Northern, Central, and Eastern Districts of California.

1	3. Since July 2009, I have been employed as General Counsel for Plaintiff
2	Xcentric Ventures, LLC. In my capacity as counsel for Xcentric Ventures I have been
3	involved in the litigation of this action since its inception. I have possession of
4	Xcentric's files relating to this case, and I am personally familiar with the contents
5	thereof.
6	4. On March 31, 2010 I received a letter from counsel for the plaintiffs in this
7	matter, a copy of which is attached hereto as <b>Exhibit A</b> . According to this letter,
8	plaintiffs are seeking damages in excess of \$75,000 in this matter.
9	
10	Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the
11	United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.
12	EXECUTED ON: April 5, 2010.
13	/S/David S. Gingras
14	David S. Gingras
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** I hereby certify that on April 5, 2010 I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing, and for transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following CM/ECF registrants: Mr. Daniel F. Blackert, Esq. Asia Economic Institute 11766 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 260 Los Angeles, CA 90025 Attorneys for Plaintiffs And a courtesy copy of the foregoing delivered to: Honorable Steven V. Wilson U.S. District Judge /s/David S. Gingras

Exhibit A

ASIA ECONOMIC INSTITUTE
DANIEL F. BLACKERT, ESQ.
11766 WILSHIRE BLVD., SUITE 260
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025
TEL. (310) 806-3000 EXT. 225
FAX (310) 826-4448
BLACKERTESQ@YAHOO.COM
DANIEL@ASIAECON.ORG

David Gingras, Esq. Gingras Law Office, PLLC 4072 E. Mountain Vista Dr. Phoniex, AZ 85048

March 31, 2010

Via email and U.S. Mail

Re: Asia Economic Institute v. Xcentric Ventures, LLC, et al.

Case No.: SC106603

Dear Mr. Gingras:

I am responding to your letter dated March 30, 2010. To answer your question, my client is seeking in excess of \$75,000.00 in this case. This figure includes both damages and attorney's fees.

Rather, we are focusing on the diversity requirement for federal subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332. As the party seeking removal, it is your burden to show that complete diversity exists. A self-serving affidavit from your client will not meet this burden. McNatt v. Allied-Signal, Inc., 1992 U.S. App. LEXIS 28787. Furthermore, there is still conflicting evidence whether your client lives in California or Arizona. On the one hand, your client in an email exchange with my client admits that he lives in California. On the other hand, you openly admitted to me that your client does not live in California and lied to my client abut his residence in hopes

of being sued in California and gaining the advantage of the Anti-SLAPP statute. A week after you admitted this to me, you filed such a motion. Finally, strangely enough your client submitted a sworn affidavit to the Court stating that he lied about living in California because my client had threatened him. Please be aware that your client's statements completely contradict our conversation where you told me that your client lied in order to benefit from the Anti-SLAPP statute. This means that your client may have **lied** in his affidavit to the Court. This is a very serious matter and we are currently investigating it and considering the repercussions.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Very truly yours,

Daniel F. Blackert, Esq.