



I-VIEW-IT HOLDINGS, INC.
I-VIEW-IT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

Eliot I. Bernstein
Founder & Inventor
Direct Dial: (561) 245-8588
2753 N.W. 34th Street
Boca Raton, Florida 33434

Friday, March 06, 2009

D. Bruce Sewell, Esq.
Senior Vice President - General Counsel
Intel Corporation

Re: Follow Up of March 3, 2009 Phone Discussion; Responsible Business Judgments; Financial Accounting Standards Board "FASB" Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 5 Accounting for Contingencies - Reporting Requirements; Limited Time Offer

Dear D. Bruce Sewell, Esq.:

As a follow up from our telephone discussion on Tuesday, March 5, 2009, I wish to make several observations as part of this 24-hour limited time offer to enter sound and responsible business negotiations on behalf of the Intel Corporation. As you will note further herein, there is definite and certain action to be taken at the conclusion of the 24-hour limited time offer herein with such 24-hour period commencing upon 3:00pm EST on Friday, March 06, 2009 and ending 3:00 pm EST on Monday, March 09, 2009. Thus, you may wish to pay particular attention herein.

As you will see, it is respectfully requested and suggested that you, Mr. Sewell, Senior Vice President - General Counsel of the Intel Corporation, will be making a sound and proper business decision herein by taking this matter and limited time offer to negotiate to your Chairman and CEO within 24-hours herein. Please read below to see the definite and certain action that I will be taking in the event you do not properly bring this matter to the Chairman and CEO within 24 hours for their response which will be due 48-hours after the ending of such 24-hour period.

As the original Owner and Inventor of backbone "technologies" and a business person myself, I was alarmed and shocked at your hostile resistance to commence sound, responsible business discussions in this matter and further alarmed at the hostile reaction you exhibited when I suggested speaking with the Chairman and the CEO of Intel Corporation in this matter.

Private & Confidential Iviewit Technologies, Inc. and Eliot Ivan Bernstein

Re: Follow Up of March 3, 2009 Phone Discussion; Responsible Business Judgments; Financial Accounting Standards Board "FASB" Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 5 Accounting for Contingencies - Reporting Requirements; Limited Time Offer

I respectfully suggest that you, Mr. D. Bruce Sewell, Esq., have admitted to failing and may be presently and currently failing in a variety of legal and ethical obligations under law and codes of conduct and as it relates to Intel and the rights of the shareholders and others in Intel and other interested parties who may incur liabilities. This failure centers around your admission that a "contingent" liability has not been booked and will not be booked on the records of Intel as it relates to my claims as Original Owner and Inventor of backbone technologies as set out further herein.

Remarkably, however, this admission by you Mr. Sewell during this phone discussion referenced above was made despite your further admission during the same conversation that you are personally familiar with our contracts that were signed with Real 3D, Inc. that were transferred with your acquisition of Real 3D and as stated by Tim Connolly when he transferred from Real 3D to Intel, our technologies and relations were now being handled by Lawrence S. Palley, Director of Business Development and further assuring by Palley with former Pres. Of Iviewit Brian G. Utley and others, that Iviewit's NDA's, Strategic Alliances and Licensing Agreements both signed and in draft with both Real 3D and Iviewit's legal counsel were going to be honored and furthered with Intel's use of the scaling imaging and video technologies they had already begun using. As Intel was also a 10% owner of Real 3D and engineers from Intel and Lockheed Martin were brought into Real 3D to evaluate the technologies that led to the agreements, we presume that Intel has had direct and binding knowledge since that original point of knowledge of possible and future litigation of the patents that you signed NDA's to review, on or about 1999 and certainly when Mr. Palley began oversight of the Iviewit patent and intellectual property agreements inherited by Intel wholly.

Because it is possible that your failures in this matter are in part premised upon an improper interpretation of applicable FASB accounting rules, I have enclosed relevant sections of these rules for your further review:

Financial Accounting Standards Board Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 5 Accounting for Contingencies rules for booking a "contingent" liability in this matter:

For the purpose of this Statement, a contingency is defined as an existing condition, situation, or set of circumstances involving uncertainty as to possible gain (hereinafter a "gain contingency") or loss (hereinafter a "loss contingency") to an enterprise that will ultimately be resolved when one or more future events occur or fail to occur. Resolution of the uncertainty may confirm the acquisition of an asset or the reduction of a liability or the loss or impairment of an asset or the incurrence of a liability.

Re: Follow Up of March 3, 2009 Phone Discussion; Responsible Business Judgments; Financial Accounting Standards Board "FASB" Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 5 Accounting for Contingencies - Reporting Requirements; Limited Time Offer

4. Examples of loss contingencies include:

e. Pending or threatened litigation.

f. Actual or possible claims and assessments.

Litigation, Claims, and Assessments

The following factors, among others, must be considered in determining whether accrual and/or disclosure is required with respect to pending or threatened litigation and actual or possible claims and assessments:

a. The period in which the underlying cause (i.e., the cause for action) of the pending or threatened litigation or of the actual or possible claim or assessment occurred.

b. The degree of probability of an unfavorable outcome.

c. The ability to make a reasonable estimate of the amount of loss.

Please take note of the following FASB language:

By way of further example, an enterprise may believe there is a possibility that it has infringed on another enterprise's patent rights, but the enterprise owning the patent rights has not indicated an intention to take any action and has not even indicated an awareness of the possible infringement. In that case, a judgment must first be made as to whether the assertion of a claim is probable. If the judgment is that assertion is not probable, no accrual or disclosure would be required. On the other hand, if the judgment is that assertion is probable, then a second judgment must be made as to the degree of probability of an unfavorable outcome. If an unfavorable outcome is probable and the amount of loss can be reasonably estimated, accrual of a loss is required by paragraph 8. If an unfavorable outcome is probable but the amount of loss cannot be reasonably estimated, accrual would not be appropriate, but disclosure would be required by paragraph 10. If an unfavorable outcome is reasonably possible but not probable, disclosure would be required by paragraph 10.

I respectfully Direct your focused attention to the following: **"In that case, a judgment must first be made as to whether the assertion of the claim is probable."**

Surely it is "probable" that a claim will be asserted as claims have already been formally asserted in litigation and I remind you of prior communications with you

Re: Follow Up of March 3, 2009 Phone Discussion; Responsible Business Judgments; Financial Accounting Standards Board "FASB" Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 5 Accounting for Contingencies - Reporting Requirements; Limited Time Offer

whereby it is noted to notify your shareholders or any others with liability of these claims.

Then I Direct your focused attention to the following: **"then a second judgment must be made as to the degree of probability of an unfavorable outcome."**

At the time of our recent discussion, I attempted on more than one occasion to suggest to you during this discussion that the claims I have currently asserted in the federal courts of New York are Not the only claims which I may assert and further attempted to politely suggest to you that despite a present Dismissal from the Southern District of New York District Court Judge, that not only is the case on Appeal to the US Second Circuit Court of Appeals, but that further Lawsuits, Motions and filings would soon be forthcoming which were not necessarily limited to the US Second Circuit Court of Appeals and not limited to the Federal Courts in New York. Further, as a result of ongoing state, federal and international investigations, it is possible that criminal charges may soon be filed by any of the numerous investigatory agencies worldwide against certain defendants and certainly this could have catastrophic individual and corporate ramifications on Intel Corporation and certainly shareholders and regulators would have to be notified of these possible actions as well.

I do note as an aside, Mr. Sewell, that your hostile reactions and refusal to have polite discussions may be a sign of personal failings and/or medical/psychological conditions or even perhaps reactions based upon intimate relevant knowledge of wrongdoings herein but no matter what the cause you may wish to Consult your company's Own Code of Conduct Rules for internal reporting where it is possible that a company employee such as yourself may or likely is Not acting in the best interests of the Intel Corporation. A Link to the Intel PDF Code of Conduct and Conflict of Interest Rules is @ <http://www.intel.com/intel/finance/docs/code-of-conduct.pdf> for your convenience.

Returning your focus, however, to the issues at hand, I remind you that the Appeal in my case is currently and presently pending at the US Second Circuit Court of Appeals which raises a very remarkable issue based on your conduct: Since in any fair and ethical court and tribunal the outcome of a matter is never certain "in advance", are You suggesting Mr. Sewell that you have some advance insight or knowledge of the outcome that is forthcoming at the US Second Circuit Court of Appeals sufficient to not render the matter "contingent"? If you do, of course, I will most certainly immediately Report this matter to any and All appropriate authorities including the US Attorney's Office, US DOJ Inspector Glenn A. Fine, Marshall Jarrett of the FBI OPR, the US Judicial Council, US House, the Internal Revenue Service, the Securities and Exchange

Re: Follow Up of March 3, 2009 Phone Discussion; Responsible Business Judgments; Financial Accounting Standards Board "FASB" Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 5 Accounting for Contingencies - Reporting Requirements; Limited Time Offer

Commission, the Intel Board and Shareholders and US Senate Judiciary Committees and other as proper.

If, however, you do not have such "definite" and "certain" information in advance which would of course be "Illegal" and proof of corruption if you did, then you Must admit that the liability is "contingent" and based upon your specific personal knowledge of the Signed NDA's, Strategic Alliance Agreements, Licensing Agreements, etc. you must Book the liability and Disclose same and Assign an estimated value which such value has been estimated to be nearly a Trillion dollars over the life of the IP and further the lawsuit you are named defendant in, contained in the Amended Complaint you have been served and current filings in the United States Court of Appeal, has 12 Counts currently cited against all and are claimed at One Trillion per Count. Obviously you must be aware of what type of catastrophic consequences these liabilities will have on Intel and if you are not taking appropriate actions I again suggest you may be either suffering from some form of personal disability or are acting directly against the Intel Code of Conduct and against the interests of Intel Shareholders and against the accounting Laws and rules.

Keep in mind, however, that just this analysis under the Rules while my current case is "pending" with the US Second Circuit Court of Appeals does not contemplate future action at the US Supreme Court, returned action at the District Court, additional motions at the US Second Circuit Court of Appeals, other Federal Courts and International venues, which I politely suggested to you during our phone conversation that Intel can definitely anticipate which is why I was suggesting as a responsible business person that we now begin possible settlement discussions, discussions which may alleviate certain of the liabilities although not perhaps your personal liabilities.

More importantly, however, as you should be expressly aware, I have yet to file a formal claim based strictly on the violations of the Signed NDA's, Strategic Alliance Agreements and Licensing Agreements themselves, although contained in broad strokes in the Amended Complaint, yet these claims may also be separate claims which not only do you have personal knowledge of the existence of the claims but were being advised during our conversation of my clear intent to pursue such filings in the near future. You have also been aware of the patent claims from Iviewit, along with many others at Intel for many years now and where shareholders will question the impact of the royalties owed that were left off the books perhaps.

Now it is possible, however unlikely, that my interpretations of these Accounting Rules possibly somehow do not comport with current interpretations of these matters by the IRS/SEC but certainly I will call them within 24 hours to apprise the IRS/SEC of the

Re: Follow Up of March 3, 2009 Phone Discussion; Responsible Business Judgments; Financial Accounting Standards Board "FASB" Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 5 Accounting for Contingencies - Reporting Requirements; Limited Time Offer

situation and seek guidance and advice relative to the proper interpretations and whatever else may be just and proper.

Prior to doing so, however, I am once again offering you as a sound and proper business judgment matter an opportunity, a 24 hour opportunity measured from 3:00pm EST on Friday, March 06, 2009 to 3:00pm EST on Monday, March 09, 2009 time to turn these matters over to the CEO and Chairman of the Board and have them call me within such time to address first if you should continue to handle these matters in light of the possible FASB issues and two if they would like to have the business discussion you failed to even desire to hear, in your repeated statements that in your opinion Intel had NO liability in these matters at this time. FASB would point to the time of liabilities beginning when Intel was aware of the Intellectual Properties in 1999 and the royalties that would be due under licensing agreements and other agreements for the technologies and additional reporting under FASB would point to the time that you and Intel were aware of the legal liabilities resulting from the lawsuits and other actions filed in these matters, including your initial contact from Iviewit and myself.

Any reply to this communication is demanded to be by the CEO and Chairman only and if they choose to have counsel present prior to our conversation, we would prefer they choose non-conflicted counsel, which would now exclude you. As you are again made aware the federal case has been called a MURDER case by Judge Shira Scheindlin and one of Patent Theft and Car Bombings, certainly we anticipate that with matters as serious of these, with liabilities over the top (some that Intel may or may not be involved in) each liability must be reported to the top senior executives and board members of Intel and anything short will prompt immediate actions on our part to inform those at risk and those in charge of investigating such failures of disclosure.


Further, I have attached for your convenience and completion of Due Diligence some selected article links, which have direct and/or related relevance to the matters herein.



Re: Follow Up of March 3, 2009 Phone Discussion; Responsible Business Judgments; Financial Accounting Standards Board "FASB" Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 5 Accounting for Contingencies - Reporting Requirements; Limited Time Offer

Finally, you asked if I was threatening you and if I thought this was a game. Yes, most certainly, I was communicating my continued assertion of rights and claims through continued litigation in multiple venues and no, I do not think people trying to Murder my wife, children and myself as a game but instead as a war.

Regretfully Yours,



Eliot I. Bernstein
Founder & Inventor
Iviewit Technologies, Inc.

ARTICLE LINKS:

1. Today's Article March 5, 2009 on Request to US Attorney General Holder for Special Prosecutor in NY Judicial and Ethics Scandals involving NYS First Department DDC and more;

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2009/03/us-attorney-general-eric-holder-asked.html>

2. Article Excerpt on Iviewit Patengate at Website Nov. 24, 2007:

The OPR investigation was sparked by a request from the DOJ - OIG, Inspector General Glenn Fine's Office whom is also conducting an ongoing investigation. The patent pending applications and other IP have been suspended by the Commissioner of Patents pending the outcome of ongoing state, federal and international investigations. The probe reaches some of New York's most prominent politicians and judges, and has already proven to be a stunning embarrassment to the State's ethics watchdog committees.

As a backdrop to the technologies in question, Mr. Bernstein's inventions, the Iviewit video scaling and image overlay systems, are the backbone, enabling technologies for the transmission of video and images across almost all transmission networks and viewable on all display devices, an elegant upstream solution (towards the content creator) of reconfiguring video frames to unlock bandwidth, processing, and storage constraints -- the "Holy Grail" inventions of the digital imaging and video worlds that enable low bandwidth video on the Internet and mobile phones."

Re: Follow Up of March 3, 2009 Phone Discussion; Responsible Business Judgments; Financial Accounting Standards Board "FASB" Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 5 Accounting for Contingencies - Reporting Requirements; Limited Time Offer

Article Link: <http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2007/11/press-release-november-23-2007-for.html>

3. Article Excerpt from "Justice Department Widens Patentgate Probe..." August 24, 2007:

This is quite serious," says an investigator close to the federal probe. "The charges allege that valuable 'back-bone enabling digital imaging technology'-- MPEG type intellectual property-- was stolen by the inventor's own attorneys, the once-untouchable Manhattan based law firm Proskauer Rose. This is going to get very ugly," he says.

I know how," says a retired federal agent who asked not to be identified. "Phone calls were made—many phone calls. Plain and simple." And while this retired federal agent isn't surprised by the apparent "cover-up," he is alarmed by his own findings after a month-long independent review of all submitted Iviewit papers. "I can't find one discrepancy in the allegations, not one unsubstantiated charge," he says.

The powers that be can't contain this story anymore—it's out, U.S. Senators and Congressman are talking about it. This involves national Commerce issues: attorneys stealing U.S. Patents from their own client, and the illegal failings of a state's ethics agency by its own cover-up, and selective, self-dealing, politically-based inaction. Patentgate appears to have exposed the true, and troubling, underbelly of ethics investigations in New York State. And it's not pretty.

**Earlier this year, FBI headquarters in Washington, D.C. assigned additional agents to the Public Integrity Corruption squad at 26 Federal Plaza in Manhattan, and where agents have been actively conducting interviews. **

Article Link: <http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2007/08/justice-dept-widens-patentgate-probe.html>

4. Article Excerpt from "NY Ethics Scandal Tied to International Espionage Scheme"; April 1, 2008;

The evidence in the corporate eavesdropping cover-up "is frightening," according to an informed source who has reviewed the volumes of documentation. The espionage scheme, he says, is directly tied to the growing state bar ethics scandal at the Appellate Division First Department, Departmental Disciplinary Committee (DDC) in Manhattan.

Article Link: <http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2008/04/ny-ethics-scandal-tied-to-international.html>

Iviewit Holdings, Inc./Iviewit Technologies, Inc.
2753 N.W. 34th St. Boca Raton, Florida 33434-3459
(561) 245.8588 (o) / (561) 886.7628 (c) / (561) 245-8644 (f)
iviewit@iviewit.tv - www.iviewit.tv



I-VIEW-IT HOLDINGS, INC.
I-VIEW-IT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

Eliot I. Bernstein
Founder & Inventor
Direct Dial: (561) 245-8588
2753 N.W. 34th Street
Boca Raton, Florida 33434

Friday, March 06, 2009

Craig R. Barrett
Chairman of the Board
Intel Corporation

and

Paul S. Otellini
President and Chief Executive Officer
Intel Corporation

Re: Limited Time Offer; Agree to Agree

Dear Mr. Barrett and Mr. Otellini:

Please accept this communication as a Limited time Offer to enter in to sound and responsible business negotiations in this matter involving the Intel Corporation and my rightful and proper claims as the Original Inventor and Owner of "backbone technologies" deemed as the "Holy Grail" of inventions back in 1998 which have been wrongfully used for over 10 years by Intel Corporation and others.


As you will both note from the attached Letter to your In House General Counsel Mr. Bruce Sewell which references a host of federal and other sources in support of my claims and rights, it is ever so clear that the Intel Corporation has had knowledge of the claims to such Technologies dating back to 1999.

In that the value of my "backbone technologies" has been estimated at nearly a trillion dollars over the life of the IP and that Intel is a named Defendant in a federal RICO case marked "related" to the federal Whistleblower case of Christine Anderson presently ongoing in the Southern District of New York, and that the US Southern District of New York Judge presiding over the "Anderson" case has declared that my case of Iviewit involves "Murder", and further considering that litigation is being pursued at the US Second Circuit Court of Appeals and is contemplated at the US Supreme Court, other federal court venues, international venues and more, I respectfully suggest that an

Paul S. Otellini, President & CEO
Intel Corporation


Re: Limited Time Offer; Agree to Agree

"Agreement" to "Agree" to a business solution in this matter is a sound and responsible judgment on the part of Intel which shall begin by an immediate Deposit of \$10 Million US Dollars into an account to be determined while Intel obtains Non-conflicted counsel and I engage Counsel for details on a Global resolution and settlement of both past claims and going forward.

Moreover, because I believe that the actions of your present In House Counsel Bruce Sewall may be conflicted, violate FASB Rules and thereby damaging to the Intel Corporation's best interests, thus further likely being in violation of Intel's own Code of Conduct, as referenced above it is requested that Intel seek non-conflicted Counsel to move forward on this Agreement to Agree which is literally a Global matter necessitating Global resolution. The attached Letter to Intel Counsel Sewall is self-explanatory in describing the various manners in which Mr. Sewall's actions are in question. 

Such Deposit shall be made by Monday, March 09, 2009 by 5pm EST as an initial good faith action on the part of the Intel Corporation in this Agreement to Agree.

Thank you for time, effort and consideration
in these urgent matters,



Eliot I. Bernstein
Founder & Inventor
Iviewit Technologies, Inc.