To whom it may concern,

Please take notice of the attached files as they comprise a comprehensive allegation of color of law organized crime of an all too familiar variety. The number of people who have complained without success is voluminous and this is a public corruption problem that is long past over-due for correction.

The enclosed USB disks contain a number of word files that include a RICO Case Statement, Civil Rico Complaint draft, a Memorandum of Facts and an Appendix listing the files on the enclosed exhibits folder, which are numbered according to the parts that reference them. Part 0 Introduction, Part 1 Trust Chronology, Part 2 The Back End Exploitation, Part 3 The Participants, Part 4 Predicate Acts and Civil Torts and Part 5 Damages. The colorable artifice are numerous and ultimately laughable as they are so absurdly profound. It all starts with an estate planning bait and switch followed by exploitation of the subsequent controversy manufactured by the estate planning law firm in which the attorneys join in collusion to facilitate the take. In the case in point those artifices involve practiced avoidance, attrition, extortion, obstruction and complete absence of due process in a court with no subject matter jurisdiction.

We had a case filed in the SDTX 94:12-cv-592) dismissed under the probate exception/reversed and remanded by the 5th Circuit, (Curtis v. Brunsting 704 F.3d, 406) followed by an active and pending injunction, while attorneys in Texas began parallel state court proceedings, first filing half of action in the Harris County District Court and then, on the day in which there was a hearing on Plaintiff’s application for injunction in the SDTX the state court attorney Bobbie G. Bayless, Texas State Bar No. 01940600 filed the 2nd half of the action in the probate court five days after no more actions of any nature could be filed in that court.

Then we have attorney collusion to obtain an unopposed administrative remand from the Southern District of Texas to a probate court from which the matter had not been removed. The remand is accepted in the probate theatre as if it were an instate transfer. The “independent executor” resigns due to lack of capacity and the next day the attorneys all produce an agreed Docket Control Order. Three weeks later the attorneys all agree to consolidate the federal plaintiff (Nominal Defendant in that court) as a co-plaintiff with the no longer serving “independent executor” (neither of whom is actually in that court as a plaintiff.) There are a lot of attrition games being played on the California beneficiary who happens to be the legitimate named trustee that refuses to enter into a settlement agreement that would pay the attorney ransom and launder the ransom as fees for legal services. Ultimately Bobbie G. Bayless, attorney for for the absent independent executor, filed a motion to sever her client from the federal plaintiff. The attorney for the no longer serving “independent executor” then filed a nonsuit of her client’s alleged co-plaintiff … ??? The case is such a mess the court signs Defendants proposed summary judgment order without a single evidentiary hearing dismissing the federal plaintiff claims that are not even in that court, corrupting the blood of her descendants and claiming her trust property is available to pay the attorney’s fees.

I have drafted all of the pleadings for the federal plaintiff in limbo, do not have a law degree and do not come within the purview of California Business and Professions Code statutes requiring a paralegal license as I have no pecuniary interest in the matter and have no records of the thousands of hours I have invested nor the money I have spent. As I read the horror stories suffered by others I think “there but for the grace of God go I”. The perfect estate plan falls on deaf ears and you can expect the same for your descendant’s if someone does not pick up the gauntlet and hold these despicable creatures to account for their crimes.

I apologize for the length of the dissertation as there is no such thing as a simple racketeering case. The necessary pleading elements for racketeering claim under 18 U.S.C. § 1962, based on the principles stated in *Ashcroft v. Iqbal* and *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, are as follows:

1. **Existence of an Enterprise**:
   * The plaintiff must allege the existence of an "enterprise" engaged in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce.
   * The enterprise must be distinct from the individual defendants.
2. **Pattern of Racketeering Activity**:
   * The plaintiff must allege a "pattern" of racketeering activity, which includes at least two predicate acts of racketeering within a 10-year period.
   * Predicate acts must be specified and supported with factual allegations (e.g., mail fraud, wire fraud, etc.).
3. **Connection to the Enterprise**:
   * The plaintiff must show how the defendant conducted or participated in the conduct of the enterprise's affairs through the pattern of racketeering activity.
4. **Causal Nexus**:
   * The plaintiff must demonstrate a causal connection between the defendant's racketeering activity and the harm suffered.
5. **Specificity in Allegations**:

# Obstruction of Justice 18 U.S.C. § 1503

This statute addresses actions that obstruct the due administration of justice, including influencing jurors or court officers. The elements are:

1. Corrupt Act: The defendant must have engaged in a corrupt act, such as threats, coercion, or other obstructive conduct.
2. Intent: The act must be done with the intent to obstruct, influence, or impede the due administration of justice.
3. Connection to Judicial Proceedings: The obstructive act must relate to an ongoing or foreseeable judicial proceeding.
4. Materiality (if applicable): If the act involves false statements, the falsehood must be material to the proceeding.

## Misapplication of Fiduciary Property

Misapplication of fiduciary property in excess of $300,000.00 is a first degree felony theft crime under Texas Penal Code § 32.45. (see damages section)

## Exploitation of Child, Elderly Individual, or Disabled Individual

Misapplication of fiduciary property held in trust for elderly and disabled beneficiaries is a felony violation of Texas Penal Code § 32.53.

## 18 U.S.C. § 495 Forgery, Mail Fraud, Wire Fraud, Illegal Wiretap Recordings, and more.

Thus is a criminal fraud smorgasbord. We can no longer maintain our defense against this siege and believe it is a public prosecutors obligation to prosecute these claims and I hope you find them worthy.

Respectfully submitted,

Rik Munson,

218 Landana St. American Canyon, CA 94503

[blowintough@att.net](mailto:blowintough@att.net)

925-349-8348
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Assistant Attorney General of Texas
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(512) 477-2348 - Fax
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Appearance April 7, 2022

Sean Teare

Harris County District Attorney's Office  
500 Jefferson Street, Suite 600  
Houston, TX 77002

United States Attorney General Pamela Bondi

U.S. Department of Justice

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20530-0001

United States Attorney for the Southern District of Texas
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1000 Louisiana, Ste. 2300

Houston, TX 77002
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Acting U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of California

Patrick D. Robbins,
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450 Golden Gate Avenue, P.O. Box 36055

San Francisco, CA 94102