2. DOCUMENTS sufficient to IDENTIFY the total number of applicants to CAP from 2005-present.

#### **RESPONSE:**

Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

3. DOCUMENTS consisting of a complete copy of each version of a representative agreement(s) between YOU and a representative individual or entity that enrolled in the CAP from 2005-present.

#### **RESPONSE:**

Objection; the request seeks evidence which has been determined to be irrelevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered in this matter on June 24, 2010.

4. DOCUMENTS sufficient to IDENTIFY the relationship of YOU to Creative Business Investments Concepts, Inc. ("Creative").

# **RESPONSE:**

Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered in this matter on June 24, 2010.

1	
2	5. DOCUMENTS relating to Creative's ownership interest in YOU from 2005-present.
3	RESPONSE:
5	Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in
6	this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
7	
8 9	The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered in this matter on June 24, 2010.
10	
11	6. DOCUMENTS that refer or relate to Creative's duties and responsibilities to YOU from 2005-present.
12	DECDONCE.
13	RESPONSE:
14	Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of
15	admissible evidence.
16 17	The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered
in this matter on June 24, 2010.	in this matter on June 24, 2010.
19	
20	7. DOCUMENTS that IDENTIFY all owner(s) of Xcentric Ventures, LLC from 2001-present.
21	DECDONCE.
22	RESPONSE:
23	Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in
this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the admissible evidence.	
25	The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered
26	in this matter on June 24, 2010.
27	
28	

1 2	8. DOCUMENTS that IDENTIFY all members(s) of YOU from 2001-present.
3	RESPONSE:
<ul><li>4</li><li>5</li><li>6</li></ul>	Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
7 8	The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered in this matter on June 24, 2010.
9 10 11	9. All YOUR employment agreements with ED MAGEDSON from 2005-present.
12	RESPONSE:
<ul><li>13</li><li>14</li><li>15</li></ul>	Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
16 17	The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered in this matter on June 24, 2010.
18 19	10. DOCUMENTS that IDENTIFY the owner of Creative from 2005-present.
20	RESPONSE:
<ul><li>21</li><li>22</li><li>23</li></ul>	Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
<ul><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>	The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered in this matter on June 24, 2010.
26	
<ul><li>27</li><li>28</li></ul>	

2

28

11.

3	RESPONSE:	
4		
5	Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery admissible evidence.	
6		
7	The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered	
8	in this matter on June 24, 2010.	
9		
10 12. DOCUMENTS that refer or relate to David Bedore's dresponsibilities for Creative from 2005-present.		
12	RESPONSE:	
13		
14	Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of	
15	admissible evidence.	
16	The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered in this matter on June 24, 2010.	
17	in this matter on valie 21, 2010.	
18	13. DOCUMENTS that refer or relate to the rates/fees that YOU charge for the	
CAP from 2005-present		
20	DECDONCE.	
21	RESPONSE:	
22	Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in	
23	this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.	
24		
25	The request also seeks information already within the possession of Plaintiffs.	
26		
27		

DOCUMENTS that refer or relate to David Bedore's duties and

responsibilities for Xcentric from 2005-present.

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

14. DOCUMENTS that refer or relate to YOUR INVESTIGATION of a representative individual or entity that has enrolled in the CAP since 2005.

### **RESPONSE:**

1

2

3

4

5

Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered in this matter on June 24, 2010.

15. DOCUMENTS that IDENTIFY the person(s) or entity(s) responsible for INVESTIGATING individuals or businesses once they have enrolled in the CAP from 2005-present.

#### **RESPONSE:**

Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered in this matter on June 24, 2010.

16. DOCUMENTS that refer or relate to YOUR use of META TAGS on ROR from 2005-present.

# **RESPONSE:**

Objection; the request is unintelligible insofar as it refers to "YOUR use of META TAGS". All 600,000+ pages on the website <a href="www.RipoffReport.com">www.RipoffReport.com</a> contain meta tags. To the extent this request requires Defendants to produce documents referring to every page on the website <a href="www.RipoffReport.com">www.RipoffReport.com</a>, Defendants object to the request as overbroad and unduly burdensome within the meaning of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(B).

1

2

3

4

Defendants further object on the basis the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered

in this matter on June 24, 2010.

All communications between YOU and Google relating to search indexing

Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of

The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered

DOCUMENTS that IDENTIFY the person(s) or entity(s) that designed the

Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of

The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered

person(s) or entity(s) most knowledgeable about how HMTL is generated for a Report on

Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Objection, the request seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay

entered in this matter on June 24, 2010.

1	
2	23. DOCUMENTS that refer or relate to either written or oral communications between DEFENDANTS and PLAINTIFFS from 2008-
3	present.
4	RESPONSE:
5	Objection: the request goales information subject to attempts alient privilege
6	Objection; the request seeks information subject to attorney-client privilege.
7 8	Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection, all non-privileged documents have previously been produced.
9	
10	24. All audio recordings (including those played by DEFENDANTS at Mr.
11	Mobrez's Deposition of May 7, 2010) of communications between DEFENDANTS and PLAINTIFFS from 2008-present.
12	DECRONCE
13	RESPONSE:
14	Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in
15	this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
16	
17	25. Recordings sufficient to IDENTIFY YOUR outgoing voice prompts prior
18	to notification of callers that calls may be recorded.
19	RESPONSE:
20	
21	Defendants are not in possession of any such recordings.
22	
23	26. Recordings sufficient to IDENTIFY YOUR outgoing voice prompts after YOU began notifying callers that calls may be recorded.
24	
25	RESPONSE:
26	Defendants are not in possession of any such recordings. Plaintiffs may obtain this
27	information by calling (602) 539-4357 and reviewing the prompts.
28	

27. DOCUMENTS that refer or relate to any instance of YOU deleting posts on ROR from 2005-present.

### **RESPONSE:**

Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered in this matter on June 24, 2010.

28. DOCUMENTS that IDENTIFY the HTML, META TAGS, META ELEMENTS, and source code for web pages displaying reports about a representative CAP member after joining CAP.

### **RESPONSE:**

Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to the request as overbroad and unduly burdensome within the meaning of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(B).

The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered in this matter on June 24, 2010.

29. DOCUMENTS that IDENTIFY the HTML, META TAGS, META ELEMENTS, and source code for web pages displaying reports about a representative CAP member as they existed before the member joined CAP.

# **RESPONSE:**

Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to the request as overbroad and unduly burdensome within the meaning of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(B).

1 2	The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered in this matter on June 24, 2010.
3	
4	30. DOCUMENTS that IDENTIFY the individual or entity that revises web
5	pages including reports about a CAP member after the member joins CAP.
6	RESPONSE:
7	Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue i
8	this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
10	in this matter on June 24, 2010
11	
13	31. DOCUMENTS that evidence that you have been contacted by Governmental agencies as stated on YOUR website at RipoffReport.com.
15	RESPONSE:
16 17 18 19	Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to the request as overbroad and unduly burdensome within the meaning of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(B).
20 21	The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered in this matter on June 24, 2010.
22 23 24	32. DOCUMENTS that evidence YOUR participation in class action lawsuits against businesses or individuals reported on ROR as stated on YOUR website RipoffReport.com.
25	RESPONSE:
26 27 28	Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to the request as overbroad and unduly burdensome within the meaning of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(B)

The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered in this matter on June 24, 2010.

DOCUMENTS that refer or relate to your relationship to the class action 33. lawyers listed on your website.

#### **RESPONSE:**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to the request as overbroad and unduly burdensome within the meaning of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(B).

The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered in this matter on June 24, 2010.

34. DOCUMENTS sufficient to IDENTIFY all individuals or entities who have an ownership interest in Xcentric Ventures, LLC from its inception to the present.

### **RESPONSE:**

Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered in this matter on June 24, 2010.

DOCUMENTS relating to, referring to, or evidencing any actions taken by 35. DEFENDANTS to create, add, remove, edit or alter the TITLE META TAG of reports against members of the CAP, including but not limited to documents evidencing changes in the Web page's HTML source code.

# **RESPONSE:**

Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to the request as overbroad and unduly burdensome within the meaning of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(B).

The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered in this matter on June 24, 2010.

36. DOCUMENTS relating to, referring to, or evidencing any actions taken by Defendants to create, add, remove, edit or alter the DESCRIPTION META TAG of the complaints against members of the CAP, including but not limited to documents evidencing changes in the Web page's HTML source code.

### **RESPONSE:**

Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to the request as overbroad and unduly burdensome within the meaning of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(B).

The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered in this matter on June 24, 2010.

DOCUMENTS relating to, referring to, or evidencing any actions taken by Defendants to create, add, remove, edit or alter the KEYWORD META TAG of the complaints against members of the CAP, including but not limited to documents evidencing changes in the Web page's HTML source code.

# **RESPONSE:**

Objection; the request seeks evidence which is not relevant to any fact at issue in this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to the request as overbroad and unduly burdensome within the meaning of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(B).

The request also seeks information within the scope of the discovery stay entered in this matter on June 24, 2010.

1	38. DOCUMENTS relating to, referring to, or evidencing any actions taken by
2	Defendants to create, add, remove, edit or alter the TITLE META TAG of
3	the complaints against PLAINTIFF, including but not limited to documents evidencing changes in the Web page's HTML source code.
4	
5	RESPONSE:
6	No such documents exist.
7	TVO Such documents exist.
8	39. DOCUMENTS relating to, referring to, or evidencing any actions taken by
9	Defendants to create, add, remove, edit or alter the DESCRIPTION META
10	TAG of the complaints against PLAINTIFF, including but not limited to documents evidencing changes in the Web page's HTML source code.
11	documents evidencing changes in the web page 3 111 will source code.
12	RESPONSE:
13	
14	No such documents exist.
15	
16	40. DOCUMENTS relating to, referring to, or evidencing any actions taken by Defendants to create, add, remove, edit or alter the KEYWORD META
17	TAG of the complaints against PLAINTIFF, including but not limited to
18	documents evidencing changes in the Web page's HTML source code.
19	RESPONSE:
20	
21	No such documents exist.
22	
23	DATED July 22, 2010.
24	GINGRAS LAW OFFICE, PLLC
<ul><li>25</li><li>26</li></ul>	/S/ David S. Gingras David S. Gingras Attorneys for Defendants Ed Magedson and Xcentric Ventures, LLC
27	Attorneys for Defendants Ed Magedson and
28	Xcentric Ventures, LLC
۵∟	