

Charles H. Clements  
1741 Dallas Street  
Aurora, Adams County  
Colorado

Donald S. Quick  
Deputy Attorney General  
Criminal Justice Section  
Office of the Attorney General  
State Services Building  
1525 Sherman Street- Fifth Floor  
Denver, CO 80203

Ref: your letter of 29 NOV 01

03 DEC 01

Mr. Deputy Attorney General Quick:

Thank you for your prompt and responsive letter of 29 November.

Reference your first paragraph; am I to understand that Attorney General Salazar will exercise jurisdiction regarding the several charges that I've made in the first letter and that you are the leader in the investigation? I certainly feel confident in your responsible professionalism and inclination to move forward firmly.

Reference your second paragraph in which you say that the 'investigators and prosecutor' mentioned in my Charges state 'unequivocally that my statements are false'. I have a few questions about their positions and the scope of their characterizations;

1. Do they maintain that they did not charge me with sixteen crimes of which I had never even been accused, and for which there was no evidence, no witness, no testimony?

The Transcript of the Grand Jury proceedings doesn't indicate in any portion that any of the sixteen false charges were in any way justified. The indictment by the State's Grand Jury only mentions my name in one instance. The Arrest Warrant details all seventeen charges, my bonding agreement mentions all seventeen charges.

All of the charges were dropped at the petition of the Jefferson County District Attorney's Office as it became obvious that they were unfounded, frivolous and untenable.

Which part of that do they consider 'unequivocally false'?

2. Do they maintain that Don Estep and Gary Clyman, and others unnamed, were not used as investigators and under the direction of Marleen Langfield of your office in some such nomenclature as the Multi-Jurisdictional Domestic Terrorism TaskForce?

These men are sworn officers; highly trained, responsible and in a special knowledge of the law. They have worked at the special direction of SAAG Langfield, both in her section at the Att'y Gen's Office and while standing as a Special Deputy District Attorney for the Jefferson County Colorado District Attorney's Office.

3. Do they deny that the two investigators Gary Clyman, of your office, and Donald Estep did not demand and receive the confidential passwords to access my computer and webspace?

The continuity of the official record available to your office is unbroken. This would be jail records, transportation logs, communications logs, such computer logs, etc. on or about the time between 18 FEB 01 and 24 FEB 01.

4. Do they deny that, on or about Thursday, 22<sup>nd</sup> of February of 2001, in the early evening, Gary Clyman did not demand, specifically, and receive the confidential means to access my computer from remote station, as well as the passwords to access any of my datasites?

5. Do they maintain that they did not make a copy of my computer's internal record, URL's and e-mail addresses on a red floppy data disc, brought for the purpose and carried away on the person of Don Estep?

Investigators Clyman and Estep demanded, threatening of 'vigorous personal prosecution' of 'aiding and abetting a Federal Fugitive', that I give them remote access to my computer, all of it's files and all confidential passwords and authorizations. They are unique, but for myself, in that knowledge.

Both Clyman and Estep spoke of their familiarity with computers and are competent to effect all of these actions by their own self-characterizations.

Shortly after they obtained this confidential information, all of my business and personal websites were destroyed, the passwords altered and access denied to me.

That data operation can only be done with the several, different, confidential access authorizations.

Investigators Clyman and Estep are the only ones in the world, besides myself, to have that complete information.

My primary password is six digits; one vowel, three consonants, one type ornament, one numeral- all case sensitive. The odds of 'decrypting' my primary password are utterly infinitesimal; there are three more passwords and proprietary number sequences; the only option is to have all the passwords and codes from the only source, me.

Your office has, and has had, remote access to my computer at your will for many months. The records of accessing my websites are immutable and held as data by the web servers. That record will also reflect the ISP of the originating computer and the precise time of the order origination, the telephone or data line used, the complete server information. The log of the originating computer will have a record of the order and reception acknowledgement of the order.

Tangible evidence of the destruction of my websites and access to them, as well as the damage to my businesses and personal reputation are available from my e-mail records

and discussion available through Google- all of which is available to you and any forensic computer scientist at your leisure- that would be in addition to the remote access option demanded by Investigators Clyman and Estep.

A forensic computer facility such as you describe will have no trouble tracking the orders from their origination to their acknowledgement of action as the information is stored on the Internet and your office has all the access passwords.

It's not presently clear to me how a physical access to my computer hardware would be any different from the immediate remote access your office has had for many months.

Any diagnostic program will give you every particular of my hardware. I would have to be somewhat more persuaded that physically taking my computer would be of any use to you at all.

I haven't changed any codes or passwords, so the forensic continuity is unbroken and available to any forensic computer scientist.

Which part of that do they consider 'false' and do they have any alternative explanation for a mathematically astronomically improbable event?

In the alternative, that still leaves a series of Computer Crimes to be solved- ones that materially destroyed evidence in both State and Federal court actions, as well as being Retaliation against a Witness and Obstruction of Justice.

Unless you have a significantly different understanding of such crimes than I have.

6. Do they deny that I've never been a Principal in any of these disputes and only a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party witness in the various State actions and Federal suits to which they are Respondent?

The Attorney General's office has been respondent to suits to which I have been a denominated witness. Gayle Norton, Maurice Knaiser and perhaps the present Mr. Salazar, if memory serves, are amongst the named respondents. A number of judges of the Jefferson County Combined Court, the District Attorney's Office of Jefferson County, the Jefferson County Sheriff's Department, the City of Golden (in Jefferson County), the Police Department of Golden Colorado are respondent to Federal Complaints and in some cases, represented by the Colorado State Attorney General's Office.

The named respondents to those suits are associated, primarily, with only two groups; those associated with Jefferson County Colorado, and those associated with, or represented by, the Colorado State Attorney General's Office.

The Complaints for Damages figure in hazard of decades of imprisonment and millions of dollars in damages and fines for several of those Respondents, and constitute a significant motive for such actions on their part.

Which part of that do they consider 'unequivocally false'?

7. Did they maintain that the testimony given by Victoria de Thouars-Tollman, Hector Bonilla and Arabella T. Bonilla was not perjury?

I know that it was perjury. I can prove it.

Perjury in front of a Grand Jury, or giving false information to Law Enforcement, must be a crime. The only question seems to be who has the jurisdiction to prosecute a perjurer in front of a State Grand Jury. I was accused, indicted, arrested, incarcerated, charged, bonded and retained counsel to go forward on charges that totaled over fifty years of possible prison time for crimes of which I could not possibly have been guilty.

Am I not equally protected under the Law, and that as enforced without fear or favor?

Victoria de Thouars-Tollman gave the only testimony that would support any idea of my being capable of any of the crimes charged. Her example was a fantasy meeting in which I was supposed to have threatened a woman with bodily harm at her place of business. That has never happened in my life- it is a fabrication and it is directly material to the indictment that accused me of a felony. Her animus towards me, and my contemplation of suit against her for criminal defamation long prior to her perjury, is well known to Don Estep and others of his associates and fully documented from years before her perjury. An interview and investigation of Ms. dT-Tollman would, no doubt, be instructive as to the genesis of her testimony/information and would, no doubt, lead to Criminal Charges.

Hector Bonilla is a liar- it's just that simple. He is well known to Don Estep and to the FBI as the closest associate of Carlos Bonilla; a convicted drug smuggler, an arms dealer to the drug cartels, a confidential informant, and the principal in all the disputed contracts and work product that form the basis for the dispute in this case. The criminal enterprise, known as the Bonilla Crime Family in it's association with Cinco Familias and La Eme, is well known to Don Estep from his association with the FBI and the interviews and complaints lodged with them as well as with the Rocky Mountain Drug Task Force- I believe the contact there is Stephanie Villafuentes.

Arabella Bonilla is delusional. I'm not sure what the depth of her incapacity is, but it's significant, chronic and has resulted in her needing professional care on various occasions. Her mental history and lack of credibility are well known to the investigators and were known or should have been known to the examiner before the Grand Jury as well as Arabella's participation in the criminal enterprise and to benefit from its fruits. I have had conversations and contacts with her that directly contravene her testimony to the Grand Jury and that reflected in the investigatory record from far prior to my knowledge of any testimony by her.

8. Do they maintain that they have not reserved exculpatory evidence from the Court that was in their possession?

The materials confiscated at the SWAT assault of record in Golden, the one at 38<sup>th</sup> Ave. and in a motor home were not only exculpatory of the charges brought in the indictment, they were material to the various Federal Cases to which Don Estep, the Jefferson County Sheriff's Department, the various judge/clients of the Attorney General's Office and the respondents in the Attorney General's Office itself are claimed for damages. None of that material showed in any way that I was a principal to any of these disputes, saving as a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Witness to various events and activities of the principals.

Which part of that do they consider 'unequivocally false'?

9. Did Gary Clyman or Don Estep discuss with you that they were the subjects of Civil Rights complaints to the Federal Bureau of Investigation long prior to the presentation of 'evidence' to a State Grand Jury?

Don Estep, and more particularly, the Jefferson County Sheriff's Department and some of the Officers of the Court for whom he is the 'Intelligence Investigator', have been claimed for damages and charged with various crimes and improprieties for some years now. A reasonable man might well be engaged to begin to discern a pattern of activity, over a period of time, of abuse of process; malicious interference, obstruction of justice, witness intimidation, evidence tampering, improprieties and slight diligence; a host of activities that seem, on their face, to be highly improper by any professional standard at all.

I would like to be able to formulate a response to declaratory answers to any of those questions as appropriate. Any slight diligence of investigation will find that my allegations are true and that the perception of impropriety, if not criminality, seems inevitable. It is, of course, the responsibility of you trusted professionals to plumb the legalities of this matter; I only present the facts of the events, as I know them, for your evaluation, investigation and vigorous prosecution.

Thank you very much for your attention and interest in this matter.

Very Sincerely,

Charles H. Clements