

**Respondent's Reply to Enforcement Opposition to Feathers Motion to Terminate Proceedings Due to Commission Interference with Due Process" re: Mark Feathers 3-15755**

In its "OPPOSITION TO FEATHERS' MOTION TO TERMINATE PROCEEDINGS DUE TO COMMISSION INTERFERENCE WITH DUE PROCESS", Enforcement presents to the court its rote pattern of insisting that the Commission's administrative law court, the Commission's FOIA process, and the Division of Enforcement, itself, do not individually, or in combination, skirt, block, or deny Respondent's due process rights for INFORMATION as to the operations of the Commission. Such self-serving denials, along with Enforcement's continued submissions of false statements, material omissions of fact, and ceaseless red herrings in these proceedings are the standards by which Enforcement operates in the Commission's (and, therefore, Enforcement's) home court.

During these proceedings Enforcement has pointed out to the court that agencies such as the California Supreme Court and the Chartered Financial Analyst ("CFA") Institute have not found Respondent's requests of them to hold "merit". Respondent never presented "merit" questions to these agencies. The California Supreme Court, on a statistical basis, sanctions far less than 1% of requests for same that come before it, and certainly none at all on matters related to those attorneys involved in SEC civil and criminal law proceedings. The CA Supreme court did not offer any comments on merit on Respondent's prior request to sanction the attorneys for SEC's receiver who twice, in SEC-referred lawsuits in which their gross billings exceeded \$10,000,000, allowed Enforcement to falsely represent their federal equity chosen to "manage Respondent's companies" as a licensed CPA. The CA Supreme Court does not offer explanations for its actions to a *pro se* party very low in the legal caste system, also who is involved in active criminal litigation (at that time). And, the CFA institute has no desire to play a game of tackle football with the Commission on the hot potato issue of why one of their member "CFAs" would falsely advertise himself as a "CPA" in materials distributed to SEC, only then to be immediately chosen by SEC for numerous federal securities lawsuits over the next decade, and profit from gross billings for himself of over \$20,000,000 during that period. As Enforcement is fully aware, the CFA Institute deferred any actual investigation of their member because of "active litigation" proceedings.

Respondent has already pointed out to this court the 900 lb. gorilla actions of Enforcement. Is any more comment needed? Respondent asks the Court for Enforcement be allowed the opportunity for additional comments on this matter, should it believe this to be beneficial in these proceedings.

And, again, Respondent asks this court for referral of an OIG, along with non-agency outside party investigation of Enforcement personnel actions since 2011 against Respondent. If Enforcement is so much in the right, as it insists, in the lawfulness of its actions since 2011, and of its own adherence to the Commission's employee Codes of Conduct, then Enforcement can only benefit from such reports. Right?

Respectfully,



Mark Feathers, *pro se*, Respondent 8-21-20