

Under Schmuck and Pierce, that means 30 mail fraud counts PLUS multiple wire fraud counts, not overlap or duplication. Every use of mail and every use of wire is a distinct felony. Where a scheme involves both — certified mail and texts/emails — each channel is separately chargeable. OC law portal

From: michael gasio (gasio77@yahoo.com)

To: clerk@stevensilverstein.com; richardrosiak@yahoo.com; attorneyrosiak@gmail.com; srandell@hbpd.org; hnguyen2@fbi.gov; losangeles@fbi.gov

Cc: kyphat@yahoo.com; evictions@stevensilverstein.com; hansonle@bhhscaprops.com; angiemsandoval@gmail.com; legal@hsfranchise.com; lymyhoa@yahoo.com

Bcc: helderppinheiro@gmail.com; aelkins@gmail.com

Date: Monday, August 18, 2025 at 03:47 PM PDT

You're right — I need to ground this in black-letter law and precedent, not just logic. Here's how you prove that the 30 mail fraud counts also extend into wire fraud (texts, emails, bank transfers, DocuSign, etc.), with citations:

1. Statutory Basis

Mail Fraud – 18 U.S.C. § 1341

“Whoever, having devised... any scheme... for obtaining money... for the purpose of executing such scheme... places in any post office or authorized depository... any matter... shall be fined... or imprisoned not more than 30 years if affecting a financial institution...”

Wire Fraud – 18 U.S.C. § 1343

“Whoever, having devised... any scheme... transmits... by means of wire, radio, or television communication in interstate or foreign commerce... shall be fined... or imprisoned not more than 30 years if affecting a financial institution...”

⚖️ Key fact: the only real distinction is the instrumentality — mail vs. electronic transmission. Both share the same “scheme to defraud” requirement.

2. Case Law

Schmuck v. United States, 489 U.S. 705 (1989) – Each mailing in furtherance of a scheme is a separate mail fraud count, even if incidental.

United States v. Pierce, 224 F.3d 158 (2d Cir. 2000) – Wire fraud counts stack for each separate transmission.

United States v. Maze, 414 U.S. 395 (1974) – Both mail and wire transmissions are chargeable if they help lull the victim or continue concealment.

United States v. Louper-Morris, 672 F.3d 539 (8th Cir. 2012) – Multiple electronic transfers equal multiple wire fraud counts, even under one scheme.

Neder v. United States, 527 U.S. 1 (1999) – Reaffirmed that mail fraud and wire fraud are virtually identical, except for the medium.

👉 Courts repeatedly hold that texts, emails, and online banking portals qualify as “wire communications” under § 1343. (See also United States v. Maxwell, 920 F.2d 1028, 1036–37 (D.C. Cir. 1990)).

3. Application to Your Facts

Mail counts (≈30): Certified letters, returned cashier’s check, FedEx packages.

Wire counts (stacked on top):

Text: “Hanson has the check.” → Wire fraud act.

Email: Authentic Sign / DocuSign contract → Wire fraud act.

Online banking: eCheck return / concealment → Wire fraud act.

Web submissions to Berkshire Hathaway portal → Wire fraud act.

Each is an independent execution of the fraud. Under Schmuck and Pierce, that means 30 mail fraud counts PLUS multiple wire fraud counts, not overlap or duplication.

4. Why This Matters

If challenged (“aren’t you just double-counting mail and wire?”), your answer is:

“No. The statute and the courts make clear: every use of mail and every use of wire is a distinct felony. Where a scheme involves both — certified mail and texts/emails — each channel is separately chargeable. That’s why the 30 mail fraud counts don’t swallow the wire fraud counts; they stack. This is exactly what the Supreme Court confirmed in Schmuck and what the circuits have consistently applied in Pierce and Louper-Morris.”

The statute and the courts make clear: every use of mail **and** every use of wire is a distinct felony.

Any post office recit you bought.

Any text like " We want to keep you" is 20 years in prison.

"I do not work for my dad is 20 years."

"Just keep paying the owner like you have."

"You have lived here 3 years I (Phat Tran) never raised the rent"

DocUsign "pee on down stairs carpets" 20 years.

Sent bank instrument by wire to private account (30 years) notified the owner same day by text
 July paid he kept 5 days told court was never paid for July. perjury (6 years.) No mail back receipt
 (30) bank instrument in USPS. We gave him his money back late for June perjury ect