

Conversation with Sergeant Darrin Joe

Recording Name:
[E36- DARRIN JOE 041124]

Transcript Prepared By:



720-287-3710
1355 S. Colorado Blvd.
Suite C515
Denver, CO 80222

DUNS Number: 037801851
CAGE Code: 6C7D5
Tax ID #: 27-2983097

1 Female: Okay. (Inaudible - 00:00:08).

2 Joe: Sergeant Darrin Joe.

3 Bereki: Darrin, this is Adam Bereki, how are you?

4 Joe: Hey, Adam, I'm good. How are you doin', sir?

5 Bereki: I'm doing well, thank you for asking. Sorry, I'm in a
6 carwash, if there's any crazy noise. Um --

7 Joe: That's okay.

8 Bereki: I was --

9 Joe: What can I do for ya?

10 Bereki: I was calling to ask a question, um, to get a little
11 bit more clarification about your report and your
12 speaking with supervisors. Um --

13 Joe: Okay.

14 Bereki: Did anybody actually order you to make the
15 determination, or was that your determination?

16 Joe: Uh, off the top of my head, I believe it was mine. I
17 don't think I was -- I don't think I was ordered to do
18 anything.

19 Bereki: Okay. And was your order -- or was your determination
20 based upon what the OC District Attorneys told you?

21 Joe: Uh, I don't believe so. I think I -- I was looking
22 at, uh, this case independent of anything else. Um,
23 yeah, it -- oh, you mean, um, when I -- when I
24 presented it to the DA? I'm -- I'm sorry, yeah, I
25 apologize. I gotta say that I haven't, uh, looked at



1 this report in a -- for a long time.

2 Bereki: It -- it's okay. Um, yeah, my -- I -- I -- I read it,
3 and it was very clear to me that you went to those
4 other officials, like your Lieutenant Crowman (ph) and
5 Joe Cartwright (ph), and the DA, and it seemed like
6 you were trying to, um, get clarity on what to do.
7 That -- that's -- that was my interpretation. Because
8 you -- you told me that it wasn't clear to you what --
9 that -- that a crime had been committed or not.

10 Joe: Mm.

11 Bereki: Um, and so, that's -- that's the way I interpreted it.
12 So, um, they ultimately told you, uh, based on your
13 report, that, um, because I had been afforded due
14 process already, that, um, basically there could be no
15 intervention. Um, and your report also says that you
16 could -- you didn't -- you weren't able to conclude
17 that a -- that a crime had been -- uh -- uh -- uh, or
18 a crime had been o- -- had occurred.

19 Joe: Mm-hmm.

20 Bereki: So, yeah. I'm -- I'm just trying to understand more
21 about where you were coming from with that to -- to,
22 you know, make some determinations on where I'm going
23 to proceed with next, because they're not -- they're
24 not specific in your report.

25 Joe: Okay. Yeah, and you know, just -- like I said, off



1 the top of my head, um, I wasn't sure with -- with
2 what I had. And, yeah, whenever that -- that happens,
3 I -- I seek outside coun- -- counsel outside of myself
4 as to what direction this could go. Um, you know,
5 better people to ask than, uh, OC DAs that -- that I
6 would be presenting to that could -- could potentially
7 file anything. And, um, yeah, that's -- that's where
8 it -- it was left at, I believe.

9 Bereki: Okay. Are you able to share with me, off the top of
10 your head, if you know? If not, I would definitely
11 like to -- to know. Um, by -- by what authority
12 basically you found that, uh, essentially that the
13 judge cannot, um, commit a crime from the bench, and
14 that there was no -- no criminal action that had --
15 that had occurred? Um, because that -- that's not in
16 the report. It just says that you found that. But
17 like, for example, I presented the issue to you that
18 there was no authority to, um, e- -- take the -- to
19 make the excessive fine. So --

20 Joe: Mm-hmm.

21 Bereki: -- if -- if there was an authority to, uh, to fine me,
22 then that would be an unlawful taking by the judge.
23 So what -- what I'm interested in is, um, what
24 authority you relied upon to -- to find that none of
25 the penal code provisions were violated when those



1 provisions don't make any exception for judges or any
2 other public officials.

3 Joe: Yeah, again, Adam, off the top of my head, um, it
4 appeared to me as if the judge was following the, uh -
5 - is it the Business and Professions Code?

6 Bereki: Yes.

7 Joe: That -- that talks about, um, the --

8 Bereki: You're right. That's exactly what it was.

9 Joe: -- the type of consequence that -- that comes along
10 with -- with, uh -- and refresh my memory. What's the
11 term again?

12 Bereki: Um, just basically --

13 Joe: Is it -- is it --

14 Bereki: Oh, the term --

15 Joe: Is it disgorgement or some- --

16 Bereki: -- the term was disgorgement. Yeah, yeah, the term
17 was disgorgement.

18 Joe: Oh, okay. Yeah.

19 Bereki: Yeah.

20 Joe: Shoot, I can't believe I pulled that out of thin air.
21 Um, disgorgement. Um, you know, again a concept that
22 I wasn't familiar with until I -- I'd first spoken to
23 you. Um, based on my recollection, disgorgement is
24 actually written into the -- the BNP, and the judge
25 has the, um, ability or opportunity to -- to render



1 that as part of the -- the, uh, his findings, and
2 that's what happened in your case. So, um, if he's
3 following that procedure, then that can't be
4 considered a crime of -- of unlawful taking or -- or
5 cruel and unusual.

6 Bereki: Y- --

7 Joe: I mean, that's just -- again, I'm -- I'm riffing off
8 the top of my head, um.

9 Bereki: I -- I understand. Yeah, that -- that --

10 Joe: It was somethin' that -- that I learned maybe three
11 years ago, two and a half years ago.

12 Bereki: It's okay. Yeah, I understand. And I -- I agree with
13 you. If it was within the authority of the judge to
14 do it, that's not -- that's not --

15 Joe: Uh-huh.

16 Bereki: -- that's not a crime, a hundred percent you're right
17 about that.

18 Joe: So -- so if we're -- we're debating or discussing, uh,
19 what the judge's authority is, that's -- to me, that
20 doesn't seem like it should fall within the -- the
21 realm of local law enforcement. That should probably
22 be in, uh, something that gets disputed in court.

23 Bereki: Yeah, th- -- th- -- you know, as -- as -- I -- I don't
24 wanna, you know, rehash all the issues, but just to
25 basically address what you --



1 Joe: Yeah.

2 Bereki: -- said was that, you know, um, if there is no remedy
3 in the Judicial system, and --

4 Joe: Mm-hmm.

5 Bereki: -- and property is being taken without lawful
6 authority, the duty of the Executive Branch is to see
7 the law is faithfully executed. And that includes by
8 all public officials and people. So there is no
9 exclusion for judges or other public officials. Now I
10 get it that the police cannot be, uh, an appeal for
11 the, um, for the court system. But if you exhaust
12 those remedies and there is a still a severe injustice
13 happening and a crime happening --

14 Joe: Mm-hmm.

15 Bereki: -- because property's being taken without authority,
16 where else do you go? That --

17 Joe: Yeah, I --

18 Bereki: -- that's the problem I continue to have. And -- and,
19 you know, I continue --

20 Joe: Right.

21 Bereki: -- to face foreclosure on my home, and --

22 Joe: Uh-huh.

23 Bereki: -- um, uh, yeah, that -- that -- that's the issue. So
24 -- so I -- I'm trying to just get clear about, you
25 know, you said that you weren't able to determine if a



1 crime has been com- -- committed or not, but again, in
2 your report, it doesn't address any of the substantive
3 issues that I raised. For example, the fact of what
4 is disgorgement, right? I gave you the -- the --

5 Joe: Mm-hmm.

6 Bereki: -- the case from the Supreme Court, saying that it
7 only applies to profits, but there were no profits in
8 my -- in the evidence of my case.

9 Joe: Mm-hmm.

10 Bereki: It was a total refund. So fine --

11 Joe: Okay.

12 Bereki: If I -- they were allowed to take profits, that's
13 fine. You know, if that's what -- that -- that --
14 that's what the statute says, that's what they have
15 authority to do. But again, there were no profits.
16 So that's a problem, because that's not disgorgement.
17 And -- and then -- there -- there were a number of
18 these substantive issues --

19 Joe: Okay.

20 Bereki: -- that I -- that I raised to you that I feel that in
21 order for you to make a determination that no crime
22 was committed --

23 Joe: Mm-hmm.

24 Bereki: -- that you would have to resolve some of those
25 issues. Like you would have to say, "Adam -- Adam



1 made a mistake about disgorgement."

2 Joe: Uh-huh.

3 Bereki: "The -- the -- you know, this is what disgorgement
4 means, as far as I can understand from the highest law
5 of our -- the highest court in our country. The U.S.
6 Supreme Court has said that this is what disgorgement
7 is. And when held up to the light of what the judge
8 did in Adam's case, it's lawful. What the judge did
9 is right. I am not -- Adam has not presented me with
10 any other evidence, and I am unable to find any myself
11 that there's been any violation of law here." But th--
12 -- that isn't in the report. Um --

13 Joe: Well, you understand that it -- we're still not in the
14 proper forum. Local law enforcement, it -- it's not
15 in our -- in our -- within our scope to, uh, argue or
16 interpret legal terms or legal remedies. It's --

17 Bereki: Well, it -- just in this case, those happen to be how
18 the crime is being committed.

19 Joe: Yeah.

20 Bereki: And that's exactly what you do all day long, to find
21 out whether -- whether there's been a crime been
22 committed. I -- I get it. I get it. It may be an
23 unusual circumstance. Um --

24 Joe: Mm-hmm.

25 Bereki: -- but -- but it still is within the scope and power



1 and duty of law enforcement when you take an oath of
2 office. I -- I mean, it's --
3 Joe: Furthermore, you know, c- -- may I ask you this?
4 Bereki: Yeah.
5 Joe: Um, you know, you talk about all -- all possible
6 solutions exhausted. Did you ever end up hiring a --
7 an attorney to look into this? Or did we ever end up
8 taking this to the Supreme Court?
9 Bereki: Yeah, the -- I --
10 Joe: I can't remember.
11 Bereki: I -- I did go to the Supreme Court, and they --
12 Joe: Uh-huh.
13 Bereki: -- um, refused to stop my case from going into
14 bankruptcy.
15 Joe: Okay.
16 Bereki: So I was forced into bankruptcy, and -- and my case is
17 still actively in bankruptcy while, um, yeah, other
18 investigations are being -- being conducted. Um --
19 Joe: Okay, and then about the attorney? Uh, 'cause again,
20 Adam, I -- I -- I'm almost embarrassed to say that I'm
21 not a specialist in this field, but, uh --
22 Bereki: Well, no one -- no one --
23 Joe: -- but, you know, this is --
24 Bereki: No one would expect you to be a specialist in, you
25 know, nuanced area like disgorgement, or something



1 like that. But -- but here's -- here's where --
2 Joe: Right. And this is a very nuanced area, to me
3 (inaudible - 00:10:27).
4 Bereki: Here's -- here's -- here's where my -- my problem
5 comes in, Darrin.
6 Joe: Mm-hmm.
7 Bereki: Her- -- here's where it ultimately comes in, right?
8 At the end of the day, all public officials have to
9 have constitutional authority or statutory authority
10 to do what they're doing.
11 Joe: Right.
12 Bereki: Doesn't matter if it's the police, the legislature, a
13 judge. Doesn't matter.
14 Joe: Mm-hmm.
15 Bereki: Okay, so all I'm saying is that I have evidence that
16 the judge did not have a lawful -- did not have lawful
17 authority. And because he didn't have lawful
18 authority that's the only thing that separates what an
19 official can do by law and what a criminal does.
20 Joe: (Inaudible - 00:11:05).
21 Bereki: See, a criminal isn't supported by law to take
22 something. But -- but a judge or a police officer may
23 be if it's within the law. But if it's not within the
24 law --
25 Joe: Okay.



1 Bereki: -- then there's a problem, right? And I get that
2 there may be a nuanced area here. You know, cops
3 aren't dealing with disgorgement. Cops aren't
4 normally dealing with --

5 Joe: Right.

6 Bereki: -- how restitution is applied to crime victims.
7 However --

8 Joe: Here's the thing, you -- you do keep bringing up, uh,
9 the important fact that if it's not within the law,
10 then it -- it is a crime. But what if it is in --
11 what if it is in within the law, and then we -- it's
12 just a -- a matter of differing opinions?

13 Bereki: Well, it's not. I mean, because i- -- in order for it
14 to be within the law -- for l- -- for example, the
15 term disgorgement has been defined by the Supreme
16 Court to mean, uh -- uh, the -- the giving up of the
17 fruits of illegal, um, conduct. In this case it has
18 to do with profits.

19 Joe: Mm-hmm.

20 Bereki: Okay? So look, if I -- if I -- if I did act as an
21 unlicensed contractor, fine. What are my profits?
22 What do I have to give back?

23 Joe: Mm.

24 Bereki: I can tell you that my profits were not, from my
25 recollection, anywhere near close to \$100,000. So how



1 do they get \$930,000?

2 Joe: Okay.

3 Bereki: That's the first problem. Then --

4 Joe: Yeah. Yeah, see, I don't know.

5 Bereki: So -- so -- so that's what I'm saying. That's what --

6 that's what --

7 Joe: And -- and I don't -- I don't know if it -- if it just

8 -- if it specifically discusses profits either,

9 because, um, I was under the impression, at least the

10 last time we spoke, that it wasn't necessarily profit,

11 but it was -- it was money that was actually handed

12 over to the unlicensed contractor.

13 Bereki: Right, but you -- you -- but again, th- -- that's what

14 the statute --

15 Joe: Is that a misinterpretation by the court, or?

16 Bereki: No, the -- the -- the -- the statute says that you

17 have to give all the money back.

18 Joe: Right.

19 Bereki: Okay.

20 Joe: And then it -- and then it gets doubled, right?

21 That's -- that's the whole concept of disgorgement?

22 Bereki: Um, no, um, it's --

23 Joe: Oh.

24 Bereki: What happens is -- so like let's say you hired me to

25 build your house, and you gave me the million bucks.



1 Joe: Mm-hmm.

2 Bereki: Well I went out and bought the million bucks in
3 materials and hired the laborers and paid them, and
4 now you have a million-dollar home. So the statute
5 says, "Don't take into account what's already been
6 returned with all the labor and materials. Make then
7 pay" --

8 Joe: Oh.

9 Bereki: -- "another million." So I already gave the money
10 back to my clients by building them a custom home.

11 Joe: Uh-huh.

12 Bereki: And then the judge ordered me --

13 Joe: See, that might be the matter of law that's under
14 debate, and that's why -- I mean, I'm -- I'm tellin'
15 you, Adam, I -- I would love to help you and do what I
16 can to help you, but this is not a matter for local
17 law enforcement, let alone the incorrect jurisdiction.
18 This -- what the judge decided had actually occurred
19 in Santa Ana, so --

20 Bereki: Yeah, but you're a law enforcement author- -- well,
21 the crime actually -- the situation occurred in
22 Newport, and Protocol 101 says that --

23 Joe: But the judge didn't misinterpret in your -- your
24 scenario, the judge didn't misinterpret the law in
25 Newport.



1 Bereki: Um, correct. However, there's also Protocol 101 that
2 says that every police officer in the county has
3 authority throughout the entire county. And I've gone
4 to those other agencies, and they're --

5 Joe: Which is -- and which is also why I- -- I've listened
6 to you thus far. You know, ever since -- whenever
7 this -- this issue was brought to me, I didn't just
8 completely blow you off. I -- I was willing to --

9 Bereki: You did not. Exactly.

10 Joe: -- entertain the -- the idea of -- of --

11 Bereki: Exactly.

12 Joe: -- a proper legal argument.

13 Bereki: Right, but what -- what ultimately I'm getting at is
14 that, uh, you know, you -- your report found that you
15 were not able to establish, um, that a crime had been
16 committed. But in order to do that, you have to make
17 a determination on the issues that I presented to you.
18 Like there were -- let's just say there were three of
19 'em, and those issues --

20 Joe: Okay.

21 Bereki: -- aren't found anywhere in the report. So I have no
22 idea how to determine where to go, what to do, what
23 your state of mind was, how you come -- came to this
24 conclusion when you didn't address those issues. So
25 like -- like there was an issue of what's



1 disgorgement. I gave you the U.S. Supreme Court case
2 that says what disgorgement is, and then said how does
3 that apply to my case, because the statute doesn't
4 mention disgorgement. It doesn't say anything about
5 it. It's com- -- yeah. And -- and -- and according
6 to the Supreme Court, it means profits. And so,
7 again, I realize that this is a nuance, but this is no
8 more technical than -- I mean, what bureau -- type of
9 -- what type of crimes are you the supervisor of the -
10 - in the Detective Bureau? Is it fraud and forgery?

11 Joe: Uh, it used to be, yeah.

12 Bereki: Okay.

13 Joe: At that -- at that time that we last spoke.

14 Bereki: Yeah, so that -- that is always generally very highly
15 sophisticated stuff.

16 Joe: Mm-hmm.

17 Bereki: And often there's new ways that crimes are being
18 committed, and you have to figure out how it's being
19 done.

20 Joe: Sure.

21 Bereki: In this case, it's -- it's not accounting and hiding
22 things like that. It's legal terms and phrases.
23 That's how this crime's being committed. Um, and so
24 that's what needs to get looked into. And, you know -
25 -



1 Joe: Yeah, again, Adam, the -- the proper forum for this
2 would be in civil court with an attorney that
3 specializes in legal interpretations, or
4 interpretations of legal terms.

5 Bereki: Yeah, but tho- -- those -- those things are not
6 working for me, Darrin. I do not have access to a --

7 Joe: Have you --

8 Bereki: -- legitimate court.

9 Joe: Did you ever get around to having legal
10 representation? (Inaudible - 00:16:37).

11 Bereki: Darrin, I -- I -- I cannot. I -- I can't afford it,
12 and I trust my own determination and that of the
13 highest court in the country, the U.S. Supreme Court
14 to tell us what these things are. I mean, this -- see
15 that's -- that's one of the things that -- the issues
16 that I think you perceive that I was just kind of
17 making this all up by a whim. But I'm giving -- what
18 I gave you were the authorities of the highest court
19 saying what I'm saying. That's where I'm getting this
20 from.

21 Joe: Mm-hmm.

22 Bereki: So it's not just me sayin' it. I get it if you -- I
23 was just kind of arguing something out of thin air.
24 But no --

25 Joe: No, yeah, I know you put in the time, in terms of --



1 of the research.

2 Bereki: Yeah.

3 Joe: But what you -- what you need is somebody that knows
4 where to go next, and I'm tellin' you that -- that
5 this avenue, pursuing it criminally through the
6 Newport Beach Police Department, is not where you go
7 next.

8 Bereki: Well, I have to have some type of remedy. And it's
9 not the courts, 'cause I've been all the way to the
10 highest court in the nation, multiple times. And I've
11 been to other police agencies. And I've been to the
12 legislature. And there's not one agency that --
13 that's offering to help me.

14 Joe: And, you know, and I -- I don't mean to sound
15 flippant, and I -- this is not being rude. But,
16 because you disagree with -- with what's been told to
17 you doesn't mean that you're afforded in- -- infinite
18 number of remedies.

19 Bereki: Well, I -- I hear you, and I understand what you're
20 saying. But in this case, I'm certain that I'm
21 correct. And I have the -- the documents, the -- the
22 -- the case decisions from the highest court in our
23 country to back up what I'm saying.

24 Joe: Mm-hmm.

25 Bereki: All I need is someone to actually take action now.



1 And so, again, um, you know, I -- I'm just asking you
2 -- and you can refuse to do it if you want to, but I'm
3 just asking if you could email me -- um, I have an
4 appointment I need to go to right now. But if you
5 could --

6 Joe: Okay.

7 Bereki: -- email me, or, um, just by -- by what authority you
8 relied upon to conclude that there wasn't a crime
9 being committed. That -- that's what I -- that's what
10 I'm just trying to find, is -- is what -- what actual
11 law you're relying upon to make that conclusion,
12 because it -- it can't be an arbitrary determination.
13 It has to be based in law. And so if you wanna say
14 that, you know, I examined disgorgement, this case
15 that Adam gave me, and it -- it doesn't say what Adam
16 says it says, and you know, that's fine. Fine. I --
17 I -- I -- you know, but that's what I need. Um,
18 because it's not --

19 Joe: Uh --

20 Bereki: -- it's not in your report.

21 Joe: Okay. I, uh, when I get a moment today, I'll pull up
22 the report, take a look, see if there's anything that
23 needs to be added on our end.

24 Bereki: Okay.

25 Joe: Uh, if there is, I'll -- I'll shoot you a message. If



1 -- if not, then we're gonna leave things where they
2 lie.

3 Berekhi: Okay. Yeah, I'm just -- I'm just saying that I think
4 you're -- there's one sentence in there that says, "I
5 concluded that there was nothing, you know, no
6 probable cause that -- that a crime had been com- --
7 committed."

8 Joe: Mm-hmm.

9 Berekhi: And again, it doesn't address any of the issues I
10 raised.

11 Joe: Okay.

12 Berekhi: So that's all I'm asking. Nothing more, no- --
13 nothing less. If you -- you're gonna say that it's
14 not a crime, then why?

15 Joe: Okay. Yeah, I'll -- I'll take a look at the report
16 and see if it's -- if those bases aren't covered. Um,
17 and then we can go from there. But if they -- if they
18 are covered sufficiently, uh, for the purposes of --
19 of why I wrote the report, then, um --

20 Berekhi: Yeah, they're not.

21 Joe: -- then we're --

22 Berekhi: There's -- there's no mention of them at all.

23 Joe: Okay.

24 Berekhi: There's no mention of any -- any issue that I raised.
25 Not the disgorgement issue, not the fine issue --



1 Joe: Mm-hmm.

2 Bereki: -- not the -- not the, um --

3 Joe: And -- and again, the -- the whole disgorgement issue
4 is not something that should be, uh, argued to the
5 police department. Again, the -- the proper forum
6 would've been in front of another judge,
7 unfortunately.

8 Bereki: Yeah, well, and -- and I -- we can disagree about
9 that. But if that's the --

10 Joe: Sure.

11 Bereki: If the words and phrases -- the manipulation of words
12 and phrases and -- and fraud through those means are
13 the means by which the crime is being committed, then
14 that would mean that you have to investigate those and
15 see how those --

16 Joe: Uh-huh.

17 Bereki: -- terms are being used. That's absolutely part of
18 the criminal investigation.

19 Joe: Uh-huh.

20 Bereki: That's absolutely part of determining whether a crime
21 has been committed or not. Because if -- if the
22 highest court in our country is saying that the word
23 only applies to profits, and then another judge is
24 saying that implies to all the entire transaction,
25 that's a problem. Because in that case, we have a



1 variance of a fine ranging from nearly a million
2 dollars to a hundred thousand. That -- that makes all
3 the difference. That word and phrase is how this is
4 being done. So, that's what resolution is to me. And
5 if you're gonna say there's not a crime committed,
6 then -- then there has to be a resolution of that.
7 You did the investigation. You looked into the
8 accusations and the claims that I made, and -- and
9 basically you determined that I was full of shit, or
10 not. But just -- just -- just to wave a wand --

11 Joe: Yeah, I mean (inaudible - 00:21:24) --

12 Bereki: -- and say there's nothing doesn't cut it.

13 Joe: At the basis level, you're -- you're arguing -- you're
14 -- you're disagreeing with the -- the judgment in a
15 court case. That doesn't mean it's a crime.

16 Bereki: Correct. That's why I brought it to you to make that
17 determination.

18 Joe: Yeah, I mean, I could -- I could literally write that
19 in a -- write a sentence on that in this report, and
20 where do you go from there?

21 Bereki: Well, but that's not what I'm asking you --

22 Joe: You're right back where you started.

23 Bereki: That -- that's not what I'm --

24 Joe: Oh no, but I'm -- I'm telling you, that's what I can
25 do, because that's my interpretation of all this. At



1 its most simple level.

2 Bereki: Okay. And --

3 Joe: Well, you're asking me to -- to get into all these

4 legalese terms and defining what you've already told

5 me, um, but that still brings us back to Square One,

6 where --

7 Bereki: Wait a minute, can you -- can you say that a- --

8 Joe: -- you disagree with --

9 Bereki: Yeah, yeah.

10 Joe: (Inaudible - 00:22:15).

11 Bereki: I -- I disagree with it. And I'm making an accusation

12 that because of that disagreement, it's not just that

13 I'm unhappy wit it, it's that it's unlawful. There

14 has to be lawful authority to do it. That's it, at

15 the end of the day. And so, I brought the issue --

16 Joe: Yes, but after an appeal it still -- it still holds

17 the -- it still passes the test of what has occurred

18 in court.

19 Bereki: Um, but that doesn't mean that it's lawful, even if it

20 goes to an appeal. Because it still has to has a- --

21 authority.

22 Joe: Okay, and then you -- and then you have other remedies

23 within the court.

24 Bereki: I don't. I've exhausted them.

25 Joe: (Inaudible - 00:22:48).



1 Bereki: I've exhausted them.

2 Joe: Then you're -- you're stuck with your opinion.

3 Bereki: No, I'm going to start arresting people --

4 Joe: Right, that's where we are.

5 Bereki: -- is where we are. So what I'm trying to do is avoid
6 doing that, avoid making a big scene and arresting a
7 whole bunch of public officials for treason --

8 Joe: Mm.

9 Bereki: -- by trying to get public officials to just do their
10 job and do it appropriately. That's it.

11 Joe: Okay.

12 Bereki: So, I'm telling you --

13 Joe: Okay, so (inaudible - 00:23:18).

14 Bereki: -- that other road is coming. We are -- we are days
15 away from that.

16 Joe: Okay.

17 Bereki: So this is a last ditch effort to -- to try to get
18 somebody to do the right thing, to just look at the
19 terms, and see if what I'm saying has validity or not.

20 Joe: Okay.

21 Bereki: But just passing it off and saying --

22 Joe: Like I said, Adam, I'm gonna take -- I'll take a look
23 at the report after you and I hang up.

24 Bereki: Okay.

25 Joe: If, in my opinion, I did the right thing, did right by



1 you, did right by my job, did right by the -- the
2 criminal justice system, then I'm not doing anything
3 else.
4 Bereki: And -- and that's fine.
5 Joe: Okay?
6 Bereki: But I can just tell you from a lawful standpoint --
7 Joe: Uh-huh.
8 Bereki: -- you haven't fulfilled that.
9 Joe: Okay.
10 Bereki: From a law standpoint, you haven't.
11 Joe: Is there anything else I can help you out with today,
12 Adam?
13 Bereki: No.
14 Joe: Or?
15 Bereki: Nope, nope.
16 Joe: Okay.
17 Bereki: That's all.
18 Joe: All right. Have a good day, sir.
19 Bereki: Okay, you too. Thank you.
20 Joe: Bye.
21 Bereki: Bye.
22
23
24
25



TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, DANEN MURRAY, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE
FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A FULL, TRUE, AND CORRECT
STATEMENT OF THE AUDIO FILE PROVIDED TO ME TITLED "E36- DARRIN
JOE 041124".

DATED this 26th day of June, 2025.



Danen Murray

Ditto Transcripts
1355 S. Colorado Blvd.
Suite C515
Denver, CO 80222
Tel: 720-287-3710
Fax: 720-952-9897

DUNS Number: 037801851
CAGE Code: 6C7D5
Tax ID #: 27-2983097

