

Top 10

The Top 10 Reasons why President Trump should commute Trudeau's cruel and unusual ten year prison sentence for contempt of court

10) Trudeau's sentence should be reduced because Trudeau is categorically not guilty of criminal contempt of court. An innocent man is serving a ten-year prison sentence.

In order for Trudeau to be considered guilty of criminal contempt due to violation of the consent decree, the government had to prove beyond reasonable doubt that: a) Trudeau misrepresented the contents of his book "The Weight Loss Cure", and b) that he did so "wilfully, with intent, and knowingly".

Firstly, Trudeau did not misrepresent the contents of his book.

Every word in the infomercial could also be found in the book. Trudeau simply quoted the book, paraphrased the book, stated his opinions, and shared his own personal journey as well as the experiences of other people. This is speech protected by the First Amendment.

The author described the Weight Loss Cure book in the same way, and using the same "formula" as he'd previously applied to the "approved" infomercials that featured the Natural Cures book.

Had Trudeau misrepresented the contents of the book, the prosecutors would have been able to produce hard evidence and proof, including:

- massive refunds requested by customers

- class-action lawsuits filed by customers
- complaints filed by angry customers with the FTC, the US Postal Inspector, and other state, local, and federal regulatory agencies
- a civil or criminal "fraud" case filed against Trudeau by a law enforcement agency.

None of these events transpired and no such evidence brought forth.

The facts demonstrate that people did not feel at all misled. The exonerating evidence, which was all deemed inadmissible by Judge Guzman due to "irrelevancy", establishes that Trudeau never misrepresented the contents of his book. The evidence, had it been admitted, would clearly show that many people who purchased the book:

- ordered more copies following receipt of the original order to give as gifts
- recommended the book to others, making it a NY Times bestseller
- ordered Trudeau's future books
- wrote unsolicited testimonial letters stating that they loved the book and found the weight loss method to be easy
- requested refunds at rate of approximately 8%, which is substantially lower than the industry average (12% - 15%).

None of this would have taken place had the customers felt misled.

The tens of thousands of written testimonials from customers who bought the book and loved it were deemed inadmissible evidence. None of the people who were willing to testify that they watched the infomercial, purchased the book, and did NOT feel misled, were permitted to speak in court.

Had Trudeau in fact misrepresented the contents of his book, the government should have had no trouble producing at least ONE person to testify that he or she watched the infomercial, purchased the book, and felt misled. The prosecution failed to bring any such witnesses to the stand.

Trudeau is also innocent because he had no willful intent to misrepresent the contents of his book or violate the order in any way.

Clearly, Trudeau had no criminal intent. The author believed that he was simply exercising his First Amendment right of free speech. All the evidence that was deemed "inadmissible" would have established clearly that Trudeau believed he was in full compliance with the order.

When Trudeau spoke passionately about his book in the infomercials, never for a moment did it cross Trudeau's mind that he was committing a "crime".

Trudeau believed that he was accurately describing the contents of his book. After all, as the author of the book, he alone knew the intended meaning of its contents.

There is no "willfulness", since Trudeau at all times "believed" and "thought" that he was in compliance with the order. Absent "willfulness" or intent to violate the order, there is no criminal contempt. Trudeau is innocent.

Trudeau is also innocent because he was extremely diligent in his efforts to obey the order. It is undisputed that Trudeau spent an enormous amount of time and money working with his legal counsel to remain compliant with the order. The law is clear. If Trudeau simply tried, or made an earnest attempt, to obey the order, then his diligence is established - and that alone is sufficient to prove his innocence. The evidence that demonstrated Trudeau's good faith efforts to comply with the order was likewise deemed "inadmissible".

For all of the reasons outlined above, as well as many others, Trudeau is innocent. He did not commit criminal contempt of court. An innocent man is serving a ten-year prison sentence.

9) Trudeau's sentence should be commuted because a mountain of evidence, including documents and witnesses, which would have established Trudeau's innocence, was deemed "irrelevant" and inadmissible. Trudeau was virtually denied the opportunity to defend himself.

All the evidence that proved Trudeau:

- did not misrepresent the contents of his book
- had no wilful OR criminal intent; believed he was in full compliance with the order; believed that he was simply exercising his First Amendment rights; and did not know that he could even possibly be violating the order
- was fully diligent, and worked very hard and to the very best of his ability to ensure that he remained fully compliant with the order at all times

was deemed inadmissible.

Here is a partial list of evidence that was excluded from the proceedings due to "irrelevancy". This evidence demonstrates that Trudeau did not misrepresent the contents of the book, and that he had no wilful intent to do so. This evidence shows that Trudeau was diligent and did not "know" that his speech could be considered "criminal". We believe this evidence would have fully exonerated Trudeau, resulting in a verdict of "Not Guilty".

- Written testimonials from customers who purchased the book and loved it
- Witnesses who wanted to testify that they bought the book and did not feel misled

- Witnesses who wanted to testify that they used the Dr. Simeons HCG weight loss protocol and found it to be easy
- Medical Doctors who wished to offer expert testimony on the success stories about patients applying the techniques described in Trudeau books
- The original "approved" infomercial for the book "Natural Cures They Don't Want You to Know About"
- The transcript, including the Judge's comments, from the New York State case (when Trudeau emerged victorious after suing the government for suppression and violation of his First Amendment rights), to establish that the Natural Cures infomercial accurately reflected the contents of the book
- Judge Gettleman's and FTC statements certifying that the Natural Cures infomercial accurately reflected the contents of the book
- Facts demonstrating that the now famous Dr. Simeons HCG weight loss protocol that Trudeau describes in his book is indeed safe and effective, was featured on the Dr. Oz TV show, and was routinely administered, endorsed, and recommended by licensed Medical Doctors across America and the world
- And much, much more

Astonishingly, Trudeau was not allowed to use the First Amendment as a defence. The presiding judge instructed Trudeau that the words "First Amendment" would not even be uttered in his courtroom. Trudeau was forbidden to read to the jury the section of the "Order", which stated that nothing in the order would impede Trudeau's First Amendment rights, as related to the promotion of his book. The fact that the entire order was entered into evidence by the prosecution did not sway the judge's ruling on the matter.

Trudeau had relied heavily on this stipulation when producing the infomercials in question.

The author was not even allowed to point out to the jury the multiple episodes of the infomercial where Trudeau directly states that "all I am doing is exercising my First Amendment rights of free speech".

The fact that Trudeau's voluminous evidence was deemed inadmissible in its entirety, leads one to consider the possibility that the whole judicial process was in certain ways "rigged", or that the deck was stacked against the author starting on day one. Many knowledgeable observers noted at the very beginning of the case, that both judges had already predetermined that Trudeau would be found guilty and would go to prison. The unfair and one-sided nature of the proceedings become even more pronounced as the trial progressed.

Trudeau never had a chance.

8) Trudeau should have his sentence reduced because Trudeau's right to a speedy trial under the Speedy Trial Act was clearly violated.

The criminal contempt case against Trudeau should have been dismissed in its entirety. Both Judge Guzman and the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals effectively made their own law when they denied Trudeau's arguments in relation to the Act, summarily ignoring clearly defined statutes as well as precedent.

It appeared that it didn't matter to these arbiters of justice what the law actually said. Their decision had been predetermined well in advance. Trudeau was destined to be found guilty.

7) Trudeau's ten-year prison sentence should be reduced because Trudeau was punished and incarcerated for exercising his Constitutional rights.

One can reasonable speculate that had Trudeau not exercised his right of free speech by going on his radio show and verbally attacking Judge Gettleman and

the FTC, that had he not solicited his listeners to exercise their First Amendment rights to "petition for grievances" by e-mailing Judge Gettleman, the magistrate would have never retaliated against Trudeau by charging him with "criminal contempt". It was clear that Gettleman wanted to punish Trudeau with some prison time - perhaps as much as thirty days.

However, Trudeau exercises his legal rights, appealed the original criminal contempt charged, and emerged victorious. Trudeau did not spend a single night in prison.

If Trudeau simply took his lumps, and served his thirty days, the story would have ended right then and there.

Yet once again, Gettleman appeared to seek retaliation, by revisiting the civil contempt case and doing something that has no precedent in US history. Gettleman "upgraded" the civil contempt charges to criminal contempt, for identical conduct that had already been adjudicated. He proceeded to increase the potential prison term from thirty days to a maximum of six months.

Once charged with criminal contempt by Gettleman, had Trudeau pleaded guilty instead of maintaining his innocence and demanding a trial, he would have faced a maximum of six months in prison. However, Trudeau maintained his innocence and exercised his right to a trial, thereby exposing himself to a possible sentence of life in prison.

Had Trudeau not exercised his right to file a motion for Judge Gettleman's recusal due to the appearance of judicial bias, the case would not have been transferred to Judge Guzman. The latter would then never get the chance to lift Gettleman's maximum applicable sentence of six months in prison and replace it with as much as life behind bars.

None of these actions can be described as fair, justified, or (as many would have it) "legal".

Every time Trudeau exercised his legal and Constitutional rights, the judges appeared to take retaliatory action against the defendant, "punishing" him with ever-increasing terms of potential incarceration.

6) President Trump should commute Trudeau's sentence because Judge Guzman ignored, and some would argue "violated", Judge Gettleman's order to cap Trudeau's maximum possible prison sentence at six months and treat the case as a misdemeanour.

Nothing in this case changed between the moment the FTC originally charged Trudeau with simple civil contempt and the time when Guzman issued a brand new show cause order, charging the author with criminal contempt, and subjecting him to the prospects of life in prison if the case went to trial and Trudeau was found guilty. The chain of events that led up to Trudeau's ten-year incarceration term was fundamentally and profoundly wrong.

Some would suggest that Guzman, in fact, wilfully violated Judge Gettleman's court order, and even that Judge Guzman should be held in criminal contempt for wilful violation of a court order.

5) The President should grant Trudeau's request for a reduction of the prison sentence because the author was forced to endure almost everything that could go "wrong" in court, and subjected to all the "ugly realities" that sometimes emerge in the judicial and government regulatory processes, including:

- Selective, vindictive and retaliatory prosecution
- Seemingly "rigged" proceedings chaired by Judges who had pre-determined that Trudeau would be found guilty, even before any evidence was presented

- The appearance of bias, prejudice, and political motivations
- The dubious distinction of being the first civil contempt case in US history to be "upgraded" by the presiding Judge to a criminal contempt case, years after the fact

It appears that Trudeau did not have the benefit of having his case tried by impartial, independent arbiters of fact. Judge Guzman stated that Trudeau's books and opinions were "worthless and dangerous", and he was sentencing Trudeau to ten years in prison "to send a message to others who think like Trudeau." Such statements are more than simply disturbing. They are utterly terrifying.

The appearance of bias and prejudice throughout the proceedings is borne out by the facts.

Consider that Guzman would not even allow Trudeau to self-surrender, a courtesy that is routinely extended to many convicted felons (which Trudeau was not). Instead, the Judge refused to consider the bail option, and ordered Trudeau to be immediately taken into custody. The author was then confined to maximum security solitary confinement pending his sentencing. This is anything but standard practice.

Guzman was informed that both of Trudeau's parents were elderly and did not have long to live. Trudeau's counsel requested that he be allowed to visit his parents, who could not travel due to illness. Judge Guzman was aware that Trudeau would never be able to see them alive again, and wanted a chance to at least say goodbye to his Mother and Father. Judge Guzman denied the request, adding with a smirk that Trudeau "could go to their funerals". Doesn't this seem odd? Doesn't this sound cruel and vindictive?

Once Trudeau was incarcerated, both his Mother and Father did, in fact, pass away. Trudeau's request to attend their funerals was denied. Such requests are routinely granted to inmates of Trudeau's security and custody levels. Does

this appear to be "fair", or does it smell like someone "had it in for Trudeau" and was going to "teach him a lesson"?

Throughout the entire course of the civil and criminal proceedings against him, it seemed like Trudeau could not get a fair and impartial hearing. Why did Guzman deny me, a former US Congressman, the opportunity to speak on my friend's behalf at sentencing, and instructed three bailiffs to physically remove me from the courtroom?

Virtually every one of Trudeau's motions were denied, and every motion filed by the prosecution granted. In one instance, Trudeau's attorneys filed a routine motion on their client's behalf. Several days later, Counsel inquired about the status of the motion. Gettleman responded that he did not know about any motion, did not read it, and whatever it was about, he was denying it anyway, adding that "you can appeal me if you want."

It appears to anyone reviewing this case that Trudeau did not receive his fair and impartial "day in court".

4) Trudeau should have his sentence reduced because Trudeau could not face his accusers.

Judge Gettleman accused and "charged" Trudeau with criminal contempt. Trudeau was not allowed to call Gettleman, his accuser, to the stand for questioning. Judge Guzman dismissed Gettleman's original order and issued one of his own, making Guzman another accuser who "charged" Trudeau with criminal contempt. How can the accuser also be the presiding Judge? How can the accuser be expected to act as an impartial and fair arbiter of the facts? Answer: he cannot. It is impossible. it is unfair.

3) President Trump should commute Trudeau's egregious ten-year sentence because the FTC told Trudeau that he would be "left alone" if he stopped talking about his books on TV and his radio show.

How can it be that authors who hold opinions that the "powers that be" and the "Establishment" find unfavourable, are continuously threatened, coerced and intimidated into silence by our government? This is censorship. Because Trudeau did not bow and submit to these fascist-style threats, he will spend ten years in prison for the "non crime" of contempt of court.

2) Trudeau should have his sentence reduced by the President because there are no victims and nobody suffered a financial loss.

There are only happy customers. Millions bought the book and loved it. The government failed to produce even a single witness to testify that they watched the infomercial, purchased the book, and felt misled. The product was backed by an unconditional 100% money-back guarantee. Every person who asked for a refund received one. In the free market system, the only way to gauge the quality of the product and the veracity of marketing claims is to ask the CUSTOMER - not the government bureaucrats. In this case, the customers said loud and clear that they did not feel misled, that they were not victimized, and that they had not suffered a financial loss.

And the NUMBER ONE reason President Trump should commute Kevin Trudeau's ten-year prison sentence is.....

1) Ten years in a federal prison is categorically absurd for the "non-crime" of contempt of court

A ten-year sentence is simply too long, too severe, and absolutely insane.

It is cruel and unusual punishment.

Trudeau's "contempt" emanated from his use of the word "easy" to describe the Dr. Simeons HCG weight loss method. It described Trudeau's personal opinion and reflected the opinions of a multitude of people who actually followed the HCG protocol. Nevertheless, the term is universally acknowledged to be subjective, and has been used in marketing campaigns for all kinds of products without ever being challenged.

Virtually every weight loss method, diet, and exercise program claims that their system is "easy".

All kinds of marketing materials employ the term "easy".

Learn a foreign language, it's easy.

Go sky diving, it's easy.

Learn to play the piano, it's easy.

Get rich in real estate, it's easy.

The list of examples goes on and on.

Trudeau's "crime" is speech; providing his opinions and exercising his First Amendment rights.

His ten-year prison sentence should absolutely be reduced.

EVEN IF TRUDEAU WAS 100% GUILTY OF CRIMINAL CONTEMPT OF COURT (which he is not), ten years in prison is simply too much time!

This is the longest sentence ever imposed for contempt. It is excessive, unfair, and egregious. A truly Draconian sentence that borders on human rights abuse.

Had Trudeau been subjected to similar treatment in any other country, the world would drown in a sea of outrage!

Ten years of imprisonment does not fit the crime. Consider that if Trudeau was convicted of:

- rape
- assault with a deadly weapon
- armed bank robbery
- child molestation
- kidnapping
- attempted murder

or a number of other violent crimes, in most instances, Trudeau would serve less than ten years in prison.

Recall that over the last few decades, dozens of corporations have been convicted of "criminal fraud" that led to "real financial losses" of millions of dollars (rather than a phantom "intended" financial loss). Many of these cases featured real victims who had been purposefully defrauded and suffered major financial damage. The corporations that perpetrated these atrocious crimes - including a plethora of pharmaceutical companies - were fined BILLIONS of dollars for violations of laws and statutes.

Amazingly, in the vast majority of cases, only the faceless corporations were charged and convicted of criminal fraud. For the most part, no criminal charges

were brought against the officers and directors, and no one spent even a day inside a prison.

Yet Trudeau has already served four years in federal prison, with six more left to go, for contempt of court, which is not a felony or even a misdemeanour. Where is the equal justice under the law?

It is undisputed that Trudeau is not guilty of breaking any federal laws.

We are not aware of a single other case defined by a similar set of circumstances, where the defendant was sentenced to ten years for contempt of court.

We are also not aware of any other case featuring similar facts, where the defendant was sentenced to ten years, in the absence of any evidence of actual harm incurred by the consumer.

President Trump should commute Trudeau's sentence for the simple reason that the ten-year sentence is an aberration in comparison to the "non-crime" of contempt.

Trudeau has proven to be an exemplary inmate throughout his nearly four years of incarceration. He is universally respected both by the Bureau of Prison staff and other inmates.

Kevin is not some sort of a left-wing or right-wing radical. He is not a fringe element. Trudeau has been a productive member of American society. He has created thousands of jobs, while peacefully challenging the status quo by exercising his Constitutional rights and blowing the whistle on corrupt and unfair practices.

While Trudeau adamantly maintains his innocence, he is clearly unlikely to "reoffend".

Any person reviewing the specifics of his case will have no trouble identifying it as a gross miscarriage of justice.

Commuting Trudeau's sentence to "time served" is the only appropriate course of action.

As mentioned above, even if Trudeau was guilty of criminal contempt for speaking on TV and writing a book, the four years Trudeau has already spent in prison is punishment enough.

Former President Obama commuted the sentences of over 1,500 federal inmates. These included mostly drug dealers, and real criminals who committed real crimes. Obama also commuted the sentence of a convicted terrorist and the convicted "spy", Chelsea Manning.

Manning was convicted of espionage and originally sentenced to thirty-five years imprisonment. Obama commuted her sentence to seven years, stating that she had been punished enough.

If seven years of imprisonment is "punishment enough" for the crime of espionage, then clearly the four years Trudeau has already spent behind bars is "punishment enough" for the "non crime" of contempt of court.

Taking into consideration all the facts and circumstances surrounding this most macabre and grotesque injustice, I believe that Trudeau deserves to have his sentence commuted.

We ask President Trump for Executive Clemency. Mr. President, please exercise the authority granted to you by the Constitution and grant Trudeau's

Petition for Commutation of Sentence. It's in your hands to ensure that a measure of justice is restored. Trudeau's sentence should be commuted to "time served" and he should be immediately released from custody.

Ed Foreman

Former US Congressman

EdForeman.com