The Wolf Brief

Please download/print a copy for safekeeping and then forward on to all.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA
THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT AT ANCHORAGE

DAVID HAEG, Applicant	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No: 3KN-10-01295CI
	)	
STATE OF ALASKA, Respondent	)	
	)	

Filed in the Trial Courts
State of Alaska Third District
at Kenai Alaska
FEB 16 2018
Clerk of the Trial Courts
By_____Deputy

2-16-18 SUPPLEMENTAL AFFIDAVIT, AS ORDERED BY COURT OF APPEALS AND JUDGE WILLIAM MORSE, BEFORE HOLDING AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING

Issues Not Allowed by Court of Appeals (COA) or by Morse, Who Claimed He Must Enforce the COA Order, Without Checking Its Validity, Even After I Told Morse the COA Order is Provably Fraudulent

All issues allowed briefing/evidentiary hearing by COA/Morse are a smokescreen to cover up the fact that other, far more serious issues - proving serious criminal conduct and corruption by State officials/private attorneys/oversight agencies - are being fraudulently denied. Issues corruptly denied include, but are not limited to: (1) Assistant Attorney General/District Attorney Scot Leaders violation of a specific, written pretrial discovery request from attorney Arthur "Chuck" Robinson for the following items prior to trial: (a) a copy of a tape-recording capturing, *prior to trial,* Leaders, Trooper Brett Gibbens, and State witness Tony Zellers discussing how no wolves were taken in my guide area and discussing how they had falsified their physical trial evidence (map) to support their trial case I was killing wolves in my hunting guide area to benefit my guide business; and (b) a copy of the map used against me at trial which, 8 years after my trial, was discovered to have been falsified to prove the State's case that I was killing wolves in my hunting guide area to benefit my guide business (to justify eliminating an evidentiary hearing on this the COA claimed I gave them no briefing on it – yet I gave them 25 pages of briefing on it and at oral argument used the actual trial map – provided by State at my request – to prove to them it had been falsified to obtain my conviction. See COA briefing and oral argument on YouTube); (2) my right to question Robinson, Leaders, Gibbens, and

Zellers during an evidentiary hearing to prove the above corruption – especially since my trial attorney Robinson, in recent interviews, is recorded stating:

"Since I was not provided a map copy, so I could check it for accuracy, I cannot be blamed for the jury's use of this map to convict Mr. Haeg and I cannot be blamed for Judge Murphy's use of the map's falsified GMU 19-C/19-D boundaries to sentence Mr. Haeg. Since I was not provided a tape-recording copy prior to trial or during trial, I did not know there was evidence of an intent to falsify the location of where the wolves were taken. Because of Mr. Leaders failure to abide by my discovery request this evidence was withheld and I only found out about it many years after trial."

When asked what he would have done had he been provided the required discovery:

"I would have argued you didn't get a fair trial because they were using false evidence to convict you. I could have proved they were intentionally lying at trial. And you would have had evidence of their motive to do so."

When asked if the COA could prevent an evidentiary hearing to prove this Robinson stated:

"It seems ridiculous the Court of Appeals has prevented Mr. Haeg from an evidentiary hearing on the discovery violation and false map when Mr. Haeg gave them briefing on this. Mr. Haeg should be heard."

(3) evidence, certified by Judge Stephanie Joannides as true, that 28-year sole Alaska Commission on Judicial Conduct judge investigator Marla Greenstein falsified the official investigation into my trial judge (Margaret Murphy) being chauffeured full time by the main trial witness against me (Gibbens) when Murphy destroyed my evidence before my jury could see it - and evidence Greenstein committed perjury to cover up her corrupt investigation (to justify eliminating an evidentiary hearing on this the COA claimed I gave them no briefing on it – yet I gave them 54 pages of briefing on it and included it in argument to them. See COA briefing and oral argument on YouTube); (4) State threats to my private attorneys so they would lie to me and help the State frame me (to justify eliminating an evidentiary hearing on this the COA claimed I gave them no briefing on it – yet I gave them 38 pages of briefing on it and included it in argument to them. See COA briefing and oral argument on YouTube); (5) cover up of the forgoing by Alaska Commission on Judicial Conduct (ACJC), Bar Association, and Department of Law (to justify eliminating an evidentiary hearing on this the COA claimed I gave them no briefing on it – yet I gave them 72 pages of briefing on it and included it in argument to them. See COA briefing and oral argument on YouTube); (6) that I was given "transactional

immunity" for statement given Leaders and Gibbens. COA claimed I don't get an evidentiary hearing on this because my claim is "patently false...based on the existing record". Yet the existing record captures my own attorneys testifying under oath in two different hearings that I was specifically given "transactional immunity" for my statement – their words, not mine. This meant I could not be prosecuted. Period. And the law governing evidentiary hearings is that if your claim, if proven true, means you get relief you are guaranteed a hearing - and in deciding this the courts must accept as true any facts asserted by the defendant (in other words you don't need to have any evidence to obtain the evidentiary hearing – you just need to make a claim):

Lott v. State, 836 P.2d 371 (AK 1992); *"It is true that, for purposes of determining whether a claim may be rejected summarily, without affording the defendant an opportunity for an evidentiary hearing, the court must accept as true any facts asserted by the defendant."*

Hampel v. State 911 P.2d 517 (AK 1996) *"Rejection of claim is premature at first phase of post-conviction relief process since it is in that phase trial court must accept as true all allegations and inquire whether those facts, if proven, would entitle applicant to relief sought."*

Widermyre v. State, 452 P.2d 885 (AK Supreme Court 1969) *"Unless the motion & files & records of the case conclusively show that [PCR applicant] is entitled to no relief, the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon the State District Attorney, grant a prompt hearing thereon, determine the issues & make findings of fact & conclusions of law with respect thereto. In the case at bar the superior court denied appellants application for post conviction relief without holding an evidentiary hearing."*

Hymes v. DeRamus, 222 P.3d 874 (AK 2010) *"We hold the pleadings of pro se litigants to a less stringent standard than those of lawyers. We therefore read Hymeses' pro se brief generously."*

So COA lied twice to eliminate this. First to claim there needs to be evidence before I am entitled to an evidentiary hearing. Second to claim there was no evidence. More disturbing yet is the existing record – specifically pointed out to the COA - captures the attorneys testifying that Leaders outright told them he was *"not going to honor"* the transactional immunity after my interview required by it. Does this seem like there is no evidence of transactional immunity? There was transactional immunity, Leaders violated it, and my attorneys didn't protest. If Leaders had the power to do this without my attorneys protesting (only years after my conviction did they testify what Leaders had done – and that Leaders would harm them if they protested) it seems logical that Leaders could outright tell my attorneys, without them protesting, that he was going to frame me by destroying the evidence I killed the wolves where the State told me to and by falsifying evidence and testimony that they were taken in my 19-C hunting guide area.

COA lied numerous times to make sure corrupt judges, prosecutors, and troopers can continue framing innocent citizens in violation of nearly every constitutional right we possess. And, to stop me from presenting the recordings, transcripts, map, and COA oral argument video to prove it in Judge Morse's court, the troopers tased me numerous times while Morse just stood and watched. See tasing video on Facebook page Alaska, State of Corruption and YouTube.

Issues COA/Morse Claim Must Be Evidenced Further

(1) *"[Robinson] failing to properly advise Haeg regarding the strength of his defense"* – page 4 COA order (which Robinson has now agreed happened when Leaders failed to provide requested discovery, resulting in Robinson failing to advise me of the conviction prohibiting defense that the State was intentionally using false evidence and testimony against me at trial); (2) Robinson *"was ineffective for failing to enforce what Haeg alleges was an enforceable plea agreement"* – page 3 COA order: (3) *"Robinson failing to object to inaccuracies in the trial court's finding at sentencing"* – page 4 COA order (I never gave the COA a single word of briefing on this – so how was it let in when they claim issues above - with 25, 54, and 72 pages of briefing each to them - will not be let in because they received no briefing?); (4) if I *"was diligent in raising his concerns (Judge Murphy riding/eating with the main witness against me, Gibbens, during my trial) with his attorney and informing the attorney of the extent of the alleged ex parte contact"* – page 20 COA order; and (5) *"that his attorney was ineffective for failing to file either a motion to disqualify the trial judge or a motion for a new trial based on Haeg's allegations. To prove ineffectiveness in this context, Haeg must show not only that his attorney had no valid reason for his inaction, but also that the motion would have resulted in either a new trial or a new sentencing hearing in front of a different judge."* – page 20 COA order.

Every issue the COA/Morse has ruled must be briefed further has already been answered, and supported by affidavit, in my opening and reply briefs to the COA. Because of this fact I hereby incorporate them by reference into this document.

Additional Facts

1. My name is David Haeg. I am a master big game hunting guide/pilot, married, and am father of two. Prior to 2004 my wife Jackie and I operated a hunting guide lodge and business in Game Management Unit (GMU) 19-C. This was virtually our sole source of income.

2. In 2004 I was asked, and permitted, by the State of Alaska to kill wolves for their Wolf Control Program (WCP), which was taking place in part of GMU 19-D.

3. The State official running the WCP, Alaska Board of Game Chairman Ted Spraker, told me to kill wolves in an area not yet open to the WCP and I killed the wolves there. [R.0008, 00104]

4. State then prosecuted me for killing wolves in our GMU 19-C hunting guide area to benefit our guide business – despite the fact the State's own GPS coordinates proved the wolves were killed in GMU 19-D, where we were not allowed to guide hunts. [R.00010-49]

5. No prompt post-seizure hearing was ever given or offered when the State seized the airplane that was the backbone of our guide business, despite the fact this was required by the U.S. and Alaska constitutions. [R.00013] See Waiste v. State 10 P.3d 1141 (AK Supreme Court 2000)

6. Hired criminal attorney Brent Cole, who stated it was not a legal defense that the State told me to kill the wolves where I did and stated that there was no way to protest the State falsely claiming, on every warrant/affidavit used to search our home and seize airplane/property/evidence, that the wolves were killed in our GMU 19-C hunting guide area. [R.00008-10]

7. Cole stated that Governor Frank Murkowski had called Leaders and Judge Murphy and told them to make an example of me; that he could do nothing about the devastating hunting guide charges against me; and that I must plea out. [R.00010-12, 34, 355-381, Cole Dep. 137]

8. Asked our business attorney Dale Dolifka about it not being legal to bring I killed the wolves where the State told me. Dolifka stated this was my entire defense so we ordered Cole put it into the court record for my defense. *Yet afterward Judge Murphy removed it out of court record while its cover letter, proving it had been admitted, remained in record.* [R.0009-104, Tr.261]

9. Cole told me I was given immunity that required me to give Leaders and Gibbens a statement and to mark on their aeronautical map where I killed the wolves. [R.00016-19, 68-78]

10. Leaders quoted parts of my statement to charge me with crimes. [R.00017-19, 98-103, 106-115]

11. In August 2004 Cole told me Leaders agreed to a plea agreement requiring me to give up guiding for 1 to 3 years, to be decided by the judge, and did not require plane be given up. Cole stated I should give up a guide year before sentencing because Leaders agreed to give me credit for it if given up before sentencing. Gave up fall 2004/spring 2005 guide year (by cancelling all clients and returning all deposits) prior to the agreement being presented to court. November 9, 2004 was set for the agreement to be presented to the McGrath court. [R.00020]

12. Notified court and Leaders I was going to testify I killed the wolves where State told me to. Paid to fly in witnesses from Illinois on November 8, 2004, to go to McGrath on 9th. On November 8, 2004 Cole stated Leaders had changed the already filed, agreed to charges to charges far more severe – that would require the court to take my guide license for 3 years to life. Cole stated we could not go out to McGrath on November 9, 2004 because of the severe charges. [R.00009-104]

13. We now know this was to stop my testimony the State told me to kill the wolves outside the program. After my conviction we found out Murphy had also removed out of the court record the physical evidence of this – proven by the fact the evidence's cover letter remains in the court record while the evidence itself is missing. In other words, for the cover up to work the physical evidence had to be removed and my testimony stopped.

14. Cole stated that he could not believe Leaders could break the plea agreement because we already had a complete and binding deal, stated all he could do to force Leaders comply was *"call Leaders' boss, a lady I used to work with when I was a prosecutor."* Cole also stated that he couldn't enforce the plea agreement because *"I can't do anything that will piss Scot [Leaders] off because after your case is done I still have to be able to make deals with him."* [R.00034-57]

15. Cole stated Leaders would change the charges back if I agreed to give up airplane. Leaders also agreed only one year of guiding be given up, so I would not have to testify. (Remember, I was to testify that the State told me to kill the wolves where I did - confirming the animal rights activists' claim the program was fraudulently run, likely ending the program.) [R.00056]

16. Asked Cole if I could tell Judge Murphy how Leaders had broken the agreement. Cole stated, *"She will tell you anything you say can and will be used against you in a court of law and that will be the end of it."* [R.00034-57]

17. Cole stated, *"When Scot [Leaders] screwed you he really screwed me"* and stated there was nothing he could do if Leaders broke the agreement again after he got the airplane. [R.00034-57]

18. Attorney Dolifka advised we fire Cole and hire attorney Arthur "Chuck" Robinson. [Tr.29-33]

19. Robinson stated we could not bring up I killed the wolves where State told me to; stated there was no way to protest the State claimed, on all search/seizure warrants used to take plane, property, and evidence, the wolves were killed in our GMU 19-C hunting guide area; stated everything with Cole "was water under the bridge"; stated that nothing could be done to enforce the plea agreement Cole had made with Leaders; stated it would do no good to talk with Cole about the plea agreement Cole had made with Leaders; stated that Leaders did not have to give me credit for the guide year we had already given up for the agreement Leaders broke; stated there was no way to get credit for the year of guiding already given up; and stated we would have to start from scratch if we wanted a plea agreement with Leaders.[R.00004-46]

20. Asked Robinson have PI Joe Malatesta investigate why the plea agreement Cole made fell through. Robinson stated an investigation wasn't necessary. Despite Robinson's advice we had Malatesta investigate why Cole's plea agreement fell through. PI Malatesta tape-recorded Cole stating that Leaders broke the "Rule 11" plea agreement to get the airplane. [R.00061-66]

21. Robinson stated that he had found a subject-matter defense "that will no doubt win." This defense was the court did not have subject-matter jurisdiction because Leaders didn't swear to, or provide an affidavit for, the charging information. [R00004-46]

22. Told Robinson I would plea to an agreement giving the State the airplane if Leaders would give me credit for the guide year already given up – as Leaders had agreed to while Cole represented me. Leaders refused to give me credit for the guide year and Robinson stated that Leaders did not have to give credit for this guide year already given up for the first plea agreement. [R.00004-46]

    "We hold that the constitutional guarantee against multiple punishments for the same offense absolutely requires that punishment already exacted must be fully "credited" in imposing sentence..." North Carolina v. Pearce, 395 U.S. 711 (U.S. Supreme Court 1969)

23. Robinson stated why would I plea out, and have a conviction on my record, when the subject-matter jurisdiction defense would make sure I was never convicted, and we got to keep plane. In a 3-1-05 invoice Robinson states: *"recommendation that David go to trial."*

24. Jackie and I discussed whether I should plea out and agreed I could not, because there was nothing to stop Leaders from breaking the agreement over and over to get more and more from us – as proven by the first guide year already taken without credit. We discussed how Robinson's "no doubt win" subject-matter jurisdiction defense would leave me without a conviction and let us keep the plane. Because we believed no plea agreement could be enforced and believed in Robinson's "no doubt win" subject-matter jurisdiction defense, I agreed to trial. [R.00004-46]

25. Robinson filed a motion the court lacked subject-matter jurisdiction because the information wasn't sworn to, Leaders opposed and filed another information, Murphy denied Robinson's motion, Robinson stated Leaders had mistakenly sworn to his [Leaders] opposition to Robinson's motion to dismiss, and stated that because of this the subject-matter defense was still a "no doubt win" issue – so much so that he would call the COA during my trial because they would find this so "juicy" an issue they would halt my trial and dismiss the case. [R.00036-123]

26. Robinson stated that because Cole "gave the State everything" I would lose at trial; stated we should not put up a defense or oppose the State's case for conviction, as this may "admit" the court had subject- matter jurisdiction; and stated he should "stand mute" at trial. [R.00036-123]

27. Jackie and I called family and friends – who advised opposing the State and putting up every defense – so we told Robinson to oppose everything and raise every defense. [R.00122-163]

28. Robinson motioned that since my actions more closely resembled Wolf Control Program action I must be charged with a program violation (minor because by law it could not affect my guide license) rather than with career-ending charges of same-day airborne hunting big game (wolves) as a big game guide. [R.00036-153]

29. Leaders opposed, stating this was a "factual issue the jury must decide". Murphy agreed, ruling jury must decide. About a week later Leaders asked for a "protection order" preventing Robinson from asking jury to decide this - stating it was now a "legal issue" the jury could not decide. Murphy agreed and prohibited us from presenting this to the jury – even though it meant her rulings were in opposition ("factual" then "legal"), both times to side with State - which took away the protection of my wolf control permit – making it as if I never had one. [R.00036-153]

30. Robinson motioned (supported by my affidavit and certified delivered to Leaders by both courier and fax) that Leaders could not use my statement in his charging information. Murphy failed to rule on this and Leaders left my statement in the information forcing me to trial. [R.00164-165]

31. My trial occurred in McGrath on 5-17-05, 5-18-05, 7-25-05, 7-26-05, 7-27-05, 7-28-05, and 7-29-05. Trial went till 11:29 pm somedays and I was present at the courthouse (which doubled as an official Iditarod Sled Dog Race checkpoint) every hour of trial. Sentenced on 9-29-05 and 9-30-05 and I was present at the courthouse every hour of sentencing.

32. Murphy lived in Aniak and because trial was in McGrath she had to fly there, as McGrath is a remote village of 300 people with no road to any other village or city – and without any public transportation. We traveled with Robinson to McGrath, with airplane leaving Anchorage, usually flying first to Aniak, and then landing in McGrath on its way back to Anchorage. Because of this we normally traveled to McGrath on the same airplane as Murphy. We did not travel to McGrath with Robinson on July 25, 2005 – as Robinson's flight from Kenai to Anchorage had problems and as a result he missed the flight out of Anchorage to Aniak/McGrath on July 25, 2005.

33. Every time Murphy deplaned in McGrath we all watched her get into a white trooper pickup truck driven by Gibbens, who was the main witness against me and who falsified all affidavits to get search/seizure warrants from Murphy to search our home/seize our property. Every day of my trial Jackie, Robinson, and I watched Murphy go to court in the white trooper pickup truck driven by Gibbens, leave and return with Gibbens in the same truck during breaks, lunch and dinner; and leave with Gibbens when court was finished for the day. [R.00572-586]

34. Jackie, Robinson, and I even watched Murphy eat with Gibbens when we stayed at the McGrath B & B with Murphy. [R.00572-586]

35. Robinson, Jackie, and I either walked, rode old borrowed bicycles, and once used a car from the B &B to get to and from the courthouse, and watched Gibbens and Murphy pass us in their white trooper pickup numerous times as we did so – as there are very low speed limits on the few gravel roads. Since Robinson smoked, we would all go outside the courthouse so he could do so during trial and sentencing breaks, where we would all watch Murphy get in with Gibbens to go run errands. Not one time did we see Murphy traveling, arriving or leaving the court house alone or with anyone other than Gibbens. [R.00572-586]

36. I told Robinson, when we first seen Murphy get in the pickup truck with Gibbens, that it didn't seem right for Gibbens to be giving Murphy rides. Robinson replied that *"there is nothing I can do - this is the way it is in the villages."* Because I was with Robinson virtually every time I witnessed Murphy riding/eating with Gibbens, I did not continue to protest the chauffeuring to Robinson – he seen as clearly as I how pervasive it was.

37. By far, most of the rides/meals I witnessed, and I know Robinson witnessed, occurred during my trial, as it lasted for 7 days as opposed to my sentencing, which lasted 2 days. Robinson had to see Murphy ride with Gibbens dozens of times during my trial alone.

38. My jurors also witnessed Gibbens continuously giving Murphy rides during trial. [R.00033]

39. Even the tape-recording of the court record captures Murphy and Gibbens themselves joking about the rides Gibbens was giving Murphy. [R.00164]

40. Robinson has testified that Murphy *"was a law-enforcement judge and not the independent, judicial type you are supposed to have."* [Rob. Dep 204] Robinson testified Murphy ruled he could not argue my defense. [Rob. Dep. 203]

41. On December 13, 2004 (over 5 months before trial) Robinson documented giving Leaders a written discovery request for copies of any tape-recordings of witnesses, anything to be used against me at trial, or anything that would be favorable to my defense or punishment. In violation of Robinson's discovery request Leaders did not give Robinson, prior to trial or ever, a copy of the map the State used against me at trial. In violation of Robinson's discovery request Leaders did not give Robinson, prior to trial or ever, a copy of the tape-recording capturing Leaders, Gibbens, and State witness Zellers discussing how the wolves were not killed in my GMU 19-C hunting guide area and discussing how their map was falsified to make it seem as if the wolves were taken in my GMU 19-C hunting guide area to benefit my guide business.[R.00046-49]

42. Leaders and Gibbens presented their map (while knowing it had been falsified to corruptly make it seem as if the wolves were taken in my GMU 19-C guide area) against me at trial to support their case to my jury I was killing wolves in my GMU 19-C hunting guide area to benefit my guide business – arguing to my jury wolves prey on moose and I sold moose hunts. [Tr. 281-333]

43. Leaders and Gibbens, to exactly support their false map, suborned and committed perjury to my jury the wolves were killed in my GMU 19-C hunting guide area to benefit my hunting guide business. (Proven by the tape-recording of Leaders and Gibbens discussing, prior to trial, how no wolves were killed in my GMU 19-C hunting guide area and discussing how they falsified their trial map to corruptly prove this. [Tr. 281-333]

44. Even though Robinson didn't want to, I forced him to make Gibbens admit he knew that his trial testimony was false. Gibbens, only after he knew his false trial testimony had been found out, admitted the wolves were not taken in GMU 19-C and admitted they were all taken GMU 19-D. Although Gibbens' admission, made only after he knew his false testimony had been found out, proved he was guilty of perjury, my trial continued as if nothing happened. Since no one, other than Gibbens and Leaders, knew the map had been falsified to also corruptly prove the wolves were taken in GMU 19-C, Murphy and my jury continued to use it throughout trial/deliberations.

    AS 11.56.235. Retraction as a defense. *(a) In a prosecution under AS 11.56.200 or 11.56.230, if the false statement was made in an official proceeding, it is an affirmative defense that the defendant expressly retracted the false statement (1) during the course of the same official proceeding;(2)* ***before*** *discovery of the falsification became known to the defendant...*

45. Robinson told me I was forced to testify at trial because the State was using my pretrial statement against me, but told me not to bring up I killed the wolves where the State told me to. Robinson told me that when Leaders questioned me to only state that I killed the wolves for the program and told me to only provide answers to the questions asked and nothing more. At trial

Robinson never had me testify I killed the wolves where the State told me - but I was required to testify that I killed wolves outside the Wolf Control area. [R. 00001-46 Rob. Dep. 140-141]

46. Convicted. Told Robinson to subpoena Cole to sentencing to make sure I got credit for the guide year we had already given up and to make sure Murphy knew that Leaders had broken the plea agreement after I had paid for it. Robinson agreed and billed me for subpoenaing Cole.[R.00024]

47. I had Jackie write an email to Robinson asking if we should subpoena attorney Kevin Fitzgerald to my sentencing because Fitzgerald would also have known that I had given up a year's guiding for a plea agreement Cole failed to enforce. Robinson emailed back stating, *"I don't think we need Fitzgerald. Brent [Cole] is sufficient since he was Dave's lawyer and not Fitzgerald."*

48. I had Jackie write up the questions that I demanded Robinson, at my sentencing, to ask Cole and other witnesses about the guide year we had given up for the plea agreement Leaders broke and Cole stated could not be enforced because he couldn't do anything to piss Leaders off since he still had to be able to make deals with him after my case was over. Robinson promised he would ask these questions of the witnesses. We purchased Cole an airplane ticket to McGrath.

49. When Cole failed to show up to my sentencing, as subpoenaed, Robinson told me that there was nothing that could be done about it. The court record proves Robinson never asked any of the other witnesses the questions, as he promised he would, about the plea agreement that Cole told all of us couldn't be enforced after we had given up a year of guiding in reliance on it.

50. I told Robinson to tell Murphy we had given up a year of guiding for Cole's plea agreement that Leaders broke so he could get the airplane. The court record proves Robinson never did this.

51. Leaders and Gibbens claimed, at my sentencing, they did not know why I had given up guiding for a year prior to my sentencing – in direct opposition to Cole's prior statements to me, Jackie and other witnesses that Leaders knew we had given it up for the broken plea agreement and that Leaders agreed to give us credit for it. Leaders stated I must be sentenced severely to protect the Wolf Control Program. [Tr. 1394-1395]

52. Murphy's reason for sentencing me to 2-years in prison, airplane forfeiture, $20,000 fine, and 5-year suspension of my guide license was *"the wolves were killed in GMU 19-C...where you were hunting"* – proving the effectiveness of Leaders/Gibbens false trial testimony and pretrial falsification of the GMU 19-C/19-D boundary on their trial map – that corruptly made it appear as if the wolves were taken in my 19-C hunting guide area. Robinson never protested this known false justification for my sentence. [Tr. 1437-41]

53. Court record proves I never got credit for the guide year we gave up for the agreement Leaders broke to get plane and Cole claimed could not be enforced because, *"I can't do anything to piss Scot [Leaders] off because I have to be able to make deals with him after your case is done."*

"[T]he Constitution was designed as much to prevent the criminal from being twice punished for the same offence as from being twice tried for it. We hold that the constitutional guarantee against multiple punishments for the same offense absolutely requires that punishment already

exacted must be fully "credited" in imposing sentence... " North Carolina v. Pearce, 395 U.S. 711 (U.S. Supreme Court 1969)

54. Robinson stated, before trial, that any guide license action must be "stayed" during appeal – but stated, after my conviction, the court was not required to stay my guide license during appeal. Murphy and COA refused to stay my guide license suspension during appeal.

55. I asked Robinson if I could appeal my sentence and Robinson told me that I could not. Later, on my appeal docketing statement, Robinson checked the box "conviction only" and not the box "conviction and sentence." See court record.

56. I have now personally seen that AK Criminal Rule 32.5 and Appellate Rule 215(b) *required* that Murphy notify me that I could appeal, or just seek review of, my sentence. Yet the court record proves that Murphy did not give me this notice. So Murphy violated my right to notice and Robinson outright lied to me – making sure the fame job wasn't exposed and that Cole never testified how he could not enforce my plea agreement because, *"I can't do anything to piss Scot [Leaders] off because I have to be able to make deals with him after your case is done"*.

57. Caselaw below proves that prosecutors must be held to an agreement if the defendant has relied upon it. I gave up a year's guiding for mine (which nearly bankrupt Jackie and I), along with paying to fly in people from around the United States. In other words I had, before trial, paid for charges far less severe than what I went to trial on – meaning my trial is invalid.

    Santobello v. New York, 404 U.S. 257 (U.S. Supreme Court 1971) *"Government must adhere strictly to the terms of agreements made with defendants—including plea, cooperation, and immunity agreements..."*

    Closson v. State, 812 P.2d 966 (AK 1991) *"Where an accused relies on a promise...this individual...will not be able to "rescind" his or her actions. In the plea bargaining arena, the United States Supreme Court has held that states should be held to strict compliance with their promises. ...courts consider the defendant's detrimental reliance as the gravamen of whether it would be unfair to allow the prosecution to withdraw from a plea agreement..."*

58. After I was convicted Robinson told me I would still win on appeal because there was no subject-matter jurisdiction because Leaders still had not supported my charging information with an affidavit. Robinson's appeal issue was that the court did not have subject-matter jurisdiction because Leaders had not supported my charging information with an affidavit. See court record. Because I wanted to help I asked Robinson what cases proved this. Robinson told me that U.S. Supreme Court cases Albrecht v. U.S. and Gerstein v. Pugh supported it. [Rob. Dep 126]

59. I now know subject-matter jurisdiction is set by State statute – superior courts have subject-matter jurisdiction over felonies; district courts over misdemeanors; small claims court over small claims; divorce court over divorces; etc; etc.

60. I have personally seen Alaska Statute 22.15.060, which gives district courts subject-matter jurisdiction over misdemeanors – and since I was prosecuted in district court for misdemeanors it is irrefutable that my court had subject-matter jurisdiction from the very beginning.

61. I personally read Albrecht v. U.S. and Gerstein v. Pugh and seen they prove the exact opposite to what Robinson told me. First, they are not about "subject-matter jurisdiction" at all, but are about personal jurisdiction and are specifically about how there needs to be a sworn affidavit to support pretrial detention/ arrest. They state that when a prosecutor signs a charging information he does so under his oath of office – so he does not need to swear to a charging information for it to be valid. And if, as in my case, the defendant appears in court voluntarily without being arrested, there doesn't need to be a sworn affidavit to support an arrest warrant. Finally, they hold that even if a defendant were arrested with an illegal arrest warrant not supported by sworn affidavit, this still would not invalidate the charging information.

    Albrecht v. U.S., 273 U.S. 1 (U.S. Supreme Court 1927) *"The claims mainly urged are that, because of defects in the information and affidavits attached, there was no jurisdiction in the District Court and that rights guaranteed by the Fourth Amendment were violated... As the affidavits on which the warrant issued had not been properly verified, the arrest was in violation of the clause in the Fourth Amendment, which declares that 'no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation.' But it does not follow that, because the arrest was illegal, the [charging] information was or became void."*

62. It is clear Robinson lied that Albrecht v. U.S. and Gerstein v. Pugh and supported his subject-matter defense because if he could not give me any cases that supported it I would immediately know he had been lying to me. A lie, once made, requires other lies to continue the charade.

63. In an October 17, 2005 email I asked Robinson to appeal the fact that Leaders continued to use my statement against me even after Robinson protested this to Murphy – who never ruled on the protest. Despite my request Robinson never appealed this – even though it positively required my conviction be overturned.

64. Fired Robinson at Dolifka's advice. Dolifka said not to hire another attorney inside Alaska as *"Alaska's attorneys have turned on you."* Tried hiring from outside Alaska but none would agree to after we explained situation. Ended up hiring Alaskan attorney Mark Osterman. Because of the problems with Cole and Robinson we tape-recorded every conversation with Osterman.

65. Before firing him we tape-recorded Robinson stating I would never overturn my conviction *"because in Alaska there is a good old boys system... of judges, cops, and prosecutors who protect their own"* when they commit crimes to convict people. When I said I was going sue everybody Robinson stated that Shaw v. State of AK Public Defenders Agency 861 P.2d 566 (AK Supreme Court 1993) prevented me from suing anyone unless my conviction were overturned – explaining why, 14 years after being framed, my conviction still stands.

66. After we fired Robinson, and obtained my file, we found a letter PI Malatesta wrote to Robinson before trial, *"don't forget to motion on the DA backing out of the original offer."*

67. On 12-14-05 I called Cole and told him I would like to talk to him about his actions in handling my case before Jackie and I paid the rest of the money we owed him. Cole replied that he wouldn't send any more bills and hung up.

68. Osterman stated it was the *"biggest sellout of a client I have ever seen by not one but 2 attorneys"* (Cole/Robinson) and that I *"didn't know they (Cole/Robinson) were going to set it up so their (State's) dang dice was goanna be loaded. They were always goanna win. Scot Leaders stomped on your head with boots... he violated all the rules and your attorney allowed him, at that time, to commit all these violations...I can't figure out why Chuck's protecting him [Cole]."* Stated my conviction would be overturned immediately and we would sue Cole/Robinson because proving ineffective assistance of counsel proves malpractice. [R.00174-303]

69. Osterman started refusing to let me to see my appeal brief, even though a condition of hire was that I help write it. Finally told him he was fired if I could not see it. Upon examination, everything Osterman had agreed was the "sellout" was missing. When asked, Osterman replied, *"I cannot do anything that will affect the lives or livelihoods of Cole and Robinson."* [R.00174-303] After Osterman stated this I fired him, and Jackie and I took over writing my appeal.

70. Jackie found evidence that Murphy had removed my evidence, proving I killed the wolves where the State told me to, out of the court record before my jury could see it. A cover letter, proving the evidence had been properly admitted and then corruptly removed by someone with unrestricted access to the court record, was all that remained in the court record. AS 11.56.610 Felony Tampering with Evidence. [R.00437-449]

71. Received a tape-recording [#4MC-304-24] capturing Gibbens coaching a witness in McGrath prior to my trial – and validating Cole's claim Governor Frank Murkowski had called Leaders and Murphy and told them to make an example of me:

    Gibbens: *"What are you concerns with regards to people who are issued Predator Control permits to participate in the wolf control project and they kill wolves outside of the wolf control area -um-what are your thoughts about that and what it might- what affects it could have on the – on the project?"*
    Lewis Egrass: *"I was told by you know-uh-yourself Officer Gibbens – the sensitivity you know of -of-you now this goes all the way up to the Governor- the Governors putting himself on the line"*
    Gibbens: *"Yeah"*
    Lewis Egrass: *"-you know politically but uh"*
    Gibbens: *"Right yeah I would hate to see any ammunition giving to-given to the animal rights groups that are-that could potentially be used in the fight to get these programs shut down."*

72. On direct appeal the COA denied every motion I made for expedited consideration, as without my guide license we were headed for bankruptcy. Yet COA (in opposition to their own caselaw it is the proper procedure for appellants wishing to conduct post-conviction relief - so they can litigate things not in the trial record, such as discovery violations, false evidence presented at trial, lies by attorneys, etc, etc.) refused to stay my appeal so I could conduct PCR. See State v. Jones 759 P.2d 558 (AK 1988). This alone added over 3 years to our journey for justice.

73. COA gave the State 380 days to file their direct appeal brief after I had filed mine -when Appellate Rule 217 (d) required State file within 20 days. Another year to our journey. COA also required the State to file a second opening brief when their first opening brief failed to refute my claims (a "do over") – irrefutable proof of COA bias in favor of the State.

74. In direct appeal decision, COA ruled that the Wolf Control Program was "hunting under Title 16" – and thus my conviction of same day airborne hunting as a guide was legal. Yet by State law the WCP was specifically not hunting, it was game management – so it didn't violate the federal Airborne Hunting Act. See AS 16.05.783, 5 AAC 92.039(h), and 5 AAC 92.110(m).

75. After the 5-year suspension of my hunting guide license (actually 6 because year already given) was over the State refused to return it and stated they would never give it back. [R.0763-775]

76. Robinson was deposed. Testified the lack of "subject-matter jurisdiction", because Leaders had not sworn to the charging information, was my only valid defense during trial and appeal. Yet when the State asked if Leaders had cured the subject-matter jurisdiction defect prior to my trial, Robinson testified that Leaders had in fact cured the subject-matter jurisdiction defect prior to my trial. This proves that not only did Robinson lie to me at trial and appeal that this was a valid defense, it means he committed perjury by inconsistent statements during his deposition. Robinson testified it was Cole's duty to file motions to protect me. [Rob. Dep. 9-129]

    AS 11.56.230. Perjury By Inconsistent Statements. *(a) A person commits the crime of perjury by inconsistent statements if (1) in the course of one or more official proceedings the person makes two or more sworn statements which are irreconcilably inconsistent to the degree that one of them is necessarily false*

77. It is clear that Robinson was a double-agent, paid tens of thousands by Jackie and I to defend me, but in reality working with Leaders and Gibbens to convict me - using my blind trust and ignorance to do so. No other explanation is possible when Robinson told us for the "subject-matter jurisdiction" defense to have the best chance to work he should "stand mute" at trial and not put up any defense or oppose anything Leaders and Gibbens wanted to use to convict me – and continued to tell us this was a valid defense during and after trial – when he knew it wasn't.

78. It is like your doctor giving you a bottle of pills to take for a bad infection and telling you for it work you must not take antibiotics, penicillin, or anything else. And then you finding out the pills he gave you was rat poison. By my own instinct I took a little penicillin to combat the rat poison administered by Robinson – by having him make Gibbens admit no wolves were killed in my guide area – not that this did any good because of the amount of poison being administered.

79. Cole was deposed and testified that his tactic for my defense was to have me "fall on my sword" – and then, at AAG Andrew Peterson's advice he not answer, refused to answer what "fall on my sword" meant or if I agreed to it; testified the State would harm him/his business if he had tried to defend me; testified I had been given "tractional immunity" for my statement; testified it was possible the State intentionally falsified the evidence to my guide area to make an example of me; testified he told me to give up guiding prior to sentencing; testified Leaders promised to give me credit for the guide year if I did so; testified he submitted evidence in my defense that I killed

the wolves where the State told me to; testified I put the wolf kill locations on the State's map so this map could not be used against me (yet Leaders and Gibbens, after they put false GMU boundaries on it to make it corruptly seem as if the wolves were taken in my guide area, used it against me at trial); refused to answer what was to stop Leaders from breaking new plea agreements after he broke the first one unchallenged; testified Leaders was allowed to break the plea agreement after I had relied on it; and testified it was Robinson's duty to file motions to protect me. [Cole Dep. 21-163 R.00074]

80. Cole had attorney Kevin Fitzgerald testify to support I was given transactional immunity for my statement. Fitzgerald testified I was given "transactional immunity" and that, after Leaders had got my statement required by the immunity, Leaders told he and Cole that he [Leaders] *"would not be honoring the immunity."* [R.00016-78]

81. I researched "transactional immunity". It is the only type of immunity allowed in Alaska and prevents any prosecution for actions discussed during a statement required by the immunity. Yet I was prosecuted for everything I was required to discuss because of the immunity. See State of Alaska v. Gonzalez, 853 P.2d 526 (AK Supreme Court 1993), Kastigar v. U.S. 404 U.S. 441 (U.S. Supreme Court 1972), and AS 12.50.101.

82. Filed a complaint the main trial witness against me (Gibbens) chauffeured, and ate with, Murphy during my trial. AK Commission on Judicial Conduct's only investigator for the past 28 years, attorney Marla Greenstein, asked me to provide a list of witnesses and I provided a written list of four, certified as received by the ACJC on April 24, 2006. [R. 00551-571]

83. At the end of my August 15, 2006 representation hearing before Magistrate David Woodmancy in McGrath, Woodmancy asked Gibbens for a ride and Gibbens responded: *"I can't because of all the trouble I got into by doing this the last time."* [R.00826]

84. On January 12, 2007 I tape-recorded Greenstein stating she had interviewed every witness I had provided; stating that every witness I provided testified Murphy's rides were provided by someone other than Gibbens; stating that Gibbens and Murphy testified Gibbens did not give Murphy rides during my prosecution; and stating she was dismissing my complaint against Murphy because of this. [R. 00551-571]

85. On January 21, 2010 AAG Peterson motioned that Murphy must decide my PCR claims, which included my claim that Murphy corruptly rode/ate with Gibbens full time during my trial.

86. On March 3, 2010, over my objection she could not decide my claim she was corrupt, Judge Raymond Funk assigned Murphy to decide my PCR claims.

87. On April 23, 2010 Murphy denied my motion she must be disqualified for cause. On April 30, Judge Sharon Gleason assigned Superior Court Judge Stephanie Joannides to review Murphy's denial. Judge Joannides asked me to provide evidence proving Murphy must be disqualified.

88. I contacted all four witnesses previously given to ACJC investigator Greenstein. Every single one swore out an affidavit that no one, other than myself, had ever contacted them about Gibbens

chauffeuring Murphy during my prosecution. Every single witness swore out an affidavit that they personally witnessed Gibbens giving Murphy rides continuously during my prosecution.

89. I provided Judge Joannides with: (a) the four witnesses' affidavits; (b) the tape-recording of ACJC investigator Greenstein claiming to have contacted all of them and claiming none of them witnessed Gibbens giving Murphy rides during my prosecution; (c) a transcript of the tape-recording; (d) a transcript of my prosecution capturing Murphy and Gibbens joking about the chauffeuring Gibbens was giving Murphy during my prosecution; and (e) evidence (a cover letter in the court record proving my evidence had been admitted and then corruptly removed) that Murphy had removed my evidence (that I killed the wolves where the State told me to) out of the official court record so my jury would never see it. [R.00523-531]

90. Judge Joannides certified the transcripts I provided, ruling they were "substantially accurate" and ordered ACJC investigator Greenstein to produce her *"investigative report"* into Gibbens chauffeuring/eating with Murphy during my trial. *ACJC investigator Greenstein refused to provide her "investigative report" to Judge Joannides as ordered.* [03038-3040]

91. Judge Joannides scheduled a 2-day evidentiary hearing on August 25/26, 2010 and, over AAG Peterson's on record objection *"this may be a career ender for Judge Murphy"*, ordered the State to produce Gibbens and allowed me to subpoena Murphy, Greenstein, Leaders, Woodmancy (Murphy's clerk during my trial), Robinson, Cole, our business attorney Dolifka, and the witnesses who Greenstein falsified contacting and whose testimony she falsified.

92. Virtually everyone (other than Dolifka and the witnesses against Greenstein/Murphy) lawyered up to quash their subpoenas, with Murphy and her clerk Woodmancy hiring Peter Maassen (currently an Alaska Supreme Court Justice) to do so. [R.03063-3105]

93. Judge Joannides cancelled the 2-day evidentiary hearing, ruling: (a) that *without an evidentiary hearing* I had already provided enough evidence that Murphy must be disqualified; (b) that, regarding Murphy's conduct during my prosecution, *"there was an appearance of impropriety, **at a minimum**"*; and (c) that, once Murphy was replaced, I would get an evidentiary hearing to prove that Gibbens chauffeured/ate with Murphy full time during my trial; removed my evidence out of the court record while doing so; and that all this was covered up by the ACJC and its investigator Marla Greenstein. (Yet I have never got a hearing to prove any of this in the 8 long years since Joannides ruling.)

94. Judge Joannides certified the evidence proving ACJC investigator Greenstein falsified an official ACJC investigation to cover up the corruption of Murphy and Gibbens during my trial, *put it into the official record of my case*, and referred copies to authorities for prosecution. This included all nine members making up the Alaska Commission on Judicial Conduct, Alaska Department of Law's Office of Special Prosecutions, Alaska Bar Association, and even Alaska's Ombudsman. To date not a single entity has investigated. [R.00523-3105]

95. Murphy swore out an affidavit that Gibbens never gave her a ride during my prosecution.

96. I filed an Alaska Bar Association complaint against ACJC investigator Greenstein (an attorney), claiming she had falsified an official ACJC investigation (by falsely claiming to have contacted witnesses and falsifying what they would have testified to had they been contacted) to cover up the corruption of Murphy and Gibbens during my trial. I provided Judge Joannides certified evidence as proof. [R.00896-908]

97. On January 21, 2011 ACJC investigator Greenstein, in a certified written response to my Bar complaint, testified that not only had she contacted witnesses I gave her, she also contacted my trial attorney Robinson during her investigation into Gibbens chauffeuring Murphy during my trial. I placed this into the official record of my case. [R.01494-1495]

98. On February 4, 2011 I contacted Robinson and tape-recorded him stating that no one had ever contacted him about Gibbens chauffeuring Murphy during my trial and stating, *"I remember seeing Margaret [Murphy] riding around with Trooper Gibbens in the trooper car...during your trial."* I placed this into the official record of my case. [R.01482]

99. I provided a copy of my conversation with Robinson to the Bar and, despite this proving ACJC investigator Greenstein had now committed perjury to the Bar to cover up her corrupt investigation of Gibbens chauffeuring Murphy during my trial, the Bar dismissed my complaint. I placed this into the record of my case. [R.00776-787]

100. I provided a copy of Robinson's statement to FBI Section Chief Doug Klein, along with Judge Joannides certified evidence against ACJC investigator Greenstein. Special Agent Klein stated: *"It is obvious why Greenstein falsified her investigation. No one would believe you got a fair trial if your judge was riding around with the main witness against you."* [R.02531-2563]

101. Every witness who ACJC investigator Greenstein falsified contacting, and whose testimony she falsified, asked to testify during an ACJC public meeting. Although ACJC rules "encourage" public participation/testimony, ACJC denied their request to testify, in spite of having asked more than 48 hours in advance of the meeting, as required by ACJC rule. When the witnesses showed up at the meeting hoping to testify anyway, they were met at ACJC's door by what appeared to be a trooper SWAT team. [R.02013-2040]

102. Filed Bar complaint that Leaders used my statement in his charging information. Leaders certified that he could not use my statement in his charging information; certified he didn't use my statement in the information, & certified that the proof was no one protested pretrial. Provided Bar with information copies – signed by Leaders & quoting my statement. Provided Bar a copy of pretrial affidavit from me protesting this use – certified as delivered to Leaders pretrial. Although this proved Leaders illegally convicted me & had now committed perjury to cover up, the Bar exonerated Leaders. This is official record in this case [R.00051-787]

103. On April 4, 2011, over 5 years after my September 30, 2005 sentence, AAG Peterson motioned to modify my sentence to include the corporation Bush Pilot Inc. - stating the State could not sell the airplane because the FAA refused to title it to them as the sentence was imposed against me and not against the airplane's owner (Bush Pilot Inc.). Even after I pointed out that State law made it illegal to modify a sentence under a motion made more than 180 days

after the original sentencing (and that Bush Pilot was never given an opportunity for a trial or to protest the seizure/forfeiture even though it asked) – Magistrate David Woodmancy (who, as Murphy's clerk during my trial, had to hire Peter Maassen to quash my subpoena requiring him to testify about Gibbens chauffeuring Murphy during my trial) illegally modified my sentence to include Bush Pilot Inc, over 5-years after my original sentencing. [R.01136-1160]

AS 12.55.088 - Modification of Sentence. *(a) The court may modify or reduce a sentence by entering a written order under a motion made within 180 days of the original sentencing.*

104. On August 23, 2011 AAG Peterson told me the State would give me back the airplane if I agreed not to sue anyone. I declined. [R.02239-2242]

105. Judge Carl Bauman was assigned to conduct my PCR & delayed until my criminal and ACJC complaints that he was intentionally falsifying pay affidavits to starve me out. ACJC investigator Greenstein dismissed my complaints against Bauman by ruling I pointed to nothing other than adverse rulings – when my complaint specifically stated Bauman was intentionally falsifying sworn pay affidavits – a felony. Shortly after this Bauman dismissed my PCR claim that Greenstein falsified her ACJC investigation to corruptly exonerate Gibbens chauffeuring Murphy (quid pro quo). Tried disqualifying Bauman for deciding my "*1-10-11 Motion for Hearing & Rulings before Deciding States Motion to Dismiss*" on 1-17-12, or 372 days later – while he swore at the time nothing had gone longer than 6 months. Judge Anna Moran ruled I "miscalculated" as Bauman had "stayed" my PCR from May 27, 2011 to August 3, 2011, (68 days). Yet 372 days minus 68 days is still far over the 180 day time limit. [R.01995-1999]

AS 22.10.190 (b) *A salary disbursement may not be issued to* ***a superior court judge*** *until the judge has filed with the state officer designated to issue salary disbursements an affidavit that no matter referred to the judge for opinion or decision has been uncompleted or undecided by the judge for a period of more than six months.*

106. Bauman ordered State to produce discovery (trial map & pretrial recordings of Leaders/Gibbens/Zellers) that, because of Robinson's pretrial discovery request, should have been provided prior to my trial 8 years earlier. Realized: (a) trial map was same I was given immunity to place wolf kills on; (b) false GMU 19-C/19-D boundaries had been placed on the map to corruptly make it seem the kill locations were in my 19-C guide area; & (c) *pretrial recording captured Leaders/Gibbens/Zellers how no wolves were killed in my GMU 19-C hunting guide area and discussing how they put false GMU 19-C/19-D boundaries on their trial map to corruptly make it appear the wolves were killed were in my 19-C hunting guide area to benefit my business.* [R.00046-49 Tr.418-20]

107. Realizing this proved State felony tampering with evidence, State discovery violation, State knowingly using false trial evidence, State knowingly committing trial perjury, & State violating self-incrimination right, I filed a 13-page *"5-11-12 Motion for Immediate Evidentiary Hearing on Newly Discovered Known False Evidence Presented During Haeg's Trial"*. Bauman refused an evidentiary hearing & just days later overturned my sentence but not conviction - claiming Murphy/Gibbens' *trial* corruption meant my sentence was invalid but not conviction.

Entitled to overturn sentence without evidentiary hearing, what would I be entitled to after evidentiary hearing? [R.02917-28]

108. Congressman Don Young's Deputy Director Greg Kaplan went with to deliver evidence of Leaders/Gibbens/Murphy/attorney corruption to DOJ. FBI section chief Colton Seale: *"We have received a number of complaints nearly identical to yours. In every case our investigation expanded rapidly & implicated nearly everyone."* FBI stated we must exhaust state remedies before federal prosecution. FBI Assistant Special Agent in Charge David Heller stated we must deliver evidence to AK attorney general in person. Deputy AG Richard Svobodny denied AG meeting request even though he knew ASAC Heller requested it. FBI asked I give evidence to trooper internal affairs. Sole trooper Internal Affairs investigator Lieutenant Keith Mallard stated on the phone, *"I've heard of your case & all you have are sour grapes over being convicted. I won't dignify your evidence with an address to send it to"*- and hung up. [R.01982-2563]

109. Appealed Bauman not overturning conviction & prepared for resentencing. Requested 4 days to prove I was framed. State asked I be prohibited from presenting evidence or testimony. I indicated this would be over my dead body. State's request was denied. State claimed it only needed 30 minutes, as only "Robert Fithian" would testify against me. Court scheduled 4-day resentencing. [Tr. 346-358] As State never mentioned Fithian before, we contacted him. Fithian stated he was going to testify that I told him I was going to use my WCP permit to shoot wolves in my 19-C guide area to benefit my business. I stated we had proof State falsified trial evidence & testimony to frame me for this. Fithian stated he didn't know this. I asked why State was having him commit perjury & Fithian replied State worked too hard to get WCP going to see my case end it. After this tape-recorded admission the State appealed my sentence being overturned & COA cancelled my resentencing – so again no evidentiary hearing. After Fithian's explanation, we realized everything had one thing in common –it all protected the WCP at my expense. Animal right activists had sued to shut WCP down by claiming State was running it fraudulently and my evidence would have proved this - explaining why Murphy destroyed it before jury seen it & why State falsified evidence & testimony to prove the wolves were killed in my guide area – to create a motive, other than following State orders, for me to kill wolves outside the WCP. This is official record in this case [R.02239-2242 & Tr. 346-358]

110. For COA oral argument we sent out 45,000 mailings inviting public attend. Resulting crowd couldn't fit, as courtroom only held 300, who applauded as I presented corruption evidence – which included using the trial map to prove the State had falsified it before trial to support their case to my jury I was killing wolves in my guide area to benefit my business.

111. COA failed to decide my appeal within "6-month law". COA Clerk Marilyn May confirmed the time limit imposed by AS 22.07.090 in my appeal started on May 20, 2014 (oral arguments). After 6 months I asked for ruling – citing 6-month law. COA ruled 6-month law didn't apply to 3 judge panels. Even assuming this, & each of the 3 judges got 6 months consecutively, this only gives 18 months. Yet the COA went 30 months past oral arguments – 12 months beyond even an 18-month limit. This is 24 felony perjury counts minimum per judge, as each COA judge continued filing pay affidavits every 2 weeks. I filed criminal complaint with

troopers & finally asked legislature & governor to step in. COA finally decided my appeal - ordering the current "remand" that, by completely ignoring issues & evidence (like those exposed by the pretrial recording/trial map) & by outright falsifying facts & law, again prohibits me from bringing up evidence of corruption and felony crimes by State officials.

AS 22.07.090 Compensation. *A salary disbursement may not be issued to* ***a judge of the court of appeals*** *until the judge has filed with the state officer designated to issue salary disbursements an affidavit that no matter referred to the judge for decision has been uncompleted or undecided by the judge for a period of more than six months.*

112. To deny an evidentiary hearing on it during remand, COA claims there is no evidence in the record of this case, or even a specific claim, of Leaders & Gibbens fabricating trial evidence, & then, knowing both were false when presented, presenting both false evidence & testimony against me at trial – along with failing to provide this discovery prior to trial in violation of a written pretrial discovery request. Yet I gave COA a copy of my 13-page *"5-11-12 Motion for Immediate Hearing on Newly Discovered Known False Evidence Presented During Haeg's Trial"*, along with 25 pages of additional details including the violated discovery request; transcripts of Leaders, Gibbens, and State witness Zellers (which is in the record) talking about how no wolves were killed in my guide area; talking about how and why they were fabricating their trial map to prove this; and transcripts of trial proving they used the map against me at trial and testified at trial how the wolves were killed in my guide area to benefit my business. At COA oral argument, I had even used the original trial map (provided by State at my request and part of the record) to point out to the COA how Gibbens/Leaders had placed false guide boundaries on it to corruptly make it seem as if the wolves were killed in my guide area to benefit my business. I also had made the specific claim that Leaders never provided the map/recording copies prior to trial even though we requested them in a certified, written discovery request prior to trial – a request that is also in the record.

Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (U.S. Supreme Court 1963) *"Suppression by the prosecution of evidence favorable to an accused who has requested it violates due process where the evidence is material either to guilt or to punishment, irrespective of the good or bad faith of prosecution."*

AS 11.56.610. Tampering With Physical Evidence.
(a) A person commits the crime of tampering with physical evidence if the person
(1) destroys, mutilates, **alters,** suppresses, conceals, or removes **physical evidence with intent to impair its verity** or availability **in a official proceeding** or criminal investigation;
(2) makes, **presents, or uses physical evidence, knowing it to be false, with intent to mislead a juror who is engaged in an official proceeding** or a public servant who is engaged in an official proceeding or a criminal investigation;
(b) Tampering with physical evidence is a class C felony.

AS 11.56.200. Perjury.
(a) A person commits the crime of perjury if the person makes a false sworn statement which the person does not believe to be true....

(c) Perjury is a class B felony.

Napue v. Illinois, 360 U.S. 264 (U.S. Supreme Court 1959) *"Conviction obtained through use of false evidence, known to be such by representatives of the State, is a denial of due process."*

Mooney v. Holohan, 294 U.S. 103 (U.S. Supreme Court 1935) *"Requirement of 'due process' is not satisfied by mere notice & hearing if state, through prosecuting officers acting on state's behalf, has contrived conviction through pretense of trial which in truth is used as means of depriving defendant of liberty through deliberate deception of court & jury by presentation of testimony known to be perjured."*

Giles v. Maryland, 386 U.S. 66 (U.S. Supreme Court 1967) *"The principle that a State may not knowingly use false evidence, including false testimony, to obtain a tainted conviction, [is] implicate in any concept of ordered liberty..."*

Northern Mariana Islands v. Bowie, 243 F.3d 1109 (9th Cir. 2001) *"This record emits clear overtones of the Machiavellian maxim: "the end justified the means," an idea that is plainly incompatible with our constitutional concept of ordered liberty. Nowhere in the Constitution or in the Declaration of Independence, nor for that matter in the Federalist or in any other writing of the Founding Fathers, can one find a single utterance that could justify a decision by an oath-beholden servant of the law to look the other way when confronted by the real possibility of being complicit in the wrongful use of false evidence to secure a conviction in court."*

113. COA, to prohibit an evidentiary hearing on it, claimed there was no harm if my evidence were destroyed before my jury could see it. Yet criminal & civil attorney Dolifka testified this evidence was critical to my defense as it proved I killed the wolves where State told me to. State never disputed it told me this, but my jury never saw the evidence because Murphy destroyed it.

American Bar Association *"Aside perhaps from perjury, no act serves to threaten the integrity of the judicial process more than the spoliation of evidence."*

Jury never knew I was doing exactly what State told me to do. All jury ever saw or heard was false evidence I was a rogue guide out to get rich by shooting wolves in his guide area.

"Context is everything. It was a truth I had learned through years of experience as an attorney, where the setting, the situation, & the circumstances surrounding a crime can often make all the difference in the final perception of innocence or guilt." United States Attorney David Iglesias.

114. To deny an evidentiary hearing on it during remand, COA claims there is no evidence in the record of this case, or even a specific claim, of corruption in ACJC; Bar; &/or attorneys/ judges involved in this case. Yet Judge Joannides, in the record of this case, certified 70 pages of evidence & sent to authorities for prosecution, that Marla Greenstein, the ACJC's only investigator of judges since 1989, falsified an official investigation to corruptly exonerate Judge Murphy from my claim that Gibbens was corruptly chauffeuring Murphy while she conducted my trial & destroyed my evidence. This is also my specific claim – along with others that include copies of the actual documents proving them: (a) that when witnesses, who Greenstein falsified

contacting & whose testimony she falsified, wished to testify during a public ACJC meeting about Greenstein's actions, the ACJC called a SWAT team to stop the testimony; (b) that when Greenstein & Leaders committed provable perjury to the Bar, the Bar exonerated them without investigation; (c) that COA judges & Judge Bauman falsified pay affidavits to starve me out; & (d) that Judge Moran, to exonerate Bauman, ruled 372 days, minus 68 days, was less than 6 months. This is all record in this case. See facts & citations above.

115. COA, to eliminate this issue on remand, claims there is no evidence in the record I was given "transactional immunity" for my statement. Yet my attorney Brent Cole testified on the record in this case. Regarding transactional immunity I was given for my statement I ask Cole:

"Did I have immunity for that statement?" Cole: *"Yup."* I then ask Cole: "What kind of immunity?" Cole: *"Transactional."* [Cole Dep. 22]

Attorney Kevin Fitzgerald (who worked with Cole while Cole represented me) also testified I was given *"transactional immunity"* for my statement & that after I had given the statement required by the immunity Leaders told he & Cole that the State *"would not be honoring the immunity"*. All this is record in this case. [R.00072-73]

Black's Law Dictionary (9th Ed.2009). *"Transactional immunity" affords immunity to the witness from prosecution for the offense to which the compelled testimony relates.*

116. COA claims my statement and map, upon which I placed kill locations, could be used against me at trial - *even if I was given immunity to compel them.*

Yet the U.S. Supreme Court & Alaska Supreme Court hold the opposite.

Kastigar v. United States, 406 U.S. 441 (U.S. Supreme Court 1972) *"The Government must do more than negate the taint; it must affirmatively prove that its evidence is derived from a legitimate source wholly independent of the compelled testimony."*

State of Alaska v. Gonzalez, 853 P2d 526 (AK Supreme Court 1993) *"Procedures & safeguards can be implemented, such as isolating the prosecution team.... In a case such as United States v. North, 910 F.2d 843 (D.C. Cir. 1990), where the compelled testimony receives significant publicity, witnesses receive casual exposure to the substance of the compelled testimony through the media or otherwise. Once persons come into contact with the compelled testimony they are incurably tainted... This situation is further complicated if potential jurors are exposed to the witness' compelled testimony through wide dissemination in the media. Mindful of Edward Coke's caution that 'it is the worst oppression, that is done by colour of justice,' we conclude that use & derivative use immunity is constitutionally infirm."*

U.S. v. North, 910 F.2d 843 (D.C. Cir. 1990) *"From a prosecutor's standpoint, an unhappy byproduct of the Fifth Amendment is that Kastigar may very well require a trial within a trial (or a trial before, during, or after the trial) if such a proceeding is necessary for the court to determine whether or not the government has in any fashion used compelled testimony to indict or convict a defendant. If the government chooses immunization, then it must understand that the Fifth Amendment & Kastigar mean that it is taking a great chance that the witness can't*

constitutionally be indicted or prosecuted. This burden may be met by establishing that the witness was never exposed to North's immunized testimony.... If the government has in fact introduced trial evidence that fails the Kastigar analysis, then the defendant is entitled to a new trial."

My compelled testimony (map which State required me to place wolf kill locations on) was used against me at trial. Leaders & Gibbens, the very people who took my statement, prosecuted me and testified against me at trial. Leaders quoted my statement in the charges & printed excerpts of it in the Anchorage Daily News, so my jurors could read it before trial.

117. To deny an evidentiary hearing on it during remand, COA claims there is no evidence in the record of this case, or even a specific claim, that my attorneys lied about nearly every right I specifically asked them about (what to do about the false search/seizure warrants/affidavits, false evidence locations, plea agreement violation, etc, etc etc.) Yet I gave 38 pages of briefing to the COA on this issue alone & include the sworn deposition testimony from my attorneys proving they lied to me and proving the reason they lied/didn't do anything was the State threatened to harm/did harm them when/if they tried to help me – meaning they had a direct conflict of interest that they acted on to my detriment.

Smith v. State, 717 P.2d 402 (AK 1986) *"We believe it self-evident that an indispensable component of the guarantee of effective assistance of counsel is the accused's right to be advised of basic procedural rights, particularly when the accused seeks such advice by specific inquiry. Without knowing what rights are provided under law, the accused may well be unable to understand available legal options & may consequently be incapable of making informed decisions."*

Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668 (U.S. Supreme Court 1984) *"[P]rejudice is presumed when counsel is burdened by an actual conflict of interest. In those circumstances, counsel breaches the duty of loyalty, perhaps the most basic of counsel's duties. Moreover, it is difficult to measure the precise effect on the defense of representation corrupted by conflicting interests."*

Cuyler v. Sullivan, 446 U.S. 335 (U.S. Supreme Court 1980) *"A defendant who shows that a conflict of interest actually affected the adequacy of his representation need not demonstrate prejudice in order to obtain relief."*

Holloway v. Arkansas, 435 U.S. 475 (U.S. Supreme Court 1978) *"[I]n a case of joint representation of conflicting interests the evil – it bears repeating – is in what the advocate finds himself compelled to refrain from doing...."*

Osborn v. Shillinger, 861 F.2d 612 (10th Cir. 1988) *"In fact, an attorney who is burdened by a conflict between his client's interests & his own sympathies to the prosecution's position is considerably worse than an attorney with loyalty to other defendants, because the interests of the state & the defendant are necessarily in opposition. [Defendant's] attorney didn't simply make poor strategic choices; he acted with reckless disregard for his clients best interests &, at times, apparently with the intention to weaken his client's case. Prejudice, necessary or not, is established under any applicable standard."*

Cole testified his tactic was to have me "fall on your sword", but, after the State told him not to, refused to answer what "fall on your sword" meant or if I ever agreed to it. Fall on your sword means: *"To voluntarily take the blame for a situation."* Except I didn't volunteer to take the blame for the State telling me to kill wolves where it was not open. Or agree to have the State falsify trial evidence and testimony to prove the wolves were killed in my hunting guide area so they could destroy my guide career and sentence me to years in prison. All so the State could, as they did, deny they had anything to do with the wolves being killed outside the open area; claim, as they did, I was nothing more than a rogue guide killing wolves inside my guide area to get rich; and claim, as they did, that my severe sentence should prove to animal rights-activists the high standards to which the Wolf Control Program was being conducted.

COA: *"Haeg is correct that Trooper Gibbens search warrant application misidentifies the location of the wolf kill sites. He contends that Trooper Gibbens knew that the wolves were found in 19-D & that he fraudulently claimed that they were found in 19-C because he wanted to make it look as though Haeg killed the wolves for his own commercial interests. (Game Management Unit 19-C is where Haeg's works as a professional guide.) Here, Robinson knew that the trooper's search warrant application had misidentified the game management unit where the wolf kill sites were found, but he did not know that the trooper would continue to misidentify the kill sites in later proceedings. Given these circumstances, we agree with the district court that Haeg's pleadings failed to state a prima facie case of ineffective assistance on this claim."*

Yet it is proven ineffective assistance when Robinson said *"nothing"* after I specifically asked him what could be done about the false warrants and false affidavits supporting them:

State v. Davenport, 510 P.2d 78, (AK.,1973) *"State & federal constitutional requirement that warrants issue only upon a showing of probable cause contains the implied mandate that the factual representations in the affidavit be truthful."*

Mapp v. Ohio, 367 U.S. 643 (U.S. Supreme Court 1961) *"[A]ll evidence obtained by searches & seizures in violation of the Federal Constitution is inadmissible in a criminal trial in a state."*

Motions to suppress evidence & to return property/plane should have been filed. I would have been far better off without an attorney, because even as ignorant as I was back then I would have brought up that I killed the wolves where the State told me to and brought up the State was falsifying warrants/affidavits where the wolves were killed and why. But because of Robinson's (& Cole's) lies my jury never heard I killed the wolves where the State told me to and Gibbens and Leaders were free to continue their falsification in testimony & map they presented to my jury at trial. Robinson/Cole lied to me *to make sure* Gibbens & Leaders could, after falsifying all the warrants and affidavits to seize everything, assault me again at trial with the false evidence that I was killing the wolves in my guide area to benefit my business:

Powell v. Alabama, 287 U.S. 45 (U.S. Supreme Court 1932) *"The right to be heard would be, in many cases, of little avail if it did not comprehend the right to be heard by counsel. Even the intelligent & educated layman has small & sometimes no skill in the science of law. If charged with crime, he is incapable, generally, of determining for himself whether the indictment is good*

or bad. He is unfamiliar with the rules of evidence. Left without the aid of counsel he may be put on trial without a proper charge, & convicted upon incompetent evidence, or evidence irrelevant to the issue or otherwise inadmissible. He lacks both the skill & knowledge adequately to prepare his defense, even though he have a perfect one. He requires the guiding hand of counsel at every step in the proceedings against him. Without it though he not be guilty, he faces the danger of conviction because he does not know how to establish his innocence."

Rickman v. Bell, 131 F.3d 1150 (6th Cir. 1997) *"Prejudice presumed because counsel did not serve as advocate – such that he was a 'second prosecutor' & defendant would have been 'better off to have been merely denied counsel.'"*

Wood v. Endell 702 P.2d 248 (AK 1985) *"It is settled that a claim of ineffective assistance is one that generally requires an evidentiary hearing to determine whether the standard adopted in Risher v State, 523 P.2d 421 (Ak 1974), was met by counsel's performance. Particularly where, as here, it is the pretrial & post-trial performance of counsel as well as the performance during trial that is specifically alleged to have been inadequate, it isn't sufficient that the trial judge found counsel's performance as observed in the course of trial to be adequate."*

118. COA, to justify eliminating a remand evidentiary hearing on Robinson not requiring the enforcement of Cole's subpoena to my sentencing, states Robinson's refusal *"was not unreasonable [because] at the time of sentencing Haeg and Cole were immersed in a contentious fee arbitration case that had not resolved."* Yet I didn't even file for fee arbitration against Cole until February 10, 2006 – which is 5-months *after* my sentencing – proven my application.

119. COA, to justify eliminating a remand evidentiary hearing on Robinson coercing me to testify, states, *"Haeg had not alleged (nor is there any evidence to suggest) that Robinson coerced him into testifying or that his decision to take the stand and testify on his behalf was anything other than voluntary."*

Yet in my briefing to the COA there are these sworn statements from me: Page 10 opening brief, *"Haeg, told by Robinson his interview forced him to, testified at trial."* Page 25 opening brief, *"Robinson told Haeg he must testify because the State was using his interview against him."* Page 35 opening brief, *"Robinson told Haeg he had to testify at trial."* Page 40 opening brief, *"Haeg's attorneys stated he must testify at trial because the State was using his interview against him."* Page 47 opening brief, *"Haeg claimed Robinson told him he must testify because State was using his statement against him. Robinson admitted this when deposed."* Page 7 reply brief, *"Robinson testified he told Haeg he must testify because State was using his prior statement (which couldn't be used for anything - Evidence Rule 410) against him."* Page 8 reply brief, *"Haeg's testimony, compelled with his prior statement, requires his conviction be overturned."* Page 16 reply brief, *"Haeg's testimony was compelled – meaning Haeg is entitled to a new trial."* Page 25 reply, *"As shown Haeg's trial testimony was coerced and thus requires Haeg's conviction be overturned by itself."* Page 33 reply brief, *"Haeg claimed he was forced to testify because State was using his prior statement to force him to."*

120. COA, to justify eliminating a remand evidentiary hearing on my being forced to represent myself, states, *"There is nothing in the record to suggest that Haeg's decision to represent*

himself was anything but voluntary." Yet the on-record sworn testimony from longtime attorney Dale Dolifka, before Judge Joannides with AAG Peterson cross-examining, located on page 42 of this document – proves *"collusion and corruption"* (AAG Peterson's own words) within Alaska's attorneys forced me to represent myself.

121. COA, to justify eliminating a remand evidentiary hearing on Judge Bauman's corruption, states, *"Haeg does not point to anything other than Judge Bauman's adverse rulings against him to support these alleged claims of corruption. We therefore find no merit to these claims."*

Yet on pages 33, of my opening brief and on pages I swore this *"Bauman, in violation of AS 22.10.190 (requiring him to file affidavits nothing presented to him was undecided for more than 6 months) failed to decide many of Haeg's motions within 6 months – such as Haeg's 1-10-11 Motion for Hearing and Rulings before Deciding the State's Motion to Dismiss, decided by Bauman on 1-17-12 or over a year later, making it long overdue even after Bauman's 68 day stay. Haeg filed criminal and ACJC complaint against Bauman for perjury, and asked Bauman be disqualified for corruption [R.02179-2203] Troopers dismissed criminal complaint, Greenstein dismissed ACJC complaint, And Kenai Judge Anna Moran refused to disqualify Bauman by ruling Haeg miscalculated time. [R.01995-1999] Yet Haeg didn't miscalculate. After these complaints Bauman immediately ruled on about 20 outstanding motions – backdating some so they would appear to have been made within the 6-month time limit. [R.02013-2040]"* On pages 48 and 49 of my opening brief and on pages 1, 5, and 25 of my reply brief I also point to Bauman's perjury so he could be paid and corrupt backdating of motions – and included copies of Bauman's false affidavits and overdue orders to support my claims.

122. COA, in their decision, states, *"No witness affidavits report actually witnessing Trooper Gibbens and Judge Murphy eating meals with each other. Haeg claims he has evidence that the judge was seen eating meals with the trooper but we were unable to find any affidavits or other evidentiary support for this claim.."*

Yet on page 14 of my reply brief to the COA states this, *"Page 33 of the record is an affidavit stating: 'Trooper Gibbens, the state's main investigator and witness against Haeg, chauffeured Judge Murphy everywhere on every day of Haeg's trial and sentencing – in front of Haeg's jury.* ***This chauffeuring included having meals together.*** *Page 2537 of the record is an affidavit stating: "Judge Murphy flew into McGrath from Aniak, state Trooper Gibbens picked her up at the airport and chauffeured her everywhere every morning, noon, and night of Haeg's trial and sentencing – which took place in McGrath.* ***In addition to the chauffeuring, Judge Murphy and Trooper Gibbens were seen having meals together."***

123. On December 18, 2017 Judge William Morse held a hearing on how I was to comply with the COA remand order. I told Morse that the COA order (which Supreme Court refused to correct) falsified facts and law to fraudulently deny an evidentiary hearing on the most egregious violations of my right to a fair trial. Morse stated he would follow the COA order without letting me prove it fraudulent. To stop me from presenting the trial map, pretrial recording, and video of COA oral argument proving I was unconstitutionally being deprived of my right to a evidentiary hearing to prove the State framed me, the Alaska State Troopers tased me numerous times in the courtroom while Judge Morse stood by and watched. See video on Facebook and YouTube.

124. On December 19, 2017 Judge Morse ordered I was entitled to an evidentiary hearing to question Robinson about the reasons for his actions and inactions while he represented me. To prepare, I met with Robinson on December 20, 2017; December 21, 2017; January 9, 2018; and January 14, 2018. I was accompanied by others greatly concerned with this case, including a representative from Senator Peter Micciche's office.

125. Robinson stated the reason he didn't protest Cole not appearing to my sentencing as required by Robinson's subpoena was that it was Judge Murphy's duty to enforce the subpoena, even if he didn't protest Cole not appearing.

126. Robinson stated the reason he didn't protest Gibbens chauffeuring Judge Murphy during my trial was that, *"I didn't think it was my job to protest."*

127. Robinson confirmed that 28-year ACJC investigator Marl Greenstein committed perjury when she testified that she had also contacted him during her investigation of Murphy being chauffeured by Gibbens during my trial.

128. Robinson stated the reason he didn't protest Judge Murphy specifically using the false GMU 19-C evidence location to severely sentence me was:

"Since I was not provided a map copy, so I could check it for accuracy, I cannot be blamed for the jury's use of this map to convict Mr. Haeg and I cannot be blamed for Judge Murphy's use of the map's falsified GMU 19-C/19-D boundaries to sentence Mr. Haeg. Since I was not provided a tape-recording copy prior to trial or during trial, I did not know there was evidence of an intent to falsify the location of where the wolves were taken. Because of Mr. Leaders failure to abide by my discovery request this evidence was withheld and I only found out about it many years after trial."

129. Robinson confirmed Leaders violated his discovery request by not providing, prior to trial, a copy of the recording made of the Leaders/Gibbens/Zellers meeting or a copy of the map used against me a trial. Robinson confirmed the trial map had been falsified to support the State's case and confirmed the recording captured Leaders/Gibbens/Zellers discussing how no wolves were taken in my GMU 19-C hunting guide area and discussing how their map had been falsified to support their case I was killing wolves in my GMU 19-C hunting guide area to benefit my business. When asked if and what he would have done differently at trial if prosecutor Leaders had given him copies of the tape-recording and map prior to trial, as required by Robinson's pretrial discovery request, Robinson answered:

"I would have argued you didn't get fair trial because they were using false evidence to convict you. I could have proved they were intentionally lying at trial. And you would have had evidence of their motive to do so."

130. We told Robinson we had given COA the same evidence as he, along with 25 pages of briefing, and they still denied an evidentiary hearing on the discovery violation that covered up direct evidence the State had intentionally framed me. Robinson replied:

"It seems ridiculous the court of appeals has prevented Mr. Haeg from an evidentiary hearing on the discovery violation and false map when Mr. Haeg gave them briefing on this. Mr. Haeg should be heard."

131. On January 16, 2018, because of Robinson's December 2017/January 2018 confirmation that Leaders violated his pretrial discovery request so Leaders and Gibbens could knowingly present false evidence and testimony against me at trial without being caught, I motioned Morse to confirm when I must question Robinson during an evidentiary hearing.

132. The same day I made the motion as to when I could place, on the record, Robinson's sworn testimony that the State had knowingly framed me at trial, Judge Morse issued an order that I could not question Robinson during an evidentiary hearing:

"The court has learned that Mr. Robinson is deceased. Therefor he is not available for questioning at a hearing."

133. My brother, Thomas Haeg, advised to me to contact Senator Peter Micciche's office and have they request the FBI conduct the autopsy, reasoning that if the State killed Robinson so he couldn't testify, the State would rig the autopsy to cover up what they had done. I contacted Senator Micciche's office and made this request to aide Konrad Jackson.

134. It was a very great shock when Robinson later called to inform me he was alive and well. People following this informed me that Judge Morse ordered Gibbens to kill Robinson, Gibbens missed, and Gibbens failed to inform Morse of his failure, resulting in Morse erroneously issuing the order that Robinson was deceased and thus could not testify.

135. I motioned to Morse to reconsider his ruling in light of the fact Robinson was alive and well. Morse reconsidered, ruling he would set an evidentiary hearing for me to question Robinson *"after the [written] pleadings are complete."* Morse then extended the deadline for written pleadings to February 19, 2018 for my initial pleading, March 5, 2018 for State's response, and March 19, 2018 for my reply.

Discussion of Issues Allowed by COA and Judge Morse

1. ***"[If Robinson] was ineffective in failing to properly advise Haeg regarding the strength of his defense"***

Robinson never told me the State violated his pretrial discovery request (which he must have known happened when the State presented their false map against me at trial without first giving him a copy), and since this discovery would have made been favorable to my defense (we would have found out the State knew the wolves were not killed in my guide area; intentionally falsified the map so they could convict me of killing wolves in my guide area to benefit my guide

business; knowingly presented false trial evidence to my jury convict me; and was intentionally committing perjury to my jury to convict me) it prevented my conviction. See Brady.

Robinson never told me the State, before trial, was intentionally tampering with physical trial evidence to support their case to my jury that I was killing wolves in my hunting guide area to benefit my guide business – or told me this prevented my conviction. See Napue, Mooney, Giles, and Northern Mariana Islands.

Robinson never told me that the State was presenting physical trial evidence to my jury that they State knew had been falsified to support their case - or told me this prevented my conviction. See Napue, Mooney, Giles, and Northern Mariana Islands.

Robinson never told me the State was intentionally testifying falsely to my jury to support their case I was killing wolves in my hunting guide area to benefit my guide business – or told me this prevented my conviction. See Napue, Mooney, Giles, and Northern Mariana Islands.

Recently Robinson explained the consequences of his failure on my trial:

"I would have argued you didn't get fair trial because they were using false evidence to convict you. I could have proved they were intentionally lying at trial. And you would have had evidence of their motive to do so."

Robinson told me I had "a no doubt win" defense because there was no subject-matter jurisdiction when Leaders had not sworn to the charging information. Yet, as shown above, AS 22.15.060 provides all that is needed for subject-matter jurisdiction.

Murphy denied Robinson's pretrial motion to dismiss, stating *"[Robinson] has not provided any authority, nor has the court found any, which requires an information to be sworn to."* When Leaders fixed the charging information even though he didn't need to, Robinson told me Leaders had mistakenly swore to the opposition Leaders filed against Robinson's motion - so I would continue to believe in this meritless defense. Robinson told me the subject-matter jurisdiction defense was still valid during trial and appeal - proven by Robinson's post-trial appeal point: *"the court lacked subject-matter jurisdiction to proceed with the case where information is unsupported by oath or affirmation"*. Yet, when deposed years after, Robinson admitted Leaders had in fact "cured" the subject-matter jurisdiction defect before trial. This means Robinson lied to me that Leaders had mistakenly swore to an opposition; lied to me that this was a "no doubt win" defense during trial and appeal; and means he was pursuing a defense at trial and on appeal for me he positively knew was completely invalid. Worse yet, when I

questioned him during the same deposition, Robinson swore the subject-matter jurisdiction defect was my only defense at trial and appeal – meaning he committed perjury by inconsistent statements during his deposition - to cover up his sellout of me. See AS 11.56.230.

Finally, Robinson told me (and confirmed this at his deposition) that the U.S. Supreme Court cases Albrecht v. U.S. and Gerstein v. Pugh proved the court did not have subject-matter jurisdiction when an information is not sworn to. As explained above, they prove the exact opposite – meaning he lied again to cover up that his defense was completely invalid – and to cover up that he knew it was invalid while telling me it wasn't.

Robinson's failure to properly advise me absolutely altered the outcome of my case – when the standard for ineffectiveness is far less:

Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668 (U.S. Supreme Court 1984) *"[A] defendant need not show that counsel's deficient conduct more likely than not altered the outcome in the case. The result of a proceeding can be rendered unreliable, and hence the proceeding itself unfair, even if the errors of counsel cannot be shown by a preponderance of the evidence to have determined the outcome..."*

False counsel after specific inquiry is also automatic ineffective counsel:

Smith v. State, 717 P.2d 402 (AK 1986) *"We believe it self-evident that an indispensable component of the guarantee of effective assistance of counsel is the accused's right to be advised of basic procedural rights, particularly when the accused seeks such advice by specific inquiry. Without knowing what rights are provided under law, the accused may well be unable to understand available legal options and may consequently be incapable of making informed decisions."*

2. *"[If Robinson] was ineffective for failing to enforce what Haeg alleges was an enforceable plea agreement"*

Not only was there an enforceable plea agreement because of the year of guiding and all else we had given up in reliance on it (Santobello and Closson – and not even considering my statement), Robinson outright lied to us it could not be enforced when we asked if it could.

Worse, Robinson actively thwarted our own efforts by telling us not to have PI Malatesta investigate (who tape-recorded Cole stating that Leaders broke my "Rule 11" plea agreement to also get the airplane); by telling us there was no way to enforce Cole's plea agreement; by telling us Leaders did not have to give us credit for the year of guiding after he promised to; and by lying to us there was no way to enforce Cole's subpoena to my sentencing when I demanded Cole be forced to testify that he had us give up a year of guiding for a plea agreement Cole said

could not be enforced because *"I can't do anything that will piss Scot [Leaders] off because I still have to be able to make deals with him after your case is done."* This testimony alone would have proved Cole's and Leaders corruption and collusion – which Robison prevented because he placed their interests before mine, and thus had a direct conflict of interest that he was acting on to my detriment.

Robinson's failure to enforce my undoubtedly enforceable plea agreement absolutely altered the outcome of my case – when the standard for ineffectiveness is far less. See Strickland above. False counsel after specific inquiry is automatic ineffective counsel. See Smith above.

Representation by an attorney with a direct conflict of interest is also ineffective:

Holloway v. Arkansas, 435 U.S. 475 (U.S. Supreme Court 1978) *"[I]n a case of joint representation of conflicting interests, the evil -- it bears repeating -- is in what the advocate finds himself compelled to refrain from doing, not only at trial but also as to possible pretrial plea negotiations and in the sentencing process...to assess the impact of a conflict of interests on the attorney's options, tactics, and decisions in plea negotiations would be virtually impossible."*

Cuyler v. Sullivan, 446 U.S. 335 (U.S. Supreme Court 1980) *"[A] defendant who shows that a conflict of interest actually affected the adequacy of his representation need not demonstrate prejudice in order to obtain relief. An actual conflict of interest negates the unimpaired loyalty a defendant is constitutionally entitled to expect and receive from his attorney."*

3. *"[If Robinson] was ineffective for failing to object to inaccuracies in the trial court's finding at sentencing"*

Murphy's on-record justification for my sentence was *"the wolves were killed in GMU 19-C...where you were hunting"* Robinson, during recent meetings, stated he did not protest Murphy's false sentence justification for this reason:

"Since I was not provided a map copy, so I could check it for accuracy, I cannot be blamed for the jury's use of this map to convict Mr. Haeg and I cannot be blamed for Judge Murphy's use of the map's falsified GMU 19-C/19-D boundaries to sentence Mr. Haeg. Since I was not provided a tape-recording copy prior to trial or during trial, I did not know there was evidence of an intent to falsify the location of where the wolves were taken. Because of Mr. Leaders failure to abide by my discovery request this evidence was withheld and I only found out about it many years after trial."

Robinson's failure to protest Murphy's reliance on the false map absolutely altered the outcome of my case – when the standard for ineffectiveness is far less. For had he protested, it would have proved the State was presenting evidence to my jury that the State knew had been falsified to support their case for my conviction – prohibiting my conviction. See caselaw above.

4. ***[If Haeg] was diligent in raising his concerns (Murphy riding/eating with the main witness against me - Gibbens - during my trial) with his attorney [Robinson] and informing the attorney of the extent of the alleged ex parte contact"***

When Robinson, Jackie, and I first watched Murphy climb in with Gibbens during trial and drive off I told Robinson this didn't seem right, and Robinson told us *"there is nothing I can do - this is the way it is in the villages."* Robinson was with us the dozens of times we all watched Gibbens chauffeur Murphy afterward – and eat together, since Robinson, Jackie and I all stayed together in the same B and B; walked/biked to the courthouse together; on breaks all went outside the courthouse with Robinson so he could smoke while we talked; and we did nothing else but attend trial as Murphy ran it as late as 11:30 pm. Since Robinson watched the continuing "ex parte contact" with me, I did not continue to protest – Robinson had already told me nothing could be done. Not once did any of us see Murphy travel alone or with anyone other than Gibbens. It was so pervasive that Murphy even joked on the court record, when she need some soda: *"I think we're going to need about a 10-minute break...I have to get to the store because I need to get some diet Coke. And I'm going to commandeer Trooper Gibbens and his vehicle to take me because I don't have any transportation"* – proving Gibbens was her only transportation in McGrath. And absolute proof that he knew about the pervasive chauffeuring is that Robinson himself twice said to Gibbens: *"You've been commandeered."*

5. ***"that [Robinson] was ineffective for failing to file either a motion to disqualify the trial judge or a motion for a new trial based on Haeg's allegations. To prove ineffectiveness in this context, Haeg must show not only that his attorney had no valid reason for his inaction, but also that the motion would have resulted in either a new trial or a new sentencing hearing in front of a different judge."***

During recent meetings Robinson stated the reason he did not protest Gibbens chauffeuring Murphy was that, *"I didn't think it was my job to protest."*

Robinson knew Murphy was biased against me. When deposed he testified that Murphy "*was a law-enforcement type judge and not the independent judiciary type you are supposed to have*" - outright admitting Murphy was biased against me but didn't replace her when he had a reason all could plainly see – her being chauffeured during trial by the main witness against me. Withrow v. Larkin, 421 U.S. 35 (U.S. Supreme Court 1975) *"Not only is a biased decisionmaker constitutionally unacceptable but our system of law has always endeavored to prevent even the probability of unfairness."*

Proof that Murphy and Gibbens had a "quid pro quo" arrangement for Murphy to pay back Gibbens for the chauffeuring - proving Murphy was actually biased against me: (A) Murphy illegally removing my evidence (proving I killed the wolves where the State told me to) out of the court record before my jury seen it; (B) Murphy specifically citing Gibbens false trial testimony, *which Gibbens had already told Murphy was false*, to justify sentencing me (no prior criminal history) to two years in prison, plane forfeiture, $19,500 fine, and complete destruction of my guide career; (C) Murphy (to side with the State) ruling my jury must decide if my actions were wolf control or guiding - and then, (to side with the State and strip me of the protection of my wolf control permit) ruling I am prohibited from presenting this to my jury (meaning she made two conflicting decisions so she could side with the State both times); and (D) refusing to rule on Robinson's pretrial motion the State could not use my statement against me (which allowed the State to use it to force me to trial via the charging information and to use it against me at trial via the map upon which – before Leaders and Gibbens put false GMU boundaries on it - I was required to mark the wolf kill locations):

Tumey v. Ohio, 273 U.S. 510 (U.S. Supreme Court 1927) *"Every procedure which would offer a possible temptation to the average man as a judge to forget the burden of proof required to convict the defendant, or which might lead him not to hold the balance nice, clear, and true between the State and the accused denies the latter due process of law. No matter what the evidence was against him, he had the right to have an impartial judge."*

Wasserman v. Bartholomew, 923 P.2d 806 (AK Supreme Court 1996) *"Disqualification 'was never intended to enable a discontented litigant to oust a judge because of adverse rulings made.' **The trial court's findings are amply supported by the evidence.**"*

Murphy's findings aren't just adverse, they are in exact opposition with what even her chauffeur Gibbens finally admitted was the truth. But Murphy's findings are in exact agreement with Gibbens false GMU trial testimony, his false GMU trial map, and the false case so skillfully put together by Leaders and Gibbens - spoon fed into Murphy's mind from over a year prior to my trial with the false GMU affidavits Gibbens gave her to illegally search our home/seize our property. After Gibbens admission no wolves were killed in my guide area Leaders continued to argue at trial I must be convicted because I killed the wolves to benefit my guide business. No one corrected this false argument or the false map - which Murphy and my jury continued to use. Writing this even I realize it is no wonder Murphy forgot Gibbens one-time admission of what the truth really was – it got drowned out by the falsehood being repeated over and over.

Although Robinson had proof of actual bias, he didn't even need this to require Murphy's removal, only appearance of impropriety – as it is an absolute:

Alaska Code of Judicial Conduct: Canon 2. *A Judge **Shall** Avoid Impropriety & the Appearance of Impropriety in All of the Judge's Activities.*

*"The prohibition against behaving with impropriety or the appearance of impropriety applies to both the professional & personal conduct of a judge. **The test for appearance of impropriety is whether the conduct would create in reasonable minds a perception that the judge's ability to carry out judicial responsibilities with integrity, impartiality, & competence is impaired."***

B. A judge shall not knowingly* convey or permit others to convey the impression that anyone is in a special position to influence the judge.

Alaska Rules of Judicial Conduct - Canon 4. *A Judge Shall So Conduct the Judge's Extra-Judicial Activities as to Minimize the Risk of Conflict with Judicial Obligations.*

*A. Extra-Judicial Activities in General. A judge shall conduct all of the judge's extra-judicial activities so as to comply with the requirements of this Code and **so that these activities do not**:*

*(1) **cast reasonable doubt on the judge's capacity to act impartially as a judge**;*

Superior Court Judge Stephanie Joannides has ruled, in this case, that Murphy's conduct during my trial was *at least* the appearance of impropriety, meaning that a new judge and new trial positively was required had Robinson protested the chauffeuring:

*"On July 28, 2010, this court issued an order narrowing the issue of whether Judge Murphy should recuse herself to the question of whether her contacts with prosecution witness Trooper Gibbens during the trial and sentencing proceedings warranted recusal on the appearance of impropriety. **I found that, at a minimum, there was an appearance of impropriety."*** [August 25, 2010 and March 25, 2011 orders]

Judge Joannides ruled that Murphy, while she presided over my prosecution, rode with Gibbens. Murphy has sworn out an affidavit that she never rode with Gibbens while she presided over my prosecution – evidence of felony perjury by Murphy and additional proof of actual bias, impropriety, corruption, and cover up. As Robinson testified during his deposition: *"Murphy being chauffeured by Gibbens during your trial is appearance of bias. Murphy and Gibbens lying about it afterwards is proof of bias."* [R.03109-3167]

In Re Murchison (U.S. Supreme Court 1955) *"A fair trial in a fair tribunal is a basic requirement of due process. Fairness of course requires an absence of actual bias in the trial of cases. But our system of law has always endeavored to prevent even the probability of*

unfairness. Circumstances and relationships must be considered. This Court has said, however, that ***"every procedure which would offer a possible temptation to the average man as a judge . . . not to hold the balance nice, clear and true between the State and the accused, denies the latter due process of law."*** *Such a stringent rule may sometimes bar trial by judges who have no actual bias and who would do their very best to weigh the scales of justice equally between contending parties. But to perform its high function in the best way "justice must satisfy the appearance of justice."*" See also Ward v. Monroeville, 409 U.S. 57 (U.S. Supreme Court 1972)

State v. City of Anchorage, 513 P.2d 1104 (AK 1973) *"[Disqualification] is a provision obviously not applicable save in those rare instances in which the affiant is able to state facts which tend to show not merely adverse rulings already made, which may be right or wrong,* ***but facts and reasons which tend to show personal bias or prejudice.***" (Citing Ex Parte American Steel Barrel Inc. 230 U.S. 35 (U.S. Supreme Court 1913)

Millan v. Dahlmann, WL 1168174 (AK Supreme Court 2016) *"An appearance of impropriety is found when 'the conduct would create in reasonable minds a perception that the judge's ability to carry out judicial responsibilities with integrity, impartiality, and competence is impaired.'"*

Phillips v. State 271 P.3d (AK 2012) *"[W]hen a question arises as to whether a judge's acquaintance or friendship with a particular person requires the judge's disqualification, the answer must ultimately turn on the specific facts of the case - in particular,* ***the precise nature of the judge's relationship with that person, and the way in which that person is connected to the litigation.*** *Although Phillips asserts that Judge Aarseth's relationship with K.M.'s sister Sara exceeded mere social acquaintance or social friendship, the record does not support this assertion. According to the record,* ***Judge Aarseth had very limited contact with Sara.*** *The primary relationship here was between Sara and Judge Aarseth's wife. Moreover, that relationship appears to have been the kind of social friendship that one might expect between two women who live in the same neighborhood and who are the primary caretakers of children of similar ages. In Barrett v. Barrett, the question was whether a trial judge should be disqualified because of the judge's acquaintance with a potential witness — a woman who worked at the eye care office where the judge was a patient. The supreme court noted that the judge's contact with this potential witness was limited, and that* ***their relationship was a professional one.*** *Moreover, this woman* ***was not actually called to testify; thus, nothing in the ultimate decision of the case hinged on any matter within this witness's knowledge.***"

Gibbens falsified GMUs on numerous affidavits to get search/seizure warrants from Murphy in March and April of 2004 – for our home/property/plane. Gibbens and Leaders took my immunized statement – which they then unconstitutionally presented to Murphy as reason to force me to trial. Gibbens and Leaders required me to place wolf kill locations on their map and then unconstitutionally prosecuted me afterward. Gibbens and Leaders falsified GMUs on the map prior to my trial. Gibbens privately chauffeured Murphy continuously while she presided over my trial in May and July of 2005. Gibbens privately ate with Murphy. Gibbens was the State's main trial witness against me, and testified extensively, while Murphy presided over my

trial. Gibbens and Leaders presented their false map to Murphy and my jury while she presided over my trial. Gibbens privately chauffeured Murphy continuously while she presided over my sentencing in September of 2005. Gibbens was the State's main witness against me, and testified extensively, while Murphy presided over my sentencing.

Caperton v. A. T. Massey Coal Co., 556 U.S. 868 (U.S. Supreme Court 2009) *"Court noted that the objective inquiry is not whether the judge is actually biased, but whether the average judge in his position is likely to be neutral or there is an unconstitutional 'potential for bias. Rather,* ***the question is whether, 'under a realistic appraisal of psychological tendencies and human weakness,' the interest 'poses such a risk of actual bias or prejudgment that the practice must be forbidden*** *if the guarantee of due process is to be adequately implemented.'"*

Aetna Life Insurance Co. v. Lavoie (U.S. Supreme Court 1986) *"The Due Process Clause "may sometimes bar trial by judges who have no actual bias and who would do their very best to weigh the scales of justice equally between contending parties. But to perform its high function in the best way, `justice must satisfy the appearance of justice.'"*

Lacher v. Lacher, 993 P.2d 413 (AK 1999) *"[A] judge shall disqualify himself or herself in a proceeding in which the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned..."*

In re Cummings, 211 P.3d 1136 (AK 2009) *"Suspension of three months without pay was warranted as a sanction for district court judge whose* ***ex parte communications*** *with a witness for the prosecution created the appearance of impropriety and constituted wilful misconduct in office, conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice, conduct that brings the judicial office into disrepute, and a violation of the Alaska Code of Judicial Conduct; while judge's conduct* ***could have unfairly affected the outcome of the criminal trial****, harm to the administration of justice was ultimately minimal, judge had no prior discipline record, there* ***was no dishonest or selfish motive****, judge was relatively new, judge had a reputation for truth and honesty,* ***and judge was remorseful*** *and* ***recognized that his conduct was wrong.****"*

Murphy removed my evidence (that I killed the wolves where the State told me to) before my jury seen it; made conflicting decisions to deprive me of the protection of my Wolf Control permit; refused to rule on Robinson's motion that Leaders could not use my statement to prosecute me; and affirmatively used Gibbens' false testimony against me even after she knew it was false. And as I testified in COA briefing: *"As Haeg/witnesses/jurors were left walking in a cloud of dust each day as Gibbens/Murphy sped off it was impossible to tell if Murphy was discussing the case with Gibbens, exchanging notes with Gibbens, investigating the case with Gibbens, or having sex with Gibbens."* My life was destroyed by Murphy's corruption.

Murphy had a dishonest motive - Cole told us that Governor Murkowski had called

Murphy and Leaders and told them to make an example of me. Murphy had a selfish motive for riding with Gibbens – she didn't want to walk to and from court, store, B and B, etc, as everyone else had to. Murphy was not remorseful/recognized her conduct was wrong – in fact she denies it happened at all when an independent review by Judge Joannides proves it did in fact happen.

Inquiry Concerning a Judge, 822 P.2d 1333 (AK 1991) *"Test for evaluating allegations of judicial misconduct involving alleged appearance of impropriety is whether judge* ***failed to use reasonable care to prevent objectively reasonable person from believing that impropriety was afoot.*** *There were reasonable steps that petitioner could have taken to avoid creating the appearance of impropriety.* ***The thinking public easily could conclude that the justice might someday return the favor to the Governor (quid pro quo).*** *Precisely this sort of conduct jeopardizes and erodes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary and is prohibited by the judicial canons. Aggravating factors for determining whether baseline sanction for judicial misconduct should be increased include prior disciplinary offenses, dishonest or selfish motive, pattern of misconduct,* ***multiple offenses,*** *bad faith obstruction of disciplinary proceedings by intentionally failing to comply with rules or orders of disciplinary agency,* ***submission of false evidence, false statements****, or other deceptive practices during disciplinary process, refusal to acknowledge wrongful nature of conduct, vulnerability of victim, substantial experience in practice of law, and indifference to making restitution. He should not lend the prestige of his office to advance the private interests of others;* ***nor should he convey or permit others to convey the impression that they are in a special position to influence him.*** *The Commission found that petitioner's parking lot encounter with Judge Michalski did not violate any of the judicial canons because "it was apparent at the time of the contact that no further legal proceedings were contemplated."*

Murphy *"failed to use reasonable care to prevent objectively reasonable person from believing that impropriety was afoot."* She could have simply walked while in McGrath, like we did. *"The thinking public easily could conclude that [Murphy] might someday return the favor"* to Gibbens. It is entirely understandable for Murphy to pay Gibbens back for personally chauffeuring her all 9 days of my McGrath prosecution. As FBI Section Chief Klein stated: *"No one would believe you got a fair trial if your judge was riding around with the main witness against you."* During my prosecution – seemingly to pay Murphy and Leaders back for making an example of me as he requested - Governor Murkowski appointed Murphy to a plum Homer judgeship apparently without Murphy even applying for Homer (over top of those who had) and appointed Leaders to a plum District Attorney position in Kenai. Murphy committed *"multiple offenses"*. Not counting meals together, Murphy rode with Gibbens at least 3 times a day, meaning at least 27 times during my prosecution. During the investigation into the chauffeuring Murphy *"submitted false evidence"* (her affidavit denying the chauffeuring) and made *"false*

statements" denying the chauffeuring. Finally, to both my jury and I, Murphy absolutely did *"convey the impression that [Gibbens was] in a special position to influence [Murphy]".*

Greenway v. Heathcott, 294 P.3d 1056 (AK 2013) *"Facial expression and body language, in addition to oral communication, can give others an appearance of judicial bias."*

COA/Morse claim I must prove I "was diligent" in raising my concerns with Robinson, in informing him the extent of the "ex parte contacts", and prove Robinson was ineffective for not protesting. What if my trial were conducted in the Nesbett Courthouse, where it is impossible to see if judge and troopers come and go together because they have their own door, parking garage, road to leave on, and more than one or two B & Bs for all to spend the night and eat at? Would this have made my trial fair just because no one witnessed or protested them running around together outside of court full time during my trial? Absolutely not. It was Judge Murphy's responsibility, and hers alone, not to ride with the main witness against me during my trial. When she did she poisoned my trial. Period. When she falsified an affidavit to deny it she committed perjury to cover up and in effect admitted she and Gibbens talked about how to frame me when they were alone together. Otherwise why would she lie about the chauffeuring? When she worked with ACJC investigator Greenstein and Gibbens to cover it up Murphy entered into a criminal conspiracy. As Judge Joannides already ruled – without hearing – *"there is an appearance of impropriety, **at a minimum**."* This, *alone*, invalidates my conviction.

Roussel v. Stet 115 P.3d 581 (AK 2005) *"Cumulative error requires reversal only when the impact of errors at trial is so prejudicial that the defendant was deprived of a fair trial, even if each individual error was harmless."* See also Sawyer v. State 244 P.3d 1130 (AK 2011) and Crawford v. State, 337 P.3d 4 (AK 2014)

Kyles v. Whitley, 514 U.S. 419 (U.S. Supreme Court 1995) *"[Counsel's errors must be] considered collectively, not item by item."*

Gibbens and Leaders tampered with evidence and knowingly presented false evidence and testimony at trial to convict me; Gibbens chauffeured Murphy so she would decide all motions against me and remove my evidence out of the record before my jury could see it; State threatened my attorneys so they would help frame me; my trial attorney lied to me and used a trial defense he positively knew was invalid; etc., etc. Each of the forgoing errors alone require my conviction be overturned – cumulatively they make a complete mockery of my trial.

In Re Johnstone 2 P.3d 1226 (AK Supreme Court 2000) *"Alaska statutory law and the Code of Judicial Conduct hold judges to the highest standard of personal and official conduct .... [a] judge's unethical or seemingly unethical behavior outside the courtroom detracts from the efficient administration of justice and the integrity of the judicial office, as it diminishes respect for the judiciary in the eyes of the public. One way to protect the public is to remove the offending judge from office.* ***Another way to protect the public is to keep it informed of judicial transgressions and their consequences, so that it knows that its government actively investigates allegations of judicial misconduct and takes appropriate action when these allegations are proved. Judicial discipline thus protects the public by fostering public confidence in the integrity of a self-policing judicial system."***

Yet when I complained Gibbens chauffeured Murphy continuously during my prosecution, AK Commission on Judicial Conduct's 28-year sole investigator Marla Greenstein is tape-recorded stating she dismissed my complaint because she contacted all 4 witnesses I gave her and stating that all 4 testified that someone other than Gibbens chauffeured Murphy during my prosecution. Afterward, when I contacted the 4 witnesses, every single one swore out an affidavit that no one, other than myself, had ever contacted them about Murphy riding with Gibbens and every single one swore that they personally witnessed Gibbens chauffeuring Murphy during my prosecution. Superior Court Judge Stephanie Joannides certified the recordings/transcriptions of Greenstein, certified the affidavits of all 4 witnesses, and sent everything to all 9 members of the AK Commission on Judicial Conduct; AK Department of Law Office of Special Prosecutions; AK Judicial Council; AK Bar Association; AK Ombudsman; Judge Bauman (my PCR judge); and Peter Maassen, the attorney (now AK Supreme Court Justice) Murphy hired for her defense. Not a single entity investigated. It gets worse. When I filed a Bar complaint against her, Greenstein swore that, during her investigation, she also contacted Robinson in addition to the witnesses I provided. Robinson has since testified Greenstein never contacted him and is tape-record stating he remembered Murphy riding with Gibbens during my trial. When the witnesses, who Greenstein falsified contacting and whose testimony she falsified, wanted to testify to the ACJC, a SWAT team was called in to stop their testimony. Then I was tased 10 times for trying to present this evidence in Judge Morse's court.

As FBI Section Chief Doug Klein stated: *"It is obvious why Greenstein falsified her investigation. No one would believe you got a fair trial if your judge was riding around with the main witness against you."* [R.02531-2563]

So, to make it crystal clear for all reading this: the Alaska Commission on Judicial Conduct and its 28-year sole ACJC judge investigator Marla N. Greenstein, *because they knew* that Judge Murphy riding around with the main trial witness against me during my trial would require my conviction be overturned, falsified their investigation to cover up what Murphy and Gibbens did during my trial.

My, and my family's, ***"confidence in the integrity of a self-policing judicial system"*** is gone. We are angry and getting angrier. A growing number of others feel the same.

Confirmation of Unconstitutional and Corrupt Political Influence in This Case

State interview of witness Lewis Egrass during my prosecution [#4MC-304-24]:

Gibbens: *"What are you concerns with regards to people who are issued Predator Control permits to participate in the wolf control project and they kill wolves outside of the wolf control area -um-what are your thoughts about that and what it might- what affects it could have on the – on the project?"*
Lewis Egrass: *"I was told by you know-uh-yourself Officer Gibbens – the sensitivity you know of -of-you now this goes all the way up to the Governor- the Governors putting himself on the line"*
Gibbens: *"Yeah"*
Lewis Egrass: *"-you know politically but uh"*
Gibbens: *"Right yeah I would hate to see any ammunition giving to-given to the animal rights groups that are-that could potentially be used in the fight to get these programs shut down."*

Leaders argument during my prosecution:

"Mr. Haeg's actions and the impact it will have on these programs is really yet to be determined, based on, you know, how these cases all—this all comes out."[Tr. 1394-1397]

Murphy's specific on-record reasoning for my conviction and severe sentence:

"Others take into consideration things that you may not think of, such as the politics involved. Such as the affects to the wolf kill program."

[Robinson Dep. 210-213] *"State was in some political pressure [to make an example of me.]"*

Cole: *"The governor put immense pressure on the judge and prosecutor to make an example of you."* [Cole R.00064]

Anchorage Daily News, November 9, 2005: *Groups Taking Aim at Aerial Wolf Hunt "Jans said he believed such abuse [of the wolf control program] is widespread but it's just too hard to catch the culprits. State officials called Haeg a 'bad apple', and pointed to his harsh sentence...jail, losing his airplane, and giving up his guide license for five years."*

Anchorage Daily News, January 14, 2006: *"Even though Haeg [was] permitted under the state's predator control program [he was] acting on his own, said Matt Robus, director of the Division of Wildlife Conservation. 'We do not consider this a part of the McGrath wolf control program,' Robus said. Patricia Feral, president of Darien, Conn.-based Friends of Animals, said the behavior of the program participants illustrates how 'abominable then entire program is and how little enforcement there can be to make sure it goes the way the state wants it to.'"*

IN JUSTICE, by Unites States Attorney General David Iglesias, *"Judges and prosecutors are expected to stay out of politics, and the sanction for breaking that historic shibboleth is impeachment for the judge and job termination or disbarment for the prosecutor. It is un-American and unconstitutional to act otherwise.*

America stands for many inspiring principles, the rule of law being one of the pillars in our noble experiment in democracy. Failed states don't recognize this principle – in some countries prosecutors and judges are mere pawns of the corrupt elected officials. Justice cannot flow from such a polluted source. On the other hand, the American public has the absolute right to believe that when someone is charged with a crime, it is based on the evidence alone."

Independent Mollen Commission Report on Corruption (7/7/94)

"What we found is that the problem of police corruption extends far beyond the corrupt cop. It is a multi-faceted problem that has flourished – because of a culture that exalts loyalty over integrity; because of the silence of honest officers who fear the consequences of "ratting" on another cop no matter how grave the crime; because of willfully blind supervisors who fear the consequences of a corruption scandal more than corruption itself; because of the demise of the principle of accountability that makes all commanders responsible for fighting corruption.

All these factors contributed to the state of corruption we uncovered. To cover up their corruption, officers created even more: they falsified official reports and perjured themselves to conceal their misdeeds. Thus, police corruption has become more serious and threatening than ever before.

In the face of this problem, the Department allowed its systems for fighting corruption virtually to collapse. It had become more concerned about the bad publicity that corruption disclosures generate than the devastating consequences of corruption itself. As a result, its corruption controls minimized, ignored and at times concealed corruption rather than rooting it out. Such an institutional reluctance to uncover corruption is not surprising. No institution wants its reputation tainted – especially a Department that needs the public's confidence and partnership to be effective. A weak and poorly resourced anti-corruption apparatus minimizes the likelihood of such taint, embarrassment and potential harm to careers. Thus there was a strong institutional incentive to allow corruption efforts to fray and lose priority – which is exactly what this Commission uncovered. This reluctance manifested itself in every component of the Department's corruption controls from command accountability and supervision, to investigations, police culture, training and recruitment.

Basic equipment and resources needed to investigate corruption successfully were routinely denied to corruption investigators; internal investigations were prematurely closed and fragmented and targeted petty misconduct more than serious corruption; intelligence-gathering was minimal; reliable information from field associates was ignored; supervisors and commanders were not held accountable for corruption in their commands; and corruption investigators often lacked investigative experience and almost half had never taken the Department's "mandatory" basic investigative training course. Most Internal Affairs investigators and supervisors embraced a work ethic more dedicated to closing corruption cases than to investigating them. Most volunteered for Internal Affairs to get on a quick promotion track rather than to get corrupt cops off the job. Indeed, a survey of Internal Affairs investigators we conducted through an Internal Affairs "insider" revealed that over 50% of Internal Affairs investigators' time was spent on non-investigatory matters. And no one said a word about this state of affairs until this Commission commenced its investigations.

This was no accident. Weak corruption controls reduced the chances of uncovering serious corruption and protected police commanders' careers. Since no entity outside the Department was responsible for reviewing the Department's success in policing itself, years of self-protection continued unabated until this Commission commenced its independent inquiries.

This abandonment of effective anti-corruption efforts did more than avoid public exposure of corruption, it fueled it. It sent a message through the Department that integrity was not a high priority and that Department bosses did not really want to know about corruption. In short, it gave everyone in the Department an excuse for doing what was easiest: shutting their eyes to corruption around them.

And that is precisely what happened. The principle of command accountability, which holds commanders responsible for fighting corruption, completely collapsed. Supervisors and commanding officers were largely complacent about maintaining integrity. Few were concerned with corruption on their watch – unless it exploded into an embarrassing corruption scandal."

Confirmation of Systemic Judicial Corruption

Long-time Alaskan business (formerly criminal defense) attorney Dale Dolifka examined the above evidence & on August 25, 2010 testified on the record about my prosecution - before Judge Stephanie Joannides with AAG Peterson cross-examining:

Mr. Dolifka: *"And the case that you had is very different than the normal criminal case because I knew, as did Mr. Obendorf [Haeg's tax accountant] when you lost your airplane, that your livelihood was impacted. Your life, because your livelihood had changed, is really what concerned me as your business attorney. Again, I'm not a criminal lawyer, but when things crashed with Mr. Robinson, I became more proactive in actually reading documents, and that's when I became very confused about your case. Again, not being a criminal lawyer, I still am an attorney and I was very confused, even to the point of contacting Judge Hanson, my old friend from Kenai, a 20-year superior court judge, and I called him more than once about your case*

because I -- I couldn't get my arms around it. It made no sense what had happened. And I don't know how you possibly had due process with regard to the seizure of your airplane. I have read it and read it and read it. I could write a doctor's brief on it. And I -- I can't -- and I'm just wore out trying to figure it out because I can't."

Mr. Haeg: *"Is Mark – from what you know of the pleadings and stuff Mark Osterman, my third attorney, is what happened with him what you feared may happen if I hired an attorney inside the state for a third time?"*

Mr. Dolifka: *"Well, yeah. If you read the tape-recordings he made of what he said to you, I mean, that just – that part of when I said the hackles come up on my neck. How could a lawyer, especially who believes in ethics, read those tapes of things he said to you, assuming they were transcribed correctly, and -- and not be appalled by what happened?"*

Mr. Haeg: *Okay. And do the -- the recordings basically say, you know, before I hire him – my God, it's the biggest sellout of a client I've ever seen by not only one, but two attorneys, and we're going to get this thing reversed and we're going to sue them" And then I hired Mr. Osterman and then he flops around 180 degrees and says not only have I spent all that money, which was supposed to be all the money for the appeal, but here's another bill for a another $36,000 and, by the way, I can't do anything with what I agreed was the sellout, quote, because I can't affect the livelihoods of your first two attorneys. Is that what appalled you in the transcript?*

Mr. Dolifka: *"Not only is that what appalled me, that is primarily what I sought counsel from Judge Hanson. That – those were the things that disturbed me, was we were – Judge Hanson and I were talking about – as was Mr. Ingaldson – about other cases that were just disturbing. But the main thing with yours that I would talk with Judge Hanson was – and I would actually call him and say Judge, am I losing my mind, am I reading this correctly? And he took an interest in your case and I think he was shocked by those tapes as well, of what you just read. I just – I did – your case became more and more troubling to me because it was endemic of our whole community. It might have been cutting edge, but it wasn't the only one. And for what – what Mr. Osterman said to you on tape should disturb any lawyer who believes in ethics of any kind."*

Mr. Haeg: *"Okay. And I guess you answered this, but in essence, the – the fear or reason why you had advised me to go outside the state was proven correct? It wasn't just a theory that this was going on, it was proven correct because of Mark Osterman, because the tape recordings, if you looked at them – I taped everything from the day I called him to hire him to the day I fired him. And so would it be fair to say that you and I, knowing that this may happen, prepared – or I prepared for it and Mr. Osterman proved this is going on, that attorneys are – intentionally not representing their clients?"*

AAG Peterson: *"Your Honor, I just – I want to object...the testimony regarding collusion and corruption, I think is better saved for the PCR hearing because that's going to go, at least with respect to his first two lawyers, it's going to go directly to the issue of his PCR claim."*

Judge Joannides: *"And do you have a tape of Mr. Osterman's comments to you that he did – he won't take the case because it would affect..."*

Mr. Haeg: *"He wouldn't – he wouldn't use the arguments. He took the case..."*

Judge Joannides: *"No, but that he wouldn't use the arguments because he didn't want to impact...their livelihood. You have that on tape?"*

Mr. Haeg: *"Yeah."*

Mr. Dolifka: *"Never has there been a case in history that cries out more for outside intervention because you have been to all the major players. Other than just an outright payoff of a judge or jury it is hard to imagine anyone being sold down the river more. The judge riding around with the Trooper and commandeering vehicles. I mean that smelled to high heaven. Your case has shades of Selma in the 60's, where judges, sheriffs, & even assigned lawyers were all in cahoots together. The reason why you have still not resolved your legal problems is corruption. I can tell you exactly what happened. In the early stages you were one of the first that I realized it was corruption. At first I thought it was ineptness. Over time in this journey with you here's a corrupt case, here's a corrupt case, and here's a corrupt case. Now here's what happens when they come up on appeal. You have a [Appeals] Court sitting there looking at a pile of dung & if they do right by you & reveal you know you have the attorneys going down, you have the judges going down, you have the troopers going down. Everyone in your case has had a political price to pay if they did right by you. You had a series of situations which everyone was doing things to protect everyone rather than you because there was a price to pay. If they did right by you the DA would take it out on them in other cases. I walked over here & lawyer A says my God they're violating every appeal rule ever. How can it be like this? I think almost everyone goes back to that original seminal issue that how the hell did this case go on when it appears to lay people & to me a lot of it was built on a lie in a sworn affidavit? You're just one of many. It's absolute unadulterated self-bred corruption. It will get worse until the sleeping giant [public] wakes up. Everyone is scared & afraid.... I have paid a huge price for helping you."*

Mr. Haeg: *"Can you tell me what the price..."*

Mr. Dolifka: *"No, I'm not going to tell. I'm not telling you anything more because it will just get worse."* [R.00523-3105]

I called my wife Jackie who testified under oath as follows:

Mr. Haeg: *"At some point, did I tell you and kind of tried to show you proof that our own attorneys had not been doing a – a good job for us?"*

Jackie Haeg: *"Yeah, you did. In the beginning, you told me that."*

Mr. Haeg: *"Okay. And did you, at that time, did you believe me?"*

Jackie Haeg: *"I was skeptical. I felt that attorneys were there to help us and I – I had a hard time believing it, yes."*

Mr. Haeg: *"Okay. And did anything ever change your mind about that?"*

Jackie Haeg: *"We went in another proceeding where your attorney had me under oath and he was asking me if he had done certain things and -- or he basically told me that he did it and I knew that wasn't true, so that made me change my mind and made me realize that yes, you were telling – what you were telling me was true."*

Mr. Haeg: *"Okay. And – and so it was – it wasn't my telling you as a husband and trying to show you proof, it was the attorney himself trying to get you to testify falsely that made you believe?"*

Jackie Haeg: *"Yes, that made me believe."*

Mr. Haeg: *"And I guess you could just – can you explain what it was about bas – just come out and say what – what—what it was about?"*

Jackie Haeg: *"Well, he had said that when this had first happened that – and this – when he had me under oath was years after we had first hired him, and he was explaining to me about how he could file motions in the court and that we chose not to do that because it would cost us money. And at that time, we didn't even have an idea what a motion was, so I knew that he wasn't telling me the truth."*

Mr. Haeg: *"And wasn't the motions that he was saying that he could have filed to enforce the plea agreement?"*

Jackie Haeg: *"Yes."*

Mr. Haeg: *"Okay. And – what did – what did you remember him saying he could do about the plea agreement?"*

Jackie Haeg: *"He told us back when the plea agreement was broke that the only thing he could do was to notify Leaders' boss because she was the lady that he had worked with before when he was a prosecutor, and that was the only thing he could do."*

Mr. Haeg: *"Now and so his – then when you were under oath, he was trying to get you to say that he offered to file motions to enforce the plea agreement and we didn't want to because it would cost money?"*

Jackie Haeg: *"Correct."*

Mr. Haeg: *"And if you had said that, that would have been perjury?"*

Jackie Haeg: *"Correct."*

Mr. Haeg: *"Okay. And can you explain briefly what this has cost us?"*

Jackie Haeg: *"Well, we lost our business, we lost savings, our girls' college funds. We had lot of mental issues. It was hard on our family, our marriage. There was just – it just was a lot. It was really, really hard."*

Mr. Haeg: *"Okay. Did we have to mortgage our house and stuff like that?"*

Jackie Haeg: *"Oh, well, yeah, we did that too. We had to sell things and – to pay bills. We had a big – a lot of credit issues because of the bills that we had and the attorney fees."*

Mr. Haeg: *"Okay. Do you think if most families ran into what we did, that they would have enough resources and be able to figure it out or do you think that they would just be ground up and – and would never be able to do anything about it?"*

Jackie Haeg: *"I don't think that most families could have gone through this."*

Mr. Haeg: *"Okay. Do you think that this -- it's important that this be addressed so it doesn't happen to anyone else?"*

Jackie Haeg: *"Yes, I do."*

Judge Joannides: *"You've explained to me – well, could you tell me what is your educational background?"*

Mr. Haeg: *"I went to third grade and then was home schooled in Chinitna Bay, which is one of the most remote places in Alaska. There were times when my parents and I would go four months without seeing another person. And everything I learned I learned from books....I personally think because I learned to read so well is why I picked up on being, you know, Mr. Jailhouse Lawyer so well."*

Judge Joannides: *"Well, it appears that whoever home schooled you gave you a wonderful education in terms of developing your language skills and your writing ability. And it appears to me from looking at your pleadings that you understand the legal issues, I mean, as best as any non-lawyer could understand them and possibly even better than some inexperienced lawyers must understand them."*

Mr. Haeg: *"But one of the main reasons why I think I do well is, we have a – a tremendous grassroots ability to run it by people. In fact, most everybody here gets everything I send out and they have a chance to comment on it before it actually gets sent out."*

Judge Joannides: *"Well, it does seem like you have an amazing support network from the information sent to the court as part of this proceeding and the number – the sheer number of people who are here today."* [R.00523-3105]

Adickes v. S. H. Kress, 398 U.S. 144 (U.S. Supreme Court 1970) *"Such occurrences show that there is a pre-concerted & effective plan by which thousands of men are deprived of the equal protection of the laws. The arresting power is fettered, the witnesses are silenced, the courts are impotent, the laws are annulled, the criminal goes free, the persecuted citizen looks in vain for redress."*

42 U.S.C. 1983 *"[S]tate courts were being used to harass & injure individuals, either because the state courts were powerless to stop the deprivations or were in league with those bent upon abrogation of federally protected rights...Sheriffs, having eyes to see, see not; judges, having ears to hear, hear not; witnesses conceal the truth or falsify it."*

How would you know if *"state courts... were in league with those bent upon abrogation of federally protected rights"?* Would the judge pick up a gun to help rob someone? Probably not. Would the judge ride around with prosecution during trial, grant prosecution's motions, deny defendant's motions, & destroy defendant's evidence – like Judge Murphy did? Yes. Would the judge overlook prosecution's trial perjury & then cite the perjury as reason to forfeit defendant's airplane to prosecution & sentence him to years in prison/career destruction – like Judge Murphy did? Absolutely. *Is this a form of robbery using the color of law?* No doubt. Would the judge refuse to order an evidentiary hearing that would prove the prosecution is manufacturing and using false trial evidence - like Judge Bauman, COA, and Judge Morse did? Absolutely. Would the judge order that no evidence can be presented proving prosecution is threatening defense attorneys to do all this – exactly as Judge Bauman, COA, and Judge Morse did? No doubt.

Would *"state courts in league with those bent upon abrogation of federally protected rights"* need an oversight agency that will falsify official investigations to protect corrupt judges – exactly like the Alaska Commission on Judicial Conduct/Marla Greenstein did? Absolutely.

Would they tase someone to keep the evidence from being presented in court? No doubt.

If the courts close their doors to me without a new trial or a full/fair evidentiary hearing on all *my* issues with everyone compelled to testify – as the law holds must be allowed - I will travel to the locked trooper impound yard at 4825 Aircraft Drive, Anchorage, AK & start taking back the airplane/property I used to provide for my family so long ago. I will ask all those now following this to come watch - and help if they believe our constitution is worth fighting for.

Bracy v. Gramley, 520 U.S. 899 (U.S. Supreme Court 1997) *"Where specific allegations before the court show reason to believe that the petitioner may, if the facts are fully developed, be able to demonstrate that he is entitled to relief, it is the duty of the courts to provide the necessary facilities and procedures for an adequate inquiry."*

I have thought hard about breaking into the trooper impound yard. Our babies when this started have turned into beautiful, strong, & intelligent young ladies – our eldest being senior Valedictorian in a class of 200 graduates with college already paid for by scholarships - our youngest a student pilot & accomplished huntress – taking a grizzly & caribou on the same day at 14 & taking over 60-inch antler-spread moose most every year since (each feeds our family for over a year). They no longer need my help or guidance to successfully navigate life. I have been with my beautiful wife for nearly 30 years. I will be proud, without regret, to die to expose the sophisticated evil we have found in Alaska's judicial system – in part because, after 14 years of diligent & exhaustive effort, it appears this is the only way it can be exposed & in part because those following this, many of whom I have never met before, have given their word to keep an eye on my beautiful ladies after I am gone. But mostly because I believe the best way for me to protect my family is to stop it before it grows – even if it takes my life to do so. As strong & as intelligent as my daughters are, I don't know if they could prevail if this evil gets stronger. Winston Churchill & Thomas Jefferson explain this truth better than I can:

"If you won't fight for right when you can easily win without blood shed; if you won't fight when your victory is sure & not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you & only a precarious chance of survival. There may even be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than to live as slaves.... There is only one duty, only one safe course, & that is to try to be right & not to fear to do or say what you believe to be right.... This is the lesson: never give in, never give in, never, never, never, never — in nothing, great or small, large or petty — never give in except to convictions of honour & good sense. Never yield to force; never yield to the apparently overwhelming might of the enemy.... One ought never to turn one's back on a threatened danger & try to run away from it. If you do that, you will double the danger. But if you meet it promptly & without flinching, you will reduce the danger by half...It's not enough that we do our best; sometimes we have to do what's required.... If you have an important point to make, don't try to be subtle or clever. Use a pile driver. Hit the point once. Then come back & hit it again. Then hit it a third time-a tremendous whack." Winston Churchill

"And what country can preserve its liberties if their rulers are not warned from time to time that their people preserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take arms. What signify a few lives lost in a century or two? The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots & tyrants. It is its natural manure." Thomas Jefferson

After I am killed I ask the public demand an independent commission, with power to subpoena & grant immunity, be formed to publicly investigate Alaska's judicial corruption – &,

if proved, demand that Alaska's court system, Commission on Judicial Conduct, Bar Association, Department of Law, & State Troopers be placed into federal receivership – as done with corrupt agencies elsewhere. Events, confirmed by the sworn testimony of attorney Dale Dolifka, have given me an unshakeable belief that, in the deciding of this one lowly case concerning the killing of wolves in remote Alaska, the integrity of Alaska's entire judicial system hangs in the balance.

"The liberties of our Country, the freedom of our civil constitution, are worth defending at all hazards: & it is our duty to defend them against all attacks. We have receiv'd them as a fair Inheritance from our worthy Ancestors: They purchas'd them for us with toil & danger & expence of treasure & blood; & transmitted them to us with care & diligence. It will bring an everlasting mark of infamy on the present generation, enlightened as it is, if we should suffer them to be wrested from us by violence without a struggle; or be cheated out of them by the artifices of false & designing men. Let us remember that 'if we suffer tamely a lawless attack upon our liberty, we encourage it, & involve others in our doom.' It is a very serious consideration, which should deeply impress our minds, that millions yet unborn may be the miserable sharers of the event." Samuel Adams

Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury

I, David S. Haeg, declare under penalty of perjury that the above is true & correct.

Executed at Browns Lake, Alaska on February 16, 2018.

David S. Haeg
PO Box 123
Soldotna, Alaska 99669
(907) 262-9249 home; (907) 398-6403 cell; & haeg@alaska.net

Certificate of Service: I certify that on February 16, 2018 a copy of the forgoing was served by mail to: AAG Peterson. By:

I ask everyone reading this to download, print, and keep a copy for safekeeping, and then to forward it on to all possible, by any means possible. Please ask our government officials have an independent commission publicly investigate. Please follow this on the Facebook page "Alaska, State of Corruption" and group "Stop Alaska's Judicial Corruption". Much of the physical evidence proving the above corruption is on website www.alaskastateofcorruption.com, YouTube, and Facebook in "#1 EVIDENCE PACKET", "#2 EVIDENCE PACKET", etc., etc. Finally, I ask everyone to vote no on retaining every Alaskan judge in every election until an independent commission publicly investigates the above and especially the entity tasked with keeping them honest – the Alaska Commission on Judicial Conduct. "Want Judge Swamp to Drain? – VOTE NO!!! DO NOT RETAIN !!!"