



## **IVIEWIT HOLDINGS, INC.**

**Eliot I. Bernstein**  
**Founder**  
**Direct Dial: 561.364.4240**

**VIA – EMAIL**

Friday, January 09, 2004

Norman Zafman  
Partner  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030

**Re: Response to your Letter Dated December 10, 2003**

Dear Norm,

To clarify your letters numerous mistakes and mistruths is of utmost importance to the Company, as we now have to evaluate where exactly you are coming from. First, the tone of the letter was dictated by the tone of your previous correspondences whereby you somehow try and accuse us of lying to you and violating your trust.

First, it is apparent that despite what you think about Martyn and the Company's conversations, you are wrong; he did plan to file our response. Moreover, he did in fact make the filings contrary to your letters comments that he would not. Therefore, an apology is owed, as we did not misrepresent the conversations with Martyn as your letter tries to indicate.

Second, you did make all the decisions with Crossbow on which patents to file and then accepted a direct payment from Crossbow to execute such decisions, against the Board's and my own desires and repeated requests. Accepting this money from Crossbow was done without Company consent or knowledge. Then, after this fiasco, you commented that you had done it for my own good and subsequently after repeated requests from the Company stated you would not deal with Crossbow from that point forward, of which you have honored. Problem is, damage was already done.



Norman Zafman  
Partner  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
Friday, January 09, 2004  
Page 2 of 19

As to the assignments on the 939 patent amongst others, the assignment was found to be non-existent by the Company and then when you were confronted with the fact that we discovered no assignment, you sent one over, 2 years after you were retained to do so. Further, did you send assignment forms to all the inventors to get this corrected, not just me and did you seek to correct the inventors to what was repeatedly told to you as Eliot Bernstein, Zakirul Shirajee and Jude Rosario?. Again you failed to perform as this was never done and so the assignment you sent to Eliot Bernstein would have only covered 1/3 of the inventors, again leaving the Iviewit shareholders in a situation whereby their rights in the patents remain defective and shareholder fraud has occurred as all shareholders were assured that the assignments were being corrected and the inventors were all assigning their interests, without all the proper inventors their interests remain fraught with error.

As to investigating the allegations of fraud that you were engaged to do, you were fully apprised with the knowledge of what Iviewit had been alleging against attorney's Raymond Joao, Kenneth Rubenstein, William Dick, Douglas Boehm, Christopher Wheeler, Steven Becker, and Brian Utley (the then past President and COO of Iviewit). Iviewit and Crossbow initially wanted to investigate the status of the patents and we retained your firm and billed for services to have the patents investigated and analyzed on assignment problems, inventor problems, content problems, etc.

The reason for us retaining your firm was to address these issues and these issues surfaced as you know because we found two sets of patents in Brian Utley's possession, one the Company had never seen, which contained math errors and wrong inventors and the likes. Issues arose whereby Crossbow commissioned work from you for themselves of which they also were apprised of issues with the missing inventors and discovery by your firm of patents written directly into Brian Utley's name which were in diametric opposition to the terms of his employment agreement per your review and done by Foley & Lardner and Mr. Utley's friend Mr. William Dick. Once your firm found these patents that shareholders were unaware of, and had to have them assigned to Iviewit and then based on your evaluation those patents were abandoned,. At this point you were fully aware that Utley invented nothing and that he was being removed from ALL patents and again we find your failure to correct this may in fact pose serious problems risk of more shareholder fraud.

Further, upon Crossbow ceasing funding of the Company, partly due to what they claimed was the state of the patents your opinion letter uncovered, you were given clear orders by the Company to not accept any funds for future filing fees until they had paid the past due balance owed for the services they commissioned you to do. At the point



Norman Zafman  
Partner  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
Friday, January 09, 2004  
Page 3 of 19

that you knew we were at odds with Crossbow and that they were trying to bill the Company for the investigative work they hired you to perform, we had asked that you refrain from any future dealings and transactions directly with them and you usurped the decision and instead took the filing fees directly from them and filed what they requested.

You were aware when you met with us initially that we had discovered two sets of patent books in Brain Utley's possession and then further you were aware that inventors were missing, content was missing, titles had been changed and that this all exposed the Company's patents to problems that you undertook to correct. Further, after receiving the records from Foley & Lardner we found further evidence of fraud as the Company became aware of patents not assigned to the Company, that were not disclosed to the Company or investors, in Mr. Utley's sole name, aided and abetted by Foley & Lardner, that neither the Company nor its investors were aware of. With regards to the patents illegally applied for in Utley's name, you undertook the task of then attempting to assign the patents back to Iviewit using Mr. Utley's employment contract as a basis for reverting them back to the Company. With regards to the overlapping patents discovered whereby Utley tries to insert himself on prior patents, we commissioned you to remove Utley and put back the original inventors (Eliot Bernstein, Jude Rosario, Zakirul Shirajee and Jeffrey Friedstein), you then sent out letters to each of the original inventors to accomplish this, but it appears that you have failed to ever complete this. Once you were FULLY aware of the problems with the patents as you received them, you then recommended that they be corrected and assured us that you were undertaking the task of correcting them. Inventors would be corrected and you then sent the inventor signature pages to change the names to the correct inventors, or so we thought, and you further recommended that we fix the patents and prepared amendments. Also, upon your and Crossbow's actions, you made decisions to drop inventions and reduce overlap caused by the findings of your firm in analyzing Foley and Lardner's two sets of patents (one set without Utley and one set whereby Utley through Foley & Lardner replaces true and known inventors with himself). These decisions were, despite your whining, made by your firm and Crossbow without authorization of the Company, in direct violation of the Companies directives to you, without payment by the Company, and finally the payment was made directly from Crossbow to BSTZ, (Exhibit 2) which again seems so odd, that we further had to demand that you firm forever cease direct dialogue with Crossbow, in writing. Clearly from the Crossbow attorney letter you see that you performed work and accepted monies from our investor directly which posed a huge and damaging effect on the Company and our portfolio and was a severe conflict of interest on your part. The fact that after the fact you ceased to continue in this bizarre fashion after we had requested prior that you not accept their money directly or their work requests, does not



Norman Zafman  
Partner  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
Friday, January 09, 2004  
Page 4 of 19

alter what further has happened, nor does it indemnify you from problems arising from these decisions.

We have been working with your firm under the impression that you were fully cognizant of these matters and this amazing twist of your knowledge leaves one highly skeptical of what you have been doing and whom you have been working for. Moreover, receiving your patent portfolio we are very concerned about several issues that appear still incorrect and appear to have never been rectified. Inventors are still knowingly wrong, invention titles have not been corrected, matter is still missing and assignments have been left incorrect. To confirm these issues, outside patent counsel was hired and after a thorough review of the patents it was determined that (your work included) the state of the patents was a mess and that to correct just the active ones, it would take another \$250,000 to fix.

They found that the inventions as described (including your amendments) still failed to cover the inventions and that certain inventions had been abandoned and no one could make out how or if they could be fixed. Investor fraud is apparent in that the assignments are still incorrect. Original filing dates had been lost and hosts of other issues remained stemming from the prior malfeasances. Further, it was determined that due to the malfeasances and the errors throughout the patent process by patent counsels, after expending the resources to correct the patents, it would not be certain that the corrections would hold. Thus, a paradigm exists making it impossible to raise capital due to the fact that the assignments do not still appear to be correct and with wrong inventors still listed, even more exposure exists. Additionally, as you are well informed, Crossbow Ventures has claimed that they have assigned the patents first to themselves and then sold our Company to DiStream Interactive and yet although you think that the assignments are not legitimate, you fail to list the assignments on the portfolio you prepared and that we have been submitting to various authorities investigating the matters and to potential investors.

On numerous occasions, we have requested that you send the Company information regarding the cause and effect of the malfeasances. (Exhibit 1) Repeatedly, you have failed to respond and so with imminent due dates hinging on your response to the issues, we were forced to take actions to expose the malfeasances and get the answers directly from the patent offices worldwide and from our foreign correspondent. (Exhibit 3) Your current claim of not knowing anything is ludicrous if not professional misconduct and stands in the face of tremendous evidence that you have had full knowledge since the day the Company engaged you and your failure to report these malfeasances is in fact a complete violation of your Rules of Professional Conduct

Your request to remove yourself as counsel to the patent offices is also steeped in false information regarding the billing matters and your mired "trust" issue which despite your



Norman Zafman  
Partner  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
Friday, January 09, 2004  
Page 5 of 19

letters statement that an explanation would be forthcoming we have never received. In fact, your accusations regarding our contact with the foreign associate is baseless and an attempt to cover up that we demanded that the malfeasances be uncovered and exposed months ago by your firm. We questioned Norm, how you had failed to report any of this to the authorities after we had seen that it falls within your code of professional conduct to report knowledge of attorney misconduct to the Bar and the prp proper authorities and your failure to even respond to our requests is what forced us to action with hours before the filings were due. You have repeatedly counseled the Company that the wrong inventors most likely have left investors without full interest in the patents, which would constitute a complete fraud on our shareholders. What has impressed us is that when we asked Martyn to petition the foreign examiners to hold the cases based on the frauds and he agreed to do so after we sent him copies of the OED letter, whereas we asked you months earlier of to file for extensions based on the malfeasances and you failed to even respond to our requests, as is exhibited in the attachments.

Now that you became aware that the Company has taken corrective actions directly and petitioned the OED and foreign offices (the European Patent and Japanese Offices), your plea of ignorance is laughable, as we will now add you to the list of corrupted patent attorneys that have aided and abetted this fiasco on the Company, it's shareholders and the USPTO and Foreign Offices. We will be advising the patent office of the true intent behind your sudden withdrawal as counsel and the true reasons behind your actions.

Your letter stating that it appears that it is Iviewit's position to abandon applications is erroneous in that we have never stated that we wanted to abandon any applications, other than the at your suggestion, other than what you previously abandoned unilaterally and without Company consent with Crossbow Ventures. Your advice that they were overlapping and wasteful patents as you determined in investigating the patents sent to you by Foley & Lardner and for this again we feel that the money wasted on these patents to then be abandoned and corrected should have been reported to OED at the USPTO and the counterpart to OED in the foreign arena's. We have not suggested anything but our repeated request to get all applications both past and present reviewed for the errors and frauds you are aware of and therefore extensions in prosecuting the patents until the malfeasances can be dealt with. To further perpetrate wrong inventors and assignments and applications is to further perpetrate the frauds that already pose serious risk to their rights in the patents of all of Iviewit's shareholders. This is why Norm, we asked you months ago, if you had reported these malfeasances and that further it was ethically required that you report the actions of the attorney's involved to the respective authorities. We again asked you notify the respective offices and to find that you have



Norman Zafman  
Partner  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
Friday, January 09, 2004  
Page 6 of 19

not and are now trying to skirt the issues and shift focus with your claim of ignorance nonsense is utterly intolerable and will be duly noted to all authorities.



Norman Zafman  
Partner  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
Friday, January 09, 2004  
Page 7 of 19

## EXHIBIT 1 – Letter Requesting Information

**Eliot I Bernstein**

---

**From:** Eliot I Bernstein [viewit@bellsouth.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 01, 2003 11:05 PM  
**To:** 'Farzad\_Amini@bstz.com'; Mitchell Welsch (E-mail); Mitchell Welsch (E-mail 2); P. Stephen Lamont (E-mail); Simon L. Bernstein (E-mail); Simon L. Bernstein (E-mail); Jeffrey Friedstein (E-mail); Jeffrey Friedstein (E-mail 2); Michele M. Muironey (E-mail); Alan J. Epstein (E-mail); Norman Zafman (E-mail)  
**Co:** Tom\_Coester@bstz.com; Caroline Prochotska Rogers (E-mail)  
**Subject:** RE: foreign patent filing deadline in Europe (June 2, 2003 in Europe)  
**Importance:** High

Norman and Tom,

It came about that I basically sold one of my children tonight, lucky me to have found a buyer for \$500, ha ha. Yet, I did come across \$500 and would like to file if there is still time to file on the application that is said to have died on Friday. If so, I clearly need you to respond that this office action can and will be filed on Monday to continue the application in the European office. The \$500 will be sent as you demand however will satisfy you.

I would just like to be certain that before I send this money that would feed my remaining children whom will go hungry without it, of a few things and either way will need your statement to the following:

1. Without the money - that the patent is officially dead (as of what time and date) in the European community with no chance to appeal and/or pay a penalty to resurrect it. And that the patent rights are now lost forever for 20 years.
2. That there was no appeal process based on the frauds and malfeasances currently under investigation regarding this patent that you are aware of, caused by past patent counsel. Further, that the patent could not be delayed as under pending investigation status into these malfeasances uncovered.
3. I would like if the patent is unrecoverable in the foreign office an explanation in writing as to your understanding, as was told to you, regarding all the problems you were aware of with this and other filings and whether they be from the original Joao filings or the the follow-up Foley and Lardner filings all problems that I made you aware of at our first meetings and the problems you uncovered in your review.
4. I would like an explanation as to your understanding as to the ownership issues purported by Crossbow to your firm, as to whom owns the patents at this point, including any assignment issues.
5. I would like an accounting of all correspondences regarding Crossbow and any representations they have made to your firm.
6. I would like an estimate, if possible, of the potential damages caused by loss of these patent rights in foreign countries and any other damages that might result in the US filings.
7. I would like a statement from the firm as to the series of events uncovered by your firm, (i.e. Utley patents written into his own name and not assigned to the Company, missing inventions disclosures, missing inventors) that have led to the Companies needing to file amendments to the patents and recover stolen patents from Mr. Utley visa vi Foley and Lardner's work and the work you had to do to correct these errors. The costs to repair and amend the filings would also help.
8. A complete timeline as to the events leading up to all abandoned patents that were abandoned by your firm and the reasons such filings were abandoned and the costs. A timeline of the decisions regarding the countries to file in on the patents and whom made such decisions on behalf of the Company and/or Crossbow.
9. A complete recant leading up to the sending of patent disclosures to Mr. Wayne Smith, Esq. of Warner Bros. and P. Stephen Lamont with your amendments to such patent applications.
10. Why the patents needed to be amended in your opinion and what the deficiencies were at the time of your review, the review entailing both the provisionals and pending filings.
11. A statement as to why Iviewit hired your firm and the problems exposed at the



Norman Zafman  
Partner  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
Friday, January 09, 2004  
Page 8 of 19

time regarding prior patent counsel.

As you know, I will now have to report these losses to countless Iviewit shareholders and investors. I will need to explain why your firm was brought in and why corrective actions had to be taken to try and protect their interests. I will have to explain why the patents have so much air of concern that it virtually makes it impossible to raise the necessary capital to fix them. Also, I will be trying to explain the damages caused to them. Finally, I will have to try and explain why Crossbow Ventures has tried to call their assignment without following proper actions to secure the patents and how this may have caused the Company the inability to protect the patents which based on the correspondences you are party to, may not be even owned by the Company.

As you know billions are riding on this and I will need to explain such loss not only to my children but the many investors in Iviewit. I truly appreciate your firms help throughout these most troubling times and I am sorry to burden you with getting your statements as facts to the record, but the crimes committed against the Company are finding there way to Federal Authorities and I need a statement from your firm as to these events.

Thank you in advance for your time,  
Eliot

-----Original Message-----  
From: Farzad\_Amini@bstz.com [mailto:Farzad\_Amini@bstz.com]  
Sent: Sunday, June 01, 2003 2:14 PM  
To: iviewit@bellsouth.net  
Cc: Tom\_Coester@bstz.com  
Subject: RE: foreign patent filing deadline in Europe (June 2, 2003 in Europe)

Eliot,  
Yes, as I clearly stated in my previous email to you, there is a cost of about \$500 to make the request to effectively give us an opportunity to file a late response within another two months. However, I needed assurances of payment from you no later than Friday. I am not sure if we can still avoid abandonment of the application as it is now almost midnight Sunday in Europe.

Abandonment of the EPO application will probably preclude re-filing applications in other countries of Europe, since the PCT application has already been published.

-Farzad.

Farzad E. Amini  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 700  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026 U.S.A.  
www.bstz.com

telephone: 1 (310)207-3800 extension 752  
facsimile: 1 (310)820-5988  
email: farzad\_amin@bstz.com  
pgp: <http://pgpkeys.mit.edu:11371/pks/lookup?op=get&search=0x28R0168A>

\*\*\* The information herein is confidential and may be privileged. Access to this email by anyone besides the intended recipient is not authorized. If you are not the intended recipient, then disclosure, copying or use of the contents of this email is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify me immediately by a collect or by email and destroy the email you have received. \*\*\*





Norman Zafman  
Partner  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
Friday, January 09, 2004  
Page 9 of 19

"Eliot I  
Bernstein"  
<iviewit@bell  
south.net>  
mail)"  
Bernstein (E-mail)"  
05/31/03  
Welsch (E-mail)"  
02:22 AM  
mail 2)"  
Please  
respond to  
in Europe (June  
iviewit  
To: <Farzad\_Amini@bstz.com>  
cc: "Caroline Frochotska Rogers (E-mail)"  
<iviewit@cploggers.com>, "P. Stephen Lamont (E-  
<pstephen.lamont@verizon.net>, "Simon L.  
<sison@lifelnsuranceconcepts.com>, "Mitchell  
<mitchell.welsch@ubspw.com>, "Mitchell Welsch (E-  
<mwelsch@comcast.net>  
Subject: RE: foreign patent filing deadline  
2, 2003 in Europe)

I am a bit unclear on what happens here. To make the request do we have a cost obligation? What happens if we cannot afford to make a payment today, is that application dead in the foreign office and at what point exactly is it dead? We are trying to get the money together but we are in a precarious position at this point and it might be several more weeks until we are able to close on our deals.

If the patent is dead and there is no appeal process I need to assess the damages which will be attributed to others malfeasances and thus what countries does this lose our rights too? What period of time, 20 years, are the foreign patents good for? Does this hurt the application in the US?

Thanks,  
eb

-----Original Message-----

From: Farzad\_Amini@bstz.com [mailto:Farzad\_Amini@bstz.com]  
Sent: Thursday, May 29, 2003 4:06 PM  
To: iviewit@bellsouth.net  
Cc: Tom\_Coester@bstz.com; iviewit@cploggers.com  
Subject: RE: foreign patent filing deadline in Europe (June 2, 2003 in Europe)

Eliot,

According to our foreign associate, it is unlikely that the European Patent Office (EPO) will grant our request for a further extension of one month, to file the response.

However, if the request is made and no response is filed, then the EPO will likely issue a communication giving us two months within which to pay a further processing fee and file a complete response. Our total cost estimate for this "extension" option is \$500. If you wish to continue to try to obtain the European patent, please let us know and give us the payment no later than tomorrow because we need to instruct our foreign associate as soon as possible.

Regards,  
-Farzad.



Norman Zafman  
Partner  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
Friday, January 09, 2004  
Page 10 of 19

Farzad E. Amini  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 700  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026 U.S.A.  
www.batz.com

telephone: 1 (310)207-3800 extension 752  
facsimile: 1 (310)820-5988  
email: farzad\_aminibatz.com  
pgp: <http://pgpkeys.mit.edu:11371/pks/lookup?op=get&search=0x28E0168A>

\*\*\* The information herein is confidential and may be privileged. Access to this email by anyone besides the intended recipient is not authorized. If you are not the intended recipient, then disclosure, copying or use of the contents of this email is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify me immediately by a collect or by email and destroy the email you have received. \*\*\*

"Eliot I  
Bernstein"  
<iviewit@bell  
south.net>  
To: <Farzad\_Amini@batz.com>  
cc:  
Subject: RE: foreign patent  
Europe  
filing deadline in  
05/28/03  
10:35 AM  
Please  
respond to  
iviewit

Thank you again!  
eb

-----Original Message-----  
From: Farzad\_Amini@batz.com [mailto:Farzad\_Amini@batz.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, May 28, 2003 11:33 AM  
To: iviewit@bellsouth.net  
Cc: iviewit@progers.com; Tom\_Coester@batz.com  
Subject: RE: foreign patent filing deadline in Europe

I have requested our foreign associate to tell us whether additional extensions of time can be obtained in this case, and will let you know as soon as I hear from him.

Farzad E. Amini  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 700  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026 U.S.A.  
www.batz.com

telephone: 1 (310)207-3800 extension 752  
facsimile: 1 (310)820-5988  
email: farzad\_aminibatz.com  
pgp: <http://pgpkeys.mit.edu:11371/pks/lookup?op=get&search=0x28E0168A>



Norman Zafman  
 Partner  
 Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
 Friday, January 09, 2004  
 Page 11 of 19

\*\*\* The information herein is confidential and may be privileged. Access to this email by anyone besides the intended recipient is not authorized. If you are not the intended recipient, then disclosure, copying or use of the contents of this email is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify me immediately by a collect or by email and destroy the email you have received. \*\*\*

----- Forwarded by Farzad Amini/Batz on 05/28/03 08:31 AM -----

Tom Coester  
 Amini/batzsecure@BSTZ 05/27/03 08:23 AM  
 of Meltzer Lippe

To: Farzad  
 cc:  
 Subject: RE: Original Records Goldstein & Schlissel

----- Forwarded by Tom Coester/batzsecure on 05/27/03 08:17 AM -----

"Eliot I  
 Bernstein"  
 (E-mail)"  
 south.net"  
 "Caroline Prochotska  
 <iviewit@progers.com>, "Mitchell  
 05/25/03  
 <mitchell.welsch@ubspw.com>,"  
 03:12 AM  
 Please  
 respond to  
 of Meltzer Lippe  
 iviewit

To: <Tom\_Coester@batz.com>  
 cc: "P. Stephen Lamont  
 <pstephen.lamont@verizon.net>,"  
 Rogers (E-mail)"  
 Welsch (E-mail)"  
 "Simon L. Bernstein (E-mail)"  
 <simon@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com>  
 Subject: RE: Original Records Goldstein & Schlissel

Thanks - Tom I may be in need of another extension on these filings of 60 days due to some of the circumstances currently under investigation. Is there a way and what would be the process. I am trying to get information that will determine the course of action and it will take more time. We are in discussions with several people on getting the financing necessary to carry these through and that as well may take some more time.

Thanks

-----Original Message-----  
 From: Tom\_Coester@batz.com [mailto:Tom\_Coester@batz.com]  
 Sent: Saturday, May 24, 2003 6:15 AM



Norman Zafman  
Partner  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
Friday, January 09, 2004  
Page 12 of 19

To: iviewit@bellsouth.net  
Subject: RE: Original Records of Meltzer Lippe Goldstein & Schlissel

Eliot,  
There are no CD's in any of those files.  
Regards,  
Tom

"Eliot I  
Bernstein"  
<iviewit@bell  
south.net>  
of Meltzer Lippe Goldstein &  
Schlissel

To: <Tom\_Coester@bztz.com>  
cc:  
Subject: RE: Original Records  
Schlissel

05/24/03  
09:14 AM  
Please  
respond to  
iviewit

Thanks Tom!!! Did you have any CD's from Ray?

-----Original Message-----  
From: Tom\_Coester@bztz.com [mailto:Tom\_Coester@bztz.com]  
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2003 12:24 PM  
To: iviewit@bellsouth.net  
Cc: pstephen.lamont@verizon.net  
Subject: RE: Original Records of Meltzer Lippe Goldstein & Schlissel

Eliot,  
I have now reviewed the relevant files. The original correspondence from  
the USPTO e.g. filing receipts etc are present. As one would expect the  
correspondence sent to Iviewit and the correspondence sent to the PTO are  
copies. It is not possible to discern whether there are any omissions e.g.  
correspondence that was removed prior to transferring the file out.  
Regards,  
Tom

"Eliot I  
Bernstein"  
<iviewit@bell  
south.net>  
Rogers (E-mail)\*\*  
<pstephen.lamont@verizon.net>  
of Meltzer Lippe Goldstein &  
Schlissel

To: <Tom\_Coester@bztz.com>  
cc: \*\*Caroline Prochotska  
<iviewit@progers.com>,  
Subject: RE: Original Records  
Schlissel

05/21/03  
09:43 AM  
Please  
respond to  
iviewit



Norman Zafman  
Partner  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
Friday, January 09, 2004  
Page 13 of 19

Much obliged, sorry to have caused a problem, it appears from what I copied from you that you are not in receipt of all original Joao files but the confirmation will suit us well.  
Thanks  
eb

-----Original Message-----  
From: Tom Coester@bantz.com [mailto:Tom.Coester@bantz.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2003 12:14 PM  
To: iviewit@bellsouth.net  
Cc: Elliot I Bernstein; Caroline Prochotska Rogers (E-mail); pstephen.lamont@verizon.net  
Subject: RE: Original Records of Meltzer Lippe Goldstein & Schlissel

Elliot,  
I have ordered the files back from off site storage and will let you know it the contents appear to be originals.  
Regards,  
Tom

"Eliot I. Bernstein" To:  
<pstephen.lamont@verizon.net>, "Caroline Prochotska Rogers (E-mail)"  
<iviewit@worldnet.att.net>, "Thomas M. Coester (E-mail)"  
<tom\_coester@bantz.com>  
Sent by: "Eliot I Bernstein" cc:  
Records of Meltzer Lippe Goldstein & Schlissel  
<iviewit@bellsouth.net>  
05/21/03 04:27 AM  
Please respond to iviewit

Tom the real question was were all these documents the original documents of Meltzer Lippe and not copies. It has been claimed by Meltzer that they have transferred ALL their Original documents to Foley and Lardner and that Foley and Lardner then stated they transferred all the Meltzer Lippe ORIGINAL documents to your firm. Since this is the subject of a Bar of NY investigation into what has happened to the ORIGINAL documents of Raymond Joao we would appreciate if you could ascertain if you are in possession of the ORIGINAL documents and not copies. What we need to know is if you have the ORIGINALS or copies. We understand that you have copied us in the past but those look like copies of the copies because such pertinent data is missing on the copy. Raymond Joao stated that he called your offices and



Norman Zafman  
 Partner  
 Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
 Friday, January 09, 2004  
 Page 14 of 19

you would not release such documents to him to the bar of NY. Also are you in possession of any of his ORIGINAL notes and CD's and other forms of data (i.e. faxes, etc)?

Thanks,  
 Elliot

-----Original Message-----  
 From: P. Stephen Lamont [mailto:pstephen.lamont@verizon.net]  
 Sent: Friday, May 16, 2003 2:44 PM  
 To: Elliot I. Bernstein (E-mail); Caroline P. Rogers Esq. (E-mail)  
 Subject: FW: Original Records of Meltzer Lippe Goldstein & Schlissel

-----Original Message-----  
 From: Tom Coester@bstz.com [mailto:Tom\_Coester@bstz.com]  
 Sent: Friday, May 16, 2003 6:34 PM  
 To: pstephen.lamont@verizon.net  
 Subject: Re: Original Records of Meltzer Lippe Goldstein & Schlissel

Stephen,  
 We have files for 60/125,824, 09/522,721 and a corresponding PCT file these files have been retired and are in offsite storage. Even were the files present I would have no way to discern if all documents originally created by Meltzer are present. Moreover, for each of these cases, we have at least twice copied and sent all the documents in our possession to iViewit.  
 Regards,  
 Tom

<p>"P. Stephen Lamont"          &lt;pstephen.lamont@verizon.net&gt;          &lt;Tom_Coester@bstz.com&gt;          (E-mail)* &lt;iviewit@bellsouth.net&gt;,          (E-mail)* &lt;caroline@progers.com&gt;          05/14/03 01:18 PM          Records          of Meltzer Lippe Goldstein &amp;          Please respond to          pstephen.lamont</p>	<p>To:          cc: "Elliot I. Bernstein"          "Caroline P. Rogers Esq."          Subject: Original          Schlissel</p>
---	--

Tom,  
 Greetings again, and can you confirm or deny that you are in possession of ORIGINAL Meltzer records such as, but not limited to: filing documents, receipts, assignments, etc for provisional patent application no. 60/125,824, patent application no. 09,522,721, and the PCT filing thereto.  
 Best regards,  
 P. Stephen Lamont  
 Chief Executive Officer  
 iViewit Holdings, Inc.  
 10158 Stonehenge Circle  
 Boynton Beach, Fla. 33437



Norman Zafman  
Partner  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
Friday, January 09, 2004  
Page 15 of 19

Tel.: 914-217-0038  
Email: pstephen.lamont@verizon.net; 9142170038@mobile.att.net  
URL: www.iviewit.com

THIS MESSAGE AND ITS EMBEDDED AND/OR ATTACHED FILES INCORPORATED HEREIN BY REFERENCE CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PROPRIETARY AND CONFIDENTIAL, PRIVILEGED INFORMATION. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE PROHIBITED FROM READING, OPENING, PRINTING, COPYING, FORWARDING, OR SAVING THIS MAIL AND ITS EMBEDDED AND/OR ATTACHED FILES. PLEASE DELETE THE MESSAGE AND ITS EMBEDDED AND/OR ATTACHED FILES WITHOUT READING, OPENING, PRINTING, COPYING, FORWARDING, OR SAVING THEM, AND NOTIFY THE SENDER IMMEDIATELY AT 561.364.4240. IF YOU ARE THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE PROHIBITED FROM FORWARDING THEM OR OTHERWISE DISCLOSING THESE CONTENTS TO OTHERS, WITHOUT THE EXPRESS WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE SENDER.

=====  
Incoming mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.481 / Virus Database: 277 - Release Date: 5/13/2003

=====  
Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.481 / Virus Database: 277 - Release Date: 5/13/2003

=====  
Incoming mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.483 / Virus Database: 279 - Release Date: 5/19/2003

=====  
Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.483 / Virus Database: 279 - Release Date: 5/19/2003

=====  
Incoming mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.483 / Virus Database: 279 - Release Date: 5/19/2003

=====  
Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
9



Norman Zafman  
 Partner  
 Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
 Friday, January 09, 2004  
 Page 16 of 19

Exhibit 2 – Crossbow Letter

**Bazerman & Drangel, P.C.**

May 24, 2002

**Via FedEx**  
 Thomas M. Coester, Esq.  
 Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman  
 12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
 Seventh Floor  
 Los Angeles, CA 90026-1026

**RECEIVED**  
 MAY 28 2002

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP  
 LOS ANGELES

**NO DOCKETING REQUIRED**  
 L.A. Ops per TRC

Re: Alpine Venture Capital Partners LP investments in Iviewit Holdings, Inc.

Dear Mr. Coester:

I represent Alpine Venture Capital Partners LP. As you know your client, Iviewit Holdings, Inc., entered into a series of notes upon which it defaulted. Under the terms of the agreement the patent, patent applications, trademarks, trademark applications and copyrights, which were formally owned by Iviewit are now the property of Alpine Venture Capital Partners LP. In particular paragraphs 1(d) of the amended and restated parent security and of the subsidiary agreements include any invention or patent applications as acquired. This merely reiterates the rights granted in the original security agreements which covers any applications "hereafter acquired." Equally, your client is in default of its obligation to perfect the assignments and supply full information with regard to the applications to our client. Copies of the security documents accompany this letter.

This letter is to give your client an opportunity to cure its breach with regard to the assignment and to place your firm on notice that you are holding files which belong to our client and which should be immediately transferred to us on our client's behalf. Equally, this letter places your client and your firm on notice that any failure to maintain these assets as part of the transfer is not only a breach of the agreement but, in the present situation, may constitute a tort which gives rise to individual liability on all who participate in the intentional destruction of our client's property. I am sure it is in the best interest of all parties concerned to amicably settle this matter by having your client conform to the requirements of its agreement.

I also do note that you have accepted direct payment from our client in connection with the performance of services in connection with these applications. Accordingly, you have some obligations to Alpine arising out of this transaction, which you should consider in withholding necessary information with regard to Alpine's property.

---

Lincoln Building, 60 East 42nd Street, Suite 820, New York, NY 10165  
 Phone: (212) 292-5390 Fax: (212) 292-5391 E-mail: bdpc@ipcounselors.com





Norman Zafman  
Partner  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
Friday, January 09, 2004  
Page 17 of 19

### Exhibit 3 – Lamont Letter

**Eliot I Bernstein**

---

**From:** Eliot I. Bernstein [iviewit@adelphia.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 14, 2003 2:59 PM  
**To:** Norman Zafman (E-mail); Thomas M. Coester (E-mail); Farzad E. Amini (E-mail)  
**Subject:** FW: Updated IP Docket

**Importance:** High

-----Original Message-----

**From:** P. Stephen Lamont [mailto:pstephen.lamont@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 14, 2003 3:01 PM  
**To:** Norm\_Zafman@batz.com  
**Cc:** Tom\_Coester@batz.com; Farzad\_Amini@batz.com; iviewit@adelphia.net; Caroline P. Rogers Esq. (E-mail)  
**Subject:** Updated IP Docket  
**Importance:** High

Norm,

It has been some weeks since I first requested an updated IP docket. At this point, your lack of communication causes me grave concern; on behalf of the Company and our shareholders, I must file the Written Statement in answer to the international Office Actions through Martyn Molyneux by December 1. Please advise as to your delivery of the updated IP docket and your statement concerning the status of the patent portfolio at the time of your engagement (requested last week of August, and Farzad's indication of its eminent delivery to iViewit).

Best Regards,

P. Stephen Lamont  
Chief Executive Officer  
iViewit Holdings, Inc.  
10158 Stonehenge Circle  
Boynton Beach, Fla. 33437  
Tel: 914-217-0038  
Fax: 845-279-7710  
Email: pstephen.lamont@verizon.net; 9142170038@mobile.att.net  
URL: www.iviewit.com

THIS MESSAGE AND ITS EMBEDDED AND/OR ATTACHED FILES INCORPORATED HEREIN BY REFERENCE CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PROPRIETARY AND CONFIDENTIAL, PRIVILEGED INFORMATION. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE PROHIBITED FROM READING, OPENING, PRINTING, COPYING, FORWARDING, OR SAVING THIS MAIL AND ITS EMBEDDED AND/OR ATTACHED FILES. PLEASE DELETE THE MESSAGE AND ITS EMBEDDED AND/OR ATTACHED FILES WITHOUT READING, OPENING, PRINTING, COPYING, FORWARDING, OR SAVING THEM, AND NOTIFY THE SENDER IMMEDIATELY AT 561.364.4240. IF YOU ARE THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE PROHIBITED FROM FORWARDING THEM OR OTHERWISE DISCLOSING THESE CONTENTS TO OTHERS, WITHOUT THE EXPRESS WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE SENDER.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Farzad\_Amini@batz.com [mailto:Farzad\_Amini@batz.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 07, 2003 5:23 PM  
**To:** P. Stephen Lamont; iviewit@adelphia.net



Norman Zafman  
Partner  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
Friday, January 09, 2004  
Page 18 of 19

Cc: [iviewit@progers.com](mailto:iviewit@progers.com); [Norm\\_Zafman@batz.com](mailto:Norm_Zafman@batz.com); [Tom\\_Coester@batz.com](mailto:Tom_Coester@batz.com)  
Subject: substantive EPO actions; envelopes

Further to my earlier email to you today, attached are copies of the subject documents.

Farzad E. Amini  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 700  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026 U.S.A.  
[www.batz.com](http://www.batz.com)

telephone: 1 (310)207-3800 extension 752  
facsimile: 1 (310)820-5988  
email: [farzad\\_amin@batz.com](mailto:farzad_amin@batz.com)  
pgp: <http://pgpkeys.mit.edu:11371/pks/lookup?op=get&search=0x28E0168A>

\*\*\* The information herein is confidential and may be privileged. Access to this email by anyone besides the intended recipient is not authorized. If you are not the intended recipient, then disclosure, copying or use of the contents of this email is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify me immediately by a collect or by email and destroy the email you have received. \*\*\*

(See attached file: [substantive\\_action\\_P011EP.PDF](#)) (See attached file: [substantive\\_action\\_P010EP.PDF](#)) (See attached file: [envelope\\_2.PDF](#)) (See attached file: [envelope\\_1.PDF](#))



Norman Zafman  
Partner  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
Friday, January 09, 2004  
Page 19 of 19

As always, with best regards and thank you very much!

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "E.I. Bernstein", written in a cursive style.

Eliot I Bernstein  
Founder  
I View It Technologies, Inc.

and

X \_\_\_\_\_  
P. Stephen Lamont  
CEO  
I View It Technologies, Inc.