

Mr. James K. Schweitzer
Special Agent in Charge
Federal Bureau of Investigation
151 Westpark Boulevard
Columbia, SC 29210-3857
Via Fax: 803-551-4219
Via Email: jschweitzer@fbi.gov

March 22, 2004

Mr. Schweitzer;

This letter is a formal request for an internal investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation into the conduct and motivation of Thomas E. O'Neill, Chief Division Council of The Columbia SC FBI Office regarding his actions taken, dated March 12, 2004 and mailed March 16, 2004 in regards to a request for investigation and prosecution of several federal and state crimes committed under the color of law, and a formal request for proper investigation of violations of 18 U.S.C. § 24 and others.

In the letter received from Mr. O'Neill, he stated: "In order for the FBI to initiate an investigation of any complaint we receive, specific facts must be present to indicate that a violation of federal law within our investigative jurisdiction has occurred." 18 U.S.C. § 24 is specifically within the FBI's jurisdiction.

In an article published by The State, dated Wed, Nov. 26, 2003, Mr. O'Neill is credited with this statement; "... Tom O'Neill, spokesman for the FBI's Columbia division, explained the way the process works when it receives a complaint: The FBI, he said, conducts a preliminary investigation and turns over its findings to the Justice Department. The Justice Department determines whether a violation has been made or if additional information is needed, O'Neill said."

Mr. O'Neill did not conduct a preliminary investigation prior to his response. Instead, he referred to a prior complaint filed with your office in 2002 for a completely different issue and purposely mixed those two complaints, claiming, "As you recall, in 2002, you provided similar information to our office and were advised that this matter did not warrant investigation by the FBI. Unfortunately, the additional information you provided March 10, 2004, failed to convince me that our earlier decision was made in error."

The facts are:

1: The 2002 complaint was in regards to a terrorist inspired email with an implied threat on my life, of two Palestinian gunmen and Yassar Arafat, sent after the 9/11 tragedy to a Jew. It was not only offensive, but very threatening.

2: The local agent in Charleston ruled no investigation would take place as the threat on my life was 'not current'. Under that logic, investigating any crime is not possible as crimes take place, then are investigated to find culpability. They are hardly ever 'current'.

3: Mr. O'Neill was copied in written correspondence by J. Strom Thurmond's office advising him of my continued interest in having the present matter investigated wherein Thurmond's office stated they would be happy to send a copy of the complaint to O'Neill if he had not received the copy sent to Director Mueller.

4: No response came from Mr. O'Neill after that referral from the United States Attorney's Office. After a month of no response a copy of the complaint was faxed to Mr. O'Neill.

5: Mr. O'Neill either failed to read both complaints, or at least the second complaint, as having done so would show beyond any doubt the present complaint is regarding a series of crimes committed BY the EEOC, the SCNAACP and the FCC and a radio broadcast licensee company among others, with intent to defraud the United States and the victim and nothing remotely similar to the first complaint.

6: To summarily rule, "unfortunately, the additional information you provided March 10, 2004, failed to convince me that our earlier decision was made in error," is simply not possible for a person who would have read and reviewed either complaint as they are not related.

7: The present complaint provides, not only detail of each allegation made (plenty enough for initial indication of crimes being committed) but included a private username and password for Mr. O'Neill to 'investigate' the documents proving the allegations. That location is a secure server on the Internet. Mr. O'Neill did not access that location and never once reviewed the evidence before making his judgment.

8: Mr. O'Neill's statement that: "you provided similar information to our office and were advised that this matter did not warrant investigation by the FBI" is simply untrue.

9: Mr. O'Neill stating; "additionally, it would appear that your complaints are being addressed by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and , possibly, by the Federal Communications Commission," is also untrue as the EEOC is NOT investigating their own commission of crimes, they have in fact, ignored the complaint in writing, yet an unauthorized person acquired the private access credentials of Cari M. Dominguez and attempted access to the secure server from North Carolina. The FCC is NOT investigating their culpability as no complaint was filed with them to do so. Complaints were filed with the FCC in 2002 and 2004 as the motive of the commission of the crimes in the present complaint was the license renewal of the radio broadcast licensee and was perpetrated through fraudulent submission of EEO and License Renewal forms to the FCC, made possible by a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 24, among others.

10: The EEOC and the FCC do NOT investigate the laws within the investigative jurisdiction of the FBI, to which, Mr. O'Neill has refused to follow his own procedure. He refused to investigate by claiming two completely different complaints were related directly, with the second supposedly supporting the first. That is untrue.

11: By mixing the two complaints into one action Mr. O'Neill has attempted to brand me as an 'unreliable' source, which is not only untrue but as the relevant evidence shows beyond any doubt, is absurd.

12: What is truly amazing to me is Mr. O'Neill saying; "As you recall." The documents speak for themselves and 'as I recall' (which means to read the documents), the documents are not remotely connected as the first complaint deals with a crime committed during the period contained within the EEOC Charge and the present document deals with the commission of felonies following the EEOC Charge filing and proves, with documented relevant evidence Mr. O'Neill failed to investigate or view, the charges to be valid in a conspiracy of government employees, acting under color of law with accomplices in business and outside influence to deprive the victim of a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States and did so willfully in a direct violation of 18 U.S.C. § 242.

Section 242 of Title 18 makes it a crime for a person acting under color of any law to willfully deprive a person of a right or privilege protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States. For the purpose of Section 242, acts under "color of law" include acts not only done by federal, state, or local officials within their lawful authority, but also acts done beyond the bounds of that official's lawful authority, if the acts are done while the official is purporting to or pretending to act in the performance of his/her official duties. Persons acting under color of law within the meaning of this statute include police officers, prisons guards and other law enforcement officials, as well as judges, care providers in public health facilities, and others who are acting as public officials. It is not necessary that the crime be motivated by animus toward the race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status or national origin of the victim.

13: This case involves the direct corruption of protected civil rights by EEOC staff and others and as such has implications nationwide and presents an important public policy consideration; a novel issue of law; a case that be-

cause of peculiar facts and circumstances, may set important precedent, namely exposing corruption within the EEOC; and is therefore undeniably of "national interest".

The United States Attorneys may decline cases in their offices by orally advising the FBI, which declination shall then be reflected in the investigative report submitted by the FBI. The United States Attorney in this case referred it to Mr. O'Neill for 'investigation'. Not even Mr. O'Neill's letter indicated any USAO declination.

14: The United States Attorney is responsible for the enforcement of criminal civil rights statutes in accordance with written procedures and advised Mr. O'Neill of my continued interest in having the matter investigated, yet Mr. O'Neill did not respond to the USAO's referral and did not act upon it in his own admission having acted: "Unfortunately, the additional information you provided March 10, 2004, failed to convince me that our earlier decision was made in error," in error of fact and reason as the present complaint was NOT additional information to the prior complaint and the combination of the two is suspect of Mr. O'Neill's motivations for having combined them.

15: In the Civil Rights Resource Manual 44, Standards for FBI Investigation -- Investigation Required: Investigation Is Required when: Upon receipt of a civil rights allegation from a complainant or victim not known to be unreliable. The failure of the 2002 complaint to be investigated was not due to the complainant or victim being 'unreliable' and the present complaint does not relate to it. The complainant or victim IS reliable where documented relevant evidence shows explicit reliability. And Upon receipt of a request from a United States Attorney. Upon receipt of a civil rights complaint alleging a "Color of Law" violation (Title 18, U.S.C., Sec. 242) from any source not known to be unreliable.

Mr. O'Neill failed to conduct any investigation into a serious and substantial in nature case by not interviewing each subject for full details of the incident and by not accessing and reviewing the evidence. Mr. O'Neill did not, as a part of each interview, secure the identity of witnesses or obtain a complete physical description and background for each subject during interview or from police records. (See Section 44-10.6(9) of the FBI Field Manual regarding the need for signed statements.)

Mr. O'Neill failed to interview all or a sufficient number of witnesses to fully develop the facts of the case. Mr. O'Neill failed to acquire the identity of witnesses, which may be obtained from subject(s), victim(s), or police reports. Mr. O'Neill failed to obtain and document the names and addresses of all witnesses who were not interviewed during the investigation. Mr. O'Neill failed to, as a part of the interview with each witness, obtain full name, address, telephone number, employment, race, sex, date of birth and social security number. Mr. O'Neill failed to advise witnesses that information furnished may be used in a court of law.

Mr. O'Neill failed to contact appropriate officials at the subject officer's (middle management of the EEOC) agency to obtain pertinent records, i.e., Internal Affairs Report, personnel file, etc., and any other complaint(s) against subject.

According to "Standards for FBI Investigation -- Additional Investigation Required -- Substantial Case": After completion of the investigation, advise the United States Attorney of the results and ask the United States Attorney if further investigation is warranted. Regardless of the United States Attorney's answer, submit report of investigation completed. If United States Attorney requests further investigation, conduct whatever investigation the United States Attorney requests as long as such requests are reasonable and pertinent to the case. If a problem arises with a request of this nature, handle pursuant to instructions set forth in Section 8-3.311(c), supra. The results of this investigation should be furnished in an investigative report supplementing the initial report. When the United States Attorney states that the investigation is adequate, request the United States Attorney to furnish an opinion as to the prosecutive merit of the matter. Do not delay the submission of any report pending a prosecutive opinion by the United States Attorney. The United States Attorney's prosecutive opinion can be furnished in a supplementary report.

Instead, Mr. O'Neill furnished his own opinion of prosecutive merit in incorrectly relating the present complaint to the 2002 complaint and literally brushed off his official responsibility to FBI regulations and his refusal to review the relevant evidence.

Federal Rules of Evidence: Rule 401 Definition of "Relevant Evidence": "Relevant evidence" means evidence having any tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence. The FBI failed to review the "Relevant Evidence" and just as the USDOJ Civil Rights Division, ruled against the evidence without ever viewing it.

Although Rule 1002. Requirement of Original: requires the original writing, recording, or photograph, except as otherwise provided in these rules or by Act of Congress, the information provided to the FBI was scanned copies of originals in a secured online location as providing originals to the FBI would be detrimental to the case and no assurance of the return thereof would be justified and review of the evidence for investigation does not require originals. The failure of the FBI to even look at the evidence provided shows prejudice in refusing to honor the charge allegations.

A United States Attorney forwarded the request for investigation to Mr. O'Neill who failed to act upon it and in doing so provided false and untrue statements regarding a previous complaint in relation to the present complaint, and in doing so failed to show the complainant or victim as 'unreliable' and in fact showed his own judgment to be unreliable.

The South Carolina Governor's office received the present complaint, signed for it in certified mail, then promptly failed to log it into their mail log and have never responded to the request for its location.

The South Carolina Attorney General's office representative Robb McBurney, wrote an email to someone within that department (or outside of it) and said the following: "I don't recall this. it could be one of those calls that Marian forwards to me from time to time, but i don't have any record of it. I will call him back and find out what it was that he sent if you like. Let me know."

That email, obviously not intended to be mailed to Hempfling, was received on March 16, 2004 at 5:07 pm Eastern Time. That is the same day the Mr. O'Neill mailed his rejection letter, dated March 12, 2004.

Hempfling's response asked, "If no record was kept of the phone call, which took place as indicated in the letter copied below, then what was the purpose of telling me I would receive a return phone call with an update as to where the case document was?"

McBurney is the person Hempfling spoke with on the phone who promised to follow up and find the complaint.

On March 17, 2004 at 12:42 Eastern Time, 'Amy' of the SC AG office called Hempfling and left a message. The return call resulted in this "...was trying to find if she had the documents in her office...wondered what it was about...she was told about the <http://www.rollovermartin.com> site and she said she would have one of their attorneys review the site contents but most likely they would refer such a thing to the FBI for investigation as well."

I respectfully request the Federal Bureau Of Investigation to investigate the allegations, proven in documented relevant evidence contained in government emails from a government mail server through the EEOC and other documents and all pertinent and relevant evidence contained in the secure server and public server location previously provided, and to follow the requirements for investigation as provided in official FBI documentation without prejudice, to properly collect and analyze all relevant evidence and to submit the proper required documentation and forms to the United States Attorney J. Strom Thurmond Jr., and to investigate the reasons and methods behind Mr. O'Neill's letter of March 12, 2004, mailed March 16, 2004 in refusing to investigate a valid and reliable complaint of violations of 18 U.S.C. § 24, among others.

The following synopsis of the case is publicly available but was not accessed by Mr. O'Neill.

This case is of nationwide interest in uncovering a prevailing and ongoing corruption within the EEOC. I cannot stress my disappointment more at the lack of interest paid to it by the FBI.

I await your timely response.
Sincerely,



Lee Kent Hempfling
PO Box 6932
Apache Junction AZ 85278
480-332-1535

Public record files: [Http://www.rollovermartin.com](http://www.rollovermartin.com)
Secure record files: <http://secure.ency.org>

Username and password are in the possession of Mr. O'Neill. All letters are publicly available for review a the public records site.

The Case:

The case, although complicated in depth and scope, involves the simple premise of equal protection and equal rights, with violation of such under the color of law.

Essentially, an EEOC claim was filed for retaliation for upholding the rights of a minority under Title VII.

That case was used in negotiations for the minority's case and discarded to provide her a preferential settlement. That settlement was sealed in May 2003.

The motive was two-fold:

For the employer: eliminating this case allowed filing a license renewal for government broadcast license (the employer filed that license renewal and accompanying EEO report and fraudulently misrepresented this case in all three elements) as well as removing financial responsibility for a case they knew they could not adequately defend in court. They would lose this case if it were to go to trial. The best way to deal with it was to get rid of it, hide it, cover it up, conspire with a willing Government official to quietly put it away hoping the victim would simply 'move on'.

FCC EEO FORM FCC 396 filed 07/28/2003: "IN LATE 2002, A FORMER PART-TIME EMPLOYEE, PATRICIA THOMPSON, FILED A COMPLAINT BEFORE THE EEOC (FILE NO. 140A201837) AGAINST WCOO CONTENDING THAT SHE WAS DISCRIMINATED AGAINST IN HER ATTEMPT TO ACHIEVE FULL-TIME STATUS. THIS CASE WAS SETTLED IN MAY 2003, AND THE COMPLAINT WAS DISMISSED. IN LATE 2002, A FORMER EMPLOYEE, LEE HEMPFLING, FILED A COMPLAINT BEFORE THE EEOC (FILE NO. 140A20187) AGAINST WCOO ALLEGING WRONGFUL TERMINATION BECAUSE OF HIS JEWISH HERITAGE. THE LICENSEE DISPUTES THIS CLAIM. THERE HAS BEEN NO FURTHER ACTION TAKEN BY THE EEOC ON THIS MATTER." There had been considerable action taken by the EEOC on that matter, records are available to law enforcement only. The reported Charge Number is NOT the charge number of the case. The claim was for 'retaliation' not heritage. That form is fraudulent.

FCC FCC 303-S filed 07/28/2003, APPLICATION FOR RENEWAL OF BROADCAST STATION LICENSE : "IN MAKING THIS CERTIFICATION, THE APPLICANT HAS RELIED ON A REVIEW OF ITS FILES AND RECORDS, AND HAS EXAMINED THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF THE COMMISSION AVAILABLE AS OF MAY 12, 2003. AS USED IN THIS CERTIFICATION, THE PHRASE 'TO APPLICANT'S KNOWLEDGE' MEANS TO APPLICANT'S ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE WITHOUT FURTHER INVESTIGATION OTHER THAN AS DESCRIBED IN THIS EXHIBIT. BASED UPON AND SUBJECT TO THE QUALIFICATIONS IN THE PRECEDING PARAGRAPH, TO APPLICANT'S KNOWLEDGE, THERE HAVE BEEN NO FCC VIOLATIONS OR ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OR THE FCC'S RULES AS DEFINED BY THE INSTRUCTIONS TO QUESTION 4 OF SECTION II OF FORM 303-S BY THE APPLICANT DURING THE PRECEDING LICENSE TERM." Public record of the FCC will show August 13, 2002 an official complaint was filed in email to the FCC for violations of seven rules and laws alleging WCOO, L. M. Communications Inc. of Charleston South Carolina as the violator. It will further show correspondence with the FCC regarding that complaint and that it was never acted upon by FCC. Public record of the FCC will also show

receipt of the same complaint in U.S. Mail and a subsequent additional email submission. The form for license renewal is a fraudulent submission.

For the SC NAACP & EEOC: eliminating this case allowed the preferential treatment of a minority person who had filed her complaint through the SC NAACP.

Both cases are against the same employer.

EEOC Program Manager Billy C. Sanders (active in the NAACP) handled both cases and in many emails in government email laid out the 'plan' to discard this case and detailed the manner of defense to be used by the employer if there was to be a persistence in demanding this case be acted upon.

EEOC has not issued a ruling on this case in two years.

Issues: EEOC is able to manage cases through preferential treatment by sacrificing same-employer cases of non-minorities and hiding the results of such in sealed settlements. EEOC is continuing to evade the case, not ruling on it and claiming the contents of records in the minority's case to be other than fact as they were submitted. The original copy of the minority's EEOC filing, including her signed FORM5 and the entire packet sent to the EEOC, provided by Thompson are in file. EEOC's inaction is intended to extend Hempfling's right to sue past the limit, thereby removing claim potential for the employer and hiding the case from the public's interest.

Main issues of the EEOC's emailed statement:

EEOC stated: "the documents in her file don't mention you in a positive way because she feels you were part of her problem and did not go to bat for her for a full time job"

Fact: The documents that were submitted as her file do include such statements, including the original FORM 5 signed by her, written by the EEOC or NAACP for her claims, extensive letters written by her to the station owner showing character references, and within her filing were scores of documents from this case, referenced and included. The documents in her file now are the result of the EEOC's tampering with evidence to allow the scheme to play out in sealed settlement.

FORM5 (contained in Thompson's original EEOC submission packet): Thompson's original submission EEOC FORM5 signed by her and dated August 21, 2002, states: "In fact a white manager tried to get them to hire me to a full time job and they refused and forced him out."

LETTER (contained in Thompson's original EEOC submission packet): A letter dated February 28, 2002, addressed to Lee Kent, signed by Thompson, in which she resigned due to prior discrimination states: "I am writing this letter, first of all, to thank you for your professionalism, insight and words of wisdom, you have shared with me, as well as your vision for COOL 105.5. I am certainly excited about watching your vision reach fruition. ... our conversation on this Wednesday has piqued my interest, I must confess. And, I do appreciate your sincerity in asking me to stay. Furthermore I must reiterate, that my decision to leave was made, and based solely on numerous events, prior to your arrival at COOL 105.5. ... Lee, I have enjoyed the opportunity to work with you for this short time in the field in which I choose to major in college... Thanks for your mentoring! ... And Lee, if this should not work out at this particular time, PLEASE, keep me in YOUR mind for any future endeavors or opportunities that you know I would be well suited for."

DEMO: Thompson, after her resignation, did not have a demonstration compilation tape of her on-air work. She provided numerous cassettes of past shows to Hempfling. Hempfling, on his own time, at home, edited those tapes into a CD demo and provided Thompson with the copies she had to 'officially' submit to the station to be considered for re-hire.

LETTER (contained in Thompson's original EEOC submission packet): Dated March 9, 2002, signed by Thompson, addressed to Lynn Martin of L.M. Communications Inc., stated: "I'd like to assure you that my reasons to leave have absolutely nothing to do with the arrival of Mr. Lee Kent as the new Program Director (PD) for COOL 105.5. In fact, hiring Mr. Kent is probably the BEST decision that your organization has made in regard to personnel matters, in quite some time. I am certain, that through his professional leadership, Mr. Kent will accomplish great things for both COOL 105.5 and L M Communications. It is already evident that Mr. Kent is truly a radio professional and I am confident he will clean up what has become a very unprofessional and unorthodox work environment in the COOL 105.5 Programming Department. It's about time someone put a stop to the nonsense. To my dismay, Mr. Kent has arrived too late for me to continue to endure, while he makes the necessary adjustments.

However, I am grateful to have worked with him the short time I have and appreciate his mentoring., However, what occurred prior to Mr. Kent's arrival is why I have resigned."

That letter also contained: "I am in the process of seeking counsel and advisement as to possible EEO violations... I was the only African American female and Disabled Veteran in the department..."

EMAIL: In an email dated September 04, 2002, sent to Billy C. Sanders of EEOC, Thompson, after receiving a phone call from Lynn Martin states: "God what have I done. How did he get my phone number ... am I going to start being harassed ... am I safe at work now, or at home ... I began to feel that this might be some kind of intimidation tactic to try to ... I don't know what ... I just know it has me on edge right now ... and I'm concerned about his true intentions or is this just another ploy ... If he contacted me and was not supposed to ... what can I do about it to ensure that he doesn't continue to contact me in this manner? Or, contact my current work place ... They all know where I work Billy, now I'm looking all around me, wondering if I'm being followed, all kind of stuff man. Please give me some guidance ... As soon as possible ... I need to be able to think and right now ... I can't think about anything else ... I know what these people did to Lee ... my God Billy, what's going to happen to me next? So, if I all of a sudden end up injured or dead ... this is becoming scary ... do please don't think I'm being playfully jokey right now, because I'm not ... Please do not let this go ... Please do not let this go, if something does happen to me."

REFERENCE: After being fired for attempting to hire an African American female, Disabled Veteran full time, Hempfling sought employment elsewhere in the market and wanted to hire Thompson for a full time on-air position at that station. Thompson provided a job reference for that interview process. She stated, in part: "I'd like to share a piece of my heart and mind with you in regard to Mr. Kent and pray that you give what I share with you your utmost consideration while you go through your decision making process in effort to bringing MEGA 100 to its full on-air capacity. First, and by far, Mr. Kent is a true and consummate professional. I hope you can appreciate when I state that, it's truly a breath of fresh air to be associated, in any endeavor, with such a professional of Mr. Kent's caliber. And, just as refreshing as it is, I'm sure you are aware that it's also very rare. Mr. Kent's vision, coupled with his vast experience, knowledge and long time radio perspective is only surpassed by his work ethic, business knowledge, and managerial expertise. Ms. Aidoo, I know I'm baking a six layer cake here, but the thoughts I possess of this man and that I graciously share with you, do not come from me lightly, I assure you. However, when I think of all the wonderful things I could fill your eyes and ears up with in regard to Mr. Kent, if I had to just narrow it down to one thing about Mr. Kent that strikes me the most, I would have to say it's his passion for people. And along with that comes integrity, honesty, trustworthiness, and relentlessness." That reference was written long after the LM Communications employment issue, making any claims of reversed bias by Thompson, written by Sanders, a lie.

ORIGINAL SUBMITTED THOMPSON EEOC PACKET page 19: "I have become aware that the new P. D. Lee Kent had been planning prior to my departure to promote me to the midday position to replace Linda Logan Grumbein but such attempts had been refused by Charlie Cohn with Cohn saying he had 'issues' with me"

ORIGINAL SUBMITTED THOMPSON EEOC PACKET page 21: "I have learned that in a discussion between station Consultant Don Hallett and PD Lee Kent, that Mr. Kent was instructed to receive my application and let Linda go. Afterwards, to then actively publish a job opening and to consider hiring me when it was complete. That process I have learned was rejected by Charlie Cohn."

40 enclosures were within the EEOC Packet of Thompson, provided by Hempfling that detailed the attempts to hire her, the issues within both cases and the fact that Martin and his attorney both questioned Hempfling following Thompson's invoking Title VII of the EEO Act of 1964 as amended wherein Hempfling stood up for her rights causing further retaliation.

EEOC stated: "you will need a statement from her to support some of your case"

Fact: The documents filed by her contained numerous statements from her supporting this case. These include character references, comments and praise as well as detailed letters to the employer regarding the standing of this case. Additional references to the case are contained in other documents from her on file.

EMAIL: See the email dated September 04, 2002 above.

EMAIL: Extensive email correspondence is on file between Thompson and Suesie Hempfling and Lee Kent Hempfling. Suesie Hempfling and Thompson were 'close' friends up until the period where Sanders of EEOC took over the case. Those emails, as well as birthday, sickness and well-wishing greeting cards from Thompson are available to law enforcement only.

EEOC stated: "Harassment you need to know that if they took some type of discipline against the harasser and it ended we might not find a violation of the law despite having the graphic info"

Fact: This implied threat by EEOC spells out the manner in which a defense was to be concocted by sim-

ply reversing the harassment claim. This has come to fruition in an email received March 10, 2004 by someone posing as a former employee of the employer. That person was to be replaced with the minority and was used throughout the ordeal by ownership to add intimidation and threaten legal action for doing the job of a Program Director: (critiquing her on air performance). The emailed letter received said; "The government won't do anything about it because you are crazy and you deserved to be fired, not for trying to hire a black employee, but because you were a lazy troublemaker who refused to help Mike Allen when the Commercial computer was down." Documents from numerous other employees show otherwise. Those documents, from both full and part time personnel at the station are available to law enforcement only.

EEOC stated: "But we will cross them bridges when we get to them."

Fact: 'them' bridges were already built awaiting the pressuring of this case in a conspiracy between the EEOC and the employer and the SC NAACP to use this case to settle the minority's case preferentially and provide a reason for the employer to settle a small claim in lieu of having to deal with a far larger claim.

EEOC stated: "I am waiting to hear from their attorney re the Fact Finding Conference."

Fact: This statement was made on August 20, 2004 (as were the above statements) after Senator Lindsey Graham's office's inquiry into this case to the EEOC. In reality, a fact finding conference was scheduled by EEOC for April 24 or 25, 2003, but canceled at the last minute by the EEOC only for this case. The minority's case was settled the following month. No fact finding conference has ever been held for this case, no ruling has ever been made, no right to sue letter has ever been received. EEOC wrote a letter to me after I sent a copy of the proven 21 counts of federal and state laws violated in this issue by EEOC and others stating that Billy C. Sanders would contact me regarding this case. That has never happened. It is a stalling tactic to wait me out and ignore my constitutional rights to equal protection.

EEOC stated: "C U Later"

Fact: Clearly intended to be the 'kiss off'.

That EEOC correspondence was following the contact by Senator Lindsey Graham's office to EEOC Greenville SC and came from EEOC Charlotte NC.

Criminal allegations were in the hands of Tom O'Neill Chief Division Council of the FBI in Columbia. Nancy C. Wicker of US Attorney J. Strom Thurmond Jr's office referred the case to him. The allegations were faxed to him March 10, 2004 after not hearing from him for a month. On March 16, 2004, O'Neill mailed a letter, dated March 12, 2004 wherein he attempted to declare Hempfling to be an 'unreliable' source by incorrectly and purposely claiming the complaint he had received in fax was 'additional information' regarding a complaint filed with the FBI in 2002 involving threats received in interstate e-mail. Neither were related, yet O'Neill dismissed the current complaint of 'color of law', criminal civil rights violations as 'additional information' to the first complaint. The document he ruled was 'similar' to the first complaint was not at all similar making his ruling intentional deprivation of civil rights by a federal officer under 'color of law'.

That document was originally submitted for action to Attorney General Ashcroft, who's office has not responded; to FBI Director Mueller, who's office has not responded; to SC Attorney General Henry McMaster, who's office has responded after a phone call they could not find record of and an email they called about. SCAG is expected to hand the case to the Columbia FBI, which has already ruled against it, to NC Attorney General Roy Cooper, who's office has not responded; to SC Governor Mark Sanford, who's office has not responded; to Glenn A. Fine, USDOJ Inspector General, who's office has not responded; to FCC Commissioner Michael Powell, who's office has not responded; to EEOC Commissioner Cari. M. Dominguez, who's office responded twice: once by giving Dominguez's private username and password for access to the law enforcement secured server to an unauthorized person who attempted to break into that server, and once in U.S. mail informing Hempfling, without reference to the federal offenses that Sanders was in charge of the case and would be contacting soon. No such contact has been made.

It was the right thing in upholding the rights of a minority who was alleging violations of Title VII and state labor laws.

It was the right thing in filing directly to the EEOC. The 'back door' entrance for preferential treatment was not used.

It was the right thing when in filing an FCC complaint showing how the employer illegally reduced power to the transmitter to damage the results of Arbitron ratings the position of Program Director was responsible for. That filing was stopped within FCC and lost three times, two email and one ground mail submission were 'mysteriously' ignored.

It was the right thing in showing EEOC their claim of the employer not qualifying for EEOC jurisdiction was in error.

It was the right thing in attempting to hire a minority to a full time position, then to attempting to rehire her to a fulltime position after she resigned over previous discrimination.

It was the right thing trying to make a black music radio station have black air talent.

It was the right thing in every step of the employment and every step of the case that followed.

It was the right thing in filing an FCC complaint showing proof the employer lied on their EEO and license renewal forms.

It was the right thing in keeping records of all incidents, emails, letters and notes: every single allegation proven by document.

It was the right thing to assume one's Senator to be an advocate of his constituency.

It was the right thing to request the FBI to uphold its responsibilities.

It is a sad thing to know that "An independent, bi-partisan agency within the executive branch responsible for enforcement and compliance concerning elimination of employment discrimination by private and public employers", is guilty of the very law it is to enforce and seems to be beyond oversight.

Not this time. Every crime is documented. Every scheme is documented. Every claim is documented.

"I will stand up for equal rights. I will stand up for affirmative action in cases needing it. I will also stand up for my own rights as those rights afforded by the constitution are for all persons in this country, not just for those who have special consideration." Lee Kent Hempfling.