

Suzanne S. Uhland, Esquire (CA State Bar #136852) is just starting her own 15 minutes of fame.

- [Profiles in Dishonesty](#)
- [To Rat, or Not To Rat](#)
- [Uhland Walking](#)
- [Irish Neo Mafia](#)
- [BigLaw protects each other's Fraud](#)

Depending upon how she plays her cards, she may find herself with another number issued by the Feds followed by up to 15 years "out of the spotlight" so to speak.

[SONICblue](#) is kind of special. Sure, it's sort of like the [eToys](#) & [Aureal](#) bankruptcy cases: top heavy with high dollar law firms, massive web of conflicts, fraudulent disclosure of conflicts by various counsel to the Court, and a belated realization of such crimes by some of the public. But why is SONICblue

sooo
different?

Maybe **Suzanne actually knows why She is being picked on**. Maybe Suzie can explain the simple fact as to why Bruce couldn't, or wouldn't, come through with his firms roster of current **DOJ**

"

Sabbatical Leave

" nodes and sundry DOJ alumni. Maybe it would just look too obvious for HBD at this point in time and Ms. Uhland was not considered worth the chips.

But why did so many of her brethren throw Suzanne Uhland so rudely under the bus?

Well Suzanne, we think it might be instructive for you to [reread your firms own annual report from 2003](#) to get a feel for how a

government prosecution goes and is best dealt with. In

Rite Aid

the Feds started their investigation in 1999 and it wasn't until June of 2003 that the trial was about to start. Your O'Melveny's report reads:

Early on in the investigative process in the summer of 1999, O'Melveny & Myers was retained to represent former Rite Aid Chief Financial Officer **Frank Bergonzi** in connection with various probes and eventual suits

Instructive - better to be proactive... But like what your current mess is shaping up to be, poor Bergonzi was facing the unfortunate common denominator of **Mail Fraud** and **Wire Fraud** which we know are:

*Predicates for **RICO** - and we ain't talking *Suave* !*

Look at what your own firm convinced Frankie to do... rat and then testify. What's the problem with his informing on his peeps to protect his own hide? O'Melveny & Myers gave him good, just, and ethical legal advice to do so, otherwise your firm wouldn't have bragged about it.

But now think: Did Bergonzi have a family more important to him than yours?

And even if you have no family of your own, presumably you'd prefer to exercise your own freedom of choice as to whom to cuddle with. And if you really wanted to get worried you'd realize that you are

worse

off than Frankie.

Did Bergonzi have to worry about

facing a jury as a rich white woman lawyer who had no excuse to claim she didn't know better

?

You think your Partners are going to risk [RICO's drastic](#) [monetary forfeiture](#) [provisions](#) to the FEDs now that

Obama's Health Care Plan

could really use the money? You think those comrades of yours wouldn't prefer to just allow you to linger under that bus ... without a fuss?

OK, You were probably kind of cute *back in your day*, at [Stanford University](#) and [Yale Law](#) . But take a look in the mirror

now

honey and perform a little

reality check

as to

who

you think is going to risk his house, childrens' college educations &

derriere

in prison

just to preserve the

status quo

for your

current

windowed office at

[The Firm](#)

. Do you remember from the movie

"

[Wall Street](#)

"

how quickly and easily workmen can scrape off a name from a door and paint a new one?

BankruptcyMisconduct.com has been talking about the [coming purge](#) , the need for everyone to look out for herself, and the short window of opportunity to cut a deal.

When you think about it, all BigLaw players in the bankruptcy industry are just one white collar crime investigation by the FBI away from [pulling their own](#) [WolfBlock](#) [retreats](#) .

Godspeed, Suzanne.

Should Suzanne Uhland Inform & Testify against the SONICblue Co-Conspirators?

{loadposition mypoll}