

## **THE SUPREME COURTS IN ALASKA AND VERMONT HAVE RULED...**

Here is how it works:

The Attorney General brings a stupid charge with no victims and in some cases the company having never done business with even one customer as in the case of Vermont. In preparation for any trial there are discovery demands where both sides are entitled to get information that is relevant to their case from the other side. In the case of a criminal charge the defendant has rights not to give things out that could hurt himself, but in civil cases the same rules do not apply. A classic example would be where they railroaded OJ Simpson in the civil trial but could not convict him in the criminal trial where he had rights. In either case, they can demand discovery (to discover certain facts that are relevant to the charges.) In Alaska and Vermont they demanded to have all our proprietary information on all our research projects and even how to build them. Of course this had nothing to do with consumer affairs since none of these things were products or were even ever offered for sale. We objected to this far reaching discovery and the judges just told us to “give the AG anything he asked us for”. We demanded a hearing and the judge refused to even meet to discuss the relevance of the discovery demands. We had no choice but to refuse to give them what they were demanding (see the presentation I gave to the Vermont Supreme Court.) Then the judge could hold us in contempt of court. The AG then files a motion for Summary Judgment. He argument was that since we refused to give them their discovery they could not prepare for a trial so they should win without a trial. The judge ruled in their favor, and gave them a Summary Judgment, which means they win without having to prove we ever did anything wrong. We could either lose this judgment or give them all our top-secret research.

Of course we appealed the judgment to the higher courts (including in both cases, the Supreme Court.) In Vermont I applied to be heard and was granted that right. The reader can read the exact presentation I gave to these justices and I gave them all a copy and it is part of the record. Their reactions that day indicated to me, and my attorney, that they were moved toward my arguments. Of course behind the scenes that could never do. Believe it or not they ruled that I should have given all our secret research to the AG! How do you avoid abuse when the fix is in to this level? They win nothing. It is civil and all they can get is a fine from me and I am broke and own nothing of value. In case you are wondering I also do not control any trusts, either. These are the facts behind the two loses in Alaska and Vermont which will most likely be settled out of court and voluntarily changed to no wrong doing.

Now comes the Vermont AG crowing over his victory. If you read his interpretation he word smiths an impression that there was ever a trial or that anything was ever proven... which it was not. There was no trial and all that happened was that we refused to give them discovery, which finally at the very end of his dialogue he, in the last paragraph, he writes that the Superior Court acting within their discretion in requiring Lee to respond to the State’s DISCOVERY DEMANDS ( but they now refer to them as REQUESTS), and

imposing sanctions (the sanction was a SUMMARY JUDGMENT) **FOR HIS (LEE'S)  
FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THOSE ORDERS!!!**

**Your honors, I rest my case!**

**Dennis**