

No. 25-2423

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

Andrew Chien

Plaintiff – Appellant

v.

**Patricia Tolliver Giles; Rossie D Alston, Jr.; J. Harvie Wilkinson III;
James Andrew Wynn; Pamela A. Harris; Robert B. King; Albert Diaz
Defendants - Appellees**

**Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Virginia
1:25-cv-1232- LMB-WBP**

INFORMAL BRIEF

Of

Plaintiff -Appellant

**Andrew Chien (Pro Se)
665 Ellsworth Avenue
New Haven, CT 06511
Tel: 203-4353783
Jcs23@yahoo.com**

Date: December 15, 2025

| CONTENTS | pages |
|--|--------|
| I. Contents | ii |
| II. Authorities | iii-vi |
| III. Informal Brief | |
| STATEMENT OF SUBJECT MATTER AND APPELLATE JURISDICTION..1 | |
| STATEMENT OF ISSUES | 2 |
| STATEMENT OF THE CASE..... | 4 |
| STATEMENT OF THE FACTS..... | 9 |
| Part 1. Grogan’s Activities | 9 |
| Part 2. Acts of RICO in First Stage..... | 22 |
| Part 3. Financial Institution Fraud and Falsified Corporation Identities | 31 |
| Part 4. VA-CHBM Compares with CHBM..... | 35 |
| SUMMARY of ARGUMENT..... | 41 |
| ARGUMENT | 41 |
| A. The Subject Errors Committed by Virginia Debt Collection..... | 41 |
| B. Grogan’s Arbitrary Detention of Chien with Abductive Nature..... | 43 |
| C. Grogan Aided Freer’s Fraud from Case CL.12-485 to Securities Laws..... | 45 |
| D. The Importance of Allegations under RICO Acts | 50 |
| E. Credit of Later Discovery Allowed for Chien’s Future Countersuits..... | 54 |
| CONCLUSIONS..... | 60 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| Certification of Compliance | 61 |
| Certification of Service..... | 61 |

AUTHORITIES

Cases

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Freer v Chien et al. CL 12-485 | see generally |
| Andrew Chien v Grogan, et al. 1:13cv0993..... | 1, 4, 9, 51 |
| Appeal 13-8017 | 2, 5, 56, 57 |
| Appeal 18-1346..... | 2 |
| Andrew Chien v. Grogan et al. 1:17cv 358 | 3, 6, 36, 56, 61 |
| Appeal 17-1944 | 3, 13 |
| Andrew Chien v Commonwealth et al. 1:17cv 677..... | 3, 6, 56 |
| Appeal 18-1523 | 56 |
| Appeal Case: 22-1004 Chien v Robbins & Rockwell et al. | 3 |
| Andrew Chien v, LeClairRyan et al 3:19cv135 (HCH) | 3, 50, 51, 52 |
| Andrew Chien v UnitedLex et al. 1:25cv 2041..... | 55, 56 |
| Cadle Co. v. Flanagan, 271 F. Supp. 2d 379 (D. Conn. 2003) | 25 |
| Heintz v. Jenkins, 514 U.S. 291 (1995) | 43 |
| National Bank of Commerce v. All American Assurance Co., | |
| 583 F.2d 1295 (5th Cir. 1978) | 16 |
| Stump v. Sparkman, 435 U.S. 349 (1978) | 5 |

Thompson v. Clark, 142 S. Ct. 1332 (2022) 44

Federal Statutes

U.S. Constitution

Tenth Amendment 41

Due Process Clauses (5th & 14th Amendments) 46, 56

11 U.S.C. § 362 (Automatic stay) 44

11 U.S.C. § 1127(b) 29

15 U.S.C. § 78j (Exchange Act § 10(b)) 49

15 U.S.C. § 78n (Exchange Act § 14 Proxy)17, 24, 32, 37

Section 13 & 15(d), Exchange Act..... 50

15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6)(D), (F)43

15 U.S.C. § 1692d(1) 43

15 U.S.C. § 1692i(a)(1) 41

FDCPA.....2,,51, 56

18 U.S.C. § 1028A (Aggravated identity theft)49

18 U.S.C. § 1350 (SOX certification) 48

18 U.S.C. § 1512 (Witness tampering)12, 52,53

18 U.S.C. § 1513(e) (Whistleblower retaliation) 25, 50, 52, 53

18 U.S.C. § 1951 (Interference with commerce) 52, 53

18 U.S.C. § 1956 (Money laundering) 52

| | |
|--|------------------|
| 18 U.S.C. §§ 2314–2315 (Stolen goods/securities) | 52, 53 |
| 18 U.S.C. § 4001(a) (Arbitrary detention) | 43 |
| 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961–1968 (RICO) .1, 8, 9,22, 23, 25,32,41,46, 49,50,52,53,56,59,60 | |
| § 1961 | .8, 23,25 49, 52 |
| § 1962(a)–(d) | 53, 54 |
| 28 U.S.C. § 1291 | 2 |
| 28 U.S.C. § 1331 | 2 |
| 28 U.S.C. § 1343 | 2 |
| 28 U.S.C. § 1367 | 2 |
| 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2), (b)(5) | 24, 29 |
| 28 U.S.C. § 1738 (Full faith & credit) | 15 |
| 28 U.S.C. § 1915A | 5 |
| 28 U.S.C. § 2007(a) (No imprisonment for debt) | 44 |
| 42 U S C §1983..... | .2,51, 56 |

Federal Regulations

| | |
|-------------------------------|----|
| 12 C.F.R. § 239.29(a) | 33 |
| 17 C.F.R. § 240.17Ad-15 | 34 |

Virginia State Statutes

| | |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Va. Code § 8.01-247 | 42 |
| Va. Code § 8.01-262.5(a) | 9 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Va. Code § 8.01-506C | 9 |
| Va. Code §§ 8.01-507 & 509 & 615 | 15 |
| Va. Code § 8.01-609 | 8 |
| Va. Code § 8.01-612 | 10 |
| Va. Code § 18.2-22(a) (Conspiracy) | 52 |
| Va. Code § 18.2-47(A) (Abduction) | 8, 43, 52 |
| Va. Code § 18.2-59 (Extortion) | 59 |
| Va. Code § 18.2-108 (Larceny) | 20 |
| Va. Code § 18.2-168 (Forgery) | 52 |
| Va. Code § 18.2-213 (Unlawful debt collection) | 43 |
| Va. Code § 18.2-434 (Perjury) | 52 |
| Va. Code § 18.2-436 (Inducing false statements) | 31 |
| Other Authorities | |
| Nevada Revised Statutes § 78.379 | 32 |
| CHBM By-Laws (Officer signatures required) | 33, 34 |
| SEC FOIA Correspondence..... | 34 |
| SEC Revocation Orders (USChina Venture I & II) | 38 |

STATEMENT OF SUBJECT MATTER AND APPELLATE JURISDICTION

This appeal was raised on the order dated 11/18/2025, to reconsider the merits of Case 1:13cv0993, Chien v. Grogan et al. The case concerns the unauthorized detention of Chien under the orders of William K. Grogan (“Grogan”), Commissioner in Chancery of the Chesterfield Circuit Court, conspired with lawyers including Andrew K Clark (“Clark”) of LeClairRyan (“LCR,” now dissolved), and creditor Richard J Freer (“Freer”). The unauthorized detention or abduction began in 2013 and lasted for about 38 months, until 06/27/2016. It constituted a critical part of the scheme designed to permanently destroy Chien’s life, business, properties, and reputation.

Grogan, a private lawyer (B4) whose office is currently closed (B6), was acting as an agent in a civil case investigation under assignment (B5). If a judge does not issue an assignment, Grogan has no role in the court. He is not a salaried employee; instead, he receives payment from clients (Virginia Code §8.01-619.1). No judge ever assigned Grogan to engage in debt collection in Virginia. Through self-dealing, Grogan improperly assumed the functions of both a falsified judge and a falsified prosecutor to obtain the unjust-enrichment from Chien. The Virginia debt collection proceedings had no jurisdiction, particularly because Chien is a Connecticut resident with no property in Virginia. Moreover, debt collection proceedings remain ongoing

in Connecticut (B3) to this day.

Grogan is not a member of law enforcement and has no authority to initiate or preside over a criminal case. Nevertheless, he conspired with police under the pretext of consumer debt collection for his unjust-enrichment. Grogan engaged in acts constituting a Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organization (RICO) together with Freer and Clark and other lawyers from LCR. Because Grogan's fraud was never uncovered, Freer continued expanding falsified corporate identities and occupying the seized commercial assets, including those of the third parties under Chien's custody, during Chien's unauthorized detention in Virginia. This misconduct extended into Connecticut, and to the falsified corporation stock registration in U S Securities Exchange Commission ("SEC") to the present day.

The purpose of this appeal is to confirm the merits under jurisdiction of "28U.S.C§1331" "28U.S.C §1343", "42U.S.C §1983", "28U.S.C§1367", and the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA"), codified as 15 U.S.C §1692-1692n, and RICO codified as 18 U.S.C §1961-1968. The Notice of Appeal was filed timely. This court, therefore, has appellate jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C §1291.

STATEMENT OF ISSUES

a) In Case 1:13cv993 Chien v. Grogan and LCR, and Appeals 13-8017 & 18-1346, did the judges fail to recognize that Chien's illegal incarceration by Grogan

amounted to abduction?

b) All of Grogan's orders (Appendix B) were submitted in Case 1:17cv358, and Appeal 17-1944. These orders failed to acknowledge that, during the abduction, Grogan, Clark, and Freer conspired to forge a CHBM stock certificate for Freer and then stole CHBM's cash (Appendix C).

c) From January to September 2023, Chien was wrongly subjected to a restrictive filing order after presenting evidence that Freer extended the fraud from Grogan's orders by falsifying corporate stock registration with the SEC (Appendix D) in the reopening of Case 1:17cv358.

d) In Case Cl.12-485 (Appendix A), Freer committed court fraud involving subject error, evidence fraud, and due process violations to obtain a default judgment. These issues were disclosed in Case 1:17cv677, appeals 18-1523, and 22-1004 against Hon. Frederick G. Rockwell III ("Rockwell"). They also were raised in a pending case 3:19cv135 (HCH), Richmond Division, in which Freer, Grogan and Clark together listed as defendants, but the errors have not been recognized in the judgments.

e) In Case 1:17cv358, since April 2025, Chien filed several motions including one dated 10/14/2025 to invalidate all of Grogan's orders (Appendix B). Hon. Patricia Tolliver Giles ("Giles") refused to load the motion documents into the

record, which is more serious judicial fraud than merely to deny them.

f) The issue is whether Chien has a constitutional right to claim compensation for his losses, including fiduciary interests in third-party assets under his custody, despite suffering a time bar on damages, and whether his long-term experience of judicial misconduct should allow consideration of later discovery in support of his claim.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. Plaintiff-Appellant Andrew Chien (“Chien”) in the underlying case 1:13cv0993 to attack the unauthorized detention during the period when the US Bankruptcy Court, New Haven Division, already accepted Chien’s personal bankruptcy filing (B10-B26). The bankruptcy court told Freer’s lawyers and Grogan that Chien should be released because the offense is “civil contempt” (B28), indicating Chien had no criminal offense charge. However, Grogan, LCR, and Freer refused to release Chien considering Freer’s default judgment debt, obtained from the Chesterfield Circuit Court under case CL.12-485, Freer v Chien, which Chien alleged was full of court fraud. Consequently, Chien filed Adversary Case 13-03037 against Freer dated 08/02/2013 (Dkt 10, B13) in the bankruptcy court (the bankruptcy case was closed on 12/12/2013, following Chien’s motion, after he failed to obtain an assigned attorney).

Thus, under the fully paid filing fee Chien initiated Case 1:13cv993 with filings of both Complain and a writ of habeas corpus. The judge did not process the writ of habeas corpus, and rejected to issue summons for defendants. On 11/05/2013, after the court received a report that Chien personally served the copy of complaint to defendants. The judge did not take action to issue the summons. On the contrary, on 11/06/2013 under 28 U.S.C §1915A, he dismissed the case. Further, he asserted defendants Grogan and LCR had no liabilities under 42 U.S.C §1983 because they were private. This judgement was wrong, because the rule 28 U.S.C §1915A(c) limits the civil complaint filing for those under the government's criminal procedure while Chien had no criminal allegation at all (jail records: B34-B35), and Grogan and LCR acted under the color of the state law and deserved being sued under 42 U.S.C §1983.

2. In this court, Chien filed appeal under Recording No. 13-8017. In April, 2014, this court made a wrong ruling as stated:

“We affirm the district court’s dismissal of the claims against Grogan in his capacity as a Commissioner in Chancery on alternative ground ***While Grogan was a state actor***, he is entitled to judicial immunity for actions taken within the scope of his official duties. See *Stump v Sparkman*, 435 U.S. 349,362(1978) (defining factors used to determine whether an action is a judicial act)” (adding emphases.)

After this ruling. Grogan, LCR, and Freer expanded to detain Chien for triple time until 06/27/2016. This order has been used as evidence to dismiss Chien’s

complaints in case 1:17cv 358 Chien v Grogan et al., 1:17 cv 677, Chien v Commonwealth after Chien was released to count the unauthorized detention. Although Chien has never been convicted, Freer, either personally or through his attorneys, repeatedly cited Chien's previously unsuccessful cases and thereby created a legal environment in which Chien's 38-month unauthorized detention appeared lawful. To date, in more than a dozen of Chien's lawsuits related to the 13-year debt collection proceedings, no judgment has acknowledged that Chien's 38-month unauthorized detention was illegal.

3. Following evidence shows that Grogan violated standard criminal procedure:

(a) A magistrate's order dated 03/02/2013 (B7–B8) specified bail for Chien at \$1,000 if Grogan attempted to imprison him again.

(b) A letter to Chien dated 01/07/2014 (B9), issued by the prosecutor or the Chesterfield County Attorney General's Office, instructed that Chien was eligible for a writ of habeas corpus.

(c) Hon. Judge Rockwell, presiding over case CL 12-485, wrote three letters dated 6/12/14, 6/25/14 (this letter served copies to both Grogan and Mr. Clark), 10/21/15 respectively to announce Chesterfield Circuit Court has no jurisdiction identifying subject errors committed in Virginia debt collection (B30–B32).

(d) Judge Rockwell's order dated 05/27/2016 clarified that Chien's detention

was based on civil contempt, not court contempt—indicating that the unauthorized detention was Grogan’s self-dealing, not a lawful court action.

(e) The jail record listed offense code “CON321019” (B35), corresponding to court contempt under Virginia Codes §§ 18.2-456 and 18.2-457, which carry a maximum penalty of only 10 days of unauthorized detention. Misuse of this code constitutes tampering with court records. As a result, Chien’s 1,146-day unauthorized detention from the second arrest was misclassified as a series of misdemeanor offenses, with Chesterfield County bearing the financial burden. This misclassification effectively treated the unauthorized detention as 114 consecutive misdemeanor charges.

4. Chien was incarcerated for 38 months, a term equivalent to the punishment prescribed for a Class 4 felony. Under Virginia Code § 53.1-20(B), convicted persons must be committed to the custody of the Director of the Department of Corrections, who is responsible for ensuring compliance with established legal standards. In Chien’s case, however, his detention bypassed the inmate administration process entirely: there were no allegations, no conviction trial, and no lawful criminal proceedings. Instead, all required judicial procedures were supplanted by Grogan’s unilateral orders, amounting to a form of personal dictatorship. As a result, Chien became a “secret debt inmate”—a virtually

unprecedented human rights disaster within a democratic society.

From the above, it can be concluded that Grogan's tortious conduct against Chien included the character of abduction Virginia Code § 18.2-47(A), or RICO under definition of 18 U S C §1961(1)(A).

5. Every order issued by Grogan—later introduced separately—was made under case CL 12-485, Freer v. Chien et al.

(a) From the procedure, all of Grogan's orders in that matter are invalid because they violated Virginia Code §8.01-609, having been issued without proper reporting or judicial authorization.

(b) Further, this was a civil case, plaintiff Freer could not request criminal punishment, and Grogan, acting under self-motivated corruption, had no power to impose such punishment. By conspiring with sheriffs to misuse police power to unlawfully suppress and retaliate against Chien, Grogan undermined the judicial system and committed abduction.

6. The debt collection proceedings in Virginia, conducted under the shield of Freer v. Chien, were orchestrated as part of a broader RICO scheme. Although Freer appeared as the nominal party, his fraud was consistently tied to Attorney Clark with whom he conspired to obtain the default judgment against Chien on 08/09/2012, for \$1.6 million in principle plus 6% annual interest. Clark and

Grogan sought to profit from Freer's fraud immediately. In practice, Clark and Grogan exploited the court system to obtain judicial misconduct. At the same time, Freer served primarily as a cover for their actions. Thus, scheme functioned less as Grogan's independent enterprise and more as a coordinated mechanism through which Clark, Freer, and Grogan, acting together under RICO enterprises, sought to profit under the guise of Freer's litigation and debt collection. Thus, the correction of case 1:13cv0993 is tied to the discovery of all schemes among Grogan, Freer, Clark, and others hidden behind.

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

Part 1. Grogan's Activities

7. On 1/03/2013, Freer at his lawyer James Byrne of LCR, initiated debt inquiries in Connecticut State Court under Case NNH- CV12-4063717-S(B36).

8. The following day, January 4, 2013, Freer and Mr. Clark conspired with Grogan, under a subject-matter jurisdiction error (Virginia Code §8.01-262.5(a)), to falsely declare that no debt interrogatory had been filed against Chien within the past six months and unlawfully initiated debt collection proceedings in Virginia.

"I certify that I have *not proceeded* against the Judgment Debtor(s) under §8.01-506 within *six(6)* months from this date

01/04/2013

Date

Andrew Clark

Creditor's Attorney" (emphases added)

Mr. Clark completed the Form of (B37) “Summons to Answer Interrogatories-Virginia Code §8.01-506” with false certification. From Virginia Code “§8.01-506C”, Mr. Clark deserved punishment of Class 1 of Misdemeanor. But, on the same day of 01/04/2013, Grogan made self-dealing to conspire with Mr. Clark, without motion procedure and authority, illegally on behalf of Chesterfield Circuit Court to issue order to Virginia Secretary for Summons service for Chien. This action violated Virginia Codes “§8.01-506C” (no motion procedure), and “§8.01-608” (Court did not refer the case to Grogan). Chien did not attend Grogan’s hearing because he lived in Connecticut, in which the same issues was on going.

9. When Chien traveled to VA to attend Chapter 11 hearings of Commonwealth Biotechnologies Incorp (“CBI”), Chien was falsely arrested twice due to the CAPIAS (B41, B49-B51), the first arrest was on 02/28/2013, and released on 3/2/2013, and the second arrest was on 5/8/2013 and released on 6/27/2016. Grogan had no authority to sign arrest warrants due to Virginia Code “§8.01-612”.

10. During the Virginia illegal debt collection, Grogan issued the 15 paper or verbal orders as listed in the following Table 1, which did not include the transportation orders for Chien attending the hearings.

The first CAPIAS issued on 2/25/2013 (B41).

Grogan’s order dated 3/2/2013 (B42-B48) ordered Chien to submit cash not

only for Chien's personal account (in Connecticut Freer twice took cash for total \$109,207 from Chien personal account, one was in March 2013, another was in December 2016), but also for the business accounts.

Table 1. Grogan's Orders

| No. | Date | Purposes |
|-----|------------|---|
| 1 | 01/04/2013 | Initiating VA debt Collection by violating §8.01-506C, |
| 2 | 02/25/2013 | Capias by violating "§8.01-612" and "§ 19.2-71" |
| 3 | 03/02/2013 | Order Chien paying debt by Corporation/personal cash |
| 4 | 03/19/2013 | Capias |
| 5 | 05/10/2013 | Indefinite detention for commercial assets (hostage) |
| 6 | 06/19/2013 | Indefinite detention for commercial assets (hostage) |
| 7 | 02/18/2014 | Making forged stock certificates for Freer |
| 8 | 05/07/2014 | Indefinite detention for commercial assets (hostage), ordered under impersonating as a judge |
| 9 | 06/06/2014 | Indefinite detention for commercial assets (hostage) |
| 10 | 09/18/2014 | Order Island making forged stock certificate for Freer |
| 11 | 12/09/2014 | Hearing records, to affirm Freer as director and president of CHBM, and ordered to seize the laptop of CHBM |
| 12 | 10/31/2014 | Stealing cash & changing control of CHBM & forged Freer stock certificate pledged to LCR through Clark |
| 13 | 03/09/2015 | Indefinite detention for computer systems & intelligent assets (hostage) |
| 14 | 08/31/2015 | detaining to punish Chien in CT Courts' Motion and Appeal |
| 15 | 06/24/2016 | Release order contained sentence for over three years |

The Second CAPIAS issued on 3/19/2013 (B49-B51).

11. The second arrest occurred on May 8, 2013, in the hearing room of the Bankruptcy Court, Richmond Division, during the CBI's hearing. At that time, Chien discovered and verbally objected to the Motion filed on April 26, 2013, by

Freer's counsels—Mr. Vogel, Mr. Clark, and LCR—which sought to misappropriate approximately \$34,000 from CBI to cover Freer's legal fees in Chien's counter-suit in the District Court of Connecticut, Case No. 12CV01378 (AWT). As reflected in the transcript of that hearing (B52–B58), the Judge informed Chien that any objection (B55–B56) must be submitted in writing, with a deadline of May 20, 2013 (B57). This directive caused panic for Freer and Mr. Clark.

Following Chien's arrest, an immediate hearing was held in Grogan's office, attended by Freer and Clark. After Chien was escorted out by police, Freer, Clark, and Grogan engaged in a private discussion. Chien was then subjected to a 72-hour consolidated unauthorized detention in jail. Chien was held alone in a small, windowless room under harsh lamp light. He was denied access to reading and writing materials, which contributed to the deterioration of his memory. After the 72-hour period, he was unable to recall the address of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court and was not permitted to access the documents he had previously brought with him. These actions were intended to prevent Chien from preparing and submitting a written objection, constituting serious violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1512.

12. On 5/10/2013, through a fax (B59), Grogan directly issued the indefinitely unauthorized detention order for commercial assets (B60-B64). In this order he

used the excuse of the “court contempt” (B64). His self-claimed authority to represent the court, was later abandoned because of the objection of Hon. Judge Rockwell.

13. On 6/19/2013, he issued an order (B65-B69) to specify the condition of Chien’s release to exchange the commercial assets of Chien’s relative corporation. There is no any contempt mentioned.

14. Because Chien consistently opposed the illegal Virginia detention, and refused to submit his stock certificates of China Bull Management Inc. (“CHBM,” ticker) and other companies, Grogan, on 2/18/2014, conspired with Freer and Mr. Clark (who ghost-wrote the order) to instruct Island Stock Transfer in Florida to secretly create false stock certificates for several companies (B70-B74). These certificates were intended for Freer to replace Chien, constituting offenses of forged securities, 18 U.S.C. §513 (emphasized in Appeal case 17-1944).

The order was issued in secret, with the condition that it not be served on Chien until completed (Bottom, B73). There were no motion procedure and no judge’s order. Nevertheless, Secretary Judy Worthington falsely certified it as a court order (B74). The judge’s certification (B74) only affirmed Judy Worthington was a truth secretary, not for the verification of the motion’s procedure.

Island did not act immediately but agreed to proceed only for CHBM, on the

condition that Grogan deliver Chien's original certificates. Because among the several companies controlled by Chien, only CHBM was qualified for public trading and had engaged a stock transfer agency.

15. To enhance Grogan's falsified authority, attorney Clark sought Hon. Judge Rockwell's endorsement of Grogan's order. On 4/30/2014, he wrote a letter to clerk Mary Craze (B75–B76), arranged a court hearing for 5/7/2014, and predicted that Judge Rockwell would preside. He also asked the clerk to lodge Grogan's order dated 2/18/2014, in the docket of case CL.12-485. Subsequently, Chien was served a copy of Grogan's order 10 weeks after it was secretly issued.

16. On 5/7/2014, the hearing was not presided over by any judge but by Grogan himself. He impersonated a judge, sat on the bench, signed the order submitted by Clark (B77–B84), and reiterated that the release condition required Chien to submit the assets in Connecticut.

17. A news report (B85) discussed how Illinois state authorities commented on a clerk impersonating a judge, raising the question of whether such conduct constituted criminal behavior. In this case, although Grogan physically impersonated a judge for only one day, all his actions in case CL 12-485 were carried out as an unlawfully acting judge.

18. On 6/6/2014, Grogan arranged another hearing in his office, signed the

order submitted by attorney Clark (B86–B88), and again reiterated that the release condition required Chien to submit the assets in Connecticut. None of Grogan’s orders followed proper motion procedures. It was fortunate that Chien received a copy of the order at the end of the hearing, since in other instances he had to wait several weeks or months before obtaining copies of Grogan’s orders.

19. Grogan attended three conference calls of the Connecticut State Court on 6/17/2014, 6/30/2014, and 4/24/2015. During these calls, he requested the transfer of Chien’s commercial assets from Connecticut to his office in Virginia, falsely claiming that he represented the Virginia State Court. This conduct violated 28 U.S.C. §1738, as no certificate from the Virginia State Court was issued to endorse his secretly prepared orders. Furthermore, Grogan engaged in the unauthorized practice of law, since he held no license in Connecticut and was not qualified as a levying officer to sell property located there. In Virginia, the codes §§8.01-507.1 8.01-509, 8.01-615 require judicial approval for the sale of assets, but Grogan disregarded these rules entirely.

20. Even apart from the procedural error in Grogan’s order dated 2/18/2014, he still misused the law of Va Code §8.01-507 which limited to the monetary value of securities. In this context, a pledge requirement is proper and does not interfere with Chien’s operation of the business. In *National Bank of Commerce v. All*

American Assurance Co., 583 F.2d 1295 (5th Cir. 1978).

“Pledge of stock as collateral for loan to owner of stock was not “purchase” for purpose of §17(a) of Securities Act (15USCS §77g(a)) or 10(b) of Securities Exchange Act (15USCS §78j(b)), *since rights and privileges of parties are not affected by pledge in same manner as by “sale” or purchase.*” (Emphases added).

Subsequent developments revealed that Grogan, Clark, and Freer conspired to fabricate a forged stock certificate, transferring control of CHBM to Freer as a purported officer. This maneuver enabled them to misappropriate cash, assets and other shareholder shares, ultimately destroy the entire business of CHBM.

21. In September 2014, Grogan received eight bankers’ boxes of materials (contained about 50 stock certificates of a dozen of shareholders in 3 companies, 2 foreigner tax identification cards, many confidential contracts signed by paper, hundreds of sets of confidential documents, bank statements, wire records and other), along with a laptop computer, shipped from Chien’s original office in Connecticut. After the items arrived in Virginia, Chien was never notified and was denied any opportunity for a hearing. Grogan failed to obtain a court warrant to open the boxes, violating the Fourth Amendment. Together with Freer, Mr. Clark, and LCR, Grogan secretly separated, transferred, and appropriated these items without providing an inventory or any payment to Chien.

23. On 09/18/2014, after obtaining Chien’s original stock certificate, Grogan

issued a new order (B88–B90) to Island, with copies served Clark and Chien, enabling Freer to secure a forged stock certificate (No. 1073 of CHBM) on 9/26/2014. Freer’s certificate (B92) was issued under the same authority as Chien’s (B91), bearing the signatures of Chien as president, and Kin Y Li (“Mr. Li”) as secretary. CHBM had no property or business in Virginia and owed no debt to Freer. Prior to 2017, CHBM was a Nevada corporation. Therefore, the Virginia State Court lacked jurisdiction to alter the ownership or leadership of this private company.

24. Even under the detention, Chien executed an affidavit on 09/23/2014 (B93), declaring that any attempt to change CHBM’s ownership was unlawful and violated the Exchange Act of 1934, due to the failure to file a proxy statement with the SEC for shareholder approval. Freer, in his letter dated 09/14/2015, admitted that he had to file proxy to SEC to legalize his control over CHBM (B101).

25. On 11/18/2014, Freer accessed the Nevada State Corporation website and amended CHBM’s officer list to claim himself as director, president, treasurer, and secretary. Through LCR’s attorney, he then submitted this form to People’s Bank (later acquired by M&T Bank), asserting control over CHBM and misappropriating \$73,430 to pay Grogan and LCR. Further details will follow.

26. At the hearing on 12/09/2014, Grogan verbally ordered that Freer be

affirmed as director and president of CHBM (B97). He also directed Clark to seize CHBM's laptop as an asset of LCR.

27. After learning CHBM cash stolen, Chien filed motion to disclose the Freer's fraud to Connecticut State Court, which presided a conference call on 04/24/2015. On that conference call, Freer, at LCR, filed the objection, and delivered a set of the attached documents to the court, while Mr. Clark delivered copies of same set to Chien in Virginia, and enabling Chien received a copy of Freer forged stock certificate or first time, and a copy of Grogan's order dated six months ago on 10/31/2014, with following:

(a) he (Grogan) repeated that the creation of a forged stock certificate of CHBM for Freer (B104) was successfully finished under his order.

(b) he made several perjury statements:

(1) He ordered Chien to deliver several corporate controls under his directive (§11, B104), disregarding the fact that he had no authority to do so. He ignored the distinction between liquidity shares, which have market value, and non-liquidity shares, which establish corporate control. Although non-liquidity shares have no market value, they possess private transactional value under very specific conditions. Arbitrarily changing ownership destroyed that special value entirely.

(2) He declared that Freer's forged stock certificate No. 1073 was legal under his order dated 2/18/2014 (bottom, B106). He ignored the fact that the legal authority to issue shares rested with Chien and Mr. Li, whose powers were misused by the conspiracy between him and the stock transfer agency. His order served merely as an excuse to justify the forgery and did not function as a legitimate process for creating Freer's stock certificate.

(3) He asserted that CHBM was not a qualified publicly traded company (§11, B 104).

(4) He falsified the process of stealing CHBM's cash by ordering its liquidation (§§13,16, B105). He concealed the fact that no other shareholder received liquidation proceeds. As a publicly traded company, CHBM's liquidation required SEC filings and shareholder approval.

(5) He ordered that Freer's shares be granted voting rights (middle, B106), rejecting Chien's claim that such rights violated Nevada Revised Statute §78.379. That statute specifies that voting rights for shares of a new controlling person must be approved by many old shares. In fact, the existing shareholders rejected Freer's control shares.

(6) He ordered that Freer's CHBM stock certificate to be pledged to the counsel (Mr. Clark) (second order above the bottom, B106).

(7) The order contained the request to lodge in the case docket CL.12-485, (last order B107) which was never occurred.

28. According to VA Code §18.2-108, larceny encompasses the transfer of stolen goods. The process of pledging the stock certificate to Mr. Clark of LCR may have involved larceny.

29. Later, the time sheet disclosed that Grogan order was on 4/22/2014 ghostwritten by Mr. Clark at (B112), and reviews by James Byrne.

30. On 03/09/2015, Grogan issued another order to continue indefinitely incarcerating Chien for delivery additional desktop computers (B116), and additional assets. Chien filed objection and appeal in Connecticut court.

31. On 09/09/2015 (B119), attorney Clark on behalf of Grogan, wrote letter to clerk for distribution another Grogan's order ghost-written by him.

32. Grogan's order dated 8/31/2015 (B120-B126), clearly stated incarcerating Chien in Virginia for purpose to punish Chien for Chien's opposition or appeal in the court process of Connecticut.

ORDERED that Mr. Chien shall remain in the custody of the Chesterfield County Sheriff's Department and *incarcerated* at the Riverside Regional Jail until Mr. Chien and/or Ms. Fu comply with Connecticut Court's decisions/ rulings ordering the computers and any other property to be turned over, and upon the delivery of such computers and other property, Mr. Chien answers questions under oath about the computers and other property; (bottom, B124)

ORDERED that Mr. Chien shall remain in the custody of the Chesterfield County Sheriff's Department and incarcerated at the Riverside Regional Jail during the *duration of any appeal of the Connecticut Court's* decisions/ rulings ordering the computers and any other property relevant to satisfying the Judgment Creditor's Judgment to be turned over;

ORDERED that upon my receipt of any further decision(s) and/or rulings by any *Connecticut state court* relating to the Connecticut Court's decisions/rulings ordering the computers and any other property to be turned over by Mr. Chien and/or Ms. Fu, I will promptly review such decision(s) and/or rulings to determine if any further action should be taken with regards to Mr. Chien's remedial detention at the Riverside Regional Jail and/or any other aspect of this Debtor Interrogatory." (Emphases added) (above B 125)

33. The two desk-top computers were shipped in November 2015, then no one informed Chien where they are in past 10 years of litigations. The CHBM's computer was equipped with a professional software "Go-Filer" with market value over \$4,000, specialized to create interactive data for SEC filings. Most valuable, this computer housed data for approximately ten companies, each identified by their Edgar filing codes. It had the confidential financial statements about 20 companies including CHBM's auditing journals. Moreover, the computer held confidential information on approximately four thousand shareholders, comprising names, addresses, and identification numbers, including some social security numbers and brokerage account details. The computer contained the shareholder and business information of a planned IPO of USChina Venture III, and a confidential financial information for a manufacturing company for a special sale

to Chinese investors with the initial discuss price for \$6 million. Additionally, the two computers stored Chien's personal and private information, such as tax forms, photographs, family-related documents, and other private communications.

34. Despite the computers were shipped in November 2015, Grogan, Clark and Freer still rejected to release Chien. After Chien filed writ of habeas corpus in Chesterfield Circuit Court and twice submitted complaints alleging that Grogan's acts were criminal, to every judge of the Chesterfield Circuit Court, and the grand-jury. Chien ultimately overcame the unauthorized detention on Monday from Grogan's Friday (06/24/2016) order:

“It is the Commissioner's belief that the dignity of the Court can be best protected by recognizing that individual freedom is such an important concept, and valuable right, that forfeiture of it for slightly over three years is a severe punishment..... The power of the Court *to hold Chien indefinitely still exists*; it is just that it chooses not to exercise that power

For those reasons, IT IS ORDERED that Andrew Chien be released from the custody of the Sheriff of Chesterfield County” (B128-B129) (Emphases added)

William K Grogan
Commissioner in Chancery

His order was still issued at his falsified function of both a judge and a magistrate for the jail administration.

Part 2. Acts of RICO in First Stage

35. Grogan's action motivated by attorney Clark and Freer to assault and suppress Chien's physical capability in discovery of the court fraud in case CL.12-

485 through various countersuits. Freer's violation of 28 U.S.C §152 in case CL.12-485, was act of RICO as defined by 18 U.S.C §1961(1)(D). The initial conflict between Freer and Chien arose during the Chapter 11 bankruptcy proceedings of CBI. Freer, at Clark lodged a complaint in Case Cl. 12-485, asserting two allegations at Chien.

(a) Firstly, Chien allegedly defamed Freer during the Bankruptcy Court's §341 meeting by asserting that Freer involved in embezzlement, through his assertion of unpaid 2010 compensation. The process unfolded as follows: After CBI entered Chapter 11, Freer filed a "Summary of Schedules" (A2-A6, Appendix A) where he falsely claimed pre-petition unpaid compensation initially amounting to \$211,019. This figure was later adjusted to \$158,519, intending to eliminate a dual claim of \$52,500. The fabricated amount included \$97,582 for unpaid cash and \$52,500 for unpaid stock options. This claim was part of a conspiracy without specific details on when and how it occurred. Ultimately, it was revealed that the compensation claim was based on an undisclosed and exaggerated 2010 salary of \$222,097. However, the audited financial statements for the years 2010 and 2011 of CBI (A62-A67) with its accuracy guaranteed by Freer under certified affidavits (A66, A67), contradicted Freer's claim, confirming that his 2010 salary was \$124,515, and it had been fully paid (A63). Additionally, although Freer's stock option of

\$52,500 remained, it became practically worthless due to the bankruptcy, causing the share price to plummet to \$0.02/share, significantly below the option exercise prices above \$3.3/share (A63-A64).

(b) Secondly, Chien was accused of aiding CBI in filing a proxy with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) to disqualify Freer from representing CBI in the bankruptcy proceedings. However, the reality is that the proxy was authorized by CBI Chairman Bill Guo, who drafted CBI's 8-K disclosures dated 03/09/2011 (A8-A13, id) and 03/11/2011, detailing the shareholder meeting. In these documents, Guo explicitly stated that Freer had filed the 'Summary of Schedules' without board approval, signaling unauthorized self-dealing (A10-A11, id).

(c) These two issues constituted the core issues of CBI's bankruptcy case under 28 U.S.C §157(b)(2), conferring federal court-mandated jurisdiction as per 28 U.S.C §157(b)(5). Freer at attorney Clark evaded federal court proceedings by utilizing a State Court to disrupt the issues being administered by the bankruptcy court, contravening 28 U.S.C §157. Consequently, Case CL.12-485 committed a subject-matter jurisdictional error, was an invalid judgment. Either embezzlement or conceal of assets in the chapter 11 bankruptcy case constitutes criminal offense as defined by 18 U.S.C §152(1) & (5) and §153. A notable case illustrating this is

Cable Company v. Flanagan, heard in the District Court for Connecticut (Civil No.3:01CV531). In this case, a federal jury delivered a verdict mandating that CT Senator Len Fasano pay \$500,000 under RICO for his involvement in aiding a client to conceal assets during bankruptcy proceedings. There was an early ruling, in 2003, Cadle Co. v. Flanagan, 271 F. Supp. 2d 379, 385, to state:

“a claim of bankruptcy fraud under 18 U.S.C. § 152^[3] can constitute a predicate act and support a claim under RICO”

Thus, Freer through Clark engaged acts of RICO, as outlined in 18 U.S.C §1961(1)(D).

36. Although Freer filed “Summary of Schedules” in February of 2012, but paid in April of 2013. The long time waiting and Chien’s periodically attended CBI hearing, caused the uncertainty of Freer’s embezzlements. Then Freer wanted to suppress and retaliate Chien’s whistle-blower.

Freer violated Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOA). Chien, acting as a shareholder and CBI agent, exposed Freer’s embezzlement during CBI’s Chapter 11 proceedings through evidence from CBI’s auditing. In response, Freer and Clark of LCR, suppressed Chien’s discovery and retaliated through court fraud (Case CL.12-485). They violated Section 1107 of the SOA and 18 U.S.C §1513(e) for retaliation of Chien’s whistle-blower against a major officer of a company with its stock being public traded.

37. Freer through Clark, filed complaint (F-Compl.) (A.14-35, dkt.30, id) on 02/17/2012 under CI 12-485, in which there were three defendants, Bill Guo as the major defendant, then Chien, and U.S. China (dissolved Chien's business). F-Compl. attacked Chien's defamation with two events: one was Chien attended CBI's §341 meeting, dated 2/18/2011, politely questioned Freer about his 2010 unpaid salary claim; another was Chien made SEC filings for the shareholder meeting.

38. In F-Compl:

“31. At the §341 meeting, Chien.....made *defamatory statements* about, Dr. Freer... Those defamatory statements included the following exact words:

.....

Why do you consider continuing running [CBI] and take your salary of **\$200,000?**

Further F-Compl. ¶34, 44 & 61, masqueraded Freer's false claim for 2010 irregular salary payments as unpaid salary, further falsely painted as Freer's loyalty to CBI:

“34. Because of his (Freer's) loyalty to CBI and its shareholders, Dr. Freer has not taken a *full paycheck* since May of 2010. For June and July 2010, Dr. Freer voluntarily reduced his salary by 50% per cent. From August of 2010 ..., Dr. Freer received a salary of 0 ...”

“44..... As stated above, Dr. Freer received no salary from August 2010 through April 2011.”

“61.... Freer... *did not receive a full salary*...did not receive a full salary” (emphases added).

More, in F-Compl. ¶ 8, 29-37, 62, 74(b)&(c), Chien's discovery of embezzlements, was widely attacked as defamation: Chien made “defamation

statements” of “painting Dr. Freer as a CEO who put his personal economic interests above CBI in breach of his fiduciary duty” (§29,31,38 of F-Compl) and “Dr. Freer took, and intended to take, scarce CBI cash resources while the company was in bankruptcy” (§31, 43 of F-Compl).

39. Chien removed this case to U.S. District Court for Eastern District of VA on 03/ 22/2012 with case number 3:12cv214. After waiting nearly six weeks, Freer at his attorney did not serve major defendant Bill Guo the summons and complaint, and committed the conspiracy of creating a fictional major defendant. Then the District Court remanded the case back on May 4, 2012 (A36-A37, *id*). Chien quickly filed Motion to Dismiss. The Chesterfield Court received Chien’s motion on 05/22/2012, as shown in the docket of Case CL 12-485 (A.38, *id*), which was with eighteen days including three days spent in the mail, after the case reopened.

40. But Freer at Clark, filed “Motion for Default Judgment’ on 5/14/2012 with wrong claim that

“33. Chien’s filing of a copy of the Notice of Removal with this Court did not constitute an appearance in this Court and did not extend the time to appear and plead pursuant to Rule 3:8 of the Rule” (A48, *id*)

Then Freer at Clark concluded that the period when the case removed into the U S District Court, should not deduct in the 21 days reply rule, which is conspiracy theory, because they ignored the facts that when the case removed, the original

Court lost its jurisdiction.

41. On 08/02/2012 afternoon, Chien received an express mail from Freer's lawyer Clark, to arrange a "may be heard" hearing on 06/082012 (A52, *id*). Chien had business arrangement during that period, and was no time to prepare the documents necessary for that hearing within a couple of days. Further VA Supreme Court has "Rule 4.15(b) Notice" to specify that the mail motion for hearing should be fourteen days ahead to file and serve opposite party. There is also general rule of adding three days of mailing time for party out of the state. Also, the notice with words of "may be heard" indicated the uncertainty of the arrangement. Chien called the clerk who did not find Chien's case, and answered the rule that the court will have notice for the arranged hearing. Chien did not receive any notice from the court, and determined not to attend the hearing. However, Freer and Mr. Clark, in one-side arranged hearing with Chien's absent, deceived Chesterfield Circuit Court to strike Chien's Judicial Notice and to rubber-stamp on their asked order dated 06/08/2012 for default judgment (A54-56, *id*), by wrongly alleged Chien's reply time violated Rule 3:8(a) of VA Supreme Court for twenty-one days (A54, *id*). Further, Clark claimed "a defendant [Chien] in default is not entitled to notice of any further proceedings in the case ..." (A55, *id*) in defending his fraud hearing notice. Then, the default judgment was the due process fraud,

42. Freer's "Summary of Schedules", Chien's attending §341 meeting, and the shareholder meeting issue of who should represent CBI in the chapter 11 process, are core proceedings of the Bankruptcy Court due to "28 U.S.C §157(b)(2) Core proceedings include.... (A)matters concerning the administration of the estate." Any tort during CBI bankruptcy should be raised in the US District Court, "28 U.S.C §157(b)(5)".

"(b)... (5) The district court shall order that personal injury tort and wrongful death claims shall be tried in the district court in which the bankruptcy case is pending, or in the which district court in the district in which the claim arose, as determined by the district court in the bankruptcy case is pending",

Therefore, the final judgment dated 08/09/2012 (A75-A77, *id*), committed subject error.

43. CBI filed Debtor's Amend Plan of Reorganization ("Reorganization Plan") (A83-A98, *id*) (source: Case 11-30381-KRH, Doc. 291, Filed on 01/04/2013, 13:12:27, total 31 pages), which has clear words that U.S. Bankruptcy Court fully considered Freer's compensation claim under dominated and exclusive jurisdiction from 11 U.S.C §1127(b) (A 94, *id*) and other jurisdiction cannot interfere when the Bankruptcy Court not abstains its jurisdiction (A97, *id*). The plan fully executed what Freer claimed unpaid compensation including the embezzlement claims in the "Summary of Schedules." (A86, *id*). Then Chien had no affection to Freer's

embezzlement and compensation.

44. (a) There was damage hearing on 7/30/2012. Mr. Clark first submitted documents on 7/16/2012 with two documents Exh. 17 (A61, *id*) and Exh. 20 (A63, A62-A67, *id*) to identify Freer's CBI salary was \$124,515, and fully paid.

Exh. 17. Freer's CBI compensation table from year 2003 to 2011 (not to July 15, 2012) with record that Freer's compensation in 2010 was \$124,515 only, fully paid.

Exh. 20. CBI 10-K for year 2011 which reported Freer in 2010 had compensation of \$124,515 fully paid

Due to Exhibits 17 & 20, the defamation was hard to win. During this time, Freer's claim in the "Summary of Schedules" not being paid in the Bankruptcy Court. The conflicted evidence of Freer's 2010 salary would cause the jeopardy of Freer's embezzlement in CBI's Chapter 11. Then Freer, at Clark's direction, who had spent 10.5 hours at the end of June fabricating the compensation table (Exh. 27, A71, *id.*), submitted Exh. 27 to the court on July 27, 2012 (A68, *id.*), just three days before the hearing:

Exh. 27. Freer's CBI compensation table for year 2003 to July 15, 2012 with record that Freer's compensation in 2010 was \$222,096.70 with unpaid of \$97,581.70.

On the damage trial, Exh. 27 was projected onto the big screen to demonstrate Chien's defaming, while Clark never mentioned Exh. 17, and Exh. 20 of audited financial statement.

In the beginning of the hearing, Freer and Clark solicited the judge issued order “To Grant Freer’s Motion In Limine” (A72-A74, *id*) to prohibit Chien from submitting evidence to protect himself (A72, *id*). Therefore, the Final Judgment dated 08/09/2012 (A75-A77, *id*) was also based on the perjured evidence of Freer’s unpaid salary in 2010, and due process error of bias. This is another court fraud.

(b) Making conflicted evidence on the same matter offended perjury as defined by VA Code “§18.2-435”, and Freer offended “§18.2-436” also because he induced the falsified evidence to his lawyers.

45. Later, Chien’s appeal to Virginia Supreme Court, Recording No. 131044, Freer at Clark Submitted same Chart of Exh. 27 (A82, *id*) as only evidence to win the appeal by claiming Freer with 2010 higher salary as evidence as “a successful businessman”. Following was cited from “Opposition to Petition’s Motion to Disqualify” filed on 12/20/2013 by Clark and other lawyer (A79-A80, *id*)

“The evidence clearly was relevant. The table shows that Dr. Freer was *a successful businessman earning around \$200,000 a year* (EX.1). Chien defamed Dr. Freer with allegations that Dr. Freer breached his fiduciary duties to CBI and misappropriated its property (Comp. ¶38-51), the table of Dr. Freer’s compensation was evidence..... relating to Dr. Freer’s damages. Dr. Freer *accurately* related the history of his case” (emphases added).

This was another offense of both perjury and conspiracy by Freer and Clark.

Part 3. Financial Institution Fraud and Falsified Corporation Identities

46. In Appendices C and D, additional evidence documents demonstrate extended acts of RICO involving financial institution fraud, falsified corporate identities, and securities fraud, all stemming from Freer's forged stock certificate of CHBM (C2).

47. Freer's stock certificate was forged because CHBM's secretary, Mr. Li, issued an affidavit (C3–C4) dated 3/11/2015, during Chien's detention, stating that his signature had been used without authorization. Chien also confirmed this in his own affidavit (C5).

48. Freer by claiming the falsified president of CHBM (C6–C8), stole the cash of \$73430. (C6–C8).

49. CHBM was a Nevada company, and Nevada Revised Statutes §78.379 (C9) specified Freer's acquiring shares' voting right should be determined by a shareholder special or annual meeting, not fabricated by Grogan's order dated Oct 30, 2014.

50. On 07/07/2016, CHBM filed a proxy to elect a director (C10–C14), with the notice signed by Secretary Li (C11). The proxy detailed Chien's imprisonment status and the ongoing dispute with Freer (C12–C13). The Form 8k filed on 7/11/2016 showed that 100% voted shares elected Chien and rejected Freer as the director (C15–C16).

51. To verify the authenticity of the shareholder meeting, seven months later, in February 2017, eleven shareholders submitted affidavits or letters (C18–C32) confirming that Freer’s claim of corporate liquidation to distribute cash was false, and they rejected his attempt to control CHBM.

52. Two shareholders submitted affidavits in 2024(C33-C34) affirming their support for Chien as president of CHBM.

53. The By-laws of CHBM specified that any stock certificate must be signed by both a director and a secretary (C35). This requirement is consistent with 12 CFR §239.29(a), which mandates that a stock certificate be signed by a director and attested by a secretary.

54. Here was the agreement (C36-C40) between Island Stock Transfer (acquired by TranShare in March 2019) and CHBM signed by Chien. The agreement outlined the service authority and the procedure (C38), including:

“3.1. After the Company has provided Agent with all the documentation..., Agent will issue original stock of the Company, as directed by the Company,

3.2. After the Company has provided Agent with all the documentation required..., in the event of a transfer of stock by a shareholder, Agent will issue replacement certificates upon receipt of the following:

3.2.2. In the event of a stock transfer, the old certificate being surrendered with *a validly executed and medallion guaranteed stock power* outlining the new recipients and amount of stock to be issued to each recipient;”

4. Purchase of Stock Certificate.... Such certificate must be signed by

authorized officers... as set forth by laws or by-laws of the company.

In accordance with the Agreement, Chien submitted his signature with photo's identity not only, but also submit under genuine guarantee, the secretary Mr. Li's signature with photo's identity. Island could then use these two signatures, together with the corporate seal, to create a special stamp called a Medallion Guarantee, required for all CHBM stock certificates. This rule applies to every registered stock transfer agent as required in 17 CFR § 240.17Ad-15 Signature guarantees.

55. The fee for building the "Medalion Guarantee" is high. The initial fee is \$7000 (C36), equivalent to the 35 months of maintenance fee by \$200/month as shown in the receipt issued by Island (C41).

56. Freer's stock certificate (C2) used the Medallion Guarantee created by Chien. In addition to Chien's opposition, Freer could not secure a legitimate secretary to support his falsified company under CHBM's corporate shield.

57. To dispute with Chien, Freer at his counsel, in Connecticut state court submitted a board meeting minutes of CHBM dated 12/09/2014, which listed Vincent McNeeley (McNeeley), CPA as the active secretary (C42). In his letter to SEC (Chien through SEC FOIA program obtained copies of Freer's submission to SEC), he also showed that he offered McNeeley (C43) as secretary.

58. However, McNeeley's CPA license had been cancelled in 1993(C44).

59. In 2016, in the U.S. District Court for Connecticut, Chien filed complaint 3:16-cv-1881 Chien v. Clark et al., naming McNeeley as a defendant alongside Freer. McNeeley's address was difficult to locate, and the summons was returned undelivered (C46). Records show McNeeley had filed for personal bankruptcy in 2005 and had outstanding liens in 2015 (C47). On 1/30/2017, Chien filed a motion questioning his attorney, Timothy Jensen, about whether McNeeley had hired him in the case. No answer was provided before case 3:16-cv-1881 was dismissed against Chien.

Part 4. VA-CHBM Comparing with CHBM

60. In Appendix D of CHBM's corporate state registrations, Freer never listed McNeeley as secretary in Nevada or Virginia registrations. Chien believes Freer could not obtain McNeeley's signature and photo identification together to create his own Medallion Guarantee with Island. Instead, Freer, Grogan, and Clark conspired with Island to forge a stock certificate for Freer. Whether Freer paid \$7,000—or another amount—to Island remains subject to discovery.

61. To replace the SEC stock registration, Freer attempted to establish a legal state registration of CHBM, which amounted to repeated perjury. CHBM never had registration, business, or property in Virginia. Therefore, Grogan's orders—even if falsified under state court authority—had no jurisdiction over CHBM.

62. During Chien's detention, Freer made no SEC filings. Although he and his lawyers won Chien's litigations through summary judgments, his failure to file with the SEC was strong evidence against him for securities law violation.

63. In District of Columbia, Freer expanded his falsified corporation identity by using VA-CHBM in place of CHBM to support his misrepresentations in Virginia litigation. On 12/16/2016, citing Grogan's order dated 10/31/2014 (B102-B107), Freer sent a letter to the SEC (C49-C51) claiming CHBM was a Virginia company and that the Virginia state court had assigned him control of CHBM. In litigation 1:18-cv-2050, Chien v. Freer et al., Freer submitted two affidavits dated 10/05/2018 (C52-C55) and 10/10/2019 (C56-C57). In both, he falsely claimed that CHBM was legally registered in Virginia and that he had made all necessary SEC filings (C56). However, after obtaining filing authority at the end of 2017, he failed to submit any periodic financial statements for nearly two years in 2019.

64. Attorney Clark and Grogan did not escape the conspiracy scheme with Freer. On 08/10/2022, Clark represented Freer in Case CL 12-485(3), denying all of Chien's allegations (C58-C61). On 01/20/2023, in case 1:17cv 358, Grogan likewise denied every allegation against him and his conspiracy with Freer and Clark (C62-C64). These filings serve as updated evidence of their involvement.

65. CHBM was qualified for public trading as demonstrated in the records of

E-Trade in 2017 (C65).

66. Chien obtained an offer of \$300,000 for CHBM (C66-C67), but Chien cannot proceed because he lost SEC filing authority in 2017 and did not possess CHBM's stock certificate.

67. Chien frequently contacted the SEC for assistance. On 01/09/2015, during his detention, SEC employee Levy responded to Chien's complaint that Freer was illegally controlling CHBM without filing a proxy with the SEC (C68).

68. On 12/12/2016, Chien responded to SEC director David Fredrickson for Freer's dispute (C69-C71). After that, Chien retained Edgar filing authority until 2/13/2017 when another director Ransom suspended Chien's filing rights(C72). Ransom instructed that either Chien or Freer must obtain the authority through a court order.

69. On 12/14/2017, Edgar notified Chien that the filing authority had shifted to Freer (C73). The notice did not disclose the person's name who made the decision.

70. On 08/21/2022, FINRA informed Chien that CHBM's trading had been revoked in September 2018 (C74)

71. On 4/21/2025, SEC lawyer informed Chien (C75) that SEC would not restore his filing authority unless he obtained a court order or reached a private settlement with Freer. Chien has refused to make any private settlement until

Freer's fraud is fully uncovered.

72. On 03/23/2016, during Chien's detention, the SEC revoked (C76) the share registrations of USChina Venture I and USChina Venture II due to missing required filings. Although Freer obtained the original documents detailing how to maintain SEC registration for these shares, he had no interest in servicing them. Meanwhile, Chien, being detained, was not permitted and lacked the physical ability to conduct business. The revocation was therefore an inevitable result of his prolonged detention.

73. On 12/09/2016, Freer, under public notary, falsified a form of "Update Passphrase Confirmation" to claim the position of President of CHBM. He attempted to replace Chien in handling EDGAR filings (D2, Appendix D).

74. On 2/15/2018, Freer in Edgar filed form 8k (D3-D5) announcing that he was the president and director of CHBM and declaring that previous SEC filings of CHBM were inaccurate:

After months of discussion with the SEC, EDGAR filing access for China Bull Management, Inc. (CHBM) (the "company") has been returned to the company. In the interim, several unauthorized filings have been posted. The market is hereby noticed that those filings, posted between July, 2016 and December, 2016, are not accurate and should not be relied upon when making decisions about the company. The company is working to bring filings current as soon as possible

China Bull Management, Inc.

By: Richard J. Freer, Ph.D.

Title: President and Chief Executive Officer

After the 8K filing, Freer's address and telephone number were listed on the EDGAR website, replacing CHBM's, and have remained there to the present.

75. The fully list of Edgar filings (D6-D8) demonstrated Freer never filed the second document after submitting the Form 8K. He failed to file financial statements for the past nine years, beginning with the annual financial statement for 2016, which was due before April 15, 2017. Till current, Freer failed to file 10 forms 10K for annual reports, and 33 forms 10Q for quarterly financial statements.

76. Additionally, Freer represented his company with the same name of China Bull Management Inc with registration in Virginia on 12/01/2016 (D9), abbreviated as "VA-CHBM". This entity was distinct from CHBM controlled by Chien. CHBM had been registered in Nevada since December 2010 (D15-D18), as affirmed by the lawyer's opinion (D19-D20), and later changed the registration to Wyoming as public announced in the filed form 8K dated 12/29/2016 (D31-D32). CHBM's Wyoming registration has been consistently maintained from 2017 to the present (D33-D37).

77. There are five key differences between VA-CHBM and CHBM of Wyoming:

- (a) Different state of incorporation indicates two separated identities.
- (b) Different operational timeframes. VA-CHBM existed for five years from

December 1, 2016 to April 30, 2011(D9), while CHBM has history spanning over 15 years, from 2010 to 2016 in Nevada, and from 2017 up to the present in Wyoming.

(c) Different officer structure. VA-CHBM had only one officer, Freer himself (D10), whereas CHBM maintained two officers with Mr. Li as the secretary consistently, in accordance with the Medallion Guarantee Program, which mandates that any public company must have two officers to sign the stock certificates or oversee shareholder meetings involving financial matters.

(d) VA-CHBM operated as an S-type corporation for tax purposes (D11-D12), implying that its profits were distributed to all shareholders, and the corporation was not allowed to retain them (D13-D14). This tax structure is unprecedented in the realm of U.S. publicly trading companies. With perpetually zero profits, it became exceedingly challenging for the market to evaluate the stock's price. By contrast, CHBM paid federal tax on operating profits in 2011 as demonstrated in its audited financial statement for years 2011 and 2012.

(e) VA-CHBM never provided financial statements, while CHBM has filed the federal tax forms every year up to the present.

78. Despite warnings of felony violations for falsifying corporate identity on the Nevada corporation website (D21), Freer, on 11/18/2014—during Chien's detention—submitted a falsified CHBM officer form claiming he was Director,

President, Treasurer, and Secretary (D22). This allowed him to misappropriate CHBM's cash on 11/26/2014. The Nevada Secretary corrected this error (D23–D24). Freer repeated these officer identity falsifications on 12/30/2014 (D25) and 11/15/2016 (D28), both of which were subsequently corrected by the Nevada Secretary (D26–D27; D29–D30).

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

79. This is a declaration case for guidance of future court actions, including:

- A. The Subject Errors Committed by Virginia Debt Collection.
- B. Grogan's Arbitrary Detention of Chien with Abductive Nature.
- C. Grogan Aided Freer's Fraud from Case CL.12-485 to Securities Laws.
- D. The Importance of Allegations under RICO Acts.
- E. Credit of Later Discovery Allowed for Chien's Future Countersuits.

ARGUMENT

A. The Subject Errors Committed by Virginia Debt Collection

80. Virginia debt collection by Grogan, committed the subject errors:

(a) Under the Tenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Virginia lacks authority over matters exclusively tied to Connecticut, where Chien's property is located. Furthermore, 15 U.S.C § 1692i(a)(1) requires that debt collection actions be brought in the jurisdiction where the property is situated.

(b) Virginia debt collection proceedings also violated Va Code § 8.01-247, which prohibits actions on contracts governed by the laws of another state.

(c) Virginia debt collection targeted Chien's business such as CHBM, USChina Venture I, USChina Venture II, and USChina Venture III, and committed the subject errors. The SEC registrations of USChina Venture I, USChina Venture II were revoked on 3/23/2016 (C76) due to the failure to submit financial statements and the expiration of Nevada registrations. However, the historic legal documents of these companies—including Nevada registrations and communications with the SEC—had already been shipped to Grogan's office in September 2014. If Freer had been able to manage this business, he could have continued operating it, since these companies had only one shareholder: Chien himself, and no stock certificate existing. USChina Venture I and USChina Venture II were Form 10 blank check companies designed to provide for SEC reporting under the private financing. The market is limited because SEC reporting is not mandated by law. On 10/10/2010, Chien registered a Form 10 company under the name FangXing Holding, which he later sold to China Complant Group on 01/14/2011, for \$50,000. This serves as another example of the damage caused by interfering with the debtor's business through abusive consumer debt collection practices, while the creditor lacked the skill to conduct business and instead

harmed both the business environment and the debtor's reputation.

B. Grogan's Arbitrary Detention of Chien with Abductive Nature

81. Grogan was a debt collector as defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(6)(D) and (F):

15 U.S.C. §1692a(6)(D): "[A]ny person while serving or attempting to serve legal process on any other person in connection with the judicial enforcement of any debt."

15 U.S.C. §1692a(6)(F): "[A]ny person collecting or attempting to collect any debt owed or due or asserted to be owed or due another

Further, in case *Heintz v Jenkins* 514 U.S. 291, 297 (1995), U.S. Supreme Court specified that "[FDCPA] regulates debt collection, not the practice of law."

82. Grogan deceived and manipulated the police force to indefinitely detain Chien for the purpose of seizing commercial assets. Such conduct constitutes tortious acts with the nature of abduction under Va. Code § 18.2-47(A), which prohibits the unlawful seizure, detention, or transportation of another person by force, intimidation, or deception, without legal justification.

(a) Grogan violated Va. Code § 18.2-213, which makes it a Class 4 misdemeanor for any debt collector to threaten or employ unlawful methods.

(b) Offense of 15 U.S.C. §1692d(1) which prohibits to use the criminal means to hurt anyone of the physics, business, properties, and reputation in the debt collection. Grogan's conduct directly contravened this statute.

(c) Offense of 18 U.S.C. § 4001(a): Federal law prohibits arbitrary

detention. In case *Thompson v Clark*, 142 S. Ct. 1332,1334 (2022) U.S Supreme Court held that detaining Thompson for 2 days without a conviction constituted malicious prosecution. Grogan's orchestration of Chien's indefinite confinement without lawful authority constitutes a clear offense under this statute.

(d) Offense of 28 U.S.C. § 2007(a) (prohibiting imprisonment for debt in jurisdictions where abolished). In Virginia, debtors' prison was formally abolished in 1849. The Debtors' Prison Museum at 321 Prince Street, Tappahannock, Virginia, stands as a solemn reminder of that discredited era. Chien's detention demonstrates a disturbing persistence of this outlawed legacy.

(e) Violated automatically stay 11 U S C §362. Grogan openly defied the bankruptcy court's order requiring Chien's release, thereby violating the automatic stay provisions designed to protect debtors during bankruptcy proceedings.

(f) Violated the criminal procedure. Grogan disregarded fundamental safeguards of criminal procedure by rejecting both the magistrate's bail order and the prosecutor's determination that detention was unwarranted. Such conduct undermines the fairness and integrity of the judicial process.

(g) He issued orders at his private office (B6) for his unjust-enrichment.

83. Grogan used the illegal detention to retaliate Chien's complaint against Grogan, Freer and Clark including the 72 hours solid confinement from

05/08/2013 to 05/11/2013 to prevent Chien timely writing the objection against Freer, Clark and LCR to embezzle CBI's cash to pay LCR for Freer personal legal fee about \$34000.

C. Grogan Aided Freer's Fraud from Case CL.12-485 to Securities Laws.

84. Grogan used the illegal detention to assist Freer's blackmail in connection with the fraud judgment of Case Cl.12-485. Had Grogan not interfered with Chien's personal bankruptcy; Chien's debts would have been discharged in 2013. Currently, Chien owes Freer more than \$3.4 million in principle, with daily accruing interest exceeding \$560.

85. Grogan joined to steal the cash of CHBM and made his unjust enrichment.

86. Grogan conspired with Clark and Freer to create forged stock certificate No. 1073 of CHBM for Freer, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 513(c)(2), as it unlawfully incorporated the signatures of Chien (President) and Mr. Li (Secretary) without their consent. Under 18 U.S.C. § 513(a), the statute criminalizes not only the creation of forged securities but also their possession and "uttering"—the act of considering it as genuine by offering or using a forged document. Although the forgery occurred in 2014, Freer continues to possess the certificate today, and Grogan and Clark who joined the forgery process, have recently uttered it by denying any wrong doing against Chien's allegations. Accordingly, all three

remain culpable for the offense of forgery.

87. Grogan conspired with Clark and Freer to assist Freer in creating a falsified corporate identity for VA-CHBM's stock registration in SEC.

Although further discovery is required to discover whether Grogan or Clark directly involved in Freer's creation and maintenance of using VA-CHBM to make the falsified corporation stock registration in SEC. But, Freer's action for purpose to count CHBM July 2016's shareholder meeting against his theft of the cash and seizure of the assets and shareholders' shares, was inevitable, and in compliance of the common interests of the RICO enterprises. Freer had to do so for their three persons common interests. Especially, in the state court's filings, they already claimed that Freer was the only legal officer replacing Chien, to operate CHBM.

88. The fraud committed by Freer, Clark, and Grogan is interconnected through their consistent violations of due process. Freer and Clark violated the civil procedure in Case CL.12-485. Furthermore, they solicited Grogan, and together they violated criminal procedure for 38 months, damaging all of Chien's businesses. This expanded into more serious due process errors, overwhelming the violations in Case CL.12-485. Without official correction of the 38-month wrong detention, the correction of the court fraud in Case CL12-485 is impossible. After Chien's release, Freer's violations of securities law—including falsified corporate

stock registrations with the SEC—were intended to conceal money laundering and the illegal seizure of computer systems, shareholder shares, and other commercial assets during Chien’s detention.

However, the securities law and SEC rules created further trouble for Freer. Freer could not file the annual financial statements (Form 10-K) of VA-CHBM for simple reasons. The old Form 10-Ks of CHBM from 2011 to 2015 provided a complete picture of the corporation’s records, including corporate structure, financial statements, and officer information. These reports were supported by legal documents, audited reports, and bank accounts. Fabricating all these records was impossible.

(a) Corporation Structure as stated in

“Item 1. Description of Business — China Bull Management Inc. was incorporated in the State of Nevada on December 17, 2010 for the purpose of engaging in financial consulting.”

This description is supported by CHBM’s state registration records, which must be submitted to auditors for review. Had Freer filed a 10-K claiming that CHBM was incorporated on December 1, 2016 in Virginia, as he did in court filings (C52, C56), any investor with basic business knowledge would recognize this as a false statement because it had the different day or state for the establishment.

(b) Item 8 Financial Statements. These statements disclosed the company’s

assets, operations, and cash flow. In Form S-1, shareholder names were listed along with their purchased shares. In the 2011 and 2012 Form 10-Ks, operating revenue, income, and tax payment were reported. However, because Freer was required to report his company under the tax structure of an S-corporation, no corporate profits would ever be generated. If Freer had attempted to use liquidation as an excuse to conceal theft of cash, it would have been impossible to reconcile the cash losses reported in the 2014 and 2015 Form 10-Ks. These losses were further confirmed at the shareholder meeting held on 7/10/2016. The shareholders who contributed money to CHBM sought to hold Freer liable for their investment losses.

(c) Item 10. Directors, Executive Officers....

Freer was required to report how he became director and president of CHBM despite objections from all voting shareholders. He also had to disclose why the company operated without a secretary. Investors would question how a company without a secretary could issue valid stock certificates.

(d) CEO and CFO Affidavits

Both the CEO and CFO of the corporation must submit affidavits with financial statements (Form 10-K or 10-Q) under criminal penalties for perjury, as outlined in 18 U.S.C. § 1350. Violations carry a maximum fine of \$1 million, imprisonment of

up to 10 years, or both. In failing to file 10 Form 10-Ks and 33 Form 10-Qs, Freer avoided submitting these affidavits 86 times. This may have been a calculated decision to avoid the potential maximum cumulative penalty of \$86 million in fines and 860 years of imprisonment.

(e) The SEC did not take administrative action against Freer (C75) for his failure to submit periodic financial statements, in contrast to the SEC's enforcement actions against USChina Venture I and USChina Venture II (C76). This discrepancy raises a serious public concern, as it undermines confidence in the integrity of the U.S. stock market.

89. Summary of Freer's Violation of the Securities Law.

(a) Freer's stock certificate 1073 of CHBM was forged.

(b) Freer violated 10(b) and 10(b)-5 of Exchange Act of 1934, and 15 U S C §78j because he used the manipulative and deceptive devices - the Medallion Guarantee Stock Power with signatures of Chien and Mr. Li - in purchase of No.1073 of CHBM stock certificate.

(c) Freer violated 18 U S C §1028A for aggravated identity theft under RICO definition of 18 U S C §1961(1)(B) because he used VA-CHBM replacing CHBM in the corporation stock registration with SEC. VA-CHBM was a short-lived Virginia S-corporation, having only one officer, and no submission of the

required periodical financial statement.

(d) Freer violated the filing requirements of Section 14 in his attempt to take control of CHBM, and Section 13 and 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Acts of 1934 for periodical financial statements.

90. After verifying Freer's fraud in securities laws and Virginia debt collection, thus, Freer's fraud in Case Cl.12-485 should be quickly discovered. This included that Freer committed the subject error, fraudulently using his embezzlement in CBI's bankruptcy case as evidence Exh. 27, to wrongly accuse Chien's defamation and further manipulated the fraud default judgment on 6/8/2012. In fact, Freer violated 18 U.S.C. §1513(e) by retaliating against Chien's disclosure of his embezzlement during CBI's bankruptcy process. The 13-year debt collection is an operation of blackmail.

D. The Importance of Allegations under RICO Acts

91. Although in the underlying cases of this appeal there was no district court case listing Grogan, Freer, and Clark together as defendants, they are jointly named in Case No. 3:19-cv-135 (HCH) in the Richmond Division. That case has been pending for six years without any denial or affirmation of Chien's RICO claim against them. For this reason, Chien did not mention that case in the appeal. Nevertheless, this court's decision regarding Grogan's orders and Freer's fraud in

Case No. CL-12-485 will advance Case No. 3:19-cv-135 (HCH) into discovery.

Facially, the 13-year dispute appears to be only between Freer and Chien. However, Freer was able to prevail against Chien in more than a dozen cases in both state and federal courts, largely due to the efforts of private lawyers such as Grogan and, especially, Clark, aided by other attorneys under the shield of performance while representing LCR, a once mid-sized law firm with over 300 employed lawyers.

In these proceedings, not only did the state court judges act as rubber stamps for the demands of private lawyers, but the federal judges did as well. In case 1:13CV0993, the federal judge clearly and openly refused to apply 42 U.S.C. § 1983, which addresses civil rights violations under “color of law.” Instead, the judge’s position was that the federal court should not interfere with the misconduct of private lawyers operating under the cover of state court actions.

Applying the FDCPA requires greater challenges to federal judges, given their entrenched habits of favoring lawyers over pro se parties. The FDCPA makes clear that debt collection is not the practice of law. Therefore, in cases where lawyers assisted Freer in collecting debt, the judges’ first question should have been whether Freer’s lawyers were legally authorized to practice law. Unfortunately, they were not. Their actions failed to meet the minimum ethical standard that a

citizen's liberty must be protected under criminal procedure.

The SEC, as an important government agency, should protect investors by ensuring that every SEC-registered company maintains a proper financial statement. Yet both the federal court and the SEC failed in their duty to perform this basic and essential function. Who, then, should bear liability? It is the private lawyers who represented Freer and who, in doing so, significantly engaged in fraud for their own personal interests.

92. As already raised the RICO allegations among Grogan, Clark and Freer in case 3:19cv135 (HCH), the claims under "18 U S C §1961(1)(A)&(B)" are:

"18 U.S.C§1961(1) 'racketeering activity' means (A) any act or threat involving..., robbery, bribery, extortion, which is chargeable under State law and punishable by imprisonment for than one year(B) any act which is indictable under any of the following provisions of title 18, United States Code;...section 1028 (relating to fraud and related activity in connection with identification documents), ...section 1341 (relating to mail fraud), section 1343 (relating to wire fraud),...section 1512 (relating to tampering with a witness, victim, or an informant), section 1513 (relating to retaliating against a witness, victim, or an informant),,,, section 1951 (relating to interference with commerce, robbery, or extortion) ...section 1956 (relating to the laundering of monetary instruments)...section 2314 (transportation of stolen goods, securities...), section 2315 (sale or receive of stolen goods, securities....)"

(a) They offended 18 U.S.C§1961(1)(A) such as offenses of Va. Code §§ 18.2-22(a) conspiracy, 18.2-47(A) kidnapping; 18.2-59 extortion, 18.2-168 forgery of public record, 18.2-434 perjury.

(b) They offended 18 U.S.C§1961(1)(B) by (1) falsified Freer as president and

director of CHBM to cheat the U S Government; in violation of 18 U S C §1028.

(c) Their communications directly or at LCR, with Chesterfield Circuit Court or Connecticut Court, committed the mail fraud and wire fraud 18 U S C §§1341& 1343;

(d) Their Virginia debt collection and imprison Chien were retaliation in offenses of 18 U S C §1513(e) and §1512;

(e) Their conspiracy to solicit the commercial assets being shipped from Connecticut to Virginia, offended 18 U S C §2314 & 2315;

(f) Their seizing commercial assets, committed offenses under 18 U.S.C §1951, which fall within the nature of robbery as defined in 18 U.S.C §1951(b)(1).

92. The RICO allegations under 15 U.S.C §1962.

(a) Offenses of 15 U.S.C §1962(a). Grogan, and Clark obtained the unjust enrichment from racketeering activities, including misappropriation of CHBM's cash. Freer obtained unjust enrichment through the creation, maintenance, and continuous collection of a fraudulent judgment debt spanning 13 years.

(b) Offenses of 15 U.S.C §1962(b). Grogan, Clark, and Freer used racketeering activities to interfere with and control interstate commerce, including the operations of CHBM and other entities.

(c) Offenses of 15 U.S.C §1962(c). Grogan, Clark, and Freer conducted the

affairs of an enterprise through a pattern of racketeering, including manipulation of court clerks and sheriffs to facilitate unlawful confinement, issuance of falsified court orders, and wrongful occupation of cash, assets, and computer systems, and other intellectual properties of third parties under Chien's custody.

(d) Offenses of 15 U.S.C §1962(d). The conspiracy among Grogan, Clark, and Freer is extensive. It includes collusion with private parties, such as other lawyers from the Connecticut division of LCR, Island Stock Transfer, and Virginia state employees — including sheriffs, clerks, and a judge of the Chesterfield Circuit Court — to aid Grogan in impersonating as a judge on May 7, 2014.

E. Credit of Later Discovery Allowed for Chien's Future Countersuits.

93. On November 13, 2025, in case 1:25-cv-1232, Chien filed a Motion and Memorandum (Dkt. 17) pointing out that the fundamental mistake in prior cases affirming Grogan's arbitrary detention as lawful was an administrative error: criminal punishment was executed in a civil case. Grogan did not have the authority to change case CL 12-485, *Freer v. Chien*, into *Commonwealth v. Chien*, yet his orders functioned as if he did. Distinguishing between the execution of a civil case and a criminal case is basic social education taught from middle school onward, and this legal knowledge is widely understood in society. It should be considered the minimum competency of a federal judge. Unfortunately, these

errors persisted for a long time and continue to be perpetuated by some federal judges.

Hon. Leonie M. Brinkema, who closed the case 1:25-cv-1232 on 11/18/2025, issued another order the following day 11/19/2025, in a new case, 1:25-cv-2041, Chien v. UnitedLex et al. In her order, she cited over a dozen of rulings by other judges affirming Grogan's 38-month detention of Chien as lawful. She further abridged Chien's constitutional right to the First Amendment by dismissing his complaint without even issuing summons to the defendants. She cited the following reasons:

(a) The court deemed the action frivolous, waived review, and relied on a list of more than a dozen of Chien's previously failed cases alleging that his 38-month incarceration was illegal, as well as the pre-filing restriction imposed in Chien v. Robbins et al., No. 3:21-cv-501, even though none of the defendants in Case 1:25-cv-2041 were parties to Case 3:21-cv-501.

(b) In the footnotes of the second page, the judge added that the claims were time-barred, noting that all events listed were approximately 8 years old and therefore, too stale for litigation.

(c) In the same footnote, the judge expressed disbelief that a jury trial would quickly favor Chien's assertion that his 38-month detention was unlawful. In doing

so, the judge seriously underestimated Virginia citizens' urgent, energetic, independent, and widely shared constitutional due process knowledge in protecting innocent liberty.

94. The judgment in case 1:25 cv 2041, further demonstrated the resistance of some judges in the district court for performing both 42 U.S.C §1983 and FDCPA. The solution is left for the decision of this appeal.

95. After Chien's appeal being favored, then the time bar of five years for business associated conspiracy or the four years for civil RICO allegation, should be accounted from the dates of 11/06/2013, or 03/06/2018. Accordingly, the computer-fraud allegation that occurred in November 2015 should be admitted. Moreover, the alleged fraud includes the continuing wrongful occupation, which persists to the present.

This reverse decision on case 1:13cv993 and 13-8017 will automatically reverse the previous decisions on Case 1:17cv358 & Appeal No. 17-1944, and 1:17cv677 & Appeal No. 18-1523. aided Chien in reopen the old cases in Virginia.

96. Here is the discussion of whether Chien can raise the new defendants in 1:25 cv 2041, under the time bar extension for discovery delay. In the new case, there are 14 defendants. Most of them are not in the old cases 1:13cv993, 1:17cv358, and 1:17cv677.

(a) Freer can be listed as a new defendant because he is currently subject to debt collection in Connecticut and has violated securities laws. Moreover, Chien has never obtained a court order permitting him to disclose Freer's fraud in case CL.12-485, in either state or federal court. Chien continues to carry the \$3.2 million judgment debt against Freer, which accrues daily interest of over \$560. He is entitled to due process, which the judicial system has consistently failed to provide.

(b) Joseph M. Rainsbury committed court fraud in appeal case 13-8017. The reversal of case 13-8017 constitutes a discovery of Rainsbury's fraud, with the resulting delay justified by the later discovery. Furthermore, Chien believes that most filings signed by Rainsbury were ghost-written by Clark.

(c) Attorney Clark is currently engaged in conspiracy activities with Freer, representing Freer to conceal the conspiracy they initiated in Case CL.12-485. Clark also maintained a closer conspiracy with Grogan, as Chien believes Grogan's orders were ghost-written by Clark. The reversal of the judgment in Case 1:17cv385, Chien v. Grogan et al., will provide an opportunity to detail the conspiracy among them in addition to the pending case 3:19cv135(HCH).

(d) The trustees for CBI and LCR, are first time to list as the defendants for declaration relief because they involved to aid Freer's CBI embezzlement, which is

never discovered. This discovery is important to disclose the fraud concealment of Freer in Case CL.12-485. The concealment is a continuous fraud from 08/09/2012 till current, thus it does not have time bar to ban the discovery efforts. The allegations, limited to declaratory relief, already encompass the benefits they derived from litigation. Acting as LCR trustees, they inherited critical information regarding confidential contracts and communications between LCR and the UnitedLex Party. This information is essential evidence to verify the fraud committed by UnitedLex. Accordingly, the trustees have an obligation to disclose such information; failure to do so would render them liable for conspiracy. Thus, listing them for the first time as defendants is proper.

97. Listing UnitedLex Party as defendants is an important step in exploring the fraud within the AI-technology-controlled, failed law firm of LCR. As stated in the complaint, in the early communications of 2013, UnitedLex did not even have hardware operations in the U. S. They learned from LCR how to operate an AI system within a law firm. With substantial capital support, UnitedLex advanced rapidly, growing to 3,000 professional employees, while LCR gradually deteriorated.

In 2018, with the establishment of the joint venture ULX Partner, LLC (“ULXP”), ULXP provided services such as data collection, litigation case

analysis, and preparation of documents for court filings and other legal matters, while LCR was required to pay \$3.6 million per month to ULXP, which was a heavy financial burden on LCR. Building a powerful network requires significant capital, and such networks have reshaped the legal industry. The influence of a strong network is far greater than simply hiring a few lawyers. From a legal responsibility perspective, UnitedLex Party should bear part of the failure of LCR, as it did in the LCR bankruptcy case.

Furthermore, Chien believes that although a dozen LCR lawyers signed various litigation documents against him, Clark made the most significant contribution, since the firm's internal network made dominance much easier.

97. In more than a dozen litigations involving LCR or Freer, no one ever disclosed to Chien that UnitedLex Party had joined the litigation or seized copies of the hardware from desktop computers, or the computers themselves. Chien believes UnitedLex Party carried out these actions, and he asserts his right to locate the hardware, protect the confidential information of the companies and thousands of shareholders, and safeguard his personal privacy.

98. The unusual relationship between UnitedLex and LCR was revealed during LCR's bankruptcy and dissolution proceedings, including the adversary case. Daniel Reed was named as a defendant on 09/02/2021, and the final settlement

between UnitedLex/CVC and LCR Trustee Tavenner occurred in July 2024. If Chien is given credit of discovery delay of fraud which UnitedLex Party joined in 2014 to 2018. This time frame falls within four years for a RICO claim and five years for a business-conspiracy damages claim under Virginia Code §§ 18.2-499 and 18.2-500. Due to delays in discovery and what Chien describes as consistent bias in the litigation process, he argues that a new case naming UnitedLex as defendants should be protected by allowing credit for the discovery delay in overcoming the time bar, pursuant to the First Amendment of the Constitution.

CONCLUSIONS

99. The Virginia detention for debt collection was primarily intended to prevent Chien from challenging judicial misconduct in Case CL-12-485, Freer v. Chien. This detention harmed Chien's liberty, property, and reputation, and it also expanded into serious securities law violations lasting more than ten years. These violations extended to falsified corporate stock registrations with the SEC from 2018 to the present. Such violations constitute a significant legal problem, as they raise public concerns about the integrity and safety of government-mandated financial forums.

A detailed instruction contained in the declaration release must reflect Chien's claim of being a victim of RICO for 13 years, encompassing every stage before,

during, and after the detention. The judicial misconduct of refusing to lodge Chien's filing in the record of Case 1:17cv358 should be corrected immediately.

Respectively Submitted

Signature: A Chien

Appendixes: B, A, C, and D separately

Certification of Compliance

1. This document complies with the word limit of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(7)(B)(i) because excluding the exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(f), it contains less than 13,000 words.

2. This document complies with the typeface requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and the type-style requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(6) because it has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using 14-point font of Times New Roman.

Plaintiff-Appellant: A Chien

Certification of Services

All Parties are served by CM/ECF system.

Plaintiff-Appellant: A Chien