EXHIBIT 3-1

EXHIBIT 3

REPLY DECLARATION OF GARY E. MASON

LETTER TO OPPOSE THE SETTLEMENT BETWEEN CLASS LAWYER AND DEFENDANTS LAWYER

I send this letter to oppose the settlement agreed to between the COURT appointed class lawyer and the Defendant Lawyer.

My name, address and telephone number are Satish Chandar Bhardwaj, 171 Lexington Ave Apt. 403, New York, NY 10016, USA, 646-243-2625.

As more fully explained in the pages that follow this page 1 the Litigation is not suitable for class action as the Plaintiffs are concerned only about a minor Privacy issue involving only one of the hacking tools developed by Google to gather information about a minor class of Gmail holders to profit monetarily from the information thus gathered. The plaintiffs chose a site in the back yard of defendant which is more likely to rule in favor of the defendant.

I sincerely believe that the settlement agreed to by the defendant is an attempt to Bribe the class lawyers that was choosen by the Court, which itself was highly irregular since it is an unheard off type of Act since if it was a Litigation that was initiated by a bona fide Plaintiff he'd have insisted on choosing a lawyer himself. IT BAIRS THE PRIVACY WATCHDOGS BY RESERVING ATTORNEY OF SETTLEMENT FOR THEM.

The Court appointed lawyer was not interested serving the interest of the plaintiff but of the Defendant with a view to earning his Fee. With that in mind he pursuaded the Court to certify the Litigation as a Class action and negotiated the least amount of monetary settlement that would be enough to pay his fee and a few thousand Dollars for each of the original Plaintiffs. That is not the way a lawyer is supposed to handle a case. Itis highly irregular for a court apponted lawyer.

The lawyers (Defendant and Class lawyer appointed by court) made sure that no class members would be aware of the class litigation so that they would not be able to exclude themselves from the action.* The remaining pages of this letter more fully discuss these issues.

* GOOGLE INFORMED GMAIL HOLDERS OF THIS ACTION ONLY AFTER THE EXPIRATION DATE OF DECEMBER 6, 2010. IT WAS THE DUTY OF PLAINTIFFS TO PUT NOTICES IN WIDELY NEWSPAPERS.

IN RE. GOOGLE BUZZ USER PRIVACY LITIGATION NO. 5:10-cv-00672JW
SWORN OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENTOF SAID LITIGATION

Upon being duly sworn before a NOTARY PUBLIC in the city of New York I depose as follows

I. PRILIMINARY

1. My name and address are stated at the top right hand corner of this page.

2. The statements made by me in this document under oath are known to me to be trueunder the best of my knowledge or are believed by me to be true.

3. I've had Gmail for several years. My gmail address is pundit005@gmail.com/ My telephone number is 646-243-2625

4. Only recently I received an email from Google telling me about Buzz.

5. The gmail informed me that as a holder of gmail I and all other gmail holders are affected by this litigation in as much as if they do not exclude themselves from this action they would for ever be barred from ever bringing any action against Google.

HOWEVER the gmail reached the holders after the time to exclude had expired. So that option is history for me and every body else who will be born in the future or will purchase a PC or any electronic device like a mobil phone in the future

II, THE ACTION IS NOT SUITABLE AS A CLASS ACTION

1. The case involves every body on this earth, if life exists on planets in other galaxies it involves them also.

2. Most of these people will not have yet been born on the cut off Date of January 10, 2011 ARBITRARILY SET UP BY GOOGLE,

let alone their possessing an electronic device that can communicate with or can be communicated by any electronic device.

3. Buzz Action deprived them all of an opportunity to bring a law suit against Google for any Google invasion of their privacy if the settlement being proposed by Google and Litigants is accepted by the court.

4. This settlement is a fraud against the holders of the electronic devices. It should not be imposed on any body but the litigants who initiated the Privacy action against Google and on Google.

5. Google sent a gmail to holders of Gmail only after December 6, 2010 after these people lost the right to exclude themselves

6. Google created a special Buzz site for the Buzz Privacy action. It made no mention of this action on google.com that is more widely known.

7. The Litigants made no EFFORT to inform the world that it is being recruited as a class member by virtue of an action that was filed in a court in a western corner of the United States.

8. They did not discuss this action and the existance of a class, in which they have recruited every breathing human in any and every corner of the worls from Bandra (a suburb of Mumbai to Kaula Lampur to Accra to Nigeria to the world down under, IN ANY INTERNATIONAL MEDIA LIKE WALL STREET JOURNAL NEW YORK TIMES, TIMES OF INDIA ETC

9. I demand that the Court void this class and treat this case as a simple case whose plaintiffs are the Litigants (a handf full of them) and whose respondent is Google. This matter is discussed in the next Section III.

III. THE CLASS IS TOTALLY IMPROPER AND UNJUST AGAINST ALL EXCEPT THE LITIGANTS AND THE LAWYERS AND GOOGLE

1. The class lawyers have devided the class in to two parts.

2. One class is reprented by lawyers who will be paid by Google at the same rate as google attorneys will be paid.

3. The class lawyers have negotiated a settlement with google. This settlement will pay a part of the financial settlement to the clients that originally retained them under the disguise that they performed a service to the class.

4. They performed a service to Google. But they performed no service to the class. The settlement will not bar Google from any practice. Google will be allowed to invade the Privacy of every electronic device user that it has been doing prior to the commencement of Buzz Privacy Action.

5. If the settlement is accepted by the court all the owners of the electronic Devices will loose heavily whether or not they possess Gmail

6. These lawyers lacked the experience to present the case of the class to a Jury of the peers.

7. They lacked the experience in the selection of a Jury that will not be biased in favor of Google

8. The lawyers lacked an understanding of any and all internet matters.

9. The only interest of these class lawyers was to generate an income for themselves and the clients who hired them.

III Continued

10. As soon as Google AGREED TO PAY to a paltry Sum that the lawyers thought would cover their fee and some reward for their clients they agreed to the settlement

IV. THE LITIGANTS LACKED THE RESOURCES TO PROCEED AGAINST GOOGLE

1. The litigants paid no retainer to the lawyers they choose to represent them.

2. They had no money to hire lawyers who had an understanding of the internet Privacy and internet hacking. They did not and do not understand the difference between the two.

3. They accepted lawyers who would represent them on contigency basis.

4. These lawyers invested the least amount of time necessary to get least amount of financial settlement that would cover their own fee and a compensation for their handful of clients.

5. The remaining class members, who were recruited in to the class were not represented at all. Their interests were totally ignored by the class attorneys.

6. The settlement is only a monetary settlement in which the clients who hired them will share with the class lawyers.

7. The Settlement is totally BIASED AGAINST THE CLASS, EXCEPT COUPLE OF ORIGINAL LITIGANTS

V. LITIGANTS SHOULD HAVE CONFINED THEIR CLASS TO A VERY LIMITED AREA LIKE THE COUNTY THEY LIVE IN

1. No Court can bestow upon itself the jurisdiction to include a person living ten thousand or fifteen thousand miles away from his court in a litigation brought to his court by a person living in the back yard of the Court.

2. Google is an International Company [illegible] having an office in the jurisdiction of any and every court.

3. Google and the litigants are acting as thugs to include any body and every body from any and every corner of the world to include any body and every body in a local Litigation brought before a local Court by a local person whose displeasure with Buzz AMOUNTED only to the insertion of a meter that counted the number of times he'd used Buzz and displayed the count for the world to see.

4. This Litigant or a very few litigants then decided that they did not want to have the case tried before a Jury of peers especially after Google offered each of them just under ten thousand Dollars.

5. Google then shut its door so that no body can exclude himself from the litigation and it is in the process to shut the door to even THOSE WHO oppose the SETTLEMENT.

6. Google is using a Local judge to rule the case in the favor of a few local Litigants and a International Company acting Locally.

7. I doubt this sort of thing would have happened if a San Digo Litigant would have sued Google in a Poone Court. I'm sure Google has an office in Poone. If it does not have an office in Poone IT MUST HAVE ONE IN TOKYO.

V. THE LITIGANTS SHOULD HAVE CONFINED THEIR CLASS TO A LIMITED AREA LIKE THEIR HOME TOWN COUNTY OR STATE. (CONTD.)

8. What I'm trying to point out that Google is an International Company. It is an abuse of adminstration of Justice to decide a Privacy Case in the back yard of a couple of Litigants hailing from the home state of Google. The class should have been limited to the area in the direct jurisdiction of the Court it is on the Calendar of.

9. This class is a fraud against the Laptop, personal Computer and Apple Users and should be dismantled and USER Litigation treated as a Simple Litigation between a disgr-unted Gmail User who does not care about Privacy issues that every owner of these devices face.

10. this Litigant is only concerned about making a few dollars although the money was not an issue in the Action. But as soon as a few thousand dollars were offered to the litigant their lawyers accepted A big plus for the lawyers was the consent of the Google to pay their fee for selling out the class without getting any concessions from Google on the Privacy issue.

11. this case should be dismissed without prejudice so thata a real an injured party can bring a class action suit against Google on more substantive issues than in this case. The only issue in this case is Dollar issue. That too is laughable like trading Privacy for a few dollars.

IN RE. GOOGLE BUZZ PRIVACY LITIGATION NO. 5:10-cv-00672-JW

VI. THE SETTLEMENT IS A PAYOFF TO A COUPLE OF LOCAL DISGRUNTLED LITIGANTS TO BRIBE THEM NOT TO PURSUE THEIR PRIVACY CASE

1. Google has agreed to NOTHING that will amount to a settlement of the original diluted Privacy Complaint against Google based on a single Privacy violation relating to a single Google Hacking Tool which is named BUZZ.

2. The willingness of Google to settle the original charge amounts to an admission of the original charge IN THE COMPLAINT.

3. Google did not want the case to go to a trial that would amount to exposure to Google hacking Activities.

4. Buzz is an Google attempt at Hacking.

5. Google started as a search engine to keep a tab on what people search for and how often they search what they search. Buzz is an attempt to dig dipper into their affairs.

6. Having built up a base of searchers who trust Google to deliver the web sites for their needs Google is resorting to building its own sites for its own account or for an account of its customers. It is systematically placing these sites in search results ahead of other sites. See Wall Street Journal Dated December 13 2010 item 6 gutter column.

7. If Google is allowed to continue BUILDING ITS HACKING NETWORK by placing no restraints on it no body would be allowed by law to sue Google again when it has built a vast network of hacking tools.

8. Google must not be allowed TO build more hacking tools BY ALLOWING THE PLAINTIFF TO ACCEPT MONEY TO DROP THE PRIVACY COMPLAINT AGAINST GOOGLE WITH PREJUDICE TOWARD THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY.

VII, GOOGLE HAS TRANSFORMED ITSELF INTO A HACKING COMPANY FROM BEING A SEARCH ENGINE.

1. Hacking is a very misunderstood word. It is thought of to be a process in which words in a simple text are assigned the task of wiping out the documents of a person to whome this text is emailed or by having him click on a link or use a URL.

2. It is no longer limited to that kind of Action. Hacking can enable a company to read the letters or numbers that are depressed on the key pad of the electronic device possessed by a person.

3. Google has that kind of power. As an example in December 2011 Google disabled AOL as well as Yahoo whom it accused of harboring elements of of two web sites that can read the passwords of the people who use Yahoo or AOl. These people could loose their email addresses and have new owners without any body knowing the change of ownership.

4. When a web site is thus disabled the only recourse these websites has to apply to Google for a recertification of their websites after proving that the elements of the Hacking have been removed.

5. Google knows when you enter your My way or Crawler email account or when you use Hotmail search Engines and how many times you use them including the exact times you use them.. It sells this information to merchandisers.

6. The Privacy case known as Buzz Privacy has nothing to do with Buzz use. By closing the Case on Buzz Google seeks to Close the entire Privacy issue whether it is related to whether Google keeps track of what times you used your electronic devices or how long you used them them when you did use them or how many telephone numbers you have or how often you change your telrphone numbers.

7. Google probably knows how many bank Accounts you have and how much money you have in each of them.

VII. GOOGLE HAS TRANSFORMED ITSELF IN TO A HACKING COMPANY (CONID)

8. IF Google does not yet know your Bank Balances it soon will. Its CEO Eric Schmidt gave a peek at it its Droid Powered Mobile Phone that will act as a credit card reader. For his picture giving a peek at the mobil phone see page 19 (middle paragraph) of Newsweek dated November 29, 2010

9.Google has already started to abuse its Search Engine. It is increasingly listing its own sites ahead of other sites in search engine results.

10. BUZZ is just a test of the ease with which it can collect Privacy data of the individuals without provoking their wrath.

11 Until recent past Google's sources of income were the revenues from the ads businesses put on Google Search Engine Results, the fee site owners paid Google for reviewing their Sites for inclusion in the Google Search results and their ads that Google placed on the Sites. If people clicked on the links in those ads Google paid for those clicks and it also made money on those clicks. There was no loss of Privacy for people who placed their ads with Google

12. Google is not satisfied this income that caused its stock price to fall from the IPO price of $95 per share to under $75 per share. After Google started Hacking its shareholders noticed the hacking. Presently the share price of Google is over $500 per share.

13. The Companies like Time Warner that own AOL and through AOL Netscape are seeing the prices of their shares fall. As a matter of Fact the price of the shares of Netscape had fallen from about $160 per share to low two digit figures. Hence Netscape Directors sold the Company to AOL. Netscape got merged with AOL and its Browser came to be known as AOL.

VII. GOOGLE HAS TRANSFORMED ITSELF TO A HACKING COMPANY (CONTD.)

14. AOL had hoped that buying Netscape would provide it a Browser Browser and its share prices, that had fallen sharply from their highs reached soon after AOL developed its Internet service But Netscape purchase did not help AOL. Time Warner thought that the failure had something to with AOL Marketing. So It bought AOL and has been trying to sell AOl ever since without sucess. There are simply no buyers.

15.Times Warner has to compete with Hacking Companies like Google that has its own Browser. There are Browsers like Mozilla Firefox with which AOL must compete.

16. After Buzz privacy Litigation is closed with prejudice Google would get a license to use its Browser and gmail and all the tools it has developed to spy on the world. Goole is a Cash rich Company. It already has a lerge IT staff in India. The IT staff in India costs very little like less than $5 per day. And Indians are better at hacking than any body else in the world.

17. Only a Trial of the Litigation and the Google evidence under oath will throw the light on the extent of the damage Google inflicts on the privacy of the individuals who do not have Gmail and hence do not have buzz and hence are not class members and will in no likelihood oppose the Google Settlement. But even these individuals will not be able to bring a law suit against Google for damage to their privacy whether they become Google Customers in the future or even if they do not become Google Customers after January 10, 2011.

18.This discussion of Hacking is not exhaustive in nature. I'm not an attorney and I can only of some ways HACKING CAN DESTROY YOUR PRIVACY. I'm Not an attorney. I believe that my pleading will fall on deaf ears. In case my arguments get thrown out I'll appeal As high as I can go. For that eventuality I state that I be not deemed to have waived any arguments in this hacking section or any other section If I've not mentioned them.

VIII. INTERNET SERVICE MAKES IT EASY TO HACK THE COMPUTERS OF ~~EVERYBODY~~ BECAUSE OF THE HASTE WITH WHICH IT WAS DEVELOPED

1. When Gore was Vice President he made the federal data bases available to public. This data base was stored in powerful main frames.

2. At that time there were no personal Computers. They leased terminals capable of having their tasks perfo-rmed remotely on main Frames owned by others. These main frames performed several tasks simultaneously. Each secon of the processor time of the main frames was devided in to million lion ticks. The main frames worked on the tasks of a single customer for one tick. The customer was charged by the jour. Tese Companies were called Time Sharing.

3. Just about that time Apple, IBM had made Portable computers that had their own processors, their own key boards, their own monitors. They did not need processor time to get the tasks performed. They were very inexpensive to buy. But they could not communicate with other computers.

4. When the federal Government made ther Data bases stored in main Frames available one man found a money man who would buy the shares of Common Stock of his then start up company NETSCAPE for $90,000,000 (Ninety Million dollars) and provided him a seed money. His intention was to used the money to enable the then available mobil computers communicate with the main frame computers.

5. Soon thereafter Netscape filed an offering for its Imitial public offering ("IPO") to raise hundreds of millions of dollars of additional capital to develop its Browser.

VIII. INTERNET SERVICE MAKES IT EASY TO HACK THE COMPUTERS OF EVERYBODY BECAUSE OF THE HASTE WITH WHICH IT WAS DEVELOPED

9. The success of AOL in raising its seed capital of hundreds of millions of Dollars enabled Netscape to have its IPO oversubscribed and when the offering was declared effective by SEC all that was needed was to deliver the shares to whom they had been promised. Minutes after the offering became effective Netscape shares started trading and rose to a very high premium.

10. Never before had any IPO shares of Common Stock been sold out even before the SEC Okayed the offering. As soon as the Okay was received the underwiters declared the offering closed. The trading started. Within hours share rose to unprecedented premiums. While the Google shares fell after the close of the offering Netscape shares were on fire. Netscape split the shares. The split shares brought the share prices to pre-split prices.

11. Netscape had yet no earnings, no revenues. Only a promise. The Aol founders decided to conduct a public offering of its shares based upon the success of Netscape offering. Now AOL offering got over-subscribed and shares were sold before the offering became effective. After the offering became effective the shares caught fire like Netscape shares. They went straight up defying gravity. Gravity did not apply to Netscape and AOL SHARES.

13. Only Netscape ran out of money it had raised in its IPO. AOL was its new partner. It still had money. It bought Netscape. Netscape became a part of AOL. Only it was not producing a profit. It approached Time Warner and it too became sold on the Netscape Aol concept. It acquired the AOL company that was now not only an Internet service Provider but also a Browser.

VIII. INTERNET SERVICE MAKES IT EASY TO HACK THE COMPUTERS OF EVERYBODY BECAUSE OF THE HASTE WITH WHICH THEY WERE DEVELOPED

13. Time Warner soon found out it had made a big mistake. It found out why AOL-NETSCAPE combination was not a money maker. It found out how people were using the Combination to hack out the files of total strangers.

14. IT engineers of Time Warner, Microsoft have been spending hundreds of millions of dollars to correct the weaknesses in their systems and finding that just as soon as they had corrected the weaknesses that were brought to their attention the hackers had found out more weaknesses and Time Warner and Microsoft had to find ways to remove the weaknesses.

15. Only Google does not try to wipe out those weaknesses.It has its engineers find out ways of exploiting those weaknesses and to profit from them by using them to attack the Privacy of the people who surf the web.

16. For this reason Time Warner has been trying to unload AOL ever since it bought it. Only there are no buyers. Any Buyer would face stiff competition from Google and others.

17 When Netscape started to develop its Browser and once the Browser was available AOL had to spend a lot of money amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars to develop a concept of producing the internet service.

18. Inspite of spending hundreds of millions of dollars the IT Engineers produced a misguided concept because all these engineers had was a knowledge of the code and they how to program for a task.

VIII. INTERNET SERVICE MAKES IT EASY AND POSSIBLE TO HACK THE COMPUTERS OF EVERY BODY BECAUSE OF THE HASTE WITH WHICH THEY THEY WERE DEVELOPED. (CONTD)

19. The Browser enabled a Computer owner to use the Browser to ask for information from ther server, use it for whatever purpose the person wahed the information for like altering it to suit his needs and storing it back in the serverwithout leaving any marker to indicate that the information has been altered.

20 The unsuspecting next person would then use the Browser to ask for the information not knowing that the information has been contaminated and made infected with viruses and thus harmful.

21. It is not the Browsers developed by Netscape, Mozilla-Firefox or even by Google that are at fault. It is the Concept of empowering the personal Computers developed by AOL that is misguided and at fault.

22. This concept has to be banished and a new Concept developed if Hacking is to be stopped.

23. But There is no way Companis whose shareholders have spent hundreds of Billions of Dollars to develop a concept

24. In the present method of surfing the internet Apples, Personal Computers and Laptops (collectively known as Clients) have a major role in the surfing of Internet. The servers have only a minor clerical role of sending documents stored in them to the clients that order them or to receive the documents from clients and store them. This empowers the owners of clients to hack.

25. Google uses the power of Clients to hack and to spy on their owners.

IX. TO PREVENT THE INVASION OF PRIVACY THE METHOD OF SURFING THE WEB HAS TO BE REDEVELOPED

1. It has been mentioned in the previous section that the development of Internet service is totally misguided.

2. The founders of Netscape and AOL were College drop outs. They were incapable of developing New Tools. They found out ways to use the tools that were available then like the IBM PCs and IBM Compatibles that were meant to process the data with their own CPUs.

3. The founders of Netscape and AOL were misguided in having these computers acquire the ability of Communicating with other computers whose job was to store information on their hard disk after receiving it from other computers and to distribute this information among computers that ask for it.

4. Hacking has also been confined to the likes of college or school drop outs. But it is no longer the case. Money rich Companies like Google and Microsoft have billions of Dollars and have the ability to pay the salaries of Educated IT staff. But they have found out thatthey don't have to pay high salaries to American College graduates to do Hacking. They can Use educated Indian College graduates in India and have them do the Hacking.

5. This can be stopped by redeveloping internet service by changing Client server roles. The surfer should have the role of processing the data by its CPU rather than by the CPU of the Clients.

6. If this is done there would be no hacking since it would not be possible.

7. Instead of settling the Buzz Privacy Litigation by paying a paltry amount it should voluntarily pay the sum that an International Jeer of Peers would pay as Compensatory and Punitive Damages.

IX. TO PREVENT THE INVASION OF PRIVACY THE METHOD OF SURFING THE WEB SHOULD BE REDEVELOPED (CONTD.)

8. If a trial of the entire Privacy Issue were held in an International Court before a jury of Peers the jury would award Compensatory and Punitive damages of one thousand times the settlement amount of $8,000,000 (eight million Dollars) that Google wants to pay without a trial.

9. If Google wants to avoid a Jury trial it should agree to pay a settlement of $8,000,000,000 (eight Billion Dollars and the money should be earmarked for redeveloping the Internet service rather than bribing the Privacy organizations who would be rendered powerless if Buzz Litigation is settled without any restraints on Google

X. THE SETTLEMENT SHOULD NOT BE USED TO BUY THE SILENCE OF ANY PARTIES.

1. Settlement amount is a Google Thank you to the people who brought the Buzz Privacy Issue before a local Court.

2. Privacy Issue is a much bigger issue than mere Buzz issue.

3. It does not involve only the holders of gmail. It involves every body who may not even be born yet

4. Google is paying these people who Bought this Buzz Litigation in the local court as it gives Google an opportunity to close the entire Privacy issue since the agreed to settlement will not Curb Google in any way

5. It is a pay off to the Privacy watch dogs to prevent them from intervening in the matter.

XI. SETTLEMENT AMOUNT IS ONE THOUSANDTH OF WHAT AN INTERNATIONAL JURY OF PEERS WOULD AWARD AFTER A TRIAL

1. Google wants to award a trial not because of the cost involved but because of the damaging evidence that would be presented to the Jury .

2. The evidence would involve not only the Hacking Activities of Foogle involving Privacy invasion but also Google Hacking Ability and the capital available to Google to accomplish its objectives.

3. The evidence would involve the tools Google now has to invade the privacy but can develop in the future to invade the Privacy.

4. Google wants to avoid a jury trial. But does not want to pay for avoiding the monetary damage a jury trial would cause. This damage would occur even if Google would win after the trial. But if it looses at the trial it would incur an additional loss of Billions of Dollars.

5. $8,000,000 (eight Million Dollars is totally arbitrary and without any regards to the facts of the case and too little even as a bribe to the party involved.

XII. AFFIDAVIT

I, Satish Chandar Bhardwaj, upon being duly sworn before a Notary Public in the City of New York, depose as follows:

i. I Live at 171 Lexington Ave, Apt. 403, New York, NY 10016

ii. My telephone number is 646-243-2625

iii. The Statements, made in this letter, are true as to facts known to me.

iv. I believe the statements, made in this letter, to be true if they contain any facts not known to me.

SC Bhardwaj

MY SIGNATURE

January 4, 2011

Steven E Hiller

SIGNATURE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

Dated January 4, 2011

New York City, NY

SEAL OF NOTARY PUBLIC

STEVEN E. HILLER
Notary Public, State of New York
No. 01HI4507658
Qualified in New York County
Commission Expires November 30, 2013