Plaintiff – Plaintiff 1
Represented by:
Address: TBA
E-Mail: TBA
Phone: TBA

DRAFT 1.9 – Copied To FBI & DOJ & HUD

The Plaintiff

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF MARIN

PLAINTIFF 1	)	Court Case No.
,	)	
	)	COMPLAINT FOR INTENTIONAL
Plaintiff,	)	INTERFERENCE WITH
	)	CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS;
	)	INTENTIONAL INTERFERENCE
	)	WITH PROSPECTIVE ECONOMIC
	)	ADVANTAGE; CYBER-STALKING;
vs.	)	FRAUD; INVASION OF PRIVACY;
	)	CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS; ABUSE
GAYLE SUITS, an individual,	)	OF OFFICE; RETALIATION; RICO
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	)	RACKETEERING VIOLATIONS;
	)	DISCRIMINATION AND...XXXXXXXXX
A California State,	)	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
THE COUNTY OF MARIN	)	**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**
A California County and,		
Staff of The County of Marin		
named individually as XXXXX and	)	
DOES 1 through 50, Inclusive	)	Date:
	)	
Defendants	)	Time:
	)	Dept.:
_____	)	Trial Date:

FACTS OF THE CASE

Plaintiff is a lawful, senior, disabled, low-income native born American citizen who has served his nation and community for decades. Plaintiff is an individual residing in, and paying rent in Marin County and communicating with HUD and the Marin County housing agency since, at least, November 2008.

Defendants are in California at Marin County Offices on Redwood Road and 4020 Civic Center Drive in San Rafael and In Sacramento, California with homes in nearby cities.

The true names and capacities of the Defendants, DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are presently unknown to the Plaintiff at this time and the Plaintiff does sue those Defendants and each of them, by such fictitious names pursuant to the pertinent provisions of the California Code of Civil Procedure. The facts and veracity of the charges and claims herein are evidenced in evidence hard drives and existing online cloud-based evidence repositories containing millions of pages of validating evidence compiled by Plaintiff, FBI, GAO, SEC, EU, private, Congressional, news industry, forensic specialist and leaked archive investigators.

The HUD Federal Housing Home Ownership Choice Voucher program is a key program in section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937. (42 U.S.C. § 1437 et seq., as amended by § 201(a)of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.) Commonly referred to as "Section 8," the program provides low-income families a monthly subsidy to pay for a portion of their mortgage. The amount of the subsidy depends, in part, on the income Section 8 families receive. The program, which is funded and regulated by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development(HUD), is administered locally by public housing authorities (PHAs). Here is what kind of trouble PHA's are now in: https://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2015/02/12/18768410.php

http://www.tenant.net/nycha/pub-hous/pub-hous-corrupt-1.html

https://reason.com/2018/01/15/the-corrupt-politics-of-low-in/

https://www.bostonglobe.com/opinion/editorials/2012/05/06/sweeping-changes-needed-curb-abuses-local-housing-authorities/QqQm4ZZQ3SdUoIZXMuWpgP/story.html

This matter is NOT about a Section 8 rental voucher. Plaintiff has been applying and waiting for a voucher since 2008. He finally got a HUD Section 8 to fund a tiny no-bedroom studio apartment and he has ***more than put in his time*** (over 2 years in a Marin Section 8) to receive his HUD Homeownership voucher. This case is about Plaintiff's entitlement to a HUD Home Ownership Voucher to build, or buy, his own home which will also help to solve California's housing crisis by, again, demonstrating new housing solutions, as Plaintiff has done on other national public interest broadcast news-documented housing projects. Because the tech billionaires live in Marin they don't want poor people in Marin because they might scuff their Tesla's and this has led to an "anti-everything" mentality in local policy actions. Plaintiff began requesting his voucher in 2008 and has been re-requesting it, and asking for status updates, every six months since then.

HUD and any others have sued Marin for refusing to do anything but the barest minimum for low income people. Many government agencies have rated Marin County as *"The richest county in the world that does the least to support low income people."* Let's face the facts: Marin County bosses hates anybody that is not a rich male with a mansion. It goes beyond simply "snooty" to an agency mentality that verges on evil.

Because the Marin program is operationally "gate-keeper"- controlled through a single person in Marin County it has created conflicts of interest and abuses of process with no oversight or transparency. The vast numbers of lawsuits filed against Marin county by everybody from citizens to HUD itself, show that there is a huge transparency and bias problem here. (per http://www.pacer.gov) The only "criteria" that Marin Housing seems to use is: *Do we like your politics and can we use this for our friends stimulus funding skims.*

Each Marin Housing staff person has highly visible social media, web photo gallery, event attendance, political support and ideological statements publicly visible on the internet. Additionally, many of their personal emails have been leaked. This data, along with evidence visible in their

work cubicles (Huge numbers of pictures of them wearing "pink, knitted, ANTIFA caps" and political posters in their cubicles, for example), their Instagrams, their Facebook profiles, etc. display clear biases, political hatreds and personal vendettas against everybody from "*Trump*", to "*Starbucks*", to "*Strip Malls*" to "*Disco Dancers*". Marin County workers never leave their politics at home. Defendant gatekeepers have clearly displayed their bias and discrimination interests for all to see, so it is hard for Defendants argue that they "don't have any bias".

In 1974, Congress added the Section 8 housing program to the United States Housing Act of 1937 "[f]or the purpose of aiding low-income families in obtaining a decent place to live." (42 U.S.C. § 1437f(a); see generally Friedman et al., Cal. Practice Guide: Landlord-Tenant (The Rutter Group 2019) ¶12.) The program gives eligible families either "tenant-based" or "project-based" rent subsidies administered locally through PHAs. (See Park Village Apartment Tenants Ass'n v. Mortimer Howard Trust(9th Cir. 2011) 636 F.3d 1150, 1152–1153 [overview of Section 8 housing assistance].) "'[T]enant-based assistance'" is a home ownership subsidy that is tied to a specific family even if the family moves to other suitable housing. (42 U.S.C.J.4§1437f(f)(7).) "'[P]roject-based assistance,'" on the other hand, is tied to a specific housing development or unit. (42 U.S.C. §1437f(f)(6).)We focus on tenant-based home ownership assistance, which is at issue in this case. Under the tenant-based assistance program, at least 75% of all admitted families must be "[e]xtremely low[]income,"i.e., their income may not exceed 30% of the median income calculated by HUD for the relevant area (24 C.F.R. §5.603(b)(2020)); and all remaining admitted families must be "[l]ow income," i.e., their income may not exceed 50% of the median income.(Ibid.; id., §982.201(b)(1),(2)(i)(2020)[eligibility and targeting].) After a Section 8 family selects an eligible home approved by the applicable PHA, the PHA enters into a contract with the bank. The bank "functions as a landlord in the private market. The bank signs a contract with the Section 8 home buyer (which includes a HUD Lease/Tenancy Addendum) and also signs a Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) contract with the Housing Authority."(Apartment Assn. of Los Angeles County, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles(2006) 136 Cal.App.4th 119, 123.) The PHA gives the subsidy payments directly to the bank. (24 C.F.R. § 982.311(a)(2020).)

Plaintiff has been requesting his voucher since 2008. Plaintiff has asked, ever since April 4, 2012: ***"...how many people in Marin County received any kind of section 8 voucher and why did they get to jump ahead of Plaintiff? While everyone knows that vouchers are based on criteria, NO INVESTIGATOR has been able to find a single post-2012 voucher recipient who had as complete a set of criteria compliance as Plaintiff. Why is that unless, Plaintiff was targeted? Why wasn't the fact that Plaintiff exceeded all of the qualifications not as good as those who got a voucher who were not as qualified? Why were the 42+ emails, web form submissions, letters and meetings Plaintiff had with Marin Housing "lost" or deleted? Why are there so many ex Marin housing and county staff describing and suing against Marin County for "targeting" by Marin County staff?…"***

Plaintiff has filed a vast number of emails, requests, voucher applications, letters, reports and other notifications and attended meetings to join the HUD Home Ownership Voucher program since 2008, but, since 2013, every time he called the Marin Housing Department (Gale Suits in particular in later years), he was told, "we have no record of you.". Plaintiff then resubmits the application, or re-meets with staff and then a few months later is told: "We have no record of you". Marin Housing staff who have left County employment have told Plaintiff that he was "black-listed" by County officials because he exposed corruption shenanigans by public officials. Checks cashed by Marin County show that they, indeed, have a record. In fact this case shall depose every personal and office email account of each Marin County Housing official since 2012 with the knowledge that many of those individuals emails, and Marin County email servers were previously hacked. Any "missing emails" will be found by compared leaked document sets with email PST and server files provided by defendants.

Federal records have proven that Applicant communicated with HUD, Social Security and County officials in writing, via telephonic communications and in-person in 2008, and every year since then. Applicant filed for benefits in 2008 for toxic poisoning and disabling conditions from his federal engagements with the U.S. Department of Energy over the previous decades.

Applicant has been stone-walled in his HUD approved housing benefits since then and placed on County-manipulated "waiting lists" that have been manipulated in order to harm Applicant in political reprisal for his work in the arrests of multiple public officials.

Applicant was working in Marin Housing lead XXXXXXXXX, a black man, who had promised to provide the voucher paper but he suddenly quit Marin Housing in disgust saying that Marin Housing was a "dysfunctional biased racist mess".

It is a FELONY for County, or another other officials, to "*Shadow-Ban*" and database manipulate Applicant's benefits applications in this ongoing political reprisal. Applicant is a life-long public servant devoted to his community who deserves far better than a ten year blockade of his housing rights.

Our position is that it is an absolute falsehood for County officials to state that Applicant has been equitably and fairly placed on agency lists and HUD housing Section 8 and HUD mortgage financing resource lists.

While County Defendants argue that Applicant has been processed equal to others in processing lists or access to HUD and County housing resources, it is, in fact, now documented by law enforcement, investigative journalists and Edward Snowden-like leakers that Applicant has been stone-walled using, now exposed, "Lois Lerner"-like black-holing tactics in reprisal for Applicant's, and his peers, highly successful support of anti-corruption law enforcement cases.

Applicant's peers have learned from another agency, and Ritter Center of San Rafael, that hundreds, maybe even thousands, of people received Section 8 vouchers from the County ahead of Applicant even though Applicant has been applying for years before any of them. Additionally, many of them are not natural U.S. citizens and very few of them have worked on SE 1099 and W2 employment from 1970 to 2008 in the USA and contributed as much to the tax base as Applicant.

This is very obvious a political hit job placed on Applicant because he is so good at getting criminally corrupt politicians fired and helping the federal authorities with clean-up campaigns. At least two U.S. Senators have communicated their hatred of Applicant, because they are now under FBI investigation, to County officials. Those Senator's and/or their staff, have communicated "orders to harm Applicant" to public officials as political reprisal.

Applicant has emailed, engaged in personal interviews, filed County requests, filed federal requests, sent letters to every known County housing operator, filled out waiting list requests and otherwise engage in all known reasonable attempts to secure their overtly earned benefits.

Since the 1970's, Plaintiff has been a U.S. Patent Office awarded Silicon Valley inventor of seminal first-ever inventions, now in use by billions of people globally, and a program director of national projects. Plaintiff has been awarded federal commendations, state and federal innovation grants, government R&D contracts, White House commendations by The Vice President, Mayoral proclamations, industry innovation awards, issued patents, and recognition in thousands of news articles and news broadcasts. *Plaintiff is affiliated with no political party.*

The issue of hacked documents is a significant issue in this case. In our communication with HUD counselors, some of those agencies provided links to their entire server files which exposed the names, addresses, phone numbers, poverty status, emails and other records of their clients. They also exposed direct server access for hackers to easily exploit. We have informed each agency and they have now deleted the materials but other agency systems are known to be at risk and we do not have the resources to address them all. Marin County "hacked itself" in some cases, by sending out open access to their servers.

In most of the leaked emails of Marin Housing staff, they appear to have been hacked by third parties enabled by terrible IT security in Marin County. Whereas, numerous Congressional reports, IT staff reports and security industry reports have verified that agency servers and files, including those upon which Plaintiffs records were housed, have been hacked, moved, deleted and edited by outside third parties including Chinese and Russian hackers, bored teens and hired opposition research operatives and that the hardware level back-doors for SPECTRE and many other incursion sets still exist in agency Cisco, Intel, Juniper Networks and other Network devices now connected to government file networks at DOE, SSA, FEC, and other agencies and this fact is indisputable. At the very least, China, Russian or Brazilian teen hackers have them up for sale on the Dark Web. The NSA certainly has copies of them.

Per the FBI, DOJ, FCC and Congressional investigators: It is widely verified by the U.S. DOJ that hackers such as Wang Dong, Sun Kailiang, Wen Xinyu, Huang Zhenyu, and Gu Chunhui, who were officers in Unit 61398 of the Third Department of the Chinese People's Liberation Army (PLA) and Aleksei Sergeyevich Morenets, 41, Evgenii Mikhaylovich, Serebriakov, 37, Ivan Sergeyevich Yermakov, 32, Artem Andreyevich Malyshev, 30, and Dmitriy Sergeyevich Badin, 27, who were each assigned to Military Unit 26165, and Oleg Mikhaylovich Sotnikov, 46, and Alexey Valerevich Minin, 46, who were also GRU officers, and hackers-for-hire including Kevin David Mitnick, Adrian Lamo, Albert Gonzalez, Matthew Bevan, Richard Pryce, Jeanson James Ancheta, Michael Calce, Kevin Poulsen, Jonathan James, The hacker known as ASTRA, The hacker known as GUCIFER, The hacker known as ANON 4CHAN and THOUSANDS of other individuals had free acess and free reign throughout NSA, FBI, SSA, HUD, DOJ, OPM, CIA and other government servers via the SPECTRE, EMOTET, PRIME ROOTKIT, SERCOMM BACKDOOR, NOTPETYA, MELTDOWN, MASTERKEY, RYZENFALL, FALLOUT, CHIMERA, and hundreds of other back doors and penetration vulnerabilities in Cisco, Intel, Juniper Networks, AMD, and other equipment. Additionally, all of the core server penetration tools used by the CIA and the NSA were hacked by foreign nations and their core source code posted on the internet for all to use. The Bohemian Club, just outside of Marin, was famously hacked by Guccifer. On July 27, 2021 this was disclosed: https://news.sky.com/story/irans-secret-cyber-files-on-how-cargo-ships-and-petrol-stations-could-be-attacked-12364871

Marin County computer servers are a security mess and leak like a sieve.

It is ludicrous for any agency to state that any government servers, prior to 2020, were not widely penetrated and manipulated. The hackers are all known to have sold, or provided the results of their work to famous politicians for use against their competitors.

Even Nancy Pelosi has supported such hackers for political tricks. She is an owner and financier of the hacking manipulation firm: CROWDSTRIKE. Crowdstrike and famous California Senators had the easy means, the motivations, the staffing, the resources and the known engagement of services to manipulate SSA, DOJ, SEC, FTC and other agency decisions and filing records in order to harm Plaintiffs, reporters and whistle-blowers who reported their crimes and corruptions.

(http://www.opensecrets.org/personal-finances/nancy-pelosi/net-worth?cid=N00007360&year=2011)

(https://www.realclearinvestigations.com/articles/2020/10/09/pelosi_takes_big_stake_in_crowdstrike_democrat-tied_linchpin_of_russiagate_125557.html)

Per our FBI contacts, the hackers, daily, use these common tools to hack County servers and look for "juicy opportunities". They use these tactics which appear to work on Marin County servers:

A. Injection. Injection flaws, such as SQL, NoSQL, OS, and LDAP injection, occur when untrusted data is sent to an interpreter as part of a command or query. The attacker's hostile data can trick the interpreter into executing unintended commands or accessing data without proper authorization.

B. Broken Authentication. Application functions related to authentication and session management are often implemented incorrectly, allowing attackers to compromise passwords, keys, or session tokens, or to exploit other implementation flaws to assume other users' identities temporarily or permanently.

C. Sensitive Data Exposure. Many web applications and APIs do not properly protect sensitive data, such as financial, healthcare, and PII. Attackers may steal or modify such weakly protected data to conduct credit card fraud, identity theft, or other crimes. Sensitive data may be compromised without extra protection, such as encryption at rest or in transit, and requires special precautions when exchanged with the browser.

D. XML External Entities (XXE). Many older or poorly configured XML processors evaluate external entity references within XML documents. External entities can be used to disclose internal files using the file URI handler, internal file shares, internal port scanning, remote code execution, and denial of service attacks.

E. Broken Access Control. Restrictions on what authenticated users are allowed to do are often not properly enforced. Attackers can exploit these flaws to access unauthorized functionality and/or data, such as access other users' accounts, view sensitive files, modify other users' data, change access rights, etc.

F. Security Misconfiguration. Security misconfiguration is the most commonly seen issue. This is commonly a result of insecure default configurations, incomplete or ad hoc configurations, open cloud storage, misconfigured HTTP headers, and verbose error messages containing sensitive information. Not only must all operating systems, frameworks, libraries, and applications be securely configured, but they must be patched/upgraded in a timely fashion.

G. Cross-Site Scripting XSS. XSS flaws occur whenever an application includes untrusted data in a new web page without proper validation or escaping, or updates an existing web page with user-supplied data using a browser API that can create HTML or JavaScript. XSS allows attackers to execute scripts in the victim's browser which can hijack user sessions, deface web sites, or redirect the user to malicious sites.

H. Insecure Deserialization. Insecure deserialization often leads to remote code execution. Even if deserialization flaws do not result in remote code execution, they can be used to perform attacks, including replay attacks, injection attacks, and privilege escalation attacks.

I. Using Components with Known Vulnerabilities. Components, such as libraries, frameworks, and other software modules, run with the same privileges as the application. If a vulnerable component is exploited, such an attack can facilitate serious data loss or server takeover. Applications and APIs using components with known vulnerabilities may undermine application defenses and enable various attacks and impacts.

J. Insufficient Logging & Monitoring. Insufficient logging and monitoring, coupled with missing or ineffective integration with incident response, allows attackers to further attack systems, maintain persistence, pivot to more systems, and tamper, extract, or destroy data. Most breach studies show time to detect a breach is over 200 days, typically detected by external parties rather than internal processes or monitoring.

All of Marin Counties Servers and Marin Housing personal android, iPhone, Gmail, MS Outlook and related accounts and devices are known to have been susceptible to, and exploited by, the above methods. The accounts of Gale Suits, Taija Aguirre, XXXXXXX, XXXXXXX, XXXXXX, XXXXXXX, XXXXXX, XXXXXX, Latitia Rogers, Kimbereley Carroll, Noele Kostelic, Jill Symkowick. are thought to have been leaked. The leaked documents issue is crucial because if the Defendants deny that certain communications "can't be found" or "are lost" or "never happened", or "accidentally got deleted"; such outside versions can be used to verify the veracity via dark web sellers or others. In fact, Plaintiff filed some of these charges with Federal investigators years ago, and one must presume that the FBI, HUD (who has sued and investigated Marin Housing previously) may also have acquired a copy of all of those staff office and personal emails. Defendants are, thus, advised to not lie about the contact history.

In a lawsuit filed on January 31 in Marin County Superior Court, multiple Marin residents charge that the County uses illegal and unfair While California law requires counties to distribute GA funds fairly, the lawsuit charges that Marin County shirks this duty by running its GA program like a corrupt garage sale for public policy. (http://www.pilpca.org/2012/04/10/marin-county-illegally-refuses-subsistence-money-to-thousands-of-poor-residents/) When he found this case, it caused Plaintiff, a former

Congressional investigator, to do some digging. As of July 27, 2021, he found out that the Federal Government and numerous citizens have sued Marin County for a vast number of targeting and discrimination matters. Even though Marin County is rather small, it has an inordinate number of lawsuits for abuses of civil rights and corruption, compared to it's size. A report entitled: "***The Mind Numbing Corruption And Perversions In Marin County In California***.pdf" is attached to this filing. It is shocking to see how vast these public policy dirty deeds extend. There is an endemic corruption culture in Marin County that must be corrected.

After waiting since 2008, and specifically, since aggressive communications from April of 2012, Gayle Suits, the Family Self Sufficiency/HCV Homeownership Coordinator for Marin County, who has had interaction with Plaintiff for years, told Plaintiff on July 27, 2021 that "NO" he can't have the home ownership voucher he had waited for since 2008. Plaintiff has filed for and received over 22 State and Federal variances from government agencies and produced over 7 changes in federal law. There is no such thing as "NO" in public policy services for the public. The Constitution says that when the procedure is unjust, the procedure must be changed to be just. The law also says that when the public administrator is unjust, the administrator must be changed. The only consistent factor in the huge number of justice lawsuits against Marin County, shown on http://www.pacer.gov is the administrators. The situation speaks for itself.

Marin County had sent Plaintiff to HUD Home Ownership Classes – gave him a completion certificate, sent him to bankers, assured Plaintiff he was "next in line" and verified that Plaintiff was "one of the most eligible candidates" they had seen. After waiting almost a decade for Gale Suits, and her predecessors, to deliver the voucher they promised, *Plaintiff got shafted*. After jumping through all of the hoops and gauntlets Gale Suits, and her predecessors, asked Plaintiff to undertake for residency, criteria, waiting, suffering and waiting, *Plaintiff got shafted.* It was not an accident that *Plaintiff got shafted.* ***It was intentional reprisal, discrimination and retribution.***

Plaintiff told Gayle Suits: *"It is no secret that I sue when my civil rights are violated and/or I am bias-targeted or vendetta targeted by public officials. My winning federal cases have been headlines in every major news paper and TV show and have resulted in hundreds of public officials getting indicted, fired and/or arrested for abusing the public and the public policy system. HUD has sued Marin County in the past and this is yet another opportunity for both HUD, the Community groups and myself to sue again. You know exactly who I as as we have been communicating for years and my team have the emails and your servers show the stats. You and your office keep LOIS Lernering my records, requests, applications and filings as political reprisal, retaliation. I have records of nearly a decade of lies, obfuscations and falsehoods by your staff. Your staff that have quit are now my witnesses. My cases don't cost me more than postage as big law firms undertake them for a percentage of the winnings and for the extra promotion that the massive media coverage, that my associates can generate, brings. My cases serve the public interest; so support for by the public them falls on my side. At least two, or more officials, in your county have targeted me for reprisals. That is a felony, by the way. They did it because I pointed FBI, DOJ, CFPPC and others in their direction. The worst thing any public official can do is to not give me the same fair rights as every body gets. I can bring a hellstorm of legal action, a hurricane-size press circus and shame that no public official wants. Let's figure this out in a fair way and avoid a war. I have technological and media resources that few in the county can comprehend until they deploy. The cheapest, safest, most fiscally responsible thing to do with me is "the right thing". I make a better friend than enemy. Put me on the subsidy list as the law requires or I will bring justice media and individual investigations and legal hell. I don't stand for political retaliation by those who are paid to serve me and the public.*

Gayle Suits refused to respond even though they had been emailing back and worth with Plaintiff that morning. Plaintiff told Suits: "*….You can't be both the exclusive gate-keeper and the perpetrator at the same time without consequences. If I didn't have to go through you to get my voucher, I wouldn't, but HUD and DOJ said they needed one more example of discrimination and blacklisting to "get you" and now we have it! I, personally, created the federal lawsuit, that I won - proving government discrimination of my funding. That lawsuit made history, was on the front page of the New York Times, The Washington Post and on network TV and got the Secretary of Energy and his staff fired for corruption. Taking out a county official is child's play for my FBI-trained investigators! They took out Epstein and Madoff! Give me the voucher I earned or this, and wayyyyyy*

more happens and it will consume you. The County will hold YOU liable for all the hell you are dragging them into…"



Figure 1: Plaintiff has filed requests for waiting list status every year since 2008 without getting a response more than twice

Plaintiff attached his past law enforcement and IC credentials and press coverage of his past cases. Plaintiff maintains that this is a typical case of the foxes being in the hen-house and those foxes love a good political retribution attack program. The only problem with that is that it is a felony for those public officials to have engaged in it.

In the attached FBI/DOJ report, (***FEDERAL REPORT - CASE MATTER AND CLAIMS – 7.27.21. pdf***) Plaintiff's credentials, credibility and the proven charges are clearly documented. The political corruption matter of "*skimming state and federal funds*" from stimulus and emergency funds is clearly documented in the document as well as the feature films: "***HOW POLITICAL CORRUPTION WORKS***", "***OMERTA***" and the related CBS News 60 Minutes Episodes. Additionally, the favoritism, black-listing and crony-capitalism charges are deeply documented using FBI, DOJ, HUD, FTC and Congressional investigation case files.

Plaintiff described the matter to federal officials who said that this issue demonstrates that Marin officials actions are: *"discriminatory, arbitrary, capricious, confiscatory and oppressive, and the same is unconstitutional, null and void, and constitutes an unreasonable exercise of power on the part of you and the County of Marin,"* and they and HUD are holding that ***Plaintiff is entitled*** to his HUD Home Ownership Voucher! ..Even more so than all other Applicant's in light of what he has had to endure and to offset the pain and suffering forced on him by County officials! Plaintiff has demanded that this matter include a Federal Department Of Justice investigation as a follow-up to the existing case numbered previous DOJ and HUD investigations and previous discrimination lawsuits documented on www.pacer.gov against Marin County!

Plaintiff has had a multi-decade relationship with County officials, White House, Congressional, campaign finance, law enforcement and business parties discussed in this matter and had eye-witness knowledge of the crimes and misdeeds of Defendants and, as such, Plaintiff and his peers have received additional evidence from other eye-witness parties and have been provided with verified evidence notification of further validated evidence held by law enforcement agencies which confirm the veracity of Plaintiff statements. Plaintiff, in fact, moved to Marin in order to help with housing issue solutions like his network televised : "***NOWHOUSE***" , which he built and donated to the community, and "***Building Americas Home***" Projects televised on Discovery Home Channel and promoted by Better Homs And Gardens magazine. Even though Plaintiff supports Habitat For Humanity and a vast number of charitable causes, and gives free homes to Counties, he is not allowed to have a home.

Per:



I. INTRODUCTION

The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the Department or HUD) pursuant to its law enforcement responsibilities under Section 109 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, conducted a compliance review of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program administered by the County of Marin (hereinafter referred to as the County or Recipient). The purpose of the review was to determine whether the CDBG program managed by the County is administered in compliance with the nondiscrimination provisions of Section 109, Title VI, and Section 504.

The Department conducted an on-site review of the Recipient during the period June 29-July 2, 2009. The areas reviewed included Citizen Participation; Benefits, Services and Methods of Administration; Section 504 programmatic requirements; and a limited physical accessibility survey.

The review disclosed that the program is administered in general compliance with regulations implementing Section 109 (24 CFR Part 6), Title VI (24 CFR Part 1), and Section 504 (24 CFR Part 8). However, the Department found that the County was in preliminary non-compliance with: 24 CFR §6.6, citizen participation; 24 CFR §§1.6, 6.10, and 8.55, record-keeping; 24 CFR §§1.4, 6.4, and 8.4, meaningful participation; 24 CFR §8.6, communications; 24 CFR §§1.4 and 6.4, affirmatively furthering fair housing; and, 24 CFR §§8.20 and 8.21, program and physical accessibility. The Department identified a number of programmatic concerns regarding the Recipient's administration of the program in areas that were reviewed, as well.

Figure 2: Every time HUD investigates Marin County, they find corruption and misdeeds

.. Marin Housing was found to be engaging in negligent activities and sketchy operations. Even today, Marin Housing's Below-Market-Rate (BMR) homes are such pieces of crap with insanely high "HOA Fees" that they provide nothing of value. These "HOA Fees" pay to get the plants in your planter watered at a cost of $400.00 per month on top of the poor persons mortgage payment. WOW! That makes these so-called "BMR's" unaffordable to most SSA, SSI and SSDI low income people. HUD does not like that. HUD wonders why the richest, mansion-filled county in America can only come up with pathetic hovels to offer in their BMR program. Marin Housing needs to buy and build some decent, designed, low-income homes like those Plaintiff proposed by local builders, ie:

Marin Low-Income, Rapid-build Homes Proposed

The Marin housing crisis has been created by special interest groups who control the Marin Housing Department via “orders from above”: 1.) Real estate broker lobbyists; 2.) big corporate developers; 3.) NIMBY's and 4.) certain exclusionist tech billionaires want to NEVER allow affordable housing and affordable pre-fab builders to exist. Almost every politician, especially county planning staff, are paid bribes by real estate broker lobbies and big corporate developers.

CalHome does not get the funds it needs because of these special interest groups.Dwell Magazine-type modern low-cost prefab homes, CREATED in California, are blockaded by these special interest groups.

Over a million Californians get $1500.00 from HUD Section 8 and related programs but they are blockaded by lobbying from these special interest groups from using those funds to buy a home. The HUD Section 8 Home Ownership program in California is a sham. HUD should be aware that Marin has bastardized and hidden HUD’s showcase program in this area. Nobody can find the paperwork, get the help or get the counties to pay attention when they apply.

So there is this massively financed army of mega-powerful anti-housing people who have huge law firms working to stop all of your good deeds and manipulate all of your politicians and social service agencies. How do you win that battle? Let's take a look:

As California enters what Sacramento calls: *"the worst housing crisis in 100 years!"*, one must look at the big picture. The U.S. housing market is 4 million single-family homes short of what is needed to meet the country’s demand, according to a new analysis by mortgage-finance company Freddie Mac. The estimate represents a 52% rise in the nation’s home shortage compared with 2018, the first time Freddie Mac quantified the shortfall because states like California have made home-building practically a crime.

Thousands of modern Dwell magazine-type pre-fab home suppliers can deliver amazing modern homes for around $150K but they are stonewalled, delayed and forced to double or triple those costs because of anti-building rules promoted by California and now mirrored nationally by greedy politicians. Greedy politicians take bribes from real estate lobbies and big developer corporations who HATE affordable homes because they don't make much profit on them.

One approach is to break-up and sue ALL of the real estate broker lobbies and big development corporations. You can sue them and their political lap dogs under RICO and anti-trust laws. Politicians receive bribes from the anti-housing bad guys as: cash, search engine rigging, hookers, dinners and via hundreds of other forms of payola and stock market trades. You would think that using legal tactic to take them all down would be a slam dunk. It isn't. Those politicians control whether or not those legal actions can get launched. So you have to be very creative to counter-measure them. For example, you can shame them into submission using the internet's mass media technologies.

If the Marin was serious about solving the housing crisis it would support a SIMPLE program for the hundreds of thousands of renters, who get $1600.00 a month, forever, from HUD for tiny rental apartments, to EASILY use that money for mortgage to build, or buy, a small home.

By law, there is SUPPOSED to be such a program: The HUD Section 8 Home Ownership Program, is supposed to allow this to happen, but it is shadow-banned across the state. Most county officials don't even know how it works or direct inquiries to dead-ends. The HUD Section 8 Home Ownership Program must be easier to get into, easier to find out about and no longer HIDDEN by County officials.

Don't believe it? Do a test yourself. Call the Housing agency office in each of California's 58 counties. When someone pick's up the phone say: "I am HUD-qualified for the HUD Section 8 Home Ownership Program. I would like to use the program to buy or build a home in your county. What do

I need to do to complete the process?". Then experience a hell beyond anything you can imagine. You won't get in, most likely, and it won't be your fault. You will be kept out. This is a federal law. It is your right to use this law. If you already get HUD money to underwrite your rent, you are per-qualified to use this program. Santa Cruz, Marin, San Francisco and other snooty counties will try to stop you because using it means you might not be white enough for their vision of high tax revenue home owners. You might be a deplorable if you use your federal $1500.00 for an actual home. The average mortgage payment in America is $940.00 per month to own a home. HUD pays an average of $1500.00 per month to your landlord. Do the math! These people will build free home inventory for California, die, and leave that inventory in California. Why won't California help them to help solve California's housing inventory crisis? A person building their own home is going to make sure it is done right if they are going to live in it. Build-your-own-home singular home-builders can contribute to the home inventory problem faster and more cost-effectively.

Marcia Fudge at HUD said the Biden administration plans to level the playing field for Americans who want to buy a home by providing down payment assistance for people to move from public housing to homeownership. “We will make sure those who can afford a mortgage are put in a position to be able to buy a home,” Fudge said. “Right now we have banks who don’t want to lend to people to buy a home for less than $50,000″ — homes, she said, that “poor people” can afford, with monthly mortgage payments often lower than rent.

San Francisco built brand new homes across from the Police HQ in San Francisco and these small prefab units ended up costing hundreds of thousands of dollars per unit: They cost twice as much as the same unit in Austin, Texas would cost to build. Why are cities spending the same per apartment for homeless people that you can build a 1600 sq. ft. stand-alone single family modular home for!??? The answer is: Cronyism. They could have cost much less but the process tripled their cost in California.

California spends an average of $800,000.00 to build each "low income apartment" for low income people. That is what the government pays for each unit. If you are not aware of how much things actually cost, and you are willing to pay all of the mark-ups and inflated numbers of retail prices then your average cost to build a 2,600 sq.ft. single-family home in the U.S. ranges from $240,000 to $710,000, with most homeowners spending around $423,800 for the job. The high cost is $1,000,000+ for a 2,600 sq.ft. custom-built home with high-end materials, three-car garage, covered deck, and landscaping. That million dollar+ price is for the yuppie people who pay $150.00 per month for the same tv channels that smart people get for $10.00 per month. BUT!...The build-it-yourself cost for this is $140,000 for a 2,600 sq.ft. builder-grade home with no changes. Every time you change even the tiniest thing in your construction plan, add $10,000.00, or more, to your cost. Most people only ACTUALLY need a 1,200 sq. ft. home but they can't let go of the "mine-is-bigger-than-yours" syndrome. That build-it-yourself modular/prefab home at 1,200 sq. ft. can be under $100,000.00 if you are an EDUCATED general supervising contractor who hires a licensed, top-references, electrician, carpenter and plumber to build it with them. If you build-it-yourself without hiring those seasoned specialists, your project will usually fail. Homes only cost a million dollars if you are a sucker.

2 bedroom stand-alone homes can be built for $100,000.00 in costs. Realtors, builders, developers and politicians will LIE all day long to keep this fact from being exposed. The bribes, mark-ups, payola, padding, profiteering, etc. make that same house cost $1.2M on the market. For example, see: http://ruralstudio.org/project/2020-20k-home/

San Francisco City Hall found that painting and servicing a white rectangle on the ground for homeless people to put their tent in cost the City $6000.00 per month per rectangle. That is how much a penthouse luxury apartment with multiple bathrooms costs in Austin, Texas. Why is building something costing more than the thing is worth? Cronyism, kickbacks and self-dealing with buddies.

Many Housing Permit Department and City Hall people in San Francisco have been arrested, recently, but the corrupt practices and bribery continues without pause. Even more interesting: San Francisco took over luxury hotels and offered them to the homeless but 70% of the homeless refused to use the free housing. 70% of the homeless refused a free home in a luxury hotel!!! Why? The homeless people said why, and it is documented, but NOBODY IN SACRAMENTO EVER reads the statements or they hide the statements from the public.

Here is why the homeless said they don't want California's free housing:
1.) The rules to live in the housing are not rules they can, or will, comply with.
2.) Most of them are addicted to smoking, drinking and drugs and the "free units" have cameras and sensors that record them doing the illicit things. They know that and won't move into a place they know they will get arrested or evicted from as fast as they move in.
3.) The vast contracts and regulation documents they must agree to are something they need a lawyer to explain to them and none of them have lawyers.
4.) Many of them use sex bartering and the cameras on the units will record sex worker activities.
5.) None of them want to be condensed into a tight space with other crazy people because they get set-upon by the worst of the bunch.
6.) They don't want multi-unit housing! They hate it. They want individual homes where they control the whole environment. San Francisco is spending at least TWICE as much money for short term solutions as it would cost for individual pre-fab stand-alone homes.

The San Francisco construction unions and lobbies won't allow the homeless solutions that will work. All of the special interests in San Francisco, from unions, to rich people, to politicians, to realty lobbies, to you-name-it, will block anything that makes housing cheaper. They ALL make their money off of a percentage of the most expensive property values. The Realtor lobby and the big building lobby are probably the most powerful special interest groups in California, after the teachers union. They HATE affordable housing. Anything they say to the contrary is a lie. They bribe 90% of the politicians in the state via Dark Money conduits. They are NOT going to help solve this.

California has published a vast number of reports, at a cost of tens of millions of dollars, listing the exact number of homeless people, but California has never spent the $60,000.00 it would cost to ask each homeless person the 10 questions about what they want! California politicians in Sacramento don't actually care what homeless people want. They care what they can scam out of a "stimulus" fund to scrape their cut off-the-top of. When you call top Housing agency officials in Santa Cruz, Marin, San Francisco, Tulare and other counties to ask them what the main reason is that poor people can't get new homes built, they all pretty much said: "The State and County laws prevent us from building anything these days..."

San Jose got it right by promising a one hour permit time-frame for ADU home construction but other counties are resisting this permit optimization effort because permits are where bribes happen! Factory OS, BluHomes, Clayton Homes, Homes Direct, and an army of other factory built home companies, have offered homes to Californians for $150,000.00, or less, if the State will just fix the permit process and give them a pre-order of 200 homes at a time. Banks will finance these...if the State of California will help bundle land and construction financing in the same package.

Marin County staff said: "We have enough open, empty fields in the county to house every single homeless person in the State but we can't get anything built here without a ton of lawsuits, 5 year studies and permit hell-scapes. Every homeless person could get a modern Dwell Magazine-style stand-alone small house if the Country Office's didn't block every single construction project that is attempted!"

The difference between what California says, and does, is the same difference between night and day. San Francisco is an example of how home-building has been halted in the State. The rest of the state is following the profiteering based blockades to keep homes from getting built to deliver permanent supportive rental housing for people living with a serious mental illness who are homeless, chronically homeless, or at-risk of chronic homelessness. The government funds are rarely ACTUALLY used to acquire, design, construct, rehabilitate, or preserve permanent supportive housing, which may rarely include a capitalized operating subsidy reserve. OK, so say you don't care about the homeless people. "Screw em all" you say. "They are low life drug users and weirdos who won't confirm to our white picket fence social programming…" If you care about getting a home for yourself, you have the same problems. Want to buy a home or buy a bigger home? Forget it, you are screwed if you live in California. The State has, essentially, "outlawed" construction. You can't build a home without the process being so painful, expensive, delayed and litigation-focused that it will ruin your life.

If Marin was serious about solving the housing crisis it would create a single two to three page building permit application, that worked in every situation, that a single office could sign off on within 48 to 60 hours. If the Marin was serious about solving the housing crisis they would change the zoning codes. Nobody can build in Marin without being punished for it by County regulations. If Marin was serious about solving the housing crisis they would turn the tsunami of state-created immigrant unemployment into a positive, Now that California has let half of Mexico in to the State, you have huge clusters of skilled workers hanging around, looking for work, a few blocks away from every Home Depot in the State. Each 20 of them can erect a move-in ready home in one week. Give them an empty pasture and a challenge and turn them loose with a pay-per-house incentive payment structure.

All of the programs listed at: https://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/active-funding/index.shtml need TRIPLE the amount of funds currently allocated and they need to be moved into no less than 3 main programs. The current MASSIVE number of programs guarantees that corruption, duplication, and transparency inefficiency are at a maximum worst-case level. In all of these programs there is nothing for the individual. Almost all of the plans are based on the "Shove-them-all-in-a-big-concrete-building" concept. The public does not want that. NOBODY wants to live in, or see, multi-unit housing. The State needs to also TRIPLE the amount of programs for the SINGLE FAMILY or INDIVIDUAL. County Housing agencies have been found to be corrupt and motivated by bribes. If the State of California was serious about solving the housing crisis it would put a billion dollars of it's freebie COVID CASH from Washington, DC into it's CalHOME fund and restart that fund.

On Broadway and Divisadero streets in San Francisco, giant mansions house two to four people. Those structures, without changing the outside of the buildings one tiny bit, can house hundreds of people. NIMBY's biggest complaint is based on appearance. If you change the inside of structures and keep the outside looking "classic", you get the least amount of NIMBY issues. San Francisco already has ALL of the fully constructed square footage to solve ALL of it's housing issues, if it works from the inside out. Empty office buildings and dead millionaire mansions can deliver the square footage.

Gavin Newsom based his election on providing millions of new homes to California. Nobody has been able to find a single one of these new houses he said he was going to build. THE BIGGEST TAKE-AWAY: "NOBODY wants to live in a multi-unit concrete building block. Multi-unit project buildings harm people's mental state and create conflict, house gangs and they are bad socially. These is enough empty land for everyone in California to have a 1600 sq. ft. home of their own. Change the rules so that more people at below $100K income levels can buy or build a home and the public will solve the housing crisis.

Until those kinds of things happen, there is no hope for the State! Greed, payola, special interests and revolving door jobs control your housing opportunities in the state of California. California State has every tool, resource and dollar it already needs to solve every single housing issue in the State except one think: "Courage". It take courage to say "No" to the special interests. It takes courage to say "No to the Silicon Valley billionaires. It takes courage to cut off the spigot of Congressional bribes. Most of the federal cash that comes to California always ends up in a politicians, or their friend's pockets. It takes courage to say that every Californian that invested their lives in California deserves the home in California that they were promised. Fix the HUD Section 8 Home Ownership Program in California. Make an office in every major city that ONLY helps people with the HUD Section 8 Home "Ownership" Program and not just the Section 8 "rental" program. ALL OF THE MONEY needed to fund that is already paid out in California, by HUD, EVERY MONTH! Give citizens their promised right to build and own a home!

Plaintiff was solicited to participate in Defendants corruptions and schemes by public officials but Plaintiff refused to participate on the grounds that Defendants plans and schemes were illegal illicit and immoral. Because Plaintiff refused to participate in Defendants crimes, assisted investigators with law enforcement actions and continued Plaintiff business in competition to Defendants; Defendants took the further illicit actions described herein, against Plaintiff. Many of the Silicon Valley/SF tech oligarchs may work in Silicon Valley or San Francisco but they sleep in Marin. Over 20 billion dollars of tech personal assets sleeps/lives in Tiburon/Belvedere, alone, and they tell the Marin County government

what to do, and who to do it to.

The Plaintiff is informed and believes and, based on that information and belief, allege that some of the named Defendants herein and each of the parties designated and every one of them, are legally responsible jointly and severally for the Federal RICO Statute violating events and happenings referred to in the within Complaint for Intentional Interference with Contractual Relations, Intentional Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage, Cyberstalking, Fraud, Invasion of Privacy, Unfair Competition and Theft of Intellectual Property, RICO statute violations and other causes of action including XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. Key points of this case include:

Defendants have formed a "Cartel", as defined by law under RICO Racketeering Statutes and were the financiers of the political campaigns and received payola and kick-backs from those campaigns via government stimulus payments for 2008 and 2020 national issues. Over a TRILLION dollars of COVID, 2008 Housing Crisis and 2020 Stimulus funds have been announced by Congress and aimed at California but, mysteriously, it never shows up in public projects in Marin. Whose pockets did it end up in? Let's take a look!

Investigators have been monitoring the California Department of Housing & Community Development reports, emails, hearings and newsletters for over a decade and Marin County is notable in all of the communications in that it avoids certain public support efforts with respect to all other counties in California. For example, even though Marin County is a deeply agricultural region, Marin County had zero presence in the ***Joe Serna, Jr. Farmworker Housing Grant (FWHG) program, February 25, 2021, NOFA Awardee List*** from the California Department of Housing & Community Development. Further, California Department of Housing & Community Development officials have stated that *"Marin County made little or no effort to participate". Point Reyes officials reported that "Farmworker housing advocates are facing some hard lessons from a pilot project that fell drastically short of its goal. Starting in 2012, a collaborative between the Marin Community Foundation and Marin County used a combination of public and private funds to build and renovate agricultural worker housing on ranches in West Marin. The group initially planned to fund 200 units within five years, but later sharply reduced the goal to 20 units.* In the end, only a dozen units were built, while the need for more affordable housing not only never went away: It increase by over 20 TIMES! Producers of the failed West Marin housing project blame: ***"complete and utter dysfunction and corruption in Marin County."*** Plaintiff has built famous public homes that cost less that $100,000.00 each in less than 30 days each. Marin County officials blew these worker housing projects because of corruption. Officials are skimming taxpayer cash! If Plaintiff can do it, why can't Marin use the millions of dollars and vast resources to do it?

Answer: CORRUPTION and funds skimming.

A Sausalito lawyer with extensive experience suing Marin County has also echoed the corruption concern via XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Marin officials seek retaliation against Plaintiff because Plaintiff does what they can't do. Marin officials seek retaliation, revenge, vendetta, omerta, reprisal and payback against Plaintiff because Plaintiff has walked the talk against corruption and put public officials in prison. It is a felony violation of the law for Marin officials to do what Marin officials did. HUD says: *"**Retaliation Is Illegal** - It is illegal to retaliate against any person for making a complaint, testifying, assisting, or participating in any manner in a proceeding under HUD's complaint process at any time, even after the investigation has been completed. The Fair Housing Act also makes it illegal to retaliate against any person because that person reported a discriminatory practice to a housing provider or other authority. If you believe you have experienced retaliation, you can file a complaint."*

*"**We don't like him because he reports our corruption to the cops"** is* **NOT** a legal reason for Marin County to deny Plaintiff his earned, entitled, HUD Home Ownership Voucher that he has waited longer for than anyone else, yet that is why they have targeted Plaintiff.

Violations by Defendants include, but are not limited to: Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (race, color, national origin); Section 109 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (race, color, national origin, religion, sex); Section 504 of the

Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (disability); Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (disability); Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 (disability); Age Discrimination Act of 1975 (age); Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972 (sex), civil rights, whistle-blower rights, State and Federal Constitutional Rights and XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

In exchange for financing political campaigns, Defendants were illegally exchanging profits and stock market perks from state and federal emergency funds. This was an illegal quid-pro-quo arrangement. Plaintiff designed, produced, received patent awards on, received federal commendations for, received federal funding for and first marketed the very products which Defendants and their tech financiers who live in Marin County interfered with and made billions of dollars on and which Defendants felt might beat them in hundreds of billions of dollars of competitive market positions and stock market trades. Defendants operated a criminal CARTEL as defined by RICO LAWS and that Cartel ran an an anti-trust market rigging and crony political payola operation. Defendants spent tens of millions of dollars attacking Plaintiff because Defendants Belvedere, Tiburon, Mill Valley and other "fancy town" high tech financiers were not clever enough to build better products. Defendants chose to "CHEAT RATHER THAN COMPETE" and to try to kill the Plaintiff 's life, careers, brands, revenues, assets, businesses and efforts via malicious and ongoing efforts and manipulations of City, State and Federal programs. If anyone does not think that "cute woodsy Marin County" is not a hot bed of global tech crime. Consider that Mark Felt lived in Santa Rosa, you know him as "Deep Throat" from the Watergate Scandal. Plaintiff knew him. Consider that rare earth mining investments control the multi-trillion dollar electric car industry and the majority of the owners of rare earth mining interests live in Marin. Rare Earth mining "blood minerals"are now the largest cause of rape, genocide and torture in the world. Want more? Read: ""***The Mind Numbing Corruption And Perversions In Marin County In California***.pdf", attached as an exhibit. Dark deeds exist under the trees in Marin, now they have come to light.

Had these facts come to light earlier, famous politicians would have been forced to resign mid-term, in disgrace, in the same way that Richard Nixon was forced to resign when disgraced by the "Watergate" revelations. (Exposed by Marin citizen: Mark Felt. He was "*Deep Throat*" in the Watergate investigations.

Due to Defendants fears of the loss of millions of dollars of crony payola from the illegal abuse of taxpayer funds and Defendants warnings from White House staff that the crony scheme must "never come to light", Defendants engaged in felonious gangster-like actions in order seek to terminate all witnesses, reporters and opposition government staff who attempted to expose these crimes.

Just as, over time, the Watergate crimes are now intimately documented (Thanks to local Marin Santa Rosa hero Mark Felt) and detailed; over time State Solyndra, Tesla and Silicon Valley Crony Scandal has been detailed and exposed in numerous federal, news media and public investigations. Government officials had encouraged Plaintiff to "hold off" but reprisal actions by corrupt officials and increasing numbers of suspicious deaths only seem to increase. Significant barriers to justice were illicitly placed in front of Plaintiff.

Defendants organized and operated a series of malicious attacks and thefts against Plaintiff as reprisals and competitive vendettas. Defendants report to the FBI, GAO, FTC, SEC, Congressional Ethics Committees, Federal Administration and other entities on a regular basis. Plaintiff has received evidence from those entities as well as Wikileaks, Drudge Report, wearethenewmedia.com groups, private investigators and former employees of Defendants.

Defendants and their associates Elon Musk, Jon Doerr, Eric Schmidt, Larry Page, Steve Jurvetson, Vinod Khosla and other members of the "Silicon Mafia" are documented in tens of thousands of news reports, federal law enforcement reports and Congressional reports in their attempts to infiltrate and corrupt the U.S. Government in an attempt to route trillions of tax dollars to Defendants private accounts. Defendants perceived Plaintiff as a threat to their crimes. Federal investigators, news investigators and whistle-blowers have reported to Plaintiff that Defendants were the financiers and/or beneficiaries and/or command and control operatives for the crimes and corruption disclosed in the CBS NEWS 60 Minutes investigative reports entitled: "The Cleantech Crash", "The Lobbyists Playbook" and "Congress Trading on

Insider Information"; The Feature Film: "The Car and the Senator" Federal lawsuits with case numbers of: USCA Case #16-5279; and over 50 other cases including the ongoing "Solyndra" investigation and federal and Congressional investigations detailed at http://greencorruption.blogspot.com/ ; http://xyzcase.xyz ; https://theintercept.com/2016/04/22/googles-remarkably-close-relationship-with-the-obama-white-house-in-two-charts/ and thousands of other documentation sites. Plaintiff ischarged with engaging in these crimes and corruptions against Plaintiff and financing and ordering attacks on Plaintiff. Plaintiff engaged in U.S. commerce and did everything properly and legally. Unlike Defendants, Plaintiff did not steal technology. Unlike Defendants, Plaintiff did not bribe elected officials in order to get market exclusives. Unlike Defendants, Plaintiff did not poach Defendants staff. Unlike Defendants, Plaintiff was the original inventors of their products. Unlike Defendants, Plaintiff did not operate "AngelGate Collusion" schemes and "High Tech No Poaching Secret Agreements" and a Mafia-like Silicon Valley exclusionary Cartel. Unlike Defendants, Plaintiff did not place their employees in the U.S. Government, The California Government, The U.S. Patent Office and The U.S. Department of Energy in order to control government contracts to Defendants exclusive advantage. Unlike Defendants, Plaintiff did not place moles inside of competitors companies. Unlike Defendants, Plaintiff did not hire tabloid Media and Think Progress to seek to kill Plaintiff careers, lives and brands. Unlike Defendants, Plaintiff did not rig the stock market with "pump-and-dump", "Flash Boy" and "Google-stock/PR-pump" schemes. Plaintiff engaged in hard work every day of their lives for the time-frame in question under the belief that the good old American work ethic and just rewards for your creations was still in effect in the U.S.A., and that the thieves and criminals that attempted to interdict Plaintiff would face Justice. In a number of circumstances Defendants took advantages of Plaintiff hard work via come-ons; Defendants then made billions of dollars from Plainiffs work at Plaintiff expense and attacked Plaintiff in order to reduce Plaintiff competitive and legal recovery options.

Defendants compensated the corrupt City, State, County and Federal insiders with cash, stock warrants, illicit personal services, media control and a technology known as a "Streisand Effect Massive Server Array" which can control public impressions for, or against a person, party, ideology or issue. Defendants Streisand Effect internet system was used to destroy Plaintiff in reprisal, retribution, and vendetta for Plaintiff help with law enforcement efforts in the case and because Plaintiff companies competed with Defendants companies with superior technologies.

Defendants have used their Streisand Effect technology to build a character assassination ring of bloggers and hired shill "reporters" who engage in a process called a "Shiva". This process is named after a Plaintiff in a similar case named: Shiva Ayyadurai, the husband of Actress Fran Drescher. Shiva Ayyadurai holds intellectual property rights to part of Defendants email technology. In fact, the people most threatened by the Shiva Ayyadurai patent right claims, ironically turn out to be Defendants and, in particular, Defendants associates Elon Musk, Jon Doerr, Eric Schmidt, Larry Page, Steve Jurvetson, Vinod Khosla and other members of the "Silicon Mafia" who own most of the main companies exploiting email technology. Were Shiva Ayyadurai to prevail in his claims, Defendants would owe him billions of dollars. "Running A Shiva" involves the production of a series of Defamation articles by bloggers who act as if they are independent from Defendants but are in fact, not. Defendants used "the Shiva" to attack and seek to destroy Donald Trump, Shiva Ayyadurai, Plaintiff, and numerous political figures. Univision, Unimoda, Jalopnik, tabloid Media, Gizmodo and over a hundred stealth-ed, and overt, assets of Defendants have been using "The Shiva" network to attack Donald Trump, Shiva Ayyadurai, Plaintiff, and numerous political figures as recently as this morning, thus, the time bar restarts every day. Plaintiff has pleaded with Defendants to cease their attacks but Defendants have refused to comply. Even with Fran Drescher's ongoing royalty payments from her popular television series, friends have reported that the attacks on the Ayyadurai family have been devastating and have caused massive damages and personal and emotional devastation.

Defendants produced animated movies, attack articles, fake blog comments, DNS routes, "Shiva" Campaigns, and other attack media against Plaintiff and expended over $30 million dollars in value, as quantified by Defendants partner: Google, in placing the attack material in front of 7.5 billion people on the planet for the rest of Plaintiff lifetime. No person could survive such an attack and in the case of Plaintiff, lives were destroyed and multiple companies invested into by Plaintiff, which Defendants made over $50B off of the copies of, were destroyed because they competed with Defendants.

The public has rejected the abuse of the domestic economy by politicians working with billionaire financiers, which, instead of selling goods or services, use their schemes to manipulate

politics, operate corruption schemes and bribe politicians. Sony Pictures Entertainment and Starbucks Coffee have just seen dramatic drops in shareholder value and faced boycotts because of their use of their companies for political manipulation instead of simply trying to sell goods and services. Task-forces of public/private forensic experts, along with hundreds of millions of voters now regularly exterminate such corrupt companies and entities, ie: BROBECK LAW FIRM, BILL COSBY, FOREX, SOLYNDRA, ABOUND SOLAR, A123, ENERDEL, AMY PASCAL, MICHAEL LYNTON,E.F.HUTTON, RADIO SHACK, ENRON, MCI WORLDCOM, EASTERN AIRLINES, STANDARD OIL, ERIC HOLDER, STEVEN CHU, ARTHUR ANDERSON, DELOREAN, PETS.COM, BEAR STEARNS, BEATRICE FOODS, HEALTHSOUTH, ALLEN STANFORD, TYCO, LANCE ARMSTRONG, PARMALAT, BANINTER, HSBC, GLOBAL CROSSING LTD., BLACKBERRY, HIH INSURANCE, IMCLONE, DEUTSCHE BANK (SPY CASE), URBAN BANK, JEROME KERVIEL, BARCLAYS BANK, BRE-X, FISKER, BARINGS BANK, PATRICIA DUNN, SIEMENS AG, ELIZABETH HOLMES AND THERANOS, TOM PERKINS, PETROBAS, FERNANDO MARCOS, KELLOG BROWN AND ROOT, BAE SYSTEMS, KERRY KHAN, ALCATEL-LUCENT SA, PRESIDENT RICHARD NIXON...and many, many more.

FBI investigations of corrupt state officials including the arrests of James Brown Jr., the head of the California Healthcare system for corruption, The arrests of multiple California Senators, the FBI Raid of Solyndra and the recently announced $3B California “Budget Error” known to be a racketeering related “book-cooking incident” demonstrate that State offices are rife with criminal corruption and that retribution, reprisal and vendetta activities are common-place in the current Administration of California State government. **The law says: Such activities and such reprisal efforts by any political employee in the state of California are felony-class actions which shall subject those state and county employees to arrest and prosecution. Harming or engaging in reprisal activities against a federal witness is a felony-class action which shall subject those state and county employees to arrest and prosecution.**

The Plaintiff is informed and believe, and based on that information and belief allege that at all times mentioned in the within Complaint, all Defendants were the agents, owners and employees of their co-Defendants and, in doing the things alleged in this Complaint, were acting within the course and scope of such agency and employment.

As to any corporate employer specifically named, or named herein, the Plaintiff is informed and believe and therefore allege that any act, conduct, course of conduct or omission, alleged herein to have been undertaken with sufficient, malice, fraud and oppression to justify an award of punitive damages, was, in fact, completed with the advance knowledge and conscious disregard, authorization, or ratification of and by an officer, director, or managing agent of such corporation. The Statute of Limitations and time bar on this case has not expired. Plaintiff only became aware of all of the facts in 2017 due to the FBI, Congressional and hacker-exposed investigation data on Defendants operating and receiving cash, rewards and assets from an illegal and illicit set of political slush-funds established to compensate them for financing the campaigns and schemes of politicians. The Sony, Swiss leaks, Wikileaks, HSBC, Panama Papers and other hacks and publication of all of the relevant files and the Congressional investigation of illicit activities and the continuing issuance of federal documents to Plaintiff confirming Plaintiff intellectual property are all vastly WITHIN the statutes of limitations to allow this case to proceed to Jury Trial. Plaintiff has had a long, ongoing and high-level interaction with Defendant in both the work effort and the monetization and collection effort. Plaintiff has been continually interactive with Defendant in order to try to collect his money. Attacks and interference with Plaintiff has occurred as recently as this week by Defendants.

Defendants are among the largest financiers and/or beneficiaries and/or command and control operatives for the certain political campaigns.

Plaintiff has had an intimate and personal relationship with members of the Congress and former White House staff campaign and has received extraordinary access to whistle-blowers associated therewith.

Mining magnates (ie: Guistra, et al) and investment bank executives who controlled mined commodities stock trades co-financed the political campaigns and live in Marin.

The political campaigns and had a quid-pro-quo relationship with defendants for lithium, indium, copper and all rare earth metals used in batteries, solar panels and the exact mined materials that the political campaigns promised an exclusive on, and in fact, delivered a monopolistic exclusive market on to Defendants. Defendants produced vast numbers of documentation valuing their crony kick-back payola deal at "*Over six trillion dollars*", promoted by USAID and Goldman Sachs agents. One can easily see the types of criminal measures Defendants might undertake in order to steal, embezzle or monopoly route such an outrageous potential sum to their personal bank accounts.

Because Defendants were engaged in the operation of "*an organized crime racketeering operation"*, according to FBI and Congressional sources, Defendants felt insulated, arrogant and above the law. Defendants undertook extreme attacks against Plaintiff because their "Frat Boy" elitist ego's were bruised and they thought they were "*untouchable*". Defendants did not believe that any Elliot Ness-class agents still existed at the FBI. They were wrong. Defendants staged the following attacks on Plaintiff as described in the text of this report: *"While most people may think that "hit-jobs" are the realm of Hollywood movie plots, these kinds of corporate assassination attempts do take place daily in big business and politics. At the request of the U.S. Government, Plaintiff developed and patented an energy technology that affected trillions of dollars of oil company and technology billionaire insider profits. They didn't realize this at the time. Let me make this point clearly: The control of Trillions of dollars of energy industry profits were being fought over by two groups and the Government plunked Plaintiff down in the middle of that war. Plaintiff had no affiliation with either group. They thought they were just accepting a challenge to help their nation and were not aware that Defendants had infected the entire process with crony corruption insider schemes.*

Plaintiff won commendation from the U.S. Congress in the Iraq War Bill. They won federal patents. They won a Congressional grant. They won a huge number of letters of acclaim and they won the wrath of a handful of insane Silicon Valley billionaires who could not compete with Plaintiff technology. Defendants chose to "...CHEAT RATHER THAN COMPETE!"

The attacks were carried out by Marin County and California State employees and U.S. Government officials who had received stock, perks, and other quid-pro-quo payment from these billionaires.

Department of Energy Executives and their campaign billionaire handlers engaged in these attacks in order to control the solar and "green car" markets in violation of anti-trust laws. The billionaires did not care about "green" issues, they only cared about green cash.

Federal and state employees ran retribution campaigns against applicants who competed with inside deals they had set up to line their own pockets at taxpayer expense. These corrupt politicians thought they could take over a promised "six trillion dollar "Cleantech" industry that was being created to exploit new insider exploitation opportunities around global warming and Middle East disruption. After an epic number of Solyndra-esque failures, all owned by the Department of Energy Executives and their campaign financiers, the scheme fell apart. The non crony applicants suffered the worst fates. As CBS News reporter Cheryl Atkisson has reported, the willingness to engage in media "hitjobs" was only exceeded by the audacity with which Department of Energy officials employed such tactics.

Now, in a number of notorious trials and email leaks, including the Hulk Hogan lawsuit and the DNC and Panama Papers leaks, the public has gotten to see the depths to which public officials are willing to stoop to cheat rather than compete in the open market.

Department of Energy employees and State of California employees engaged in the following documented attacks against applicants who were competing with their billionaire backers personal stock holdings. Plaintiff and the other applicants including Bright Automotive, Aptera, ZAP and many more, suffered these attacks:

- Social Security, SSI, SDI, Disability and other earned benefits were stone-walled. Applications were "lost". Files in the application process "disappeared". Lois Lerner hard drive "incidents" took place.

- Defendants had lawyers employed by Defendants contact Plaintiff and offer to "help" Plaintiff when, in fact, those lawyers worked for Defendants and were sent in as moles to try to delay the filing of a case in order to try to run out the time bar.

- State and federal employees played an endless game of Catch-22 by arbitrarily determining that deadlines had passed that they, the government officials, had stonewalled and obfuscated applications for, in order to force these deadlines that they set, to appear to be missed.

- Some applicants found themselves strangely poisoned, not unlike the Alexander Litvenko and Rodgers cases. Heavy metals and toxic materials were found right after their work with the Department of Energy weapons and energy facilities. Many wonder if these "targets" were intentionally exposed to toxins in retribution for their testimony. The federal MSDS documents clearly show that a number of these people were exposed to deadly compounds and radiations without being provided with proper HazMat suits which DOE officials knew were required.

- Applicants employers were called, and faxed, and ordered to fire applicants from their places of employment, in the middle of the day, with no notice, as a retribution tactic.

- Applicants HR and employment records, on recruiting and hiring databases, were embedded with negative keywords in order to prevent them from gaining future employment.

- One Gary D. Conley and one Rajeev Motwani, both whistle-blowers in this matter, turned up dead under strange circumstances. They are not alone in a series of bizarre deaths related to the DOE.

- Disability and VA complaint hearings and benefits were frozen, delayed, denied or subjected to lost records and "missing hard drives" as in the Lois Lerner case.

- Paypal and other on-line payments for on-line sales were delayed, hidden, or re-directed in order to terminate income potential for applicants who competed with DOE interests and holdings.

- DNS redirection, website spoofing which sent applicants websites to dead ends and other Internet activity manipulations were conducted.

- Campaign finance dirty tricks contractors IN-Q-Tel, Think Progress, Media Matters, tabloid Media, Syd Blumenthal, etc., were hired by DOE Executives and their campaign financiers to attack applicants who competed with DOE executives stocks and personal assets.

- Covert DOE partner: Google, transfered large sums of cash to dirty tricks contractors and then manually locked the media portion of the attacks into the top lines of the top pages of all Google searches globally, for years, with hidden embedded codes in the links and web-pages which multiplied the attacks on applicants by many magnitudes.

- Honeytraps and moles from persons employed by Defendants or living on, or with, Defendants were employed by the attackers. In this tactic, people who covertly worked for the attackers were employed to approach the "target" and offer business or sexual services in order to spy on and misdirect the subject.

- Mortgage and rental applications had red flags added to them in databases to prevent the targets from getting homes or apartments.

- McCarthy-Era "Black-lists" were created and employed against applicants who competed with DOE executives and their campaign financiers to prevent them from funding and future employment. The Silicon Valley Cartel (AKA the "PayPal Mafia" or the "Silicon Valley Mafia") placed Plaintiff on their "Black-List".

- Targets were very carefully placed in a position of not being able to get jobs, unemployment benefits, disability benefits or acquire any possible sources of income. The retribution tactics were audacious, overt..and quite illegal.

While law enforcement, regulators and journalists are now clamping down on each and every one of the attackers, one-by-one, the process is slow. The victims have been forced to turn to the filing of lawsuits in order to seek justice. The Mississippi Attorney General's office, who is prosecuting Cartel Member Google, advised Plaintiff to pursue their case in civil court while the Post Election FBI expands its resources."

While Defendants have sought to mock Plaintiff exposure of Defendants organized crime operation by denigrating Plaintiff data as "Conspiracy Theory", the articles located at:

1.) http://www.zerohedge.com/news/2015-02-23/1967-he-cia-created-phrase-conspiracy-theorists-and-ways-attack-anyone-who-challenge

2.) http://www.infowars.com/33-conspiracy-theories-that-turned-out-to-be-true-what-every-person-should-know/

3.) How, After This Crazy Year, Is 'Conspiracy Theorist' Still Being Used As An Insult? http://www.newslogue.com/debate/152

...and thousands of other links prove that Defendants further attempts to malign Plaintiff over their conspiracy FACTS are ill advised.

On or about May 3, 2005, the Plaintiff received, in recognition by the Congress of the United States in its Iraq War Bill, a commendation and federal grant issued jointly by the Congress of the United States and the United States Department of Energy in the amount of approximately $2M including additional resources and access to federal resources, as and for the development of domestic energy technology designed to offset the anticipated failure of Western access to the Middle East. That energy storage technology was to be used in connection with the research and development of an electric car to be used by the Department of Defense and the American retail automotive market to create domestic jobs, enhance national security and provide a domestic energy solution derived entirely from domestic fuel sources. Plaintiff had been invited into the program by U.S. Senate and Agency officials with the request that Plaintiff "help their country in a time of need..".

Beginning in or about July of 2006, the Plaintiff was contacted by, various individuals representing venture capital officers and investors employed by, and/or with, the Defendants. These individuals were agents of the Defendant, Defendants, "RechargeIT" Project and Defendants partner, Tesla Motors. They also represented the Kleiner Perkins Group,[1] McKinsey Consulting, Deloitte Consulting, Khosla Ventures, In-Q-Tel and associated parties funded by and reporting to the Defendants, Alphabet and Defendants, and included Karim Faris, a Defendants "partner."[2].

These investors feigned interest in emerging technology designed and developed by the Plaintiff and requested further information from Plaintiff. These investors informed the Plaintiff that their interest was in purchasing the emerging technology from the Plaintiff, investing in the venture, or structuring a form of joint venture with him.

This was not the truth.

The truth was that the Plaintiff was contacted in efforts on behalf of the Defendants, so as to harvest confidential data and gather business intelligence and trade secrets for the purpose of copying the intellectual property and ideas of the Plaintiff and interdicting Plaintiff efforts, which

1

2

Defendants found to be competitive, in a superior manner, to Defendants business. The Defendants agents and investors were simply on fishing expeditions while operating under the guise of proffered investment potential when, indeed, the Defendants had a covert plan to *"Cheat rather than compete"*. Historical facts and public testimony have proven that Defendants had poor skills at innovation and invention and that Defendants regularly chose to steal technologies, from multiple parties, on an ongoing basis, rather than invent their own technologies. A simple search, by any one, on the other top non-Defendants search engines for the phrase: *"Defendants steals ideas"* brings up a remarkable set of documentation of an ongoing pattern of theft by Defendants. Plaintiff has cooperated with federal investigators and journalists who are also investigating Defendants and who have legally shared some of the research, contained herein, with Plaintiff.

In or about August 21 of 2009, just as the Plaintiff was informed they were about to be awarded federal funding in amount over $50 million, the Plaintiff fuel cell and electric vehicle project was suddenly defunded and the same funds re-allocated to the Defendants, and to their various related entities, shell companies and projects. In other words, federal investigators state that Defendants bribed public officials to take Plaintiff money away from Plaintiff and give it Defendants using illegal manipulations of State and Federal taxpayer funded Treasury accounts. Defendants then manipulated those funds in stock market pump-and-dump schemes, off-shore tax evasion and tax write-off schemes which U.S. Treasury investigators called "unjust rewards at the expense of the taxpayer and the law.."

In or about August of 2009, just as the Plaintiff was informed they were about to be awarded the first $60 million federal funding for their energy storage technology and vehicle factory, this project was similarly defunded and the same funds re-allocated to the Defendants, and to their various related entities, shell companies and projects.

These funds, were ear-marked to be used by Defendants in a scheme designed for mining and exploiting non-domestic energy resources, (which eventually created a threat to U.S. domestic security by destabilizing other nations) via investment bank stock market mining commodities manipulations Defendants had arranged with their investment bankers, including Goldman Sachs. Until 2016, Plaintiff was not aware that Defendants had placed their friends, employees and business associates in charge of the public agencies responsible for distributing these taxpayer funds. Indeed, the facts on public record and in breaking investigations and investigative journalism reports now prove that Defendants bought public policy influence with cash and internet services, much of that influence buying now found to have not been legally reported. The Defendants had their agents in California State and U.S. Federal offices distribute those funds to themselves while cutting out and sabotaging most all competing applicants.

In or about September 20, 2009, the Plaintiff, was contacted by the Government Accountability Office of the United States with a request that they participate in an investigation being conducted by that entity into the business practices of the Defendants, and their associates, pursuant to anti-trust allegations and allegations of corruption.

In or about January 15, 2010, the Plaintiff, did, in fact, provide live testimony to, and receive information from, the Government Accountability Office of the United States, the Department of Justice, Robert Gibbs (who immediately thereafter quit his job at The White House) and their staff at the White House Press Office, the Washington Post White House Correspondent and other investigators.

The testimony provided by the Plaintiff, was, in fact, truthful and did, in fact, tend to support the veracity of the anti-trust allegations under investigation by the Government Accountability Office and other federal and EU agencies.[3]

3

In or about June, 2010 and January, 2015 the Defendants, Alphabet and Defendants, exchanged funds with tabloid publications. As a result, those tabloid publications coincidentally published the only two articles and the only custom animated attack film including false, defamatory, misleading and manufactured information belittling the Plaintiff, attacking them and discrediting their reputation as an inventor, project developer and project director.

In or about January 20, 2011, the Plaintiff, contacted Defendants, ith written requests that it delete the false, defamatory, misleading and manufactured information belittling the Plaintiff, attacking them and discrediting their reputation as an inventor, project developer and project director from its search engine servers.

The Plaintiff had numerous lawyers, specialists and others contacted Defendants requesting a cessation of Defendants harassment and internet manipulation and removal of the rigged attack links and hidden internet codes within the links on Defendants server architecture.

At all times pertinent, the Plaintiff, including Defendants staff members, Matt Cutts, Forest Timothy Hayes, Defendants legal staff and others refused to assist and commonly replied: *"...just sue us..", "...get a subpoena..."*, etc., even though the Plaintiff, and the Plaintiff representatives, provided the Defendants with extensive volumes of third-party proof clearly demonstrating that not a single statement in the attack links promoted by google was accurate or even remotely true.

In, or about, February 20, 2011, YouTube, published a custom produced and targeted attack video that also included false, defamatory, misleading and manufactured information

belittling the Plaintiff, and discrediting their reputation as an inventor, project developer and project director. The video is believed to have been produced by Defendants as part of their anti-trust attack program against Plaintiff.

In or about February 25, 2011 the Plaintiff contacted the Defendants, YouTube and Defendants, with many written requests that they delete the false, defamatory, misleading and manufactured information belittling the Plaintiff, attacking them and discrediting their reputation as an inventor, project developer and project director from its website. [*See*, Sample responses of the Defendants Defendants and YouTube, attached as Exhibits and incorporated herein by reference.]

All of the written demands of the Plaintiff was to no avail and none of the Defendants, agreed to edit, delete, retract or modify any of the false, defamatory, misleading and manufactured information belittling the Plaintiff, attacking them and discrediting their reputation as an inventor, product developer and project director from their websites and digital internet and media platforms and architecture.

The Plaintiff, whose multiple businesses ventures had already suffered significant damage as the result of the online attacks of the Defendants, contacted renowned experts, and especially Search Engine Optimization and forensic internet technology (IT) experts, to clear and clean the internet of the false, defamatory, misleading and manufactured information belittling the Plaintiff, attacking them and discrediting their reputation as an inventor, product developer and project director from their websites.

None of the technology experts hired by the Plaintiff, at substantial expense, were successful in their attempts to clear, manage or even modify the false, defamatory, misleading and manufactured information belittling the Plaintiff, attacking him and discrediting their reputation as an inventor, product developer and project director which only Defendants, the controlling entity of the internet, refused to remove. In fact, those experts were able to even more deeply confirm, via technical forensic internet analysis and criminology technology examination techniques that Defendants was rigging internet search results for its own purposes and anti-trust goals.

All efforts, including efforts to suppress or de-rank the results of a name search for “Plaintiff” failed, and even though tests on other brands and names, for other unrelated parties did achieve balance, the SEO and IT tests clearly proved that Defendants was consciously, manually, maliciously and intentionally rigging its search engine and adjacent results in order to “mood manipulate” an attack on Plaintiff.

In fact, the experts and all of them, instead, informed the Plaintiff, that, not only had Defendants locked the false, defamatory, misleading and manufactured information belittling the Plaintiff, attacking them and discrediting their reputation as an inventor, project developer and project director into its search engine so that the information could never be cleared, managed or even modified, Defendants had assigned the false, defamatory, misleading and manufactured information belittling the Plaintiff, attacking them and discrediting their reputation as an inventor, project developer and project director “PR8” algorithmic internet search engine coding embedded in the internet information-set programmed into Defendantsinternet architecture. [*See*, Information received from one of over 30 IT, forensic network investigators and forensic SEO test analysts, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto in the Exhibits.] Plaintiff even went to the effort of placing nearly a thousand forensic test servers around the globe in order to monitor and metricize the manipulations of search results of examples of the Plaintiff name in comparison to the manipulations for PR hype for Defendants financial partners, for example: the occurrence of the phrase ”Elon Musk”, Defendants business partner and beneficiary, over a five year period. The EU, China, Russia, and numerous research groups (ie: http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2015/08/how-google-could-rig-the-2016-election-121548 By Robert Epstein) have validated these forensic studies of Defendants architect-ed character assassination and partner hype system .

The "PR8" codes are hidden codes within the Defendants software and internet architecture which profess to state that a link is a "fact" or is an authoritative factual document in Defendantsopinion. By placing "PR8" codes in the defamatory links that Defendants was manipulating about Plaintiff, Defendants was seeking to tell the world that the links pointed to "Facts" and not "Opinions". Defendants embedded many covert codes in their architecture which marketing the material in the attack links and video as "facts" according to Defendants.

The "PR8" codes are a set of codes assigned and programmed into the internet, by the Defendants to matters it designates as dependable and true, thereby attributing primary status as the most significant and important link to be viewed by online researchers regarding the subject of their search.[4] Defendants was fully aware that all of the information in the attack articles against Plaintiff was false, Defendants promoted these attacks as vindictive vendetta-like retribution against Plaintiff.

At all times pertinent from January 1, 2006, to in or about November 20, 2015, Defendants maintained it had no subjective control or input into the rankings of links obtained by online researchers as the result of a search on its search engines and that its search engine algorithms and the functions of its media assets were entirely "arbitrary" according to the owners and founders of Defendants.

In or about April 15, 2015, The European Union Commission took direct aim at Defendants Inc., charging the Internet-search giant with skewing and rigging search engine results in order to damage those who competed with Defendants business and ideological interests.

In those proceedings, although Defendants continued to maintain that it has no subjective control or input into the rankings of links obtained by online researchers as the result of a search on its search engines and that its staff had no ability to reset, target, mood manipulate, arrange adjacent text or links, up-rank, down-rank or otherwise engage in human input which would change algorithm, search results, perceptions or subliminal perspectives of consumers, voters, or any other class of users of the world wide web, also known as The Internet, the court, in accord with evidence submitted, determined that Defendants, does in fact have and does in fact exercise, subjective control over the results of information revealed by searches on its search engine.[5]

---

[4] Defendants have a variety of such hidden codes and has various internal names for such codes besides, and in addition to, "PR8". Defendants has been proven to use these fact vs. fiction rankings to affect elections, competitors rankings, ie: removing the company: NEXTAG from competing with Defendants on-line; or removing political candidates from superior internet exposure and it is believed by investigators and journalists, that Defendants are being protected from criminal prosecution by public officials who Defendants have compensated with un-reported campaign funding.

[5] The EU case, and subsequent other cases, have demonstrated that Defendants sells such manipulations to large clients in order to target their enemies or competitors or raise those clients subliminal public impressions against competitors or competing political candidates. In fact, scientific study has shown that although Defendants claims to "update its search engine results and rankings, sometimes many times a day", the attack links and codes against Plaintiff has not moved from the top lines of the front page of Defendants for over FIVE YEARS. If Defendants were telling the truth, the links would have, at least, moved around a bit or disappeared entirely since hundreds of positive news about Plaintiff was on every other search engine EXCEPT Defendants. Many other lawsuits have now shown that Defendants locks attacks against its enemies and competitors in devastating locations on the Internet. The entire nations of China,

As a result of receiving this information, the Plaintiff became convinced of the strength and veracity of their original opinion that the Defendants, had, in fact posted the false, defamatory, misleading and manufactured information belittling the Plaintiff, attacking them and discrediting Plaintiff reputation as inventor, project developer and project designer had been intentionally designed, published, orchestrated and posted by them in retaliation to the true testimony provided by the Plaintiff, to the Government Office of Accountability of the United States in May of 2005, and to the Securities and Exchange Commission, The Federal Bureau of Investigation, The United States Senate Ethics Committee and other investigating parties, and had been disseminated maliciously and intentionally by them in an effort to do damage to their reputation and to their business prospects and to cause him severe and irremediable emotional distress.

In fact, the Plaintiff, has suffered significant and irremediable damage to their reputation and to their financial and business interests. As a natural result of this damage, as intended by the Defendants, tabloid, Defendants and Youtube, the Plaintiff has also suffered severe and irremediable emotional distress.

To this day, despite the age of the false, defamatory, misleading and manufactured information belittling the Plaintiff, attacking him and discrediting their reputation as an inventor, project developer and project director, in the event any online researcher searches for information regarding the Plaintiff, the same information appears at the top of any list of resulting links.

In addition, due to their control of all major internet database interfaces, Defendants have helped to load negative information about Plaintiff on every major HR and employment database that Plaintiff might be searched on, thus denying Plaintiff all reasonable rights to income around the globe by linking every internal job, hiring, recruiter, employment, consulting, contracting or other revenue engagement opportunity for Plaintiff back to false “red flag” or negative false background data which is designed to prevent Plaintiff from future income in retribution for Plaintiff assistance to federal investigators.[6]

It should be noted here that, in 2016, one of the companies Plaintiff was associated with, in cooperation with federal investigations, won a federal anti-corruption lawsuit against the U.S. Department of Energy in which a number of major public officials were forced to resign under corruption charges, federal laws and new legal precedents benefiting the public were created, and Defendants and its associates and related entities found culpable of corruption.

Russia, Spain and many more, along with the European Union have confirmed the existence and operation of Defendants“attack machine”.

[6] Major public figures and organizations, including the entire European Union, have also accused Defendants of similar internet manipulation by Defendants. The attacks, by Defendants, continue to this day. In 2016, the renowned Netflix series: “House of Cards” opened its sixth season with a carefully held script-surprise researched by the script factuality investigators for the production company of “House of Cards.” The surprise featured Defendants, fictionally named “PollyHop,” and described, in detail, each of the tactics that Defendants uses to attack individuals that Defendantsowners have competitive issues with. The Plaintiff maintains that each and every tactic included in the televised example were tactics actually used to attack the Plaintiff, his intellectual properties, his peers and his associates as threatening competitors.

.INTENTIONAL INTERFERENCE WITH CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS

The Plaintiff hereby incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through inclusive as though fully set forth herein.

On or about May 3, 2005, the Plaintiff, received, in recognition by the United States Congress in the Iraq War Bill, a Congressional commendation and grant issued by the United States Congress and the United States Department of Energy in the amount of over $2M plus additional access to resources as, and for, the development of a domestic energy fuel cell and energy storage technology to be used in connection with the research and development of an electric car to be used by the Department of Defense and the American retail automotive market in order to create domestic jobs, enhance national security and provide a domestic energy solution derived from entirely domestic fuel sources.

Defendants knew of the above described contractual relationship existing between the Plaintiff and COMPANY B and the United States Department of Energy, in that the grant was made public record and, at the request of representatives of the Venture Capital group of the Defendants, the Plaintiff believing that the request for information was as to providing additional funding for the project, did, in fact, submit complete information regarding the subject of the grant to Defendants agents upon their request. Many of the Defendants were living and working in Marin County at this time and were part of, or had controlling influence over Marin County decisions. They were also major financiers of Marin County politicians.

Defendants, who had, and have, personal, stock-ownership, revolving-door career and business relationships with executive decision-makers at the United States Department of Energy and other Federal and State officials, lobbied and service-compensated those executive decision-makers to cancel, interfere and otherwise disrupt the grant in favor of the Plaintiff, with the intention of terminating the funding in favor of the Plaintiff and COMPANY B and applying the information they pirated from the Plaintiff, for their own benefit as well as terminating the Plaintiff competing efforts, which third party industry analysts felt could obsolete Defendants products via superior technology.

Individuals approached Plaintiff offering to “help” the Plaintiff get their ventures funded or managed. Those individuals were later found to have been working for Kleiner Perkin's, the founding investor and current share-holder of Defendants. The Plaintiff discovered that those “helpful” individuals were helping to sabotage development efforts and pass intelligence to Defendants for its own use and applications.

Accordingly, Defendants was successful in its efforts and, in or about August of 2009, the grant and other funding programs in favor of the Plaintiff, was summarily canceled and re-directed to Defendants and their holdings.

Commencing in or about 2008, Defendants commenced to take credit for advancement in its own energy storage and internet media technology, as based on the information it had pirated from the Plaintiff.

The interference of Defendants, with the relationship of the Plaintiff, was intentional, continues to today, and constitutes an unfair business practice in violation of Business and Professions code section 17200.

As a proximate result of the conduct of the Defendants, and severance and termination of the grant to the Plaintiff, the Plaintiff has suffered damages including financial damage, damage to their reputation and loss of critical intellectual property.

The aforementioned acts of the Defendants, were willful, fraudulent, oppressive and malicious. The Plaintiff is therefore entitled to punitive damages.

.INTENTIONAL INTERFERENCE WITH PROSPECTIVE ECONOMIC ADVANTAGE

The Plaintiff hereby incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through this paragraph inclusive as though fully set forth herein.

Defendants became aware that the Plaintiff was intent on telling the truth about these facts.

In order to put a stop to the Plaintiff and in an effort to discredit Plaintiff, divest Plaintiff of contacts in the industry and also of financial backing, Defendants enlisted the services of the Defendants, media attacker hit job services. Defendants own wide array of media and branding manipulation tools which are service offerings of Defendants.

In 2011, Defendants published a contrived “hatchet job” article describing the Plaintiff as a scam artist and a scammers.

In 2011, Defendants YouTube posted a video which depicted the Plaintiff as a cartoon character who attempts to engage in unethical behavior. The video employs Plaintiff personal name and personal information.

Defendants have paid tens of millions of dollars to tabloid Media and has a business and political relationship with tabloid Media according to financial filings, other lawsuit evidence, federal investigators and ex-employees.

Also as intended by Defendants, this damage, especially because the false representations become immediately apparent to anyone conducting an internet search for the “Plaintiff,” have caused investors to shy away from the Plaintiff, causing the Plaintiff further difficulty in obtaining funding from in, or about, 2011 to the present time.

Defendants has also placed on human resources and and job hiring databases negative and damaging red flags about the Plaintiff, relative to the tabloid and Defendants attacks. These postings were intended by Defendants to prevent the Plaintiff, not only from working for himself, but also from working for other, noteworthy individuals of good repute.

Additionally, Defendants representatives sent a copy of the tabloid attack article to an employer of the Plaintiff via their human resources office and asked this employer, “You don't want him working for you with this kind of article out there, do you?” This resulted in the Plaintiff immediate termination because of that article. Plaintiff has recovered documents between Defendants showing the preplanned and premeditated deployment of this attack. As documented in one of the Hulk Hogan cases against Defendants associates: *“As evidence, the lawsuit points to a tabloid article by its founder, Nick Denton, that predicted Mr. Bollea’s “real secret” would be revealed — it was posted soon before The Enquirer report — and a 14-minute gap between the publication of the article and a tabloid editor, Albert J. Daulerio, tweeting about it. “Based upon the timing and content of Daulerio’s tweet, Daulerio was aware, in advance, of The Enquirer’s plans to publish the court-protected confidential transcript,” the lawsuit argues...”* Plaintiff in this case also have the same form of evidence from the same parties.

As a proximate result of the conduct of the Defendants, the Plaintiff and COMPANY B have suffered severe financial damage and, accordingly, loss of their good will and reputation.

Plaintiff is informed by investigators and Defendants' own former staff that Defendants planned an effort to “take him down” in retribution for effectively competing with Defendants and for co-operating with law enforcement and regulatory investigations of Defendants.

The aforementioned acts of the Defendants were willful, fraudulent, oppressive and malicious. The Plaintiff is therefore entitled to punitive damages.

.CYBER-STALKING

The Plaintiff hereby incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through this paragraph inclusive as though fully set forth herein.

By hiring and/or making an arrangement with associated tabloids to publish an article replete with false and misleading statements disparaging the Plaintiff, in the guise of publishing opinion, the Defendants Defendants intended to harass the Plaintiff and did in fact harass the Plaintiff.

By refusing to remove the offending publication and, in fact, assigning it a value associated with "truth", "factuality" and a position in its web browser that came up and still comes up the first and most prominent link pursuant to any search for the Plaintiff and maintaining this link for the past 5 years as globally marketed, public, published, permanent, un-editable and unmovable, Defendants intended, and continues to intend to harass the Plaintiff.

By doing the things described in paragraphs above, Defendants, did and do continue to intend to cause the Plaintiff substantial emotional distress.

The Plaintiff, commencing in or about their discovery of the post and the link, has experienced and continues to experience substantial emotional distress.

Defendants engaged in the pattern of conduct described above with the intent to place the Plaintiff in reasonable fear for their safety or in reckless disregard for the safety of the Plaintiff.

The Plaintiff admits here that Plaintiff knew of a number of Bay Area technologists including Gary D. Conley, Rajeev Motwani who also had strange run-ins with Defendants and who subsequently suffered suspicious deaths, per investigators, (See attached list of ***deaths of connected whistleblowers*** in exhibits) and media who continue, at the request of the families and friends of those individuals, and others, to examine those cases. This has caused concern and stress for Plaintiff. While Defendants did not necessarily have the intent to do physical harm to the Plaintiff, by arranging for publication of the subject article, ensuring the subject article could not be moved or altered and would be certain to appear first and permanently as the result of any search for the Plaintiff, intended to do significant damage to Plaintiff financial interests in retaliation for their testimony at the proceedings described above and also intended to ensure the Plaintiff would have no future as a competitor in the industry of technology populated by the Plaintiff and by the Defendants.

Defendants chose to cheat rather than compete and decided, as a whole to plan, operate and deploy "hit jobs", defamation attacks, media hatchet jobs, character assassinations, venture capitol black-lists, technology hiring no-poaching blacklists, public officials influence buying and other illicit tactics against Plaintiff, public officials, journalists, ex-employees, political candidates and others, as retribution, vengeance and vendetta tactics.

The results of any search for the Plaintiff on Defendants search engine are attached hereto in the Exhibits and incorporated herein by reference. These same results have remained consistently in place and unmovable and un-editable since April 3, 2011.

In 2011, and through 2015, the Plaintiff did contact Defendants with written requests to remove the offending content. [*See*, Correspondence, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibits and incorporated herein by reference.] In response, Defendants consistently stated it has no control over the results of any search on its search engine or the operation of its technology or its algorithm and, accordingly, refused to remove the results or cease the harassment.

Defendants continues to refuse to allow any member of the public to search for the Plaintiff, without locating results that falsely identify the Plaintiff in a negative and damaging narrative contrived for

the sole intended purpose of Plaintiff financial and social destruction.

As so aptly stated by Hulk Hogan's lawyers in their own suit against associates of the Defendants: The Defendants *"chose to play God."*

.FRAUD

The Plaintiff hereby incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through this paragraph inclusive as though fully set forth herein.

As above, Marin Housing asserted to Plaintiff that if he did certain things and met certain criteria he would receive his HUD Home Ownership Voucher. Plaintiff more than complied, exceeded the criteria waited longer than any other Applicant and was already owed the voucher from government damages caused by his work with the government.

The Defendant made this statement with the intent to induce the Plaintiff to rely on it.

The Plaintiff continued to rely on the statement and to believe that the Defendant was telling the truth but, in fact, later discovered that Defendants were lying to him.

On or about early 2012, defendants made the following representation(s) to the Plaintiff: They stated that Defendants would supply Plaintiff with his HUD voucher as "soon as he met he criteria".

The representations made by the defendant were in fact false. The true facts are that Defendants owners and executives can freely, consciously and manually rig, manipulate, modify, mood emphasize, re-rank, hide, adjust psychological adjacency perceptions of above-and-below text, delete or otherwise affect the local, regional vouchers on a favors basis.

When the defendant made these representations, he/she/it knew them to be false and made these representations with the intention to deceive and defraud the Plaintiff and to induce the Plaintiff to act in reliance on these representations in the manner hereafter alleged, or with the expectation that the Plaintiff would so act.

The Plaintiff, at the time these representations were made by the defendant and at the time the Plaintiff took the actions herein alleged, was ignorant of the falsity of the defendant's representations and believed them to be true. In reliance on these representations, the Plaintiff was induced to and did delay their attempts to have Defendants cease their abuse of Plaintiff by technical means. Had the Plaintiff known the actual facts, he/she would not have taken such action. The Plaintiff reliance on the defendant's representations was justified because Defendants stated that they represented government interests and because FTC and SEC investigation manipulations, by Defendants, had not yet been fully exposed in the news media.

As a proximate result of the fraudulent conduct of the defendant(s) as herein alleged, the Plaintiff was induced to expend hundreds of hours of their/her time and energy in an attempt to derive a profit from their ventures which were covertly under attack by defendant(s) but has received no profit or other compensation for their/her time and energy], by reason of which the Plaintiff has been damaged in the sum of at least two billion dollars based on the minimum reported amounts by which Defendants profited at Plaintiff expense and the paths of direction which Plaintiff was steered to by Defendants fraudulent misrepresentations.

The aforementioned conduct of the defendant(s) was an intentional misrepresentation, deceit, or concealment of a material fact known to the defendant(s) with the intention on the part of the defendant(s) of thereby depriving the Plaintiff of property or legal rights or otherwise causing injury, and was

despicable conduct that subjected the Plaintiff to a cruel and unjust hardship in conscious disregard of the Plaintiff rights, so as to justify an award of exemplary and punitive damages.

.INVASION OF PRIVACY

The Plaintiff hereby incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through this paragraph inclusive as though fully set forth herein.

The Defendant, first by arranging for and allowing/posting the attack emails and articles and by writing and planning harm to Plaintiff in their agency and personal emails, then by coding a link to the article that permanently placed the article at the top of any search results for the Plaintiff, Company A, has invaded the inalienable privacy rights of the Plaintiff, Company A as protected by Article I section 1 of the Constitution of the State of California and violated the human right known as “the right to be forgotten”, now overtly supported in other nations.

The intrusion commenced in or about April of 2011 and continues to this day, is significant and remains unjustified by any legitimate countervailing interest of the Defendant.

For five years, when any member of the public searches on the Defendant search engine holdings, for the Plaintiff, Company A, the first link to pop up refers to the Plaintiff, Company A as a horrible person via Defendants severs and postings which are locked in position on the internet. A situation which could only possibly occur if Defendants and their partner Google were maliciously rigging the internet results and processes.

The pervasiveness and longevity of this link plus its placement at the very top of any search result has resulted in a significant, albeit intentional interference with the right of the Plaintiff Company A to engage in and conduct personal and business activities, to enjoy and defend life and liberty, acquiring possessing and protecting property and pursuing and obtaining safety, happiness and privacy.

The facts disclosed about Plaintiff was and remain false. Even in the event the tabloid article might have at one time garnered protection by the First Amendment as opinion regarding a public controversy and about a semi-public figure, no further controversy exists or even could.

Five years have passed and, despite the lack of current content of controversy, the Plaintiff, Company A remains saddled with a personal, permanent and immovable reference on the internet that characterizes him as scam artist in the world of internet technology.

The Plaintiff Company A has done the best he could in these years to move on with new projects and new investors. He has made every effort to start anew and has been precluded from doing so by the tabloid article.

Maintenance of the original posting of April 2011 for five years is offensive and objectionable to the Plaintiff Company A and certainly would be to a reasonable person of ordinary sensibilities in that the original posting is false and defamatory and was intentionally arranged for by Defendant so as to do significant damage to the personal and professional reputation of the Plaintiff, Company A, because it has accomplished this damage, because there is no manner other than at the Defendant Defendants hand by which the link can be altered or removed or the search results edited or limited and because there exists no reason that the Plaintiff Company A should not be allowed to enjoy a right to move on with is life independent of a label that had no basis in truth and reality in the first place.

The facts regarding the character of the Plaintiff, Company A, included in the tabloid article are certainly no longer of any legitimate public concern nor are they newsworthy nor are they tied to any current controversy or dialogue.

IN FACT, THE Plaintiff, can truly no longer be considered a public figure or even a semi-public figure as the attacks have fairly successfully put him out of business and kept him out of business.

As a proximate result of the above disclosure, Plaintiff lost investors, contracts, was scorned and abandoned by their/her friends and family, exposed to contempt and ridicule, and suffered loss of reputation and standing in the community, all of which caused them/him/her humiliation, embarrassment, hurt feelings, mental anguish, and suffering], all to their/her general damage in an amount according to proof.

As a further proximate result of the above-mentioned disclosure, Plaintiff suffered special damages to the brand, financing, reputation and market timeframe opportunities for their/her business, in that they lost funding, market share, federal contracts and other income, to their special damage in an amount according to proof. Defendants placed material which could harm Plaintiff on an easily hackable county and personal computer system in plain view of even a 14 year old hacker in Marin City.

In making the disclosure described above, defendant was guilty of oppression, fraud, or malice, in that defendant made the disclosure with (the intent to vex, injure, or annoy Plaintiff *or* a willful and conscious disregard of Plaintiff rights. Plaintiff therefore also seeks an award of punitive damages.

Defendant has threatened to continue disclosing the above information. Unless and until enjoined and restrained by order of this court, defendant's continued publication will cause Plaintiff great and irreparable injury in that Plaintiff will suffer continued humiliation, embarrassment, hurt feelings, and mental anguish. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law for the injuries being suffered in that a judgment for monetary damages will not end the invasion of Plaintiff privacy.

.UNFAIR COMPETITION AND CLASS ACTION

The Plaintiff hereby incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through this paragraph inclusive as though fully set forth herein.

The Plaintiff brings this action on their own behalf and on behalf of all persons similarly situated. The class that the Plaintiff Company A represents is composed of all persons who, at any time since the date four years before the filing of this complaint, sought to have offensive, irrelevant and outdated material posted to the internet and available through a search on the Defendant search engine corrected, removed or re-ranked and have been informed by the Defendant that the Defendant does not have the ability to do so and that Defendants falsely states this assertion in Defendants published policy.

The persons in the class are so numerous, an estimated 39% of the population of the United States of America, that the joinder of all such persons is impracticable and that the disposition of their claims in a class action is a benefit to the parties and to the court.

There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact involved affecting the parties to be represented in that each member of the class is or has been in the same factual circumstances, hereinafter alleged, as the Plaintiff . Proof of a common or single state of facts will establish the right of each member of the class to recover. The claims of the Plaintiff is typical of those of the class and the Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the class.

There is no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy other than by maintenance of this class action because the Plaintiff and his peers who ave dealt with Marin Housing, are informed and believe that each class member is entitled to restitution of a relatively small amount of money, amounting at most to $5,000.00 each, making it economically infeasible to pursue remedies other than a class action. Consequently, there would be a failure of justice but for the maintenance of the present class action.

The Defendant is a business incorporated in the State of California and at all times herein mentioned and its ancillary commercial enterprises from its headquarters in San Rafael, California.

The position of the Defendant is illegal as it infringes on the rights of individuals as protected by the Constitution of the State of California which protects the rights and freedoms of individuals to: "All people are by nature free and independent and have inalienable rights. Among these are enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and pursuing and obtaining safety, happiness, and privacy." per the State Constitution.

The position of the Defendant is unfair as it deprives individuals of rights protected by the Constitution of the United States which protects the rights and freedoms of individuals to: "All people are by nature free and independent and have inalienable rights. Among these are enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and pursuing and obtaining safety, happiness, and privacy."

The position of the Defendant, is false because, as a processor of personal information and a controller of that information, the Defendant also possesses the technical, logistical and government official manipulation power and ability to delete, re-rank and mood manipulate any information obtained as the result of a search on its offices.

As a direct, proximate, and foreseeable result of the Defendant's wrongful conduct, as alleged above, the Plaintiff and millions of others other members of the Plaintiff class, who are unknown to the Plaintiff but can be identified through inspection of the Defendant's records reflecting requests for removal it has already received and by other means, have been subjected to unlawful and unwanted publication of in accurate, inadequate, irrelevant, false, excessive, malicious and defamatory internet postings about themselves and as a result of the Defendant's present policies, have thereby been deprived of their right to privacy and the right to control information published about them as this control now apparently is vested in the Defendant and not in and of themselves.

The Defendant, has failed and refused to accede to the Plaintiff's request for provision of their HUD Home Ownership Document and for any de-ranking or separation of the applications from a search for their name. The Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the Defendant has likewise failed and refused, and in the future will fail and refuse, to accede to the requests of other individuals requests for issuance of their voucher.

The Defendant's acts hereinabove alleged are acts of unfair competition within the meaning of Business and Professions Code Section 17203. The Plaintiff is informed and believes that the Defendant will continue to do those acts unless the court orders the Defendant to cease and desist.

The Plaintiff has incurred and, during the pendency of this action, will incur expenses for attorney's fees and costs herein. Such attorney's fees and costs are necessary for the prosecution of this action and will result in a benefit to each of the members of the class. The sum of $500,000.00 is a reasonable amount for attorney's fees herein.

.THEFT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

The Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through this paragraph inclusive as though fully set forth herein.

Plaintiff venture fund has founded, funded and launched multiple business ventures based on novel new technology inventions. In the majority of the cases, Defendants engaged in industrial espionage of Plaintiff new ventures, including using agents to solicit Plaintiff for information under the guise of "possibly investing", and then copied and exploited those ventures for substantial profit while running attacks

on Plaintiff venture in order to blockade any attempt at competition. Defendants engaged in systematic venture capitol black-listing, funding cartels, the hiring of attack-media hatchet job bloggers, internet search rigging and numerous other dirty tricks campaigns in order to steal technology and business ideas. SEC, U.S. Senate Investigators, broadcast news journalists, other federal investigators and records from other lawsuits have provided testimony that Defendants have paid tabloid Media *"tens of millions of dollars"* for *"special services"*. Of millions of publications in the world, only tabloid Media engaged in the media attacks against Plaintiff and only the Defendants derived the core benefits of those attacks.

.

RETALIATION, REPRISAL, VENDETTA ATTACKS

Defandants did have their agents, investors, executives and staff contact Plaintiff under the guise of "considering an investment" in order to induce Plaintiff to disclose trade secrets under false promises of confidentiality

CBS News staff, including Bob Simon of 60 Minutes CBS News, did inform Creditors that Defendants did attack, interfere with the business of, defraud, cyber-stalk and engage in RICO statute violations of Creditors as exemplified in the FBI Solyndra, Cleantech and Obama Administration campaign financing quid-pro-quo investigations since 2007.

Federal corruption hearings and court trials in Washington DC have proven these facts and ruled that Creditors were in fact subjected to reprisal, vendetta and retribution actions financed and directed in part by Defendants.

House Ethics investigators and San Jose Mercury News investigators have provided additional evidence and verifying data.

Tens of billions of dollars of profits were acquired by Defendants while infringing Plaintiff technologies, and Defendants sought to damage and delay Plaintiff ability to seek recovery.

Defendants maliciously harmed revenue stream of Plaintiff in order to prevent or delay legal action by Plaintiff in order to seek to expire statute of limitations. Causes of action continue to this day and Plaintiff only recently discovered much of the inside information via law enforcement and federal investigators.

Defendants' founders personally solicited and copied CEO business ventures and technologies and wanted to harm Plaintiff' brand in order to mitigate discovery of that fact.

Plaintiff testified for federal law enforcement against Defendants and Defendants sought to engage in retribution for Plaintiff' testimony. In previous related cases, Plaintiff won historical national legal precedents and overcame multi-million dollar federal litigation counter-measures by Defendants' and their associates. Plaintiff is the first known Americans to receive a federal court confirmation that they were victimized by *"a federal program infected with corruption and cronyism"*. Defendants were the *"crony's"* referred to by the U.S. Courts. The U.S. Federal Court has now issued one of, if not the, first rulings in U.S. Federal Court Record stating that Plaintiff was in fact attacked by corrupt federal employees.

.Damage Awards Demanded

- A mandated award of the $XXX,XXX,XXX.00 dollars in damages and delays
- A HUD Home Ownership Housing Voucher equal to, or exceeding the current HUD rental voucher
- Loss of funds since the start of operations of Defendants
- Punitive damages
- Title and ownership to the home of Gale Suits
- Other damages in excess of $XXX,XXX,XXX.00

Signed and Confirmed:

Date:

_____

PROOF OF SERVICE

CASE COVER SHEET