

POTUS - (02) - White House Deputy Counsel Vince Foster DEATH
Supreme Court of the United States / Docket # 02-1263

PART 3 of 3

AmeriTrust Groupe

FAXED
10 Jul 18

received
S-31-IAND

U.S. CUSTOMS
Service - OFFICE
OF INTERNAL
AFFAIRS,
ET AL

Date : 10 July 18

To : ① U.S. President D. J. TRUMP
② U.S. President Albert Gore, Jr
③ U.S. Department of Justice
④ U.S. Department of Homeland Security
⑤ All Fellow AMERICANS ⇒

SDR Passports

From : MR L.G. WANTA, No. 04362 P12535

Message : ① White House Deputy Counsel
Vince Foster, Jr. "Murder" Investigation
② ~~②~~ HTTP://FBICOVER-UP.COM

③ Supreme Court of the United States
Docket for 02-1263

HTTP://EAGLEONETOWANTA.COM



authenticity and validity of the Diplomatic Passports was contained within the original documents. The county court and representatives of the State of Wisconsin knew that originals of pertinent Diplomatic documents were in the care, custody and control of the State of Wisconsin and not in the possession of Petitioner.

Neither the Somalia Democratic Republic nor Petitioner has waived the right to assert and expect "Diplomatic Immunity" for Petitioner (either in this jurisdiction or any other jurisdiction).

The issue of Petitioner's mental competence mentioned herein not only occurred prior to the county court trial of Petitioner but also continued as an ongoing attack on the claimed lack of competency of the Petitioner by the State of Wisconsin after the trial. Petitioner continually denied that Petitioner was incompetent and medical examiners concurred with the personal opinion of Petitioner. Post-trial accusations concerning questions of Petitioner's competency repeatedly focused on Petitioner's claim of Diplomatic Immunity and multiple and repetitive assertions that the Petitioner adamantly objected to the county court improperly and illegally claiming personal jurisdiction over the Petitioner. One jurist in the United States District Court made mention that the Diplomatic relationship with the Country of Somalia was "Bizarre".

Since November of 1993 Ambassador Wanta has been held as a political prisoner by the State of Wisconsin contrary to international law, conventions and treaties to which the United States is a party. Petitioner has not only been held a political prisoner he has also been subject to State of Wisconsin judicial court orders directing that Petitioner be

administered mind altering drugs to correct conditions of non-medically documented evidence of delusion. The opinion of the court regarding the alleged delusional mental state of Petitioner is not substantiated by medical evaluation. Dr. Connie Lee the primary physician responsible for evaluating the mental condition of Petitioner, for the State of Wisconsin, specifically found that Petitioner is not delusional and Dr. Lee rejected the court order to drug the Petitioner and refused to prescribe the administering and/or dispensing of drugs to Petitioner. In addition Dr. Lee was of the opinion that administering such drugs could cause death or permanent physical damage to Petitioner.

The lack of "jurisdiction" over the person Petitioner began at the time of Petitioner's entry into the United States in November of 1993. Confirmation of a "suggestion" of Diplomatic Immunity occurred when the United States District Court Judge for the Southern District of New York acknowledges possession of Petitioner's Diplomatic Passports and possession of Diplomatic papers. The above set forth "Historical" aspects of the case reveal several instances where there is mention that Petitioner claims Diplomatic Immunity and there is acknowledgment that official Diplomatic documents are in the custody and control of agents and representatives of the State of Wisconsin. The State of Wisconsin County Court judge that ruled against Diplomatic Immunity did so based on statements concerning the credibility of copies. This County Court ruling was made by the same Judge that presided over a hearing where there was specific mention that the original Diplomatic Passports and other Diplomatic documents were seen by the prosecutor and other concerned parties. The hearing findings placed the Petitioner in a position of personal jeopardy in contravention of United States Department of State policies on dealing with Diplomatic agents.

The actions filed in the United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin and the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit set forth various causes of action. One of the causes of action addressed Diplomatic Immunity and in form and substance the Diplomatic Immunity cause of action was virtually identical with the background and facts set out in this petition. The primary distinction is that the actions filed in the two Federal Courts had transcripts and other documentation attached as exhibits that corroborates the facts set forth herein.

The crux of the decision by the United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin, which decision is in essence affirmed summarily by the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, was that all causes of action raised by Petitioner, including Diplomatic Immunity had been decided by the jury conviction of Petitioner in the State of Wisconsin County Court. The decisions found that Petitioner's only remedy was a 28 U.S.C. § 2254 post conviction filing and since the statute of limitations had expired Petitioner had no avenue available in the Federal Courts for his claims to be heard and adjudicated. A finding that Diplomatic Immunity had been ruled upon by a jury has no basis either in substance or fact since not only was this not an issue ever presented to a jury this most importantly is not an issue that would ever be presented to a jury. It is incorrect to conclude that (with the known factual background) the State of Wisconsin judicial system had jurisdiction over the person in the "first instance". Lack of personal jurisdiction in accordance with the cited statutes, regulations, Treaty and Department of State policy statements brought forth inviolability over the person in the "first instance". With no power over the person there is no jurisdiction over the person. The trial of Petitioner in the State of Wisconsin had only one of the fundamental

To state that a representative of a state or international organization shall be inviolable is to state that he shall not be subject to any arrest and/or detention.

In 1978, Congress enacted the Diplomatic Immunity Act, 22 U.S.C. §§ 254a, *et seq.*, to implement the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations as the sole law on the subject in the United States. The Vienna Convention Article 29, provides full personal diplomatic inviolability stating simply

[t]he person of a diplomatic agent shall be inviolable. Article 40 of the Vienna Convention makes the terms and conditions of the Treaty applicable to diplomatic agents coming through one State in process of returning to another State. All persons who are inviolable may not be served with process. The service of process is an assertion of jurisdiction and is thus precluded as to persons such as diplomatic agents.

See Aidi v. Yaron, 672 F. Supp. 516, 517 (D.D.C. 1987). “[I]t is axiomatic that if jurisdiction is not available, then service of process is void, making a motion to quash service of process a valid remedy”. *Vulcan Iron Works v. Polish Am. Machinery Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 77, 78 (S.D.N.Y. 1979).

The Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution provides in part that, “all Treaties made or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the Supreme Law of the Land”. United States Constitution, Article VI, Clause 2. Title 22 U.S.C. § 254(d) in describing the method of asserting and/or claiming Diplomatic immunity clearly uses the word “or” leaving open the option of either

a "suggestion", "or" as otherwise permitted. It is accepted that the "suggestion" must be from a credible source. Petitioner submits that the "suggestion" made by the overt actions of the United States Consulate and customs/immigration authorities, the substance of which "suggestion" has been known to all pertinent parties since Petitioner's arrival in the United States in November of 1993, is sufficient to lead a reasonable person to conclude that the "suggestion" comes from a credible source.

It is assumed that the United States Consulate in Switzerland issuing the "Identification Card" and/or immigration and customs authorities supervising admittance of Petitioner into the United States (using a foreign issued passport) were and are aware of the following United States Code and Code of Federal Regulation references:

8 U.S.C. § 1185 provides in part:

(b) Citizens

Except as otherwise provided by the President and subject to such limitations and exceptions as the President may authorize and prescribe, it shall be unlawful for any citizen of the United States to depart from or enter, the United States unless he bears a valid United States passport.

22 C.F.R. Section 53.1 provides in part:

Under section 215(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. § 1185(b)), it is unlawful except as otherwise provided for any citizen of

the United States to depart from or enter, or attempt to depart from or enter, the United States without a valid passport.

Obviously the issuance of the "Identification Card" substantiates a known exception to the cited references and furthermore allowing entrance into the United States by immigration officials exemplifies an exception and sufficient "suggestion" of validity to warrant confirmation of Diplomatic Immunity upon the Petitioner.

The State of Wisconsin is in possession of Petitioner's Diplomatic Passports and Diplomatic Pouch in contravention of the Vienna Convention and the holding of said items and failing to recognize the Diplomatic Immunity of Petitioner disregards policy statements issued by the United States Department of State. The meaning given treaty provisions by the departments of Government charged with their negotiation and enforcement is given great weight. *Kolovrat v. Oregon*, 366 U.S. 187 at 194 (1961). The directives of the Department of State reflect that Petitioner was entitled to Diplomatic Immunity and not subject to arrest and/or prosecution.

The State of Wisconsin has put restrictions on Petitioner that he may not make reference in any manner to his Ambassadorship unless the validity of his Ambassadorship is confirmed to the acceptance of the State of Wisconsin. Petitioner has continually argued that the State of Wisconsin has no authority to question the validity of the foreign issued passports. The issuance by the United States Consulate of the "Identification Card" within the "four corners" of the Diplomatic Passports and acceptance of the same by immigration authorities for entrance into the United States unquestionably demonstrates the validity of the documents.

The State of Wisconsin has no jurisdiction in the matter as the matter is subject to the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution, International Treaty and the Vienna Convention. The Federal Constitution, laws and Treaties therefore preempt state and local enactments that conflict with federal authority or purport to regulate in any area reserved exclusively to the Federal Government.

The issues raised by Petitioner are clearly distinguishable with the decisions of this Court in cases such as *Beard v. Greene*, 523 U.S. 371 (1998). In the *Beard* case and similar cases the issue concerns a procedural matter of allowing a foreign national defendant to have notice given to and consultation with a legal representative provided by the defendant's foreign national State consular offices. These distinguishable cases are not concerned with jurisdiction over a person having Diplomatic Immunity "in the first instance". Jurisdiction is the primary and foremost issue in this case. Petitioner's own "suggestions", motions to the county court and the "suggestions" of others invalidated any jurisdiction claimed over the Petitioner. The third party "suggestions" and other representations at or immediately prior to Petitioner's passage through immigration at the Port of Entry in New York clearly confirm that jurisdiction was negated from on or before November 13, 1993. Lack of jurisdiction and unlawful holding of Petitioner continues at the time of filing this petition.

The State of Wisconsin and other judicial jurisdictions do not have the authority and/or Constitutional right to supersede their own judgment in this matter.

Diplomatic Immunity is a privilege extended to a person by Treaty, statute, regulation and code. The inviolability of

the person diplomat and negation of jurisdiction pertains to jurisdiction over the person. Diplomatic Immunity nullifies the power of the court over the person. Petitioner satisfied the conditions for being granted Diplomatic Immunity through the endorsement by the United States Consulate in Switzerland in issuing an Identification Card in Petitioner's foreign issued Diplomatic Passport. The Petitioner strengthened his "suggestion" of Diplomatic Immunity when Consulate actions are combined with immigration authorities ratifying the right of passage into the United States by acceptance for admittance of a United States citizen in possession of foreign issued Diplomatic Passport. The Petitioner's "suggestion" was further strengthened by confirmation of existence of Diplomatic material including passports and other items by the United States District Court in New York.

II. THE QUESTION PRESENTED IS AN IMPORTANT ONE THAT WARRANTS THIS COURT'S REVIEW.

The decisions below are incorrect. They should not be allowed to stand. This Court not granting this petition would in essence amount to a sanction by this Court conferring upon States an implied power to supersede the true intent of an internationally adopted Treaty and the statements of policy issued by the United States Department of State.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be granted. Petitioner would also suggest and respectfully request that this Court issue such further Orders and findings to immediately and forthwith restore Petitioners internationally protected rights and immunity in accordance with the cited authorities and reference to State Department policy and procedure referenced in this petition.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS E. HENRY
1125 South 79th Street
Omaha, NE 68124
(402) 933-6421

STEVEN D. GOODWIN
GOODWIN, SUTTON & DUVAL, PLC
Old City Hall, Suite 350
1001 East Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 643-0000

Counsel for Petitioner

**APPENDIX A — ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH
CIRCUIT DECIDED NOVEMBER 1, 2002**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT
Chicago, Illinois 60604**

Submitted September 18, 2002
Decided November 1, 2002

Before

Hon. RICHARD A. POSNER, *Circuit Judge*

Hon. JOHN L. COFFEY, *Circuit Judge*

Hon. DIANE P. WOOD, *Circuit Judge*

No. 02-1544

LEO WANTA and
NEW REPUBLIC/USA FINANCIAL GROUP, LTD.,

Petitioners-Appellants,

v.

RICHARD CHANDLER, *et al.*,

Respondents-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Western District of Wisconsin

Appendix A

No. 01-C-0601-C

Barbara B. Crabb, *Chief Judge*

ORDER

Leo Wanta has filed a notice of appeal from the denial of a petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2254, which we will construe as an application for a certificate of appealability. Before this court is Wanta's motion for "corrective action," arguing that the appeal can proceed without the issuance of a certificate of appealability because the district court erroneously construed his civil lawsuit as a § 2254 petition. We conclude that the district court properly construed the majority of Wanta's claims as falling under § 2254 because they attack the validity of Wanta's conviction. Because we agree with the district court that those claims are untimely, we DENY Wanta's request for a certificate of appealability.

As for Wanta's claim regarding the seizure of various documents and any claims on behalf of New Republic, we summarily AFFIRM the district court's dismissal.

**APPENDIX B — ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES
DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
WISCONSIN DATED AND FILED FEBRUARY 5, 2002**

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

DPP #-04362 & 12535,

01-C-0601-C

AMBASSADOR LEO WANTA, Somalia Ambassador to
Canada and Switzerland, aka Lee E. Wanta, aka Leo E. Wanta;
and NEW REPUBLIC/USA FINANCIAL GROUP, LTD.,
GES m.b.h. (Austria),

Petitioners,

v.

SECRETARY RICHARD G. CHANDLER, Wisconsin
Department of Revenue; JAMES E. DOYLE, Attorney
General State of Wisconsin; GRANT C. JOHNSON, United
States Attorney Western District of Wisconsin; JOHN
DOUGLAS HAAG, Former Assistant Attorney General State
of Wisconsin; JACK C. VOIGHT Wisconsin State Treasurer;
JUDITH COLEMAN Clerk of the Dane County Circuit
Court, State of Wisconsin; ATTORNEY GENERAL JOHN
ASHCROFT Attorney General of the United States of
America; and PAUL H. O'NEILL, Secretary of the Treasury,
United States of America,

Respondents.

Appendix B

ORDER

This is an action labeled "Petition for Declaratory and/or Injunctive Relief and an Action in the Nature of a Petition for Writ of Mandamus," in which petitioners are seeking to overturn a jury verdict in the Wisconsin state courts finding plaintiff Leo Wanta guilty of two counts of filing false income tax returns and four counts of concealing property upon which levy was authorized. In a rambling, 22-page complaint, petitioners detail a plethora of reasons why they believe the state of Wisconsin acted improperly in charging petitioner Wanta with income tax violations, in convicting him, in attempting to levy upon certain property and in trying to collect taxes arising out of business dealings of Falls Vending and related property. Among other things, petitioners argue that the state refused to recognize Wanta's diplomatic immunity as an ambassador, his close involvement with the United States government in undertaking sensitive intelligence operations directed at persons such as Marc Rich and Osama Bin Laden and the requirements of his job that he live overseas.

In addition to an order overturning petitioner Wanta's conviction, petitioners want to prevent state authorities from collecting sales taxes or other taxes allegedly due from Falls Vending and to have this court initiate investigations into certain documents that were made part of the state court record at trial or for sentencing purposes. Also, it appears from some of the briefing, although not from the complaint, that petitioners want to obtain certain documents that they allege are in the possession of the Dane County clerk of court, respondent Judith Coleman.

Appendix B

Petitioners do not explain what stake, if any, petitioner New Republic/USA Financial Group has in correcting petitioner Wanta's conviction or what claims they might have against respondents United States Attorney Grant C. Johnson, Attorney General John Ashcroft and Treasury Secretary Paul H. O'Neill. (It appears that petitioners believe that these respondents might have access to certain documents and information that would prove petitioners' allegations about Wanta's supposed intelligence gathering activities.) The petition will be dismissed as to these three federal respondents for petitioners' failure to state a claim against them.

Petitioners are represented by counsel, who should know that the only way that a state court conviction can be challenged in a federal court is through a petition for a writ of habeas corpus brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 and filed within one year of the date on which the conviction has become final, § 2244(d)(1). This time period may be extended if one of a limited number of exceptions applies. *Id.* Petitioner Leo Wanta was convicted in 1995; his conviction was affirmed by the state court of appeals on February 4, 1999, and his petition for review was denied by the state supreme court on April 27, 1999. He did not file his petition in this case until October 22, 2001, far more than one year after his conviction had become final, even if a period of ninety days is allowed for the filing of a petition for certiorari to the United States Supreme Court. *See Gendron v. United States*, 154 F.3d 672, 674 & n.2 (7th Cir. 1998) (leaving open question whether prisoner who filed for leave to appeal to state supreme court would have time for filing certiorari with the United States Supreme Court included in his "direct

Appendix B

review"). Petitioners do not suggest that any of the exceptions set out in § 2244(d)(1) apply to their challenge so as to give them additional time for filing. This petition is untimely and must be dismissed on that basis.

Although petitioners raise matters not ordinarily raised in petitions for writs of habeas corpus brought pursuant to § 2254, such as their request for an investigation and for injunction of any attempts by the state to collect taxes based on profits earned at Falls Vending, these matters arise directly out of the charges brought against petitioner Wanta and should have been raised in connection with his trial and appeal. It is too late to raise them now. Moreover, this court has no authority to initiate an investigation into a matter that was before the state court or to enjoin the collection of state taxes that a state court has held are owed by petitioner Wanta. 28 U.S.C. § 1341.

As to petitioners' effort to obtain documents from the state courts, petitioners have not suggested any basis on which this court could order the state courts to search for documents or return them to petitioners. Therefore, the petition will be dismissed as to respondent Judith Coleman.

or li
for
Wai
con
con
hab
as t
dat
req
any
wri
fail
gra
res
Asl
fail
of
clo

7a

Appendix B

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that the Petition for Declaratory and/or Injunctive Relief and an action in the Nature of a Petition for Writ of Mandamus filed by petitioners Ambassador Leo Wanta and New Republic/USA Financial Group, Ltd. is construed as a challenge to petitioner Wanta's state court conviction that can be brought only as a petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 and is DENIED as untimely because it was not filed within one year of the date on which petitioner's conviction became final as required under § 2254(d). To the extent that petitioners seek any relief that would not be encompassed in a petition for a writ of habeas corpus, those claims are denied for petitioners' failure to show any basis on which the claims could be granted. Accordingly, the petition is DISMISSED as to respondents Grant C. Johnson, Attorney General John Ashcroft, Paul H. O'Neill and Judith Coleman for petitioners' failure to state any claims against these respondents. The clerk of court is directed to enter judgment for all respondents and close this case. Entered this 31st day of January, 2002.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Barbara B. Crabb
BARBARA B. CRABB
District Judge

8a

**APPENDIX C — ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT
DENYING THE MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
DECIDED NOVEMBER 25, 2002**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT
Chicago, Illinois 60604**

SUBMITTED NOVEMBER 22, 2002
DECIDED NOVEMBER 25, 2002

BEFORE
HON. RICHARD A. POSNER, CIRCUIT JUDGE
HON. JOHN L. COFFEY, CIRCUIT JUDGE
HON. DIANE P. WOOD, CIRCUIT JUDGE

No. 02-1544

Motion for Reconsideration

LEO WANTA AND NEW REPUBLIC/USA FINANCIAL
GROUP, LTD.,

Petitioner-Appellants.

v.

RICHARD G. CHANDLER, ET AL.,

Respondents-Appellees.

9a

Appendix C

ORDER

Leo Wanta and New Republic/USA Financial Group, Ltd., filed a motion for reconsideration of this court's November 1, 2002, order denying their request for a certificate of appealability and summarily affirming the district court judgment on their remaining claims. The motion for reconsideration is DENIED.

No signature and no stamp

THE WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

LIST OF DOCUMENTS FAXED BY THE EDITOR TO THE RECORDS OFFICER OF THE WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

1. Front and back of check Number 1098 from Attorney Steven Goodwin acting for Ambassador Leo Emil Wanta, in the sum of **\$30,626.97** made out in favour of the Wisconsin Department of Corrections.
2. Official Receipt of the Wisconsin Department of Corrections Number **2270992 PP** dated 21st July 2005 for Attorney Steven Goodwin's check Number 1098 in the sum of **\$30,626.97** re Client Number 303787, signed by Michelle Riel, Probation Agent, [REDACTED].
3. Client Account Inquiry CACU-177C re Client # 303787, Wanta, Leo E., Case ID: 802; Court Case #92CF683; original discharge date: 11/28/2010; Area # 50901 dated 22nd July 2005 stating that the total amount due was **\$30,626.97** [\$29,068.55 + \$60.00 + \$40.00 + \$1458.42] marked in Michelle Riel's handwriting: **'PAID IN FULL ON 7/21/05. MICHELLE RIEL'**.
**Note: Payment of \$30,626.97 represented the THIRD payment of the same civil assessment for tax.*
4. Letter dated 28th July 2005 from Agent Michelle Riel (Probation/Parole Agent 50901) of the Wisconsin Department of Corrections, to the Hon Judge Michael B. Torphy, Jr, recommending Ambassador Leo Emil Wanta's early discharge following payment of Mr Wanta's court ordered financial obligations in full; see final sentence of paragraph two of that letter. I am afraid that this copy is of very poor quality but since this is your own Department no doubt you will be in a position to retrieve a better copy from the files.
5. WI Department of Corrections Discharge document dated 14th November 2005 signed by Matthew J. Frank, Secretary, Department of Corrections, providing for Ambassador Leo Emil Wanta's **ABSOLUTE DISCHARGE**.
6. Letter dated 30th October 2006 from **Mr Gregg T. Frazier**, Chief of the Central Audit Section, State of Wisconsin Department of Revenue [reference: GTR:K IP-A923REVC2B3460 + A923 (R.896); email address: gfrazier@dosr.state.wi.us], asking for payment against item 7 below.
7. Notice of Amount due enclosed with Mr Frazier's letter [6 above] for **\$43,304.42**, due date January 01, 2007 which the document says should be made payable to the Wisconsin Department of Revenue.
8. Computation enclosed with Letter dated 30th October 2006 from Mr Gregg T. Frazier, item 6 above. This indicates amounts 'outstanding' of **\$29,175.42** of 'regular interest' plus penalties amounting to **\$14,129.00**. **Excuse me? As you will see below, this \$14,129.00 was already paid TWICE.** Please examine this document and note the word **AMENDED** which was written on the sheet as received by Ambassador Wanta. The word **AMENDED** was accompanied by the handwritten rubric below the computation: **'Per Wisconsin Supreme Court Order Dated December 30, 2005' The Ambassador had no prior knowledge of any such Wisconsin Supreme Court Order, and neither did he have any knowledge of this latest false civil tax assessment prior to its receipt by him on 2nd November 2006.**
9. Letter from Thomas A. Wilson, occasional Attorney for Ambassador Leo E. Wanta, of Bachman, Cummings, McKenzie, Hebble, McIntyre & Wilson, S.S., 211 East Franklin Street, P.O. Box 1155, Appleton, WI 54912-1155 (414-739-6356) re Leo Wanta Social Security # 396-XX-XXXX dated 12th June 1992, enclosing his firm's Trust Account check # 6992 for **\$14,129.00**, which is the same amount as is indicated in item 8 above.
10. Front and back of Attorney Thomas A. Wilson's Trust Account check # 6992 for **\$14,129.00**. This check, dated 3rd June 1992, was enclosed with Attorney Wilson's letter, item 9, dated 12th June 1992. Please note that it was cashed by the State of Wisconsin Treasurer on 24th June 1992.
11. Notice of Amount due dated 24th December 1990 which appears to demand \$14,027.00 which should read \$14,029.00. Note that this document is issued to Leo E. Wanta and Joanne 'G' Wanta, his estranged wife from whom he was separated with effect from 1985, in which year he resided in Vienna, Austria, having been ordered there by the White House on direct instructions of President Reagan. In June 1985, Mr Wanta obtained Austrian residency from the Austrian court, which he took up from January 1989. The only way residency can be obtained in Austria is by Court Order. Irrespective of this, Mr Wanta was resident in Vienna Austria, from 1985 - as it was from Vienna that he handled sensitive high level intelligence operations directly for the White House on President Reagan's instructions. He was NEVER resident in Wisconsin from 1985 and should NEVER have been charged ANY Wisconsin state tax. I have contacted sources to obtain a copy of the relevant Austrian Court document. The same sources will be furnishing back-up documentation including Austrian corporate documents showing Mr Wanta to be the Principal of one or more Austrian corporations. These documents separately prove Mr Wanta's Austrian location. I have not yet obtained these documents, but steps were taken today to obtain them from another US Attorney, a former Federal Prosecutor, who is also an Attorney from time to time for Mr Wanta.
12. Wisconsin Department of Revenue document stating that Leo Wanta and Joanne Wanta file taxes jointly. In reality, Mr Wanta was separated from his wife and was resident in Vienna, Austria, so this assertion, **not** initiated by Leo Wanta, stated the position inaccurately. However for the purposes here, please note specifically that the Wisconsin Department of Revenue asserted that the two file jointly. Note also that this document reflects a payment made on 3rd June 1992 of \$14,129.00 - made up of two amounts: unpaid penalty of \$10,249.00 for 1988 and unpaid penalty of \$3,880.00 for 1989 - in neither of which years Mr Wanta was resident in Wisconsin.
13. "Delinquent Tax Warrant" dated 9th May 1991 docketed 2nd May 1991 at 10.15 am, with the following Warrant #: **44-00162088**. Note that there are two Social Security Numbers on this Delinquent Tax Warrant, namely: 396-XX-XXXX, which is the SS# of Ambassador Leo Wanta; the second SS# is that of