07/08/2013

IN THE SUPREME COURT

VERONICA HANDY, ESQUIRE CLERK OF THE COURT

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

FATHI YUSUF AND UNITED CORPORATION,	
Appellants/Defendants, v.	S. Ct. Civ. No. 2013-CV-0040 Re. Super. Ct. Civ. No. 2012/37
MOHAMMAD HAMED By His Authorized Agent WALEED HAMED,	

Appellee/Plaintiff.

APPELLEE'S OPPOSITION TO APPELLANTS' MOTION TO STRIKE WALEED HAMED'S DECLARATION

The Appellee ("Hamed") hereby opposes Appellants' motion to strike the declaration of Waleed ("Wally") Hamed. For the reasons set forth herein, it is respectfully submitted the motion should be denied.

At the outset, it should be noted that the declaration was filed in support of the opposition to the motion to stay, which not only permits but requires such sworn statements to be submitted pursuant to S. Ct. R. 8(b) if the facts are in dispute. Waleed Hamed's declaration was filed to address both the facts in dispute as well as to explain why the granting of the motion to stay would cause significant harm to the Appellee.

Despite the Appellants' venomous assault on Waleed Hamed's declaration, Appellee stands fully behind all of the statements in the declaration, as none are untrue. Indeed, Appellants' motion to strike did not address most of the facts asserted in the declaration, which are fully supported by the record in this case, reserving their attack for the IRB related issues discussed in **¶¶** 28-37 of the declaration.

Notwithstanding Appellants' objections, the representations made by Waleed

Hamed regarding the status of his father's taxes are completely accurate. As noted by

the attached declaration of counsel (see Exhibit 1):

- Hamed has been concerned since the outset of this litigation about the filing of true and accurate tax returns.
- Hamed's counsel has repeatedly raised this issue with Appellants' counsel, challenging them to explain why they would allow United Corporation to file tax returns claiming 100% of the income from the three Plaza Extra Supermarkets, when in fact they (and Fathi Yusuf) have repeatedly acknowledged that 50% of these profits belong to Hamed.
- When this matter remained unresolved with Appellants' counsel, this issue was addressed in detail with IRB representatives in April of 2013 (in writing and in person).
- Hamed then filed tax returns on May 16, 2013, for the years in which he had not previously filed tax returns, reporting 50% of the profits from the three Plaza Extra supermarkets as his income, along with a cover letter explaining in detail why the tax due in these profits had already been paid, with the exception of an amount still due for the years 2002-2012 as part of the closure of the criminal case.
- Counsel was present with Waleed Hamed when this last payment of \$6.5 million was being addressed as part of the closure of the criminal case in St. Thomas on June 19, 2013.
- When it was pointed out that the tax payment of \$6.5 million was being paid from an account in which Hamed had a 50% interest, which counsel believed required Hamed's consent before it could be released, the IRB promised and subsequently delivered letters confirming that Hamed's taxes were paid in full for the prior years in question, not just the 2002-2010 period.¹

The Appellants' dismay at this turn of events is evidenced by counsel's June 29th letter

to the IRB, unbelievably threatening a variety of actions if (1) the letters to Hamed were

not withdrawn and (2) a letter was not received confirming the \$6.5 million was only

¹ The documents referenced in the attached declaration are probably not needed to resolve the issues on appeal, but if the Court wishes to review them, they can all be submitted. If needed, it is requested that any documents submitted to the IRB be filed under seal.

Appellees' Opposition to Appellants' Motion to Strike Waleed Hamed's Declaration Page 3

used to cover the Appellants' taxes and not the taxes of <u>any</u> of the Hameds. See Exhibit C attached to Appellants' motion.

Of course, one has to ask---why do the Appellants have any issue with Hamed's taxes being deemed paid if their taxes were deemed paid as well? The answer is simple—Appellants want to use the payment of taxes to try to justify taking the entire \$37,000,000 that remains in escrowed profits as soon as the criminal case ends,² confirming the Hamed's assertions that staying the preliminary injunction will significantly harm him.

As for the other letters submitted by Appellants, the letter of the U.S. Attorney (Exhibit D) is disappointing, but understandable—she wants to end a criminal case in which Mohammad Hamed has no part.³ The letter submitted by IRB Director Watson-Anderson (Exhibit E) at first appears perplexing, but in reality it is quite ingenious. She managed to satisfy the parties in the criminal case yet kept the IRB's promise to Hamed, avoiding taking a side in this dispute (while getting 100% of the taxes owed on the profits generated by Plaza Extra). However, neither letter (which are unverified) contradicts the declaration of Waleed Hamed that (1) his father has filed his tax returns and (2) the IRB has acknowledged that his taxes have been paid in full for the years in question.

In short, Hamed's declaration should not be stricken—it is not inaccurate and it is relevant to the "stay" issues for which it was submitted.

² That case is now tentatively set to end on July 16th. **See Exhibit 2.**

³ Her suggestion that the items discussed with the court should perhaps be kept confidential was actually one initially made by the undersigned counsel, which counsel for the Appellants rejected, obviously because he had hope to use the tax issue to his clients' advantage. **See Exhibit 1.**

Appellees' Opposition to Appellants' Motion to Strike Waleed Hamed's Declaration Page 4

Dated: July 8, 2013

/s/ Joel H. Holt

Joel H. Holt (Bar # 6) Counsel for Appellee 2132 Company Street Christiansted, VI 00820

/s/Carl J. Hartmann, III, Esq.__

Carl J. Hartmann III (Bar # 48) *Co-Counsel for Appellee* 5000 Estate Coakley Bay, L-6 Christiansted, VI 00820

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on July 8, 2013, I electronically filed the foregoing **APPELLEE'S OPPOSITION TO APPELLANTS' MOTION TO STRIKE WALEED HAMED'S DECLARATION** with the Clerk of the Court using the VISCEFS system, which will send a notification of such filing (NEF) and I caused two true and exact copies of the foregoing to be served by mail to:

Joseph A. DiRuzzo, III Fuerst Ittleman David & Joseph, PL 1001 Brickell Bay Drive, 32nd. Fl. Miami, FL 33131 305-350-5690 Email: jdiruzzo@fuerstlaw.com

Dated: July 8, 2013

/s/ Joel H. Holt

07/08/2013

IN THE SUPREME COURT

VERONICA HANDY, ESQUIRE CLERK OF THE COURT

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

FATHI YUSUF AND UNITED CORPORATION.

v.

Appellants/Defendants,

MOHAMMAD HAMED By His Authorized Agent WALEED HAMED, S. Ct. Civ. No. 2013-CV-0040 Re. Super. Ct. Civ. No. 2012/370

Appellee/Plaintiff.

DECLARATION OF JOEL H. HOLT

- I, Joel H. Holt, declare, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1746, as follows:
 - 1. I represent Mohammad Hamed in this case.
 - 2. I have direct personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein.
 - 3. My client has been concerned since the outset of this litigation about the filing of true and accurate tax returns.
 - 4. I have repeatedly raised this issue with Appellants' counsel in writing, sending multiple letters between October, 2012, and April, 2013, asking counsel to explain why they would allow United Corporation to file tax returns claiming 100% of the income from the three Plaza Extra Supermarkets, when in fact they (and Fathi Yusuf) have repeatedly acknowledged that 50% of these profits belong to Hamed.
 - 5. When this matter remained unresolved with Appellants' counsel, I addressed this tax issue in detail with IRB representatives in April of 2013 (in writing and in person).
 - 6. My client filed tax returns on May 16 2013, for the years in which he had not previously filed tax returns, reporting 50% of the profits from the three Plaza Extra Supermarkets as his income, along with a cover letter explaining in detail why the tax due in these profits had already been paid except for a final amount still due for the time period 2002-2012 as part of the closure of the criminal case.

EXHIBIT	
L	
	EXHIBIT 1

- 7. I was present with Waleed Hamed in St. Thomas on June 19, 2013, when this last payment of \$6.5 million in taxes was being addressed as part of the closure of the criminal case.
- 8. I initially suggested that all agreements be kept confidential, but counsel for the Appellants rejected that offer.
- 9. When I pointed out that the tax payment of \$6.5 million was being paid from an account in which Hamed had a 50% interest, which I believe required Hamed's consent before it could be released, the IRB promised and subsequently delivered letters confirming that Hamed's taxes were paid in full for the prior years in question, including the 2002-2010 period.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: July 8, 2013

JOEL H.

Case: 1:05-cr-00015-RLF-GWB Document #: 1374 Filed: 07/03/13 Page 1 of 3 Г I I

07/08/2013

IN THE SUPREME COURT

VERONICA HANDY, ESQUIRE CLERK OF THE COURT

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS DIVISION OF ST. CROIX

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and GOVERNMENT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED CORPORATION d/b/a Plaza Extra,

Defendant.

CRIMINAL NO. 2005-015

JOINT MOTION TO SCHEDULE SENTENCING HEARING

The parties move the Court to schedule the sentencing hearing for United

Corporation on Tuesday July 16, 2013.

Dated: _____7/3/2013 ____

Dated: _____7/3/2013

s/Lori A. Hendrickson LORI A. HENDRICKSON Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice

s/Joseph A. DiRuzzo, III¹ JOSEPH A. DIRUZZO, III Attorney for Defendant United Corporation

0.5208	EXHIBIT	
Blumberg A	2	

¹ Joseph A. DiRuzzo, III has consented to his signature being represented as "s/Joseph A. DiRuzzo, III" as permitted by LRCi 5.4(h)(4)(ii).

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Lori A. Hendrickson, certify that on July 3, 2013, I filed the foregoing with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send a notification of such filing (NEF) to:

Henry C. Smock, Esquire Suites B18-23 Palm Passage P.O. Box 1498 St. Thomas, Virgin Islands 00804' smock@islands.vi

Derek M. Hodge, Esquire Mackay & Hodge P.O. Box 303678 St. Thomas, VI 00804 derek@mackayhodge.com

John K. Dema, Esquire Law Offices of John K. Dema, P.C. 1236 Strand Street, Suite 103 St. Croix, VI 00820-5008 jdema@lojkd.com

Gordon Rhea Richardson, Patrick, Westbrook & Brickman, LLC 1037 Chuck Dawley Boulevard, Suite 200 Mount Pleasant, South Carolina 29464 grhea@rpwb.com

Randall P. Andreozzi Andreozzi, Bluestein, Fickess, Muhlbauer, Weber, Brown LLP 9145 Main Street Clarence, NY 14031 rpa@abfmwb.com

Pamela Lynn Colon, Esquire Law Offices of Pamela Lynn Colon, LLC 2155 King Cross Street, Suite 3 Christiansted, VI 00820 pamelalcolon@msn.com Joseph A. DiRuzzo, III Fuerst Ittleman David & Joseph, pl 1001 Brickell Bay Drive 32nd Floor Miami, Florida 33131 jdiruzzo@fuerstlaw.com

Mitchell S. Fuerst Fuerst Ittleman David & Joseph, pl 1001 Brickell Bay Drive 32nd Floor Miami, Florida 33131 mfuerst@fuerstlaw.com

Nizar A. DeWood The DeWood Law Firm 2006 Eastern Suburb, Suite 101 Christiansted, VI 00820 dewoodlaw@me.com

Alphonso Andrews, Esquire U.S. Attorney's Office Federal Building & U.S Courthouse 5500 Veterans Drive, Suite 260 St. Thomas VI 00802-64254 alphonso.andrews@usdoj.gov

Nelson Luis Jones U.S. Attorney's Office Ron De Lugo Federal Bldg. 5500 Veterans Drive, Suite 260 St. Thomas, VI 00802 nelson.jones@usdoj.gov

> <u>s/ Lori A. Hendrickson</u> Lori A. Hendrickson