

14-10499

11-3-15 RT
RECEIVED
MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
NOV 03 2015

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Name and Address Chang guo su
3340 Gardella Plz Apt 104
Livermore, CA. 94551

FILED _____
DOCKETED _____ DATE _____ INITIAL _____

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Case No. 11-CV-00288-JST

Plaintiff / Petitioner

Document Name:

VS.

Melinda Haag

Defendant / Respondent

Susan Xiao-Ping Su

Appeal

The respected appellant judge:

I am the father of respondent for the case "11-CY-00288-JST", and also the petitioner for the case "15-CV-02435-KAW". After I was informed about the court hearing for "Tri-Valley University" case on Oct. 21, 2015, because the respondent has mental illness, and the present attorney for this case is very stubborn and cannot understand the nature of the case, only count on the small issues, which is not beneficial to the correction of this case. Now I hereby appeal as follows:

1. This case is obviously a case with serious political factor in the US justice history. Like what the public defender made the final conclusion report at court: "This is the federal government only targeting the respondent. She is running the school with her own conscience." (refer to 'World Journal' on Mar. 25, 2014).
Somebody created a political rumor, saying that the US has 'three more' --- 'numerous, like iceberg, and gradually increasing' visa factories. Then, she was sentenced to a prison term for 'Tri-Valley University' case that is 9 times more than any punishment in the history, for the purpose of punishing one to warn hundreds. Is it a political victory for a US Berkeley doctor to suffer such a miserable punishment? Can this really solve the problem of 'Three More' visa factories?
2. The appeal by the prosecutor of this case is rather silly. First, how can Indian diplomats issue visas at tens of times more than the

1 quotas? The prosecutor didn't conduct any investigation to this
2 issue before the appeal, but only complained swindled by others.
3 Whether is there a bribery issue inside? Whether is there any
4 Vietnamese diplomats selling visas? Whether is there any political
5 factors to favor India? Second, the accusations listed on the appeal
6 statement have their major source of swindling tuition and the
7 tainted witnesses' revenge.

- 8
- 9 3. The judgment by this case's jury is obviously guided by senior
10 officers. They have two guidance from senior officer Diane
11 Feinstein: decided by interference of 'To attack similar schools'
12 and 'Order to terminate them'. Now it is investigated.
- 13
- 14 4. This case considers all tuition illegal. In fact, till now, we didn't
15 find any improper payment for selling visas similar to Vietnamese
16 diplomat's '15000 – 70000USD per visa'.
- 17
- 18 5. This is a typical case of 'School discrimination' and 'Visa flood'.

19

20 The above appeal is for the judge's reference, so as to avoid re-appeal
21 with refusal of the second trial.

22 *Chang Gui Su*

23 Appellant: Chang Gui Su

24 10/29/2015

申 诉 书

尊敬的上诉法院法官：

我是“11-CV-00288-JST”案被告人的父亲，也是“15-CV-02435-KAW”案的原告人。得知10/15上诉法院审理“密大案”的情况之后，因被告有精神病，必对此案现场的律师图谋已见，抓不住案件的本核，只靠心证，不利于对案件的正，故特上书作如下申诉：

①此案明显是美国司法史上最严重政治因素的案件。正如公辩律师在法庭上最后作总统性发言讲道：“这是联邦政府只想拿被告开刀，她办学是凭良心去办的。”（见10/14《世界日报》）有人首先制造出一种政治谎言，说美国有“三年一核年；水之年；日增增年”的[签证工厂]，然仇，美国对密大案的量刑超不过同案例刑期最长记录9个月的严惩，以达到惩一儆百的目的。难道一个伯克利大学博士因办学遭到如此悲惨下场，真是一种政治酷刑？真能解决美国签证工厂？

②此案检察官的起诉是带糊涂性的。其一，驻印援外交官为什么会超过指标时候的批准签证？这个问题检察官在起诉之前没作任何调查，一味指控受地诈骗。这其中有没有什么问题？有无类似越南外交官卖签证问题？有无偏袒印援的政治因素？其二，起诉书仰到的罪状，占大数的来源，是照抄贪污费并敲诈勒索的治点让人极复杂的治先说词。

③此案院审团的裁决，明显受高官指使。是受立法高层范以两项指示：“透打去这同案学校”和“要求勒令学校停办”的平案而作出的，现已立案审查。

④此案把办学仰收的全部学费统统定为非法仰得。其实，至今为止并未发现学校有类似驻越南外交官15-20万美元一送出去签证之美的不正当收费。

⑤此案是“校制歧视”和“滥签”的典型案例。

以上申诉供法官参考，以免二审尔服再上诉。

申诉人：姜长贵 Chang Gui Su

10/29/15