

ORIGINAL

0208

In the case of s-20804A-11-2080



0000140737

I deny all allegations and believe that the evidence brought up at trial proved beyond a shadow of a doubt the innocence of all parties charged.

First, the prosecutor was taken off the case and the chief prosecutor of the AZ SEC took the case over then, in my opinion, the chief prosecutor then took herself (Julie Coleman) off the case because of the chance of attaining a conviction and put a novice prosecutor in charge. There are multiple discrepancies in the brief filed by the prosecution.

I believe that the Az SEC wants to control all business initiated in the state of AZ.

This is another overzealous governmental takeover of private companies to tell them how to run their companies. I believe I initiated contact with all investors as a finder of DEE.

I never was involved in negotiations, handling of money, contract signature or any other day to day activities or operations of DEE.

I was not privy to any dealings that had to do with the activities of the investors and DEE.

All parties that invested through the referrals on Mr. Munsey had been involved in oil and gas investment before participation in DEE. The prosecution has at many times if not lied, manipulated the truth.

Here are some facts that have been fabricated by the prosecution either by ignorance or just plain outright lies.

1. DEE investors had knowledge of and had invested in other oil and gas projects.
2. DEE finders were never told to sell, but to provide information
3. Mr. Munsey told potential clients that MRC was A marketing arm of DEE, not THE marketing arm. The email was only used as a vehicle to provide info.
4. Finders were never told about any violations in Pennsylvania
5. Mr. Robert Jackson was never a real potential investor, in fact he was an illegal bait trap to illicit info from the information he provided which made Mr. Munsey believe he was a sophisticated investor as well as a rich investor.
6. If the prosecution had reviewed the information that Mr. Munsey provided, the prosecutor would of found supporting documentation Mr. Munsey provided to potential investors.
7. All statements about production have been provided by the defendants and the prosecution has decided to ignore common practices of the oil and gas industry and include their own conclusions which go against common practices of the industry.
8. The prosecution is relying solely on the TRRC website which is months behind on uploading info from production. Also the novice approach the prosecution has shown relying solely on a website is beyond comprehension.
9. The prosecution has gone overboard in trying to maximize the any damage they believe was done by saying checks that were paid monthly to investors was not provided during the hearing. That is totally bogus. Another incident of government bs.
10. The prosecution stated that Mr. Munsey referred 5 investors when in fact he only referred 4. Another instance of fabrication.
11. There are to many fabrications from the prosecutions to have the time to answer their allegations.
12. In fact, there was no material harm to any investor and as such, they are still receiving commission checks monthly. This all comes down to prosecutorial misconduct and the belief that the state should be allowed to tell private company what it can and cannot do.

Craig Munsey 11/30/2012

RECEIVED

2012 DEC -4 P 3: 38

CORP COMMISSION  
DOCKET CONTROL