Redaction Notice: This page, and the following 12 pages of this document, include redactions of telephone numbers and e-mail addresses.

ATTACHMENT "A"

EXHIBIT A
Ellie Gray

From: Anonymous-Remailer@SeeComment.Header
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2002 11:01 AM
To: 
Subject: ELI GRAY WEARING STRIPES ;)

grey

aka 'POPE'

Now all that remains are the criminal charges and resulting indictments.

Conspiracy, racketeering, to name a few ;)

'You best think about telling the truth 'boy' ;-

Turn yourself in before we have to hunt you down like a dog.
Larry Cole

From: Anonymous [nobody@mail.jmbcv.net]

Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2002 1:40 AM

To: Anonymous [nobody@mail.jmbcv.net]

Subject: JUDGEMENT DAY PALLY :)

"protected species, tippy toe around, sit there and do nothing and he will go away. Take all of his written and verbal crap and turn the other cheek"

"I should have asked him 'do I need to tell them to bring an ambulance or a hearse'

Learn how to spell you ignorant.

Most useful information though. (thanx)

Certain to be 'Properly desimated' throughout the transportation industry. :)"
From: Bunker Boy <nobody@mixmaster.thehunker.net>
To: 
Date: 10/18/02 12:30PM
Subject: search engine progress report

davis (you dumb-ass redneck):

moving right along as scheduled

they just love you, turkey!

http://msxml.excite.com/_1_2SLTTIB04JW1ME5__info.xcite/dog/results?otmp=dog/webresults.htm&qkw=oscar+davis&qcat=web&top=1&start=&ver=27551
Larry Cole

From: Anonymous Via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer [nobody@cypherpunks.to]

Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2002 8:14 PM

To: "Every breath you take, every move you make, I'll be watching you"

Subject: You asked for it "shithead", now you gotta BELLY-FULL of trouble.

(You ain't seen nothin yet)

http://www.altamahariver.net/guestbook/guestbook.html

For those of you who are interested in learning THE TRUTH
about just what kind of a person MR. LARRY COLE REALLY is,
behind the hypocritical [nauseating] satire posted here
I suggest you examine the INFORMATIVE URLs listed below.

Cole is TRULY evil. Cole FIRES ATTACKS AND Retaliates against
whistleblowers that keep america's workplaces
safe. Larry Cole is guilty of EXTREME perjury in a FEDERAL TRUCK SAFETY CASE
(2002-SRH-46 Somerson v. Mail Contractors of America)

Cole is deceitful and a born liar. This individual (and others like him in
the trucking industry) are personally responsible for needless carnage
that is occuring on our nation's highways due to fatigue and unsafe equipment.

Mr. Cole (a 'Safety Director') and his employer (Mail Contractors of America)
are

engaged in a pattern and practice of harassing their truck drivers, intimidating
them
to operate unsafe equipment and work when ill and/or fatigued or face losing
their jobs.

Cole's company, (MCofA) is one of the most willfulDOT violators in the
truckers business today.

These Websites will inform all who are interested of Mr. Cole's tyranny.

May the Altamaha River and this organization never (again)
have to know of such a lawless and evil man as Mr. Larry Cole.
From: OSCAR DAVIS SUCKS! <Anonymous-Remailer@See.Comment.Header>
To: [Redacted]
Date: 10/6/02 12:54PM
Subject: you're chicken

You're chicken davis :-)

click--> http://www.truckingsolutions.com/chicken.wav

nothing closer to the truth pecker-head!
From: <mailto: contractorssucks@yahoo.com>  
To:  
Date: 9/24/02 10:28AM  
Subject: Here on Happy Halloween

There is a Greeting Card waiting for you!  
It's from Mail Contractors Sucks! at (mailcontractorssucks@yahoo.com).

To see your card try one of these ways

click on the link below

http://www.ohmygoodness.com/cgi-bin/g-card.pl?020924DAMAMMQWLUA2

or copy and paste the entire line into your browser's window

for AOL Users and for those who could not click on the above link, click below

<A HREF="http://www.ohmygoodness.com/cgi-bin/g-card.pl?020924DAMAMMQWLUA2"> http://www.ohmygoodness.com/cgi-bin/g-card.pl?020924DAMAMMQWLUA2 </A>

If you can't retrieve your card by clicking, go to our "View Your Card" page at
http://www.ohmygoodness.com/getcard.htm
and enter your key card code in the pickup window.
Your key card code is: 020924DAMAMMQWLUA2

Cards will be available for 2 weeks only. If you haven't picked up your card by then, or if you need assistance, write to biancio@ohmygoodness.com and include the keycode in the subject.

Thank you,
This is a FREE service from
http://www.ohmygoodness.com
Here on happy halloween
whiffling bats could be seen
Each wriggled and squirmed
with no end in sight
But at Halloween's end
all was made right
Denning the cuffs
and leg irons for all
Now I0 halloween
makes sense of it all.

Mail Contractors Sucks! sent it on:
Sep 24, 2002 at 06:29
It is now: Sep 24, 2002 - 14:33
From: OSCAR DAVIS SUCKS! MAIL CONTRACTORS SUCKS! Now in Brazil
<Anonymous-Remailer@SeeComment.Header>
To: 
Date: 9/22/02 2:16AM
Subject: (No Subject)

Folks:

The internet brings us all closer together.

Small world isn't it?

http://www.mailcontractorsucks.hpg.ig.com.br/

http://www.oscardavissucks.hpg.ig.com.br/
From: Frog <FrogRemailer@bigfoot.com>
To: [Redacted]
Date: 9/21/02 4:09AM
Subject: choke on this

CHOOSE ON THIS CRACKER-HEAD!

for every '1' you take down I upload 3 more:

http://www.oscardavissucks.20m.com/

http://www.oscardavissucks.4t.com/

http://www.geocities.com/oscardavisreallysucks/

I'll bet you run out of bacon around your blubber-ball waist
before I run out of server space--you peckerhead!
From: Anonymous User <anonymous@remlayer.havenco.com>
To: [Redacted]
Date: 9/21/02 9:31PM
Subject: "YOU DON'T HAVE THE BALLS"

http://members.lycos.nl/mailcontractorsucks/no-balls.wav

http://members.lycos.nl/oscardavissucks/no-balls.wav
OSCAR DAVIS SUCKS!

"IT'S A WITCH HUNT YOUR HONOR!"
"THEY'RE ON NOTHIN' MORE THAN A DERN FISHIN' EXPEDITION!"

THIS RUDE, LOUDMOUTHED HAY-SEED RACIST BAFFOON FROM ARKANSAS ACTUALLY "PRACTICES" LAW?

http://www.geocities.com/oscardavissucks/
OFF FOR ANOTHER BOURBON!

This website is currently under construction. Please check back soon.

CONTACT US:

OSCARDAVISSUCKS@YAHOO.COM

http://www.geocities.com/oscardavissucks/

9/19/2002
Enclosures
As stated
CONSENT ORDER

COMES NOW the parties to Consent to the entry of the following terms as an Order of this Court regarding the circumstances giving rise to this action.

This action was commenced with the filing of the Order Certifying Facts of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida by Richard E. Huddleston, Administrative Law Judge, U.S. Department of Labor, pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §18.29(b). Thereafter, this cause came to be heard before this Court on February 27, 2002 pursuant to the Order to Show Cause entered on February 14, 2002. Having been duly advised in the premises and based on the consent of the parties, the Court now finds that:

Daniel S. Somerson has engaged in unacceptable conduct in connection with certain communications with the Office of Administrative Law Judges, U.S. Department of Labor, with Administrative Law Judge Huddleston and his staff, and has acted in non-compliance with certain orders and directives associated with proceedings conducted under the authority of the Office of Administrative Law Judges, U.S. Department of Labor. Specifically, Daniel S. Somerson did
1. Present for filing certain papers via facsimile instead of by U.S. Mail in violation of Administrative Law Judge Huddleston's prehearing orders and directives prohibiting the filing of said papers by facsimile,

2. Interrupt hearing proceedings and engage in impertinent conduct and discourse with Administrative Law Judge Huddleston and other hearing participants during the proceedings, and

3. Engage in impertinent and derogatory conduct and discourse during a telephone conversation with Administrative Law Judge Huddleston's law clerk.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing findings and the further consent of the parties, it is hereby ORDERED

1. That Daniel Somerson shall conduct himself within the bounds of appropriate respect and decorum, albeit with allowance for appropriate zeal and vigor, during any proceedings, and any matters related thereto, held under the authority of the Office of Administrative Law Judges, U.S. Department of Labor, and regarding any other official purpose with any person or organization of the Office of Administrative Law Judges, U.S. Department of Labor, wherein Daniel S. Somerson is a party, a representative, a witness or other participant,

2. That Daniel S. Somerson shall issue written apologies, based on the foregoing, to
a. Judge Huddleston,
b. Judge Huddleston's law clerk, and
c. John M. Vittone, Chief Administrative Law Judge, U.S. Department of Labor, and
3. That this Court shall retain jurisdiction to enforce any violation by Daniel S. Somerson of this Consent Order and to impose any such sanction as may be provided for by law.

The following hereby CONSENT to and AGREE to the foregoing terms as an Order of this Court regarding the circumstances giving rise to this action, as evidenced by their signatures having been affixed below on the dates indicated.

[Signatures]

DANIEL S. SOMERSON
Date: April 17, 2002

RALPH J. LEE
Assistant United States Attorney
Date: ______________

MITCHELL A. STONE
Attorney for Daniel S. Somerson
Date: ______________

APPROVED, DONE and ORDERED this 8th day of __________, 2002

[Signature]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

cc:
Daniel Somerson
Mitchell A. Stone, Esq.
Ralph J. Lee, AUSA
March 7, 2002

Chief Judge John Vittone
OALJ
800 K Street NW, Suite 400-N
Washington, DC 20001-8002

Dear Judge Vittone:

This letter is intended to address my conduct with respect to 2002-STA-18&19. While precipitated by my passion for truck safety on America's highways, specific comments, remarks and behavior on my part before and during the hearing were in fact inappropriate and counterproductive.

Therefore, please accept my most sincere apologies.

Sincerely,

Daniel S. Somerson
March 7, 2002

Judge Richard E. Huddleston
Ms. Valerie Harris
OALJ
603 Pilot House Drive, Suite 300
Newport News, VA 23606

Dear Judge Huddleston and Ms. Harris:

This letter is intended to address my conduct with respect to 2002-STA-18&19. While precipitated by my passion for truck safety on America's highways, specific comments, remarks and behavior on my part before and during the hearing were in fact inappropriate and counterproductive.

Therefore please accept my most sincere apologies.

Sincerely,
[Signature]
Daniel S. Somerson
November 20, 2002
Honorable Edward Terhune Miller
United States Administrative Law Judge
800 K Street, N.W. Suite 400-N
Washington, D.C. 20001 via fax/mail

RE: Mr. DANIEL S. SOMERSON v. MAIL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA, 2002-STA-44
MR. SOMERSON'S SUPPLEMENTAL CITATIONS, MOTION TO LIFT STAY AND
MOTION TO LIST RESPONDENT'S WEBSITE SURVEILLANCE AS ISSUE FOR TRIAL

Dear Judge Miller:

Mr. Somerson respectfully stands on his prior responses to the Respondent's filings and the Court's Show Cause Order and moves for the Court to lift the stay and to kindly rule on
discovery matters. Mr. Somerson has complied with the Consent Order and should not be
further queried or stigmatized by lawbreaking Respondent seeking to chill his free speech rights
on his web site <www.truckingsolutions.com>. The Court has emphatically ruled that Mr.
Somerson's post-firing website is irrelevant and will not be considered. There was no violation
of the Consent Order. There are no sanctions in DOL proceedings, e.g., for willful labor law
violators like Mail Contractors of America to invoke to threaten whistleblower free speech and
civil rights. See Rex v. EBASCO Services, Inc., 87-ERA-6 (Sec'y, March 4, 1994); Parsley v.
America West Airlines, Inc., 2002-AIR-10 (Honorable Richard S. Stansell-Gamm KDU, August
2, 2002). It is not a crime in America for a worker to criticize disgruntled employers' actions.

It is illegal to punish or censor Mr. Somerson for criticizing large organizations. This is a matter
of First Amendment rights, which this Court is duty-bound to protect. 5 U.S.C. § 3105.
No Government may punish citizens because of their views. See, e.g., Bond v. Floyd, 385 U.S.
792 (1975). Litigation performs a vital role in protecting First Amendment rights. In re Primus,
436 U.S. 412, 431-32 (1978); In re Sawyer, 360 U.S. 622, 631-36 (1958). Litigation is itself a
form of freedom of expression protected by the First Amendment. In re Harkin, 598 F.2d. 176,
187 (D.C. Cir. 1979); see also NAACP v. Button, 317 U.S. 415, 429-31 (1963). Litigation is
often "a vehicle for effective political expression and association, as well as a means of
Whistleblower laws are like other labor laws patterned after the First Amendment. 1 See, e.g.

---

1. Worker protection laws protect free speech and are "modeled on the First
Amendment." The Courts defer to this principle in legislative construction, e.g., by
borrowing the statute of limitations used in 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil rights actions. See
Reed v. United Transportation Union (UTU), 488 U.S. 319, 334 (1989):
Congress modeled Title I after the Bill of Rights, and that the legislators intended
s 101(a)(2) to restate a principal First Amendment value—the right to speak
one's mind without fear of reprisal." Steelworkers v. Sadowski, 457 U.S. 102,
111, 102 S.Ct. 2339, 2345, 72 L.Ed.2d 707 (1982).

As Justice William O. Douglas stated in Craig, even "Judges are supposed to be [people] of fortitude, able to thrive in a hardy climate." 331 U.S. at 376; In re: Little, 404 U.S. 553, 555 (1972). Respondent would best heed Justice Douglas' sage 1941 advice in Craig. Instead, Respondent is thin-skinned and squealing -- in ancient Arkansas argot, "like a hog caught under a gate." Respondent seeks to gag, chill, silence, taunt and punish criticism of Mail Contractors of America, evidently not a company "of fortitude," one unwilling (or unable) to "thrive in a hardy climate." 331 U.S. at 376. Respondent is an oligopolist USPS contractor, begging the Court to stifle criticism. Therefore, Mr. Somerson filed a new OSHA complaint, requesting investigation of Respondent's speech-chilling defense tactics, a "witch hunt" (in Mr. Davis' words). Respondent begs the Court to intrude into protected activity, stop the trial, and evade the implications of the Respondent's own acts, words and admissions during eight days of trial and intensified E-mail searches -- the very "hardy climate" that Respondent fears, loathes and seeks to chill, depriving the Constitution of "breathing space." See id. Both the First Amendment

2(...continued)

Reed v. UTU, 488 U.S. at 325 (Emphasis added). The Sixth Circuit held in a Railway Labor Act (RLA) case that it would apply the NLRA statute of limitations to an action brought pursuant to RLA. The Sixth Circuit stated that the "same principles and rationale logically follow under each Act dealing [with] ... employer-employee relations." Bailey v. Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., 852 F.2d 185, 186 (6th Cir. 1988)(Emphasis added). See also Legislative history of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act cited in Conference Report of Clean Air Act, 1977 U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News, 1077, 1404. In so delaying, prolonging and distorting the whistleblower process, Respondent has flaunted "First Amendment values," Sadowski, supra.

and whistleblower law require "breathing space." New York Times v. Sullivan, 376 U.S. 254, 271-72 (1964). The environmental whistleblower laws, like the First Amendment, are entitled to considerable "breathing space" to prevent a "chilling effect" on protected activity. Respondent not give "breathing space" to Mr. Somerson's whistleblower rights: like a boa constrictor, it tried to suffocate him and thus halt his protected activity, and is now seeking to abuse this Court to extinguish his concerns, violate his rights and undermine the whistleblower laws.

As our American Founder Benjamin Franklin said, our critics are our friends* and we should learn from them. As Dr. Karl Z. Morgan, the father of Health Physics (radiation protection) wrote in his memoirs not long before his death:

No society that severely restricts freedom of speech will ultimately survive.4 Karl Z. Morgan, The Angry Genie: One Man's Walk Through the Nuclear Age (Oklahoma University Press 1999). Dr. Morgan writes about how free speech was (sometimes) treasured in the early days of Oak Ridge, as when Dr. Alvin Weinberg was Director of Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Dr. Morgan writes that Dr. Weinberg

not only tolerated but sought employees who had the guts to disagree with them.

They did not behave like so many other [ORNL] directors who only want to look in the mirror and see a reflection of their own views. Morgan at 66.

As President Harry S Truman said, if Respondents "can't stand the heat, they should get out of the kitchen." Contrary to the American spirit, Respondent oligopolist USPS contractor wants to punish disagreement: it wants the Court compliant and the whistleblower silenced: it wants this

---

2 (...continued)


4 See also, U.S. Constitution, Amendments. I, IV, V, VI, VIII, IX, XIV; Tennessee Constitution:

"Government being instituted for the common benefit, the doctrine of non-resistant against arbitrary power and oppression is absurd, slavish and destructive of the good and happiness of humankind." Art. I, § 2.

"...The free communication of thoughts and opinions is one of the invaluable rights of man, and every citizen may freely speak, write and print on any subject...." Art. I § 19

If our Constitution had followed the style of Saint Paul, it would have said, "But the greatest of these is speech." In the darkness of tyranny, this is the key to the sunlight. If it is granted, all doors open. If it is withheld, none.
--- Robert F. Kennedy, January 22, 1963, Center for Study of Democratic institutions.
Honorable Court to act as its short order cook, or its amanuensis in a “witch hunt.” See, e.g.,
Arthur Miller, The Crucible. Under whistleblower and First Amendment law, there can be no
“gag orders” or “prior restraint” on DOL environmental protected activity. Any requests for such
unconstitutional orders should be referred to the FBI and the United States District Court,
whose duty is to protect free speech rights. Meanwhile, Mr. Somerson’s case should not be
delayed any further by Respondent’s diversion.

Any effort to compel Mr. Somerson to give testimony on his own (or others’) web activities
would invade the First Amendment and violate DOL whistleblower precedents. Before
Respondent asks any questions relating to protected activity, Respondent should be ordered to
post a bond equal to the lifetime future income (with retirement benefits) of all persons
concerned, so as to protect against retaliation. See, Management Information Technologies v.
employers asking whistleblower identification questions unless defendants post a bond equal to
whistleblowers’ lifetime future income, benefits and pension and other retirement, protecting
them from retaliation). Mr. Somerson also respectfully notes the Respondent’s latest round of
retaliation bears on the need for relief sought in his Motions in Limine 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,12.

Respondent’s continued discovery stonewalling is without foundation. Further E-mail searches
must be ordered of the two backup tapes not yet searched. As documented, the value of the
information sought outweighs any annoyance or expense on the part of the Respondent. See
America -- by its retaliation, blacklisting, evidence withholding and delays -- violates civil and
constitutional rights to Due Process and to present evidence in a civil case. See Adams v. St.
Francis Regional Hospital Center, 344 P.2d 1169 (Kansas 1958). Edward J. Imwinkelried. “The
litigation tactics themselves violate the whistleblower laws. See Connecticut Light & Power Co.
v. Secretary of the United States Department of Labor, 85 F.3d. 89 (2d Cir. 1996). Respondent
government contractor is on notice that its actions could give rise to liability under federal civil
and criminal civil rights laws as well as under DOL truck safety whistleblower law.

Mr. Somerson hereby respectfully moves to include Respondent’s admitted website surveillance
as an issue for trial due to Respondent’s injection of it into this litigation and their chilling effect
on Mr. Somerson’s operation of a website that criticizes Respondents. As Mr. Somerson stated
in support of his renewed August 28, 2002 Motion in Limine:

...the Court has the power to order Respondents not to create the impression among
employees that their protected activity is under surveillance, and not to engage in such
surveillance. Consolidated Edison Company, 1 NLRA 71, 01 (1937), enforced, 305 U.S.
197 (1938); Atlas Underwear Co. v. NLRA, 116 F.2d 1020, 1023 (6th Cir. 1941); NLRA v.
Ford Motor Co., 119 F.2d 326 (5th Cir. 1941); Press Co. v. NLRA, 118 F.2d 937 (D.C.
Cir. 1940), cert. denied 61 S.Ct. 1118; NLRA v. Baldwin Locomotive Works, 128 F.2d 39,
49 (3d Cir. 1942); NLRA v. Jasper Chair Co., 138 F.2d 756 (7th Cir. 1943); NLRA v.
Collins & Aikman Corp., 146 F.2d 454, 455 (4th Cir. 1944). It is well known by DOL that-
whistleblowers often face some type of surveillance ...The experience can be
very frightening and can add an ominous presence to the misery of blowing the
whistle.... We often advise that if someone is watching you, he or she wants you
to become affected by the surveillance and to act irrationally about it. It can be
another way of bullying you into a mistake.
Government Accountability Project, et al. Courage Without Martyrdom — A Survival Guide for Whistleblowers 5 (1989)(Emphasis added). An Order barring surveillance or giving the impression of surveillance will protect the integrity of the proceedings and will deter future lawbreaking. See NLRB v. Anchorage Times Publishing Co., 637 F.2d 1359, 1365-6 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 454 U.S. 835 (1981); NLRB v. Randall P. Kane Co., 581 F.2d 1124, 1131 (9th Cir. 1978); NLRB v. Squire Shops, Inc., 559 F.2d 486, 487 (9th Cir. 1977); NLRB v. Miller Redwood Co., 407 F.2d 215, 218 (9th Cir. 1970); NLRB v. Intertherm, 596 F.2d 267 (8th Cir. 1979); Russell Stover Candies, Inc. v. NLRB, 551 F.2d 204, 207 (8th Cir. 1977); NLRB v. Speed Queen, 469 F.2d 189, 191 (8th Cir. 1973); NLRB v. Hawthorn Co., 404 F.2d 1205, 1208-09 (8th Cir. 1969); Olsen Rug Co. v. NLRB, 304 F.2d 710, 714-15 (7th Cir. 1962); NLRB v. Tidelands Marine Service, 339 F.2d 291 (5th Cir. 1964); National Phosphate Corp., 211 NLRB 567 (1974); Fotomat Corp., 207 NLRB 481 (1973); J.P. Stevens & Co., 245 NLRB 198 (1979); Laidlaw Waste Systems, 305 NLRB No. 5 (1991); see also Local 309, United Furniture Workers v. Gates, 75 F.Supp. 620, 625-26 (N.D. Ind. 1948); Alliance to End Repression v. City of Chicago, 742 F.2d 1007 (7th Cir. 1984); Handlin v. Special Services Divn., 349 F.Supp. 766 (S.D.N.Y. 1972); Presbyterian Church (USA) v. United States, 870 F.2d 518 (9th Cir. 1989); Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends v. Tate, 519 F.2d 1335 (3d Cir. 1975); Balon v. LaPrade, 624 F.2d 882 (3d Cir. 1979); Cf. Fr. Robert F. Drinan, "First Amendment Endangered" (book review) 78 Geo L.J. 2057 (1990).

Injunctive relief against Mail Contractors of America engaging in surveillance or giving the impression of surveillance must be ordered by DOI...

Any order against Mr. Somerson by the Court based upon Respondent's website surveillance would be poisoned by that surveillance, not unlike the proverbial "fruit of the poisonous tree." The Court must reject all proposed First Amendment violations, "prior restraints," and improper attempts to use this forum for discovery on some inchoate actions. Respondent retaliator Allison Brewer hinted at during trial. The Court must reject all civil rights violations. The Court must reject all censorship orders as outside the Court's in personam and subject matter jurisdiction. Otherwise, "[o]nly a brave soul would dare to express anything other than orthodoxy under such circumstances." White v. Davis, 120 Cal. Rptr. 94 (1975). Any and all licit or illicit pressures upon the Court to punish, inquire into, refer or sanction any alleged out-of-court protected activity must be rejected as outside the Court's jurisdiction: that is the law of the case. The stay should be lifted. Respondent's self-confessed website surveillance must be scrutinized by the Court at trial to see if Respondent's web surveillance activities may give rise to further liability and remedies under the Surface Transportation Act and DOL whistleblower precedents.

Mr. Somerson looks forward to the Court's further orders, hearing and trial in this action.

Respectfully submitted,

EDWARD A. SLAVIN, JR.
COUNSEL FOR COMPLAINTANT DANIEL S. SOMERSON

This document was mailed November 22, 2002 mailed/received to this Honorable Court and to Messrs. Somerson, Davis, Moore, Bachman and Mr. Brewer, Esquires and mailed to senior Special Agent Robert E. Tyndall (Retired) and the USPS Inspector General.

Edward A. Slavin, Jr.
December 2, 2002
Honorable Edward Terhune Miller
United States Administrative Law Judge
800 K Street, N.W. Suite 400-N
Washington, D.C. 20001 via fax/mail

RE: Mr. DANIEL S. SOMERSON v. MAIL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA. 2002-STA-44
MR. SOMERSON’S SUPPLEMENTAL CITATIONS

Dear Judge Miller:


Respectfully submitted,

EDWARD A. SLAVIN, JR.
COUNSEL FOR COMPLAINANT DANIEL S. SOMERSON

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
This document was on December 2, 2002 transmitted to the Court and to Secret Service, Davis, Moore, Daniels, and Brewer, Esquires and mailed to Senior Special Agent Robert E. Tye and the US Postal Service.

Edward A. Slavin, Jr.