

To: Bravo Fleet Appeals Board  
From: Charles Star, lead counsel for Jack Pike (aka Jason)  
Via: Bravo Fleet Magistrate (Sean Stephens)

Subject: Appeal of verdicts in Bravo Fleet v. Jack Pike (BFM-001)

Date: June 12, 2020

In accordance with Bravo Fleet Magistrate Code Section 3, my client (Jack Pike) hereby appeals both guilty verdicts in the case of Bravo Fleet v. Jack Pike (BFM-001). It is our contention that each of the two items below individually is enough to warrant overturning the recent convictions.

**1. Process Error: The Bravo Fleet Magistrate did not follow his own plea deadline, thus not affording Mr. Pike with a proper opportunity to enter a plea**

Bravo Fleet Magistrate Code Section 1 Paragraph 7 states: *“The Magistrate’s office must issue a summary of charges to the accused, and offers the accused the opportunity to enter a plea of innocence or guilt. ...”*

On June 6, 2020, the Bravo Fleet Magistrate informed Mr. Pike of the charges against him via email. Within that email, regarding Mr. Pike’s right to submit a plea, the Bravo Fleet Magistrate wrote: *“As part of the Magistrate Code, I am required to enter a plea for you of innocence or guilt. Please respond to this email within 48 hours indicating your plea, or I will move forward with the facts as presented. If no response is received by 7:12 pm Pacific Time on Monday, June 22, I will move forward with my findings.”*

First, the two plea deadlines caused significant confusion. Second, a strict reading of the text clearly states that the Bravo Fleet Magistrate will move forward with the facts (i.e., continue with proceedings) if no plea is made within 48 hours (June 8, 2020). However, it also clearly states that the Bravo Fleet Magistrate will not move forward with findings (i.e., judgments) if a plea is not entered by June 22, 2020. The literal reading clearly gives Mr. Pike until June 22, 2020 to enter a plea to prevent a final judgment absent a plea. Beyond this, given the general confusion created, the later date should be followed to give all parties ample time to evaluate the facts.

On June 9, 2020, I introduced myself to the Bravo Fleet Magistrate as Mr. Pike’s new lead counsel. Later in the email chain, I pointed out the deadline discrepancy. The Bravo Fleet Magistrate responded to that point with *“I will 100% own up to the fact that I entered the wrong date in my original email, and I sincerely apologize for the confusion that may have caused. That is absolutely on me.”*

While the Bravo Fleet Magistrate acknowledged and claimed responsibility for the error, he did nothing to correct or remediate the problem. Instead, later that evening, he still released a

guilty verdict a mere ~72 hours after informing Mr. Pike of the charges against him. Indeed, the Bravo Fleet Magistrate did not even inform Mr. Pike when the initial 48 hours had passed. Whether or not it was intended, the goalposts were moved.

In short, this uncorrected process error by the Bravo Fleet Magistrate did not give Mr. Pike the proper opportunity to enter a plea of innocence or guilt before the trial began (and was concluded).

## **2. Process Error: The Bravo Fleet Magistrate did not provide the defense with all relevant case information, thus not affording Mr. Pike with a proper opportunity to appeal**

Bravo Fleet Magistrate Code Section 3 Paragraph 2 states: *“If the defendant or prosecution feels that an error has been made, they can write an appeal and present it to the Magistrate, who will in turn bring it before the appeals panel. Appeals cannot be trivial in nature, and must specifically point to the error(s) made. The appellant must find either an issue arising from Bravo Fleet documents or judicial process error.”*

Despite two requests for full trial transcripts and documentation, the Bravo Fleet Magistrate has not provided my client or me with any information beyond the two exhibits (the exhibits were only provided after the second request). If both parties have a right to appeal based on an error, either in Bravo Fleet documents or the judicial process, they must have access to all documents and the entire judicial process.

It is impossible for the defense to fully exercise its right to appeal any errors with documentation when we don't know what other documents exist. It is impossible for the defense to fully exercise its right to appeal any errors of process when we are only privy to a small fraction of that process. Without access to a full trial transcript, we have zero visibility on the judicial process and no idea if other documents or evidence exists. As a result, we are functionally unable to scrutinize either.

To summarize, this uncorrected process error by the Bravo Fleet Magistrate did not give Mr. Pike the proper opportunity to submit an appeal based on the totality of information from trial.

### **Request that a new special Magistrate be appointed**

If this appeal is successful, we also request that the Appeals Board assign the case to a new special Magistrate. The Bravo Fleet Magistrate has made numerous statements affirming his belief in Mr. Pike's guilt, including that new evidence would not change his mind. As such, we do not believe he is the right person to oversee future proceedings on this matter. This is not an attack on the Bravo Fleet Magistrate's character, but rather a simple fact of human nature.

*“This case [Bravo Fleet V. Jack Pike] hardly needed to come across the Magistrate's desk, other than to be an exercise in administration.”* - MAGISTRATE DECISION: BFM-01

*“Bravo Fleet will no longer stand idly by while malcontents utilize our resources to boost their numbers, and then depart over some perceived slight, or for no reason at all.”* - MAGISTRATE DECISION: BFM-01

*“There is an admission of guilt in an email to the Commanding Officer of the Fleet. It is frankly laughable that anything else could be pertinent other than that.”* – Bravo Fleet Magistrate, email from Sean Stephens to Charles Star, June 9, 2020.

## **Closing**

My client and I have no doubt that a careful review of these facts will result in an overturned conviction and the case being assigned to a special Magistrate for its remainder. However, I must apologize for any spelling or grammatical mistakes that might exist in this document. The Bravo Fleet Magistrate yesterday gave us only 24 hours to submit any appeal. Regardless, thank for this opportunity to present our case at this level within one of the greatest simming fleets ever to exist.

Sincerely,

Charles Star  
Lead Counsel for Jack Pike (aka Jason)

References:

[MAGISTRATE DECISION: BFM-01](#)

[BRAVO FLEET V. JACK PIKE \(BFM-001\)](#)

[Bravo Fleet Magistrate Code](#)

[Bravo Fleet Charter](#)

[Email conversation between Charles Star and Bravo Fleet Magistrate \(attached separately\)](#)