Exhibit "K-4"



SJD <sophisticatedjanedoe@yahoo.com> Reply-To: SJD <sophisticatedjanedoe@yahoo.com>

To: Delvan Neville



fightcopyrighttrolls.com

IP addresses (whatismyipaddress.com resolution):

99% Steele or one of his gang

- 94.75.220.253 (LeaseWeb B.V, Mullvad VPN, Netherlands)
- 94.75.220.77 (LeaseWeb B.V, Mullvad VPN, Sweden)
- 66.202.128.10 host10.connectregus.com (Regus Business Center, LLC, Miami Beach)
- 174.140.100.242 174-140-100-242-dhcp.mia.fl.atlanticbb.net (Atlantic Broadband, Miami Beach)
- 64.190.14.220 64-190-14-220.static.cypresscom.net (Cypress Communications, Chicago)
- 46.21.99.22 se2x.mullvad.net (GleSYS Internet Services AB, Mullvad VPN, Sweden)
- 204.195.150.212 204-195-150-212-dhcp.atlanticbb.net (Atlantic Broadband, Miami Beach)

Not clear - last (chronologically) post with questions

• 24.234.211.161 wsip-24-234-211-161.lv.lv.cox.net (Cox Las Vegas)

Case 6:12-cv-01493-CEH-KRS Document 37-15 Filed 06/03/13 Page 3 of 21 PageID 509 **Comments** (all I could locate, I could miss some) with direct links, in the reverse chronological order

Maybe Steele, not clear: a page was dedicated to this comment.

~Anon~

kellyjansen1989@hotmail.com 24.234.211.161 Submitted on 2012/11/21 at 5:41 pm

There is a lot of hyperbole, anger, and creative pictures out there regarding copyright litigation. Is there a few things we can agree on?

- 10 Points that should be automatically agreed to by everyone
- 1. Copyright infringement is against the law and covered by Title 17 of the US Code.
- 2. People that do actually commit copyright infringement (pirates) are wrong and according to our laws, liable.
- 3. Being named in a lawsuit does not mean that you are a pirate, just that your alleged to be one.
- 4. Pirates are not going to report themselves to the copyright holders on their own.
- 5. There is disagreement over whether the current laws are fair to pirates and alleged pirates.
- 6. Plainitff's attorneys are not expected to have all the evidence necessary to win their case the moment they file the complaint, including attorneys that represent copyright holders (trolls).
- 7. IP address are not people, nor does irrefutable proof exist via ones ISP that if an IP address is observed illegally downloading infringing material, that means the subscriber of the internet account with that IP address is liable.
- 8. No one likes to be involved as a defendant in copyright infringement cases.
- 9. It is possible for someone to be named in a copyright litigation case that did not personally download the copyrighted material.

Case 6:12-cv-01493-CEH-KRS Document 37-15 Filed 06/03/13 Page 4 of 21 PageID 510 10. #9 does not mean all cases involving copyrighted content should be disallowed. Otherwise, any type of case in which a defendant has ever won should never be allowed to be filed again, including ever criminal charge in history.

- 11. The legal system does not allow people to appear anonymously unless granted leave to do so first by the court.
- 12. Legally produced porn, and adult content owners, deserve the same constitutional rights that other companies receive, and should not be discriminated against because of what they produce.
- 13. There is a method for changing laws you don't agree with. Part of that process occurred earlier this month on the 6th.
- 14. If a defendant in a case states he didn't do whatever he is being accused of, the Plaintiff is not required to drop the case.
- 15. Pre-suit litigation is favored by every judicial branch in the US, including the United States Supreme Court who has been clearly articulating that central premise since 1898.

5 points that trolls think is accurate, that almost every attorney will agree with, but that pirates may not agree with:

- 1. Discovery in America is liberal, and all that is required to receive the requested information is for that information to reasonably lead to relevant information. In other words, even if the subscriber is not the pirate, if knowing who the subscriber is might reasonably lead to knowing who the pirate is, then the subscribers information is discoverable.
- 2. To date, piracy is hurting entire industries, and if everyone can get away with stealing content rather than paying for it with NO risk of getting caught, piracy will increase or at least continue to be very high.
- 3. Whether or not you agree with the laws, they are the laws. You do not get to pick and choose which laws to follow AND get to pick whether the consequences apply.
- 4. If content producers receive money from a pirate through litigation, or pending litigation, it is legally permissible. Granted, almost every pirate and pirate friendly site does not like that producers might make money from copyright litigation, but this dislike is based on subjective hate of porn producers and trolls, and not based on the law.

Case 6:12-cv-01493-CEH-KRS Document 37-15 Filed 06/03/13 Page 5 of 21 PageID 511 5. If the content being stolen was a non-profit film on caring for sick children, and any settlement money received went to the Red Cross, pirates would still be upset about having to pay anything if they were caught

Anonymous

46.21.99.22

Submitted on 2012/10/09 at 7:02 pm | In reply to that anonymous coward.

Your name says it all . . .

Anonymous

46.21.99.22

Submitted on 2012/10/09 at 6:59 pm | In reply to SJD.

The irony of one of your thieving pirates complaining of someone on the other side daring to post anonymously just made my day. Time to go raise a toast to the best day in 2 months!!!

Anonymous

46.21.99.22

Submitted on 2012/10/09 at 5:50 pm | In reply to anonimal.

Hey Brett M., you really are stupid enough to give us enough information to figure out who you in this blog? REAL smart!. I just called your house. Now that we know who you are, we will be filing in TN and naming you on Thursday. You have until then.

I will post the complaint on this site so you DTDtards can see I'm not bluffing.

Anonymous

46.21.99.22

Submitted on 2012/10/09 at 5:11 pm | In reply to Johnny Doe.

Robo calls are so 6 months ago.

We are suing the living ^%@\$* out of people. Consider this: What you are seeing now was put in place 2 months ago. You would wet yourself if you saw our crew of attys and pirate hunters now! You will find out soon enough. Oh, settlement is higher after your served BTW.

Anonymous

46.21.99.22

Submitted on 2012/10/09 at 4:57 pm | In reply to Johnny Doe.

Case 6:12-cv-01493-CEH-KRS Document 37-15 Filed 06/03/13 Page 6 of 21 PageID 512 Starting? We named 500 people in the last 2 months! And why are you guys complaining that Prenda is filing all over the country against individuals? I thought that is what you wanted! Be careful what you wish for. . .

I know for a fact that there is more recovery now than there ever was with the large cases. From the bottom of my heart, I want to thank this website for pushing Prenda into individual suits so hard! Oh, thats right, we are supposedly losing our cases. Looking at the settlement board, I keep forgetting.

Anonymous 46.21.99.22

Submitted on 2012/10/09 at 4:52 pm | In reply to Raul.

ALL OF IT. http://wefightpiracy.com/userfiles/Lessere%20Judgment.pdf

People get really good advice from this site, keep it up!

eff.org mitch@eff.org 64.190.14.220 Submitted on 2012/10/04 at 5:48 pm

I'll take my medicine when things don't go my way. I give credit to Erin Russell, although she was as surprised as I was the judge stayed the discovery. Don't worry, all the info was already back except for one ISP. Oh, BTW, you pirates will note there is a new pleading in the Guava case withdrawing the IP's of all of Erin's clients from discovery. I wonder why??? Hmmmm. Its a puzzle. Here is a clue. Check http://wefightpiracy.com/suits-against-individuals.php tomorrow at 5pm.

Again, congratulations Erin, I'm sure the rest of your clients will be as happy as Mitch Goldstein is in a couple of days.

Mr. Troll

 $hairy palms.com\ x\ imatoughguy @when myidentity is hidden.com \\174.140.100.242$

Submitted on 2012/05/25 at 5:23 pm

I beg to differ. The divorce practice was located in the Loop, which is not a low rent area.

The pirate hunter

dontcry.com x themastertroll@youknow.com 94.75.220.253

Case 6:12-cv-01493-CEH-KRS Document 37-15 Filed 06/03/13 Page 7 of 21 PageID 513 **Submitted on 2012/04/13 at 11:25 am**

And if you idiots think that the ISP's being ordered to give Prenda 6500 names in 60 days with no ability to play delaying games is good, you guys need to get some fresh air. I think this judge in this case already denied the standard MTQ filed by pirates.

The pirate hunter

dontcry.com x themastertroll@youknow.com 94.75.220.253 Submitted on 2012/04/13 at 11:22 am

You know what, that is a fair criticism. It is harder than it looks to have this much litigation going on and to name as many pirates as we want to. We know we have two years to name the pirate, so I would rather do it right than do it quick. But the ramp up has been slower than expected.

I only ask one thing: IF I come back here in a week or so and start posting case numbers in large numbers, I want you, DIETROLLDIE, to admit we are finally naming pirates in bulk. Quite frankly, its time for both me (and you anonymous cowards) to put up or shut up. I only pray that when we start naming people, we get some of the people on this site so they can learn that its a lot easier to talk tough when your hiding behind a screen name.

The pirate hunter

dontcry.com x themastertroll@youknow.com 94.75.220.253 Submitted on 2012/04/13 at 11:09 am

blah blah is right. Yuen just lost his ass. He tried to avoid the depo and the judge ordered his client to an 11 hour depo. Opps. Of course my favorite port was when Yuen said some stupid, and the judge said "Mr. Yuen, if you say one more word, I am going to sanction you".

Yep, your boy Yuen as a real ace!

Mr. Troll

youknowthesite x

johndoes@thatusegmailaddressesareidiots.com

94.75.220.77

Submitted on 2012/02/14 at 3:43 pm

Case 6:12-cv-01493-CEH-KRS Document 37-15 Filed 06/03/13 Page 8 of 21 PageID 514 HAPPY VALENTINES DAY TO THE PIRATE AT 71.122.51.152!!!

Yep, Florida is a horrible place to go after piracy. Uh oh! Except for the new 8 page single spaced, order just released today from Federal Judge Robert N. Scola (11-23036) that is probably the biggest smack down of a pirate I have seen since Judge Howell. I knew it was going to be nice when the the judge opened with:

"The Court finds that the Doe Defendant's argument lack merit. As such, the subpoena to Verizon will not be quashed, a protective order will not be entered, severance will not be granted, and this action will not be dismissed at this early stage."

Don't read the order if you are dreaming of using a MTQ in Florida. You will not be happy. I wonder if this order will ever be referenced in future FL cases . . .

I am sure the Doe associated with IP address 71.122.251.152 is really happy he listened to the brilliant legal minds on this and other sites. I know of one lawyer sitting in Miami who cannot wait to make his acquaintance. And since he already promised to sue each Doe who filed a MTQ, I think there will be a new lawsuit filed verrrrry soon.

The pirate hunter ihatethieves@gmail.com 94.75.220.77 Submitted on 2012/02/05 at 11:15 am

Its too painful to read some of this sad blog without responding to a few things.

- 1. The EFF's motion is for the judge to allow them to actually file an amicus brief. The issue for the judge now is whether the EFF has a unique perspective that allows them to bring facts and law to the attention of the court that the court would otherwise be ignorant of. Because if the purpose of the brief is to simply argue against one side, that would be improper. I know this site is not big on real caselaw, But this judge you people have never heard of, Judge Posner has an excellent opinion stating exactly that. An amicus brief is a "friend of the court" role, and thus if someone would like to oppose a motion for leave to file an amicus brief, they attack the objectivity and motives of the so called amicus. That is why Prenda cited some of the EFF's past to show what they are about.
- 2. the ARDC's website is http://www.iardc.org. They have investigated this type of litigation and I hear that Prenda has received over 10 complaints in the past 4 months. All have been simply dropped. People can file as many as they want. The

Case 6:12-cv-01493-CEH-KRS Document 37-15 Filed 06/03/13 Page 9 of 21 PageID 515 problem for Freetards is that since a sitting Federal judge says what Prenda is doing is AOK, then what exactly is the ARDC going to say? "Judge, your an idiot that doesn't understand the law". No, I think the ARDC, and the lawyers who compose it, probably will continue to defer to judges appointed by the President of the United States. Which brings me to my favorite;

- 3. When Freetards file their silly MTQ. and they keep getting rejected, its because your telling the judge, "Judge I know you looked at this case, and issued an order. But let me tell you (in a completely conclusory, non-legal argument) why you are a fool that made a mistake. Here is a news flash, the judges know from day one all about our cases, and have spoken amongst themselves about these cases in judicial conferences. They know when they sign a discovery order what it means.
- 4. One post, which makes fun of Steele for making fun of pirates (a bit ironic) must not be paying attention. I'm not aware of a case in the past three months that Prenda has lost (although I am not practicing in CA and have heard some there have been kicked). Bragging about filing a pleading, like dietrolldie filed recently is fine. But then you Freetards forget to update your site with the inconvenient truth that the hail mary you were all excited about was kicked out. dietrolldie's "torpedo" must have missed the proverbial boat. And I am sure this site got right on the fact that Judge Castillo threw out the EFF's last 100+ page opus. If I was a pirate, or hosting some sad site like this, I wouldn't want to write about Judge Castillo's complete destruction of every one of the EFF's arguments either.
- 5. Not everyone who posts here in favor of protecting copyrights, or who posts making fun of you Freetards is Steele. There is more than one attorney who makes good money off of fighting pirates. Some of us are feeling neglected. And one of my fellow pirate hunters is mad his photo isn't on your troll board! How can I have nailed more pirates than Steele and hardly every get mentioned!?
- 6. We pirate hunters love to read these blogs. Its not like we aren't coming up with new litigation every month. Some work, some don't. Sometimes we even get idea's from these posts. (for example, I think its time to rotate area codes we call from). Have a wonderful Superbowl Sunday, I will!

The pirate hunter ihatethieves@gmail.com 66.202.128.10 Submitted on 2011/12/02 at 8:28 am

What would you call a (or The) Super Troll who converted Mike into a Weretroll? I want a new cool nickname. Pirate Slayer is so 2010.

Case 6:12-cv-01493-CEH-KRS Document 37-15 Filed 06/03/13 Page 10 of 21 PageID 516 Mike is only the first, as I have been busy in 'retirement'.

The pirate hunter

ihatethieves@gmail.com 66.202.128.10

Submitted on 2011/12/02 at 8:20 am

Spin Spin Spin.

Almost every judge in America denies those stupid MTQ's.

Hmmm, state court seems nice . . .

The pirate hunter

ihatethieves@gmail.com 94.75.220.253

Submitted on 2011/11/23 at 10:32 am

U.S. District Court

District of Columbia

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered on 11/22/2011 at 5:48 PM EDT and filed on 11/22/2011

Case Name:

OPENMIND SOLUTIONS, INC. v. DOES 1-565

Case Number:

1:11-cv-01884-EGS

Filer:

Document Number:

4

Docket Text:

ORDER granting [3] Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Take Discovery Prior to Rule 26(f) Conference. Signed by Judge Emmet G. Sullivan on November 22, 2011. (lcegs6)

4 for 4 in DC. Yep, the end is in sight all right. Another 565 Does might disagree though.

Good news BTW, we started filing against individuals on Monday. I know, no one will believe me. But in a couple of days our new site will be up with PDF's of the complaints. I am just glad I can finally satisfy the Does who complained that Does

Case 6:12-cv-01493-CEH-KRS Document 37-15 Filed 06/03/13 Page 11 of 21 PageID 517 are not sued.

Oh, since I know talk is cheap (especially on this site), if any of the Does wish to be moved to the top of the list and get named right away, email me and I will try to accommodate you.

Happy Thanksgiving!

john steele wefightpiracy.com x jlsteele@wefightpiracy.com 66.202.128.10

Submitted on 2011/11/17 at 10:54 am

I like that. Its also very patriotic.

john steele

wefightpiracy.com x jlsteele@wefightpiracy.com 66.202.128.10 Submitted on 2011/11/16 at 3:37 pm

Another MTQ one:

California – 3:11-cv-03822-MEJ – Judge Maria-Elena James explains the joinder issue is silly.

To 'sophisticated janedoe' – It does cost more to settle after the MTQ is denied. My former clients always settle for a higher amount, due to the cost of litigation and so on.

As opposed to this site, I will be fair when it comes to making announcements about rulings. In fact, I will post any rulings that come out, whether they are in our favor or not. People can add up the win/loss column on their own.

I agree that the first trials will be a big test. Why do you think deeper pockets with a lot more attorneys are running the litigation now?

To 'anonymous' - Thank you.

john steele

wefightpiracy.com x jlsteele@wefightpiracy.com 66.202.128.10

Case 6:12-cv-01493-CEH-KRS Document 37-15 Filed 06/03/13 Page 12 of 21 PageID 518 **Submitted on 2011/11/16 at 12:51 pm**

OK. I will stop with the snarky comments. Let me just present what has come out this morning:

- 1. California 3:11-cv-02330 EDL. Judge Laporte just kicked out all the MTQs saying Does lack standing. The judge cited 9th Cir. App. decision to say you guys have no standing to even be in court, which was a first. That will be going in future pleadings for sure.
- 2. Illinois 4:11-cv-03035. Judge Hibbler just kicked out all the MTQs saying that the Does lacked standing.
- 3. Texas 4:11-cv-03035. Judge Miller just kicked out all the MTQs saying there is no standing.

I will be more than happy to provide pdfs of the orders to anyone who emails me. My point is that I believe this website is misleading people by citing one or two old rulings and seem to ignore the daily rulings that come out in our favor.

And since I'm retired now, I have the time to blog.

john steele

wefightpiracy.com x jlsteele@wefightpiracy.com 66.202.128.10

Submitted on 2011/11/11 at 4:58 pm

Happy hour! Time to go laugh at the pirates and have a beer (we prefer piraat ale).

BTW, you guys are still missing several states and several local counsels. Look harder.

john steele

wefightpiracy.com x jlsteele@wefightpiracy.com 66.202.128.10

Submitted on 2011/11/11 at 4:47 pm

You guys think that is something, I've got something coming your really going to like . . .

john steele

wefightpiracy.com x jlsteele@wefightpiracy.com 66.202.128.10

Case 6:12-cv-01493-CEH-KRS Document 37-15 Filed 06/03/13 Page 13 of 21 PageID 519 **Submitted on 2011/10/29 at 9:46 am | In reply to JohnnyBoy.**

Nothing I say here will change anyone's mind about anything. I'm just relaxing on a Saturday morning having fun with Pirates. From my perspective, it truly is entertaining to read these posts. Wanna be lawyers and people too cheap to pay \$20 a month for legal porn.

To the extent that I have another (also successful) law firm dealing with divorce, I guess I'll have to live with that. If I was just some stupid divorce lawyer who didn't know anything about IP, why would almost every case our firm files be allowed to continue? Judge Darrah said the other day that our pleadings are so well written, he directs his clerks to read them to understand complex IP litigation.

Everyone who accesses PACER knows that almost every motion filed against our cases lose. Not all, but most. That is simply a fact. calling me names and making fun of me for having another successful law firm does not change those facts. And only mentioning the rare motions that win is misleading. And those same bloggers forget to mention we almost always file a suit the next day against the Doe who got the case severed. Talk about pyrrhic victories.

Unlike many posts, I do not believe I have mislead anyone. We do not sue everyone, I admit that. We are trying the best we can. Playing russian roulette with our firm is a choice most people with any assets, or a job, would never do. Besides, when you get a letter from us, you know you (or your loser son living in the basement) did it.

Lastly, I love the person calling me asshole slayer. You are calling yourself an asshole. That is funny.

john steele

jlsteele@wefightpiracy.com

204.195.150.212

Submitted on 2011/10/29 at 7:42 am | In reply to Anonymous.

- 1. Don't be prejudiced and assume older women don't watch adult content.
- 2. I do have time to go on these blogs. I have plenty of employees that can handle things while I check out the blogs every so often. Its entertaining.
- 3. Of course we are not going to stop piracy. We can only fight the good fight and hope to be fairly compensated while we do so.

Case 6:12-cv-01493-CEH-KRS Document 37-15 Filed 06/03/13 Page 14 of 21 PageID 520

- 4. Most importantly, does everyone notice how the pirates/posters here never approach the question of guilt? Its always, "this isn't fair", "your a meanie", etc. Its like the car thief who claims the cop that caught him is mean to arrest him.
- 5. Keep up the good work of convincing people that they will not be harmed if they keep stealing porn. My clients appreciate it.
- 6. Sites like this skew what is happening in the courts and do a disservice to people looking for information. Its true that some judges have severed cases. In IL there have been 3 (Shadur, Manning, Conlon). But its also true that many more judges has denied any efforts by pirates to stop us and made it clear they think what my firm is doing is fine (Chief Judge Holderman, Castillo, Pallmeyer, Coleman, Grady, Lefkow, Kennelly, Bucklo, Denlow, Gettleman, Gottchall, Guzman, Kendall, Lindberg, St. Eve, Zagel, many others).
- 7. The really angry pirates on this site should come up with some more creative names for me. As shole and douche are boring.

john steele

jlsteele@wefightpiracy.com 204.195.150.212

Submitted on 2011/10/29 at 7:22 am | In reply to anon.

I apologize for not being clear. I was not trying to say getting a default judgment is hard. I was showing that our firm actually names Does and takes them to court. As more people get named and judgments are entered, the question of whether we actually go after individuals will answer itself. Of course people like Mr. Famula will probably be less than happy about following the advice of this site when the garnishment starts next month. Yes, Michael, we found out about your new job.

john steele

wefightpiracy.com x jlsteele@wefightpiracy.com 66.202.128.10

Submitted on 2011/10/28 at 6:01 pm

I find this site very interesting. I will keep my post brief, as apparently no one believes it is me anyway. To be more fair, you should make it clear that most judges do not grant these cookie cutter motions to dismiss/sever/quash. I can send you 50+ orders denying these motions and the people running this site know this. Its public record.

Case 6:12-cv-01493-CEH-KRS Document 37-15 Filed 06/03/13 Page 15 of 21 PageID 521 Also, there really was a case where all 28 IP's was one person. That one person settled the matter. I would have preferred 28 different does, since we had to pay 28 fees to the ISP, and only settled one person.

And lastly, we have named 10 people this week and got a judgment against Michael Famula from Judge Grady in NDIL. Michael was our first Doe to be named earlier this year. This is all public record. If your site is unable to pull up the court docket I will be more than happy to send copies straight off of PACER for you. In all fairness, it took a little time for our firm to ramp up our legal staff to sue so many people. I guess we will all see if I'm telling the truth or not.

John Steele
"The Pirate Slayer"













