

December 24, 2013

THE HONOURABLE MARK S. DAVIS,
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE,
UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE,
600 GRANBY STREET,
NORFOLK, VIRGINIA 23510

Dear Judge Davis:

Re: Cullen Johnson

ATTACHED, PLEASE FIND SENTENCING SUBMISSIONS I
HAVE PREPARED WITH RESPECT TO THIS MATTER.

I TRUST my COMMENTS WILL ASSIST YOUR
DELIBERATIONS.

Respectfully,

CJ Johnson

CULLEN JOHNSON #13-046330
P.O. Box 6098,
VIRGINIA BEACH, VA. 23456

①

Sentencing submissions

United States of America v. Cullen Johnson.

Personal Background

I WAS BORN INTO A MIDDLE-CLASS FAMILY IN TORONTO, ONTARIO, CANADA ON AUGUST 19, 1948. I WAS LEFT ALONE AT HOME ON FREQUENT OCCASIONS. I HAD LITTLE QUIET TIME WITH MY PROMETHEUS FATHER WHO CONSISTENTLY WORKED SIX DAYS A WEEK BEFORE HIS DEATH IN 1961 AT AGE 51 (I WAS 13). MY MOTHER, A GENTLE SOUL AND HOMEMAKER, BUSIED HERSELF WITH VOLUNTEER HOSPITAL AND CHARITY WORK BOTH BEFORE AND AFTER I LEFT HOME TO ATTEND UNIVERSITY. MY ONLY SIBLING, A SISTER SEVEN YEARS MY SENIOR, A PHYSIOTHERAPIST, MARRIED AND LEFT HOME SILENTLY AFTER MY FATHER'S DEATH. MOTHER DIED IN AUGUST 2000 AT AGE 93 (I WAS 48) AND MY SISTER DIED IN OCTOBER 2009 AT AGE 68 (I WAS 61). MY SISTER ACCOMPANIED MY PARENTS ON GENERAL EXTENDED VACATIONS TO WESTERN CANADA BUT I WAS NEVER INCLUDED, INSTEAD BEING LEFT WITH AN AUNT AT HER COTTAGE FOR ABOUT TEN WEEKS DURING EACH SUMMER FROM 1956 TO 1962, NEARLY SELDOM SEEING MY PARENTS OR SISTER DURING THOSE TIMES.

SCOUTING BECAME VERY IMPORTANT AFTER MY FATHER'S DEATH. I EVENTUALLY ATTAINED THE LEVEL OF

(2)
QUEEN'S SCOUT - SIMILAR TO THE EAGLE SCOUT LEVEL
IN THE U.S. - AND WORKED EACH SUMMER FROM 1963 TO
1967 AT A LARGE SCOUT RESERVATION IN NORTHERN
ONTARIO.

I ATTENDED THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO
BETWEEN 1967 AND 1971, OBTAINED A BACHELOR OF ARTS
DEGREE (ENGLISH) AND SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED THE FIRST
YEAR OF THE LL.B. PROGRAMME AT THE FACULTY OF LAW,
WITHDRAWING IN THE SECOND YEAR IN DECEMBER 1971
FOLLOWING THE ENDING OF A SIGNIFICANT PERSONAL
RELATIONSHIP. THIS EVENT IMPACTED ME SEVERELY AND
I INTERPRETED IT AS A VERY NEGATIVE REJECTION.

DURING THE SUMMER OF EACH UNIVERSITY YEAR
I WORKED IN THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY AS A LABOURER
AND SOMETIME SURVEYOR WHICH SUBSTANTIALLY FINANCED MY
ACADEMIC AND LIVING COSTS.

SUBSEQUENTLY, I ATTENDED THE UNIVERSITY OF
TORONTO BETWEEN 1972 AND 1978 AND SUCCESSFULLY
COMPLETED A MASTER'S DEGREE IN CRIMINOLOGY. I HAD
FEEL A NEED FOR RENEWED ACADEMIC SUCCESS AND
REDEMPTION AFTER WITHDRAWING FROM LAW SCHOOL.

I MARRIED MY FIRST WIFE IN MAY 1975. MY
LOOSE PLANS TO RETURN TO LAW SCHOOL GRADUALLY EVAPORATED
WITH THE ARRIVAL OF FOUR CHILDREN, FINANCIAL AND
OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES. UNFORTUNATELY, THE MARRIAGE
BECAME INCREASINGLY DYSFUNCTIONAL BUT RESPONSIBILITIES
AND MODEST INCOME PRECLUDED SEPARATION OR DIVORCE. I HAVE
NO DOUBT THAT CERTAIN PREDISPOSITIONS AND ATTITUDES OF
MINE CONTRIBUTED TO THIS DYSFUNCTION.

(S)

I JOINED THE TORONTO POLICE SERVICE IN MARCH 1972.
I BELIEVE I DID SO BECAUSE I WAS ATTRACTED TO
AN ACTIVE, OUTDOOR, SERVICE ORIENTED ROLE BUT ALSO
I WANTED TO CONFRONT CERTAIN SELF DOUBTS. I
THOUGHT THAT BY PUTTING MYSELF IN HARM'S WAY
I COULD CONFRONT AND PUT TO REST THESE ISSUES
IN A MANLY AND HONOURABLE WAY.

MY SERVICE INCLUDED PRIMARILY CRIMINAL
INVESTIGATION ASSIGNMENTS AS WELL AS PLENTY REQUESTS
TO WRITE BRIEFS AND POSITION PAPERS AND TO APPEAR
BEFORE BOTH FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL LEGISLATIVE BODIES
AND COMMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE TORONTO POLICE SERVICE,
THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF POLICE, THE CANADIAN
ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE, THE ONTARIO ASSOCIATION
OF CHIEFS OF POLICE, TWO TERMS AS EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT
TO TWO CHIEFS OF POLICE AS WELL AS A THREE YEAR
ASSIGNMENT TO THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS UNIT.

DESPITE THIS, FOLLOWING YET ANOTHER EXCELLENT
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IN SEPTEMBER 1995, I WAS
ADVISED, OFF-THE-RECORD BY THE REVIEWING POLICE
SUPERINTENDENT, THAT I WOULD 'NEVER BE PROMOTED'
BECAUSE I 'WROTE TOO WELL', 'SPOKE TOO WELL', WAS
'TOO WELL EDUCATED' AND THAT 'PEOPLE WERE AFRAID OF
ME' AMONG OTHER SIMILAR REASONS. IT BECAME
OBVIOUS THAT MY EDUCATION AND SPECIAL ASSIGNMENTS
HAD UNINTENTIONALLY RESULTED IN JEALOUSY, ENVY,
ANXIETY, DISRESPECT, ANGER AND FEAR ON THE PART
OF MANY OTHER RANK- AND FILE AND SENIOR OFFICERS

(4)

IN A SERVICE THAT I WAS TOLD HAD ONLY TWO
DOCTORED UNIVERSITY GRADUATES WHEN I JOINED IN 1972.

DESPITE MY AGE AND EXPERIENCE, I REACTED
EMOTIONALLY, FEELING BETRAYED THAT MY FAITH
IN THE POLICE SERVICE, MY EDUCATION, LONGEVITY, DEDICATION,
DISCIPLINE AND HONEST WORK EFFORT OVER 23
YEARS HAD MEANT LITTLE TO NOTHING AND WOULD
LEAD TO NOTHING LARGELY BECAUSE OF THE INSECURITY
OF OTHERS WHO APPARENTLY FELT THREATENED BY THESE
ATTRIBUTES. INSTEAD OF BEING VALUED ASSETS, MY
EDUCATION, EXPERIENCE AND SKILLS BECAME, IRONICALLY,
LIABILITIES. I COULD HAVE REMAINED IN THE SERVICE
BUT AT THE TIME DID NOT REACH THE THOUGHT OF
SIMPLY LANGLISHING ANOTHER TWENTY YEARS
LARGELY BECAUSE OF INADEQUATE FEELINGS BY OTHERS
THAT I DID NOTHING DESERETABLY OR CONSCIOUSLY TO
CREATE OR ENCOURAGE. THE UNHAPPINESS I FELT IN MY
MARRIAGE WAS ALSO A DETERMINING FACTOR. IT WAS
A VERY LOW POINT IN MY LIFE.

I MAKE NO CLAIM TO PSYCHIATRIC OR PSYCHOLOGICAL
EXPERTISE, BUT I KNOW THAT AT AN EMOTIONAL LEVEL
I FEEL USED, IGNORED, UNWANTED, REJECTED, DISCARDED AND
BETRAYED BOTH AS A CHILD AND AS AN ADULT, PERSONALLY
AND PROFESSIONALLY. MY PREDOMINANT FEELINGS WERE OF
INSECURITY, INADEQUACY, LOWNESS AND INCREASING
DISRESPECT BOTH THEN AND NOW. I KNOW I DEVELOPED
A VERY INSULAR AND DEFENSIVE ATTITUDE AND A REJECT
OF MY EXPERIENCES. AT THE SAME TIME, I STILL CLUNG
TO SEE THE GOOD IN PEOPLE BUT TENDED TO MINIMIZE THEIR FAULTS.

D.R.

(5)

I INJURIOUSLY, HOWEVER, LEFT PEACE AT HENRY'S LENGTH AND DID NOT FORM CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS.

I MAKE THESE COMMENTS NOT TO Elicit ANY SYmpathy. I AM NOT SPECIFIC AND RECOGNIZE THAT MANY OTHER GOOD PEOPLE IN THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATIONS HAVE PASSED OVER THE TIME FOR REASONS HAVING NOTHING TO DO WITH THEIR QUALIFICATIONS. I AM SIMPLY RELATING MY BEST UNDERSTANDING OF THE PERSONAL REALITY I EXPERIENCED, HOW I FEEL ABOUT IT, AND HOW IT IMPACTED ME. (I FAILED TO REAIZE AT THE TIME THAT I HAD ALLOWED OTHERS TO FLATTER AND MANIPULATE MY EGO FOR THEIR OWN PURPOSES, TAKING CREDIT (ITSELF) FOR MY TALENT AND CONTRIBUTIONS.)

DESPITE THIS, I CONTINUED TO ENGAGE IN FURTHER PUBLIC SERVICE INITIATIVES BEYOND MY EMPLOYMENT AS A MEMBER OF THE BOARD, AT VARIOUS TIMES, OF A COMPETITIVE SWIM CLUB, THE NORTH NEWMARKET LIONS CLUB, THE SOUTH SIMCOE RIDING OF THE REFORM PARTY OF CANADA AND THE COUNCIL OF PRIVATE INVESTIGATORS - ONTARIO (C.P.I.O.). IN SPITE OF MY FEELINGS, I NEVERTHELESS SOUGHT ACHIEVEMENT, RECOGNITION AND SUCCESS DURING OTHER FORMS OF PUBLIC SERVICE.

AFTER THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IN SEPTEMBER 1995, I DETERMINED THAT, SHOULD AN EARLY RETIREMENT OFFER PRESENT ITSELF, I WOULD TAKE IT. AS IT HAPPENED, SEVERAL RETIREMENT PACKAGES AND I SELECTED ONE THAT LEAD TO ME RETIRING IN MARCH 1996 AFTER

(6)

SLIGHTLY MORE THAN TWENTY-FOUR (24) YEARS
WITH THE POLICE SERVICE. (YES, I HAVE REGRETED)
THAT DECISION ON OCTOBER.

PRIVATE INVESTIGATION BACKGROUND.

IN 1999, THROUGH NETWORKING, I LEARNED OF AN
OPPORTUNITY IN PRIVATE INVESTIGATIONS WITH THE RESULT
THAT I BECAME LICENSED TO A FIRM IN TORONTO.

AFTER ABOUT A YEAR, I FEEL THAT I COULD BE
SUCCESSFUL WITH MY OWN COMPANY. ACCORDINGLY, I
INCORPORATED JOHNSON'S INVESTIGATIONS INC. OPERATING
UNDER THE TRADENAME INTERNAL AFFAIRS ON MARCH 3, 2001.

I BEGAN OPERATIONS ON OR ABOUT SEPTEMBER 15, 2001 AND
BOUGHT MY FIRST OFFICE COMPUTER THAT MEMORABLE
DAY. MY PURPOSE IN CREATING INTERNAL AFFAIRS WAS TO
PROVIDE TRADITIONAL PRIVATE INVESTIGATION SERVICES AND DO
SO IN A LAWFUL MANNER.

I DID NOT MEET ELAINE WHITE, MY PRESENT SPOUSE
AND CO-DEFENDANT, UNTIL FEBRUARY 27, 2002 FOLLOWING
A REFERRAL BY ANOTHER PRIVATE INVESTIGATOR (A RETIRED
R.C.M.P. OFFICER) WHO SPoke HIGHLY OF ELAINE'S INVESTIGATION
AND RESEARCH SKILLS. ELAINE AND I MET IN A DONUT
SHOP IN NEWMARKET, ONTARIO. I CONFIRMED SHE WAS
LICENSED PROPERLY AS A PRIVATE INVESTIGATOR, SPONSORED
BY A LICENSED PRIVATE INVESTIGATION FIRM CALLED
TAG SERVICES. THE PRINCIPALS OF THIS COMPANY
WERE TERRY GRONIS AND HIS BROTHER GEORGE
GRONIS. (GEORGE LEFT THE FIRM IN OR ABOUT 2003.)

Elaine LATER TOOK ME THAT SHE HAD KNOWN AND WORKED WITH TERRY AND GEORGE SINCE ABOUT 1998.

FOLLOWING OUR MEETING, ELAINE ASSISTED ME ON A VERY FEW OCCASIONS BY SUPPLYING CERTAIN BACKGROUND INFORMATION (ADDRESSES, TELEPHONE NUMBERS, ETC.) BUT OTHERWISE WE HAD LITTLE CONTACT UNTIL DECEMBER 2002 WHEN SHE ASKED ME TO CONDUCT SURVEILLANCE ON HER THEN HUSBAND TO CONFIRM THE ADULTERY SHE HAD SUSPECTED. LATER I CONDUCTED ADDITIONAL SURVEILLANCES ON HER BEHALF WITH RESPECT TO THIS AND OTHER MATTERS.

THROUGH TELEPHONE CONVERSATIONS AND OTHER LIMITED PERSONAL CONTACT, I GRADUALLY LEARNED MUCH MORE ABOUT ELAINE AND DETERMINED THAT SHE WAS A CARING, CAREFUL, CAUTIOUS, CONSERVATIVE, EXPERIENCED, ANALYTICAL AND DISCIPLINED PERSON. I LEARNED THAT SHE HAD BEEN A VALUED RESEARCHER FOR A WELL-KNOWN TORONTO BASED FORENSIC ACCOUNTING FIRM THAT WAS LATER PURCHASED BY THE KROLL INVESTIGATION GROUP. I ALSO HAD OCCASION TO MEET THE HER TWO DAUGHTERS WHO IMPRESSED ME WITH THEIR ACHIEVEMENTS. I HAD NO REASON WHATSOEVER TO SUSPECT THAT ELAINE WAS OR MIGHT BE INVOLVED IN ANY CRIMINAL ACTIVITY WHATSOEVER (THE THOUGHT, FRANKLY, NEVER ENTERED MY MIND). OUR RELATIONSHIP GRADUALLY DEVELOPED FROM THAT OF A PROFESSIONAL BUSINESS TO A PERSONAL

(CONT)

RELATIONSHIP TO THE POINT THAT WE BEGAN CO-HABITATING
IN FEBRUARY 2004.

I DEVELOPED A DEEP ADMIRATION FOR ELAINE IN THE
FIRST TWO AND THEN SUBSEQUENT YEARS OF KNOWING
HER. SHE PROVIDED ME A LEVEL OF RESPECT I HAD
NOT PREVIOUSLY EXPERIENCED WITH ANYONE.

AMONG OTHER THINGS, SHE INDICATED THAT SHE AGREED
TO MARRY ME - WHICH OCCURRED ON SEPTEMBER 14, 2006 -
BECAUSE, "I KNOW YOU WOULD NEVER HURT ME." (I
CAME TO LEARN THAT ELAINE HAD BEEN ABUSED PHYSICALLY
AND EMOTIONALLY AS HAS HER CHILDREN DURING THE
COURSE OF HER THREE PREVIOUS MARRIAGES.) THE WORD
'LOVE' DOES NOT INADEQUATELY DESCRIBE THE NATURE
OR DEPTH OF OUR RELATIONSHIP.

BUT THOUGH ELAINE HAD TOLD ME SOME GENERAL
INFORMATION ABOUT TERRY GRANT'S, TO THE BEST OF
MY MEMORY, I DID NOT ACTUALLY MEET HIM
UNTIL SOMETIME IN THE SUMMER OR FALL OF 2004.

BY THAT TIME, ELAINE HAD KNOWN HIM FOR ABOUT
SIX YEARS. TERRY'S COMPANY WAS THE SPONSOR
OF ELAINE'S LICENCE BUT I HAD NOTHING TO DO
WITH HIM APART FROM ABOUT SIX BRIEF, PURELY
SOCIAL, CONTACTS BETWEEN 2004 UNTIL ELAINE
AND I LEFT CANADA IN APRIL 2008. (HE WAS, FOR
EXAMPLE, AN INVITED GUEST AT OUR WEDDING
RECEPTION IN OCTOBER 2006.) I HAVE NO
MEMORY OF EVER HAVING E-MAIL OR TELEPHONE
CONTACT WITH HIM DURING THAT TIME AND I HAD

(9)

NO REASON TO EMPLOY HIS COMPANY FOR ANY MATTER
WHATSOEVER. HE WAS A VIRTUAL STRANGER TO ME.

~~ELAINE AND I DID NOT MERGE OUR BUSINESSES~~
~~OR BANK ACCOUNTS FOLLOWING OUR COHABITATION OR~~
~~MARRIAGE ALTHOUGH WE DID BECOME JOINT SIGNATORIES~~
~~OF OUR EXISTING BANK ACCOUNTS AFTER OUR MARRIAGE~~
~~TO AVOID PROBATE ISSUES IN THE EVENT EITHER OF~~
~~US DIED.~~

ELAINE'S BUSINESS, WORLD SOUTIEN (2004) INC.,
AND MINE, INTERNAL AFFAIRS, REMAINED DISTINCT
AS DID OUR OFFICE ADDRESSES. I DID NOT BECOME
A BENEFICIAL OWNER OR OFFICER OF HER COMPANY
AND SHE DID NOT BECOME A BENEFICIAL OWNER
OR OFFICER OF MY COMPANY. WE BOTH WORKED,
FOR THE MOST PART, SEPARATE AND APART FROM
EACH OTHER. ELAINE HAD HER OWN CASES AND I
HAD MINE.

FULLY 98% OF MY TIME WAS ENGAGED IN
PROVIDING TRADITIONAL PRIVATE INVESTIGATION SERVICES
TO MY OWN CLIENTS AS WELL AS CARRYING OUT VERY TIME-
CONSUMING RESPONSIBILITIES AS THE MEMBER OF THE BOARD
OF A SMALL CONDOMINIUM DEVELOPMENT IN CENTRAL ONTARIO.
I AM AWARE OF NO DIFFICULTIES OTHER THAN MINOR
HOUSEKEEPING ISSUES RELATED TO MY TRADITIONAL PRIVATE
INVESTIGATION UNDERTAKINGS.

ELAINE HAS TOLD ME AROUND THE TIME I FIRST MET
HER IN 2004 THAT TERRY GRANTIS WAS PROVIDING HER WITH
SOME FINANCIAL ACCOUNT AND INCOME TAX INFORMATION

AFTER

(10)

THROUGH A REVENUE CANADA CONTACT BETTY RECALLED THAT THIS AND OTHER SOURCES OF INFORMATION SHE WAS ABLE TO ACCESS WERE HER PROPRIETARY CONTACTS AND AS SUCH, THEY WERE HER BUSINESS ASSETS, NOT MINE. (ELAINE REMAINED APPROPRIATELY CAUTIOUS AND DISCREET WITH HER INFORMATION SOURCES FOR SEVERAL YEARS AFTER I MET HER IN 2002.)

MY BUSINESS FOCUS WAS AND REMAINED TRADITIONAL PRIVATE INVESTIGATION ISSUES AND OPERATIONS AND NOT ON THE MATTERS THAT ELAINE APPEARED TO DEAL WITH ALTHOUGH I DID REFER ABOUT A DOZEN POTENTIAL CLIENTS TO ELAINE BETWEEN 2004 AND APRIL 2006, AND RECEIVED RETAINED MONEY FROM A SMALL NUMBER OF THOSE CLIENTS, I RETAINED NONE OF THESE FUNDS WHATSOEVER, PAYING ALL AMOUNTS OVER TO ELAINE'S COMPANY. (FOR EXAMPLE, I DID THIS BEFORE ELAINE ACQUIRED A POINT-OF-SALE TERMINAL SIMPLY TO FACILITATE RECEIPT OF SOME INITIAL RETAINERS BY CREDIT CARD).

DURING THIS TIME, I TOOK STEPS TO DEVELOP PROFESSIONAL AND INDUSTRY SOURCES IN ORDER TO BETTER SERVE MY CLIENTELE AND BROADEN MY KNOWLEDGE BASE. FOR EXAMPLE, I BECAME A MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL OF PRIVATE INVESTIGATORS—ONTARIO (C.P.I.O.), LATER SERVING ON THE BOARD OF THAT ORGANIZATION. I ALSO OBTAINED FOR AND BECAME A MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATION OF CERTIFIED ANTI-MONEY LAUNDERING SPECIALISTS (A.C.A.M.S.) AND RECEIVED CONTINUING E-MAIL UPDATES FROM THIS AND, LATER, OTHER RELATED ORGANIZATIONS.

P.11

CONCERNING ISSUES AND CASES INVOLVING MONEY LAUNDERING, TAX EVASION AS WELL AS CRIMINAL BEHAVIOUR BY FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS. I DID NOT TAKE THESE STEPS FOR THE PURPOSE OF FACILITATING A CRIMINAL ENTERPRISE. RATHER, I WAS INTERESTED IN THESE INITIATIVES BECAUSE OF CONCERN EXPRESSED BY CLIENTS AND FEEL MEMBERSHIP IN THESE ORGANIZATIONS WOULD ENHANCE MY KNOWLEDGE BASE ALLOWING ME TO BETTER CONDUCT BUSINESS AND ASSIST MY CLIENTS.

I ALSO CONDUCTED RESEARCH ON THE INTERNET WHICH HIGHLIGHTED SIGNIFICANT CRIMINAL ACTIVITY BY VARIOUS FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS, FOR EXAMPLE, JBS v IRS, AS WELL AS OBVIOUS INVOLVEMENT IN MONEYLAUNDERING AND TAX EVASION, FOR EXAMPLE, AS OUTLINED IN THE 2007 REPORT OF THE U.S. SENATE ON TAX HAVENS. THE HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE, ARGUABLY ILLEGAL ACTIVITY OF NUMEROUS U.S. FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND MORTGAGE LENDERS THAT RESULTED IN THE NEAR COLLAPSE OF THE U.S. AND WORLD ECONOMY IN 2007 AND LATER YEARS WAS ALSO CLEARLY APPARENT, PARTICULARLY WHEN NONE OF THE PRINCIPALS OF THESE FIRMS WERE INDICTED, TRIED OR INCARCERATED FOR THE MASSIVE FINANCIAL DESTRUCTION THEIR DECISIONS CAUSED. THIS INFORMATION SERVED TO ENHANCE THE CREDIBILITY OF THE DATA AND EXPLANATIONS TERRY GROUTIS WAS PROVIDING OBVIOUSLY AS SUPPLIED BY HIS CANADA REVENUE AGENCY

(12)

Again, I did not conduct this research for the purpose of facilitating a criminal enterprise.

- THERE WERE OBVIOUSLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES RELATED TO THE BEHAVIOR OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS OF LEGITIMATE INVESTIGATIVE INTEREST AND I FEEL THESE ISSUES TO BE 'BONA FIDE' AREAS TO RESEARCH.
ELAINE AND I LEFT ONTARIO FOR THE BAHAMAS IN APRIL 2008. AT THE TIME OF OUR LEAVING, THERE WERE NO KNOWN CIVIL LAWSUITS OR CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS, INVESTIGATIONS OR CHARGES EXISTING OR CONTEMPLATED WHATSOEVER.

THERE WAS A LICENCE INVESTIGATION IN PROGRESS THAT LASTED FULLY TWO (2) YEARS THAT BEGAN IN OR ABOUT APRIL 2007 THAT LED TO A TWO (2) DAY HEARING IN FEBRUARY AND MARCH 2009, BUT THIS INVESTIGATION FAILED TO ESTABLISH THE ALLEGATION THAT I HAD 'LIED' TO POLICE INVESTIGATORS. IN THE RESULT, BOTH MY PERSONAL AND BUSINESS LICENCES WERE CONTINUED AND WERE RENEWED WITHOUT INCIDENT IN SEPTEMBER 2009. THE LICENCE INVESTIGATION HAD BEEN A REGULATORY MATTER WITHOUT PUNITIVE CONSEQUENCES.

OUR PURPOSE FOR LEAVING ONTARIO WAS TO ESTABLISH A PERMANENT RESIDENCE IN THE BAHAMAS. ELAINE HAD WANTED TO DO THIS FROM WHEN SHE WAS A YOUNG GIRL. SHE HAD FIRST VISITED THE BAHAMAS IN 1973, THE YEAR INDEPENDENCE WAS OBTAINED FROM GREAT BRITAIN. WE DID NOT 'FREE' ONTARIO; RATHER WE SIMPLY MOVED TO THE

(P.B)

BAHAMAS PRIMARILY FOR PERSONAL REASONS. IT WAS OBVIOUS THAT A SIGNIFICANT RECESSION WAS ABOUT TO IMPACT CANADA AND WE WANTED TO SELL OUT HOME WHILE IT WAS STILL POSSIBLE TO DO SO. OUR PRESENCE IN ONTARIO WAS NOT REQUIRED TO FACILITATE THE INVESTIGATION RELATED TO MY PRIVATE INVESTIGATION LICENCES.

AFTER ARRIVING IN THE BAHAMAS, WE DID ESTABLISH A HOME OFFICE AND WORKED TOGETHER FOR THE VERY FIRST TIME. I ALSO BEGAN TO DEAL WITH TERRY GRANTIS FOR THE FIRST TIME AS WELL.

EXTREME AND I DID ATTEMPTS TO CONFIRM THE VALIDITY OF AS MUCH OF THE INFORMATION PROVIDED BY TERRY GRANTIS TO THE EXTENT THIS WAS POSSIBLE VIA THE CLIENT'S THEMSELVES (INTEGRITY TESTS) AFFIDAVITS, CERTIFIED COPIES OF DOCUMENTS AND PHOTOCOPIES OF DOCUMENTS WHERE APPLICABLE BUT WE WERE NOT ABLE TO DO SO IN RELATION TO THE VAST MAJORITY OF CASES AS WE HAD NO STANDING OR MEANS TO DO SO.

SOME OF OUR ATTEMPTS TO CONFIRM THIS DATA INVOLVED WELL-INTENTIONED BUT 'BONK SIDE' CONTACT WITH VARIOUS MEDIA, THE R.C.M.P., AND CORRESPONDENCE WITH VARIOUS CANADIAN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS, INCLUDING THE PRIME MINISTER, EXPRESSING CONCERN WITH RESPECT TO A CONFIRMED OFFSHORE COMPANY,

SUPERSTAR LTD., AND CERTAIN NAMED PROMINENT CANADIAN DIRECTORS. WE ALSO REQUESTED SOME CONFIRMATION OR ACTION IN REGARD TO NAMED ACCOUNT INFORMATION THAT HAD BEEN PROVIDED TO US RELATED TO SEVERAL OTHER CANADIAN SUBJECTS. WE ATTEMPTED TO DEAL WITH THIS INFORMATION IN A RESPONSIBLE, CONFIDENTIAL MANNER, BASED ON WHAT WAS A GENUINE BELIEF WE HAD AT THE TIME. WE WERE OPEN WITH THIS INFORMATION WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT AND OTHER OFFICIALS.

IT WAS NOT UNTIL WE WERE ADVISED IN EARLY APRIL 2009 THAT CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS HAD BEEN INVESTIGATED IN ONTARIO THAT WE BECAME AWARE OF ANY CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS OR CHARGES.

WE SURRENDERED OURSELVES ON OR ABOUT APRIL 9, 2009 AFTER RETURNING FROM THE BAHAMAS WITH RESPECT TO THESE MATTERS AND SUBSEQUENTLY RETURNED TO ONTARIO ON TWO FURTHER OCCASIONS. WE WERE RELEASED ON A FORM OF PERSONAL BAIL AND WERE NOT REQUIRED TO SURRENDER OUR PASSPORTS. WE SIMPLY RETURNED TO THE BAHAMAS ON EACH OCCASION WHERE ALL OUR POSSESSIONS WERE THEN LOCATED. ULTIMATELY, WE DID NOT RETURN TO ONTARIO TO APPEAR FOR TRIAL ON OR ABOUT OCTOBER 18, 2010. WE DID NOT MAKE THE DECISION NOT TO FIGHT UNTIL AFTER MEETING WITH OUR CANADIAN LAWYERS IN NASSAU IN AUGUST 2010.

I OBVIOUSLY KNOW THE BASIC ELEMENTS OF FRAUDULENT BEHAVIOR IN PRINCIPLE FROM

LIFE EXPERIENCE, EDUCATION, MY PROFESSIONAL CAREER IN LAW ENFORCEMENT AS A CRIMINAL INVESTIGATOR AND FROM ATTAINING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN CRIMINOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

DESPITE THIS BACKGROUND, AND PRIOR TO CHARGES BEING LAID IN APRIL 2009, I NEVERTHELESS VIGOROUSLY DEFENDED WHAT LITTLE KNOWLEDGE AND INVOLVEMENT I HAD WITH ASSET INVESTIGATIONS - PARTICULARLY AFTER MOVING TO THE BAHAMAS - BECAUSE I KNEW THAT SUPPLYING FALSE INFORMATION OF ANY KIND THAT WAS LIKELY TO BE USED IN A LEGAL PROCEEDING WAS WRONG. IT WAS ABSURD TO ME TO EVEN HAVE IT SUGGESTED THAT I WOULD ENGAGE IN SUCH BEHAVIOUR AND I WAS PERSONALLY APPALLED AT EVEN A HINT THAT I MIGHT DO THIS. AT THE SAME TIME, CLAINE AND I HAD NEVER DISCUSSED THIS ISSUE TO MY MEMORY AT ALL AND CERTAINLY NEVER AGREED THAT IT WOULD BE A GOOD IDEA OR WISE BUSINESS PRACTICE TO DELIBERATELY ENGAGE IN FRAUDULENT BEHAVIOUR BY PROVIDING CLIENTS WITH FALSE FINANCIAL DATA. OBVIOUSLY, IT WOULD BE BOTH UNLAWFUL AND STUPID TO ENGAGE IN THIS ACTIVITY.

Basically, I had come to trust Claine's experience and judgement in this regard and never suspected or believed for one moment that she herself would be a party to such behaviour. I trusted her.

(10)

THEN AND I TRUST HER NOW, BUT I ALSO
KNEW NOW, IN RETROSPECT, THAT MY SUBJECTIVE
EVALUATION OF HER CHARACTER LED ME TO OVERLOOK
WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN CRITICAL QUESTIONS CONCERNING
THE DATA ITSELF AS WELL AS THE CHARACTER OF THE
PERSON ELENE WAS RECEIVING IT FROM

I HAD LITTLE INVOLVEMENT WITH CASES
OF THIS KIND BEFORE MOVING TO THE BAHAMAS
AND, BASED ON THE TRUST THAT HAD DEVELOPED
BETWEEN ELENE AND I DURING THE PERIOD
2002 TO 2008 TO WHICH MY ASSESSMENT OF
HER CHARACTER, I THOUGHT THE NOTION THAT
SHE OR WE WERE SUPPLYING FALSE INFORMATION
WAS PREPOSTEROUS.

AFTER CHARGES WERE LAID IN APRIL 2009,
IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN CONCEIVABLY IMPOSSIBLE TO
MAINTAIN THIS MINDSET AND YET, FOR A COMPLICATED
VARIETY OF REASONS THAT APPEARED JUSTIFIABLE
TO ME AT THE TIME, I CONTINUED TO ENGAGE IN
AND DEFEND THE BEHAVIOR. WHEN I SHOULD HAVE
STOPPED DOING SO AND PREVAILED UPON ELENE
TO DO THE SAME, ~~Hindsight~~ CLEARLY INDICATES
THAT WE SHOULD HAVE KNOWN AND SHOULD HAVE STOPPED.

UNFORTUNATELY, AT THE TIME WE DID NOT
HAVE THE BENEFIT OF ~~Hindsight~~ WHICH IS
GENERALLY 20/20, BUT PARTLY ONLY FORESIGHT
WHICH CAN BE BECAUSE GIVEN AVAILABLE
INFORMATION, BUT CERTAINLY IS MORE PRONE TO
ERROOR IF DATA IS EQUIVOCAL OR NOT EASILY VERIFIABLE.

(P.17)

(1)

IF THE EXPRESSION THE 'FOG OF WAR' IS
DEEMED TO BE ACCEPTABLE AND RECOGNIZED
AS BASIS FOR EXPLAINING TRAGIC MISJUDGEMENTS
AND ERRORS IN MILITARY SITUATIONS, THE
EXPRESSION THE 'FOG OF INFORMATION' SHOULD
BE DEEMED TO BE AN ACCEPTABLE AND
RECOGNIZED BASIS FOR EXPLAINING OTHERWISE
IRRATIONAL MISJUDGEMENT AND ERRORS
IN INVESTIGATION SITUATIONS. I DO NOT MEAN
HOWEVER THAT THIS SHOULD BE A BASIS TO NECESSARILY
EXPLAIN away (OR FORGIVE SUCH MISJUDGEMENT)
AND ERRORS.

AFTER ALL, IT IS BELIEF IN FACT OR
CIRCUMSTANCES, EVEN IF THEY ARE NOT CORRECT,
THAT CAUSES DECISIONS TO BE MADE THAT IN
Hindsight may seem irrational.

I BELIEVED AT THE TIME - OBVIOUSLY
WITH HINDSIGHT, ERRONEOUSLY - THAT BASED
ON INFORMATION WE HAD BEEN PROVIDED THAT
WE WERE ABLE TO CONFIRM RELATED TO A
COMPANY NAMED SUPERSTAR LTD, AS WELL AS
OTHER DATA WE WERE ABLE TO CONFIRM
THAT WE WERE BEING FALSELY TARGETED TO
PROTECT THE INTERESTS OF CERTAIN PROMINENT
CANADIANS TO FORCE US TO TERMINATE
CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS. ILLUMINATING AS THIS
BELIEF MAY SEEM TO BE NOW, IT WAS VERY
REAL TO US AT THE TIME.

END

I BELIEVE THAT NO ONE DELIBERATELY SETS OUT IN LIFE TO APPEAR TO BE FOOLISH IN RELATION TO ANYTHING, CERTAINLY NOT TO HAVE SUCH FOOLISHNESS EXPOSED PUBLICLY AND, MORE IMPORTANTLY, CERTAINLY NOT TO HAVE SUCH FOOLISHNESS ACTUALLY RESULT IN VERY PUBLIC CONDEMNATION, PROSECUTION AND INCARCERATION.

THIS, IT WAS A GROSS MISJUDGEMENT BASED ON WHAT WE NOW KNOW TO HAVE BEEN IRRATIONAL BELIEFS FOR ELLIOTT AND I TO CONTINUE DEALING WITH ASSET INFORMATION THAT WE KNEW HAD BEEN RECOGNISED TO BE FALSE DATA. IT WAS NOT RATIONAL FOR US TO CONTINUE BUT WE NEVERTHELESS DID. CONTINUING THE BEHAVIOUR IN QUESTION, QUITE APART FROM ANYTHING ELSE, MAKES ELLIOTT AND I LOOK EXTREMELY FOOLISH, EVEN STUPID.

WHETHER OUR EARLIER OR CONTINUING BELIEF IN THE VALIDITY OF THE DATA SHOULD BE CATEGORISED AS WILFUL BLINDNESS, DENIAL, DENIAL OR DISSOCIATION, THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT AFTER APRIL 9, 2009, THERE SHOULD HAVE BEEN NO RATIONAL DEFENSIVE BASIS FOR CONTINUING TO CONDUCT AFTER INVESTIGATIONS AS WE HAD BEEN DOING. UNPREDICTABLY, EVEN AFTER THIS DATE, THERE WAS NO FORMAL DECISION OR AGREEMENT MADE BY ELLIOTT AND I TO CONTINUE THIS BEHAVIOUR. RATHER, WE SIMPLY CARRIED ON IN THE WAY WE HAD BEEN DOING.

(19)

REGARDLESS, I AM A RESPONSIBLE PERSON AND
ULTIMATELY RECOGNIZE THAT MY BEHAVIOR
BECAUSE NEITHER LOGICAL OR JUSTIFIABLE.

BY MY ACTIONS, I HAVE CAUSED FINANCIAL
HARM AND LOSS TO MANY INDIVIDUALS
DESPITE ANY EARLIER LAUDABLE MOTIVATION
TO THE CONTRARY.

I CHOSE TO PLEAD GUILTY TO ACKNOWLEDGE
AND RECOGNIZE MY UNDENIABLE RESPONSIBILITY
FOR BEHAVIOR THAT, IN Hindsight — AND
SHOULD IN FORESIGHT — NOT HAVE OCCURRED.

FURTHER, I HAD NO INTENT TO PUT THE UNITED
STATES GOVERNMENT TO ADDITIONAL EXPENSE, WASTE
SCARCE COURT RESOURCES OR IMPOSE FURTHER
DEMANDS ON VICTIMS AND WITNESSES WITH
THE OUTCOME OF A TRIAL WOULD NOT LIKELY BE
IN DOUBT.

I AM PRESENTLY EXPERIENCING, NOT SURPRISINGLY,
A VARIETY OF NEGATIVE EMOTIONS, INCLUDING ANGER
(AT MYSELF AND TERRY GRONKIE), REGRET, SHAME,
EMBARRASSMENT AND HUMILIATION.

I FORGIVE MYSELF FOR NOT
DECODIFYING THE FALSE NATURE OF THE DATA AND
CONTINUING TO PROVIDE THIS INFORMATION TO
CLIENTS PARTICULARLY AFTER APRIL 9, 2009. I
AM ALSO ANGRY FOR PAYING TERRY GRONKIE
ANYTHING, ESPECIALLY AFTER APRIL 9, 2009, FOR
WHAT WE SHOULD HAVE RECOGNIZED AS FALSE INFORMATION.

(over)

(20)

WITHOUT QUESTION, IT HAD BEEN EXPECTED AND WE BELIEVED THAT TERRY WOULD PROVIDE ONLY ACCURATE INFORMATION. OTHERWISE, THERE WAS NO OTHER REASON TO PAY HIM ANYTHING AT ALL. WE DID NOT WANT OR NEED HIM TO PROVIDE FALSE INFORMATION. WE COULD HAVE DONE WITHOUT HIM AND FABRICATED THE INFORMATION OURSELVES. IF THAT HAD BEEN OUR INTENT, WE DID NOT DO THIS, HOWEVER, AND THESE PAYMENTS TO HIM FOR WHAT WE NOW KNOW TO BE FALSE INFORMATION CLEARLY REFLECTS OUR OWN CONTINUING, ALTHOUGH IRRATIONAL, BELIEF IN THE VERACITY OF THE DATA DESPITE WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN RECOGNIZED AS EVIDENCE TO THE CONTRARY.

I AM NOT ANGRY WITH ELAINE. I BELIEVE BOTH SHE AND I SHARED A SUBJECTIVE LEADING TO IRRATIONAL BELIEFS BASED ON A VARIETY OF NOW CLEARLY UNJUSTIFIABLE CIRCUMSTANCES. MY ROLE AS HER HUSBAND WAS TO SUPPORT AND PROTECT HER, A ROLE THAT BECAUSE OF OUR PERSONAL RELATIONSHIP, LED TO A LOSS OF OBJECTIVITY AND TUNNEL VISION IN OUR BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP. THIS INTERFERED WITH WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN MORE CRITICAL DUE DILIGENCE ENQUIRIES.

I ~~SHOULD~~ ALLOWED MY PERSONAL MOTIVATIONS AND CARING FOR ELAINE TO OVERRIDE AND IGNORE MORE IMPORTANT PRINCIPLES.

P.21

I AM PERSONALLY SICKENED THAT MY BEHAVIOUR RESULTED IN HARM TO OTHERWISE TRUSTING INDIVIDUALS AND I AM MORE SORRY THAN WORDS ALONE CAN EXPRESS FOR BEING A PARTY TO THIS BREACH OF TRUST.

I HAVE MANAGED SINGLEHANDEDLY, WITHOUT THE SLIGHTEST INITIAL INTENT OR PLEA TO DO SO, TO VIRTUALLY DESTROY IN THE LAST FIVE(S) YEARS ALL OF THE ACADEMIC, PROFESSIONAL, SELF-EMPLOYMENT AND PERSONAL ACHIEVEMENT OF THE FIRST SIXTY (60) YEARS OF MY LIFE INCLUDING MY PERSONAL REPUTATION AND CREDIBILITY. I WOULD HAVE BEEN HARD-PRESSED TO HAVE ENGINEERED A SIMILAR NEGATIVE OUTCOME IF I HAD HIRED A SKILLED CONSULTANT TO ACHIEVE THE SAME RESULT.

I SINCERELY APOLOGIZE TO THIS COURT AND PARTICULARLY TO THOSE AMERICANS AND CANADIANS WHO WERE VICTIMIZED BY MY BEHAVIOR.

I ALSO APOLOGIZE TO THE TORONTO POLICE SERVICE, THE ONTARIO PROVINCIAL POLICE — PARTICULARLY CONSTABLE BARBARA HOATH — AND THE PRIVATE INVESTIGATION INDUSTRY BOTH IN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES FOR ANY CRITICISM OF THEM THAT MAY HAVE RESULTED FROM MY ACTIONS AND FORMER BELIEFS AS EXPRESSED IN WEBSITE: WWW.SUPERSTARCORRUPTION.COM. THE FAULT IS MINE ALONE AND SHOULD NOT REFLECT NEGATIVELY ON THESE ORGANIZATIONS OR PERSONS.

FINALLY, IN THIS REGARD, I APOLOGIZE TO ALL THOSE CANADIANS I NAMED AS DIRECTORS OF SUPERSTAR LTD.

(22)

Based on my original belief in the veracity of the information, all of it fabricated and provided by Terry Grannis and/or the source we believed to be within the Canada Revenue Agency (C.R.A.).

I will do everything I can to wholly or partially to the belated possibility reimburses the funds unlawfully obtained by my behavior despite the obvious challenges I will face in that regard. While the best marginal employment prospects post-release are likely to be available I have given considerable thought to the creation of a non-profit foundation to raise funds for the purpose of reimbursing victims in both the United States and Canada. I intend to do this through public speaking, writing and interviewing enhancement following whatever period of incarceration may be imposed.

Furthermore, as you might imagine, I am very motivated to co-operate with and do whatever possible to ensure that Terry Grannis is returned to the jurisdiction for prosecution. I owe the DuPucios individual absolutely no loyalty or protection whatsoever. Basically, both Eileen and I allowed him, indecisively, to take improper and criminal advantage of the subjective nature of his long history (14 years) personal relationship with Eileen, ten (10) years of which occurred before I personally had occasion to deal with him.

Let me be plain in this regard. While

(25)

GROUTIS NEEDS TO BE BROUGHT TO JUSTICE FOR THE
CRIMES HE HIMSELF COMMITTED IN HIS OWN RIGHT,
I AM SOLELY RESPONSIBLE FOR MAKING THE INAPPROPRIATE
DECISIONS I DID TO INTELLIGENTLY AND SUBSEQUENTLY,
AFTER APRIL 9, 2009, DEAL WITH HIM. I SHOULD
NOT HAVE DONE SO AND THE FAULT AND
RESPONSIBILITY FOR DOING SO IS MINE ALONE REGARDLESS
OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES.

I LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH PEOPLE
ALONG BRIAN RUTTER AND /OR OTHERS IF FEASIBLE
TO, HOPEFULLY, BY WAY OF SOME 'STING' OR
OTHER ENFORCEMENT ACTION, ARRANGE FOR THE
ARREST AND RETURN OF THIS INDIVIDUAL.

I HAVE NO DOUBT THAT TERRY GROUTIS IS AND
WILL CONTINUE TO TRICK AND DEFRAUD OTHER
INDIVIDUALS AND PRIVATE INVESTIGATORS AT ESTATE
AND I ALLOWED HIM TO DO TO US. I SUSPECT THAT
HE IS GLOATING NARCISSISTICALLY IN GREECE ABOUT
OUR SITUATION AND HOW HE OUTSMARRED A FORMER
POLICE OFFICER AND A WOMAN HE USED TO CALL
THAT HE LOVED AND RESPECTED MORE THAN HIS OWN
MOTHER. THIS IN ITSELF, IS REASON ENOUGH FOR ME
TO ATTEMPT PUT A STOP TO HIS SOCIO PATHIC BEHAVIOR FOREVER.
MY FEELINGS OF FOOLISHNESS ARE ABSOLUTELY PALPABLE.
I STUPIDLY IGNORED AND ABDIPLICATED MY OWN
PERSONAL SENSE OF CAUTIOUS SELF-PROTECTION INHERENT
IN THE PARASE 'CAVEAT EMPTOR' AND HURT MYSELF,
ELAINE AND OTHERS IN DOING SO.

(24)

MY ONLY CONSOLING THOUGHT IS THAT I AM NOT ALONE IN MY FOOLISHNESS, AS I KNOW I AM JOINING A SELECT BUT VERY LARGE GROUP OF OTHER INDIVIDUALS, WHO HAVE SIMILARLY BEEN RESPONSIBLE LARGELY FOR THEIR OWN HUMILIATION AND EMBARRASSMENT IN THIS AND MANY OTHER SITUATIONS INVOLVING FALSE AND FABRICATED DATA.

AS EARLIER STATED, I AM NOT SPECIAL AND REQUEST NO PARTICULAR CONSIDERATION, LENIENCY OR MITIGATION FOR MYSELF PERSONALLY. I ACCEPT AND ACKNOWLEDGE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR MY BEHAVIOR DESPITE VARIOUS CIRCUMSTANCES I COULD OTHERWISE HAVE CITED IN AN ATTEMPT TO MAKE EXCUSES FOR MY ACTIONS. I ASK ONLY FOR A MODICUM OF UNDERSTANDING, NOT SYMPATHY. I HAVE CONFIDENCE THAT THE COURT WILL ARRIVE AT AN APPROPRIATELY WISE AND JUST DECISION IN MY CASE. I HAVE ALWAYS DEALT WITH MATTERS BASED ON THEIR OWN MERITS IN THE PAST AND I WILL NOT BEG FOR ANY SPECIAL CONSIDERATION NOW.

I DO, HOWEVER, REPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT THE COURT EXTEND WHATEVER SPECIAL CONSIDERATION, LENIENCY OR MITIGATION MAY BE POSSIBLE AND APPROPRIATE TO MY DAU~~S~~LE AND CO-DEFENDANT ELAINE WHITE IN LIGHT OF HER MORE ADVANCED AGE AND, ACCURATELY, HER MORE LIMITED APPRECIATION AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE CONCEPT OF CRIMINAL FRAUD. FURTHERMORE, ELAINE HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OR CONTENT OF THE

P.25

(25)

SuperStarCorruption.com website. I associated her name with the site for 'Pro Forma' Reasons only. If necessary and possible, I request that the court add any period of mitigated sentence reduction to my disposition.

I also make this request because contrary to any of my intentions and I believe that I would never hurt her, I believe that my subjective, uncritical and irrational decisions led to my participation in behaviour that should never have occurred and that these decisions ultimately hurt her when this could and should have been prevented. By attempting to support and protect her, I actually unintentionally caused her preventable and avoidable harm.

in Recreational terms, I was once a proud, outwardly confident and successful individual leading a largely honourable life reflecting considerable dedication to public service and private dedication, despite challenges, to my family. I had committed myself to serving and protecting the citizens of Toronto through my employment with the Toronto Police Service.

I no longer, however, feel pride about myself to the slightest degree, having destroyed my former history of academic, employment and personal achievement and whatever good name I may once have had through my own foolish and indefensible behaviour. My father, mother and sister, if alive, would be horrified and ashamed of my irrational actions. I know that it will be impossible for me to fully recover from this despite the mere will be an indelible private mark left on my soul and conscience (in addition to a public record condemning my behaviour).

(27)

I CAN ONLY PRAY THAT MY WIFE, CHILDREN
AND OTHERS WILL HAVE SUFFICIENT GRACE AND
FORGIVENESS IN THEIR HEARTS TO UNDERSTAND
AND HELP ME WALK THROUGH THE PERSONAL
CHALLENGES THAT PREDISPOSED ME TO BEHAVE
SO REPREHENSIBLY AND THAT WILL ALLOW THE
RECOVERY OF A MODicum OF SELF-RESPECT
AND REINTEGRATION INTO SOCIETY. GIVEN
MY AGE AND CIRCUMSTANCES, I AM NOT
CONFIDENT AT THE MOMENT ABOUT THIS
PROCESS BUT, NEVERTHELESS, I INTEND TO TRY
TO ACHIEVE SOME MODest REDEMPTION. I
AM ABSOLUTELY PERSUASIVE RESPONSIBLE
FOR CREATING THIS MOST IRONIC, HUMILIATING
AND SURREAL SITUATION AND I AM MORE
SORRY FOR HAVING DONE SO THAN WORDS
CAN EXPRESS.