

When Mr. Conrad Black got into trouble and was being Threatened with 100 years behind bars on issues I had clear legal insights into – not just With the most relevant courses in legal philosophy and Commercial law at high marks at world class Cdn University at the time, but also in my business acumen, experience and experience with the particular type of Employment contract related clause Conrad Black got himself into hot water seeming in back at the time certainly too.

Essentially, Conrad Black while running a newspaper on behalf of a large number of public shareholders To whom he had given up ownership in exchange for what he received selling off the newspaper to them, Was in a position subsequently where a private buyer was interested in purchasing the paper (in the USA Where this particular paper publishing effort was then located) from the shareholders of the company With Conrad Black, as lead manager as it were, doing the negotiating.

Now I dunno whose suggestion it was, as it would have much bearing on the opinion Of men to a large extent in first looking at this, essentially it would appear that a deal Would not be possibly consummated if in fact Conrad black could not assure the new Purchaser that he himself (Black) would not proceed to subsequently setup shop as a competitor across the street as it were as he is a man with a huge following In the subculture involved and in the newspaper publishing business Including relations with potential major advertising entities continent wide. To be frank it's a suggestion both Conrad Black or the purchaser might have come up With as it was a reasonable potential stumbling block to a deal, and without this Assurance (called a non-compete agreement clause when enshrined into an Employment contract – as that is where one would find it rather than as An appendix to an agreement with a manager of a company you are instead buying From other shareholders in the main)

Nonetheless, it's a plausible type of legal arrangement that honest Seeming parties might get into with all good intents potentially.

The stumbling block however was the inane idea that Conrad black needn't Have informed the shareholders of this major complication and As someone acting from a position of trust in representing the shareholders, And yet having a personal angle here involving a payout of millions to himself He chose not to bother mentioning to shareholders. Reality check pray tell?? Well, although it still doesn't excuse him on the need to inform, and to keep his fiduciary obligations clean of such an obvious charge of potentially taking "under The table", it must be pointed out that Conrad Black made a huge gesture In the direction of seeming to stay within some bounds of decency and away from Criminality On the face of it – and this was shown in the fact that he did INFORM the companys AUDITING accountants who at that point then stood just as guilty as in any blame that might Be attached to Conrad Black, in failure to report to shareholders and even regulators potentially On what was clearly a matter of the gravest possible concern to the shareholders at large And in fact NO EXCUSE can be allowed either party for wanting to keep their jobs And freedom to negotiate at will for oneself – as Conrad Black stood guilty of Then too. This then taints the whole system – after all- the buyer got the newspaper Facility they wanted, they got Conrad blacks signature that he wouldn't compete against them, The accountants kept their jobs and were never charged in any way, or even disciplined By the regulating bodies as far as Im aware. The shareholders Conrad Black worked

For got the sale of the newspaper done and got enough out of it apparently to not Smelling a rat as it were. So happy all around – EXCEPT that Conrad Black alone was Then charged – not the purchase for giving what seemed to be considered by Some onlookers as a potential bribe, not the accountants for going along, Just Conrad Black – who ultimately had to give most of the money to the Mob of lawyers assembled to take the money back – for themselves personally – Apparently divvying up tens of millions of dollars along the way (see Conrad Black Use the word rapacious on the attached clip) It means they essentially had the effect on the Mind as if one had been raped – in Toronto notorious BLM related LGBT infested Prisons along the way, many many “routine full strip” searches are done with no seeming sanity Or justification. Hell, Ms Barbara Amiel (Macleans Magazine columnist at the time And Conrad Blacks spouse) on a visit to the prison where he was held Said in an article she was searched with a wand and found to have “metal-like wire” Which turned out to be seamed into her brassiere as she stated in her article And had to dispense of this so-called threat before being allowed to proceed To visit her husband – would you believe

Anyway, I would get real mad watching TV reports on CBC etc As I thought they were overdoing the fraud bit just a touch to support the treats they were hammering him With to potentially die in prison toiling under 100 year sentence possibility as was being flouted – The justice system there is plain insane – they are constantly power tripping with insane jury awards and verdict and judges who don't seem to have Sense in when to stop adding years and years just to seem really competent in some insane seeming idea of it as far as I or anyone sane can tell I say.

I then thought to myself that it may just be that the worst thing Conrad Black may have Been guilty of is having been blindsided as to having good enough judgment to have Held his position had he been found out, or in keeping whatever of the money he received Which would have been deemed by a responsible jurist – reasonable arbitrator etc Would have been more fairly due to the shareholder as part of a fairer purchase price they might have received or been entitled To had conrad blacks share have been deemed to have been excessively figured out at the time Or perhaps the buyers had overpaid if in fact an element of extortion along the lines of a third would bakshish payment as it were – in any event if the amount might have been deemed excessive in the light of day and in open court as it were that then would be the worst of it for him – having to pay something back. But 100 years – cmon! Only of he had NO entitlement as might have been so if the aws no merit but just an “under The table” payment to him personally which he would then have had no right to.

As it turned out no one denied him he had gotten a sum willingly from Willing purchasers – and I don't think there was any success by the selling Shareholders he had worked for at that newspaper to the effect that He had what was in fact their money. In fact he was found not guilty on these related Fraud charges across the board – and instead did time for “obstruction” in having taken Off with personal records from his office the court had ruled be kept sealed And unavailable to him.

My own part was to point out to 100,000 lawyers at the topmost lawfirms Across the USA and some in Canada and Europe (London mainly) in personalized emails I sent each one using my computer programming background

To compile personalized mailing lists using legal means to scour the net at lawfirms websites (I sent Conrad Black an example of some of the computer code I was using having written it for the project) – I sent a quarter of a million emails on his behalf Over many weeks including more than one round of emails to most on the list – Pointing out the following in his defence – I gave them access to the video attached Of my comments in his defence as leader of britishcanada.org, and then as Civil rights And Human rights advocate as I had been promoting ideas of on the net for Martha Stewart Etc additionally, I pointed out that as one learns in Contract law studies, the courts do not normally Concern themselves with “adequacy of consideration” (ie they won’t normally revisit a bargain you Have made to see if you made a good enough deal for yourself – no matter the difference – short of claiming oppression, fraud, insanity etc – in which case the entire contract would normally then I suppose be of course just simply set aside (rescinded or voided more like) rather than a fix be made as to the amount in terms of what might have been a fierier idea of relative value for each party involved) However there is one exception – a clause affecting “Non compete arrangements” in regards to ones employment being restricted by such a device. In such a case as that, courts DO want to make sure that the signatory giving up valuable rights to work in competition as Conrad Black had certainly done, no one questions that I believe, has in fact done so for an large enough sum of money or the clause fails to be enforced. The parties involved in the payment to Conrad Black would all have been aware of such and would therefore probably have wanted to err on the side of judgment that would allow them clear rights to enforce the agreement against Conrad Blacks ability or rights rather, to compete, by ensuring a sufficiently high enough payment had been made.

Furthermore I argued he hadn’t acted like a criminal, because he only took what Was his own – give or take – if an arbitrator was to disagree on splitting hairs Only as it were. He had instead acted foolishly – but if no harm done – why the vengeful 100 Year sentence hanging over his head – expect he was seeming saner in being responsive To human concerns seeming than any Bush type would have been. That’s why I thought they set him up (rather than involve the shareholders early on so all were cleared on this Deal) sent him to jail – and took his money anyway – the bastards.

I communicated with him many times, his responses to me Included an email to my blackberry when he was heading on to superior court In that state at the time, and I sent all my defence arguments as a lay Person with interest in justice by email to every member of the court Seeing it as no different from mailing in the documents and they could have had the Same procedural vetting before being considered by the court similar to views I have sent The Canadian Human rights commission when Melissa Guille Had been charged with allowing the posting offending views at her website To the Human rights code at the time, under regulations at the time, which seemed To influence her judgment received and she sent me a nice thank you note following The victory.

My efforts on behalf of Conrad Black which included faxes to every US senator, members of congress (he’s Never even chipped in a dime towards my phone bill – EVER), emails to the press worldwide on his behalf And the lawyer responses seem to cool things down for him, even former Vice President Mondale

Who received one of my initial emails took the time to personally respond having read my arguments against Threatening him harshly with a prison sentence certainly. I had mentioned to Conrad Black that when possible to do, I would have Expected a substantial sum for my efforts over the weeks involved, involving personal effort, professional expertise And an great deal of influence expended on his behalf with valid arguments over the semantic seeming ones from his Own lawfirm – even they thanked me for the ideas I gave them all the their firm there too.

One item I did mention was my Mastercard account number which I gave to him Asking he take care of the amount when in a position – he never said no to [any](#) of my ideas ([including such](#)) which helped lower the threat in the legal community I was sure I had Helped him with that level of support and decency of my [views](#) I'm still now even more Known for and worldwide respected for I daresay

To this day, all I've gotten was a note a year or two ago saying he had “no idea what the emails were about and never asked for them” Sounds like an ingrate and an man who isn't in fact being decently a fair chap or a man Of integrity after all – not to us here at [eurocoalition.org/britishcanada.org](#) – in fact Looks like we were stiffed even more than a decade later we got nothing but an insulting newspaper column from a man who can't do it as well as us – keeping the system respected that is and actually thereby showing respect for “British culture” as having some meaning in its ability to civilize the conduct of Men so we aren't in a “state of nature” as the Scottish movie “Rob Roy” warns against.

Michael Rizzo Chessman

Donations to Box 5864 Toronto M5W-1P3

Cdn interac email donations or ANY paypal donations

may be made at our websites [michaelchessman.com](#) and related sites