



American Justice Alliance

July 10, 2017

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Honorable Tani Gorre Cantil-Sakauye, Chief Justice
and the Associate Justices
California Supreme Court
350 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: *Amici Curiae* Letter in Support of the Petitioner, Anand Jon Alexander's
Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus in the California Supreme Court No.
S242897.

Dear Chief Justice Cantil-Sakauye and Associate Justices:

Pursuant to California Rule of Court Rule 8.500(g), *Amici Curiae*, the named organizations of the Alliance, respectfully urge this Court to grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus in the above-referenced case *In re Anand Jon Alexander*.

1. The Undersigned's Interest in Supporting Review

The organizations joining this letter, along with the American Justice Alliance (hereinafter the "Alliance") have the common goal of ensuring a fair trial for every defendant in a criminal case, especially for those of minority race and religions and specialty groups of "foreign" origin, because the Los Angeles prosecutors in *People v. Anand Jon Alexander* (BA327190) highlighted this area in violation of the trial courts in rulings, and at least one juror improperly considered the same.

The organizations of this Alliance live in a post September 11, 2001 time and under a volatile political, racially charged atmosphere in America today, where their concerns of [un]equal protection of the law and abuse of power by law enforcement is unfortunately, justified.

As seen from recent elections, race, religion, immigrants, and aliens are polarizing subjects that cause people to vote one way or the other. A jury is a microcosm of this group.

While no one expects a "perfect" trial, the harm manifested in the instant case is a grim example of when our legal system fails and falls far below constitutionally acceptable standards.

An honest review of the record and chronology of filings indicate that the lower courts were misdirected as to the merits as well as the timeliness of Mr. Alexander's efforts.

Unless this court, the highest in the State of California, grants relief of such a compelling habeas petition infused with evidence of substantial due process violations of constitutional magnitude, indications of factual innocence that undermines confidence in the outcome, and the prosecution's admittedly "troubling" misconduct while utilizing false evidence along with a pattern of underhanded communal-racial-religious inflammatory tactics, it sends a message that their potentially criminal conduct will be rewarded.¹ The crucial role of requiring 12 unbiased-impartial jurors as a bulwark of protection against "tyranny"² and as the sole fact finder considering only the evidence before it, would be reduced to a sham.

The loss of confidence of a fair trial in California, taint upon the jury system, corruption of our State's law enforcement, and compromise of our justice system in California has left the above-mentioned minority and specialty groups in dire concern because they, like Mr. Alexander, could be targeted next and deprived of due process.

Petitioner Anand Jon Alexander, an Indian born fashion designer, went to school, lived, and had a successful career in the United States of America, his adopted home since he was 16 years old, without any history of violence or illegal substance abuse.

Mr. Alexander's story is that of the creative, hard-working, productive, immigrant's American Dream. Upon graduating from the prestigious Parson's School of Design, Mr. Alexander won numerous awards, appeared as a celebrity designer on television shows like America's Next Top Model, had a high-profile clientele, and went on to be funded by Wall Street. He was named one of the most influential South Asians in the world, featured in Newsweek Magazine's list of "Who's Next in 2007?"

It has been conceded that, like many successful men, Mr. Alexander enjoyed many female companions. In context to the fast-paced, high fashion, entertainment industry, this was by no means unusual.

¹ Notably, even after the motion for a new trial was denied, the trial court expressed how "troubled... Not happy with the way the [prosecution] handled this case" (July 6, 2009). Especially, under the recent tectonic shifts in the law such as "California Assembly Bill 1909" (September 2016), that makes it a criminal offense, punishable by fines and prison time for police or prosecutors to have done precisely the sort of tampering, destruction, and withholding of favorable evidence and witnesses as they did in the instant case. Furthermore, the trial court declared "juror misconduct" in the instant case (July 6, 2009) and articulated his [mis]conduct as being "criminal" in nature (at the juror's conviction and sentencing on September 14, 2009). See also The United States Supreme Court's ruling in *Pena Rodriguez vs Colorado* 580 U. S. ____ (2017) (dealing with a juror's racially inclined inquiries being intolerable).

² Adopted from the "Magna Carta" into the U.S. Constitution. (www.judges.org) powered by The National Judicial College).

Even based on the "evidence" presented at trial,³ the elements of any force or duress based criminal conduct is highly dubious to unreliable. In fact, post-trial investigations and newly discovered evidence has turned out to be exculpatory and impeaching, thus supporting Mr. Alexander's factual innocence on most, if not all, counts. The above evidence not presented to the jury supports Mr. Alexander's trial defense theory of conspiracy. This also materially undercuts the prosecution's theory, vouching that their witnesses did not know each other, had no credibility issues, had nothing to be impeached (no acts of moral turpitude or convictions), no "motives" to lie (no interest in money or publicity), and had only "strictly professional relationships." The prosecutors intimidated, threatened, and coerced witnesses and a trial attorney with impunity.

2. The Prosecution's Misconduct Undermines the Integrity of our Entire Justice System

Prosecutors have free reign to choose who, when or what to charge an accused individual. They have virtually unlimited resources and they are consequently held to an elevated standard of conduct. *People v. Hill* (1998) 17 Cal. 4th. 800, 819. *Supra*, 17 Cal. 4th at p. 820. This is also because a prosecutor exercises the sovereign power of the state. *Id.* The police are an extension of the executive branch and have even been given the right to take a human life, at their discretion.

The prosecutor's interest in a criminal prosecution is not in winning a case, but in seeing justice done. (*Hill, supra*, 17 Cal. 4th at p.820 (quoting *Berger v. United States* (1935) 295 U.S. 78, 88.)); prohibited from "foul blows."

"A prosecutor's intemperate behavior violates the federal Constitution when it comprises a pattern of conduct 'so egregious that it infects the trial with such unfairness as to make the conviction a denial of due process.'" (*Hill, supra*, 17 Cal.4th at p.819 (quoting *People v. Gionis* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 1196, 1214). Conduct by a prosecutor that does not render a criminal trial fundamentally unfair is prosecutorial misconduct under state law only if it involves "the use of deceptive or reprehensible methods to attempt to persuade either the court or the jury." (*Hill, Supra*, 17 Cal.4th at p. 819). All of the above and worse occurred in the instant case.

During the trial of Mr. Alexander's prosecution, the Los Angeles District Attorney's office and the Beverly Hills Police Department engaged in a disturbing pattern of "foul blows" and misconduct in bad faith.

³ As recently as June 29, 2017 the LAX court ordered an evidentiary hearing for July 25, 2017 based on red flags and California Penal Code 1054, *Brady vs. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963) and Trombetta Youngblood violations whereby the Beverly Hills Police Department, the lead investigating agency in this multi-jurisdiction prosecution, withheld humanist impeachment and exculpatory materials for over a decade. The Los Angeles. prosecutors presumed guilt and relied heavily on yet to be adjudicated claims as a "very rich history of sexual violence in other states." Mr. Alexander has since either gotten all such out of state charges resolved favorably to him or dismissed entirely.

This case is of particular importance because of its far-reaching effect on the entire justice system. As discussed above, a prosecutor's interest should not be focused on winning the case by any means and at any cost, but on ensuring that "justice is done." Justice is not done when an innocent person was deprived of a fair trial and sent to prison with a draconian 59 years to life sentence, despite admittedly "no assault related findings" (see OES medical report) and not a scratch on anyone.

The United States justice system is deemed the beacon of justice in the world, not one where the ends justify the means. Neither *Berger v. United States* (1935) 295 U.S. 78, 88, *Brady v. Maryland*, (1963) 373 U.S. 83, nor *Darden v. Wainwright* (1986) 477 U.S. 168, 181 were concerned with the defendant's guilt or innocence. They were simply focused upon the prosecutor's conduct and whether that conduct, if improper, infected the trial with unfairness. This case presents one of the clearest examples of prosecutorial misconduct leading to an unfair trial in recent history. If such outrageous transgressions are allowed to go unchecked, it will encourage other prosecutors to push the envelope of acceptable behavior and will undermine the public's confidence in the entire system.

3. The Prosecution's Misconduct Sends an Overarching Message to the Foreign Communities, Especially South Asian, Indian, Middle Eastern, Immigrants and Refugees That They Will Not Receive Due Process on American Soil

At trial, the prosecution improperly, and in violation of a court order, depicted Mr. Alexander as a "smelly" and "dirty" old Indian. The prosecution emphasized to the jury that Mr. Alexander was "from India"; not loyal to the United States of America and believed he was above the law and targeted "white women," and "caucasian women." Despite a court order not to go into or ask any questions regarding moral "spirituality" or "religion," the prosecution repeatedly demonized these subjects as religious "rituals" as part of unlawful child porn (which has since been forensically proven to not be any such unlawful child porn), how he sat "cross legged," "meditated," and "read foreign symbols [Hebrew] names of God from right to left."

Prosecutors elicited testimony that Mr. Alexander was a "Hindu from India," believed he was his own God, and that he had power from his ancestors. Although he did not testify, in closing arguments, the prosecution attributed those testimonial hearsay statements as "narcissistic" direct quotes by Mr. Alexander saying, "He told you that."

Although Mr. Alexander's trial was over a decade ago, not much progress has been made in eliminating racism and implicit bias against foreigners, immigrants, or the South Asian, Indian, and Middle Eastern ethnic community.

Not only is fairness fundamental to our justice system, but the appearance of fairness is also crucial. The disproportionate application of the law appears to be lopsided

against people of color or whose belief system is outside the majority or mainstream structure.⁴

The prosecutor's statements in closing argument during Mr. Alexander's trial directly contradict the US Supreme Court's holding in *Baldwin v. Adams*, 899 F. Supp 2d. 889 where the Court stated the following:

"We have consistently cautioned against prosecutorial statements designed to appeal to the passions, fears and vulnerabilities of the jury...jurors may be persuaded by such appeals to believe that by convicting a defendant, they will assist in the solution of some processing social problem. The amelioration of society's woes is far too heavy a burden for the individual defendant to bear."

As the court warned in *United States v. Sanchez*, 659 F.3d 1252, 1256 (9th Cir. 2011), "Prosecution may not urge jurors to convict...in order to protect *community* values, preserve civil order or deter future law breaking." However, in the instant case, the Los Angeles prosecutors inflamed the jury by urging the jury to convict Mr. Alexander, "on behalf of the people that live in this *community*." As such, they placed an unconstitutional burden on the jury to convict on behalf of the "*community*."⁵

As one irrefutable example of overt prejudice, the trial court in Mr. Alexander's case admonished the prosecution that ethnic background and religion have no role in the case. Yet, in actuality, the prosecution was permitted to interject stereotypes about the Indian culture. This was heard loud and clear by at least one juror. Juror number 12, later identified as Mr. Dymally, sought and received extrinsic information about Mr. Alexander's Indian race, culture, religion and character from a non-juror. Mr. Dymally expressed his belief that Mr. Alexander's porn and religious rituals [as was pitched by the prosecution] showed that he led an immoral lifestyle.⁶ The circumstances are far more egregious than the recent United States Supreme Court ruling in *Pena Rodriguez v. Colorado*, 580 U. S. ____ (2017) (March 2017) based on similar racial bias by a juror.

Unless the prosecution's improper and inflammatory attacks on race, religion and cultural heritage are held accountable in Mr. Alexander's case, this will severely affect the minority "foreign" and the South Asian, Middle Eastern, and Indian communities, as it will facilitate a green light for prosecutors to employ similar unconstitutional attacks, assert how such "smelly" outsiders to America target "white" people, have no loyalty to

⁴ Dr. Michelle Alexander's groundbreaking research on this epidemic bias against minorities has received much attention since her 2010 book "The New Jim Crow."

⁵ The prosecuting attorney in Mr. Alexander's case stated in the closing argument, "and I ask you on behalf of the people that live in this community, on behalf of the people that live in the State of California...and I am going to ask you again, on behalf of the State of California and on behalf of the citizens of this community to find this man, this serial rapist, this child molester guilty on all counts." RP 10593-4.

⁶ There are at least three different witnesses that Juror Dymally, in violation of court instructions, sought extrinsic information, including researching the internet, and expressing a personal motive of animus towards Mr. Alexander.

the United States, and therefore should be “locked up.” This overt xenophobia has no place in society in general, let alone court proceedings determining someone’s liberty.

Unlike back in 2007 where it would have been difficult to believe police would lie under oath, cover up and destroy favorable evidence, target and set up minorities, the reality has been exposed due to technology (such as smart phones; YouTube and body cams) catching these often-lethal abuse of power violations red-handed.

Despite the many clear disputes in material facts between the State and Mr. Alexander (which under the law, could only be resolved via an evidentiary hearing), he has thus far been denied an evidentiary hearing by the lower courts until recently, when the LAX court granted him a limited evidentiary hearing due to the overwhelming amount of newly discovered evidence and the evident destruction or concealing of evidence by the police department. At a minimum, the California Supreme Court should remand this case for an evidentiary hearing in order to get a reliable full and factual picture in order to make a fair ruling, something no other court has bothered to do thus far.

4. Finding Juror Number 12’s Outrageous Pattern of Misconduct to Be "Harmless" Sends a Clear Message That Racial Bias is an Acceptable Practice

On top of several other transgressions by Juror number 12, Mr. Dymally, no court had held a hearing, much less had findings on his improper solicitation and discussions about the case with a spectator at the trial named Jani V.

The extrinsic information included Mr. Alexander’s race, religion, family and Indian culture and expressed his intent to convict “if defendant did not testify.” Furthermore, his research of the media on the high-profile case and his discontent with Mr. Alexander’s intertwining of “unlawful porn” into his religious rituals as was pitched by the prosecutor, was the very definition of juror misconduct.

Juror number 12 also initiated contact and discussed the case with Sanjana, Mr. Alexander’s sister, who was a key percipient witness, as well his tenant Leila L.⁷

The court approved a meeting between Sanjana and Dymally which was to be secretly recorded to show the nature of his misconduct.⁸ This plan was sabotaged when

⁷ Juror Dymally admitted researching the internet and expressed animus, a personal motive to convict Mr. Alexander.

⁸ While the trial court declared juror misconduct on Dymally's contact with Sanjana (the only aspect raised and adjudicated anywhere thus far) and "presumed prejudice," it then deemed there was "no prejudice" proven because it assumed the prosecution theory of Dymally being merely romantically and sexually obsessed with Sanjana was "trifling" and "harmless." Not only is this improper consideration of a juror’s feelings, motives, and thoughts, but is the courts supposed rebuttal that it's okay and harmless for a sitting juror to be sexually obsessed and romance a defendant’s sister, who is a key witness nevertheless? Two weeks later, the same trial court found the juror’s misconduct to be criminal in nature, highly disturbing, and deserving of prison time, but the maximum he could sentence him under his authority was limited to the maximum fines and jail time for contempt of court. The trial court’s conduct was not consistent and clearly shows the juror’s conduct was neither trifling or harmless misconduct.

the Prosecution intercepted him and tipped him off that Sanjana planned to record their conversation. The prosecution's interception of the juror and their own words caught on audio, "we don't want you [Juror Dymally] to get into any trouble," followed by holding criminal charges over his head, refusing him "immunity" to silence and make him invoke the fifth, only to decline to prosecute his admitted criminal conduct shows that they wanted to protect the verdict at any cost.

Juror number 12's criminal ventures exploiting his position and subsequent perjury show that he was trying to collect information about Indian culture, or perhaps confirm what he already believed. Either way, his conduct was prohibited and directly violated the court's admonishments to the jury. The court had already ruled that culture and religion had no role in this case. It is clear that juror number 12 thought that it did. If this juror misconduct is found to be harmless, it sends a clear message to the Southeast Asian and Indian communities that racial bias is an acceptable practice. *See People v. Weatherton*, 328 P.3d 38 (Cal. 2014); *Remmer v. United States*, 347 U.S. 227 (1954). *People v. Nesler*, 1997 16 Cal.4th 561.

The present case affords this Court an opportunity to uphold the integrity of our system as a whole and to specifically reassure the "foreign," Southeast Asian, Middle Eastern, and Indian communities that they can and will be afforded full due process of law a fair trial and that racial bias by a juror is unacceptable.

As the filings themselves clearly show, petitioner and the state have a litany of material facts that they disagree upon even now. Said facts were left unresolved on the record and require fact-finding via testimony.

An evidentiary hearing is appropriate when an important question hinges on the resolution of disputed facts. Pen. Code, § 1484; *People v. Romero*, supra, 8 Cal.4th 728, 739 ["[I]f the return and traverse reveal that petitioner's entitlement to relief hinges on the resolution of factual disputes, then the court should order an evidentiary hearing."]; Cal. Rules of Court, rule 4.551, subd. (f) ["An evidentiary hearing is required if, after considering the verified petition, the return, any denial, any affidavits or declarations under penalty of perjury, and matters of which judicial notice may be taken, the court finds there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner may be entitled to relief and the petitioner's entitlement to relief depends on the resolution of an issue of fact."].

As such, based on the aforementioned, we urge this court to compel an evidentiary hearing to resolve the clear factual disputes asserted.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, *amici* respectfully requests that the Court accept review of Mr. Alexander's petition. If the Court accepts the Petition, *amici* will request permission from the Chief Justice, pursuant to Rule 8.520(f)(1) of the California Rules of Courts, to file an *amici curiae* brief on the merits to more fully set forth its positions on this important matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Corey Evan Parker

Corey Evan Parker, Esq.
Counsel for *Amici Curiae* American Justice Alliance, Indian Government, Ministry of Women and Child Development, Indian National Congress, Non-Resident Keralites Affairs Department, Bay Area Alliance, Justice for All America, Gurudwaras of California, Islamic Center of Temecula Valley, Jain Social Groups, Orthodox Jewish Chaplaincy Board, Syed Aziz Nizami, St. Thomas Malankara Orthodox Church, Citizens for Democracy, Sarva Kalla Vallabhan Group, Shiri Guru Ravidass Temple, Indo American Center, Jain Arogya Naturocare, Khalsa Law Firm, Boise Sikh Community, Maha-Shakti Ashram, Institute of Communication and Development, Sree Narayana Darma Paripalana Yogam Kollam Union, Jeeway Punjab Entertainment, Justice for All America



The Ministry of Women & Child Development, a branch of the Government of India, is the apex body for formulation and administration of the rules and regulations and laws relating to women and child development in India. Their efforts are directed to ensure that women are empowered both economically and socially and thus become equal partners in national development along with men. The ministry is headed by Minister Maneka Sanjay Gandhi, who has held numerous government positions and has been the recipient of numerous awards for her public service. On behalf of the Government of India, she fully supports Mr. Alexander's petition.

"I have seen the details of the case of Anand Jon and have come to the conclusion that he has been wrongfully convicted...I strongly urge you to take up his case...so that justice can ultimately prevail."

ੴ
ਬੇ ਏਰੀਆ ਸਿੱਖ ਅਲਾਇਸ
BAY AREA SIKH ALLIANCE

The Bay Area Sikh alliance propagates the message of Guru Granth Shaib and the Ten Gurus. They participate in activities within and outside of the Sikh Community for the benefit of Sikhs. The organization provides a platform for youth to excel in their goals. They fully support Mr. Alexander's petition.

“We have been following this case since the beginning and we as a community believe that Mr. Alexander has been wrongfully accused and convicted.”



The Indian National Congress, lead by P.C. Chacko, is the Presidium or the central decision-making assembly of the Indian National Congress. It is composed of members elected from State-level Pradesh Congress Committees and can have as many as a thousand members. It is the AICC that elects members of the Congress Working Committee and the Congress President, who is also the head of the AICC. The organizational executives of the AICC are several general-secretaries selected by the Congress President and the members of the Congress Working Committee.

“Mr. Alexander, a nonresident Keralite, has been wrongfully convicted on charges of sexual misconduct and sentenced to imprisonment in the USA. The jury delivered its verdict based on evidence pertaining to un-charged crimes.”



The Indian Government set up the Non-Resident Keralites Affairs Department (NORKA) in 1996 to take care of the diaspora. In 2002, Norka Roots, a field agency, was established as an interface between the non-resident Keralites and the government of Kerala and a forum for addressing the NRK's problems, safeguarding their rights and rehabilitating the returnees.

“There has been prejudicial misconduct on the part of the prosecution. The prosecution relied upon evidence outside the record, made inflammatory speeches, denigrated the trial counsel, and falsely accused the defense for manipulation of evidence...During the closing statements, they employed racist stereotypes to appeal to the prejudices of the jurors, and cast aspersions on the defendant, convicting him in advance even before a verdict of the grand jury.”



**The St. Thomas Malankara Orthodox Church, Inc.,
Long Island, New York**

“I understand that it is evident from the trial that Mr. Anand Jon has been subjected to a wrongful judgment. Mr. Anand is a man of principles. I believe that Mr. Anand Jon is undergoing an unfair trial and judgment. He deserves a fair judgment to release him from the prison at the earliest.”



“I believe that Mr. Anand Jon is undergoing an unfair trial and judgment. He deserves a fair judgment to release him from the prison at the earliest... The Concept of non-violence lies at the heart of our Jain belief system. The Jain community has looked into and stand for Mr. Anand Jon Alexander being granted a new trial. The talented well know artist and fashion designer has no history of any violence.”



“It is appalling to see the court has overlooked the factual evidence. The witnesses were pressured, tampered, and intimidated by the prosecutors and the police. Mr. Jon has been framed by a group for money and revenge. Moreover, the Police Department and Los Angeles Prosecutors have handled the whole process in an intolerant, racist, and xenophobic manner.”



“The Indo American Center supports Anand Jon Alexander because we believe in his innocence and we believe that references to his race were inappropriately used by the prosecution.”



“We believe that Anand was wrongly convicted in a Los Angeles Court for Rape and drug charges at the hands of unscrupulous police and prosecutorial misconduct, ill prepared defense lawyers, and a tainted jury. After a lie-detector test, Anand came to New York where the court proceedings enabled him to obtain court documents that prove his innocence and those were hidden from him at the Los Angeles trials.”

JAIN AROGYA NATUROCARE

WELFARE SOCIETY

Reg. Off C-4/360, Yamuna Vihar, Delhi - 110053

“The present case affords this Court an opportunity to uphold the integrity of our system as a whole and to specifically reassure the southeast Asian and Indian communities that they can and will receive a fair trial and that racial bias by a juror is unacceptable.”



Khalsa Law Firm

Estate Planning · Elder Law

“I truly believe that Mr. Jon was a victim of the worst behavior and actions of, not only our society, but our criminal justice system due to, among other things, his success, his Indian ethnicity and his heritage...Prosecutors have handled the whole matter in an intolerant, racist and xenophobic manner.”



“I am aware of the events regarding Mr. Anand Jon Alexander. I truly believe that Mr. Anand Jon Alexander is being framed by the California Court, Prosecutors and the Police Department due to his Indian ethnicity and heritage. The handling of the case by the authorities exposes the racist, intolerant and xenophobic values underlying in our judicial and legal systems.”



MAHA-SHAKTI ASHRAM

3885 E. EIGHT MILE ROAD
LODI, CA 95240
209-334-3686

www.mahashaktiashram.com

“We believe that Mr. Jon became the victim of greed and politics. Mr. Jon has spent the prime years of his life in prison. Keeping our faith alive in the American judicial system Mr. Jon must be given a chance to prove his innocence.”



Institute of Communication and Development

“It is evident from the trial that Mr. Alexander was subject to a wrong a deceitful judgment. The jury had given its judgment based on the basis of unreliable and perjured information.”



**SREE NARAYANA DHARMA PARIPALANA YOGAM
KOLLAM UNION**

“I have been following the case for the past ten years. From testimonies of witness, discrepancies in evidence and prejudice has denied justice to Mr. Anand Jon Alexander. I request your honor, the judiciary, to reconsider his case with sympathy to help him.”



“His incarceration has raised several questions on the credibility of the American judicial system. Legal authorities have a deep underlying notion of intolerance, racism, illiberality and xenophobia in the American society.”



Justice for All America

“As per a Director’s meeting held on July 6th, 2017, Justice For All, Inc. and its officers and members wholeheartedly support all efforts to provide justice to Anand Jon Alexander. We also would like to request the California Court system to show leniency by giving him an opportunity for a free and fair retrial because we believe that he was not given an opportunity to present all his evidences during his trial. The evidences and the witnesses will support the reasons for a retrial.”

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Corey Evan Parker, am over the age of 18 years, and not a party to the within entitled cause, and maintain my business address at 1230 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 300 Manhattan Beach, CA 90266. I served the attached:

***Amici Curiae* Letter in Support of the Petitioner, Anand Jon Alexander’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus in the California Supreme Court No. S242897**

On the following individuals/entities by placing a true and correct copy of the document in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepared, in the United States mail at Manhattan Beach, California addressed as follows:

California Court of Appeal
Ronald Reagan State Building
300 S Spring St B-228
Los Angeles, CA 90013

LA District Attorney’s Office
211 W. Temple St Suite 1200
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Honorable Stephen A. Marcus
Criminal Clerk Dept 102
210 West Temple St
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Orly Ahrony
AHRONY, GRAHAM, & ZUCKER, LLP
401 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor Penthouse
Santa Monica, California 90401

Anand Jon Alexander

I declare under penalty of perjury that service was effected on July 10, 2017 at Manhattan Beach, California.

Dated: July 10, 2017

Corey Evan Parker
Corey Evan Parker, Esq.