

November 21, 2009

John Gregory Lambros
Reg. No. 00436-124
U.S. Penitentiary Leavenworth
P.O. Box 1000
Leavenworth, Kansas 66048-1000
Website: www.BrazilBoycott.org

U.S. CERTIFIED MAIL NO.
7008-1830-0004-2648-6779

NALVEN & SCHACHT
Alexei Schacht & Paul R. Nalven - Attorney's
350 Fifth Avenue - Suite 4022
New York, NY 10118

RE: **JUAN CARLOS RAMIREZ-ABADIA**

Dear Mr. Schacht & Nalven:

On September 14, 2009, I mailed you via U.S. Certified Mail [7008-1830-0004-2648-5864] copy of:

"JOHN GREGORY LAMBROS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A PETITION OF INTERVENTION - OR ALTERNATIVELY - JOHN GREGORY LAMBROS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF." Dated: September 14, 2009.

that was mailed to the Clerk of the Court for the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

On October 5, 2009, Judge Emmet G. Sullivan **DENIED** my above-entitled motion without even filing same. See attached or go to www.BrazilBoycott.org and download copy of same in PDF.

Currently I'm researching the best ways to **APPEAL** the decision of Judge Sullivan's DENIAL - 28 USC §1653; Rule 21, Fed.R.App.P. MANDAMUS; and Rule 29, Fed.R.App.P. BRIEF OF AMICUS CURIAE, etc.

YOUR ASSISTANCE: As you know, Rule 29(a) Fed.R.App.P. states:

"..... Any other amicus curiae may file a brief **ONLY** by leave of court **OR IF THE BRIEF STATES THAT ALL PARTIES HAVE CONSENTED TO ITS FILING.**" (emphasis added)

Your client - **JUAN CARLOS RAMIREZ-ABADIA** - is still pending extradition in Brazil in this action, with the other defendant's either listed as fugitives, awaiting plea/trial, or transferred to other districts per Rule 20. I believe the bottom line will be that your client - **RAMIREZ-ABADIA** - will either plead guilty or go to trial by himself. Thus, the only party I will need **CONSENT FROM TO FILE AN AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF WILL BE YOU.**

File

Page 2

November 21, 2009

Lambros' letter to Attorney's SCHACHT & NALVEN

RE: JUAN CARLOS RAMIREZ-ABADJA

I believe my Petition of Intervention and/or AMJCUS BRIEF is desirable in order to reconcile the principle claim of:

"Whether the term of SUPERVISED RELEASE must be included within the conditions of extradition LIMITING what sentence could be issued to person extradited to the United States."

Please advise me if you plan to incorporate the above argument - as prepared within my September 14, 2009 filing with the district court - at the following courts:

1. Federal District Court in Sao Paulo, Brazil, where RAMIREZ-ABADJA was arrested on or about August 8, 2007.
2. Supreme Federal Court in Brasilia, Brazil - The highest court in Brazil that approves all extraditions from Brazil to United States.
3. U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, USA vs. WILBER ALIRJO VARELA, et al., Criminal No. 1:04-cr-00126-EGS.
4. Circuit Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit.


AS IT IS NOT MY INTENT TO FILE DUPLICATE ARGUMENTS MADE WITHIN YOUR BRIEF(s), IN EFFECT, MERELY EXTENDING THE LENGTH OF YOUR CLIENT'S BRIEF AND ADDING TO THE VOLUMINOUS RECORD ALREADY BEFORE THE ABOVE COURT'S.

CONCLUSION:

Please remember that I am your client's - RAMIREZ-ABADJA - friend within this argument and it is my only intent to reduce his possible 30-year sentence **WITH "SUPERVISED RELEASE"** to a sentence of **20 or 25-years WITH "SUPERVISED RELEASE"**. Again, ARTICLE 75 of the Brazilian Criminal Code, limits prison sentences to thirty (30) years. I was sentenced to a MANDATORY LIFE SENTENCE WITHOUT PAROLE after being extradited from Brazil, a sentence your client does not want to receive.

Thank you in advance for responding to the above.

Sincerely,


John Gregory Lambros

c:
File