

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT ..... 1

FACTUAL BACKGROUND..... 1

    The Iraq Embargoes And United Nations’ Oil-For-Food Program ..... 1

    The Indictment ..... 3

ARGUMENT ..... 5

I.    COUNT TWO SHOULD BE DISMISSED BECAUSE IT IS BASED ON A SCHEME TO DEFRAUD VICTIMS WHO LACK THE CAPACITY TO SUSTAIN THE ALLEGED INJURY TO THEIR MONEY OR PROPERTY ..... 5

    A.    The Indictment Fails To Adequately Allege The Elements Of Wire Fraud ..... 6

    B.    The People of Iraq, As Subjects Of The Recognized Sovereign Government Of Iraq, Lack Independent Juridical Personality And Therefore Cannot Constitute A Victim Of The Alleged Fraud ..... 8

        1.    The People of Iraq, As An Entity, Lack Juridical Personality Independent of the Government of Iraq and Therefore Are Not Cognizable by This Court ..... 9

    C.    The Court Should Decline The Government’s Invitation To Give Official Recognition To The People Of Iraq Because Such Recognition Impugns The Sovereignty Of Iraq, And Has Broad Implications For Foreign Relations And International Law..... 12

        1.    Recognition of the ‘People of Iraq’ Independently of the Iraqi Government, Involves the Court in Determinations of International Relations and Offends Iraq’s Sovereign Authority, Which Has Been Recognized by the United States Government and the International Community ..... 12

        2.    The United Nations’ Oil-For-Food Program Cannot Constitute A Victim Of The Alleged Offense..... 20

            (a)    The OFFFP Lacks Sufficient Capacity to be the Victim of a Money or Property Fraud..... 20

            (b)    The U.N.’s Regulatory Interest in the Embargo of Iraq Does Not Sustain An Actionable Property Interest in Surcharge Payments Held In Escrow..... 22

II.	COUNTS THREE AND FOUR SHOULD BE DISMISSED DUE TO THEIR RELIANCE UPON AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL DELEGATION OF CONGRESSIONAL POWER AND AN INVALID EXTENSION OF A NATIONAL EMERGENCY .....	27
A.	The ISRs are Dependent on Actions by the U.N. ....	27
B.	The Charges in Counts Three and Four of the Indictment are Based On Violations of OFAC Regulations.....	30
C.	The Carefully Crafted Balance Between The Executive and Legislative Branches Established In The Relevant Statutes Was Upset Here By the Private Delegation to the U.N. and the Failure to Declare a New National Emergency.....	32
1.	The Overall Structure of IEEPA Demonstrates Congressional Concerns Over Expansion of Executive Authority to Declare and Respond to National Emergencies and Establishes Meaningful Restraints on The Exercise of Such Powers .....	33
D.	The Delegation of Authority to the U.N.to Define Criminal Conduct Violates the Non-Delegation Doctrine.....	37
1.	The Nondelegation Doctrine.....	37
2.	Congress Permitted a Limited and Restricted Exercise of Delegated Power to Criminalize Conduct under IEEPA .....	39
E.	The Failure To Declare a New National Emergency Justifying the OFFP Constitutes a Significant Breach Of The Restraints Placed Upon the Exercise of Delegated Authority Which Precludes Criminal Prosecution .....	43
F.	The Indictment Rests Upon An Unconstitutional Private Delegation of Authority to Define Criminal Conduct and Cannot Stand.....	45
III.	DISMISSAL OF COUNTS TWO AND THREE REQUIRES THAT COUNT ONE BE DISMISSED .....	53
IV.	WYATT SHOULD BE GRANTED A SEVERANCE UNDER RULE 8 SINCE THE INDICTMENT ALLEGES MULTIPLE, UNCONNECTED CONSPIRACIES OR UNDER RULE 14 SINCE HE WILL BE PREJUDICED BY THE SCOPE AND COMPLEXITY OF A JOINT TRIAL.....	53
A.	The Government's Indictment Alleges Multiple Conspiracies .....	54
B.	The Indictment is Facially Deficient Under Rule 8 Because It Groups Unrelated Schemes.....	56
1.	The Court Should Exercise Its Discretion And Sever The Trial Under Rule 14 Because Of The Unfair Prejudice To The Defendants .....	59

V. WYATT'S PROSECUTION IS SELECTIVE, DISCRIMINATORY AND VINDICTIVE AND THE COURT SHOULD EITHER DISMISS THE INDICTMENT OR PERMIT DISCOVERY .....62

    A. The Prosecution Of Defendant Wyatt Is Selective And Discriminatory. ....62

    B. The Prosecution Of Defendant Wyatt Denies Him Due Process Since He Has Been Singled Out From Others Who Engaged In Similar Conduct Based Upon His Exercise Of First Amendment Rights. ....67

    C. Wyatt’s Prosecution Is Based On Vindictiveness And Thus Denies Him Due Process.....71

    D. Defendant Wyatt Has Produced Sufficient Evidence Of Selective Prosecution and Vindictive Prosecution To Obtain Discovery And Requires An Evidentiary Hearing.....72

CONCLUSION.....74