

**To: Attorney Christine Long, Berliner-Cohen, San Jose. SBN 199676.** May be left with an associate.

Ms. Long, good day. **THIS SUPERSEDES AN OLDER COPY THAT DOUG V. MAY HAVE EMAILED IN ERROR.** Thank you for communicating recently with Doug V. Try to do so more often this month. Or we can wait until the demurrer. See further down about the demurrer. Unrelated: For your convenience, this document and others delivered recently will go into Google along with process server notes.

I need to ask you about two issues. First, in a February 2024 hearing, you referenced a State Farm matter. A CA-DOI supervisor told me that the matter was so confidential that he himself was unable to send me basic information. So, how, exactly, did you learn about the matter? Did Tracey Kennedy violate the rules, or did you? Second, Sheppard-Mullin later attempted to relay a threat to me. The wording was “Kiraly should be warned that Sheppard-Mullin is far more powerful than Berliner-Cohen”. I feel that the wording may be of interest to the State Bar. Regardless, explain the nature of the communications this year between your firm and Sheppard-Mullin.

Moving on, I’m interested in proposals such as the one that you’ve sent. Yes, if everything is addressed, we can put the legal side of the current matter aside. However, I need to be able to move forward without the continuing damage that you and your clients have caused. This means that I don’t presently plan to sign an agreement unless the State Farm matter is addressed.

I never expected you to agree to provide the cash needed to retain an attorney to sue State Farm. Nor do I necessarily expect you to work things out directly with Tracey Kennedy. Though the evidence does suggest that the two of you are familiar with each other. However, a flat refusal by you means a flat refusal by me. Regarding that path, the path of refusal to settle, allow me to note a few more points.

Your downside risk in the demurrer this month is greater than my downside risk. In my worst case, I’ll need to do a defense that I’m prepared to do. But, in your worst case, things will be rather negative for your clients and, ultimately, for you. Is this not so?

Additionally, my understanding is that, noise aside, the case will depend, to some extent, on the use of the word “Jihadi”. The thing is, your clients, or at least some of the individuals involved, are certainly Jihadis. And, as I’ve said before, I will, and I don’t believe that you can prevent this, look into bringing in an expert witness who is familiar with Muslim issues. It might be an Imam. I ask you again, are your Jihadi clients prepared to face a witness of this nature? And for all of it to go into Google and to stay there?

I’ll add that I met in person on May 02, 2024 with a Muslim attorney in part to discuss expert witnesses. He’s a Muslim of faith, unlike your Jihadis. He literally laughed at the thought that you’d win based on the word.

The Muslim attorney in question has never respected you. Not for honesty or for ability. Respectfully, and the term is sincere though only for this letter, few do respect you. The point is relevant. Let’s talk about your past cases in due course. 100% of which cases, all of them, I’ve taken the liberty of pulling for review and analysis.

It would be nearly as audacious as the “Jihadi” issue to put somebody, Mark Hashimi, on the stand to protest that he is lily-white in terms of fraud when his own wife Katheryn Campos cited concerns of fraud as grounds for divorce. As the kids say, “Awk-ward”. By the way, those divorce papers are on the website now.

While we’re on the subject of documentation, you’re aware that, if the case must proceed, some of the discovery you’ve demanded will, for legitimate and reasonable purposes, be posted and will go into Google. Have you reflected on the scope and the implications of your demands?

We’d all like this matter to be brought to a close as opposed to continuing, with legitimate and reasonable consequences that are protected under U.S. laws, until the 2030s. You’re invited to settle.

Regards, Robert (the Old Coder)