

Corporate council duty Mr Beard Berkshire Hathaway California homes franchisor LLC question number six out of 408 I'm going to love being prose

From: michael gasio (gasio77@yahoo.com)

To: legal@hsfranchise.com; srandell@hbpd.org; hnguyen2@fbi.gov; losangeles@fbi.gov

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

Date: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 at 06:00 PM PDT

Subject: Corporate Counsel Duty,

> "Mr. Beard, as legal counsel for one of the most recognized real estate brands in the United States, would you not agree that accuracy is not optional in your role — particularly when corresponding with shareholders, tenants, or the court?

At the time you wrote to me, I held over \$500,000 in Berkshire Hathaway within my retirement account — a stake I have since liquidated after what I viewed as a pattern of systemic fraud and willful indifference within your organization.

Now let me bring your attention to one particular statement made in your correspondence:

You claimed that after speaking with State Inspector Tom Nguyen, you were 'satisfied' that there had been no wrongdoing by your agents.

Mr. Beard — please identify, for this court:

1. The exact date and method by which you communicated with Mr. Nguyen.
2. The complete contents of that communication — including who else was copied or present.
3. Whether you received or requested any official investigative report before rendering your conclusion.


Because what we have here is a tenant — later a plaintiff — who:

- Was told by your own agent, while he was in Europe, that his rent was increasing by 20%,
- Received no proper 90-day notice,
- Had his lease co-signed by the owner's daughter (who lives with your agent),
- And was later evicted using a counterfeit lease initiated by your company — while the original leaseholder was never served.

And your claim is that Mr. Nguyen's assurance — not the law, not the documents, not the certified evidence — is what led you to conclude there was no fraud.

So, Mr. Beard:

Produce the call log, the message, or the written summary that justified your inaction — or admit, under oath, that you never confirmed that claim."

 This will be indexed in:

questions.html#db03

charges.html#fiduciary-breach

actors.html#beard

Connected to evidence.html#E100 (Nguyen notice request) and E046/E049 (Beard letters)

Would you like to push this into the “Jury Card: Beard” outline now — or focus next on Nguyen’s conflicting communications that Beard claims as his defense?