

SYNOPSIS OF THE PURPOSE OF THIS POSTING

BEING THE TARGET OF A CONSERVED MEDIA SMEAR CAMPAIGN BASED ON OUTRIGHT LIES AND BLATANT MISREPRESENTATIONS DESERVES A RESPONSE TO SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT.

PREAMBLE: The truth needs to be told. Robert Anglen of the Arizona Republic, a Gannett Company property, with his tales of fallacy having also appeared with the USA Today and Channel 12 News Phoenix, is an irresponsible, unethical, unprofessional, integrity challenged, repeated liar and charlatan who operates under the guise of being a so-called “investigative journalist.” This piece is the response to the four (4) years of abuse of journalism perpetrated by Robert Anglen. It is an EXTENSIVE recap of the FACTUAL events that occurred. It is a LONG rendition of the issues that surrounded these circumstances. Sorry, it is difficult to respond to 3.5 years of printed deception, an 11 piece series of articles totaling over 55 pages of content, multiple TV news segments and a number of online video posts in some pithy and concise manner. Especially when taking into account the amount of lies, misrepresentation and predatory journalism practiced by Robert Anglen that needs to be addressed.

This post is not for everyone. It is for anyone who cares about journalistic integrity and the code of ethics for responsible journalism. It is of interest to anyone who is concerned about the media being actively involved in an attempt to prejudice legal litigation to sway the judicial process based on conjured up emotional reactions to the detriment of the legal and factual basis of the arguments before the courts. It is of interest to anyone who has been the target of media attacks calling for a vigilante mob mentality to involve law enforcement on what is a modern day “witch hunt.” It is of interest to anyone who believes major media is no longer a credible source of objective and unbiased news reporting, it is just another online “blog” resource spewing whatever opinion suits the mood of an individual (“journalist”) at the moment. If you fit into any of these groups you may find the detail and perspective presented to be an interesting study of what has become of a once respected and revered profession. That idealism has been destroyed by the likes of a journalist hack such as Robert Anglen.

Here the TRUTH will be told for those that care. Again, sorry for the voluminous amount of content – a rebuttal based on FACTS is a tedious endeavor considering the amount of manure that has been spread by Robert Anglen since his first articles were published thirty-eight (38) months ago.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PG. 3 ... THE DEATH OF ETHICAL JOURNALISM: ROBERT ANGLLEN PROVES THE OLD STANDARDS OF JOURNALISTIC INTEGRITY HAVE GIVEN WAY TO THE MOB ONLINE BLOG SENSATIONALISM.

PG. 4 ... AN AGENDA WAS ESTABLISHED EARLY THAT WOULD DICTATE THE ANGLLEN NARRATIVE THROUGHOUT THE ARTICLES PUBLISHED OVER THE NEXT THREE AND HALF (3.5) YEARS

PG. 5 ... THE SOR WEBSITES: WERE THEY CREATED TO BE AN “EXTORTION” SCHEME TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF CONVICTED SEX OFFENDERS?

PG. 8 ... ALL ARTICLES AUTHORED OVER A PERIOD EXCEEDING THREE YEARS ESTABLISH A PATTERN OF BLATANT DISREGARD TO THE PRINCIPLES OF UNBIASED AND OBJECTIVE JOURNALISM

PG. 8 ... THE ANGLER ARTICLES: ALL ELEVEN PIECES PUBLISHED BY GANNETT COMPANY MEDIA ARE MADE EASILY AVAILABLE TO THE READER FOR THEIR REVIEW. THE SOR WEBSITES DOES NOT HIDE FROM THE NEGATIVE COVERAGE; IT ONLY PROVES THE TRUTH OF THE MALFEASANCE OF ANGLER

PG. 9 ... WHAT ANGLER DID NOT WANT READERS TO KNOW ABOUT? THE FACTS ARE PROVIDED FOR READERS REVIEW TO MAKE THEIR OWN CONCLUSIONS OF WHAT THE TRUTH IS TO THIS "STORY"

PG. 9 ... EXTORTION

PG. 10 ... \$50 MILLION ALASKAN PONZI-SCHEME

PG. 10 ... A JUDGMENT AGAINST WEB EXPRESS, LLC FOR \$80 THOUSAND

PG. 11 ... GILSON VS. RODRICK NAME CHANGE MISREPRESENTATION

PG. 11 ... ANGLER CLAIMS WEB DEVELOPER PAID \$230 THOUSAND IN CREATING THE SOR WEBSITES

PG. 12 ... ANGLER IS NOT NEW TO SHODDY RESEARCH AND FABRICATING NEWS STORIES. HE HAS PRIORS

PG. 14 ... EXPUNGED RECORDS AND STRESS DUE TO PROFILES APPEARING ON THE SOR WEBSITES

PG. 14 ... FRANK SILVA INTERVIEW AND THE TRIAL OUTCOME

PG. 16 ... THE CONVICTED CHILD MOLESTER FROM LOUISIANA

PG. 18 ... GLENN WYRICK ARTICLE AND HIS RETRACTION

PG. 20 ... THE GORDON GRAINGER INTERVIEW

PG. 22 ... THE CONVICTED CHILD MOLESTER ADAM GALVEZ INTERVIEW

PG. 25 ... THE SUSAN GALVEZ TRIAL TESTIMONY

PG. 25 ... THE JEREMY RYAN GRAVES AND JANINE GRAVES INTERVIEWS

PG. 27 ... ATTORNEY DAN WARNER TESTIFIES AT THE TRIAL

PG. 28 ... THE RODRICK LOSS IN THE ARIZONA SUPERIOR COURT LAWSUIT

PG. 30 ... ANGLER FABRICATES RODRICK QUOTES AFTER ARIZONA SUPERIOR COURT LOSS

PG. 30 ... THE JUDGE COOPER FIASCO AND AN APPEAL BASED ON THE APPEARANCE OF IMPROPRIETY

PG. 33 ... MICHIGAN CASES AGAINST THE SOR WEBSITES

PG. 34 ... ANGLER IMPLIES IRS ISSUE

PG. 34 ... CARSON DEVASTATING LOSS ON ALL SEX OFFENDER CLAIMS - BELLUCCI CALLS RODRICK A "BULLY"

PG. 36 ... THE FALSE CLAIMS AS REPORTED BY ANGLER WAS AIRED ON PHOENIX CHANNEL 12 NEWS

PG. 37 ... ANGLER REPEATEDLY ATTEMPTS TO INVOLVE LAW ENFORCEMENT TO PURSUE CHARGES AGAINST THE SOR WEBSITES. THIS IS NOT JOURNALISM. THIS IS ADVOCACY

PG. 39 ... FBI INVESTIGATION AND "VICTIM" LETTERS

PG. 41 ... ANGLER REPEATEDLY DEFENDS REDACTED DESPITE THE OVERWHELMING EVIDENCE OF LIES

THE "REAL" UNTOLD STORY

THE DEATH OF ETHICAL JOURNALISM: ROBERT ANGLER PROVES THE OLD STANDARDS OF JOURNALISTIC INTEGRITY HAVE GIVEN WAY TO THE MOB ONLINE BLOG SENSATIONALISM.

There was a time when being a journalist required meeting a standard of ethics and integrity that were above reproach. People actually believed there was such a thing as journalistic integrity based on a revered [code of ethics](#). Due to these perceived prerequisites the readers/viewers believed they could trust the basis of a story to have a foundation based on the TRUTH and supported by the FACTS. High profile media icons such as Dan Rather and Brian Williams shattered our naivety. The disclosure of such individual professional indiscretions were just indicative of a profession that was being negatively influenced and radically reshaped due to the onslaught of competition coming in the form of internet social media like Facebook/Instagram/Twitter – news blogs - 500 plus cable TV channels – an array of other outlets like Reddit - all fighting and clamoring for the same eyeballs. The reality of the profession of the "news" that had been based on a set of ethics and integrity has given way to the dictates of viewer ratings and online clicks – the TRUTH is damned when it is an inconvenience to telling a "story." This brings us to the work of the so-called "investigative journalist" Robert Angler.

Robert Angler (hereafter, "Angler") is employed by Gannett Company as a self proclaimed "investigative journalist." In regard to the subjects discussed in this posting, it will address work authored by Angler and published on Gannett Company properties; such as their papers Arizona Republic and USA Today; their online properties such as azcentral.com and USAToday.com; and video segments prepared for and aired by Phoenix Channel 12 News (previously a Gannett Company property before a ["spin off"](#) between Publishing Properties and Broadcast, Digital Properties). Sometime in 2012, working in the capacity of "Consumer Investigations" for the Arizona Republic and Channel 12 News, Angler would begin investigating complaints received concerning Arizona based websites Offendex.com and SORarchives.com (*hereafter*, "SOR websites"). The websites provide approximately 775,000 profiles detailing the criminal convictions of individuals that involved sex crimes – convicted sex offenders. The complaints received were alleging the websites were guilty of many transgressions including "extortion," collecting payments to "remove" profiles that would not be "removed," falsely naming individuals as having committed sex crimes that had never been convicted of any crime, falsely claiming individuals had to register with a Sex Offender Registry, and cyber harassment just to name the core and most serious accusations. On its face such allegation would seem to justify a thorough "consumer investigation", if such fraudulent conduct so brazen and disturbing were actually being perpetrated by an Arizona enterprise. The problem is all the allegations were complete fabrications of the FACTS. At

best the information provided to Anglen then and over the next 3 years were misrepresentations, one-sided depictions of events, falsified documentation, no documentation at all, and obvious fabrications. Many of the allegations were outright blatant lies easily verified as such. Did “investigative journalist” Anglen objectively and thoroughly review the information in order to present the FACTS based on the evidence available when authoring his findings in this matter? No, he did not. The work of Anglen is an affront to the code of ethics purported to be practiced by professional journalists. It has been a travesty to the principles of TRUTH in journalism and we are going to detail why with irrefutable evidence – a concept that is foreign to the practices employed by Anglen as demonstrated with his series of articles associated with the SOR websites.

AN AGENDA WAS ESTABLISHED EARLY THAT WOULD DICTATE THE ANGLEN NARRATIVE THROUGHOUT THE ARTICLES PUBLISHED OVER THE NEXT THREE AND HALF (3.5) YEARS

The foundation for the series of the Anglen articles has been that the SOR websites were engaged in deceptive and/or illegal practices. According to Anglen they had even crossed the line to criminal conduct. To this day it is not understood the legal or factual basis that would justify such determinations. He derived at this conclusions solely on personal opinion and presented his own bias as substantiated evidence. His articles openly acknowledge he has actively been in contact with multiple law enforcement agencies questioning their lack of a criminal investigation. He has even implied criminal indictments were a necessary outcome for the parties. When does the “objective” journalist persona become proper to cross over to zealot advocate when publishing articles with a national media conglomerate like Gannett Company calling for action as the judge, jury and executioner? If Anglen wishes to write fiction based on whatever his personal opinions may be on a subject such as the online dissemination of the factual criminal histories of convicted sex offenders – so be it. Just call it what it is: “fiction.”

The basis for this clear bias repeatedly demonstrated by Anglen is unknown (some unproven theories have involved a family connection and personal history). Its existence was first exposed in an exchange found on the [Anglen Facebook](#) page prior to the first article being published May 26, 2013. Two months prior, on March 22, 2013, an exchange occurred between Anglen and convicted sex offender Gordon Grainger. We will detail the FACTS about Gordon Grainger later in this piece when addressing the interview that was reported by Anglen in one of his articles. In the exchange, Anglen reveals his efforts in preparing the article is specifically geared to drawing the attention of law enforcement (see, [Exhibit 1](#)):

Anglen: “This is a pretty straight lawsuit story that doesn’t really have the scope or the reach of an investigation. I know you’re glad to see it getting attention; what you want is a story that is also going to grab the attention of law enforcement, or at least ask the question why this has been allowed to go on so long, which we intend to do.”

Anglen: “Is Adam part of this suit?” (We will address who convicted child molester Adam Galvez is later in this piece)

Grainger: “Yes it is about time they got this started. Yes the FBI in my city told me that this is a state issue and not federal which I call bullshit on that because Chuck Rodrick a.k.a. Gilson has violated laws in all 50 states.”

Prior to publishing the first of the articles, Anglen is discussing with a convicted sex offender, who would be portrayed as some kind of “victim” of the SOR websites in the article, the need to beef up the story

by getting a criminal investigation aspect added to the narrative. Even though Grainger openly conveys to Anglen that the FBI had been contacted and no such criminal conduct was being investigated. Anglen would prove to be determined to introduce a criminal aspect to his version of events, no matter how many misrepresentations would be required. No matter the ignored FACTS, lack of any evidence, no support documentation, no case law and no criminal statutes existing and/or violated to support the direction Anglen had chosen to present his “story.”

Special Note: Anglen would have an interview with Brent Oesterblad (hereafter, “Oesterblad”) to discuss the ownership of the SOR websites. Oesterblad was not an owner; he was in charge of handling all communications required for the SOR websites (online forms, emails, telephone calls, fax, letter correspondence, complaints and Government contacts). He also authored content that were rebuttal pieces addressing attacks against SOR websites such as the Anglen articles. In the interview Oesterblad would specifically mention the Facebook exchange with Grainger to which Anglen claimed he did not recall his comments. However, the very NEXT DAY the posting was pulled down from the Anglen Facebook. Why would a journalist feel compelled to pull down a Facebook exchange with a source used in his articles months after it had occurred?(Just asking) Luckily a screenshot had been taken to be able to provide a future review (see, [Exhibit 1](#)).

THE SOR WEBSITES: WERE THEY CREATED TO BE AN “EXTORTION” SCHEME TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF CONVICTED SEX OFFENDERS?

Many of the attacks directed toward the SOR websites have been rationalized that they are justified because they constituted a “Mugshot Extortion” scheme. We are going to address the fallacy of these claims by discussing the original business model, the inclusion of a “review” and “removal” option, the difference between the SOR websites vs. “Mugshot Extortion” websites, direct contact with hundreds of Government agencies, all 50 states have a version of a Freedom of Information Act or Public Record Act and a variety of case law from the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals all the way to the Supreme Court. Although over the entirety of working on the articles spanning four (4) years, Anglen consistently chose to ignore the FACTS of these variables or inexplicitly remained ignorant to these factors that directly impact the validity of his assertions presented to his readers/viewers.

The website Offendex.com was developed in December of 2011 and launched in January of 2012. It was a very simple website based on the foundation of the backend MySQL database of approximately 775,000 profiles of individuals convicted of any designated sex crime across all 50 states. The website provided search functionality that allowed the input of ten (10) different criteria to identify a possible convicted sex offender by name, address, zip code, facial hair, tattoos, ethnicity, etc. Also a very important facet of the SOR websites is the data was NOT stored behind a firewall. This allowed Google “spiders” to access the data and categorize the information. This simple program allowed the data to receive high relevancy scores placing the results many times on the first page of a Google search. It was a unique approach to the sex offender database space that made it exceedingly easy to find information that otherwise may have been difficult to locate online. This was obviously NOT to the liking of convicted sex offenders or their advocates such as Anglen.

The original business models was a Google AdSense advertising concept and to provide a subscription model for news, alerts and updates for a small monthly fee. The subscription model was not received by viewers as an option worth signing up to receive. There was minimal interest in paying for such a service no matter the modest charge. Accessing the database from the SOR websites was a free service that peaked in 2013 with over 20,000 UNIQUE DAILY VISITORS (600,000 monthly) searching for information about convicted sex offenders in their neighborhoods. The SOR websites provide a very

valuable tool for people to be informed about very important facts concerning their communities. However, the 50 -100 (a minuscule 0.25% – 0.50%) of these daily visitors who found themselves displayed with their FACTUAL criminal histories of a sex offense conviction were not pleased. It was NOT foreseen when launching the website there would be such an overwhelming deluge of threats coming from profiled individuals of physical harm, cyber harassment and imminent legal action. The basis for these threats was claims the information detailing their criminal histories were not accurate. Basically they would deny the sex offense conviction had ever occurred or for one excuse or another that their profiles were prohibited from being disseminated online. As the 775,000 profiles had been obtained from third party sources, there was no way that each individual profile had been reviewed. After consulting with a prominent law firm in Phoenix, Jennings Strouss Law Firm, it was decided to offer a FREE “review” and a \$500 “removal” option. This program was designed to allow a profile to be identified and challenged for its validity as representing a sex offense CONVICTION had actually occurred. This was done for FREE and thousands of “reviews” were performed. To pay for these options, a profile could be requested to be removed for a fee of \$500. Upon request for “removal” the profile would be investigated to confirm that the convicted sex offender was NOT a repeat offender and had NOT been designated by the authorities at some time to be a “High Risk” recidivism concern. If they met these criteria they would be removed from further dissemination on the SOR websites. If not, their money was returned. There were dozens of “removal” requests denied and monies paid were returned when it was discovered they did not meet the requirements.

The sex offenders, sex offender advocacy groups and Anglen would claim these practices constituted “extortion.” NOTE: an “extortionist” does NOT return money for any reason – ever. They are all categorically wrong. For one thing, there are very distinct differences between how the SOR websites operated and so called “Mugshot Extortion” websites. First, the data was exclusive to sex crimes. Second, only CONVICTED sex offenders were displayed versus other websites which display individuals charged with any number of criminal offenses that may at a later date be dismissed or the person was found innocent. (REPEATING FOR EMPHASIS: ONLY CONVICTED SEX OFFENDERS WERE FOUND IN THE SOR DATABASE). Third, other “mugshot” website did not offer a FREE “review” option. Fourth, a paid “removal” was researched to confirm a set of criteria before approved, other “mugshot” websites operated on a pay and any profile is immediately removed. Fifth, the case law is VERY clear supporting the legalities of republishing and online dissemination of public records. Anglen in writing his articles has failed to ever point out these obvious differences that a simple comparison when “investigating” the story would have revealed. Why would a journalist omit such pertinent details from his stories?

It is not surprising that the torrent of complaints being received from angry convicted sex offenders would be followed with inquiries being received from a number of government and law enforcement agencies. In all there were over 250-300 such inquiries. The SOR websites had actually provided a dedicated online form and fax number for official inquiries. These inquiries were from Sheriff Departments, Police Departments, State Sex Offender Registry departments and a Virginia Congressman’s Office. Also, correspondence was received from over two (2) dozen states and their Attorney General’s Office. The AG complaints were interesting as they were in the form of a standard “consumer complaint.” Yet, there had not been anything actually purchased by the complaining sex offender justifying being classified as a “consumer” of a service or product they had paid for. There was one exception with the State of Virginia AGs Office being received July 3, 2012 from “criminal investigator” George McLaughlin. This complaint will be discussed further when addressing the Anglen article involving Glenn Wyrick of Ashland, Virginia (John Doe #11 in the Federal lawsuit that occurred in Arizona). Every one of these complaints received from government and law enforcement agencies were promptly addressed and responded to. After receiving the response that detailed the legalities of the

database and supported with extensive case law, every one of the complaints were DISMISSED. The agencies found no wrong doing on the part of the SOR websites and there was no legal basis to challenge the dissemination of republished public records released into the public domain. In his articles Anglen discusses his direct efforts to involve law enforcement in Arizona, other states and national agencies such as the Federal Trade Commission and the FBI. The arrogance of this journalist that somehow believes HE knows more about the law – criminal conduct – criminal intent – than more than 300 professionals is astounding. Anglen is not a journalist; he is a “wannabe” cop. He believes he can intimidate and/or mislead government agencies by reporting fabricated fiction to pursue groundless accusations of wrongdoing.

What is truly amazing about the Anglen articles is that they COMPLETELY ignore ALL the case law associated with sex offender registration, republishing information from a third party source online, providing the general public access to public records released into the public domain. Although one would believe an “investigative journalist” working for a media conglomerate such as Gannett Company would have access to resources that could provide the necessary research material into these legal areas. However, even if this was not the case, all the necessary research had been done by the SOR website and was available for his review in the “Right to Know” section. For example:

[Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn, 420 U.S. 469 \(1975\)](#), was a United States Supreme Court case involving freedom of the press publishing public information. The Supreme Court ruled 8–1 in favor of Cox Broadcasting, holding Georgia's Shield Law and its common-law counterpart violated the First Amendment. The majority held "[t]he freedom of the press to publish that information appears to us to be of critical importance to our type of government in which the citizenry is the final judge of the proper conduct of public business. In preserving that form of government the First and Fourteenth Amendments command nothing less than that the States may not impose sanctions on the publication of truthful information contained in official court records open to public inspection." Since Cox's reporter had legitimately obtained the name in a public document in open court, the court held that later publication of the name was an activity protected by the 1st Amendment.

[Section 230](#) of the Communications Decency Act of 1996 is a landmark piece of Internet legislation in the United States, codified at 47 U.S.C. § 230. Section 230(c)(1) provides immunity from liability for providers and users of an "interactive computer service" who publish information provided by others: No provider or user of an interactive computer service shall be treated as the publisher or speaker of any information provided by another information content provider.

[Levitt v. Yelp, Inc., 9th Circuit Court of Appeals](#), Filed September 2, 2014. “Explaining that extortion by threatening economic harm “is an exceedingly narrow concept,” the court said that the plaintiffs didn’t adequately allege extortion. First, Yelp never directly threatened businesses with economic harm for failing to buy its advertising. Second, removing positive reviews wasn’t extortion because Yelp didn’t have to publish those reviews at all. Third, publishing or showcasing negative reviews wasn’t extortion because Yelp has the legal right “to post and sequence the reviews.”

[Freedom of Information Act or Public Record Act](#) is part of legislation found in all 50 states. With four of the Plaintiffs in the Federal Court lawsuit being from the State of Washington, the verbiage used in constructing the Public Records Act is of particular interest and telling of the purpose of such laws. The Construction of the PRA RCW 42.56.30 states:“The people of this state do not yield their sovereignty to the agencies that serve them. The people, in delegating authority, do not give their public servants the right to decide what is good for the people to know and what is not good for them to know. The people

insist on remaining informed so that they may maintain control over the instruments that they have created. This chapter shall be liberally construed and its exemptions narrowly construed to promote this public policy and to assure that the public interest will be fully protected.”

Although Anglen has repeatedly attacked the SOR websites and those associated with its operation, not once has he presented an argument that is based on **ANY** legal standard or basis that would suggest and/or certainly establish some laws had been broken. Yet, he openly insinuated that criminal conduct had occurred and called upon law enforcement to take action against parties associated with the SOR websites. One has to question the motivation for Anglen’s vitriol attacks when they cannot be supported with one statute being violated - civil or criminal. One has to conclude that the articles written by Anglen are an expression of some hidden personal disposition, flagrant ignorance or just gross incompetence.

ALL ARTICLES AUTHORED OVER A PERIOD EXCEEDING THREE YEARS ESTABLISH A PATTERN OF BLATANT DISREGARD TO THE PRINCIPLES OF UNBIASED AND OBJECTIVE JOURNALISM

According to Anglen, he had conducted an eight month “investigation” before finally submitting his first articles for publication with the Arizona Republic May 26, 2013. The article would be a front page piece for the Sunday edition accompanied with three (3) additional support pieces that would be in total a three (3) page expose’. In conjunction with the articles, he would produce a piece for Channel 12 News Phoenix to be aired at the same time. With three (3) plus years to now look back on Anglen’s work, it becomes easy to see the clear bias and concerted effort to BURY any and all FACTS pertaining to the SOR websites with character assassination and conjecture. This is not to say everything asserted by Anglen is not factually correct, but it is not difficult for an unethical journalist to “paint a picture” that skews the facts by parsing out chosen material and excluding others entirely to have the reader reach a conclusion that may not reflect the true circumstances and their association with the subject matter of an article. Anglen had an obvious agenda to attack Rodrick and Oesterblad personally and he was not holding back any punches. His goal was to make the focus on past decades old personal difficulties the focus in order to distract from the legitimate value and business practices of his true target – the SOR websites. Conversely he would use the same concept in painting the parties in opposition to the SOR websites in the best possible light. Not a particular easy job considering we are talking about child molesters, child rapists, perpetrators of sexual assault, sellers and distributors of child porn and a multi-occurrence philandering wife beater of a husband. Throw in an unethical, incompetent, “bully” of an attorney with a zealot agenda and you have quite the menagerie of fanatic malcontents. However, this is exactly what happened with repeated intentional omissions and “soft-shoe” depictions by Anglen of the adversaries of the SOR websites.

THE ANGLLEN ARTICLES: ALL ELEVEN PIECES PUBLISHED BY GANNETT COMPANY MEDIA ARE MADE EASILY AVAILABLE TO THE READER FOR THEIR REVIEW. THE SOR WEBSITES DOES NOT HIDE FROM THE NEGATIVE COVERAGE; IT ONLY PROVES THE TRUTH OF THE MALFEASENSE OF ANGLLEN

Unlike Anglen, the SOR websites believe people are intelligent and wish to be afforded FACTS in order to ascertain what the TRUTH of a subject may entail. They do NOT need to have a “story” forced fed upon them that is riddled with conjecture, supposition, obvious bias and clearly striving to depict a narrative that arrives at a predetermined agenda of the personal opinions of a so-called “journalist.” The SOR websites believe FACTS speak for themselves. In that spirit, despite the fraudulent journalism they represent, the eleven (11) pieces authored by Anglen attacking Rodrick and the SOR websites are made easily accessible online to an interested party here:

Article #1: [“Operators have had legal issues”](#) – Arizona Republic May 26, 2013

Article #2: ["Decorated veteran says websites damaged his reputation"](#) – Arizona Republic May 26, 2013

Article #3: ["No-contest plea comes back to haunt La. man years later"](#) – Arizona Republic May 26, 2013

Article #4: ["Offender's relative alleges retaliation against family"](#) – Arizona Republic May 26, 2013

Article #5: ["Sex-offender data is used to collect money and intimidate"](#) – Arizona Republic July 2, 2013

Article #6: ["Scrutiny suspends websites' dealings"](#) – Arizona Republic March 22, 2014

Article #7: ["Court hammers operator of intimidation sites"](#) – Arizona Republic April 9, 2014

Article #8: ["Sex offender websites' victims awarded \\$3.4 million"](#) – USA Today May 16, 2014

Article #9: ["Federal judges slam man in sex-offender extortion cases"](#) – Arizona Republic September 12, 2014

Article #10: ["Phoenix website's owner attorney denies harassment claims in federal complaints trial"](#) – Arizona Republic June 29, 2016

Article #11: ["Jury delivers \\$325,000 verdict against sex-offender website owner"](#) – Arizona Republic July 2, 2016

WHAT ANGLLEN DID NOT WANT READERS TO KNOW ABOUT? THE FACTS ARE PROVIDED FOR READERS REVIEW TO MAKE THEIR OWN CONCLUSIONS OF WHAT THE TRUTH IS TO THIS "STORY"

As vast a task as it represents, the SOR websites will respond to the unethical journalism of Anglen and his eleven (11) articles totaling over 17,000 words of overt "fiction," misrepresentations, omissions, conjecture, supposition, personal opinions and blatant lies authored by Anglen. All of the issues and people that were part of the articles will be addressed individually to counter the distortions of Anglen with the TRUTH supported with FACTS and EVIDENCE.

EXTORTION:

In the Anglen articles he refers to the SOR websites by using the term "extortion" TWENTY-ONE (21) TIMES. He uses such descriptions as "extortion scheme", "extortion racket", "online extortion", "extortion websites", "extortion cases" and independently just "extortion." In fact, the use of the word "extortion" was found in the subtitle of two of the articles. The repeated usage of such a derogatory and accusatory term was an intentional attempt by Anglen to sway the opinions of the readers. And what came of the claims of "extortion" against the SOR websites that Anglen made such a point to focus attention of a reader by repeatedly alleging and emphasizing the sites had engaged in such conduct? Every one of the claims alleging the SOR websites had engaged in "extortion" was DISMISSED. Beyond a simple review of the clear case law addressing the legal standards of this allegation, [Levitt v. Yelp, Inc., 9th Circuit Court of Appeals](#), there also is the FACT that the claims of the Plaintiffs NEVER produced ONE piece of supporting evidence documenting that ANY of them had paid the SOR websites for a "removal." **NOT ONE** piece of evidence would ever be produced to support claims filed in Federal Court, with FORTY (40) MONTHS to do so, that payment for a "removal" had occurred and was NOT honored by the SOR websites. How about the simplest explanation, that the denials by the SOR websites asserting that such allegations were complete fabrications were truthful. The challenges levied to Anglen to produce ONE

example of such an occurrence were never responded to because it NEVER happened. The SOR websites did not engaged in such deceptive practices, it was Anglen and his cohort convicted sex offenders who had lied from the very beginning. A listing of the twelve (12) Plaintiffs who all alleged a claim of RICO – “Extortion by Theft” is posted online [HERE](#). Where is the Anglen and Gannett Company retraction of their reporting this issue? Where is the coverage of filing false claims in Federal Court by attorney Janice Bellucci, Plaintiff REDACTED and others having knowingly falsified their allegations? When interviewing both attorney Janice Bellucci and REDACTED after the trial and this claim had been dismissed, why is this NOT a question of interest? After all, it was important enough to garner mention TWENTY-ONE (21) times in the series of articles. Where is the “call 12 for action” from Anglen for law enforcement to be “investigating” such obvious Abuse of Process, Conspiracy and Perjury by Bellucci, REDACTED and others – for actual crimes?

\$50 MILLION ALASKAN PONZI-SCHEME:

Another great example of intentional fraudulent journalism by Anglen is his referencing the “biggest-ever Ponzi-scheme in Alaska history” in his first article. He writes of Rodrick’s “**ROLE**” in this “\$50 million” fraud and how he was assessed a Judgment of \$58,900 in a Federal lawsuit. Anglen would double down on his misrepresentation in the SAME article by referring to the same situation only presenting it with different wording by writing: “Three years later, Rodrick was hit with a civil judgment for his part in a frequent-flier mileage fraud case in Alaska that cost investors as much as \$50 million.” Anglen would revisit this rendition of having a “**ROLE**” in the Alaska Ponzi-scheme in his fifth article two (2) months later to once again depict Rodrick in the worst possible light to the reader.

This depiction of the FACTS is intentional fraudulent journalism by Anglen. Yes, “Rodrick had a minor role” in the “biggest-ever Ponzi-scheme cases in Alaska.” His “**ROLE**” was that of one of the more than 1100 VICTIMS. And just like the victims of the infamous Bernie Madoff scandal, if you received any monies even though completely innocent and not aware of any wrongdoing, you were included in a “federal lawsuit” as a Bankruptcy trustee was entrusted to pursue ANYONE who received monies. This is how such Ponzi-scheme litigation is handled in the BK courts even though a litigant was not involved with any wrongdoing. Anglen knows this is how these types of cases are handled (or he is completely incompetent). To misrepresent the FACTS is reprehensible and was done by Anglen knowing full well that the manner in which he worded this situation, although technically correct, would be interpreted by the reader that Rodrick had an active “**ROLE**” in the fraudulent scheme. In fact, Rodrick wasn’t even one of the “investors” expecting to receive high returns for their involvement; he was a supplier of a delivered product that was paid for with funds from the criminal bank account. The TRUTH of the case was easily obtainable. Anglen was well aware of the FACTS and he chose to “paint a picture” of wrongdoing by Rodrick that was completely and knowingly false. He added for good measure the shocking amount of “\$50 million” to give the impression of a massive criminal endeavor perpetrated by Rodrick. His “**ROLE**” was that of a victim along with 1100 others left holding the bag of a single criminal by the name of Rae Jean S. Bonham who was prosecuted, found guilty and sentenced to prison (5 years). This is nothing short of knowingly sensationalizing a point with the intent to mislead the reader to incorrectly interpret the FACTUAL circumstances of the subject. Anglen designed his wording to intentionally implicate Rodrick to have been a participant in the fraud when it was the polar opposite. It should be noted Anglen did not supply any support documentation for his carefully worded implied accusations against Rodrick. This is nothing short of Anglen committing journalistic FRAUD. Here are the FACTS for anyone that may be interested, see [Exhibit 2](#).

A JUDGMENT AGAINST WEB EXPRESS, LLC FOR \$80 THOUSAND:

Anglen would write: “Rodrick has also faced other liens and judgments, including an \$80,000 verdict against his current company, Tempe-based Web Express LLC, in 2004.”

What Anglen does not bother to mention is the judgment he is referencing involved a billing dispute with InfoSpace, Inc. of Seattle, Washington. Web Express, LLC had done substantial business with InfoSpace for many years as one of their biggest clients. There was a dispute and it was **SATISFIED** between the parties. The document of the settlement in the form of a “Satisfaction of Judgment” **October 25, 2005** is easily accessible for online review (see, [Exhibit 3](#)). There are a couple of points of interest. First, why would Anglen bring up a common legal dispute that had been **SATISFIED** and did so having made no apparent effort to clarify the FACTS? Is it more likely ANGLEN knew full well of the “Satisfaction of Judgment” and simply CHOSE to omit any acknowledgement of the TRUTH? Second, the billing dispute involved two legal entities (InfoSpace, Inc. vs. WebExpress, LLC) that have nothing to do with the operations of the SOR websites. Third, what does this “satisfied” 2004 billing dispute have to do with the SOR websites and their operation **NINE (9) YEARS** later? This is just one of dozens of examples of intentional disinformation disseminated by Anglen to falsely discredit Rodrick. It is nothing short of ludicrous unprofessional journalism.

GILSON VS. RODRICK NAME CHANGE MISREPRESENTATION:

Anglen would write: “Court records show Rodrick’s birth name is Charles Gilson. Court records show he legally changed his name to Rodrick in 1993 after being convicted as Gilson in Maricopa County on a felony charge of intent to defraud.”

This is absolutely supposition on Anglen’s part. Changing the name had absolutely nothing to do with the cable descrambler box charge and PROBATION. In fact, the paper work filed and is made easily available for examination clearly disclosed that Rodrick was dealing with being on “probation” (see, [Exhibit 4](#)). The name change was exclusively motivated by “Gilson” being the name of his adoption parents. With the first child on the way and Rodrick’s wife being Catholic, she wanted the baby to be baptized properly in the REAL family name of the father – Rodrick. This is an example of the discussed bias and skewing the facts to create a derogatory narrative with no concern to the truth and objective reporting. Besides being wrong when making such postulation, what does a name change to ones REAL name have to do with the SOR websites **20 YEARS** later? This is just another example of building a “story” on a predetermined narrative that has VERY little to nothing to do with the FACTS of what should matter in presenting a NEWS article. Anglen is a wannabe “fiction” writer with no skill so he pretends to be a “newsman” to pay the bills. Congratulations, you get what you pay for Gannett Company.

ANGLEN CLAIMS WEB DEVELOPER PAID \$230 THOUSAND IN CREATING THE SOR WEBSITES:

In the articles, Anglen would reference several times the work done by independent contractor Ernie Souhrada in the development of the SOR websites and the database of 775,000 profiles. He would write: “Financial records obtained by Call 12 show Rodrick paid Souhrada more than \$230,000 since 2005.” Again, Anglen in his carefully chosen words is technically correct. However, again the FACTS of the circumstances when properly researched convey a very different “story” than the one being peddled by unethical and generally incompetent “investigative journalist” Anglen.

This is just another example of obvious shoddy research done by Anglen when preparing his articles. What continues to be a perplexing question to be determined is just how STUPID and/or INCOMPETENT

can Anglen be? The documentation relied on to establish payments made to an independent contractor doing computer programming and website development work totaling over \$230 thousand is absolutely valid and correct. However, as the documentation clearly displays for anyone with eyes to see is these payments were made between **2005 and 2009**. As the URL Offendex.com was not even purchased and registered with Network Solutions until December of **2011** and SORarchives.com was purchased and registered in October **2012**; what do payments of approximately \$50 thousand a year occurring years **BEFORE** the creation of the SOR websites have anything to do with anything. This OBVIOUS discrepancy in the so called “research” of Anglen is cause for concern for any news media organization such as Gannett Company allowing such shoddy research work to be published on their media properties. The payment history to Ernie Souhrada for his work with Web Express LLC (not the SOR websites) that Anglen used for his articles is clearly dated and can be reviewed at [Exhibit 5](#).

ANGLEN IS NOT NEW TO SHODDY RESEARCH AND FABRICATING NEWS STORIES. HE HAS PRIORS:

This is not the first time Anglen’s work with simple research involving dollars spent working on a project being “investigated” for an article has been called into question. Nor that he was capable of fabricating pieces within his “stories.” Prior to his employment in Arizona, Anglen worked in Ohio in 2003 for The Cincinnati Enquirer. Just prior to his hasty departure from Ohio, he was involved in two local controversies that received a significant amount of attention in the Cincinnati news circles.

The first of the problems in Cincinnati involved a similar issue of Anglen not being able to research and present the FACTS when it came to understanding a simple record of payments scheduled and most importantly the TIMELINE associated with the dollars involved. In August of 2007, Alan S. Kalmanoff PhD. wrote a scathing 38 page report that included detailing the media inaccuracies of Anglen in his coverage of a high profile problem involving the City of Cincinnati, the Cincinnati Police Department and the Department of Justice. The matter revolved around the settlement of a class action lawsuit against the Cincinnati Police Department charging decades of racial profiling. Anglen would become the center of a high charged controversy created by a series of articles he authored in October of 2002 involving the “Monitor” of the settlement requiring reform of the Cincinnati Police Department procedures involving racial interactions. Beside the shoddy research performed in Anglen’s series of stories, Kalmanoff would detail how the articles demonstrated a clear bias and were designed to evoke a reaction from the readers to a predetermined conclusion to meet an obvious agenda. Sound familiar? Here are a few of the highlights worthy of note:

*“The Enquirer [first] article also contained the **first serious misstatement published** regarding the Agreements. Reporter **Robert Anglen erroneously reported** that the financial obligation of the City was \$1 million. In fact, the Collaborative Agreement specified and obligation of up to \$5 million over a five year period.”*

*“That relatively benign article was followed by a series of ever-more incendiary articles The Enquirer reporter **Robert Anglen**, who appeared to intent on publishing an “expose” that revealed some shocking (**if fabricated**) revelations about Cincinnati’s new Monitor.”*

*The Enquirer over an 11-day period would repeatedly misstate how much the monitoring would cost. **Robert Anglen**, then *The Enquirer's* City Hall reporter, wrote that a review of Kalmanoff's proposal to get the monitor job indicated it might cost \$7.5 million or more to do the monitoring work, well above the \$5 million cap. The articles included comments from the then-city manager and some city council members reacting with shock and bristling at the figures.*

Kalmanoff writes that his proposed budget to monitor both agreements was only \$3.9 million, well below the cap.

"Anglen mistakenly added together our projected budgets for monitoring each agreement, *plus* our combined budget for monitoring both agreements together," Kalmanoff writes. "These three calculations were called for in the application process. Mistakenly or otherwise, **Anglen added all three figures together, thus arriving at a grossly inflated and inaccurate figure.**"

Despite an email to him attempting to correct the error, Anglen printed the false figure. Subsequent media reports reproduced his figure uncritically, **without even reviewing ILPP's application to check the facts.**

"What possible purpose could such **deceptions** serve? Perhaps the city and its **friends** at *The Enquirer* hoped to avoid imposition of police reforms," he writes.

Kalmanoff's report also states that his firm's work was undermined by "the local media, which enjoyed (then and now) an unusually cozy relationship with the city. Officials encouraged the local news outlets, which misrepresented the Collaborative Agreement and (his firm's) role to **sow confusion** and stall reform."

The second problem Anglen's reporting in Cincinnati for *The Enquirer* stirred up involved the fabrication of information he printed in one of his articles. This time he drew the attention and ire of law enforcement personnel. The incident was reported in June 2003:

"Police group says it wants reporter fired"

The Fraternal Order of Police demanded the **firing** of a *Cincinnati Enquirer* reporter **Robert Anglen** Friday over allegations regarding local restaurateur Jeff Ruby.

The reporter, acting on a tip, had asked Ruby if he offered free meals to police investigating his son.

But Ruby never made the offer, he and the FOP said in a joint news conference Friday. FOP Vice President Keith Fangman alleged that the **reporter fabricated the tip** to get Ruby to comment on charges against his son.

Enquirer Editor Tom Callinan said: "A reporter asked some questions about some rumors we had heard. **But there didn't appear to be anything to the story, so we dropped it.**"

More details concerning these events are available for interested parties to be reviewed at [Exhibit 6](#). Due to the calling for his firing by **The Fraternal Order of Police**, as the City Hall reporter being stonewalled by ALL police sources, his ability to continue doing his job was severely compromised. Shortly thereafter Anglen would have to leave Ohio (where his wife and her family hailed from) seeking employment in the friendlier (uninformed) pastures of Arizona working for the Arizona Republic.

EXPUNGED RECORDS AND STRESS DUE TO PROFILES APPEARING ON THE SOR WEBSITES:

Anglen attempts yet another attack upon the practices of the SOR websites by presenting two quotes from convicted sex offenders NOT pleased that their FACTUAL criminal histories were made available online. The first quote: “I have an expunged record that is not available to anyone, but if you Google my name, low and behold, it shows up on this website,” a person identified as crsmolti wrote on the website Sueeasy.com. The second: “This has caused severe stress knowing Offendex has put this information on the internet after eight years of being off any sex offender registry,” shawnyc36 wrote on the same site. “I have a background check for a job in progress, I’m so nervous they are going to Google my name.”

The fact that an “Expunged record” can no longer be found at a Government website is the VALUE of the SOR websites. That the criminal history now reflects an “expunged record” DOES NOT eliminate the FACT that there had been a sex crime CONVICTION and communities have “The Right to Know.” An “expunged record” is a Government scheme that allows a convicted felon to legally falsely answer an employment and housing application that they do not have a criminal record. This does NOT somehow magically erase the FACT they were convicted of a sex crime. Such records are NOT removed from the database and this practice is supported by all case law across the country. Anglen would know this if he actually performed even rudimentary due diligence legal research before publishing his articles. As for the anxiety experienced by a convicted sex offender who fears their FACTUAL criminal history may be discovered – what is Anglen’s point? “Severe stress” and being “nervous” of discovery are likely a few of the consequences when one has committed a serious sex crime. Too bad, don’t commit sex crimes.

FRANK SILVA INTERVIEW AND THE TRIAL OUTCOME:

In Anglen’s second round of attack journalism in July of 2013, he would write about an interview he had with John Doe #8 of the Federal lawsuit that had been filed in California by attorney Janice Bellucci and the California Reform Sex Offender Laws (RSOL). In the interview Anglen would write about the MANY claims being alleged by John Doe #8 as to his information found on the SOR websites. According to Anglen’s article these claims included: 1) he “is NOT a convicted sex offender”; 2) “But for Offendex, this record wouldn’t exist.” 3) “He pleaded no contest in Oregon to possessing a sexually related image of a child. He was sentenced to two years of probation for a non-registered offense”; 4) a few years after, “he was arrested in Virginia and accused of possessing marijuana in Virginia”; 5) he “said Offendex and SORArchives used his mug shot from the Virginia arrest and the conviction in Oregon to create a new profile calling him a sex offender”; and 6) “he said ‘The repercussions of this are far worse than the actual sentence,’ adding that the stigma of being portrayed as a sex offender already has cost him a relationship and nearly a job.” That sounds pretty bad and would be rather reprehensible, if his version of events were TRUE and not completely DELUSIONAL.

Is it not the responsibility of a reputable journalist to perform basic due diligence research when interviewing a subject for a series of ongoing articles for a major media conglomerate? Either Anglen just solely relies on the “honesty” of his convicted sex offender sources when interviewing them, did not perform ANY research whatsoever or had simply decided to ignore all basic information easily obtained with online searches, private information sources and fundamental background checks. Knowing that researching, or disclosing such research, would thwart his efforts in presenting his “fictional story” he had decided to write from the beginning of this particular assignment. Checking out this man’s version of events was just not that difficult, certainly not for a so-called “investigative journalist.” Had Anglen

made any attempts to do so, he would have instantly found evidence that dramatically contradicts the circumstances of the criminal history as depicted by John Doe #8.

The person in question, John Doe #8, is [Frank Silva](#) of Eugene, Oregon. Researching his claims (1) and (3) would confirm that on July 6, 2007 Silva was indicted and charged for “Encouraging Child Sex Abuse 2” and “Possess Child Sex Material 2” (child porn). On September 11, 2007 Silva would agree to a plea deal eliminating the Child Sex Abuse charge and entering an “Alford Plea” to the Child Porn charge. An “Alford Plea” is an admission of the conduct alleged, but questions the legalities of the charges. The Court reviewed the case and confirmed the CONVICTION contrary to the Silva assertion otherwise. He was sentenced to two years probation and was NOT required to register with the State of Oregon Sex Offender Registry per the statute of this particular crime O.R.S. 163.689. This “non” registration requirement is what has fueled Silva’s contention he was not found guilty of a “sex offense.” Perhaps Anglen agrees with his comrade Silva’s interpretation, however, most reasonably minded people reviewing the confession found in the public records may take umbrage wherein the plea deal has Silva stating for the record the following: “I unlawfully and illegally possessed a visual depiction of sexually explicit conduct involving a child and intended to use the visual depiction to induce a child to participate or engage in sexually explicit conduct.”

In addressing Silva’s claim (2) published by Anglen, he says “But for Offendex, this record wouldn’t exist.” This is categorically not correct. The Silva criminal history of a sex offense conviction can be found TODAY with the original source used by the SOR websites to obtain the data and is available online at [NationalPredatorDatabase.com](#). Simply input in Frank – Silva - Oregon to confirm. Also, when researching the original claims alleged by Silva in the Federal lawsuit filed, his original public record was found to have been released by the State of Virginia Sex Offender Registry for Crimes Involving a Minor. This posted public record was found using the [Internet Archives Way Back Machine](#) searching the archives of VineLink.com which is a private company that contracts with states to handle such online applications for a state’s Sex Offender Registry. The State of Virginia is one of VineLink’s customers.

In responding to the Silva’s claims (4) and (5), it once again brings into question the motivations of Anglen and/or his “investigative journalist” credentials. When running a simple background check it was immediately ascertained that the Silva’s depiction that “he was arrested in Virginia and **accused of possessing marijuana** in Virginia” was a rather significant misnomer (a lie). The facts, Silva was indicted and charged with four (4) criminal counts involving two separate occurrences of Drug Trafficking. Two counts each Conspiracy to Dispense Drugs and Possession with Intent to Dispense Marijuana. He would be found guilty and sentenced to three (3) year incarceration in a State of Virginia prison. Silva was **CONVICTED OF DRUG TRAFFICKING** not merely “accused of possessing marijuana” as stated by Anglen. This is where the unique twist to the convicted sex offender Frank Silva story comes into play. He “said Offendex and SORArchives used his mug shot from the Virginia arrest and the conviction in Oregon to create a new profile calling him a sex offender.” This is an asinine statement. First, all profiles, including Silva’s, were obtained and displayed exactly as they were released as a public record. Second, there is no mechanism built into the MySQL database to CREATE an individual profile. What occurred is the public record that was released into the public domain concerning Silva’s Oregon sex offender conviction was by the State of Virginia Sex Offender Registry for Crimes Involving a Minor. When Silva was incarcerated in Virginia, by the statutes of Virginia ANYONE who had been convicted of a sex crime involving a minor is REQUIRED to be registered with the Sex Offender Registry. This is regardless of the rules as they apply in Oregon. When in Virginia, Silva was subject to the laws of that jurisdiction and was registered as a sex offender by the Virginia Department of Corrections. Silva had banked on no one would unwind this conundrum and based his false and fabricated claims in the Federal lawsuit on this expectation.

Apparently the professional “investigative journalist” for a media giant was not able to unravel the deceptions of Silva. The gamble Silva took did not pay off, the SOR websites were able to unravel the lies of Silva and presented the FACTS to the jury at the trial. ALL of Silva’s claims were dismissed.

Anglen closed out the segment discussing the Silva interview by writing “he said ‘The repercussions of this are far worse than the actual sentence,’ adding that the stigma of being portrayed as a sex offender already has cost him a relationship and nearly a job.” Silva was convicted of a serious sex crime involving a minor in Oregon. He also was convicted of felony Drug Trafficking in Virginia. The two events led to his profile appropriately being disseminated online and were found on the SOR websites within the database. Silva’s attempt to rewrite the FACTS surrounding his criminal activities was delusional. Any “REPERCUSSIONS” experienced by Silva for HIS actions are his own RESPONSIBILITY - no one else.

After the trial in a discussion with Oesterblad, Anglen revealed that Silva had acknowledged to him that he was aware that the State of Virginia had listed him on the state’s Sex Offender Registry. However, Silva claimed it was a “mistake.” First, that is not relevant to the legality of SOR websites republishing a public record that was in fact released into the public domain. Second, Silva is delusional in his never ending excuses. A simple review of the appropriate Virginia statutes ([specifically 18.2-374.1:1\(C\)](#)) on the subject would confirm this fact. Third, Silva’s admission was akin to confessing he knew his claims and allegation in the Federal lawsuit were not valid and were fabrications of the TRUTH. Fourth, where is Anglen’s article breaking down the FACT that the claims of the Federal lawsuit were knowingly an Abuse of Process, Malicious Prosecution and involved numerous incidences of Perjury? Where is the unbiased, objectivity and truth in journalism?

Unlike the irresponsible work authored by Anglen that is based on pure conjecture and supposition, the SOR websites will back up their research with support documentation and evidence for a reader to review at their own discretion. The FACTS concerning Silva are made available at [Exhibit 7](#).

THE CONVICTED CHILD MOLESTER FROM LOUISIANA

In the first series of articles published by Anglen in May of 2013, he would include a piece specific to a convicted child molester from Louisiana. He interviewed and wrote about “Melvin Dominquez” who was “The 58-year-old Lafayette, La., man said his ex-wife accused him of child molestation during a custody dispute. He said he took a deal that did not require him to register as a sex offender or to spend any time in prison.”

The first problem with this piece by Anglen is the man’s name is NOT “Melvin Dominquez.” The actual name of the convicted child molester was [Melvin DOMINQUE](#). The article ran with the alias that Dominique would use to hide in anonymity from his child molestation conviction. It is interesting that Anglen would go with the alias of his subject for his article which begs two questions: 1) Did Anglen know that he was using an alias to hide the TRUE identity of the subject and thus intentionally reported false information to the readers? 2) Was Anglen fooled by Dominique into using the alias because he had not done the proper due diligence research to properly prepare his article? The apparent answers to either choice does not bode well to the reputation of the reporting techniques of Gannett Company when presenting a series of articles/expose’ such as those about the SOR websites. It is also telling that Dominique would describe his conviction in a manner that would imply his innocence, and Anglen would actually print such nonsense. Melvin Dominique was guilty of child molestation.

The next OBVIOUS problem with the Anglen article pertaining to Dominique involved his depiction of the registration requirement with the State Sex Offender and Child Predator Registry for Louisiana. Anglen would write: "A bureaucratic snafu in 2005 caused his name to appear on the Lafayette Parish sex-offender registry until a judge ordered it removed in 2009. A year later, Dominguez said he sold his house, moved and put the incident behind him." This would be a complete fabrication of what actually occurred.

Had Anglen actually researched this spin of the TRUTH by "Dominique," he may have found the "bureaucratic snafu" that occurred was the polar opposite as he had described it. The "snafu" was in Melvin Dominique NOT being on the Louisiana Sex Offender Registry after his child molestation conviction in 1999. It is stipulated by Louisiana Statutes (the law) as a requirement that CANNOT be circumvented by plea deals with the prosecution or ordered by Judges (See, Court of Appeal of Louisiana, [State of Louisiana vs. Charles Griffin, No. 99-K-2025](#), November 17, 1999). There is no exemption from a registration requirement. When this oversight was realized in 2005, Dominique was required to immediately begin the registration process as REQUIRED by Louisiana Statutes. A judge did order the removal of the registration requirement in 2009 after Dominique had submitted to the Court a petition which is permitted by Louisiana Statutes (law) after a ten (10) year period has elapsed since the date of conviction. It had nothing to do with Dominique appearing on the Sex Offender Registry since 2005 having been improper. A simple review by Anglen of the Louisiana sex offender registration requirements would have revealed the deceitful self serving fairy tales of a convicted child molester weaving a web of lies.

The most brazen of the fallacies told by Dominique and reported by Anglen would be a yarn depicting Dominique as some kind of Good Samaritan in his dispute with the SOR websites. Anglen would write: "Until his phone rang in 2012. The caller was the woman who had bought his house. The single mother and schoolteacher was in a panic because she found her address listed on a sex-offender website called Offendex.com, he said." The article would further champion Dominique's efforts to assist a "damsel in distress" claim: "What I really hope happens to the website operators is that they get shut down," he said. "Melvin Dominguez said he never imagined that a no-contest plea in 1999 could be used more than a decade later to make innocent people suffer." Of course, due to the mean SOR websites, "Dominguez said the woman's neighbors received cards postmarked from Arizona giving Dominguez's profile, as if he still lived at her address. Dominguez said the woman moved out." Anglen would even claim he had verified this "story is supported by payment and property records." Really, that is interesting.

Had Anglen actually checked this Dominique self-serving fantasy story he may have found the "woman who bought his house" was NOT "single." She was happily married. She was upset that Dominique had NOT disclosed the fact of his child molestation and thus the address being released as a public record into the public domain. She felt this FACT required full disclosure at the time of the home purchase as a matter of real estate law. The woman and her family (husband included) did NOT move out as claimed by Anglen's article. Had Anglen performed a simple search as claimed in the article back in May of 2013 with the County Recorder's Office (in Louisiana they are called parishes,) he would have found the information being provided by Dominique was clearly not accurate (a lie). A simple search [TODAY](#) confirms the family still resides at the same residence. In fact, the family has NOW put the house up for [SALE](#) in July of 2016. Also, there has never been a copy of one of the supposed "post cards postmarked from Arizona" ever produced as evidence. NOT ONE... in 40 months. Anglen did not perform even the most basic due diligence in vetting a source and the information being provided. This just seems beyond inept when dealing with a known convicted felon with a transparent agenda. A level

of professional journalism just does not appear to have any place in today's media requirements, certainly not with the work of Anglen.

The closing point to this article in Anglen's series would be just another concoction of events. Anglen stated: "Dominquez said he hired an attorney and filed complaints with authorities in Louisiana and Arizona."

At no time was a complaint received from either Louisiana or Arizona filed by Dominique. At no time were the SOR websites contacted by an attorney representing Dominique. Or for that matter from "Melvin Dominique." Why would Anglen not insist on a copy of these "filed complaints"? In the event that Dominique was not being perfectly candid during his interview with Anglen. You think – maybe?

The full rebuttal that was posted on the SOR websites back in 2013 after Anglen published this article is available online today. In the rebuttal there is also an email received from "Melvin Dominique" that tells a very different story than the one Anglen was pitching. Dominique is not assisting the "single mother" who purchased his house unaware of the public record associated with the address. He is in a panic fleeing the state for fear of a lawsuit for real estate "nondisclosure" issues from a very angry home owner. It would be funny if Dominique's depiction of being a Good Samaritan wasn't so pathetic and presented by Anglen to a large readership as truthful. The TRUE story can be found online [HERE](#).

GLENN WYRICK ARTICLE AND HIS RETRACTION:

In an effort to introduce another peripheral issue into the mix of the SOR websites articles Anglen would interview and write about Glenn Wyrick of Ashland, Virginia. The problem Wyrick had with SOR websites is that his deceased brother-in-law [Robert Lee Knighton](#) was profiled as a convicted sex offender. There is no dispute the profile in question is FACTUALLY correct. The issue that Wyrick had and Anglen attempts to exploit to discredit the SOR websites is to claim that the dissemination of the criminal histories of a person who is deceased constitutes some wrong doing or may be viewed as an invasion of privacy. Both are opinions that are reasonable from a certain perspective, but neither have any basis in the law. There may be the belief that upon one's death all the NEGATIVE mistakes that may have occurred during one's lifetime would just magically disappear. This "wish" is not reality, and certainly not in the digital age when a public record can be stored, retrieved and disseminated with extreme ease.

Anglen would present the Wyrick dealings with the SOR websites in a very loosely formulated and one-sided depiction of the series of events. He would make such assertions as: 1) "He said he contacted the website in an effort to spare his sister and her two young daughters from learning about the 18-year-old conviction. But when he said he balked at paying, the websites posted his name and e-mail"; 2) "Wyrick complained to the FBI and the Arizona and Virginia attorneys general"; 3) "Wyrick said he got little response from authorities, but he did get one from Offendex. Operators posted his brother-in-law's home address and his obituary notice, complete with the names of his entire family"; and 4) "Offendex also posted Wyrick's e-mail address under a boldface headline encouraging users to get in touch with him: 'Sex Offender Robert Lee Knighton dead @ 46. By special request, please send any condolences or emails to Glenn Wyrick.'"

Addressing the first reported assertion by Wyrick as reported by Anglen is the following: Wyrick did contact the SOR websites concerned about HIS family's possible reaction if they were to learn of the previously not known factual criminal history of Robert Knighton. Although totally understandable from

THEIR very personal perspective, neither the SOR websites nor anyone else is responsible for the FACTUAL depiction of public records released into the public domain for the action of their family member. The man committed the crime (sex crime). Playing a “blame game” is nothing more than projection (in psychology terms).

The second point alleged by Anglen concerned the filing of complaints, however, it is not disclosed the degree of animosity and number of complaints submitted by Wyrick. Once again, when it came to describing the activities of antagonist of the SOR websites, Anglen would either down play the conduct or completely ignore what had been done as was the case with Wyrick. Yes, Wyrick filed complaints with the FBI and Attorney General’s Office in both Arizona and Virginia. He also filed complaints with a Virginia State Representative, Network Solutions, Amazon Cloud Services, a local Police Department (Tempe, AZ.), DMCA Copyright Infringement Complaint, RipOffReport.com, multiple online complaint websites and had created TWO Facebook pages specifically attacking the legitimacy of the SOR websites. What is important is that ALL these COMPLAINTS were not based on any wrong doing; they were designed explicitly as a form of intimidation and harassment. It is important to note that NOT ONE of the Wyrick complaints generated a derogatory result that affected the SOR websites.

One particular complaint is worth further detail; the complaint filed online with RipOffReport.com (ROR). Although no transaction had ever occurred between SORArchives and Wyrick, he chose to file an online complaint claiming some sort of “Rip Off”. This complaint went into great detail to identify several individuals as the owners of the website. As a form of intimidation and harassment the names, addresses and phone numbers to the personal residences were also included in this “complaint”. One major problem with this listing of information is that it was not correct. People who were not the owners, people who had absolutely nothing to do with the website in any capacity were listed as such and their private and personal information was posted online. In fact, the Wyrick post on ROR called upon CONVICTED SEX OFFENDERS to contact these individuals at their homes and/or to contact family members: “Many people have asked for contact info. On a website called offendex.com and how they can get in touch with them. I encourage you to do so at either addresses listed below.” This followed with a list of names, home addresses and home phone numbers. Another interesting aspect to this story is the FACT that Anglen was well aware of the false ROR complaint filed by Wyrick. Anglen even interviewed the unfortunate parties NOT associated with the SOR websites that were mercilessly intimidated and harassment by convicted sex offenders for months. Yet, this aspect of “Wyrick complaints” never found its way into any of the Anglen articles.

The third accusation in the Anglen article acknowledges there was no action taken by ALL the authorities Wyrick had filed complaints with. As for the “obituary” appearing on the SOR websites, the information was provided by George McLaughlin, criminal investigator, in the Virginia Attorney General’s Office (see, [Exhibit 8](#)). It was suggested providing the information of the demise of Robert Knighton was a disclosure that would be beneficial to the profile. The content was added and the complaint was DISMISSED. This exchange occurred in July of 2012. Afterward, if interested parties wanted to place a verifiable legitimate link to an online obituary as a “comment” to convey the profiled individual was deceased, this was not only allowed but encouraged by the SOR websites.

The fourth attack point in the Anglen article involves information about and the activities engaged in by Wyrick that were posted in “The Right to Know” section of the SOR websites. It is three years later and the SOR websites stand by the response made in the [rebuttal](#) to this Anglen article in 2013 that address this issue:

“We have meticulously detailed all the complaints filed (that we are aware of), also referenced the hundreds of online postings written by Mr. Wyrick. The sole intent for Mr. Wyrick’s crusade has been to discredit the SORArchives database and the factual PUBLIC RECORDS displayed. We wish to acknowledge Mr. Wyrick’s rights under the U. S. Constitution and the First Amendment; Freedom of Speech to express whatever ill conceived prattle he may wish to convey. He is entitled to his opinion. What Mr. Wyrick and the Arizona Republic (Gannett Company) seem to ignore, not understand and/or refuse to take into consideration is WE are afforded the exact same RIGHTS. It is acknowledged the information that motivated Mr. Wyrick’s onslaught of criticism is factual. That the TRUTH is a source of embarrassment to the family of convicted sex offenders is unfortunate. We are more concerned for the families of victims. We believe the communities **Right to Know** far supersedes the desire of convicted sex offenders to hide in anonymity.”

A development to the Wyrick vs. SOR websites occurred in March of 2015 which involved taking his claims to a whole new level by becoming Plaintiff John Doe #11 in the Federal lawsuit being litigated in Arizona. Wyrick would agree to be another patsy for the false claims of the Janice Bellucci and California RSOL. The Wyrick allegations would make a claim for RICO – Theft by Extortion, even though no monies were “demanded” nor exchanged. He would also make claims for Defamation, False Light Invasion of Privacy, Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress and Right to Publicity based on the allegation that the SOR websites had posted that Wyrick had been “convicted of a sex offense and was required to register as a sex offender. “ These allegations were completely false and absolute fabrications designed and filed by attorney Bellucci in an attempt to bolster her fledging lawsuit of the original Ten (10) Plaintiffs that was unraveling. The realization of the ramifications of making such false claims in Federal Court and trusting Janice Bellucci in her ongoing scheme came to light for Wyrick. He made a filing with the Court confirming the removal of Bellucci as his attorney. He would follow with a Motion to the Court requesting dismissal of ALL claims only two weeks before the trial occurred. The Court granted the request. At no time has Anglen reported these FACTS in any follow up work to reveal what came of the Wyrick allegations against the SOR websites and those associated with their operations.

A new development to this story occurred in June of 2016. The SOR websites received an email authored by Wyrick sent as John Doe #11. In the email he apologizes for his actions. He would assert attorney Janice Bellucci’s representation in the Federal lawsuit did not “honor” her responsibilities. Further he would state: “I have filed complaints with the California State Bar because she **LIED** to me and **USED ME** to legitimize her case by having plaintiffs like myself that are not convicted felons.” More significant to this discourse detailing the Anglen articles are his statements in regard to his dealings with Anglen in preparing the article. Wyrick’s words convey what occurred in the most direct manner: “Statements he [Anglen] made in his article are **completely FALSE**. He wrote that I said things about you and your websites that I never said. The day after I read the article I called him to **ask he print a retraction**, but **he refused**.” Well Mr. Wyrick, the SOR websites are all too familiar with Anglen’s refusal to retract the irrefutable lies and misrepresentation he publishes as a journalist. Glenn Wyrick’s closing says it all: “It’s too bad that **dishonest lawyers** and **dishonest journalist** cannot be trusted to tell the truth.” The email received from Wyrick can be viewed as [Exhibit 9](#).

THE GORDON GRAINGER INTERVIEW:

It has previously been discussed Anglen had communications with Gordon Grainger of Helena, Montana via Facebook exchanges two (2) months prior to the first articles being published in May of 2013. There would also be an interview with Grainger that would be included in the article published in July 2013. Anglen would introduce Grainger by providing quotes given for the interview: “I feel

degraded, humiliated, harassed and intimidated,” said Gordon Grainger of Montana, a former registered sex offender who said he has tried to get his name removed from the websites. “I won’t lie. It’s gotten to the point where I have had suicidal thoughts.”

Gordon Grainger the “victim” according to Anglen. No one made Gordon Grainger have sexual relations with a 15 year old “girlfriend.” He was not forced to abduct his “girlfriend” after stealing her father’s car and hand gun. At his trial it was disclosed that he had offered to “kill the parents.” He served ten (10) years in Michigan prisons and when released it was from the psychiatric hospital (documented fact). It should not be considered too much of a stretch to assert that Grainger may have required skilled professional psychiatric evaluation and treatment long before the SOR websites were launched. The facts of Grainger’s conviction can be found online [HERE](#). It is dumbfounding that Anglen’s research for this article apparently did not include simple Google searches to review the FACTS associated with his source being interviewed or the MANY posting he had placed online in his ongoing vitriol attacks against the SOR websites and those associated with their operations, including their family members.

Anglen would further write: “Grainger, 36, of Great Falls, Mont., said his family **has been under siege** for almost a year. He said Rodrick and Oesterblad threatened him in a series of e-mails and sent him a photograph of his own infant son to punctuate their demands.”

Gordon Grainger claiming HE was “under siege” is laughable. Important to this piece is Anglen was all too aware of the conduct of Grainger as he was the first person that would join as a “FRIEND” to the many unauthorized Facebook profiles Grainger created solely for the purpose of attacking the SOR websites. A convicted sex offender such as Grainger is strictly prohibited by the Terms of Service of Facebook to utilize their social media platform. This did not dissuade the Grainger efforts or Anglen actively supporting the convicted sex offender in his nefarious endeavors. There were numerous Facebook profiles and a number of online blogs created that would be shut down for the vicious and threatening content Grainger made a practice of posting. One particular disturbing example involved a Facebook profile with a “cover photo” of a person literally with their head blown off by a shotgun blast. Please review the [Exhibit 10](#) provided as such a perverse display of a disturbed mind could not be demonstrated better. When viewing, there are a few other points of interest to take notice; 1) Anglen is one of two of Grainger’s “friends” which indicates he had accepted the “friend” request. Anglen VIEWED this not too subtle threat to the people and families of the SOR websites and he agreed to be associated; 2) the photo of the first female is the young family member niece to Oesterblad; 3) the second photo of a young female with her dog is the minor (at the time) daughter of Oesterblad; and 4) the pet dog of Rodrick in the middle of the photo grouping on the left side of page. PLEASE VIEW [Exhibit 10](#).

Anglen’s version of who harassed – threatened – stalked – and presented a real danger is so upside down it is shocking that a so called “journalist” had lost any inkling of objectivity and/or just decency. Included in [Exhibit 11](#) are just a couple of emails received from Grainger. It is worth reminding the readers that these are the postings and communications from a man who had sexually assaulted a 15 year old, absconded with her after stealing a car and handgun, had offered to kill the parents, served ten (10) years in prison and was released from a psychiatric hospital. What cannot be provided is recordings of the many phone calls received from Gordon Grainger in the middle of the day when he was clearly intoxicated. These are all FACTS of who Grainger is and Anglen wants to downplay these FACTS and portray that it was the SOR websites postings in “The Right to Know” section identifying who and what they were dealing with as a form of protection was somehow unreasonable and “harassment” on their part. We will let the readers of this piece decide for themselves and ask what they would do if confronted with the incessant assaults from such a deranged individual as Grainger. Apparently Anglen

found his “friend” to be a “credible source” of trust worthy input to include in the crusade embarked upon in the eleven (11) article series of attacks against the SOR websites. That sort of twisted rationalization speaks for itself and solidifies the odious intent Anglen had undertaken in authoring his articles.

THE CONVICTED CHILD MOLESTER ADAM GALVEZ INTERVIEW:

Another source of misrepresentation, fabrications and outright lies utilized by Anglen to prepare his articles was Adam Galvez of Shoreline, Washington. In the 5th article of the series published in July 2013 Anglen would include interview material he garnered from Adam Galvez. It has been claimed by Galvez that it was his complaints sent to Anglen and Call 12 News in 2012 that was the start of the “eight month investigation” that preceded the first articles appearing in the Arizona Republic. Anglen would claim: “Galvez, 38, is a sex offender who in 1996 pleaded guilty to child molestation.”

Adam Galvez of Shoreline, Washington was born April 30, 1972. He was 41 YEARS OLD when this article was published. Does any due diligence research get done in preparation of Anglen’s work? Some of these FACTS are just not that difficult to get right.

Anglen would provide some additional “soft shoe” detail: “Galvez was 22 and working as a store security guard when he said he befriended a 13-year-old boy who had significant family problems and was living on the streets. He said the boy later accused him of abuse. Galvez was sentenced to 18 months in prison.”

Amazing, Anglen would actually try to depict a [convicted CHILD molester](#) as some kind of Good Samaritan just “helping” the CHILD. The boy was 12 at the time of their meeting and had just turned 13 at the time of Galvez’s arrest. Previously in Lynnwood, Washington (Case 95-72831) Galvez had been arrested for falsely claiming to be the boy’s foster parent. He had tried to be named the boy’s foster parent but was denied. The boy resided at Galvez’s apartment for over six months prior to the arrest. The boy did not accuse Galvez of abuse to see him get arrested. He was interviewed AFTER Galvez had been arrested when two neighbors witness Galvez through an uncovered window on his knees performing fellatio upon the boy. The police were called and after a short investigation Galvez was arrested and charged. Through officials interviewing the boy, it was disclosed that Galvez had been sodomizing him (consensual) for months. The boy said he would not testify against Galvez because he “loved him.” The Prosecutor decided to offer a plea deal of only 18 months to Galvez to spare the CHILD the pain of a trial. Galvez wisely grabbed the generous plea deal and admitted to his abuse of the CHILD otherwise he was facing decades in prison. Now Adam Galvez like so many of the convicted sex offenders claims innocence and having been framed. Apparently a conspiracy involving all the neighbors (6 were interviewed by police), a police detective, 2 police officers, the prosecutor, the social worker, the case worker, the Judge and of course – the boy. The well documented public records made available through the Washington courts of Adam Galvez’s conviction are provided for review in [Exhibit 12](#).

More “soft shoe” detail is provided: “After his release, Galvez said he was arrested on several alcohol-related offenses, including driving under the influence. Galvez said he was required to register publicly as a sex offender for about six months before his name was removed from public databases.”

Galvez has been convicted of three DUI charges. He has been charged three times for driving on a suspended license. He was charged with domestic assault. He has been arrested for impersonating a

police officer. He has been arrested 13 times in total. He does have to register with law enforcement yearly, but currently is classified as a “Level 1” risk assessment and therefore does not appear on the publicly displayed Washington Sex Offender Registry (NOTE: his risk level 1 is currently under an investigation by the authorities). His official Washington arrest record can be viewed online [HERE](#).

Anglen would “powder puff” the Galvez story further: “By 2012, Galvez said he was on the road to recovery when he found his profile on Offendex. Like so many others, he said, he contacted the website thinking he could get his name removed.”

Yes, Adam Galvez did contact the SOR websites; although it was under the alias Adam Daniels. This first contact would be followed up two days later with a fax allegedly from attorney Lorne Grier (represented Galvez for the child molestation conviction) threatening a class action suit was forthcoming unless Adam Galvez was immediately removed from the database. Of course, when the law office of Lorne Grier was contacted they couldn’t speak about PREVIOUS client Galvez, but they would confirm they knew nothing of a class action lawsuit. Imagine the shock and surprise of SOR websites to learn the fax was forged (sarcasm). These incidents would be followed with additional bizarre attempts of intimidation including claims of arriving at the front doors of SOR website personnel with his NBC Universal News crew doing a national expose’ alleging “extortion.” Investigating who this crazy person was would lead to discovering the alias Adam Daniels was a stable to the Adam Galvez online persona. He had a Facebook under this alias with over 500 friends (many single mothers with children) claiming to be an “investigative journalist” (kind of ironic/funny now that he is such a good buddy with Anglen) for NBC Universal (20 plus years UNEMPLOYED), 32 years old (42 at the time), graduate of University of Washington (no college education – none) , 5 years law enforcement training (he was a security guard at Fred Meyer – 20 years prior) and of course a millionaire (living at his mother’s apartment for two decades). He also claimed to have a Detective agency, listed as [Daniels Private Detective Services](#) listed out his mother’s apartment. Adam Galvez was the poster child for the importance of the SOR websites and the information provided by the database. He was a convicted child molester active online with social media under an alias claiming respectability in employment and financial position actively making contact with minors that conveyed troubled situations – classic online trolling techniques of a sexual child predator. A detailed report of the communications received from Adam Galvez by the SOR websites was made available in 2013 in “The Right to Know” section and is available online [HERE](#).

Just as additional insight to this person’s activities; it was recently discovered he was using the same Adam Daniels alias with Yahoo chats claiming to be a Doctor (literally referred to himself as Dr. Adam) and also a member of law enforcement as he once again directed his comments to posts that would appear to have been submitted by minor boys. The information was turned over the FBI who has stated they are reviewing the information. Adam Galvez AKA Adam Daniels has been Anglen’s chief source of information and confidant throughout the 46 months of his “investigation” of the SOR websites. Is there any wonder Anglen has gotten his “story” so completely upside down? However, this doesn’t explain why he has made it a practice to ignore ALL the available evidence in order to continue his original agenda of creating a law enforcement response to justify his own personal agenda of attack. Details and documentation to these facts and the many impersonations including being a war veteran with two tours in Afghanistan, a medical Doctor and a law enforcement officer are available online [HERE](#).

Anglen would tell his readers of Adam Galvez’s additional accusations against the SOR websites: “Operators of Offendex posted pictures of Galvez’s mother and brother on the sex-offender websites along with their addresses. They also put his Facebook friends on the sites. In e-mails, website operators accused him in the most stark and graphic terms of preying on young boys.”

Pictures of Galvez's mother and brother NEVER appeared on the SOR websites and this was definitely proven at the Federal lawsuit trial. Yes, the emails sent from Adam Galvez making all kinds of threats (physical, legal, harassment – everything under the sun) were responded to with VERY harsh but FACTUALLY accurate opinions responding to rants of a convicted child molester. What is of interest to this response to Anglen's articles is where is the support documentation to prove the stated actions of the SOR websites actually occurred. If pictures and addresses of Susan Galvez and Brian Galvez had been posted on the SOR websites, where is the screen shot of this occurring? How hard would it have been to document such an occurrence? There has NEVER been evidence brought forward to support these allegations because it NEVER occurred.

Anglen would claim his Facebook "friend" through his harassment website was a legitimate endeavor: "Galvez fought back, launching his own investigation of Offendex and posting his findings on a website he called offendextortion. The website quickly became an Internet gathering place for Offendex critics. Offenders and others exchanged information and stories of harassment; they discussed legal strategies, ways to expose the sites and get law enforcement involved. Galvez created links on the site for Rodrick and Oesterblad, whom he identified by name. He also identified Rodrick's girlfriend."

There are literally thousands of pages of documentation of exactly what appeared on the Galvez cyber harassment and intimidation website (see, [Exhibit 13](#)). It would be impossible to list the number of assaults posted on this website. A few of interest would be pictures of daughters (one of which was under age), a niece, sons of girlfriends, even the family dogs were not exempt. The kicker, considering the false allegations of the mother Susan Galvez claiming in the Federal lawsuit that her photo was posted and claiming she was a convicted sex offender (proven at trial to be complete fabrications), was the Galvez website posted a picture of Oesterblad's elderly father and claimed he had been convicted of child abuse along with a number of other crimes (see, [Exhibit 14](#)). None of these claims of criminal convictions were true. Now is that ironic or what? This is the website Anglen defends and justifies as some kind of "fighting back" effort. Galvez was once AGAIN the perpetrator. Anglen depicting this cyber harassment website as some form of an "investigation" effort is both laughable and reprehensible.

A recent example of the efforts of "investigation" posted by Adam Galvez on the smear website involves the creation of a posting involving Rodrick's time in the Navy 35 years ago. Galvez took a small news report found online concerning a theft of two historic statues off the *Coral Sea* where Rodrick was serving. Galvez then created the headline "Charles Rodrick Busted While in the Navy!" There is a scanned copy of the photo in the *Coral Sea* yearbook of Rodrick he had received from REDACTED and Lois Flynn. As a kicker there would be a more recent photo depicting Rodrick behind bars and claiming he was "Inmate No. 24601" (see, [Exhibit 15](#)). This is the work of Adam Galvez, a convicted child molester who is an able body 44 year old, has been unemployed for over 20 YEARS, is solely supported by his 67 year old mother who cannot retire, after 3 DUI convictions is prohibited from driving, spends all his time engaging male minors online under the alias Adam Daniels claiming to be a medical Doctor (Dr. Adam) or a member of law enforcement. This is the source Anglen had the most contact with in his preparation for the series of articles concerning the SOR websites.

Furthermore, Adam Galvez was John Doe #5 in the Federal lawsuit litigated in Arizona. In his claims he would allege the SOR websites had falsely stated he was required to register with the Washington Sex Offender Registry. He also claimed being forced by demands received by the SOR websites to pay for "removal" of his profile that was then not removed. In sworn testimony during his deposition he would have to concede these claims were NOT truthful. He claimed it was a "misunderstanding" he had with his attorney Janice Bellucci. The Federal Judge would issue a strongly worded admonishment against

Bellucci. All of the Galvez claims would be dismissed from the lawsuit. Anglen has NEVER bothered to revisit and give any reasonable coverage to these FACTS that were the foundation of his article's original allegations.

THE SUSAN GALVEZ TRIAL TESTIMONY:

In the Anglen articles there would be mention of Adam Galvez's mother being part of the Federal lawsuit due to content posted on the SOR websites that was defamatory. Susan Galvez of Shoreline, Washington is the mother of convicted child molester (12/13 year old boy) Adam Galvez who at 44 has been unemployed for over 20 years choosing to live and be supported by his mother. Susan Galvez claimed she was identified on the SOR websites as a "convicted sex offender required to register with a Sex Offender Registry," had her photo accompanied with her home address posted, was "threatened" with "extortion" to remove these allegations and paid to have content associated to her removed from the SOR websites.

Beside the FACT that all claims of Susan Galvez are absolutely fabricated nonsense, the degree of utter ridiculousness and Abuse of Process of the litigation procedures was exposed for all present to witness when she was on the witness stand at trial. When asked by the defense counsel representing Rodrick to confirm her allegations that she had been "identified on the website at issue as a sex offender but who have not been convicted of a sex offense"; to which she responded: "**I have no idea what you're talking about.**" Believing the question must have been misunderstood, the defense counsel reworded the same question: "So you don't remember suing my clients because you claim that one or more of the three websites at issue falsely identifies you as an individual required to register as a sex offender?" Again the answer was the same shocking admission: "**I have no idea what you're talking about.**" A third attempt of clarification was requested: "So that would be false, right? You're not claiming that....—"To be interrupted by Susan Galvez with an emphatic confirmation without reservation: "**I don't know what you're talking about**" (see, [Exhibit 16](#)). After 40 months of litigation with OVER 400 docket entries to the Court's Record (a lot of entries), Susan Galvez testified she had no idea what her claims in the lawsuit had been and/or submitted by attorney Janice Bellucci. The Jury found in favor of the Defendants dismissing all five (5) of the claims of Susan Galvez. Although **Anglen was present** in the courtroom during the Susan Galvez testimony and witnessed the shocking admissions first had, he has NOT written one word of what occurred and/or acknowledge the significance of such an affirmation that ALL the claims levied against the SOR websites had been fabricated as a concoction of "litigation intimidation" by the California RSOL and attorney Janice Bellucci.

THE JEREMY RYAN GRAVES AND JANINE GRAVES INTERVIEWS:

In Anglen's 6th Article published in September of 2014 he would interview John Doe #4 Jeremy Ryan Graves and Jane Doe #9 Janine Graves, a married couple from Seattle, Washington. In the article Anglen would bring forward the Graves' claims in regard to their dealings with the SOR websites and their purpose for being involved in the Federal lawsuit.

Anglen would qualify his article by presenting the background of the Graves by claiming: 1) **The 37-year-old man**, who was convicted of the rape of a child in 2002, is no longer required to register as a sex offender and his profile was removed from public databases in 2012; 2) But that didn't prevent Rodrick's websites from posting his name and picture online last year; and 3) The websites also posted the name of the man's wife and a link to their wedding pictures.

It is enough to drive one crazy, the lack of basic due diligence Anglen performs in his preparation. Again he gets it wrong when he claims Jeremy Ryan Graves is a "37-year-old man." His birth date is May 18, 1973, which at the time of the article clearly made Jeremy Graves a 41 year-old man. One begins to wonder if these repeated obvious errors are in fact done on purpose by Anglen in an attempt to obscure discovery of his interview sources true identities and potentially expose the blatant practice of misrepresentations and lies found in the series of articles. Jeremy Ryan Graves was charged and convicted of two counts of Child Rape of a 14 year old boy. After ten (10) years being listed on the publicly accessible State of Washington Sex Offender Registry, Graves' status was downgraded to a Level 1 Risk Assessment and his profile was no longer in the public database. Yes, his profile of his FACTUAL criminal history was still made available on the SOR websites. It was NOT a "picture" of Graves stored in the SOR database, it is his official MUGSHOT released as a public record into the public domain. The SOR websites did NOT post Janine Graves name, her name appeared in a REBUTTAL to a false complaint the Graves' had filed online with RipOffReport.com (ROR). They had made completely erroneous claims in THEIR online posting with ROR and the SOR websites provided a response with a detailed depiction of the FACTUAL events that exposed the FRAUDULENCE perpetrated by the Graves. In an attempt to reverse their stupidity in originating the ROR post, they posted a rebuttal APOLOGY in hopes THEIR post would be removed. They would learn the hard way that once posted online with ROR, that content is NOT removed. The LINK that appeared on SOR websites was NOT to wedding pictures; it was a link to a YouTube video THEY made available for anyone accessing the Internet of a promotional video for their business Seattle Wedding Videographers.

Anglen's article would include additional allegations backed up with quotes from the Graves'. These would include: 1) John Doe 4 [Jeremy Graves] said the purpose was to expose him to shame and ridicule in an effort to squeeze him for cash. 'I actually considered paying him," he said. "This is not a legitimate record. It's not official'; 2) John Doe 4 [Jeremy Graves] instead filed reports with local, state and federal authorities. 'We wanted him (Rodrick) reprimanded and we want the sites taken down," he said. "We want to live in peace'; 3) John Doe's wife [Janine Graves] said Rodrick was "literally banking" on making her ashamed of her husband through abusive e-mails and online posts. She added: "Rodrick was trying to debase and defame the wrong guy."

The SOR websites purpose is NOT to "expose and ridicule" a profiled individual. It is to provide the FACTUAL criminal histories of convicted sex offenders that may be present in our communities. It is a matter of a "Right to Know" if members of a neighborhood wish to be informed of this information. If Graves perception of this information being accessed by concerned citizens interesting in protecting their CHILDREN exposes him "to shame and ridicule" he has NO ONE to blame but HIMSELF. He committed a heinous crime in the CHILD RAPE of a 14 year old boy (twice). The [Jeremy Graves profile](#) is absolutely LEGITIMATE. It is "not official," it is the republishing of the OFFICIAL public record that was released by THREE different Government sources into the public domain. It is FACTUALLY accurate in all aspects. Jeremy Graves would in fact file complaints with EVERY agency imaginable in hopes that the "sites taken down." He said he wants to "live in peace." Of course, but to be more specific is Jeremy Graves desires to be allowed to HIDE in anonymity from his FACTUAL criminal history with no chance for anyone in his neighborhood with CHILDREN to be aware of the FACTS. The communities "Right to Know" far outweigh the desire of a convicted CHILD rapist to bury the TRUTH.

Janine Graves chimes in with personal attacks against Rodrick claiming he had somehow singled her out trying to "make her ashamed of her husband through abusive emails and online posts." First, there were NEVER any emails received from or sent to Janine Graves, contrary to her fabricated claims in the Federal lawsuit. There were three online posts associated with the Graves and the SOR websites: 1) the

FACTUAL profile Of Jeremy Graves in the SOR database; 2) the REBUTTAL to the ROR post that the Graves had created; 3) a REBUTTAL to a complaint filed with the Arizona Attorney General's Office that will be addressed in detail later in this piece. According to Anglen, Janine Graves added: "Rodrick was trying to debase and defame the wrong guy." Rodrick did not single out Jeremy Graves by somehow individually deciding to research his criminal history and posting it online. The Jeremy Graves records had been made available by a number of Government agencies and private concerns. The last point Janine Graves wanted to make for the Anglen article was that the goal was "to debase and defame the **wrong guy**." No, nothing could be further from the TRUTH. Jeremy Ryan Graves was in fact convicted of the CHILD RAPE of a 14 year old boy. Perhaps if Anglen had done some basic research of the available public records prior to publishing his article, he would have obtained the WHOLE story of the conduct perpetrated by Jeremy Graves. How Graves was a "youth minister" placing himself in a position of trust in a Church environment and had registered and was attempting to start his own ministry by the name PREYEZE Ministries. Yes, spelled P-R-E-Y and EZE (you just cannot make this stuff up). That he had a LONG history of indiscriminate homosexual activities that had originated as a child after being sexually molested by his older brother (5 years older) since he was 8 years old. He would engage in sexual conduct with his dog "Buddy." He would place the cat of his child victim's family into a microwave in front of the children thinking it was a funny joke. These public records of the "psych evaluation" would also provide the shocking official determination that: "During the Presentence process, a risk assessment tool was utilized to help determine risk for danger to the community. It was determined that Mr. Graves presents a high risk of danger to the community as an untreated sex offender who preyed on teenage boys in a church setting' as a 'youth minister.' The Department of Corrections will supervise Mr. Graves accordingly," Currently Jeremy Graves runs the family business, [Seattle Wedding Videography](#), which places him in the very same "church setting." The SOR websites did NOT have the "WRONG GUY." Please review all the details available in the public records found in the King County Superior Court made available in [Exhibit 17](#).

The final piece to the sordid dealings concerning the Graves' would occur in relation to their involvement in the Federal lawsuit. In September of 2015 ALL claims of Jeremy Graves were dismissed by the Federal Judge due to the SOR websites immunity under Section 230 of the CDA. Janine Graves would take her fabricated claims and allegation all the way to the DAY OF THE TRIAL only to refuse to be put under oath as a witness; even after the Judge had allowed her to give her testimony from her HOME. She still refused and ALL her claims were dismissed. After 40 MONTHS of making her false and fabricated claims in anonymity as Jane Doe #9, publicizing these claims in utilizing national media to make claims of "extortion by theft", threats and demands along with defamation and invasion of privacy due to alleging being accused by the SOR websites of being a "convicted sex offender who was required to register for the Sex Offender Registry." On the day of reckoning to be accountable, she literally REFUSED to go under oath to testify to her claims and allegations. The biggest point to be made for this expose' focusing on Anglen's work, where is the article updating the FACTS of what really occurred? He has NOT written one word to tell the TRUTH of the Graves' saga and how it ended. WHY NOT?

Since Anglen will not write a conclusion to the Graves sophistry, the SOR websites will. It was the Graves through their venomous and unjustified attacks against the SOR websites and personal assaults against those associated with the operations of the websites AND their family members that brought the TRUTHFUL rebuttals that created the additional attention that they were trying to avoid. They have no one to blame but themselves.

ATTORNEY DAN WARNER TESTIFIES AT THE TRIAL:

In one of the recent articles written in June 2016, Anglen would discuss the inclusion of Rodrick's previous attorney Dan Warner being called as a witness for the Plaintiffs. He would provide a very simpleton (8th grade level reporting) description of the testimony: 1) "Rodrick's former lawyer in the federal case also has accused Rodrick of trying to extort free legal services and of lying to the court"; 2) "Daniel Warner, who has been called as a witness in the federal case and testified Wednesday, said Rodrick filed a complaint with the State Bar of Arizona alleging misconduct after Warner withdrew from the case"; 3) "Rodrick accused Warner of violating several professional rules, including fraudulent billing, conflict of interest and revealing privileged attorney-client information through an article on the firm's blog last year with the headline, "Two men, one extortion racket website?"; 4) "Warner, in a denial letter to the State Bar, said the blog was a mistake by a contract employee and went on to detail emails and statements about Rodrick's false claims. Although most attorney-client communication is protected under law, the privilege was waived so Warner could respond to the allegations." As is the practice of Anglen, he makes no effort to put any of these points into any understandable context or what may be the "other side of the story." That would require being a professional and ethical journalist providing unbiased and objective reporting.

The accusation that Rodrick tried to "extort free legal services" is so ludicrous coming from a lying scum-bag attorney who refused to do his job while being paid \$10s of thousand. There is that "extort" word again. Rodrick did file a bar complaint against Warner **20 MONTHS AFTER** his withdrawal and in **RESPONSE** to the Kelly/Warner Law firm posting an article berating their previous (paying) client Rodrick claiming he had been "**arrested**" and was responsible for the "largest Ponzi-scheme in Alaska history." Here we go again with the "Ponzi -scheme." This posting did in fact occur, Kelly/Warner law firm does NOT deny the article was published on their website. What should Rodrick have done when your previous attorney publishes such defamatory completely false accusations online? Warner's answer to the Bar Complaint was to BLAME an EMPLOYEE by the name of Barri Grossman, a person described in the Warner's response to be both a male and a female (???). Also, it seems no one at the law firm knows how to contact this Barri Grossman. Perhaps this may have something to do with the "agreement" and "admission" provided to the State Bar of Arizona is NOT signed by a Barri Grossman. It is initialed by someone as "BW" and is signed as "B" something and last name "W" something. Interesting don't you think? (see, [Exhibit 18](#)) For a full review of ALL the dirty pool shenanigans of the worst type of attorney imaginable such as Warner – the one ALL the lawyer jokes stem from – you may wish to take a look at the COMPLETE version of the Bar Complaint filed. In contrast to the limited version presented to the Federal lawsuit litigation by equally slimy attorney Janice Bellucci (who also had clients filing complaints against her like Glenn Wyrick and Doe #7 Keith Johnson of Johnson City, Tennessee). The full complete version of the Warner Arizona State Bar complaint is available to anyone interested in exploring the FACTS (see, [Exhibit 19](#)).

Did Anglen "investigate" any aspect of the Warner allegations and the Rodrick bar complaint prior to submitting an article discussing these issues? Based on the article he did zero research – again.

THE RODRICK LOSS IN THE ARIZONA SUPERIOR COURT LAWSUIT:

In May of 2014 the trial occurred addressing the original claims Rodrick filed in Arizona Superior Court for defamation among others against those directly associated with the postings being disseminated online at the Galvez smear website. The Defendants filed counter-claims against Rodrick.

A series of unexpected events occurred that would lead to a crushing defeat for Rodrick that would award three of the four Defendants turned Plaintiffs judgments in the bizarre trial. Anglen would

gleefully report the outcome by relishing in Rodrick's defeat as validation for all his previous articles depicting him as a villain. What Anglen did not do was provide any details to explain the extremely unusual circumstances that occurred throughout the litigation process and the trial itself.

The first of these series of events had occurred when attorney Dan Warner had completely side swiped his (paying) client Rodrick with his abrupt withdrawal after being accused of fraudulent billing practices. Warner would execute this improper action in a way that was done to create the MOST damage to his client's case as possible as a means to divert attention from the manner in which he conducts his law practice. (Review all gory the details provided in the Bar Complaint – [Exhibit 19](#)). Not trusting attorneys, Rodrick would make a VERY ill advised decision to precede going forward with the lawsuit representing himself. The stories of an individual acting as their own attorney with complicated litigation are categorically true. It was a TERRIBLE decision.

The next occurrences had to do with the manner in which the presiding Judge Katherine Cooper was conducting the case. Rodrick not being a learned attorney did not know what the basis was to elicit his apprehension or what the legal objections may be, but as a person with a wide range of business experience he knew when something was going on that wasn't copacetic. He felt strongly enough about his intuition that he filed **TWO** Motions for Judge Cooper to recuse herself from the case. His Motions were denied due to a lack of verified evidence to support the request. This would prove in time to have been very perceptive of Rodrick as his trepidation was spot on correct. There was something going on with Judge Cooper that demanded her immediate removal from presiding over this particular case.

The huge setback Rodrick would experience was the first day of the trial; it was even after the jury had been picked. Although Judge Cooper was still the presiding over the case, she had turned over the trial to be overseen by Judge Gerlach. After reviewing the Joint Pretrial Statement (JPS) of the litigants, Judge Gerlach would declare that Rodrick had not "preserved" his claims in the required JPS. He was dismissing ALL of Rodrick's claims and declared the Defendants were now the Plaintiffs and could proceed with their claims. As one can imagine this was an unforeseen and shocking development. As Rodrick was not a learned attorney, when preparing the JPS he had naively simply followed the process and way in which the three attorneys had prepared their portions of the JPS. Rodrick would make this point before Judge Gerlach and he questioned the status of the Defendants/Plaintiffs claims on the same grounds. Judge Gerlach confessed he had not reviewed the manner in which the Defendants/Plaintiffs attorneys had addressed their claims in the JPS. After reviewing this matter, Judge Gerlach would discover that many of their claims had also not been "preserved" and was required to dismiss those specific claims also. However, the now Plaintiffs did have a least one claim in which they could proceed with the trial. Of course, it seems odd that Judge Gerlach had specifically reviewed the claims of Rodrick but had not done the same due diligence for the oppositions claims. One has to wonder how that would happen. What this amounted to was a very technical legal error had occurred and Judge Gerlach was correct – the claims had not been "preserved" in the JPS. Another point of interest is the JPS itself had not been signed off on as REQUIRED by ALL the litigants. This FACT should have invalidated the entire JPS and required a hearing before Judge Gerlach to iron out the existing points of contention that clearly existed between the parties and would have addressed if the claims of ALL litigants were properly "preserved." Not being a learned attorney Rodrick had no idea what had just happened or the procedure to properly challenge this series of events that saw ALL his claims Dismissed.

What Rodrick did understand from a common sense perspective is the case he had prepared diligently and methodically to litigate had been eliminated in one fatal blow. He was now only a Defendant with no case – no preparation – no chance. He would be completely overwhelmed by the

trial process and not surprisingly was defeated handedly. Had Rodrick understood the legal process, especially the requirements for the trial he would have been able to Appeal the verdict based solely on the JPS NOT having been presented to the Court and properly signed by ALL the parties as required by the Rules of Civil Procedure for the Superior Courts of Arizona, Rule 16(g). Rodrick had 30 days to file an Appeal based on this egregious trial error. That filing did not occur out of sheer ignorance of the law.

ANGLEN FABRICATES RODRICK QUOTES AFTER ARIZONA SUPERIOR COURT LOSS:

After the Rodrick loss in the Arizona Superior Court, Anglen would write an article that was published in nationally distributed paper the USA Today. In the article Anglen would claim that after the verdict was announced Rodrick would declare in the courtroom: "Well, gentleman. You know the drill," he said in a **loud**, mirthful voice." He would make a similar (suspiciously different) posting on his Facebook page declaring Rodrick had reacted in the following: "The court clerk had barely finished reading the judgments when Rodrick leaned sideways in his chair and **called out** to the opposing parties with a promise to appeal." Why the difference in description? Perhaps it is difficult to get the "story" straight when you are completely FABRICATING the occurrence entirely. It did not happen. Perhaps when writing such drivel it is because Anglen is NOT aware the proceedings are being recorded – in video. The Clerk of the Court provides Digital Recording (FTR) Proceedings for purchase. In response to Anglen's false portrayal of Rodrick's reaction to the verdict, he made such a purchase to PROVE that Anglen was engaged in his "FICTION" writing – AGAIN. The segment of the FTR immediately following the reading of the verdict is made available as [Exhibit 20](#). (to view, FTR Player Required)

Robert Anglen is not a journalist – newsman – investigative journalist. He is an unskilled "wannabe" fiction writer that has to keep his "day job" of pretending to be a journalist. Sometimes his imagination and desire to write fiction gets the best of him. Another example of his "creative license" in depicting an event was in reporting to many people that Rodrick had "taken a swing at him" in a courtroom after a hearing. Oesterblad was there to witness this encounter firsthand and it was another exaggeration / misrepresentation / LIE. Anglen had approached Rodrick and shoved his cell phone close to his face trying to take a photo. Rodrick had merely waved the camera away in a sweeping motion. However, the drama queen Anglen would report too many that Rodrick had "taken a swing at him." Anglen is a man who knows no shame.

THE JUDGE COOPER FIASCO AND AN APPEAL BASED ON THE APPEARANCE OF IMPROPRIETY:

The verdict in the Arizona Superior Court was a devastating defeat. As previously discussed Rodrick was overwhelmed with the legal process when trying to represent himself after his attorney Dan Warner had intentionally and maliciously "threw him under the bus." He made a terrible decision in going it alone and lost due to his legal missteps and mistakes due to his legal ignorance. However, he did prove to be judicious in his assessment of Judge Katherine Cooper having an unknown and hidden prejudice to the outcome of this particular case.

It had been the contention of Rodrick that there was an obvious bias against him demonstrated by Judge Cooper throughout case. Although there are numerous situations that occurred during the case, the difficulty in making such an assertion had been to establish the underlying foundation for such a prejudice to exist in the first place. There was no historical record to connect Rodrick with Judge Cooper or any mutual associates or circumstances to his knowledge. However, these unexplained reoccurrences of unjustified bias were made abundantly clear when Donna Rossi of Phoenix Channel 5 News broke the story on [January 19, 2015](#), subsequently receiving extensive local and national media attention, that

Judge Cooper had a live-in companion (“boyfriend”) for over two (2) years at her residence by the name of [Michael Kent Krause](#) (hereafter, “Krause”). This situation became a media event when officers from the State of New York traveled to Arizona to execute an outstanding “Fugitive Warrant” for “extortion” upon Krause at Judge Cooper’s residence. Judge Cooper was harboring a **wanted fugitive** who also had a long criminal history in the State of California and spent time in prison for burglary; assault with a deadly weapon and assault with intent to commit a sex offense. What was of particular interest to Rodrick is the connection created by the sex offense charges (specifically being that of assault with the intent to rape, sodomy or oral copulation), where in Krause’s name and details of these charges could be found online with the [SOR websites](#).

It is important to detail the significance of the many circumstances surrounding this situation. The boyfriend Krause had been residing at Judge Cooper’s residence for more than two (2) years, before the inception of the case, yet had been listing to law enforcement authorities an address of a RV Park and a “run down trailer in Mesa” which was used solely for registration purposes to the Sex Offender Registry. When the New York authorities sent to Arizona to extradite Krause did not find him at the RV Park, they would arrest him at Judge Cooper’s residence in central Phoenix which had been his domicile for more than 2 years. He was a wanted fugitive with an arrest warrant for criminal felony charges of “grand larceny via the use of extortion” issued by the State of New York. Even today as was the case in 2013 and 2104, doing a Google search of the name “Michael Kent Krause” would return a **NUMBER 1** listing on the first page of results (see, [Exhibit 21](#)). This Google search did NOT provide any other results that reveal the of sex crime conviction. The SOR websites were the best and virtually exclusive online resource available to uncover the factual criminal history of Krause and thus was a direct threat to his objective of hiding in anonymity and obscuring his whereabouts. Further, the dissemination of this data via the websites would also threaten Judge Cooper’s personal and professional reputation, arguably even her viability as a sitting Arizona Superior Court judge which was demonstrated when Phoenix Channel 5 News exposed the story January 19, 2015.

On January 21, 2015 Judge Cooper finally acknowledged the latent issues that obviously had hindered her ability to properly handle the case and she “disqualified herself” (see, [Exhibit 22](#)). However, only after the breaking story by Phoenix Channel 5 News on January 19, 2015 **and** receiving an email inquiry from Rodrick on January 21, 2015. Almost immediately, only 34 minutes, after receiving the Rodrick inquiry the judge’s staff responded that an Order would be filed – what would be the recusation. Unfortunately the late and/or untimely recusation was the proverbial “closing the barn door after the horse is gone”. The damage to Rodrick had already been done and was irreparable. The Self-Disqualification by Judge Cooper was an admission she should never have been allowed to preside over case as Rodrick had repeatedly alleged during the litigation.

The extensive details of all the issues of questionable conduct by Judge Cooper during the case have been previously documented and were submitted as a judicial complaint. This information is available for review if there is an interest. Although a warning, it is every bit as comprehensive as this paper (see, [Exhibit 23](#)). As reported by the [Arizona Capitol Times](#) when posting on this matter: “Arizona judges must abide by numerous rules on such matters as impartiality, integrity and extrajudicial activities.” As the situation certainly caused a rather significant uproar in both the media and legal circles, Judge Cooper would release a press release: “I was shocked when I learned of the allegations regarding Michael Krause on Tuesday. I had no knowledge of any of the charges against him. I have no further relationship with Mr. Krause, and he no longer resides at my residence.” Cooper also denied knowing that Krause was a convicted felon and registered sex offender. Of course, she had to claim NO KNOWLEDGE of the crimes associated with the man she had lived with for TWO YEARS, to have done otherwise would have resulted in her immediate termination as a Judge for the Arizona Superior Court. To accept the denials

of Judge Copper as truthful requires you to believe that a middle aged professional female met and began a relationship with a man who recently moved from California under questionable circumstances, lived in a “run down trailer in a RV Park”, was unemployed throughout the relationship and even after residing at HER residence for over two years, she NEVER once did a basic Google search of his full name “Michael Kent Krause California.” If she had, she would have found the SOR website search result in the **number 1 position**. Anyone of Judge Cooper’s age, education and experience that would be this naïve and/or unformed has no business serving in the Arizona Superior Court Judicial Branch. Even if one was to accept Judge Cooper’s explanations on their face value, it does not alleviate the APPEARANCE OF IMPROPRIETY. This is the basis for the Appeal under Rule 60 that Rodrick has filed and is navigating the Appellant Court process. Even if Rodrick were to lose at the Appellant Court level, he WILL be taking his argument all the way to the Arizona Supreme Court. If the presiding judge of a case who is in a long-term relationship with a convicted sex offender who is a fugitive from the law who’s criminal history and “mugshot” are almost exclusively accessible via the very website that the judge is being asked to “shut down” and repeatedly the Judge made questionable Rulings against said websites doesn’t qualifies as having the possibility of the “appearance of impropriety” (the standard does not call for actual impropriety, only the perception of reasonably minded people that it may have occurred), then the Arizona legislature needs to abolish that provision in the statutes as it does not or could not possibly exist under a more obvious scenario.

The Judge Cooper situation was a scandalous Arizona story garnering significant media attention both local and national. After all, she had been a high profile Judge having presided over some very big Arizona cases (Cave Creek Unified School District vs. State of Arizona - \$1.3 Billion Judgment). The circumstances involving the relationship with Krause were undeniably salacious and of a public interest. What was the coverage by Anglen and/or the Arizona Republic, especially considering the amount of coverage afforded the Rodrick case? It was virtually non-existence, consisting of an Associated Press “blurb” amounting to a total of 125 words. However, Anglen would feel compelled to comment on his Facebook page consisting of another attack tirade against Rodrick (see, Exhibit 24):

“Here is a piece of back story to consider. For two years I have been investigating the owner of sex offender websites who is accused of extorting money from sex offenders. Last year Cooper presided over his case pre-trial. She made a series of motions against him and a jury hit him with a \$3+million verdict. The owner is now claiming that Cooper's boyfriend was listed on his site and that she knew it, hid her conflict and ruled against the Website. The owner is a convicted con man. Records suggest he updated his website yesterday to include Cooper's boyfriend's information. That's why stories like this matter.”

Breaking down the Anglen Facebook comment, we have the tired old and repeatedly defeated claim of “extorting money.” Referring to Rodrick as a “convicted CON man” is certainly telling of his bias and ill-will demonstrated throughout Anglen’s series of articles about him and the SOR websites. Rodrick pled guilty to building and selling cable descrambling boxes twenty-three (23) years ago for which he was sentenced to probation. That is NOT the rap sheet of a “CONVICTED CON MAN.” Anglen would actually prove once and for all to see his deep rooted animosity and propensity to falsely report whatever “fiction” he could write about Rodrick and the SOR websites. He really made a stretch displaying his lack of credibility when asserting that **AFTER Donna Rossi** disclosed her bombshell story about the Judge Cooper and Michal Krause connection for Phoenix CBS News 5, Rodrick “updated his website yesterday to include Cooper’s boyfriend’s information.” First, the video segment shown of the breaking story on CBS 5 Phoenix shows a

screenshot TWICE of the Krause sex offense criminal history profile AND it is from the SOR websites that Donna Rossi used. Thus proving Anglen's accusation was just another example of STUPIDITY and a lack of due diligence research (not to mention common sense). Further, if Anglen had done just a little bit of actual basic online research, such as a Google search of the relevant known terms being "michael krause offendex California" a link is found on the FIRST page of results (4thdown) of a posting with RipOffReport.com. Seems Krause was involved in some shady business practices in California which may explain his sudden move to Arizona. What's important is the ROR post was submitted **March 13, 2012** and specifically provides the SOR websites link to Krause's profile (see, [Exhibit 25](#)). Apparently another non-sex offender found value in using the SOR websites. What is also worth noting, this is ANOTHER post on Facebook Anglen would choose to delete it from future viewing. Again, luckily the SOR websites documented the post with a screenshot that can be viewed today at [Exhibit 24](#).

It can be agreed that ONE point made in the Anglen Facebook post stands true (yeah!): "That's why stories like this matter." It is important to prove to the average reader/viewer that fraudulence does exist in journalism by unethical participants like Anglen. That you cannot believe everything you read from a "major media" source. They do have "bad apples." That it can be exposed to those that care about integrity in journalism so such transgressions may be dealt with in the future. Maybe someday we can get back to the journalism [Code of Ethics](#) mattering again.

MICHIGAN CASES AGAINST THE SOR WEBSITES:

In the Anglen article of September 2014, he would reference a loss for Rodrick in a lawsuit filed in Michigan. Of course, he would provide no details for a reader to have any understanding or be able to place any context to this situation. Anglen reported: "The next day, a federal judge in Michigan ordered Rodrick to pay \$5,270 in attorneys fees and banned Rodrick "from ever posting any similar sex-offender posting concerning plaintiff or otherwise posting defamatory statements concerning plaintiff on the Internet."

What Anglen was obviously unaware, since he does not perform basic research when writing his articles, is the legal ramifications of this judgment awarded in a Michigan court were none whatsoever. At the time this lawsuit was filed in Michigan, Rodrick did not have an attorney and was embroiled in the two lawsuits in Arizona that he was representing himself. He did not have the time or energy to deal with another frivolous lawsuit in a jurisdiction that he had ABSOLUTELY NO connection. He did not "Answer" the lawsuit nor have any knowledge of what was required to deal with a lawsuit in another jurisdiction. The fact is the State of Michigan has no "jurisdiction" over Rodrick to enforce any collection of a judgment or impose any sort of injunction. And that is exactly what has occurred – NOTHING. Should the Plaintiff ever try to pursue any action associated with this lawsuit it would be dealt with in Arizona and accompanied with the appropriate counter claims for Abuse of Process, Defamation and a few more choice legal remedies by Rodrick.

What makes Anglen's reporting the Michigan defeat so interesting is he does absolutely NOTHING in reporting the VICTORY obtained in a different lawsuit filed in Federal Court in Michigan – David William Nail vs. Autumn Schrauben , et. al., Case No. 1:15-cv-0177. When this lawsuit was filed in Michigan, Rodrick had retained attorneys to deal with such matters. The Judge in this case would grant the Motion to Dismiss on all claims and would write some significant clarification on the issues surrounding the SOR websites and these legal challenges. In the Michigan Federal Court Order, the Honorable Ellen S. Carmody clearly recognized the ridiculousness of the claims brought forward by David Nail when stating:

“The Court need not accept as true, however, factual allegations which are ‘**clearly irrational or wholly incredible.**’ *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992).” She would also state in her Ruling the following: “Stated differently, “immunity under the CDA depends on the pedigree of the content at issue.” *Jones*, 775 F.3d at 409. Accordingly, if a website operator is merely displaying or allowing access to information or content from a separate and distinct “information content provider,” **the website operator enjoys immunity. Id.**” (see, [Exhibit 26](#))

Anglen does not write ONE word when it comes to a VICTORY for the SOR websites in the legal arena. To do so would discredit ALL of the Anglen articles and demonstrate the TRUTH to what are really the issues at hand. It would also expose all of Anglen’s efforts to assault the reputation of Rodrick for what it has always been from the beginning, a personal agenda to shutdown the SOR websites from disseminating the FACTUAL criminal histories of convicted sex offenders. The big question is the still unknown why, what was Anglen’s motivation to so willingly engage in deceit to further the efforts and cause of convicted sex offenders (child molesters, child rapists, child porn, etc)?

ANGLEN IMPLIES IRS ISSUE:

In Anglen’s articles he would imply Rodrick had IRS problems. As is his practice, Anglen does not have any FACTS to support such allegations, only supposition and hearsay.

The FACTS are Rodrick had been engaged in a contentious divorce for several years. His ex-wife Lois Flynn is the one who REFUSED to deal with the necessary IRS issues. She would not supply any of the family documentation that was needed to complete the IRS filings correctly. It did not matter how many times Rodrick went to the Judge presiding over the Divorce and Orders were issued to disclose the documentation that only she had access to. She would continue to stonewall and would not comply.

After the divorce was (finally) finalized, Rodrick was allowed to proceed independently. He hired a professional CPA to work through all the necessary paperwork and complete the required filings. There are no IRS issues requiring Rodrick’s attention. All outstanding financial obligations have been met and Rodrick is 100% caught up with his IRS filings and payments. The same can NOT be said for Lois Flynn. Based on Anglen’s past propensity of biased and one-sided reporting you can count on his NOT updating his implied accusations against Rodrick while never making mention of an adversary to the SOR websites such as Lois Flynn.

CARSOL DEVASTING LOSS ON ALL SEX OFFENDER CLAIMS - BELLUCCI CALLS RODRICK A “BULLY”:

Sometimes there is just no other way to describe a situation than the most basic way possible. Attorney Janice Bellucci claiming victory at the completion of the long awaited Federal trial is complete bullshit. And that is putting it politely. After the trial Anglen would quote Bellucci as saying: “There was nothing decent about his communication. It was about a bully who made outrageous comments about people he didn’t like.” He would further report “Bellucci said Friday the case was not about the First Amendment or the Communications Decency Act.” Bellucci actually claimed the lawsuit was a victory.

It figures attorney Janice Bellucci would claim the case was NOT about the “First Amendment or the CDA.” These are the legal issues that this case was ALL about. Her statements are not some lawyer legal trick; she is just that dumb of an attorney. The fact that she could not win dealing with the legal or factual basis of the case is why she has been guilty of fabricating false claims based on utter lies. Her case completely unraveled prior to the trial no matter how she tries to place a spin on it to avoid the TRUTH. What Anglen does not do for the readers is breakdown what occurred in the case. It began with

ten (10) Plaintiffs making three claims each that was filed in March of 2013. A Third Amended Complaint was filed in March of 2015 and upped the Plaintiffs to twelve (12) and the claims to five (5) each amounting to sixty (60) claims against Rodrick and sixty (60) claims against Oesterblad. A total of one hundred twenty (120) claims overall. The first defeat for Bellucci and her Plaintiffs occurred in June 2015 when the Judge Ruled on Rodrick's Motion to Dismiss and eliminated ALL claims for John Does #1 - #6. This Ruling eliminated one quarter of the claims of all Plaintiffs making the number from one hundred twenty (120) down to ninety (90). Plus for Bellucci and her California RSOL, who initiated the lawsuit, it dismissed the majority of convicted sex offender Plaintiffs and their sex offender issues except John Doe #7 Keith Johnson (will detail outcome shortly) and John Doe # 8 Frank Silva. We have explained in detail what became of the Frank Silva claims at trial. The second defeat for Bellucci and her Plaintiffs was in September 2015 when the Judge Ruled in favor of Oesterblad's Motion to Dismiss. Attorney Bellucci could not muster a Response to Pro Se Oesterblad's filing, not because he was such a legal eagle but rather Bellucci being such a horrible lawyer who had fabricated this whole lawsuit with misrepresentations and lies. The Ruling immediately eliminated **ALL** 60 claims against Oesterblad. No matter the spin that is a devastating **DEFEAT**. A total of thirty (30) claims remained against Rodrick with six (6) Plaintiffs still in the lawsuit. Two weeks before trial in June 2016, John Doe #11 Glenn Wyrick would withdraw all five (5) of his claims as previously explained. There were a total of twenty-five (25) remaining claims. On the day of the trial in June 2016, John Doe #7 Keith Johnson of Johnson City, Tennessee would withdraw all of his claims. His involvement with the lawsuit had been in question since the withdrawal of legal representation by Bellucci in December of 2014. Johnson had claimed Bellucci had not been representing his best interest in favor of those of the CA RSOL. A piece was written and posted online detailing ALL the events occurring prior to the trial documenting the unraveling of the Bellucci/RSOL lawsuit and is available online [HERE](#). On the day of reckoning (the trial,) after forty (40) months of asserting false and fabricated claims, he refused to participate and withdrew his claims instead. Also on the day of the trial as previously detailed, Jane Doe #9 Janine Graves would refuse to testify for the trial and all of her claims were dismissed by the judge – ON THE DAY OF THE TRIAL. After dealing with forty (40) months of litigation, the day of the trial had finally arrived and what remained were three Plaintiffs and a total of fifteen (15) claims. As detailed all the claims of Susan Galvez and Frank Silva were ruled in favor of Rodrick by the Jury. The remaining Plaintiff REDACTED would have three (3) of his claims dismissed and would have the jury rule in favor of two (2) claims because they did NOT understand how the CDA applied to the allegations of REDACTED. The math is pretty straight forward; Janice Bellucci and the California RSOL temporally have two victories for a non-sex offender and are subject to legitimate appeals vs. the SOR websites **158 VICTORIES**. Plus, Rodrick has a claim against the losing eleven (11) Plaintiffs for the attorney fees associated with defeating their frivolous and falsified claims that were litigated for forty (40) months (not an insignificant amount of a judgment). These are the FACTS of the outcome of the lawsuit. Bellucci talks of the lawsuit as if some kind of victory for her Plaintiffs and RSOL cause occurred? That is nothing short of delusional. She is the most incompetent and ignorant attorney to ever disgrace a courtroom. The truth is she is a lobbyist for child molesters and child rapists with a law degree pretending to be an attorney. Her legal work certainly speaks for itself and reflects this reality.

What is important to this project is detailing the Anglen involvement with reporting this dispute from the beginning. Where is the article that actually addresses the TRUTH to what occurred in the case and the outcome? He actually presents the FACTS as though the Plaintiffs did in fact somehow prevail in their claims. They didn't just lose; they were crushed and are facing \$100s thousands in personal liability for a Judgment for Attorney fees. Once again, this is NOT rocket science, the FACTS speak for themselves. Who has seemed to lose a voice is Anglen doing his job and reporting the news truthfully and objectively. He demonstrates what the SOR websites have alleged all along, that Anglen has always

had some “dog in this fight” and he will NOT tell the TRUTH that undermines his own personal agenda. The breakdown of the trial and lawsuit results was prepared and posted online the day after the completion of the trial. It is entitled “Sex Offenders and Non Sex Offenders Lose Frivolous Lawsuit Fake Claims Exposed” and is available online [HERE](#). After forty-six (46) months of following the SOR websites legal challenges, Anglen does NOT prepare and publish a similar comprehensive accounting of the END of the story which only validates the contention that Robert Anglen is NOT a journalist. He is a hack and an embarrassment to the profession.

It is hilarious that Janice Bellucci would have the audacity to call another person a “bully.” It just further exhibits her complete lack of self awareness of just what a disgraceful excuse of humanity she represents. She intentionally violates all the required prerequisites of the Model Rules of Professional Conduct. Of course, for lawyers such as Bellucci this is by definition an oxymoron. Then you have to top that off with she makes a profession of endangering our children by scheming , lying and cheating for her dregs of the earth child molesters (Adam Galvez), child rapists (Jeremy Graves & Keith Johnson), child porn (Frank Silva & Larry Anthony Quintero) etc. etc.. The business model that attorney Janice Bellucci has built over the last few years exploiting the California RSOL front façade has been to create a criminal enterprise that is based on “litigation intimidation.”She files completely frivolous lawsuits that have no legal or factual basis in the charlatan premises of being so called “civil rights activist” for convicted sex offenders (what a joke – only not funny at all). The premise is to target defendants whether an individual or a small community that will be forced to decide whether to spend say forty (40) months (for an example this case) of contentious litigation and hundreds of thousands of dollars in attorney fees. Not very many people or small communities are willing to commit the time, effort and resources necessary and they feel forced to capitulate and agree to a settlement that pays Janice Bellucci. It is nothing short of litigation “EXTORTION.” This subject with all the supporting facts and documentation is being completed and will be posted online later this week. It is entitled “CHILD ENDANGERMENT: The CALIFORNIA RSOL “Litigation Intimidation” Strategy.” This piece will go into great detail of just what a scam Janice Bellucci is running with the CA RSOL. . The true history of the RSOL, breakdown of all the frivolous lawsuits filed against small communities in California, the Anti-SLAPP defense to defeat all future litigation by the CA RSOL and the next crushing defeat that will be the IML lawsuit being litigated in Federal Court in Oakland, California.

Again, where is Anglen in doing the job of an “investigative journalist”? He is nowhere to be found. That would be too much like actually working his profession. After spending an enormous amount of time dissecting all of Anglen’s articles in the series involving the SOR websites, what began to stand out is the ridiculous amount of copy and paste work that is included in his published articles. It is not uncommon to find that 50% for the later articles Anglen published are just repeating the exact same sentences/paragraphs from his previous work. Gannett Company must pay him by the word and he makes it a practice to take the easy way and just top out an article with filler from previous work to pad the word count. It really is no surprise; Anglen demonstrated what kind of journalist he chooses to be from the very beginning with his abhorrent lack of due diligence research and no comprehensive detail.

THE FALSE CLAIMS AS REPORTED BY ANGLLEN WAS AIRED BY PHOENIX CHANNEL 12 NEWS:

Anglen would involve respected news anchor [Mark Curtis](#) of Channel 12 News Phoenix in reporting his version of misrepresentations, omissions and outright lies. It is hoped that at least one media person in Phoenix that knows Mark Curtis will read this piece and inform him of its content. It is interesting to know that a “journalist” such as Anglen can write his rubbish and hand it off to a reputable newsman such as Mark Curtis to convey to the Channel 12 News audience. Mark Curtis is not culpable for this

fraudulent journalism, naturally he had trusted his colleague had performed the proper due diligence and had abided by the Journalism Code of Ethics. Anglen did not honor the trust shown to him by Mark Curtis and fellow Consumer Complaint reporter [Veronica Sanchez](#). It was their reputation in reporting his fallacy of a story that was tarnished when conveying to their TV audience such a poorly prepared, biased and factually unsound conjecture of a “news story.” It is unfortunate that good reporters are reliant upon their colleagues to be responsible for the preparation of and due diligence for a story that is aired on live TV news when they are as utterly incompetent as the so-called journalist Robert Anglen.

It is interesting that Anglen felt the need to emphasize in a discussion with Oesterblad after the trial that he does NOT work for Channel 12 News any longer. There is no dispute that this would certainly be technically correct since the “[spin off](#)” implemented by Gannett Company in 2014. Yet, his personal [Facebook](#) page “Cover Photo” is a photo op for “Call 12 for Action” with [Veronica Sanchez](#) and Anglen. Why is Anglen so concerned that his association and past work with Channel 12 News Phoenix would be discussed? There is no question that a few segments concerning the SOR websites, Rodrick and Oesterblad were aired on Channel 12 News Phoenix. Is it that he knows time has proven the segments as depicted and presented utilizing his work were complete fabrications of the FACTS and intentionally misrepresented the TRUTH? It is now supported with irrefutable evidence that the claims aired on Channel 12 News by [Mark Curtis](#) and Veronica Sanchez claiming the SOR websites engaged in “Extortion”, people that paid for “removal” remained on the SOR websites and that “people with NO criminal records were profiled as having been convicted of a sex crime and were required to register as a sex offender” were false. Yes, Channel 12 News Phoenix can thank Anglen personally for making them appear completely incompetent and guilty of sensationalizing a “news story” based on unmitigated lies and flagrant misrepresentations. It is kind of embarrassing from a professional reputation perspective.

ANGLLEN REPEATEDLY ATTEMPTS TO INVOLVE LAW ENFORCEMENT TO PURSUE CHARGES AGAINST THE SOR WEBSITES. THIS IS NOT JOURNALISM; THIS IS ADVOCACY:

From the very beginning in late 2012 Anglen set out on a crusade to get SOR websites “shut down.” More nefarious were his efforts to see to it Rodrick and Oesterblad were arrested and facing criminal charges. As previously mentioned, it is not known what is the basis and/or motivation for what is clearly a very personal agenda that Anglen has engaged in using his media clout to pursue his artifice. Whatever the rationalization Anglen uses to justify his conduct, it is clearly personal.

In Anglen’s articles he repeatedly makes mention of contact he makes with a wide variety of different law enforcement and government agencies. These are not just benign inquiries asking for an opinion or an update on status of an investigation. In fact, he acknowledges he is again and again told there is NO investigation ongoing. He does not leave it at that, he actively is pursuing these agencies to open an investigation and/or to take some actions. At no time in these exchanges, as they are described in Anglen’s articles, does he provide to the reader concrete facts to support some clear legal statute that the SOR websites and/or their operators have violated. He is not acting as a journalist; he has clearly crossed over to a zealot advocate with an agenda. He is using his credentials as a journalist with a large media concern in an attempt to intimidate the agencies involved to sway their view of the target – the SOR websites and Rodrick personally.

Anglen specifically references repeated contact with the Arizona Department of Public Safety. Their offices are in charge of managing the Arizona Sex Offender Registry. At no time was an inquiry received from the AZ DPS. There is NO law prohibiting the republishing of public records released into the public domain such as those that are managed by the AZ DPS.

Anglen also discusses Tempe Police receiving a multitude of complaints and his contact discussing any action being taken. At no time was an inquiry received from the Tempe Police. This should not have been a surprise to Anglen if he had done any basic due diligence “investigative” work because there would NOT be any jurisdiction for the Tempe police. The SOR websites operations (offices or technical hardware such as servers) were never located in Tempe. No party with the operations of the SOR websites lived in Tempe. The only thing Anglen and his sex offender vigilante posse could have been relying on is very old information when the OnlineDetective offices had been in Tempe back in 2005. A full eight (8) years before the complaints concerning the SOR websites were being sent to the Tempe Police in 2013.

Anglen mentioned national agencies he believed would have an interest in the operations of the SOR websites such as the Federal Trade Commission. There was contact received from the Federal Trade Commission which did send one inquiry back in late 2012. After the inquiry was addressed and a response was sent detailing the process and the number of case law precedents across the entire country that supported the validity of the SOR websites further contact was NOT received.

Anglen wrote of complaints being filed and his contact with the Virginia Attorney General’s Office. As previously discussed when dealing with the issues involving Glenn Wyrick of Ashland, Virginia a complaint was received from the AGs Office specifically from George McLaughlin, Criminal Investigator, in July of 2012. The concerns were responded to and that was the last contact received by the SOR websites from the State of Virginia. Beside the AGs Office there were additional attempts and Anglen acknowledged what he would have been told by Wyrick: “One offender said federal prosecutors in Virginia told him they would not open a case.”

Another out of state contact involved the State of Montana. Anglen wrote: “Officials with the Montana Department of Justice said they, too, have sent information and complaints about the websites to the Arizona attorney general.” Of course, these complaints and contacts would have been based on the incessant efforts of previously discussed convicted sex offender Gordon Grainger of Helena, Montana. In fact, Anglen would interview his multi-Facebook “friend” on the subject of complaints to various agencies and quote him whining: “They don’t take action because of who we are: sex offenders,” said Grainger, who lodged complaints with state and federal authorities in Montana and Arizona. “But we deserve equal protection under the law.” “They” didn’t “take action” because there had been NO laws violated – civil or criminal. Trying to make the subject about being a “sex offender” has no legal or factual basis. Playing the boo-hoo card just doesn’t work with professional organizations and agents if there is no evidence to support the claims – no matter how many and adamant the submitter of these complaints may be. They base their investigations on the FACTS that must be supported with evidence. Anglen could take a few lessons on what it takes to be a true professional.

The most active State agency that was involved in dealing with an unknown (but large) number of “consumer complaints” was the Arizona Attorney General’s Office. A few dozen complaints were received and ALL were promptly addressed and a response returned. NOT one of these consumer complaints was to garner further inquiries from the AZ AGs office requesting additional contact to discuss concerns with the operations of the SOR websites. Anglen would repeatedly make a point in his articles that NO ACTION was being taken by the AZ AG. He seemed determined to imply there was some neglect occurring by the professional investigators and even went as far as implying some form of agency “shell game” was occurring. There was a much simpler explanation; no laws were being violated by the SOR websites. Anglen has refused for years to accept this FACT no matter the number of cases.

An interesting aspect of the complaints that were being received by the Arizona Attorney General's Office was many were being originated by a concerted and planned campaign organized by the convicted sex offenders active in the advocacy efforts of the California RSOL and the Galvez smear website. These groups went as far as actively calling for complaints to be prepared in a certain manner and provided the mailing address and a contact person to signify for receipt. The plan being to create the impression of impropriety by the SOR websites based on the receipt of so many complaints detailing the same sort of violations – there must be something to the wrongful conduct being alleged. To counter these efforts a specific complaint was chosen and a great deal of effort and detail was put into the preparing a response. The particular complaint chosen for this task was one received from Jeremy Ryan Graves of Seattle, Washington who has been discussed previously in this project. Like the convicted sex offenders the response was sent not only to the standard response address but also the "Special Investigator" named at the sex offender advocacy websites, a Charles Lofton. The response to the ridiculously absurd complaint submitted by Graves is available for review at [Exhibit 27](#). The good news is after explaining exactly what was occurring, NOT ONE more complaint would ever be received from the AZ AGs office again. They understood the fallacy of the complaints and the charade being perpetrated in the manner in which they were being submitted.

FBI INVESTIGATION AND "VICTIM" LETTERS:

After the concerted efforts of hundreds of sex offenders following the instructions of their advocacy groups on what to file and with who along with the Anglen's media push they finally received the attention of the FBI. It was an interesting game plan as it took on a little different attack plan than the one used with the Arizona Attorney General. A template was prepared and provided to this following with instructions to send to the Phoenix FBI office (address provided). Its creation was a means to manipulate investigators to the concerns identified by the IC3 (Internet Crime Complaint Center) alleging the SOR websites had engaged in misconduct. The template worked off a posting by the IC3 addressing issues involved with so-called "[Mugshot Extortion](#)" sites back in 2013. The sheer number of these complaints all claiming the same or very similar circumstances was intended to create the appearance of wrong doing. This issue has been addressed earlier and is available as [Exhibit 28](#).

Just one of several examples was posted by [Christine C McCall](#), Pasadena Administrative Law Lawyer, on the Galvez smear website explaining the game plan when writing: "I will continue to add state and federal statutes, and addresses and links to each state's AG office, and the FBI. Also, a boilerplate complaint for visitors to cut and paste and send to their state's AG, Arizona's AG, and the FBI. Traffic to the Arizona AG will **compel them to bring a criminal complaint I believe.**"

The FBI did make contact with the parties associated with the SOR websites. Both Oesterblad and Rodrick agreed to cooperate with the investigation. They would make themselves available for a direct interview in the Phoenix offices of the FBI. They did NOT "lawyer up and shut up." They appeared as agreed and answered all questions and provided a large number of documents of evidence associated with the operations of the SOR websites. They would also discuss what they had experienced in the way of threats, harassment and Abuse of Process of the legal process. They agreed to the meetings because they did not have anything to hide as they had not violated any laws. The most interesting take away from the meetings is all the so-called "victims" were just the same old group of malcontents the SOR websites had been dealing with for years: REDACTED, Gordon Grainger, Adam Galvez, Susan Galvez, Jeremy Ryan Graves, Janine Graves, Frank Silva, Glenn Wyrick, and Lois Flynn – the usual suspects. The first of these meetings took place in early August of 2015 – one (1) year ago. At that time, apparently the FBI had been working on the complaints received from the convicted sex offenders and their supports

for a year. We are now two (2) years into the “ongoing investigation,” although there has not been a case presented to a Grand Jury and one has not been “scheduled.” There was never criminal intent. There were no crimes committed by the SOR websites or Rodrick no matter the number of fabricated complaints that are filed and the emphatic claims of wrongdoing. The true irony of the situation is the accusers are the perpetrators of the very crimes they have tried to project onto others. Arguably the complaints submitted were blatant lies which would constitute new criminal conduct perpetrated by the authors who had engaged in a jointly organized and implemented attack agenda to make false claims. The number of complaints is irrelevant when they were created as a group effort committing a fraud to achieve a stated goal that intentionally falsified the facts. The goal: shut down the SOR websites no matter what it takes and the amount of lies that need to be told to law enforcement.

Anglen writes of letters being received from the FBI agent overseeing the case “identifying victims” such as Frank Silva whose involvement has been detailed thoroughly earlier in this piece. You can review an example of a “victim” letter; one sent to Frank Silva is available for review as [Exhibit 29](#). Some of the other known recipients of FBI “victim” letters: REDACTED, Gordon Grainger, Adam Galvez, Susan Galvez, Jeremy Ryan Graves, Janine Graves, Glenn Wyrick, Lois Flynn – the usual suspects – AGAIN.

A truly ironic twist to the mix is the claim by Anglen himself that he has been ACTIVELY involved in the investigation by the FBI. Anglen has claimed a posting that appeared on the Facebook page for CourtKey.com was the cause for a page deactivation due to the direct involvement of the FBI contacting Facebook. Anglen apparently went to the FBI alleging someone unknown (?), supposedly associated with the SOR websites, posted the Social Security number of his wife (not named). The Anglen allegation that was made to the FBI would be an added variable to their investigation. This is undeniably a cross over from objective and unbiased journalist to being personally involved in the outcome of his ongoing agenda. A FACT the SOR websites has claimed from the very beginning back in 2012 when it comes to Anglen involvement with his “story.” As a means to actually do proper due diligence, as Anglen has proven he is incapable of such work himself, he was requested to provide a screen shot that he claimed he had available (of course, the SS# could be redacted). Why? This is NOT rocket science and can be properly investigated. A comment “post” appearing on Facebook would have had the screen name of the party making the “post.” Who made this “post”? It was NOT anyone associated with the SOR websites as alleged by Anglen. With the name you simply follow to the Facebook profile from which it originated. In the event it is a “fake” FB profile, created by someone making postings anonymously and/or on the “down low”, you can still track the “post” back to the IP Address from which it originated. The SOR websites CHALLENGE Anglen to back up his punk allegations he made to the FBI. Here is the counter allegation – Anglen working with his sex offender “friends” and/or REDACTED are the ones who intentionally planted the “post” to get the Facebook page deactivated. They would do anything imaginable, including such a devious scam of a setup “post,” to get the content associated with CourtKey.com and its Facebook page taken offline. They DO NOT want the TRUTH being made available. The SOR websites challenge the FBI to follow the obvious trail of the IP address associated with this alleged “post.” It will not lead back to the SOR websites. The first place to look would be the fake Facebook profiles of REDACTED like [Ted Sille](#). Or Adam Galvez, who makes it a practice to always have a few fake FB available for his ongoing cyber-harassment, is always a likely suspect. The FBI could check a couple of his fake FB accounts in the names [Andrew Grey](#) or [David Johnson](#) and [David Sigmund](#).

Perhaps one other explanation that needs to be taken into account is an email sent by REDACTED wherein he claims that his good fortune in his battles with Rodrick and the SOR websites is due to his “friends in the NSA and S.A. [FBI Special Agent] GXXX...” (see, [Exhibit 30](#)). The FBI Special Agent has handed out “victim” letters to the convicted child rapist, child molesters, child porn, and sexual assault

etc. which have found their way into the public domain as public records in civil litigation cases. REDACTED also testified on the witness stand that REDACTED ex-employee Holly Johnson-Oates name was provided to him directly from this same FBI Special Agent. There is plenty of evidence to warrant being skeptical of anything this man claims, however, if true it would be a concern of how that type of disclosure is appropriate and brings into question if there really is some kind of “friendship” that has influenced the FBI involvement.

ANGLLEN REPEATEDLY DEFENDS REDACTED DESPITE THE OVERWHELMING EVIDENCE OF LIES

The SOR websites experienced a resounding victory in the Federal lawsuit litigated in Arizona – except for the ongoing nemesis that is REDACTED (hereafter, “REDACTED”). Anglen has reported on the involvement of REDACTED in the battles against the SOR websites from the beginning in May 2013. He has consistently made it a mission to intentionally portray REDACTED as some kind of “victim” of cyber harassment by the SOR websites. The paradox and source of never ending frustration for the SOR websites, and specifically Rodrick, is the TRUTH is the polar opposite. This delusion has been able to survive scrutiny exactly because of the efforts like those of Anglen in his articles to continually play the emotional card of calling upon the military career of REDACTED who is a retired United States Marine Corps (“USMC”) officer. Because of this association that concluded well over a decade ago, REDACTED has been able to escape objective analysis of his conduct based on the FACTS – the EVIDENCE – the TRUTH. For these reasons and these reasons exclusively, REDACTED has prevailed with jury verdicts that are NOT founded on the legal and factual basis of the evidence, but rather a fabricated persona of righteousness that is nothing more than a façade of a true rogue.

REDACTED is a retired Marine Corps Officer and contrary to his manifesto, he is a LIAR:

The foundation for ALL of the REDACTED’ attack positions against the SOR websites, Rodrick and even Oesterblad has been due to his having been a Marine Corps officer (fourteen (14) years removed since retirement,) and the self-serving and delusional pronouncement that his PERSONAL INTEGRITY is beyond reproach. As he stated twice before the jury at the trial in June 2016, which was just an outburst and not an answer to any question: “I am a U.S. Marine and I am truthful” (see, [Exhibit 31](#)). The FACTS supported by irrefutable evidence tells a completely different reality. First, it is a truism that one who is “truthful” NEVER feels compelled to shout it to the world. The person is comfortable in themselves; they know the world will declare their virtues for them if deserved. Second, he is NO longer a U.S. Marine being fourteen (14) years removed from active duty. Third, he is the farthest thing possible of being “truthful.” To state it quite simply and succinctly, based on the available information supported by the FACTS and multiple sworn testimony, REDACTED is a lying, cheating, drunkard, wife beater, philander, delusional and self absorbed miscreant. Plus, (solely) based on the allegations supported by sworn testimony of a past “executive assistant” with firsthand knowledge, REDACTED was directly involved with falsifying test results in the manufacture of airplane parts. Activities if true would constitute criminal conduct. REDACTED’ whole self important persona rests on having been an officer in the USMC. He is a disgrace to the USMC as he customarily violated the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), enacted at 10 U.S.C. § 933, that defines the manner in which REDACTED comports himself as “Unbecoming of an officer and a gentleman” – [933. Article 133](#). REDACTED does not get to claim alliance to and enjoy all the benefits of having been associated with military service as an officer and its accompany perception of being honorable when he IGNORES and DOES NOT ABIDE by the REQUIRED prerequisites dictated by the UCMJ to earn an esteemed reputation. Honor is something earned by ones actions – not obtained by osmosis.

REDACTED’ third wife Margie had some interesting input on his aversion to the TRUTH:

The first series of articles published by Anglen with the Arizona Republic in May 2013 included a support piece highlighting the allegation of REDACTED against the SOR websites. In the piece written by Anglen, REDACTED would claim his “personal information” of his name, business address and phone number were posted on the SOR websites. REDACTED claimed the issues he was having with the SOR websites ended the effort of reconciliation with his wife Margie REDACTED. Anglen would write that she would file for divorce. ALL of these allegations by REDACTED and included in the article by Anglen were definitively false.

The first time REDACTED’ name **EVER** appeared on the SOR websites was in September 2013, four (4) months after the article in the Arizona Republic. This inclusion occurred in conjunction with a rebuttal piece authored by the SOR websites to address the many false and fabricated claims printed by Anglen in his articles. This rebuttal is available online for review [HERE](#). It is worth noting Anglen was challenged to produce ANY documentation to refute the FACTS stated in the rebuttal. The challenge went unanswered. The point is how hard would it have been to provide this “personal information” of REDACTED ACTUALLY appearing on the SOR websites in May 2013? Anglen did NOT provide any proof of this allegation because it was a lie by REDACTED, which was only retold by Anglen without ANY supporting documentation. How is that even possible in journalism and a major media publication?

As noted in the rebuttal, the so called failure of the “effort of reconciliation” between REDACTED and his wife was not the responsibility of the SOR websites. In fact, Margie REDACTED would address this specific issue in her [Declaration](#) (Pg. 2/3: 12): “This lawsuit did not cause the demise of my marriage. Rather, REDACTED’s affair with Lois Flynn, in addition to the many other marital problems, caused the demise of our marriage.” Also, when the article was published by Anglen in May of 2013, Margie REDACTED had NOT filed for divorce as claimed. Such an assertion could have been easily verified one way or the other by Anglen with simple due diligence research by checking the court dockets of either Maricopa or Pima County. Apparently Anglen does not believe in such journalistic protocols. Further, Margie REDACTED would testify under oath that she contacted Anglen after the article had been published demanding a retraction as the depiction of the REDACTED’ relationship was clearly inaccurate. She would assert under oath that Anglen’s response was a refusal stating that “it didn’t matter whether it was true or not.” Margie REDACTED testified she pushed further on the point about the statements being made by REDACTED was a “lie.” To which Anglen would respond: “Does it really matter?” Well, since Anglen does not seem to understand these precepts, let us spell it out; **YES, IT DOES REALLY MATTER!** His articles are SUPPOSE to be “news” stories based on the **TRUTH**, not fiction based on ANGLLEN’S own whims and likings. Let him save those efforts for his very dark disturbing fiction writing found at “[The Poisoned Pen](#)” (the irony is unavoidable – [Phoenix Noir](#) - not to mention the context of the content involving incestual child molestation between a mother and her young son – you just cannot make this stuff up). It is amazing such distinctions apparently have to be explained to Anglen. Oh yeah, that is the point of the expose’. The sworn Declaration and Deposition of Margie REDACTED is available online [HERE](#).

The point that needs to be addressed is what was the basis for Margie REDACTED to contact Anglen demanding a retraction claiming her husband REDACTED had lied in the article? It was based on her first hand knowledge and experiences that the depiction by Anglen of REDACTED being the honorable retired military officer being FALSELY accused of infidelity was a “lie.” Margie REDACTED knew the LONG history of REDACTED’ acts of infidelity spanning decades and THREE marriages. In sworn testimony of both a Declaration and Deposition she would chronicle the TRUTH of the propensity to infidelity and the degree of deception and **LYING** REDACTED made it a standard practice to engage. Including throughout his military career in violation of Code of Conduct of an “officer and a gentleman” (a dishonorable discharge offense - [Article 134 – ADULTERY - UCMJ](#)). To highlight these FACTS that are direct contradictions to the

persona repeatedly portrayed in the Anglen articles and the flamboyant proclamation and perjurious testimony of REDACTED when making his spacious self-endorsement on the witness stand before the jury: "I am a U.S. Marine and I am TRUTHFUL" is Margie REDACTED' testimony:

- "REDACTED and I have had marital problems for many years for many reasons. I believe REDACTED has a drinking problem. He has also **hit me** in the past...." [Declaration](#) (Pg. 1: 3)
- "This lawsuit did not cause the demise of my marriage. Rather, REDACTED's affair with Lois Flynn, in addition to the many other marital problems, caused the demise of our marriage." [Declaration](#) (Pg. 2/3: 12)
- "I learned that REDACTED had been seeing another woman, Lois Flynn.... For this reason, I asked REDACTED to leave the house on February 27, 2013." [Declaration](#) (Pg. 2:8)(see, [Exhibit 32](#))
- In the Deposition of Margie REDACTED she would give sworn testimony revealing the numerous acts of infidelity that REDACTED had engaged in – along with some rather sordid details to further establish the degree of lying that he made a practice to engage in, such as (highlighted deposition – [Exhibit 33](#)):
 - a) His first wife's name was Maria. He had an extra-marital affair with Dyvonne.
 - b) REDACTED impregnated Dyvonne while married to Maria. REDACTED divorced Maria.
 - c) The affair and impregnation of Dyvonne by REDACTED occurred while on active duty of the USMC in violation of Article 134.
 - d) REDACTED married Dyvonne and their child born from the affair was a daughter.
 - e) REDACTED had an extra-marital affair with a "Stacy" while stationed in California.
 - f) REDACTED would meet and have a six month extra-marital affair with Margie REDACTED while stationed in California before she learned he was married.
 - g) REDACTED had told Margie REDACTED his "**wife [Dyvonne] and daughter had died in a car accident**" in North Carolina.
 - h) Margie REDACTED learned this was not true from another officer stationed at the base in California when REDACTED had taken a "business trip" to North Carolina.
 - i) The affair with "Stacy" and Margie REDACTED by REDACTED occurred while on active duty of the USMC in violation of Article 134.
 - j) REDACTED' daughter would be "child molested" by his father Robert REDACTED in New Hampshire. Factual criminal history of conviction is provided [HERE](#). Make what you will of this FACT and how it may play into current circumstances and REDACTED' association with his sex offender "[ARMY](#)."
 - k) Dyvonne would divorce REDACTED. According to Margie REDACTED the daughter Sara has rescinded any association with the REDACTED name and is estranged from the father REDACTED and any REDACTED family association.
 - l) REDACTED and Margie REDACTED were married in November 2000.
 - m) Margie testified that REDACTED had had an extra-marital affair with Lois Flynn starting in 2011.
 - n) Margie REDACTED found text messages ("sexting") on REDACTED' cell phone involving his masturbation practices that had been sent to THREE different women. Lois Flynn, a woman in New Hampshire and another in North Carolina.
 - o) Margie REDACTED had just received a medical settlement in excess of \$400 thousand in mid-November 2012, just two weeks priors to REDACTED moving

back into their residence attempting a potentially fortuitous and of course coincidental “reconciliation” beginning the first week of December 2012.

- p) Margie REDACTED and REDACTED were divorced in late 2013 (see, [Exhibit 34](#)). Marie was awarded \$25,000 for community funds being used in connection with extra-marital affair expenditures associated with Lois Flynn that REDACTED had paid while married to Margie REDACTED. (see, [Exhibit 35](#))

Margie REDACTED would also opine post-divorce on Facebook her thoughts and beliefs that REDACTED was a pathological liar (see, [Exhibit 36](#)). After knowing REDACTED intimately for 15 years; she would have a keen understanding of the man’s TRUE character and her conclusion is shockingly blunt when stating he “believe[s] his own lies.” Based on the extensive sworn testimony of Margie REDACTED, there is a well documented history of infidelity associated with REDACTED that would certainly vividly contradict his bold self depiction of being “TRUTHFUL.”

REDACTED and Lois Flynn also had some interesting insight into extra-marital relationships:

The testimony of Margie REDACTED is not the singular source of sworn testimony that establishes the FACTUAL allegation that REDACTED had engaged in numerous incidences of infidelity. There was the deposition of Lois Flynn that provides additional evidence that REDACTED had participated in another extra-marital affair with her prior to his filing for a divorce from Margie REDACTED in late 2013 (see, [Exhibit 37](#)). The best source of FACTUAL verification possible was REDACTED himself with his own sworn testimony. In the deposition of REDACTED he would make a number of admissions that confirm his depiction of his marital history were ... false. In the deposition of May 14, 2013 it would be documented REDACTED stated for the record: “I cheated on Dyvonne with Margaret.” He would also confirm his relationship with Lois Flynn was ongoing prior to filing for divorce from Margie REDACTED (see, [Exhibit 38](#)). Despite the numerous denials, including at the Federal lawsuit trial and the Anglen’s imbecilic portrayal of these extra-curricular activities as being “complex” in his article, REDACTED was irrefutably involved in NUMEROUS occurrences of infidelity.

REDACTED is the one who made the issue of “infidelity” a key point of contention in the Federal lawsuit trial as a diversion from addressing the claims and allegation put filed in the Third Amended Complaint:

What is important to convey in this report is that NO ONE cares about the infidelities of REDACTED. The irony being the least of which is Rodrick. He couldn’t care less; from his point of view good riddance as Lois Flynn and REDACTED certainly deserve each other. What is IMPORTANT is this subject of infidelity irrefutably PROVES a propensity to lying, deception and the degree of delusional hypocrisy REDACTED will perpetrate without any conscious and/or qualms in repeatedly committing perjury. The issue that matters is REDACTED changed his allegations as listed in the Third Amended Complaint filed in the Federal lawsuit at trial. He completely abandoned his allegation of making payments to remove content (RICO – Theft by Extortion), being threatened (RICO), being identified by the SOR websites “as a convicted sex offender and required to register as a sex offender” (False Light Invasion of Privacy – Infliction of Emotional Distress) and communications with the SOR websites that the content pertaining to him was false. Instead he made an issue of false claims of infidelity being posted online by Rodrick and the SOR websites which constituted cyber harassment, defamation and false light of a decorated “military officer.”

After Anglen began reporting on the SOR websites and specifically the Federal lawsuit case, he developed an ongoing relationship with REDACTED for years. However, he did not write one word acknowledging the major flip-flop on the allegations being asserted at trial by REDACTED from those

listed in the lawsuit (see, [Exhibit 39](#)) to view the actual allegations in the lawsuit. Nor did he bother to “investigate” the voluminous and overwhelming evidence of the testimony that conclusively proves that REDACTED persistently LIES contrary to his brazen assertion: “I am a U.S. Marine and I am TRUTHFUL.” This proclivity to lying is not just a matter of a few “white lies,” it is “cheating” on ALL three of his wives. It entails pick up lines at the Officer’s bar that included claiming his “wife and daughter had died in a car accident” to garner sympathy from his “bar target.” That is pathological and indicative of a man with absolutely no moral compass, shameless, no conscience and/or devoid of HONOR (as required in being an “officer and gentleman” of the USMJ). This is an extremely important DISTINCTION as it matters in that REDACTED has blatantly **LIED** to two juries relying on his reputation as a retired military officer as validation that his “word of honor” is proof that his allegations against Rodrick were TRUE. Anglen has been all too willing to perpetuate this illusion of REDACTED’ credibility in his articles which any degree of due diligence would have easily exposed as a charade and DELUSIONAL.

REDACTED tells the jury Rodrick posted an allegation that he had “young male gust [guest]” visit him at his apartment:

Another diversion topic to garner empathy from the jury was REDACTED’ claim Rodrick created a post insinuating conduct that would amount to “child molestation of young boys.” First, these allegations were not part of the Third Amended Complaint, nor had any Discovery evidence been provided prior to the trial as required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (FRCP), [Rule 26](#). Second, Rodrick did NOT create the post in question; it was submitted by an “anonymous” source NOT associated with the SOR websites. Third, REDACTED is aware the “anonymous” source was far more likely much closer to home than he wishes to disclose; he knew Rodrick was NOT the one making the allegation involving “boys.” This entire discourse at trial was just the continuation of the Bellucci “smoke and mirror” show to avoid addressing the actual claims in the lawsuit SHE illegally filed.

The Rules for disclosure of evidence to be used at trial are standard procedures employed in all Federal Civil lawsuit cases. Bellucci as the attorney sworn to abide by the FRCP and REDACTED required to provide any and all available evidence to the Defendants circumvented these requirements as means to sabotage the trial. The purpose to concoct such a plan of stealth is to have provided the trial exhibits in a timely manner would have allowed the Defense to bring forward a computer forensic “expert” that would have easily been able to discredit EVERY exhibit brought before the jury. The “post” in question is provided as [Exhibit 40](#) for the readers review. The claim is “He lies about his residence he lives in Cabana on Thomas apartments and he has YOUNG male gust all the time...??” The post originated from an IP address in Mesa, AZ provided by Sprint PCS. Neither Rodrick nor anyone associated with the SOR websites lives or works in the “east valley” or have cell phone service with Sprint PCS. Rodrick did NOT create this “post.” Plus, he knows how to spell “guest.”

Had the Plaintiffs provided the exhibits presented to the jury at the trial in a timely manner, All FOUR of them, Rodrick would have been able to properly (and fairly) been able to challenge the credibility of the so-called evidence. It is telling that such a ridiculous and extremely telling number of exhibits (4) were the only thing brought to trial by the Plaintiffs considering we are talking about a case that was litigated over 40 months with as many 12 Plaintiffs asserting 5 claims each against 2 Defendants – a total of 120 claims garnered **FOUR (4) EXHIBITS** for the trial. You cannot make this stuff up. Does Anglen report this astonishing FACT in his article written during the trial or the post-trial article? Of course not, it would undermine his long established agenda of attacks against Rodrick and the SOR websites.

It would have been interesting (and may be followed up on) to “investigate” who actually made this posting. Who would know the name of the apartment complex where REDACTED was residing – Margie

REDACTED? Someone might track down an address – but the name of the complex would not be common knowledge. Who had firsthand knowledge and expressed details and “concerns” of the sexual proclivities of REDACTED – Margie REDACTED? Who had cell phone service provided by Sprint PCS – Margie REDACTED? Who would have had an IP Address originating in Mesa/Apache Junction – Margie REDACTED? Who had recently completed a contentious Divorce process in December of 2013 and was posting her displeasure about her “cheating husband” REDACTED only days before (see, [Exhibit 41](#)) – Margie REDACTED? It was incumbent upon the Plaintiff REDACTED and his attorney Bellucci to PROVE the post was created by Rodrick and posted on the SOR websites. They merely made an accusation and did nothing to ascertain the source for IP Address: [66.87.70.111](#) - SprintPCS - Mesa, AZ. Which according to REDACTED he is an “IP Address expert” (see, [Exhibit 42](#)); where was this “expertise” at the trial proving Rodrick was associated with this IP Address? Perhaps this was intentional as the results of such an inquiry were already known and would not have been conducive to the ongoing “smoke and mirror” show that was the trial presentation. Had Rodrick and his legal representation been properly notified of this line of questioning in a timely manner, an expert would have been retained to determine who exactly controlled [66.87.70.111](#) on December 28, 2013 with Spring PCS (all the information needed to track down the TRUE author of the post in question). It was NOT Rodrick and REDACTED knew this when planning his non-disclosure. Once again, where is “investigative journalist” Anglen on this subject? What exactly is it that a so-called “investigative journalist” does in preparing his articles? If it is simply writing eighth grade level recitation of the most basic of occurrences at a trial – why not just hire a high school sophomore intern for the job?

The REDACTED claims involving REDACTED, Inc. are knowingly false as it has long been well established that Rodrick was NOT the person who originated the allegations posted online:

The most significant allegations that has garnered REDACTED a perception of validity in his claims against Rodrick and the SOR websites has been postings concerning his work at REDACTED of Phoenix, Arizona (*hereafter*, “REDACTED”). The first post in question occurred on October 13, 2013 and appeared on [RipOffReport.com](#) (ROR):

AUTHOR: not4show – ()”sexual harassment”

SUBMITTED: Monday, October 21, 2013

There is so much more to add to this. He is a **liar**, a **cheat** he will do anything to anyone to get ahead. He wanted Margie back only because of her lawsuit winnings. He has had multiple sexual harassment s filed against him at work, but he knows how to turn it around away from him. Helps to be the puppet master of the President of REDACTED. Gunner the owner is never around, as long as his company’s show profit he could care less. If you don’t do as REDACTED says you are as good as gone. That’s what happened to me, questioned fault aerospace parts that were being signed off as good by REDACTED and being sent to the customer. **Think twice before taking a flight. He falsified test results**, forces the inspectors to say parts are good when he and everyone else knows they are not.

The post that appeared on ROR was **republished** on the SOR websites. It was viewed as a significant piece of evidence that presented the other side to the “REDACTED” (insufferable) persona that the SOR websites and Rodrick were battling BOTH in legal litigation and media reports that intentionally omitted the FACTS in favor of the biased misrepresentations and lies being reported by Anglen.

The problem with the post appearing on the SOR websites is Rodrick was accused of having authored the accusations. It did not matter that there was absolutely NO evidence to substantiate this

claim or that any effort WHATSOEVER had ever been made to acquire the available documentation that would establish from where the posting originated (following the IP Address process - again) that could be used to determine the identity of the author. To be clear, if Rodrick in his frustrations of dealing with the multitude of lies being repeatedly perpetrated by REDACTED in 2013 had resorted to authoring fabricated claims and posting them online; ones that involved sexual harassment at the workplace and the VERY serious accusations of “falsified test results” in the manufacture of airplane parts at REDACTED, this would be conduct JUSTIFYING litigation and a CRIMINAL investigation. REDACTED does the casting work in manufacturing a number of parts for major aerospace concerns such as Boeing, Airbus, General Dynamics and many more. Some parts being for commercial aircraft like the 747 and A380. However, Rodrick did NOT author these serious accusations as alleged before TWO juries. Once again, because REDACTED is making the “insinuation” that Rodrick and the SOR websites are the responsible parties he was awarded two favorable verdicts. The question that should have been the focus of a jury; what is the legal and factual basis of such allegations. That is not what has occurred – TWICE. This same prerequisites should have been the EXACT SAME for the preparation and authoring of the series of articles by Anglen – ELEVEN TIMES (plus a half dozen video segments).

REDACTED had successfully leveraged the posting of misdeeds occurring at his workplace REDACTED and a hefty judgment claiming damage to his reputation. In the Arizona Superior Court trial the attorney for REDACTED would claim that REDACTED had experienced a significant loss in business amounting to 15% in gross sales. NOT ONE piece of documentation was ever provided to support or substantiate such an assertion. The jury awarded the astonishing sum of \$1.2 million as a judgment based on these damages supposedly realized by REDACTED/REDACTED against Rodrick due to **HIS** “post.” REDACTED would again try to leverage the accusation of the REDACTED “post” by joining the Federal lawsuit in Arizona in March of 2013. His goal, beside the continued attacks upon Rodrick personally, was to file for a Permanent Injunction in a U.S. Federal court which would have some significant teeth when enforcing if successful.

On April 9, 2015 attorney Janice Bellucci would file an Ex Parte Application for Temporary Restraining Order and Order to Show Cause RE Preliminary Injunction. The application was based solely on the online postings associated with the misdeeds being attributed to REDACTED having occurred at REDACTED (see, [Exhibit 43](#)). This attempt for an Injunction failed miserably as the legal and factual basis of the REDACTED claims were scrutinized by a Federal judge who is not so easily deceived with these “smoke and mirror” legal arguments put forth by incompetent attorney Janice Bellucci. The Application was summarily denied. The Ruling of Judge Bolton concerning REDACTED’ request for an Injunction can be viewed as [Exhibit 44](#).

A new development would occur on the EXACT SAME day as the filing the Application for an Injunction when another post would be submitted on ROR by the anonymous author “not4show.” Apparently the author had been monitoring the activities of REDACTED and was aware he had won a judgment against Rodrick blaming him for the ROR post. They were also aware of REDACTED having recently joined the Federal lawsuit making the same claims against Rodrick, Oesterblad and the SOR websites in March of 2015. So on the same day of the filing by REDACTED attempting to get a Federal Court order to “bury” the information previously posted, a follow up post was submitted with [ROR on April 9, 2015](#):

AUTHOR: not4show - (USA) – “Ex-employee want REDACTED to realize he is not untouchable “SUBMITTED: Thursday, April 09, 2015

I wrote the ex-employee report about REDACTED and REDACTED . REDACTED **believes he is untouchable, he threatens, harrasses and does whatever he can to make his employees do whatever he says regardless of ethics.** He has no respect for employees, the company or Gunner for that matter. If Gunner would have never given REDACTED the money to pay off the IRS when he got audited and was going to loose the house he and Margie lived in, REDACTED went crying to Gunner and got \$25,000

All edicts aside by REDACTED and Anglen's articles, Rodrick knew he had not authored the post on the ROR. He posted a reward on CourtKey.com requesting the person who authored and posted the accusations against REDACTED to come forward and take the rightful credit. As much as this was a rather desperate long shot, it actually was successful in bringing forward the person in question. REDACTED' amazing luck in being able to just make whatever claims he wanted based solely on being a retired military officer had finally run its course and would be exposed for the charade it had always been.

It would be revealed that the author of the ROR posts under the pseudonym "not4show" was one Holly Johnson-Oates. She had worked for REDACTED back in 2007 when she was "executive assistant" to REDACTED in the Quality Assurance Department, literally the right hand person with her desk next to REDACTED'. The second tour with REDACTED was in 2012 after returning to Arizona from California. **ALL** of Holly's accusations against REDACTED that **SHE** posted on ROR were from **FIRSTHAND** knowledge of activities that occurred at REDACTED. The referencing the Margie REDACTED medical settlement that REDACTED had disclosed to her in person was a means to convey the lack of character and true nature this man possessed. She was addressing his incessant reliance of being a retired "Major" of the USMC was the sham Rodrick and the SOR websites had been stating of years. The supposed "reconciliation" that began in early December 2012, only weeks after his physically disabled wife Margie REDACTED had received a \$400 thousand medical settlement all the while he was involved in an extra-marital affair with Lois Flynn, was nothing more than an attempt at a brazen money grab under the most despicable of intent and circumstances. Had Anglen actually attempted to interview Margie REDACTED before the original article, or had he taken the time to follow up on her claims REDACTED accusations were a "lie" instead of his flippant response "Does it really matter?" perhaps he may have unraveled the **TRUTH** of what was occurring. Of course, that would have only been possible if he was ever interested in portraying the **TRUTH**, which is highly unlikely based on **ALL** the evidence and **FACTS** he choose to omit, ignore, misrepresent and blatantly lie about in writing his series of articles.

Holly Johnson-Oates did not just come forward stating she was responsible of the postings on ROR. She agreed to provide a sworn declaration under the penalty of perjury to be true and accurate detailing the particulars to these posting. The Declaration of Holly Johnson-Oates is available to an interested reader as [Exhibit 45](#). She would even take an additional form of official verification and agreed to submit to a sworn deposition when she was under no legal or personal obligation to do so. The full deposition of Holly Johnson-Oates is available to an interested reader as [Exhibit 46](#). A highlighted and condensed version of the deposition was prepared to address the main subjects of interest and is available for review as [Exhibit 47](#). The discovery of the identity of the ROR postings author has been information known to Anglen for many months (9 – 10 at least) and yet he has NEVER attempted to discuss his rendition of the "war hero" REDACTED with Ms. Johnson to perhaps learn there may be an alternative version to this man he has so adamantly defended in his series of articles. Sounds a lot like another Anglen "looking through rose colored glasses" version of character and event development employed

when presenting his “Melvin Dominquez” (real name Dominique convicted child molester) story of fiction. The problem with his presentation involving REDACTED is it may have influenced two juries, the legal process and even potentially put the general public in danger if the misdeeds as described by Holly Johnson-Oates did in fact take place at REDACTED.

One of the “sexual harassment” complaints allegedly filed against REDACTED at REDACTED was of his “executive assistant” in the Quality Assurance Department, which had replaced Holly Johnson-Oates. This person was Margie REDACTED’ sister. Yes, he was accused of “sexual harassment” by his sister-in-law while working at REDACTED . What became of the “sexual harassment” complaints? First, according to the testimony and email of Holly Johnson-Oates, the sister-in-law was terminated from REDACTED employment. Second, the then President [Patti Bredengerd](#) of REDACTED who was “investigating” the allegations was terminated after almost 20 years of employment with REDACTED along with her husband and daughter who were also employed there. Holly Johnson-Oates would elaborate in an email on the details surrounding the complaints of sexual harassment levied against REDACTED by women at REDACTED:

In regard to sexual harassment being brought up against REDACTED and him having the power to make the claim disappear. Margie REDACTED sister was REDACTED ’s assistant at REDACTED and sexually harassed her as well as Theresa Chapman who is the Level 3 for REDACTED as well the NDT lead. Margie’s sister was fired Theresa job threatened and Patti the ex President was fired. Surprise the claims went away.

You just cannot make this stuff up. Do Rodrick or the SOR websites have FIRST HAND KNOWLEDGE of these events? NO! But generally reliable and credible people with no logical reason to fabricate the story of such incredible serious circumstances and ramifications have come forward and they HAVE claimed them to be true and accurate depictions of REDACTED’ part while being employed at REDACTED. What is known is that Holly Johnson-Oates testified under oath that she was contacted by Theresa Chapman the “Level 3” at REDACTED in April of 2014 per REDACTED’ instruction and was warned against continuing as the “whistle blower” of the activities she witnessed involving REDACTED while employed at REDACTED. It is known that REDACTED has been promoted to President of REDACTED and any repercussions for the sexual harassment complaints have been eliminated. The big question, where is the **REAL** story by Anglen that should have been “investigated” by a professional journalist?

What are or should be the legal ramifications of the Holly Johnson-Oates being identified:

The admission of making the ROR postings about REDACTED and REDACTED are not just a matter of establishing the FACTUAL basis of many of the legal claims litigated in TWO trials. It also incomparably affects a wide range of issues in regards to the LEGAL BASIS of the REDACTED claims and allegations that is established with a large number of case law precedents that are IRRREFUTABLE in cases of online Defamation, False Light -Invasion of Privacy and Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress.

The FACT is the postings found on the SOR websites referencing the accusations levied against REDACTED and his activities associated with his employment at REDACTED are the REPUBLISHING of those found on [ROR](#). This is EXACTLY the type of Internet activity that was addressed by the U.S. Legislature when passing and enacting into law Section 230 of the [Communications Decency Act](#) of 1996 (CDA). The main take away from this sweeping Internet legislation and how it applies to the issues in the cases involving Rodrick and the SOR websites is it grants IMMUNITY from Civil Liability when REPUBLISHING existing content found elsewhere. It is exactly the legal standard that the Federal Judge presiding over the case sited in September of 2015 when she dismissed ALL the claims of convicted sex

offenders John Does 1 through 6 (see, [Exhibit 48](#)). The ONLY reason this Ruling did not apply to the remaining Plaintiffs was there claims were worded and alleged in such a manner that it was a question of FACTS and not LAW. In Ruling on a Motion to Dismiss the judge is limited to examining the basis in LAW ONLY, any issues of FACT cannot be considered at this time. The FACTS would be determined over the long and trying next 10 months of additional unwarranted litigation dealing with the false and fabricated claims of attorney Janice Bellucci in regard to Does 7 through 11 and REDACTED. In time, as previously discussed, ALL of their claims would be dismissed. Only the two (2) claims remaining involve REDACTED and that is what is now being addressed. The disclosure of the origin of the ROR post and accusation clearly fall under the protection and provide the stated immunity of the CDA. This FACT was hidden from the jury by a number of devious deceptive tactics at the trial such as the non-disclosure issue previously mentioned. Some of these ridiculous examples of shady legal maneuvering will be explained in a below section. Hiding the Holly Johnson-Oates responsibility for the REDACTED /REDACTED postings was done in a number of ways: 1) just out right denial by REDACTED that it occurred and “Holly” would not have posted it; 2) the insistence that Rodrick was still liable for the postings found on the SOR websites and not afforded the CDA IMMUNITY although not providing one iota of supporting evidence, merely a “he said – he said” argument based on the word of REDACTED vs. Rodrick; 3) claiming if Holly Johnson-Oates stated she was responsible for the original ROR posts it was because she was paid to say such a thing (again NO evidence to support such an accusation); 4) presenting an exhibit to the jury of the SOR website page with the REDACTED/REDACTED postings that had been DOCTORED to only show what Bellucci/REDACTED wanted the jury to see and had DELETED the additional FACTUAL content that told the REAL story of the creation of the content. BTW, presenting DOCTORED exhibits is a clear violation of the FRCP and in itself are grounds for a VERY legitimate and winnable appeal. The DOCTORED exhibit is made available as [Exhibit 49](#). What you see is a screenshot of the SOR website page that was rendered in a Chrome Plug-In and then was “edited” (illegally altered) to delete approximately four additional pages of content that included the Declaration and Deposition of Holly Johnson-Oates along with the detailed explanation of what laws applied and their significance. Clearly content attorney and Plaintiff REDACTED obviously DID NOT want the jury to see and gain an understanding of the legal ramifications. They were willing to illegally alter an exhibit presented to the jury in a Federal Court trial. That the jury could have used further explanation of the CDA bears out in that they would request one clarification from the Judge after taking the case to deliberation; they asked if they could have access to the actual legislation of the CDA to read for themselves to better understand its application to this case. They were denied this opportunity and instructed to follow the “jury instructions” provided.

Did Anglen report the significance of these legal issues and the obvious trepidation the jury was experiencing in understanding the rather complex application of the CDA? No, he did not as would be expected based on his repeatedly demonstration of incompetence and biased fraudulent journalism.

REDACTED *Letters to Government agencies and the official investigation that is active contrary to REDACTED’ claims otherwise.*

At trial an exhibit was presented to the jury of a letter sent by Rodrick to NADCAP, the organization that provides oversight of businesses that are sub-contractors for the aerospace industry. Companies such as REDACTED are required to meet set standards and abide by industry approved processes and protocol in order to be in “good standing” and allowed to do business with the aerospace giants such as Boeing and Airbus. It was the contention of REDACTED to the jury that this letter constituted additional harassment by Rodrick directed at him and REDACTED. REDACTED also testified to Government agencies receiving similar letters that led to a number of inspections and “investigations.” He claimed all

“investigations” had been completed and he had been cleared of any wrongdoing. The letter sent to NADCAP and presented to the jury as an exhibit at the trial is provided for review as [Exhibit 50](#).

It is true that Rodrick authored and sent a number of letters to appropriate organizations and agencies. A simple review of a couple of portions of the letters reveals the ACTUAL circumstances and FACTS to do so:

I do not have firsthand knowledge if the accusations of Ms. Johnson-Oakes are truthful; however, she has come forward with serious allegations that would be very problematic for her (possible defamation litigation of her own) if she was just a disgruntled ex-employee. I found her to be a credible witness who was willing to come forward under sworn testimony to disclose her firsthand knowledge of events that had occurred at REDACTED and directed by David REDACTED. It does not seem logical that Ms. Johnson-Oakes would be falsely making accusations, sign sworn declaration, and participate in a sworn videotaped deposition unless she did in fact have firsthand knowledge of the described events and circumstances. There is no endgame benefit for Ms. Johnson-Oakes to be a “whistle blower” other than to convey the truth in order to protect the public from potentially very dangerous circumstances involving air travel.

Also:

Considering the potential of endangerment of unknown parties that may occur due to faulty airplane parts not properly tested to meet required specifications, bypass inspection testing and certification, I am requesting that you investigate the validity of these allegations and/or pass on to the proper departments or law enforcement authorities.

It was the contention of REDACTED at trial that the jury award damages to him against Rodrick for having written such letters that were the cause for a number of inspections and “investigations.” They were also the source for personal embarrassment and a loss to his professional reputation.

Writing an [article](#) while the trial was occurring, Anglen would report on this particular testimony by REDACTED:

REDACTED said Rodrick last year sent complaints to the Department of Defense calling for an investigation of REDACTED' company, REDACTED in Phoenix, claiming that REDACTED manufactured faulty airline parts for commercial and military airplanes and falsified test results.

REDACTED said there were several federal and private investigations of his firm, including the Department of Defense and the Federal Aviation Administration and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which cleared him of the charges.

First, Rodrick does NOT claim “that REDACTED manufactured faulty airline parts.” Rodrick clearly states he DOES NOT have firsthand knowledge of the activities of REDACTED. He is reporting the FACTS surrounding the allegations of Holly Johnson-Oates who did have firsthand knowledge and she had provided sworn testimony as such. Copies of the sworn [Declaration and Deposition](#) were provided to the recipients of the letters for their review. Second, there have not been any “charges” made against REDACTED to have been “cleared” by law enforcement (at all). Third, the investigations are far from being completed by ALL the agencies involved and REDACTED was well aware of this fact when he falsely testified to the contrary.

The big question for Anglen, AKA “investigative journalist,” that of course does not find its way into his article, what exactly was it that Rodrick was SUPPOSE to do with the information he had obtained from Holly Johnson-Oates? He met with her, witnessed her testify under oath and found her to be honest, knowledgeable, forthright and extremely credible. Her SERIOUS accusations involve the testing and certification of parts made for AIRPLANES. Her denouncement of the role REDACTED had in these activities that occurred at REDACTED are of a man Rodrick has witnessed on numerous occasions and examples to be an unscrupulous charlatan and a pathological liar. Rodrick did NOT exaggerate the situation and acknowledges he has personal animosity toward REDACTED. He is TRUTHFUL in simply providing the available FACTS for the appropriate authorities to do their jobs and determine for themselves the necessary actions to be taken. Is it Anglen’s contention that Rodrick should have remained silent and done nothing knowing there was a possibility (however remote) that the general public had been placed in danger from the falsification of the required testing and certification of AIRPLANE PARTS. For Rodrick to have written such letters is it Anglen’s belief this constitutes harassment justifying an award of a judgment against Rodrick for being a concerned citizen? Is that the point Anglen is trying to convey to his readers?

What happened to the REDACTED “Claims” based on the “Factual Allegations” in the Third Amended Complaint?

REDACTED joined the Federal lawsuit being litigated in Arizona with the filing of the Third Amended Complaint (hereafter, “TAC”) in March of 2015. He would have the same five (5) claims being asserted by his convicted sex offender partners (see, [Exhibit 51](#)). REDACTED was only one of the three out of twelve Plaintiffs to actually make it to the trial. What is extremely interesting and telling of the false and fabricated claims that were the Third Amended Complaint prepared and filed by unethical attorney Janice Bellucci is how she presented her case concerning REDACTED before the Court and the jury. Here is a brief breakdown of the claims and allegations:

REDACTED Claims within the TAC:

- 1) “Plaintiffs [REDACTED] by requiring payment to remove their names, photographs, and/or identification as ‘sex offenders’ from websites available to the public” (#1). REDACTED would testify at the trial that he had NOT made any payment to the SOR websites. The SOR websites denied this allegation from Day 1 because it NEVER happened. No explanation was offered why he had falsely claimed otherwise in the TAC filed in U.S. Federal Court.
- 2) “REDACTED on websites available to the public after Plaintiffs notified Defendants that the information was false or misleading” (#4). REDACTED would testify at the trial that he had NOT made any contact at any anytime with the SOR websites. The SOR websites denied this allegation from Day 1 because it NEVER happened. No explanation was offered why he had falsely claimed otherwise in the TAC filed in U.S. Federal Court.
- 3) “REDACTED who were identified on the websites at issue as sex offenders but who have not been convicted of a sex offense” (#5). REDACTED would NOT testify at the trial that such false claims had ever been published on the SOR websites concerning him. REDACTED did NOT produce one piece of evidence to support the original claim in the TAC that this had ever occurred at anytime as alleged. The SOR websites denied this allegation from Day 1 because it NEVER happened. No explanation was offered why he had falsely claimed otherwise in the TAC filed in U.S. Federal Court.

REDACTED Factual Allegations with the TAC:

- 4) “REDACTED – as individuals required to register as sex offenders” (#28). REDACTED would NOT testify at the trial that such false allegations had ever been published on the SOR websites concerning him. REDACTED would NOT produce one piece of evidence to support the original claim in the TAC that this had ever occurred as alleged. The SOR websites denied this allegation from Day 1 because it NEVER happened. No explanation was offered why he had falsely claimed otherwise in the TAC filed in U.S. Federal Court.
- 5) “REDACTED one or more of the websites after Plaintiffs notified Defendants that the information published on the websites was false and/or misleading” (#30). REDACTED would testify at the trial that he had NOT made any contact any anytime with the SOR websites. The SOR websites denied this allegation from Day 1 because it NEVER happened. No explanation was offered why he had falsely claimed otherwise in the TAC filed in U.S. Federal Court.
- 6) “Plaintiff REDACTED by falsely identifying him as a registered sex offender” (#64). REDACTED would NOT testify at the trial that such false allegations had ever been published on the SOR websites concerning him. REDACTED would NOT produce one piece of evidence to support the original claim in the TAC that this had ever occurred as alleged. The SOR websites denied this allegation from Day 1 because it NEVER happened. No explanation was offered why he had falsely claimed otherwise in the TAC filed in U.S. Federal Court.

The point that is being hammered home is that the claims and allegations of the actual lawsuit (the TAC) and what was presented to the jury at trial in June 2016 are NOTHING alike. They are basically two completely different cases. How is this even remotely legal and allowed in a U.S. District Court?

Anglen had followed the Federal lawsuit from its inception in March of 2013, the addition of his long time “buddy” REDACTED into the TAC in March of 2015 and was present throughout the trial. He witnessed the testimony of REDACTED that was completely devoid of dealing with and/or addressing the claims and allegations as detailed in the TAC. Anglen did not write ONE word concerning this dramatic and obvious switch in “strategy.” The fact is the trial PROVED the claims as reported throughout the series of articles written by Anglen had been false and fabricated by attorney Janice Bellucci. Did Anglen report this obvious development? Not a word. Does Rodrick, Oesterblad and/or the SOR websites expect Anglen to be a professional journalist and prepare a retraction for ANY of the false and flagrant lies he repeatedly reported as FACTS? Of course NOT, that would require a complete reversal of all Anglen has demonstrated in his professional conduct over the last four (4) years – that isn’t going to happen.

REDACTED is exposed lying under oath on the witness stand. He is a LIAR.

REDACTED would DECLARE to the jury that “I am a U.S. Marine and I am truthful.” A pattern of self delusion repeated by REDACTED for the entire four (4) years of his dealings with Rodrick and the SOR websites. This insufferable repetition of such an obvious lie has been infuriating to have to endure year after year. It has already been well established some major chinks in this impaired proclamation of REDACTED with the detailed facts of his marital history. Just one other example of many will be documented for the reader to indisputably establish the point that REDACTED is a liar. As the foundation of all of REDACTED’ legal strategy has been based solely on his being “truthful”, establishing the true character of REDACTED will expose the reality of the many lies that have been repeatedly perpetrated by this man.

On May 10, 2013 an Order had been issued by Judge Cooper strictly forbidding the litigants from discussing the case with anyone other than their legal counsel. This especially applied to discussing the case with the media (see, [Exhibit 52 - #10](#)). The Order was very clear in this regard: “Information shall

not be disclosed to anyone other than counsel in this case, the parties, and expert witnesses (if any). Under no circumstances shall any information obtained or exchanged or relating to this case be duplicated, published on a website or disseminated electronically or otherwise.” Moreover, Judge Cooper claimed “The failure to comply with any of these orders will result in sanctions.”

On May 14, 2013 REDACTED was examined under oath for a deposition. In the deposition he was questioned specifically about any contact he any have had with the media. He was asked and would answer the following (see, [Exhibit 53](#)):

Q: Has the media ever contacted you?

REDACTED: Yes.

Q: When?

REDACTED: I can't pick an exact date, but it was probably 30, 45 days ago.

Q: And what was it about?

REDACTED: It was about the California civil case.

Q: And what did you tell them?

REDACTED: I told them that I needed to talk to my attorney first before I discuss anything with him.

Under sworn testimony REDACTED claims the only time he spoke to the media was once between April 1, 2013 and April 15, 2013. He also claimed it was only to express he would need to speak with attorney before agreeing to an interview.

On May 26, 2013, only TWELVE DAYS after the REDACTED deposition, the first of the series of articles authored by Anglen appeared in the Arizona Republic. This would include the specific piece detailing the [INTERVIEW](#) with Anglen. There would also be a video segment featuring pieces of the Anglen interview with REDACTED that would be aired on Channel 12 News Phoenix. It would impossible for ANYONE to deny the FACTUAL occurrence of the interview that took place between REDACTED and the “media” in May 2013 as his picture appeared in the Sunday addition of the Arizona Republic. Of course, the picture displayed REDACTED with an American flag and military medallions. The video segment produced for Channel 12 News is certainly REDACTED speaking to the “media.” This media interview involved an extensive discussion of the case and was in direct violation of the Court’s Order of May 10, 2013 issued ONLY 16 days prior and was subject to and Judge Cooper had assured would “result in sanctions.”

Anglen was directly involved in this interview and was well aware at the time that REDACTED was guilty of flamboyantly defying the Judge’s Order. It was not Anglen’s responsibility to abide by the Court’s Order. However, as a professional journalist reporting objectively and unbiased, it was his duty as a journalist to be TRUTHFUL in disclosure in reporting this FACT in his articles. This did not happen – of course.

Obviously realizing the media contact REDACTED had engaged in with Anglen (Arizona Republic) and the Channel 12 News Phoenix was in direct violation of the Court’s Order, he would exacerbate his misconduct by committing perjury under oath on the witness stand before the Court. On February 19, 2014 there was a hearing before Judge Copper. Faced with this serious dilemma when being cross-examined by Rodrick at the hearing, REDACTED would contradict his testimony of his deposition and claim the interview had occurred prior to May 10, 2013 (see, [FTR @ 4:08:35PM](#))(to view, [FTR Player Required](#)). A ludicrous assertion as the Channel 12 News video interview aired May 26, 2013. Rodrick

would jump on this contradiction (otherwise known as a lie – or in legal terms... perjury) in his cross-examination by demanding an answer from REDACTED to explain his chicanery. Presenting the very appropriate and direct question, had REDACTED lied during his sworn testimony in his deposition or was he lying on the witness stand under oath before the Court. What happened next was the completely unexpected and inappropriate interference by Judge Cooper who would repeatedly interrupt Rodrick in his cross-examination of REDACTED. She had clearly recognized the significance of the perjury REDACTED had just committed in her Court and was doing everything she could to act as REDACTED' advocate to get him out of the quagmire he had create for himself. Judge Cooper abruptly interrupted Rodrick's cross-examination of REDACTED by rudely ordering Rodrick; **"You're done, you're done. Sit down!"** (see, [FTR @ 4:09:10](#)). Rodrick did not get his answer from REDACTED for the discrepancy between the "sworn" testimony at his deposition and the hearing before the Court. In this case, you just cannot make this stuff up. What does not change is REDACTED did in FACT commit a lie under oath – either at the deposition or before the Court on the witness stand. The two incongruent statements prove REDACTED committed perjury – **AGAIN** – contrary to his detestable boast of being "truthful."

Anglen does not report ANY reference to REDACTED committing this obvious example of perjury under oath. Nor did Anglen report any of the dozens of additional examples of equally obvious lies by REDACTED. Protecting REDACTED from his own self disclosure of being a LIAR was a job requiring both a Judge and the media [Anglen] to be active participants in the ongoing deceptions of REDACTED.

REDACTED has repeatedly presented his role as being a benevolent do-gooder turned "victim" of Rodrick cyber harassment

So much of the series of events that constitute the "story" of the SOR websites battling for its validation both online and in the courts against REDACTED , ALL stem from your basic sordid extra-marital affair that is as old as time. Unfortunately, the truth of the level of animosity between the parties can be traced back to a contentious divorce. This would not necessarily be important to this narrative except for the Bellucci/REDACTED trial strategy required the "mudding the waters" so as to deflect from addressing the claims and allegations as stated in the TAC.

At the Federal lawsuit trial, Bellucci would claim that Rodrick had initiated online cyber harassment against REDACTED by posting content alleging "infidelity" on the part of REDACTED with his then wife Lois Flynn. Of course, Bellucci/REDACTED would deny these postings were justified and that they were the cause for much "emotional" and "professional" damage to his physical well-being and business reputation. The irony to this "legal" strategy is Bellucci/REDACTED introduced the "love notes" posted online by Rodrick as evidence against him. Reminder: one of the FOUR exhibits brought before the jury for the whole 40 month – 12 Plaintiffs – total of 120 claims – Federal court civil lawsuit, just to put perspective on the ridiculousness of the so-called trial preparation by Bellucci. The "love notes" consisted of a card and a letter written by REDACTED to Lois Flynn (see, [Exhibit 54](#)):

- "Love Card" dated 2011: "Then you sparkled. Love you. You are already making me a crazy man. XOXOXO REDACTED"
- "Love Letter" also from 2011: "I guess that is what makes me attractive to ladies. Man of mysterious qualities. I am not anything like Chuckles in any way, shape, or form. You are a major piece of my life right now. Love you to death. All will come together." (yikes, what a creep)

The point of presenting this "evidence" to the jury at trial was to establish that Rodrick had falsely claimed the relationship between then married REDACTED and then married Flynn was proof of "infidelity." Posting this claim online proved in theory according to Bellucci that Roderick had engaged

in cyber harassment that caused harm to REDACTED and required punishment in the form of a judgment.

The obvious problem with this “legal” strategy to prove the claims of REDACTED, he had to establish the required “elements” were met by the preponderance of “evidence.” For the REDACTED claim of False Light – Invasion of Privacy these include: [1] “highly offensive to a reasonable person” and [2] the defendant “had knowledge of or acted in reckless disregard as to the falsity of the publicized matter and the false light in which the [plaintiff] would be placed.” For the REDACTED claim of Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress these include the similar: [1] “the conduct of the defendant must be extreme and outrageous and [2] “the defendant must either intend to cause emotional distress or recklessly disregard the near certainty that such distress will result from his conduct.” It is difficult to imagine how someone would believe that an online post asserting REDACTED with his FACTUAL marital history had engaged in “INFIDELITY” would meet ANY of the above listed “elements” required for him to prevail in a Federal lawsuit. Inexplicably this is exactly what occurred. To this day Lois Flynn continues to lie about the history of the REDACTED “love notes.” At the trial in June 2016 she would give sworn testimony on the witness stand that she had received the “love notes” in 2013 and testified at the trial Rodrick stole then by entering her residence through a “doggy door.” You just can’t make this stuff up. However, they are clearly dated 2011 and were in Rodrick’s possession in October of 2011. They were posted online in 2012 which represent irrefutable evidence of Flynn’s continued propensity to perjury. Her timeline is intentionally warped to fit her depiction of her affair with REDACTED to be more in line with her false proclamations with the Catholic Church and her divorce timeline. On just the common sense level, if “a reasonable person” believes a married man in his 50’s with REDACTED’ marital history is just writing his “just friend” married woman in her 50’s chummy notes when reviewing the specifics provided above – there is bad news to convey. The Easter Bunny is NOT real. Sorry to report that it is deception that is real, especially when people are trying to hide the TRUTH.

Dealing with the delusional lies of REDACTED from the legal perspective has certainly been a source of angst and frustration. Dealing with the hypocrisy as it has been characterized by Anglen in the “media” has been intolerable. You naively believe a journalist actually cares about the TRUTH and is committed to digging deeper than a surface superficial façade to a story. You think the unbiased and objective “investigative journalist” is committed to getting to the REAL story that is not your basic he said – she said – he said that is the standard content found in today’s day-to-day major media dribble sold as the news. The ludicrousness of the REDACTED/Flynn cheating spouse’s story is only topped by the absurdity of if being told first in an Arizona Superior Court, then to be recently retold in a U.S. Federal courtroom. Such idiocy is an embarrassment to the judicial process and should garner genuine empathy to the Federal Judge and a jury of eight (8) citizens required to witness such an abuse of process instigated by a rogue attorney Janice Bellucci. **IF** Anglen had done the job of a professional journalist instead of running with the cursory depiction of the angry ex-husband acting badly through the divorce process it could have uncovered the FACTS to “get to the truth.”

As testified by both Rodrick and Flynn the divorce was requested in October of 2011 after Rodrick discovered the REDACTED “love notes” in a drawer in the Master bedroom. A few days later Rodrick moved out of the house. In November of 2011 Flynn filed the divorce papers. This was fine with Rodrick and should have been a matter of simply going through the tedious process of completing the divorce proceedings. That is NOT what would occur. Contrary to Anglen’s completely one-sided and simpleton depiction of events, it was NOT Rodrick who initiated ANY of the peripheral attack activities with his online postings. It was REDACTED interjecting himself directly into the divorce proceedings for over the entire year of 2012. Something that is COMPLETELY inappropriate and not allowed. This did not deter

REDACTED. One of many examples of this interference was the November 26, 2012 letter he sent directly addressed to the Judge presiding over the divorce proceedings (see, [Exhibit 55](#)). The letter would be repugnantly entitled “Enclosed: Objective Evidence.” What a classic oxymoron as there was NO “evidence” provided with the letter that was certainly the antithesis to being “objective.” In the letter REDACTED would refer to Rodrick supposedly “communicated intent to **blackmail / extort**, via correspondence....” Yet, he does NOT provide the “evidence” of this “correspondence” with the letter. Why not? Because what the so called “blackmail / extort correspondence” entailed was an email from Rodrick to Flynn stating that due to REDACTED’ increased efforts to interject himself into the divorce proceedings he was petitioning the Court to schedule depositions of both REDACTED **AND his wife Margie REDACTED**. There was no request for any action to be taken on Flynn’s part, like a payment or a demand to do something that would constitute “Blackmail”. It was a simple statement of an action that Rodrick was pursuing. The REDACTED depiction of events is moronic.

What makes the timing interesting for this REDACTED letter to the Judge on November 26, 2012 is this is only days after Margie REDACTED had received a \$400 thousand medical settlement. In October 2012 she had filed for divorce (see, [Exhibit 56](#)). REDACTED was obviously “negotiating” an “attempt of reconciliation” that would begin December 9, 2012 as previously discussed when detailing the Margie REDACTED [deposition](#). REDACTED would file with the court a withdrawal of the divorce filed by Margie REDACTED in January 2013 (see, [Exhibit 57](#)). The possibility of Rodrick scheduling a deposition of Margie REDACTED must have been cause for some “great personal angst” as stated by REDACTED in his letter. Back to November 26th when Margie REDACTED had **NO IDEA** about the ongoing one and half year old affair between REDACTED and Flynn, nor having been hired as his “personal assistant.” What REDACTED **DOES NOT** disclose to the Judge in the letter is that he had been involved in an extra-marital affair with “employee Ms. Flynn” for an extended period of time.

What becomes a truly ironic aspect of the letter to the Judge presiding over the Rodrick/Flynn divorce is upon objective examination it is REDACTED who is attempting to engage in **EXTORTION**. He proclaims to the Court: “I **expect** and pray that the Court provide some sort of admonishment, punitive or otherwise, at the very least a cease and desist order for to Attorney and client [Rodrick].” To be immediately followed with the direct threat (REDACTED submitted in bold and underlined): “**Suffice to say, that harassing behavior that effects Petitioner’s Flynn employer, affects the prospects for her to keep her job.**” Just for good measure, in case the Judge did not get his first round of threats, he concludes his letter by stating: “I will terminate Ms. Flynn’s employment if Mr. Rodrick continues in his attempts to disturb my life personally and professionally and that of my employee” (referencing Flynn as though she was chattel). “Let what may, ride out in the halls of court. **Not my place of business.**” What arrogance and over inflated ego this man demonstrates to the Court with his threats and demands. Especially considering there is no allowed insertion of such a letter from an employer (let alone the partner adulterer) into a divorce proceeding. For the edification of ANGLIN, this is what constitutes an attempt of EXTORTION, upon a Court and the intimidation of a Superior Court Judge no less. It was never a question that REDACTED would actually follow through in “firing” his long time “girlfriend” Flynn. It was a bluff with intent to manipulate the Court with his heavy handed “Major” REDACTED bombastic persona of self importance. Where is the Anglin article chronicling the conduct of one “Major” REDACTED for who he **REALLY** is, not the “sugar coated” version appearing in his eleven (11) article series of fallacy?

Another example of REDACTED directly interjecting himself into his “girlfriend” Flynn’s divorce proceeding was in the “manufacturing” of a financial analysis report that would be submitted to the Superior Court. It was this so-called “financial analysis” that Anglin would rely on when reporting that

Rodrick had absconded with over “\$1 million of family assets” and moved them to Mexico. The question for the “investigative journalist” Anglen is does he validate this so-called evidence as a credible source when publishing such an accusation? Although Flynn had hired a licensed CPA qualified as an expert in forensic accounting, Mr. Sell was NOT utilized in the preparation of this “financial analysis.” A letter had been prepared detailing ALL the details involved in the “manufacturing” of this so-called “financial analysis” that involved REDACTED overseeing InterAlpha, Inc. employees in the production of the report and is available for review online [HERE](#). In the filing that included this report would be a request for the Judge to award \$25,000 in attorney fees to be paid by Rodrick for the work associated with this particular filing. The work involved in “manufacturing” this report is truly an astonishing brazen manipulation of the FACTS to meet a predetermined outcome. It has no basis in basic and fundamental accounting procedures and requirements. **ANY CPA** would immediately dismiss such shoddy work for the hoax it is. In his [deposition](#) in May of 2013, REDACTED would actually acknowledge his involvement in the “manufacturing” of the report:

Q: And doesn't this say that “I want to stress to you that the QB files that I am sending are by no means complete”? It says that, right?

REDACTED: Yes.

Q: Did you take that into consideration when you **manufactured** this analysis?

REDACTED: Yes.

Q: You did?

REDACTED: Yes.

Q: Are you more qualified than a CPA to do financial analysis like this?

REDACTED: No, I'm not more qualified than a CPA.

Q: Are you more qualified than the expert — excuse me — the expert Mr. Romley hired prior to your financial analysis, Mr. Sell? Are you more qualified than him?

REDACTED: I do not know Mr. Sell.

Q: Why would Mr. Romley have you, your company, perform an analysis when he hired Mr. Sell a while before?

REDACTED: I do not know. I know that I took some of this upon myself to break down into a more readable document for Mr. Romley so that he knew what it was that he was looking at.

Q: Okay. Did he ask you to perform the analysis or did you volunteer to do that?

REDACTED: The terminology that might have been used in our conversation is — is probably different, but **I provided him what I thought he was asking for.**

Q: I'm sorry. Can you repeat that?

REDACTED: The terminology with whatever — I don't recall 100 percent what Mr. Romley asked me to do. **I provided him what I thought that I had — that I thought he had asked me to do.**

Q: Why would you use company resources to get involved in your employee's divorce case? Why would you do that?

REDACTED: She's my employee and she's also my friend.

Q: Do you realize how much money this report has cost Mr. Rodrick? Do you have any idea?

REDACTED: I don't know.

Q: Did you consult your attorney before you **manufactured** this report?

REDACTED: I did not consult my attorney, no.

Q: Are you aware that there's a certain standard of care that's used when performing financial analysis of this type?

REDACTED: No, I'm not.

The years of misconduct of REDACTED have finally begun to receive the proper attention of the appropriate authorities. The “manufacturing” of a falsified “financial analysis” that was illegally submitted into an Arizona Superior Court was a nice addition that received the desired attention being sought by Rodrick. What remains a mystery is the amount of media attention created by Anglen in his series of articles and his refusal to “investigate” and report on the easily available evidence and documentation to ascertain the FACTS when preparing his reports associated with this case. It is quite shocking.

The interference by REDACTED in the Rodrick/Flynn divorce process would take an unforeseen and unexpected twist in January of 2013. He would initiate direct contact with convicted child molester Adam Galvez, the administrator of the cyber harassment smear website. REDACTED would begin to provide attack content against Rodrick, family, friends, business associates and the SOR websites. Most of the content provided to Galvez by REDACTED was knowingly both falsified information and openly defamatory. These activities of REDACTED have been well documented over the years. Just one example was a video created by Rodrick that is available on [YouTube](#) which was created as a means to document exactly what REDACTED was doing at the time. Another example (among the HUNDREDS available) is an email sent by REDACTED to convicted child molester Galvez and convicted sexual assault offender Grainger providing the whereabouts of the minor son of Rodrick’s girlfriend. The objective for REDACTED to create this alliance with his convicted sex offender partners was to provide disinformation that he knew would be posted online with no concern for accuracy or authenticity. Having Rodrick and the SOR websites being viciously attacked online with defamatory content would repeatedly find its way into the divorce proceedings as planned by REDACTED. Obviously REDACTED was utilizing his military background to implement strategies of scorched earth attack plans against Rodrick and the SOR websites. Of course, Anglen was oblivious to such tactics and/or choose to knowingly ignore the obvious agenda that had been implemented by REDACTED.

The Anglen portrayal of Rodrick’s dealing with a contentious divorce involving marital “infidelity” was so cliché and ignored the direct intervention that REDACTED perpetrated during the legal proceedings. Anglen’s portrayals of the events ignored the readily available evidence, he chose in favor of sticking to the agenda that he had set for his narrative back in 2012. Reporting on the FACTS and TRUTH of the actual events in these stories sordid circumstances would have made for a much for interesting and entertaining tale.

REDACTED conclusion:

REDACTED has relied on his two trump cards through these years of attacks against the SOR websites and his litigation with Rodrick. First, his association with the USMC that he is 14 years removed since retirement. Second, successfully manipulating of the media utilizing the reporting of his good buddy and so-called “investigative journalist” Anglen (see, [Exhibit 58](#)). He has shown himself to be a one-trick pony that has run its course. It is time to challenge the lies and deceptions that are the way of REDACTED. Now understanding his repeated game plan, it will be possible to properly create a successful stratagem to finally receive the much deserved victory over the tyranny of REDACTED along with the media contingent that has been Anglen.

CONCLUSION

To offer a conclusion that perhaps can wrap up this long dissertation in its proper context; on July 2, 2013 Anglen published his 5th article which appeared in the Arizona Republic. The point of interest is a sub-title that Anglen attached to this piece: **“Innocent people listed as sex offenders on databases.”** The SOR websites have challenged Anglen on several occasions to actually back up his printed allegations against the SOR websites and its one database of 775,000 profiles of convicted sex offenders. He has NEVER responded. Anglen makes a VERY serious allegation with this sub-title. One if true would arguably be criminal conduct. So the question for Anglen, Arizona Republic, USA Today, Gannett Company, Channel 12 News Phoenix, Mark Curtis and Veronica Sanchez all of whom have made this same allegation to actually SUPPORT it with one INNOCENT person by name that is listed in the SOR database. How hard can this be as there are 775,000 to work with? They dish it out – back it up. Or are these news people and organizations the same as attorney Bellucci and her twelve (12) Plaintiffs who could NOT produce one piece of evidence to support their claims of their Federal lawsuit. Is it the media contingent’s position that the adversaries of the SOR websites that were involved in the pieces/articles published were the “INNOCENT PEOPLE” they were referring to? “Innocent people” like:

- Adam Galvez, a convicted child molester, when questioned in a sworn deposition would confess his claims involved a few “misunderstandings.”
- Susan Galvez when asked about her lawsuit claims under oath on the witness stand at trial responded by stating “I have no idea what you are a talking about.” (3 TIMES!)
- Janine Graves who would NOT show up at the trial to take the witness stand after 40 months of litigation of a lawsuit SHE initiated. Even after the Judge Ruled allowing her to testify from home.
- Frank Silva was not only proven to have been listed as a registered sex offender, his claims of being arrested for marijuana possession in Virginia actually involved convictions of DRUG TRACKING.
- Keith Johnson, a child rapist from Johnson City, Tennessee, would NOT show up for the trail. He did file a Motion to Dismiss all claims on the day of the trial. He also had the audacity to include a request for sanctions against Rodrick as a parting shot of absurdity.
- REDACTED would assert before the jury that “I am a U.S. Marine and I am TRUTHFUL.”
- Lois Flynn would testify under oath at the trial about Rodrick sneaking into her house via a “doggy door” in order to steal “love notes.” “Love notes” she testified she received in 2013 even though they are clearly dated in 2011. She also claimed there was an “emergency” escape plan out of a NONEXISTENT back door in the event of a “raid” (by whom??) of the OnlineDetective offices.
- Larry Anthony Quintero claims child porn is a “non victim offense” and is a “thought crime.”
- Jeremy Ryan Graves, convicted of Child Rape of a 14 year old boy, filed a complaint with the Arizona Attorney General’s Office that was proven to be falsified allegations to harass.
- Frank Lindsay, Duane Ledward, Daniel Van Waes, Keith Johnson, Frank Silva and Larry Quintero all paid for an “Expedite review” but knowingly falsely claimed they paid for a “removal” that was not deleted from the database. Plus, the payment just by coincidence made by all perps occurred within a week of the filing the original lawsuit. (Can we say RICO – Conspiracy and Fraud?)
- Janice Bellucci at the trial after litigating a lawsuit consisting of false and fabricated claims (120 of them) for 40 months had the audacity to call Rodrick a “BULLY” (twice).

These “innocent people” of the Anglen articles have been PROVEN with FACTS, SWORN TESTIMONY, DOCUMENTATION and overwhelming EVIDENCE to be LIARS one and all. Where is the REAL story appearing on the Gannett Company media properties that tell the TRUTH of what was PROVEN in the end? Where is the retraction of ALL the falsehood and repeated LIES reported by ROBERT ANGLLEN?