

Intervenor Amicus Curiae Brief

I have been retained by Sue Bell to represent her in the matter of presenting evidence to the U.S. federal prosecutor in the criminal matters surrounding the convicted pedophile Wilfred Bell.

Due to the delicate legal nature, I request and urge that this brief should be sealed due to the potential of an impaneling of a grand jury to examine the evidence that has been provided to U.S. Prosecuting Attorney by Sue Bell. Evidence for determination as to whether any political malfeasance wrongdoing transpired by any Judiciary review, or criminal wrongdoing by plaintiff's and plaintiff's attorneys that may have been a party to endangering an interdict, attempts to defraud the federal government and the wrongful death of an interdict. Attorneys involved in the Bankruptcy case steered this case for personal revenge having been sued on negligence and malpractice as evidence was provided. Wrongfully filed TRO, non compliance of Rule 11 and a trustee who did not make any attempt to recover damages that a judgment was provided with only the quantum to be decided.

In the course of my representation with regards to her meeting with the Prosecutor, Ms. Bell also advised me of pertinent information with regards to circumstances that prevailed during a trial on the merits in the Louisiana Western Bankruptcy District as follows:

1. That mid way during her trial in the above referenced matter, her attorney upon leaving a chamber meeting disclosed to her what the Judge advised being; "If she puts everything back now I might not charge her with the \$162,000." The urgency is that this statement was made after the plaintiff's case presentation and prior to any testimony or evidence on her case.
2. That the plaintiff's were not deterred once during a three day presentation of their case. Upon her proceeding to present her case the Judge stopped her from testifying with regards to the evidence in her bench book. This is very important, because this testimony was to be the only testimony on the factual evidence in this very unusual criminal case.
3. Ultimately, the Judges Decision makes absolutely no mention of a preponderance of evidence in the bench books. What is even more concerning is that although ALL the evidence was designated to transfer to the District Court, this did not happen accordingly. In fact no evidence, transcripts, or exhibits were transferred.
4. The evidence not being presented to the District Court certainly poses the potential the justice certainly could not prevail and extraordinary circumstances or intent of the withholding of ALL the case evidence.

Because of these circumstances and other information I am privileged of. I am compelled to urge this 5th circuit panel to please review the case before them on appeal from a De Novo standard examining the issues of abuse of discretionary power, clear errors of the law and standards and clear error of evidence that did not support any of the Bankruptcy's Court's conclusions.