

Alkiviades “Alki” David, a single man; Anakando Media Group, a British Virgin Islands limited company incorporated in St. Vincent and the Grenadines; FilmOn TV Ltd., a UK company; FilmOn TV Inc., a Delaware corporation; Alki David Productions Inc., a Delaware corporation; Swissx Labs AG, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Swissx Labs AG, a Swiss Corporation; SwissX Group Worldwide, Hologram USA Inc., a Delaware corporation, with its principal place of business in Gstaad, Switzerland; FOTV, Inc., a Delaware corporation.

vs.

Gloria Allred, in her individual capacity and as a principal in Allred, Maroko & Goldberg; Nathan Goldberg, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in Allred, Maroko & Goldberg, Delores Y. Leal, in her individual capacity and as a partner of Allred, Maroko & Goldberg; Renee Mochkatel, in her individual capacity and as a partner of Allred, Maroko & Goldberg; Lisa Bloom, in her individual capacity and as the owner of the The Bloom Firm; Braden Pollack, husband of Lisa Bloom; Arick Fudali, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in the Bloom Firm; Avi Goldstein, in his individual capacity, and a partner in The Bloom Firm; Sarah Bloom in her individual capacity, and as an employee of The Bloom Firm; Thomas V Girardi, in his individual capacity, as a member of his marital community with Erika Girardi, a/k/a Erika Jane, and as a partner in Girardi Keese; Gary A. Dordick, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in Dordick Law Corporation;; Keith Griffin, in his individual capacity, and in his capacity as a former partner in Girardi & Keese, and in his capacity as an associate for Dordick Law Corporation; Joseph Chora, Esq., in his individual capacity, and as a partner in Chora, Young & Manasserian; Ebby S. Bakhtiar, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in The Law Offices of Ebby S. Bakhtiar; Oren Warshavsky, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in Baker Hostetler, Joseph L. Chairez, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in Baker Hostetler, Joseph S. Persoff, in his individual capacity, and an associate with Baker Hostetler; Baker Hostetler; Baker Hostetler, a law firm operating in California, Marc Gillieron, as a partner in Chabrier Avocats, SA, Emilie Theintz, in her individual capacity and as an associate in Chabrier Avocats, SA, Chabrier Avocats, SA, a law firm based in Geneva Switzerland, Mahim Khan, a single woman, Elizabeth Taylor, a single woman; Lauren Reeves, a single woman; Chastity Jones, a single woman; Gavin Newsom, a married man; The State Bar of California; The Honorable Yolanda Orozoco, a judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court; The Michelle Williams Court, a judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court; ABC individuals 1-25 inclusive; XYZ corporations 1-25, inclusive; Does 1-25, inclusive.

COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs Alkivades David (“Plaintiff David”), FilmOn TV, Inc., Alki David Productions, Inc., FilmOn U.K. Limited, Anakando Media Group, SwissX, Inc., a U.S. corporation (U.S. SwissX), SwissX Lab, A.G. a Swiss company (Swiss Lab); Hologram USA, a U.S. Corporation (“Entity Plaintiffs”), for their complaint against Defendants Gloria Allred, in her individual capacity and as a partner in Allred, Maroko & Goldberg; Nathan Goldberg, in his individual capacity and as a partner in Allred, Maroko & Goldberg, Delores Y. Leal, in her individual capacity and as a partner in Allred, Maroko & Goldberg; Renee Mochkatel, in her individual capacity, and as a partner in Allred, Maroko & Goldberg; Lisa Bloom, in her individual capacity, and as a partner in The Bloom Firm, Arick Fudalli, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in The Bloom Firm; Alan “Avi” Goldstein, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in The Bloom Firm, Braden Pollack, in his individual capacity, and as an employee of The Bloom Firm; Tom Girardi, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in Girardi Keese; Gary A. Dordick, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in Dordick Law Corporation; Keith Griffin, in his individual capacity, in his capacity as a former partner in Girardi & Keese, and as an associate in Dordick Law Corporation; Joseph Chora, in his individual

capacity, and as a partner in Chora, Young & Manasserian, Ebby S. Bakhtiar, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in The Law Offices of Ebby S. Bakhtiar, Oren Warshavsky, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in Baker Hostetler, Baker Hostetler, a law firm operating in California, (“Attorney Defendants”), Marc Gillieron, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in Chabrier Avocats, SA, Emilie Theintz, in her individual capacity, and as an associate in Chabrier Avocats, SA, a law firm based in Geneva Switzerland, (Swiss Attorney Defendants), as well against Mahim Khan, a single woman; Elizabeth Taylor, a single woman; Lauren Reeves, a single woman; and Chastity Jones, a single woman, (“Litigating Defendants”).

Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs allege as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

The United States District Court for the Southern District of California has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 (Diversity Jurisdiction). The Court also has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331 because some of the claims arise under the RICO, 18 U.S.C. §1961 *et. seq.*

The Attorney Defendants and the Litigating Defendants (Collectively “All United States-Based Defendants”) are subject to specific personal jurisdiction in California. All United States-Based Defendants were physically present in California, emailed and otherwise transmitted documents in California in furtherance of their extortion scheme and wrongful enterprises and they committed multiple intentional torts in whole or in part in California, causing injury to Plaintiff David and to the Plaintiff Entities.

All United States-Based Defendants’ conduct was purposefully directed at California and was continuous and systematic. The United States-Based Defendants have more than minimum contacts with California such that the exercise of personal jurisdiction over them comports with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice and is consistent with the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution.

Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §1965 and 28 U.S.C. §1391 because the United States-Based Attorney Defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in this judicial district as they reside, are found, have agents, and transact affairs in California. A substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims asserted in this action occurred in the Southern District in California, where Plaintiff David and Plaintiff Entities suffered actual and special damages.

Swiss Defendant Attorney Marc Gillieron, in his individual capacity, and as a

partner in Chabrier Avocats, SA, and Swiss Defendant Attorney Emilie Theintz, in her individual capacity, and as an associate in Chabrier Avocats, SA, a law firm based in Geneva Switzerland, (“Swiss Defendant Attorneys”) were hired by Defendants Allred and Bloom and Litigating Defendants Chastity Jones and Mahim Khan to attempt to collect on judgments obtained in this jurisdiction, where Plaintiff David and Plaintiff Entities, suffered actual and special damages.

Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §1965 and 28 U.S.C. §1391 because the Swiss Defendant Attorneys are subject to personal jurisdiction in this judicial district. Defendants have agents, and transact affairs in California. A substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims asserted in this action occurred in the Southern District in California, where Plaintiff David and Plaintiff Entities, suffered actual and special damages.

Swiss Attorney Defendants were hired by Attorney Defendant Allred on behalf of Defendant Allred, Maroko & Goldberg and by Defendant Attorney Oren Warshavsky, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in Baker Hostetler, a law firm operating in California, in *Mahim Kahn v. Alki David, et. al*, LASC County No. BC654017 2022).

PARTIES

Plaintiffs Alkiviades David (Plaintiff David), is a resident of California and a citizen of the United Kingdom.

Plaintiffs FilmOn TV, Inc., Alki David Productions, Inc., FilmOn U.K. Limited, Anakando Media Group, SwissX, Inc., a U.S. corporation (U.S. SwissX), SwissX Lab, A.G. a Swiss company (Swiss Lab); Hologram USA, a U.S. Corporation (“Entity Plaintiffs”) conduct business operations in the United States, including but not limited to, in California.

Attorney Defendant Gloria Allred is a citizen of California.

Defendant Allred, Maroko & Goldberg is a California law firm. 4

Attorney Defendant Nathan Goldberg is a citizen of California and is a named partner in Allred, Maroko & Goldberg.

Attorney Defendant Delores Y. Leal is a citizen of California and is a partner in Allred, Maroko & Goldberg.

Attorney Defendant Renee Mochkatel is a citizen of California and is a partner in Allred, Maroko & Goldberg.

Attorney Defendant Lisa Bloom, is a citizen of California and is a partner in The Bloom Firm, a California law firm.

Defendant Braden Pollack, is Lisa Bloom's husband, and all pertinent times Pollack acted on behalf of the marital community consisting of Defendant Lisa Bloom and Defendant Braden Polack, as well as on behalf of The Bloom Firm.

Attorney Defendant Arick Fudalli is a citizen of California and is a partner in The Bloom Firm.

Attorney Defendant Alan "Avi" Goldstein, is a citizen of California and is a partner in The Bloom Firm.

The Bloom Firm is a law firm operating in California.

Attorney Defendant Thomas V. Girardi is a citizen of California.

Defendant Girardi & Keese was a law firm in California.

Attorney Defendant Ebby S. Bakhtiar is a citizen of California, practicing at his own California law firm, Ebby S. Bakhtiar, PC.

Defendant Gary A. Dordick, is a citizen of California and a partner in Dordick Law Corporation.

Defendant Dordick Law Corporation is a law firm operating in California. Attorney Defendant Keith Griffin is a citizen of California. Upon information and belief, Griffin was a member of the Girardi Keese firm, and is presently an associate at Dordick Law Corporation.

Upon information and belief, Attorney Defendant Oren Warshavsky, is a resident of New York and a partner in Defendant Baker Hostetler, who caused

Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs (“All Plaintiffs”) harm in California.

Attorney Defendants Joseph L. Chairez and Joseph S. Persoff are residents of California and are attorneys with Defendant Baker Hostetler, who caused Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs (“All Plaintiffs”) harm in California.

Defendant Baker Hostetler is a firm operating in California.

Upon information and belief, Attorney Defendant Marc Gillieron is a resident of Switzerland.

Upon information and belief, Attorney Defendant Emilie Theintz is a resident of Switzerland.

Defendant Chabrier Avocats, SA, is a Swiss law firm that caused Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs harm in California.

Upon information and belief, Litigating Defendant Mahim Khan is a citizen of Pakistan and she is a resident of California. Upon information and belief, Litigating Defendant Mahim Khan is a single woman.

Upon information and belief, Litigating Defendant Elizabeth Taylor is a citizen of California. Upon information and belief, Litigating Defendant Taylor is a single woman.

Upon information and belief, Litigating Defendant Lauren Reeves is a citizen of California. Upon information and belief, Litigating Defendant Reeves is a single woman.

Upon information and belief, Defendant Chastity Jones is a citizen of California. Upon information and belief, Defendant Jones is a single woman.

The State Bar of California is a State Government Entity charged with overseeing attorneys' ethical practicing of law and with suspending and disbarring those attorneys who violate ethical standards.

Governor Gavin Newsom appoints four of the six members to the Board of Governors for the State Bar of California and, upon information and belief, therefore had substantial control over the State Bar of California during all relevant times encompassed by this lawsuit.

INTRODUCTION

Earlier this year, the California Court of Appeals considered the following question: "Lawyers argue for a living. Some do more than argue. They lace their settlement demands with threats. When do such aggressive settlement tactics cross the line and become professional misconduct? *Falcon Brands, Inc., v. Mousavi & Lee, LLP*, 74 Cal. App.5th 506, 511 (2022).

The answer to that question is presented by the facts underlying this case. This is a case about extortion by The Litigating Defendants and the United States-Based Attorney Defendants. This case also alleges that the United States-Based Attorney Defendants, the Litigating Defendants, and the Swiss

Attorney Defendants (“All Defendants”) committed obstruction of justice, wire fraud, mail fraud, bribery, and aiding and abetting against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs.

This Complaint also alleges that Attorney Defendants Allred and Bloom and Litigating Defendants Khan and Reeves committed defamation against Plaintiff David in the United States and Switzerland.

This Complaint also alleges corporate defamation against FOTV, Inc. and its holding companies, Anakando and its holding companies, and the Hologram, USA Group of Companies, as well as intentional interference with contractual relations, intentional interference with prospective contractual relations, and intentional infliction of emotional distress against Plaintiff David, all allegations based on the pattern of extorting actions committed by: Attorney Defendant Allred, in her individual capacity, and as a member of Allred, Maroko & Goldberg and its employees and partners, Attorney Defendants Goldberg, Leal, Mochkatel, and Goldstein, each of whom Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs are suing in their individual capacities, in addition to in their capacities as employees and partners in Allred, Maroko & Goldberg; Attorney Defendant Lisa Bloom, in her individual capacity, on behalf of her marital community, and as a partner in The Bloom Firm, Attorney Defendant Arick Fudali, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in The Bloom Firm, Attorney Defendant Braden Pollack, in his individual capacity,

on behalf of his marital community with Lisa Bloom, and as an employee of The Bloom Firm; Attorney Defendant Goldstein, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in The Bloom Firm; The Bloom Firm; Defendant Girardi, in his individual capacity and as a member of his marital estate with Erika Girardi, aka Defendant Erika Jane; Defendant Erika Jane as a member of the Girardi Family Syndicate or The Girardi Syndicate. Attorney Defendant Dordick, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in Dordick Law Corporation; Attorney Defendant Griffin, in his individual capacity, and in his capacity as a former partner in Girardi & Keese, as well as in his capacity as an associate in Dordick Law Corporation; Attorney Defendant Joseph Chora, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in Chora, Young & Manasserian; Attorney Defendant Bakhtiar, in his individual capacity, and as a partner or owner in The Law Offices of Ebby S. Bakhtiar, Attorney Defendant Warshavsky, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in Baker Hostetler, (Collectively, “United States-Based Attorneys”), Attorney Defendant Gillieron, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in Chabrier Avocats, SA; Attorney Defendant Emilie Theintz, in her individual capacity and as an associate in Chabrier Avocats, SA; and Chabrier Avocats, SA, a law firm based in Geneva Switzerland. (Collectively “Swiss Attorney Defendants.”)

This is also a case that illustrates the ancient admonition - “Where law ends, tyranny begins.” (John Locke, 1689) because at every stage of all Litigating

Defendants' lawsuits asserted against Plaintiff David and the Plaintiff Entities, those in power, including attorneys who are duty bound to be officers of the court, judges who are duty bound to fairly adjudicate cases so that all parties' constitutional rights are protected, law enforcement officials who are duty bound to investigate wrongdoing such as the extortion, obstruction of justice, and bribery that has victimized Plaintiff David and The Entity Plaintiffs - all of those persons in power failed to fulfill their roles. In doing so, they have permitted the pattern of criminal racketeering and All United State-Based Attorneys to continue their wrongdoing.

Unfortunately, as renowned L.A. attorney Patty Glaser, whose firm Glaser Weil is representing Plaintiff David and Entity Plaintiffs has said, "America has become a country of what you can allege, rather than what you can prove."

This action is filed pursuant to the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Practices Act ("RICO"), 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-68, alleging that the United States-Based Attorney Defendants, The Swiss Attorney Defendants, and the Litigating Defendants (Collectively "All Defendants") caused Plaintiff David's and the Entity Plaintiffs' injuries by committing predicate acts in violation of 18 U.S.C. §1951 (extortion), 18 U.S.C. § 1341 (mail fraud), 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (fraud by wire, radio, or television), 18 U.S.C. § 1503 (obstruction of justice), as well as for bribery and aiding and abetting in furtherance of an illegal racketeering enterprise

as set forth in this Complaint.

This Complaint seeks monetary damages, including statutory treble damages, for Plaintiff David's and the Entity Plaintiffs' compensable injuries directly related to all of the Defendants' racketeering enterprises which are cognizable pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§1962(b)(c) and (d).

This action also asserts claims for intentional and negligent interference with prospective and ongoing contract relations, and seeks damages for Plaintiff David and The Entity Plaintiffs ("All Plaintiffs") compensable injuries directly related to All Defendants harassing and extorting Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs, causing All Plaintiffs to lose then-existing customers and business relationships, as well as to lose future business customers and future contracts in an amount to be proven at trial.

Plaintiff David also asserts a claim against All Defendants for defamation against Plaintiff David and The Entity Plaintiffs assert corporate defamation claims against All Defendant Attorneys, including both the United States-Based Attorney Defendants and the Swiss Attorney Defendants, who have defamed Plaintiff David.

This action also asserts intentional infliction of emotional distress claims against All Defendants because they have harmed Plaintiff David, who has suffered terribly as a result of the All Defendants wrongfully suing him, trying to

extort money from him and harassing both Plaintiff David and The Entity Plaintiffs so as to extort money and property from Plaintiff David.

Plaintiff David and The Entity Plaintiffs seek damages for their pecuniary losses attributable to All Defendants' extortion, obstruction of justice, wire fraud, mail fraud, bribery and aiding and abetting, as well as for All Defendants' intentional and negligent interference with Plaintiff David's and The Entity Plaintiffs' ongoing and prospective contract relations, damages for Plaintiff David's emotional harm caused by All Defendants' intentional infliction of emotional distress, damages for the wrongful defamation perpetrated against Plaintiff David and for the corporate defamation perpetrated against the Entity Plaintiffs.

The Pattern of Criminal Racketeering

Plaintiff David is but one of many targets who were victimized by Defendants Girardi, Allred, and Bloom, in their initial illegal enterprise, as more completely alleged herein. Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs were targeted by United States-Based Attorney Defendants as the illegal enterprises expanded to further their conspiracies, and by the Swiss Attorneys and Litigating Defendants Jones and Khan who conspired to attempt to collect judgments for punitive damages in Switzerland in contravention of Swiss law. Litigating Defendant Khan and her Swiss counsel, the Defendant Swiss Attorneys, attempted to collect a

non-final judgment in the *Khan* case, thereby violating Swiss law.

Plaintiff David is but one of many targets who were victimized by Defendants Girardi, Allred, and Bloom, in their initial enterprise. Other notable targeted individuals include Steve Wynn, who Defendant Bloom recently paid to settle his defamation claim against her. See *Wynn v. Bloom*, D. Nev., No. 2:18-cv-00609, Stipulation of Dismissal 5/19/22. [Microsoft Word - SAO for Dismissal.docx \(aboutlaw.com\)](#)

Remarkably, Defendant Bloom's modus operandi in the *Wynn* matter mirrors her behavior against Plaintiff David ~ Bloom and her client accused Wynn of sexual harassment and retaliation in a press release. Here, Bloom has accused Plaintiff David of rape, thereby defaming him.

Edelson, PC, v. David Lira; Keith Griffin, Erika Girardi, a/k/a Erika Jayne et. al., Case 3:22-cv-03977 (7/06/22), filed in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, San Francisco Division also illustrates the United States-Based Defendants' wrongful, illegal enterprise. The *Edelson* Complaint alleges the former firm Girardi Keese allegedly operated as a continuing criminal enterprise that stole more than \$100 million from its clients, co-counsel, and vendors and siphoned off clients' settlement payments to members of the Girardi Family Syndicate, including Defendant Erica Girardi a/k/a Erica Jayne.

On May 1, 2022, Paul Marciano ("Marciano") filed a personal injury lawsuit

against Attorney Defendants Lisa Bloom and The Bloom Firm law firm in the Los Angeles County Superior Court of California, seeking general, compensatory, and punitive damages, among other reliefs, for the Defendants' alleged extortion, deceptive and improper behavior. Marciano's complaint alleged, "This is a case of extortion. It arises out of what has become a pattern of tortious, deceptive, and otherwise improper behavior by the defendants that has been exposed by a former client who had the courage to be a whistleblower to their outrageous conduct. *The Bloom Defendants have hidden behind their status as lawyers. But a bar card is not a license to commit extortion.*" (Emphasis added).

Marciano further alleged, "The Bloom Defendants' practice is to target well known individuals and public companies with accusations of improper behavior, typically under the guise of a purported sexual harassment claim, and threaten to make those accusations public. Whether the accusation is true or not does not matter. *What matters is making the target pay up.*" (Emphasis added).

Marciano also alleged, "The Bloom Defendants set their sights on Plaintiff and the company he co-founded, Guess? Inc. ("Guess"). Consistent with their typical shakedown practice, the Bloom Defendants threatened to publicly accuse Plaintiff of having committed, and Guess of being complicit in, serious and violent felony criminal conduct unless Plaintiff and Guess paid the Bloom Defendants' client (and by extension, the Bloom Defendants) money."

Marciano's allegations continue by asserting, "The Bloom Defendants forced Plaintiff to play an extortive game of Russian roulette. They intentionally sought to induce fear in Plaintiff that he would suffer severe consequences and damage if the Bloom Defendants pulled the trigger on their threats. The Bloom Defendants threatened to publicize despicable accusations that they knew were utterly false."

Marciano also alleged, "*The Bloom Defendants carry out such schemes under the guise of legal advocacy, using their client as a tool to line their own pockets. They concoct phony allegations of horrific conduct, and bank on the reality that their targets do not want such disgusting and outrageous allegations made public, even if they are false.* (Emphasis added).

Marciano further alleged that "the Bloom Defendants knew that Plaintiff did not 'rape' S.S. and made such threats regardless of the fact that such threats were false." Like Marciano¹, Plaintiff David has been targeted by the Litigating Defendants and Defendant Attorneys Allred, Bloom, Goldberg and Chora, all of whom conspired to wrongfully accuse Plaintiff David of sexual misconduct.

Enterprise Allegations Specific to Plaintiff David and The Entity Plaintiffs

¹ Notably, another prominent figure, Rose McGowan, was also targeted by Attorney Defendant Allred **AUGMENT FOOTNOTE. Insert Rose's texts? Pros and Cons discuss.**

<http://www.tvmix.com/la-court-gives-ok-to-hollywood-actress-rose-mcgowan-fraud-suit-against-harvey-weinstein-and-lisa-bloom/123>

Rose has a bit of a win with defamation going forward.

In this case, Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs' also suffered at the hands of Bloom, who has defamed Plaintiff David and twice accused him of rape, when, in fact, *nothing could be further from the truth*. She did so in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse and she did so in the United Kingdom, as more fully alleged herein in this Complaint's Defamation Count, *infra* at _____.

This Complaint is filed during the demise of the house of cards nefariously and corruptly constructed by Attorney Defendants Girardi, Allred, and Bloom and by the named United States-Based Attorney Defendants who conspired with one another as well as with Girardi, Allred, and Bloom in decades-long criminal enterprises.² Such enterprises, commonly referred to as the Girardi Family Syndicate or The Girardi Syndicate, are criminal enterprise syndicates that conducted their fraudulent and extortionate activities under the auspices of legitimate law firms.

As of this filing, it is now known that Attorney Defendants Allred and Bloom, in coordination with the now-disbarred Thomas V. Girardi and his firm, Girardi Keese, and Girardi's former partner, Keith Griffin, who illegally participated in using their respective law firms as criminal enterprises for decades.³

Plaintiffs David and the Entity Plaintiffs allege that the United States-Based

² See www.law360.com/articles/1349235/girardi-s-legacy-in-shambles-amid-shakespearean-scandal.

³ **Insert State Bar investigations. Insert Edelson.**

Defendant Attorneys targeted Plaintiff David and The Entity Plaintiffs, exploited the media to defame those innocent targets, and extorted Plaintiff David by demanding unjustified settlements and by filing spurious malicious lawsuits against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs.

The series of allegations set forth in good faith in this Complaint are asserted after a thorough exercise of due diligence. The allegations are so egregious that their existence contravenes all due process guarantees to which every American is entitled. It strains credulity that such unethical and illegal actions by Defendant Attorneys would occur and indeed, had the acquiescence of The State Bar of California, and, upon information and belief, with the acquiescence of various California State Court judges, who for a series of years ignored complaints against Defendant Attorneys Girardi, Allred and Bloom while their law firms, Girardi & Keese, Allred, Maroko & Goldberg and The Bloom Firm operated as ostensibly legitimate law firms but were in fact criminal enterprises.

That is precisely what occurred.

The Allred-Bloom-Goldberg-Griffith-Dordick-Chora syndicate utilized and continues to utilize, similar corrupt, extorting, and litigating tactics against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs, as more fully alleged herein, while their law firms, Allred, Maroko & Goldberg, The Bloom Firm and Chora, Young & Manasserian, and The Dordick Law Corporation are their criminal enterprises disguised as

legitimate law firms.

This Complaint is also being filed as the pendulum regarding the laudatory “#Me Too” movement, which was originally intended to protect women’s rights, but which has been grossly misused by many opportunistic plaintiffs - swings from providing a basis for a tsunami of spurious lawsuits filed against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs, and similar innocent defendants worldwide, to achieving an equitable jurisprudential balance wherein such suits, when valid, can provide proper remedies for those who truly have been victimized.

Plaintiffs assert that the United States-Based Attorney Defendants’ pattern of racketeering activity is to target well-known individuals, such as Plaintiff David, with accusations of improper behavior, typically under the guise of purported, fallacious sexual harassment claims, and to threaten to make those allegations public, all with a willful intent to get the target to pay up.

The United States-Based Attorney Defendants unlawfully and tortiously attempted to, and in some instances did, extort millions of dollars from Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs through their illegal enterprises that employed calculated media campaigns, threats, and intimidation, and abusive, fabricated litigious actions. Most notably, Litigating Defendants Taylor and Khan demanded millions of dollars from Plaintiff David as hush money so they wouldn’t “report crimes.” Litigating Defendant Taylor demanded \$2.2 million and Litigating

Defendant Khan, with the help of their counsel, demanded \$1.9 million. Although Barry Rothman (now deceased), who was then attorney for Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs, reported the extortion to Detective Audra Alatorre of the Beverly Hills Police⁴ and then to the District Attorney, no authorities took any action to address the extortion. Just like Steve Wynn, Plaintiff David was the object of extortion. Just like Paul Marciano, Plaintiff David was the object of extortion.

Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs allege that Defendants Mahim Khan, Elizabeth Taylor, Lauren Reeves and Chastity Jones (Collectively, “Litigating Defendants”) knowingly and wilfully conspired and colluded with the US-Based Attorney Defendants against Plaintiff David and The Entity Plaintiffs to further their participation in the past and ongoing interrelated enterprises calculated to extort money from Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs.

Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs further allege that Litigating Defendant Reeves and Khan knowingly and wilfully conspired and colluded with The Swiss Defendants to further their participation in their past and ongoing interrelated enterprises calculated to extort money from Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs. *See* Defamation Claim, *infra* at **Count 7 at _____**.

⁴ Rothman wrote to Detective Audra Delatorre attaching sworn affidavits executed by employees of the Entity Plaintiffs stating that Plaintiff David had never touched or sexually harrassed Litigating Defendants Khan or Taylor. **INSERT A LINK to Correspondence between Barry Rothman and Detective Audra Delatorre and from Rothman to the District Attorney’s office.**

Culpable Persons

Plaintiffs allege: that Attorney Defendants Gloria Allred, in her individual capacity, and as a partner in Allred, Maroko & Goldberg; Nathan Goldberg, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in Allred, Maroko & Goldberg; Delores Y. Leal, in her individual capacity and as a partner in Allred, Maroko & Goldberg; Renee Mochkatel, in her individual capacity and as a partner in Allred, Maroko & Goldberg; Lisa Bloom, in her individual capacity, on behalf of the marital community consisting of Lisa Bloom and Braden Pollack, and as an owner of the Bloom Firm; Braden Pollack, individually, on behalf of his marital community with Lisa Bloom, and as an employee of The Bloom Firm; Thomas V Girardi, in his individual capacity and on behalf of his marital community with Erika Jones; Gary A. Dordick, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in Dordick Law Corporation; Keith Griffin, in his individual capacity and in his capacities as a former partner in Girardi & Keese, and as an associate in Dordick Law Corporation; Dordick Law Corporation; Joseph Chora, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in Chora, Young & Manasserian; Ebby S. Bakhtiar, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in The Law Offices of Ebby S. Bakhtiar; Oren Warshavsky, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in Baker Hostetler; Marc Gillieron, in his individual capacity, and as a partner in Chabrier Avocats SA;

Emilie Theintz, as an individual, and as a associate in Chabrier Avocats, SA (Collectively, “All Defendant Attorneys,”) are each culpable persons capable of holding legal or beneficial interests in property, who wilfully intended to commit the alleged RICO predicate acts despite knowing that those acts were illegal.

All Attorney Defendants have participated in long-term, organized conduct consisting of a criminal enterprise affecting interstate and international commerce through a continuous and interrelated pattern of racketeering activity, in violation of RICO laws set forth in 18 U.S.C. §§1962 (b)(c)(d).

As more fully stated herein, those predicate acts consist of extortion, wire fraud, mail fraud, bribery, and obstruction of justice (“RICO Predicate Offenses”).

The criminal enterprise continues to violate the hereinstated RICO predicate offenses and thereby harm Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs. Litigating Defendants Mahim Khan, Elizabeth Taylor, Lauren Reeves, and Chastity Jones colluded and conspired with the United States-Based Attorney Defendants, seeking to extort money from Plaintiff David and Plaintiff Entities and filing spurious lawsuits against Plaintiff David and Plaintiff Entities.

Each Litigating Defendant is a culpable person capable of holding legal or beneficial interests in property, who participated with United States-Based Defendant Attorneys in a long-term, organized conduct of a criminal enterprise affecting interstate and international commerce through a continuous and

interrelated pattern of racketeering activity, in violation of RICO laws.

FACTS COMMON TO ALL ALLEGATIONS

Defendant Attorneys Conspire with Litigating Defendants and File a Tsunami of Me Too Claims Against Plaintiff Alki David

Plaintiff David first met Defendants Allred and Bloom when the three of them appeared on the Dr. Drew Show on December 4, 2012. Upon information and belief, from that day forward, Defendants Allred and Bloom viewed Plaintiff David as a possible target to attack in the future with spurious lawsuits alleging that David harmed Litigating Defendants, just as Defendants Allred and Bloom have targeted many others, as more fully discussed herein.⁵

⁵ **Note:** Girardi was disbarred on July 1, 2022.

<https://apps.calbar.ca.gov/licensee/Detail/36603>.

Strategy Question: Girardi is in personal bankruptcy, so the stay most likely will preclude suing him personally. Further he is in messy divorce proceedings. In December, 2020, involuntary Chapter 7 Bankruptcy proceedings were filed against Girardi's law firm, Girardi & Keese. The firm became defunct on or near January, 2021 and its assets were sold by the bankruptcy trustee. *Tom Girardi's Law Office will be sold, as his home goes on the market, Trustee tells Court, by Amanda Bronstad, The Recorder, April 27, 2021.* Robert Keese, who helped Defendant Girardi found the Girardi & Keese law firm in 1965, also has been placed on involuntary inactive status and is not eligible to practice law. <https://apps.calbar.ca.gov/licensee/Detail/46858>.

Strategy Question: Given these complications with Girardi, I have named him as an individual and a member of his marital estate and have otherwise included references to him in the complaint with regard to averments regarding the enterprise and continuous activity? I have also named Erica Girardi a/k/a Erica Jayne as a Defendant as she is part of the criminal enterprise. Note: Girardi's



Gloria Allred (left/right) Lisa Bloom, Alki David, Kato Kaelin, Dr. Drew

Monica D'Oofrio filed *D'Onofrio v. Alki David Productions Inc., FilmOn Com., Inc. and Alki David*, Case No. BC496165³ on November 6, 2012, alleging employment discrimination. Plaintiff David strongly denied any liability, but made a business decision to settle the case for a minimal amount. The case was dismissed in 2013 in a settlement agreement that had a confidentiality provision. Upon information and belief, with the urging of Defendant Attorneys, various conspiring and colluding employees and ex-employees subsequently filed false claims against Plaintiff David and some of the Entity Plaintiffs.

Current and former employees of the Entity Plaintiffs, encouraged and aided

former partner, Keith Griffin, has joined the Dordick Law Firm, whose principal is Defendant Gary A. Dordick.

and abetted by the Defendant Attorneys,⁶ targeted Plaintiff David as a defendant to name in spurious lawsuits and targeted the Entity Plaintiffs. Former employees and their counsel deemed Plaintiff David to be a deep pocket from whom they could extort monies.

In filing this lawsuit - Plaintiff David and the Plaintiff Entities seek justice to recoup millions of dollars, consisting of lost profits, improperly obtained court judgments, and lost profitable contracts, as well damages attributable to Plaintiff David's two IPO's failing. (Insert IPO's for FilmOn and XXXXX). **Note: Yelena was CONTROLLER and she had a very strong grasp on finances and taxes so we are getting an affidavit from her in this regard.**

Upon information and belief, Attorney Defendants Girardi, Allred, Bloom, Goldberg, Deitrich and Griffin conspired to pursue vexatious litigation creating a continuous and related pattern of racketeering activity against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs by filing numerous spurious and unfounded lawsuits against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs. Soon thereafter, other Attorney Defendants joined the enterprise, including Attorney Defendants Leal, Mochkatel, Goldstein, Griffin, and Bakhtiar, thus expanding the illegal racketeering enterprise and

⁶ **Note to Counsel:** Ali's affidavit will establish that she saw other Defendants contrive claims by constantly entering Plaintiff David's office in hopes of enticing him to commit sexually offensive conduct. Carl Dawson's affidavit will also establish that employees and former employees of the Entity Plaintiffs contrived to target Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs.

increasing the damages sustained by Plaintiffs David and The Entity Plaintiffs.

The US Based Attorney Defendants were enabled by one another and their retained experts to assist them in committing the RICO predicate offenses of extortion, bribery, obstruction of justice, wire fraud, mail fraud and aiding and abetting solely because of each U.S. Based Attorney Defendants' position in the enterprise and their involvement in and/or control over the enterprise's affairs and because their offenses of extortion, bribery, obstruction of justice, wire, mail fraud and aiding and abetting are related to the activities of their enterprise, *i.e.*, to enrich themselves by filing spurious lawsuits against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs, thereby depriving those Plaintiffs of their property and money.

Upon information and belief, (**Allie and Carl Affidavits provide this good faith basis**) Defendants Girardi, Allred, and Bloom intentionally conspired to recruit employees of Plaintiff Entities and former employees of those Plaintiff Entities, to independently file tort lawsuits against Plaintiff David, alleging he committed sexual misconduct and/or that those Plaintiffs had viable employment law claims against Plaintiff Entities in order to extract and extort money from Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs in furtherance of an enterprise specifically designed to enrich Attorney Defendants.

The Defendant Attorneys' illegal enterprise activity will extend beyond the initial period of time when the predicate acts commenced because litigation

continues in the suit filed by Elizabeth Taylor, and the *Mahim Khan* case is on appeal. Defendant Allred continues to further the criminal enterprise by utilizing illegal tactics to obstruct justice, both in the U.S. and in Switzerland, as she seeks to collect on a judgment in the *Mahim Khan* case despite that case being on appeal before the Supreme Court of California.

Defendants Attorneys Allred and Bloom's extortionate tactics have no bounds, as evidenced by this Complaint, which establishes that many prominent citizens are victimized by Allred's and Bloom's predatory targeting of prominent people, whom they victimize, all the while alleging their clients are "victims."

Defendants Allred and Bloom are the actual predators who consistently utilize the same criminal enterprise modus operandi, *i.e.*, name and shame - as alleged herein. Defendant Attorneys Allred and Bloom have targeted everyone from Princess Latifa to 50 Cent, from Alan Dershowitz to Rose McGowan, from Chris Brown to Steve Wynn, to Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs. After targeting those victims, Defendant Attorneys Allred and Bloom maliciously fabricate fallacious testimony, with the intent to extort money and property from their targets to further their criminal enterprise.

The Parade of Spurious Lawsuits Filed to Further The Enterprise's Goals

In 2017, Karl Zirpel, a former employee of Alki David Productions, claimed he was improperly fired after raising safety concerns prior to an event hosted by

Entity Plaintiff Hologram at Hologram Theater. Zirpel's sexual harassment claims, like that of many other Plaintiffs whom Defendant Attorneys helped to victimize Plaintiff David, was dropped the claim on the eve of trial. *Karl Zirpel v. Alki David Productions, Inc., et al.*, LASC Case No. BC684618. Note: Alki was not personally named in this suit, but Zirpel's attorneys claimed in The Daily Beast that they would pursue Alki personally once the judgment was finalized.

<https://www.thedailybeast.com/alki-david-coca-cola-heir-who-called-lawyer-a-fuck-tard-loses-dollar1-million-case>.

Note: Alki, counsel for Zirpel and Zimmerman are not named Attorney Defendants - just ensuring you do not want to add them. Also Note: Alki was previously involved in unrelated litigation over a business dispute with Barry Diller, whose company, IAC owns the Daily Beast.

In 2017, Hologram USA's independent contractor Grant Zimmerman filed *Grant Zimmerman v. Alkiviades David, et al.*, Case No. BC675552, in the Los Angeles County Superior Court, wrongly alleging wrongful termination and that he was fired by Plaintiff David for revealing David committed sexual misconduct as to other of David's employees.

Alki: Here is a link to a mediation brief filed on Plaintiff David's behalf and on behalf of Hologram Inc., but not the other various entities related to Alki named in Zimmerman's suit. **Note: Alki and his counsel need to determine whether to divulge this as, per evidentiary rules, it is confidential.**

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/#search/Zimmerman/FMfcgxwLtsxhWHtZJFmDWqjCNmJckqSG?projector=1&messagePartId=0.1> -

On February 2, 2017, Litigating Defendants, Elizabeth Taylor and Chastity Jones filed a Labor-Wrongful Termination lawsuit that also alleged sexual harassment in Los Angeles County Superior Court against Plaintiffs David, Hologram USA Entertainment, Inc., FilmOn Media Holdings, Inc., FilmOn TV., Alki David Productions, Inc. Hologram USA, Inc., Anakando Media Group, USA, FilmOn TV Networks, Inc., and FilmOn TV U.K., Limited.

There is no truth to the allegations asserted by Litigating Defendants Taylor and Jones. Upon information and belief, the suit was filed by legal counsel, Defendants Goldstein, Bloom and Chora to extort settlement proceeds from Plaintiff David and/or the Entity Plaintiffs. Tellingly, Taylor dropped her sexual harassment claim on the day of jury selection, after spending three years maligning and defaming Plaintiff David, with Defendant Attorney promoting Taylor's fallacious sexual harassment claims on TMZ for those three years.

To show good faith, and in an attempt to prove his innocence, Plaintiff David voluntarily underwent a polygraph test:

6:11




ALKIDAVID Posts

September 21, 2019



alkidavid



[View insights](#)

[Boost Post](#)



42,898 views • Liked by **bobbywilson22**





CONFIDENTIAL
POLYGRAPH RE-EXAMINATION REPORT

QUESTION #	EXAMINEE'S PHYSIOLOGICAL REACTIONS RECORDED ON POLYGRAPH CHARTS	OPINION OF POLYGRAPH EXAMINER
1	No Significant Physiological Reactions or Disturbances	No Deception Indicated (NDI) The Examinee Has Told the Truth
2	No Significant Physiological Reactions or Disturbances	No Deception Indicated (NDI) The Examinee Has Told the Truth

The polygraph charts and physiological reactions were extensively reviewed during the data analysis. It is the examiner opinion (additionally supported by a computer algorithm analysis-OSS-3) that the examinee has **TOLD THE TRUTH** when answered the pertinent questions listed in **Section 2** above.

Based on the test results the examinee, **Mr. Alkiviades Andrew David** did not falsify any detail in his written statement above, made on 8/18/19 at the examiner office, shortly prior to taking the re-examination polygraph test.

Following the review of the polygraph charts and the re-examination test results with the examinee, the examiner confirmed that the examinee had no further questions prior to his departure from the office.

Respectfully Submitted,

Examiner,

Oded Gelfer
President,
APA Full Member # 7662
Global Polygraph & Security LLC
Tell: 424-302-2498
www.90210polygraph.com




View insights

Boost Post



42,898 views • Liked by **bobbywilson22**





In 2019, Lauren Reeves, represented by Attorney Defendant Allred, sued Plaintiff David and Plaintiffs Hologram USA and Alki David Productions, LASC Case No. BC649025, for sexual battery and sexual harassment. Attorney Defendants Goldberg and Leal of the Attorney Defendant Allred's firm, represented Reeves, who worked as a comedy writer for Plaintiff Hologram USA. Reeves was

awarded \$650,000 in compensatory damages and \$4.35 million in punitive damages.

In November, 2019, Mahim Khan, a former production assistant who worked at Entity Plaintiff FilmOn TV and Entity Plaintiff Alki David Productions, Inc., sued Plaintiff David and Entity Plaintiffs Alki David Productions, Hologram USA, FilmOn Inc., and Plaintiff David. LASC Case No. BC654017 (2019). Khan obtained an award of \$58 million, \$55 Million of which was for punitive damages for battery, sexual battery and sexual harassment against Plaintiff Alki David.

Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs are seeking reversal on appeal due to the misconduct of Khan's counsel, Allred, Maroko & Goldberg, including, but not limited to, Defendants Allred, Goldberg, Leal, and Mochkatel, misconduct intended to further the criminal enterprise those counsel participated in in violation of RICO, as more fully alleged herein.

Note: Counsel will need to link to the Petition for Review before the California Supreme Court.

The Los Angeles Superior Court ordered Litigating Defendants Jones and Taylor's lawsuits to be bifurcated and those cases were tried separately. In Litigating Defendant Jones' action, LASC Case No. BC649025 (2017), Jones asserted that she was subjected to sexual harassment and battery and that she was wrongfully terminated because she refused Plaintiff David's advances.

In April, 2019, Litigating Defendant Jones won an award against Plaintiff David for \$11 Million in compensatory damages, an amount that was reduced by \$437,120 by the court because Jones had over-estimated her damages. Counsel representing Litigating Defendant Jones were Attorney Defendants Bloom, Sarah Bloom of the Bloom Firm, and Attorney Defendants Fundali and Goldstein of the Bloom Law Firm and Attorney Defendant Chora.⁷

In October, 2019, a jury deadlocked 8-4 in Litigating Defendant Taylor's suit, LASC Case No. BC649025 (2017). Los Angeles County Superior Court Judge Christopher Lui declared a mistrial. Counsel for Litigation Defendant Taylor was Attorney Bloom.

Alki: Attached is a mediation brief filed on Plaintiff David's behalf and on behalf In 2019, Lauren Reeves, represented by Attorney Defendant Allred, sued Plaintiff David and Plaintiffs Hologram USA and Alki David Productions, LASC Case No. BC649025, for sexual battery and sexual harassment. Attorney Defendants Goldberg and Leal of the Attorney Defendant Allred's firm, represented Reeves, who worked as a comedy writer for Plaintiff Hologram USA. Reeves was awarded \$650,000 in compensatory damages and \$4.35 million in punitive damages.

In Mary Rizzo's deposition conducted by Attorney Defendant Bloom in the

⁷ In Mary Rizzo's deposition conducted by Attorney Defendant Bloom in the *Chastity Jones* case, Rizzo discussed a long chain of text messages between Rizzo and Jones evincing that the Litigating Defendants conspired to contrive claims against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs.

For the Court's convenience, here is a dropbox link to these texts:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/14IX-XfL3oOGUS9MV4-zd3GXt0WTE1g3M/view?usp=sharing>.

Chastity Jones case, Rizzo discussed a long chain of text messages between Rizzo and Jones evincing that the Litigating Defendants conspired to contrive claims against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs.

Counsel for Plaintiff David in the Jones Trial, Fred Heather of Glaser Weil, pointed out to the Court that Ms. Jones blatantly lied, causing a manifest miscarriage of justice in the case that materially and unfairly prejudiced Plaintiff David in the *Jones* case:

5. Ms. Jones Was Untruthful and Dishonest in Her Trial Testimony¹⁴

Mary Rizzo worked for Filmon as an advertising account representative from approximately January 2015 to March 2016. (David Decl. ¶ 2.) In or around June 2016, she filed a lawsuit against Mr. David and other entities and her claims were settled in or around October 2016. (See *id.* at ¶ 3.) Ms. Rizzo and Mr. David had a text-message conversation in or around November 2019 where Ms. Rizzo expressed her belief that “some of the lawsuits that were filed against [Mr. David] and the entity defendants after her settlement were filed at least because of the plaintiffs’ knowledge of the terms of her settlement and not because they had valid claims,” including Ms. Jones’ lawsuit. (*Id.* at ¶ 4.) The following are some examples of Ms. Jones’ trial and deposition testimony that are contradicted by Ms. Rizzo’s text messages to Mr. David and a former Filmon employee’s sworn declaration:

- At trial, Ms. Jones claimed that when she posted a picture of herself in her bathing suit on Instagram on Easter Sunday 2015, Mr. David came up to her the next day and said that he liked the picture she posted and that, “You need to post more pictures like that.” (Reporter’s Transcript, 362:2-19.) Ms. Jones testified that as a result of Mr. David’s comment she “was in shock,” “felt violated by [her] superior,” and “wanted to get away from [Mr. David].” (RT, 362:20-23) Ms. Jones testified that she “went immediately and told Mary Rizzo.” (RT, 362:24-26.) Ms. Rizzo stated that she “was right next to [Ms. Jones] when [Mr. David] commented on [the picture]. She [Ms. Jones] posted it for [Mr. David], she [Ms. Jones] told

¹⁴ The information presented in sections 5 and 6 regarding Ms. Jones’ dishonesty in her trial testimony and Ms. Jones’ attorney bullying a witness punctuate the fact that there has been a miscarriage of justice with respect to Mr. David. Mr. David does not request that the Court award sanctions for this specific conduct. Instead, these are instances that, combined with the clearly egregious perjury of Ms. Jones and the misconduct of her counsel, demonstrate that the Court cannot have faith that the trial of this matter was fair.

12

DEFENDANT ALKIVIADIS DAVID’S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AGAINST PLAINTIFF CHASTITY JONES AND HER ATTORNEYS; REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE

1986261

18 6. Ms. Jones' Attorneys "Bullied" At Least One Potential Witness to Testify
19 on Ms. Jones' Behalf
20 Mr. David has obtained a declaration from a percipient witness who did not testify at the
21 Jones trial, but who states under oath that she believed Ms. Jones' lawyers tried to "bully" her to
22 provide testimony that was "not true." (See Menifee Decl., ¶ 16.)
23 In or around May 2019, Ms. Jones' lawyers contacted Ms. Menifee through her then lawyer,
24 David Osorio. (Menifee Decl., ¶ 10.) "With the help of Mr. Osorio, [Ms. Menifee] prepared a
25 written statement about [her] knowledge of Ms. Jones and her claims against Mr. David and the
26 Company," which included the following information: (i) "[o]n several occasions, Ms. Jones—who
27 had learned about Ms. Rizzo's lawsuit against and settlement with Filmon and Mr. David—asked
28 [Ms. Menifee] how much money Ms. Rizzo had received as a result of her settlement. [Ms.

13

DEFENDANT ALKIVIADES DAVID'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AGAINST PLAINTIFF CHASITY
JONES AND HER ATTORNEYS; REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE

1986265

Note: Fred Heather may have a better format to set forth these allegations.

Indeed, that was not the first time Defendant Jones lied - when Plaintiff David's deceased attorney, Barry Rothman, contacted Detective Audra Delatorre of the Beverly Hills Police Department, and, at Detective Delatorre's suggestion, Rothman also contacted the District Attorney, alleging that Mahim Kahn and Elizabeth Taylor committed extortion by seeking to have Plaintiff David pay them so they would not report his "crimes," Defendant Jones executed a draft that stated in relevant part: **insert quotes**

See Appendix _____.

This marked inconsistency in Jones' statements manifest how markedly inconsistent with fundamental principles of due process the trials in *Khan* and *Taylor* and the other trials addressed herein have been. Plaintiff David *was not*

allowed to represent himself in the Khan and Taylor trials so he could not cross examine witness Jones as to her inconsistent statements. Such due process violations have been rife in the various trials where The Litigating Defendants filed lawsuits against Plaintiff David and The Entity Plaintiffs.

On September 30, 2020, Jane Doe (Rita Nichols) filed a Labor-Wrongful termination lawsuit in Los Angeles County Superior Court against Plaintiffs David, FilmOn TV Networks, Inc., FilmOn TV La Inc. SwissX Labs AG Inc. a California Corp. AKA Swiss Lounge; Hologram USA Entertainment Inc.; FilmOn TV Inc. Hologram USA Inc. a California Corp. AKA Hologram USA Productions Inc; SwissX Labs AG Inc. AKA SwissX Lounge AKA FilmOn UK Ltd; Hologram USA Inc. AKA Hologram USA Productions Inc. AKA Hologram USA Entertainment Inc. AKA FilmOn TV Inc. AKA FilmOn.Tv La. Inc. LASC Case No. 20STCV37498.

Defendant Doe's attorneys in that action are Attorney Defendants Girardi, Bakhtiar and Dordick. The case is still pending.

Defendant Attorneys also filed lawsuits on behalf of Litigating Defendants Elizabeth Taylor (represented by Defendant Attorney Goldstein, Bloom, Chora); (represented by Attorney Defendants Bloom, Sarah Bloom of the Bloom Firm, and Attorney Defendants Fundali, Goldstein of the Bloom Law Firm and Attorney Defendant Chora); Mahim Khan, (LASC Case No. BC654017) (represented by

Defendant Attorneys Allred, Maroko & Goldberg, Allred, Goldberg, Leal and Mochkatel;) and Lauren Reeves (represented by Defendant Attorney Allred).

Attorney Defendants Girardi, Allred, Goldberg, Goldstein, Leal, Mochkatel, Bloom, Fudalli, Chora, Warshavsky, Gillieron, Theintz, and Chabrier Avocats, SA and their agents mercilessly and maliciously pursued Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs in courts, as well as in the media, seeking to extort Plaintiff David so that he would pay expeditiously money to settle with the parties who sued Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs.

Litigating Defendant Khan participated in the Swiss Attorney Defendants' illegal efforts to enforce immature judgments against Plaintiff David, knowing that her case was on appeal in the United States, and thus was not collectible in Switzerland. Further, Defendant Khan wrongfully and illegally defamed Plaintiff David in Switzerland, alleging David had been "convicted" of sexual harassment, all the while knowing through her Swiss counsel that her wrongly accusing him of being "convicted" constituted wilful defamation (art. 174 SCC) in Switzerland.

Litigating Defendant Lauren Reeves participated in the Swiss Attorney Defendants' illegal efforts to enforce a judgment against Plaintiff David for punitive damages which are not collectible in Switzerland. Defendant Reeves participated in the Swiss Attorney Defendants' illegal efforts to enforce a punitive damages award, knowing through her Swiss Attorneys that punitive damages are

not collectible in Switzerland, as more fully detailed below.

Further, Defendant Khan wrongfully and illegally defamed Plaintiff David in Switzerland, alleging he had been “convicted” of sexual harassment, all the while knowing through her Swiss counsel that her wrongly accusing him of being “convicted” constituted wilful defamation (art. 174 SCC) in Switzerland.

Plaintiffs assert, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§1962(b)(c) and (d), that the Attorney Defendants, their clients (The Litigating Defendants), and some of their experts, employees and agents, conspired with one another and intended to conduct, and wilfully conducted, an interrelated, clear and continuous pattern of racketeering activity to benefit Defendant Attorneys’ unlawful enterprise.

In Mary Rizzo’s deposition conducted by Attorney Defendant Bloom in the *Chastity Jones* case, Rizzo discussed a long chain of text messages between Rizzo and Jones evincing that the Litigating Defendants conspired to contrive claims against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs.

For the Court’s convenience, here is a dropbox link to these texts:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/14IX-XfL3oOGUS9MV4-zd3GXt0WTE1g3M/view?usp=sharing>.

As more fully alleged herein, they did so in their modus operandi of naming and shaming Plaintiff David - as they have many other well-known targets and the fabricating a constellation of facts and all aspects necessary to prosecute a

contrived lawsuit from false and biased witnesses, to non-meritorious and ill-informed testimony by experts, to incomplete and inaccurate witness and exhibit lists and trial evidence. Plaintiffs have evidence to prove this modus operandi.

Specifically, the Attorney Defendants Girardi, Allred, Goldberg, and Bloom (Initial Enterprise Defendants), established the initial enterprise when they filed a series of unethical, spurious lawsuits against Plaintiff David and the Plaintiff Entities, without investigating the merits of those actions with the goal of extracting money and property from Plaintiff David. To further the enterprise, the Initial Enterprise Defendants unethically coached clients and witnesses about what to say to bolster the Attorney Defendants' filed spurious lawsuits and/or make unreasonable and unfounded settlement demands against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs.

Further, Plaintiffs allege that the Attorney Defendants continue to do so, by, inter alia, wilfully and intentionally conspiring against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs, by filing spurious lawsuits against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs, who were and continue to be, victimized by Attorney Defendants' continuous pattern of racketeering conducted to benefit their enterprise, including wire fraud, mail fraud, extortion, tampering with witnesses and witness and evidence lists, as well as with evidence itself, obstruction of justice.

Litigating Defendants' Conspiracy to Target Plaintiff David and The Entity Plaintiffs ~ A Conspiracy Facilitated by the Defendant Attorneys

Upon Information and Belief the Litigating Defendants met at a restaurant near Plaintiff Entity Hologram, Inc.,'s location at least once to collude, conspire and form untruthful allegations against Plaintiff David and the Entity Defendants. Upon information and belief, the Litigating Defendants, coached by the Attorney Defendants, also met at other various times to compare theories for asserting spurious and trumped-up claims against Plaintiff David and the Entity Defendants.

⁸ Rizzo's Deposition and her trial testimony in the *Jones* trial establish that after the Rizzo Settlement with Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs, The Litigating Defendants conspired and colluded to fabricate complaints against Plaintiff David and The Entity Plaintiffs. **Alki - Please Insert Affidavit Malik Spellman as a dropbox link.**

file:///C:/Users/alki.000/Downloads/Affidavit_Malik%20David%20SpellmanConspiracy.pdf

Note: We have affidavits from Zimmerman and Ciara Menieffe.

We are getting statements from some affiants who previously provided affidavits:

- 1) Carl Bowen (Rita recently spoke with Carl and stated that Bloom threatened her to keep her from recanting;
- 2) Ali;
- 3) David Haigh;
- 4) Peter Van Prusisenn;
- 5) Ylena Calendar;
- 6) Ian Robertson;
- 7) Corey Weisman and Weisman Worldwide;
- 8) Isabel Peterman; and
- 9) The affidavits requested of Dana Cole. Please note that Alli's affidavit will establish that she saw other Plaintiffs contrive claims by constantly entering Plaintiff David's office in hopes of enticing him to commit offensive conduct. Please also note that on July 12, Alki David received 42 boxes of evidence and litigation records from Fred Heather's office, consisting of files from David and the Entity Plaintiffs being represented by Barry Rothman (deceased). Barbara and Alki are reviewing those documents and are finding more support for more specific allegations.

On February 2, 2017, Litigating Defendants, Elizabeth Taylor and Chastity Jones filed a Labor-Wrongful Termination lawsuit that also alleged sexual harassment in Los Angeles County Superior Court against Plaintiffs David, Hologram USA Entertainment, Inc., FilmOn Media Holdings, Inc., FilmOn TV., Alki David Productions, Inc. Hologram USA, Inc., Anakando Media Group, USA, FilmOn TV Networks, Inc., and FilmOn TV U.K., Limited.

There is no truth to the allegations asserted by Litigating Defendants Taylor and Jones. Upon information and belief, the suit was filed by legal counsel, Defendants Goldstein, Bloom and Chora to extort settlement proceeds from Plaintiff David and/or the Entity Plaintiffs. Tellingly, Taylor dropped her sexual harassment claim on the day of jury selection, after spending three years maligning and defaming Plaintiff David, with Defendant Attorney promoting Taylor's fallacious sexual harassment claims on TMZ for those three years. CAN WE LINK TO TMZ?

To show good faith, and in an attempt to prove his innocence, Plaintiff David voluntarily underwent a polygraph test:

6:11




ALKIDAVID Posts

September 21, 2019



alkidavid



[View insights](#)

[Boost Post](#)



42,898 views • Liked by **bobbywilson22**





CONFIDENTIAL
POLYGRAPH RE-EXAMINATION REPORT

QUESTION #	EXAMINEE'S PHYSIOLOGICAL REACTIONS RECORDED ON POLYGRAPH CHARTS	OPINION OF POLYGRAPH EXAMINER
1	No Significant Physiological Reactions or Disturbances	No Deception Indicated (NDI) The Examinee Has Told the Truth
2	No Significant Physiological Reactions or Disturbances	No Deception Indicated (NDI) The Examinee Has Told the Truth

The polygraph charts and physiological reactions were extensively reviewed during the data analysis. It is the examiner opinion (additionally supported by a computer algorithm analysis-OSS-3) that the examinee has **TOLD THE TRUTH** when answered the pertinent questions listed in **Section 2** above.

Based on the test results the examinee, **Mr. Alkiviades Andrew David** did not falsify any detail in his written statement above, made on 8/18/19 at the examiner office, shortly prior to taking the re-examination polygraph test.

Following the review of the polygraph charts and the re-examination test results with the examinee, the examiner confirmed that the examinee had no further questions prior to his departure from the office.

Respectfully Submitted,

Examiner,

Oded Gelfer
President,
APA Full Member # 7662
Global Polygraph & Security LLC
Tell: 424-302-2498
www.90210polygraph.com




View insights

Boost Post



42,898 views • Liked by **bobbywilson22**





In 2019, Lauren Reeves, represented by Attorney Defendant Allred, sued Plaintiff David and Plaintiffs Hologram USA and Alki David Productions, LASC Case No. BC649025, for sexual battery and sexual harassment. Attorney Defendants Goldberg and Leal of the Attorney Defendant Allred's firm, represented Reeves, who worked as a comedy writer for Plaintiff Hologram USA. Reeves was

awarded \$650,000 in compensatory damages and \$4.35 million in punitive damages.

In November, 2019, Mahim Khan, a former production assistant who worked at Entity Plaintiff FilmOn TV and Entity Plaintiff Alki David Productions, Inc., sued Plaintiff David and Entity Plaintiffs Alki David Productions, Hologram USA, FilmOn Inc., and Plaintiff David. LASC Case No. BC654017 (2019). Khan obtained an award of \$58 million, \$55 Million of which was for punitive damages for battery, sexual battery and sexual harassment against Plaintiff Alki David.

Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs are seeking reversal on appeal due to the misconduct of Khan's counsel, Allred, Maroko & Goldberg, including, but not limited to, Defendants Allred, Goldberg, Leal, and Mochkatel, misconduct intended to further the criminal enterprise those counsel participated in in violation of RICO, as more fully alleged herein.

Note: Counsel will need to link to the Petition for Review before the California Supreme Court.

The Los Angeles Superior Court ordered Litigating Defendants Jones and Taylor's lawsuits to be bifurcated and those cases were tried separately. In Litigating Defendant Jones' action, LASC Case No. BC649025 (2017), Jones asserted that she was subjected to sexual harassment and battery and that she was wrongfully terminated because she refused Plaintiff David's advances.

In April, 2019, Litigating Defendant Jones won an award against Plaintiff David for \$11 Million in compensatory damages, an amount that was reduced by \$437,120 by the court because Jones had over-estimated her damages. Counsel representing Litigating Defendant Jones were Attorney Defendants Bloom, Sarah Bloom of the Bloom Firm, and Attorney Defendants Fundali and Goldstein of the Bloom Law Firm and Attorney Defendant Chora.⁹

In October, 2019, a jury deadlocked 8-4 in Litigating Defendant Taylor's suit, LASC Case No. BC649025 (2017). Los Angeles County Superior Court Judge Christopher Lui declared a mistrial. Counsel for Litigation Defendant Taylor was Attorney Bloom.

Alki: Attached is a mediation brief filed on Plaintiff David's behalf and on behalf In 2019, Lauren Reeves, represented by Attorney Defendant Allred, sued Plaintiff David and Plaintiffs Hologram USA and Alki David Productions, LASC Case No. BC649025, for sexual battery and sexual harassment. Attorney Defendants Goldberg and Leal of the Attorney Defendant Allred's firm, represented Reeves, who worked as a comedy writer for Plaintiff Hologram USA. Reeves was awarded \$650,000 in compensatory damages and \$4.35 million in punitive damages.

In Mary Rizzo's deposition conducted by Attorney Defendant Bloom in the *Chastity Jones* case, Rizzo discussed a long chain of text messages between Rizzo

⁹ In Mary Rizzo's deposition conducted by Attorney Defendant Bloom in the *Chastity Jones* case, Rizzo discussed a long chain of text messages between Rizzo and Jones evincing that the Litigating Defendants conspired to contrive claims against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs.

For the Court's convenience, here is a dropbox link to these texts:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/14IX-XfL3oOGUS9MV4-zd3GXt0WTE1g3M/view?usp=sharing>

and Jones evincing that the Litigating Defendants conspired to contrive claims against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs.

Counsel for Plaintiff David in the Jones Trial, Fred Heather of Glaser Weil, pointed out to the Court that Ms. Jones blatantly lied, causing a manifest miscarriage of justice in the case that materially and unfairly prejudiced Plaintiff David in the *Jones* case:

Glaser Weil

6 **5. Ms. Jones Was Untruthful and Dishonest in Her Trial Testimony¹⁴**

7 Mary Rizzo worked for Filmon as an advertising account representative from approximately
8 January 2015 to March 2016. (David Decl., ¶ 2.) In or around June 2016, she filed a lawsuit against
9 Mr. David and other entities and her claims were settled in or around October 2016. (See *id.* at ¶ 3.)
10 Ms. Rizzo and Mr. David had a text-message conversation in or around November 2019 where Ms.
11 Rizzo expressed her belief that “some of the lawsuits that were filed against [Mr. David] and the
12 entity defendants after her settlement were filed at least because of the plaintiffs’ knowledge of the
13 terms of her settlement and not because they had valid claims,” including Ms. Jones’ lawsuit. (*Id.* at
14 ¶ 4.) The following are some examples of Ms. Jones’ trial and deposition testimony that are
15 contradicted by Ms. Rizzo’s text messages to Mr. David and a former Filmon employee’s sworn
16 declaration:

- 17 • At trial, Ms. Jones claimed that when she posted a picture of herself in her bathing suit on
18 Instagram on Easter Sunday 2015, Mr. David came up to her the next day and said that he
19 liked the picture she posted and that, “You need to post more pictures like that.” (Reporter’s
20 Transcript, 362:2-19.) Ms. Jones testified that as a result of Mr. David’s comment she “was
21 in shock,” “felt violated by [her] superior,” and “wanted to get away from [Mr. David].”
22 (RT, 362:20-23) Ms. Jones testified that she “went immediately and told Mary Rizzo.” (RT,
23 362:24-26.) Ms. Rizzo stated that she “was right next to [Ms. Jones] when [Mr. David]
24 commented on [the picture]. She [Ms. Jones] posted it for [Mr. David], she [Ms. Jones] told
25

26 ¹⁴ The information presented in sections 5 and 6 regarding Ms. Jones’ dishonesty in her trial testimony and
27 Ms. Jones’ attorney bullying a witness punctuate the fact that there has been a miscarriage of justice with
28 respect to Mr. David. Mr. David does not request that the Court award sanctions for this specific conduct.
Instead, these are instances that, combined with the clearly egregious perjury of Ms. Jones and the
misconduct of her counsel, demonstrate that the Court cannot have faith that the trial of this matter was fair.

18 6. Ms. Jones' Attorneys "Bullied" At Least One Potential Witness to Testify
19 on Ms. Jones' Behalf

20 Mr. David has obtained a declaration from a percipient witness who did not testify at the
21 Jones trial, but who states under oath that she believed Ms. Jones' lawyers tried to "bully" her to
22 provide testimony that was "not true." (See Menifee Decl., ¶ 16.)

23 In or around May 2019, Ms. Jones' lawyers contacted Ms. Menifee through her then lawyer,
24 David Osorio. (Menifee Decl., ¶ 10.) "With the help of Mr. Osorio, [Ms. Menifee] prepared a
25 written statement about [her] knowledge of Ms. Jones and her claims against Mr. David and the
26 Company," which included the following information: (i) "[o]n several occasions, Ms. Jones—who
27 had learned about Ms. Rizzo's lawsuit against and settlement with Filmon and Mr. David—asked
28 [Ms. Menifee] how much money Ms. Rizzo had received as a result of her settlement. [Ms.

13

DEFENDANT ALKIVLADES DAVID'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AGAINST PLAINTIFF CHASITY
JONES AND HER ATTORNEYS; REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE

1986265

Note: Fred Heather may have a better format to set forth these allegations.

EXTORTION

Title 18 U.S.C. Section §§875(d)¹⁰ (Extortion) criminalizes the conduct engaged in by Litigating Defendants Khan and Taylor as they blatantly attempted to extort money from Plaintiff David so that they would not report his "crimes".

Plaintiff David, accompanied by his attorney, Barry Rothman (Deceased),

¹⁰18 U.S.C. Section §§875(d) states:

Whoever, with the intent to extort from any person, firm . . . or corporation, any money or other thing of value, transmits in interstate . . . commerce any communication containing any threat to injure the property or reputation of the addressee or of another . . . or any threat to accuse the addressee or any other person of a crime, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

went to the Beverly Hills Police Department and reported Elizabeth Taylor and Mahim Khan for trying to extort Plaintiff David by demanding \$ 2.2 Million and \$1.9 Million respectively. Rothman sent a letter to Detective Audra Alatorre stating:

BARRY K. ROTHMAN
GORDON J. ZUIDERWEG
MARTIN J. KOTOWSKI
ROBIN B. RATNER
LAWRENCE M. BOESCH
LAWRENCE J. WALDINGER

LAW OFFICES OF
BARRY K. ROTHMAN
1901 AVENUE OF THE STARS
SUITE 370
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067

TELEPHONE: (310) 557-0062
TELECOPIER: (310) 557-9080
E-MAIL: BKR@BKRLEGAL.COM
WWW.BKRLEGAL.COM

OF COUNSEL
FREDERIC R. BRANDFON

March 30, 2016

VIA E-MAIL

aalatorre@beverlyhills.org

Beverly Hills Police Department
Attention: Detective Alatorre

Re: Alki David / Taylor-Khan

Dear Detective Alatorre:

Enclosed please find two separate Confidential Settlement Agreements and Releases, one executed by Elizabeth B. Taylor and the other executed by Mahim Khan, and as well executed by their attorneys.

Elizabeth Taylor has agreed to accept \$2.2 million not to prosecute criminal claims against Alki David. Mahim Khan has agreed to accept \$1.9 million not to prosecute criminal claims against Alki David.

I have circled and starred the relevant portions of the Agreement for your review.

Paragraph 5b. is particularly important.

The purpose of this letter is not for you to determine if Alki David is guilty of any of the asserted claims (which he isn't, and you have multiple third party declarations I gave you which betray Taylor-Khan's assertions), but rather to determine if Alki David is being extorted.

The enclosed Settlement Agreements have been fully drafted by opposing counsel.

I would like to meet with you upon the conclusion of your review.

Very truly yours,

LAW OFFICES OF BARRY K. ROTHMAN

Barry K. Rothman

BKR/cf
Enclosure


cc: Alki David (via email w/enclosure)

033016 David

complained to me or told me that she was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched. No one else at the offices ever told me that Ms. Khan was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed in Beverly Hills, California, on January 28, 2016.



Carl Dawson

contractors, doctors, representatives, attorneys, insurers and employees, and that no party will initiate or pursue any other action or proceeding arising out of or relating to the Claims, Khan's employment with Defendants, or the facts alleged therein against Defendants, except as may be required to enforce this Agreement.

b. In consideration of the settlement sum and as a material inducement for the Defendants to enter into this Agreement, by the above language in paragraph 5a, Khan agrees not to initiate or pursue any criminal claims arising from or related to the Claims asserted by her in this matter. If criminal proceedings are initiated by a third party, Khan agrees to provide testimony only in compliance with the issuance of a validly served subpoena or Court order.

6. Confidentiality of Agreement:

a. Khan hereby states, represents, warrants, and agrees that the terms and conditions of the Agreement and each and every document and communication regarding the Agreement, including, but not limited to, the fact of and the amount of the payment required herein, are strictly confidential. Khan agrees that she will not seek or promote publicity nor cooperate in any efforts to promote or publicize any of the terms or conditions of the Agreement, including, but not limited to, the fact of and the amount of any of the payments required herein. Khan agrees not to disclose the settlement to any third person or third party and also agrees not to publicize the settlement in any forum or form, including but not limited to the identity of Defendants, the identity of Khan, the fact of and the amount of any of the payments required herein, including but not limited to any media outlet such as newspapers, magazines, television, radio, internet, websites, advertisements, blogs, as comments to existing internet postings, social media, or any other electronic media outlet.

b. Khan and Khan's Counsel further agree that, except as provided in this paragraph, they will not communicate, discuss, disclose, disseminate, or publish (1) the amount of the payment, whether generally or specifically, made by Defendants, or (2) the fact that Khan has received a payment in any amount from Defendants as a result of the Claims. Upon inquiry, Khan and her attorney agree to limit themselves to the following or to similar effect:

"All claims have been amicably resolved by the parties."

Notwithstanding the foregoing, Khan may communicate the terms of the Agreement if required by law. Khan will inform Defendants or their counsel in writing of the receipt of any subpoena compelling her to testify or produce documents concerning the terms of this Agreement and will immediately provide a copy of any such subpoena to Defendants or their counsel. Khan may also communicate the terms of the Agreement to her spouse or domestic partner (common law or legal), children, insurance carriers, legal counsel, tax advisors, accountants, health care providers, and as reasonably necessary for purposes of credit, housing, education, immigration, and governmental tax authorities provided that Khan first advises them of the confidentiality provisions of the Agreement in writing and secures their agreement, in

April 28, 2016

VIA E-MAIL
tfehr@akgllp.com

Tracy Fehr

VIA E-MAIL
sam@gscleaverlaw.com

Sam Cleaver

Re: Alki David / Taylor-Khan

Ms. Fehr and Mr. Cleaver:

Please be advised that the Settlement Agreement will not be executed by Mr. David. He has reviewed it, and he deems it to be extortionate.


As well, you should be advised that as a consequence thereof, I have communicated the Settlement Agreement to the Beverly Hills Police Department and the Los Angeles District Attorney's Office, who have reviewed it.

There will be no settlement. We have five Declarations from five individuals under penalty of perjury who worked at FilmOn and witnessed the events that occurred, all of whom attest to the fact that none of the claims that you have asserted have in fact occurred. You will receive the Declarations under separate cover.

All rights are reserved against each of you and your clients.

Very truly yours,

LAW OFFICES OF BARRY K. ROTHMAN


Barry K. Rothman

BKR/cf


cc: Alki David (via e-mail)

21. Counterparts: This Settlement Agreement may be executed in counterparts, each shall be deemed an original. Additionally, the Parties understand and agree that a faxed signature shall be deemed an original signature for purposes of this Settlement Agreement.

The Settlement Parties

Dated: March 25, 2016

PLAINTIFF
ELIZABETH TAYLOR

By:  _____

Elizabeth Taylor

Dated: March __, 2016

DEFENDANTS
ALKI DAVID PRODUCTIONS;

CONFIDENTIAL SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND RELEASE

This Settlement Agreement and Release (the "Agreement") is made by and between Plaintiff Elizabeth B. Taylor ("Taylor" or "Plaintiff"), an individual, on the one part, and Defendants Alki David Productions, Filmon.TV, Inc., Hologram USA, Inc., Anakando Media Group, and Alki David individually and any business entity owned or controlled in whole or in part directly or indirectly by Alki David ("Defendants") on the other part (Plaintiff and Defendant are hereinafter collectively referred to as the "Settlement Parties.")

Recitals

WHEREAS, on January 11, 2016, Plaintiff sent a letter to Defendants outlining the claims she would bring against Defendants in future litigation, including but not limited to, sexual harassment, sexual battery, assault and battery, retaliation, defamation, wrongful termination, false imprisonment, invasion of privacy, wiretapping, and wage and hour violations ("the Claims");

WHEREAS, Defendants dispute that they are liable for any damages and deny the allegations made in the Claims;

WHEREAS, the Settlement Parties wish to avoid the expense of further proceedings in the above matters and to resolve all issues which have been raised, could have been raised or which otherwise pertain to the January 11, 2016 letter, the facts alleged therein, the Claims, and any other aspects of the relationship between the Settlement Parties;

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the covenants and agreements contained and the consideration described in this Agreement, the Settlement Parties do hereby agree as follows:

Covenants

1. No Admission of Liability: This Settlement Agreement and compliance with it may not be construed as an admission by any Party of any liability whatsoever or as an admission by any Party of any wrongdoing under any common law, statute or contractual obligation. Defendants specifically disclaim any wrongdoing and disclaim any liability to Taylor for any violation of law, regulation, duty, or contract, including but not limited to the facts alleged relating to the Claims or otherwise.

2. Consideration: After Defense counsel receives: (1) a completed W-9 from the Law Offices of G. Samuel Cleaver; and (2) a fully executed copy of this Agreement, Defendant will forward one settlement check, totaling Two Million Two Hundred Thousand dollars (\$2,200,000) (the "Settlement Sum") to the Law Offices of G. Samuel Cleaver payable to "Law Offices of G. Samuel Cleaver, Lawyers Trust Account" for which a 1099 shall be issued. The Settlement Sum represents payment for Plaintiff's physical and emotional injuries in this matter, and no amount of the Settlement Sum shall be characterized as wages. The check will be delivered to the Law Offices of G. Samuel Cleaver, as follows:

b. In consideration of the settlement sum and as a material inducement for the Defendants to enter into this Agreement, by the above language in paragraph 5a, Taylor agrees not to initiate or pursue any criminal claims arising from or related to the Claims asserted by her in this matter. If criminal proceedings are initiated by a third party, Taylor agrees to provide testimony only in compliance with the issuance of a validly served subpoena or Court order.

6. Confidentiality of Agreement:

a. Taylor hereby states, represents, warrants, and agrees that the terms and conditions of the Agreement and each and every document and communication regarding the Agreement, including, but not limited to, the fact of and the amount of the payment required herein, are strictly confidential. Taylor agrees that she will not seek or promote publicity nor cooperate in any efforts to promote or publicize any of the terms or conditions of the Agreement, including, but not limited to, the fact of and the amount of any of the payments required herein. Taylor agrees not to disclose the settlement to any third person or third party and also agrees not to publicize the settlement in any forum or form, including but not limited to the identity of Defendants, the identity of Taylor, the fact of and the amount of any of the payments required herein, including but not limited to any media outlet such as newspapers, magazines, television, radio, internet, websites, advertisements, blogs, as comments to existing internet postings, social media, or any other electronic media outlet.

b. Taylor and Taylor's Counsel further agree that, except as provided in this paragraph, they will not communicate, discuss, disclose, disseminate, or publish (1) the amount of the payment, whether generally or specifically, made by Defendants, or (2) the fact that Taylor has received a payment in any amount from Defendants as a result of the Claims. Upon inquiry, Taylor and her attorney agree to limit themselves to the following or to similar effect:


"All claims have been amicably resolved by the parties."

Notwithstanding the foregoing, Taylor may communicate the terms of the Agreement if required by law. Taylor will inform Defendants or their counsel in writing of the receipt of any subpoena compelling her to testify or produce documents concerning the terms of this Agreement and will immediately provide a copy of any such subpoena to Defendants or their counsel. Taylor may also communicate the terms of the Agreement to her spouse or domestic partner (common law or legal), children, insurance carriers, legal counsel, tax advisors, accountants, health care providers, and as reasonably necessary for purposes of credit, housing, education, immigration, and governmental tax authorities provided that Taylor first advises them of the confidentiality provisions of the Agreement in writing and secures their agreement, in writing, not to communicate, discuss, disclose, disseminate, or publish the terms and conditions of the Agreement, except as allowed hereby.

ng me, which she did.

alty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the fo

ly Hills, California, on February 16, 2016.


Chasity Jones

Tay

DECLARATION OF CHASITY JONES

I, Chasity Jones, declare as follows:

1. This Declaration is based upon my personal knowledge and personal participation in the events described. If called to testify as a witness, I could and would testify competently as follows.

2. I am a Business Development Manager for FilmOn TV Networks, Inc. I held the same position with FilmOn TV Networks, Inc., in 2015 when Elizabeth B. Taylor was employed by FilmOn. I interacted with Elizabeth B. Taylor on a daily basis.


3. I understand that Elizabeth B. Taylor is accusing Alki David, the president and CEO of Film TV, Inc., and Alki David Productions, Inc., of sexual harassment, including inappropriate touching. I never observed any sexual harassment in regard to Ms. Taylor. I never observed Ms. Taylor being subjected to sexual advances, sexual conduct, or sexual comments by Mr. David or anyone else. I never observed Mr. David inappropriately touching Ms. Taylor or using crude language around her or in any way acting inappropriately around her. I never observed anyone inappropriately touching Ms. Taylor or acting inappropriately around her. Although Ms. Taylor told me after she left FilmOn that she had been sexually harassed while at FilmOn as set forth in Paragraph 4 below, while she worked at FilmOn, Elizabeth B. Taylor never complained to me or told me that she was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched. No one else at our offices ever told me that Ms. Taylor was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched. I understand that Ms. Taylor is saying that Mr. David would invite her into his office, close the door, and then sexually harass her. On multiple occasions, I observed Ms. Taylor enter Mr. David's office and close the door, and then Mr. David immediately open the door.



4. After Elizabeth B. Taylor was terminated in June 2015, Ms. Taylor contacted me on multiple occasions via text messaging. Ms. Taylor asked me to testify that I had witnessed Alki David sexually harass Ms. Taylor "to make her case bigger." I have never been sexually harassed by Mr. David. I once again told Ms. Taylor that I would not testify or be a part of her case. I finally asked her to stop contacting me, which she did.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed in Beverly Hills, California, on February 16, 2016.


Chasity Jones

DECLARATION OF GARY SHOEFIELD

I, Gary Shoefield, declare as follows:

1. This Declaration is based upon my personal knowledge and personal participation in the events described. If called to testify as a witness, I could and would testify competently as follows.
2. I work for FilmOnTV, Inc., and Hologram USA as an entertainment consultant. I was so employed when Elizabeth B. Taylor and Mahim Khan were employed by FilmOn TV, Inc. I occasionally interacted with Elizabeth B. Taylor and Mahim Khan when they worked directly for me.
3. I understand that Elizabeth B. Taylor is accusing Alki David, the president and CEO of Film TV, Inc., and Alki David Productions, Inc., of sexual harassment, including inappropriate touching. I never observed any sexual harassment in regard to Ms. Taylor. I never observed Ms. Taylor being subjected to sexual advances, sexual conduct, or sexual comments by Mr. David or anyone else. I never observed Mr. David inappropriately touching Ms. Taylor or using crude language around her or in any way acting inappropriately around her. I never observed anyone inappropriately touching Ms. Taylor or acting inappropriately around her.
4. At one point, Mahim Khan came to me to complain that someone at FilmOn TV was sexually harassing her, including touching her breasts. I asked her to give that person's name to me, and told her that I would speak to that person and make sure that it stopped. I also told her to go to Yelena Calendar in human resources and file a sexual harassment complaint. Ms. Khan never did either. She never permitted me to talk to the person allegedly sexually harassing her, and she never went to Ms. Calendar in human resources to file a complaint. I never understood why Ms. Taylor


would make such a claim and not allow me to take action on her behalf or why she never pursued the incident herself.

5. I understand that Mahim Khan is also accusing Alki David of sexual harassment, including inappropriate touching. I never observed any sexual harassment in regard to Ms. Khan. I never observed Ms. Khan being subjected to sexual advances, sexual conduct, or sexual comments by Mr. David or anyone else. I never observed Mr. David inappropriately touching Ms. Khan or using crude language around her or in any way acting inappropriately around her. I never observed anyone inappropriately touch Ms. Khan or act inappropriately around her. No one else at the offices ever told me that Ms. Khan was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed in Beverly Hills, California, on February 4th, 2016.

Gary Shoefield

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Gary Shoefield', is written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized and cursive.

DECLARATION OF MARIA NETSVETAEVA


I, Maria Netsvetaeva, declare as follows:

1. This Declaration is based upon my personal knowledge and personal participation in the events described. If called to testify as a witness, I could and would testify competently as follows.
2. I work for FilmOnTV, Inc., as an operations manager. I worked for FilmOnTV, Inc., when Elizabeth B. Taylor and Mahim Khan were employed by FilmOnTV, Inc. I interacted with Elizabeth B. Taylor and Mahim Khan on a daily basis. I can partially see Alki David's office from my desk.
3. Ms. Taylor was often highly emotional and dramatic. Ms. Taylor often cried and complained.
4. I was informed that Elizabeth B. Taylor is accusing Alki David, the president and CEO of Film TV, Inc., and Alki David Productions, Inc., of sexual harassment. I never observed any sexual harassment in regard to Ms. Taylor. I never observed Ms. Taylor being subjected to sexual advances, sexual conduct, or sexual comments by Mr. David or anyone else. I don't recall Mr. David inappropriately touching Ms. Taylor or using crude language around her or in any way acting inappropriately around her. I don't recall anyone inappropriately touching Ms. Taylor or acting inappropriately around her. I don't recall anyone at our offices telling me that Ms. Taylor was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched. I was informed that Ms. Taylor is saying that Mr. David would invite her into his office, close the door, and then sexually harass her. Mr. David usually keeps his office door open.

5. I was informed that Mahim Khan is also accusing Alki David of sexual harassment. I never observed any sexual harassment in regard to Ms. Khan. I never observed Ms. Khan being subjected to sexual advances, sexual conduct, or sexual comments by Mr. David or anyone else. I don't recall Mr. David inappropriately touching Ms. Khan or using crude language around her or in any way acting inappropriately around her. I don't recall anyone inappropriately touching Ms. Khan or act inappropriately around her. I don't recall anyone at the offices telling me that Ms. Khan was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched. Ms. Khan did complain that she was not happy with her role. I was informed that she eventually did quit without warning. She just did not appear for work one day. I believe that she quit because she was unhappy.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed in Beverly Hills, California, on February 4, 2016.



Maria Netsvetaeva

LAW OFFICES OF BARRY K. ROTHMAN

From: Yelena Calendar [yelena@filmon.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2016 12:46 PM
To: 'FilmOn LiveTV'; 'LAW OFFICES OF BARRY K. ROTHMAN'
Subject: FW: Elizabeth Taylor Experience (Wil Master)
Attachments: ~WRD000.jpg; image001.jpg; image002.jpg

Hi Alki and Barry,

Please see below a letter from one of our employees who had a bad experience with Elizabeth Taylor, depicting her erratic behavior.

Thank You,
Yelena

From: Carl Dawson [mailto:carl.dawson@filmon.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2016 9:04 AM
To: 'Yelena Calendar' <yelena@filmon.com>
Cc: 'FilmOn TV' <wil.master@filmon.com>
Subject: FW: Elizabeth Taylor Experience (Wil Master)

From: Wil Master [mailto:iwilmaster@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2016 12:41 AM
To: Carl Dawson <carl.dawson@filmon.com>
Subject: Elizabeth Taylor Experience

To whom it may concern,

My experience/history with Elizabeth Taylor was very interesting to say the least.

Generally, she appeared to be very sweet although she was very swayed by her environment & basic life circumstances. She was erratically emotional: very happy one moment from a to crying moments later, from confidently offering advice to insecurely falling into a paranoid or jealous rage. She was very unpredictable (in a concerning way).

Because of this and because she asked, I would often provide her with basic life advice/coaching as I wanted to help her find her way and win. It was successful at times although mostly very challenging.

I continued to support her until a series of invasive and manipulative advances towards me and highly vindictive actions left me no choice but to distance myself from her.

Here's a brief history:

1. When she learned about a Multi-Million Dollar deal I was working on, Elizabeth showed up at my desk, looked up at me "starry-eyed" (and in front of everyone), knelt down on both knees and asked: "would you marry me?" and presented me with a ring (of candy).

I was very confused and mildly amused, but as she held on to this moment, it became very unnerving. I didn't want her to feel foolish so I played along with jokes until it seemed that our colleagues believed that she was just playing around. I "coached" her away and continued with my work.

2. Before I knew it, Elizabeth was back, but this time inside my work station and "skillfully" spilled her coffee on my desk, computer and rug where she remained in my space for a few hours "cleaning," flirting and apologizing. I assured her it was okay and actually handled most of the cleaning myself. The mood in the whole area reverted back to concern (for me, but for her too - I believed).

Basically, she voluntarily rolled a chair in my workspace and moved onto my desk and said something like, "Well we are partners now." I calmly endured this for hours. Eventually she left with a "Bye husband."

3. Random happy/sad/laughing crying moments continue for weeks (I believe), and we all did our best to support her AND then one time, Elizabeth invited herself to lunch where i was with some other colleagues. At one point, Elizabeth said that she had to go to the bank, but her phone was out of battery and was afraid that she would be helpless in the event of an earthquake.

Appealing to knowing my experience as a First Responder, Elizabeth asked to use my phone, and I said OK but only if she agreed to only use it in the event of an emergency. When she returned, she began historically yelling/complaining that everyone was getting fired and that she believed that someone was referring to her as the devil because she read a bunch of my texts (unauthorized).

For some reason, Elizabeth thought the texts were about her. They were not. I actually calmed her down and showed her the texts: One said, "The devils in the details," a common term in business negotiations and other was a Buddhist quote that advised on how to challenge "devilish functions" and win in life. Neither of these texts were written to, from or about her, but she was not "buying" it and kept up with this erratic behavior.

I got very serious and offered some very strict guidance about what she had just done and how her reading my texts where a violation of trust and a slandering of my compassion for helping her out. It was strict, but not mean. It was clear that she was taking advantage of my good nature and "borrowed" my phone to "spy" into my texts.

She unwarrantedly and frantically ran back to the office crying and said (to a various colleagues) that I was mean to her and made her cry. She was again clearly manipulating others to build a case against me. She succeeded with a few uninformed and easily manipulated people, but the people who knew me and separately, Elizabeth, including myself, realized there was a very "sick" person running amuck in our office.

4. From that point onward, she continued to act paranoid, anxious and negative about everything. She interrupted every single sales rep and shot down everyone's ideas in sales meetings including those of our CEO. She was certainly devolving and isolating herself from everyone. Many, including myself were very concerned about Elizabeth.

In one such meeting and in front of everyone (including the Sales Manager), Elizabeth threatened to

call one of my contacts and "run any chances with the client" because her boyfriend knew the guy.


Unrelated to any of this, my office and new initiative moved across the street to another building and didn't have any further contact with Elizabeth.

Further, when I learned she had been fired, I believe I sent her a text and offered encouragement and best wishes into her next position. She never responded and that was the last I heard about Elizabeth.

In conclusion, this a factual portrayal of my experience with Elizabeth Taylor, and I have nothing to gain other than the hope that this will shed light on the real concern that I had for Elizabeth, and that she gets the help she still may need and certainly deserves :-)


Thank you.

Wil Master



i WIL MASTER

301 N. Canon Drive
Beverly Hills, CA 9021
0
USA



T: +1.213.290.6468
SKYPE: iwilmaster

**Global Business &
Social Media
Gateway**

**: i
WILMASTER**

+++++

This non-binding email is intended solely to facilitate discussions among the parties. This email is not intended to create nor will it be deemed to create a legally binding or enforceable offer, agreement or the like of any type or nature. Neither party will have any obligation or liability as to the matters described herein unless and until the duly authorized representatives of the parties execute a written definitive agreement as to such matters and neither party will have any liability for any failure or refusal to execute a definitive agreement for any reason.

The information contained in this e-mail (and all attachments) is for the exclusive use of the intended recipient(s) and may be confidential, proprietary, and/or legally privileged. Inadvertent disclosure of this message does not constitute a waiver of any privilege. If you receive this message in error, please do not directly or indirectly use, print, copy, forward, or disclose any part of this message. Please also delete this e-mail and all copies and notify the sender. Thank you.

DECLARATION OF MARY RIZZO

I, Mary Rizzo, declare as follows:

1. This Declaration is based upon my personal knowledge and personal participation in the events described. If called to testify as a witness, I could and would testify competently as follows.

2. I am employed by Filmon, TV, Inc. I have been employed by FilmOn TV, Inc., for about one year. I started as a sales representative, but I am now an advertising account manager. For six months, my desk was next to that of Elizabeth B. Taylor. During that time, I interacted with Elizabeth B. Taylor on a daily basis. For about six weeks, my desk was next to that of Mahim Khan. During that time, I interacted with Mahim Khan on a daily basis.

3. Elizabeth B. Taylor was very emotional and would often complain. Mahim Khan liked to gossip about people in the office. On multiple occasions she would complain about her job and she didn't go to school to be a personal assistant. I would hear her often say that she wanted to quit because she was unhappy with her job position.

4. I understand that Elizabeth B. Taylor and Mahim Khan are accusing Alki David, the president and CEO of Film TV, Inc., and Alki David Productions, Inc., of sexual harassment, including inappropriate touching. I was surprised when I heard this.

5. I do not recall any sexual harassment in regard to Elizabeth Taylor. I do not recall Ms. Taylor being subjected to sexual advances, sexual conduct, or sexual comments by Mr. David or anyone else. I do not recall Mr. David inappropriately touching Ms. Taylor or using crude language around her or in any way acting inappropriately around her. I do not recall anyone inappropriately touching Ms. Taylor or acting inappropriately around her. While at FilmOn,


Elizabeth B. Taylor never complained to me or told me that she was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched. No one else at our offices ever told me that Ms. Taylor was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched. After Ms. Taylor was terminated, she texted me stating that Mr. David had touched her and that she was getting an attorney to sue Mr. David. This was the first time Ms. Taylor had told me or indicated to me that she had been sexually harassed or inappropriately touched by Mr. David. On another occasion on text, I told Ms. Taylor that she needed to give me back my belongings that I lent her and never received back. I also told her over the text that she needed to seek help because how she was replying was threatening. I understand that Ms. Taylor is saying that Mr. David would invite her into his office, close the door, and then sexually harass her. It appears to me to be highly unlikely that Mr. David would invite Ms. Taylor into his office and then close the door. On one occasion, I observed Ms. Taylor enter Mr. David's office and close the door. Mr. David immediately reopened the door.

6. I understand that Mahim Khan is also accusing Alki David of sexual harassment, including inappropriate touching. I do not recall any sexual harassment in regard to Ms. Khan. I never observed Ms. Khan being subjected to sexual advances, sexual conduct, or sexual comments by Mr. David or anyone else. I do not recall Mr. David inappropriately touching Ms. Khan or using crude language around her or in any way acting inappropriately around her. I do not recall anyone inappropriately touching Ms. Khan or acting inappropriately around her. Mahim Khan never complained to me or told me that she was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched. No one else at the offices ever told me that Ms. Khan was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched

//

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
is true and correct.

Executed in Beverly Hills, California, on February 8, 2016.


Mary Rizzo

Defendants Allred and Bloom made threats intended to cause economic harm to Plaintiff David and to the Entity Plaintiffs and were intended to extort settlements. Those threats were wrongful because Defendants Girardi, Allred and Bloom used the threats and maligned Plaintiff David's reputation to try to obtain property and money to which they were not entitled. **SPECIFY THE CIRCUMSTANCES**

Defendants Allred and Bloom are guilty of extortion because they sought money or property to which they did not have, and could not reasonably believe they had, a claim or right. Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs suffered damages and incurred substantial losses as a result of Defendants Allred, Bloom's, Goldberg's and Chora's implementation and continuation of the extortion. **Specify Chora's collection efforts with Dana yesterday . - Alki needs to help develop this.**

OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, 18 USC §§1503

Obstruction of Justice During Trials

Plaintiff David's ethics counsel Attorney, Murray Greenberg wrote a letter to the State Bar of California Office of Chief Trial Counsel Intake Department setting forth the manifest abuse of process in the *Mahim Khan* case by Attorney Defendants Allred, Goldberg, Leal and Ms. Mochkatel. (Appendix _____).

In relevant part, Greenberg’s letter, dated April 29, 2020, stated:

I, Murray B. Greenberg, Esq. submit this complaint on behalf of Alkiviades (“Alki”) David against attorneys Gloria Allred, Nathan Goldberg, Dolores Y. Leal and Renee Mochkatel based on their professional misconduct in the case held before Judge Michelle Williams Court in Los Angeles Superior Court, Central District Case No. BC654017 entitled MAHIM KHAN, Plaintiff v. HOLOGRAM USA, Inc.; ALKI DAVID PRODUCTIONS, INC.; FILMON TV, INC.; ALKIVIADES (“ALKI”) DAVID, an individual; and DOES 1 through 25, Defendants.

“This was a highly contentious lawsuit which involved allegations of battery and harassment against the defendant, Mr. David and associated companies. The above-named attorneys used dishonest means and violated their ethical responsibilities during the trial which hampered Mr. David’s ability to properly mount a defense.

The most egregious ethical breach involved the manipulation of a joint exhibit list by plaintiff’s attorneys which caused a doctored list to be filed with the court. As if this action was not serious enough, the plaintiff’s attorneys also removed the signature page with defendant’s attorney’s (renowned litigator and trial attorney, Ellyn S. Garofalo) signature¹¹ affixed to it from a previous agreed upon version (See Attachment 3 EXHIBIT A – page 31). They then attached it to the fraudulent version (Attachment 3 EXHIBIT B – page 31) when she was unavailable. Mr. Goldberg then signed the exhibit list and filed it with the court.

This was done without the knowledge, permission or authorization of Ms. Garofalo or anyone else in her office. (Attachment 3 Declaration of Ellyn S. Garofalo page 2, paragraphs 6-9).

A comparison between the doctored document and the original agreed upon version indicates that one document was added (EXHIBIT B, page 5 - Ex. #131 – “Dr. Reading Documents”) and

¹¹ **ADD ELLYN GAROFALO'S FILING**

three documents were deleted (EXHIBIT B, page 30 – Exs. #647, 648 and 649).

Ms. Leal and Ms. Mochkatel were two other attorneys listed on the pleading as well as Gloria Allred who is a partner of the law firm. In addition to the above referenced misconduct, the attorneys for plaintiff sought to exclude documents that were previously produced to plaintiff's attorneys by indicating falsely to the court that they were not disclosed or produced in discovery. Based upon the fact that the documents were Bates stamped, these items were in fact provided to plaintiff's attorneys during discovery (Attachment 3 Declaration of Ellyn S. Garofalo page 1, paragraphs 2 -3).

During the closing argument, Mr. Goldberg indicated on several occasions that Mr. David did not call witnesses on his behalf. He also suggested that if he were not culpable, witnesses would have testified for him. (See Attachment 10 – page 83, lines 27-28, page 84, lines 1-4; page 146, lines 20-27; page 147, lines 1-4 and page 148, lines 17-25). This was done even though the judge had previously ruled outside the jury's presence that Mr. David would not be able to call any witnesses (including himself) on his behalf.(See Attachments 3 through 9 – Motions in Limine by plaintiff, response by defendants and court rulings) This created a false and unfair impression to the jury.

By filing a doctored document purporting to be a joint exhibit list, making a false statement to the court regarding the status of discovery in order to gain an unfair advantage in litigation and creating a false impression to the jury, attorneys Gloria Allred, Nathan Goldberg, Dolores Y. Leal and Renee Mochkatel breached their ethical responsibility under Rule of Professional Conduct, rule 3.3 Candor

Toward the Tribunal; rule 3.4 Fairness to Opposing Party and Counsel; rule 5. Responsibilities of Managerial and Supervisory Lawyers; rule 8.4 Misconduct; and Business and Professions Code section 6106 Moral Turpitude.

Insert a link to the entire complaint to the State Bar of California.

Plaintiff David and Entity Defendants _____ assert that by filing a doctored document purporting to be a joint exhibit list, making a false statement to the court

regarding the status of discovery in order to gain an unfair advantage in litigation and creating a false impression to the jury, attorneys Gloria Allred, Nathan Goldberg, Dolores Y. Leal and Renee Mochkatel committed obstruction of justice, 18 USC §§1503, a predicate RICO offense.

Obstruction of Justice During Counsels' Collection of Judgments

In The United Kingdom

Defendant Attorney Chora placed a judgment lien on the PayPal account owned by Plaintiff Entity Hologram U.S.A., seeking to garner funds from that account as he seeks to collect on the Judgment awarded to Litigating Defendant Chastity Jones. In *Jones*, the jury returned a special verdict, awarding her \$591,300 in economic damages, \$1,500,000 in past noneconomic damages, and \$1,000,000 in future noneconomic damages. After a second phase of trial, the jury awarded Jones \$8 Million in punitive damages **against Plaintiff David only - not against any of the Entity Plaintiffs.**

Upon information and belief, Attorney Defendant Chora followed inappropriate and unlawful collection procedures, both in the United States and United Kingdom, by seeking to enforce judgments obtained in **WHAT CASES** by United States-Based Attorney Defendants **which ones?** on behalf of the Litigating Defendants (**which ones**) as against the Plaintiff Entities' PayPal accounts in the United States and in the United Kingdom because, in freezing a total of four (4)

PayPal accounts, two in the United Kingdom and two in the United States, which resulted in PayPal freezing *all of* the Plaintiff Entity PayPal accounts, **for which Plaintiff entities? Thereby committing corporate defamation - move to that count as well.**

Dordick and Bakhtiar - Jane Doe Matter - add

Upon Information and Belief, Defendants Allred, Marc Gillieron and Emilie Theintz and Chabrier Avocats, SA (“The Collection Defendant Attorneys”) violated United States Law and Swiss Law by seeking to collect money and property from Plaintiff David, *and members of his family having nothing to do with any of the lawsuits addressed in this Complaint.*

Specifically, the Collection Defendant Attorneys both obstructed justice and committed extortion by attempting to collect money and property from Plaintiff David, including \$55 Million in punitive damages based solely on the trial court order in *Mahim Khan*, knowing that making such collection efforts were unlawful: 1) because an appeal was ongoing - and still is; and 2) Punitive damages are not available under Swiss law. Swiss courts refuse to award punitive damages even if the applicable foreign law provides for such damages (Article 135(2) Swiss Private International Law).

Swiss Criminal Proceedings Demonstrate that Litigating Defendants Chasity Jones and Mahim Khan have Defamed Plaintiff Alki as Have The Defendant Swiss Attorneys

Beilage 1: Amended Judgment vom 10. September 2020

2. Das Dispositiv des Urteils lautet wie folgt:

« **NOW THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that Plaintiff Lauren Reeves shall have and recover damages as follows:

As against Defendants Hologram USA, Inc., Alki David Productions, Inc., and Alkiviades David, jointly and severally, for compensatory damages the sum of: **\$650,000** with interest thereon at the rate of ten (10%) percent per annum from the date of the entry of the Judgment, January 7, 2020 until paid.

As against Defendant Alkiviades David individually for punitive damages the sum of: **\$4,350,000** with interest thereon at the rate of ten (10%) percent per annum from the date of the entry of the Judgment, January 7, 2020 until paid.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that

Pursuant to the Court's Order of July 22, 2020, Plaintiff Reeves shall have and recover from said Defendants jointly and severally:

Attorneys' fees in the amount of **\$1,299,675.00**, and costs in the amount of **\$65,346.02**, plus interest thereon at the rate of ten percent (10%) per annum from the date of entry of this Amended Judgment until paid. »

In freier Übersetzung:

«**DARUM WIRD ANGEORDNET, ERKANNT UND BESCHLOSSEN**, dass der Klägerin Lauren Reeves folgender Schadenersatz zusteht:

Gegen die Beklagten Hologram USA, Inc., Alki David Productions, Inc., and Alkiviades David, gesamtschuldnerisch, als Schadenersatz die Summe von: **\$650'000** zuzüglich Zinsen in Höhe von zehn (10%) Prozent pro Jahr ab dem Datum des Urteilstretts am 7. Januar 2020 bis zur Zahlung.

Gegen den Beklagten Alkiviades David einzeln als Strafzuschlag zum Schadenersatz die Summe von: **\$4'350'000** zuzüglich Zinsen in Höhe von zehn (10 %) Prozent pro Jahr ab dem Datum der Urteilsverkündung am 7. Januar 2020 bis zur Zahlung.

ES WIRD FERNER ANGEORDNET, ERKANNT UND BESCHLOSSEN, dass

Gemäß der gerichtlichen Verfügung vom 22. Juli 2020 hat die Klägerin Reeves von den Beklagten gesamtschuldnerisch folgende Ansprüche

Anwaltshonorare in Höhe von **\$1'299'675.00** und Kosten in Höhe von **\$65'346.02**, zuzüglich Zinsen in Höhe von zehn Prozent (10%) pro Jahr ab dem Datum des Urteilstretts

MOVE - Ellyn's Theory: We have now filed your new trial motion in the Chasity Jones case. The motion will be heard by the original judge, Judge Ongeko, on August 16, 2019. New trial motions are rarely granted. However, we have a good argument that there was no admissible evidence of your net worth and thus the punitive damages award must be stricken, or substantially reduced. Interestingly, the Bloom Firm (in another example of their incompetence) filed a motion in the Taylor case which supports our argument in the Jones new trial motion that there was no admissible evidence of punitive damages, and thus the award *must* be set aside or it is "automatically reversible" on appeal. This argument, made to obtain financial discovery in the Taylor case, supports our argument in the new trial motion and makes it difficult if not impossible for Jones to defend the punitive damages award. In short, they are now adverse to their own client. We will have fun with this at the hearing and it should be very helpful to our argument.

EINGEGANGEN
05. Nov. 2021

Marc GILLIERON
Partner

mg@chabrier.ch

Emilie THEINTZ
Associate

Regionalgericht Oberland **EINSCHREIBEN**

15. OKT. 2021

Regionalgericht Oberland
Verwaltungsgebäude Selve
Scheibenstrasse 11B
3800 Thun

Postaufgabe Nr. 14. 10. 21

The screenshot shows a PDF document viewer with the following content:

A. Forderungen der Antragstellerin

1. Mit Urteil vom 3. Februar 2021 (nachfolgend: «das Urteil») verurteilte der Superior Court of the State of California Herrn Aliviades DAVID (nachfolgend: «Herr DAVID» oder «der Geschädigte») wegen sexueller Belästigung von Frau Mahim KHAN (nachfolgend: «Frau KHAN» oder «die Geschädigte»).

Beilage 1 Corrected Amended Judgment vom 3. Februar 2021

2. Das Dispositiv des Urteils lautet wie folgt:

«NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Plaintiff Mahim Khan recover from said Defendants Aki David Productions, Inc., Filmon TV, Inc., and Aliviades ("Aki") David, jointly and severally for damages in the amount of

\$8,250,000 with interest thereon at the rate of ten percent (10%) per annum from the date of entry of the Judgment on January 21, 2020 until paid.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Plaintiff Mahim Khan recover from said Defendant Aliviades ("Aki") David damages in the amount of

\$50,000,000 with interest thereon at the rate of ten percent (10%) per annum from the date of the entry of the Judgment on January 21, 2020 until paid.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that

Pursuant to the Court's Order of September 1, 2020, Plaintiff Khan shall have and recover from Defendants Aki David Productions, Inc., Filmon TV, Inc., and Aliviades ("Aki") David, jointly and severally:

Attorneys' fees in the amount of **\$1,388,885**, and costs in the amount of **\$74,165.60**, plus interest thereon at the rate of ten percent (10%) per annum from the date of entry of this Corrected Amended Judgment until paid.»

In ihrer Übersetzung

«DARUM WIRD ANGEORDNET, ERKANNT UND BESCHLOSSEN, dass der Klägerin Mahim Khan von den Beklagten Aki David Productions, Inc., Filmon TV, Inc., and Aliviades ("Aki") David, gesamtschuldnerisch, Schadenersatz in Höhe von

\$8'250'000 zuzüglich Zinsen in Höhe von zehn Prozent (10%) pro Jahr ab dem Datum des Urteilserritts am 21. Januar 2020 bis zur Zahlung.

DARUM WIRD ANGEORDNET, ERKANNT UND BESCHLOSSEN, dass der Klägerin Mahim Khan von dem Beklagten Aliviades ("Aki") David Schadenersatz in Höhe von

INSERT: POLYGRAPH IMAGES FROM TOP OF DOCUMENT

<https://www.instagram.com/p/B1Vhe9NgUoC/?igshid=YmMyMTA2M2Y=> INSTAGRAM POLYGRAPH

The Defendant Attorneys tampered with the Litigating Defendants' testimony, and with the evidence that Defendant Attorneys used to assert the spurious complaints made by Defendant Litigants, all with an effort to extort money from Plaintiff David and the Plaintiff Entities. We need to add specificity here.

Enterprise Allegations

The Attorney Defendants' conspiring to extort, and their extorting, money and property from Plaintiff David and the Attorney Defendants, and the Attorney Defendants tampering with witnesses by telling them what to say, and Defendant Goldberg wilfully obstructing justice by introducing documents and exhibits that were not produced properly into evidence, and Defendant Goldberg falsifying the signature of Plaintiff's Counsel Ellyn Garofalo, all were actions committed under the auspices of otherwise legitimate enterprises, including Allred, Maroko & Goldberg; Bloom Law Firm; Girardi Keese; Dordick Law Corporation; Chora,

Young & Manasserian and The Law Offices of Ebby S. Bakhtiar.

Accordingly, Plaintiff David and the Entity Defendants sue all Attorney Defendants for injuries to Plaintiff David's and the Entity Plaintiffs' businesses and properties directly and proximately caused by reason of the Attorney Defendants' extortion, a predicate claim pursuant to RICO.

Further, the United States-Based Attorney Defendants', Defendant Swiss Attorneys' and Litigating Defendants' RICO violations constitute extortion aimed at taking Plaintiff David's and the Entity Plaintiffs' property and money through wrongful means, 18 U.S.C. § 1951(a), which, in relevant part, involves "the obtaining of property from another, with his consent, induced by wrongful use of actual or threatened force, or violence."

Specifically, the Attorney Defendants Girardi, Allred, Goldberg, and Bloom (Initial Enterprise Defendants), established the initial enterprise when they filed a series of unethical, spurious lawsuits against Plaintiff David and the Plaintiff Entities, without investigating the merits of those actions, with the goal of extorting money and property from Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs. To further the enterprise, the Initial Enterprise Defendants unethically coached clients and witnesses about what to say so as to bolster the Attorney Defendants' filed spurious lawsuits and/or make unreasonable and unfounded settlement demands against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs.

Further, Plaintiffs allege that the United States-Based Attorney Defendants continue to do so, by, inter alia, wilfully and intentionally conspiring against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs, by filing spurious lawsuits against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs, who were and continue to be, victimized by Attorney Defendants' continuous pattern of racketeering conducted to benefit their enterprise, including wire fraud, mail fraud, extortion, tampering with witnesses and witness and evidence lists, as well as with evidence itself, obstruction of justice, including Defendant Goldberg's falsification of a signature in a civil proceeding in the *Khan* case, as more fully discussed herein, bribery, and aiding and abetting, all cognizable as RICO predicate acts pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 1862(b)(c) and (d).

The Defendant United States-Based Attorneys' prohibited acts were continuous and interrelated having similar goals - extorting money from Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs, and defaming Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs. Defendant United States-Based Attorneys' enterprise actions had similar purposes, as alleged herein in more detail: to enrich the United States-Based Attorney Defendants by extorting Plaintiff David's and the Entity Plaintiffs' money and property and by seeking to malign and defame Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs.¹²

¹² **Note to Counsel:** The Attorney Defendants' and the Individual Defendants' RICO violations that cannot be characterized in a RICO Action as supporting a Tampering with Witnesses, 18 U.S.C. §1512(b) violation as those Defendants' actions did not involve federal court proceedings. 18 U.S.C. §1512(b) prohibits the corrupt persuasion of another

MOVE: Despite Numerous Recusal Requests Biased Judges Refused to Recuse to Provide Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs with Due Process and Judicial Impartiality

Petition for Rehearing conformed (2).pdf - Alki to insert a link.

Orozco was partners with the Judge that signed the appellate decision from which Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs are seeking review from the California Supreme Court and there is a close nexus between Gloria Allred and Judge Michelle Court.

person with an intent to impede an “Official Proceeding” which is defined, in relevant part, in the RICO statutes as a proceeding in a federal court, or a federal administrative tribunal.

Nevertheless, case law in the Ninth Circuit discusses “corrupt persuasion,” the phrase used in 18 U.S.C. §1512(b), which encompasses what Defendant United States-Based Attorneys have done ~ coaching witnesses about how to testify, without conducting any due diligence to verify the allegations and wire and mail fraud committed with the intent to defraud and to cause the loss of money and property belonging to Plaintiffs. As to Defendant Allred, this pattern of manipulating witnesses, and, upon information and belief, paying some of the witnesses to testify in a particular fashion, is a pattern of obstruction of justice and witness tampering that is more than fifty years old. In the landmark Supreme Court Case, *Roe v. Wade*, upon information and belief, Defendant Allred coached Plaintiff Roe about what to testify about without verifying the allegations. Allred thereby commenced her pattern of committing obstruction of justice and tampering with witnesses, as evidenced by Plaintiff Roe’s informing, soon before she died, that Allred committed those acts. See [Gloria Allred On The New Norma McCorvey Documentary \(forbes.com\)](#). **Strategy Question:** Does counsel want to reference corrupt persuasion to characterize The United States-Based Defendant Attorneys’ actions even though we cannot allege the federal witness tampering? I ask because the phrase “corrupt persuasion” is so very, very apt here.

Strategy Question: Shall the Plaintiffs allege tampering with witnesses as a separate count. California Penal Code 136.1 PC (makes it a crime in California to dissuade, intimidate or tamper with a witness to (or a victim of) a crime, or from otherwise cooperating with police or prosecutors).

Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, Defendant Attorneys were individual persons within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. §§1961(4) and 1962(e), and Defendant Attorneys and Does 1-25 constituted an enterprise pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961(4), 1962(e), that associated with and/or participated in the conduct of said enterprise's affairs doing business in the form of an association in fact.

Defendant Attorneys in their individual capacities, conducted, participated in, conspired to engage in, or aided and abetted the continuing and ongoing conduct of the affairs of that enterprise, together with others, through a pattern of racketeering as defined in 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961(1), 1961 (5), and 1962(c).

There is a strong threat that Defendant Attorneys' continuing criminal activity furthering their enterprise will extend beyond the initial period of time when the predicate acts commenced, because litigation continues in the lawsuits filed by Elizabeth Taylor and Jane Doe, and the Khan case is on appeal. The Petition for Review before the California Supreme Court was filed on July 6, 2022. *Mahim Khan, Plaintiff and Respondent, v. Hologram USA, Inc. et al., Defendants and Appellants*, Case No. 2nd Civ. Case No. B308727 c/w B305849 (LASC Case No. BC654017)(Appealing from the Decision of the Court of Appeal Second Appellate District, Division Two). **LINK TO PETITION FOR REVIEW**

Further, as alleged in this Complaint, the illegal collection efforts by United States-Based Attorney Defendants Allred, Bloom and Chora and the Swiss Attorney Defendants also are illegal because those Attorneys illegally attempted to collect

money and property from Plaintiff Defendant and the Entity Plaintiffs and also tortiously defamed Plaintiff David in both the United Kingdom and Switzerland and committed corporate defamation against the Entity Defendants.

Litigating Defendant Khan participated in the Swiss Attorney Defendants' illegal efforts to enforce immature judgments against Plaintiff David, knowing that her case was on appeal in the United States, and thus was not collectible in Switzerland. Further, Defendant Khan wrongfully and illegally defamed Plaintiff David in Switzerland, alleging David had been "convicted" of sexual harassment, all the while knowing through her Swiss counsel that her wrongly accusing him of being "convicted" constituted wilful defamation (art. 174 SCC) in Switzerland.

Litigating Defendant Lauren Reeves participated in the Swiss Attorney Defendants' illegal efforts to enforce a judgment against Plaintiff David for punitive damages which are not collectible in Switzerland. Defendant Reeves participated in the Swiss Attorney Defendants' illegal efforts to enforce a punitive damages award, knowing through her Swiss Attorneys that punitive damages are not collectible in Switzerland, as more fully detailed below.

Further, Defendant Khan wrongfully and illegally defamed Plaintiff David in Switzerland, alleging he had been "convicted" of sexual harassment, all the while knowing through her Swiss counsel that her wrongly accusing him of being "convicted" constituted wilful defamation (art. 174 SCC) in Switzerland.

FACTS COMMON TO ALL ALLEGATIONS

Defendant Attorneys Conspire and File a Tsunami of Me Too Claims Against Plaintiff Alki David

Plaintiff David first met Defendants Allred and Bloom when the three of them appeared on the Dr. Drew Show on December 4, 2012. Upon information and belief, from that day forward, Defendants Allred and Bloom viewed Plaintiff David as a possible target to attack in the future with spurious lawsuits alleging that David harmed Litigating Defendants, just as Defendants Allred and Bloom have targeted many others, as more fully discussed herein.¹³

¹³ **Note:** Girardi was disbarred on July 1, 2022.

<https://apps.calbar.ca.gov/licensee/Detail/36603>.

Strategy Question: Girardi is in personal bankruptcy, so the stay most likely will preclude suing him personally. Further he is in messy divorce proceedings. In December, 2020, involuntary Chapter 7 Bankruptcy proceedings were filed against Girardi's law firm, Girardi & Keese. The firm became defunct on or near January, 2021 and its assets were sold by the bankruptcy trustee. *Tom Girardi's Law Office will be sold, as his home goes on the market, Trustee tells Court, by Amanda Bronstad, The Recorder, April 27, 2021.* Robert Keese, who helped Defendant Girardi found the Girardi & Keese law firm in 1965, also has been placed on involuntary inactive status and is not eligible to practice law. <https://apps.calbar.ca.gov/licensee/Detail/46858>.

Strategy Question: Given these complications with Girardi, I have named him as an individual and a member of his marital estate and have otherwise included references to him in the complaint with regard to averments regarding the enterprise and continuous activity? I have also named Erica Girardi a/k/a Erica Jayne as a Defendant as she is part of the criminal enterprise. Note: Girardi's former partner, Keith Griffin, has joined the Dordick Law Firm, whose principal is Defendant Gary A. Dordick.



Gloria Allred (left/right) Lisa Bloom, Alki David, Kato Kaelin, Dr. Drew

Note to Counsel: Ali's affidavit will establish that she saw other Plaintiffs contrive claims by constantly entering Plaintiff David's office in hopes of enticing him to commit sexually offensive conduct. Carl Dawson's affidavit will also establish that employees and former employees of the Entity Plaintiffs contrived to target Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs.

Monica D'Oofrio filed *D'Onofrio v. Alki David Productions Inc., FilmOn Com., Inc. and Alki David*, Case No. BC496165³ on November 6, 2012, alleging employment discrimination. Plaintiff David strongly denied any liability, but made a business decision to settle the case for a minimal amount. The case was dismissed

in 2013 in a settlement agreement that had a confidentiality provision. Upon information and belief, with the urging of Defendant Attorneys, various conspiring and colluding employees and ex-employees subsequently filed false claims against Plaintiff David and some of the Entity Plaintiffs.

Current and former employees of the Entity Plaintiffs, encouraged and aided and abetted by the Defendant Attorneys,¹⁴ targeted Plaintiff David as a defendant to name in spurious lawsuits and targeted the Entity Plaintiffs. Former employees and their counsel deemed Plaintiff David to be a deep pocket from whom they could extort monies.

In filing this lawsuit - Plaintiff David and the Plaintiff Entities seek justice to recoup millions of dollars, consisting of lost profits, improperly obtained court judgments, and lost profitable contracts, as well damages attributable to Plaintiff David's two IPO's failing. (Insert IPO's for FilmOn and XXXXX). **Note: Yelena was CONTROLLER and she had a very strong grasp on finances and taxes so we are getting an affidavit from her in this regard.**

Upon information and belief, Attorney Defendants Girardi, Allred, Bloom, Goldberg, Deitrich and Griffin conspired to pursue vexatious litigation creating a

¹⁴ **Note to Counsel:** Ali's affidavit will establish that she saw other Defendants contrive claims by constantly entering Plaintiff David's office in hopes of enticing him to commit sexually offensive conduct. Carl Dawson's affidavit will also establish that employees and former employees of the Entity Plaintiffs contrived to target Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs.

continuous and related pattern of racketeering activity against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs by filing numerous spurious and unfounded lawsuits against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs. Soon thereafter, other Attorney Defendants joined the enterprise, including, but not limited to, Attorney Defendants Leal, Mochkatel, Goldstein, Griffin, and Bakhtiar, thus expanding the illegal racketeering enterprise and increasing the damages sustained by Plaintiffs David and The Entity Plaintiffs.

The US Based Attorney Defendants were enabled by one another and their retained experts to assist them in committing the RICO predicate offenses of extortion, bribery, obstruction of justice, wire fraud, mail fraud and aiding and abetting solely because of each U.S. Based Attorney Defendants' position in the enterprise and their involvement in and/or control over the enterprise's affairs and because their offenses of extortion, bribery, obstruction of justice, wire, mail fraud and aiding and abetting are related to the activities of their enterprise, *i.e.*, to enrich themselves by filing spurious lawsuits against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs, thereby depriving those Plaintiffs of their property and money.

Upon information and belief, (**Allie and Carl Affidavits provide this good faith basis**) Defendants Girardi, Allred, and Bloom intentionally conspired to recruit employees of Plaintiff Entities and former employees of those Plaintiff Entities, to independently file tort lawsuits against Plaintiff David, alleging he

committed sexual misconduct and/or that those Plaintiffs had viable employment law claims against Plaintiff Entities in order to extract and extort money from Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs in furtherance of an enterprise specifically designed to enrich Attorney Defendants.

Defendants Attorneys Allred and Bloom's extortionate tactics are systemic and know no bounds, as evidenced by this Complaint, which establishes that many prominent citizens are victimized by Allred's and Bloom's predatory targeting of prominent people, whom they victimize, all the while alleging that their clients are "victims."

Defendants Allred and Bloom are the actual predators who consistently utilize the same criminal enterprise modus operandi, *i.e.*, name and shame - as alleged herein. Defendant Attorneys Allred and Bloom have targeted everyone from Princess Latifa to 50 Cent, from Alan Dershowitz to Rose McGowan, from Chris Brown to Steve Wynn, to Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs. After targeting those victims, Defendant Attorneys Allred and Bloom maliciously fabricate fallacious testimony, with the intent to extort money and property from their targets to further their criminal enterprise.

Conspiracy 28 U.S.C. §§
Litigating Defendants' Conspiracy to Target Plaintiff David and The Entity Plaintiffs ~ A Conspiracy Facilitated by the Defendant Attorneys

Upon Information and Belief, the Litigating Defendants met at a restaurant

near Plaintiff Entity Hologram, Inc.,’s location at least once to collude, conspire and form untruthful allegations against Plaintiff David and the Entity Defendants. Upon information and belief, the Litigating Defendants, coached by the Attorney Defendants, also met at other various times to compare theories for asserting spurious and trumped-up claims against Plaintiff David and the Entity Defendants.

AIDING AND ABETTING

The Litigating Defendants who are current and former employees of the Entity Plaintiffs, encouraged and aided and abetted by the Defendant Attorneys, targeted Plaintiff David as a victim to name in spurious settlement demands and in

¹⁵ Rizzo’s Deposition and her trial testimony in the *Jones* trial establish that after the Rizzo Settlement with Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs, The Litigating Defendants conspired and colluded to fabricate complaints against Plaintiff David and The Entity Plaintiffs. Alki - Please Insert Affidavit Malik Spellman as a dropbox link.

file:///C:/Users/alki.000/Downloads/Affidavit_Malik%20David%20SpellmanConspiracy.pdf

Note: We have affidavits from Zimmerman and Ciara Menieffe.

We are getting statements from some affiants who previously provided affidavits:

- 1) Carl Bowen (Rita recently spoke with Carl and stated that Bloom threatened her to keep her from recanting;
- 2) Ali;
- 3) David Haigh;
- 4) Peter Van Prusisenn;
- 5) Ylena Calendar;
- 6) Ian Robertson;
- 7) Corey Weisman and Weisman Worldwide;
- 8) Isabel Peterman; and
- 9) The affidavits requested of Dana Cole. Please note that Alli’s affidavit will establish that she saw other Plaintiffs contrive claims by constantly entering Plaintiff David’s office in hopes of enticing him to commit offensive conduct. Please also note that on July 12, Alki David received 42 boxes of evidence and litigation records from Fred Heather’s office, consisting of files from David and the Entity Plaintiffs being represented by Barry Rothman (deceased). Barbara and Alki are reviewing those documents and are finding more support for more specific allegations.

lawsuits, as alleged more fully herein. Former employees and their counsel, Defendant Attorneys, deemed Plaintiff David to be their gravy train and to be a deep pocket source of funding.

In October, 2019, Judge Ongkeko of the Los Angeles Superior Court, who oversaw the Elizabeth Taylor case, admonished Defendant Bloom for significantly overstating her already very expensive law firm bills submitted to the Judge when Litigating Defendant Jones won a compensatory award against Plaintiff David.

Tellingly, the Judge said, “If I were a Bloom client - one that was actually paying out of pocket instead of these sad ambulance chasing contingency cases - I’d be very careful to go over the firm’s bills before I paid anything,” Judge Ongkeko said.

Such over-billing and seeking to bilk Plaintiff David is just one of innumerable events demonstrating that Defendant Bloom extorted money from Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs in order to further the criminal enterprise, primarily overseen by Defendants Girardi, Allred, Bloom and Goldberg. Fred, can you help with the transcript of these statements by Judge Ongkeko.

Note to Counsel: Fred, do you have the Transcript we can cite to with regard to Judge Ongkeko’s comments?

In October, 2019, a jury deadlocked 8-4 in Litigating Defendant Taylor’s suit, LASC Case No. BC649025 (2017). Los Angeles County Superior Court Judge Christopher Lui declared a mistrial. Counsel for Litigation Defendant Taylor was

Attorney Bloom.

Hologram USA's independent contractor Grant Zimmerman filed *Grant Zimmerman v. Alkiviades David, et al.*, Case No. BC675552, in the Los Angeles County Superior Court, wrongly alleging wrongful termination and that he was fired by Plaintiff David for revealing David committed sexual misconduct as to other of David's employees.

Alki: Attached is a mediation brief filed on Plaintiff David's behalf and on behalf of Hologram Inc., but not the other various entities related to Alki named in Zimmerman's suit. **Note: Alki and his counsel need to determine whether to divulge this as, per evidentiary rules, it is confidential.**

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/#search/Zimmerman/FMfcgxwLtsxhWHtZJFmDWqjCNmJCKqSG?projector=1&messagePartId=0.1> -

In November, 2019, Mahim Khan, a former production assistant who worked at Entity Plaintiff FilmOn TV and Entity Plaintiff Alki David Productions, Inc., sued Plaintiff David and Entity Plaintiffs Alki David Productions, Hologram USA, FilmOn Inc., and Plaintiff David. LASC Case No. BC654017 (2019). Khan obtained an award of \$58 million, \$55 Million of which was for punitive damages for battery, sexual battery and sexual harassment against Plaintiff Alki David.

Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs are seeking reversal on appeal due to the misconduct of Khan's counsel, Allred, Maroko & Goldberg, including, but not limited to, Defendants Allred, Goldberg, Leal, and Mochkatel, misconduct intended to further the criminal enterprise those counsel participated in in violation

of RICO, as more fully alleged herein.

Note: Link to Petition for Review before the California Supreme Court

Litigating Defendant Khan Seeks to Obstruct Justice in her Case Against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs

On November 8, 2019, Litigating Defendant Khan was the subject of a police report filed by her roommate, Lauren M. Berkley, who informed officers that *Khan* was threatening Berkley and her infant daughter because Berkley was going to testify in support of Plaintiff David in the *Mahim Khan* case.

Woodbridge Police Department
4 Meetinghouse Lane, Woodbridge CT 06525
(203) 367-2511

CASE/INCIDENT REPORT SUPPLEMENTARY

CFS NO 190022823	DAY 6	INCIDENT DATE 11/01/2019	TIME 14:18	DATE OF RPT 11/01/2019	TIME OF RPT 17:26	TYPE OF INCIDENT THREATENING	INCIDENT CODE 009	INVESTIGATING OFFICER Officer Rodriguez-Perez, Karla	BADGE NO 014
DIVISION Patrol	DIVISION NO	REFERENCE DIVISION	REFERENCE DIVISION NO	CASE X-REFERENCE	UNIT ID 114	TYPIST KAR0167	DATE TYPED 11/01/2019	TIME TYPED 17:26	
STREET NO 00016	STREET NAME AND TYPE BURNHAM Woodbridge		APARTMENT NO/LOCATION	INTERSECTING STREET NAME AND TYPE			STATUS Closed	TOWN CD T167	
OFFENSE Informational		LOCAL X-REF CODE INF	IRI CODE INF	ATT/COMP Completed	OFFENSE DESCRIPTION Cyberspace				
STATUS CODE C=COMPLAINANT V=VICTIM A=ARRESTEE J=JUVENILE H=OTHER M=MISSING W=WITNESS O=OFFENDER D=DRIVER S=SUSPECT P=POLICE OFFICER T=TOT									
STATUS	NAME	SEX	RACE	D.O.B.	TELEPHONE	ADDRESS	JOB STATE & NO.		
C	Berkley, Lauren M.	F	W	08/16/1987	Cell (203) 512-1076	18 Burna Rd Woodbridge CT	CT 06794935		

On November 1, 2019 I was dispatched to the lobby of this department for a report of threatening. While en route dispatch said the complainant has received threatening text messages.

Upon arrival I met with the complainant, Lauren Berkley (DOB 8/16/87) who said she received threatening text messages on Tuesday October 22, 2019. Berkley goes on to say that she used to be friends with the person who sent the text messages. Her name is Mahim Khan but Berkley said she may have changed her last name to Ashraf.

Berkley provided me with screen shots of the conversation between the two which shows that Mahim started the conversation. It should be noted that the last time either had communication with each other was last year. While Mahim did not specifically threat Berkley she did write, "I hope nothing happens to Grace (Berkley's daughter) but karma is real. And you will get yours. Mark my words." Berkley said that because Mahim specifically mentioned her child, she wanted the incident documented. Prior to Berkley leaving she provided me with Mahim's phone number and was advised to block Mahim on all forms of communication.

I called Mahim, multiple times, but there was no answer. I left a message advising her to have no contact through any forms of

<small>THE UNDERSIGNED, AN INVESTIGATOR HAVING BEEN DULY SWORN, DEPOSES AND SAYS THAT: I AM THE WRITER OF THE ATTACHED POLICE REPORT PERTAINING TO INCIDENT NUMBER [REDACTED] THAT THE INFORMATION CONTAINED THEREIN WAS SECURED AS A RESULT OF (1) MY PERSONAL OBSERVATION AND KNOWLEDGE; OR (2) INFORMATION RELAYED TO ME BY OTHER MEMBERS OF MY POLICE DEPARTMENT OR OF ANOTHER POLICE DEPARTMENT OR (3) INFORMATION SECURED BY MYSELF OR ANOTHER MEMBER OF A POLICE DEPARTMENT FROM THE PERSON OR PERSONS NAMED OR IDENTIFIED THEREIN AS INDICATED IN THE ATTACHED REPORT. THAT THE REPORT IS AN ACCURATE STATEMENT OF THE INFORMATION SO RECEIVED BY ME.</small>			
INVESTIGATOR SIGNATURE: /OFC. Karla A Rodriguez-Perez/	INVESTIGATOR I.D.#: 014	SIGNED DATE: 11/02/2019	SUPERVISOR SIGNATURE: /SGT. Michael R Blume/

Defendant Attorneys also filed lawsuits on behalf of Litigating Defendants Elizabeth Taylor (represented by Defendant Attorney Goldstein, Bloom, Chora); Chastity Jones (represented by Attorney Defendants Bloom, Sarah Bloom of the Bloom Firm, and Attorney Defendants Fundali, Goldstein of the Bloom Law Firm and Attorney Defendant Chora), Mahim Khan (represented by Defendant Attorneys Allred, Maroko & Goldberg, Allred, Goldberg, Leal and Mochkatel;) and Lauren Reeves (represented by Defendant Attorney Allred).

Upon information and belief, the Defendant Attorneys committed extortion against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs, obstructed justice by manipulating

their clients' testimony and committed mail and wire fraud by communicating with their clients and witnesses in such a manner as to defraud Plaintiff David and the Plaintiff Entities. Such actions by the Defendant Attorneys were permitted, over objections by attorneys for the Plaintiff Entities and Plaintiff David. Specifically,

Judge Liu - Court - Orozco - amplify - This continuous pattern of biased judges continues to this day as repeated efforts to ask the judges to recuse have been summarily denied. ADD Petition for Rehearing filed in the Chastity Jones matter. Dana Cole to help supplement.

Alki/counsel - we need to bolster this allegation - perhaps in the 40 boxes?

Attorney Defendant Bloom's Egregious Conduct in Her Spurious Lawsuits Against Plaintiff David - Judge Onegoko

Not satisfied with extorting money from Plaintiff David and the EntityPlaintiffs, Defendant Bloom could not even control herself in the hallway outside of the courtrooms of the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, a public building, where she screamed at Plaintiff David and accused him of multiple rapes.

[Watch Video of Lisa Bloom Defaming Plaintiff David](#)

“How many women have you raped?”



1 minute 45 seconds in

[PLAY VIDEO](#) of Lisa Bloom in Stanley Mosk Courthouse / Downtown Los Angeles

defamatory allegations. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QvCshThAnTQ> 41

(The video with Bloom's allegations in the foyer of the Stanley Mosk Courthouse saying that Plaintiff David committed Rapes - plural - The allegations are at 1:45 on this video).

Defendant Bloom's defamations against Plaintiff David were overheard by others, most notably an appalled mother who can be heard on the tape asking for Defendant Bloom to stop her screaming of such allegations because the mother's young daughter was hearing Bloom's defamatory accusations against Plaintiff David, as were attorneys waiting for court hearings). While Defendant Bloom has manifested unethical behavior in many instances as against Plaintiff David and the Plaintiff Entities, perhaps this is the most paradigm illustration that her behavior in litigation is not merely grossly unethical, but is also unstable and bordering on the

pathological.

ADD BLOOM IN THE UK AND DAVID HAIGH & Latifa

DEFENDANTS ALLRED AND BLOOM EXCEEDED THE BOUNDARIES OF ADVOCACY AND DEFAMED PLAINTIFF DAVID

Throughout the entire, years-long campaign to obliterate Plaintiff David's reputation and bankrupt him and the Plaintiff Entities, Defendant Allred exceeded all respectable boundaries of advocacy and she exceeded the boundaries of the United States as well, maligning Defendant Alki's character and reputation in Switzerland.

In Switzerland, Defendant Allred wrongfully sought to enforce a non-final judgment against Plaintiff David *and his family*, none of whom were parties to any

relevant litigation filed by Defendant Attorneys, in *Mahim Kahn v. Alki David, et al*, in violation of Swiss law.

Béatrice Stahel, of MC Avocats SA (Ltd.) in Gstaad, Switzerland, provides Plaintiff David with Swiss representation. Plaintiff David has filed criminal complaints in Switzerland against Reeves, alleging Reeves is guilty of wilful defamation (art. 174 SCC) / defamation (art. 173 SCC). Reeves is represented by Attorney Defendant Allred. Stahel informs in an English translated letter that Allred has violated Swiss law.⁴

In Switzerland, Defendant Allred also wrongfully sought to enforce a

non-final judgment against Plaintiff David *and his family*, none of whom were parties to any relevant litigation filed by Defendant Attorneys, in *Mahim Khan v. Alki David, et. al*, in violation of Swiss law.⁵

The Swiss courts rejected Allred's extraterritorial efforts to collect on the *Mahim Khan* judgment because appellate proceedings are ongoing in that case. Indeed, Defendant David and the named Entity Defendants in the *Mahim Khan* case have a Petition for Review pending before the California Supreme Court.

At the time that Attorney Defendant Allred violated Swiss law and national

⁴<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/#search/Swiss+translation+/KtbxLzfhXkdXKQwHMJbkPTWfLhtpgXOSgV?projector=1&messagePartId=0.1>. (Letter from Plaintiff David's Swiss Counsel, December 16, 2021).

⁵https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Sqn9smWheF_6yI_bNY1EPne1yxweAiO3zNX6_g4PiJg/edit (Letter from Plaintiff David's Swiss Counsel, December 16, 2021).

43

policy, Defendant David's and the named Entity Defendants' appeal was pending before the California Court of Appeal of the State of California District Division Two, *Mahim Khan v. Alkiviades David*, B305849, B3088727.

Defendant Allred's illegal actions in Switzerland have caused, and continue to cause, Plaintiff David extreme expense and have, and continue to cause, further damage to Plaintiff David's reputation as such filings are public record in Switzerland. Plaintiff David has gone to great expense to hire legal counsel to fight the criminal enterprise conducted by Defendant Allred and Defendant Bloom's

continuous, wrongful spurious actions and defamatory actions.

Defendant Allred's corrupt, wilful and intentional actions, constituting criminal acts under relevant Swiss law, were committed under the auspices of an otherwise legitimate enterprise, Allred, Maroko & Goldberg.⁶

However, Defendant Allred's reprehensible conduct alleged above is not the end of the story recounting her actionable wrongful actions.

On the day after the *Mahim Khan* verdict issued, Allred and Litigating Defendant Khan, went beyond the pale by calling a press conference in front of the Beverly Hills Police Station as they sought unsuccessfully to file criminal charges against Plaintiff David with regard to Khan's claims against David.

⁶<https://www.globenewswire.com/en/news-release/2019/11/01/1939286/0/en/Billionaire-Hires-Three-Major-UK-Law-Firms-to-Fight-Lisa-Bloom-and-Gloria-Allred.html>.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ROxzyBADKvQ>.

However, the Police turned Defendants Allred and Khan away, stating that they did not have the evidence necessary to file such charges. **No such charges were ever filed.** Defendant Allred called a news conference at the Beverly Hills police station on the date she attempted to file criminal charges against Plaintiff David with the express purpose of intimidating, harassing and defaming Plaintiff David. Defendant Allred's actions in calling the press conference **and what other**

of her actions have caused serious and lasting emotional harm to Defendant David. After having been told by the police that she did not have the requisite proof to support a criminal filing against Plaintiff David, upon information and belief, Defendant Allred arranged to have a false article published in the LA Times. [Self-appointed ambassador for 'wronged men' of #MeToo Alki David faces criminal complaint - Los Angeles Times \(latimes.com\).](#)

Notably, Plaintiff David has thrice asked the LA Times to retract the article, only to be ignored completely. **Alki can we include a link where you asked the LA Times to retract the article.**

Therefore, Defendant Allred's defamatory comments against Plaintiff David continue on for anyone to see. Upon information and belief, Defendant Allred, an officer of the Court had a duty to retract her defamatory remarks against Plaintiff David. To this day - crickets. This is one in a voluminous number of Allred's

45
nefarious, harassing and extorting actions against Plaintiff David. **With David Haigh advising us how to best present the wrongdoings by Lisa Bloom and Gloria Allred and Latifa -**

The Racketeering Enterprise Defendants' Conspiracy to Extort

The Attorney Defendants' Allred, Bloom, Goldberg and Girardi conspired to extort money from Plaintiff David and the Attorney Defendants, and the Attorney

Defendants tampering with witnesses constitute wrongful actions under the auspices of otherwise legitimate enterprises, including, but not limited to, Allred, Maroko & Goldberg, The Bloom Firm; Girardi Keese; Dordick Law Corporation; Chora, Young & Manasserian and The Law Offices of Ebby S. Bakhtiar. Accordingly, as more fully set forth in this Complaint, Plaintiff David and the Entity Defendants sue all Attorney Defendants for injuries to Plaintiff David's and the Entity Plaintiffs' businesses and properties directly and proximately caused by the Attorney Defendants' mail fraud, bribery, extortion, all of which predicate claims pursuant to RICO.

Further, the Defendant Attorneys conspired to tamper with witnesses and to have witnesses and the Litigating Defendants collude against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs by contriving allegations to support their actions against Plaintiffs David and the Plaintiff Attorneys. Such tampering with witnesses constitute wrongful actions under the auspices of otherwise legitimate enterprises, including, but not limited to, Allred, Maroko & Goldberg, The Bloom Firm; Girardi Keese; Dordick Law Corporation; Chora, Young & Manasserian and The Law Offices of Ebby S. Bakhtiar.

The Attorney Defendants played fast and loose with both the Litigating Defendants and witnesses as well as the evidence they introduced in each case. Defendant Allred kept Defendant Mahim Kahn and Defendant Lauren Reeves as

clients, but sent Defendant Elizabeth Taylor to Defendant Bloom, Allred' daughter.

Subsequently, Defendant Bloom was retained by Defendant Chastity Jones, all with an effort to extort money from Plaintiff David and the Plaintiff Entities. Upon information and belief, Defendants Mahim Khan, Elizabeth Taylor, Lauren Reeves, and Chastity Jones (Litigating Defendants), with the encouragement of the Defendant Attorneys, conspired and colluded to make up stories about the actions of Plaintiff David and Plaintiff Entities in order to file their spurious lawsuits against Plaintiff David and Plaintiff Entities. **Insert text messages from Chastity etc.**

The Attorney Defendants' conspiring to extort and extorting money from Plaintiff David and the Attorney Defendants, and the Attorney Defendants tampering with witnesses, committed actions under the auspices of otherwise legitimate enterprises, including, but not limited to, Allred, Maroko & Goldberg, The Bloom Firm; Girardi Keese; Dordick Law Corporation; Chora, Young & Manasserian and The Law Offices of Ebby S. Bakhtiar.

Insert more specific instances if available.

Accordingly, Plaintiff David and the Entity Defendants sue all Attorney Defendants for injuries to Plaintiff David's and the Entity Plaintiffs' businesses and properties directly and proximately caused by the Attorney Defendants' mail fraud, bribery, and extortion, all of which predicate claims pursuant to RICO.

Plaintiffs assert, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§1962(b)(c) and (d), that the Attorney Defendants, their clients, experts, employees and agents, conspired with one another and intended to, and did, wilfully conduct an inter-related, clear and continuous pattern of racketeering activity to benefit Defendant Attorneys' unlawful enterprise, and that Defendants continue to do so, by, inter alia, wilfully and intentionally conspiring against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs by filing spurious lawsuits against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs, who were, and continue to be, victimized by Attorney Defendants' continuous pattern of racketeering conducted to benefit their enterprises, including mail fraud, extortion, bribery, and aiding and abetting, all of which are cognizable as RICO predicate acts pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 1861 and 1862 (b)(c) and (d).

Defendants Allred, Bloom and Swiss Counsel Illegally Further the Enterprise

Defendant Allred continues to further the criminal enterprise by utilizing illegal tactics to obstruct justice, both in the U.S. and in Switzerland, as she seeks to collect on a judgment in the *Mahim Khan* case despite that case being on appeal before the Supreme Court of California. Defendant Allred has violated relevant Swiss law in seeking to collect punitive damages in both the *Khan* and *Reeves* cases as such damages are prohibited in Switzerland. Punitive damages are not available under Swiss law. Swiss courts refuse to award punitive damages even if the applicable foreign law provides for such damages (Article 135(2) Swiss Private

International Law).

Litigating Defendant Khan participated in the Swiss Attorney Defendants' illegal efforts to enforce immature judgments against Plaintiff David, knowing that her case was on appeal in the United States, and thus was not collectible in Switzerland. Further, Defendant Khan wrongfully and illegally defamed Plaintiff David in Switzerland, alleging David had been "convicted" of sexual harassment, all the while knowing through her Swiss counsel that her wrongly accusing him of being "convicted" constituted wilful defamation (art. 174 SCC) in Switzerland. *See* Defamation Count at _____.

Litigating Defendant Lauren Reeves participated in the Swiss Attorney Defendants' illegal efforts to enforce a judgment against Plaintiff David for punitive damages which are not collectible in Switzerland. Defendant Reeves participated in the Swiss Attorney Defendants' illegal efforts to enforce a punitive damages award, knowing through her Swiss Attorneys that punitive damages are not collectible in Switzerland, as more fully detailed below.

Further, Defendant Khan wrongfully and illegally defamed Plaintiff David in Switzerland, alleging he had been "convicted" of sexual harassment, all the while knowing through her Swiss counsel that that her wrongly accusing him of being "convicted" constituted wilful defamation (art. 174 SCC) in Switzerland.

Specifically, in an opinion letter, Plaintiff David's and The Entity Plaintiffs'

Swiss counsel, Arthur Seppey, Avocat au barreau, wrote to Swiss prosecutors, stating:

“Dear Colleague, We hereby refer to our client’s latest emails and to your request to receive an update concerning the Swiss current proceedings. As a result, you will find here a summary of the current Swiss criminal proceedings regarding our client. In the frame of his activities led through his companies based in the US, FilmOn. TV, Inc. (FilmOn hereinafter), Alki David Productions, Inc. (Delaware) (ADP hereinafter) and Hologram USA, Inc. (Delaware) (Hologram hereinafter), Mr. DAVID formerly employed Mrs. Lauren REEVES and Mrs. Mahim KHAN.

I. Lauren REEVES (a comedy writer, former model and comedy performer born on September 4th 1983) was employed as a writer for FilmOn (2015), as an employee charged to attract and write for comedians for Hologram (2016) and as a creative producer/host for ADP (2016). Lauren REEVES filed an application in California against our client for battery, sexual battery and sexual harassment asking for damages and punitive damages. On the basis of a popular jury’s decision (cf. **Bordereau plainte pénale 21-11-18, exhibit n° 9**), 58 our client and two of his companies (Hologram and ADP) have been sentenced to pay her :

- \$ 650'000 (compensatory damages)
- \$ 1'299'675 (attorneys’ fees)
- \$ 65'346.02 (proceedings costs) Our client has additionally been personally sentenced to pay to Lauren REEVES \$ 4'350'000 as punitive damages. Lauren REEVES, even though she never tried to enforce the above-mentioned judgment in the United States (US hereinafter), filed on October 14th 2021 a freezing in Switzerland against our client’s Swiss goods, including his real estate property in Gstaad, to enforce the above-mentioned judgment (cf. **Bordereau plainte pénale 21-11-18, exhibit n° 8**). By filing her freezing order, Lauren REEVES said that our client has been convicted in the US for sexual harassment. Lauren REEVES managed to freeze our client’s Swiss goods to enforce the judgment’s amounts except the \$ 4'350'000 of punitive damages. This Swiss judgment is now under appeal.

II. As did Lauren REEVES, Mahim KHAN, represented in the US by the same lawfirm (ALLRED MAROKO & GOLDBERG), filed an application in California against our client for battery, sexual battery and sexual harassment. On the basis of a popular jury’s decision (cf. **Bordereau plainte pénale 21-11-29, exhibit n° 6**), our client and two of his companies (FilmOn and ADP) have been sentenced to pay her :

- \$ 8'250'000 (damages)
- \$ 1'398'885 (attorneys’ fees)

59

- \$ 74'165.60 (proceedings costs)

Our client has additionally been personally sentenced to pay to Mahim KHAN \$ 50'000'000 as punitive damages.

Mahim KHAN, represented in Switzerland by the same law firm (CHABRIER AVOCATS) than Lauren REEVES filed on the same day than

Lauren REEVES, which means on October 14th 2021, a freezing order against our client's Swiss goods, including his real estate property in Gstaad, to enforce the above mentioned judgment, even though she never tried to enforce it in the US beforehand (cf. Bordereau plainte pénale 21-11-29, exhibit n° 10). However, unlike Lauren REEVES, Mahim KHAN totally lost her Swiss judgment because the US judgment on which she based herself was not enforceable as an appeal has been introduced in the US by our client, which means that the judgment isn't final (when someone try to obtain a freezing order in Switzerland on the basis of a judgment, that judgment has to be final).

As a reaction to those freezing order applications against him in Switzerland our client filed a criminal complaint against Lauren REEVES on November 19th 2021 and against Mahim KHAN on November 30th 2021 in front of the Public prosecutor's office in Geneva. Both complaints, based on similar facts, denounce 4 Swiss criminal offences (https://www.fedlex.admin.ch/eli/cc/54/757_781_799/en) :

1. Defamation (art. 173 of the Swiss criminal code, SCC hereinafter)

Art. 173

« 1. Any person who in addressing a third party, makes an accusation against or casts suspicion on another of dishonourable conduct or of other conduct that shall be liable to damage another's reputation, any person who disseminates such accusations or suspicions, shall be liable on complaint to a monetary penalty. 2. If the accused proves that the statement made or disseminated by him corresponds to the truth or that he had substantial grounds to hold an honest belief that it was true, he is not liable to a penalty. 3. The accused is not permitted to lead evidence in support of and is criminally liable for statements that are made or disseminated with the primary intention of accusing someone of disreputable conduct without there being any public interest or any other justified cause, and particularly where such statements refer to a person's private or family life.

4. If the offender recants his statement, the court may impose a more lenient penalty or no penalty at all.

5. If the accused is unable to prove the truth of his statement, or if it is shown to be untrue, or if the accused recants his statement, the court must state this in its judgment or in another document. »

Both Lauren REEVES and Mahim KHAN said that our client has been convicted for sexual harassment by the Superior Court of the State of California. First of all it's wrong because it doesn't exist a Superior Court of the State of California but many (the Los Angeles one in our client's case). Then, it's not a judge but a popular jury who has sentenced and not convicted our client. Furthermore our client has not been "convicted" for sexual harassment (civil cases) but sentenced to pay them indemnities which is completely different.

As a matter of fact our client has never been criminally convicted for any offence, sexual harassment included. As a result and according to our client, saying that both Lauren REEVES and Mahim KHAN committed a defamation towards him, dirtying his honour.

2. Wilful defamation (art. 174 SCC)

Art. 174

« 1. A person in addressing a third party, and knowing his allegations to be untrue, makes an accusation against or casts suspicion on another of dishonourable conduct, or of other conduct that shall be liable to damage another's reputation, any person who disseminates such accusations or suspicions, knowing them to be untrue,

shall be liable on complaint to a custodial sentence not exceeding three years or to a monetary penalty.

2. If the offender has acted systematically to undermine the good reputation of another, he shall be liable to a custodial sentence not exceeding three years or to a monetary penalty of not less than 30 daily penalty units.¹⁹⁷

3. If the offender recants his statement before the court on the grounds that it is untrue, the court may impose a more lenient penalty. The court must provide the person harmed with a document confirming the recantation. »

Here the same explanation than the one used above for Defamation (art. 173 SCC) is taken up. The only difference is that this criminal offence is more serious because the perpetrator knows the innocence of the victim. Both Lauren REEVES and Mahim KHAN knew our client was innocent because they took part in the US proceedings, they also were represented by Swiss and US attorneys and finally they couldn't have ignored that the cases were civil ones and not criminal ones. As a result and according to our client, both Lauren REEVES and Mahim KHAN committed a wilful defamation towards him, dirtying his honour.

3. Attempted fraud (art. 146 SCC)

Art. 146

«¹ Any person who with a view to securing an unlawful gain for himself or another wilfully induces an erroneous belief in another person by false pretences or concealment of the truth, or wilfully reinforces an erroneous belief, and thus causes that person to act to the prejudice of his or another's financial interests, shall be liable to a custodial sentence not exceeding five years or to a monetary penalty.

²If the offender acts for commercial gain, he shall be liable to a custodial sentence not exceeding ten years or to a monetary penalty of not less than 90 daily penalty units.

³Fraud to the detriment of a relative or family member is prosecuted only on complaint. »
First of all both Mahim KHAN and Lauren REEVES tried to enforce in Switzerland millions of punitive damages meanwhile punitive damages are not only illegal in Switzerland : they are contrary to Swiss public order, in other words contrary to Swiss legal quintessence. By doing so they tried to trick the judge and the trial.

Secondly, both of these women tried to convince the judge that our client has been convicted for sexual harassment.

In other words they tried to lead the judge to make himself a misrepresentation of the US legal situation in order to obtain what they wanted.

As a result and according to our client, both Lauren REEVES and Mahim KHAN committed an attempted fraud (attempted fraud to the trial, which is a particular case of fraud) towards him.

4. Attempted coercion (art. 181 SCC)

Art. 181

« Any person who, by the use of force or the threat of serious detriment or other restriction of another's freedom to act compels another to carry out an act, to fail to carry out an act or to tolerate an act, shall be liable to a custodial sentence not exceeding three years or to a monetary penalty. »

First of all both Lauren REEVES and Mahim KHAN tried to enforce in

Switzerland huge amounts of money (millions of punitive damages) that are in Switzerland highly illegal, what they knew because they were both represented by Swiss attorneys.

Secondly and in view of the above, they filed their freezing order in Switzerland knowing that there were no connection to Switzerland. As a matter of fact all the elements of the case concern directly the US.

Thirdly, both of these women acted in Switzerland without having at least tried to enforce the concerned judgments in the US neither against our client nor against the two of his companies. Regarding Mahim KHAN her freezing order application presents one more shocking aspect next to all the above-mentioned ones : she tried to enforce in Switzerland an US judgment which is not even final. As a result and according to our client, both Lauren REEVES and Mahim KHAN committed an attempted coercion towards him. The two above mentioned criminal complaints are dealt by a public Prosecutor in Geneva : Adrian HOLLOWAY, who has a leading function in the public Prosecutor's office. Furthermore he's member of the political party called UDC, which is a strong right-wing political party.

- The one against Lauren REEVES is registered under reference : P./22539/2021.
- The one against Mahim KHAN is registered under reference : 23339/2021.

Our client currently doesn't have any concrete result about his criminal complaints filed in Switzerland, the proceedings having just begun (November 2021). . . .

Yours sincerely,
ARTHUR SEPPEY
Avocat au barreau

Defendant Attorney Allred's Illegal Actions Furthering the Criminal Enterprise

Upon information and belief, Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs assert that Defendant Allred, conspired with the other United States-Based Attorney Defendants, including Goldberg, Leal, Mochkatel, Bloom, Fudali, Dordick, Griffith, Goldstein, Chora, and Bakhtiar, to carry on with their criminal enterprise aimed at harming Plaintiff David and The Entity Plaintiffs.

The United States-Based Attorney Defendants did, and continue to, coach Litigating Defendants to lie and to mischaracterize their interactions with Plaintiff David and to file spurious lawsuits against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs

in order to deprive Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs of their property.

Note: Do we have any examples other than this one: Carl Bowen Affidavit stating that Rita told him that Defendant Allred coached her about what to say in the court proceedings. Rita also stated that Allred told her to lie about the allegations against Plaintiff David. Carl said that Rita stated that Allred told her she cannot recant and that Rita also stated to Carl that Allred has threatened that if she does recant, she will have to pay all of Allred's attorneys' fees and court costs, which significantly intimidated her. Rita also stated that Allred told her to lie about the allegations against Plaintiff David.

Insert texts and coaching

Mahim Khan Trial: Illegal and Unethical Acts of Attorney Defendants Allred, Goldberg, Leal and Mochkatel and Defendant The California Bar's Failure to Respond, Let Alone to Intervene, in the Interests of Justice

Plaintiff David's legal counsel Attorney Murray Greenberg wrote a letter to the State Bar of California Office of Chief Trial Counsel Intake Department setting forth the manifest abuse of process in the *Mahim Khan* case by Attorney Defendants Allred, Goldberg, Leal and Ms. Mochkatel.

In relevant part, Greenberg's letter, dated April 29, 2020, stated:

I, Murray B. Greenberg, Esq. submit this complaint on behalf of Alkiviades ("Alki") David against attorneys Gloria Allred, Nathan Goldberg, Dolores Y. Leal and Renee Mochkatel based on their professional misconduct in the case held before Judge Michelle Williams Court in Los Angeles Superior Court, Central District Case No. BC654017 entitled MAHIM KHAN, Plaintiff v. HOLOGRAM USA, Inc.; ALKI DAVID PRODUCTIONS, INC.; FILMON TV, INC.; ALKIVIADES ("ALKI") DAVID, an individual; and DOES 1 through 25, Defendants.

"This was a highly contentious lawsuit which involved allegations of battery and harassment against the defendant, Mr. David and associated companies. The above-named attorneys used dishonest means and violated their ethical responsibilities

during the trial which hampered Mr. David's ability to properly mount a defense.

The most egregious ethical breach involved the manipulation of a joint exhibit list by plaintiff's attorneys which caused a doctored list to be filed with the court. As if this action was not serious enough, the plaintiff's attorneys also removed the signature page with defendant's attorney's (renowned litigator and trial attorney, Ellyn S. Garofalo) signature **ADD AS A FOOTNOTE ELLYN'S FILING ON THIS ISSUE** affixed to it from a previous agreed upon version (See Attachment 3 EXHIBIT A – page 31). They then attached it to the fraudulent version (Attachment 3 EXHIBIT B – page 31) when she was unavailable. Mr. Goldberg then signed the exhibit list and filed it with the court.

This was done without the knowledge, permission or authorization of Ms. Garofalo or anyone else in her office. (Attachment 3 Declaration of Ellyn S. Garofalo page 2, paragraphs 6-9).

A comparison between the doctored document and the original agreed upon version indicates that one document was added (EXHIBIT B, page 5 - Ex. #131 – “Dr. Reading Documents”) and three documents were deleted (EXHIBIT B, page 30 – Exs. #647, 648 and 649).

Ms. Leal and Ms. Mochkatel were two other attorneys listed on the pleading as well as Gloria Allred who is a partner of the law firm. In addition to the above referenced misconduct, the attorneys for plaintiff sought to exclude documents that were previously produced to plaintiff's attorneys by indicating falsely to the court that they were not disclosed or produced in discovery. Based upon the fact that the documents were Bates stamped, these items were in fact provided to plaintiff's attorneys during discovery (Attachment 3 Declaration of Ellyn S. Garofalo page 1, paragraphs 2 -3).

During the closing argument, Mr. Goldberg indicated on several occasions that Mr. David did not call witnesses on his behalf. He also suggested that if he were not culpable, witnesses would have testified for him. (See Attachment 10 – page 83, lines 27-28, page 84, lines 1-4; page 146, lines 20-27; page 147, lines 1-4 and page 148, lines 17-25). This was done even though the judge had previously ruled outside the jury's presence that Mr. David would

not be able to call any witnesses (including himself) on his behalf.(See Attachments 3 through 9 – Motions in Limine by plaintiff, response by defendants and court rulings) This created a false and unfair impression to the jury.

By filing a doctored document purporting to be a joint exhibit list, making a false statement to the court regarding the status of discovery in order to gain an unfair advantage in litigation and creating a false impression to the jury, attorneys Gloria Allred, Nathan Goldberg, Dolores Y. Leal and Renee Mochkatel breached their ethical responsibility under Rule of Professional Conduct, rule 3.3 Candor

Toward the Tribunal; rule 3.4 Fairness to Opposing Party and Counsel; rule 5. Responsibilities of Managerial and Supervisory Lawyers; rule 8.4 Misconduct; and Business and Professions Code section 6106 Moral Turpitude.

Insert a link to the entire complaint to the State Bar of California.

The Defendant Attorneys' illegal enterprise activity will extend beyond the initial period of time when the predicate acts commenced because litigation continues in the suit filed by Elizabeth Taylor and the *Mahim Khan* case is on appeal. Defendant Allred continues to further the criminal enterprise by utilizing illegal tactics to obstruct justice, both in the U.S. and in Switzerland, as she seeks to collect on a judgment in the *Mahim Khan* case despite that case being on appeal before the Supreme Court of California.

Defendants Allred's, Bloom's and The Collection Defendant Attorneys' Illegal Actions in Switzerland to Further Their Criminal Enterprise and Obstruct Justice

Defendants Allred, Bloom, Marc Gillieron and Emilie Theintz and Chabrier Avocats, SA (“The Collection Defendant Attorneys”) and Litigating Defendants Reeves and Khan violated United States Law and Swiss Law by seeking to illegally collect money and property from Plaintiff David, *and members of his family having nothing to do with any of the lawsuits addressed in this Complaint.*

Specifically, the Collection Defendant Attorneys obstructed justice and committed extortion by attempting to collect money and property from Plaintiff David, including \$55 Million in punitive damages based solely on the trial court order in *Mahim Khan*, knowing that making such collection efforts was unlawful: 1) because **an appeal was ongoing - and still is**; and 2) Punitive damages are not available under Swiss law. Swiss courts refuse to award punitive damages even if the applicable foreign law provides for such damages (Article 135(2) Swiss Private International Law).

The Collection Defendant Attorneys knowingly and wilfully participated in a racketeering enterprise aimed at extorting money from Plaintiff Alki and the Entity Plaintiffs. Defendants Oren Warshavsky, Baker Hostetler, Marc Gillieron, as a partner in Chabrier Avocats, SA, Emilie Theintz, an associate in Chabrier Avocats, SA, a law firm based in Geneva Switzerland.

Defendants Allred, Bloom and Swiss Counsel Illegally Further the Enterprise

Defendants Allred and Bloom continue to further the criminal enterprise by

utilizing illegal tactics to obstruct justice, both in the U.S. and in Switzerland, as she seeks to collect on a judgment in the *Khan* case despite that case being on appeal before the Supreme Court of California. Defendant Allred has violated relevant Swiss law in seeking to collect punitive damages as such damages are prohibited in Switzerland. Punitive damages are not available under Swiss law. Swiss courts refuse to award punitive damages even if the applicable foreign law provides for such damages (Article 135(2) Swiss Private International Law).

Upon Information and Belief, Defendants Allred, Bloom, Gillieron and Theintz and Chabrier Avocats, SA (“The Collection Defendant Attorneys”) violated United States Law and Swiss Law by seeking to collect money and property from Plaintiff David, *and members of his family having nothing to do with any of the lawsuits addressed in this Complaint*. Specifically, the Collection Defendant Attorneys obstructed justice and committed extortion to further their racketeering enterprise by attempting to collect money and property from Plaintiff David, including \$55 Million in punitive damages based solely on the trial court order in *Mahim Khan*, knowing that making such collection efforts was unlawful: 1) because an appeal was ongoing - and still is; and 2) Punitive damages are not available under Swiss law. Swiss courts refuse to award punitive damages even if the applicable foreign law provides for such damages (Article 135(2) Swiss Private International Law).

Upon information and belief, the Defendant Collection Attorneys wilfully and intentionally defamed Plaintiff David, in violation of Swiss law, to further their wrongful enterprise to obstruct justice, use mail and wife fraud to harm Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs, and to commit bribery and extortion, as more fully set forth herein.

Obstruction of Justice *Jones v.*

Defendant Attorney Chora placed a judgment lien on the PayPal account owned by Plaintiff Entity Hologram U.S.A., seeking to garnish funds from that account to collect on the Judgment awarded to Litigating Defendant Chastity Jones. In *Jones*, the jury returned a special verdict, awarding her \$591,300 in economic damages, \$1,500,000 in past noneconomic damages, and \$1,000,000 in future noneconomic damages. After a second phase of trial, the jury awarded Jones \$8 Million in punitive damages **against Plaintiff David only - not against any of the Entity Plaintiffs.**

Upon information and belief, Defendant Chora followed inappropriate and unlawful collection procedures, both in the United States and United Kingdom by seeking to enforce judgments obtained by the United States-Based Attorney Defendants on behalf of the Litigating Defendants as against the Plaintiff Entities' PayPal accounts in the United States and in the United Kingdom.

Dordick and Bakhtiar - Jane Doe Matter - add

Upon Information and Belief, Defendants Allred, Marc Gillieron and Emilie Theintz and Chabrier Avocats, SA (“The Collection Defendant Attorneys”) violated United States Law and Swiss Law by seeking to collect money and property from Plaintiff David, *and members of his family having nothing to do with any of the lawsuits addressed in this Complaint.* Specifically, the Collection Defendant Attorneys obstructed justice and committed extortion by attempting to collect money and property from Plaintiff David, including \$55 Million in punitive damages based solely on the trial court order in *Mahim Khan*, knowing that making such collection efforts were unlawful: 1) because an appeal was ongoing - and still is; and 2) Punitive damages are not available under Swiss law. Swiss courts refuse to award punitive damages even if the applicable foreign law provides for such damages (Article 135(2) Swiss Private International Law).

Swiss Criminal Proceedings Demonstrate that Litigating Defendants Chasity Jones and Mahim Khan have Defamed Plaintiff Alki as Have The Defendant Swiss Attorneys

Beilage 1: Amended Judgment vom 10. September 2020

2. Das Dispositiv des Urteils lautet wie folgt:

« **NOW THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that Plaintiff Lauren Reeves shall have and recover damages as follows:

As against Defendants Hologram USA, Inc., Aiki David Productions, Inc., and Alkiviades David, jointly and severally, for compensatory damages the sum of: **\$650,000** with interest thereon at the rate of ten (10%) percent per annum from the date of the entry of the Judgment, January 7, 2020 until paid.

As against Defendant Alkiviades David individually for punitive damages the sum of: **\$4,350,000** with interest thereon at the rate of ten (10%) percent per annum from the date of the entry of the Judgment, January 7, 2020 until paid.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that

Pursuant to the Court's Order of July 22, 2020, Plaintiff Reeves shall have and recover from said Defendants jointly and severally:

Attorneys' fees in the amount of **\$1,299,675.00**, and costs in the amount of **\$65,346.02**, plus interest thereon at the rate of ten percent (10%) per annum from the date of entry of this Amended Judgment until paid. »

In freier Übersetzung:

«**DARUM WIRD ANGEORDNET, ERKANNT UND BESCHLOSSEN**, dass der Klägerin Lauren Reeves folgender Schadenersatz zusteht:

Gegen die Beklagten Hologram USA, Inc., Aiki David Productions, Inc., and Alkiviades David, gesamtschuldnerisch, als Schadenersatz die Summe von: **\$650'000** zuzüglich Zinsen in Höhe von zehn (10%) Prozent pro Jahr ab dem Datum des Urteilseintritts am 7. Januar 2020 bis zur Zahlung.

Gegen den Beklagten Alkiviades David einzeln als Strafzuschlag zum Schadenersatz die Summe von: **\$4'350'000** zuzüglich Zinsen in Höhe von zehn (10 %) Prozent pro Jahr ab dem Datum der Urteilsverkündung am 7. Januar 2020 bis zur Zahlung.

ES WIRD FERNER ANGEORDNET, ERKANNT UND BESCHLOSSEN, dass

Gemäß der gerichtlichen Verfügung vom 22. Juli 2020 hat die Klägerin Reeves von den Beklagten gesamtschuldnerisch folgende Ansprüche

Anwalts honorare in Höhe von **\$1'299'675.00** und Kosten in Höhe von **\$65'346.02**, zuzüglich Zinsen in Höhe von zehn Prozent (10%) pro Jahr ab dem Datum des Eintritts

MOVE - Ellyn's Theory: We have now filed your new trial motion in the Chasity Jones case. The motion will be heard by the original judge, Judge Ongeko, on August 16, 2019. New trial motions are rarely granted. However, we have a good argument that there was no admissible evidence of your net worth and thus the punitive damages award must be stricken, or substantially reduced. Interestingly, the Bloom Firm (in another example of their incompetence) filed a motion in the Taylor case which supports our argument in the Jones new trial motion that there was no admissible evidence of punitive damages, and thus the award *must* be set aside or it is "automatically reversible" on appeal. This argument, made to obtain financial discovery in the Taylor case, supports our argument in the new trial motion and makes it difficult if not impossible for Jones to defend the punitive damages award. In short, they are now adverse to their own client. We will have fun with this at the hearing and it should be very helpful to our argument.

EINGEGANGEN
05. Nov. 2021

Marc GILLIERON
Partner

mg@chabrier.ch

Emilie THEINTZ
Associate

Regionalgericht Oberland **EINSCHREIBEN**

15. OKT. 2021

Regionalgericht Oberland
Verwaltungsgebäude Selve
Scheibenstrasse 11B
3800 Thun

Postaufgabe Nr. 14. 10. 21

021

mloads/211014%20Attachments%20request%20for%20CV%2021%202670.pdf

Page view | Read aloud | Add text | Draw | Highlight

A. Forderungen der Antragstellerin

1. Mit Urteil vom 3. Februar 2021 (nachfolgend: «das Urteil») verurteilte der Superior Court of the State of California Herrn Aliviades DAVID (nachfolgend: «Herr DAVID») oder «der Geschädigte») wegen sexueller Belästigung von Frau Mahim KHAN (nachfolgend: «Frau KHAN») oder «die Geschädigte»).

Beilage 1 Corrected Amended Judgment vom 3. Februar 2021

2. Das Dispositiv des Urteils lautet wie folgt:

« NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Plaintiff Mahim Khan recover from said Defendants Aki David Productions, Inc., Filmon TV, Inc., and Aliviades ("Aki") David, jointly and severally for damages in the amount of

\$8,250,000 with interest thereon at the rate of ten percent (10%) per annum from the date of entry of the Judgment on January 21, 2020 until paid.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Plaintiff Mahim Khan recover from said Defendant Aliviades ("Aki") David damages in the amount of

\$50,000,000 with interest thereon at the rate of ten percent (10%) per annum from the date of the entry of the Judgment on January 21, 2020 until paid.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that

Pursuant to the Court's Order of September 1, 2020, Plaintiff Khan shall have and recover from Defendants Aki David Productions, Inc., Filmon TV, Inc., and Aliviades ("Aki") David, jointly and severally:

Attorneys' fees in the amount of **\$1,388,885**, and costs in the amount of **\$74,165.60**, plus interest thereon at the rate of ten percent (10%) per annum from the date of entry of this Corrected Amended Judgment until paid. »

In feiner Übersetzung

«DARUM WIRD ANGEORDNET, ERKANNT UND BESCHLOSSEN, dass der Klägerin Mahim Khan von den Beklagten Aki David Productions, Inc., Filmon TV, Inc., and Aliviades ("Aki") David, gesamtschuldnerisch, Schadenersatz in Höhe von:

\$8,250,000 zuzüglich Zinsen in Höhe von zehn Prozent (10%) pro Jahr ab dem Datum des Urteilsverkehrs am 21. Januar 2020 bis zur Zahlung.

DARUM WIRD ANGEORDNET, ERKANNT UND BESCHLOSSEN, dass der Klägerin Mahim Khan von dem Beklagten Aliviades ("Aki") David Schadenersatz in Höhe von:

INSERT: POLYGRAPH IMAGES FROM TOP OF DOCUMENT

<https://www.instagram.com/p/B1Vhe9NgUoC/?igshid=YmMyMTA2M2Y=> INSTAGRAM POLYGRAPH

Mail Fraud

- 1. David - got emails/letters/phone calls from Lisa Bloom - in what context did she state to David that Alki was a rapist. We need dates/specifics.**
- 2. Swiss Defendants wrote to Swiss Counsel - we need dates and to prove they communicated with them - Beatrix or Mr. Seepey?**
- 3. Chora - communications trying to collect PayPal -**
- 4. Dordick and Bakhtiar - Jane Doe Matter - add**
- 5. Griffin:**

Wire Fraud

The Law: Courts have recognized a variety of means of communications, including facsimile, telex, modem, and Internet transmissions, as constituting “wire, radio, or television communication[s].” See, e.g., *United States v. Selby*, 557 F.3d 968, 978-79 (9th Cir. 2009) (defendant’s act of sending a single email was “sufficient to establish the element of the use of the wires in furtherance of the scheme”); *United States v. Drummond*, 255 Fed. Appx. 60, 64 (6th Cir. 2007)(affirming wire fraud conviction where defendant made airline reservation with stolen credit card over the Internet); *United States v. Pirello*, 255 F.3d 728 (9th Cir. 2001) (affirming sentence of defendant who used the Internet to commit wire fraud).

Allred Wire Fraud: She held two press conferences With Mahim Kahn

outside of the Beverly Hills police station.

 Statement by Gloria Allred regarding the police report filed by, Mahim Khan, ...

Goldberg: He participated in the press conference with Allred after the *Khan* verdict. Lauren Reeves press conference:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IHSwzNsO6xk&t=1219s> - Defamed

My law partners Leal, Allred, Mochkatel -

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IHSwzNsO6xk&t=1219s>


Allred, Goldberg, Leal, Mochkatel:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yT1ZReqJCDQ>

My law partners, Nathan Goldberg, Dolores Leal and Renee Mochkatel,

First Cause of Action

FEDERAL RICO 18 U.S.C. 1862(b)



The image shows a screenshot of a social media post. On the left is a document titled "CONFIDENTIAL POLYGRAPH RE-EXAMINATION REPORT" with the GFS logo. The report contains a table with two rows of questions and their corresponding physiological reactions and examiner opinions.

QUESTION	EXAMINEE'S PHYSIOLOGICAL REACTIONS RECORDED ON POLYGRAPH CHARTS	OPINION OF POLYGRAPH EXAMINER
1	No Significant Physiological Reactions or Disturbances	No Deception Indicated (NDI) The Examinee Has Told the Truth
2	No Significant Physiological Reactions or Disturbances	No Deception Indicated (NDI) The Examinee Has Told the Truth

Below the table, the report states: "The polygraph charts and physiological reactions were extensively reviewed during the data analysis. It is the examiner opinion (additionally supported by a computer algorithm analysis ONS-1) that the examinee has **TOLD THE TRUTH** when answered the pertinent questions listed in Section 2 above. Based on the test results above, made on 5/15/19 at the examiner office, shortly prior to taking the re-examination polygraph test. Following the review of the polygraph charts and the re-examination test results with the examinee, the examiner confirmed that the examinee had no further questions prior to his departure from the office. Respectfully Submitted, Examiner, Oded Geller, President, APA Full Member # 7662, Global Polygraph & Security LLC, Toll: 424-302-2895, www.9021foolish.com"

On the right, a social media post from @alkidavid is visible. The post includes a comment from @lisabloomessq: "see you in court tomorrow - what you see here is nothing compared to what's coming to you and your firm. Prepare for total humiliation." and another comment from @cj.ivix: "I had no idea who you were before the @hotboxinpodcast interview but dude you're my idol now". The post has 41,594 views and is dated August 18, 2019.

ADD other images from the Polygraph - Alki - the other

**polygraph images are in the drive but the “share” and “copy and paste” functions do not migrate those images over to this document -
Sooooo - what do we do?**

67

Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs restate paragraphs 1 through XXXX of this Complaint.

18 U.S.C. 1862(b) states that “It shall be unlawful for any person through a pattern of racketeering activity to acquire or maintain, directly or indirectly, any interest in or control of any enterprise, which is engaged in, or the activities of which, affect, interstate or foreign commerce.”

The Attorney Defendants conspired to pursue vexatious litigation against Plaintiff David and the Entity Defendants by filing spurious and unfounded lawsuits against Plaintiffs, seeking to extort Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs, and trying to force Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs to settle the Litigating Defendants’ spurious claims.

Upon information and belief, **(Alli and Carl Affidavits provide this good faith basis) INSERT CARL AND ALLI’S AFFIDAVITS**

Attorney Defendants Girardi, Allred, Bloom, Goldberg and Chora

intentionally conspired to recruit employees and independent contractors of Plaintiffs FilmOn and Anakando and former employees of the Entity Plaintiffs, to independently file tort lawsuits against Plaintiff David alleging he committed sexual misconduct in order to extract and extort money from Plaintiff David and the Defendant Entities in furtherance of an enterprise specifically designed to enrich Defendants and the Individual Defendants with whom they conspired to concoct and fabricate non-meritorious claims against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs.

Specifically, Defendant Attorneys and their agents and employees mercilessly and maliciously pursued Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs, in courts as well as in the media, seeking to force Plaintiff David to settle with the parties who sued Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs. *Alki wishes to point out that with regard to a nexus between Allred and Dordick* - this pleading should show a connection between those Defendant Attorneys as to Jane Doe but also



From the sun to your fridge.
Learn about our commitment to brewing with solar electricity™



GAVIN NEWSOM - Published June 22, 2021 11:26am EDT

Gavin Newsom has longstanding ties to Dem power player facing lawsuits, investigations

Girardi has backed many a Democratic candidate, including Newsom

Los Angeles Times @latimes

He could get Govs. Gavin Newsom and Jerry Brown on the phone with ease, associates said.

He and then-wife Erika Jayne regularly traveled to Washington, D.C., where then-Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid appointed him to a Library of Congress board.



latimes.com

'Real Housewives' attorney Tom Girardi used cash and clout to forge political c...



Tom Girardi was one of Gavin Newsom's most important political/financial contributors

Major Donor and Independent Expenditure Committee Campaign Statement (Government Code Sections 84200-84216.5)		Type or print in ink. TOM GIRARDI		Date Stamp	CALIFORNIA FORM 461
<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment	Statement covers period from <u>07/01/2018</u> through <u>12/31/2018</u>	Date of election if applicable: (Month, Day, Year)		1Q	For Official Use Only
SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON REVERSE					
1. Name and Address Of Filer			3. Summary		
NAME OF FILER (Include names(x) of all affiliated entities whose contributions are included in this statement.) <u>Thomas V. Girardi</u>			(Amounts may be rounded to whole dollars.)		
MAILING ADDRESS (NO. AND STREET)			1. Expenditures and contributions (including loans) of \$100 or more made this period. (Part 5.)		
CITY STATE ZIP CODE <u>Los Angeles CA 90017</u>			\$ <u>34200.00</u>		
RESPONSIBLE OFFICER (If filer is other than an individual) <u>Thomas V. Girardi</u>			2. Unitemized expenditures and contributions (including loans) under \$100 made this period.		
			\$ <u>0.00</u>		
2. Nature and Interests of Filer (Complete each applicable section.)			3. Total expenditures and contributions made this period. (Add Lines 1 + 2.)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A FILER THAT IS AN INDIVIDUAL MUST LIST THE NAME, ADDRESS, AND BUSINESS INTERESTS OF EMPLOYER OR, IF SELF-EMPLOYED, THE NAME, ADDRESS, AND NATURE OF THE BUSINESS			SUBTOTAL \$ <u>34200.00</u>		
NAME OF EMPLOYER/BUSINESS <u>Girard & Keese</u>		BUSINESS INTERESTS <u>Law Firm</u>	4. Total expenditures and contributions made from prior statement. (Enter amount from Line 5 of last statement filed. If this is the first statement for the calendar year, enter zero.)		
ADDRESS OF EMPLOYER/BUSINESS <u>Los Angeles CA 90017</u>			\$ <u>43000.00</u>		
			5. Total expenditures and contributions (including loans) made since January 1 of the current calendar year. (Add Lines 3 + 4.)		
			TOTAL \$ <u>77200.00</u>		

Conspiracy Plaintiffs assert, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§1962(b)(c) and (d), that the Attorney Defendants, their clients, experts, employees and agents, conspired with one another and intended to and willfully conducted an

inter-related, clear and continuous pattern of racketeering activity to benefit Defendant Attorneys' unlawful enterprise, and that Defendants continue to do so, by, inter alia, wilfully and intentionally conspiring against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs by filing spurious lawsuits against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs (which entity plaintiffs were named in which suits?), who were, and continue to be, victimized by Attorney Defendants' continuous pattern of racketeering conducted to benefit their enterprise, including mail fraud, extortion, falsification of a signature in a civil proceeding, bribery, and aiding and abetting, all cognizable as RICO predicate acts pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 1862(b)(c) and (d).

Specifically, the Attorney Defendants filed unethical, spurious lawsuits against Plaintiff David without investigating the merits of those actions, unethically coaching their clients and witnesses about what to say, only to then often dismiss some of those complaints years later when trial proceedings were forthcoming. Further, the Defendant Attorneys conspired to tamper with witnesses and to have witnesses collude against Defendant David and the Entity Plaintiffs by sharing the actions against Plaintiffs David and the Plaintiff Attorneys. Defendant Allred kept Defendant Mahim Kahn and Defendant Lauren Reeves as clients, but sent Defendant Elizabeth Taylor to Defendant Bloom, her daughter. After Defendants Reeves, Taylor and Jones conspired to

sue Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs, Subsequently, Defendant Bloom was retained by Defendant Chastity Jones, all with an effort to extort money from Plaintiff David and the Plaintiff Entities.

In October, 2019, Judge Ongkeko of the Los Angeles Superior Court admonished Defendant Bloom for significantly overstating her already very expensive law firm bills submitted to the Judge when Jones won a compensatory award against Plaintiff David. Tellingly, the Judge said, “If I were a Bloom client - one that was actually paying out of pocket instead of these sad ambulance chasing contingency cases - I’d be very careful to go over the firm’s bills before I paid anything,” Judge Ongkeko said. Such over-billing and seeking to bilk Plaintiff David is just one of innumerable events demonstrating that Defendant Bloom extorted money from Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs.

Defendant Allred wrongfully sought to enforce a judgment against Plaintiff David *and his family*, none of whom were parties to any relevant litigation filed by Defendant Attorneys, in Switzerland in *Mahim Kahn v. Alki David, et. al*, in violation of Swiss law. The Swiss courts rejected those efforts as appellate proceedings are ongoing in that case, causing Plaintiff David extreme expense and further damaging his reputation as such filings are public record. Further, in *Lauren Reeves v. Alki David, et. al*, Defendant Allred again

sought to enforce a judgment against Plaintiff David *and his family*, none of whom were parties to any relevant litigation filed by Defendant Attorneys.

In response, Plaintiff David filed criminal proceedings in Switzerland against Defendants Allred, Bloom and Girardi alleging that those Defendants conspired to discredit and extort Plaintiff David - **append**. Upon information and belief, the Swiss Court will impose???? **can Swiss Counsel provide proper language summarizing that country's laws.**

Defendant Allred's corrupt, wilful and intentional actions, constituting criminal acts under relevant Swiss law, were committed under the auspices of an otherwise legitimate enterprise, Allred, Maroko & Goldberg.

The Attorney Defendants' conspiring to extort and extorting money from Plaintiff David and the Attorney Defendants, and the Attorney Defendants, were actions committed under the auspices of otherwise legitimate enterprises as follows: Allred, Maroko & Goldberg, The Law Offices of Lisa Bloom; Girardi Keese; Dordick Law Corporation; Chora, Young & Manasserian and The Law Offices of Ebby S. Bakhtiar.

Accordingly, Plaintiff David and the Entity Defendants sue all Attorney Defendants for injuries to Plaintiff David's and the Entity Plaintiffs' businesses and properties directly and proximately caused by reason of the Attorney Defendants' mail fraud, bribery, extortion, witness tampering, predicate claims

pursuant to RICO.

Moreover, Girardi's former partner, Gary A. Dordick, formed his law offices independently and coordinated and conspired with Girardi, Allred and Lisa Bloom, sharing documents in the various lawsuits against Plaintiff Alki David and the Entity Plaintiffs. At times, those documents were not revealed in discovery in the various proceedings.

Further, Defendant Keith Griffin, formerly of the Girardi firm has joined the Dordick Law Firm, whose principal is Defendant Gary A. Dordick.

Note: Relevant law instructs that we need a strong factual nexus suggesting coordination between the defendants.

- 1. Quote Ellyn's signature being forged and the witnesses and exhibits list being manipulated - the judge did nothing.**

Defendant Attorneys Girardi, Allred, Goldberg and Bloom were part of an initial enterprise consisting of a union or group of individuals with a common purpose that are associated in fact. Defendant Attorneys Delores Y. Leal, Renee Mochkatel, Dordick, Griffin, Choro, **WHAT OTHERS?** also joined the enterprise. ADD: Recount the details of the following:

The enterprise has as its purposes, extortion, mail fraud, wire fraud, and obstruction of justice, in order to deprive Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs of their money and property.

The relationship of the parties consists of informal and formal agreements and understandings to cause harm, threaten, embarrass and defame through unlawful means, including, but not limited to, the filing of spurious

lawsuits with longevity - a scheme that began in 2014.

The members of the enterprise are manifold and they share a common purpose of enhancing their reputations as attorneys, and of seeking to extort payments from Plaintiff David and the Plaintiff Entities by means of their illegal concerted actions and conspiracies. Each and every member of the enterprise intended to engage in the conduct harming Plaintiff Alki and the Entity Plaintiffs and they did so with actual knowledge of their illegal activities.

The various harassing practices asserted against, and lawsuits filed against, Plaintiff David and the Plaintiff entities share an uncanny and unethical pattern. First, Defendant Attorneys would coach employees of Plaintiff David's companies about what to say at press conferences called by Defendant Attorneys Allred, Goldberg, and Bloom after Defendant Attorneys filed hastily composed legal complaints against Plaintiff David and Plaintiff Entities. **Do we need to add Girardi? Did Goldberg have any press conferences?**

Upon information and belief, Defendant Attorneys filed lawsuits without conducting a due diligence investigation into the verity of the allegations set forth in those lawsuits. Not only did those filings constitute manifest abuse of the legal process as they were entirely devoid of any supporting documentary or factual evidence, as proscribed by relevant ethical standards governing attorneys practicing law. They also are cognizable under RICO because the filing of those

spurious lawsuits furthered the Defendant Attorneys' criminal enterprise and thereby harmed Plaintiff David and the Plaintiff Entities. Members of the enterprise who intended to engage in the witness tampering to harm Plaintiff Alki and the Entity Plaintiffs in the *Mahim Kahn* lawsuit were Attorney Defendants Girardi, Allred, Goldberg, Leal and Mochkatel and Attorney Defendants did so with actual knowledge of their illegal activities.

Here, we need to allege: that there was an association in fact having a common purpose and that there is evidence regarding the continuity of the illegal enterprise organization and that its members function as a unit. *U.S. v. Christensen*, 828 F.3d 763, 780 (9th Cir. 2015)(quoting *U.S. v. Eufrazio*, 935 F.3d 553, 557 n. 29 (3d Cir. 1991)(internal quotation marks omitted). *Odom v. Microsoft Corporation*, 486 F.3d 541 (9th Cir. 2007)(en banc), *cert denied*, 128 S.Ct. 464 (2007).

To do so, we need to show: 1) evidence of hierarchy - Girardi-Allred-Bloom and now Goldberg, etc. 2) Role differentiation, chain of command - we must discuss this to demonstrate that there is an association-in-fact enterprise.

Insert quotes from this trial transcript [FW: Ali Botto - Vol. 13 - October 4, 2019 Testimony.pdf - filmonpersonal@gmail.com - Gmail \(google.com\)](#) Also demonstrate that the Court in Mahim Khan was made aware of the conspiring

between the various former employees who interacted with one another to concoct claims against Plaintiff David. [FW: 139167.491786 Khan v Hologram USA, Inc, et al. \(BC654017\) - filmonpersonal@gmail.com - Gmail \(google.com\)](#)

Defendant Goldberg in the *Reeves* case represented Reeves¹⁶ and he shared documents that Defendant Goldberg and his partners and firm had not listed on the list of witnesses and exhibits her filed in that matter. He wrongfully sought to use undisclosed documents he exhibits he obtained from Bloom.

Not only did the Attorney Defendants commit such wrongdoing during the *Reeves* trial, Plaintiffs' counsel in *Mahim Khan* committed gross ethical violations during his closing argument and violated Plaintiff David's constitutional and due process rights. [Khan ARB conformed - Google Docs](#) - Add specifics.

Rothman sought a meet and confer meeting about interrogatories he had generated in that litigation, referencing Reeves' use of a phone (more than one phone perhaps?) that she claimed helped bolster her claims against

¹⁶ *Elizabeth Taylor, an individual, Chastity Jones, an individual v. Alkiviades David, an individual, Hologram USA, Inc. a Delaware Corporation, Hologram USA Entertainment, a Delaware Corporation, FilmOn Media Holdings, Inc., a Delaware Corporation, FilmOn TV, Inc., a Delaware Corporation; FilmOn TV Networks, Inc., a Delaware Corporation; Alki David Productions, Inc., a Delaware Corporation, Anakando Media Group USA et. al.*, Case No. BC649025, Superior Court of the State of California, Los Angeles-Central District.

Plaintiff David.¹⁷

Second Cause of Action
18 U.S.C. Sec. 1862 (c)

Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs restate paragraphs 1 through XXXX of this Complaint,

18 U.S.C. Sec. 1862 (c) provides, “It shall be unlawful for any person employed by or associated with an enterprise to engage in or the activities of which affect, interstate or foreign commerce, to conduct or participate, directly or indirectly, in the conduct of such enterprise’s affairs through a pattern of racketeering activity.”

Upon information and belief, the Attorney Defendants’ enterprise

¹⁷

https://mail-attachment.googleusercontent.com/attachment/u/0/?ui=2&ik=68ad5627e5&attid=0.1&permmsgid=msg-f:1581550983980536602&th=15f2cc3d9254531a&view=att&disp=safe&sadbat=ANGjdJ9-5bpRafrPc6mzVjKA3XI0-ayZU7civdXpsd83db8fANLjou0wH6gkHQitU6I6glB2oTWBBW3QENef-uHEQi8uCTr1Q106GKiQb8tbarCdfhAFWgg8LVANTNjBJZXxG_eQ5K1A8XJKB64JVy6sSB4rzkkOYY7AzKnZRG7jIhW7bXi_EK8DHuWxf9H3W4q6iyThtqtJBxZwBdYxPWUZZDF2Vsm1Du3tU6RaeVn8ufRVXWamy_uUWhGy4kXh5Fli8MF8eud_NL8D0ar9SyjM5ea_nlukQ_Ouj2umUYkIza- FELth5XIFPHuCRQgdWjYo99iaUX8N_U2VZMxcWK67W8DNcnwloh3FTheQqZSkSFac2raYoI7HFVL425j2jvqeTPLgkQBjTweZA9ykbUM8Kp6xMcIJ969CgAdEJMmjzxnFQw4zYeJJhp9amLuIl-qop28yDIa8xy5ecquyB5FkqeKM8Vax3XdWZCtKZs4cA_XVf8HwXOpVk9_wGwh0P7hGJVy0pR3RBKb_T3WUN7Fxc-GPWI0fOpGZRnhhgH_NWsNR8Jo5rvrVxEpWM6S0-st_YhCrVHLp3xIE1zaIGXMmH6ly89w6yrnBWvcD6B1_7VIPVeipqhqd-Zc3-hHlnO7z45w1B9HhJQbE1j7_hTBReDMIYx7oV95ahboF1QE1osLcNltAf-Z0UIpvgXld7JqtlwpJjGDS-1DuNYyfYHCNDNnH3JTUJyaD4nVtOpBQkgYcfUh62uPjeTOgolbeQqBik19h4D7N5Zr_rilbG_aXiqHZzHo5miZxhrEL49AJ5Rgb5c3kGMUMqQNjWGplIm4PSkKa_L6Cpe

consisted of an ongoing association that functions as a continuing unit motivated by the Attorney Defendants' wanting to harm Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiff's property and conducting their activities furthering the criminal enterprise by engaging in activities affecting interstate and foreign commerce.

Upon information and belief, the Attorney Defendants' pattern of racketeering activities were actions taken to perpetrate fraud against Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs.

Defendants Girardi, Allred and Bloom made threats intended to cause economic harm to Plaintiff David and to the Entity Plaintiffs. The threats were intended to extort settlements. The threats were intended to cause reputational harm to Plaintiff David. The threats were wrongful because Defendants Girardi, Allred and Bloom used the threats and maligned Plaintiff David's reputation to try to obtain property to which they were not entitled.

Defendants Girardi, Allred, Bloom and Goldberg are guilty of extortion because they sought money or property to which they did not have, and could not reasonably believe they had, a claim or right.

Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs suffered damages and incurred substantial losses as a result of Defendants Girardi, Allred, Bloom's and Goldberg's

implementation and continuation of their extortionate claims.

The Defendant Attorneys tampered with the Litigating Defendants' testimony, and with the evidence Defendant Attorneys used to assert the spurious complaints made by Defendant Litigants, all with an effort to extort money from Plaintiff David and the Plaintiff Entities.

The Defendant Attorneys tried to extort Plaintiff David and the Plaintiff Entities by making spurious allegations against those Plaintiffs, often calling press conferences to assert their nefarious claims and touting the large award against Plaintiff David in *Mahim Khan*, even as it remains under appeal. *See e.g.*, <https://www.phillymag.com/news/2021/12/21/gloria-allred>.

The Attorney Defendants' conspiring to extort, and their extorting, money and property from Plaintiff David and the Attorney Defendants, and the Attorney Defendants tampering with witnesses, were actions committed under the auspices of otherwise legitimate enterprises as follows: Allred, Maroko & Goldberg, The Law Offices of Lisa Bloom; Girardi Keese; Dordick Law Corporation; Chora, Young & Manasserian and The Law Offices of Ebby S. Bakhtiar.

Upon information and belief, Attorney Defendant Chora, counsel in *Chastity Jones*, ruined \$5 Million in business lost by Plaintiffs David and the Entity Plaintiffs. **Alki - we need specificity as to which entities?**

Further, Attorney Defendant Chora caused PAYPAL to terminate Plaintiff FilmOn's two accounts. Note to counsel:

The CFO of FilmOn provided this information and perhaps counsel would like this in an affidavit?

According to [Isabel Ann Peterman](#), Financial Controller, Filmon TV

UK Group:

“Filmon had two accounts with PayPal 1) sales@filmon.com (old accounts,

used for over 10 years) and onlinesales@filmon.com (new opened in Jan 21 as a result of suspending the old one)

They were closed with explanation “in breach of user agreement”, consequently, all funds held there were deducted and no specific reasons were provided of the cases of violation PayPal was using as an argument. Filmon lost half of its customers as a result.

a) Some PayPal stats:

- PayPal was the preferred choice of payment for our Filmon customers.
- In the last year (2020) there were a total of 61959 orders placed successfully via PayPal with an estimated value converted in GBP of £1.2m.
- Since Feb 1, 2021 when PayPal took down our account, the total amount of canceled PayPal subscriptions (users finally gone) was 5,415 (equivalent to lost sales orders per **month**)

The total amount of expected and not received incomes in 2021 because of canceled subscriptions based on 2020's sales rate is £1.3m, without embedding any possible further lost opportunities due to company marketing efforts etc.

b) Enclosing a file of customer complaint cases. (Theses are most representative cases. There were higher number or complaints in general but in some of them. the customers did not specifically mention PayPal, so they were excluded).

c) List of canceled PayPal subscriptions (file name “r2.xls”) with encrypted emails for data protection purposes as a backup.

Note: Ms. Peterman provided a table demonstrating the amount of monies that PayPal still has in segregated funds, stating the value of those funds in USD, EU, and BGB - pounds. I could not copy that table from her email so I am asking her to send it as an attachment and I will insert it as soon as I hear from her.

**Third Cause of Action
18 U.S.C. Sec. 1862 (d)**

Conspiracy - Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs restate paragraphs 1 through XXXX of this Complaint,

18 U.S.C. Sec. 1862 (d) states “It shall be unlawful for any person to conspire to violate any of the provisions of subsection (b) or (c) of this section.”

Howard v. Am. Online, Inc, 208 F.3d 741, 751 (9th Cir. 2000) instructs that to establish a 18 U.S.C. Sec. 1862 (d) violation, the Attorney Defendants either had to establish an agreement that constitutes a substantive violation of RICO or the Attorney Defendants had to agree, commit or participate in the violation of at least two predicate offenses. *Salinas*, 522 U.S. at 63-64 instructs, quoting Justice Holmes, that a conspiracy may exist even if a conspirator does not agree to commit or facilitate each and every part of the substantive offense.

In this case, Attorney Defendants conspired to target Plaintiff Alki David and the Plaintiff Companies.

The initial enterprise participants, Defendants Girardi, Allred, Bloom and Goldberg, knowingly agreed to facilitate the activities of each of them as they operated and managed a criminal enterprise and extorted Plaintiffs David and The Entity Plaintiffs. All Attorney Defendants conspired with the initial enterprise participants.

Upon information and belief, Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs assert that the Attorney Defendants' pattern of racketeering activity is to target well-known individuals, such as Plaintiff David, with accusations of improper behavior, typically under the guise of a purported, falacious sexual harassment claims, and to threaten to make those allegations public, all with a wilful intent to get the target to pay up.

The Attorney Defendants unlawfully and tortiously attempted to, and in some instances did, extract millions of dollars from Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs by a concerted enterprise that consisted of calculated media campaigns, threats and intimidation, and abusive litigious actions.

Upon information and belief, the Attorney Defendants are individually vicariously liable for their co-conspirators' illegal actions conducted to further the illegal enterprise.

Plaintiff David and The Entity Plaintiffs allege that the clients of the Defendant Attorneys, Mahim Khan, Elizabeth Taylor; Lauren Reeves, and Chastity Jones (Litigating Defendants), knowingly and wilfully participated in the interrelated enterprise calculated to extort money from Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs.

Defendant Allred and her client, Mahim Kahn, attempted to file criminal charges against Plaintiff David, but, upon information and belief, were told by Beverly Hills police that they lacked the necessary evidence to support such allegations. Upon information and belief, Defendant Allred called a news conference at the Beverly Hills police station on the date she attempted to file criminal charges against Plaintiff David with the express purpose of intimidating, harassing and defaming Plaintiff David.

No such criminal charges were ever filed. Indeed, in a taped press conference, Defendant Allred stated that the standards of proof between *Mahim Kahn's* civil action and any purported criminal action thwarted the filing of any criminal action. **Link to Taped News Conference.** Nevertheless, upon information and belief, despite the fact that there was no basis for filing a criminal action against Plaintiff David, Defendant Allred arranged to have a false article published in the LA Times so as to further cause Plaintiff David to suffer. [Self-appointed ambassador for 'wronged men'](#)

[of #MeToo Alki David faces criminal complaint - Los Angeles Times \(latimes.com\)](#) No such criminal charges were ever filed.

As to Defendant Allred, her pattern of manipulating witnesses, and, upon information and belief, paying the witnesses to testify in a particular fashion, is a pattern of obstruction of justice and witness tampering that is more than fifty years old. In the landmark Supreme Court Case, *Roe v. Wade*, upon information and belief, Defendant Allred coached Plaintiff Roe about what to testify to without verifying the allegations and thereby commenced her pattern of committing obstruction of justice and tampering with witnesses, as evidenced by Plaintiff Roe's informing, soon before she died, that Allred committed those acts. See [Gloria Allred On The New Norma McCorvey Documentary \(forbes.com\)](#).

Specifically, the Attorney Defendants filed unethical, spurious lawsuits against Plaintiff David without investigating the merits of those actions, unethically coaching their clients and witnesses about what to say, only to then often dismiss some of those complaints years later when trial proceedings were forthcoming. Further, the Defendant Attorneys conspired to tamper with witnesses and to have witnesses collude against Defendant David and the Entity Plaintiffs by sharing the actions against Plaintiffs David and the Plaintiff Attorneys. Defendant Allred kept Defendant Mahim Kahn and Defendant

Lauren Reeves as clients, but sent Defendant Elizabeth Taylor to Defendant Bloom, her daughter. After Defendants Reeves, Taylor and Jones conspired to sue Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs, Subsequently, Defendant Bloom was retained by Defendant Chastity Jones, all with an effort to extort money from Plaintiff David and the Plaintiff Entities. **Insert Information from prior counsel Ellyn.**

Defendant Allred wrongfully sought to enforce a judgment against Plaintiff David *and his family*, none of whom were parties to any relevant litigation filed by Defendant Attorneys, in Switzerland in *Mahim Kahn v. Alki David, et. al*, in violation of Swiss law. The Swiss courts rejected those efforts as appellate proceedings are ongoing in that case, causing Plaintiff David extreme expense and further damaging his reputation as such filings are public record.

Further, in *Lauren Reeves v. Alki David, et. al*, Defendant Allred again sought to enforce a judgment against Plaintiff David *and his family*, none of whom were parties to any relevant litigation filed by Defendant Attorneys.

In response, Plaintiff David filed criminal proceedings in Switzerland against Defendant Allred - append.

Defendant Allred's corrupt, wilful and intentional extortion, constituting criminal acts under relevant Swiss law, were committed under the

auspices of an otherwise legitimate enterprise, Allred, Maroko & Goldberg.

The Attorney Defendants' conspiring to extort and extorting money from Plaintiff David and the Attorney Defendants, and the Attorney Defendants tampering with witnesses, were actions committed under the auspices of otherwise legitimate enterprises as follows: Allred, Maroko & Goldberg, The Law Offices of Lisa Bloom; Girardi Keese; Dordick Law Corporation; Chora, Young & Manasserian and The Law Offices of Ebby S. Bakhtiar.

Accordingly, Plaintiff David and the Entity Defendants sue all Attorney Defendants for conspiring to injure to Plaintiff David's and the Entity Plaintiffs' businesses and properties directly and proximately caused by reason of the Attorney Defendants' extortion, witness tampering, mail fraud and bribery, all of which constitute predicate claims pursuant to RICO.

Fourth Cause of Action Interference with Contract Relations

Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs restate paragraphs 1 through XXXX of this Complaint. **Chora**

Defendant Attorneys' Intentionally Interfered in Plaintiff's Contracts

Alki - we need to go through each contract that each company had and we must meet these elements:

Elements of the tort of intentionally interfering with the performance of a

contract are: (1) a valid contract between plaintiff and a third party; (2) defendant's knowledge of this contract; (3) defendant's intentional acts designed to induce a breach **or disruption** of the contractual relationship; (4) actual breach or disruption of the contractual relationship; and (5) resulting damage.

(Ixchel Pharma, LLC v. Biogen, Inc. (2020) 9 Cal.5th 1130.)

Discuss specifics with Alki re:

<https://www.upcounsel.com/tortious-interference-with-contract-california>

Upon information and belief, Attorney Defendant Chora, counsel in *Chastity Jones*, ruined \$5 Million in business lost by Plaintiffs David and the Entity Plaintiffs. **Alki - we need specificity as to which entities?**

Further, Attorney Defendant Chora caused PAYPAL to terminate Plaintiff FilmOn's two accounts. Note to counsel:

The CFO of FilmOn provided this information and perhaps counsel would like this in an affidavit?

Also Alki had to send an email to Chora in February, 2022, saying:

Att JOSEPH CHORA

Mr Chora you must CEASE & DESIST from further communication with ALKIVIADES DAVID and anyone related to him.

Despite being repeatedly told that there is an active FBI investigation you have continued to extort and harass me and my family. You have sent Subpoenas to family members of mine just in order to harass.

Considering that you are a lawyer in California your actions are coercive and criminal. I accuse you of being a Girardi lawyer.

I will find the links and publish them. In the meantime please cease and desist or face criminal prosecution now or in the future.

I have copied members of the FBI who you can refer to this case to.

Sincerely

Alki David

According to [Isabel Ann Peterman](#), Financial Controller, Filmon TV

UK Group:

“Filmon had two accounts with PayPal 1) sales@filmon.com (old accounts,

used for over 10 years) and onlinesales@filmon.com (new opened in

Jan 21

as a result of suspending the old one)

They were closed with explanation “in breach of user agreement”, consequently all funds held there were deducted and no specific reasons were provided of the cases of violation PayPal was using as an argument. Filmon lost half of its customers as a result.

a) Some PayPal stats:

- PayPal was the preferred choice of payment for our Filmon customers.
- In the last year (2020) there were a total of 61959 orders placed successfully via Paypal with an estimated value converted in GBP of £1.2m.
- Since Feb 1, 2021 when PayPal took down our account, the total amount of canceled PayPal subscriptions (users finally gone) was 5,415 (equivalent to lost sales orders per **month**)

The total amount of expected and not received incomes in 2021 because of canceled subscriptions based on 2020’s sales rate is £1.3m, without embedding any possible further lost opportunities due to company marketing efforts etc.

b) Enclosing a file of customer complaint cases. (Theses are most representative cases. There were higher number or complaints in general but in some of them. the customers did not specifically mention PayPal, so they were excluded).

c) List of canceled PayPal subscriptions (file name “r2.xls”) with encrypted emails for data protection purposes as a backup.

Note: Ms. Peterman provided a table demonstrating the amount of monies that PayPal still has in segregated funds, stating the value of those funds in USD, EU, and BGB - pounds. I could not copy that table from her email so I am asking her to send it as an attachment and I will insert it as soon as I hear from her.

Fifth Cause of Action

Interference with Prospective Contract Relations

Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs restate paragraphs 1 through XXXX of this Complaint,

The Prospective Contract Relations consist of the thwarted IPO's. Alki - we need to go through each contract that each company had and we must meet these elements:

We must be very specific as to these elements:

Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs (**which ones?**) claims that [name of defendant] intentionally interfered with an economic relationship between [him/her/nonbinary pronoun/it] and [name of third party] that probably would have resulted in an economic benefit to [name of plaintiff]. To establish this claim, [name of plaintiff] **Plaintiffs must prove all of the following:**

1. That [name of plaintiff] and [name of third party] were in an economic relationship that probably would have resulted in an economic benefit to [name of plaintiff];
2. That [name of defendant] knew of the relationship;
3. That [name of defendant] engaged in [specify conduct determined by the court to be wrongful];
4. That by engaging in this conduct, [name of defendant] [intended to disrupt the relationship/ [or] knew that disruption of the relationship was certain or substantially certain to occur];
5. That the relationship was disrupted;
6. That [name of plaintiff] was harmed; and
7. That [name of defendant]'s conduct was a substantial factor in causing [name of plaintiff]'s harm.

New September 2003; Revised June 2013, December 2013

Directions for Use

Sixth Cause of Action
Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress¹⁸

Plaintiff David hereby alleges and incorporates by reference, as though fully set forth herein, the allegations in paragraphs 1 through XXXX of this Complaint,

<https://www.justia.com/trials-litigation/docs/caci/1600/1600>

As alleged herein, All Defendants engaged in outrageous conduct towards Plaintiff David, with the intention to cause, or with reckless disregard of the probability of causing, Plaintiff David to suffer severe physical, emotional and psychological distress.

As a direct result of said outrageous conduct, Plaintiff David has and continues to suffer damages as set forth in Paragraphs X through Y hereof.

¹⁸ **Negligent infliction of emotional distress -**

Note - in California to prove negligent infliction of emotional distress, there must be a special relationship between the Plaintiff seeking the award and the Defendant causing the emotional distress.

REFERENCE:

<https://www.justia.com/trials-litigation/docs/caci/1600/1600>.

<https://www.justia.com/trials-litigation/docs/caci/1600/1620>

Accordingly, I recommend that we just sue for Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress unless Alki can establish a special relationship between him and one or more of the Defendants.

Press Conferences - Allred & Bloom

Alleging that Alki committed rape - Girardi stated that and also Bloom stated that - details and particulars need to be specific

The Defendant Attorneys coaching the Litigating Defendants to conspire against Alki and the Plaintiff Entities and seek to extort settlement monies - add details with specificity and state with specificity how that caused Alki emotional harm.

In addition to the expense of defending Defendant Attorneys' and Litigating Defendants' spurious lawsuits, incurring a total amount of \$ _____ in attorneys' fees and costs, the time required to defend against those actions resulted in lost business opportunities costing Plaintiff David and the Plaintiff Entities a total amount of \$ _____.

Subsequently, Defendant Allred and her client, Mahim Kahn, attempted to file criminal charges against Plaintiff David, but, upon information and belief, were told by Beverly Hills police that they lacked the necessary evidence to support such allegations. Upon information and belief, Defendant Allred called a news conference at the Beverly Hills police station on the date she attempted to file criminal charges against Plaintiff David with the express purpose of intimidating, harassing and defaming Plaintiff David. Defendant Allred's actions in calling the press conference **and what other of her actions** have caused

emotional harm to Defendant David. No such criminal charges were ever filed. Nevertheless, upon information and belief, Defendant Allred arranged to have a false article published in the LA Times. [Self-appointed ambassador for 'wronged men' of #MeToo Alki David faces criminal complaint - Los Angeles Times \(latimes.com\)](https://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-alki-david-faces-criminal-complaint-2018-08-22-story.html)

Despite repeated requests that the LA Times retract the article, it still exists, documenting how Allred manipulated the media to further defame Plaintiff David.

Lisa Bloom called Alki a rapist - uttered that defamatory comment to David Haigh - insert his affidavit.

Plaintiff David's counsel has informed the court in one of the many spurious lawsuits urged against him that his mental health is in a downward spiral.

<https://www.courthousenews.com/coke-bottling-heirs-mental-health-in-downward-spiral-lawyer-says>

Is there emotional harm to anyone else? Family members? Business associates?

**Seventh Cause of Action
Defamation Of Alki David**

Litigating Defendant Khan participated in the Swiss Attorney Defendants' illegal efforts to enforce immature judgments against Plaintiff David, knowing that her case was on appeal in the United States, and thus was not collectible in Switzerland. Further, Defendant Khan wrongfully and illegally defamed Plaintiff David in Switzerland, alleging David had been "convicted" of sexual harassment, all the while knowing through her Swiss counsel that her wrongly accusing him of being "convicted" constituted wilful defamation (art. 174 SCC) in Switzerland.

Litigating Defendant Lauren Reeves participated in the Swiss Attorney Defendants' illegal efforts to enforce a judgment against Plaintiff David for punitive damages, which are not collectible in Switzerland. Defendant Reeves participated in the Swiss Attorney Defendants' illegal efforts to enforce a punitive damages award, knowing through her Swiss Attorneys that punitive damages are not collectible in Switzerland, as more fully detailed below.

Further, Defendant Khan wrongfully and illegally defamed Plaintiff David in Switzerland, alleging he had been "convicted" of sexual harassment, all the while knowing through her Swiss counsel that her wrongly accusing him of being "convicted" constituted wilful defamation (art. 174 SCC) in Switzerland.

Attorney Defendant Bloom defamed Plaintiff David by overtly pretending

to be inappropriately touched by Plaintiff David *during trial* - the second time the Jury recognized Bloom's actions as inappropriate - Elizabeth Taylor - and the jury voted 8-4 in Plaintiff's favor, believing there was a fraud on the Court and that Taylor and her mother misled the Court. **Alki did you film this or do you have a transcript?**

Attorney Defendants Goldberg and Gloria Allred defamed in *Khan* and *Reeves* saying in trial that David - aspersions had been found guilty of wrongdoing by the SEC fraud trial with SEC as well as re: press conference as well in trial - used over and over that Plaintiff David and had committed a crime in St. Kitts - convicted of transporting marijuana - LINK not true - misdemeanor CAN WE SHOW

Said David Didn't want to represent himself - in trial - refer to State Bar complaint.

Chastity Jones -has been on TV in afternoon TV shows - **link Allred excerpts**

Mahim Khan and Lauren Reeves have defamed in Switzerland - repeat

Litigating Defendant Lauren Reeves participated in the Swiss Attorney Defendants' illegal efforts to enforce a judgment against Plaintiff David for punitive damages which are not collectible in Switzerland. Defendant Reeves participated in the Swiss Attorney Defendants' illegal efforts to enforce a punitive damages award, knowing through her Swiss Attorneys that punitive

damages are not collectible in Switzerland, as more fully detailed below.

Further, Defendant Khan wrongfully and illegally defamed Plaintiff David in Switzerland, alleging he had been “convicted” of sexual harassment, all the while knowing through her Swiss counsel that that her wrongly accusing him of being “convicted” constituted wilful defamation (art. 174 SCC) in Switzerland.

Specifically, in an opinion letter, Plaintiff David’s and The Entity Plaintiffs’ Swiss counsel, [Arthur Seppey](#), [Avocat au barreau](#), wrote to Swiss prosecutors, stating:

“Dear Colleague, We hereby refer to our client’s latest emails and to your request to receive an update concerning the Swiss current proceedings. As a result, you will find here a summary of the current Swiss criminal proceedings regarding our client. In the frame of his activities led through his companies based in the US, FilmOn. TV, Inc. (FilmOn hereinafter), Alki David Productions, Inc. (Delaware) (ADP hereinafter) and Hologram USA, Inc. (Delaware) (Hologram hereinafter), Mr. DAVID formerly employed Mrs. Lauren REEVES and Mrs. Mahim KHAN.

I. Lauren REEVES (a comedy writer, former model and comedy performer born on September 4th 1983) was employed as a writer for FilmOn (2015), as an employee charged to attract and write for comedians for Hologram (2016) and as a creative producer/host for ADP (2016). Lauren REEVES filed an application in California against our client for battery, sexual battery and sexual harassment asking for damages and punitive damages. On the basis of a popular jury’s decision (cf. **Bordereau plainte pénale 21-11-18, exhibit n° 9**), 58 our client and two of his companies (Hologram and ADP) have been sentenced to pay her :

- \$ 650'000 (compensatory damages)
- \$ 1'299'675 (attorneys’ fees)
- \$ 65'346.02 (proceedings costs) Our client has additionally been personally sentenced to pay to Lauren REEVES \$ 4'350'000 as punitive damages. Lauren REEVES, even though she never tried to enforce the above-mentioned judgment in the United States (US hereinafter), filed on October 14th 2021 a freezing in Switzerland against our client’s Swiss goods, including his real estate property in Gstaad, to enforce the above-mentioned judgment (cf. **Bordereau plainte pénale 21-11-18, exhibit n° 8**). By filing her freezing order, Lauren REEVES said that our client has been convicted in the US for sexual harassment. Lauren REEVES managed to freeze our client’s Swiss goods to enforce the judgment’s amounts except the \$ 4’350’000 of punitive damages. This Swiss judgment is now under appeal.

II. As did Lauren REEVES, Mahim KHAN, represented in the US by the same lawfirm (ALLRED MAROKO & GOLDBERG), filed an application in California against our client for battery, sexual battery and sexual harassment. On the basis of a popular jury's decision (cf. Bordereau plainte pénale 21-11-29, exhibit n° 6), our client and two of his companies (FilmOn and ADP) have been sentenced to pay her :

- \$ 8'250'000 (damages)
- \$ 1'398'885 (attorneys' fees)

59

- \$ 74'165.60 (proceedings costs)

Our client has additionally been personally sentenced to pay to Mahim KHAN \$ 50'000'000 as punitive damages.

Mahim KHAN, represented in Switzerland by the same law firm (CHABRIER AVOCATS) than Lauren REEVES filed on the same day than Lauren REEVES, which means on October 14th 2021, a freezing order against our client's Swiss goods, including his real estate property in Gstaad, to enforce the above mentioned judgment, even though she never tried to enforce it in the US beforehand (cf. Bordereau plainte pénale 21-11-29, exhibit n° 10). However, unlike Lauren REEVES, Mahim KHAN totally lost her Swiss judgment because the US judgment on which she based herself was not enforceable as an appeal has been introduced in the US by our client, which means that the judgment isn't final (when someone try to obtain a freezing order in Switzerland on the basis of a judgment, that judgment has to be final).

As a reaction to those freezing order applications against him in Switzerland our client filed a criminal complaint against Lauren REEVES on November 19th 2021 and against Mahim KHAN on November 30th 2021 in front of the Public prosecutor's office in Geneva. Both complaints, based on similar facts, denounce 4 Swiss criminal offences (https://www.fedlex.admin.ch/eli/cc/54/757_781_799/en) :

1. Defamation (art. 173 of the Swiss criminal code, SCC hereinafter)

Art. 173

« 1. Any person who in addressing a third party, makes an accusation against or casts suspicion on another of dishonourable conduct or of other conduct that shall be liable to damage another's reputation, any person who disseminates such accusations or suspicions, shall be liable on complaint to a monetary penalty. 2. If the accused proves that the statement made or disseminated by him corresponds to the truth or that he had substantial grounds to hold an honest belief that it was true, he is not liable to a penalty. 3. The accused is not permitted to lead evidence in support of and is criminally liable for statements that are made or disseminated with the primary intention of accusing someone of disreputable conduct without there being any public interest or any other justified cause, and particularly where such statements refer to a person's private or family life.

4. If the offender recants his statement, the court may impose a more lenient penalty or no penalty at all.

5. If the accused is unable to prove the truth of his statement, or if it is shown to be untrue, or if the accused recants his statement, the court must state this in its judgment or in another document. »

Both Lauren REEVES and Mahim KHAN said that our client has been convicted for

sexual harassment by the Superior Court of the State of California. First of all it's wrong because it doesn't exist a Superior Court of the State of California but many (the Los Angeles one in our client's case). Then, it's not a judge but a popular jury who has sentenced and not convicted our client. Furthermore our client has not been "convicted" for sexual harassment (civil cases) but sentenced to pay them indemnities which is completely different.

As a matter of fact our client has never been criminally convicted for any offence, sexual harassment included. As a result and according to our client, saying that both Lauren REEVES and Mahim KHAN committed a defamation towards him, dirtying his honour.

2. Wilful defamation (art. 174 SCC)

Art. 174

« 1. A person in addressing a third party, and knowing his allegations to be untrue, makes an accusation against or casts suspicion on another of dishonourable conduct, or of other conduct that shall be liable to damage another's reputation, any person who disseminates such accusations or suspicions, knowing them to be untrue,

shall be liable on complaint to a custodial sentence not exceeding three years or to a monetary penalty.

2. If the offender has acted systematically to undermine the good reputation of another, he shall be liable to a custodial sentence not exceeding three years or to a monetary penalty of not less than 30 daily penalty units.¹⁹⁷

3. If the offender recants his statement before the court on the grounds that it is untrue, the court may impose a more lenient penalty. The court must provide the person harmed with a document confirming the recantation. »

Here the same explanation than the one used above for Defamation (art. 173 SCC) is taken up. The only difference is that this criminal offence is more serious because the perpetrator knows the innocence of the victim. Both Lauren REEVES and Mahim KHAN knew our client was innocent because they took part in the US proceedings, they also were represented by Swiss and US attorneys and finally they couldn't have ignored that the cases were civil ones and not criminal ones. As a result and according to our client, both Lauren REEVES and Mahim KHAN committed a wilful defamation towards him, dirtying his honour.

3. Attempted fraud (art. 146 SCC)

Art. 146

«¹ Any person who with a view to securing an unlawful gain for himself or another wilfully induces an erroneous belief in another person by false pretences or concealment of the truth, or wilfully reinforces an erroneous belief, and thus causes that person to act to the prejudice of his or another's financial interests, shall be liable to a custodial sentence not exceeding five years or to a monetary penalty.

²If the offender acts for commercial gain, he shall be liable to a custodial sentence not exceeding ten years or to a monetary penalty of not less than 90 daily penalty units.

³Fraud to the detriment of a relative or family member is prosecuted only on complaint. »
First of all both Mahim KHAN and Lauren REEVES tried to enforce in Switzerland millions of punitive damages meanwhile punitive damages are not only illegal in Switzerland : they are contrary to Swiss public order, in other words contrary to Swiss legal quintessence. By doing so they tried to trick the judge and the trial.

Secondly, both of these women tried to convince the judge that our client has been convicted for sexual harassment.

In other words they tried to lead the judge to make himself a misrepresentation of the US legal situation in order to obtain what they wanted.

As a result and according to our client, both Lauren REEVES and Mahim KHAN committed an attempted fraud (attempted fraud to the trial, which is a particular case of fraud) towards him.

4. Attempted coercion (art. 181 SCC)

Art. 181

« Any person who, by the use of force or the threat of serious detriment or other restriction of another's freedom to act compels another to carry out an act, to fail to carry out an act or to tolerate an act, shall be liable to a custodial sentence not exceeding three years or to a monetary penalty. »

First of all both Lauren REEVES and Mahim KHAN tried to enforce in Switzerland huge amounts of money (millions of punitive damages) that are in Switzerland highly illegal, what they knew because they were both represented by Swiss attorneys.

Secondly and in view of the above, they filed their freezing order in Switzerland knowing that there were no connection to Switzerland. As a matter of fact all the elements of the case concern directly the US.

Thirdly, both of these women acted in Switzerland without having at least tried to enforce the concerned judgments in the US neither against our client nor against the two of his companies. Regarding Mahim KHAN her freezing order application presents one more shocking aspect next to all the above-mentioned ones : she tried to enforce in Switzerland an US judgment which is not even final. As a result and according to our client, both Lauren REEVES and Mahim KHAN committed an attempted coercion towards him. The two above mentioned criminal complaints are dealt by a public Prosecutor in Geneva : Adrian HOLLOWAY, who has a leading function in the public Prosecutor's office. Furthermore he's member of the political party called UDC, which is a strong right-wing political party.

- The one against Lauren REEVES is registered under reference : P./22539/2021.
- The one against Mahim KHAN is registered under reference : 23339/2021.

Our client currently doesn't have any concrete result about his criminal complaints filed in Switzerland, the proceedings having just begun (November 2021). . . .

Yours sincerely,
ARTHUR SEPPEY
Avocat au barreau

JANE DOE VS ALKIVIADES DAVID, ET AL.

This Case Was Updated 1 Month Ago [Update Case Information Now](#)

- Download Docket
- Print Docket
- Share Docket
- Track Case Changes

JANE DOE VS ALKIVIADES DAVID, ET AL.

This Case Was Updated 1 Month Ago [Update Case Information Now](#)

Case Details

CASE NUMBER 20STCV37498 Track Case Changes	JUDGE Hon. Mel Red Recana Track Judge's New Case	VERDICT Unclassified
FILING DATE September 30, 2020	CATEGORY Wrongful Termination (General Jurisdiction)	CASE LAST UPDATE 1 Month Ago Update Case Information
LAST REFRESHED May 12, 2022	PRACTICE AREA Labor and Employment	
FILING LOCATION Los Angeles County, CA	MATTER TYPE Wrongful Termination	

sexual harassment allegations
magically disappeared
after three years of accusing me RAPE

Parties

Plaintiffs	Attorneys For Plaintiffs	Defendants	Attorneys For Defendants
Doe Jane	Bakhtiar Ebby S.	David Alkiviades Aka Alki David	Heather Fred D.
	Dordick Gary A.	Filmon.Tv Inc.	
	Girardi Thomas Vincent	Filmon.Tv La Inc.	

Eighth Cause of Action

Corporate Defamation Against WHAT PLAINTIFF ENTITIES?

DAMAGES

Plaintiffs have sustained damages in an amount to be determined at trial, including loss of prospective business relations, the cessation of ongoing business relations, **CAN ALKI CLAIM (AND PROVE) THE SEC SETTLEMENT OF 100 k is directly attributable to Defendants' actions?**

<https://sec.report/CIK/0001656589>

[Ylena Calendar - has damage information as do accountants.](#)

Move to damages All told, the Girardi Family Enterprise and the United States Based Attorneys' Illegal Enterprise stole \$1.75 Billion from Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs through their schemes which entirely destroyed Plaintiff David's legitimate business entities and public offerings on NASDAQ. Defendant Attorneys Goldberg, Bloom, and Chora repeatedly alluded before juries and judges that the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) had determined that Plaintiff David had committed fraud with regard to the IPOs. In fact, Plaintiff David and the SEC settled amicably, with a finding that Plaintiff David committed no wrongdoing whatsoever. Ironically, **WHAT COMPANIES** was fined \$120,000 to pay administrative costs to the SEC, after Plaintiff David's \$200 million investment had been destroyed and Plaintiff David had been defamed. Plaintiff

David and The Entity Plaintiffs seek treble damages, attorneys' fees, and punitive damages, for an amount in excess of \$6 Billion. **NOTE: Alki needs to establish a nexus between Defendants' actions and the SEC IPO's - On July 14, Barbara sent Fred/Veronica a request for documents.**

<https://www.sec.gov/divisions/enforce/claims/hologram.htm>

Alki needs to expand here: Defendants (Allred? Bloom? Both?) filed lawsuits alleging numerous spurious counts, only to retract the claims as trial approached. **We need specifics here.**

Pulled on the day of filing - SEC - Gloria Allred, Lisa Bloom. Call witnesses like Gary Shoefield and Peter VanPruissen and he slayed CFO officer of the FilmOn - they would write up all the people make them as their witnesses

Chastity Jones - \$11 million reduced by \$445,000 by Judge Rafaael Ongkeko - her out of pocket damages were excessive.

Mahim Kahn, a former production assistant for David's media companies, including FilmOn TV and Alki David Productions, Inc., consisting of \$8.25 million in compensatory damages and \$50 million in punitive damages. Khan was hired in October 2014 and quit about a year later awarded \$58.25 million for sexual battery

Subsequently, Defendant Allred and her client, Mahim Kahn, attempted to file criminal charges against Plaintiff David, but, upon information and belief, were told by Beverly Hills police that they lacked the necessary evidence to support such allegations. Upon information and belief, Defendant Allred called a news conference at the Beverly Hills police station on the date she attempted to file criminal charges against Plaintiff David with the express purpose of intimidating, harassing and defaming Plaintiff David.

No such criminal charges were ever filed. Nevertheless, upon information and belief, Defendant Allred arranged to have a false article published in the LA Times. [Self-appointed ambassador for 'wronged men' of #MeToo Alki David faces criminal complaint - Los Angeles Times](#)

latimes.com)

Indeed, no criminal charges have ever been filed against Plaintiff David in any jurisdiction. **Other than the St. Kitts thing.**

Extortion

Title 18 U.S.C. Section 875(d) also criminalizes the conduct engaged in by Defendants Girardi, Allred, Bloom and their employees and agents. That statute provides as follows:

Whoever, with the intent to extort from any person, firm . . . or corporation, any money or other thing of value, transmits in interstate . . . commerce any communication containing any threat to injure the property or reputation of the addressee or of another . . . or any threat to accuse the addressee or any other person of a crime, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

Defendants Girardi, Allred and Bloom made threats intended to cause economic harm to Plaintiff David and to the Entity Plaintiffs and were intended to extort settlements. The threats were intended to cause reputational harm to Plaintiff David - those threats were wrongful because Defendants Girardi, Allred and Bloom used the threats and maligned Plaintiff David's reputation to try to obtain property to which they were not entitled.

Defendants Girardi, Allred and Bloom are guilty of extortion because they sought money or property to which they did not have, and could not reasonably believe they had, a claim or right. Plaintiff Alki, accompanied by his then attorney Barry Rothman went to the

DA and reported Elizabeth Taylor and Mahim Kahn for trying to extort me by demanding \$ 2.2 Million dollars

Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs suffered damages and incurred substantial losses as a result of Defendants Girardi, Allred, and Bloom's implementation and continuation of the extortionate claims.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs pray that judgment be entered in their favor and against Defendants as follows.

1. For general damages in an amount to be determined at trial; Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1964(c), Plaintiffs respectfully request their compensatory damages at the statutory rate of ten percent. Additionally, pursuant to RICO, plaintiffs respectfully request an award treble the damages that Plaintiffs have sustained and the costs of the suit, including reasonable attorneys' fees.
2. For medical expenses, past, present and future - Alki - counseling? Medical?
3. For incidental expenses, past, present and future;
4. For punitive damages in an amount to be determined at trial;
5. For Attorney fees pursuant to
6. For costs of suit incurred herein;
7. For such other and future relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Strategy Questions Re: Damages: Plaintiffs have sustained damages in an amount to be determined at trial, including loss of prospective business relations, the cessation of ongoing business relations, **CAN ALKI CLAIM (AND PROVE) THE SEC SETTLEMENT OF 100 k is directly attributable to Defendants' actions?** <https://sec.report/CIK/0001656589>

IPO's interfered with - IPO's both stalled BOTH Hologram USA and

FOTV Inc., a Delaware and current Public offerings on the NASDAQ marketplaces. International Damage in an amount of at least \$600,000.

Note: Alki states that he spent more than \$100 million of his own money and reinvested many millions more from revenues in the companies - The audits of the IPO should help to prove those damages.

As to the First Cause of Action

As to the Second Cause of Action

As to the Third Cause of Action

As to the Fourth Cause of Action

As to the Fifth Cause of Action

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

Emotional health damages:

<https://www.courthousenews.com/coke-bottling-heirs-mental-health-in-downward-spiral-lawyer-says>

With regard to the defamation claim, Plaintiff David is seeking compensatory damages “for all physical injuries, emotional distress, psychological harm, anxiety, humiliation, physical and emotional pain, and suffering, family and social disruption, and other harm.”

Move to damages All told, the Girardi Family Enterprise and the United States Based Attorneys’ Illegal Enterprise stole \$1.75 Billion from Plaintiff David

and the Entity Plaintiffs through their schemes which entirely destroyed Plaintiff David's legitimate business entities and public offerings on NASDAQ. Defendant Attorneys Goldberg, Bloom, and Chora repeatedly alluded before juries and judges that the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) had determined that Plaintiff David had committed fraud with regard to the IPOs. In fact, Plaintiff David and the SEC settled amicably, with a finding that Plaintiff David committed no wrongdoing whatsoever. Ironically, **WHAT COMPANIES** was fined \$120,000 to pay administrative costs to the SEC, after Plaintiff David's \$200 million investment had been destroyed and Plaintiff David had been defamed. Plaintiff David and The Entity Plaintiffs seek treble damages, attorneys' fees, and punitive damages, for an amount in excess of \$6 Billion. **NOTE: Alki needs to establish a nexus between Defendants' actions and the SEC IPO's - On July 14, Barbara sent Fred/Veronica a request for documents.**

<https://www.sec.gov/divisions/enforce/claims/hologram.htm>

Specifically, the Attorney Defendants filed unethical, spurious lawsuits against Plaintiff David without investigating the merits of those actions, unethically coaching their clients and witnesses about what to say, only to then often dismiss some of those complaints years later when trial proceedings were forthcoming. Further, the Defendant Attorneys conspired to tamper with

witnesses and to have witnesses collude against Defendant David and the Entity Plaintiffs by sharing the actions against Plaintiffs David and the Plaintiff Attorneys. Defendant Allred kept Defendant Mahim Kahn and Defendant Lauren Reeves as clients, but sent Defendant Elizabeth Taylor to Defendant Bloom, her daughter. After Defendants Reeves, Taylor and Jones conspired to sue Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs, Subsequently, Defendant Bloom was retained by Defendant Chastity Jones, all with an effort to extort money from Plaintiff David and the Plaintiff Entities.

In October, 2019, Judge Ongkeko of the Los Angeles Superior Court admonished Defendant Bloom for significantly overstating her already very expensive law firm bills submitted to the Judge when Jones won a compensatory award against Plaintiff David. Tellingly, the Judge said, “If I were a Bloom client - one that was actually paying out of pocket instead of these sad ambulance chasing contingency cases - I’d be very careful to go over the firm’s bills before I paid anything,” Judge Ongkeko said. Such over-billing and seeking to bilk Plaintiff David is just one of innumerable events demonstrating that Defendant Bloom extorted money from Plaintiff David and the Entity Plaintiffs.

Defendant Allred wrongfully sought to enforce a judgment against Plaintiff David *and his family*, none of whom were parties to any relevant

litigation filed by Defendant Attorneys, in Switzerland in *Mahim Kahn v. Alki David, et. al*, in violation of Swiss law. The Swiss courts rejected those efforts as appellate proceedings are ongoing in that case, causing Plaintiff David extreme expense and further damaging his reputation as such filings are public record.

Further, in *Lauren Reeves v. Alki David, et. al*, Defendant Allred again sought to enforce a judgment against Plaintiff David *and his family*, none of whom were parties to any relevant litigation filed by Defendant Attorneys.

In response, Plaintiff David filed criminal proceedings in Switzerland against Defendant Allred - append. Upon information and belief, the Swiss Court will impose???? can Swiss Counsel provide proper language summarizing their country's laws.

Defendant Allred's corrupt, wilful and intentional actions, constituting criminal acts under relevant Swiss law, were committed under the auspices of an otherwise legitimate enterprise, Allred, Maroko & Goldberg.

The Attorney Defendants' conspiring to extort and extorting money from Plaintiff David and the Attorney Defendants, and the Attorney Defendants tampering with witnesses, were actions committed under the auspices of otherwise legitimate enterprises as follows: Allred, Maroko & Goldberg, The Law Offices of Lisa Bloom; Girardi Keese; Dordick Law Corporation; Chora,

Young & Manasserian and The Law Offices of Ebby S. Bakhtiar.

Accordingly, Plaintiff David and the Entity Defendants sue all Attorney Defendants for injuries to Plaintiff David's and the Entity Plaintiffs' businesses and properties directly and proximately caused by reason of the Attorney Defendants' extortion, witness tampering, mail fraud and bribery, all of which constitute predicate claims pursuant to RICO.

Plaintiff David and the Plaintiff Entities have incurred unnecessary, onerous, and undue expenses, both in legal and expert costs, but also in lost profits and opportunities. Their actions also seriously damaged Plaintiff David's reputations.

WHERE IS THIS BEST TO PLACE IN TEXT? INSERT: POLYGRAPH IMAGES FROM TOP OF DOCUMENT

<https://www.instagram.com/p/B1Vhe9NgUoC/?igshid=YmMyMTA2M2Y=> INSTAGRAM POLYGRAPH

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff David and The Entity Plaintiffs hereby demand a jury trial on all

issues so triable in the Complaint.

DATED:

NAME OF FIRM

By: _____

INSERT certificate of service

BARRY K. ROTHMAN
GORDON J. ZUIDERWEG
MARTIN J. KOTOWSKI
ROBIN B. RATNER
LAWRENCE M. BOESCH
LAWRENCE J. WALDINGER

LAW OFFICES OF
BARRY K. ROTHMAN
1901 AVENUE OF THE STARS
SUITE 370
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067

TELEPHONE: (310) 557-0062
TELECOPIER: (310) 557-9080
E-MAIL: BKR@BKRLEGAL.COM
WWW.BKRLEGAL.COM
OF COUNSEL
FREDERIC R. BRANDFON

May 2, 2016

VIA E-MAIL

alki@filmon

Alki David

Re: Alki David / Taylor-Khan

Dear Alki:

The cat's out of the bag. I've written a letter to Taylor-Khan's attorneys telling them the Settlement Agreement will not be signed and accusing them of extortion.

Enclosed you will find a response from Khan's attorney only dated April 28, 2016, from Bernard Alexander.


It is interesting to note that Elizabeth Taylor's attorney, Samuel Cleaver, has not yet responded to my letter, only Alexander has responded on behalf of Khan. All communication prior to now has been joint communication by them.

They accuse me of deceiving them and tell me they will file something with the court. Whether they will file it remains to be seen.

Please review the enclosed, Alki, and please call me upon the conclusion of your review.

Best regards,

LAW OFFICES OF BARRY K. ROTHMAN



Barry K. Rothman

BKR/cf
Enclosure

BARRY K. ROTHMAN
GORDON J. ZUIDERWEG
MARTIN J. KOTOWSKI
LAWRENCE M. BOESCH
ALAN E. WALCHER

LAW OFFICES OF
BARRY K. ROTHMAN
1901 AVENUE OF THE STARS
SUITE 370
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067

TELEPHONE: (310) 557-0062
TELECOPIER: (310) 557-9080
E-MAIL: BKR@BKRLEGAL.COM
WWW.BKRLEGAL.COM
OF COUNSEL
FREDERIC R. BRANDFON

May 2, 2016

VIA E-MAIL
tfahr@akgllp.com

Tracy Fahr

VIA E-MAIL
sam@gsclaverlaw.com

Sam Cleaver

Re: Alki David / Taylor-Khan

Ms. Fahr and Mr. Cleaver:


Enclosed please find five separate third-party Declarations for your review, all executed under penalty of perjury, from the following individuals:

1. Gary Shoeield
2. Carl Dawson
3. Chasity Jones
4. Alli Botto
5. Maria Netsvetaeva

We believe that your clients are attempting to deceive you. Please be so advised.

Very truly yours,

LAW OFFICES OF BARRY K. ROTHMAN


Barry K. Rothman

BKR/cf

Enclosures

cc: Alki David (via e-mail w/o enclosure)

LAW OFFICES OF BARRY K. ROTHMAN

From: Mary Rizzo [mary.rizzo@anakando.com]
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2016 11:53 AM
To: 'Law Offices Of Barry K. Rothman'
Subject: RE: Alki David/Taylor-Khan - Revised Declaration
Attachments: image001.png; image003.jpg; MaryRizzo Declaration.pdf

Hello Gordon,

Thank you for making changes. After reviewing the old texts, I wanted to add in more to my declaration as I want to be as accurate as possible. Please see changes.

Thank you

Mary Rizzo
Advertising Account Manager

FilmOn.TV

FilmOn TV Networks
338 N. Canon Drive, Penthouse
Beverly Hills, California 90210
O: 310 598 7699
C: 818 404-9640
E: mary.rizzo@filmon.com
W: www.filmon.com

Anakando Media Group <http://www.ANAKANDO.com>
www.filmon.com | www.hologramusa.com | www.3dhead.com
www.battlecam.com | www.tvmix.com | www.shockya.com | www.advirally.com

The information contained in this message may be privileged and confidential and protected from disclosure. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.

From: Law Offices Of Barry K. Rothman [mailto:bkr@bkrlegal.com]
Sent: Monday, February 8, 2016 11:00 AM
To: 'Mary Rizzo' <mary.rizzo@anakando.com>
Subject: Alki David/Taylor-Khan - Revised Declaration
Importance: High

Ms. Rizzo:

We are in receipt of your February 6, 2016 email. A revised Declaration is attached for your review and signature. If the revised Declaration meets with your approval, please date and sign it where indicated and email the signed Declaration to our offices.

Time is of the essence.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

DECLARATION OF MARY RIZZO

I, Mary Rizzo, declare as follows:

1. This Declaration is based upon my personal knowledge and personal participation in the events described. If called to testify as a witness, I could and would testify competently as follows.
2. I am employed by Filmon, TV, Inc. I have been employed by FilmOn TV, Inc., for about one year. I started as a sales representative, but I am now an advertising account manager. For six months, my desk was next to that of Elizabeth B. Taylor. During that time, I interacted with Elizabeth B. Taylor on a daily basis. For about six weeks, my desk was next to that of Mahim Khan. During that time, I interacted with Mahim Khan on a daily basis.
3. Elizabeth B. Taylor was very emotional and would often complain. Mahim Khan liked to gossip about people in the office. On multiple occasions she would complain about her job and she didn't go to school to be a personal assistant. I would hear her often say that she wanted to quit because she was unhappy with her job position.
4. I understand that Elizabeth B. Taylor and Mahim Khan are accusing Alki David, the president and CEO of Film TV, Inc., and Alki David Productions, Inc., of sexual harassment, including inappropriate touching. I was surprised when I heard this.
5. I do not recall any sexual harassment in regard to Elizabeth Taylor. I do not recall Ms. Taylor being subjected to sexual advances, sexual conduct, or sexual comments by Mr. David or anyone else. I do not recall Mr. David inappropriately touching Ms. Taylor or using crude language around her or in any way acting inappropriately around her. I do not recall anyone inappropriately touching Ms. Taylor or acting inappropriately around her. While at FilmOn,


Elizabeth B. Taylor never complained to me or told me that she was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched. No one else at our offices ever told me that Ms. Taylor was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched. After Ms. Taylor was terminated, she texted me stating that Mr. David had touched her and that she was getting an attorney to sue Mr. David. This was the first time Ms. Taylor had told me or indicated to me that she had been sexually harassed or inappropriately touched by Mr. David. On another occasion on text, I told Ms. Taylor that she needed to give me back my belongings that I lent her and never received back. I also told her over the text that she needed to seek help because how she was replying was threatening. I understand that Ms. Taylor is saying that Mr. David would invite her into his office, close the door, and then sexually harass her. It appears to me to be highly unlikely that Mr. David would invite Ms. Taylor into his office and then close the door. On one occasion, I observed Ms. Taylor enter Mr. David's office and close the door. Mr. David immediately reopened the door.

6. I understand that Mahim Khan is also accusing Alki David of sexual harassment, including inappropriate touching. I do not recall any sexual harassment in regard to Ms. Khan. I never observed Ms. Khan being subjected to sexual advances, sexual conduct, or sexual comments by Mr. David or anyone else. I do not recall Mr. David inappropriately touching Ms. Khan or using crude language around her or in any way acting inappropriately around her. I do not recall anyone inappropriately touching Ms. Khan or acting inappropriately around her. Mahim Khan never complained to me or told me that she was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched. No one else at the offices ever told me that Ms. Khan was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched

//

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed in Beverly Hills, California, on February 8, 2016.

Mary Rizzo 

BARRY K. ROTHMAN
GORDON J. ZUIDERWEG
MARTIN J. KOTOWSKI
ROBIN B. RATNER
LAWRENCE M. BOESCH
LAWRENCE J. WALDINGER

LAW OFFICES OF
BARRY K. ROTHMAN
1901 AVENUE OF THE STARS
SUITE 370
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067

TELEPHONE: (310) 557-0062
TELECOPIER: (310) 557-9080
E-MAIL: BKR@BKRLEGAL.COM
WWW.BKRLEGAL.COM
OF COUNSEL
FREDERIC R. BRANDFON

April 28, 2016

VIA E-MAIL
tfehr@akgllp.com

Tracy Fehr

VIA E-MAIL
sam@gscleaverlaw.com

Sam Cleaver

Re: Alki David / Taylor-Khan

Ms. Fehr and Mr. Cleaver:

Please be advised that the Settlement Agreement will not be executed by Mr. David. He has reviewed it, and he deems it to be extortionate.

As well, you should be advised that as a consequence thereof, I have communicated the Settlement Agreement to the Beverly Hills Police Department and the Los Angeles District Attorney's Office, who have reviewed it.

There will be no settlement. We have five Declarations from five individuals under penalty of perjury who worked at FilmOn and witnessed the events that occurred, all of whom attest to the fact that none of the claims that you have asserted have in fact occurred. You will receive the Declarations under separate cover.

All rights are reserved against each of you and your clients.

Very truly yours,

LAW OFFICES OF BARRY K. ROTHMAN


Barry K. Rothman

BKR/cf

cc: Alki David (via e-mail)



Salary Addendum to Employee Contract

This Addendum is for the contract between Alki David Productions, Inc., a subsidiary Company of Film On TV, Inc., and Employee, Mahim Kahn, in which this Salary Addendum is to become effective as of, 05/04/2015. The Employment Contract is attached and made a part of this document.

The parties, for good consideration, hereby agree as follows:

1. Negotiated Rate of Pay has been modified as follows with the text in bold. And the text containing a strikethrough deleted.

New Payment Terms: \$20 / HR - \$220 / Flat Day Rate

Previous Payment Terms: ~~\$15 / HR~~

Yes

Alki David Productions, Inc., Employer
338 N. Canon Dr. 3rd FL
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Mahim Kahn

Mahim Kahn
6898 Mimosa Drive
Carlsbad, CA 92011

Date: 6/29/15

Date: 6.29.15



DECLARATION OF ALLI BOTTO

I, Alli Botto, declare as follows:

1. This Declaration is based upon my personal knowledge and personal participation in the events described. If called to testify as a witness, I could and would testify competently as follows.
2. I have worked for FilmOnTV, Inc., and Alki David Productions, Inc., for approximately 2½ years. I started assisting in the production of programming. I am now an operations coordinator and sales representative for Hologram USA, a related company. My desk is near Alki David's office.
3. I interacted with Elizabeth B. Taylor and Mahim Khan on a daily basis when they were employed by FilmOn TV, Inc. I did not particularly like Elizabeth B. Taylor. Ms. Taylor was highly emotional and dramatic. Ms. Taylor was always claiming that people were talking about her and saying bad things. She was always complaining that men wanted her and were pursuing her sexually. Ms. Taylor told me that she had worked for the WWE and that she was suing them for sexual harassment.
4. I understand that Elizabeth B. Taylor is accusing Alki David, the president and CEO of Film TV, Inc., and Alki David Productions, Inc., of sexual harassment, including inappropriate touching. I never observed any sexual harassment in regard to Ms. Taylor. I never observed Ms. Taylor being subjected to sexual advances, sexual conduct, or sexual comments by Mr. David or anyone else. I never observed Mr. David inappropriately touching Ms. Taylor or using crude language around her or in any way acting inappropriately around her. I never observed anyone inappropriately touching Ms. Taylor or acting inappropriately around her. Elizabeth B. Taylor never

complained to me or told me that she was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched. No one else at our offices ever told me that Ms. Taylor was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched. I understand that Ms. Taylor is saying that Mr. David would invite her into his office, close the door, and then sexually harass her. I observed Ms. Taylor going into Mr. David's office and closing the door, but I never witnessed Mr. David closing the door after Ms. Taylor entered his office. On two occasions in March/April 2015, I overheard Elizabeth B. Taylor solicit Chasity Jones, a co-worker, to join Ms. Taylor in asserting sexual harassment claims against Mr. David. On both occasions, Ms. Jones refused.

5. I understand that Mahim Khan is also accusing Alki David of sexual harassment, including inappropriate touching. I never observed any sexual harassment in regard to Ms. Khan. I never observed Ms. Khan being subjected to sexual advances, sexual conduct, or sexual comments by Mr. David or anyone else. I never observed Mr. David inappropriately touching Ms. Khan or using crude language around her or in any way acting inappropriately around her. I never observed anyone inappropriately touch Ms. Khan or act inappropriately around her. Mahim Khan never complained to me or told me that she was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched. No one else at the offices ever told me that Ms. Khan was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched.

//

//

//

//

//

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
is true and correct.

Executed in Beverly Hills, California, on February 9, 2016.

Allison Botto
Alli Botto

DECLARATION OF MARIA NETSVETAeva

I, Maria Netsvetaeva, declare as follows:

1. This Declaration is based upon my personal knowledge and personal participation in the events described. If called to testify as a witness, I could and would testify competently as follows.

2. I work for FilmOnTV, Inc., as an operations manager. I worked for FilmOnTV, Inc., when Elizabeth B. Taylor and Mahim Khan were employed by FilmOnTV, Inc. I interacted with Elizabeth B. Taylor and Mahim Khan on a daily basis. I can partially see Alki David's office from my desk.


3. Ms. Taylor was often highly emotional and dramatic. Ms. Taylor often cried and complained.

4. I was informed that Elizabeth B. Taylor is accusing Alki David, the president and CEO of Film TV, Inc., and Alki David Productions, Inc., of sexual harassment. I never observed any sexual harassment in regard to Ms. Taylor. I never observed Ms. Taylor being subjected to sexual advances, sexual conduct, or sexual comments by Mr. David or anyone else. I don't recall Mr. David inappropriately touching Ms. Taylor or using crude language around her or in any way acting inappropriately around her. I don't recall anyone inappropriately touching Ms. Taylor or acting inappropriately around her. I don't recall anyone at our offices telling me that Ms. Taylor was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched. I was informed that Ms. Taylor is saying that Mr. David would invite her into his office, close the door, and then sexually harass her. Mr. David usually keeps his office door open.

5. I was informed that Mahim Khan is also accusing Alki David of sexual harassment. I never observed any sexual harassment in regard to Ms. Khan. I never observed Ms. Khan being subjected to sexual advances, sexual conduct, or sexual comments by Mr. David or anyone else. I don't recall Mr. David inappropriately touching Ms. Khan or using crude language around her or in any way acting inappropriately around her. I don't recall anyone inappropriately touching Ms. Khan or act inappropriately around her. I don't recall anyone at the offices telling me that Ms. Khan was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched. Ms. Khan did complain that she was not happy with her role. I was informed that she eventually did quit without warning. She just did not appear for work one day. I believe that she quit because she was unhappy.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed in Beverly Hills, California, on February 4, 2016.



Maria Netsvetaeva

DECLARATION OF CARL DAWSON

1. This Declaration is based upon my personal knowledge and personal participation in the events described. If called to testify as a witness, I could and would testify competently as follows.

2. I am employed by Filmon, TV, Inc. I have been employed by FilmOn TV, Inc., since November 2014. I am Vice-President for Marketing. From January 19, 2015 to June 1, 2015, Elizabeth B. Taylor was employed by FilmOn TV, Inc., as a sales representative. I was Elizabeth B. Taylor's direct supervisor. During her time at FilmOn TV, Inc., I interacted with Elizabeth B. Taylor on a daily basis. Mahim Khan was employed by Alki David Productions, Inc., as a production assistant. I was not her immediate supervisor, but, as a result of the fact that FilmOn TV, Inc., and Alki David Productions, Inc., share offices, I interacted with Ms. Khan on a daily basis.

3. Elizabeth B. Taylor was a complainer, malingerer, and hypochondriac.

4. I terminated Elizabeth B. Taylor on June 1, 2015, for lack of production, malingering, and constantly being late to work.

5. I understand that Elizabeth B. Taylor is accusing Alki David, the president and CEO of Film TV, Inc., and Alki David Productions, Inc., of sexual harassment, including inappropriate touching. I never observed any sexual harassment in regard to Ms. Taylor. I never observed Ms. Taylor being subjected to sexual advances, sexual conduct, or sexual comments by Mr. David or anyone else. I never observed Mr. David inappropriately touching Ms. Taylor or using crude language around her or in any way acting inappropriately around her. I never observed anyone inappropriately touching Ms. Taylor or acting inappropriately around her. Elizabeth B. Taylor never complained to me or told me that she was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched. No

one else at our offices ever told me that Ms. Taylor was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched. I understand that Ms. Taylor is saying that Mr. David would invite her into his office, close the door, and then sexually harass her. It appears to me to be highly unlikely that Mr. David would invite Ms. Taylor into his office and then close the door because, as a custom and practice, Mr. David keeps his office door open after people enter his office.

6. I understand that Ms Taylor is saying that I commented on her "prettiness," initially telling her to tone down her "prettiness" and then instructing her to "tone it up" to attract customers. This is absolutely untrue. I never commented on Ms. Taylor's appearance or alleged "prettiness."

7. After Elizabeth B. Taylor was terminated, Ms. Taylor contacted me by telephone. She stated that she had consulted with attorney Gloria Allred to file a sexual harassment action against Alki David. She stated that Ms. Allred's office would only take the case if I would state that Ms. Taylor had complained to me about sexual harassment and a hostile work environment prior to her termination. Ms. Taylor asked me to make such a statement - that she had complained to me about sexual harassment and a hostile work environment prior to her termination. That was not true. I told her that that was a lie and that I would not make such a statement. She never contacted me again.

8. I understand that Mahim Khan is also accusing Alki David of sexual harassment, including inappropriate touching. I never observed any sexual harassment in regard to Ms. Khan. I never observed Ms. Khan being subjected to sexual advances, sexual conduct, or sexual comments by Mr. David or anyone else. I never observed Mr. David inappropriately touching Ms. Khan or using crude language around her or in any way acting inappropriately around her. I never observed anyone inappropriately touch Ms. Khan or act inappropriately around her. Mahim Khan never

complained to me or told me that she was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched. No one else at the offices ever told me that Ms. Khan was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed in Beverly Hills, California, on January 28, 2016.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'C Dawson', written over a horizontal line.

Carl Dawson

DECLARATION OF CARL VASHAWN DAWSON

1. This declaration is based upon my personal knowledge and personal participation in the events described. If called to testify as a witness, I could and would testify competently as follows.
2. I was employed by FilmOn, TV, Inc. from November, 2014 until the fourth quarter of 2016. I was the Vice-President of Marketing and Sales.
3. From January 19, 2015 to June 1, 2015, Elizabeth B. Taylor was employed by FilmOn TV, Inc., as a sales representative. I was Elizabeth B. Taylor's direct supervisor. During her time at FilmOn TV, Inc., as a sales representative, I interacted with her on a daily basis. Mahim Khan was employed at Alki David Productions, Inc., as a production assistant. I was not her immediate supervisor, but, as a result of the fact that FilmOn TV, Inc., and Alki David Productions, Inc., shared offices, I interacted with Mahim Khan on a daily basis.
4. Elizabeth B. Taylor was a complainer, malingerer, and hypochondriac.
5. I terminated Elizabeth B. Taylor on June 1, 2015, for lack of production, malingering, and constantly being late to work.
6. I never observed Alki David, the President and CEO of FilmOn TV and Alki David Productions, Inc., subjecting Ms. Taylor to sexual advances, sexual conduct, or sexual comments by Mr. David or anyone else. I never observed Mr. David inappropriately touching Ms. Taylor or using crude language around her or in any way acting inappropriately around her. I never observed anyone inappropriately touching Ms. Taylor or acting inappropriately around

her. Elizabeth B. Taylor never complained to me or told me that she was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched. No one else at our offices ever told me that Ms. Taylor was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched.

7. After Elizabeth B. Taylor was terminated, Ms. Taylor contacted me by telephone. She stated that she had consulted with attorney Gloria Allred to file a sexual harassment action against Alki David. She stated that Ms. Allred's office would only take the case if I would state that Ms. Taylor had complained to me about sexual harassment and a hostile work environment prior to her termination. Ms. Taylor asked me to make such a statement - that she had complained to me about sexual harassment and a hostile work environment prior to her termination. That was not true. I told her that was a lie and I would not make such a statement. She never contacted me again.
8. I never observed Alki David sexually harassing or inappropriately touching Mahim Khan. Mr. David never subjected Ms. Khan to any sexual advances, sexual conduct, or sexual comments. Ms. Khan never complained to me or told me that she was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched. No one else at the office ever told me that Ms. Khan was being sexually harassed or inappropriately touched.
9. Mahim Khan left the firm because she was having fights with a lot of women there and fights with a roommate. At the time Ms. Khan left, she was in disputes with a lot of people in the workplace regarding matters having nothing to do with Mr. David. Although Ms. Khan would not have

come to me directly to state any complaints against Mr. David, I would have been aware of any such allegations.

10. Lauren Reeves was hired by David Nussbaum, a salesman for Hologram USA. Ms. Reeves was a blunt and straightforward person. I was in several writing sessions with her and there were no incidents between Ms. Reeves and Alki David to my knowledge. Ms. Reeves wrote content that was risqué, which fit into the culture of our company.
11. From mid January, 2015 on & off until around Q3, 2016, Chastity Jones was employed by FilmOn TV, Inc., as a sales representative. I was Chastity Jones direct supervisor. During her time at FilmOn TV., Inc., as a sales representative, I interacted with her on a daily basis. Chastity Jones never stated any claims against Alki David. In fact, Chastity Jones often shared her fondness of Alki due to his generosity. Chastity Jones directly told me how much she appreciated and cared for Alki. Alki was very understanding of Chastity Jones' personal issues, he was accommodating to Chastity Jones' hardships. One of her personal hardships in particular was when Chastity Jones' mother passed away. Alki allowed Chastity Jones nearly a month-off work with full pay to recover. Another accommodation that Alki gave to Chastity Jones was to advance her over \$40,000 for a pending deal,

which subsequently was revealed to be a fake deal that never amounted to anything. Essentially, Chastity Jones lied about that printing deal and took advantage of Alki David's generosity.

12. Another pure accommodation given by Alki to Chastity Jones was when I fired Chastity Jones due to lack of performance and Alki rehired Chastity Jones. After several weeks, Chastity Jones called Alki and asked for her job back. Alki allowed Chastity Jones to not only return back to work, BUT Alki gave her a raise and a shared office to place Chastity Jones in a better position to produce for the company.
13. It was during Ms. Jones' second round of employment that Chastity Jones made the false claim about the sale which Alki gave Chastity Jones the advance of \$40,000. These are only a couple of accommodations that Alki provided to Chastity Jones which I witnessed firsthand.
14. Where everything seemed to change course was after Chastity Jones was fired for the second time in the third quarter of 2016. Alki refused to allow Chastity Jones to return then back to Film On TV. That was the first time that Chastity Jones' animosity against Alki David started. At this time, in my opinion, Chastity Jones was probably approached by Lisa Bloom in the same manner I was approached and was most likely told that she would

benefit if she made the claim. In my opinion, this is when Chastity Jones decided to take this perceived opportunity and she decided to sue Alki David in a Me Too lawsuit even though she knew this was completely false.

15. My opinion about the lawsuits brought against Alki David by Elizabeth Taylor, Mahim Khan, Lauren Reeves and Chastity Jones is that those ladies are completely trying to take advantage of a situation and they are alleging completely false claims. Most of these women were very open and the office environment we all worked in was open. If any of those ladies had any issues with Alki David or anyone else, they would have spoken with me.
16. Approximately a month after Elizabeth Taylor was fired, she called me on a phone line with her attorney, stating that Elizabeth and the attorney wanted me to confirm Elizabeth Taylor's statement about Alki David committing sexual misconduct and acting inappropriately towards Elizabeth Taylor. I refused. The attorney responded that if I would confirm Elizabeth Taylor's story, I "would benefit." I immediately hung up on them.
17. Shortly after that telephone call from Elizabeth Taylor, Elizabeth Taylor called me crying immensely and telling me, "You're the key to my case, Carl. Why wouldn't you do this to me and help me." I refused to cooperate

with her, stating that what she was saying was a complete lie. That was the last time I spoke with Elizabeth Taylor.

18. Rita Nichols was in sales and marketing. She was referred to Alki David's firm by a friend named Johnny Frato. I supervised Rita Nichols, who was a sales associate. I terminated Rita Nichols as part of a massive layoff in 2016. Two years later, in 2018, Rita Nichols sought to work with Alki David at SwissX.
19. At no time did I observe Alki David doing anything inappropriate toward Rita Nichols.
20. In the Fall of 2019, Rita came to my Woodland Hills office and she stated
21. Rita Nichols came to see me at my Woodland Hills office in the Autumn of 2019 and she said that she had a romantic relationship with Alki David and she was trying to marry him. Rita Nichols told me that on the morning of that day, she had a fight with her estranged husband and she said her husband raped her that morning. She also said that on that same day, she went to SwissX and met with Alki at his office. She stated that she and Alki David had sex in his office. Finally, she said she said went to her friend's house and her friend's boyfriend raped her.
22. On that same day, she said she spoke with Tom Girardi and his law firm

Girardi Keese assigned her a therapist. She stated that Tom Girardi and the assigned therapist convinced her that everything that happened to her on that day was rape. Girardi convinced her to file a lawsuit against Alki David, alleging that he raped her.

23. My last conversation with Rita Nichols occurred on June 6, 2022, when Rita Nichols called me on my telephone. Rita Nichols said she knows that Alki David did not rape her but that her lawyers are pressuring her to stick with her story that Alki David did rape her. She further stated that her lawyers told her that if she recants, they will charge her for her legal costs. She stated she is still with the same attorneys affiliated with Mr. Girardi and they also told her that she would have to pay for her psychiatric and doctor bills if she recanted her statement. She said she felt intimidated and that the attorneys are ridiculing her.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed in Malibu, California on July 15, 2022.



Carl Dawson