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# Introduction

I, Eliot Bernstein, of 2753 NW 34th Street, Boca Raton, Florida 33434 as the Original Owner and Inventor of key "backbone technologies" for digital video and imaging, am filing this **FORMAL COMPLAINT** against Warner Bros. Entertainment, Inc., with corporate offices located at 4000 Warner Blvd, Burbank, Ca 91522. The complaint is also against AOL, Inc., Time Warner, Inc. and Time Warner Cable, whereby these four companies and all of their subsidiaries, affiliates, contractors, agents and employees collectively are referred to herein as (“Warner Bros et al.”).

Please note that these companies previously were under the same corporate structure during most, if not all, of the critically relevant times to this complaint. This timeframe includes both the original merger of Warner Bros. et al. to the recent breakup of Warner Bros. et al. and the allegations levied herein may have directly, and illegally, influenced those transactions to the detriment of Shareholders. Future detrimental effects on Shareholders, if failure to investigate these matters is not instant, may result in causing further massive losses to Shareholders of these highly traded New York Stock Exchange companies. The losses could be thousands of times greater than the Ponzi Schemes of Stanford, Madoff and Dreier combined and those schemes evidenced herein have ties to the alleged crimes described herein.

For your convenience, I have attached the following link to a Press Statement issued about the Merger of Warner Bros. et al. back in 2000[[1]](#footnote-1). In addition, I make a special note concerning the urgency and Time Sensitive nature of these matters predicated upon various factors, including but not limited to, the recent corporate split of AOL Inc. and Time Warner, Inc., which itself should be fully and completely investigated by the SEC as part of this complaint with direct correlation to the matters herein, for all of the reasons set forth herein. The Investigation should, include but not be limited to, all original stock and securities related transactions in the original Warner Bros. et al. merger and all transactions forward. All of these transactions dating back to 1998 may have been influenced by the alleged fraud and involvement in criminal activity described herein.

 Leading Industry Experts working inside Warner Bros. et al. ( See attached [Exhibit 1](#_EXHIBIT_1) – List of Warner Bros. et al. contacts ) and related companies, tested, used, viewed, approved, validated, Contracted and Licensed[[2]](#footnote-2) my technologies under multiple Non Disclosures and other Licensing Agreements. Attached hereto are various Internal communications within Warner Bros. et al. documenting the relationship and admitted uses, including an ADMISSION by technologists within the organization, that my Technologies were being infringed upon AFTER NDA’s had been executed. These agreements then resulted in Signed and Executed Licensing Agreements at that time as illustrated and exhibited herein. Warner Bros. et al. and others complained of herein may be perpetrating Massive Fraud on their Shareholders through concealment of these Massive Liabilities resulting from the theft and unauthorized uses of my technologies over almost a decade.

The technologies have revolutionized digital imaging and video hardware and software and instantly heralded by leading experts in 1998 as the “Holy Grail” of the Internet that allows quality video and imaging as now used worldwide by almost every user of a PC. But broader than merely the Internet the technologies are used on virtually every camera, video camera, television, medical imaging device, telescope, microscope, satellite, DVD, graphics chip, gaming hardware and software, flight and space simulators, etc. and paved the way for new markets entirely, such as cell phone video and Voice Over Internet Protocol (“VOIP”).

Then it was discovered that our Intellectual Property Attorneys from Proskauer Rose LLP (“Proskauer”), Foley & Lardner LLP (“Foley”) and Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolfe & Schlissel LLP (“Meltzer”) with the help of early licensors of my technologies, including Intel Corporation (“Intel”), Lockheed Martin (“Lockheed”), Silicon Graphics Inc. (“SGI” ), Warner Bros., AOL, IBM and more, tried to grab the “Grail”. When caught, as evidenced herein, these powerful law firms and blue chip companies resorted to terrorist styled attacks on the key inventor, including a Car Bombing and Death threats.

As I have attempted to pursue my rights and report their crimes, they have further resorted to a litany of cover up crimes in the courts and at regulatory agencies and again they were caught violating law and public offices over the last nine years in efforts to stave off prosecution for their crimes. All of these offenses are subject to multiple ongoing State, Federal and International investigations and a 12 Count, 12 Trillion Dollar Federal RICO and Antitrust Lawsuit[[3]](#footnote-3). The Federal RICO and Antitrust Lawsuit has been marked legally “RELATED” to a Federal Whistleblower Lawsuit of a New York Supreme Court Staff Attorney, discussed herein in under the section Titled [“Discussion of Ongoing Lawsuits and Related Cases to Federal Whistleblower Lawsuit of Christine C. Anderson”](#_Discussion_of_Ongoing) .

# Time Sensitive Urgency to this Complaint; Potential Catastrophic Effects to the Shareholders of Warner Bros. et al.; Fraud could Trigger Rescissory Shareholder Rights

To further establish the urgency and Time Sensitive nature of this formal complaint, please note that the criminal fraud and other crimes described herein will likely trigger Rescissory Rights of Shareholders at all of the respective and related companies of Warner Bros. et al., which likely will have Catastrophic impact on both the companies and its shareholders. Therefore, the SEC must instantly investigate these matters and instantly bring the matters to the attention of the Warner Bros. et al. Shareholders, Auditors, Financial Institutions and all other parties with potential liabilities resulting from the allegations herein and whereby if the companies fail to notify Shareholders and Regulators, the SEC must act quickly to notify them. The SEC must begin immediate investigation of the Securities Frauds described herein and prevent ongoing and future fraudulent transactions from further harming Shareholders of Warner Bros. et al.

Further, I point out to the SEC herein what looks like a recent pattern of Shareholder Fraud and Deceit done with Scienter, beginning on or about March 2009, by Officers, Directors, Counsel and Auditors for Warner Bros et al., which are alleged to have been done in order to commit further fraud upon the Warner Bros. et al. Shareholders. That these recent corporate restructurings may be the result of Key Executives attempting to abscond with corporate assets through the recent complex corporate breakups, immediately after being contacted in March 2009 by me and my business consultant Kevin Hall, Esq. (“Hall”) regarding the Massive unreported liabilities to their Shareholders[[4]](#footnote-4). Liabilities resulting from involvement in my 12 Count 12 Trillion Dollar Federal RICO and Antitrust Lawsuit and Intellectual Property infringements and for their failure to report liabilities under FASB No.5.

This Formal Complaint for Investigation of Warner Bros. et al. on this day, Tuesday, February 02, 2010, comes after Hall and I made repeated Good Faith attempts since March 2009 to address the Business and Corporate Responsibility issues with Executives, Officers, Board Members and Auditors at the respective companies. Warner Bros. et al. was contacted in order to find possible solutions to avoid the catastrophic events from occurring to their Shareholders, if possible. A timeline of events will help establish the correlations between the allegations of fraud described herein and the relation to corporate restructurings of Warner Bros. et al., in both their 2001 merger and now in their 2009 breakup and provide the SEC a basis, mired in factual evidence, to begin immediate investigation of this complaint.

# TIMELINE OF WARNER BROS ET AL. RELATIONSHIP WITH IVIEWIT

 The following Timelines are presented to give a factual timeline to the allegations herein, the exhibits are linked online and all Uniform Resource Locators (“URL”) and Exhibited Links throughout this document are hereby incorporated, in entirety by reference herein, including over 1000 evidentiary links on the homepage at [www.iviewit.tv](http://www.iviewit.tv) with exhibits that contain thousands of pages of factual evidence. The timeline will also reveal facts regarding the relationships between many of the Defendants in my Federal RICO and Antitrust Lawsuit and the Warner Bros. et al. companies, including relations to the main perpetrators of the alleged crimes from Proskauer Rose.

\*Note Warner Bros et al. relevant mergers, acquisitions and breakups to these matters in the timeline below are in ***bold italics.***

## 1998-2002 Relevant Communications Between Iviewit and Warner Bros. et al.

* 1998-2001 Inventions in Imaging and Video Discovered and Intellectual Property Filings begin in 1998. Proskauer Rose is retained Intellectual Property counsel for Iviewit and at this time claims Warner Bros. was a client of theirs, although this was not learned until later.
* 2000-2002Warner Bros. et al. signs multiple Iviewit Non Disclosure Agreements.
	+ Non Disclosure Agreements @ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/Patents/Confidentialities/confidentialities%20total.pdf>
	pages 1-5, 10, 61-62, 80, 108-109, 234
* November 02, 2000 ~ Letter to GS regarding Warner Bros. Technological Calls to Iviewit Investors by Warner Bros. employees, describing the efficacy of the Inventions and the results of the review by Warner Bros., including the anticipated uses by Warner Bros et al.
	+ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20001101%20Goldman%20Friedstein%20Letter%20from%20Buchsbaum%20re%20AOLTW%20Colter%20meetings.pdf>
* ***January 11, 2001 ~ America Online and Time Warner Complete Merger to Create AOL Time Warner***
	+ [http://www.timewarner.com/corp/newsroom/pr/0,20812,668364,00.html](http://www.timewarner.com/corp/newsroom/pr/0%2C20812%2C668364%2C00.html)
* February 08, 2001 ~ Letter from David J. Colter (“Colter”) ~ Vice President Technology - Technological Operations Warner Bros. to Founder of AOL, Ted Leonsis (“Leonsis”), regarding the efficacy of the Iviewit technologies.
	+ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20010208%20Colter%20to%20Leonsis%20Warner%20Bros%20AOL.pdf>
* **February 15, 2001 EFFECTIVE DATE - Signed Warner Bros. License and Service Agreement @**
	+ <http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20010822%20-%20SIGNED%20Warner%20Bros%20Agreement%20AOL.pdf>
* August 15, 2001 Irell & Manella LLP Bills for Services for Warner Bros et al. and Sony Licensing Agreements @
	+ [http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/Patents/Paul%20Allen/old%20patent/LEGAL/Irell%20&%20Manella/Bills/2001%2008%2029%20-%20Irell%20Bill.pdf](http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/Patents/Paul%20Allen/old%20patent/LEGAL/Irell%20%26%20Manella/Bills/2001%2008%2029%20-%20Irell%20Bill.pdf)
	+ It is imperative for the SEC to note that after the Signed Licensing and Service Agreement, Iviewit opened a California Office inside a Warner Bros. building, in order to take over encoding operations for their online content, and more. Iviewit began billing according to the Licensing and Service agreement. Please note the language in the Licensing and Service agreement pertaining to the Proprietary nature and Confidentiality of the Iviewit inventions.
	+ Suddenly, after the agreements were signed and operations were underway, Wayne M. Smith ~ Vice President and Chief Patent Counsel at Warner Bros. began seeking a re-review of Proskauer Partner Kenneth Rubenstein’s (“Rubenstein”) prior patent opinions regarding the Iviewit inventions to Warner Bros. employees. Smith then claimed to Colter that he found problems while reviewing Rubenstein’s opinion with the patents on file at the US Patent Office[[5]](#footnote-5). At this point, allegedly, a coordinated conspiratorial effort between Smith, Rubenstein and others began to derail the already signed Iviewit agreements with Warner Bros. et al.
	+ Whereby former Acting CEO of Iviewit P. Stephen Lamont, ( a referral emanating from AOL’s Leonsis ) Smith and Rubenstein then worked to derail the Licensing and Service Agreement. Warner Bros. then further attempted to deny the existence of this BINDING CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATION as further evidenced in letters exhibited herein, whereby the agreement is attempted to be wholly denied. The amount owed in service fees since the signing of the contracts would be an enormous amount over the almost 10 years of use and where Warner Bros et al. have never notified Iviewit they were cancelling such contract, perhaps because they were denying its existence.
	+ The emails forward from this point in the timeline begin to attempt to hide from the fact that Licensing and Service Agreements were already in place while also hiding these facts and liabilities from Shareholders and Auditors. The alleged fraud may again have catastrophic effect on these highly traded stocks, reaching back to this point in time and possibly further back.
* April 04, 2001 Letter from Colter to William J. "Bill" Raduchel (“Raduchel”) ~ Chief Technology Officer and Executive Vice President at AOL. AOL’s Leonsis referred Raduchel to do further due diligence for an investment in the Iviewit companies, in addition to the Licensing and Encoding deal already signed.
	+ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20010404%20Colter%20to%20Raduchel%20Leonsis%20referral%20AOL%20Warner%20Bros.pdf>
* May 25, 2001 Letters to and from Douglas Chey (“Chey”), Senior Vice President of Technology for Sony Pictures Digital Entertainment and Divisional CIO, Motion Pictures and Television Productions of Sony Pictures Entertainment. Chey formerly with Warner Bros. was working with Iviewit at Sony ( also under Signed Agreements ) together with Warner to do a Five Studio Movie Download Project, Movielink, where the Iviewit inventions were to be the backbone enabling technologies to make digital download and streaming possible as a commercial endeavor. Since that time, Warner Bros. and Sony have both done similar digital downloading projects, in violation of Signed Agreements with Iviewit.
	+ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20010525%20Sony%20Doug%20Chey%20Endorsement%20of%20Tech%20and%20Advisory%20Board%20Option%20letter.pdf>
	+ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20100120%20Douglas%20Chey%20Sony%20Bio.pdf>
	+ **The SEC should also begin FORMAL INVESTIGATION of Sony’s involvement in these matters. Similar calls to those described herein to Warner Bros. et al. for sound business discussions to attempt to alleviate shareholder liabilities have gone wholly ignored by Sony’s In House Counsel, Executives and Auditors. I will be filing a more formal complaint shortly with the SEC but this should not delay immediate investigation by the SEC, in order to preclude Massive Liabilities to Shareholders of Sony. The SEC can take this Formal Complaint additionally as a FORMAL COMPLAINT AGAINST SONY.**
* December 20, 2001 ~ Lamont letter to Rubenstein regarding Smith and Rubenstein and the refusal of Rubenstein to RE-OPINE to Smith due to what he claims is a “CONFLICT”, which led further to the breakdown of relations between Iviewit and Warner Bros et al. Lamont later affirmed to Shareholders in a written communication that Microsoft had planted him in the Iviewit companies. Later Lamont changed that story to AOL and Leonsis’ niece had planted him in Iviewit through AOL Founder Leonsis’ best friend Chuck Brunelas (“Brunelas”). Brunelas recruited under contract Lamont to the Iviewit companies on behalf of Leonsis. Lamont’s revelations of being planted at the company which came after he was hired led to the termination of Lamont at that time[[6]](#footnote-6).
	+ December 20, 2001 Lamont Letters to Rubenstein ~

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20020611%20System%20and%20Method%20for%20Fraud%20on%20USPTO.pdf>

Pages 455-462

* + November 09, 2001 ~ Brunelas Employment Agreement

<http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20011109%20Chuck%20Brunelas%20Agreement%20re%20Warner%20Bros%20AOLTW.pdf>

* + Based on new information since that time, it is alleged that Rubenstein, Lamont, Leonsis and Smith operated together to sabotage Iviewit/Warner Bros. et al. relations and others, purposefully to breach the prior signed licensing agreements and avoid paying the royalties owed to the Iviewit companies, using the old “good guy / bad guy” routine.
	+ The SEC should note here that Hall and I recently reported Lamont to Federal and State authorities for alleged collusion in the RICO activities claimed in my Federal RICO and Antitrust Lawsuit, including ongoing criminal activities[[7]](#footnote-7). Further, Lamont continues to represent himself and Iviewit Shareholders as the Iviewit CEO, when he is fully aware of his termination from employment and that he has no authorization from the Board of Directors, Management or Shareholders to represent their security interests in Iviewit companies, this securities fraud also should be subject for investigation by the SEC.
		- Lamont claims to be CEO of Iviewit Technologies, Inc. in multiple correspondences and Federal court papers with an address at 175 King Street. Armonk, N.Y. 10504 and whereby no Iviewit offices were ever opened or authorized at this address. The office is directly across the street from Defendant in my Federal RICO and Antitrust Lawsuit IBM’s world headquarters.
	+ Additional Evidence for the SEC regarding Lamont is contained in a June 18, 2009 Letter to New York Attorney General Chief of Staff, Steven M. Cohen regarding fraudulent activities of Lamont @

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090618%20FINAL%20NYAG%20Steven%20Cohen%20Letter%20Re%20Lamont%20Signed.pdf>

* + The SEC should note here that Lamont’s initial resume submitted by Iviewit contracted employment recruiter, Brunelas, is materially different and contradicts what Lamont himself recently claims regarding his past on the Iviewit Homepage, in multiple court filings and other letters to Iviewit shareholders.
		- Original 2001 Resume Submitted to Iviewit on P. Stephen Lamont by Brunelas @

<http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/Lamont%20Resume%20Given%20to%20Iviewit%20by%20Chuck%20Brunelas%20AOL%20Warner%20Bros.pdf>

* + - 2001 Resume Claims the following:

Columbia University School of Law ~ J. D. in Commercial and Regulatory Law - May 1992

Columbia University Graduate School of Business ~ M.B.A. in Finance and Accounting - May 1981

State University of New York at Cortland ~ B.A. in Economics - June 1978

* + - 2009 Iviewit Homepage Statement written by P. Stephen Lamont claims:

“By way of introduction, I am P. Stephen Lamont, former Acting CEO of Iviewit (counsel advised all Iviewit executives to resign their posts and work along side Iviewit rather than within Iviewit, as the former Board of Directors, Counsel and Accountants, disbanded without requisite notice to Shareholders in violation of law, thereby leaving massive liability and exposure) and a significant shareholder in Iviewit. **With more than a fifteen year track record as a multimedia technology and consumer electronics licensing executive and holder of a J.D. in Intellectual Property Law from Columbia University, an M.B.A in Finance, and a B.S. in Industrial Engineering” Source** [www.iviewit.tv](http://www.iviewit.tv) **homepage.**

* + - Whereby Lamont’s legal and other degrees claimed are wholly different and therefore false in one or both of his background accounts as they are materially different, again causation for further investigation of Lamont by the SEC and other investigators this letter has been copied or addressed to.
		- Further, you will note that Lamont refers to himself as “former Acting CEO of Iviewit” and claims counsel advised him to resign any official role due to the potential for charges of fraud, and I advised Lamont to follow counsels’ advice and personally, I did not accept any official roles on counsels’ advice. Yet, even in recent court documents and other illegally signed documents executed by Lamont to major Blue Chip companies, including Microsoft, Lamont now represents himself as CEO of Iviewit inapposite of counsels’ advice, at an address that is not registered to any company Lamont claims to be employed as CEO by.
		- August 05, 2009 Lamont Letter to Microsoft <http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20090805%20Lamont%20Illegal%20Letter%20to%20Microsoft.pdf>
		- Lamont further now claims such executive role in my Federal RICO and Antitrust Lawsuit, claiming he is CEO of Iviewit, when no Board has ever put him in that position and when he is fully cognizant that he has no authority legally to represent Iviewit Shareholders. Lamont even attempts to represent Iviewit Shareholders and Companies currently in Federal Court, while not having ever passed the bar to practice law and therefore precluded from representing others in court. Again, cause for further investigation of Lamont.
		- February 09, 2009 Lamont Court Filing <http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090209%20Lamont%20Attempt%20to%20Quash%20Bernstein%20Motion.pdf>
		- The SEC should note here that while the document claims service on February 09, 2008, it appears executed February 09, 2009. Whereby the SEC should also note that Lamont does not represent himself individually in the Lawsuit but acts on behalf of Iviewit Shareholders of which he has no authorization from Shareholders to act on their behalf and also is not a lawyer, making it ILLEGAL for him to act on others behalf in a legal capacity. The District Court and Second Circuit Court notified of this ILLEGAL representation and asked by me to force amendment of the complaint, instead continue to allow the ILLEGAL representation of Lamont to continue. This ILLEGAL representation of Shareholders is also a serious criminal act.
		- Finally, at the company Digital Factory that Lamont lists as one of his former employers, in his resume previously exhibited herein, one of the company employees later disclosed that Lamont had been in stock trouble for securities fraud with the board of that company, of course Lamont’s resume failed to disclose this material fact.
* December 31, 2001 – Letter from Brunelas to Greg B. Thagard (“Thagard”) ~ Vice President Advanced Technology Technical Operations at Warner Bros. The letter is regarding Thagard’s acceptance of an Iviewit Advisory Board Position. Later both Thagard and Colter would receive Iviewit Stock options for their Board roles with approval of Warner Bros. and Sony executives.
	+ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20011231%20Brunelas%20to%20Thagard%20Regarding%20Joining%20Iviewit%20Advisory%20Board.pdf>
* January 07, 2002 ~ Letters by Lamont regarding his meeting with Rubenstein regarding Warner Bros et al. Rubenstein was presented the exhibited document in draft form at his deposition, where he read it and then dodged questions regarding why his name is referenced in relation to opinions he gave to Warner Bros. et al. after denying he knew anything about Iviewit or the patents. The letter wholly contradicts his prior denial of knowing of the Iviewit inventions or Eliot Bernstein, contradicting his sworn deposition statements and sworn letters to Judge Jorge Labarga constituting multiple instances of perjury and more.
	+ January 07, 2002 and more Lamont letters to Rubenstein

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/2003%2006%2003%20Iviewit%20Rebuttal%20to%20Wheeler%202nd%20Response_Final.pdf>

Pages 19-23

* + November 20, 2002 Rubenstein Deposition and Deposition Exhibits

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/Depositions%20BOOKMARKED%20SEARCHABLE%20with%20hyperlink%20comments.pdf>

Pages 1-100, the exhibits attached to the deposition show Rubenstein’s denials.

* January 14, 2002 Warner Bros. employee Colter’s internal Warner Bros. document containing an **Admission of Use of Iviewit Proprietary Processes and Violation of NON-DISCLOSURE agreements** by many Warner Bros. et al. employees. The letter also provides affirmation that Rubenstein ( MPEGLA LLC Patent Counsel, former Iviewit Proskauer Rose Patent Counsel and Warner Bros. counsel ) opined favorably to Warner Bros. The document again directly refutes Rubenstein’s statements in deposition and written communications to the Labarga court that he did not opine or even know of the Iviewit inventions.
	+ <http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/2002%2001%2015%20AOLTW%20RUBENSTEIN%20OPINION%20comments.pdf>
* February 17, 2002 – Eliot Bernstein letter to Brunelas Regarding Smith’s sudden request to have Rubenstein of Proskauer speak to him to re-opine on his former statements, already exhibited herein, regarding the efficacy and novelty of the patents. Rubenstein was acting Patent Counsel to Iviewit as indicated in the exhibited Wachovia Private Placement Memorandum that Proskauer billed to author and distribute to Iviewit potential investors when he opined to Warner Bros. The links below provide information on Rubenstein’s position as an Iviewit Board member and Iviewit Patent Counsel despite his statements to the contrary. At the time Smith requested to speak with Rubenstein, Proskauer and Rubenstein already were terminated by Iviewit and investigations were already underway regarding the patent thefts and more.
	+ February 17, 2002 Letter from Eliot Bernstein to Brunelas.

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20020117%20Bernstein%20letter%20to%20Brunelas%20Regarding%20Smith%20response%20to%20Colter%20to%20talk%20with%20Rubenstein%20Poskauer.pdf>

* + January 2001 Wachovia Private Placement Memorandum, whereby the SEC should note here that Rubenstein is listed both as Iviewit Patent Counsel and an Iviewit Advisory Board member.

<http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/Wachovia%20Private%20Placement%20Memorandum%20Bookmarked.pdf>

Page 4 – “Company has retained Foley & Lardner to shepherd its patent development and procurement. **In addition, the Company has retained Kenneth Rubenstein of Proskauer Rose, LLP to oversee its entire patent portfolio - Mr. Rubenstein is the head of the MPEG-2 patent pool.**

Page 16 - **“Strong and Experienced Board of Directors and Advisory Board.**” iviewit's Board of Directors and Advisors consist of several well-established individuals from the technology, entertainment, and financial community. Directors have extensive backgrounds with top-tier firms such as Goldman Sachs, Kidder Peabody, and McKinsey & Co. Crossbow Ventures has provided $3.0 million in funding and sits on the Board. **Technology and entertainment guidance comes from a partner at Armstrong Hirsch Jackoway & Wertheimer and from Kenneth Rubenstein, the head of the MPEG-2 patent pool.**

Additionally on Page 16 - “The Company has retained Foley & Lardner to shepherd its patent development and procurement. In addition, the Company **has retained Kenneth Rubenstein of Proskauer Rose, LLP to oversee its entire patent portfolio.** The Company's strategy is to establish market precedence through licensing of trade secrets and know-how.

Page 38 – **ADVISORY BOARD SECTION** “Kenneth Rubenstein Partner, Proskauer Rose LLP. Mr. Rubenstein is a partner at Proskauer Rose LLP law firm **and is the patent attorney for iviewit**. He is a registered patent attorney before the US. Patent & Trademark Office. Mr. Rubenstein counsels his clients with respect to the validity and infringement of competitors' patents, as well as prosecutes patent applications. For the past several years he has worked on the formation of a patent pool, for MPEG-2 technology, involving large consumer electronics and entertainment companies. He is also a former member of the legal staff at Bell Laboratories. Mr. Rubenstein received his law degree, cum laude, from New York Law School and his Ph.D. in physics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology where he also graduated with a B.S. Degree.

* + The SEC should note here that Rubenstein’s attempt to claim he never heard of Iviewit, including at his deposition, allegedly is due to the massive conflicts of interest that Rubenstein had. If Rubenstein were patent counsel to Iviewit and simultaneously counsel to Warner Bros. et al. when he originally opined to Colter, without conflict waivers or disclosure, this obviously would have violated attorney conduct codes and law.
	+ Additionally, Rubenstein is conflicted with the patent pooling scheme and artifice to fraud inventors he has created, MPEGLA LLC, where again he acted as counsel and founder of MPEGLA LLC while also patent counsel to Iviewit. The conflict here is again obvious where the Iviewit technologies were the single greatest threat to his pools as Iviewit has the dominant technology, which without, the MPEG license would be worthless. The SEC should note that Rubenstein initially misrepresented himself and Joao as Proskauer Partners to Iviewit, when prior to learning of my inventions they were both with Meltzer. Rubenstein is counsel and sole patent evaluator for MPEGLA LLC now one of the largest infringers of the Iviewit technologies, licensing Warner Bros et al.

Proskauer, after learning of my technologies value, estimated at a trillion dollars to “priceless” by leading engineers at Real 3D, Inc. and without a patent department at the time in 1998, then rushed to acquire Rubenstein and his Meltzer patent group and the MPEGLA LLC pools. When the acquisition was complete, Proskauer, my former patent counsel, directly began inuring benefits from the stolen technologies via their new client MPEGLA LLC in their new Intellectual Property department created after learning of my inventions.

MPEGLA has now tied and bundled my inventions to their pools licensing schemes, converting the royalties from the technologies from Iviewit and through other anticompetitive tactics have kept Iviewit from market in classic RICO and Antitrust violations, including violations of Sherman and Clayton, as further defined in my Federal RICO and Antitrust Lawsuit exhibited already herein.

* + The SEC should note here that Warner Bros. et al. and many of those involved directly in these matters are also involved in DVD patent pooling schemes, including but not limited to, DVD6C Patent Pool[[8]](#footnote-8). Whereby, similar to MPEGLA LLC’s illegal use of my technologies, DVD6C has similarly tied and bundled my technologies to their pools licenses, excluding me from royalties and then inuring royalties from others from my technologies directly from their membership in the pool.
	+ The SEC should note that the only Meltzer Intellectual Property attorney not to transfer to Proskauer at the time of acquisition was a one Raymond Joao, who initially with Rubenstein was represented as a Proskauer partner and who took initial patent disclosures with Rubenstein. In 1999-2000 it was learned that Joao was putting patents into his own name while sabotaging the Iviewit patents. Upon leaving Iviewit, Joao claimed publically that he had 90+ patents in his name and then went to work for Marc S. Dreier, recently prosecuted and convicted by the SEC for an alleged Ponzi scheme, as further evidenced later herein.
* February 08, 2002 – Lamont letter to John D. Calkins (“Calkins”) ~ Senior Vice President New Media Business Development of Warner Bros., regarding stock issued to Warner Bros. employees Colter and Thagard for Advisory Board roles they accepted and also regarding their about face and breach of contracts.
	+ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20020208%20Lamont%20to%20Calkins%20Warner%20Bros%20Re%20Colter%20and%20Thagard%20Advisory%20Board%20Stock.pdf>
* February 20, 2002 – Calkins Letter to Lamont denying IP infringement and contract violations in utter denial of the facts and evidence, including the Signed License and Service Agreement, Signed NDA’s, letters from Warner Bros. employees citing violations of the NDA’s and more, already presented herein. The SEC should note that opposite of Warner Bros. claim in the letter that Iviewit is creating a false record, it is instead Warner Bros. that attempts to create a false and misleading record of fact in the letter.
	+ <http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20020220%20Calkins%20Letter%20to%20Lamont%20Warner%20Bros%20Wayne%20Smith.pdf>
* February 27, 2002 – Lamont to Calkins about Warner Bros. Breach of Contracts, the SEC should note that while Lamont relies on the NDA, the February 15, 2001 SIGNED LICENSING AGREEMENT, illustrated above, also has strong language about IP rights concerning the Iviewit technologies that also are violated. Also, take note, that at this time in 2002, Warner Bros. et al. knew of the breaches and formally was notified by Iviewit at that time of such breaches and therefore they should have begun accounting for the IP Liabilities at this time, if not earlier according to FASB accounting rules.
	+ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20020227%20Lamont%20to%20Calkins%20Warner%20Bros%20Breach%20more.pdf>
* March 05, 2002 – Smith letter to Lamont denying IP infringement and contract violations in utter denial of the facts and evidence, including the Signed License and Service Agreement, Signed NDA’s, letters from Warner Bros. employees citing violations of the NDA’s and more, already presented herein.
	+ <http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20020305%20Wayne%20Smith%20Warner%20Bros%20Letter%20to%20Lamont%20Calkins.pdf>
* November 20, 2002 - April 15, 2002 Letter by Lamont to Rubenstein Regarding Conversations with Warner Bros et al. presented to Rubenstein at his November 20, 2002 Deposition as already discussed herein.
	+ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/Kenneth%20Rubenstein%20Deposition%20with%20Exhibits%20CERT.pdf>
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* + Please note that the correspondence exhibited above refers to a notification issued to Warner Bros. at that time, which provided Warner Bros. et al. further notice at that time that Cease and Desist letters and threatened litigation would be forthcoming regarding the technology infringements. Warner Bros. et al. already was given notice of Breach of Contracts regarding the Intellectual Properties in prior communiqués exhibited and these letters certainly cite specific liabilities Warner was aware of going forward.

Liabilities exist for Warner Bros et al. for their involvement in the alleged criminal RICO activities initially discovered from information partially uncovered by Warner Bros. et al. in 2001, as they were on the verge of pouring in $25 Million Dollars in investment capital to my companies. When doing their due diligence on a $12 Million Dollar Private Placement with Wachovia Securities, corporate and intellectual property frauds were uncovered, including discoveries by Smith regarding the filed patents and Calkins regarding corporate fraud. At that time, Warner Bros et al. employees and personnel became aware of fraud relating to both the patents filed with the US Patent Office and additional corporate fraud, additional to what Andersen had found on or about that time and this information was relayed to Iviewit by Colter on behalf of both Smith and Calkins.

Colter relayed that Warner Bros. et al. uncovered fraud, including fraudulent statements made by Proskauer Rose and Foley & Lardner, former Iviewit counsel, regarding statements made in the Wachovia Private Placement. A Private Placement Memorandum that Proskauer circulated to potential Iviewit investors including Warner Bros. et al. These Securities Frauds contained in the Private Placement are also cause for further SEC investigation.

Per Colter, Warner Bros. et al. and Smith uncovered Intellectual Property Frauds involving fraudulent oaths to the US Patent Office and Worldwide Patent Authorities, which has in part led to suspension of my Intellectual Properties by the US Patent Commissioner pending investigations by the US Patent Office and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This series of events led to further uncovering Patent Fraud by my former counsel Proskauer, Foley and Meltzer and others that are subject to several state, federal and international ongoing investigations and legal actions.

Investigations now include one by Harry I. Moatz (“Moatz”), Director of the United States Patent & Trademark Office – Office of Enrollment and Discipline (“OED”), charged with oversight of the Federal Patent Bar and patent attorney criminal issues. Moatz confirmed that W. Palm Beach FBI Special Agent, Stephen Lucchesi had joined his investigation of FRAUD ON THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE. Moatz also directed me to file claims of Fraud on the USPTO with the Commissioner of the US Patent Office which resulted in the exhibited herein patent suspensions. Moatz assembled a team of Patent Office Officials to aid me in getting the Intellectual Properties ready for suspension while investigations proceeded, as he removed all prior counsel from access to the IP.

Per Colter, Calkin’s had found fraud involving a fraudulent billing lawsuit against the Iviewit companies by their counsel Proskauer. Prior to Calkin’s information Iviewit corporate officers, directors and management did not know about such lawsuit, except those now charged with the RICO crimes and therefore it was not disclosed by Proskauer or Iviewit Accountants to Wachovia Securities for their due diligence and therefore not reflected in the Private Placement. It was later learned that the companies sued by Proskauer were companies fraudulently set up by former counsel Proskauer and had stolen Intellectual Properties in them, this was learned from information discovered directly from the US Patent Office OED Investigations. Whereby, Arthur Andersen on or about this time, while auditing the Iviewit companies for the largest investor Crossbow Ventures of West Palm Beach Florida, whose investment funds were two-thirds SBA SBIC funds found identical and similarly named companies to the Iviewit companies. The Fraud involving the stolen Small Business Administration Funds is under ongoing investigation with the SBA Inspector General’s office and others.

Per Colter, Smith discovered Fraud involving Kenneth Rubenstein, a Proskauer Rose law firm partner and sole patent evaluator for one of the largest infringers and criminal suspects in my Federal RICO and Antitrust Lawsuit. Rubenstein is under investigation with other attorneys by Moatz and was also ordered for investigation by unanimous consent of five justices of the New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department for Conflicts and the Appearance of Impropriety for violating public offices to block complaints I filed against him.

Where later, after discovery of the Intellectual Property fraudulent filings, it was learned that Smith, IP counsel for Warner Bros. was working with Rubenstein ( Iviewit Patent Counsel, MPEGLA Counsel and Warner Bros. Counsel ) and that their relationship somehow now precluded Rubenstein from re-opining on his prior opinion of the patents for Warner Bros. employees as already evidenced herein. Whereby Warner Bros. then breached their contracts and began illegally using and licensing the technologies to others in violation of those binding signed agreements. The MPEGLA LLC patent pooling scheme created and overseen by Counsel Rubenstein is merely an artifice to defraud inventors and has illegally precluded me from market in classic antitrust activities, including death threats and a car bomb. Whereby the DVD Patent Pooling Schemes that Warner Bros. is directly involved in have also used the technologies in violation of signed contracts and agreements, admittedly, yet since that time they too have excluded Iviewit from market, again in classic antitrust activities and not only failed to pay Iviewit royalties but have failed to account for the 10 year Massive Liabilities.

The SEC should note that while there is a long gap in time between these prior Iviewit and Warner Bros et al., communications and contracts and the current contact to notify them again of liabilities resulting from the IP infringement and the newer Lawsuit liabilities, that during the gap I was actively pursuing my rights. I have given similar information to several investigators and courts over the several years in between communications regarding Warner Bros. et al. involvement in the Iviewit allegations in my Federal RICO Lawsuit. During the time, I was also forced to flee my home several times for my family’s safety, including from death threats from Mr. Brian Utley on behalf of the law firms Proskauer Rose and Foley & Lardner and then from actual Attempted Murder of my family. Attempted Murder through a Car Bombing of my family minivan in Del Ray Beach, FL., images of the Car Bombing can be found on the [www.iviewit.tv](http://www.iviewit.tv)[[9]](#footnote-9) homepage.

## 2009-2010 Recent Communications with Warner Bros et al.

* March 17, 2009 ~ Hall and myself left a message for John Rogovin (“Rogovin”) ~ Executive Vice President and General Counsel @ Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc. with his assistant Ginger Tipton (“Tipton”) to arrange a business meeting to discuss lawsuit liabilities, patent infringement liabilities and FASB NO. 5 accounting liabilities and regulatory issues that would likely result in Massive Shareholder Liabilities if not quelled, if possible.
* April 23, 2009 ~ Hall and I left a second message for Rogovin with assistant Tipton, as the March 17, 2009 call was not returned although Tipton was aware that urgent time frames were involved.
* April 28, 2009 ~ Hall and I spoke to Rogovin’s office and were referred to Smith. The referral to Smith despite potential conflicts from his previous involvement in the alleged fraud, the fact that he is a central witness in the matters and the fact that as a lawyer he has multiple legal conflicts of interest, as well as, corporate conflicts in handling the matters he is central too. Yet, these conflicts would not matter unless Smith directly handled the matters, which he then did.
* April 30, 2009 ~ Bernstein spoke to Smith’s assistant Yolanda who claimed that Smith was now tied up in litigation for two weeks and that he would get back with an answer. This delay was despite pressing the need with Yolanda for urgent action on Smith’s part due to the MASSIVE Shareholder liabilities and the need for a twenty-four hour response.
* ***May 28, 2009 ~ Time Warner Inc. Announces Plan to Separate AOL***
	+ <http://bx.businessweek.com/america-online/view?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.thedeal.com%2Fcorporatedealmaker%2F2009%2F05%2Ftime_warner_aol_timeline.php>
	+ Note the timing of this announcement with the delays in response by Warner Bros. et al. and Smith to the Iviewit notice of IP infringement liabilities and their involvement in my Federal RICO and Antitrust lawsuit.
	+ **The SEC should instantly ascertain if Warner Bros et al. notified Shareholders and Auditors during these securities transactions to complete the separation and determine if Shareholders were formally noticed of the MASSIVE TRILLION dollar liabilities and if there was full disclosure by Counsel, including but not limited to, Smith and Rogovin. Finally, were the liabilities noted in the Audited Financials where it does not appear to have been?**

**Obviously if these material facts regarding Massive liabilities were omitted from financial reporting, Shareholders would have Rescissory Rights from the securities fraud by the Officers and again they may have claims dating back to Merger for similar failures during those transactions. As evidenced in the following series of communications, not only is counsel notified and fails to disclose the liabilities but Officers, Directors and Auditors of the companies when contacted regarding the liabilities, all fail to handle the issues as fiducially required by law.**

* October 07, 2009 ~ Eliot Bernstein letter to Smith sent a letter regarding setting up meeting to discuss matters that could have Catastrophic effect on the Shareholders. Smith had already been advised by Tipton of the Time Sensitive Nature of the request and the seriousness of the matters in relation to their Shareholders.
	+ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20091007%20Eliot%20Bernstein%20letter%20to%20Wayne%20Smith%20re%20Warner%20Bros%20AOL%20meeting%20request.pdf>
* November 23, 2009 ~ Hall spoke alone and directly with Smith, who claimed he was not the best person to handle the matters but that he was assembling a team from Warner Bros. et al. to discuss the matters. Yet, instead of putting a team together Smith continued handling the matters despite the multiple conflicts.
* November 30, 2009 ~ Hall sent a letter to Smith reviewing their call @
	+ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20091201%20Wayne%20Smith%20Fax%20Email%20Demand%20Receipt%20of%20Kevin%20Hall%20Confirmation%20Letter.pdf>
* December 02, 2009 ~ Smith response to Hall request for meeting @
	+ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20091202%20Wayne%20Smith%20Response%20Warner%20Bros%20to%20Iviewit%20letter%2012-2-09.pdf>
	+ It should be noted by the SEC here, that the above linked exhibit has two attachments from February and March 2002. Whereby, despite the previously exhibited evidence herein, including but not limited to, Signed NDA’s, Admission of Use and Violation of NDA’s by a Warner Bros. employee and a SIGNED LICENSING AGREEMENT, the letter and the attached letters all attempt to deny these material incontestable facts.
* ***December 09, 2009 ~ AOL Time Warner completes split.***
	+ <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/low/business/8403302.stm>
	+ **Did Warner Bros et al. notify Shareholders and Auditors during these transactions that they were formally noticed of MASSIVE TRILLION dollar liabilities, further was there full disclosure? Finally, were the liabilities noted in the Audited Financials where it does not appear to have been?**
* December 18, 2009 ~ Hall and Bernstein response to December 02, 2009 Warner Bros. letter @
	+ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20091218%20FINAL%20Wayne%20Smith%20Warner%20Bros%20Demand%20Letter36889%20SIGNED%20KRHEIB%20fax.pdf>
	+ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20091218%20FINAL%20Wayne%20Smith%20Warner%20Bros%20Demand%20Letter%20Cover%20Email.pdf>
* December 23, 2009 ~ Warner Bros. Letter from Smith to Iviewit and Bernstein.
	+ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20091223%20Warner%20Bros%20Wayne%20Smith%20to%20Bernstein%20Response.pdf>
	+ Note that in this letter Smith claims that,

 “Your time-barred claims hinge almost entirely on an internal email written by David Colter on January 15, 2002 - an email he subsequently disavowed and admitted that he had written ( and improperly provided you with a copy ) only as a personal favor to you.”

This statement attempts to deny that liability claims were based on Multiple Signed NDA’s, Admission of Use by Warner Employees, Admission of Violation of NDA’s by Warner Bros. employees, a SIGNED LICENSING AND SERVICING AGREEMENT, correspondences and notices of an ongoing Federal Lawsuit. Wherein that Federal RICO and Antitrust Lawsuit Smith is a central witness and actor, again conflicting his involvement in the matter.

Note that Smith is a licensed and practicing attorney and therefore has additional conflicts of interest under the Attorney Conduct Code in addition to the Corporate Conflicts.

* December 29, 2009 ~ Hall and Bernstein, unclear if Smith had notified Senior Executives and Auditors, as demanded in the preceding letters, contacted Warner Bros. et al. Officers, Directors and Auditors. The first AOL Inc. spokesperson was a one Jerry McKinley (“McKinley”) ~ Sr. Liaison of Executive Escalation at AOL Inc. calling to follow up on the earlier message to Tim Armstrong (“Armstrong”) ~ Chairman and CEO of AOL Inc. A follow up letter to our call with McKinley can be found @
	+ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20091231%20Jerry%20McKinley%20AOL%20Inc%20letter%20Re%20Wayne%20Smith%20Warner%20Bros%20response.pdf>
	+ McKinley was then givenexpressing tand Hall and methe named E, Officers and Auditors regarding the liabilitiesthe SEC and others, through sound business discussions and practices
* December 29?, 2009 ~ Hall and Bernstein calls to Time Warner Inc. and Warner Bros. executives
	+ liabilities describedboth Hall and Iere. Tthe unidentified employees transferred us to deliver Sthey too to the Executives and several refused to give their proper names or oversight
	+ for Time Warner we presume that avoidance equals concealment. This stands as additional cause for the SEC to investigate and fiOfficers Directors,AOC and further determine if they have reported the liabilities their offices have been notified about to Auditors and Shareholders.
* January 06, 2010 ~ Phone conversation with Day
	+ (“Day”)& COB , including General Counsel Ira Parker (“Parker”)
	+ and gave him orders backed
	+ , or why documents and to him. Y,
	+ Ei, and DirectorsA Upon leaving messages for Ira Parker, his assistant returned the call and stated that Parker was on vacation, could not be disturbed despite the PRIORITY situation and would return the call upon his return. As of this date, I have received no call back from Parker, perhaps he is on extended vacation.
* January 07, 2010 ~ Letter out to AOL Management Regarding Evasive Tactics of Management from Shareholder Liabilities
	+ Sent to: Tim Armstrong ~ Chairman and Chief Executive Officer @ AOL Inc. ( tim.armstrong@corp.aol.com ); Artie Minson ~ Chief Financial Officer @ AOL Inc. ( arthur.minson@corp.aol.com ); Jerry McKinley @ AOL Inc. ( mackinleyj@aol.com ); Ira Parker ~ General Counsel and Executive Vice President, Corporate Development @ AOL Inc ( ira.parker@corp.aol.com ); Christopher Day ~ Assistant General Counsel - Patent Litigation, Prosecution, and Licensing @ AOL Inc ( christopherday@corp.aol.com )
	+ January 07, 2010 Letter to CEO, Armstrong at AOL Inc. @

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20100110%20Kevin%20Hall%20Letter%20sent%20to%20Tim%20Armstrong%20AOL%20re%20Christopher%20Day%20calls%20to%20eib.pdf>

* January 08, 2010 ~ Additional Offer made to AOL Inc. CEO Armstrong thru Assistant General Counsel Christopher Day Summarizing Notes of Jan. 6, 2010 conversation @
	+ January 08, 2010 Letter to Tim Armstrong, CEO at AOL Inc.

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20100108%20Letter%20to%20Tim%20Armstrong%20AOL%20Warner%20Bros.pdf>

* January 2010 ~ Calls were next placed to CEO Armstrong and Day with Counsel Marc R. Garber, Esq. ( Garber ) of Flaster Greenberg PC, Kevin Hall, Esq. and Eliot Bernstein. Whereby, all messages were left by Garber with his personal phone numbers for AOL Counsel, Officers, Directors or Auditors to return his call. Again, not even a return call by AOL counsel to counsel Garber. This failure to return calls to counsel regarding matters as serious as this to Shareholders is unheard of and indicates further cause for the SEC to investigate all named parties herein and in the attached Exhibit 1, individually, as well as, corporately, including all stock transactions personally from1999-Present, including all recent breakup transactions.
	+ We left messages with both Armstrong and Day, giving them both a chance to return the calls, now that it was established that Armstrong had direct actual receipt of correspondences via email and now direct knowledge of the impending liabilities. These calls to contact Counsel Garber where not returned as of this date, leading to the filing of this Formal Complaint against Warner Bros. et al. as it appears they choose to not attempt to resolve the issues through sound business discussions and licensing of the technologies with the true and proper inventors and in fact continue to conceal the liabilities from Shareholders and others with potential liabilities, while transacting volumes of individual and corporate securities transactions.

This timeline and evidence should more than establish for the SEC that Smith’s recent claim, in his December 23, 2009 communication already exhibited herein, that

“Your time-barred claims hinge almost entirely on an internal email written by David Colter on January 15, 2002 - an email he subsequently disavowed and admitted that he had written ( and improperly provided you with a copy ) only as a personal favor to you”

is both false and misleading, in light of the substantial evidence presented and exhibited herein regarding the binding contractual relations between Warner Bros. et al. and Iviewit. The nature of the statement attempts to dismiss the liabilities as based on a single letter from a Warner Bros. employee, when the SEC is presented herein with the far more complete and truthful picture of the long and contractual relationship between Iviewit and Warner Bros et al. based on thousands of pages of documented evidence and legal binding contracts. The need to deny the extensively documented and contracted relationship is obviously in an effort to cover up why Warner Bros et al. has failed to properly report to Shareholders and Auditors these facts that will likely result in Catastrophic Liabilities triggering Rescissory Rights of Shareholders due to such fraud.

# FASB No. 5 Accounting Issues regarding the reporting of litigation liabilities and Intellectual Property infringement liabilities

Our intent in reaching out to Warner Bros. et al. starting in March 2009, prior to filing this Formal Complaint and other federal complaints, was to find out if Liabilities to their Shareholders could be eliminated with sound business and licensing practices with the true and proper inventors of the technologies. Also, contact was made due to the fact that Warner Bros. and certain employees of Warner Bros. had initially done the right thing and licensed the technologies and signed confidentialities, etc. and we were offering them an opportunity to explain the about face in 2002 and breaches of those binding contracts, to determine if remedy could be made. Knowingly infringing on backbone technologies and being involved in Ongoing Litigation would require proper accounting for the Liabilities on financial reports to Shareholders, Auditors, Outside Counsel and Regulators under Financial Accounting Standards Board (“FASB”) rules, including but not limited to the following FASB rules,

FASB

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.

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 regarding Intellectual Property infringement:

**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 statement, “**In that case, a judgment must first be made as to whether the assertion of the claim is probable”** and where in this case, both the liabilities incurred by ongoing and future litigations and intellectual property infringement liabilities, are far more than probable and indeed actual.

As the Intellectual Properties at the center of these matters are currently suspended by the Commissioner of the US Patent Office[[10]](#footnote-10), pending ongoing investigation of the attorneys involved by the US Patent Office OED Director, and investigations are ongoing ( part of our delay in getting back to Warner Bros et al. since 2002 ), a stream of additional lawsuits may further be anticipated by Warner Bros. et al. over the twenty-year life of the Intellectual Properties. An Injunction on use of the technologies would have catastrophic effects on Warner Bros. et al. shutting down their entire Online Video and reducing their cable channels throughput by 75% or more to consumers and result in likely payment of almost a decade of royalties owed for misuse. Members of the companies and the companies have violated signed licensing agreements and other binding agreements, admittedly, and therefore Injunction or Licensing the technologies is again far more than probable and would have to be accounted for by Auditors and Outside counsel and reported to Shareholders.

Whereas ongoing litigation over the criminal acts again is not probable but **actual** and this too should have been recorded in their financial statements and disclosed to by Auditors, Officers, Directors, Shareholders and others with liabilities, since the time that Warner Bros. et al. had knowledge of relevant information pertaining to the legal actions over the years 2000-Present.

Warner Bros. et al. has been formally noticed of the IP infringement and the actual ongoing and threatened future criminal litigations stemming from the alleged RICO and Antitrust civil and criminal crimes and yet chooses to conceal this information and attempt to deny factual evidence. Therefore, formal notice of these matters was also sent to Warner Bros. et al. accounting firm Ernst & Young to the attention of James Turley (“Turley”) ~ Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Ernst & Young Global Limited (“EYG”). Turley has also been noticed as auditor for Intel of the Iviewit SEC Intel Complaint and where Ernst & Young also is conflicted with the Iviewit companies and these matters, which is clouding their better judgment in reporting these matters, as they were accountants for my companies at the time the initial crimes were discovered.

Further, Ernst & Young replaced Arthur Andersen (“Andersen”) in an audit of Iviewit for its largest investor, Crossbow Ventures of West Palm Beach, whose funds were two-thirds SBA SBIC funds. After Andersen discovered evidence of fraudulent corporations and fraudulent technology transfers[[11]](#footnote-11), including information regarding possible illegal technology transfers by former Proskauer and Proskauer referred management, to Enron Broadband. The Enron Broadband division was perhaps the leading cause behind the Enron bankruptcy and the resulting document destruction by Andersen, which then led to the dissolution of Andersen. In fact, Enron Broadband was also part of a short-lived deal to distribute Internet movies with Blockbuster Video, which fell apart at approximately the same time Andersen and Warner Bros. et al. employees discovered fraud, accounting irregularities, fraudulent bankruptcies of illegally set up Iviewit companies and illegal technology transfers through these schemes. Also, take note that Iviewit’s seed investor was Wayne Huizenga who was the Founder of Blockbuster.

The recent 2009-2010 business calls to Warner Bros. et al. could have possibly eliminated civil lawsuit issues in my ongoing Federal RICO Lawsuit[[12]](#footnote-12) and given them potential remedies to eliminate the need to have a forensic audit to determine the liabilities under FASB, which will be catastrophic for Shareholders. One question for the SEC to investigate arises from how long the Warner Bros. et al. companies have **not** reported the liabilities to Shareholders and Auditors, knowingly. The liabilities from the infringement of the technologies required reporting since the signing of Licensing Agreements and signing of multiple NDA’s.

The financial reporting of my Federal RICO lawsuit and other earlier legal actions as liabilities required reporting since Warner Bros. et al. were notified of various legal actions from 2001-Present. Warner Bros et al. and certain of their employees are also central witnesses and defendants, regarding many of the allegations of fraud and more, allegations that include Fraud on the United States Patent & Trademark Offices, which has led to suspension of my Intellectual Properties pending ongoing Federal investigations and more, already evidenced herein.

The apparent lack of reporting the lawsuit liability of a Trillion Dollar plus Federal RICO Lawsuit, marked legally “related” to a Whistleblower Lawsuit by Federal Judge Shira Scheindlin, may have further catastrophic effect on the Warner Bros. et al. Shareholders. Where fraud is a major element of my RICO lawsuit, this could trigger Rescissory Shareholder Rights and cause a run on these blue chip companies by investors who remain unaware of the alleged fraudulent accounting and other allegations of criminal activities being concealed from them.

With my Intellectual Properties at the heart of these matters SUSPENDED by the US Patent Office, future litigation and lawsuits will continue over the twenty-year life of the IP or more and require reporting of liabilities throughout this time or until licensing arrangements are reached with the true and proper inventors. The resulting liabilities of the current and foreseen litigations must be properly audited and disclosed during this time for all financial reports, including for example, for lines of credits with banks, for annual reports, for audited regulatory financial statements, insurance carriers with risk, bond managers, etc. With the entire companies at stake and an opportunity to possibly remedy the liabilities, avoidance of the calls and denial of material facts imparts a certain disregard for Shareholder and Auditor disclosure. This concealment of these liabilities may be the actual reason for the recent breakup of the Warner Bros et al. companies, while further concealing the liabilities from Shareholders while these transfers occurred, all would be in violation of a plethora of SEC Codes.

All of this recent and past bizarre conduct is absolute cause for immediate investigation by your offices for alleged fraud, diversion/conversion of assets and other possible criminal securities violations, as the respective Warner Bros et al. Executives and Key Personnel seek to continue to conceal, dodge and obfuscate the Massive Trillion Dollar legal liabilities. All this coming on the heels of the BREAKUP between the respective companies apparently after I began notifying them again in March of 2009 of the massive lawsuit liabilities, as illustrated in the timeline herein,. Note that several years earlier in 2003-2004 efforts were also made to resolve certain of these issues.

This background is provided in part due to the long history of concealment and hiding of the truth, documents, information and the like regarding this Multi Trillion Dollar Fraud as further set out herein. I have specifically noticed Senior Management, Board Members, Officers and Auditors of Warner Bros et al. of the liabilities described herein and that those liabilities could and likely will have Catastrophic impact on the companies’ Shareholders and that the liabilities are in the Trillions of Dollars.

# New Evidence and Important Information for Ongoing SEC Investigations of; Allen Stanford, Bernard L. Madoff, Proskauer Rose, Marc S. Dreier, Galleon, Enron Broadband, Enron, Arthur Andersen and their direct RELEVANCY to this Complaint

ongoing SEC investigations all be revisited as much of the information contained herein may prove as central to those investigations. Whereby converted royalties from the stolen technologies may have been funneled through Ponzi scheme’s, especially where Defendants in my Lawsuit are found involved in the Ponzi scheme’s.

Many of the following Ponzi scheme’s involve Defendants in my Federal RICO and Antitrust Lawsuit. The SEC should note all of Proskauer’s involvement in these ongoing Ponzi schemes and other ongoing SEC investigations, as Proskauer’s involvement is pointed out in each. Additionally, the FBI should take note of Proskauer’s involvement in the Sir Robert Allen Stanford Ponzi “Stanford”, as Stanford tentacles into International Criminal Cartels, also deserving formal investigation by not only the SEC but the FBI. News reports confirm that the FBI is already conducting investigations into Stanford but both the SEC and FBI should pay particular attention as to how that crime may also relate to the stolen technologies. The Ponzi’s allegedly may be a vehicle for the criminal enterprise law firms to launder the illegally converted royalties from the thefts of my Intellectual Properties.

The following information represents where correlations to these schemes have involved defendants named in my lawsuit, including but not limited to all of the following SEC actions.

## Robert Allen Stanford ~ SEC Ongoing Investigation Indictment and FBI Investigation

The SEC Indictment and FBI Investigation of Sir Robert Allan Stanford involve the main Defendant in my RICO Lawsuit Proskauer Rose and partner Thomas Sjoblom who has since resigned from Proskauer, directly implicated in criminal activities in the Stanford investigation by the SEC. Acting as counsel for Stanford, Proskauer and Sjoblom allegedly aided and abetted Stanford employees in lying to SEC agents investigating the Ponzi in a meeting in a Miami Airport Hanger. **Sjoblom was an SEC Enforcement Official Prior to Joining Proskauer.**

A Global Class Action lawsuit was filed against Proskauer for the entire damages resulting from the Stanford Ponzi.

* August 31, 2009 “Proskauer Targeted in Class Action Over Handling of Stanford Financial” by Leigh Jones @ The National Law Journal

<http://www.law.com/jsp/article.jsp?id=1202433436276&rss=newswire>

* List of Stanford Actions including actions against Proskauer Rose

<http://74.125.47.132/search?q=cache:zDFm5gEXCbYJ:www.oakbridgeins.com/clients/blog/stanfordlist.doc+Troice+v.+Proskauer+Rose&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us>

* August 27, 2009 “Proskauer Rose, LLP; Thomas V. Sjoblum/ Samuel Troice; Horacio Mendez; Annalisa Mendez; Punga Punga Financial, Ltd., on behalf of all investors who purchased or held Certificates of Deposit or otherwise maintained accounts with Stanford International Bank as of February 2009.”

<http://www.oakbridgeins.com/clients/blog/troice.pdf>

Legal action has been filed against Proskauer and Sjoblom by Laura Pendergest Holt, one of the Stanford officers arrested by the SEC in the Stanford Ponzi

* March 27, 2009 Thomas V. Sjoblom and Proskauer Rose, LLP/ Laura Pendergest-Holt

<http://amlawdaily.typepad.com/sjoblom.pdf>

Note that Stanford is also under ongoing investigated by the SEC for involvement with leading International Criminal Cartels and where it has been reported that the FBI has been conducting a long-standing investigation of this connection.

More information Regarding the Stanford, Proskauer and Iviewit relation can be found at all of the following URL’s, hereby incorporated in entirety by reference herein:

* March 02, 2009 “**EMERGENCY MOTION TO INVESTIGATE PROSKAUER ROSE DEFENDANTS INVOLVEMENT IN THE ALLEN STANFORD FINANCIAL, THE BERNARD MADOFF AND THE MARC DRIER FRAUD SCANDALS. REMOVE PROSKAUER FROM SELF REPRESENTATION IN THESE MATTERS UNTIL SUCH TIME THAT THE FBI REMOVES THEM FROM THE ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS INTO THE STANFORD FINANCIAL FRAUD**”
	+ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090302%20FINAL%20Emergency%20Motion%20Re%20Proskauer%20Stanford%20Madoff%20Dreier%20Scandals4017.pdf>
* August 21, 2009 –08-4873-CV United States Court of Appeal for the Second Circuit “**Iviewit Motion to Compel US Second Circuit Court to Follow Law. Allen Stanford, Bernard Madoff, Marc S. Dreier links to Iviewit via Proskauer Rose and Foley and Lardner implicated in Trillion Dollar Suit. Citizen Arrest of Judge Ralph Winter & Clerk Catherine O’Hagan Wolfe.**”
	+ Online Interactive Version @ <http://iviewit.tv/wordpress/?p=78>
	+ Original Signed Filed Motion @

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090908%20FINAL%20Emergency%20Motion%20to%20Compel%20SIGNED44948.pdf>

* September 24, 2009 New York Senate Judiciary Committee Hearing, Eliot Bernstein testimony before the Committee
	+ Bernstein testimony begins in the video at 3 Hours 38 Minutes <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HR8OX8uuAbw&feature=player_embedded>
* October 05, 2009 – “**Prepared Statement of Eliot I. Bernstein of Iviewit to New York Senate Judiciary Committee John L. Sampson Regarding Trillion Dollar Iviewit Federal Lawsuit Naming Proskauer Rose, Foley & Lardner, IBM, Intel, SGI, Lockheed and More”**
	+ Online Interactive Version @

<http://iviewit.tv/wordpress/?p=165>

* + Filed Copy @

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20091005%20FINAL%20NY%20Judiciary%20Cover%20Letter%20for%20Prepared%20Statement%20to%20Committee%20John%20Sampson1897%20Signed.pdf>

 This information should be cause for the SEC to reanalyze the entire Madoff scheme in light of this new evidence.

The links provided in this Stanford Section are also beneficial for the following sections on Madoff and Dreier Ponzi Schemes and therefore will not be relisted in those sections.

## Bernard L. Madoff SEC Ongoing Investigation and Conviction as it Relates to Proskauer Rose

A tie between Proskauer and Madoff exists, learned from the SEC OIG stinging report on Madoff, which harshly criticized lax regulators for overlooking the Madoff information from Whistleblowers and Insiders at the SEC, over several years. According to TPM, in 2004 an SEC attorney, Genevievette Walker-Lightfoot, notified the SEC of the Ponzi but was forced out of her job, the SEC later settling a claim filed by Lightfoot. Upon termination, Lightfoot turned over the Madoff file to Jacqueline Wood who then presumably buried the report that could have exposed the Ponzi in 04. The SEC OIG’s report mentions Wood of Proskauer throughout the entire report as a key figure in the regulatory failure. After leaving the SEC, Wood took a cozy Proskauer Rose partnership.

I, Eliot I. Bernstein, filed Motions that are still pending at the US Second Circuit Court of Appeals, already exhibited herein, with similar claims of regulatory failures of the prior administration, failures alleged directly to relate to the Madoff case and I have reported this to Federal Authorities. The Motions also discuss Conflicts centering on the Madoff saga where the Proskauer Rose law firm publicly identified their firm as having the most clients in the Madoff Ponzi and now it is revealed in the press that many Madoff clients are the subject of ongoing SEC investigations.

The motion at the US Second Circuit is to Compel the Court to address these very Conflicts of Interest and other matters according to law, laws ignored while the Court and the Defendants perpetuate never ending Conflicts and Crimes. Note here that the handling of the Madoff Ponzi is by the same courts handling my RICO Lawsuit and that the same courts notified for months of the correlations between the Madoff Ponzi and my Lawsuit have failed to notify the proper authorities, including the SEC. Note further that in the courts handling my Lawsuit, many of the judges and clerks are also defendants.

This information should be cause for the SEC to reanalyze the entire Madoff scheme in light of this new evidence.

## Marc S. Dreier SEC Investigation and Conviction

The SEC Indictment and Conviction of Marc S. Dreier as it relates to Proskauer Rose, comes from the connection to Patent Attorney Raymond A. Joao. Joao initially introduced to Iviewit as a Proskauer partner by Wheeler, along with Rubenstein, when they were actually with Meltzer at that time. Upon investors learning Rubenstein and Joao were not with Proskauer as represented, Proskauer partner Christopher C. Wheeler (“Wheeler”) claimed they were transferring to Proskauer shortly. Rubenstein then transferred almost overnight and Joao was to follow after he finished work at Meltzer but since he was actually writing the patent applications under Rubenstein’s direction for Iviewit, Iviewit had to take an additional retainer to Proskauer’s with Meltzer until Joao transferred.

Joao never transferred to Proskauer and during his first year of work, it was then discovered that Joao might not be filing timely and correct patent applications and patenting inventions in his own name. Wheeler then claimed that he was beginning an investigation of Joao and Wheeler then suggested his good friend William Dick (“Dick”) of Foley to replace Joao for filing the patents, under Rubenstein’s oversight, as described in the Wachovia Private Placement already exhibited herein. What Wheeler failed to disclose to Iviewit is that Dick had been involved with Wheeler and another Wheeler referral to Iviewit, Brian G. Utley, immediately prior to coming to Iviewit, in another patent theft attempt from a Florida businessman Monte Friedkin, of Diamond Turf Equipment Co.

Wheeler presented a falsified resume for his friend Utley to Iviewit that not only failed to disclose the attempted theft but also failed to disclose, and in fact materially falsified the resume to conceal this fact. Factually, the attempted theft led to the firing of Utley, by Friedkin and Friedkin’s then closing the business and taking a multimillion-dollar loss due to the scheme perpetrated by Utley, Dick and Wheeler. Dick also failed to disclose this fact when joining Iviewit. In both Utley and Wheeler’s depositions, already exhibited herein, both Utley and Wheeler contradict each other’s statements when confronted with the Friedkin information and Dick in his Virginia Bar Response to a complaint filed against him, further contradicts both Wheeler and Utley regarding the Friedkin events.

When Dick replaced Joao, it was then learned from publicity directly from Joao that upon his departure from working with **Iviewit**, he had 90+ patents in his own name, many allegedly directly lifted from Iviewit. Joao then joined the Marc S. Dreier law firm.

This new information should be cause for the SEC to reanalyze the entire Dreier Ponzi scheme in light of this new evidence and in fact, the monies Dreier had allegedly directly related to sales of Joao’s stolen Intellectual Property and the Ponzi may have been a money-laundering scheme.

In addition to the links in the Stanford section, which deal with the Drier / Joao / Iviewit connections, additional links below substantiate these claims.

* Joao’s Dreier & Baritz LLP Bio

“Raymond A. Joao joined Dreier & Baritz LLP in 2001 as Of Counsel to the Firm's intellectual property department. Mr. Joao brings to the Firm an extensive legal, business and engineering background encompassing virtually all aspects of intellectual property, including prosecution of patent applications; reexaminations; preparation of patent opinions; litigation; and counseling clients in the development, management and exploitation of their intellectual property assets.

Mr. Joao is also currently an intellectual property management consultant for various start-up software, telecommunication, Internet and e-commerce companies. He regularly directs new business and intellectual property development efforts; negotiates contracts; drafts license agreements; performs due diligence in mergers and acquisitions; assists in the preparation of business plans, executive summaries and other corporate documents; conducts competitive analysis studies; aids in the formulation of litigation strategies; and assists in capital raising efforts.

Notably, Mr. Joao is the inventor of 10 issued U.S. patents and has over 80 patent pending technologies. Mr. Joao was also a founder of Electroship (N.Y.), Inc. which was formed to exploit certain patent pending technologies of which Mr. Joao was a co-inventor. Electroship (N.Y.), Inc. was acquired by a public company within six months of its formation. Mr. Joao headed Electroship's intellectual property and corporate efforts, as well as the merger and acquisition deal leading up to the merger.

Prior to joining Dreier & Baritz, Mr. Joao was head of the Intellectual Property Department at Meltzer, Lippe, Goldstein & Schlissel, P.C. in Mineola, New York. He was also formerly a partner at Anderson Kill & Olick, P.C. in New York in the Intellectual Property Group. Prior to the commencement of his legal career, Mr. Joao was an electrical engineer with Loral Corporation in the Systems Engineering Group, and prior to that was an engineer with Sperry Corporation. Mr. Joao obtained a Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering in 1982 and a Master of Science in Electrical Engineering in 1984 from Columbia University School of Engineering and Applied Science. He received his law degree in 1990 from St. John's University School of Law. Most recently, in 1999, he obtained a Masters in Business Administration in Finance from Baruch College/City University. Mr. Joao is admitted to practice before the United States Patent and Trademark Office, the U.S. District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, and the New York State and Connecticut Bars. e-mail: rjoao@dreierbaritz.com.

* January 02, 2009 ~ The WallStreet Journal “Former AUSA Selected as Bankruptcy Trustee in Dreier Case”

“For a week, it’d been all quiet on the Marc Dreier front. But now a new lawyer is set to be welcomed to the Dreier Party. The NYLJ reports that Sheila M. Gowan (University of Minnesota, Brooklyn Law) has been selected as the bankruptcy trustee in the case. Dreier, founder and sole owner of the law firm Dreier LLP — for those of you took December off — is alleged to have perpetrated a massive fraud against a group of hedge funds. (Here’s our coverage.) Gowan, a former Proskauer associate and AUSA in the Southern District of New York, is now a partner at Diamond McCarthy…”

Again, the SEC should note Proskauer’s involvement in the Dreier matters as trustee Gowan was a former Proskauer associate.

* March 03, 2009 ~ USDOJ Letter by Lev L. Dassin, Acting US Attorney to Judge Stuart M. Bernstein. Note that not only Gowan is copied but also Proskauer Attorney Jeffrey W. Levitan, Esq. ( Levitan ) is also copied. The SEC has absolute cause to investigate if Levitan, Gowan and/or Proskauer disclosed their involvement with Dreier and Joao regarding the allegations, they are fully aware of involving my patent theft through my Federal RICO and Antitrust Lawsuit. Failure to disclose this material fact in the Bankruptcy court is allegedly further fraudulent activity.

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20090325%20Dreier%20USDOJ%20Letter%20to%20BK%20Judge%20copies%20Proskauer%20and%20former%20Proskauer%20Gowan.pdf>

Again, all this new information is cause for the SEC to reinvestigate the Dreier Ponzi in light of these facts and whereby the Dreier Ponzi may be further efforts to launder monies gained from the stolen Intellectual Properties. This would represent possible Fraud Upon a United States Bankruptcy Court.

## Galleon SEC Ongoing Investigation and Convictions

 With information just beginning in this massive SEC insider trading case, the SEC should not that several of the key defendants in these matters are also defendants in my Federal RICO and Antitrust Lawsuit.

## October 16, 2009 SEC Complaint Galleon

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20091016%20SEC%20Galleon%20Complaint.pdf>

1. Intel Capital Rajiv Goel indicted by SEC and Intel Corporation is a defendant in my Federal RICO and Antitrust Lawsuit.
* Intel Capital Rajiv Goel, a managing director at Intel Corporation has been implicated by the SEC in the Galleon Complaint
	+ The SEC should take note that one of the first people on the scene at the time of the Iviewit inventions was a one Hassan Miah (“Miah”), who signed NDA’s while analyzing Iviewit as an Investment for EarthLink founders Sky Dylan Dayton and Kevin O’Donnell. Miah had worked at the Intel / Creative Artist Agency (“CAA”) Multimedia Lab prior to involvement with Iviewit and upon viewing the inventions, called them the “Holy Grail” of the Digital Imaging and Video world, including the Internet. Later Miah again joined Intel at Intel Capital.
	+ From Miah’s Biography @ Digital Hollywood <http://www.digitalhollywood.com/%231-DHEurope/London-WednesdayFive.html> , I quote,

“Hassan Miah is the former Managing Director of Intel Capital, where he led worldwide media and entertainment investments. Today, he remains an advisor to Intel Corporation’s Digital Home Group, which is responsible for the company’s global consumer PC product line. He is also the former head of New Media for CAA, one of Hollywood’s leading entertainment and talent agencies. While at Intel, Mr. Miah led such media related investments as Bellrock Media, Synacor, Zinio, Black Arrow, Clickstar and Gametrust. At CAA, Mr. Miah established and headed the CAA/Intel Media Lab, the first significant collaboration between Hollywood and a major technology company, and helped form Tele-TV, a joint investment by NYNEX, PacBell and Bell Atlantic to provide interactive video television services over phone lines. Before joining CAA, Mr. Miah was a Management Consulting Partner for KPMG LLP, specializing in media and entertainment transactions. At KPMG, he helped structure such transactions as the sale of MCA Universal Studios to Matsushita, the sale of Geffen Records to Universal and Polygram’s acquisition of A&M Records. Mr. Miah also has extensive operating/managerial experience having developed and sold companies in the digital media sector during his career, e.g., after creating the first consumer MP3 recording software, Mr. Miah successfully sold Xing Technology Corp. to Real Networks at a 10x multiple from when he joined the company less than two years after becoming CEO. Mr. Miah is a CPA and received a B.A. in Business from the University of Michigan and a M.B.A. from Stanford University’s Graduate School of Business.”

* April 27, 1999 ~ Letter from Richard R. Rosman, Esq. to Hassan Miah regarding the Iviewit inventions and Proskauer Rose Partner Kenneth Rubenstein’s opinion on the technologies. Note that Rubenstein and Miah know each other through MPEG and Miah’s former employer XING. Immediately after learning of the Iviewit inventions, Miah sold XING to Real Networks.

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/1999%2004%2026%20Wheeler%20Letter%20to%20Rosman%20re%20Rubenstein%20opinion.pdf>

* June 01, 1999 – Donald G. Kane, Managing Director at Goldman Sachs letter regarding Hassan Miah and Miah’s letter requesting to speak to Rubenstein.

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/1999%2006%2001%20HASSAN%20LETTER%20FORWARDED%20TO%20RUBENSTEIN.pdf>

* Roomy Khan, a convicted felon and former Intel employee is pleading guilty in the Galleon case and the relations between Iviewit and Intel are already described herein.
1. Robert W. Moffat, Jr. ~ Senior Vice President, Integrated Operations at IBM Corporation.
	* The SEC should note that IBM is a Defendant in my Federal RICO and Antitrust Lawsuit.
	* The SEC should note that Dick of Foley was former IBM patent counsel for their far eastern patent pooling scheme.
	* The SEC should note that Utley of Iviewit was formerly a General Manager at the IBM Boca Raton Florida facility.
	* The SEC should note that Wheeler of Proskauer claimed to have been the real estate legal agent for the Boca Raton, IBM facility.
	* The SEC should note again that Wheeler, Dick and Utley were part of an attempted theft of Intellectual Property from Florida businessperson Monte Friedkin.
	* The SEC should note that former Chief Judge of the New York courts was Chief Judge Judith Kaye, former IBM Counsel and married to Proskauer Partner Stephen R. Kaye ( deceased ). Stephen Kaye became an Intellectual Property partner in the Proskauer Intellectual Property group formed immediately after learning of my inventions. Both Judith Kaye and her deceased husband’s estate are Defendants in my Federal RICO and Antitrust Lawsuit.
	* The SEC should note that Wheeler not only introduced Utley to Iviewit with a falsified resume but that Utley and Wheeler also brought in Michael Reale, a former IBM employee.
	* The SEC should note that Wheeler and Utley recommended Dick to Iviewit after Joao’s termination from Iviewit and under false pretenses, again failing to notify Iviewit Management, Officers, Board Members and Investors of their prior attempted theft at Friedkin’s business and the resulting loss to Friedkin.
	* The SEC should note that it is alleged in my Federal RICO and Antitrust Lawsuit that IBM is alleged to be part of a possible Criminal Patent Theft Ring committing Fraud Upon the US Patent Office and world Intellectual Property Offices.
	* The SEC should note the recent appointment by President Barack Obama, whom also has been notified of the Iviewit claims as evidenced further herein, of David Kappos (“Kappos”) as Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property. Kappos was a former IBM Vice President and Assistant General Counsel for Intellectual Property.

<http://www.uspto.gov/biographies/bio_kappos.htm>

* + The SEC should note that IBM has also been notified of the same liabilities as described herein regarding Warner Bros. et al. and is believed to have also concealed these liabilities from their Shareholders and where this is again cause for the SEC to investigate IBM to prevent Massive Liabilities to IBM Shareholders, etc.

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20090313%20IBM%20Notice%20of%20Liabilities%20Robert%20Weber%20Samuel%20Palmisano.pdf>

1. Anil Kumar, Director at McKinsey & Co.
* The SEC should note that Calkin’s of Warner Bros. was a former McKinsey employee. The SEC should also note that H. Hickman Powell, of Iviewit’s largest investor, Crossbow Ventures, was also from McKinsey.

## November 04, 2009 SEC Complaint Galleon

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20091104%20Galleon%20SEC%20Complaint%20Ropes%20Gray%20etc.pdf>

1. Ropes & Gray – Arthur Cutillo, Esq. – Intellectual Property Attorney
	* The SEC should note that Ropes & Gray is directly involved as counsel in the Silicon Graphics, Inc. Bankruptcy whereby Iviewit has already filed papers in that case, exhibited herein and discussed further in the section titled “[IVIEWIT SEC COMPLAINT FILED AGAINST INTEL, LOCKHEED MARTIN AND SGI](#_Iviewit_SEC_Complaint)”
	* Ropes & Gray - Brien Santarlas – Intellectual Property Attorney
	* The SEC should note that 3Com is an early purveyor of the Iviewit technologies and under NDA.
	* The SEC should note that Ropes & Gray has patents listed at its website in digital imaging and video and that patents were transferred in the SGI Bankruptcy case.
2. Sullivan & Cromwell ~ Michael Kimelman, Esq. – Sullivan & Cromwell may also be involved in the SGI Bankruptcy case.

<http://www.liquidatingtrustee.com/2010/01/continued-culture-of-conflict-and.html>

Since the Galleon case is unfolding this information represents the initial correlations of several of the key defendants companies that may have further involvement with the Iviewit matters herein described, amendments will be made to this request for investigation as more is learned.

## Iviewit SEC Complaint Filed Against Intel, Lockheed Martin and SGI (Formerly Owners of Real 3D, Inc.)

Please note that this Request for Investigation and Formal Complaint against Warner Bros et al. directly relates to my prior formal complaint to the SEC[[13]](#footnote-13) involving the Intel Corporation, Lockheed Martin, and Silicon Graphics, Inc. These three companies were all owners of the Real3d Inc. company ( later wholly acquired by Intel ), where my Technologies were first tested, used, viewed, approved, validated, Contracted and Licensed under Non Disclosure and other licensing agreements. Leading Industry Experts of the three companies at the Real3d Inc. laboratories, similar to Warner Bros. et al. completed validation of the novelty of the Intellectual Properties in 1998-1999. Real 3D prior to acquisition by the minority interest owner Intel (20%), were previously located on Lockheed Martin properties in Orlando, Florida.

Complaints are on file already with the SEC against these companies for likely fraudulent stock transactions similar to those described herein committed by Warner Bros. et al., as well as, likely massive fraud upon their shareholders. All transactions, stock transfers, mergers and acquisitions dating back to 1998 should be part of the investigation of these companies, in addition to likely violations of FASB No. 5 and other corporate accounting rules for failure at minimum to book liabilities on the corporate financials and provide notice to Shareholders.

## Intel

* March 06, 2009 Iviewit Letter of Liabilities to Intel

[http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090306%20Intel%20Demand%20Letter%20&%20Liability%20Exposure%20%20Signed%203549l.pdf](http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090306%20Intel%20Demand%20Letter%20%26%20Liability%20Exposure%20%20Signed%203549l.pdf)

* March 25, 2009 Iviewit SEC Complaint Filed

[http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090306%20Intel%20Demand%20Letter%20&%20Liability%20Exposure%20%20Signed%203549l.pdf](http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090306%20Intel%20Demand%20Letter%20%26%20Liability%20Exposure%20%20Signed%203549l.pdf)

* September 15, 2009 Apple Press Release ~ Intel Counsel Bruce Sewell departs Intel to Apple

<http://www.apple.com/pr/library/2009/09/15sewell.html>

* January 16, 2002 The Register “SGI transfers 3D graphics patents to MS [Microsoft]

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20020116%20SGI%20transfers%20patents%20to%20MICROSOFT.pdf>

## Lockheed

* April 16, 2009 Iviewit Letter to Lockheed’s Counsel James Comey Regarding Iviewit Liabilities

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090416%20FINAL%20SIGNED%20Demand%20Letter%20to%20Lockheed%20Comey4841clow.pdf>

* April 27, 2009 Iviewit SEC Complaint Against Lockheed

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090427%20FINAL%20Lockheed%20SEC%20Complaint2064.pdf>

## Silicon Graphics Inc.

* March 19, 2009 Iviewit Letter to Elena Ramirez regarding SGI Liabilities in the Iviewit matters.

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20090319%20SGI%20Notice%20of%20Liability%20Counsel%20Elena%20Rameriz.pdf>

* April 01, 2009 SGI Files Chapter 11 Bankruptcy
	+ The SEC should note the immediate proximity of notice to SGI counsel Elena Ramirez on March 18, 2009 to the filing of the Bankruptcy and where Ramirez fails to the notify the court of the liabilities. This transaction may also trigger Rescissory Shareholder Rights for Fraud involving this transaction.
	+ The SEC should note that all transactions of SGI stock from 1998-Present should be investigated for fraud based on SGI’s involvement with Real 3D, Inc. and as it relates to the Iviewit matters.
	+ Voluntary Petition (Chapter 11). Order for Relief Entered. Filed by Mark R. Somerstein of Ropes & Gray LLP on behalf of Silicon Graphics, Inc.. (Somerstein, Mark) (Entered: 04/01/2009)
* April 13, 2009 Inside HPC News “A visual timeline of the rise and sale of SGI”

<http://insidehpc.com/2009/04/13/a-visual-timeline-of-the-rise-and-sale-of-sgi>

* + Timeline of SGI

<http://insidehpc.com/images/04132009/SGItimeline.jpg>

* Vizworld Articles regarding what led to Rise and Fall of SGI

<http://www.vizworld.com/tag/sgi-bts>

<http://www.vizworld.com/?s=iviewit>

* April 09, 2009 Federal Bankruptcy Complaint Silicon Graphics, Inc. “Emergency Motion to Establish Proof of Claim; Vacate or Modify Order of Sale; Injunction; Priority of Claims; and Other Relief”

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090409%20FINAL%20US%20Bankruptcy%20Court%20SDNY%20SGI%20Motion.pdf>

* May 05, 2009 Ropes & Gray “OBJECTION OF THE DEBTORS TO EMERGENCY MOTION OF ELIOT I. BERNSTEIN TO ESTABLISH PROOF OF CLAIM; VACATE OR MODIFY ORDER OF SALE; INJUNCTION; PRIORITY OF CLAIMS; AND OTHER RELIEF” (related document(s) 102 ) filed by Mark R. Somerstein on behalf of Silicon Graphics, Inc.. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A - Original Complaint# 2 Exhibit B - Amended Complaint (Part 1)# 3 Exhibit B - Amended Complaint (Part 2)# 4 Exhibit B - Amended Complaint (Part 3)# 5 Exhibit C - District Court Order) (Somerstein, Mark) (Entered: 05/05/2009)
	+ Objection to Motion <http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=318>
	+ Related Document <http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=102>
	+ # 1 Exhibit A - Original Complaint <http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=318&sd=1>
	+ #2 Exhibit B - Amended Complaint (Part 1) <http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=318&sd=2>
	+ # 3 Exhibit B - Amended Complaint (Part 2) <http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=318&sd=3>
	+ # 4 Exhibit B - Amended Complaint (Part 3) <http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=318&sd=4>
	+ # 5 Exhibit C - District Court Order) <http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=318&sd=5>
	+ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/SGI%20Bankruptcy/Bernstein%20Objection.pdf>
* May 05, 2009 SGI Counsel Elena Rameriz Declaration to BK court. “Affidavit Declaration of Elena Ramirez in Support of the Objection of the Debtors to the Emergency Motion of Eliot I. Bernstein to Establish Proof of Claim; Vacate or Modify Order of Sale; Injunction; Priority of Claims; and Other Relief filed by Mark R. Somerstein on behalf of Silicon Graphics, Inc.. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A - Bernstein Letter to General Counsel of Intel Corporation# 2 Exhibit B - Bernstein Letter to the President of the United States# 3 Exhibit C - Bernstein Complaint to SEC) (Somerstein, Mark) (Entered: 05/05/2009)

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/SGI%20Bankruptcy/Ramirez%20Declaration.pdf>

* May 08, 2009 Eliot Bernstein prepared statement read into record during hearing of SGI BK

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/SGI%20Bankruptcy/20090508%20SGI%20BK%20Hearing%20Script%20into%20records.pdf>

* May 08, 2009 – Order Denying “Emergency Motion of Eliot I. Bernstein to Establish Proof of Claim; Vacate or Modify Order of Sale; Injunction; Priority of Claims; and Other Relief.” (Related Doc # 102 , Doc # 318 ) (Tetzlaff, Deanna) (Entered: 05/08/2009)

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=367>

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=102>

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=318>

* June 16, 2009 Iviewit Proof of Claim SGI BK

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090616%20FINAL%20NYSD%20BK%20Proof%20of%20Claim%20and%20Letter%20SGI%20BK.pdf>

* August 14, 2009 “Motion for Objection to Claim(s) Number: 225 - Objection of the Debtors to Claim of Eliot I. Bernstein with hearing to be held on 9/15/2009 at 10:00 AM at Courtroom 501 (MG) Responses due by 9/10/2009, filed by Mark R. Somerstein on behalf of Graphics Properties Holdings, Inc.. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A# 2 Exhibit B - Part 1# 3 Exhibit B - Part 2# 4 Exhibit B - Part 3# 5 Exhibit C - Ramirez Declaration# 6 Exhibit A to Ramirez Declaration# 7 Exhibit B to Ramirez Declaration# 8 Exhibit C to Ramirez Declaration# 9 Exhibit D# 10 Exhibit E# 11 Exhibit F - Gibson Declaration# 12 Exhibit G# 13 Exhibit H - Proposed Order)(Somerstein, Mark) (Entered: 08/14/2009)
	+ Docket for SGI Bankruptcy
	<http://www.donlinrecano.com/Dockets/sgi/09-11701>
* August 14, 2009 “Notice of Hearing regarding Objection of the Debtors to Claim of Eliot I. Bernstein (related document(s) 606 ) filed by Mark R. Somerstein on behalf of Graphics Properties Holdings, Inc.. with hearing to be held on 9/15/2009 at 10:00 AM at Courtroom 501 (MG) Objections due by 9/10/2009, (Somerstein, Mark) (Entered: 08/14/2009)”
* September 11, 2009 “Response - Claimant - Creditor Eliot I. Bernstein''s Response and Cross Motion to Debtor''s Objections to the Bernstein Proof of Claim” No. 225 filed by Debtor Counsel Ropes and Gray, LLP filed by Eliot I. Bernstein. with hearing to be held on 9/15/2009 at 10:00 AM at Courtroom 501 (MG) (Lopez, Mary) (Entered: 09/11/2009)

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=660>

* September 13, 2009 “Response - Reply Of The Debtors To Claimant Creditor Eliot I. Bernstein'’s Response And Cross Motions To Debtor's Objections To The Bernstein Proof Of Claim No. 225 Filed By Debtor Counsel Ropes and Gray, LLP, And Motion To Estimate The Claim Of Eliot I. Bernstein (related document(s) 660 ) filed by Mark R. Somerstein on behalf of Graphics Properties Holdings, Inc.. with hearing to be held on 9/15/2009 at 10:00 AM at Courtroom 501 (MG) (Somerstein, Mark) (Entered: 09/13/2009)

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=664>

* September 15, 2009 “Order Signed on 9/15/2009 Sustaining the Objection of the Debtors to Claim of Eliot I. Bernstein”. (related document(s) 606 ) (Tetzlaff, Deanna) (Entered: 09/15/2009)

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=676>

* November 19, 2009 “Motion to Compel - Letter to the Clerk’s Office with Motion to Compel and Disqualify and Other Relief Under Rule 9024 and FRCP Rule 60 filed by Eliot Ivan Bernstein.” (Lopez, Mary) (Entered: 11/24/2009)

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=841>

* + The SEC should note here that this document was not docketed when received by the court on September 18, 2009
* December 30, 2009 “Order Denying Eliot Bernstein’s (1) Motion for Reconsideration Under Bankruptcy Rule 9024 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60 and (2) Motion to Disqualify (Related Doc # 841 ) signed on 12/30/2009” (White, Greg) (Entered: 12/30/2009)

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=865>

* + The SEC should note that this document was not served upon me and was found on the docket while preparing this Formal Complaint.

Take note that only days after formally noticing SGI’s General Counsel, Elena Ramirez (“Ramirez”), regarding the infringement and litigation liabilities and offering a similar opportunity to discuss sound business and accounting practices, SGI filed a bankruptcy proceeding in Federal Bankruptcy Court under Judge Martin Glenn but failed to disclose knowledge of the liabilities. Further, the Bankruptcy attempts to shift intellectual properties, which may also be involved in these matters. Of course, if fraud is determined to have occurred by Executive Officers of Real 3D, Inc., Intel, Lockheed Martin and SGI, again the Shareholders of those companies would have Rescissory Shareholder Rights and the results will be catastrophic, as described herein and in the former Official Complaints already submitted.

## Iviewit Additional NEW Information Regarding SEC Investigations of Enron Broadband, Enron and Arthur Andersen

SEC Ongoing Investigation, Indictments and Convictions regarding Enron Broadband and Arthur Andersen as they relate to Iviewit Illegal Technology Transfers

Both Andersen and Enron where then targets of SEC investigations and the Enron investigations resulted in convictions. This Formal Complaint, as it relates to the herein relevant Federal, State and International Crimes may have direct bearing of the Ongoing Investigations of Enron and Andersen and if those investigations are not currently active, this information may be cause for further new Investigations or re-opening prior investigations in light of this information.

Huizenga Blockbuster/Enron etc.

## 2004-Present SEC Investigation of Iviewit Allegations and False Statements by Boca Raton Police Department Detectives to SEC

2004-Present SEC Investigation Regarding Iviewit and Boca Raton, Florida, Police Department regarding Investigations of Stolen Funds and Intellectual Properties and allegedly part of the stolen funds are from loans from the Small Business Administration. SEC Investigators claim that statements made by the Boca Raton Police Department were false regarding a two-year SEC investigation that the SEC was supposed to have been conducting per detectives at the Boca PD. SEC agents involved denied ever being informed or jointly working on an investigation with the Boca PD and further denied being invited to a meeting at the Boca Raton PD. Based on these false claims by the Boca PD, the agents involved at the SEC claimed they were beginning an investigation of the matters at that time.

* October 07, 2004 Iviewit Petition to the Florida Supreme Court regarding SEC and Boca Raton, FL Police Department Bogus Joint Investigation @

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/2004_10_07_Supreme_Court_Florida_Motion_Final_Cert_Signed.pdf>

* October 08, 2004 Supplemental Petition to Florida Supreme Court Regarding SEC and Boca Raton Police Department Bogus Joint Investigation @

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/2004%2010%2008%20Flordia%20Supreme%20Court%20SC104%201078%20motion%20supp%20cert%20.pdf>

* August 28, 2003 Written Statement to Boca Raton PD Regarding Stolen Funds, Including SBA funds @

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/POLICE%20REPORT%20-%20STOLEN%20CASH%20TIEDEMANN%20PROLOW%20PROSKAUER.pdf>

* September 02, 2003 Written Statement to Boca Raton PD Regarding Stolen Intellectual Property @

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/Written%20Statement%202%20-%20Stolen%20Intellectual%20Property.pdf>

# Discussion of Ongoing Lawsuits and Related Cases to Federal Whistleblower Lawsuit of Christine C. Anderson

## Related Cases to Whistleblower Case of Christine C. Anderson, marked legally “related” by US Federal Judge Shira A. Scheindlin at the US District Court Southern District NY

1. 07cv09599 Anderson v The State of New York, et al.
**WHISTLEBLOWER LAWSUIT** which other cases have been marked legally “related” to by Fed. Judge Shira A. Scheindlin
2. 07cv11196 Bernstein, et al. v Appellate Division First Department Disciplinary Committee, et al.
3. 07cv11612 Esposito v The State of New York, et al.
4. 08cv00526 Capogrosso v New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct, et al.
5. 08cv02391 McKeown v The State of New York, et al.
6. 08cv02852 Galison v The State of New York, et al.
7. 08cv03305 Carvel v The State of New York, et al.
8. 08cv4053 Gizella Weisshaus v The State of New York, et al.
9. 08cv4438 Suzanne McCormick v The State of New York, et al.
10. 08cv6368 John L. Petrec-Tolino v. The State of New York
11. 06cv05169 McNamara v The State of New York, et al.

## Cases @ United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

1. 08-4873-cv Bernstein et al. v Appellate Division First Department Disciplinary Committee, et al.
2. 08-4879-cv Luisa C. Esposito v The State of New York et als.
3. Capogrosso v New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct, et al.
4. McKeown v The State of New York, et al.

In reviewing this Formal Complaint the SEC should not one of the biggest elements in prosecuting those involved is that large law firms are committing these crimes and cover-ups with the ability to penetrate and pervert justice is far easier than for most common crooks. The ability to infiltrate justice, using their pedigree of law, allows the fox into the henhouse, allowing them to deflect criminal and civil complaints, through violating public offices, conflict of interest rules and the public trust at will. In fact, being lawyers, allows them the ability to even, in some circumstances, control law, control the courts and control those who would typically uphold the law.

Enter Christine C. Anderson, Esq. to help prove this point. Anderson is a former staff attorney at the New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee (“First DDC”) and a hero to the system of Justice. Anderson fired for standing up to injustice in the ETHICS department, injustice at the highest office of law; the regulatory body for attorney misconduct without with law becomes lawlessness. Note here, that the First DDC is the ethics department that regulates Wall Street attorneys which of late appears to be more like the streets of Sodom and Gomorra.

Anderson filed a Federal Lawsuit[[14]](#footnote-15) and in her original filing mentioned my companies Iviewit, regarding a Motion filed against the former Chief Counsel of the First DDC, Thomas Cahill (“Cahill”). Cahill ordered for investigation with the former President of the New York Bar Association (“NYSBA”) and head of the ethics’ departments in New York, Steven C. Krane (“Krane”) of Proskauer Rose and his Proskauer partners Rubenstein and Joao. Orders for investigation were by unanimous consent of five Justices of the New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department (“First Dept”)[[15]](#footnote-16) for the Appearance of Impropriety and Conflicts of Interest.

Krane found handling complaints at the First DDC against his firm Proskauer and Proskauer attorney Rubenstein, while an officer of the First DDC, the head of the ethics’ departments throughout New York. Krane also violated Public Office acting within a one-year blackout whereby the NYSBA precludes officers for a year after service from handling disciplinary complaints. Further, Cahill lied when confronted about Krane’s role at the First DDC and even claimed he did not know if Krane was an officer of the court. Yet, upon contacting then clerk of the First Dept, Catherine O’Hagan Wolfe (“Wolfe”),[[16]](#footnote-17) now clerk of the Second Circuit Court, Wolfe claimed that not only did Cahill know Krane was an officer but that they had all had a scheduled First DDC meeting shortly.

Wolfe directed me to file the Motions against Cahill, Krane, Rubenstein, Proskauer, Meltzer and Joao with First Dept that led to the Orders for Investigation. The New York Supreme Court Appellate Division Second Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee (“Second DDC”) and the New York Supreme Court Appellate Division Second Department (“Second Dept”) then derailed the investigations and then further conflicts with Krane were discovered with the investigator of the Second DDC. The SEC should note here that Krane also was a law clerk for Chief Judge Judith Kaye and Kaye was married to Proskauer Partner, Stephen R. Kaye, who late in life became a partner in the newly formed Proskauer Intellectual Property department with Rubenstein.

The complaints were then elevated to Federal Authorities, as it appeared that the New York Courts were corrupted top down, with Kaye controlling not only the courts but also the disciplinary departments of New York and where Krane was hands on controlling complaints filed against Proskauer. Unbelievable but Anderson provides pivotal evidence that the corruption was far worse than merely blocking my individual complaints against Proskauer attorneys but in fact, the corruption had reached the highest investigatory bodies in New York in conspiracy with the Ethics Department. In order to support the heroic efforts of Anderson to expose this perverse corruption I filed my Federal RICO Lawsuit as a related case to Anderson’s and while Judge Scheindlin did not approve all requests for relation to Anderson, she did include mine with several others, as legally “related” to Anderson.

Anderson, in sworn testimony to the New York Senate Judiciary Committee[[17]](#footnote-18) and in open Federal Court in Scheindlin’s court, made claims that made the First Dept. look like a mob run organization, even physically assaulting Anderson who is approximately 63 years old. Anderson revealed in Federal Court that the First Dept had a “Cleaner” named Naomi Goldstein (“Goldstein”) and that Goldstein was cleaning complaints, with Cahill[[18]](#footnote-19) for not only “favored lawyers and law firms” but that she was cleaning complaints for the US Attorney, the District Attorney and the Assistant District Attorney. Anderson went on additionally to support here testimonies with a written statement of the corruptions, including document and evidence destruction in attorney complaints found at the following URL @ <http://iviewit.tv/wordpress/?p=209> whereby Exhibit 2 is the statement.

Mind blowing revelations that not only confirming my deepest fears of alleged corruption in the ethics department but fingering Cahill, Wolfe and others in a CONSPIRATORIAL effort to deny not only individual rights in the courts but to use the Ethics Department as an Attorney Protection Agency. Anderson depicts the First DDC as a self-regulated disaster, a disgrace to the very term Ethics, a disgrace to the profession of Law with those in charge acting criminally.

Pause for a moment to capture the breadth of these implications, not only in relation to this Formal Complaint but also in relation to the problems currently facing the country as a whole. Andersons’ revelations expose not only the corruption in New York but also now force a number of investigations to begin. Investigations of Federal and State Agencies, including but not limited to, the First Dept, the First DDC, the US Attorney, the District Attorney, the Assistant District Attorney and the New York State Attorney General. Investigation into every complaint that complains of injustice and denial of due process by all of these agencies, including my complaints with these agencies that mirror almost identically the claims Anderson makes. All opinions, orders, rulings, reviews, both in the courts and at the investigatory agencies must now be discarded, re-evaluated and re-investigated by non-conflicted third parties and most likely outside of the corruption that plagues New York at the moment.

Anderson it appears had no regulatory or investigatory agency to turn to with her Whistleblower allegations as those charged with investigating such matters were all part of the alleged conspiracy and the very people and agencies she was complaining of in her allegations. In fact, the New Attorney General Andrew Cuomo, whose job it is to investigate New York Public Office Crimes through the Public Integrity Division of the AG, instead represents the State of New York Defendants, both professionally and individually. Representation that appears illegal as the AG is supposed to advise the State Defendants to get independent counsel when there is Absolute Conflict as in Anderson’s case and investigate the Public Officials on behalf of the People of New York, whose duty and honest service is with the People.

Anderson has filed a complaint with Scheindlin’s court to dismiss the entire hearing in her case due to the AG fraud on the court. Anderson’s Motion can be found at

November 16, 2009 Anderson’s “Notice of Motion” <http://www.frankbrady.org/TammanyHall/Documents_files/Anderson%20111609%20Filing.pdf>

It should be noted here, that similar to Anderson’s claims that the NY AG has acted illegally and perpetrated a fraud on the court, I also have made the same claims and for almost identical reasons, as the NY AG represents the State Defendants in my Federal RICO and Antitrust Lawsuit and has further issues of conflict in my matters that can found by a thorough review of both my District Court and Court of Appeals Motions, all included in entirety herein by reference.

Therefore, when considering this Formal Complaint and until all investigations ongoing worldwide and now in New York are fully completed, I request that any decisions emanating from New York, the First Dept, the First DDC, the New York courts, the Federal Courts, the Florida courts and Florida and Virginia State Bars be wholly discounted. Other than to serve as evidence of the crimes committed. Note here that in the state of Florida, similar conflicts to New York were discovered, again with Proskauer and again in the Florida Supreme Court and Florida State Bar Association, both Defendants in my Federal RICO and Antitrust Lawsuit.

The ongoing court cases and investigations in New York and then Florida will all be subject to appeal because they emanate from the complaints filed in the First Dept and First DDC and many agencies may have relied upon the decisions in making their decisions. Due to the material fraud on the courts and investigatory agencies committed through a never-ending sewer of Conflicts of Interest that acted to Obstruct Justice that led to a denial of due process and procedure, influencing the outcomes, all complaints and investigations will need to be removed from the persistent and continued conflicts of interest at play in New York. Without conflicts, the proverbial “peeling of the onion” will begin, revealing a massive criminal organization led by corrupted law firms inside Public Offices to make the Tammany Hall Scandal seem like a parking infraction.

On information and belief, another Whistleblower also has emerged from the First Dept, Nicole Corrado (“Corrado”), who was threatened by a First DDC official on her way to deposition in the Anderson case. Corrado’s own claims are centered upon sexual misconduct allegations. Corrado has been on leave since the Federal Witness Tampering allegations surfaced. Also of note is that on June 28, 2007 an article appeared in Expose Corrupt Courts that further illustrates just how out of control the ETHICS departments are, titled, “Sex Scandal at the Attorney Committee on Character & Fitness”, which may have been part of the cause for the departure of Cahill from the First DDC. The story at,

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2007/06/sex-scandal-at-attorney-committee-on.html>

Hard to believe? it is harder to believe that almost all of the ongoing problems in the United States at this time, from the WallStreet Meltdown, to lax or complicit State and Federal Regulators, to Violations of War Crime Statutes and Torture Treatises, all center around lawyers and in almost all instances, the lawyers come from the state of New York. This sad but true fact can also be seen in the Ponzi’s of Madoff, Dreier and Stanford, where again lawyers are center stage, rigging banking laws in Florida for Stanford, lax and complicit regulators in Madoff and Stanford and in both of these, Proskauer lawyers dead center in the scandals. Often, after committing crimes or covering them up in the public sector, these lawyers/regulators are then hired back to the nest by the law firms and rewarded with partnerships.

* January 05, 2010 The AmLaw Daily “TPM Shines Spotlight on Allen Stanford's Lawyers” by Brian Baxter <http://amlawdaily.typepad.com/amlawdaily/2010/01/stanfords-lawyers.html>

# SEC regulatory failures and Public Pressure for change resulting from Past Administration Regulatory Failures

 As the SEC may have internal problems, that have become public, the events herein are during the time were regulatory failure was the SOP at the SEC, which has led to a meltdown of our economy. I, therefore respectfully request, that not only does the SEC sign the attached Conflict of Interest Disclosure, prior to ANY action in these matters, and by all those who are charged with handling these matters but also call in immediate oversight authorities. Including but not limited to, the Inspector General to determine what if anything has occurred in the many years since the SEC had knowledge of criminal allegations from Iviewit and in the recent allegations against major Blue Chip Companies.

While your investigation may or may not include my personal involvement the need to relegate Conflict, where Conflicts are center stage in the Federal RICO and ANTITRUST Lawsuit public office violations already being investigated and where those Conflicts have led now to criminal allegations against all those who have been found conflicted as conspirators in the overall RICO and ANTITRUST. The following public information concerns me gravely but I reserve my judgment of the SEC’s investigation into all of these matters, including the Iviewit investigation dating far back regarding the Boca Raton PD, until the matters are formally reviewed and addressed per SEC formal complaint procedures.

Yet, I fear stockholders of these major companies may be horribly compromised in such time and therefore request that the SEC, in order to protect the Shareholders, immediately put restraints on all transactions of these companies named herein and in exhibit. Freezing the assets and/or other actions, until the matters can both be reviewed by the SEC, sent for a Special Prosecutor to investigate if conflict exists now, reviewed by appropriate oversight and finally fully adjudicated by all State, Federal and International Authorities having ongoing investigation of ANY of these matters.

* SEC REPORT - Investigation of Failure of the SEC to Uncover Bernard Madoff’s Ponzi Scheme - Public Version - August 31, 2009 Report No. OIG-509

<http://www.sec.gov/news/studies/2009/oig-509.pdf>

* “SEC Sued Over Failure To Disclose Post-Madoff Reforms” January 06, 2010 by Nick Pinto @ TPM Media LLC.

<http://tpmmuckraker.talkingpointsmemo.com/2010/01/sec_sued_over_failure_to_disclose_post-madoff_refo.php>

* The New York Times ~ “The S.E.C.’s Whistleblower Problem” January 21, 2010 by Legal Blog

<http://dealbook.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/01/21/the-secs-whistle-blower-problem>

* The Washington Post ~ “At SEC, the system can be deaf to whistleblowing” January 21, 2010 by Zachary A. Goldfarb Washington Post Staff Writer

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/01/20/AR2010012005125.html?dbk>

The reason for mentioning these internal regulatory problems currently and in the past is that the SEC now has the ability to tie all these investigations together to the Iviewit matters and prevent Shareholder Fraud on Companies complained of herein and in the attached exhibits and links. This presents an opportunity for the SEC to regain trust and confidence of the public and preclude future lawsuits by injured Shareholders against the SEC and many others. This is not regulatory failure or lack of regulation being complained of herein these are very real federal claims of criminal acts. Where the criminals may have infiltrated regulatory agencies in the past, it is time for the SEC to show that it will not allow MAJOR CRIMES on SHAREHOLDERS of BLUE CHIP COMPANIES but more importantly for those handling these matters that the SEC is not found COMPLICIT.

I am certain that with this new information and complaint, the SEC will forthright address these issues before exposure to massive liabilities results from failure to investigate and stop the crimes, which is allowing these complained of companies fraudulently to manipulate their corporate stocks. These fraudulent securities transactions possibly being structured to the detriment of Shareholders Worldwide in these most heavily traded blue chip companies must be stopped immediately while formal investigations are undertaken. At this time, however, as noted in my Feb. 2009 letter to the Office of the US President Barack Hussein Obama II and the US Attorney General Eric Holder[[19]](#footnote-20), I wish to bring to your direct attention the identities of several federal offices already involved in this ongoing national and international Intellectual Properties theft and fraud.

Please note that I provide the FBI and SEC and its various Office and Division heads this background solely as a starting point for full and proper investigations of Warner Bros et al. and related parties in this matter. I remain personally available to provide further information as necessary. It should be noted that a wealth of the history of these matters with additional evidence is available at my website [www.iviewit.tv](http://www.iviewit.tv), including links to the current federal complaint filed in the US Court of Appeals 2nd Circ. and the complaint filed with the US District Court – Southern District of New York.

# List of Current Ongoing Federal, State & International Investigations

Investigations that will aid and facilitate the SEC with background information for the proper performance of complete investigations by the SEC allowing for information sharing with these agencies, some of the key offices are as follows:

* Glenn A. Fine, Office of Inspector General of the US Department of Justice
* Commissioner of Patents, US Patent Office
* Harry Moatz, Director, Office of Enrollment & Discipline of the US Patent Office
* Hon. Chairman John Conyers, United States House Judiciary Committee
* Hon. Dianne Feinstein, United States Senate Judiciary Committee
* Senator John L. Sampson, Chairman, New York Senate Judiciary Committee
* Inspector General Tax
* Inspector General SBA
* A List of Ongoing Federal, State & International Actions can be found @
	+ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/INVESTIGATIONS%20MASTER.htm> .

# EXHIBIT 1

**Warner Bros. Contacts**

New Contacts Left Message of Shareholder Liabilities

1. Barry M. Meyer ~ Chairman and CEO:
2. Alan F. Horn ~ President and COO:
3. Edward A. Romano ~ EVP and CFO:

Past Contacts under NDA, Patent Confidentialities and Licensing Agreement

1. Wayne M. Smith ~ Vice President and Chief Patent Counsel:
2. Massimiliano Gasparri ~ Director Multimedia Technology:
3. Lawrence S. Kelly ~ Director Strategic Planning & Business Development
4. Brent Roberts ~ Director: Workstation Systems WB Online
5. Thomas Sanford
6. Jeremy Wall ~ Manager Business Development - Warner Bros. New Media
7. Clarissa C. Weirick ~ Vice President General Counsel, New Media:
8. Ray Caldito ~ Director of Business Development:
9. Charles L. Dages ~ Senior Vice President Technology Emerging Technology New Media: Colter and Thagard Direct Report, Oversaw Iviewit technology evaluations, etc.
10. David J. Colter ~ Vice President Technology - Technological Operations Warner Bros.
11. Greg B. Thagard ~ Vice President Advanced Technology Technical Operations:
12. Carolyn Wessling ~ Director of Business and Legal Affairs
13. Spencer H. C. Yu ~ Director Business & Legal Affairs
14. Michael Rackman ~ Counsel Patents: Colter sent patent info
15. Alan Rubenstein ~ Counsel Patents: Colter sent patent info
16. John D. Calkins ~ Senior Vice President New Media Business Development
17. Chris Cookson ~ Executive VP Technology Operations: Key decision maker in licensing deal with Iviewit
18. Kevin Tsujihara ~ Executive Vice President: Introduced Iviewit to Dages after review
19. Wendy Aylsworth ~ Vice President Technology
20. Michael Tritter ~ Chief Administrative Assistant to Don Buckley: Referred by Don Buckley, Sam Smith and Chuck Dages to expand Iviewit technologies across all sites and domains
21. Don Buckley ~ Senior Vice President Theatrical Public Relations:
22. Alan Bell ~ Senior Vice President, Technical Operations:
23. Larry Fischer ~ Director Operations & Engineering:
24. Kevin Froning ~ Director Engineering & Maintenance
25. Michael Carroll ~ Senior Staff Scientist, Network Architecture
26. Beattie Katie ~ Warner Online
27. Morgan Keiser ~ Warner Online
28. Jennifer Stewart ~ Software Specialist Advanced Technology
29. Houston T. ~ Manager of Multimedia
30. Sam Smith ~ Vice President Advanced Technology
31. Katie Beattie ~ Manager of Business Development
32. Guy Vardaman ~ Director Production & Original Programming
33. Karen Miller ~ Vice President Content Programming
34. Morgan Hall ~ Senior Producer of Original Programming

**AOL, Inc. Contacts**

Recent Contacts

1. Tim Armstrong ~ Chairman and CEO: Contacted Regarding Shareholder Liabilities from Infringement and Lawsuit
2. Ira Parker ~ General Counsel and Executive Vice President, Corporate Development: Contacted Regarding Shareholder Liabilities from Infringement and Lawsuit
3. Christopher Day ~ Assistant General Counsel - Patent Litigation, Prosecution, and Licensing: Contacted Regarding Shareholder Liabilities from Infringement and Lawsuit
4. Jerry McKinley ~ Executive Escalation Team: Contacted Regarding Shareholder Liabilities from Infringement and Lawsuit

Past Contacts involved directly with Iviewit and under NDA’s etc.

1. Ted Leonsis ~ Vice Chairman and New Product Officer: Colter contacted and he referred to Raduchel and others
2. Stephen M. Case ~ Chairman of the Board
3. William J. "Bill" Raduchel ~ Chief Technology Officer and Executive Vice President – Leonsis referred the Iviewit investment information to Raduchel for review.
4. Steven Blumenfeld ~ Vice President, Advanced Services-AOL by Phone, AOL Time Warner: Patents sent to him and NDA
5. Janet Hall ~ Technical Director ~ referred to Iviewit by Ted Leonsis and Chuck Brunelas. Meetings in Nov. 2000
6. Ted Maidenberg ~ Senior Analyst: Ted spoke to Hank Powell, Iviewit Investor from Crossbow Ventures of West Palm Beach regarding AOL investment in Iviewit.
7. Matt McConnell ~ Director, Business Affairs & Development: Worked with William Raduchel.
8. Mario Vecchi ~ Head of Broadband Technology, reviewed and passed the information to David Corboy, senior director of technology.
9. Heidi Krauel ~ Associate Business Affairs: Part of AOL review for investment group
10. Velvet Carter ~ Executive Assistant for Mario Vecchi: In August 2000 presented the technologies and she presented them to M. Vecchi
11. Amy Hyde-Juarez ~ AOL Streaming Services
12. Gerald M. Levin ~ Chief Executive Officer of AOL Time Warner Inc.:

**Time Warner Contacts**

1. Chairman and Chief Executive Officer: Jeffrey L. Bewkes
2. Executive Vice President and General Counsel of Time Warner Inc.: Paul T. Cappuccio

Respectfully Yours,



\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
Eliot I. Bernstein
Founder & Inventor

Iviewit Holdings, Inc. – DL
Iviewit Holdings, Inc. – DL
Iviewit Holdings, Inc. – FL
Iviewit Technologies, Inc. – DL
Uview.com, Inc. – DL
Iviewit.com, Inc. – FL
Iviewit.com, Inc. – DL
I.C., Inc. – FL
Iviewit.com LLC – DL
Iviewit LLC – DL
Iviewit Corporation – FL
Iviewit, Inc. – FL
Iviewit, Inc. – DL
Iviewit Corporation

cc/ec:

Enclosure(s)/Attachment(s)

Uniform Resource Locator(s)
 All Uniform Resource Locators ( URL’s) and Exhibited Links are incorporated in entirety by reference herein, including the over 1000 evidentiary links on the homepage at [www.iviewit.tv](http://www.iviewit.tv)

cmb/eib

1. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aol>

And

[http://www.timewarner.com/corp/newsroom/pr/0,20812,667602,00.html](http://www.timewarner.com/corp/newsroom/pr/0%2C20812%2C667602%2C00.html) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. February 15, 2001 ~ Signed Licensing Contract - <http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20010822%20-%20SIGNED%20Warner%20Bros%20Agreement%20AOL.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. May 09, 2008 Federal RICO 12 Count 12 Trillion Dollar Lawsuit Amended Complaint @ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20080509%20FINAL%20AMENDED%20COMPLAINT%20AND%20RICO%20SIGNED%20COPY%20MED.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. A similar alleged corporate restructuring through the Bankruptcy court was done by SGI several days after notice of liabilities identical to those described herein and is discussed in more detail in the section titled [“IVIEWIT SEC COMPLAINT FILED AGAINST INTEL, LOCKHEED MARTIN AND SGI”](#IntelSECCOMPLAINT) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. It should be noted here that the US Patent Office upon reviewing the patents found enough evidence of FRAUD UPON THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE to OFFICIALLY SUSPEND THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTIES FILED BY PROSKAUER AND MELTZER, while INVESTIGATIONS of the LAWYERS involved is ONGOING, including Rubenstein and Joao, as further described and exhibited later herein. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. March 11, 2005 Lamont Termination Letter <http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/2005%2003%2011%20Lamont%20Employment%20Termination%20Letter%20SIGNED%20Lamont%20Copy.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Also learned since that time, is that P. Stephen Lamont may have had prior fraudulent securities related problems at his former employer Digital Factory, not disclosed in his resume submitted by Brunelas. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. <http://www.dvd6cla.com/offer_080904_New.html> “On behalf of the DVD6C Licensing Group (DVD6C), we are pleased to offer your company a portfolio license that covers essential patents for certain DVD formats and +R/+RW Disc formats. The members of DVD6C --- Hitachi Ltd., Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd (Panasonic), Mitsubishi Electric Corporation, Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Sanyo Electric Co., Ltd., Sharp Corporation, Toshiba Corporation, Victor Company of Japan, Ltd. (JVC) and **Warner Bros. Home Entertainment Inc.** --- collectively own hundreds of essential patents for these DVD formats and +R/+RW Disc formats.” [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The website [www.iviewit.tv](http://www.iviewit.tv) homepage also contains links to over one thousand pieces of relevant evidence and is hereby incorporated by reference, in entirety, for use in investigations of these matters. Files are all available for download from the homepage. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. February 14, 2005 United States Patent Office Suspension Granted Exhibited @

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/USPTO%20Suspension%20Notices.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. September 20, 2000 Iviewit Letter Regarding Erika Lewin of the accounting firm Goldstein Lewin & Co. misleading Andersen auditors @ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/2000%2009%2020%20Hersh%20to%20Arthur%20Andersen%20Erika%20Lewin%20miffed%20letter.pdf>

and

October 09, 2000 Iviewit Letter to Arthur Andersen @ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/2000%2010%2009%20ARTHUR%20ANDERSEN%20LETTER%20REGARDING%20PROOF%20OF%20HOLDINGS%20OWNING%20TECH.pdf>

and

November 27, 2000 Arthur Andersen terminating Iviewit as a client in the middle of an audit for Investor Crossbow Ventures of whose money was two thirds SBA SBIC Loans @ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/2000%2011%2027%20ARTHUR%20ANDERSEN%20FILES%20TERMINATION%20LETTER.pdf>

and

Other Relevant Andersen evidence @

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/ARTHUR%20ANDERSEN%20FILES.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. May 09, 2008 Federal RICO 12 Count 12 Trillion Dollar Lawsuit Amended Complaint @ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20080509%20FINAL%20AMENDED%20COMPLAINT%20AND%20RICO%20SIGNED%20COPY%20MED.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. March 25, 2009 SEC COMPLAINT – Real 3D, Inc,, Intel, Silicon Graphics and Lockheed Martin

<http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090325%20FINAL%20Intel%20SEC%20Complaint%20SIGNED2073.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. October 26, 2007 Anderson Federal Filing Pages 24-25

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/2004%2008%2011%20new%20york%20first%20department%20orders%20investigation%20Krane%20Rubenstein%20Joao.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. August 11, 2004 First Dept Court Order for Investigation of Krane, Rubenstein and Joao

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/2004%2008%2011%20new%20york%20first%20department%20orders%20investigation%20Krane%20Rubenstein%20Joao.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. Wolfe is a Defendant in my Federal RICO and Antitrust Lawsuit, as well as, originally a Defendant in Anderson’s complaint who was removed in the Amended Complaint of Anderson. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. June 08, 2009 Senate Judiciary Committee hearing, Anderson’s testimony starts in the video at 31 min 51 sec @

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HR8OX8uuAbw&feature=player_embedded> [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. Cahill is both a Defendant in my Federal RICO and Antitrust Lawsuit and a Defendant in Anderson’s Lawsuit. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. February 13, 2009 Letter to President Barack Obama

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090213%20FINAL%20SIGNED%20LETTER%20OBAMA%20TO%20ENJOIN%20US%20ATTORNEY%20FINGERED%20ORIGINAL%20MAIL%20l.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-20)