One Fabrication. One Courtroom. Three Administrations.

How a fabricated court ruling passed through the U.S. Attorney's Office and before Judge Otis D. Wright II — and what it cost a federally identified crime victim (2016–2026)

EXHIBIT C

Demonstrative summary of record citations
No. 2:26-cv-09383-AB · No. 2:17-cv-07748

THE RECORD, 2016–2021

● DHS / the Office ● Judge Wright ● Victim's notice — and the answer ● Ninth Circuit ▼ each event leads to the next

Oct. 28 & Nov. 21, 2016 · DHS SSA Shawn S. Gibson

From his government email: a court "found in favor of Selakovic against Greenway Nutrients in regards to the assertion of the Greenway trademark." **No court ever so ruled.** Investigation suspended as to Greenway. 07748 Dkt. 1, Exs. 9–10; 09383 Dkt. 2, Ex. D

▼

Jan. 29, 2018 · Office under U.S. Attorney Nicola T. Hanna

Ownership "in doubt"; Ramey declaration of no complaint; "rather old" via a false "Ryan" substitution. Its own exhibit disproves the ruling. Dkts. 9, 9-1, 9-2

▼

Apr. 4, 2018 · Judge Wright

Dismisses on "the negative judgment in the Colorado action," the Ramey declaration, and June 2013 "knowledge" — for lack of jurisdiction. No merits. Dkt. 13 at 11, 13, 16 n.6

continued in next column ▶

Mar. 22 – Apr. 2, 2021 · Judge Wright

Before the Office appears, orders the victims to prove they are victims and that a jurisdictional dismissal does not preclude them. Four days after proof of fabrication: dismisses sua sponte without addressing it; calls his belief in a secret plea agreement "speculation pulled from the ether"; relies on an "earlier determination" that never existed. 01910 Dkts. 8, 10

▼

July 19, 2021 · Office under Acting U.S. Attorney Tracy L. Wilkison

Recast: suit "did not reach a judgment on the merits" — and Judge Wright's orders "entirely consistent." Dkt. 15 at 2–3

▼

Oct. 18–25, 2021 · Office under Acting U.S. Attorney Wilkison

Faced with a motion to set aside the Judgment for fraud on the court, the Office **denies none** of the documented instances of professional misconduct — including that Wilkison herself received the complaint Ramey swore did not exist — that stripped the victims of their rights, status, and restitution, and that it knew, or had every means to know, about. It assumes the fraud *"arguendo"* and calls it harmless — contrary to the Attorney General Guidelines for Victim and Witness Assistance and the Justice Manual that govern its conduct. Dkt. 22 ¶¶ 80, 89–91; Dkt. 23 at 5; 09383 Dkt. 24, Ex. D; JM §§ 1-4.300, 1-4.340

▼ continued on page 2

One Fabrication. One Courtroom. Three Administrations. (continued)

How a fabricated court ruling passed through the U.S. Attorney's Office and before Judge Otis D. Wright II — and what it cost a federally identified crime victim (2016–2026)

EXHIBIT C

Demonstrative summary of record citations
No. 2:26-cv-09383-AB · No. 2:17-cv-07748

THE RECORD, 2021–2026

DHS / the Office · Judge Wright · Victim's notice — and the answer · Ninth Circuit · ▼ each event leads to the next

Nov. 9, 2021 · Judge Wright

Hours after State Bar complaints, strikes the motion on Local Rules 7-3 and 11-6. No word on substance. No referral. Dkt. 25; 05207 Dkt. 21 ¶¶ 2, 5, 9

Mar. 24, 2022 · Ninth Circuit (pre-*Davis*)

Affirms on law of the case; the wrongdoing "occurred in a different action" — 07748, where it was struck, not decided. No. 21-55417

Dec. 18, 2025 – Feb. 5, 2026 · First Assistant Bilal A. Essayli · Victim-Witness

Four written requests in seven weeks, incl. Jan. 23 report of attorney and judicial misconduct. Answer: *"We cannot assist you."* 09383 Dkt. 2-1, Exs. P–T; Ex. B

continued in next column ▶

May–Aug. 2026 · Judge Wright

Petition routed to him; § 5.2 referral apparently never processed; forthwith and protection applications struck, with no chance to cure, hours after recusal denied; dismissal threatened, then sanctions; recuses 50 minutes after disqualification application entered. 05207 Dkts. 11, 35, 36, 43, 45, 49

Aug. 5, 2026 · Office under Essayli · AUSAs Castañeda, Alexander, Seiden

The victim becomes an *"uncle"*; his *"ill-fated"* claims *"involve broad allegations of government misconduct that courts have repeatedly rejected"* — yet *"the government does not address them here in substance."* ECF No. 864 at 4–5

Oct. 12–16, 2026 · Acting Civil Chief Beck · AUSA Medrano

Nine written questions about what the Office did with the report. **No answer.** Ex. A

▼ page 3: the closed loop · page 4: *Lanuza* · page 5: the cost

One Fabrication. One Courtroom. Three Administrations. (continued)


How a fabricated court ruling passed through the U.S. Attorney's Office and before Judge Otis D. Wright II — and what it cost a federally identified crime victim (2016–2026)

EXHIBIT C

Demonstrative summary of record citations
No. 2:26-cv-09383-AB · No. 2:17-cv-07748

THE CLOSED LOOP

Every path runs through the same Office and the same courtroom. Red arrows: the sequence, 2016–2026. Dashed arrows: who acted.



One Fabrication. One Courtroom. Three Administrations. (continued)

How a fabricated court ruling passed through the U.S. Attorney's Office and before Judge Otis D. Wright II — and what it cost a federally identified crime victim (2016–2026)

EXHIBIT C

Demonstrative summary of record citations
No. 2:26-cv-09383-AB · No. 2:17-cv-07748

LANUZA V. LOVE, 899 F.3D 1019 (9TH CIR. 2018)

	Lanuza v. Love	This record
False evidence	One forged document	A federal court ruling that never existed
Carried by	One ICE attorney	Three administrations of the same Office
Where	One proceeding	Four federal dockets
Duration	"Over several years"	Nearly ten years
Effect	Relief "to which he was otherwise lawfully entitled" denied	Victim rights, status, and restitution denied; investigation suspended
Consequence	§ 242 prosecution; 30 days; 10-year bar (at 1022–23)	Fraud assumed "arguendo"; called "repeatedly rejected"; not one correction

THE NINTH CIRCUIT.

"At its core, this case is about a lie, and all the ways it was used, over several years, to defraud the courts." "Failing to provide a narrow remedy for such an egregious constitutional violation would tempt others to do the same." *Lanuza*, 899 F.3d at 1034.

JUDGE WRIGHT'S OWN STANDARD (2013).

"The needs of the many outweigh the needs of the few." For one forged signature by private attorneys: "a forgery is still a forgery" — referred to their bars, the IRS, and the U.S. Attorney for this District. *Ingenuity 13 LLC v. Doe*, No. 2:12-cv-08333-ODW, ECF No. 130 at 8, 10–11.

KNOWLEDGE.

"The prosecutor's office is an entity and as such it is the spokesman for the Government." *Giglio v. United States*, 405 U.S. 150, 154 (1972); *Kyles v. Whitley*, 514 U.S. 419, 437 (1995). Hanna → Wilkison → Essayli, each supervising AUSA Castañeda. The knowledge did not reset. It accumulated.

One Fabrication. One Courtroom. Three Administrations. (continued)

How a fabricated court ruling passed through the U.S. Attorney's Office and before Judge Otis D. Wright II — and what it cost a federally identified crime victim (2016–2026)

EXHIBIT C

Demonstrative summary of record citations
No. 2:26-cv-09383-AB · No. 2:17-cv-07748

THE COST TO THE VICTIM

Rights

None accorded in ten years. 18 U.S.C. § 3771(a), (c)(1).

Status

Lead Victim in 2015; an "uncle" in 2026.

Restitution

The government itself told the victim he could recover from "an established victims' fund" (Dkt. 13 at 2). Nothing has been paid. The Office now calls his petitions seeking it *"ill-fated"* (ECF No. 864 at 4–5) — restitution Congress made mandatory for offenses committed by fraud or deceit, 18 U.S.C. § 3663A(c)(1)(A)(ii), and that the Ninth Circuit confirmed a victim may pursue in the district court. *In re Davis*, 146 F.4th 710 (9th Cir. 2025).

Due process

No court has ever reached the fabrication on the merits. Petitioner has asserted that multiple officials within the Office acted with deliberate indifference and conscious disregard of his rights (09383 Dkt. 15 at 27–29, Page ID #:726–728; 05207 Dkt. 50 at 27–30, Page ID #:1264–1267) and that Judge Wright's April 2, 2021 order was an act not judicial in nature (09383 Dkt. 18 at 20, Page ID #:860).

Prepared by Petitioner as a demonstrative summary of record citations set out in the accompanying Notice and Application; it adds no new facts. Unless noted, docket cites are to No. 2:17-cv-07748. Other cites: No. 2:21-cv-01910; No. 2:26-cv-05207; No. 2:26-cv-09383-AB; *Escamilla v. United States*, No. 21-55417, 2022 WL 874647 (9th Cir. Mar. 24, 2022); *United States v. McCormick*, No. 2:20-cr-00346-DMG, ECF No. 864 (cited only for what the Office said about Petitioner's own claims; Petitioner is not a party to that case). Characterizations of knowledge reflect Petitioner's position. Petitioner requests no finding concerning Judge Wright.