```
1
       xxxxxxxx, Sui Juris
2
       XXXXXXXX
3
       XXXXXXX
4
       XXXXXXX
5
       CALIFORNIA, USA
6
7
       tel: (xxx) xxx-xxxx
8
       fax: (xxx) xxx-x
9
10
       In xxxxxxx
11
12
13
14
15
                             Superior Court of California
16
17
                                 San Francisco County
18
19
20
       Public Services Class Action Group, ) Case No.
21
22
                 Plaintiffs,
                                              ) VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR
23
                                              )
                                                DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE
            V.
24
                                              ) RELIEF AND DAMAGES FROM
25
       Tesla Motors, Inc.,
                                              ) RACKETEERING, CONSPIRACY
26
                                                TO ENGAGE IN A PATTERN OF
       Elon Musk,
                                              )
27
       Space X, Inc.,
                                              ) RACKETEERING ACTIVITY,
28
       Solar City, Inc.,
                                              )
                                                AND RELATED CLAIMS;
29
       Google, Inc.,
30
       Eric Schmidt,
                                                JURY DEMANDED:
31
       Steven Jurvetson,
32
       Rahm Enamual,
                                              ) <u>18 U.S.C. 1961</u> et seq.;
                                                 18 U.S.C. 1964
33
       David Plouffe,
                                              )
34
                                              ) (Civil RICO Remedies); and,
       Robert Gibbs,
35
       David Axelrod,
                                              ) International Covenant on
36
       Steven Chu,
                                              ) Civil and Political Rights
37
       Steven Rattner,
                                             ) (enacted by Congress with
38
                                                 Specific Reservations)
       Valarie Jarrett,
                                              )
39
       Vinod Khosla,
                                              ) in pari materia with the
40
       David Cohen,
                                             ) Supremacy Clause in the
41
       Eric Holder,
                                                U.S. Constitution.
                                             )
42
       Jay Carney,
43
       and
44
       Doe's 121 thru 500,
45
46
                 Defendants.
47
```

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2		<u>Page</u>
3	INTRODUCTION	4
4	JURISDICTION	5
5	PROCEDURAL HISTORY	6
6 7	STRUCTURE AND INCORPORATION OF PRIOR PLEADINGS AND EXHIBITS	7
8 9	PARTIAL LIST OF RICO PREDICATE ACTS AND OTHER ACTS OF WITNESS RETALIATION	8
10	COUNT ONE	9
11	COUNT TWO	10
12	COUNT THREE	11
13	RELIEF REQUESTED:	
14	ON COUNT ONE	12
15	ON COUNT TWO	14
16	ON COUNT THREE	16
17	SUMMARY OF DAMAGES	19
18	JURY DEMAND	20
19	LIST OF EXHIBITS	20
20	VERIFICATION	21
71		

22 INTRODUCTION

This is a complex civil action for RICO remedies authorized by the federal statutes at 18 U.S.C. 1961 et seq.; for declaratory and injunctive relief; for actual, consequential and exemplary damages; and for all other relief which this honorable Superior Court deems just and proper under all circumstances which have occasioned this Initial COMPLAINT. See 18 U.S.C. §§ 1964(a) and (c) ("Civil RICO").

The primary cause of this action is a widespread criminal enterprise engaged in a pattern of racketeering activity across State lines, and a conspiracy to engage in racketeering activity involving numerous RICO predicate acts during the past ten (10) calendar years.

The predicate acts alleged here cluster around criminal antitrust infringement, trafficking in certain goods bearing illicit and unsafe technology, securities fraud affecting the public market, tampering with and retaliation against a qualified Federal Witness, interstate transportation of stolen property, obstruction of justice, obstruction of criminal investigations, obstruction of State and local law enforcement and the suspicious deaths of Mr. Gary D. Conley, Mr. Rajeev Motwani, Mr. David Bird, Mr. Forrest Hayes, Mr. Ravi Kumar, Mr. Karl Slym, Mr. Doug Bourn, Mr. Andrew Ingram, Mr. Brian M. Finn, Mr. Moritz Erhardt, Mr. Sarvshreshth Gupta, Mr. Li Jie, Mr. Kenneth Bellando, Ms. Kate Matrosova, and others. See 18 U.S.C. §§ 2319, 2320, 1512, 1513, 2315, 1503, 1510, 1511 and 1581-1588 respectively.

Other RICO predicate acts, although appearing to be isolated events, were actually part of the overall conspiracy and pattern of racketeering activity alleged herein, e.g. campaign mail fraud and bank fraud. See 18 U.S.C. §§ 1341 and 1344, respectively.

The primary objective of the racketeering enterprise has been to inflict severe and sustained economic hardship upon Plaintiffs, with the intent of impairing, obstructing, preventing and discouraging Plaintiffs from writing, publishing, investigating and conducting judicial recovery as U.S. Citizens and to create egregious business environment hardships for Plaintiffs.

JURISDICTION

This honorable Superior Court has original jurisdiction pursuant to the civil RICO remedies at 18 U.S.C. 1964, and the holdings of the U.S. Supreme Court in Tafflin v. Levitt, 493 U.S. 455 (1990), and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in Lou v. Belzberg, 834 F.2d 730, hn. 4 (9th Cir. 1987) (California State courts have concurrent jurisdiction of civil RICO claims).

8 STATEMENT OF FACTS

Defendants have been publicly charged in news reports, whistle-blower reports and federal investigations with exchanging un-reported and limit-exceeding campaign and bribery compensation with government officials in quid-pro-quo compensation transacted for the graft and gift of government contracts, stock market holding valuation benefits, tax payment exclusions, favored nations exclusive real estate deals, event tickets, government laws and policies exclusively favorable to Defendants while, at the same time, overtly damaging Plaintiffs in anti-trust, monopolistic, retribution and punitive anti-competitive attacks.

Some federal officers and employees are among the probable causes that threaten further continuation of the severe economic hardship and other wrongs described above because Defendants paid those officers with cash, stock, search engine rigging, sex workers, revolving door jobs and other benefits.

It is also apparent to Plaintiffs, who hereby make a formal offer to prove, that an instant action should <u>not</u> be removed into the Article III USDC because the USDC is presently vacant, nor should it

1	ever be removed into the Article IV USDC because of demonstrable bias
2	and prejudice among officers and employees of the USDC.
3 4	STRUCTURE AND INCORPORATION OF PLEADINGS AND EXHIBITS
5	
6	
7	
8 9	PARTIAL LIST OF RICO PREDICATE ACTS AND OTHER ACTS OF WITNESS RETALIATION
10	Particular attention of this honorable Court is now drawn to
11	Exhibits
12	Exhibit $\underline{L-6}$ is the legislative history of the Anticounterfeiting
13	Consumer Protection Act of 1996 ("ACPA"), reproduced from the House
14	Congressional Record dated June 4, 1996, 110 Stat. 1386, July 2, 1996.
15	The ACPA is particularly relevant to the instant case, because it
16	elevated copyright and trademark infringement to the status of RICO
17	predicate acts, and cited superb reasons for doing so.
18	An excellent discussion of the legal implications of the $\underline{ ext{ACPA}}$, in
19	the context of other applicable federal laws, can be seen in Exhibit
20	N-124: LETTER TO JON MUMMOLO, Washington Square News, Nov. 9, 2002.
21	Exhibit $\underline{D-46}$ is a partial list of $\underline{Documented\ Retaliations}$ which
22	Plaintiff had suffered prior to the date on which the federal case was
23	first filed (August 1, 2001 A.D.)
24	Exhibit $\underline{\text{D-47}}$ is a subset of those Documented Retaliations which
25	also qualify as one or more of the RICO <u>Predicate Acts</u> that are
26	itemized at 18 U.S.C. §§ $\underline{1961}(1)(B)$, (1)(D), and (5).

Plaintiff now testifies that the partial list of acts and events now documented in Exhibits D-46 and D-47 constitutes probable cause for granting all relief requested *infra* in the instant COMPLAINT.

Moreover, further acts and events occurred <u>after</u> August 1, 2001, which also qualify as RICO predicate acts that constitute *further* probable causes for all the relief requested *infra*.

For example, Plaintiff herein alleges that obstruction of justice did in fact occur whenever Plaintiff was deprived of specific relief from the federal district courts in Sacramento, California.

10 COUNT ONE:

Acquisition and Maintenance of an Interest in and Control of an *Enterprise* Engaged in a *Pattern of Racketeering Activity*: 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961(5), 1962(b)

Plaintiff now re-alleges each and every allegation as set forth above, and hereby incorporates same by reference, as if all were set forth fully herein. Substance prevails over form.

At various times and places partially enumerated in Plaintiff's documentary material, all Defendants did acquire and/or maintain, directly or indirectly, an interest in or control of a RICO enterprise of individuals who were associated in fact and who did engage in, and whose activities did affect, interstate and foreign commerce, all in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961(4), (5), (9), and 1962(b).

During the ten (10) calendar years preceding March 1, 2003 A.D., all Defendants did cooperate jointly and severally in the commission of two (2) or more of the RICO predicate acts that are itemized in the RICO laws at 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961(1)(A) and (B), and did so in violation of the RICO law at 18 U.S.C. 1962(b) (Prohibited activities).

Plaintiff further alleges that all Defendants did commit two (2) or more of the offenses itemized above in a manner which they

1 calculated and premeditated intentionally to threaten continuity, *i.e.*2 a continuing threat of their respective *racketeering activities*, also

in violation of the RICO law at 18 U.S.C. 1962(b) supra.

- Pursuant to the original Statutes at Large, the RICO laws

 itemized above are to be *liberally* construed by this honorable Court.

 Said construction rule was never codified in <u>Title 18</u> of the United

 States Code, however. See 84 Stat. 947, Sec. 904, Oct. 15, 1970.
- Respondent superior (principal is liable for agents' misconduct:

 knowledge of, participation in, and benefit from a RICO enterprise).

10 Conduct and Participation in a Conduct and Participation in

Conduct and Participation in a RICO Enterprise through a Pattern of Racketeering Activity:

18 U.S.C. §§ 1961(5), 1962(c)

Plaintiff now re-alleges each and every allegation as set forth above, and hereby incorporates same by reference, as if all were set forth fully herein. Substance prevails over form.

At various times and places partially enumerated in Plaintiff's documentary material, all Defendants did associate with a RICO enterprise of individuals who were associated in fact and who engaged in, and whose activities did affect, interstate and foreign commerce.

Likewise, all Defendants did conduct and/or participate, either directly or indirectly, in the conduct of the affairs of said RICO enterprise through a pattern of racketeering activity, all in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ $\underline{1961}(4)$, (5), (9), and $\underline{1962}(c)$.

During the ten (10) calendar years preceding March 1, 2003 A.D., all Defendants did cooperate jointly and severally in the commission of two (2) or more of the RICO predicate acts that are itemized in the RICO laws at 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961(1)(A) and (B), and did so in violation of the RICO law at 18 U.S.C. 1962(c) (Prohibited activities).

Plaintiff further alleges that all Defendants did commit two (2) or more of the offenses itemized above in a manner which they calculated and premeditated intentionally to threaten continuity, i.e. a continuing threat of their respective racketeering activities, also in violation of the RICO law at 18 U.S.C. 1962(c) supra.

Pursuant to 84 Stat. 947, Sec. 904, Oct. 15, 1970, the RICO laws itemized above are to be *liberally* construed by this honorable Court. Said construction rule was never codified in Title 18 of the United States Code, however. *Respondent superior* (as explained above).

COUNT THREE:

Conspiracy to Engage in a Pattern of Racketeering Activity: 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961(5), 1962(d)

Plaintiff now re-alleges each and every allegation as set forth above, and hereby incorporates same by reference, as if all were set forth fully herein. Substance prevails over form.

At various times and places partially enumerated in Plaintiff's documentary material, all Defendants did conspire to acquire and maintain an interest in a RICO enterprise engaged in a pattern of racketeering activity, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1962(b) and (d).

At various times and places partially enumerated in Plaintiff's documentary material, all Defendants did also conspire to conduct and participate in said RICO enterprise through a pattern of racketeering activity, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1962(c) and (d).

See also 18 U.S.C. \S 1961(4), (5) and (9).

During the ten (10) calendar years preceding March 1, 2003 A.D., all Defendants did cooperate jointly and severally in the commission of two (2) or more of the predicate acts that are itemized at 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961(1)(A) and (B), in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1962(d).

- Plaintiff further alleges that all Defendants did commit two (2)

 or more of the offenses itemized above in a manner which they

 calculated and premeditated intentionally to threaten continuity, i.e.
- 4 a continuing threat of their respective racketeering activities, also
- 5 in violation of <u>18 U.S.C. 1962</u>(d) (Prohibited activities *supra*).
- 6 Pursuant to 84 Stat. 947, Sec. 904, Oct. 15, 1970, the RICO laws
- 7 itemized above are to be *liberally* construed by this honorable Court.
- 8 Said construction rule was never codified in Title 18 of the United
- 9 States Code, however. Respondent superior (as explained above).

10 RELIEF REQUESTED

- 11 Wherefore, pursuant to the statutes at 18 U.S.C. 1964(a) and (c),
- 12 Plaintiff requests judgment against all named Defendants as follows:

13 ON COUNT ONE:

- 14 1. That this Court liberally construe the RICO laws and thereby find
- 15 that all Defendants, both jointly and severally, have acquired
- and maintained, both directly and indirectly, an interest in and/
- or control of a RICO enterprise of persons and of other
- individuals who were associated in fact, all of whom engaged in,
- and whose activities did affect, interstate and foreign commerce
- in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1962 (b) (Prohibited activities).
- 21 2. That all Defendants and all their directors, officers, employees,
- agents, servants and all other *persons* in active concert or in
- participation with them, be enjoined temporarily during pendency
- of this action, and *permanently* thereafter, from acquiring or
- 25 maintaining, whether directly or indirectly, any interest in or
- 26 control of any RICO enterprise of persons, or of other

- individuals associated in fact, who are engaged in, or whose
 activities do affect, interstate or foreign commerce.
- 3. That all Defendants and all of their directors, officers,
 4 employees, agents, servants and all other persons in active
 5 concert or in participation with them, be enjoined temporarily
 6 during pendency of this action, and permanently thereafter, from
 7 committing any more predicate acts in furtherance of the RICO
 8 enterprise alleged in COUNT ONE supra.
- 9 4. That all Defendants be required to account for all gains,
 10 profits, and advantages derived from their several acts of
 11 racketeering activity in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1962(b) and from
 12 all other violation(s) of applicable State and federal law(s).
- 13 5. That judgment be entered for Plaintiff and against all Defendants
 14 for Plaintiff's actual damages, and for any gains, profits, or
 15 advantages attributable to all violations of 18 U.S.C. 1962(b),
 16 according to the best available proof.
- 17 6. That all Defendants pay to Plaintiff treble (triple) damages,
 18 under authority of 18 U.S.C. 1964(c), for any gains, profits, or
 19 advantages attributable to all violations of 18 U.S.C. 1962(b),
 20 according to the best available proof.
- 7. That all Defendants pay to Plaintiff all damages sustained by
 Plaintiff in consequence of Defendants' several violations of 18

 U.S.C. 1962 (b), according to the best available proof.
- 24 8. That all Defendants pay to Plaintiff His costs of the lawsuit incurred herein including, but not limited to, all necessary research, all non-judicial enforcement and all reasonable

- 1 counsel's fees, at a minimum of \$150.00 per hour worked 2 (Plaintiff's standard professional rate at start of this action).
- 9. That all damages caused by all Defendants, and all gains, profits, and advantages derived by all Defendants, from their several acts of racketeering in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1962(b) and from all other violation(s) of applicable State and federal law(s), be deemed to be held in constructive trust, legally foreign with respect to the federal zone [sic], for the benefit of Plaintiff, His heirs and assigns.
- 10. That Plaintiff have such other and further relief as this Court
 11 deems just and proper, under the circumstances of this action.

12 **ON COUNT TWO:**

- 1. That this Court liberally construe the RICO laws and thereby find
 that all Defendants have associated with a RICO enterprise of
 persons and of other individuals who were associated in fact, all
 of whom did engage in, and whose activities did affect,
 interstate and foreign commerce in violation of the RICO law at
 18 U.S.C. 1962(c) (Prohibited activities).
- That this Court liberally construe the RICO laws and thereby find that all Defendants have conducted and/or participated, directly or indirectly, in the affairs of said RICO enterprise through a pattern of racketeering activity in violation of the RICO laws at 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961(5) ("pattern" defined) and 1962(c) supra.
- 24 3. That all Defendants and all of their directors, officers,
 25 employees, agents, servants and all other *persons* in active
 26 concert or in participation with them, be enjoined *temporarily*27 during pendency of this action, and *permanently* thereafter, from

- associating with any RICO enterprise of persons, or of other individuals associated in fact, who do engage in, or whose activities do affect, interstate and foreign commerce.
- 4 That all Defendants and all of their directors, officers, 5 employees, agents, servants and all other persons in active 6 concert or in participation with them, be enjoined temporarily 7 during pendency of this action, and permanently thereafter, from 8 conducting or participating, either directly or indirectly, in 9 the conduct of the affairs of any RICO enterprise through a 10 pattern of racketeering activity in violation of the RICO laws at 11 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961(5) and 1962(c) supra.
- 12 5. That all Defendants and all of their directors, officers,
 13 employees, agents, servants and all other persons in active
 14 concert or in participation with them, be enjoined temporarily
 15 during pendency of this action, and permanently thereafter, from
 16 committing any more predicate acts in furtherance of the RICO
 17 enterprise alleged in COUNT TWO supra.
- 18 6. That all Defendants be required to account for all gains,
 19 profits, and advantages derived from their several acts of
 20 racketeering in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1962(c) supra and from all
 21 other violation(s) of applicable State and federal law(s).
- 7. That judgment be entered for Plaintiff and against all Defendants for Plaintiff's actual damages, and for any gains, profits, or advantages attributable to all violations of 18 U.S.C. 1962(c) supra, according to the best available proof.
- 26 8. That all Defendants pay to Plaintiff treble (triple) damages, 27 under authority of 18 U.S.C. 1964(c), for any gains, profits, or

- advantages attributable to all violations of 18 U.S.C. 1962 (c) 2 supra, according to the best available proof.
- That all Defendants pay to Plaintiff all damages sustained by Plaintiff in consequence of Defendants' several violations of 18
 U.S.C. 1962(c) supra, according to the best available proof.
- That all Defendants pay to Plaintiff His costs of the lawsuit incurred herein including, but not limited to, all necessary research, all non-judicial enforcement and all reasonable counsel's fees, at a minimum of \$150.00 per hour worked (Plaintiff's standard professional rate at start of this action).
- 11. That all damages caused by all Defendants, and all gains,
 12 profits, and advantages derived by all Defendants, from their
 13 several acts of racketeering in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1962(c)
 14 supra and from all other violation(s) of applicable State and
 15 federal law(s), be deemed to be held in constructive trust,
 16 legally foreign with respect to the federal zone [sic], for the
 17 benefit of Plaintiff, His heirs and assigns.
- 12. That Plaintiff have such other and further relief as this Court
 19 deems just and proper, under the full range of relevant
 20 circumstances which have occasioned the instant action.

ON COUNT THREE:

1. That this Court liberally construe the RICO laws and thereby find that all Defendants have conspired to acquire and maintain an interest in, and/or conspired to acquire and maintain control of, a RICO enterprise engaged in a pattern of racketeering activity in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961(5), 1962(b) and (d) supra.

- That this Court liberally construe the RICO laws and thereby find that all Defendants have conspired to conduct and participate in said RICO enterprise through a pattern of racketeering activity in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961(5), 1962(c) and (d) supra.
- That all Defendants and all their directors, officers, employees, agents, servants and all other persons in active concert or in participation with them, be enjoined temporarily during pendency of this action, and permanently thereafter, from conspiring to acquire or maintain an interest in, or control of, any RICO enterprise that engages in a pattern of racketeering activity in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961(5), 1962(b) and (d) supra.
- 12 4. That all Defendants and all their directors, officers, employees,
 13 agents, servants and all other persons in active concert or in
 14 participation with them, be enjoined temporarily during pendency
 15 of this action, and permanently thereafter, from conspiring to
 16 conduct, participate in, or benefit in any manner from any RICO
 17 enterprise through a pattern of racketeering activity in
 18 violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961(5), 1962(c) and (d) supra.
 - 5. That all Defendants and all their directors, officers, employees, agents, servants and all other persons in active concert or in participation with them, be enjoined temporarily during pendency of this action, and permanently thereafter, from committing any more predicate acts in furtherance of the RICO enterprise alleged in COUNT THREE supra.
- 25 6. That all Defendants be required to account for all gains, 26 profits, and advantages derived from their several acts of

20

21

22

23

- 1 racketeering in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1962(d) supra and from all 2 other violation(s) of applicable State and federal law(s).
- 3 7. That judgment be entered for Plaintiff and against all Defendants 4 for Plaintiff's actual damages, and for any gains, profits, or 5 advantages attributable to all violations of 18 U.S.C. 1962 (d) 6 supra, according to the best available proof.
- That all Defendants pay to Plaintiff treble (triple) damages, 7 8. 8 under authority of 18 U.S.C. 1964(c), for any gains, profits, or 9 advantages attributable to all violations of 18 U.S.C. 1962(d) 10 supra, according to the best available proof.
- 11 That all Defendants pay to Plaintiff all damages sustained by 9. 12 Plaintiff in consequence of Defendants' several violations of 1813 U.S.C. 1962(d) supra, according to the best available proof.
 - 10. That all Defendants pay to Plaintiff His costs of the lawsuit incurred herein including, but not limited to, all necessary research, all non-judicial enforcement, and all reasonable counsel's fees, at a minimum of \$150.00 per hour worked (Plaintiff's standard professional rate at start of this action).
- That all damages caused by all Defendants, and all gains, 11. profits, and advantages derived by all Defendants, from their several acts of racketeering in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1962(d) supra and from all other violation(s) of applicable State and federal law(s), be deemed to be held in constructive trust, 24 legally foreign with respect to the federal zone [sic], for the benefit of Plaintiff, His heirs and assigns.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- 1 12. That Plaintiff have such other and further relief as this Court
- 2 deems just and proper, under the full range of relevant
- 3 circumstances which have occasioned the instant action.

1 SUMMARY OF DAMAGES 23 Summary of Reasonable Counsel's Fees: TBA 4 5 Summary of Consequential Damages: TBA 6 7 Summary of Actual Damages (partial list): 8 9 unpaid professional invoices: \$ 0.00 10 triple damage multiplier (3x): \$ 0.00 11 12 13 copyright infringements, actual: \$0.00 14 15 triple damage multiplier (3x): \$0.00 16 17 trademark infringements, actual: \$0.00 18 19 triple damage multiplier (3x): \$0.00 20 21 22 \$0.00 Subtotal: 23 24 25 Summary of Punitive Damages (3x): \$0.00 26 27 28 TOTAL DAMAGES (minimum): \$0.00 29 30 The damage matrix is geometric: for each Defendant, there are 31 actual, consequential, and punitive damages (3 columns) on each of

32

three counts (3 rows).

1	JURY DEMAND
2	Plaintiff hereby demands trial by jury on all issues triable to a
3	jury lawfully convened.
4	
5	LIST OF EXHIBITS
6	Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1961 (9), Plaintiff now formally
7	incorporates His documentary material by reference to all of the
8	following Exhibits, as if set forth fully here, to wit:
9	
10	Exhibit "A" with Cover Sheets
11	Exhibit "B" with Cover Sheets
12	Exhibit <u>"C"</u> with Cover Sheets
13	Exhibit "D" with Cover Sheets
14	Exhibit <u>"E"</u> with Cover Sheets
15	Exhibit <u>"F"</u> with Cover Sheets
16	Exhibit "G" with Cover Sheets
17	Exhibit "H" with Cover Sheets
18	Exhibit <u>"I"</u> with Cover Sheets
19	Exhibit "J" with Cover Sheets
20	Exhibit <u>"K"</u> with Cover Sheets
21	Exhibit <u>"L"</u> with Cover Sheets
22	Exhibit "M" with Cover Sheets

Exhibit "N" with Cover Sheets

1 VERIFICATION 2 I, _____, representative of Plaintiffs in the above 3 entitled action, hereby verify under penalty of perjury, under the 4 laws of the United States of America that the above statement of facts 5 and laws is true and correct, according to the best of My current 6 information, knowledge, and belief, so help me God, pursuant to 287 U.S.C. 1746(1). See the Supremacy Clause in the Constitution for the 8 United States of America, as lawfully amended (hereinafter "U.S. 9 Constitution"). 10 11 12 Dated: 13 14 Signed: 15 16 Printed: