

Harvard Club – Box 126
27 West 44th Street
New York, NY 10036
john@johnkarls.com
September 2, 2010

Ms. Gwen Ifill
The PBS News Hour
1700 Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22206

(This is a copy of a letter sent to each of 43 news media superstars.)

Dear Ms. Ifill:

**Re: \$84 Billion Legally Pledged For Education of American Inner-City
Children Rapidly Slipping Away Due To Judicial Improprieties –
LAST CALL FOR YOUR HELP WHICH IS URGENTLY NEEDED!!!**

The fate of an estimated 10 million inner-city children trying to escape America's permanent underclass will be decided on Monday September 27 when the U.S. Supreme Court decides whether to accept an appeal against Goldman Sachs, et. al. Since only three dozen appeals per year are accepted and none of the justices even reads any of the appeal petitions (each is summarized by solely one clerk), the 10 million inner-city children are doomed absent at least some of the kind of media coverage that David Boies and his Prop 8 case were enjoying in August.

CNN's initial coverage on August 4th trumpeted that the Supreme Court justices do not live in a vacuum – that they are influenced by media reporting in deciding whether an issue is so important that the Court should accept an appeal. David Boies agrees, as was obvious from his providing frequent interviews for the media and his participation on prestigious nationwide television programs.

The \$84 billion from Goldman Sachs, et. al., would benefit "I Have A Dream"® or IHAD-style programs replicating what a self-made multi-billionaire accomplished beginning with a promise 30 years ago to the graduating sixth graders of Harlem PS 121 that he would pay their college tuition if they would stay in school. These programs are the only thing that have proved effective in increasing significantly the typical inner-city high-school graduation rates from SINGLE DIGITS – in the case of these programs to 65%-70% and beyond primarily because their tutors and mentors become de facto surrogate parents.

The \$84 billion is the amount for which 15 worldwide financial institutions are being sued for conversion of a trade secret that was admittedly stolen by Barclays Capital Ltd. (a subsidiary of Britain's Barclays Bank plc) and transmitted by Barclays to the 15 groups of defendants. The classic common-law action for conversion (the civil equivalent of theft) rests on precisely the same grounds as what is used by heirs of Holocaust victims whose fine art was stolen by the Nazis. Like such heirs, the owner of the trade secret has elected to pursue the current holders of the stolen property. (Presumably they will be able to recover the amount of any judgments against them from Barclays Bank plc.)

Unfortunately, in recent years courts have engaged in a now common practice of making decisions that are not published and cannot be cited in order to improperly dispose of cases for which there is little interest by the media or by the public. This is true even though such practices should be viewed as an unconstitutional denial of due process of law and as an unconstitutional denial of equal protection of the law. These practices are particular egregious when they are employed to aggrandize a British bank (Barclays) which knew its actions would prevent 10 million American inner-city children from escaping America's permanent underclass.

In addition, just like years ago when a white member of the media masqueraded as a poor black person and was shocked at his treatment, the treatment by the judiciary of plaintiffs who cannot afford to hire counsel is eye-popping:

- The U.S. District Court granted the pre-trial motion of Goldman Sachs, et. al., to dismiss a classic common-law action for **conversion** of a trade secret after permitting Goldman Sachs to illegally submit

voluminous material following which the court cancelled the only scheduled hearing which would have been the plaintiff's sole opportunity to respond.

- A 3-judge Ninth Circuit panel affirmed the decision with no discussion of why the 10 million American inner-city children were being denied the same "equal protection of the law" that is routinely enjoyed by heirs of Holocaust victims whose fine art was stolen by the Nazis.
- Even though the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure ("FRAP") encourage mere motions for rehearing by the original Circuit Court panel but state that Petitions for Rehearing En Banc are not favored, plaintiff filed solely a Petition for Rehearing En Banc. The "FRAP" specify that a vote must be taken whether to grant a "Petition For Rehearing En Banc" if any Circuit Court Judge (the Ninth Circuit has 47) requests a vote. In defiance of that rule, the original three-judge panel seized control of the "Petition for Rehearing," illegally re-constructed it as a mere "Motion for Rehearing" (as if calling a "rattlesnake" a "canary" will somehow protect you if the "canary" bites), and then summarily dismissed the "canary" with no further redress and without permitting the other 44 Ninth Circuit Judges to even see the Petition.

I was chief organizer and benefactor of one of the 178 IHAD programs in the 1990's which served 200 children in public housing projects. I also served for many years as volunteer treasurer of IHAD-National. I developed the trade secret and I continue to honor my legal obligation to give all of my rights to an IHAD or IHAD-style program as soon as possible.

Unfortunately, a legal entity such as a foundation, is required to be represented by counsel. IHAD-National had to decline my gift of the rights against Goldman Sachs and the other 14 large financial institutions because IHAD-National was not in a financial position to shoulder the legal expenses. As expected, no local IHAD program was in such a position either.

When I took early retirement in 1997 from practicing law in NYC for 30 years to relocate to London to become an investment banker (Brits call us merchant bankers), my admission to practice law in New York lapsed. Therefore, I cannot represent a juridical entity though, as an individual, I can handle the lawsuits on a pro se basis in the meantime. It should also be noted that I cannot afford to hire legal counsel for IHAD because I have always given away all of my excess wealth over the years to educating inner-city children and improving the environment, and I am now retired.

Accordingly, I have contacted approximately 60 inner-city clergy to form a foundation that would be capable of handling this project. Developments are slow to materialize, but this is the way that my IHAD-Stamford CT foundation was formed two decades ago – on the framework of an Advisory Board comprising a majority of ministers and rabbis, and utilizing as tutors and mentors many of their congregants.

On August 16, 2010, you and 42 of your colleagues who are also prominent in the American media were requested to provide coverage of this imbroglio so that, like David Boies and his Prop 8 litigation, we are able to bring the plight of the 10 million inner-city children trying to escape the American permanent underclass directly to the attention of the U.S. Supreme Court justices.

If you have any comments or questions, I would be delighted to address them if you send them to john@johnkarls.com. You are also welcome to call my cell, 01-917-270-1280, which does **not** have a texting capability.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

John S. Karls
JD, Harvard Law School, 1967
Who's Who in American Law, 1988-2003
Who's Who in America, 1988-2003
Who's Who in the World, 1994-2003

cc: Mr. Michael Moore