



Darryl Cotton <151darrylcotton@gmail.com>

Mr. Phillip Zamora Affidavit re Antitrust Law Violations in Cannabis Licensing.

Darryl Cotton <151darrylcotton@gmail.com>

Mon, Mar 20, 2023 at 4:23 PM

To: "Hortencia.Barajas@usdoj.gov" <Hortencia.Barajas@usdoj.gov>, derek.ko@usdoj.gov, "fred.sheppard@usdoj.gov" <fred.sheppard@usdoj.gov>, "shital.thakkar@usdoj.gov" <shital.thakkar@usdoj.gov>

Cc: thom.mrokek@usdoj.gov, Brandi.mayers@usdoj.gov, MJenkins@usa.doj.gov, VDragalin@usa.doj.gov, Mollie.Lee@doj.ca.gov, Nichole.Elliott@cannabis.ca, Tamara.Colson@cannabis.ca.gov, Tim.Vandenneuvel@doj.ca, arden@austinlegalgroup.com, mskeels@sandiego.gov, jorge.delportio@sdcda.org, Amy Sherlock <amyjoshersherlock@gmail.com>, "chris@xmgmedia.com" <chris@xmgmedia.com>, choy@sandiego.gov, Debbie Peterson <debbiepeterson805@gmail.com>, Joe Hurtado <j.hurtado1@gmail.com>, Andrew Flores <Afloreslaw@gmail.com>, Robert.Sumner@asm.ca.gov, jeffcrilley@realnewspr.com, greg.moran@suniontribune.com, Jesse.marx@voiceofsandiego.org, lauramartin@realnewspr.com, Michael.berens@thomsonreuters.com, gary.robins@suniontribune.com, stoothacre@ferrisbritton.com, jhemmerling@sandiego.gov, "ftirandazi@sandiego.gov" <ftirandazi@sandiego.gov>, "gbraun@sandiego.gov" <gbraun@sandiego.gov>, "ccac@sandiego.gov" <ccac@sandiego.gov>, msokolowski@sandiego.gov, "Jthornton@ftblaw.com" <Jthornton@ftblaw.com>, John.shiffman@thomsonreuters.com, "corina.young@live.com" <corina.young@live.com>, "gaustin@austinlegalgroup.com" <gaustin@austinlegalgroup.com>, tamara@austinlegalgroup.com, "Biancaaimeemartinez@gmail.com" <Biancaaimeemartinez@gmail.com>, Lisa.halverstadt@voiceofsandiego.com, "jessica@mcelfreshlaw.com" <jessica@mcelfreshlaw.com>, susan.leibowitz@nbcuni.com

Ms. Barajas,

You may recall I contacted you a few years ago regarding what I was finding in pay-to-play cannabis licensing corruption occurring in the City of San Diego. I wouldn't normally bother with my civil case matters but as a result of recent events I thought it best to share this with you. Until recently, not much has changed in my, what will now be, 6 year anniversary I have spent on a so-far fruitless effort to remediate the damage I have suffered through the frivolous and malicious litigation that occurred in GERACI v COTTON (SD Sup Ct Case No. 37-2017-00010073-CU-BC-CTL) (hereinafter referred to as Cotton I). I have yet to find a court willing to act on evidence that certain attorneys have been, and continue to engage in, acts of fraud upon the court by directly assisting in the commission of crimes in violation of court orders, antitrust and cannabis licensing laws among others. I'm not giving up though and with additional information coming to light I wanted you to be aware of how you may now have criminal elements to consider.

1) Here is a list of related cases that have spawned from Cotton I @

http://www.justice4amy.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/22-10-12_Sherlock-Related-Cases.pdf

2) On or about July 2019, a series of Motions in Limine were submitted to the court which would have allowed the jury to hear evidence that, among other things, a conspiracy existed in the City of San Diego cannabis licensing process and that certain attorneys were actively engaged in these fraudulent practices. None of my Motions in Limine were granted.

<https://151farmers.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/ROA-596.pdf>

3) **On March 17, 2023, I received a sworn affidavit by Mr. Phillip Zamora who served as Director of Operations** for the 8869 Balboa Avenue marijuana dispensary in which he details the conspiracy and antitrust activities that occurred and **he witnessed** while he was there.

http://www.justice4amy.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/23-03-17_Zamora-Declaration.pdf

4) I knew of Mr. Zamora from an interview he had done in November 2018 which confirmed many of the suspicions I had regarding Geraci and his attorney Gina Austin who I believed were engaged in cannabis licensing fraud and a conspiracy to monopolize cannabis licenses in the City and County of San Diego. The March 17, 2023 Zamora Affidavit proves that to be the case.

http://www.justice4amy.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/2020-October_Mr.-Phil-Zamora-Informant-Interview-Audio-Transcript.pdf

5) While Mr. Zamora's statements leave no doubt as to the criminal activity that these people have been and continue to be engaged in, they have been quite successful at deceiving the courts that their actions would fall within the guidelines of normal attorney-client representation. Even when that representation means "ignoring court orders" (Pg's 355;20 - 356;11) and "driving getaway cars" (Pg. 358;23-25) @

http://www.justice4amy.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/19-03-08_COA-RT-Vol-4-of-7-D075028.pdf

6) To further obfuscate matters to the courts, and to those state and local licensing agencies, corrupt attorneys, such as Austin, have on occasion maintained that individuals, such as Geraci and Razuki, could own a cannabis license, with over than a 20% ownership interest, after having been sanctioned within 3 years of having applied for that license. The "expert" cannabis lawyers purposefully ignored laws that even their clients were aware of. Indeed, Razuki even sets forth the exact reasons he could not be listed on the applications as his sanctions prevented him from doing so. (Pg's 5072;21 - 5073;8) @

http://www.justice4amy.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/19-07-09_AA-Vol-16-of-19-D075028.pdf

Here we have, Razuki, describing in his own words, that the license application could not, as a result of having been sanctioned, include his name on the cannabis license application and that his "oral agreement" with his proxy would control his ownership rights! The criminals know this. It's astonishing their attorneys might argue otherwise.

7) Without getting too caught up in the details (I'll let my amended complaint speak to that) I would ask that a very simple matter of law be determined here. **Does California Business & Professions Code (BPC) § 26057, former § 19323, bar previously sanctioned individuals from owning cannabis businesses for three years from the date of their last sanction for engaging in "unauthorized commercial cannabis activities?" If that is not permissive language than those matters that relied on the courts not taking action on licensing issues that relied on a proxy or strawman practice to acquire these licenses are illegal and void ab initio.**

http://www.justice4amy.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/23-01-10_Flores-to-Multiple-Parties-Demand-Letter.pdf

8) I don't blame the courts for what has occurred here. I realize they are busy and understaffed. I do however, lay blame on the corrupt lawyers who advertise themselves as "experts" in the field of cannabis law and regulations and who gloss over the foundational disclosure laws they willfully ignore. They knew that these were illegal activities. The first question they should ask a potential client is if they had been sanctioned for illegal cannabis activity within the past three years. Some may do this. Clearly others do not. Instead the unscrupulous lawyer will tie up the courts resources for years in litigation while deceiving the courts that the legal representations, **as officers of the court**, being submitted on behalf of their client(s) are lawful and ethical. And they would have gotten away with it, unless and until there comes a property owner, such as me, who is bombarded by their superior forces and made to defend himself as a pro se litigant in these matters. That pro se litigant just won't give up though because he is right and he has nothing more to lose. Or if your another victim whose husband, Michael "Biker" Sherlock, is found dead on a beach from a reported self-inflicted gunshot wound and you question how the same people, (Razuki) are charged in a conspiracy to commit murder but later convicted of conspiracy to kidnap and not somehow be considered a suspect in Biker's death. A death that financially benefited those who stood to gain from Biker's name **NOT BEING** on the cannabis license. Simply put, Biker had to be removed!

8.1) <https://151farmers.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Complaint-Razuki-Gonzalez.pdf>

8.2) <https://151farmers.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/ECF-208.pdf>

9) For Amy Sherlock and me this is not over. I may be the quintessential "crazy pro se" but there is more to come which I intend to bring forth in my civil litigation. And while Amy has had attorney Flores representing her, he is just a sole practitioner specializing in criminal law who has been bombarded in civil suit filings and defending Anti-SLAPP motions that to date he has not yet been able to successfully defend. In fact one of the Anti-SLAPP awards was granted and is now on appeal in the 4th DCA. Literally a criminal using the courts to intimidate a widow from seeing that justice is served on behalf of her children's father!

http://www.justice4amy.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/23-01-11_COA-Sherlocks-Opening-Brief-of-Austins-Anti-SLAPP-Award.pdf

In conclusion, I'm not asking for any intervention on the civil court matters, I expect the courts will get to the truth, but what I would ask from those in a position to do so, would be to consider seeking sanctions or disbaring corrupt attorneys for their activities and where the law allows, put those who deserve to be behind bars, where they belong. That simple act sends a message to any other attorneys out there who might consider taking these shortcuts to "cannabis riches." If it takes people like Flores, Sherlock, Zamora, me and others who have yet to be heard, to demand that justice be found in civil proceedings, so be it. But rest assured we are here, and equally resolute, to assist in the criminal prosecution of those who, acting under color of authority, would abuse those positions for self-enrichment.

Should you wish to reach me regarding anything I've set forth herein I accept emails or, if you prefer, I may be contacted by phone or text at the number listed below. Thank you for your consideration and in anticipation of your reply I will remain.

Darryl Cotton
619.954.4447
151DarrylCotton@gmail.com
151Farmers.org



Changing the World One Garden at a Time!

Confidentiality Notice: The information contained in this email message is confidential and is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by email and delete the original message and all copies thereof. Thank you.