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**SIXTEEN PLUS CORPORATION’S FIRST MOTION TO COMPEL:**

**AS TO FATHI YUSUF’S ‘FIFTH AMENDMENT’ ASSERTIONS IN DISCOVERY**

**OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, TO PRECLUDE FURTHER TESTIMONY**

**(FILED SIMULTANEOUSLY IN SX-2016-CV-00650[[1]](#footnote-1)**

Plaintiff Sixteen Plus Corporation moves the Court to compel discovery responses from Third-Party Defendant Fathi Yusuf pursuant to Rules 26, 33 and 37, or in the alternative, to preclude further testimony regarding the subject of those interrogatories and related facts. Fathi Yusuf asserted his U.S. Constitutional Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination many times regarding Hamed’s *central* interrogatories—both in this case and the com, or, in the alternative to preclude his testimony companion 650 CICO action.

Attached hereto, as **Exhibit A**, is Plaintiff Hisham Hamed’s *Third Motion to CompelPreclude* in that companion CICO action, SX-2016-CV-00650. Plaintiff incorporates that motion, in full, herein.

 A proposed order is attached.
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**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH RULE A 37(a)(1)**

I hereby certify that I made the required efforts in good faith to confer with opposing counsel to obtain the foregoing requested information, and did so confer.

**Dated:** December 2, 2022 /s/ Carl J. Hartmann III

**IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS**
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**ORDER**

**THIS MATTER h**aving come before the Court on Sixteen Plus Corporation’s motion to compel discovery responses from Third-Party Defendant Fathi Yusuf pursuant to Rules 26, 33 and 37, or to preclude testimony, and the Court being fully informed,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Fathi Yusuf, having asserted his Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination, is not compelled to further answer the subject interrogatories. Yusuf has demonstrated the factual predicate pursuant to the standard for the inquiry which derives from *Hoffman v. United States*, 341 U.S. 479, 486 (1951. A witness is generally entitled to invoke the Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination where there is (1) a *realistic possibility* that his answer to a question can be used in any way to convict him of a crime. It need not be probable that a criminal prosecution will be brought or that the witness's answer will be introduced in a later prosecution; the witness need only show a realistic possibility that his answer will be used against him. Moreover, (2) the Fifth Amendment forbids not only the compulsion of testimony that would itself be admissible in a criminal prosecution, but also the compulsion of testimony, whether or not itself admissible, that may aid in the development of other incriminating evidence that can be used at trial.

 Yusuf has shown that testimony as to his acts from 1996 to the present meet these standards because the acts have not been fully immunized by a criminal Plea Agreement.

 However, he is precluded from testimony as to the interrogatories and related facts

**SO ORDERED.**

**Dated:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, 2022 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Douglas A. Brady**

**ATTEST:** TAMARA CHARLES, Judge of the Superior Court

Clerk of the Court

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**By:** Court Clerk Supervisor

1. The identical facts, issues and Rule 37 notices are presented by Fathi Yusuf’s assertions of the Fifth Amendment in both cases. Thus, the instant motion is filed in the other action by attachment there to the simultaneously-filed *Hisham Hamed’s Third Motion to Compel.* [↑](#footnote-ref-1)