

Chad Svendsen  
22710 Pinto Lane  
Lakeville, MN 55044  
Tel: (952) 224-6244

Atty. In Fact

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	( CHAD SVENDSEN INNOCENT
	( OWNER QUALIFIED UNDER 18 U.S.C.
Plaintiff	( SEC 983 (e) FOR A MOTION TO SET
	( ASIDE FORFEITURE IS FILING A
vs.	( MOTION TO INTERVENE AS ALLOWED
	( UNDER 18 U.S.C. SEC 983 (e)
Chad Svendsen Qualified Owner	(
Defense Under 18 U.S.C. Sec. 983	(
ASD# 99668	(
	( Judge: Rosemary Collyer
Claimant	(
_____	(

The Claimant Chad Svendsen come to this Court to present Chad Svendsen Innocent Owner Qualified Under 18 U.S.C. 983 (e) For A Motion To Set Aside Forfeiture Is Filing A Motion To Intervene As Allowed Under 18 U.S.C. Sec. 983 (e). This is Fully Qualified under Sec. 983 (e) as the Motion To Set Aside Forfeiture Proves. U.S. Attorneys William Cowden & Jeffrey Taylor as well as Judge Rosemary Collyer are required By Contract Law in their Defaulted Demand For Legal Evidence to "Support & Defend All of the Claimants Constitutional Rights. This clearly includes Article VI Supremacy Clause that includes Federal Statutes, U.S. Supreme Court Cases, and Appellate Court Cases.

**RECEIVED**

APR 27 2009

Clerk, U.S. District and  
Bankruptcy Courts

**PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE:** U.S. Attorneys William Cowden & Jeffrey Taylor are required under the U.S. Constitution in general and Article VI Supremacy Clause in particular to Obey the Civil Forfeiture Reform Act of 2000 and U.S.C. Sec. 983. They Have Knowingly, Willfully Violated Both Plus Violating their Oath of Office to “Support & Defend the U.S. Constitution.” This makes them Guilty of Fraud Upon The Court, Perjury of Oath, Obstruction of Justice, and Interference With Commerce under 18 U.S.C. Sec. 1951. **The following is Prima Facie Evidence Against U.S. Attorneys.** Before the Claimant got involved with making their Claim, The 2 U.S. Attorneys Defaulted well over 20 times to the Demand For Legal Evidence Affidavits that were Mailed By Return Receipt. According to the U.S. Supreme Court Kis Case and 5 Appellate Cases, these Defaults are an Admission That the U.S. Govt. does not have any Legal Evidence that ASD is guilty of Operating a Ponzie Scheme. Without such Legal Evidence, this Court Has No Jurisdiction because the U.S. Govt. has failed to State a Claim under Fed. Rule 12 (b)(6) where Relief Can Be Granted. **None of the Legal Issues raised in the Demand For Legal Evidence Was Ever Rebutted. The U.S. Govt. has totally failed to Obey the Civil Forfeiture Reform Act where the Govt. is required to produce a “Preponderance of Evidence of ASD Operating a Ponzi Scheme.” All the U.S. Attorneys presented was the Opinion of an Attorney that is not admissible as Evidence in Court, so sayeth the U.S. Supreme Court. Under Article VI Supremacy Clause, this Court is required to Obey Statutes, U.S. Supreme Court Cases, & Appellate Court Cases. As a result, the Claimants have a Constitutional Right of Due Process to have their Motion To Set Aside Forfeiture Ruled Upon.**

The Claimants would like to Take Judicial Notice related to the U.S. Attorneys 35

Pages Opposition To Members and Victims Motions To Intervene. It was purely the Opinion of An Atty. that is Not Admissible as Evidence in Court, so sayeth the U.S. Supreme Court and also under Fed. Rule 801 where it is called Hearsay Evidence. Furthermore, the Opinions & Facts were in direct contradiction to the Civil Forfeiture Reform Act of 2000, 18 U.S.C. Sec. 983, and the ASD Members Constitutional Right To Make a Contract With ASD. **As a result, there is No Evidence, only Opinion, that the ASD Members Are Creditors instead of having an Ownership Interest.**


**Furthermore, the U.S. Attorneys Opinions are in direct Conflict With 18 U.S.C. Sec. 983 where the Govt. failed to Notify the ASD Members within 60 days of Forfeiture, thus requiring the Govt. to Return The Ownership Interest Money as soon as a Motion To Set Aside Forfeiture Is Filed. In addition, the U.S. Attorneys did not present Any Legal Evidence that the ASD Members did not have a Constitutional Right To Make a Contract & did not provide Any Legal Evidence that the U.S. Govt. Was Not Guilty of Violating 18 U.S.C. Sec. 1951 Interference With Commerce, a Felony. All of this proves that the Claimants have a Constitutional Right of Due Process to have their Motion To Set Aside Forfeiture Filed.**

CONCLUSION: The Claimant believes that the Legal Evidence Presented gives the Claimant the Legal Right to have this Motion To Intervene Granted so that the Motion To Set Aside Forfeiture can be Filed and Ruled Upon according to 18 U.S.C. Sec. 983.


**Reserving ALL Natural God-Given Unalienable Birthrights and Waiving None of the Liberties granted by Almighty God. 28 U.S.C. 1746.**

I declare under penalty of perjury the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Further Affiant sayeth naught

  
Chad Svendsen, Afiant



  
Notary Public

Notary for the State of Minnesota  
My Commission Expires 1/31/2013

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true copy of the enclosed Motion To Intervene was mailed on this April 21, 2009 upon the following:

William Cowden, Assist. U.S. Atty., DC Bar No. 426301  
Chief Asset Forfeiture Unit  
555 4<sup>th</sup> St., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20530

Jeffrey Taylor, U.S. Atty., DC Bar No. 498610  
United States Attorney's Office  
555 4<sup>th</sup> St. N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20530

  
Chad Svendsen