

Mr Eric Vennes
Second Vice President
13300 Bothell Everett Hwy Ste 674
Mill Creek, Washington, 98012
faxed to: (425) 272-4278

November 25, 2012

Re: NAPPS

Dear Mr Eric Vennes:

The following directors received this and I would recommend it not to be shared with those parties that under information and belief are parts of this effort known or unknown to me. : Ruth Reynolds, Eric Vennes, Jilliana Kwiatkowski, Andy Estin, Steve Glenn, Lance Randall. Each of you received this via your published fax number except Mr Estin was emailed it as he has no fax published. Eric, as you can be assured it was never my intention to “perform I got you” I don’t operate that way. I pursue in an open and transparent way with significant communications to each of you. I am not acting in a conspiracy or acting with one other person or group in words or deeds, action or **inaction** (emphasis supplied). You, Eric Vennes, as a member of this board are required to provide oversight and act in good faith, if Eric Vennes, has knowledge concerning the “matter in question that makes reliance otherwise permitted by subsection (2) of this section unwarranted” (see below). I have provided to you information that makes this A/G complaint based on the standard under law “clear and convincing evidence facts rebutting the presumption” (see below) that it is in retaliation for inquires to law enforcement agency (IRS) which makes the A/G complaint unwarranted and illegal pursuant to Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (“SOX”) 18 USC § 1513 - Retaliating against a witness, victim, or an informant. You only need to read the complaint to determine the premise of retaliation. It is listed in there. If you need more to meet the standard of “clear and convincing” it was emailed to each of you with all files attached at 11/22/2012 1:03 PM.

The complainant YELLON has made a part of his complaint my communications to the IRS and this underlying basis of his allegation cannot be removed since he too has noticed it as the reason. Then the president is the only authorized person to remove or appoint an AG chair and he has a clear conflict in this regard as the complainant. The AG chair is authorized to send this right to the board under G-2 and due to this clear conflict the AG chair should be removed by this board; the President should no longer take a part in any further communication regarding this matter with this board nor any of the person in the material components of the charge.

This board's decision should preclude Crowe, Yellon, Musser, and Ezell since the communications in the complaint, the emails going back to 2011, posted on Facebook, and the recent filing of the IRS 990 for 2011 by Ezell, with Crowe present under penalty of perjury are all material to the proof that this complaint is in violation of my civil rights and federal law regarding retaliation for communications with law enforcement. This board should decide this without participation of MUSSER, YELLON, TAMAROFF, CROWE, and the 3 unknown secret participants in the tribunal. This board must take responsibility and oversee this issue as I have given to you this knowledge concerning this matter.

I ask you immediately meet without those parties present and prior to the AG chairmen appointment of a secret tribunal of 3 more participants in this matter. Although the retaliation has already occurred in an attempt to influence me to silence as of now the damages are not yet completely materialized.

Please govern yourself accordingly! If you have a need for any additional material to properly dispose of this please ask forthwith. This will be the last notice you receive from me in this capacity regarding your participation with this cause.

Sincerely yours,

Randy A Scott,
343 Hazelwood Ave S
Lehigh Acres, Florida
33936

Arizona Law <http://www.azleg.state.az.us/FormatDocument.asp?inDoc=/ars/10/03830.htm&Title=10&DocType=ARS>

10-3830. [General standards for directors](#)

A. A director's duties, including duties as a member of a committee, shall be discharged:

1. In good faith...

...”B. In discharging duties, a director is entitled to rely on information, opinions, reports or statements, including financial statements and other financial data, if prepared or presented by any of the following:”..

...”C. A director is not acting in good faith if **the director has knowledge concerning** the matter in question that makes reliance otherwise permitted by subsection B unwarranted.” **(Emphasis added)**

D. A director is not liable for any action taken as a director or any failure to take any action if the director's duties were performed in compliance with this section. In any proceeding commenced under this section or any other provision of this chapter, a director has all of the defenses and presumptions ordinarily available to a director. A director is presumed in all cases to have acted, failed to act or otherwise discharged such director's duties in accordance with subsection A. The burden is on the party challenging a director's action, failure to act or other discharge of duties to establish by **clear and convincing evidence facts rebutting the presumption** (emphasis added).

Oregon Law-NAPPS Foreign Corporation <http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/065.html> **65.369 Liability of qualified directors.**

65.377 Standards of conduct for officers.

(3) An officer is not acting in good faith if **the officer has knowledge** concerning the matter in question that makes reliance otherwise permitted by subsection (2) of this section unwarranted. (emphasis added)

Mr Lance Randall
Secretary
5831 Hallandale Beach Blvd
West Park, Florida, 33023
faxed to: (954) 963-5186

November 25, 2012

Re: NAPPS

Dear Mr Lance Randall:

The following directors received this and I would recommend it not to be shared with those parties that under information and belief are parts of this effort known or unknown to me. : Ruth Reynolds, Eric Vennes, Jilliana Kwiatkowski, Andy Estin, Steve Glenn, Lance Randall. Each of you received this via your published fax number except Mr Estin was emailed it as he has no fax published. Lance, as you can be assured it was never my intention to “perform I got you” I don’t operate that way. I pursue in an open and transparent way with significant communications to each of you. I am not acting in a conspiracy or acting with one other person or group in words or deeds, action or **inaction** (emphasis supplied). You, Lance Randall, as a member of this board are required to provide oversight and act in good faith, if Lance Randall, has knowledge concerning the “matter in question that makes reliance otherwise permitted by subsection (2) of this section unwarranted” (see below). I have provided to you information that makes this A/G complaint based on the standard under law “clear and convincing evidence facts rebutting the presumption” (see below) that it is in retaliation for inquires to law enforcement agency (IRS) which makes the A/G complaint unwarranted and illegal pursuant to Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (“SOX”) 18 USC § 1513 - Retaliating against a witness, victim, or an informant. You only need to read the complaint to determine the premise of retaliation. It is listed in there. If you need more to meet the standard of “clear and convincing” it was emailed to each of you with all files attached at 11/22/2012 1:03 PM.

The complainant YELLON has made a part of his complaint my communications to the IRS and this underlying basis of his allegation cannot be removed since he too has noticed it as the reason. Then the president is the only authorized person to remove or appoint an AG chair and he has a clear conflict in this regard as the complainant. The AG chair is authorized to send this right to the board under G-2 and due to this clear conflict the AG chair should be removed by this board; the President should no longer take a part in any further communication regarding this matter with this board nor any of the person in the material components of the charge.

This board's decision should preclude Crowe, Yellon, Musser, and Ezell since the communications in the complaint, the emails going back to 2011, posted on Facebook, and the recent filing of the IRS 990 for 2011 by Ezell, with Crowe present under penalty of perjury are all material to the proof that this complaint is in violation of my civil rights and federal law regarding retaliation for communications with law enforcement. This board should decide this without participation of MUSSER, YELLON, TAMAROFF, CROWE, and the 3 unknown secret participants in the tribunal. This board must take responsibility and oversee this issue as I have given to you this knowledge concerning this matter.

I ask you immediately meet without those parties present and prior to the AG chairmen appointment of a secret tribunal of 3 more participants in this matter. Although the retaliation has already occurred in an attempt to influence me to silence as of now the damages are not yet completely materialized.

Please govern yourself accordingly! If you have a need for any additional material to properly dispose of this please ask forthwith. This will be the last notice you receive from me in this capacity regarding your participation with this cause.

Sincerely yours,

Randy A Scott,
343 Hazelwood Ave S
Lehigh Acres, Florida
33936

Arizona Law <http://www.azleg.state.az.us/FormatDocument.asp?inDoc=/ars/10/03830.htm&Title=10&DocType=ARS>

10-3830. [General standards for directors](#)

A. A director's duties, including duties as a member of a committee, shall be discharged:

1. In good faith...

...”B. In discharging duties, a director is entitled to rely on information, opinions, reports or statements, including financial statements and other financial data, if prepared or presented by any of the following:”..

...”C. A director is not acting in good faith if **the director has knowledge concerning** the matter in question that makes reliance otherwise permitted by subsection B unwarranted.” **(Emphasis added)**

D. A director is not liable for any action taken as a director or any failure to take any action if the director's duties were performed in compliance with this section. In any proceeding commenced under this section or any other provision of this chapter, a director has all of the defenses and presumptions ordinarily available to a director. A director is presumed in all cases to have acted, failed to act or otherwise discharged such director's duties in accordance with subsection A. The burden is on the party challenging a director's action, failure to act or other discharge of duties to establish by **clear and convincing evidence facts rebutting the presumption** (emphasis added).

Oregon Law-NAPPS Foreign Corporation <http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/065.html> **65.369 Liability of qualified directors.**

65.377 Standards of conduct for officers.

(3) An officer is not acting in good faith if **the officer has knowledge** concerning the matter in question that makes reliance otherwise permitted by subsection (2) of this section unwarranted. (emphasis added)

Mr Andrew R Estin
Director
5503 Cahuenga Blvd
North Hollywood, California, 91601
faxed to: aestin@alssi.com

November 25, 2012

Re: NAPPS

Dear Mr Andrew R Estin:

The following directors received this and I would recommend it not to be shared with those parties that under information and belief are parts of this effort known or unknown to me. : Ruth Reynolds, Eric Vennes, Jilliana Kwiatkowski, Andy Estin, Steve Glenn, Lance Randall. Each of you received this via your published fax number except Mr Estin was emailed it as he has no fax published. Andrew R, as you can be assured it was never my intention to “perform I got you” I don’t operate that way. I pursue in an open and transparent way with significant communications to each of you. I am not acting in a conspiracy or acting with one other person or group in words or deeds, action or inaction (emphasis supplied). You, Andrew R Estin, as a member of this board are required to provide oversight and act in good faith, if Andrew R Estin, has knowledge concerning the “matter in question that makes reliance otherwise permitted by subsection (2) of this section unwarranted” (see below). I have provided to you information that makes this A/G complaint based on the standard under law “clear and convincing evidence facts rebutting the presumption” (see below) that it is in retaliation for inquires to law enforcement agency (IRS) which makes the A/G complaint unwarranted and illegal pursuant to Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (“SOX”) 18 USC § 1513 - Retaliating against a witness, victim, or an informant. You only need to read the complaint to determine the premise of retaliation. It is listed in there. If you need more to meet the standard of “clear and convincing” it was emailed to each of you with all files attached at 11/22/2012 1:03 PM.

The complainant YELLON has made a part of his complaint my communications to the IRS and this underlying basis of his allegation cannot be removed since he too has noticed it as the reason. Then the president is the only authorized person to remove or appoint an AG chair and he has a clear conflict in this regard as the complainant. The AG chair is authorized to send this right to the board under G-2 and due to this clear conflict the AG chair should be removed by this board; the President should no longer take a part in any further communication regarding this matter with this board nor any of the person in the material components of the charge.

This board's decision should preclude Crowe, Yellon, Musser, and Ezell since the communications in the complaint, the emails going back to 2011, posted on Facebook, and the recent filing of the IRS 990 for 2011 by Ezell, with Crowe present under penalty of perjury are all material to the proof that this complaint is in violation of my civil rights and federal law regarding retaliation for communications with law enforcement. This board should decide this without participation of MUSSER, YELLON, TAMAROFF, CROWE, and the 3 unknown secret participants in the tribunal. This board must take responsibility and oversee this issue as I have given to you this knowledge concerning this matter.

I ask you immediately meet without those parties present and prior to the AG chairmen appointment of a secret tribunal of 3 more participants in this matter. Although the retaliation has already occurred in an attempt to influence me to silence as of now the damages are not yet completely materialized.

Please govern yourself accordingly! If you have a need for any additional material to properly dispose of this please ask forthwith. This will be the last notice you receive from me in this capacity regarding your participation with this cause.

Sincerely yours,

Randy A Scott,
343 Hazelwood Ave S
Lehigh Acres, Florida
33936

Arizona Law <http://www.azleg.state.az.us/FormatDocument.asp?inDoc=/ars/10/03830.htm&Title=10&DocType=ARS>

10-3830. [General standards for directors](#)

A. A director's duties, including duties as a member of a committee, shall be discharged:

1. In good faith...

...”B. In discharging duties, a director is entitled to rely on information, opinions, reports or statements, including financial statements and other financial data, if prepared or presented by any of the following:”..

...”C. A director is not acting in good faith if **the director has knowledge concerning** the matter in question that makes reliance otherwise permitted by subsection B unwarranted.” **(Emphasis added)**

D. A director is not liable for any action taken as a director or any failure to take any action if the director's duties were performed in compliance with this section. In any proceeding commenced under this section or any other provision of this chapter, a director has all of the defenses and presumptions ordinarily available to a director. A director is presumed in all cases to have acted, failed to act or otherwise discharged such director's duties in accordance with subsection A. The burden is on the party challenging a director's action, failure to act or other discharge of duties to establish by **clear and convincing evidence facts rebutting the presumption** (emphasis added).

Oregon Law-NAPPS Foreign Corporation <http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/065.html> **65.369 Liability of qualified directors.**

65.377 Standards of conduct for officers.

(3) An officer is not acting in good faith if **the officer has knowledge** concerning the matter in question that makes reliance otherwise permitted by subsection (2) of this section unwarranted. (emphasis added)

Mr Steve Glenn
Director
8547 E Arapahoe Road Ste J
Greenwood Village, Colorado, 80112
faxed to: (720) 224-9165

November 25, 2012

Re: NAPPS

Dear Mr Steve Glenn:

The following directors received this and I would recommend it not to be shared with those parties that under information and belief are parts of this effort known or unknown to me. : Ruth Reynolds, Eric Vennes, Jilliana Kwiatkowski, Andy Estin, Steve Glenn, Lance Randall. Each of you received this via your published fax number except Mr Estin was emailed it as he has no fax published. Steve, as you can be assured it was never my intention to “perform I got you” I don’t operate that way. I pursue in an open and transparent way with significant communications to each of you. I am not acting in a conspiracy or acting with one other person or group in words or deeds, action or **inaction** (emphasis supplied). You, Steve Glenn, as a member of this board are required to provide oversight and act in good faith, if Steve Glenn, has knowledge concerning the “matter in question that makes reliance otherwise permitted by subsection (2) of this section unwarranted” (see below). I have provided to you information that makes this A/G complaint based on the standard under law “clear and convincing evidence facts rebutting the presumption” (see below) that it is in retaliation for inquires to law enforcement agency (IRS) which makes the A/G complaint unwarranted and illegal pursuant to Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (“SOX”) 18 USC § 1513 - Retaliating against a witness, victim, or an informant. You only need to read the complaint to determine the premise of retaliation. It is listed in there. If you need more to meet the standard of “clear and convincing” it was emailed to each of you with all files attached at 11/22/2012 1:03 PM.

The complainant YELLON has made a part of his complaint my communications to the IRS and this underlying basis of his allegation cannot be removed since he too has noticed it as the reason. Then the president is the only authorized person to remove or appoint an AG chair and he has a clear conflict in this regard as the complainant. The AG chair is authorized to send this right to the board under G-2 and due to this clear conflict the AG chair should be removed by this board; the President should no longer take a part in any further communication regarding this matter with this board nor any of the person in the material components of the charge.

This board's decision should preclude Crowe, Yellon, Musser, and Ezell since the communications in the complaint, the emails going back to 2011, posted on Facebook, and the recent filing of the IRS 990 for 2011 by Ezell, with Crowe present under penalty of perjury are all material to the proof that this complaint is in violation of my civil rights and federal law regarding retaliation for communications with law enforcement. This board should decide this without participation of MUSSER, YELLON, TAMAROFF, CROWE, and the 3 unknown secret participants in the tribunal. This board must take responsibility and oversee this issue as I have given to you this knowledge concerning this matter.

I ask you immediately meet without those parties present and prior to the AG chairmen appointment of a secret tribunal of 3 more participants in this matter. Although the retaliation has already occurred in an attempt to influence me to silence as of now the damages are not yet completely materialized.

Please govern yourself accordingly! If you have a need for any additional material to properly dispose of this please ask forthwith. This will be the last notice you receive from me in this capacity regarding your participation with this cause.

Sincerely yours,

Randy A Scott,
343 Hazelwood Ave S
Lehigh Acres, Florida
33936

Arizona Law <http://www.azleg.state.az.us/FormatDocument.asp?inDoc=/ars/10/03830.htm&Title=10&DocType=ARS>

10-3830. [General standards for directors](#)

A. A director's duties, including duties as a member of a committee, shall be discharged:

1. In good faith...

...”B. In discharging duties, a director is entitled to rely on information, opinions, reports or statements, including financial statements and other financial data, if prepared or presented by any of the following:”..

...”C. A director is not acting in good faith if **the director has knowledge concerning** the matter in question that makes reliance otherwise permitted by subsection B unwarranted.” **(Emphasis added)**

D. A director is not liable for any action taken as a director or any failure to take any action if the director's duties were performed in compliance with this section. In any proceeding commenced under this section or any other provision of this chapter, a director has all of the defenses and presumptions ordinarily available to a director. A director is presumed in all cases to have acted, failed to act or otherwise discharged such director's duties in accordance with subsection A. The burden is on the party challenging a director's action, failure to act or other discharge of duties to establish by **clear and convincing evidence facts rebutting the presumption** (emphasis added).

Oregon Law-NAPPS Foreign Corporation <http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/065.html> **65.369 Liability of qualified directors.**

65.377 Standards of conduct for officers.

(3) An officer is not acting in good faith if **the officer has knowledge** concerning the matter in question that makes reliance otherwise permitted by subsection (2) of this section unwarranted. (emphasis added)

Ms Jillina Kwiatkowski
Director
1320 Frennd Road
Depew, New York, 14043
faxed to: (716) 656-9969

November 25, 2012

Re: NAPPS

Dear Ms Jillina Kwiatkowski:

The following directors received this and I would recommend it not to be shared with those parties that under information and belief are parts of this effort known or unknown to me. : Ruth Reynolds, Eric Vennes, Jilliana Kwiatkowski, Andy Estin, Steve Glenn, Lance Randall. Each of you received this via your published fax number except Mr Estin was emailed it as he has no fax published. Jillina, as you can be assured it was never my intention to “perform I got you” I don’t operate that way. I pursue in an open and transparent way with significant communications to each of you. I am not acting in a conspiracy or acting with one other person or group in words or deeds, action or **inaction** (emphasis supplied). You, Jillina Kwiatkowski, as a member of this board are required to provide oversight and act in good faith, if Jillina Kwiatkowski, has knowledge concerning the “matter in question that makes reliance otherwise permitted by subsection (2) of this section unwarranted” (see below). I have provided to you information that makes this A/G complaint based on the standard under law “clear and convincing evidence facts rebutting the presumption” (see below) that it is in retaliation for inquires to law enforcement agency (IRS) which makes the A/G complaint unwarranted and illegal pursuant to Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (“SOX”) 18 USC § 1513 - Retaliating against a witness, victim, or an informant. You only need to read the complaint to determine the premise of retaliation. It is listed in there. If you need more to meet the standard of “clear and convincing” it was emailed to each of you with all files attached at 11/22/2012 1:03 PM.

The complainant YELLON has made a part of his complaint my communications to the IRS and this underlying basis of his allegation cannot be removed since he too has noticed it as the reason. Then the president is the only authorized person to remove or appoint an AG chair and he has a clear conflict in this regard as the complainant. The AG chair is authorized to send this right to the board under G-2 and due to this clear conflict the AG chair should be removed by this board; the President should no longer take a part in any further communication regarding this matter with this board nor any of the person in the material components of the charge.

This board's decision should preclude Crowe, Yellon, Musser, and Ezell since the communications in the complaint, the emails going back to 2011, posted on Facebook, and the recent filing of the IRS 990 for 2011 by Ezell, with Crowe present under penalty of perjury are all material to the proof that this complaint is in violation of my civil rights and federal law regarding retaliation for communications with law enforcement. This board should decide this without participation of MUSSER, YELLON, TAMAROFF, CROWE, and the 3 unknown secret participants in the tribunal. This board must take responsibility and oversee this issue as I have given to you this knowledge concerning this matter.

I ask you immediately meet without those parties present and prior to the AG chairmen appointment of a secret tribunal of 3 more participants in this matter. Although the retaliation has already occurred in an attempt to influence me to silence as of now the damages are not yet completely materialized.

Please govern yourself accordingly! If you have a need for any additional material to properly dispose of this please ask forthwith. This will be the last notice you receive from me in this capacity regarding your participation with this cause.

Sincerely yours,

Randy A Scott,
343 Hazelwood Ave S
Lehigh Acres, Florida
33936

Arizona Law <http://www.azleg.state.az.us/FormatDocument.asp?inDoc=/ars/10/03830.htm&Title=10&DocType=ARS>

10-3830. [General standards for directors](#)

A. A director's duties, including duties as a member of a committee, shall be discharged:

1. In good faith...

...”B. In discharging duties, a director is entitled to rely on information, opinions, reports or statements, including financial statements and other financial data, if prepared or presented by any of the following:”..

...”C. A director is not acting in good faith if **the director has knowledge concerning** the matter in question that makes reliance otherwise permitted by subsection B unwarranted.” **(Emphasis added)**

D. A director is not liable for any action taken as a director or any failure to take any action if the director's duties were performed in compliance with this section. In any proceeding commenced under this section or any other provision of this chapter, a director has all of the defenses and presumptions ordinarily available to a director. A director is presumed in all cases to have acted, failed to act or otherwise discharged such director's duties in accordance with subsection A. The burden is on the party challenging a director's action, failure to act or other discharge of duties to establish by **clear and convincing evidence facts rebutting the presumption** (emphasis added).

Oregon Law-NAPPS Foreign Corporation <http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/065.html> **65.369 Liability of qualified directors.**

65.377 Standards of conduct for officers.

(3) An officer is not acting in good faith if **the officer has knowledge** concerning the matter in question that makes reliance otherwise permitted by subsection (2) of this section unwarranted. (emphasis added)

Ms Ruth Reynolds
Director
1636 Glenn Street
Charlotte, North Carolina, 28205
faxed to: (704) 338-1686

November 25, 2012

Re: NAPPS

Dear Ms Ruth Reynolds:

The following directors received this and I would recommend it not to be shared with those parties that under information and belief are parts of this effort known or unknown to me. : Ruth Reynolds, Eric Vennes, Jilliana Kwiatkowski, Andy Estin, Steve Glenn, Lance Randall. Each of you received this via your published fax number except Mr Estin was emailed it as he has no fax published. Ruth, as you can be assured it was never my intention to “perform I got you” I don’t operate that way. I pursue in an open and transparent way with significant communications to each of you. I am not acting in a conspiracy or acting with one other person or group in words or deeds, action or **inaction** (emphasis supplied). You, Ruth Reynolds, as a member of this board are required to provide oversight and act in good faith, if Ruth Reynolds, has knowledge concerning the “matter in question that makes reliance otherwise permitted by subsection (2) of this section unwarranted” (see below). I have provided to you information that makes this A/G complaint based on the standard under law “clear and convincing evidence facts rebutting the presumption” (see below) that it is in retaliation for inquires to law enforcement agency (IRS) which makes the A/G complaint unwarranted and illegal pursuant to Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (“SOX”) 18 USC § 1513 - Retaliating against a witness, victim, or an informant. You only need to read the complaint to determine the premise of retaliation. It is listed in there. If you need more to meet the standard of “clear and convincing” it was emailed to each of you with all files attached at 11/22/2012 1:03 PM.

The complainant YELLON has made a part of his complaint my communications to the IRS and this underlying basis of his allegation cannot be removed since he too has noticed it as the reason. Then the president is the only authorized person to remove or appoint an AG chair and he has a clear conflict in this regard as the complainant. The AG chair is authorized to send this right to the board under G-2 and due to this clear conflict the AG chair should be removed by this board; the President should no longer take a part in any further communication regarding this matter with this board nor any of the person in the material components of the charge.

This board's decision should preclude Crowe, Yellon, Musser, and Ezell since the communications in the complaint, the emails going back to 2011, posted on Facebook, and the recent filing of the IRS 990 for 2011 by Ezell, with Crowe present under penalty of perjury are all material to the proof that this complaint is in violation of my civil rights and federal law regarding retaliation for communications with law enforcement. This board should decide this without participation of MUSSER, YELLON, TAMAROFF, CROWE, and the 3 unknown secret participants in the tribunal. This board must take responsibility and oversee this issue as I have given to you this knowledge concerning this matter.

I ask you immediately meet without those parties present and prior to the AG chairmen appointment of a secret tribunal of 3 more participants in this matter. Although the retaliation has already occurred in an attempt to influence me to silence as of now the damages are not yet completely materialized.

Please govern yourself accordingly! If you have a need for any additional material to properly dispose of this please ask forthwith. This will be the last notice you receive from me in this capacity regarding your participation with this cause.

Sincerely yours,

Randy A Scott,
343 Hazelwood Ave S
Lehigh Acres, Florida
33936

Arizona Law <http://www.azleg.state.az.us/FormatDocument.asp?inDoc=/ars/10/03830.htm&Title=10&DocType=ARS>

10-3830. [General standards for directors](#)

A. A director's duties, including duties as a member of a committee, shall be discharged:

1. In good faith...

...”B. In discharging duties, a director is entitled to rely on information, opinions, reports or statements, including financial statements and other financial data, if prepared or presented by any of the following:”..

...”C. A director is not acting in good faith if **the director has knowledge concerning** the matter in question that makes reliance otherwise permitted by subsection B unwarranted.” **(Emphasis added)**

D. A director is not liable for any action taken as a director or any failure to take any action if the director's duties were performed in compliance with this section. In any proceeding commenced under this section or any other provision of this chapter, a director has all of the defenses and presumptions ordinarily available to a director. A director is presumed in all cases to have acted, failed to act or otherwise discharged such director's duties in accordance with subsection A. The burden is on the party challenging a director's action, failure to act or other discharge of duties to establish by **clear and convincing evidence facts rebutting the presumption** (emphasis added).

Oregon Law-NAPPS Foreign Corporation <http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/065.html> **65.369 Liability of qualified directors.**

65.377 Standards of conduct for officers.

(3) An officer is not acting in good faith **if the officer has knowledge** concerning the matter in question that makes reliance otherwise permitted by subsection (2) of this section unwarranted. (emphasis added)