

January 06, 2005

Reg. No. 00436-124

v. C. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] v. [REDACTED] 1000

CLERK OF THE COURT

Petitioner,

:
:
:

23 72

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

substantively damaged by the results of this [REDACTED]

11. Lambros' appeal counsel, after remand of this case and its return

to this District Court, was not to be a copy of

1. [REDACTED]

2. [REDACTED]

3. [REDACTED]

This much is told by the Court in the case of [REDACTED]

4. [REDACTED]

order to show [REDACTED]

5. [REDACTED]

(An argument in equity).

The Leasehold Department

In Crown's name


approval" and is it "disciplinary counsel" The transcript shows...

person that Lombard was contacted by...

... .. and at the no continued boarder


... .. (Dec 1/2) by the District Court for no-sentenc-







UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT



PLAINTIFF

IN EXHIBIT B RELAY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

John Gregory Lambert

AO 256A

