FILED

APR 29 2010

ROBERT D. DENNIS, CLERK
U.S. DIST. COURT, WESTERN DIST. OKLA.
BY_____, DEPUTY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

U.S. COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION and OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT OF SECURITIES ex rel. IRVING . L FAUGHT,	**Case No. 09-CV-1284 (DLR)**
Plaintiffs,	
v.	**Relief Defendant Darren A. Lee's Response to Plaintiffs U.S. Commodity Futures Trading commission and Oklahoma Department of Securities *ex rel.* Irving L. Faught's Reply to Answer of Darren A. Lee to Motion in [sic] Brief in Support to Amend the Ex Parte Statutory Restraining Order (Docket No. 63)**
PRESTIGE VENTURES CORP., a Panamanian corporation, FEDERATED MANAGEMENT GROUP, INC. A Texas corporation, KENNETH WAYNE LEE an individual, and SIMON YANG (a/k/a XIAO YANG a/k/a SIMON CHEN), an individual,	
Defendants, and	
SHEILA M. LEE, an individual, DAVID A. LEE, an individual, and DARREN A. LEE, an individual,	
Relief Defendants,	

ENTRY OF APPEAL
PLEASE ENTER ME, DARREN A LEE, AS REPRESENTING MYSELF IN THE ABOVE CAPTIONED MATTER

I am not an attorney nor do I represent myself to have any skills in such matters. I have over 18 inches of legal documents in front of me that I have no idea what most of it means. I am having to represent myself, as no attorney would take this matter pro-bono. I have no way to retain them with my house and bank accounts frozen in the courts. I am trying to research the proper way to address the respected courts in this matter and am having difficulties understanding what exactly I am reading. I am going to have trouble addressing the plaintiffs arguments where cases are listed because I do not know how to look up those cases which could be detrimental, or beneficial, to my case.

As stated in and response to **Plaintiffs U.S. Commodity Futures Trading commission and Oklahoma Department of Securities *ex rel.* Irving L. Faught's Reply to Answer of Darren A. Lee to Motion in [sic] Brief in Support to Amend the Ex Parte Statutory Restraining Order (Docket No. 63)**, dated April 13th, 2010.

Darren A. Lee respectfully submits these answers to the Plaintiffs' response to Darren A. Lee's answer to the Statutory Restraining Order ("SRO").

Darren A. Lee's denies that his answer was a restatement of Defendants' **Motion to Stay Receivership of any Property Owned by Kenneth Wayne Lee, Sheila Marjorie Lee, Darren Alexander Lee, and David Armstrong Lee and allow Defendant Lee to Trade for the Account of Investors for the Purposes of Repayment (Docket No. 48)**, filed on March 18th, 2010. Darren A. Lee's answer was for Darren A. Lee. The Plaintiffs' are trying to tie Darren A.

Lee's answer into the Motion to Stay that Kenneth W. Lee has filed, and, yet, the Plaintiffs have objected, repeatedly, that Darren A. Lee cannot answer for anyone other than Darren A. Lee, much less the Plaintiffs' repeated objections to Kenneth W. Lee answering for anyone other than Kenneth W. Lee.

The Plaintiffs' have no ground to stand on when they approach the respected Court to reject Darren A. Lee's arguments. Those are factual arguments and the Plaintiffs know that The Plaintiffs' state that, '**To the extent, Darren Lee's Response is a restatement of Kenneth Lee's Motion to Stay'**, is a bold claim by the Plaintiff when the Plaintiff has just restated all of the Plaintiffs' allegations ever since this all started. That claim has no bearing. Darren A. Lee's answer to the SRO has nothing to do with the Motion of Kenneth W. Lee to Stay Receivership. Darren A. Lee filed an answer to Darren A. Lee's SRO, which was a restatement from the Plaintiffs' original allegations, but the Plaintiffs' just added 6 new paragraphs, out of 147. Darren A. Lee only answered to those 6 paragraphs that applied to Darren A. Lee, so how can the Plaintiffs', so blatantly and without regard to the fact that the Plaintiffs' are not telling the truth, try and state that Darren A. Lee's response is 'to an extent' a restatement.

Darren A. Lee is in the process of putting together a Motion to Stay Receivership of Darren A. Lee's property to answer for Darren A. Lee. This country was founded on a government that did not have ultimate control over the People of this great nation, and, yet, the Commission is violating every American citizen their basic rights of civil liberties to fairness and equality, when it applies to the Commission and their 'duties' to protect Americans. There is no place for that in this great nation.

Darren Lee Has Legitimate Interest and Entitlement to Darren Lee's Funds

Darren A. Lee has legitimate interest in the funds he obtained and denies, and has continued to deny, the allegations of any of the monies that Darren A. Lee was entitled to, were ill-gotten. Darren A. Lee does not bear the Burden of Proof, but Darren A. Lee does bear the Benefit of Assumption. The Commission cannot prove that the money that Darren A. Lee made were not from the trades that Darren A. Lee executed. Darren A. Lee has stated several times that an account he traded was under Prestige Ventures.

Darren A. Lee does not know where the Commission has determined that, when I stated under oath in my deposition, that "I watched Prestige trades 70% of the time I was watching any trades", means that I was watching my own trades and not of the Prestige Enterprise. This has been stated several times and Darren A. Lee cannot understand why the Commission cannot understand this and twists his words, so blatantly. Darren A. Lee refers again to Exhibit A to Declaration of Darren A. Lee. Just because Darren A. Lee had no knowledge of the alleged pool participants, or their funds, does not justify a reason for the Commission to claim the alleged illegitimate services. Darren A. Lee knew nothing of Prestige Ventures bank accounts or any other trading accounts, other than the ones that Darren A. Lee conducted occasional trades out of Darren A. Lee would like to point out that 99% of employees in a any company do not know all of the accounts that the company truly has.

All of Darren A. Lee's admissions prove the fact that Darren A. Lee provided legitimate services and any other claim is illegitimate.

<u>During the Relevant Period, Darern Lee Had a Trading Account</u>

Darren A. Lee has stated in every answer to the respected Court that his trading account was under Prestige Ventures. Alaron Trading Corporation knew that Darren A. Lee was trading

under Prestige Ventures and that is a fact. When the Plaintiffs' delivered to Darren A. Lee one of the documents that I requested, Darren A. Lee found some proof that I traded. Darren A. Lee has the right to not disclose privileged information until the Burden of Proof is upon Darren A. Lee. Darren A. Lee has no knowledge of the accounts at R.J. O'Brien or Rosenthal Collins Group.

Darren Lee's December 9, 2009 Deposition Was Not Proper

Darren A. Lee finds it very convenient that he is now a party in the suit, but wasn't before the Commission began its assault on Darren A. Lee with aggressive questioning to comply with their benefit of a '2 day notice' , and knowing that Darren A. Lee had no legal counsel after he tried diligently to obtain it. The entire direction of questioning upon Darren A. Lee during his deposition was intended to make Darren A. Lee a part of the suit. That was very underhanded and sneaky, to depose, an alleged, 'non-party' with intimidating demeanor with only one intention.

It is the Commissions' obligation to uphold the fairness, protect the citizens, respect their power, and their civil duties as a professional, to maintain the civil liberties that have established the United States of America as the greatest country in the world. They have the power in their hands to do many great things. Let us all make sure that the high standards of ethics are kept in dealing with any matter in the respected Court. It is not my job, being a citizen with rights who does not work in the legal fiels, to know the basic Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, but it is the Commissions job. If it is 'standard practice' to have the court reporter do the duties of the Officer, then the Rule 30(a)(5)(A)(ii) would have been revised appropriately.

Conclusion

Darren A. Lee does not know if it is correct to answer the response of the Plaintiffs' to

Darren A. Lee's answer to their SRO, but, in all due respect, Darren A. Lee is exactly 1,259 miles away from the respected Court and this is the only way that I can rebuke the allegations, state the facts, and have a voice in the respected Court. The Plaintiffs' have made it very hard, or impossible, to trust them at all, in my factual opinion that I am entitled to.

The allegations against Darren A. Lee are not true, and the Commission is targeting Darren A. Lee. Due to the facts stated above, Darren A. Lee respectfully requests the respected Court to release Darren A. Lee from the Order Granting Plaintiff Commission's Motion to Amend the *Ex Parte* Statutory Restraining Order (Docket No. 35)

Dated: April 23nd, 2010

Respectfully Submitted,

Darren Alexander Lee
2676 Palmetto Hall Blvd
Mount Pleasant, SC 29466
Telephone - 843-814-3884

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that, on April 23, 2010, I caused one copy of **Relief Defendant Plaintiffs U.S. Commodity Futures Trading commission and Oklahoma Department of Securities *ex rel.* Irving L. Faught's Reply to Answer of Darren A. Lee to Motion in [sic] Brief in Support to Amend the Ex Parte Statutory Restraining Order (Docket No. 63)** to be served by U.S. Mail on the following:

Katherine S. Driscoll
1155 21st Street NW
Washington, DC 20581

Terra Shamas Bonnell
Oklahoma Department of Securities
120 North Robinson Avenue, Suite 860
Oklahoma City, OK 7310