

TO: Christine H Long, 1238 Bent Drive, Campbell CA 95008-3633 *This can be left with an adult relative*

Ms. Long, good day. At a February 2024 hearing, you revealed knowledge of an issue related to State Farm. This came as a surprise. A CA-DOI manager, above the investigator level, had told me directly that the investigation in California was so confidential that he himself couldn't override this even for basic steps. One would assume that similar rules apply in Illinois.

One new development is that a Sheppard-Mullin attorney has tried to relay a threat to me through an uninvolved attorney. The threat was similar to this: [Kiraly] should be, quote, "warned" that Sheppard-Mullin is "far more powerful than Berliner-Cohen". It's my belief that you're in communication with the people involved. So, tell me, what is all of that about?

Were you, personally, involved in the instigation of the State Farm issue? This has been speculated to me. If it was more limited, were rules violated regardless? However, even sans direct involvement, you and your clients bear primary responsibility.

If it's necessary, my side will be able to handle the civil matter. Your clients and you, personally, won't find the process and the long-term outcome to be positive. Have you told Kamal Sayed the truth yet about what you promised him before that you simply can't get?

Ideally, this miscalculation on your part should be brought to a close instead. We'd all prefer that. But I can't handle one of the most fortified legal entities on the planet by myself. The State Farm issue needs to be cleaned up. Sheppard-Mullin thinks of you as low-grade ore, but you have the weight needed to initiate a discussion. Do so.

It's a less expensive, to your side, way of approaching the matter. If I were to request the dollar amount needed to initiate litigation against State Farm, we'd be unlikely to come to terms. But what I'm proposing as an alternative is feasible.

You have the option, of course, of attempting to drop the civil case on a unilateral basis. I'd have the option of a malicious prosecution action after that. You and your clients might feel that you could handle that. However, it would be sensible to consider the other implications of failure to reach a settlement.

You and Kamal Sayed are aware that there would be legitimate and reasonable implications for a decade to come that would be protected under the system which you and your clients have so enthusiastically raped.

If the State Farm issue is addressed, I'll waive the demand for further cash payment. The clauses that protect me against misconduct will obviously need to remain. To put it as gently as possible, you lie as often as you breathe. Any agreement is going to take that into account.

Doug Vining says that you aren't requesting more from me than dropping the cash demand, but other good faith concessions by me are still on the table. However, provided that you don't object to the clauses that are there to protect me against misconduct on your part, hopefully, we're down to the State Farm issue.

Responses to the effect that the State Farm issue is my responsibility will be rejected. I did nothing inappropriate in this context. You, on the other hand, have some explaining to do. The matter is your responsibility regardless.

You chose to file inappropriate cases solely to extort a gag order on behalf of racists and a criminal enterprise. You chose to commit prosecutable crimes yourself as part of the mix. Choose now to do your part to clean up the unnecessary mess that you created.

Regards, Robert (the Old Coder)