relocate to the Northeast. She took a two-year-old son, Wesley, and a one-year-old daughter, Bridget, and lived in South Bronx and worked several jobs, one of which was a teacher's aide, in a one-bedroom apartment.

It's interesting. I want you to know by the time Wesley Snipes was ten years old, he had moved five times, five times.

But in all of that he was blessed to have talent, talent that was recognized, and he was allowed and accepted in the world renown school of performing arts for high school students.

But to his dismay, in the tenth grade, just as he was being called to audition for a play, his mother said, We have to move back to Orlando. You see, his mother, like many Southern mothers and just good mothers period, started to

realize that the Bronx was not the proper place to raise a family. So she was trying to protect Wesley and her kids.

But when he moved back to Florida, he was so talented and so motivated that Wesley established a theater of arts training program that students in Central Florida benefit from today.

You know, I want you to know that there's contributions that Wesley has made in his absence to this community, and they are still benefiting from that 15, 20 years later.

As soon as he graduated from Jones High School, Wesley went where? Back to the place that his mother said he had to leave, back to New York.

But he went there with a purpose; he went there with a goal. You see, he got a scholarship to go to the State University of New York. We refer to it as SUNY. They've got a lot of different campuses, but he went to the Purchase campus where he obtained a bachelor of arts.

His career started and -- and some of you know that you have seen him as an actor in Blade or Art of War, but Wesley was a dancer and singer, a dancer and singer. You might have seen him even in videos of "Bad" by a guy by the name of Michael Jackson. He was in the group of Michael Jackson dancing on "Bad."

But early on he realized that his passion and his

true talents was in acting. By the time that Wesley Snipes was 25, he had been on Broadway twice, had made appearances on soap operas called "All My Children," and started to work with some of the industry's largest and most-popular actors at that time by the name of Matt Dillon, one of the members of what used to be known as the Brat Pack.

2.0

But, yes, like all of us who come from those beginnings, he wanted to go back to Florida and move Nana and his mother and brother in a house, because he made it, not the house that he lived in, but a house that he could move his mother and -- his mother live in a 900-square-foot home.

Wesley is now acting and making money, so he wanted to move Nana in a house where she could fish on a dock, in a house where his mother was not cramped and can be proud -- not his house, his family's home.

With the rise of his artistic success, his dependency on those who provided professional services grew. You see, unlike us who work and we're home every day and sometimes we travel, this man leaves his family and his home sometimes for six, seven months at a time.

He is a person who has become totally dependent on the financial and legal services of others.

Don't be led in this case about betrayals by Wesley Snipes. You see, Wesley Snipes is the one who has been betrayed by many, by many, not all sitting at defendants'

table today. He has been taken advantage of by many, not all named in this Indictment.

2.0

My name is Danny Meachum, and I want to thank you, all of you. You don't know me, but I'm looking at you and you'll see my face for days to come.

I want to thank you for your sacrifices. You see, when you sit as a juror in a case like this, it's a sacrifice. But I want to humbly request that you listen to this case intently.

You have a very difficult job, ladies and gentlemen.

You have a job that you have to sift through the thousands of documents that the government will show you.

There's an old saying that we have in law school:

If you throw enough stuff against the wall, maybe sometimes it will stick. But I have confidence in you that you won't let it stick because you will look at all of it.

This is probably the only time in your life that your vote really counts. Your vote, your 12 votes, really count.

I know that you're committed to doing what's fair.

I come from a town just like this. I grew up with people like you, and I know that they're fair and they want to do the right thing. I am convinced, when you do the right thing, you will acquit Wesley Snipes and send him back home to his family.

1 Thank you very much.

2.0

2 MR. BERNHOFT: Your Honor, may I proceed?

THE COURT: Mr. Bernhoft?

MR. BERNHOFT: Thank you, Dan.

Your Honor, counsel, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. Dan has provided some background, some historical background, on Wesley Snipes, who he is as a man. And now we're going to turn to talking about some of the core issues in this case.

The most important issue you will be called upon to decide in this case based on the Court's instructions on the law is this: Did Wesley Snipes -- did he lie to the IRS? Did Mr. Snipes intend to deceive the IRS and act with a bad purpose to disobey the law? That is the fundamental issue in this case, and this is the core issue upon which you must decide.

THE COURT: Mr. Bernhoft, try to stand at the lectern, if you will, please.

MR. BERNHOFT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Since I've interrupted, let me also remind counsel of the Local Rule that requires that we use surnames rather than given names in referring to co-counsel or others.

MR. BERNHOFT: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

I tend to wander, so we'll fix at the podium here.

Now, what the evidence is going to show is this. Everybody wants to know what Wesley Snipes did. What Mr. Snipes did is he sent letters to the IRS, dozens of letters and document packages. And in those letters and document packages he asked questions about his tax obligations.

The evidence will show that he was intending to comply with the law by asking the IRS questions. He asked, What tax does the law make me liable for, and what form does the law require me to file to pay that tax? Basic, straightforward questions that every American is entitled to get an answer on. And the evidence will show that there was absolutely no meaningful response from the Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. Snipes did not just engage in trying to get answers from the IRS through written correspondence, the evidence will show that he asked for sit-downs. Wesley Snipes went to the IRS, and he asked to sit down, a sit-down with the IRS to resolve these civil tax controversies. He asked for interviews, conferences, and appeals with IRS and got none of it.

So these weren't just letters asking questions; he stood ready and was prepared to sit down with the IRS with his advisors and work it out. Open the law books, open the law books, show me the law that imposes this particular tax, and

look at the law books, show it to me, tell me what form the law requires me to file to pay that tax.

Now, there's -- there's -- there's more in terms of what the evidence will show about what Mr. Snipes was doing, and that's what you're called upon to decide here.

You've heard some of the preliminary instructions from Judge Hodges, and he's talked about these critical facts about acting with a specific bad purpose to break the law, deception, trickery, deceit.

And our view of the evidence -- and we respectfully submit that your fair view of the evidence -- will show that these attempts by Mr. Snipes to get his questions answered through not just letters but through requesting sit-downs with the government, sit-downs with the IRS, will demonstrate that he was attempting to comply with the law. He wasn't hiding; he wasn't debating.

Another important fact that's going to come into evidence is that Wesley Snipes told the IRS that he stood ready to pay any and all tax that the law made him liable for and to file any form the law required him to file to pay that tax.

He went right to the IRS and said, Let's open up the law books. I'm getting conflicting views from all these tax advisors. You show me what tax I got to pay, what form I got to file. Maybe you owe me money; maybe I owe you money. And

at the end of the day we'll work this out in a civilized fashion.

In these efforts the evidence will show that

Mr. Snipes actually went to the IRS, and he corresponded and
he said, Audit me. Perform an audit on me. And he sent the
letter in requesting what the IRS calls a "field examination."

Now, that's IRS parlance for an audit, A-U-D-I-T.

So here's a man, the evidence will show, that not only writes letters to the government asking questions about his tax obligation, requests interviews, appeals and conferences, but he also asks for an IRS audit. He stands ready to file and pay. Sit down with me and show me what I got to do.

This is not a case where the IRS came knocking on Mr. Snipes' door and Wesley ran to the back room and hid in the closet. Wesley Snipes directly engaged the IRS. He knocked on their door, and they did not answer.

The evidence will also show that along the way

Mr. Snipes followed IRS published forms, rules and procedures
to get his questions answered.

Thank you.

Now, one of the things that you should keep in mind as you view the documents and as you listen to the testimony of witnesses and as you carefully, thoughtfully and conscientiously deliberate on the evidence in this case is

that this is a criminal case. As the Court has indicated and as my learned brothers at prosecution table have also indicated, this is a criminal case. This is not a civil tax case.

Your verdict in this case will have nothing to do with whether the IRS can collect tax money from Wesley Snipes, nothing whatsoever. This is a criminal tax case. Your verdict will have nothing whatsoever to do with that.

And at the end of this case, when you deliberate on the evidence -- and we respectfully suggest to you that you return the only verdict the evidence permits, not guilty on all counts -- be clear that the IRS will be able to pursue Mr. Snipes for every penny of tax they believe he owes, and at that point Mr. Snipes will have his day in federal civil tax court, and the chips are going to fall where they may. Your verdict has no effect on that.

This is about whether Mr. Snipes acted with a specific criminal intent, whether he was deceptive, whether he was trying to trick the IRS, whether he was trying to act with a specific bad purpose to disobey the law.

Now, one of the other important issues in this case is something that we call "venue." And you, the jury, will be called upon to decide where Mr. Snipes made his permanent home between the years 2000 and 2005. This is an important issue in this case.

Now, at the end of this case the Court is going to instruct you on the facts that you should consider when making this very important determination.

This is particularly important for Counts Three through Eight of the Indictment, the alleged willful failure to file tax returns. And keep in mind that the mere failure to file a tax return is not a crime; it must be willful. And we'll talk a bit about what this concept of willfulness means.

So turning to venue, it's a legal -- as Mr. O'Neill said, there's some terms of art here. This is a legal term.

In practical terms, it means, Where did Wesley Snipes make his permanent home between 2000 and 2005?

And this is one place in the law where the law has a very powerful logic, because the facts you will consider are the ordinary but important things that we all do where we live.

Now, the evidence will show that one of Mr. Snipes' companies, a company called Amen Ra Films, purchased a home in Windermere, Florida, which is outside of Orlando. And Mr. Meachum, my esteemed co-counsel, referred to this home.

That was purchased sometime in 1993 or thereabouts. It was purchased by one of Mr. Snipes' companies, and his grandmother lived there. That's what the testimony and evidence will show.

It's not unusual for international artists, people

that have obtained some measure of celebrity, that they will purchase such a home for the family members who remain behind. And as you heard Mr. Meachum talk about, Wesley Snipes left some of his family behind to pursue his acting and art career in New York.

And once he left as a sophomore in high school and went back to New York, the evidence will show that New York City, New York, and then after his home was tragically destroyed in the terrorist attacks during 9-11, he moved his family to what East Coast people call the New York suburbs, right across the bridge in New Jersey. What the evidence will show is that that's where Mr. Snipes made his permanent home between 2000 and 2005.

The evidence will also show that Mr. Snipes had a Florida driver's license, and the evidence will show that he renewed that driver's license, and he continues to renew it.

But as you noticed during jury selection and what we call voir dire, many of the jury venire had moved from other places other than Florida, and one can certainly have a driver's license any -- in any one of the states and drive in any one of the others. So that will be evidence. There's a home there bought by one of Mr. Snipes' companies, and there's a Florida driver's license.

What the evidence will also show is Wesley Snipes never lived there; his grandmother lived there.

There will be testimony and evidence that during this ten-year period Mr. Snipes might have stayed there when he was visiting family for somewhere between 45 and 60 days. He didn't live there. His wife and children never lived there. His children did not attend school there.

And none of the other ordinary but important things that we do where we live -- they didn't do any of that there. Their dentists weren't there. Their doctors weren't there. They didn't do their dry cleaning there -- the small stuff -- but important stuff in determining venue, where was his permanent home. Wife and kids didn't live there. He didn't live there. Kids didn't go to school there. None of that. Wesley Snipes' home, as the evidence will show, was in New York or the New Jersey suburbs after the 9-11 attacks.

Now, Mr. Snipes had a second home. He had a second home in the suburbs of Los Angeles that's near Hollywood, the center of the entertainment and art business. And he also had a home there that was convenient to him when he was doing business there in Hollywood. But it wasn't Windermere, Florida; he just didn't live there. So please pay careful attention to the testimony and the evidence on the critical venue issue.

Now, I wanted to talk a little bit about the Court's preliminary jury instructions. And as the Court has indicated, you have a binder with these preliminary jury

instructions, and you'll have opportunity during recess to take a look at those. And, of course, these are only preliminary. The Court will instruct and give final instructions on the law at the end of this case.

There's several important things to keep in mind about the jury instructions. Now, you have to view the jury instructions as a whole. You don't ignore certain parts of them and look at others. But I want to direct your attention to a couple of critical areas of that.

With respect to this alleged conspiracy, one of the elements upon which the government bears the burden of proof beyond all reasonable doubt is that the defendant, knowing the unlawful purpose of the plan, willfully joined it.

We're going to take a look at the word
"willfulness." The word willfully as that term is used in the
Indictment and these instructions means that the act was
committed voluntarily and purposely, with the specific intent
to do something the law forbids. Bad purpose, specific
intent, deceit, trickery, deception. And the government bears
the burden of proving that that's what all of this was about,
that Wesley Snipes went right to the IRS for answers to
important questions asking for a sit-down, asking to be
audited -- not too many people ask for an audit -- and all
that stuff constitutes some secret conspiracy that was engaged
in with the specific intent to break the law and, further,

that what he was doing he thought was illegal. That's the government's burden. And that's why, when I first spoke to you here, I said that was the core issue in this case.

2.0

Did Wesley Snipes lie to the IRS? Did he deceive the IRS with the specific intent to act in violation of the law, or was he engaged in a good-faith attempt to get answers to important questions? And did his offer to stand good and pay any tax and to file any form -- what does that say about what he was doing? You'll be called upon to judge that.

Now, I want to step back very briefly, with your permission. You've already -- Dan Meachum has been up here, spoke about Wesley Snipes. He's my co-counsel in this case. To his immediate left is attorney Kanan Henry. This is attorney Linda Moreno assisting us at counsel table as co-counsel. Attorney Robert Barnes, he is also our co-counsel.

Now, as the government mentioned, there's going to be a lot of documents in this case, and Bret Tollefson is going to assist us lawyers in keeping track of the documents.

Your Honor, I would also like to thank the government at this point for allowing us to use Chris and the digital operation. We're going to try and make this presentation of evidence as smooth as possible.

Now, let's take a look at what some of the testimony and evidence will show. Bret's going to come up here and he

is going to put this board on the easel for you to look at.

Thank you, Bret.

Now, let's talk about problems with Starr & Company.

Starr was a big, fancy, hotshot tax management, career

management and money management firm in New York. But as

Mr. Meachum talked about, Wesley Snipes is an international

artist, and he had to focus himself and did focus himself on

his art.

And when his career started to blossom and he started to realize the fruits of his hard work, he talked to some respected friends of his, and they referred him to Starr & Company in New York for career management, tax management, and financial management.

Now, one of the things Starr & Company did for Mr. Snipes and recommended to him was that he place his assets in various foreign trusts and overseas investments. And this is during the period 1991 to 1997. There were no tax issues at this time, so to speak, and, indeed, Starr placed investments overseas and used foreign trusts, and they put those investments with companies like Goldman Sachs, Blackstone. These are New York firms that specifically specialize in handling overseas investments.

Now, Starr's client list read like a who's who of the entertainment, art and sports world. Among the clients of Starr were Goldie Hawn, people like Tom Brokaw, and Sylvester

Stallone, who was a close friend and colleague of Mr. Snipes.

So that goes on, and things go along pretty well.

Mr. Snipes does not have any specialized education in tax or accounting. He's an artist; he's a creative man.

And, you know, we kind of look at our artists a little bit differently, don't we? You know, sometimes we look at Hollywood and we shake our heads a little bit and say, a little crazy out there. Maybe it is. But then these artists put that amazing vision on the big screen and our jaws drop and we say wow, how did they do that?

So he invested his faith, confidence and trust in Starr, and they managed his tax, his finances and his money.

Now, in 1997 and 1998, an issue arises with Mr. Snipes and the Starr folk about mismanaging the payments on this Windermere-Orlando property we've talked about. And this is in dispute. This happens during this period.

And as this period goes on, we look at the upper right-hand box in 1998, and Wesley Snipes loses money. And I saw a little surprise, I think, on some of your faces when Mr. O'Neill was talking about that one year.

In 1999 a full accounting is performed, and it's demonstrated that Wesley Snipes lost \$757,000 in the previous year. So the accounting is done in 1999. They do an accounting for 1998, and he loses three quarters of a million dollars.

Also during this period Wesley Snipes discovers that the Starr folk obligated him without his consent or knowledge to a \$2 million unauthorized loan, and this became a subject of hot dispute. This is not a new story -- artists, athletes, being taken advantage of and embezzling money from clients. And that was the allegation here.

During this time it's also discovered by Wesley
Snipes that his good friend and colleague, Sylvester Stallone,
has concerns about Starr, and ultimately Sylvester Stallone
sues Starr & Company in a civil lawsuit. Now, that lawsuit
was settled, and we believe there's going to be some testimony
here in court on the record, on oath, about what that was all
about. But Sylvester Stallone accuses Starr of back dealing,
improperly paid commissions, and fraud. And he sues them for
it.

So now Mr. Snipes has a problem. He's used these advisors for many years, and they say Wesley signed a tax return. There's that little yellow sticker, sign on the line.

So he starts looking around. Mr. Snipes starts looking around for options. He's got a problem with a \$2 million unauthorized loan. He lost money, three-quarters of a million dollars, in 1998. He's obviously concerned.

And then, of course, the Stallone situation crystallizes, the testimony and evidence will show, this concern that Mr. Snipes had.

Thank you, Bret.

Now, here we have the board. Snipes goes to the IRS for answers. And this is the transition period that Mr. O'Neill talked about. We're going to talk a little bit more about that, because we believe there's a little more to the evidence than that.

Someone at ARL -- and Mr. Snipes gets a referral, of course. Artists have a whole bunch of people around them all the time looking for a piece of that business. He's an artist, but he's also a business enterprise. And it's big money. And there are people that want a piece of that action. They want a piece of his back. They want a piece of that hard work.

So he's approached, he's referred, and the first issue that comes up is not tax; it's about privacy issues.

Mr. Snipes has had problems with some very aggressive stalkers. He's got a wife and children. And this is one of those cases where's although in many respects Mr. Snipes is just like everybody else around here -- you know, he's a husband, father, brother, son; he's a breadwinner; he's got to do the things that we all have to do -- this is a little bit of a burden that most of us don't have to deal with.

And he's told that they have some domestic trusts that can be utilized for privacy concerns and for security concerns, and so that's -- that's the initial contact between

Mr. Snipes and ARL, American Rights Litigators.

And while they are having their first conference,

ARL, their lawyers and CPAs and the ARL people, also tell

Mr. Snipes that Starr gave him bad advice, bad tax advice.

And that was no surprise to Mr. Snipes. He was willing to

entertain that. Starr was mismanaging his money, losing him

money, getting sued by Sylvester Stallone for fraud, back

dealing, illegal commission payments, et cetera. So this was

something that he was willing to entertain, bad tax advice.

Now, ARL touts its team of tax professionals, attorneys, accountants, CPAs, and enrolled agents. Now, an enrolled agent is a tax practitioner that is certified by the IRS to practice before the IRS and represent taxpayers. They have to take a bunch of courses, take a test in Washington, D.C.

Now, some of those enrolled agents aren't attorneys, but they can actually practice as attorneys representing taxpayers before IRS. So we've got attorneys, certified public accountants, and enrolled agents.

And he -- this is touted to him. One of the first

ARL attorneys that is rolled out for Mr. Snipes is an attorney

named Ray Pope. Mr. Pope has a spectacular pedigree,

graduated top of his law class, what we call Order of the

Coif, a special designation. He's certified to practice in

Federal Court.

And he also has a personal resume that would give one confidence. He's a Sunday school teacher and deacon in his Baptist church.

So Mr. Snipes takes a look at that, and he's willing to entertain ARL's tax advice. He's not fired Starr yet.

We're going to get to this. You're going to get to see the letter, June 29, 2000, that the prosecution has indicated says Starr fired Snipes. Pinpoint that letter; take a look at it. Starr didn't fire Snipes in that letter. What Starr did is wished Wesley Snipes good luck. They said, Good luck in your new tax endeavors with those folks. We don't agree. We don't agree with them. But, hey, by the way, could we keep managing your foreign investments through Goldman Sachs and Blackstone? Come on. ARL, you know -- you got the Starr folk. Wesley Snipes was an extremely valuable property, and the letter -- you can take a look at it and you -- you decide for yourselves whether anybody fired anybody in that letter.

The other thing ARL showed to Mr. Snipes was actual IRS refund checks that their procedures had gotten for clients. And they say, Mr. Snipes, the IRS owes you money, and they show him actual refund checks. There are a battery of attorneys, CPAs and enrolled agents.

So Mr. Snipes, April 2000, upper right-hand corner, third box from the left -- Wesley Snipes goes directly to the IRS for answers, and he follows published IRS procedures,

published procedures, authorized and approved.

So what does he do? He's got a couple of questions. Do you owe me money? Do I owe you money? He talks to the ARL people and they say, Look, you paid \$4.3 million in 1996 in tax. You didn't have to pay it. And you paid \$7.3 million in tax in 1997, and you didn't have to pay that either.

And for the first time in Wesley Snipes' life, tax advisors open up the books. They open up the holy books there, the tax law. They crack the books, and they give him court cases, statutes, regulations, and code sections.

They say, Look, our CPAs and lawyers and our enrolled agents -- this is the deal, and it's supported by the law. And he becomes extremely intrigued with this idea that there's actual law that you can have recourse to and figure out what's going on.

Of course, he hadn't read all that stuff. I doubt that any human being in the United States of America has.

The government talked about an affidavit of incompetency, and that's actually one of the alleged affirmative acts of the conspiracy. And what Wesley Snipes said in this affidavit of incompetency was, I don't get that stuff. I don't understand that. Sit down with me. Audit me. I stand ready to pay and file. That's what the evidence will show.

So he files a claim for refund. What does that

claim for refund look like? First of all, he uses published IRS forms; we call them red-flag forms. He filed a 1040X. Some of you may have seen a 1040X. This is the IRS form that you fill out to file claim for refund. And the IRS' own published website says there's billions of dollars of unclaimed refunds, and they say the reason people don't get them is they don't file the claims for refund.

Well, they said file that claim for refund, and he uses red-flag forms. Attached to the 1040X -- and you'll see these forms -- is a Form 8275. This is a special red-flag form. When a taxpayer wants to take a position that's controversial, they attach that 8275 behind the 1040X, and they tell the IRS, This is controversial. You'll probably disagree with the position, but I'll be able to get an adjudication ultimately in a civil tax court about whether I'm right. But it's a red flag. It's a special form designed to tell the IRS that this is a controversial position.

Remember what we talked about -- trickery, deceit, a specific intent to violate the law -- he went right to the IRS, used their own forms and the 8275.

What other red flags were there? His name is Wesley Snipes. That's a pretty big red flag. And the claims he was making were 4.3 million and \$7.3 million, respectively, 1996 and 1997 -- special attention for these forms.

And you'll be called upon to decide whether those

were acts of some secret conspiracy to defraud the IRS and, with respect to Count Two, the false claim, whether doing that is a willful, intentional attempt on Mr. Snipes' part to act to violate the law. You'll be called upon to determine that, on the IRS' own forms, 1040X, 8275.

And then there's a big narrative on the 8275 that will explain in detail the position that Mr. Snipes is taking based on the advice of the ARL CPAs, attorneys, and enrolled agents.

Now, June 2001, Wesley Snipes, for taxes that haven't been paid for years in which either little tax has been paid or no tax has been paid, he says, Do I owe you money? And he sends a letter to the IRS chief counsel. The IRS chief counsel is the top lawyer in the IRS. He pays a fee, a \$275 fee, and he's asking for a tax status determination. He's going right to the IRS, directly to the IRS, filing their fees -- their forms saying, Tell me what my tax status is.

A funny thing happens when he files that. The national chief counsel kicks it back down to the local district director's office. They say, We can't deal with that. We can't give you a tax status determination letter. The evidence will show this.

District director Teresa Franklin -- she finds the local district director, and she says, You know, I can't deal

with this either. They kick it around back and forth all over the place.

2.4

And finally they say, Look, we can't tell you whether you're required to file a tax return until you file the return. Welcome to the wacky world of the IRS. We can't tell you whether you're supposed to file a return until you file the return.

Frustrating experience. The evidence will show a lot of frustration with the bureaucratic apparatus of the IRS.

Now, very briefly I want to talk about, what was the IRS' response? The prosecution has talked about letters from the IRS to Mr. Snipes. You'll see these letters. I'm not going to go through them now. You'll see them in evidence.

We'll talk about them in close.

The majority of the letters are what we call computer-generated letters. The IRS has files -- you hear about these files called master files, and the IRS keeps a master file on each and every tax-paying American with detailed information about every single thing related to your tax finances. And we'll talk about this a little bit later, and these will come into evidence. These transcripts are coded, so you have to have an IRS decoding manual to figure out what most of it means.

So they boot that around and finally say, We can't tell you whether you're supposed to file a return until you

file it.

2.0

With respect to the refund claim, here's where the failures are, and the evidence will show that. There are specific published IRS procedures that they are supposed to follow when somebody files a claim for refund and when somebody files a request for a tax status determination. None of that was done.

Computer-aided -- computer-generated little letters are sent to Mr. Snipes saying, Hey, we haven't heard from you in a while. You haven't filed a return. Then they say, If you don't believe you're required to file a return, let us know why. These are generated by computer.

There is one letter in there where the IRS sent this frivolous notice to one of Mr. Snipes' tax advisors, and that will come into the record. And the record will show that ARL responded to each and every IRS letter. And there weren't that many -- three, four, five. You can take a look at them for yourselves and figure out whether they contain answers to questions. So no real answers from IRS.

With respect to the refund claim, here's how it goes. You're going to see some published IRS tax procedures. The IRS is supposed to send a notice of disallowance saying we disagree with your refund claim. Then you get a conference if you don't like it. Then you get a civil appeal if you don't like it. And ultimately you get into Tax Court where a

Federal Judge determines who owes who money.

2.0

Never sent that. Never sent the notice of disallowance. Instead, they send this frivolous notice to his lawyer saying, We don't like your questions. We don't think you're serious.

He thought he was being serious. Mr. Snipes thought he was being serious. The evidence will show that he was being serious. So no notice of disallowance, no conferences, no appeals, no Tax Court.

Now, with respect to this box over here, June 2001, this is the tax status determination letter. They are specific procedures there.

At the end of the day, when you ask for one of these, they are supposed to send you a preliminary letter, and ultimately we get a notice of deficiency.

Now, there's some substantive tax law we're talking about here, and it can get complicated. But this is basic stuff -- the IRS' obligations to do certain things when taxpayers use published IRS forms and approved IRS procedures, and none of that was done.

So they send that preliminary letter, then a notice of deficiency, and that's your ticket to Tax Court. Oh, joy.

But the evidence will show Mr. Snipes wanted his ticket to Tax Court, and that's where an independent judge gets to determine who owes who money; chips fall where they

may. No notice of deficiency.

2.4

So between March 2000 and May 2002 -- Bret,

please -- Snipes sends around about 21 document packages and

letters to the IRS requesting answers, and what he gets is no

hearings, no conferences, no audits, no appeals, no

disallowance of claim -- that's right over here on the

refund -- and no notice of deficiency so he can go to Tax

Court. Nothing. Zero. A computer-generated letter saying we

don't like your questions; you're not being serious with us.

Thank you, Bret.

Now, as the prosecution talked about, about
May 2002, one of Snipes' lawyers is contacted by the IRS, and
the IRS says, We want to talk to Wesley Snipes. He was
looking forward to that. He had been waiting for six years,
the evidence will show.

So his lawyer and Mr. Snipes get on the phone, and it's an IRS Criminal Investigation Division special agent.

Wesley Snipes is sending letters seeking a sit-down for six years, and the first time the IRS reaches out and tries to talk to him, they give him the Miranda warning, and they tell him, Anything you do can be used against you. That's that Miranda warning. Mr. Snipes takes that seriously, and so does his lawyer.

Now, if he files a 1040 at that point, it's used against him as evidence of guilt; doesn't file a 1040, that's

used against him for a failure to file -- a classic problem.

He's got a problem now, and he's getting frustrated.

There's a lot of frustration here. You'll see that in the testimony and the evidence.

Let me tell you something. You know, you're going to see all these letters. You're going to see these document packages, all sent to the IRS, the vast majority of them with the advice and upon the consultation of the ARL tax attorneys, CPAs and enrolled agents, and you know what? You're going to look at these letters, and you might find that these letters contain very unusual beliefs, beliefs that you don't hold. That's not a crime. It's not a crime to hold unusual beliefs. Not a crime.

I mean, you might even think that some of this stuff borders on being a little bit crazy, but crazy ain't a crime either. If it were, half of Hollywood would be in prison.

It's not a crime.

The government has the burden of proving that Mr. Snipes acted with a specific intent to trick, defraud, deceive, break the law.

Here's what the testimony and evidence will show what he did. So he asked the special agent why he's under criminal investigation. You know, something real interesting happens in May 2004. Wesley Snipes -- we talked about these IRS master files. And he sends what we call a Freedom of

Information Act request, a FOIA.

2.0

And you get to have your master file. You all can get one, too, if you want. And there Mr. Snipes sees a code that says MFR-01. And you'll see evidence about this.

Now, it's all in code, most of it. Your name, address, phone number, Social Security Number is in there. But everything else is coded. So the advisors at ARL show Mr. Snipes the IRS decoding manual. It's called a Document 6209. And there's also a Pocket Transaction Guide. And when you get your FOIA request and you get your master file, there's this handy little Pocket Transaction Guide that will briefly tell you what all the codes mean. Very exciting day.

Now, MFR-01. The code book says to Snipes -- it shows Wesley Snipes that MFR-01 means return not required to be mailed or filed -- further confirmation to Mr. Snipes that the boys at ARL, the attorneys, the CPAs and the enrolled agents, maybe they got the X Files of tax.

You know, we talk about things being too good to be true. We buy a lottery ticket. Is it too good to be true that we win? Sure it is.

But that's what he saw. So what he does is goes right back to the IRS, directly back to the IRS for answers. He writes them a letter. He says, You all gave me my master file, and there's a code in there that says MFR-01. And your decoding manual says return not required to be mailed or

filed. Is that right? Is that correct? No answer from the IRS. No answers, no response.

And then something really interesting happens. The evidence will show that around July 2004 the IRS is shredding Wesley Snipes' documents. You will see testimony and evidence on this. The IRS is shredding Wesley Snipes' documents. I suppose the prosecution can explain that. But the IRS' own records -- their own records as part of the master file and subsidiary files -- in plain language say documents shredded, shredding documents. A lot of frustration here. A lot of frustration.

You'll be called upon to decide whether this sequence of events, whether his letters, his requests for an audit, his declaration to the IRS that he stood ready to pay any and all tax he owed if they would just sit down with him and crack the books -- you'll be called upon to decide what that meant.

Will the government sustain its burden of proof beyond all reasonable doubt that these were acts of some secret conspiracy to defraud the government? Secret conspiracies are engaged in secret, not by going to the government with letters asking for audits.

The judge has talked a little bit about good faith, reliance on counsel, relying on attorneys, accountants and CPAs. There's going to be a ton of evidence about that. But

at the end of the day the core decision for you is whether
Wesley Snipes acted to deceive the IRS with a specific intent
to break the law and that he believed in his heart, in
Mr. Snipes' heart and mind -- it isn't what you think. You
don't have to agree with his beliefs. You might sit back and
say, I wouldn't have done it that way; that was unwise, maybe
even a little crazy. Don't tug on Superman's cape when he
comes at you. That's not what you're called upon to decide.

You're called upon to decide what was in Wesley
Snipes' heart and mind, what he thought, based on the
testimony and evidence. This is the core, critical issue in
this case.

2006, Mr. Snipes is filming overseas, and the Indictment is unsealed while he's filming overseas. And he voluntarily returns to America to stand trial. The government, IRS response -- Indictment.

The testimony and evidence will show that Wesley Snipes did not believe that asking the IRS questions and seeking answers to resolve the conflicting tax advice he was getting about what he was supposed to pay and what he was supposed to file -- the evidence will show that he didn't believe that that was a secret conspiracy to trick or deceive the IRS.

Similarly, the testimony and evidence will show that for that refund claim, Wesley Snipes -- he didn't believe that

sending published IRS red-flag forms to the IRS and seeing if they owed him money was a willful, deceptive, intentional fraud about the government.

2.0

What he thought was, if they denied his claim, he would end up in federal civil court and the chips would fall where they may.

And it's not a question for you to determine whether Wesley Snipes failed to file proper returns for a particular period of years. The question for you is whether he willfully failed to file those returns, based on the testimony and evidence about MFR-01 codes, and the answers that he gets from the IRS is -- it's a Mirandazation. It's about his intent; it's about what he believed in his heart and mind.

And, ladies and gentlemen, I have every confidence that when all of the testimony and evidence is in and based on your careful deliberation, you'll return the only verdict that that evidence allows, and that is not guilty on each and every count of the Indictment.

Thank you for your patience and your time.

THE COURT: Mr. Wilson, did you care to make an opening statement?

MR. WILSON: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.

May it please the Court, counsel.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, my name is David Wilson. I'm proud and privileged today to stand before you

and represent Douglas Rosile.

Doug, stand up, please. Thank you.

Today's one of the two times that I get to talk directly to you about this case. It's a very important time, and I'm going to try to do my best to briefly and succinctly tell you what this case is about and what the evidence will show as it relates to Doug Rosile.

Now, as you've heard and obviously, there are three individuals who are named in this Indictment. Three men stand accused by the government. It's important for you to understand that each of these gentlemen is being tried himself individually. In essence, there are three trials being conducted here today. And in this opening, as in every other point in the trial, I speak for Mr. Rosile. I'm his attorney.

There's going to be a huge amount of evidence in this case. Most of it -- the vast majority of it -- will not even apply to Mr. Rosile.

As you saw in the government's opening with all the boxes, Mr. Rosile made only, in essence, a cameo appearance. He was in one box.

Sometimes I may cross-examine a witness on the stand simply to determine and to show that the evidence that he is testifying about has nothing to do with Doug Rosile.

When you hear witnesses, when you receive evidence, when you see documents, ask yourself, who does this evidence

apply to? Does it apply to Doug Rosile? What will be shown is the vast majority of it will not apply to Doug Rosile.

2.0

My job is to represent Mr. Rosile, so what I'm going to do is talk about the evidence in this case as it relates to him.

Now, as you've been told by the Judge, my esteemed colleagues, Mr. Meachum, Mr. Bernhoft, and my very worthy adversary, Mr. O'Neill, this is the opening statement of the trial. The purpose of the opening statement is not to tell you what the evidence is. The documents and the witnesses will do that. If the lawyers tried to do that, we'd be here an awfully long time.

So what is an opening statement? Ladies and gentlemen, an opening statement is like preparing someone for a trip that they have never taken before. You try to get them oriented to various signs in the road, certain landmarks so that as they take the trip and they see these signs and landmarks, they understand where they are, where they have been, and where they are going.

My purpose today is to give you a preview of the evidence that will be presented as it relates to Mr. Rosile.

If you don't remember anything else I say in the next few minutes, please remember this: The evidence will not show that Douglas Rosile conspired or agreed with anyone to defraud or cheat the United States of America, the Internal

Revenue Service, or any other governmental agency.

What the evidence will show is that Mr. Kahn had a company called American Rights Litigators, ARL, as you've heard. This company employed numerous individuals -- accountants, attorneys, and people who prepared tax returns.

Now, this company, ARL, advocated a certain position regarding the government's authority to assess and collect income tax, referred to as the 861 argument, the details of which I'm not going to go into.

However, there are perhaps thousands of people who believe the legitimacy of this position and became members or customers of American Rights Litigators, as Mr. Snipes did.

Doug Rosile briefly worked for ARL as a tax preparer. He did so on a time -- on a part-time basis preparing amended tax returns for its customers. That's it.

ARL would furnish Mr. Rosile with the information necessary to prepare an amended tax return. He would do that. He would then give the return back to ARL, and that would be the end of it as far as Mr. Rosile was concerned, as far as his involvement, and for this he would be paid a flat fee. It wasn't much. And ARL would pay him a commission based upon any amounts that were actually refunded to the customers or clients or members of ARL for the returns that Mr. Rosile did.

Mr. Rosile rarely, if ever, had any direct contact with the customers or members of ARL himself. In fact, before

yesterday he never met Mr. Snipes.

2.0

Now, let's talk about the returns that Mr. Rosile prepared. You're going to see some of them. The government has told you the evidence will show that these amended returns were fraudulent or done with the intent to defraud the United States, the government and the IRS, and I respectfully disagree.

What the evidence will show is that Mr. Rosile prepared these returns, these amended tax returns, and to these returns he attached an IRS document. It's been called a red-flag letter. He raised the red flag. And he attached another letter telling the IRS exactly what he was doing. He told them, I'm preparing this return on the basis of this 861 argument or 861 theory. And if you disagree with me, I'm requesting a hearing in front of a judge. If you contend that I'm wrong, I request an administrative hearing in front of a judge. That's it. The evidence is going to show that Mr. Rosile told the IRS exactly what he was doing in black and white.

The evidence will show that the numbers and figures that he used in preparing these amended tax returns were given to him by ARL. He used the numbers that he was furnished. He didn't fudge the numbers. He didn't erase an eight and put a five. He didn't change anything. He used the numbers and figures he was given, furnished by ARL, for the tax return

demonstrating -- his position was that -- or ARL's position, the taxpayer's position, was that they had no tax liability, and they sent it off to the IRS.

Whether they were correct or incorrect is not what you're being asked to decide. It's not what the evidence is about. What the evidence is about is whether the intention on the part of Doug Rosile when he -- when he prepared these returns -- he didn't file them -- he prepared it; he signed it -- was his intention to defraud the government by trickery, deceit? The evidence is going to show that it wasn't.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, over the next couple of days, if not weeks, you're going to be presented with a lot of evidence, a lot. And what I'm going to ask you to do, as you have been asked before, is to keep an open mind, to fairly evaluate the evidence that you see and you're provided in this case, to give Mr. Rosile a fair trial, to give the government a fair trial. That's one thing we all agree on in this courtroom, all the lawyers, that everyone involved in the case should get a fair trial, whether it's Mr. Rosile, Mr. Snipes, Mr. Kahn, the United States government.

So what we're going to ask you to do is keep an open mind, evaluate the evidence. At the end of the case you decide what the facts are. You've decided what the facts are, and the Judge is going to give you the law. You apply those facts to the law as the Judge gives them to you and render

1 what is going to be a fair verdict, and that's what Mr. Rosile is asking for. Mr. Rosile is asking for a fair verdict in 2 3 this case. What Mr. Rosile believes is that the fair verdict in his case, after all the evidence is considered, is not 4 5 guilty. Thank you. THE COURT: Mr. Kahn, you have the opportunity to 6 7 make an opening statement, if you wish to do so. What's your 8 pleasure? 9 DEFENDANT KAHN: I have a statement, yes, sir. 10 THE COURT: Pardon? DEFENDANT KAHN: I do have a statement. 11 12 THE COURT: All right. 13 MR. BERNHOFT: Your Honor, could I respectfully 14 request a brief sidebar? 15 THE COURT: Very well. 16 MR. BERNHOFT: Thank you, sir. 17 AT SIDEBAR: 18 MR. NIELSEN: Mr. Kahn wishes to come up. THE COURT: Sure. 19 2.0 DEFENDANT KAHN: Yes, sir. 21 MR. BERNHOFT: Your Honor, I'm very concerned that 22 the jury is seeing a co-defendant not participating in the 23 trial and reading statements into the record. He's going to 24 produce a taint against Mr. Snipes and against the other

co-defendants. I would respectfully move to sever these

25

defendants.

In the alternative, this could be done outside the hearing of the jury. This won't have anything to do with the determination of guilt or innocence whatsoever. Mr. Kahn's statements are statements regarding the jurisdiction and authority of the Court. They are purely legal matters, and the jury wouldn't be entitled to consider them, in all events.

THE COURT: Well, it's anticipatory, I think,

Mr. Bernhoft. I don't have any idea what Mr. Kahn is about to say.

MR. BERNHOFT: Once those bells are rung, Judge, you can't unring them.

THE COURT: Sure you can. It's easy to do in most instances. The jury has more integrity than anybody in the courtroom. If --

MR. BERNHOFT: I agree. Nevertheless...

THE COURT: All right. Well, I'll deny the motion to sever. I heard that. We'll hear what Mr. Kahn has to say.

Now, if you're making an opening statement,

Mr. Kahn, it should be limited to what you expect the evidence to show or not show in the trial of this case and not other

22 matters. You understand?

DEFENDANT KAHN: I will tell you what I was going to say.

25 THE COURT: No. You can tell the jury. And if

1 there's objection, I'll pass on it and direct you accordingly. 2 DEFENDANT KAHN: All right. 3 IN OPEN COURT: DEFENDANT KAHN: Ladies and gentlemen, I have a 4 short statement to make here. I'm going to read it. It's because of the reasons listed in my statement of -- for the 6 record of January 14 in which I stated that it's my belief 7 8 based on Judge Hodges' oath of office and appointment affidavit that he's not an Article III Judge which I have a 9 10 right to have adjudicate any case against me. Therefore, I 11 did not accept Judge Hodges' --12 MR. BERNHOFT: I object. 13 DEFENDANT KAHN: -- offer --MR. BERNHOFT: I must respectfully object. 14 THE COURT: When you address the Court, stand up, 15 16 Mr. Bernhoft. 17 MR. BERNHOFT: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Well, I'll sustain that objection, 18 Mr. Kahn. 19 2.0 As I just explained at sidebar, and to the members of the jury, the function of an opening statement is for 21 22 counsel and the parties to have an opportunity to address what

23

24

25

they expect the evidence will show or not show in the case, as

evidence that will be presented. As you just said, Mr. Kahn,

you've heard. And I don't believe that this relates to

you have made that statement and that point a part of the record.

If you have some statement you wish to make to

If you have some statement you wish to make to the jury concerning the evidence to be presented, you may.

DEFENDANT KAHN: Well, no, sir, I don't. I was just going to explain to them why I'm not participating in the trial.

THE COURT: Well, I think you've done that.

DEFENDANT KAHN: Then I --

THE COURT: I will explain to the jury -- you correct me if I'm wrong -- you have announced that you will not be participating because you do not believe that the Court has jurisdiction to proceed with this matter against you.

DEFENDANT KAHN: Yes, sir, that's exactly what I was saying.

THE COURT: Okay.

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

DEFENDANT KAHN: And that's what I wanted to explain to them.

THE COURT: All right. They understand that, then.

DEFENDANT KAHN: All right. Thank you.

THE COURT: And, members of the jury, that then completes the opening statements of counsel. The next phase of the trial that we will now enter is the calling of witnesses and the presentation of testimony and evidence for your consideration by the United States during the

government's case-in-chief.

2.4

It's 14 minutes to 12:00. It seems to me this is an appropriate place to stop for an early lunch break. We could barely get a witness sworn before we would come to the lunch hour. So we'll stop for lunch until -- let's make it 1:15, and we will commence with the testimony and evidence this afternoon.

Please remember, as I know you will now since this is our first break after the trial itself has begun, that you should be careful to avoid any conversations or discussions with others during this or any other recess.

And by the way, those of you who do regularly subscribe to newspapers at home and wish to have newspapers available to you to read during breaks in these proceedings, if you will notify the clerk concerning the newspaper that you would like to have, we will try to see that one is obtained each morning and is edited to remove any reference that might be made in the paper to this case; and then you'll have your newspaper to read at your leisure and avoid the likelihood of being exposed through that process to anything having to do with the case.

How many of you would like to take advantage of that opportunity? Anybody? Nobody.

Well, if you change your mind, let us know and we can provide newspapers for you in the jury room.

```
1
                We will recess for lunch until 1:15.
                (The luncheon recess was taken.)
 2
 3
                (Jury present.)
                THE COURT: Thank you. Be seated, please, members
 4
      of the jury.
                Mr. O'Neill, are you ready to call your first
 6
 7
      witness?
                MR. O'NEILL: Yes, Your Honor. I believe Mr. Morris
 8
      is taking this witness.
 9
10
                THE COURT: Mr. Morris.
                MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, at this time the United
11
      States would call Brian Tucker.
12
                         *** BRIAN TUCKER was sworn
13
                          by the Deputy Clerk ***
14
15
                THE DEPUTY CLERK: Please have a seat.
                Would you state your name, and spell your last name
16
      for the record.
17
                THE WITNESS: My name is Brian Tucker. My last name
18
      is spelled T-u-c-k-e-r.
19
2.0
                MR. MORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.
21
                               BRIAN TUCKER,
      having been duly sworn, testified as follows:
22
23
                             DIRECT EXAMINATION
      BY MR. MORRIS:
24
      Q Mr. Tucker, how are you employed?
25
```

- 1 A I am employed by the Internal Revenue Service, criminal
- 2 investigation.
- 3 Q How long have you been so employed?
- 4 A I've been employed by the Internal Revenue Service
- 5 criminal investigations since June of 2005.
- 6 | Q Prior to that time, how were you employed?
- 7 A I was in public accounting for approximately eight years,
- 8 | and I worked for a number of public accounting firms.
- 9 Q Would you tell us briefly about your educational
- 10 background and your training.
- 11 A I received a bachelor's of science degree from the State
- 12 University of New York at Albany, and I also stayed there and
- received a master's of science degree in taxation.
- 14 Q Special Agent Tucker, are you one of the case agents
- 15 | that's been assigned to this case?
- 16 A No, sir.
- 17 Q What have your duties or responsibilities been with regard
- 18 to this case?
- 19 A When this case became close to trial, I was assigned to
- 20 assist with trial preparations.
- 21 | Q Would you tell us about some of the duties that you
- 22 performed in helping prepare for trial.
- 23 A I assisted with the witness coordination, and I also
- assisted obtaining certifications for business records.
- 25 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, may I get some of the

- 1 government's exhibits and approach the witness?
- 2 THE COURT: Surely. And when you are dealing with
- 3 exhibits, Mr. Morris, and for the benefit of all counsel, you
- 4 may approach the witness without requesting permission, if it
- 5 is to deal with an exhibit.
- 6 MR. MORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 7 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 8 | Q Special Agent Tucker, I have just handed you what's been
- 9 marked for identification as Government's Exhibits 1-1, 1-2
- 10 and 1-3. Would you look at the records inside of those
- 11 | folders and tell me if you recognize them?
- 12 A I do recognize them.
- 13 | Q With regard to Government's Exhibit 1-1, what is that
- 14 exhibit?
- 15 A This exhibit is a Division of Driver's License transcript
- 16 of driver's record from the State of Florida for Wesley Trent
- 17 | Snipes.
- 18 Q Has that document been certified as a public document?
- 19 A Yes, it has.
- 20 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, at this time we would offer
- 21 into evidence Government's Exhibit 1-1.
- 22 MR. BARNES: Object, Your Honor, under hearsay
- 23 grounds.
- 24 THE COURT: I will overrule that objection and,
- 25 hearing none other, will receive it in evidence.

- 1 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 2 Q With regard to Government's Exhibits 1-2 and 1-3, what are
- 3 those exhibits?
- 4 A These exhibits are driver's license information from the
- 5 State of Florida for Wesley Snipes.
- 6 Q Are they certified?
- 7 A Yes, they are certified.
- 8 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, we would offer into
- 9 evidence Government's Exhibits 1-2 and 1-3.
- MR. BARNES: Same objection, Your Honor.
- 11 THE COURT: All right. And I will make the same
- 12 ruling, and receive both in evidence.
- 13 MR. MORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor. And may we
- 14 | publish the exhibits to the jury?
- THE COURT: Very well.
- 16 MR. MORRIS: Would you please publish Exhibit 1-1.
- 17 | Could we please focus in on the upper left-hand corner of that
- 18 document.
- 19 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 20 | Q Mr. Tucker, would you read the information contained in
- 21 that box.
- 22 A The first name, Wesley; middle or maiden, Trent; last,
- 23 | Snipes.
- Q What is the address specified there?
- 25 A 9711 Deacon Court, Windermere, Orange, 34786-8942.

- 1 | Q And can we focus on the top of the document in the middle,
- 2 please.
- What does that say?
- 4 A State of Florida.
- 5 0 Please continue.
- 6 A Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles, Division
- 7 of Driver License, Transcript of Driver Record.
- 8 Q And in the box right immediately below that, what is the
- 9 date of issuance?
- 10 A Date issued is July 15th, 2004.
- 11 | Q And what is the expiration date?
- 12 A The expiration date is July 31, 2010.
- THE COURT: Would you please publish Exhibit 1-2.
- 14 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 15 Q Focusing in on the information in the middle of the page,
- 16 would you read what date this driver's license transaction
- 17 occurred on?
- 18 A This occurred on August 20th of 1997.
- 19 Q And what is the name and address specified there?
- 20 A Wesley Trent Snipes, 9711 Deacon, Windermere, Florida,
- 21 34786.
- 22 | O And what is the date of issuance?
- 23 A The issue date is August 20th, 1997.
- 24 | Q And what is the expiration date?
- 25 A The expiration date is July 31st of 2004.

- 1 | Q And would you publish Government's Exhibit 1-3, please.
- 2 | Special Agent Tucker, is this a similar record?
- 3 A Yes, sir.
- 4 Q With a different transaction date?
- 5 A Yes, sir.
- 6 Q What's the transaction date?
- 7 A The transaction date is July 15th of 2004.
- 8 Q What's the name and address?
- 9 A Wesley Trent Snipes, 9711 Deacon Court, Windermere,
- 10 Florida, 34786-8942.
- 11 Q What's the date of issuance on this record?
- 12 A July 15th, 2004.
- 13 | Q What's the date of expiration?
- 14 | A July 31st, 2010.
- 15 Q Thank you. I am handing you what's been marked for
- 16 | identification as Government's Exhibits 2-1 through 2-4.
- 17 | Would you look at those and tell me if you recognize those,
- 18 please.
- 19 A I recognize these documents.
- 20 Q Generally speaking, what are those documents?
- 21 A These are real estate documents filed with the comptroller
- of Orange County, Florida for Wesley Snipes.
- 23 | Q Do they pertain to land records?
- 24 A Yes, sir.
- 25 Q Are they certified copies?

- A Yes, sir, they are certified.
- 2 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, we would offer into
- 3 evidence Government's Exhibits 2-1, 2-2, 2-3 and 2-4.
- 4 MR. BARNES: We object, Your Honor, on Rule 402,
- 5 403, and hearsay, Your Honor.
- 6 THE COURT: Well, I will overrule those objections,
- 7 | the latter one under Rule 803(8), I think, given the
- 8 identification of the witness. Each of those exhibits is
- 9 received in evidence.
- Go ahead, Mr. Morris.
- 11 | MR. MORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.
- May we publish 2-1.
- 13 BY MR. MORRIS:

1

- 14 Q Mr. Tucker, if we could look at the top part of that
- document, would you read the title of that document.
- 16 A "Declaration of Allodium Freehold Title Land Patent, Deed
- 17 at Common Law."
- 18 | Q Would you read the first paragraph?
- 19 A "I, Wesley Trent Snipes, a Article Four, Section Two
- 20 Citizens of the Republic, State of Florida, and member of the
- 21 De jure Sovereign Body, as ordained and established by we, the
- 22 people."
- 23 Q And would you read the next sentence.
- 24 A "Therefore, be it known to all men that I am entitled and
- am claiming all of my common law rights and protection,

- 1 | guaranteed by the Constitution of the State of Florida,
- 2 Republic, and the Constitution of the United States of
- 3 | America. I do declare by this document to one and all, under
- 4 | penalties of perjury, to be the lawful assign of Franklin
- 5 | Sheen, patentee of land patent, May 23rd, 1891, Number 14183."
- 6 0 Please continue.
- 7 A "We, as his assigns, are claimant and sole owners of the
- 8 following allodial property, paid for by my labor, to wit,
- 9 Federal land patents and map showing boundary survey being
- 10 duly recorded in the county Clerk's Office of Record Book 16,
- 11 Page Number 118 to 130, recorded 8/12/93, attached as
- exhibits, and by reference made a part hereof, do declare our
- rights as assigns of the United States land patent as
- 14 described above to the segregated of the parcel of the
- 15 original land patent as follows, viz."
- 16 | Q Can we please go down to the next paragraph. Do you see
- 17 | the line, several lines down below that says "more commonly
- 18 known as"?
- 19 A Yes, sir.
- 20 Q What's the address that's specified as "more commonly
- 21 known as"?
- 22 A 9711 Deacon Court, Windermere, Florida, 34786.
- 23 | Q Skipping down to the paragraph that begins "This
- 24 property, " would you read that first sentence.
- 25 A "This property is mine to hold and to have to myself and

- 1 to my posterity or assigns without conditions or restriction
- 2 pursuant to United States Land Patent 141183, issued to
- 3 | Franklin Sheen on May 23rd, 1891 by the United States Bureau
- 4 of Land Management as the original land patent holder."
- 5 Q Thank you. And going down to near the bottom of the
- 6 document, is there a name under the signature block?
- 7 A Yes, sir.
- 8 Q What's the name written under the signature block?
- 9 A Wesley Trent Snipes.
- 10 | Q Now, are there attachments to that document that you just
- 11 read from?
- 12 A Yes, sir.
- 13 Q Going to the next page, please, would you read the title
- of that document.
- 15 A "Satisfaction of Mortgage."
- 16 Q And going on to the next document, would you read the
- 17 | title of that document.
- 18 | A Quitclaim deed.
- 19 Q And would you read the top part of that document,
- 20 beginning "this quitclaim deed."
- 21 A "This quitclaim deed, executed this 12th day of August
- 22 A.D. 1993 by Amen Ra Films, Inc., first party to Wesley
- 23 | Snipes, whose post office address is 9711 Deacon Court,
- 24 Windermere, Florida, 34786.
- 25 Q And going down to the signature block area, would you read

- 1 | that, please.
- 2 A Amen Ra Films.
- 3 | Q Excuse me. On the right-hand side, what does the
- 4 | signature block say?
- 5 | A It says Amen Ra Films, comma, Inc., by Wesley Snipes,
- 6 | Wesley Snipes, President, 9711 Deacon Court, Windermere,
- 7 Florida, 34786.
- 8 Q And going to the next page, please, would you read the top
- 9 portion of that document, beginning with "This warranty deed."
- 10 A "This warranty deed, made the 26th day of March A.D. 1992,
- 11 by Raymond T. Coudriet and Jalinda Coudriet, his wife,
- 12 hereinafter called `the Grantor,' to Amen Ra Films, Inc.,
- 13 whose post office address is 9711 Deacon Court, Windermere,
- 14 Florida, 34786, hereinafter called `the Grantee.'"
- 15 Q Thank you. Referring back up to the top, would you tell
- 16 us again what the date of that warranty deed is, the line that
- 17 says "This warranty deed made."
- 18 A "This warranty deed made the 26th day of March A.D. 1992.
- 19 Q And going back to the previous page, please, what is the
- 20 date of this quitclaim deed going from Amen Ra Films to Wesley
- 21 | Snipes?
- 22 A Executed this 12th day of August A.D. 1993.
- 23 Q Thank you. May we publish Government's Exhibit 2-2.
- 24 Focusing in on the heading there, would you read the heading
- 25 please, Mr. Tucker.

- 1 A "Affidavit of Asseveration and Revocation of Power."
- 2 Q And would you read the body of that first paragraph there.
- 3 A "This is to certify that I, Wesley Trent Snipes, am a free
- 4 and natural person living under the common law, having assumed
- 5 among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station
- 6 to which the laws of nature's God entitles me in order to
- 7 | secure the blessing of liberty to myself and my posterity and
- in order to reacquire the birthright as a member of the
- 9 sovereign body to asseverate and revoke all feudatory
- 10 contracts with the Federal government and its agencies and
- 11 | with the State of Florida and its agencies, so help me God."
- 12 Q And going down, would you read the next line on the
- 13 | signature block, please.
- 14 A Dated this 21st of February in the year of our Lord 2003.
- 15 | Q What does the signature block say?
- 16 A Wesley Trent Snipes, Sui juris.
- 17 | O Please continue.
- 18 A "Citizen of the State of Florida, care of 9711 Deacon
- 19 Court, Windermere, Florida, State, non-domestic postal zone
- 20 34786."
- 21 | Q Going up to the top of the document, in the upper
- 22 right-hand corner, what does that stamp indicate?
- 23 A That stamp indicates that this was filed with the
- 24 comptroller of Orange County, Florida on March 4th of 2003.
- 25 Q Is Orange County in the Middle District of Florida?

- 1 A Yes, sir.
- 2 Q May we publish Government's Exhibit 2-3. The upper
- 3 | right-hand corner, is there another stamp from the Orange
- 4 | County office?
- 5 A Yes, sir.
- 6 Q And would you read the title of this document.
- 7 A "Declaration of Homestead."
- 8 | Q Please read the next line and that paragraph beginning "I,
- 9 | Wesley Trent Snipes."
- 10 A "United States of America Homestead Act of 1862. I,
- 11 | Wesley Trent Snipes, taking up dwelling at 9711 Deacon Court,
- 12 | Windermere, Florida, Orange County, desire to avail himself of
- 13 the benefit of the provisions of the United States of America
- 14 Homestead Act of 1862, Section Four, and the Constitutions of
- 15 the United States and the State of Florida, and all laws
- 16 exempting property as a homestead from forced sale under any
- 17 process of law, or liable for the satisfaction of any debt
- 18 contracted prior to the issuance of the original land patent,
- 19 make this statement describing the real property declared to
- 20 be exempt, situated in the County of Orange, Florida, State."
- 21 Q And going down a couple of lines, about four lines to the
- 22 line beginning "commonly known as," would you read that,
- 23 please.
- 24 A "Commonly known as 9711 Deacon Court, Windermere, Florida,
- 25 34786."

- 1 | Q And in the signature area, who is listed as the
- 2 homesteader?
- 3 A Wesley Trent Snipes.
- 4 Q Thank you. And may we publish Government's Exhibit 2-4.
- 5 | Looking up at the top right-hand corner, is there a stamp from
- 6 Orange County?
- 7 A Yes, sir.
- 8 Q And would you read the title of this document and who it
- 9 says it is prepared by.
- 10 A "Declaration of National De jure Domicile, Floridian,
- 11 | prepared by Wesley Trent Snipes, 9711 Deacon Court,
- 12 | Windermere, republic of the Florida."
- 13 Q And would you read the first paragraph, please.
- 14 A "I, Wesley Trent Snipes, hereby make this Declaration of
- 15 National De Jure Domicile of the Florida Republic that I am
- 16 | filing in the Orange County official records department for
- 17 | the purpose of establishing my Florida state nationality in
- 18 accordance with the United States government printing office
- 19 style manual 2000, Chapter 5, page 73 5.23, in designating
- 20 natives of the several states, the following forms will be
- 21 used: Floridian."
- 22 O And would you read the next paragraph, please.
- 23 A "I hereby declare on this day that I have my national de
- 24 jure domicile in the Florida Republic since 1977, and have
- 25 from the day of June 27th of 1977 to this date maintained the

- 1 | place of my national de jure domicile in the County of the
- 2 Orange, Florida State, Republic. I am currently deed holder
- 3 | to the house and on the land as described below."
- 4 | Q And skipping down below several lines, do you see -- would
- 5 | you go down further, please -- do you see an address specified
- 6 there?
- 7 A Yes, sir.
- 8 Q Please read that.
- 9 A 9711 Deacon Court, Windermere, Republic of Florida.
- 10 | Q And would you read the next paragraph.
- 11 | A "Which house I recognize and intend to have and maintain
- 12 as my permanent home court and national de jure domicile. And
- 13 if I have or obtain another house or houses in some other
- 14 national state or states, I hereby declare that the
- above-described house in the Florida Republic constitutes my
- 16 | predominant and principal house, and that intend to continue
- 17 | it permanently as such."
- 18 Q Going to the next page, please, would you look at the
- 19 signature block there. Can you make out the signature there
- 20 as it appears to you?
- 21 A Wesley Trent Snipes.
- 22 | O And down below, do you also see a similar signature?
- 23 A Yes, sir.
- 24 | Q Showing you what's been marked for identification as
- 25 Government's Exhibit 2-5. Do you recognize that, sir?

- 1 A Yes, I do.
- 2 | Q What is that?
- 3 A This is a Second Amended Verified Complaint for damages in
- 4 | the case of SST Sterling Swiss Trust, 1987 A.G., and Wesley
- 5 | Snipes versus --
- 6 Q Who is the party that it's against?
- 7 A New Line Cinema Corporation.
- 8 Q Are there other parties listed, as well?
- 9 A Yes, sir.
- 10 O And what date is that filed?
- 11 A It's filed on August 22nd of 2005.
- 12 Q And is that a certified court document?
- 13 A Yes, sir.
- 14 Q Would you look on the back of the document. Is there a
- 15 | certificate or a seal?
- 16 A Yes, sir.
- MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, at this time we would offer
- 18 | Government's Exhibit 2-5.
- 19 THE COURT: Any objection?
- 20 Hearing none, I will receive it in evidence.
- 21 MR. MORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.
- May we publish 2-5, please, the first page.
- 23 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 24 Q I think you have talked about some of this information,
- 25 but let's highlight it quickly, Special Agent Tucker. In the

- 1 upper right-hand corner, is there a file date stamp there?
- 2 A Yes, sir.
- 3 Q It is a little faint on the screen, but can you read that
- 4 date that's in the file stamp?
- 5 A Filed Clerk, U.S. District Court, August 22nd, 2005.
- 6 Q And then going down to the middle of the page, what court
- 7 | was this filed in? In the middle of the page, do you see
- 8 "United States District Court"?
- 9 A United States District Court, Central District of
- 10 California.
- 11 | Q And on the left-hand side, would you read again the
- 12 parties.
- 13 A SST Sterling Swiss Trust, 1987 A.G., a trust formed under
- 14 the laws of Switzerland, and Wesley Snipes, Plaintiffs, versus
- 15 New Line Cinema Corporation, a California corporation; New
- 16 Line Productions, Inc., a California corporation; Avery Pix,
- 17 Inc., a California corporation; ABC Corporation, XYZ
- 18 Partnership, and Does One through and including 50, whose
- 19 identities are unknown to Plaintiffs, Defendants.
- 20 Q Flipping to the second page of that document, do you see
- 21 near the bottom a section entitled "Parties"?
- 22 A Yes, sir.
- 23 Q Do you see a paragraph numbered (5)?
- 24 A Yes, sir.
- 25 Q Would you read that paragraph, please.

- 1 A "Plaintiff Snipes is a natural person and is a citizen and
- 2 resident of the State of Florida."
- 3 | Q Thank you. Going to page 38 of that document, which is
- 4 Bates Number WS-17359, and up at the top, do you see the
- 5 verification paragraph there?
- 6 A Yes, sir.
- 7 | Q Could you read that, please.
- 8 A "Wesley Snipes states that he is a Plaintiff in the
- 9 above-entitled action, and that he has read the foregoing
- 10 | Second Amended Complaint, knows the contents thereof, and that
- 11 the same is true and correct, except as to those matters
- 12 therein stated on information and belief and as to those
- 13 matters he believes them to be true and correct, under penalty
- 14 of perjury under the laws of the United States of America,
- executed on August 18th, 2005."
- 16 Q And what is the name under the signature line there?
- 17 A Wesley Snipes, Steward.
- 18 Q Thank you.
- 19 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, may I confer quickly with
- 20 counsel.
- 21 THE COURT: You may.
- "Conference between counsel."
- 23 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 24 | Q Special Agent Tucker, I would now like to show you a
- 25 number of exhibits that I will refer generically to as bank

- 1 records. The First is Government's Exhibit 5.
- 2 I am sorry. Let me go in order. Would you look through
- 3 that box, please, and tell me the numbers of the Government's
- 4 exhibits that are contained within that box.
- 5 A 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3.
- 6 Q And would you describe for us what those records are.
- 7 A These documents are bank records from Bank of America.
- 8 Q And have they been certified by a records custodian for
- 9 Bank of America?
- 10 A Yes, they have been certified.
- 11 Q And, again, what are the exhibit numbers, 3-1 through 3-
- 12 | what?
- 13 A 3-1, 3-2 and 3-3.
- 14 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, at this time we would offer
- 15 those into evidence.
- 16 THE COURT: Any objection?
- MR. BARNES: No objection, Judge.
- 18 THE COURT: All right. I will receive in evidence
- 19 3-1, -2 and -3.
- 20 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 21 Q Contained within that box, are also 3-4, -5, -6, -7, -8
- 22 and -9, Special Agent Tucker?
- 23 A Yes, sir.
- 24 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, we would also offer those
- 25 into evidence at this time.

- THE COURT: Which exhibits, Mr. Morris?
- 2 MR. MORRIS: 3-4 through 3-9, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: 3-4 through -9 are offered. Any
- 4 | objection to those?
- 5 MR. BARNES: No objection, Judge.
- 6 THE COURT: They are all received.
- 7 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 8 | Q Special Agent Tucker, I would like to now show you three
- 9 boxes of documents marked as Government's Exhibit 4-1 with
- 10 various subparts. Would you tell us what exhibits are in that
- 11 box, please.
- 12 A These are business records from J. P. Morgan Chase.
- 13 Q And what are the exhibit numbers?
- 14 A 4-1, 4-2.
- 15 Q Would you look at that box and tell me what exhibit that
- 16 is and what those are.
- 17 A These documents are a continuation of business records
- 18 from J. P. Morgan Chase. The exhibit numbers are 4-3.
- 19 | Q Showing you the next box of documents. Will you look
- 20 through those quickly, and tell me if those are the
- 21 continuation of the J. P. Morgan documents and what exhibit
- 22 numbers they are.
- 23 A These documents are a continuation of business records
- 24 | from J. P. Morgan Chase, Exhibit Numbers 4-4, 4-5, 4-6, 4-7,
- 25 4-8, 4-9, and 4-10.

- 1 Q Have all of those records been certified by a records
- 2 custodian from J. P. Morgan?
- 3 A Yes. It was included in the first box.
- 4 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, at this time we would offer
- 5 Government's Exhibits 4-1 through 4-10.
- 6 MR. BARNES: No objection, Judge.
- 7 THE COURT: Each is received.
- 8 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 9 Q Special Agent Tucker, going back briefly to Government's
- 10 | Exhibit 3-1 through 3-9, are all of those exhibits, those bank
- 11 records from Bank of America, do they pertain to either Wesley
- 12 | Snipes or an entity related to him?
- 13 A I believe so.
- 14 Q Based on your review of those records, briefly?
- 15 A Yeah, it was -- yes. Yes, sir.
- 16 Q And with regard to Government's Exhibits 4-1 through 4-10,
- 17 same question. Do they appear to relate to Wesley Snipes or
- 18 | an entity related to him?
- 19 A Yes, sir.
- 20 Q Now showing you what's been marked as Government's Exhibit
- 21 | 5, what is that, please?
- 22 A These are business records from Colonial Bank.
- 23 Q Are they certified by a records custodian from Colonial
- 24 Bank?
- 25 A Yes, sir.

- 1 | MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, we would offer Government's
- 2 Exhibit 5.
- MR. BARNES: No objection, Judge.
- 4 THE COURT: It's received.
- 5 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 6 Q Showing you what's been marked for identification as
- 7 | Government's Exhibit 6, Government's Exhibit 7. Would you
- 8 | tell us what those are, please.
- 9 A Exhibit 6 are business records from Lazard Asset
- 10 Management.
- 11 Q Do they relate to Wesley Snipes?
- 12 A Yes, sir.
- 13 | Q And how about Number 7?
- 14 A Exhibit 7 are business records from UBS Financial
- 15 Services.
- 16 Q Do they relate to Wesley Snipes?
- 17 A Yes, sir.
- 18 Q Are those each certified by records custodians for the
- 19 respective entities?
- 20 A Yes, sir.
- 21 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, we would offer them into
- 22 evidence at this time.
- MR. BARNES: No objection, Judge.
- 24 THE COURT: 6 and 7 you are offering, Mr. Morris?
- 25 MR. MORRIS: Yes, Your Honor.

- 1 THE COURT: Both are received.
- 2 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 3 | Q Now I place before you a box containing several exhibits
- 4 | that have been marked for identification. Would you look at
- 5 those and tell us what the exhibits are and briefly describe
- 6 what they are.
- 7 A Exhibit 8 are business records from American Express.
- 8 Q Do they pertain to Wesley Snipes?
- 9 A Yes, sir.
- 10 | Q And Exhibit 9?
- 11 | A Exhibit 9 is business records from United Talent Agency.
- 12 Q Do they pertain to Wesley Snipes?
- 13 A Yes, sir.
- 14 | O Exhibit 10?
- 15 A Exhibit 10 is business records from Undisputed
- 16 Productions, Millennium Films.
- 17 | Q Do they pertain to Wesley Snipes?
- 18 A Yes, sir.
- 19 O And Exhibit 11?
- 20 A Business records from Axium International Services.
- 21 | Q Do they pertain to Wesley Snipes?
- 22 A Yes, sir.
- 23 | Q Exhibit 12, please.
- 24 A Business records from Paramount Pictures Corporation.
- 25 | Q Pertaining to Wesley Snipes?

- 1 A Yes, sir.
- 2 Q Exhibit 13, please. Can you tell us what Exhibit 13 is.
- 3 A Business records from Goldman Sachs.
- 4 Q Do they pertain to Wesley Snipes?
- 5 A Yes, sir.
- 6 Q Would you tell us what Exhibit 14 is.
- 7 A Business records from Miramax Films.
- 8 | Q Pertaining to Wesley Snipes?
- 9 A Yes, sir.
- 10 | Q Would you tell us what Exhibit 15 is, please.
- 11 A Business records from Cast & Crew.
- 12 | Q Do they pertain to Wesley Snipes?
- 13 A Yes, sir.
- 14 | Q And Exhibit 16?
- 15 A Business records from New Line Cinema.
- 16 Q Do they pertain to Wesley Snipes?
- 17 A Yes, sir.
- 18 Q Are all of those records that you have gone through, have
- 19 they all been certified by a records custodian for the
- 20 respective businesses?
- 21 A Yes, sir.
- 22 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, at this time we would offer
- 23 Government's Exhibits 8 through 16.
- 24 MR. BARNES: No objection, Judge.
- 25 THE COURT: They are each received.

- 1 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 2 Q I am now showing you a box containing a number of
- 3 | exhibits. I would like you to look first at Government's
- 4 Exhibits 17 through 28 that have been marked for
- 5 | identification. If you could please go through and identify,
- 6 specify the exhibit, and describe what the records are.
- 7 A Exhibit 17 are business records from 20th Century Fox Film
- 8 | Corporation. Exhibit 18 are business records from the Cinema
- 9 Guild, Inc. Exhibit 19 are business records from
- 10 | Entertainment Partners. Exhibit 20 are business records from
- 11 | SPE Corporate services, Inc.
- 12 Exhibit 21 are business records from Walt Disney Company.
- 13 Exhibit 22 are business records from the William Morris
- 14 Agency. Exhibit 23 are business records from Consolidated
- 15 Artists Payroll Services. Exhibit 24 are business records
- 16 from MTV Networks.
- 17 Exhibit 25 are business records from Elizabeth Singer and
- 18 Associates. Exhibit 26 are business records from Warner
- 19 Brothers Entertainment, Inc. Exhibit 27 are business records
- 20 from Mobius International, Inc. Exhibit 28 are business
- 21 records from Lions Gate Entertainment.
- 22 O Thank you. With regard to all of those exhibits that is
- 23 Government's Exhibits 17 through 28, have they all been
- 24 certified by a records custodian from the respective
- 25 businesses?

- 1 A Yes, sir.
- 2 Q And do all of them relate to Wesley Snipes?
- 3 A Yes, sir.
- 4 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, we would offer them into
- 5 evidence at this time.
- 6 MR. BARNES: No objection.
- 7 THE COURT: That's -- what numbers did you offer,
- 8 Mr. Morris?
- 9 MR. MORRIS: Government's Exhibits 17 through 28.
- 10 THE COURT: All right. Received in evidence.
- MR. MORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 12 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 13 | Q Going next to Government's Exhibit 29, do you see that
- 14 | Mr. Tucker?
- 15 A Yes, sir.
- 16 | O What is that?
- 17 A Business records from Carbone and Faasse, Attorney at Law.
- 18 Q What do they pertain to?
- 19 A Real estate records.
- 20 | Q Pertaining to a purchase of a house?
- 21 A Yes, sir.
- 22 Q Do those records relate to Wesley Snipes?
- 23 A Yes, sir.
- 24 Q Have they been certified by the records custodian for
- 25 Carbone and Faasse?

- 1 A Yes, sir.
- 2 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, we would offer Government's
- 3 Exhibit 29 into evidence.
- 4 MR. BARNES: No objection.
- 5 THE COURT: Government's Exhibit 29 is received.
- 6 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 7 | Q Mr. Tucker, would you look at Government's Exhibit 30,
- 8 | please. Would you describe that for us, please.
- 9 A These are corporate records from the State of Florida for
- 10 Amen Ra Films, Inc.
- 11 Q Are they certified?
- 12 A Yes.
- 13 Q And would you look at the next exhibit, Number 31, please,
- 14 and describe those for us.
- 15 A These are corporate records for Amen Ra Films, Inc. from
- 16 the State of New York.
- 17 | Q And are those certified?
- 18 A Yes, sir.
- 19 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, at this time we would offer
- 20 | Government's Exhibits 30 and 31.
- 21 MR. BARNES: No objection, Your Honor.
- 22 THE COURT: 30 and 31 are received.
- 23 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 24 | Q Would you look at Government's Exhibit 32 that's been
- 25 marked for identification, please, Mr. Tucker. Would you

- 1 describe that for us, please.
- 2 A These are corporate records for Kymberlyte Production
- 3 | Services, International, Inc. from the State of Nevada.
- 4 Q Have they been certified?
- 5 A Yes, sir.
- 6 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, we would offer Government's
- 7 | Exhibit 32 at this time.
- 8 MR. BARNES: No objection, Your Honor.
- 9 THE COURT: It's also received.
- 10 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 11 | Q Would you look at the next exhibit, please, Mr. Tucker,
- 12 Number 33.
- 13 A These are corporate records from the State of California
- 14 Franchise Tax Board.
- 15 Q And what persons or entities do they relate to?
- 16 A They relate to Kymberlyte Production Services, Amen Ra
- 17 | Films, Inc., and Wesley Trent Snipes.
- 18 Q Have those records been certified?
- 19 A Yes, sir.
- 20 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, at this time we would offer
- 21 those into evidence.
- MR. BARNES: Your Honor, we would object on 402,
- 23 403, 404, and hearsay grounds.
- 24 THE COURT: What was the last you said, Mr. Barnes?
- MR. BARNES: Yes, Your Honor. Hearsay would be the

last one.

1

2

3

4

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

24

THE COURT: What do you say to that? These are corporate records, not public records, as I understood the witness. Well, let me correct myself.

These are State of California records, Agent Tucker?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. They are records --

THE COURT: Certified by a state agency?

8 THE WITNESS: Certified by the Franchise Tax Board
9 from the State of California, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I will overrule the objection and receive it in evidence under 803(8).

MR. MORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: With respect to the other objection, I will treat it as a motion to strike, which can be renewed and argued subsequently if it isn't connected up as to relevancy and materiality.

Go ahead, Mr. Morris.

MR. MORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.

19 BY MR. MORRIS:

Q Would you look at Government's Exhibit 34, please, and tell us what that is.

A This is a certificate of marriage for Wesley Trent Snipes and Nakyung Park from the State of New Jersey.

Q Is it certified?

25 A Yes, sir.

- 1 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, we would offer Government's 2 Exhibit 34 into evidence.
- MR. BARNES: No objection, Your Honor.
- 4 THE COURT: It's received.
- 5 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 6 Q Special Agent Tucker, would you look at Government's
- 7 Exhibit 35 that's been marked for identification. Would you
- 8 tell us what that exhibit is.
- 9 A This is an order in the case of the United States of
- 10 America, Plaintiff, versus Eddie Ray Kahn, Defendant, in the
- 11 United States District Court for the Northern District of
- 12 Texas, Dallas Division.
- 13 Q Has that been certified by the clerk?
- 14 A Yes, sir.
- MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, we would offer Government's
- 16 Exhibit 35.
- MR. BARNES: Objection, Your Honor, on 402, 403,
- 18 | 404; and we would renew the motion that Attorney Bernhoft
- 19 raised previously at side-bar earlier.
- 20 THE COURT: What is the date of that order, Agent
- 21 Tucker?
- 22 THE WITNESS: Your Honor, this was signed this 9th
- 23 day of October 1986.
- 24 THE COURT: I will reserve ruling on that one until
- 25 I can hear from counsel, Mr. Morris.

1 MR. MORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, the next exhibits that I intend to 2 3 offer, Government's Exhibit 37 and 38, are the subject of a motion in limine filed on behalf of Mr. Rosile. 4 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Morris. Why don't you lay the predicate without disclosing the content of the 6 7 exhibit, and then I will reserve ruling on that, as well, until I can hear further from counsel. 8 9 MR. MORRIS: Thank you. 10 Special Agent Tucker --11 THE COURT: Excuse me. As to these exhibits, 12 Mr. Wilson, I take it the objection does not go to 13 authenticity, or does it? MR. WILSON: No, the objection does not go to 14 authenticity, Judge. 15 16 THE COURT: See if you can lay your predicate and I will reserve ruling, Mr. Morris. 17 BY MR. MORRIS: 18 19 Special Agent Tucker, are Government's Exhibits 37 and 38 20 records of a public agency? 21 A Yes, sir. Do they relate to Defendant Douglas Rosile? 22 23 Α Yes, sir.

24

25

respective agencies?

Have they been certified by a records custodian for those

- 1 A Yes, sir.
- 2 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, we would offer them into
- 3 evidence.
- 4 THE COURT: I will reserve ruling.
- MR. MORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 6 May I have a brief moment, Your Honor?
- 7 THE COURT: You may.
- 8 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, I would now like to publish
- 9 a select number of exhibits from the records that have already
- 10 been admitted.
- 11 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 12 | Q From Government's Exhibit 4-1, if we could publish,
- 13 please, Bates WS-04902. And would you enlarge that, please.
- 14 Thank you.
- 15 Special Agent Tucker, this is a record, Government's
- 16 Exhibit 4-1, from J. P. Morgan Chase Bank for a Wesley Trent
- 17 | Snipes with a certain account number; is that correct?
- 18 A Yes, sir.
- 19 Q And what is this particular document, again referred to by
- 20 Bates Number WS-04902.
- 21 A This is a check drawn on the account at J. P. Morgan
- 22 Chase, payable to Eddie Kahn, signed by Wesley Snipes.
- 23 Q And can you make out the date?
- 24 A I can't make out the date from here, no, sir.
- 25 Q Showing you a hard copy of that exhibit.

- 1 A The date is January 8th, 2000.
- 2 | O And what is the amount of the check?
- 3 A 2,000 dollars.
- 4 Q And, again, who is the payee, the person being paid?
- 5 A Eddie Kahn.
- 6 Q And can you make out the signature?
- 7 A Wesley Snipes.
- 8 Q And do you see the memo section of the check?
- 9 A Yes, sir.
- 10 | Q What does it say?
- 11 A Consultant fee.
- 12 Q Thank you. Now, going to Government's Exhibit 7 --
- MR. WILSON: I am sorry, Your Honor. What was the
- 14 | Bates number of that document, please?
- MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, may I respond to counsel?
- 16 THE COURT: Surely, you may. Go ahead, Mr. Morris.
- 17 MR. MORRIS: That's WS-04902.
- MR. WILSON: And that was from 4-1?
- 19 MR. MORRIS: Yes.
- 20 MR. WILSON: Thank you.
- 21 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 22 | Q We are going now to the document with the Bates number
- 23 | immediately preceding that. That is WS-04901. Would you look
- 24 at the top part of that document, Special Agent Tucker, and
- 25 tell me what this record is. Is this also a record of J. P.

- 1 Morgan?
- 2 A Yes, sir.
- 3 | Q And would you tell us what that first line states under
- 4 "check paid"?
- 5 A Check Number 505, date paid January 18, amount 2,000
- 6 dollars.
- 7 Q And at the very top, would you read the name of the
- 8 account holder?
- 9 A Wesley Snipes.
- 10 Q And going back to the previous exhibit or the previous
- 11 page, I should say, what's the check number on that check?
- 12 A Check Number 505.
- 13 Q Thank you. Going now to Government's Exhibit 7, which are
- 14 UBS Financial Services records, if you could publish, please,
- page WS-12924. Do you see that, Special Agent Tucker?
- 16 A Yes, sir.
- 17 Q What is this?
- 18 A Business records from UBS Payne Webber.
- 19 Q And, specifically, what is this page?
- 20 A It is an account application and agreement for
- 21 organizations, businesses and ERISA plans.
- 22 Q And looking down to the middle of the page, do you see the
- 23 | listed account holder?
- 24 A It's hard to read from here, sir.
- 25 | Q Do you see it now?

- 1 A Yes, sir.
- 2 | Q What's the account holder?
- 3 A Kymberlyte Production Services, International, Inc.
- 4 Q Going down to the bottom portion on the left-hand side
- 5 | under "financial information," do you see the annual income
- 6 listed?
- 7 A Yes, sir.
- 8 Q What does it say?
- 9 A One million plus.
- 10 | Q Do you see the net worth listed?
- 11 A Yes, sir.
- 12 Q What's that?
- 13 A Ten million plus.
- 14 Q And going to the next page of the document, which is Bates
- 15 WS-12925, in the upper left-hand corner, do you see who is
- listed as the principal officer or trustee?
- 17 A Yes, sir.
- 18 Q Who is that?
- 19 A Dr. Wesley T. Snipes.
- 20 Q And going two more pages in that document to Document
- 21 Number WS-12927, going down the bottom portion of the document
- 22 on the left-hand side, do you see a signature line there?
- 23 A Yes, sir.
- 24 Q And can you make out the signature?
- 25 A Yes, sir.

- 1 Q Who does it appear to be signed by?
- 2 A Dr. Wesley T. Snipes, President.
- 3 | Q Thank you. Going now to Government's Exhibit Number 30 --
- 4 MR. MEACHUM: Your Honor, could I just see that
- 5 exhibit just once more, please?
- 6 THE COURT: You may.
- 7 MR. MEACHUM: I just wanted to look at the signature
- 8 line.
- 9 MR. MORRIS: The previous one?
- MR. MEACHUM: Yes, please.
- 11 Thanks, Scot. Go ahead. I just wanted to see it.
- 12 I'm sorry.
- 13 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 14 Q Again going to Government's Exhibit 30, what you described
- as the Florida corporate records for Amen Ra Films, that's
- 16 Bates Number WS-17043. Special Agent Tucker, is that the
- certificate page that you referred to earlier?
- 18 A Yes, sir.
- 19 Q And what does it say in the first paragraph?
- 20 A "I certify the attached is a true and correct copy of the
- 21 complete file of Amen Ra Films, Inc., a corporation organized
- 22 under the laws of the State of Florida, filed on January 8,
- 23 | 1992, as shown by the record of this office."
- $24 \mid Q$ And going to the next page of the document, the next page,
- 25 | please, do you see that page?

- 1 A Yes, sir.
- 2 | Q Would you read the title?
- 3 A "Articles of Incorporation of Amen Ra Films, Inc."
- 4 | Q Would you read the first paragraph and the first line
- 5 after that first paragraph.
- 6 A "We, the undersigned, being desirous of associating
- 7 ourselves together for the purpose of becoming a corporation
- 8 for profit under the laws of the State of Florida, do make,
- 9 authorize" -- or is that subscribe -- "subscribe and
- 10 | acknowledge these articles of incorporation, pursuant to the
- 11 | Chapter 607 of the Florida General Corporation Act and other
- 12 applicable provisions of the corporation law of the State of
- 13 Florida and acts amendator thereof and supplemental thereto.
- 14 First, the name of the corporation, Amen Ra Films, Inc."
- 15 Q Going to the next page of the document, please, do you see
- 16 | Paragraph 6 --
- 17 A Yes, sir.
- 18 Q -- referring to the initial board of directors?
- 19 A Yes, sir.
- 20 Q And what is the name and address specified as the initial
- 21 board of directors?
- 22 A The name is Wesley Snipes, the address is 18888 Century
- 23 Park East, 18th floor, Los Angeles, California, 90067."
- 24 | Q And going down immediately below that, do you see the
- 25 signatures of the incorporators?

- 1 A Yes, sir.
- 2 Q What's the name of the first incorporator?
- 3 A Jonathan D. Kaufelt.
- 4 Q Now, the next page in that document -- I'm sorry. The
- 5 | next page, Page Number WS-17053, do you see Mr. Kaufelt's name
- 6 | listed on the upper left-hand portion of this document?
- 7 A Yes, sir.
- 8 Q And at the very top, does it specify that this is the
- 9 letterhead of a law firm?
- 10 A Yes, sir.
- 11 Q And if we could blow that up, please, and go down, what's
- 12 | the address of this law firm?
- 13 A 18888 Century Park East, 18th floor, Los Angeles,
- 14 | California, 90067-1788.
- 15 Q Is that the same address that was specified on the
- 16 | immediately preceding document we just showed?
- 17 A Yes, sir.
- 18 | Q Going now to Government's Exhibit 31, Bates Number
- 19 WS-17059, is this the certification page for the records
- 20 pertaining to the New York corporate records for Amen Ra
- 21 | Films?
- 22 A Yes, sir.
- 23 Q And would you read that, please.
- 24 A "I hereby certify that the records of this department show
- 25 that Amen Ra Films, Inc., a Florida corporation, filed an

- 1 | application for authority to do business in the State of New
- 2 York on August 2nd, 1995."
- 3 | O Please continue.
- 4 A "Said authority was annulled by proclamation by the
- 5 | Secretary of State on June 26th, 2002, pursuant to the tax
- 6 | law. And so far as I indicated by the records of this
- 7 department, said corporation is no longer authorized to do
- 8 business under the laws of the State of New York."
- 9 Q Thank you. Going now to Government's Exhibit 33, Bates
- 10 | Number WS-15239. Is this the first page of the records from
- 11 | the State of California Franchise Tax Board?
- 12 A Yes, sir.
- 13 Q And who are the entities or persons listed that this
- 14 pertains to?
- 15 A Kymberlyte Production Services, Amen Ra Films, Inc., and
- 16 Wesley Trent Snipes.
- 17 Q Under the heading Kymberlyte Production Services, would
- 18 you read what it says.
- 19 A "I have been unable to locate information on Kymberlyte
- 20 Production Services. Therefore, no documents are being sent
- 21 to you at this time."
- 22 O Under the heading Amen Ra Films, Inc., would you read that
- 23 | first sentence, please.
- 24 A "Our records indicate that Amen Ra Films, Inc. filed
- 25 | California corporate returns for income years ending 1994

- 1 through 1998."
- 2 Q Under the heading Wesley Trent Snipes, would you read the
- 3 | first line, please.
- 4 A "Our records show that Mr. Snipes filed California
- 5 non-resident tax returns for tax years 1994 through 1998."
- 6 Q And would you read the next paragraph?
- 7 A "Based on income information received by the Franchise Tax
- 8 Board, we issued a notice of proposed assessment against
- 9 Mr. Snipes for his 2000 and 2001 tax years."
- 10 Q Thank you. Going now to Government's Exhibit 34, Bates
- 11 Number WS-18571, would you tell us what this document is
- 12 again.
- 13 A It's a certificate of marriage from the State of New
- 14 Jersey for Wesley Trent Snipes and Nakyung Park.
- 15 | O What is the date of marriage?
- 16 | A March 17th, 2003.
- MR. MORRIS: Thank you.
- 18 May I have a moment, Your Honor?
- 19 THE COURT: You may.
- 20 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, I am now at the point where
- 21 | I would intend to offer -- to publish documents that --
- 22 exhibits rather that you previously reserved ruling on from
- 23 Government's Exhibits 35, 37 and 38.
- 24 THE COURT: Well, I don't think 38 has been
- 25 identified, but I assume it's a certified public record.

1 MR. MORRIS: Yes, Your Honor. And I may not have made the record clear. 37 and 38 are similar certified public 2 3 records pertaining to Mr. Rosile. THE COURT: I understand. 4 Well, we are coming up on the time I would normally stop for an afternoon break. Members of the jury, perhaps we 6 can accomplish two things at once, while we discuss these 7 8 exhibits with counsel and you are taking a break. So let's pause for a 15-minute recess. 9 10 (Jury absent.) 11 THE COURT: Be seated, please. 12 Let me see copies of these three exhibits. You 13 haven't mentioned 36. What's the government's intention about 14 your identified Exhibit 36? MR. MORRIS: We do not intend to offer that at this 15 16 time. THE COURT: All right. Let me see 35, 37 and 38. 17 MR. MORRIS: These are my own copies, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: What is the basis of your offer of 19 20 Exhibit 35, Mr. Morris? 21 MR. MORRIS: 803(8), Your Honor, certified public record. And the basis -- I'm sorry. 22 23 THE COURT: Well, but -- well, go ahead. 24 MR. MORRIS: The basis for which we offer the

certified judgment pertaining to Mr. Kahn is to show his

25

knowledge of the tax laws. He previously was put on notice effectively -- it's hard to imagine a more effective way that somebody could be put on notice to have been previously convicted of the very type of offense that is at issue here.

THE COURT: Well, he is not charged in this case with failure to file, right?

MR. MORRIS: That's correct, Your Honor. The conspiracy charge that he is charged with asserts as one of the manner and means of the conspiracy the intent to impair, impede and defeat the IRS through the non-filing of tax returns.

THE COURT: Well, I understand that, but I am -- at least at this early stage of the case, until I can determine with greater comfort the need of the government for this item of proof, I am inclined to sustain the objection to it under Rule 402 and 403, which I understood to be a part of counsel's objection.

I would overrule the objection with respect to hearsay. It does appear by inherent indicia to be an authentic public record, but it seems to me it has a greater potential for prejudice than probative value at the moment. And I will sustain the objection to it without prejudice to its being re-offered subsequently.

What do you say to these other exhibits, 37?

MR. MORRIS: 37 and 38 are similar, Your Honor. One

is an order from the Board of Accountancy for Ohio; the other, an order from the Board of Accountancy of Florida. Both relate to the revocation of Mr. Rosile's CPA licenses in those respective states.

2.0

They are certified public documents, admissible under 803(8). Those are specific allegations that are part of the indictment, and they are being offered for at least two purposes, Your Honor.

It has been clearly made -- stated in opening statement that there is a reliance defense by Mr. Snipes relying on advisors. And those would include Mr. Rosile, who he alleges prepared his 1997 amended tax return, the subject of Count II.

And, therefore, his -- Mr. Snipes' reliance on Mr. Rosile is colored and affected by Mr. Rosile's status as to whether he is one of the parties that Mr. Bernhoft specifically mentioned in his opening statement who is capable of representing someone before the IRS; an attorney, a CPA or an enrolled agent.

THE COURT: What exhibit, what government exhibit represents the amended return described in Count II?

MR. MORRIS: If you will give me just one moment, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's Question One. And Question Two is whether Mr. Rosile's name appears on that exhibit as a

preparer or in some other capacity.

2 MR. MORRIS: It does. In answer to Number Two, it does.

THE COURT: Well, then what do you say to that, Mr. Barnes?

MR. BARNES: Yes, Your Honor. There is no foundation that my client had any notice of this disbarment of Mr. Rosile. So that would be the objection from our grounds.

I know Mr. Wilson has his own independent grounds for objection.

MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, if I could just respond to your first question. It is proposed Government's Exhibit 64-1 and 64-2 that are the amended tax return for 1997, bearing Mr. Rosile's signature as preparer.

And, Your Honor, if I might also, the other aspect of why we're offering this is, with regard to Mr. Rosile, his former status as a CPA shows his knowledge of the tax laws.

And, therefore, any good faith defense that he may have or willfulness defense that he may have would be affected by his own business history, professional credentials and the like.

THE COURT: Well, I am inclined to reserve ruling on both of these documents, 37 and 38, but solely on the ground of Rule 402 and 403 at this point.

The other grounds for objection I would overrule

1 based upon the face of the documents. But you have got a 402 2 and 403 issue to contend with there as the evidence develops I 3 think, Mr. Morris. And then you can revisit that when you think that you have overcome that problem. 4 MR. MORRIS: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Let's take a --6 MR. MEACHUM: Your Honor, before we break, could I 7 get a point of clarification from the Court, please? 8 THE COURT: Yes. 9 10 MR. MEACHUM: I made note that the witness for the government read certain documents. And I wanted to raise 11 12 under Rule 106 the theory of completeness. It says in that 13 rule that it should be done --14 THE COURT: Mr. Meachum --MR. MEACHUM: Meachum. I understand, Your Honor. 15 16 THE COURT: What do you understand? 17 MR. MEACHUM: Well, I understand that you are having a hard time pronouncing my last name, and it can't be 18 difficult. 19 2.0 THE COURT: Well, I apologize for that. MR. MEACHUM: That's okay. 21 22 THE COURT: I have a good friend whose name is Ralph 23 Meakum (phonetic), and that's the reason for it. 2.4 The problem, Mr. Meachum, is that with respect to

this witness, under Rule 5.03(b)(8) of the local rules, I can

25

- 1 hear only from Mr. Barnes. MR. MEACHUM: I understand. 2 3 THE COURT: We will take a ten-minute break. (Short recess.) 4 (Jury present.) THE COURT: Thank you. Be seated, please, members 6 7 of the jury. 8 All right. Mr. Morris, you may continue. 9 MR. MORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor. 10 BY MR. MORRIS: Q. Special Agent Tucker, other than your involvement with 11 12 getting the records that we've just gone through certified 13 and, of course, your ability to be able to look at records and 14 read the records and determine at least what they pertain to, do you have any personal detailed knowledge of the contents of 15 the records that have just been admitted? 16 A. No, sir. 17 18 MR. MORRIS: No further questions? THE COURT: Mr. Barnes? 19 2.0 MR. BARNES: Yes, Your Honor. 21 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 22 BY MR. BARNES:
- Q. The Florida records that you reviewed, you don't know who
- 24 | prepared those records, is that correct?
- 25 A. I don't know which records you're pertaining to, sir.

- 1 Q. Okay. The -- of all the records you reviewed, you don't
- 2 know who prepared the underlying documents and records, is
- 3 | that correct?
- 4 A. I know that I got those records certified from the
- 5 | custodian of records of the represented financial institution
- 6 or entity, sir.
- 7 Q. Okay. So, for example, like the homestead declaration,
- 8 you know that the records were certified, but you don't know
- 9 who prepared the homestead declaration itself, is that
- 10 | correct?
- 11 | A. No, sir, I do not know who prepared the homestead
- 12 declaration, but I know that --
- 13 Q. The only homestead declaration that you identified is a
- 14 homestead declaration from February of 2003, is that correct?
- 15 A. I do not know without looking at the document, sir.
- $16 \mid Q$. Is that the only homestead declaration that you have or
- 17 you identified from the State of Florida records?
- 18 A. There was only one homestead declaration that I
- 19 identified, sir.
- 20 Q. Okay.
- 21 MR. BARNES: May I pull up that exhibit?
- 22 BY MR. BARNES:
- 23 | Q. What date do you see at the top right-hand corner under
- 24 Orange County, Florida?
- 25 A. March 4, 2003.

- 1 | Q. And that's the date as listed as when it was received and
- 2 recorded?
- 3 A. Yes, sir.
- 4 | Q. And that's the only homestead exemption you have?
- 5 A. Yes, sir.
- 6 Q. So you have no homestead exemption for prior to March of
- 7 2003?
- 8 A. Not to my knowledge, sir.
- 9 Q. Do you have any documents that show the homestead
- 10 exemption request was granted?
- 11 | A. Not to my knowledge, sir.
- MR. BARNES: Pull up 1-1. Could you highlight the
- 13 | top right-hand side? Thank you.
- 14 BY MR. BARNES:
- 15 Q. What date is the Florida driver's license listed as
- 16 | originally issued?
- 17 | A. March 1, 1978.
- 18 Q. Thank you.
- 19 Did you review any tax return documents or 1099 documents
- 20 as to what address was listed on those documents for
- 21 Mr. Snipes' residence?
- 22 A. No, sir.
- 23 | Q. Did you look at the underlying bank documents to see
- 24 whether -- on the checks what address was listed for
- 25 Mr. Snipes on those bank checks?

- 1 A. No, sir. I did no detailed analysis of the documents.
- 2 Q. The Bank of America records, you got that from the
- 3 certified custodian, correct?
- 4 A. Yes, sir.
- 5 | Q. And that bank account is not in the state of Florida,
- 6 | correct?
- 7 | A. No, sir.
- 8 Q. And the J.P. Morgan Chase bank records, you received those
- 9 from the custodian of records, correct?
- 10 | A. Yes, sir.
- 11 | Q. And those accounts are also not located in the state of
- 12 | Florida, correct?
- 13 A. I do not know, sir.
- 14 Q. The Colonial Bank records, you received those from the
- 15 | custodian as well?
- 16 A. Yes, sir.
- 17 | Q. And the Colonial Bank records also were not received or
- obtained from a custodian in the state of Florida, correct?
- 19 A. No. The custodian was not in the state of Florida. No,
- 20 sir.
- 21 | Q. The Lazard Asset Management records, the custodian -- you
- 22 obtained those records from the custodian as well?
- 23 A. Well, to clarify, I -- the -- most of the business records
- 24 were previously obtained during the investigation, and my duty
- 25 was to obtain a certification so...

- 1 Q. Okay. In reviewing the certification or any other
- 2 documents, the -- all of those records are not from the state
- of Florida, is that correct?
- 4 A. I do not know, sir.
- 5 Q. You did not review them to find out?
- 6 A. No, sir.
- 7 | Q. And you did not identify any voting records where
- 8 Mr. Snipes registered to vote in the state of Florida,
- 9 correct?
- 10 A. I did not; that's correct, sir.
- 11 | Q. And you did not write -- you did not identify what
- 12 property records exist in the state of New York concerning
- 13 Mr. Snipes, correct?
- 14 A. No, sir.
- 15 Q. And you did not identify what records exist for Mr. Snipes
- 16 concerning property records in the state of California,
- 17 | correct?
- 18 | A. No, sir.
- 19 MR. BARNES: Would you pull up WS-12925? Could you
- 20 highlight the top left-hand corner? Thank you.
- 21 BY MR. BARNES:
- 22 | Q. What street address is listed for Mr. Snipes on the UBS
- 23 Paine Webber account?
- 24 A. 100 Van Dam Street, Suite Number 4.
- 25 Q. And what city?

- 1 A. New York, New York, 10013.
- 2 MR. BARNES: Would you pull up Exhibit 29? Could
- 3 you go to the next page or -- go to the next page.
- 4 BY MR. BARNES:
- 5 | Q. These are the property records you obtained from the state
- 6 of New Jersey, is that correct, or from the attorney's office
- 7 | regarding a property transaction?
- 8 A. These are the records from Carbone and Faasse.
- 9 Q. It involves a residence of Mr. Snipes in the state of
- 10 New Jersey, correct?
- 11 A. Yes, sir.
- MR. BARNES: Pull up Exhibit 34.
- 13 BY MR. BARNES:
- Q. This is the marriage certificate for Mr. Snipes, correct?
- 15 A. Yes, sir.
- 16 | Q. And what city is located on there?
- 17 A. Hackensack City.
- 18 Q. What county?
- 19 A. Bergen County.
- 20 | Q. And what state is that in?
- 21 A. That's in the state of New Jersey, sir.
- 22 | O. The records that you reviewed involve a lot of financial
- 23 transactions, is that correct?
- 24 A. I did not review the records, sir, but I certified there
- 25 are a lot of records that contain financial transactions; yes,

- 1 sir.
- 2 | Q. And all of these records involve U.S. institutions or U.S.
- 3 government or public agencies of states or of the
- 4 United States government?
- 5 A. I do not know.
- 6 Q. Okay. Mr. Snipes did nothing to interfere, impede with
- 7 any -- you have no record that Mr. Snipes did anything to
- 8 impair or impede the effort to obtain those records, is that
- 9 correct?
- 10 A. That's correct, sir.
- MR. BARNES: May I have a brief moment, Your Honor?
- 12 THE COURT: You may.
- 13 (Pause.)
- 14 MR. BARNES: No further questions, Your Honor.
- 15 THE COURT: Mr. Wilson?
- 16 MR. WILSON: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
- 17 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 18 BY MR. WILSON:
- 19 Q. Agent Tucker, good afternoon. I just have a question or
- 20 two for you.
- 21 A. Good afternoon, sir.
- 22 MR. WILSON: Ma'am, would you please pull up
- 23 WS-4902.
- 24 BY MR. WILSON:
- 25 Q. Agent Tucker, you previously testified about this

- 1 particular check written by Mr. Snipes in the amount of
- 2 \$2,000, correct?
- 3 A. Yes, sir.
- 4 | Q. Okay. And you identified the person to whom the check was
- 5 | made payable, is that right?
- 6 A. Yes, sir.
- 7 | Q. Okay. Would it be fair to say that the payee of that
- 8 | check was not Doug Rosile?
- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- 10 | Q. Okay. And would it be, likewise, fair to say that the
- 11 payee of that check was not American Rights Litigators?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- 13 Q. Okay. Thank you.
- 14 MR. WILSON: No further questions, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: Any redirect, Mr. Morris?
- 16 MR. MORRIS: Would you please show Exhibit 1-2?
- 17 REDIRECT EXAMINATION
- 18 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 19 Q. Agent Tucker, do you recall this document?
- 20 A. Yes, sir.
- 21 | Q. What does it show the date that Mr. Snipes was originally
- 22 issued a driver's license in the state of Florida?
- 23 A. August 20 of 1997.
- 24 | Q. And what is the expiration date on this particular
- 25 transaction?

- 1 | A. July 31 of 2004.
- 2 Q. So this record shows that he had a driver's license from
- 3 '97 to 2004, correct?
- 4 A. Yes, sir.
- 5 0. In the state of Florida?
- 6 A. Yes, sir.
- 7 Q. Listing an address of 9711 Deacon Court, Windermere,
- 8 Florida?
- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- 10 MR. MORRIS: Would you please show Exhibit 1-3?
- 11 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 12 Q. This is apparently a renewal that occurred on 7-15-2004,
- is that correct?
- 14 | A. Yes, sir.
- 15 Q. And it shows an issuance date of driver's license for
- 16 Mr. Snipes, same address, issuance date of July 15, 2004,
- 17 | correct?
- 18 | A. Yes, sir.
- 19 Q. And it shows the expiration date to be a date in the
- 20 | future, July 31, 2010?
- 21 MR. BARNES: Objection, Your Honor, leading.
- 22 THE COURT: Sustained. Avoid leading, Mr. Morris.
- 23 MR. MORRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
- 24 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 25 Q. What's the expiration date that's listed?

- 1 A. July 31, 2010.
- 2 Q. Thank you.
- 3 MR. MORRIS: And would you show Government's Exhibit
- 4 2-4, please?
- 5 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 6 Q. Would you look in the second paragraph, please?
- 7 MR. MORRIS: Could we enlarge that?
- 8 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 9 Q. Would you read that, please?
- 10 A. "I hereby declare on this day that I have had my national
- 11 de jure domicile in the Florida republic since 1977 and have
- 12 from the day of June 27 of 1977 to this date maintained the
- 13 | place of my national de jure domicile in the county of the
- 14 Orange, Florida state republic. I am currently deed holder to
- 15 the house and on the land as described below."
- 16 Q. And what is the address described below?
- MR. MORRIS: Please go down further.
- 18 THE WITNESS: 9711 Deacon Court, Windermere,
- 19 Republic of Florida.
- 20 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 21 Q. Please read the next paragraph.
- 22 MR. BARNES: Objection, Your Honor. This has all
- 23 been asked and answered.
- 24 THE COURT: I don't think that was published
- 25 specifically. I'll overrule that objection.

- Go ahead, Mr. Morris.
- 2 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 3 Q. Please read that paragraph.
- 4 A. "Which house I recognize and intend to have and maintain
- 5 | as my permanent home, port and national de jure domicile. And
- 6 | if I have or obtain another house, or houses, in some other
- 7 | national state or states, I hereby declare that the
- 8 above-described house in the Florida republic constitutes my
- 9 predominant and principal house and that I intend to continue
- 10 it permanently as such."
- MR. MORRIS: If you could go up to the top of the
- document, please, in the upper right-hand corner.
- 13 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 14 | 0. What date was that filed?
- 15 A. May 23, 2005.
- MR. MORRIS: And the next page, please.
- 17 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 18 | Q. And who does it appear to be signed by?
- 19 A. Wesley Trent Snipes.
- 20 Q. Thank you.
- 21 | MR. MORRIS: No further questions.
- 22 THE COURT: Anything further of the witness,
- 23 | counsel?
- 24 MR. BARNES: No, Your Honor.
- MR. WILSON: No, Judge.

1	THE COURT: Thank you, Agent Tucker. You may step
2	down.
3	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: Next witness, Mr. Morris.
5	MR. MORRIS: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
6	The United States at this time calls Raymond Thomas
7	Coudriet.
8	*** RAYMOND THOMAS COUDRIET, SR.,
9	was sworn by the Deputy Clerk ***
10	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Please have a seat.
11	Please state your full name, and spell your last
12	name for the record.
13	THE WITNESS: My full name is Raymond Thomas
14	Coudriet. The last name is spelled C-O-U-D-R-I-E-T. And
15	that's senior. I have a son the same name.
16	MR. MORRIS: May I proceed, Your Honor?
17	THE COURT: You may.
18	MR. MORRIS: Thank you.
19	RAYMOND THOMAS COUDRIET, SR.,
20	being duly sworn, testified as follows:
21	DIRECT EXAMINATION
22	BY MR. MORRIS:
23	Q. Mr. Coudriet, where do you live?
24	A. I live in Orange County, in suburbs of Orlando.
25	Q. Do you currently have an occupation?

- 1 A. I'm a retired homebuilder.
- Q. What did you do before that?
- 3 A. I was an engineer at Chrysler for 17 years and then became
- 4 a homebuilder for 35 years.
- 5 Q. When you were a homebuilder, where did you build homes?
- 6 A. Lake Nona Country Club, Isleworth Country Club, Bay Hill
- 7 Country Club, Metro West Country Club.
- 8 Q. What vicinity are those areas in?
- 9 A. All of them are in the southwest portion of Orlando,
- 10 except the Lake Nona Country Club; that's by the international
- 11 airport.
- 12 Q. In Orlando?
- 13 A. In Orlando, uh-huh. Yes.
- 14 Q. Have you ever met Wesley Snipes?
- 15 A. Yes, I have met him one time.
- 16 Q. What was the occasion for meeting him?
- 17 A. The occasion was he was purchasing my personal residence
- 18 in Isleworth Country Club.
- 19 Q. Would you describe what Isleworth Country Club is like?
- 20 A. It's 370-some lots of very exclusive homes, currently
- 21 | ranging up to 15 million each. A lot of celebrities and
- 22 stars, sports figures.
- 23 Q. What was the address of the home that you sold to
- 24 Mr. Snipes?
- 25 A. 9711 Deacon Court, Windermere, Florida.

- 1 | Q. What was the purchase price, if you recall?
- 2 A. \$1,050,000.
- Q. When did you sell the home to Mr. Snipes?
- 4 A. 1992, I think about March.
- 5 MR. MORRIS: Would you please publish Government's
- 6 Exhibit 2-1, Bates number WS-18002?
- 7 BY MR. MORRIS:
- 8 | Q. Mr. Coudriet -- I know it's a little hard; we're going to
- 9 have the lights adjusted in just a moment --
- 10 A. No, I can read it.
- 11 | Q. -- do you recognize this document?
- 12 A. That's the warranty deed to Amen RA Films, Incorporated,
- 13 | from my wife and myself.
- 14 Q. So this is the deed transferring the property you just
- 15 discussed?
- 16 A. Yes, to Amen -- I guess that's how you pronounce it --
- 17 Amen, R-A, RA, Films.
- 18 Q. But you said that this house was sold to Mr. Snipes.
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Are you aware of why the deed was titled in the name of
- 21 Amen RA Films?
- $22 \mid A$. It was requested of me to go -- to allow it to be put into
- $23 \mid$ that. At the time I was told that Wesley was going to be
- 24 getting a divorce and would like to have it in the company
- 25 name.

- 1 Q. Okay. Did you have occasion to talk to Mr. Snipes about
- 2 that?
- 3 A. The one time when we were walking through the house with
- 4 | the realtor and discussing, you know, how the house looked and
- 5 what was going to happen, and so on, he wanted to know if I
- 6 | had any problem with having it in the company name, and I
- 7 | couldn't see any problem with that that made any sense to me,
- 8 as long as it was sold. That's what I was mainly looking at.
- 9 Q. And did he tell you why he wanted it in the company's
- 10 name?
- 11 | A. As I mentioned, he said he was planning on getting a
- 12 divorce and that he would just as soon not have that be part
- 13 of the issue.
- 14 Q. Thank you.
- MR. MORRIS: Those are my questions.
- THE COURT: Mr. Barnes?
- MR. BARNES: Yes, Your Honor.
- 18 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 19 BY MR. BARNES:
- 20 Q. Did Mr. Snipes tell you that he planned on purchasing the
- 21 home so that family that he had in the area could live there?
- 22 | A. No, he did not. As a matter of fact, he -- after at least
- 23 a couple of years it was still vacant.
- 24 Q. It was vacant for several years?
- 25 A. A couple of years, at least. Being a builder I used to

- 1 | see it vacant. He wanted me to move out in 30 days, and I
- 2 | did. And then two years later it's still empty. That's the
- 3 only reason I paid attention to it.
- 4 Q. Oh. Okay. So there were several years in which he was
- 5 not there?
- 6 A. At least two.
- 7 | Q. And at some point around 2004 he no longer lived there as
- 8 | well, is that correct?
- 9 A. Yes, I believe that's -- yes, I think that's right.
- 10 Uh-huh.
- 11 | Q. Did you ever meet Ruth May Dukes?
- 12 A. I don't recognize that name.
- 13 Q. Okay. Did you ever meet any of Wesley's family?
- 14 A. No, I didn't.
- 15 Q. Okay. Did you ever go over to the house much when
- 16 somebody actually was there?
- 17 A. Yes. I -- on occasion, I believe that it was Wesley's
- 18 mother that would be on the back boat dock fishing. And I
- 19 never introduced myself, but that's the only time I really
- 20 ever saw anybody there.
- 21 Q. Okay.
- MR. BARNES: One moment, Your Honor.
- 23 (Pause.)
- MR. BARNES: No further questions.
- 25 MR. WILSON: No questions, Your Honor.

- THE COURT: Any redirect, Mr. Morris?
- 2 MR. MORRIS: No, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Coudriet. You may step
- 4 down, sir.
- 5 Mr. McLellan?
- 6 MR. McLELLAN: The government calls Paul Crowley.
- 7 *** PAUL CROWLEY was sworn by the Deputy Clerk ***
- 8 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Please have a seat.
- 9 Please state your full name, and spell your last
- 10 name for the record.
- 11 | THE WITNESS: Paul Crowley, C-R-O-W-L-E-Y.
- 12 PAUL CROWLEY,
- 13 being duly sworn, testified as follows:
- 14 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 15 BY MR. McLELLAN:
- 16 Q. Mr. Crowley, how are you employed?
- 17 A. I work for the Internal Revenue Service out of Andover,
- 18 Massachusetts.
- 19 Q. And in what capacity?
- 20 A. I am the court witness coordinator.
- 21 | Q. And how long have you been working for the IRS in that
- 22 capacity?
- 23 A. Just over three years.
- 24 Q. And what are your responsibilities in that job?
- 25 | A. I am responsible for certifying the records from the

- 1 | Internal Revenue Service and testifying to those documents as
- 2 needed.
- 3 | Q. Is it part of your duty to be familiar with the records of
- 4 the IRS?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Were you requested to prepare records of tax filings and
- 7 | associated documents in this case?
- 8 A. Yes, I was.
- 9 Q. How did you go about doing that?
- 10 A. Well, a request would come in; and based on the request, I
- would do a search by the Taxpayer Identification Number,
- 12 whether it be the Social Security Number or the Employer
- 13 Identification Number.
- 14 Q. Are these searches conducted in IRS computer systems?
- 15 A. Yes, they are. I can access the computer locally at my
- 16 terminal, and I search across the entire IRS database.
- 17 Q. Do you have in front of you Government's Exhibits 39-1
- 18 through 39-6?
- 19 A. Yes, I do.
- 20 Q. And what are those documents?
- 21 \mid A. These are copies of Form 1040s for various years for
- 22 Wesley Snipes.
- 23 Q. Did you identify these documents as part of requested
- 24 searches in this case?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 MR. McLELLAN: The United States moves that Exhibits
- 2 | 39-1 through 39-6 be received into evidence.
- MR. BARNES: No objection, Your Honor.
- 4 THE COURT: Each is received.
- 5 MR. McLELLAN: Please publish 39-1.
- 6 BY MR. McLELLAN:
- 7 Q. Mr. Crowley, just generally, what is this document?
- 8 A. This is a Form 1040, U.S. individual income tax return for
- 9 1993.
- 10 Q. Okay. And whose name appears at the top of that income
- 11 tax return?
- 12 A. Wesley Snipes'.
- 13 Q. Okay. And taking a look at the second page of that
- document, if you will, what entity appears as the paid
- 15 | preparer for this return?
- 16 A. The firm's name is Starr & Company.
- 17 Q. What's the address there?
- 18 A. 350 Park Avenue, New York, New York.
- 19 Q. Directing your attention to the first page again, in the
- 20 upper right-hand corner, what Social Security number appears
- 21 there?
- 22 A. The number listed is
- 23 | Q. Okay. Now, if you will, take a look at Line 31 at the
- 24 | bottom of that return. What is that line?
- 25 A. That is the adjusted gross income.

- 1 | Q. Okay. And what figure appears for adjusted gross income
- 2 on that line for 1993?
- 3 A. \$3,309,142.
- 4 Q. Okay. Let's take a look at the second page of the return
- 5 again, I believe Line 60, total tax payments.
- 6 A. That's correct. The -- did you want the number from
- 7 there?
- 8 Q. Yes. What figure is there?
- 9 A. \$1,149,741.
- 10 | Q. Okay. And can you make out the name of the signature next
- 11 | to where it says "sign here"?
- 12 A. It appears to be Wesley Snipes.
- 13 Q. Okay. And what's given as the occupation there?
- 14 A. Actor.
- 15 Q. Okay. Directing your attention to the next exhibit,
- 16 | Number 39-2, what is that document?
- 17 A. This is a Form 1040, U.S. individual income tax return for
- 18 1994.
- 19 Q. And taking a look at the second page of the document,
- 20 whose -- if you can make out who -- who appears to have signed
- 21 | the return next to "sign here"?
- 22 A. It appears to be Wesley Snipes.
- 23 Q. And what entity is listed as the paid preparer?
- 24 A. Starr & Company at 350 Park Avenue, New York, New York.
- 25 | Q. Okay. Again, to the first page, the adjusted gross income

- 1 | line, what figure appears there?
- 2 A. That's Line 31 again: \$5,161,345.
- 3 Q. Okay. And taking a look at the second page of the return
- 4 | at Line 60...
- 5 A. Line 60, that's the total tax payments.
- 6 Q. And what figure appears there?
- 7 A. \$1,964,468.
- 8 | Q. Please take a look at the next exhibit, Exhibit 39-3.
- 9 What is that document?
- 10 A. This is a Form 1040, U.S. individual income tax return for
- 11 1995.
- 12 Q. Okay. Whose name appears at the top of it?
- 13 A. Wesley Snipes'.
- 14 Q. And who appears to have signed it on Page 2?
- 15 A. Wesley Snipes.
- 16 Q. Again, the paid preparer entity, please?
- 17 A. Starr & Company, 350 Park Avenue, New York, New York.
- 18 Q. Okay. And on Line 31, what is the total adjusted gross
- 19 income at the bottom of Page 1, please?
- 20 A. That figure is \$7,298,579.
- 21 | Q. Okay. On the second page, at Line 61, please, what is the
- 22 | figure for the total tax payments?
- 23 A. That is \$2,791,932.
- 24 | Q. Okay. Taking a look at Government's Exhibit 39-4, what is
- 25 that?

- 1 A. This is a Form 1040, U.S. individual income tax return for
- 2 | 1996 for Wesley Snipes.
- Q. Okay. And on the second page of that return, who appears
- 4 to have signed next to where it says "sign here"?
- 5 A. It appears to be Wesley Snipes.
- 6 Q. Okay. And, again, the -- which entity appears as the paid
- 7 preparer?
- 8 A. Starr & Company, 350 Park Avenue, New York, New York.
- 9 Q. Okay. On the first page of that return, at Line 31, I
- 10 believe, what figure appears there for adjusted gross income?
- 11 | A. \$13,387,378.
- 12 Q. And taking a look at Page 2 on Line 58, please...
- A. That's the total tax payments of \$4,103,645.
- 14 Q. Okay. Please direct your attention to Government's
- 15 Exhibit 39-5. What is that document?
- 16 A. This is a U.S. individual income tax return, Form 1040,
- 17 for 1997 for Wesley Snipes.
- 18 Q. And taking a look at the second page, who appears to have
- 19 | signed it as -- next to the "sign here"?
- 20 A. That appears to be Wesley Snipes.
- 21 | Q. And who was the paid preparer?
- 22 A. Starr & Company, 350 Park Avenue, New York, New York.
- 23 | Q. Okay. And just above that, can you make out the -- the --
- 24 the filing date next to the -- next to the signature that
- 25 appears to be Wesley Snipes'?

- 1 A. That looks like October 15, 1998.
- Q. Okay. On the front page of the return, Page 1, at
- 3 | Line 32, what's the adjusted gross income?
- 4 A. \$19,238,192.
- 5 Q. And on the second page, at Line 53, in the middle there,
- 6 what appears as the total tax?
- 7 A. The total tax is \$7,360,746.
- 8 | Q. Okay. A little bit below that at Line 60, what -- what --
- 9 what is that line?
- 10 A. That is the total payments.
- 11 | Q. What figure appears there?
- 12 A. \$7,180,574.
- Q. Okay. And then below that, at Line 64, what -- what is
- 14 represented by Line 64?
- 15 A. This is the amount due with the return of \$180,181.
- 16 \mid Q. Okay. On that page next to where it says "sign here" and
- 17 just above where the signature appears to be saying Wesley
- 18 | Snipes, can you please read the first sentence of that
- 19 declaration?
- 20 A. It reads: "Under penalties of perjury, I declare that I
- 21 have examined this return and accompanying schedules and
- 22 statements; and to the best of my knowledge and belief, they
- 23 are true, correct and complete."
- 24 MR. McLELLAN: Taking a look at the -- for purposes
- of projection, it's -- it's Bates range WS-00236.

- 1 For purposes of the exhibit, it's -- I believe it's
- 2 | the second page from the end of the exhibit.
- 3 BY MR. McLELLAN:
- 4 Q. Okay. What is that document?
- 5 A. This is a Form W-2 for Wesley Snipes for 1997.
- 6 Q. Okay. And who is the employer listed at, I believe, Box
- 7 | C?
- 8 A. Box C lists Amen RA Films, Incorporated.
- 9 Q. Okay. Now, what is the Employer's Identification Number
- 10 for Amen RA Films on here?
- 11 A. That would be listed in Box B, 581973093.
- 12 Q. Okay. And in Box 1, what appears as the figure for wages,
- 13 | tips and other compensation?
- 14 | A. \$16 million.
- 15 Q. Okay. And at Box 2, what appears for federal income tax
- 16 | withheld?
- 17 A. \$4,309,720.08.
- 18 Q. Directing your attention to Government's Exhibit 39-6,
- 19 | please, what is that document?
- 20 A. This is a Form 1040, U.S. individual income tax return for
- 21 | 1998 for Wesley Snipes.
- 22 | Q. Okay. And taking a look at the second page, who appears
- 23 to have signed it next to where it says "sign here"?
- 24 A. It appears to be Wesley Snipes.
- 25 Q. Okay. And the paid preparer, who would that be?

- 1 A. The --
- 2 Q. The name of the company.
- 3 A. The firm's name is Starr & Company, 350 Park Avenue,
- 4 New York, New York.
- 5 Q. Okay. Is there a date there by the preparer?
- 6 A. There is.
- 7 Q. What does it say?
- 8 A. October 5, 1999.
- 9 Q. Okay. Taking a look at the first page of the return, at
- 10 | the very bottom, Line 33, for adjusted gross income, what
- 11 | figure appears there?
- 12 A. There's a negative figure, \$757,264.
- 13 Q. Okay. And at Line 56, a figure for total tax for that
- 14 year?
- 15 A. Zero.
- 16 MR. McLELLAN: Begging the Court's indulgence. This
- 17 is a large delivery.
- 18 (Pause.)
- 19 BY MR. McLELLAN:
- 20 Q. Now, please take a look and see if you have before you
- 21 Government's Exhibits Numbers 40-1 through 51-3.
- 22 A. I do.
- 23 | Q. Okay. Taking a look at Government's Exhibits 40-1 through
- 24 | 40-4, would you please identify those documents?
- 25 (Pause.)

- 1 A. These are documents relating to Bedrock Capital Partners.
- 2 | Q. Okay. And what is Exhibit 40-1?
- 3 A. 40-1 is a true copy of the original Form 1065, U.S.
- 4 partnership return of income for Bedrock Capital Partners.
- 5 0. What is Exhibit 40-2?
- 6 A. 40-2 is a true copy of a business master file online
- 7 | transcript, BMFOLT, captioned Bedrock -- I'm sorry -- B-E-D-R,
- 8 tax Form 1065 for the tax year 2000.
- 9 Q. What is Exhibit 40-3?
- 10 A. This is a true copy of a business master file online
- 11 | transcript, BMFOLR, captioned B-E-D-R, for tax Form 1065 for
- 12 | the tax year 2000.
- 13 | O. And what is Exhibit 40-4?
- 14 A. 40-4 is a certificate of assessments, payments and other
- 15 | specified matters for U.S. partnership return of income, Form
- 16 | 1065, captioned Bedrock Capital Partners, for the tax year
- 17 2000.
- 18 MR. McLELLAN: Your Honor, the government moves that
- 19 these documents be received into evidence.
- THE COURT: Down through what exhibit, Mr. McLellan?
- 21 MR. McLELLAN: I'm sorry. 40-1 through 40-4, the
- 22 ones the witness has just identified, Your Honor.
- 23 MR. BARNES: No objection, Your Honor.
- 24 | THE COURT: Each is received.
- 25 BY MR. McLELLAN:

- 1 | Q. The next ones I would like you to take a look at are
- 2 Government's Exhibits 41-1 through 41-3.
- 3 A. These are documents related to Blaam, B-L-A-A-M, Partners.
- 4 Q. Okay. So what is -- what specifically is 41-1?
- 5 \mid A. 41-1 is a true copy of an original Form 1065, U.S.
- 6 partnership return of income, captioned Blaam Partners, for
- 7 tax year 1999.
- 8 Q. Okay. What is Exhibit 41-2?
- 9 A. 41-2 is a copy of Form 1065, U.S. partnership return of
- 10 income and admin file, captioned Blaam Partners, for tax year
- 11 1999.
- 12 | Q. And what is 41-3?
- 13 A. 41-3 is a true copy of original Form 1065, U.S.
- 14 partnership return of income, captioned Blaam Partners, for
- 15 tax year 2000.
- 16 MR. McLELLAN: The government moves that exhibits
- 17 | previously marked 41-1 through 41-3 be received into evidence.
- 18 MR. WILSON: No objection from Mr. Rosile,
- 19 Your Honor.
- 20 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Wilson.
- 21 MR. BARNES: Could I get one more time all of the
- 22 exhibits they are moving in, Judge?
- 23 THE COURT: 41-1 through 41-3.
- 24 MR. BARNES: No objection, Your Honor.
- 25 THE COURT: Each of those three exhibits is

- 1 received.
- 2 BY MR. McLELLAN:
- 3 | Q. Mr. Crowley, directing your attention to Numbers 42-1
- 4 through 42-3, please identify each in turn.
- 5 A. 42-1 is a true copy of an original Form 1065, U.S.
- 6 partnership return of income, captioned Blacap, B-L-A-C-A-P,
- 7 Partners, for tax year 1999.
- 8 Q. And 42-2?
- 9 A. 42-2 is a true copy of original Form 1065, U.S.
- 10 partnership return of income, captioned Blacap Partners, for
- 11 tax year 2000.
- 12 Q. And 42-3?
- 13 A. 42-3 is a true copy of an original Form 1065, U.S.
- 14 partnership return of income, captioned Blacap Partners, for
- 15 2000.
- 16 MR. McLELLAN: The government moves that exhibits
- 17 previously marked 42-1 through 42-3 be received into evidence.
- MR. BARNES: No objection, Your Honor.
- MR. WILSON: None, Your Honor.
- 20 THE COURT: Each is received.
- 21 BY MR. McLELLAN:
- 22 Q. Mr. Crowley, directing your attention to Number 43, what
- 23 | is that document?
- 24 A. This is a true copy of the original Form 1120S, U.S.
- 25 income tax return for an S-corporation, captioned Black Dot

- 1 Media, Incorporated, for tax year 1999.
- 2 MR. McLELLAN: The government moves that exhibit
- 3 | previously marked Number 43 be received into evidence.
- 4 MR. WILSON: No objection, Your Honor.
- 5 MR. BARNES: No objection, Your Honor.
- 6 THE COURT: It's received.
- 7 BY MR. McLELLAN:
- 8 Q. Now, Mr. Crowley, addressing Numbers 44-1 through 44-4.
- 9 Please start by identifying 44-1.
- 10 \mid A. 44-1 is a true copy of the original Form 1065, U.S.
- 11 partnership return of income, captioned Blackstone Investors
- 12 | Partnership, for the tax year 1999.
- 13 | Q. How about 44-2?
- 14 A. 44-2 is a true copy of the original Form 1065, U.S.
- 15 partnership return of income, captioned Blackstone Investors
- 16 Partnership, for the tax year 2000.
- 17 | 0. 44-3?
- 18 A. 44-3 is a true copy of the original Form 1065, U.S.
- 19 partnership return of income, captioned Blackstone Investors
- 20 Partnership, for 2000.
- 21 O. And 44-4?
- 22 A. 44-4 is a copy of Form 1065, U.S. partnership return of
- 23 income correspondence, captioned Blackstone Investors
- 24 Partnership, for tax year 2000.
- 25 MR. McLELLAN: The government moves that exhibits

- 1 | previously marked 44-1 through 44-4 be received into evidence.
- 2 MR. BARNES: No objection, Your Honor.
- 3 MR. WILSON: No objection.
- 4 THE COURT: Each is received.
- 5 BY MR. McLELLAN:
- 6 Q. Now, Mr. Crowley, addressing Numbers 45-1 through 45-3,
- 7 what is the first of those, 45-1?
- 8 A. 45-1 is a certificate of assessments, payments and other
- 9 specified matters for U.S. corporate income tax return, Form
- 10 | 1120, captioned Harmony Peace Productions, for tax year 1999.
- 11 | Q. Okay. And Number 45-2, what is that?
- 12 A. That is a true copy of a business master file online
- transcript, BMFOLT, captioned H-A-R-M, for tax Form 1120, for
- 14 | the year 1999.
- 15 | O. And what is Exhibit 45-3?
- 16 A. 45-3 is a true copy of a business master file online
- 17 transcript, BMFOLR, captioned H-A-R-M, tax Form 1120, for the
- 18 | tax year 1999.
- 19 MR. McLELLAN: The government moves that exhibits
- 20 previously marked 45-1, 2 and 3 be received into evidence.
- 21 | MR. BARNES: No objection, Your Honor.
- 22 MR. WILSON: No objection.
- 23 THE COURT: They are received.
- 24 BY MR. McLELLAN:
- 25 | Q. Mr. Crowley, directing your attention to Government's

- 1 | Exhibit previously marked Number 46, what is that?
- 2 A. This is a true copy of the original form 1120S, U.S.
- 3 | income tax return for an S-corporation, captioned
- 4 H-R-M-A-K-I-S, Incorporated, for tax year 1999.
- 5 MR. McLELLAN: The government moves that exhibit
- 6 previously marked Number 46 be received into evidence.
- 7 MR. BARNES: No objection, Your Honor.
- 8 MR. WILSON: No objection.
- 9 THE COURT: It's received.
- 10 BY MR. McLELLAN:
- 11 Q. Mr. Crowley, I'm going to ask you some specific questions
- 12 about this document.
- 13 MR. McLELLAN: I think the Bates pagination is
- 14 WS-01338.
- MR. WILSON: I'm sorry. Is this Number 46?
- MR. McLELLAN: Yes, it is.
- 17 BY MR. McLELLAN:
- 18 Q. Mr. Crowley, what name appears on this return?
- 19 A. The name is H-R-M-A-K-I-S, Inc.
- 20 Q. Okay. And it's a return for what year?
- 21 A. 1999.
- 22 | Q. Okay. And taking a look at the date stamp where it says
- 23 | "received IRS," can you make out anything about the date on
- 24 that stamp?
- 25 A. It was received at the IRS center at Brookhaven,

- 1 Holtsville, New York, on March 20 of 2000.
- Q. Okay. And at the line where it says "please sign here,"
- 3 who signed there as an officer? Whose name does that appear
- 4 to be?
- 5 A. That appears to be Wesley Snipes'.
- 6 Q. And what is the title?
- 7 A. President.
- 8 Q. Okay. Mr. Crowley, directing your attention to Numbers
- 9 47-1, 2 and 3. What is 47-1?
- 10 A. This is a certificate of assessment, payments and other
- 11 specified matters for a U.S. partnership return of income,
- 12 Form 1065, for Jezebel Kitchen, LLC, for tax year 1999.
- 13 | Q. And how about 47-2?
- 14 A. 47-2 is a business master file online transcript, BMFOLR,
- captioned J-E-Z-E, tax Form 1065, for the tax year 1999.
- 16 | Q. And 47-3?
- 17 A. 47-3 is a business master file online transcript, BMFOLT,
- 18 captioned J-E-Z-E, tax Form 1065, for tax year 1999.
- MR. McLELLAN: The government moves that numbers
- $20 \mid 47-1$, 2 and 3 be received into evidence.
- 21 MR. BARNES: No objection, Your Honor.
- 22 MR. WILSON: No objection.
- 23 THE COURT: Each is received.
- 24 BY MR. McLELLAN:
- 25 Q. Mr. Crowley, directing your attention to 48-1, 2, 3 and 4.

- 1 Please identify 48-1.
- 2 A. 48-1 is a certificate of assessments, payments and other
- 3 | specified matters for a U.S. corporation income tax return,
- 4 Form 1120, for Nile Delta Productions, for the tax year 1999.
- 5 O. And what is 48-2?
- 6 A. This is a true copy of the business master file online
- 7 transcript, BMFOLR, captioned Nile, N-I-L-E, tax Form 1120,
- 8 for the tax year 1999.
- 9 Q. 48-3, what is that?
- 10 A. This is a business master file online transcript, BMFOLT,
- captioned Nile, N-I-L-E, tax Form 1120, for the tax year 1999.
- 12 Q. And 48-4, what is that?
- 13 A. This is a copy of original Form 1120S, U.S. income tax
- 14 return for an S-corporation, captioned Nile Delta Productions,
- 15 Incorporated, for tax year 1999.
- 16 MR. McLELLAN: The government moves that numbers
- 17 | 48-1, 2, 3 and 4 be received into evidence.
- 18 MR. BARNES: No objection, Your Honor.
- 19 MR. WILSON: No objection.
- 20 THE COURT: Each of those four exhibits is received.
- 21 BY MR. McLELLAN:
- 22 Q. Mr. Crowley, looking more specifically at Exhibit Number
- $23 \mid 48-4 -- I'm$ referring to the page that is Bates numbered
- 24 | WS-01445 -- Mr. Crowley, do you see the first page of that
- 25 return?

- 1 A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Okay. What year is that form?
- 3 A. This is for 1999.
- 4 Q. Okay. And taking a look at the date stamp received, can
- 5 you make out anything about that stamp?
- 6 A. It indicates received at the IRS center at Brookhaven,
- 7 Holtsville, New York, on April 1, 2000.
- 8 Q. Okay. And there's a line there for signature of officer.
- 9 Can you make out who appears to have signed there?
- 10 A. It appears to be Wesley T. Snipes.
- 11 0. And on what date?
- 12 A. It appears to be February 1 of 2000.
- 13 | O. And with what title?
- 14 A. President.
- 15 Q. Taking a look at the paid preparer line, what entity is
- 16 | the paid preparer?
- 17 A. Starr & Company, 350 Park Avenue, New York, New York.
- 18 Q. Okay. Now taking a look at Numbers 49-1 through 49-3, do
- 19 all three of these pertain to something called Pyramid House,
- 20 | Incorporated?
- 21 A. Yes, they do.
- 22 | Q. Okay. And what's 49-1?
- 23 A. This is a certificate of assessments, payments and other
- 24 | specified matters for U.S. corporation income tax return, Form
- 25 | 1120, for Pyramid House for 1999.

- 1 | Q. And what is 49-2?
- 2 A. This is a business master file online transcript, BMFOLR,
- 3 captioned P-Y-R-A, tax Form 1120, for the tax year 1999.
- 4 0. And how about 49-3?
- 5 A. This is a business master file online transcript, BMFOLT,
- 6 captioned P-Y-R-A, tax Form 1120, for the tax year 1999.
- 7 MR. McLELLAN: The government moves that exhibits
- 8 previously marked 49-1, 2 and 3 be received into evidence.
- 9 MR. BARNES: No objections, Your Honor.
- 10 THE COURT: All three are received.
- 11 BY MR. McLELLAN:
- 12 Q. Mr. Crowley, please take a look at Number 50. What is
- 13 | that document?
- 14 A. This is a true copy of the original Form 1120S, U.S.
- income tax return for an S-corporation, for Royal Guard of
- 16 Amen RA, Incorporated, for tax year 1999.
- 17 MR. McLELLAN: And this is paginated as Bates number
- 18 WS-01388.
- 19 BY MR. McLELLAN:
- 20 Q. Does that return bear the signature of an officer?
- 21 A. Yes, it does.
- 22 O. Who does it appear has signed that document?
- 23 A. It appears to be Wesley Snipes.
- 24 | O. As -- in what title?
- 25 A. President.

- 1 Q. Okay. Is there a "received" stamp on there?
- 2 A. There is.
- 3 | Q. And can you make out what was the date received at the
- 4 IRS?
- 5 A. March 30, 2000.
- 6 MR. McLELLAN: The government offers exhibit
- 7 previously marked Number 50 to be received in evidence.
- 8 MR. BARNES: No objection.
- 9 MR. WILSON: No objection.
- 10 THE COURT: It's received.
- 11 BY MR. McLELLAN:
- 12 Q. Okay. Mr. Crowley, taking a look at Numbers 51-1, 2 and
- 13 | 3, are those all for an entity called -- or pertaining to an
- 14 entity called the Bus Company, LLC?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. Okay. And what is 51-1?
- 17 A. 51-1 is a certificate of assessments, payments and other
- 18 | specified matters for U.S. partnership return of income, Form
- 19 1065, captioned Bus Company, LLC, Kenan Rubin, member, for tax
- 20 year 1999.
- 21 Q. Okay. And what is 51-2?
- 22 A. 51-2 is a business master file online transcript, BMFOLR,
- 23 captioned B-U-S-C, tax Form 1065, for the tax year 1999.
- 24 | 0. And how about 51-3?
- 25 A. 51-3 is a business master file online transcript, BMFOLT,

- captioned B-U-S-C, tax Form 1065, for the tax year 1999.
- 2 MR. McLELLAN: The government moves that 51-1, 51-2
- 3 and 51-3 be received into evidence.
- 4 MR. BARNES: No objection, Your Honor.
- 5 THE COURT: Those three exhibits are each received.
- 6 BY MR. McLELLAN:
- 7 Q. Mr. Crowley, do you have before you Exhibit previously
- 8 marked 52-1?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. What is that document?
- 11 | A. This is a true copy of an original Form 1120S, U.S. income
- 12 tax return for an S-corporation, captioned Amen RA Films,
- 13 Incorporated, for tax year 1997.
- 14 Q. Do you have that return in front of you --
- 15 A. Yes, I do.
- 16 | Q. -- to Page 1?
- Who appears to have signed that return?
- 18 A. The signature of the officer listed appears to be Wesley
- 19 | Snipes.
- 20 Q. Okay. And taking a look at Line 6 on that return, what
- 21 | figure appears for total income?
- 22 A. Twenty million nine hundred and thirty-six dollars -- I'm
- 23 sorry -- nine hundred and thirty-six thousand, three hundred
- 24 and twenty-eight dollars.
- 25 MR. McLELLAN: The government offers the exhibit

- 1 | previously marked 52-1 into evidence.
- 2 MR. BARNES: No objection, Your Honor.
- MR. WILSON: No objection, Judge.
- 4 THE COURT: It's received.
- 5 BY MR. McLELLAN:
- 6 Q. Mr. Crowley, taking a look at Number 52-2, what is that?
- 7 A. This is a true copy of an original form 1120S, U.S. income
- 8 | tax return for an S-corporation, and administration file,
- 9 captioned Amen RA Films, for tax year 1999.
- 10 MR. McLELLAN: The government offers Exhibit Number
- 11 52-2 into evidence.
- MR. WILSON: No objection.
- MR. BARNES: No objection.
- 14 THE COURT: It's received.
- 15 BY MR. McLELLAN:
- 16 Q. Mr. Crowley, do you have before you Exhibit 53-1?
- 17 A. Yes, I do.
- 18 Q. What is that document?
- 19 A. This is a certification of lack of record.
- 20 Q. And what information period does it cover?
- 21 A. This covers tax period 1999.
- 22 Q. And what information sought does it cover?
- 23 \mid A. The information sought would be the Form 1040, U.S.
- 24 individual income tax return.
- 25 Q. And what's the name of the taxpayer?

- 1 A. Wesley Snipes.
- Q. And what is the Taxpayer Identification Number?
- 3 A.
- 4 Q. Did you prepare that document?
- 5 A. Yes, I did.
- 6 Q. Did you conduct research in order to be able to prepare
- 7 | that document?
- 8 A. Yes, I did.
- 9 Q. What method did you use to conduct this search?
- 10 A. I do a search at my terminal based on the Social Security
- 11 Number of this taxpayer, Wesley Snipes, through the Internal
- 12 Revenue Service databases.
- 0. Okay. Once you conducted your search, what steps did you
- 14 take to prepare the certification?
- 15 A. I actually typed this document and handed it to my boss,
- 16 David J. Lazarus, for him to sign.
- 17 MR. McLELLAN: The government offers Exhibit 53-1.
- MR. BARNES: Your Honor, we have an objection
- 19 pursuant to Rule 106 for this exhibit and the next ones, all
- 20 the way through 57-7, and we would move under Rule 106 to
- 21 introduce the following exhibits already marked as government
- 22 | exhibits: 87-2, 87-10, 87-11, 87-20, 87-21, 87-23, 87-26,
- 23 87-27, 87-28, 98-2, 106, 126-1 --
- 24 THE COURT: I didn't understand. 126 what?
- 25 | MR. BARNES: I'm sorry, Your Honor. 126-1, 126-2,

- 1 | 126-3, 126-4, 127, 128-1, 128-2, 129-1, 129-2, 130-1, 130-2,
- 2 | 130-3, 130-4, 130-5, 130-6, 131-1, 131-2, 132-1, 132-2, 133-1,
- 3 | 133-2, 133-3, 133-4, 133-5, 133-6, 133-7, 133-8, 134-1 and
- 4 | 134-2, Your Honor.
- 5 THE COURT: What do you say to that, Mr. McLellan?
- 6 MR. McLELLAN: Your Honor, I don't think that
- 7 Rule 106 is intended to cover situations where the adverse
- 8 party intends to point to documents that would tend to rebut a
- 9 document. It seems inapplicable, Your Honor.
- 10 THE COURT: Well, the rule applies not only to the
- 11 | principal document but any other document, it says, or writing
- which ought in fairness to be considered. I'll have to
- 13 examine this matter.
- I take it these documents are marked as government
- exhibits; you did not intend to offer them?
- 16 MR. McLELLAN: In general, Your Honor, yes, those
- 17 are documents we plan to offer. However, the list is so
- 18 | lengthy, it would be difficult to, you know, ascertain exactly
- 19 | our plans with regard to each at this time.
- 20 THE COURT: Well, if you plan to offer them, I think
- 21 | you might as well -- obviously there's no objection to them --
- 22 go ahead and admit them. You're still in control of the
- 23 examination of the witness, and you've not been publishing any
- 24 of these thus far.
- 25 MR. McLELLAN: That would be fine with the

```
1
      government, Your Honor.
                THE COURT: All right. Wait just a moment. You had
 2
 3
      offered 53-1 and what?
                MR. McLELLAN: At this time I was just offering
 4
 5
      53-1, Your Honor.
                THE COURT: Well, let's see if we can move this
 6
 7
      along a bit. Which of the exhibits following 53-1 on the
      government's exhibit list do you intend to offer through Agent
 8
      Crowley, Mr. McLellan?
 9
10
                MR. McLELLAN: One moment, please, Your Honor.
11
                (Pause.)
12
                MR. McLELLAN: In sequence, Your Honor, all the way
13
      through 64-2.
14
                THE COURT: From 53-1, which is presently pending,
      down through 63-2?
15
16
                MR. McLELLAN: I believe so, Your Honor.
                MR. WILSON: It's 64-2, Your Honor.
17
                THE COURT: 64-2? Okay.
18
                MR. McLELLAN: I'm sorry, Your Honor.
19
2.0
                THE COURT: Is there going to be an objection from
21
      the defense to any of those exhibits, counsel?
                MR. WILSON: On behalf of Mr. Rosile, Your Honor,
22
23
      yes, there will be objections to documents that pertain to
24
      Mr. Rosile that the government intends to introduce.
```

MR. McLELLAN: Your Honor, perhaps we could break

25

```
1
      them into groups so that we could address -- there's a --
 2
      there's a -- there's a sequence that precedes -- it basically
 3
      runs from Government's Exhibit 53-1, I believe, through
      Government's Exhibit 58, which these -- these documents
 4
      pertain to defendant Snipes. Perhaps we could at least
      address those in the fashion --
 6
 7
                THE COURT: All right. Let do it incrementally.
 8
                Will Mr. Snipes have any objection to Government's
      Exhibits 53-1 through 58, inclusive, on the government's
 9
10
      exhibit list, Mr. Barnes?
11
                MR. BARNES: No, Judge.
12
                THE COURT: Then they are all received in evidence,
13
      Mr. McLellan.
14
                MR. McLELLAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
                THE COURT: Just a moment.
15
16
                (Pause.)
                THE COURT: Mr. Barnes, do all of the exhibits that
17
      you enumerated insofar as the Rule 106 motion or application
18
      is concerned relate to these exhibits that were just received?
19
2.0
                MR. BARNES: Yes, Judge.
21
                THE COURT: All right. I take it, Mr. Wilson, you
      don't have any objection to any of those exhibits -- or do
22
23
      you?
24
                MR. WILSON: No, Your Honor, we do not.
                THE COURT: All right. Then all of those exhibits
25
```

- 1 | that were enumerated -- government exhibits for identification
- 2 enumerated by Mr. Barnes a few moments ago beginning with
- 3 Government Exhibit 87-2 and ending with 134-2 are received in
- 4 evidence.
- And you're in control of the presentation of your
- 6 own case, of course, Mr. McLellan, but we don't have to worry
- 7 about admitting those exhibits.
- MR. McLELLAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 9 THE COURT: We're on a roll, members of the jury,
- 10 with respect to some of this, I think.
- 11 All right. It's back to you. You may continue,
- 12 Mr. McLellan.
- MR. McLELLAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 14 BY MR. McLELLAN:
- 15 Q. Mr. Crowley, taking a look at Exhibit 53-1, does that
- 16 represent the results of your search for any tax return Form
- 17 | 1040 filed by Wesley Snipes for 1999?
- 18 A. Yes, it does.
- 19 Q. What was the result of your search?
- 20 A. That there were no records found.
- 21 Q. Does that mean Mr. Snipes did not file a return as far as
- 22 the IRS is concerned?
- 23 A. That is correct.
- 24 Q. Taking a look at 52 -- I'm sorry -- 53-2, does that
- 25 | represent the results of that same type of search but for the

- 1 | period 2000?
- 2 A. Yes, it does.
- 3 Q. Did Mr. Snipes file a Form 1040, U.S. individual income
- 4 tax return for 2000?
- 5 A. No.
- 6 Q. Taking a look at Exhibit 53-3, did Mr. Snipes file an IRS
- 7 | individual income tax return Form 1040 for 2001?
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. 53-4, did Mr. Snipes file a Form 1040, U.S. individual
- 10 income tax return for 2002?
- 11 A. No.
- 12 Q. 53-5, did he file a Form 1040 for 2003?
- 13 A. No.
- Q. 53-6, did Mr. Snipes file a Form 1040, U.S. individual
- income tax return for the period 2004?
- 16 A. No.
- 17 Q. 53-7, did he file a U.S. individual income tax return for
- 18 2005?
- 19 A. No.
- 20 Q. Directing your attention to Government's Exhibits 54-1
- 21 through 54-7, do you have those before you?
- 22 A. Yes, I do.
- 23 | Q. Okay. Do those records all pertain to an entity called
- 24 Amen RA Films?
- 25 A. Yes, they do.

- 1 | Q. And what is the Taxpayer Identification Number of that
- 2 entity?
- 3 A. 581-97-3093.
- 4 Q. Did you conduct searches regarding the tax filing history
- 5 of this entity?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. How did you conduct those searches?
- 8 A. I did a search based on the Employer Identification Number
- 9 | that we just -- that I just entered -- spoke of based on
- 10 Amen RA Films.
- 11 | Q. Okay. And on these certifications, you have a listing of
- 12 description of information sought. Could you please read out
- 13 which forms you were checking for here in this search?
- 14 A. Form 1041, U.S. income tax return for estates and trusts;
- Form 1065, U.S. return of partnership income; Form 1120, U.S.
- 16 | corporation income tax return; and Form 1120S, U.S. income tax
- 17 return for an S-corporation.
- 18 Q. Okay. And does 54-1 represent the results of your search
- 19 for those tax forms for the entity Amen RA Films for the
- 20 | period 1999?
- 21 A. Yes, it does.
- 22 | Q. And what was the result of your search?
- 23 A. There was no records found.
- 24 | Q. Okay. Did you conduct a parallel search for the period
- 25 2000?

- 1 A. Yes, I did.
- 2 | 0. What was the result?
- 3 A. No records found.
- 4 | Q. Is that represented by Government's Exhibit 54-2?
- 5 A. Yes, it is.
- 6 Q. Taking a look at Government's Exhibit 54-3, results for
- 7 the same entity, the same forms for the period of 2001?
- 8 A. That's correct.
- 9 Q. I'm sorry. What were your results?
- 10 A. The results were no records found.
- 11 Q. Taking a look at Government's Exhibit 54-4, Amen RA Films,
- 12 that taxpayer I.D., period of 2002, were there any of these
- tax forms filed for that entity for 2002?
- 14 A. No, there were not.
- 15 Q. 54-5, were any of these forms filed for Amen RA Films for
- 16 the tax period 2003?
- 17 A. No, they were not.
- 18 \mid Q. 54-6, how about for the tax period 2004?
- 19 A. No, they were not.
- Q. 54-7, Amen RA Films, those various tax forms for the
- 21 period 2005, were any filed?
- 22 A. No.
- 23 | Q. Okay. Directing your attention to Government's Exhibit
- $24 \mid 55-1, 2, 3, 4,$ all the way through 6, do you have those in
- 25 | front of you?

- 1 A. Yes, I do.
- 2 Q. And what are those documents, just generally?
- 3 A. These are certification of lack of records, in this case
- 4 | Kymberlyte Production Services International, Incorporated.
- 5 Q. Okay. And did you employ a Taxpayer Identification Number
- 6 in your search of the IRS records?
- 7 A. Yes, I did.
- 8 Q. What was that number?
- 9 A. 943-37-2002.
- 10 Q. Okay. Again, were you searching for certain tax forms,
- whether they were filed in particular tax years for this
- 12 entity?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Okay. And what were the forms that you were checking for
- 15 here?
- 16 A. Form 1041, U.S. income tax return for estates and trusts;
- 17 Form 1065, U.S. return of partnership income; Form 1120, U.S.
- 18 | corporation income tax return.
- 19 Q. Okay. For the tax period 2000, did Kymberlyte Production
- 20 Services International, Incorporated, file any of these forms?
- 21 A. No, they did not.
- 22 | O. Okay. Is that represented by Exhibit 55-1?
- 23 | A. Yes, it is.
- Q. Okay. 55-2, did you check for the same filings for
- 25 Kymberlyte Production Services International, Incorporated,

- 1 for 2001?
- 2 A. Yes, I did.
- Q. Were there any?
- 4 A. No, there were not.
- 5 Q. And 55-3, Kymberlyte Production Services International,
- 6 Incorporated, the same forms, were any filed for 2002?
- 7 A. No, they were not.
- 8 | Q. 55-4, the same forms for Kymberlyte Production Services
- 9 International, Incorporated, for the period 2003, were any
- 10 | filed?
- $11 \mid A$. No, they were not.
- 12 Q. 55-5, the period 2004, Kymberlyte Production Services
- 13 International, Incorporated, were any of these returns filed?
- 14 A. No, they were not.
- 15 Q. 55-6, for the period 2005 for Kymberlyte Production
- 16 \mid Services International, Incorporated, were any of Forms 1041,
- 17 | 1065 or 1120 filed for the entity in 2005?
- 18 A. No, they were not.
- 19 Q. Is that represented by Government's Exhibit 55-6?
- 20 A. Yes, it is.
- 21 | Q. Okay. Taking a look at Government's Exhibit 56-1 --
- 22 okay -- the entities that you were just testifying about had
- what are known as EIN numbers, did they not?
- 24 A. That's correct.
- 25 | O. What's an EIN number?

- 1 A. That's an Employer Identification Number.
- 2 Q. Okay. And when you conducted those searches, did you use
- 3 | employment identification -- Employer Identification Numbers
- 4 | that had been provided to you for these entities?
- 5 A. Yes, I did.
- 6 Q. Okay. Now, were you also requested to search for specific
- 7 entity names in this case?
- 8 A. Yes, I was.
- 9 Q. And what method did you use for that?
- 10 A. I would do a search on the database. Since I did not have
- 11 the Employer Identification Number, I would search for an
- 12 Employer Identification Number doing a wildcard search on the
- 13 | information I was given for the names.
- 14 Q. Okay. For example, the Exhibit 56-1, what is that
- 15 document?
- 16 A. This is a certification of lack of record for the taxpayer
- 17 | name of SST Swiss Sterling Trust.
- 18 Q. Okay. Did you do a search for that taxpayer name in the
- 19 IRS records?
- 20 | A. Yes, I did.
- 21 | Q. And what were the results?
- 22 A. That we had no information.
- 23 | Q. Okay. Taking a look at Exhibit 56-2, is that another
- 24 certification of lack of record?
- 25 A. Yes, it is.

- 1 | Q. Is it the results of a search for another similar name?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. And what was that name?
- 4 A. This name here is Swiss Sterling Trust.
- 5 | Q. Okay. And was that name known in the IRS records?
- 6 A. No.
- 7 | Q. How about 56-3; did you search another similar name?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And what was that name?
- 10 A. This name is SST Swiss Sterling Trust 1987AG.
- 11 Q. Okay. And did the IRS have records of any filings by that
- 12 entity?
- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. Did any of these entities have Employer Identification
- 15 Numbers?
- 16 A. No, they did not.
- 17 Q. Okay. Taking a look at the last of these certifications,
- 18 Government's Exhibits 57-1 through 57-7, do all these
- 19 represent the results of the search for the same entity?
- 20 A. Yes, they do.
- 21 | Q. Okay. What was the Taxpayer Identification Number of that
- 22 entity?
- 23 | A. 943-33-4120.
- Q. Okay. What's the name for this entity?
- 25 A. Amen RA Films PCT, Horizon Management Services, General

- 1 Partner.
- Q. Okay. And did you check to see whether this entity filed
- 3 certain types of returns that you've listed on your
- 4 certification?
- 5 A. Yes, I have.
- 6 Q. Okay. And what were those forms?
- 7 A. Form 1041, U.S. income tax return for estates and trusts;
- 8 Form 1065, U.S. return of partnership income; Form 1120, U.S.
- 9 corporation income tax return.
- 10 | Q. Okay. And did you conduct that same search for that same
- 11 entity for 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005?
- 12 A. Yes, I did.
- 13 Q. And what was the result of your searches?
- 14 A. There were no records.
- 15 Q. Taking a look at Government's Exhibit Number 58, what is
- 16 that document?
- 17 A. This is a copy of a Form 2848, power of attorney and
- 18 declaration of representative.
- 19 MR. McLELLAN: Would you please project Bates number
- 20 | 15406?
- 21 BY MR. McLELLAN:
- 22 Q. Again, Mr. Crowley, what is this document?
- 23 A. This is a power of attorney and declaration of
- 24 representative.
- Q. Okay. And in part one under taxpayer identification --

- 1 sorry -- taxpayer information, whose name appears there?
- 2 A. Wesley Snipes.
- 3 | Q. And with what Social Security Number?
- 4 A.
- 5 Q. Okay. And taking a look at the second page of this
- 6 document, who appears to have signed in Section 9 for
- 7 | signature of taxpayer?
- 8 A. That appears to be Wesley Snipes.
- 9 | O. On what date?
- 10 A. March 6, 2004.
- 11 | Q. Is there a name printed under there?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 | Q. What would that name be?
- 14 A. Wesley Snipes.
- 15 Q. Okay. And directing your attention to the first page --
- 16 MR. BARNES: Brief sidebar, Your Honor?
- 17 THE COURT: Very well.

18 AT SIDEBAR:

- 19 MR. BARNES: Yes, Your Honor. I only had a request
- 20 that they redact our particular names from the POA. My
- 21 understanding of the government's contention for the evidence
- 22 is that Mr. Snipes had an attorney and particularly for venue
- 23 purposes that he listed the residence in Florida at that point
- 24 in time. We would ask that our names be removed from the POA
- so that there wouldn't be any prejudice of that issue,

1 Your Honor. That's --THE COURT: What's the date on this document? 2 3 MR. McLELLAN: It's 2004, March -- March, is it? THE COURT: What do you say to redacting the name, 4 5 counsel? MR. McLELLAN: No objection, Your Honor. 6 7 THE COURT: Okay. Is there some way you can -- I take it you're interested in admitting the document because of 8 the address? 9 10 MR. McLELLAN: That is correct, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Why don't we stop for the day and let 12 this be done. This has been sort of a weary day for the jury, 13 I suspect. 14 MR. BARNES: Yes, Judge. MR. McLELLAN: Thank you, Judge. 15 IN OPEN COURT: 16 17 THE COURT: Members of the jury, there's a matter here that I need to pursue with counsel briefly -- or counsel 18 need to pursue. And it's coming up on 5:00. And this has 19 20 been a somewhat tedious day, but I think we've made 21 substantial progress. And it would be prudent that we recess until 9:00 tomorrow morning and continue at that time with the 22 23 trial of the case. 24 I appreciate your very patient attention today. And

being mindful, as I'm sure you will be, of all the

25

instructions you've been given about things to avoid while you're not in the courtroom, you're now excused until 9:00 tomorrow morning.

(The jury exited the courtroom, having been excused from further proceedings on this date.)

THE COURT: Agent Crowley, you can step down. We're recessed until 9:00 in the morning, as you just heard.

Be seated a moment, please, everyone.

I have one or two brief matters I wish to raise with counsel. One is, at the end of the afternoon break, as I understand it, or during the afternoon break, our first alternate juror, Charlotte Scruggs, in the thirteenth chair of the expanded jury box, notified the clerk -- who will correct me if I misstate, Madam Clerk -- that she just learned last night that an aunt whom she has not seen in 25 years has been or is employed by the Internal Revenue Service.

That's correct, Madam Clerk?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: That's correct.

THE COURT: I don't think it requires any action at all with respect to someone she's not seen in 25 years, but, nevertheless, that communication came from a juror so I relate it to you.

And, Mr. Kahn, I have not asked you about your participation with respect to the examination of witnesses.

You have announced you don't intend to participate, so I'm

1 relying on you, I want you to understand, to raise your hand 2 or stand up anytime you change your mind, you understand? DEFENDANT KAHN: Well, can I speak right now? 3 THE COURT: Surely. DEFENDANT KAHN: Okay. Yes, I wanted to talk to you about that anyway because since the jury is aware that I'm not 6 going to be participating and I don't consent to the 7 proceeding, I really don't think there's any reason for me to 8 9 continue to come here and stay, do you? 10 THE COURT: Well, your right to be present involves 11 a constitutional right, you understand, to say nothing of 12 Rule 43 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, Mr. Kahn. 13 What's the government's -- are you asking to be 14 excused from the courtroom? DEFENDANT KAHN: I'm just saying I don't see any 15 16 reason for me to be here because, number one --17 THE COURT: That's not quite -- my question was, are you asking to be excused from the courtroom? 18 DEFENDANT KAHN: Yeah, I'm -- yes. Yes. 19 2.0 THE COURT: What's the government say to this? 21 MR. O'NEILL: Your Honor, Rule 43, as the Court 22 knows, says the defendant must be present. 23 MR. BERNHOFT: May I speak briefly to that issue, 24 Your Honor? 25 THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Bernhoft.

1 MR. BERNHOFT: Just an observation that I think that 2 the -- the right to be present in a federal criminal trial at 3 all proceedings is waivable. I cannot cite a specific case but am anecdotally familiar with certain proceedings in which 4 defendants have declared their intention to absent themselves from the proceedings and be --6 7 THE COURT: Well, wait just a minute. MR. BERNHOFT: Yes, sir. 8 9 THE COURT: Let me read Rule 43, Mr. Bernhoft --10 MR. BERNHOFT: Yes, sir. THE COURT: -- and then I'll be able to entertain 11 your remarks more intelligently. 12 13 (Pause.) 14 MR. BERNHOFT: I would respectfully point the Court's attention to 43 sub (c)(1)(A) and then 43(c)(2). 15 16 (Pause.) 17 THE COURT: Clearly, Rule 43 contemplates that the right to be present may be waived either voluntarily or 18 involuntarily, Mr. O'Neill. 19 2.0 Do you intend to call any witnesses with respect to 21 whom the identification of Mr. Kahn by the witness is somehow material to the case? 22 23 MR. O'NEILL: Yes, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Well, think about that over the evening. 25 And we can have Mr. Kahn present in court on those occasions

and perhaps excuse him otherwise. That seems to be his wish,
and it might, indeed, relieve some of the burden of the
Marshal.

So we'll work on it, Mr. Kahn.

DEFENDANT KAHN: All right, sir.

MR. BERNHOFT: Your Honor, if I might, I also believe that Mr. Kahn can stipulate to any of these visual IDs in the courtroom. It's routinely done. And that would also -- a stipulation as to any identifications would also be available.

THE COURT: Well, I think that's largely up to the government, Mr. Bernhoft. I'm not going to tell the government how to try its case.

MR. O'NEILL: Your Honor, if I may, clearly Rule 43 contemplates the absence of the defendant if he voluntarily waives it.

I would only note for the Court -- the Court's obviously aware -- if he's going to waive -- it's also, in addition to a statutory right, most definitely a constitutional right, so any waiver would have to be knowing and intelligently made in order to be valid.

THE COURT: Well, I'll go over it further with him when the time comes. And I'll discuss it with the Marshal as well. See if you can drop by chambers, please, Marshal.

All right. We'll recess until 9:00 in the morning.

		185	
1	(Thereupon, the proceedings in this case for this		
2	date were concluded at this time.)		
3			
4	CERTIFICATE		
5	We hereby certify that the foregoing is an accurate		
6	transcription of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.		
7			
8			
9			
10	Dennis Miracle Date		
11			
12			
13			
14			
15	Kelly Owen McCall Date		
16			
17	WITNESS: PAGE NO.		
18	BRIAN TUCKER		
19	Direct by Mr. Morris 84		
20	Cross by Mr. Barnes 128 Cross by Mr. Wilson 134 Redirect by Mr. Morris 135		
21			
22	RAYMOND THOMAS COUDRIET, SR.		
23	Direct by Mr. Morris 139 Cross by Mr. Barnes 142		
24	PAUL CROWLEY		
25	Direct by Mr. McLellan 144		

_	_	_
1	O	4
- 1	\sim	r 1

		=00
1	EXHIBIT:	ADMITTED
2	Government's Exhibit 1-1	86
	Government's Exhibits 1-2 and 1-3	87
3	Government's Exhibits 2-1 through 2-4	90
	Government's Exhibit 2-5	98
4	Government's Exhibits 3-1 through 3-3	101
	Government's Exhibits 3-4 through 3-9	102
5	Government's Exhibits 4-1 through 4-10	103
	Government's Exhibit 5	104
6	Government's Exhibits 6 and 7	104
	Government's Exhibits 8 through 16	106
7	Government's Exhibits 17 through 28	108
	Government's Exhibit 29	109
8	Government's Exhibits 30 and 31	109
	Government's Exhibit 32	110
9	Government's Exhibit 33	111
	Government's Exhibit 34	112
10	Government's Exhibits 39-1 through 39-6	146
	Government's Exhibits 40-1 through 40-4	153
11	Government's Exhibits 41-1 through 41-3	155
	Government's Exhibits 42-1 through 42-3	155
12	Government's Exhibit 43	156
	Government's Exhibits 44-1 through 44-4	157
13	Government's Exhibits 45-1 through 45-3	157
	Government's Exhibit 46	158
14	Government's Exhibits 47-1 through 47-3	159
	Government's Exhibits 48-1 through 48-4	160
15	Government's Exhibits 49-1 through 49-3	162
1,	Government's Exhibit 50	163
16	Government's Exhibits 51-1 through 51-3 Government's Exhibit 52-1	164
17	Government's Exhibit 52-1 Government's Exhibit 52-2	165 165
/	Government's Exhibit 52-2 Government's Exhibits 53-1 through 58	169
18	Government's Exhibits 87-2 through 134-2	170
10	Government S Exhibits 67-2 through 134-2	170
19	* * * * * *	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		