1. Improper Service
	1. On date of service, December 13, 2012, no person matching the description of the Substitute Service party served, Joshua Bernstein age 15 lived at the address served. The service documents show that the alleged Joshua Bernstein served weighed as listed on the service documents 140pds with blue eyes. At the time of service Joshua Ennio Zander Bernstein, a two time high school varsity football linebacker that resides in the home as a minor child weighed approximately 210 pounds with Hazel eyes as medical records will show. This 70 pd difference in identification of the party served is so markedly different making it impossible to know if Joshua Bernstein received a complaint at all or some other party received the complaint. Residing at the home is also Bernstein’s son Jacob Noah Archie Bernstein, whom at that time was 14 years old who weighs approximately 140 pounds and has blue eyes but even if it was served upon him in error would qualify as improper service as he is not of qualified legal age to be served in the state of Florida.
	2. On the date of service, December 13, 2012 Defendant Bernstein had Lacrosse tournaments all day and 5-6 children were staying over for the weekend at the residence and at the time of service, 10:05am, Eliot I. Bernstein was not home. Defendant Bernstein’s children are not allowed to answer the door for any strangers, under any circumstances as is the case in most families but in Bernstein’s situation this rule is strictly enforced as their family has been subjected to a vicious terroristic style CAR BOMBING and several deaths threats, all currently under ongoing state and federal investigations and part of an Ongoing RICO & ANTITRUST civil lawsuit, including investigation of certain Counter Defendants in Crystal Cox’s Counter Complaint of this lawsuit, including but not limited to, Proskauer Rose LLP and Greenberg Traurig law firm.
	3. On the date of service, December 13, 2012, Plaintiff that drafted these improperly served documents, Ronald Green of the law firm of Randazza blah blah, was recently at that time, prior to drafting these documents for Randazza, a partner at Greenberg Traurig law firm, a member of the Intellectual Property department, which is former Intellectual Property counsel for Defendant Bernstein and under ongoing state, federal and international investigations, including investigation by the US Patent & Trademark Office for theft of Defendants Bernstein’s intellectual properties, which have led to suspensions of Bernstein’s Intellectual Properties by the Commissioner of Patents and instituted by Harry I Moatz, Director of the US Patent Office’s Office of Enrollment and Discipline. Therefore, due to conflicting interests of Green who was a member of the Greenberg Traurig firm just prior to drafting the improperly served service docuements, Green’s involvement as counsel in these matters for any party should be null and void due to the conflicts. Green appears to have joined the Pornography industries go to lawyer, Randazza, in order to further the conspiracy against Bernstein’s rights to his Intellectual Properties and further defame and harass Bernstein as described in the Amended RICO & Antitrust Complaint and other documents in Bernstein’s RICO lawsuit. It should be noted here that Bernstein’s complaint has been legally related to the New York Supreme Court Disciplinary Attorney, Christine C. Anderson, Esq.’s WHISTLEBLOWING LAWSUIT that evidences a pattern and practice of ATTORNEY, COURT and PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT committed by Attorneys at Law against their victim clients and those asserting their rights against these criminals with legal degrees.
	4. That for over a year, there have been several lawsuits and other complaints instituted by several of the Counter Defendants in Defendant Crystal Cox’s Counter Complaint, including but not limited to, P. Stephen Lamont, Obsidian Finance, David Aman, Tonkon Torp and others that have never been properly served on Defendant Bernstein in efforts to win false and defamatory judgments against Defendant Bernstein or otherwise do harm and injury to his name, finances and the Iviewit companies he founded. Several of these fraudulent lawsuits and complaints follow as recent examples;
		1. P. Stephen Lamont, filed a case improperly using Defendant Bernstein’s companies in the US Court of Appeals in New York. Bernstein has notified that court and the US District Court Southern District of New York of the illegal activities of Lamont acting on behalf of Bernstein’s companies without any legal authority or basis in the actions taken.
		2. P. Stephen Lamont filed a case improperly at the Supreme Court of the United States titled, “Lamont, et al. v. Appellate Division Department Disciplinary Committee, et al.: PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI”
			1. Upon Bernstein contacting the Supreme Court the clerk stated that Lamont filing was wholly insufficient lacked basis and had been returned to Lamont to quell deficiencies or words to that effect.
			2. In an email dated May 03, 2010 Lamont, acting in an UNAUTHORIZED CAPACITY as CEO of Bernstein’s Iviewit company stated the following, “There is a problem. The U.S. Supreme Court's rules prevent a Petitioner from acting on another's behalf, unless he/she is a member of the Supreme Court Bar; clearly, I am not. As such, from the point of April 26 to 60 days forward (roughly, June 25) Iviewit shareholders have the following options…” Lamont’s improper and fraudulent filing acting as Iviewit CEO comes after Lamont had made the following claim posted on the Iviewit website several years earlier, “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 alongside 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. It is clear that counsel notified Lamont, a law graduate of This action was never served to Bernstein or Bernstein’s company he founded Iviewit.
			3. On July 15, 2010 Lamont contacted several Iviewit shareholders, this time as CEO of an Iviewit company with a New York address believed to be Lamont’s home address listed for Bernstein’s Iviewit Technologies, Inc. company. Where Defendant Bernstein has knowledge of approximately 15 Iviewit companies incorporated in Delaware and Florida under the Iviewit companies names and has never incorporated in the state of New York or had corporate offices in that state for his company named Iviewit Technologies, Inc. Lamont’s email that stated “the proverbial fix being in, attached is the Supreme Court Clerk's attempt to kick back and block Iviewit shareholders. Motion to follow on the following grounds: pro se, non attorney litigant; due process; and failure to allow acting on behalf of shareholders.

Best regards,

P. Stephen Lamont

Chief Executive Officer

Iviewit Technologies, Inc.

175 King Street

Armonk, N.Y. 10504

* + 1. After failing in the prior Frauds on the US Supreme Court Lamont then filed at the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA another Fraud on the Court titled “P. STEPHEN LAMONT, Plaintiff, v. PROSKAUER ROSE, LLP, et al., Defendant.” In an illegally obtained Order in that court, the court states upon dismissal, “Lastly, the court turns to inquire whether Plaintiff received a full and fair opportunity to litigate the § 1983 claims before the Southern District of New York. See Bernstein, 591 F. Supp. 2d at 448. Plaintiff contends that he was not an individual plaintiff in the previous litigation, see Pl.’s Opp’n to Def. Joao’s Mot. to Dismiss at 10, and also rejects the notion that he acted as a representative of the shareholders in the previous action, see Pl.’s Opp’n to Meltzer Defs.’ Mot. to Dismiss at 15. In other words, Plaintiff insists that he was not a litigant in the Southern District of New York case. The record in that case, however, indicates otherwise. In his motion to re-open the case before Judge Scheindlin, Plaintiff describes himself as an “individual Plaintiff.” See Pl. Lamont’s Mot. to Re-Open, dated October 5, 2012, Bernstein v. Appellate Division First Dep’t, et al, Civ. No. 07-11196 (S.D.N.Y.). Indeed, Plaintiff’s pro se status confirms that he was in fact suing as an individual. See Ivey v. Geithner, 2009 U.S. App. LEXIS 7774, at \*2 (D.C. Cir. Apr. 10, 2009) (noting that a pro se litigant ‘may not represent the interests of other parties’). Thus, the ‘P. Stephen Lamont’ who filed suit pro se in this court is the same “P. Stephen Lamont” who filed suit pro se before the Southern District of New York.”
		2. Further in that order the court cites Plaintiff’s claim that “Defendants further argue that Plaintiff lacks standing because he does not have the right to sue in his own name, even as an individual shareholder, to assert Iviewit’s property interests and because a *pro se* plaintiff cannot represent a corporation.” The question becomes then if the court had knowledge that the Plaintiff lacked standing, then why were Plaintiff’s filings with the court acknowledge and adjudicated on in detail versus just dismissing the complaint. The answer may lie in the continued Fraud upon the Courts of the United States and Fraud Upon Courts of states in order to garnish rulings favoring the lawyers and others, including Warner Bros., in the District Court of the District of Columbia involved in these cases, all whom are Defendants in the Iviewit RICO & ANTITRUST action. The court having knowledge that law graduate of Columbia Law School, Lamont, was filing frivolous and illegal lawsuits in a Federal Courts, with no basis in the lawsuit and with false information regarding his position with the Iviewit companies, why that court failed to report these illegal actions to the proper authorities as required in Misprision of a Felony rules, state bar association rules and regulations and law.
	1. After failing in these attempts to derail the Iviewit lawsuit and replace it with a further deficient filing to illegally convert damages to himself in an illegal capacity representing the Iviewit shareholders, Lamont began working with assaulting Defendant Crystal Cox to remove her Investigative Journalism blogs exposing the Lamont illegal lawsuits and more. On information and belief, Lamont began working with Crystal Cox Counter Defendants in Obsidian v. Cox case to aid and abet their efforts at removing Investigative Reporting on the alleged crimes of the Obsidian matters.
	2. On \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_date Proskauer Rose filed complaints against Crystal Cox at WIPO for similar claims as this bogus and fraudulent lawsuit claims and lost in those matters, which attempted to scrub the web of Investigative Journalist Crystal Cox’s years of investigative reporting on Proskauer. Proskauer fumes and begins to work with other Iviewit RICO & ANTITRUST Defendants and is central to each of the following illegal frauds on the courts and prosecutorial agencies, including in this lawsuit as Defendant in Defendant Crystal Cox’s Counter Complaint.
	3. On \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_date, Obsidian filed a complaint, Case #\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, in Oregon court and in this case, after the court found in favor of the plaintiffs in that case, the plaintiffs then tried to insert Bernstein as a named Defendant in the case, despite Bernstein never being served in that matter and improper service is found now in those documents that were never approved by the court, stating that Eliot Bernstein was served as female. Yet, even after never filing proper service with Bernstein or the court and after judgment against Cox the ONLY DEFENDANT LISTED IN THAT CASE was made and was being appealed, plaintiffs and Cox Counter Defendants Obsidian et al. then tried to insert Bernstein into the case, to gain an illegal judgment of 2.5 Million against him when he was not even a Defendant in that case. The court within hours of getting this ludicrous filing dismissed the motions, per the docket in that case,
		1. 05/11/2012 136 STRICKEN per order of 5/11/2012. Supplemental Complaint. (statutory fee exempt status selected) Jury Trial Requested: Yes. Filed by Obsidian Finance Group, LLC, Kevin D. Padrick against All Defendants. (Aman,

David) Modified on 5/11/2012 (mr). (Entered: 05/11/2012)

* + 1. 05/11/2012 137 STRICKEN per order of 5/11/2012. Proposed Summons to Eliot Bernstein Filed by All Plaintiffs. (Aman, David) Modified on 5/11/2012 (mr). (Entered: 05/11/2012)
		2. 05/11/2012 138 ORDER: STRIKING the supplemental complaint 136 and proposed summons 137 for failure to comply with FRCP 15(d) which requires that the party seeking to file a supplemental complaint do so by motion. Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(d); see also Connectu, LLC v. Zuckerberg, 522 F.3d 82, 90 (1st Cir. 2008) (supplemental complaint cannot be filed as a matter of course). In any motion for leave to file a supplemental complaint, plaintiffs are requested to thoroughly address, with relevant authority, the following issues:

(1) this Court's jurisdiction over the matter given that a Notice of Appeal has

been filed; (2) whether a supplemental complaint is allowed post-judgment;

(3) why the alleged fraudulent transfer claim should be raised in a

supplemental complaint as opposed to bringing it in a new action. Ordered

by Judge Marco A. Hernandez. Copy of this order emailed and mailed to

defendant Crystal Cox. (mr) (Entered: 05/11/2012)

* 1. Despite the courts acknowledgement that Bernstein was not a defendant served in the lawsuit Bernstein’s name remains on the docket of that case as a listed defendant further defaming his name and causing injury to his company and more.
	2. Complaints were filed by the Randazza law firm with the Czech Republic??? Intellectual Property offices but again never served upon Bernstein. This complaint was then withdrawn and switched to a World Intellectual Property Organization complaint that again Bernstein was never served upon Bernstein.
1. Answer
	1. Defendant denies that he is a knowing and willing participant and co conspirator in Cox’s activities
	2. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	3. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	4. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	5. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	6. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	7. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	8. Deny “trafficking” in domain names
	9. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	10. Deny in entirety Violation of Anti-Cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act
	11. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	12. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	13. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 13 of the complaint.
	14. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	15. Deny court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant Bernstein for the baseless claims asserted in paragraph 15
	16. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 16 of the complaint.
	17. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 17 of the complaint.
	18. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 18 of the complaint.
	19. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 19 of the complaint.
	20. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	21. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	22. Admit that Defendant Bernstein currently resides in Florida. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 22 of the complaint.
	23. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 23 of the complaint.
	24. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 24 of the complaint.
	25. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 25 of the complaint.
	26. Deny – Plaintiff Randazza has no common law or federal trademark registration rights
	27. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 27 of the complaint.
	28. Deny
	29. Deny using any “infringing” Domain names or being involved in any extortion
	30. Deny as Defendant Bernstein has never contacted Plaintiffs and never tried to sell a domain name to anyone
	31. Deny and Defendant Bernstein has never received any fees from a domain name.
	32. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	33. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	34. Deny that Defendant Bernstein is a “knowing participant in Cox’s efforts to prevent the Plaintiff from testifying.”
	35. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	36. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	37. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	38. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	39. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	40. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	41. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	42. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	43. Deny as Plaintiff has no common law or federal trademark of his name and if he had had any common law rights these would only grant him state not global rights to his name
	44. Deny as Defendant Bernstein is known by any domain names he owns
	45. Deny
	46. Deny as Plaintiff has no common law rights or federal trademark rights on his name
	47. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	48. Deny any misuse of domain names
	49. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 49 of the complaint
	50. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 50 of the complaint
	51. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 51 of the complaint
	52. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	53. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	54. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	55. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	56. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	57. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	58. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 58 of the complaint
	59. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 59 of the complaint
	60. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	61. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	62. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	63. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	64. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	65. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 65 of the complaint
	66. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 66 of the complaint
	67. Deny as Defendants have a right to own any unregistered name
	68. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 68 of the complaint
	69. Deny as Defendant Bernstein has never engaged in any plot to extort anyone for anything, including any sale of a domain name. Defendant Bernstein has never worked with Cox or alone to smear anyone. The rest of the paragraph appears to vacillate between accusations against Cox individually and Bernstein and thus is vague and unclear.
	70. Deny as Defendant Bernstein has never intended to profit from any domain name and there is no infringement as Plaintiff has no common law or federal trademarks to his virtually unknown name.
	71. Deny as Defendant Bernstein has never intended to profit or profited from any domain name and has never worked to register names with Defendant Cox
	72. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 72 of the complaint
	73. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 73 of the complaint
	74. Deny as Plaintiff has no trademarks of his name
	75. Deny as Plaintiff has no trademarks or common law rights to his name
	76. Deny
	77. Deny
	78. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 78 of the complaint
	79. Deny as Plaintiff has no trademarks or common law rights to his name
	80. Deny and there are no “infringing” domain names as Plaintiff has no Federal Trademark or Common law right to his name
	81. Deny
	82. Deny
	83. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 78 of the complaint
	84. Deny as Plaintiffs have no Federal Trademarks or common law rights there can be no infringement
	85. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	86. Deny as Plaintiffs again start with Defendants in the plural and then make claims specific to Defendant Bernstein and thus is vague and unanswerable further
	87. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 87 of the complaint
	88. Deny
	89. Deny
	90. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 90 of the complaint
	91. Deny as Plaintiff has no “right” to his “identity.”
	92. Deny as Plaintiff has no right to his name
	93. Deny as Defendant Bernstein has never profited from any use of a domain name. The rest of the paragraph appears to again vacillate to claims against Defendant Cox only and thus is vague and un answerable further
	94. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 94 of the complaint
	95. Deny
	96. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 96 of the complaint
	97. Deny as registering legal domain names is not a cause of suffering
	98. Deny as the claims have no basis in law and are asserted under the basis of a reasonable person, whatever that is.
	99. Deny has nothing to do with Defendant Bernstein
	100. Deny as Defendant Bernstein has never extorted or harmed Plaintiff
	101. Deny
	102. The defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to determine the truth of the allegations in paragraph 102 of the complaint
	103. Deny as Defendant Bernstein has never conspired, confederated or colluded to violate the “rights” of Plaintiff
	104. Deny as Defendant Bernstein has never conspired with Cox to commit any acts alleged in the complaint
	105. Deny
2. Counter Complaint

Legal Process Abuse

* 1. Ronald Green is conflicted with these matters, as an IP lawyer from Greenberg Traurig where Greenberg Traurig was Eliot Bernstein and Iviewit companies IP counsel, which all is now the subject of an ongoing RICO and ANTITRUST Lawsuit, several ongoing state, federal and international criminal complaints and under investigation by the USPTO, where such USPTO investigation has led to the suspension of Defendant Bernstein’s Intellectual Properties. Therefore, Green should be removed from this lawsuit for conflict and failing to disclose such conflicts prior to acting in a legal capacity in these matters and all submissions to this court should be stricken from the record. Green worked at Greenberg Traurig during the relevant times of the Eliot Bernstein/Iviewit lawsuit and complaints and only recently transferred to the Randazza firm.
	2. Greenberg Traurig is also counsel to Defendant in the Eliot Bernstein/Iviewit RICO the Florida State Bar and is currently representing them in these matters
	3. Where in the last several months Defendant Bernstein’s name and Iviewit companies have been used in a plethora of lawsuits and other actions which were filed without his knowledge by many parties acting in various official capacities who appear to be related to the Plaintiffs in these matters, all in order to attempt to obtain unfavorable rulings against him without proper legal process.
	4. In the referenced Obsidian v. Cox case, Bernstein’s name was added to the docket of the lawsuit and remains added, despite the fact that the court acknowledged that Defendant Bernstein is not a Defendant in that case and tossed out of the court the filings trying to surreptitiously insert Bernstein as Defendant in that lawsuit. Defendant Bernstein was never listed as an original Defendant in the suit and no leave for amend to add him was made to the best of his knowledge.
	5. In several recent attempts by P. Stephen Lamont in a variety of courts Defendant Bernstein’s Iviewit companies have been suing with no basis in law by Lamont to represent Defendant Bernstein or his companies. P. Stephen Lamont has been filing these fraudulent lawsuits to further harass and defame defendant Bernstein and interfere with his businesses and further attempt to steal Intellectual Properties owned by Bernstein.

Conspiracy

* 1. On information and belief, Plaintiffs a part of a larger conspiracy by certain of the key defendants in the Eliot Bernstein/Iviewit RICO & Antitrust Lawsuit to remove media posted by journalist and investigative blogger Crystal Cox reporting on these matters.
	2. The first such attempt to scrub the web of Cox’s work came in actions by RICO & Antitrust Defendant Proskauer Rose in actions they instituted in the World Intellectual Property Organization. In those actions they accused Cox of similar claims as are stated in this lawsuit and failed to prove their case that the domain names that contain Proskauer and individual attorneys’ names be seized. All of these actions failed.
	3. Next came actions again naming Defendant Bernstein in a Czechoslovakia Patent Office dispute filed by Plaintiffs in the Obsidian v. Cox case.
	4. Next the Czech case was dropped and a new action brought in the World Intellectual Property Organization by Plaintiffs in the Obsidian v. Cox case and a decision was rendered that accused Defendant Bernstein of being part of a conspiracy to extort monies without any basis in law or any charges ever filed or any prosecution ever and where WIPO has no authority to investigate or levy criminal allegations. In this decision it should be noted that Proskauer Rose is again mentioned in the decision but was not a party to such action?
	5. Next came Defendant Bernstein being added without service or notice to the Obsidian v. Cox case, after the case had already been decided by that court. Defendant Bernstein is however now listed in the docket as a Defendant, even after the judge threw out the filing by Plaintiffs in that case that attempted to disingenuously add his name to that case.
	6. Next came this legal action, where service was made by a processor server tricking Bernstein’s 15 year old son into opening the door to their home after thirty minutes of pounding on the door as witnessed by several children who were staying over at the Bernstein’s home. The process server claimed to be a government official on government business and demanded Bernstein’s son open the door, which Defendant Bernstein’s son has been trained never to open the door for anyone as Defendant Bernstein’s family has been the center of repeated death threats, including a bomb in their car that blew up in Florida and is under ongoing State and Federal investigations. In this lawsuit, as can be seen in Defendant Bernstein’s Answer, the Plaintiffs appear to have randomly inserted Defendant Bernstein’s name into certain of the complaints allegations, yet without a single reason that involves Defendant Bernstein.
	7. Defendant Bernstein’s only involvement in these matters is that he acquired Domain Names that are either directly cited in his Federal RICO & Antitrust lawsuit or criminal complaints or linked to them in order to preserve evidence in those matters. The reason Defendant Bernstein acquired the names was due to the fact that Defendant Cox was in dire need of funds to protect herself from the many civil actions by those, including Defendants in the Iviewit RICO & Antitrust and Criminal Complaints, who were trying to shut her investigative blogging down and remove the cites directly linked to or related to exposing the Iviewit matters and those involved.
	8. Defendant Bernstein has never extorted any person or organization, nor worked with Defendant Cox to extort any person and these baseless allegations are just further harassment of Defendant Bernstein that is part of an organized Conspiratorial pattern and practice as described in Plaintiff Bernstein’s Amended Complaint in the RICO case, Exhibit \_\_, hereby incorporated in entirety by reference herein.

Harassment

Slander and Defamation