



I'm not robot



Continue

Dc everest high school transcripts

My name on this broadcast may be on it, but that's our plan. Just like this nation, the Wells Report belongs to us; We are the people. ~ John-David Wells 1-844-723-4687 844 Radio USA John-David always gives and supports others. Here he is with the Alliance for the Brave Men. They have a show on Saturday morning. The program outlines programs for veterans. His favorite charity is the Special Operations Warrior Foundation. The Wells Report was the number one show in the DFW area and now it will be going national across the US network, and many streaming services. John-David Wells is available as a spokesperson for events in the North Texas area. It can also speak at your far-right event via SKYPE. He has a variety of issues for conservative groups across the country. I got the role of general manager of a new radio station, news/talk/sports in Dallas/Worth Texas. But there's more... I also received 14:00-17:00 (the main time) on the U.S. Radio Network. After 16 years, the Wells Report, America's best conservative news/talk broadcast will be heard from coast to coast and internationally on America's fastest growing radio networks. Also, details about when you can tell your friends across the nation that there is a new voice for the United States. God bless you for listening to this broadcast all these years. Now, onwards... Here we go, here we go. John-David Wells, Moderator: Wells Report – U.S. Radio Network. John-David John David Wells is a constitutional conservative who does not discriminate against stupidity. He is open to anyone's opinion and is able to provide immediate intellectual feedback as to why someone's opinion is either good, or not so good for America. It's a pleasure to hear a radio host who can tell the good and the bad of what's going on in America, regardless of who's on duty. You rarely get that from mainstream media. Way to go, J.D.! Rob Woodmancy by John-David Wells | March 15, 2020That according to the latest data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has a total of 1629 cases of COVID-19 in the United States. Of those cases, 46 of us succumbed to it. 46.* Of these 1629 cases... 1362 are under investigation. In other words, in a country of 327 million... By Manager | December 31, 2019 Our recovery places are filled with those who provide assistance and comfort to the injured or injured. We choose to leave them defenseless in favor of targeted healing art. August 5, 2019 As it happens to be on interactive social media sites related to the Wells Report, think Americans are gathering to discuss today's big issues. Note: I didn't say thinking conservative Americans, or thinking liberal Americans. We're all gathering here. To... By John-David Wells | March 15, 2020That according to the latest data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has a total of 1629 cases of COVID-19 in the United States. Of these cases, 46 of us succumbed to it. 46.* Of these 1629 cases... 1362 are under investigation. In other words, in a country of 327 million... By Manager | December 31, 2019 Our recovery places are filled with those who provide assistance and comfort to the injured or injured. We choose to leave them defenseless in favor of targeted medicinal arts. The conclusions of the Wells Report are, at best, incomplete, wrong and out of context. The report dismisses the scientific explanation for PSI's natural loss of Patriots football by unexplained rejection of the referee's memory of which footage he used in his pregame examination. Texts recognized as attempts at humor and exaggeration are nonetheless interpreted as a plot to disqualify football, although none of them relate to any such scheme. There is no evidence that Tom Brady preferred a football that was below 12.5 PSI and there is no evidence anyone even thought he did. All the extensive evidence that inverts how the texts are interpreted by the researchers is simply dismissed as unacceptable. Inconsistencies in logic and evidence are ignored. These points, and others, are addressed in more detail in subsequent annotations to the management summary of the Wells Report by Daniel L. Goldberg, a senior partner in morgan lewis' Boston office and who represented the Patriots and was present during all patriots interviews conducted at Gylet Stadium. Our intention is to provide further context for balance and consideration. Annotations are bold. Text in blue links to relevant documents. Executive recap on January 18, 2015, the New England Patriots and Indianapolis Colts played in the AFC championship game at Gylet Stadium in Foxborough, Massachusetts, to determine which team would advance to Super Bowl XLIX. During the first half of the game, a question was raised by the Colts about the level of football inflation used by the Patriots. As he later admitted in the report (pgs. 44-45, References to current pages are to the pages of the original version of the Wells Report, not to the management summary and in these light), the Colts actually raised their concerns with league officials David Gardy and Mike Kensil the day before the game. Mr. Kanzil conveyed the Colts' concerns to James Daniel, the NFL's operations manager, and Dean Blandino and Alberto Riberton, senior members of the NFL department. They, in turn, passed the concerns along to Walt Anderson, the referee assigned to the game. The league, as well as its right, chose not to convey that concern to the Patriots. In pregame preparations, the league did not consider the impact of the weather on PSI or any preventive measures it could have taken. The league also didn't decide to record or in writing the pregame measurements. The Colts, B. Their concerns, never sought any such extra vigilance before the game, instead suggest that: it would be great if someone could check the air in the football game as the game continues... (p. 45). As a result, at halftime, members of the team in charge assigned to the game, overseen by a senior supervisor from the National Football League (NFL or League), examined the air pressure of the football used by each of the Patriots and Colts. All 11 Tested Patriots game balls measured below the minimum pressure level of 12.5 pounds per square inch (psi) allowed under Rule 2 of the NFL's official rules of play (rules of the game) in the two air pressure metrics used to test the balls. The four Colts pills tested each measured in the range of 12.5 to 13.5 psi allowed under the rules of the game on at least one of the measurements used for testing. This statement has not been completed. Halftime measurements are on pg. 8. The reality is that in the second dimension, 3 out of 4 Colts footballs were below regulation. A more accurate and heated statement regarding Colts football was: Using two different metrics (one of which was used for pregame PSI measurements), the league tested only four Colts footballs at halftime. Three of those footballs were measured below regulation on the so-called no Med logo. Four were measured in regulation or above on the so-called Med logo. Colts football averages one below regulation when taking into account both measurements. Once fourth Colts football was measured, league officials stopped any further Colts football evaluation. Relying on the higher measurements of the Colts' football logo index, league officials decided not to add air to any of the Colts' footballs. Additional measurements using the same two metrics were made after the game. After the game, each of the four Patriots footballs measured was well above the required level of 12.5 psi in both metrics (including one that was over-inflated at 13.65 times the Logo meter). Three of the four Colts footballs were measured below 12.5 psi in a non-logo meter (a violation of league rules), one measured below 12.5 psi in both metrics (also a violation), and three Colts footballs measured above 12.5 in the Logo index. The most fundamental issue in this regard is: Does science explain the loss of PSI in Patriots football? This issue addresses what PSI numbers are used for PSI levels before the game and at half-time. These numbers will show the lost amount of PSI. Given the varied metrics from each other, the only relevant halftime measurements are those shown by the gauge used before the game. One gauge, known as a Logo meter, was consistently .3 to 0.45 psi higher in its measurements than a non-logo gauge. Judge Walt Anderson, who was alerted Psi issues before the game, there is a detailed memory of the unregistered PSI levels of 48 footballs is measured before the game - basically 12.5 for patriots football and 13.0 or 13.1 for the Colts football. His memory of these PSI levels before the game is one of the foundations of this report. Mr. Anderson explicitly remembers that he used the logo meter for these measurements before the game (p. 52). (This is mr. Anderson's only memory the report rejects.) Therefore, the symbol gauge numbers are the correct numbers to use for half psi. Investigators relied on the logo's PSI numbers in dealing with Colts football. Using this footage, all the Colts football was in regulation. It justified the factors that didn't add air to them. However, when examining Patriots football, investigators reject Anderson's best memory because he used the logo gauge before the game, and instead look at a larger PSI drop shown by the lower psi, not the Med logo. What's the result of Anderson's rejection of the statement that he used the logo uniform before the game? The Ideal Gas Act, according to league consultants, states that the Patriots' PSI at halftime was between 11.32 and 11.52 due to the impact of temperature on footballs. (p. 113). With the logo gauge, 8 of the Patriots' 11 footballs are within the ideal and proposed gas law range of all 11 Patriots footballs was 11.49 - fully in line with the ideal gas law's prediction as to what exactly PSI would be. All this, relying on Mr. Anderson's best memories, basic science fully explains the patriots' football PSI decline during the first half. Mr. Anderson's memoirs are adopted by investigators for pregame PSI numbers. His recollection that he used the logo uniform before the game is the premise of investigators' justification for league officials not to re-stretch the Colts football at halftime. But his memory of what footage he used before the game was rejected when he assessed PSI's descent into Patriots football. There is no rationale for this momentum as to whether Mr. Anderson's memories were true. And it's clear that the researchers, unhappy with his memories at this point, pushed the subject to indicate that despite his best memory, it was possible that he used the second uniform. (p. 52). The report is buried in Comment 5 of the Advisor's Report (p. 65 of the Exponent's report, which is Appendix 1 of the Wells Report) and on pg. 116 of the report, the apparent rationale for rejecting Mr. Anderson's memory as to the metric he used. It's convoluted and hard to understand at best. Even during his May 12 conversation with the media, Mr. Wells didn't even try to explain it, and his colleague's explanation didn't make that clear. Maybe Drafts of the consultant's report, and all communication between investigators and their advisors regarding the development of their opinions, will shed further light on this so that the public can receive all relevant information. On January 23, 2015, the NFL publicly announced that it had hired Theodore W. Wells Jr. and law firm Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison (Paul, Weiss) to conduct an investigation, along with NFL Vice President Jeff Pash, about the footballs used by the Patriots during the AFC championship game. Mr. Wells' employment and office followed the written announcement to the Patriots (the day after the AFC championship game) that the league had already made a preliminary finding that the Patriots may have tampered with the pressure of football. See the January 18, 2015 letter from D. Gardi. League personnel, so, without foundation or misunderstood the effect of temperature on the PSI, had already judged the issues in advance. Colts linebackers also lost PSI, but no similar preliminary finding was made regarding the Colts. Wells investigators, therefore, were hired by the league to investigate an issue the league had already pre-adjudged. The report nowhere casts doubt on the league roster after making it a preliminary finding or any other prior judgment by league officials. The January 18 letter to the Patriots also contained two significant errors that set the tone for this investigation and were an apparent source of misrepresentation in the media: 1) that one patriots footballer measured 10.1 psi at halftime, a clear misconception; 2) That all Colts football is measured within the regulatory framework - another misinterpretation. The league has never corrected this announcement in any sense. Why was the league content to have the Patriots deal with this investigation for months based on inaccurate information? Investigators were unconcerned about any of these obvious mistakes or the league's failure to correct them. Inaccuracies in this letter, combined with subsequent leaks to the media that were never corrected by the league [HYPERLINK added 7/31/15 10:00AM] placed the investigation on the basis of misinformation, patriots a significant disadvantage. The report treats these inaccuracies as important (see page 101), where the opposite is true; They fueled misinformation in the international media for the Patriots serious damage. The investigation was conducted in accordance with the game integrity policy and the enforcement of competitive rules. The commissioner's policy on the integrity of the game requires that there be an evidentiary basis for any decision that was a violation of competitive rules: the level of proof required to find that a breach of league rules occurred would be a violation of the evidence. That's the extent of the evidence. It weighs more or more convincingly than the evidence offered in contrast. A finding of a violation cannot be based on speculation or speculation. To be considered evidence, there are detailed requirements relating to culling. This report circumvents the scientific issues and states that (1) all text references to deflation probably referred to the wrong deflation of football after the referee's examination, and (2) because Brady preferred the football to be at 12.5 he probably wanted them even lower, and (c) Tom Brady probably had a general awareness of the seemingly wrong deflation of game footballs. Beyond speculation about the significance of joking texts, the report relies not on evidence of any wrongdoing, but on the normal behaviour of those involved. For example: (1) The report relies on the increased level of communication between Mr Brady and Mr Jastremski in the days after the AFC championship game, although this media shows no knowledge of football tampering. As fully explained to investigators, there were some understandable reasons for increased communication between Mr Brady and Mr Jastremski in the days after the AFC championship game. First, the media frenzy over inflated football started the day after the AFC championship game. Mr. Brady is accustomed to the spotlight and to critics; Mr. Jastremski is not since Mr. Jastremski made the football, it made sense to expect that media attention to focus on him. It was also reasonable to expect that (as happened) Mr Jastremski's boss would question Mr Jastremski to see what, if anything, he knew. Mr Brady reaches out to Mr Jastremski to see how he holds up in these circumstances is not only understandable, but commendable. Second, the team had just won the AFC championship and was headed to the Super Bowl. Football had to be ready for the Super Bowl. Since this was Mr. Jastremski's first Super Bowl experience since taking the job as a football preparer, it's no surprise that he and Mr. Brady talked a lot about football preparation in the days after the AFC championship game. Topics they had to discuss included: how football would be prepared (there were a number of different ways used to prepare during the season, sometimes depending on the weather); How much more than the required number per game should be prepared so that, as he always does, Mr. Brady can choose a football game from a larger number of footballs ready; When, if anything, football will be available in Foxborough for coaching; When were they sent to Arizona; When they will be available for actual use in Arizona; Etc. All these topics of discussion were triggered by winning the AFC Championship and had to be dealt with in days This victory. Investigators could find out the former Patriots employee, whose aftermath involved making game balls whether his communications with Mr. Brady had grown during the period leading up to the previous Super Bowls. They didn't. In short, increased Brady-Jastremski media in the days after the AFC championship game doesn't make it more likely than there was no wrongdoing or knowledge of wrongdoing. They're totally consistent with total innocence. It's just speculation to conclude otherwise. However, it forms part of the report's stated rationale for its findings against Mr Brady. (2) Mr Brady expressed faith that no one would tamper with football without his knowledge and his approval was also relied upon, but he was barely proven that he really had that knowledge. It's an objectively reasonable belief, but if the preoccupation actually happened, the belief is not evidence that Mr. Brady knew about it. (3) The report relies on three signatures Mr. Brady signed for Mr. McNally and gifts he gave Mr. Jastremski as supporters of her conclusions, there was tinkering and Mr. Brady knew about it. As for Mr. McNally's signatures, Mr. Brady explained that he didn't remember signing them, but he may have done so routinely when asked. Such requests are made several times almost every day in the team's locker room or equipment room, even on game day. Mr Brady believes he has never rejected such a request. If getting an autograph from Mr Brady is evidence that you are rewarded for being compensated for despicable behaviour, then hundreds or even thousands of people must be part of a plot of wrongdoing. What is not controversial is that Mr Brady, apart from signing three items mr. McNally handed over to him, never granted anything to Mr. McNally. This cuts against the existence of the program the report speculates. As for gifts for Mr. Jastremski, as Mr. Brady explained, Mr. Jastremski is one of 15 non-actor staffers to whom he gives holiday gifts annually in addition to what they receive from the players' holiday gift pool. Mr. Jastramsky's gifts are consistent with the gifts to others. (4) Mr. Brady's agency explained to investigators why, from the perspective of precedent for other players and the players' union, there were good reasons not to hand over his private phone or any phone records or texts. Investigators have already had all of Mr. Jastremski's messages with Mr. Brady, since Mr. Jastremski's phone was given to the league within about 48 hours of notification from the investigation. They also had Mr McNally's phone records for the period before including the AFC championship game. These records don't show any messages with Mr. Brady, even about asking for or receiving the three signatures. Lack of text messages between Mr. Brady McNally was further confirmed by the insipid testimony of each of them that they never spoke to each other on the phone, never texted each other, and never even had a substantive face-to-face conversation with each other. Investigators didn't find until he contradicted those statements even though they had access to countless people who were in the Patriots locker room area or the player's bench area, where, on game day, Mr. Brady and Mr. McNally were in the same environment. The absence of one witness who watched any substantive conversation, and the lack of texts during what investigators felt was a critical period, corroborated their statements that they had never had such communication. If any information about texts on Mr Brady's phone was really a problem, they could have asked Mr Brady's agent (who suggested at the end of Brady's interview to respond to further enquiry) to confirm there were no texts with Mr McNally. Given that Mr. Jastremski and Mr. McNally both turned in their phone records, no adverse conclusions should be drawn from the fact that Mr. Brady did not make his phone or its contents available. As for the texts, which are discussed later, there is not a single text referring to a football trade program after reviewing the referee, to do so, to any instructions on Brady to do so, or to any knowledge by Mr. Brady of such conduct. It's pure conjecture and speculation that any reference to deflation in the text is to the improper deflation of football after the referee has examined them. In short, there is simply no evidentiary support for concluding that Mr Brady was aware of any actual effort or even attempted to release air from football incorrectly. All the evidence — as well as logic — is the other way around. This policy states that [a] competitive violations or suspicions will be thoroughly investigated and aroused. 1 This report is the product of this investigation. It was prepared entirely by Paul's investigative team. Paul Weiss and presents the independent views of Mr Wells and his colleagues. Any judge sitting on a case should disclose any financial relationship he or she may have with either party. This is not an attack on the integrity of the judge to expect him or her to do so. Mr. Wells began every Patriots interview and explained that his role was the same as a judge's. It's no surprise that there have been calls for Paul Weiss' law firm (acting as a prosecutor, judge and jury) to disclose in its report the extent of its financial relationship with the NFL, especially since the conduct of league personnel was part of what was being investigated. The investigation included an assessment of how the league handled the matter (p. 21) and concluded that there was no bias or unfairness in anything done by anyone Team Adam). The report was buried in a 78 footnote on pg. 138 that the league employee who took the football kicker out of the game was fired by the league shortly after the AFC Championship Game for a pattern of selling memorabilia intended for the NFL auction site. The Patriots certainly preferred that a lawyer like Mr. Wells, with an esteemed reputation, investigate these issues instead of league employees doing it. The issue raised in the media is whether the public recognition and disclosure of this extensive relationship with the league was appropriate. Such disclosures will help the public better assess the findings regarding the league's conduct, which do not have a single critical comment or suggestion for improving the report. No one should receive calls for such disclosure in person. The main issue of the investigation was the circumstances surrounding the Patriots' use of inflated footballs at air pressure levels below regulation during the AFC Championship Game, including whether patriots personnel were involved in deliberate efforts to circumvent the rules of the game. The investigation also included an assessment of the circumstances surrounding a possible attempt by the Patriots to present an unauthorized kicking ball to the field during the AFC championship game. The Patriots, from the outset, sought to have additional issues regarding the conduct of certain league personnel included in the scope of this investigation, including not only failures to take appropriate actions to protect the integrity of the game following the Colts expressing concern, but also leaks of selective and misinformation, failures to correct reported misinformation [HYPERLINK added 7/31/15 9:50], and harm to wrongdoing. The report does not address these issues. For the reasons described in this report, and after extensive investigation, we have concluded that, in connection with the

