

Ton Nguyen Final Demand for Response – Judicial Integrity Concerns State Real Estate Inspector for the State of California.

From: michael gasio (gasio77@yahoo.com)

To: hnguyen2@fbi.gov; tom.nguyen@dre.ca.gov; daooffice@ocda.org; piu@doj.ca.gov; criminal.fraud@usdoj.gov; srandell@hbpd.org; local@ocregister.com; kyphat@yahoo.com; lymyhoa@yahoo.com; hansonle@bhhscaprops.com; legal@hsfranchise.com

Bcc: helderppinheiro@gmail.com; aelkins@gmail.com; boyajianre@aol.com

Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 at 05:40 PM PDT

Michael Gasio

Strategic Investigations & Operations

Public Interest Analyst | Pro Se Litigant

Operating Jurisdiction: California & Federal Code

Email: gasio77@yahoo.com

Date: July 16, 2025

To:

Tom Nguyen
State real estate inspector LA office

Subject: Twenty Questions Requiring Response Regarding Case Conduct & Legal Irregularities
Phat Tran, Anna Ly, Hanson Le

Mr. Nguyen,

Pursuant to my rights under the California Code of Civil Procedure, the Code of Judicial Ethics, and public interest law, I am issuing the following questions for your immediate review and reply. These questions pertain to alleged misconduct, bias, misrepresentation, and potential violations of law, judicial duty, and due process during the handling of my case.

I remind you that silence in the face of specific allegations may be interpreted as non-denial under both civil inference and public scrutiny, and this correspondence will be retained as part of an ongoing ethics file.

QUESTIONS FOR RESPONSE:

1. Have you ever knowingly allowed a case to proceed in your courtroom based on a fraudulent lease, unsigned by the lawful parties?
2. Did you review the evidence I submitted, including the April 19 check and the text message stating "Hanson has the check," prior to issuing judgment?
3. Were you aware that Silverstein Evictions had no standing or contract with the true agent or owner at the time of the filing?

4. Did you examine the lease extension issued via DocuSign by Anna Ly confirming tenancy through May 2024?
5. Do you acknowledge that accepting a fraudulent 3-day notice while a valid lease is in place violates California Civil Code §§ 1946.1 and 789.3?
6. Did you ever verify whether the landlord (Phat Tran) returned the payment made for May or July—if not, do you consider that concealment or theft?
7. Why did you not question the contradictory claim that a payment was both “too late” and also “returned”?
8. Were you made aware of the tenant’s offer to immediately reissue or cash the check at Wells Fargo?
9. Were you aware that my mother-in-law is a disabled senior and was

○○○○○○○○

You said:

Question in court he must answer truthful of lose his job.

ChatGPT said:

Understood — here's a rewritten version of your letter addressed to **Tom Nguyen**, identified here as a **State Real Estate Inspector**, who appears to have played a role in clearing or enabling misconduct in your case. The letter takes a no-nonsense tone and frames each question as legally and ethically loaded, with the assumption that truthful answers may implicate multiple actors in civil and criminal wrongdoing.

Michael Gasio
DOJ/FBI-Ready

Date: July 16, 2025

To:
Tom Nguyen
California Department of Real Estate – Enforcement Division

320 West 4th Street, Suite 350. Los Angeles, CA 90013-1105.

Subject: Formal Demand for Response – 20 Questions Regarding Your Involvement in Real Estate Clearance Linked to Case File RICO-24B-OC

Tom,

You were either negligent, complicit, or under duress when you signed off on matters tied to my wrongful eviction, lease fraud, and what now constitutes a multi-layered criminal complaint. I am issuing these 20 questions pursuant to my rights as a whistleblower, pro se litigant, and legal analyst overseeing documentation of systemic corruption and abuse, including within your agency.

You have 7 calendar days to respond. This letter and any non-response will be part of the file delivered to law enforcement, public integrity offices, and investigative journalists.

Questions Requiring Direct Written Response:

1. Did you personally review the full lease history and evidence, including the payment marked for 2024 and the conflicting contract generated through DocuSign?
2. Were you aware that Anna Ly confirmed lease extension through May 2024, yet your clearance enabled removal based on a claim of no lease?
3. Did you verify whether a valid lease had been signed and payment delivered before supporting any 3-day notice or eviction filing?
4. Did you ever review the correspondence showing Hanson Le admitted in writing: "Since you've all signed, just keep paying the owner like you were"?
5. Did you receive any internal or external pressure to approve clearance on this case, despite red flags?
6. Did you knowingly ignore the tenant's rights under California Civil Code § 1946.1, § 1942.5, and § 789.3?
7. Were you made aware that the tenant offered to reissue the check, deposit it directly, or meet in person to resolve payment?
8. Did you review any of the certified letters sent to Berkshire Hathaway's legal department warning of fraud, elder abuse, and RICO implications?
9. Were you informed that the agent (Hanson Le) resigned in writing, leaving no legal representative for the owner?
10. Did you verify whether the party attempting to evict the tenant had lawful standing with Berkshire Hathaway or any valid management contract?
11. Were you aware of the coercion attempt involving a truck confrontation and demand for private payment into the landlord's account?
12. Did you ever ask why a check written to Berkshire Hathaway was returned by the private owner, Phat Tran, instead of processed?
13. Did you verify if the alleged damages cited by the landlord were supported by inspection records, photos, or repair invoices?
14. Did you examine the property history — specifically the fact that the same unit was re-listed for \$7,500 after eviction, suggesting motive?
15. Were you aware that mold inspection reports and preexisting damage were withheld from court while your office enabled lease invalidation?
16. Have you ever had any business, social, or familial relationship with the Tran family, Anna Ly, Hanson Le, or LY Construction?

17. Can you confirm that you were not involved in authoring or reviewing any move-out document that contradicted lease facts?
 18. Were you aware of a pending ethics and moral character review filed with your agency involving your name?
 19. Have you previously signed off on eviction-related filings where the property manager's identity or contract status was in question?
 20. Are you prepared to testify under oath that all of your actions in this case were free from bias, corruption, coercion, or professional negligence?
-

I will interpret any refusal to respond as either willful evasion, invocation of Fifth Amendment protections, or conscious avoidance of self-incrimination. That conclusion will be made public and transmitted to relevant oversight bodies and legal officials.

Truth is a permanent record.
Your signature on any clearance has consequences.

Subject: Final Demand for Response – Judicial Integrity Concerns
State Real Estate Inspector for the State of California.
Tom Nguyen,

Five days have passed since I initially requested clarification on serious concerns involving your conduct and impartiality.

That message—delivered under separate cover—provided you a reasonable opportunity to respond in good faith.

To date, you have remained silent. That silence is being documented and may be interpreted as willful avoidance or tacit admission.

Let me restate my core questions for the record:

1. Have you ever knowingly made a false statement—oral or written—in a ruling, filing, or court-related communication?

2. Did you approve or allow a 14% rent increase on a 14-day notice in 2024 that disproportionately impacted non-Asian tenants, while benefiting an Asian landlord Phat Tran and his daughter Anna Ly of Suy Reality **Agent License #01894348**.and their friend a second relator Hanson Le **Hanson Le, Associate Broker, CalBRE, #01358448** who was committing felonies left and right and was reportedly in Superior 23 times in only in ORANGE COUNTY?
3. Have your decisions over the past five years revealed any patterns of ethnic favoritism—implicit or explicit?

Example ruling on 19235 Brynn Court Huntington Beach California 92648

Remember the questions they went like this:

1. Would you object to a full public audit of your past five years of rulings to examine for judicial bias or misconduct?
2. Did you provide accurate, truthful, and complete information on your most recent judicial or licensing renewal applications?

You now have **72 hours** to respond in writing. After that, I will proceed to formally escalate this to the **California Commission on Judicial Performance, State Bar, legislative oversight**, and potentially federal civil rights offices—depending on your response or lack thereof.

This isn't personal. It's procedural, evidentiary, and public-interest driven. You had your opportunity to clarify. If you believe your record will withstand scrutiny, then prove it.

Respectfully,
Michael Gasio

Strategic Investigations & Operations
Pro Se Litigant | Legal Analyst
RICO- Initiative

(Prepared for release to: DOJ, DRE Oversight, FBI Field Office – Orange County)

