



U.S. OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL
1730 M Street, N.W., Suite 218
Washington, D.C. 20036-4505
202-254-3600

Hand Delivered
25 Nov 15
WRS

Mr. Lee Wanta

OCT 28 2015

Re: OSC File No. MA-16-0141

Dear Mr. Wanta:

This letter responds to the complaint you recently filed with the U.S. Office of Special Counsel (OSC). OSC has carefully reviewed the information you have provided. However, based on our evaluation of the facts and law applicable to your circumstance, we have made a determination to close our inquiry into your allegations.

OSC is authorized to investigate allegations of prohibited personnel practices and certain activities prohibited by civil service law, rule, or regulation. 5 U.S.C. §§ 1214(a)(1)(A), 1216(a) and 2302(b). There are thirteen specific prohibited personnel practices described in the statute over which we have investigative authority. However, you have not alleged an action which constitutes any of the thirteen personnel practices prohibited by 5 U.S.C. § 2302(b), or any other prohibited activity within the Special Counsel's investigative jurisdiction.

In addition, OSC's authority to investigate allegations of prohibited personnel practices extends only to employees, former employees, or applicants for employment to competitive or excepted service positions in the Executive Branch departments and agencies of the federal government. The information you provided does not indicate that you are a federal employee.

Since you are not a federal employee and because you have not alleged a prohibited personnel practice, OSC does not have investigative jurisdiction over your complaint. Therefore, we have no authority to assist you. Accordingly, we are closing our file in this matter.


Sincerely,

Kimberly S. Beatty For
Malvina Winston
Attorney
Complaints Examining Unit

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

ALEXANDRIA DIVISION

AMBASSADOR LEO WANTA,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,)
)
 Defendants.)



Civil Action No. 02-1363-A

MEMORANDUM OPINION

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Defendants the United States of America, et al.'s, motion to dismiss Plaintiff Ambassador Leo Wanta's claim of breach of contract based on lack of subject matter jurisdiction and on Plaintiff's motion to amend his complaint. The issue before the Court is whether the Court should dismiss an alleged secret government agent's claim against the Attorney General, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Government based on lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The Court grants Defendants' motion to dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) because the Government has not waived sovereign immunity and public policy forbids the adjudication of a suit relating to matters of an alleged national security contract. The Court denies Plaintiff's motion to amend his complaint under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a) because such an action would be futile.


16

Claims. Nor would an amended complaint change this Court's ability to provide equitable relief in this matter since Plaintiff does not seek recovery of payment or assessment of federal taxes. Moreover, allowing Plaintiff to amend his Complaint would not remove Plaintiff's bar from suing the United States government because he lacks express consent or a waiver of sovereign immunity by the United States government that would allow the United States Court of Federal Claims to have subject matter jurisdiction in this case. Therefore, the Court denies Plaintiff's motion to amend his complaint because such an action would be futile. Plaintiff's sole remedy in this matter is to proceed with the liquidation of the corporations and report these transactions to the Internal Revenue Service in accordance with the Internal Revenue Code and then challenge the assessment of any taxes in a refund proceeding. See *Int'l Lotto Fund*, 20 F.3d at 591.


III. CONCLUSION

The Court grants Defendants' motion to dismiss based on lack of subject matter jurisdiction and failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted. The Court denies Plaintiff's motion to amend his complaint.

Dated: *April 15, 2007*
Alexandria, Virginia


GERALD BRUCE LEE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA**



Civil Action No. 1:07 cv 609 TSE /BRP

**LEE E. WANTA, LEO E. WANTA, AMBASSADOR
LEO WANTA (Individually and as sole and exclusive
shareholder of AMERITRUST Groupe, Inc.,
a Commonwealth of Virginia registered
corporation)**

Petitioner,

v.

**HENRY M. PAULSON, JR.
SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
UNITED STATES TREASURY, and**

**ROBERT M. KIMMIT
DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY
UNITED STATES TREASURY, and**

**JAMES R. WILKINSON
CHIEF OF STAFF
UNITED STATES TREASURY, and**

**MICHAEL CHERTOFF
SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF
HOMELAND SECURITY, and**

**ALBERTO R. GONZALES
ATTORNEY GENERAL
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

**FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF RICHMOND
DIRECTOR AND/OR MANAGER OF OPERATIONS
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA**

Respondents.

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS
AND
OTHER EXTRAORDINARY RELIEF**

A. PARTIES

1. LEE E. WANTA, LEO E. WANTA, AMBASSADOR
LEO WANTA,
5516 Falmouth Street
Suite 108
Richmond, Virginia 23230 Petitioner
2. Henry M Paulson, Jr.
Secretary of the Treasury
1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W
Washington, D.C. 20220 Respondent
3. Robert M. Kimmit,
Deputy Secretary of the Treasury
1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W
Washington, D.C. 20220 Respondent
4. James R. Wilkinson
Chief of Staff
United States Treasury
1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W
Washington, D.C. 20220 Respondent
5. Michael Chertoff
Secretary of Homeland Security
Washington, D. C. Respondent
6. Alberto R. Gonzales
Attorney General
United States Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001 Respondent
7. Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond
701 East Byrd Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219 Respondent

B. JURISDICTION

1. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this cause of action pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 United States Code, Chapter 85, Section 1361 (mandamus), Title 28 United

States Code, Chapter 85, Section 1331, and Title 28 United States Code, Chapter 85, Section 1332 . .

C. VENUE

2. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to Title 28 United States Code, Chapter 87, Section 1391, and Title 28 United States Code Chapter 87, Section 1396.

D. STATEMENT OF CLAIM

3. Mandamus is regarded as an extraordinary writ reserved for special situations. Among its ordinary preconditions are that the agency or official have acted (or failed to act) in disregard of a clear legal duty and that there be no adequate conventional means for review. In re Bluewater Network & Ocean Advocates, 234 F.3d 1305, 1315 (D.C. Cir. 2000); Telecomm. Research & Action Ctr. v. FCC, 750 F.2d 70, 78 (D.C. Cir. 1984). Mandamus will be granted if the Petitioner shows “(1) the presence of novel and significant questions of law; (2) the inadequacy of other available remedies; and (3) the presence of a legal issue whose resolution will aid in the administration of justice”, see In re United States, 10 F.3d 229 at 931, 933 (2d Cir. 1993).

4. Petitioner has attempted to access monies that were transferred through international bank monetary clearing systems to financial institutions located in the United States of America. The remitting party was the People’s Republic of China, People’s Bank. The remitting party designated that the transferred funds were for the sole and exclusive use and benefit of Petitioner. The foreign entity that originated the inward remittance designated Petitioner as sole and exclusive recipient for the transferred money/financial instruments.

Irrespective of efforts proffered by Petitioner and/or agents and representatives of Petitioner, private and public individuals and entities, prevent Petitioner from exercising Petitioner’s legal right to the use, transfer and unrestricted ability to freely disburse said financial assets. The acts and/or omissions to act by named and unnamed Respondents

prevent the Petitioner (and others who are ancillary to this cause of action) from paying their respective tax liabilities to both State and Federal taxing authorities.

5. Upon best information and belief the organizations, entities, departments and individuals that prevent and/or restrict Petitioner's lawful access to said money and securities include but are not necessarily limited to the following:

- Secretary of the Treasury
- Attorney General of the United States of America
- Bank of America
- J.P. Morgan Chase
- CITIBANK/CITIGROUP/ NYC including but not limited to Mr. Charles O. Prince CITIGROUP Chief Executive Officer
- Goldman Sachs, et al including but not limited to past and present management and executive officers and members of the Board of Directors.
- United States Department of the Treasury including but not limited to Secretary Paulson, Deputy Secretary Kimmit and other known and/or unknown parties working directly or under contract with the United States Department of the Treasury.
- Secretary Chertoff, Department of Homeland Security and other known and/or unknown parties working directly or under contract with the United States Department of Homeland Security.
- One or more known and/or unknown "compliance officers" that act directly and/or under contract with private bank and/or security brokerage firms to observe rules and regulations of the United States Department of the Treasury and/or other USG investigative and reporting entities.
- Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond Virginia

6. Upon best information and belief Respondent acts and/or failures to act constitute a violation of the Securities Acts of 1933 and 1934 (as amended in 1970), the Bank Privacy Act and other non-specified banking regulations.

7. Reasonable action has been taken by Petitioner to obtain an explanation and/or under what authority Respondents are not permitting Petitioner to have access to the foreign transferred private business financial assets referenced herein. Despite written notice and request for a response the named parties avoid their legal obligations. In furtherance of this Petition for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus Petitioner directs this Courts attention to the letters and other communications that have been collectively marked as Exhibits A attached hereto and all of which documents, letters and memorandum are incorporated herein by this reference as if the same were set out in their entirety in the body of this Petition.

8. The material, substantive and immediate financial loss to the Petitioner resulting from loss of financial benefit can not adequately be addressed in conventional judicial proceedings. In one or more instances parties in position of knowledge, that can confirm the representations regarding interference in private business dealings, between Petitioner and third parties, have been placed at risk of physical harm by individuals representing to be fiduciaries of one or more of the Respondents. Additionally, the acts and actions of the Respondents prevent immediate payment of Federal taxes in the amount of \$1.575 trillion dollars into the United States Treasury.

E. BACKGROUND

9. On or about April 15, 2003 the Honorable Gerald Bruce Lee, in case number 02-1363-A filed in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, issued an Order and Memorandum of Opinion for the referenced numbered case. As part of the Order and Memorandum of the Court (in the referenced case) the Court stated that the Plaintiff (in the referenced case) should pursue liquidation of corporations, recovery of financial assets and pay all required taxes in accordance with the law.

10. Petitioner initiated contact with numerous third parties, including United States elected, nominated, appointed and career employees plus foreign countries, for the purpose of recovering financial assets.

11. Upon best information and belief in December of 2005 and January 2006, Secretary Snow (Secretary of the Treasury at the time) and Chairman Greenspan (Chairman of the Federal Reserve at the time) traveled to the People's Republic of China. The Chinese required confirmation of Petitioner's signature to facilitate cooperation of the Chinese in completing the transfer of financial assets referenced herein.

Upon best information and belief Snow/Greenspan determined that Chinese officials had the ability and willingness to cooperate with Petitioner in the recovery and transfer of substantial financial assets that had been in the care custody and control of the Chinese for an extended period of time.

12. Premised on the representations of Secretary Snow and Chairman Greenspan the legal services of Troutman Sanders, LLP and Jenkens & Gilchrist Parker Chapin, LLP, (attorney's) were used to complete the preparation and administer the execution of agreements and documents referred to collectively as "settlement documents". The following is a compilation of the significant parties that are represented as either obligors and/or beneficiaries of the settlement documents:

- Petitioner Wanta identified in this Petition.
- Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), (including but not limited to Land Baron/Xeno)
- National Security Agency (NSA)
- Department of Homeland Security
- Director of National Intelligence
- United States State Department
- United States Department of the Treasury
- United States Department of Defense
- The White House , including but not limited to the Offices of the President and Vice President
- C.B.I.C. Inc. (Mr. William Bonney Sr.)
- China (PRC), France, Great Britain, Germany and other foreign nations participating under one or more international "Protocol"

including but not limited to the Reagan-Mitterrand Protocol agreements.

- Others of interest not intentionally omitted as part of this Petition.

The entirety of the financial assets mentioned in the settlement documents prepared by the above mentioned attorneys concerns approximately \$27 Trillion United States Dollars in value. The portion attributable and payable to the Petitioner is \$4.5 Trillion United States Dollars.

13. In May of 2006 the People's Republic of China caused a free and unrestricted transfer of \$4.5 Trillion United States Dollars through international bank fund transfer facilities to an account at Bank of America located in Richmond, Virginia. The designated beneficiary of the transferred funds from the People's Republic of China was Petitioner herein. This transfer was made by the People's Republic of China solely and exclusively as a requirement under the mentioned settlement agreement.

14. Upon best information and belief between the dates of July 31st to August 2nd of 2006 the United States Department of the Treasury, without authorization of either the remitting party or the receiving party removed the People's of Republic of China transferred financial assets from Bank of America Richmond, Virginia to an account in the name of Goldman Sachs at CITIBank New York, New York as the beneficiary holder of the monies transferred by the People's Republic of China referenced above. This "Chip" (Clearing House Interbank Payment) transfer was facilitated from Virginia domiciled banks to New York domiciled banks via the Federal Reserve Bank Richmond. The Chip transfer did not remove the name of Petitioner as the intended recipient of the transferred money from the People's Republic of China. The transfer to the Goldman Sachs et. al. account at CITIBank put a lawless restriction that the funds were not to be released to Petitioner without the authorization of United States Treasury. At or about the time of the unauthorized transfer mentioned in this paragraph 14 Petitioner protested the alleged right of "entitlement" by Secretary Paulson and to facilitate protest of right of ownership under the "Securities Acts" accounts were opened in the name of AmeriTrust

Groupe, Inc at Morgan Stanley, fiduciary client account at CITIBank/NYC to receive direct deposit transfer of Petitioner funds from Goldman Sachs.

15. The Petitioner has been contacted by "Compliance Officers" that are contract employees of the United States Department of the Treasury that the transfer records of the United States Department of the Treasury and the recipient (past and present holder of the funds transferred to Petitioner by the People's Republic of China) reflect that the accounts opened to receive the financial assets are tagged and coded for the benefit of Petitioner. Access to the tagged and coded accounts requires lawless authorization to be provided in writing by Secretary Paulson. To date Secretary Paulson refuses to provide the required written authorization to the compliance officers. In addition one or more compliance officer (referenced herein) has been contacted by Secret Service Agents who have advised the compliance officers that the "White House" ordered that the compliance officers cease and desist from communicating in any manner with Petitioner.

16. Upon best information and belief the compliance officers mentioned in paragraph 15. have been in contact with law enforcement officers representing the Central Intelligence Agency and the United States Department of Defense. These mentioned law enforcement officers confirm that the information provided by the compliance officers is true and correct and that upon best information and belief the "order" preventing Secretary Paulson from releasing the "tagged and coded" funds that are the sole and exclusive property of the Petitioner have been either lawlessly and individually controlled by Secretary Paulson and/or restricted through direct participation by other United States of America elected and/or nominated officials..

17. Upon best information and belief Troutman Sanders, LLP and Jenkins & Gilchrist Parker Chapin, LLP, seeking legal recourse on behalf of C.B.I.C. Inc. (Mr. William Bonney Sr.) and the People's Republic of China obtained an Order to Show Cause Why a Writ of Mandamus Should Not Be Issued from the United States Supreme Court signed by Justice Ginsberg. The People's Republic of China, as a foreign

government, invoked the original jurisdiction authority of the United States Supreme Court to obtain the document signed by Justice Ginsberg. Upon further best information and belief the responding parties to the action filed in the United States Supreme Court are exercising any and all assumed defenses to ward off the issuance of the Writ of Mandamus.

18. The United States Department of Justice and/or any agency or investigative authority contacted has refused to assist Petitioner in the collection of lawful funds. Said parties refuse such assistance irrespective that there is clear and undisputed evidence that the subject funds are identified in official United States government agency documents as being the sole and exclusive property of Petitioner. As of the date of the filing of this Petition, all requests for payment of lawful funds has been ignored by any and all elected and nominated public officials that have the implied and apparent authority to complete all requirements of the settlement documents.

19. Petitioner individually and as sole and exclusive controlling shareholder of AmeriTrust Groupe, Inc certifies as follows:

- The Petitioner has personally had conversations with one or more officials at the United States Department of the Treasury and said officials confirm the sequence of events concerning inward remittance of subject funds from the People's Republic of China and inter-bank transfers within the United States

- Petitioner confirms that he has personal knowledge about the "Claims and Background" set out in this Petition and verifies upon penalty of perjury that the same are true and correct.

- Petitioner has fully and completely reviewed the content of this Petition and certifies by sworn affidavit attached hereto that the "Statement of Claim and Background" are true and correct.

20. Upon best information and belief "Respondent" individuals, agencies, public, private, nominated and/or elected have knowingly, overtly, covertly and with specific intent conspired together to defraud Petitioner. The individual and/or

conspiratorial acts amount to a violation of the Securities Acts of 1933 and 1934 (as amended in 1970), the Bank Privacy Act, the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970, specifically RICO and applicable international and national money laundering restrictions. In addition it is further the mentioned Respondent's acting individually and/or "acting in concert" violate Petitioners rights under the provisions of H.R. 3723 as the same pertains to private business transactions being protected under both private and criminal penalties.

Reasonable action has been taken by the Petitioner in an attempt to obtain explanation and/or under what authority Respondents are not following the "Rule of Law" and permitting access by Petitioner to the financial accounts referenced herein. Despite continued written notice and request for a response the named parties continue to avoid their legal obligations and continue to commit covert and/or overt acts in furtherance of their knowing and purposeful violation of the statutory references mentioned hereinabove. In furtherance of this Petition for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus Petitioners direct this Courts attention to the letters and other communications that have been marked as Exhibits A, B and C attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference as if the same were set out in their entirety in the body of this Petition.

F. CONCLUSION


21. The "Statement of Claim and Background" demonstrate, "(1) the presence of novel and significant questions of law; (2) the inadequacy of other available remedies; and (3) the presence of a legal issue whose resolution will aid in the administration of justice".

G. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

1. Emergency consideration of this Petition with an expedited response time for Respondents to respond to this Petition and an expedited time for the Court to hear the merits of this matter.

2. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper to protect the Constitutionally protected rights of the Petitioner.

Executed on this ^{18TH}18 day of June 2007



LEE E. WANTA, LEO E. WANTA, AMBASSADOR
LEO WANTA, _ Pro Se _
5516 Falmouth Street
Suite 108
Richmond, Virginia 23230 Petitioner
Telefon : 814 455 9218
Telefax : 202 330 5116

AFFIDAVIT

The undersigned, being fully advised by counsel of the seriousness of the claim of making false statements to a Court and being fully apprised of the consequences for committing perjury (and the associated penalties), hereby make the following statements concerning the Petition for Writ of Mandamus being filed on my behalf, by my counsel, in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia:

1. I am more than twenty-one years of age and I am a citizen of the United States of America.
2. For an extended period of time I am functioning as a representative, investigator, contract employee and/or facilitator of one or more assignments that were either executed and/or performed at the direction and/or under the supervision of one or more persons and/or agencies that were accountable to the Executive Offices of the United States government.
3. During most recent three to five years I have been attempting to coordinate the repatriating of substantive financial resources from foreign locations to the United States and cause the tax payments owed on the patriated funds to be paid to the United States Treasury. I have substantially completed the stated objective task with the assistance of one or more foreign sources.
4. I have read the entirety of the Petition for Writ of Mandamus prepared by my attorney's. I confirm that I have personally directed communications with the banks, security firms, the United States Department of the Treasury (including one or more individual parties associated with the Treasury that are named as Respondents) and other entities mentioned in the Petition.
5. I have personally confirmed that the financial assets sent by the People's Republic of China were received by Bank of America in Richmond, Virginia and that upon best information and belief the subject financial assets were "tagged" in my name and transmittal instructions by the People's Republic of China directed that the same be paid to me without offset or delay.
6. I have been personally advised by agents and/or contract regulation compliance workers, that are accountable to the United States Department of

the Treasury, that release of funds sent by the People's Republic of China for payment to me is being restricted and/or blocked by one or more parties.

- 7. The exact party and/or parties that are restricting and/or blocking payment of financial assets to my designated accounts is not known absolutely.
- 8. Upon best information and belief the United States Department of the Treasury has the power and authority to direct release of the funds for my unrestricted use.
- 9. Despite continued demand for release of financial assets (that were transmitted by the People's Republic of China) for payment to me personally the demands are ignored and are not rebuked by any responsive communication.
- 10. I have been personally informed by parties, that have the authority to release the block on funds leveraged against recipient banking accounts established in my name, that directives have been received from known and unknown parties that have the affect of negating my ability to have free and unrestricted access to financial assets that are "tagged" solely and exclusively in my name.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I am causing the above set forth affidavit to be notarized and sworn with full recognition of the penalty of perjury this 17th day of June 2007.

Lee E. Wanta

Lee E. Wanta, Leo E. Wanta and
Ambassador Leo E. Wanta

County of Chippewa)
State of Wisconsin)

On this 17th day of June 2007 the above named individual, being personally known to me, appeared before me and after being first duly sworn signed the above Affidavit.

January 5, 2009
My commission expires

Marge L. Gieseler
Notary signature and seal

