

EXHIBIT F

**CORRESPONDENCES WITH
HEARST AFTER MARCH 23, 2018
ARTICLE #2 LIBEL.**

**MY PRE-DEPOSITION FEB. 1, 2021
OFFER TO HEARST.**

**MY POST-DEPOSITION FEB. 22, 2021
OFFER TO HEARST.**

~~usa0270@fedex.com~~

From: James Larenaissance <sancorgoman@gmail.com>
 Sent: ~~Friday, April 17, 2018 1:22 PM~~
 To: usa0270@fedex.com
 Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: James Lawrence Potential Lawsuit

----- Forwarded message -----

From: James Larenaissance <sancorgoman@gmail.com>
 Date: Thu, Jun 14, 2018 at 6:26 AM
 Subject: James Lawrence Potential Lawsuit
 To: <lhorsley@hearst.com>

Thank you Lori Horsley - please see to it that this is in the hands of Eve Burton today. I have a meeting with my lawyer John R Williams of New Haven Ct. on Monday to which I will review the suit. Best to hear from Eve Burton before Monday 1pm. Please guarantee some kind of response so I do not waste energy. Once again - the following is a peace offering.

Thank you for hearing my complaint **Eve Burton.**

I will keep this as succinct as possible ...

yet the details amount to a novel, and a documentary is already in the works about my 2017 experiences with the American gender war along with a website dedicated to this case/experience.

The link to the site/campaign/documentary is

www.WestportJamesLawrenceNOTGuilty.com

This site will be made live **WITH ALL THE DETAILS all the players** and shared with various news sources and blogs if we are not able to come together to resolve the outrageous and very very very out-of-the ordinary mistreatment, slander, defamation, and libel I received by the Westport News.

So... here is a succinct timeline.

The Westport News did a hit job on me after I was arrested for an alleged 2nd Degree Breach of Peace on March 5th 2018 for walking up to girl in a car outside a market. The alleged incident happen November 5th 2017. The very biased and negligent Westport Police did an "investigation" and had me turn myself in 4 months later. Crazy. There are many theories as to why this low end arrest happened but these details are for the documentary and case against the Westport Police so I will stick to where you - Hearst Communications - come into play. Here is the first article from the Westport News - it is fair - hence "allegedly".

<https://www.westport-news.com/news/article/Westport-man-allegedly-followed-woman-around-12741834.php>

What proceeds after this false arrest is something the entire country will hear about for I am an obvious victim of being tried and convicted via biased media and conflated with the MeToo or Nasty Woman or Times Up movements before I received Due Process. YES - false arrest because FACT - after my first court appearance the District Attorney wanted me to plea to an "Infraction" and not 2nd Degree Breach of Peace misdemeanor. But FACT- I did not break any law as my lawyer has repeatedly said to me and so we are fighting this \$100 infraction til the end of time. FACT - As of now after the first court appearance I am facing a \$100 fine for approaching a girl in a car at a supermarket parking lot. FACT- There are no cams, there is no witnesses, and to

date the alleged victim of me "walking up to her" is not giving her name along with the **FACT - I did not break any law**. The entire fiasco was blown out of proportion and if this now \$100 fine/alleged "Infraction" goes to trial my lawyer assures me of a successful outcome. The most likely scenario is that this insanely biased case against me will be dismissed in the coming court date for they do not want to spend the money to go to trial against an innocent man over a \$100. All in all, I look forward to taking everything I painfully experienced to every court possible and every public forum possible.

So given the severity of the alleged "crime" of walking up to a girl at a market this following link is how I am being reported on by you all - Hearst Communications - the second Westport News article every day of every week of every month of every year. The damages done to me are growing every day. I ask you - Is this insanity deserving given the **FACT - that I did not break any law aka not guilty aka a victim of biased coverage. Do you do such hit jobs on all alleged "infractions" soon to be vindicated?** This you would expect from the likes of politically driven blogs as opposed to responsible and fair news sources.

<https://www.westport-news.com/news/article/Police-Westport-man-harassed-women-for-years-12774215.php>

"Haunted women for years".....???

FACT - I lived in San Fran from 2005 - 2015. I have been in Westport since Jan 2016.

2017 is when the storm of going after men erupted and I have 3 complaints ...

Coincidence - MeToo and Nasty Woman avalanche ...

and I get screwed for "walking up to a car" and "handing out my business card".....???

What kind of insanity is this.!!!

How in the hell do you print "haunted for years" when I was never even living here.

You have to go back to 2003 ... to use the plural... years...

"haunted" not living here 3000 miles away from 2005-2016

12 years.... just complete insanity.

FACT - I did not break any law and have never been arrested in my 52 years in Connecticut. The only time I was convicted of a crime was in California in 1995!!! - 23 YEARS AGO.

The hit job states:

"they (women) felt afraid to pursue charges against him for fear of retaliation according to court documents"...

This is total bullshit. Complete jingo of the MeToo times.

FACT - if I committed a crime I would have been arrested and women were never afraid to come forward (the obvious jingo of the MeToo movement). Jesus Christ - how could you allow a young girl reporter to do this to my life?!!! I have every police report. The facts are before me - 7 run-ins with various people/women since 2000 not 10 including my cousin and mother. All happened in Westport (a very different place in comparison to the numerous cities I lived in around the world) while I have lived all over the world never with any such run-ins. Crazy America.

FACT - I never broke a law and was never arrested.

FACT - I never asked out this Wendy Chambers for she is married. Her entire story is full of lies. I remember every detail of how I met her a year before and it was within a market and we talked for 15 minutes. But the Westport News never got any perspective from me. They took a complaint from some random woman who never went to the police or anyone ... and ran with it without getting my story of how I met her ran with the story without any proper investigation of Wendy Chambers.

Can you even tell me what I did at a public place that was no different than anyone else. ?

The entire article is easily criticized/destroyed. Learned women come up to me and can't believe the malicious bias I received at the hands of The Westport News.

A quick note on this woman Wendy Chambers your paper gave so much credibility - I met her a year ago in a market and she made no complaint to me nor the market nor the police or anyone. We actually had a civil conversation for 15 minutes. What she did was read the arrest in the news 8 months later and took it upon herself to be some kind of martyr for the MeToo Nasty Woman movement and play some kind of victim. **CRAZY** - read the article - "I gave her my card" ... this is an every day occurrence and this is some kind of news with you guys?!!!! In addition, there is ample evidence this vindictive woman Wendy Chambers was offended by my writing - I have political websites that are now taken down until my case is resolved - and she took the opportunity to foment more coverage of me. She should have been vetted by the Westport News. But they were sloppy to say the least.

FACT - I meet many women within a year and give my card to hundreds of people.

How in the hell is this news?

And how in the hell is this news worthy of destroying someone's life with such a nasty article before I received Due Process? I look forward to proving this gross negligence because it is time the country report upon how men's lives are being ruined by biased, opportunist, sensationalist, and negligent media.

I do not think any jury will every defend your right to slander/defame/libel someone to the degree the Westport News did to me before I received Due Process. Especially since I was never ever arrested in Connecticut as the article says.

The Westport News listed complaints that never amounted to an arrest. These complaints are a dime a dozen amongst various people over the years - like my 52 year history. The Westport News writes of charges that never amounted to a conviction. They associate me with "stalking". There is no mentioning of the FACT that these previous charges like "stalking" my girlfriend of 3 years in 1995 did not result in a conviction. Most readers do not know the difference between charges and convictions. And using the word "harassment" which I was never charged with for this "harassment" is a actual charge/crime in Ct., is another improper term deployed by Sophie Vaughan given what I was arrested for and once again found not guilty. The entire amateurish article from little Sophie Vaughan reeks of wannabe breaking the lid off some kind of MeToo incident that never has happened in my entire life!.

All is so easy to prove. And I am confident the atmosphere is ripe for some kind of story/case that defends men from extreme reporting that destroys their lives. The question is - do you all want to be the target of this obviously pressing subject within the crazy America.

I am appealing to your sense of fair reporting because this article effects my life every day and proceeding with a lawsuit can take a couple years. I am fully ready to file a lawsuit with my lawyer John R Williams of New Haven Ct. next week, but I would prefer to appeal to your sense of reason and fair play. We both can win here if you take in all the facts and empathize with the damages done to my life because I merely "walked up to a car"/"handed my business card to someone". The Westport News did an unfair hit job on me before I received Due Process. The numerous ways they were out of line are obvious.

1: since when do you report upon someone in such a nasty way when this someone has not been arrested since 1995. Meaning there is no recidivism nor criminal history.

2: since when do you do a special article on someone before they receive Due Process. Once again as of now - "infraction" of \$100 fine which will be contested all the way to the Supreme Court if necessary. It appears the D.A. does not want to spend the money on a trial for a \$100 dollars because I broke no law.

3: there are arrests for all kinds of crimes where the person arrested is not publicly humiliated with past complaints that resulted in no arrests or past charges that led to no convictions AKA NOT GUILTY. **You will need to do your homework and see my history - I was arrested once in 1995 in California and since then have not been arrested nor broken any laws like this crazy accusation I fight now within the crazy American zeitgeist where it is open season to attack men ... where I merely approached a car and had no words with someone at a market.**

4: it is obvious this "reporter" responsible for this hit job - Sophie Vaughan - only 6 months out of college and obviously part of the feminist movements (she writes for Huff Post) is not qualified to be doing her work. The media has been out of line - trying and prosecuting men via the media before they receive Due Process when allegations/complaints arise, for this unfair treatment is even so with the more serious cases/complaints aside from "walking up to a friggin car at a market". Lunacy.

5: since when do you take some random woman's opinion and go with such a life changing hit job. You need to know the facts about this crazy woman Wendy Chambers who fomented the second Westport News article.

*** Wendy Chambers (the woman in the article) attempted to foment something with News 12 Connecticut. YES... you see ...News 12 Connecticut visited me after my arraignment at my house, proceeded with a slanderous news story saying I was arrested for "stalking" amongst 4 other lies and after a call from my lawyer the next day News 12 Connecticut took down all their coverage of me. A google search of their**

coverage results in a page that reads "OUR APOLOGIES". They are so afraid of a lawsuit that they seemingly pressured Google to get rid of the evidence for you cannot find it on-line now. I am a ghost to them now. You cannot even get the story on their website and yes they are getting sued. I have all the videos and written material copied and will gladly share this with you if need be because it is this outrageous News 12 Connecticut slander/defamation/libel that caused the second slanderous Westport News article. This vindictive woman Wendy Chambers who fomented the News 12 Connecticut hit job, seeing that News 12 Connecticut pulled their coverage from the internet, then actually went to the Westport News and Sophie Vaughan the negligent reporter. Yes this crazy woman Wendy Chambers kept pushing her story of me "giving her my business card" (LOL) even after News 12 took down their slanderous coverage. Why would you Hearst Communications and Westport News want to be associated with this very questionable woman??? None of my side was reported upon. NONE of my side was reported on even the facts listed in the police report about my attempt to ask the paranoid woman a question about what I found next to our cars. No facts as to why I approached the car. COMPLETE BIAS. Read the police report.

A quick note on this woman Wendy Chambers your paper gave so much credibility - I met her a year ago in a market and she made no complaint to me nor the market nor the police or anyone. We actually had a civil conversation for 15 minutes. What she did was read the arrest in the news 8 months later and took it upon herself to be some kind of martyr for the MeToo Nasty Woman movement and play some kind of victim. CRAZY - read the article - "I gave her my card" ... this is an every day occurrence and this is some kind of news with you guys?!!!! In addition, there is ample evidence this vindictive woman Wendy Chambers was offended by my writing - I have political websites that are now taken down until my case is resolved - and she took the opportunity to foment more coverage of me. She should have been vetted by the Westport News. But they were sloppy to say the least.

I respectfully ask you to meet me asap to resolve this.

I would like this second article taken down much like how News 12 Connecticut took their slander/defamation/libel down off line because this type of coverage is not fair given the fact I broke no law nor broke any laws in the past!!! It is not fair to be conflated with the sex harassment cases and have my entire life destroyed because I walked up to a car. I am appealing to your sense of fair reporting. It is obvious this very very young and inexperienced "reporter" Sophie Vaughan fresh out of college was not acting professionally and showed bias that will be easy to prove in court. The damages are numerous:

Damages:

Ramifications of the Slander and Defamation:

- 1: having my social media profile/name spoiled by the false news.
- 2: having local merchants and stores that I regularly frequent see/read this false news.
- 3: having my gym/YMCA staff see/read this false news.
- 4: having my girlfriend see/read this false news.
- 5: having my mother and father read this false news while they are in Florida for the winter.
- 6: having the friends of my mother and father read this false news as well as the merchants they frequent here in Westport (my family own a house and stay in Westport 6 months of the year).
- 7: having my employer see./read this false information.
- 8: having potential employers in the future seeing/reading this false information.
- 9: having my potential dates see/red this false information.
- 10: having my landlord see/read this false news.
- 11: having the students of my girlfriend (she is a teacher in Norwalk) see/read this false news.
- 12: having the family of my girlfriend/future girlfriends see/read this false information.
- 13: costs to my physical health.
- 14: mental abuse and trauma and cost to my health.
- 15: Facebook blog of Fairfield County Moms .
- 16: having to consider moving out of the country.
- 17: my reputation as a writer

18: my plans to run for office ...

19: social media profile destroyed

20: having to change my name on facebook, email, etc..

21: having to change my phone number ...

etc...

A lawyer will show this and a whole lot more.

I mean really --- "walking up to car"/"giving my business card" and now about to have my case completely thrown out deserve all this pile of shit the Westport News did to me before I received Due Process!?!?

Of course not.

REPORT ON THE FACTS.

How in the hell has this crazy culture devolved into a place where a man gets his life ruined for approaching a woman in a public place amongst numerous people. There was not even any words spoken!!!

You really need to get to know this "reporter" Sophie Vaughan because she will be your defense in court. A nearly pubescent 22 year old writing about a 50 year olds life. Something really stinks and her language reeks of the MeToo movement when **FACT - my case has nothing to do with METOO whatsoever**. This girl reporter Sophie Vaughan is negligent and should be fired.

I WILL NOT REST UNTIL JUSTICE IS SERVED.

I look forward to a prompt response for if I do not have some kind of meeting lined up next week to resolve this fiasco I will sue Hearst Communications next week. I will also empower the production company handling my documentary to proceed. Every step of this hideous experience will be documented. I will also launch the website dedicated to this experience and the calling out of corrupt media who unnecessarily destroy a man's life in today's very raw time - a raw gender warring time now becoming very ripe for what I have planned if this slander does not go away fast. We can both win with a proper meeting that brings in all facts so you can now make a prudent decision.

thank you

James Lawrence

telephone

2032461295

email

sancorgoman@gmail.com

HEARST

**Office of
General Counsel**

Eve Burton
**Senior Vice President
Chief Legal Officer**

Catherine A. Bostron
Corporate Secretary

Jonathan R. Donnellan
Mark C. Redman
**Vice President
Deputy General Counsel**

Kristina E. Findikyan
Kenan J. Packman
Maureen Walsh Sheehan
Ravi V. Sitwala
Jack Spizz
Associate General Counsel

Debra S. Weaver
Senior Counsel

Sultan Barazi
Liddy Barrow*
Jennifer D. Bishop
Lisa Bozman
Andrea Chui
Adam Colón
Travis P. Davis
Ignacio Diaz*
Carolene S. Eaddy
Carl G. Guida
Audra B. Hart
Diego Ibarguen
Monika Jedrzejowska
Siu Y. Lin
Miyuki Matsumoto
Kate Mayer
Marianne Chow Newman
Aimee Nisbet*
Shira R. Saiger
Eva M. Sacketkoo
Evan Saucier
Jennifer Schanes
Aryn Sobo
Jennifer G. Tancredi
Federica Tigani*
Kitty Yang*
Stephen H. Yuhan
Counsel

June 15, 2018

**Stephen H. Yuhan
Counsel**

VIA EMAIL

James Lawrence
sancorgoman@gmail.com

Re: Your June 14, 2018 Email to Lori Horsley

Dear Mr. Lawrence:

This office represents the Westport News (the “News”), a Hearst newspaper. Your above-referenced email to Lori Horsley has been referred to me for response. In your email, you appear to request that the News remove from its website a March 23, 2018 article titled *Police: Westport man harassed women for years* (the “Article”), and threaten to sue the News for defamation if the Article is not removed. Respectfully, we disagree with the assertions in your email and decline your request to remove the Article, as the Article is protected under the First Amendment and Connecticut law as substantially true and as a fair and accurate report of an official proceeding.

At the outset, as you concede, Westport Police arrested you on a charge of breach of the peace arising out of an incident that occurred on November 5, 2017 – as you put it, “for walking up to a girl in a car.” That arrest was pursuant to a sworn affidavit filed in court by Westport Police Officer James Sullivan. In that affidavit, Officer Sullivan stated that in the course of his investigation, he “learned that there were 10 case incidents logged from 2002 till present.” (¶ 11.) As set forth in the affidavit, “[i]n all of these complaints Lawrence was seen following the complainants around a store or coffee shop and following them out to their cars where he would either stare at them or get right into their personal space.” (*Id.*) The affidavit goes on to recount your arrest history in Florida and California: “In Florida he had charges of Resisting Arrest and Fleeing/Eluding Police. In California he was charged with Petty Theft, Theft of Personal Property, Stalking, Inflicting Corporal Injury to Spouse and Battery of Spouse.” (¶ 12.)

Accordingly, the gist of the Article – that Westport Police had received a number of complaints over the years where women felt harassed by you – is


300 West 57th Street
New York, NY 10019
T 212.649.2021
F 646.280.2021
syuhan@hearst.com

* Not admitted or
resident in New York

substantially true and is protected under Connecticut law by the fair report privilege. *See, e.g., Gianetti v. Connecticut Newspapers Publ'g Co.*, 136 Conn. App. 67 (2012).

The News takes legal threats seriously. In the event it is forced to defend itself against your baseless claims, the News will fully pursue any and all remedies available to it. Among other things, under Connecticut's newly enacted Act Concerning Strategic Litigation Against Public Participation, P.A. No. 17-71, the News will seek full recovery of any fees and costs it is forced to incur in its defense.

Yours truly,



Stephen H. Yuhan

usa0270@fedex.com

From: James Larenaissance <sancorgoman@gmail.com>
Sent: [REDACTED]
To: usa0270@fedex.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Westport News

----- Forwarded message -----

From: James Larenaissance <sancorgoman@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Jun 15, 2018 at 7:01 PM
Subject: Re: Westport News
To: Yuhan, Stephen <SYuhan@hearst.com>

SEE YOU IN COURT.

YOU OBVIOUSLY FAIL TO SEE THE CONNOTATIONS OF SUCH AN OUT OF THE ORDINARY HIT JOB.

PLENTY OF NEWS ORGANIZATIONS COULD CHOOSE TO DO THE SAME.

THEY DID NOT.

IN FACT ONE IS IN RETREAT MODE FOR THE SAME TYPE OF COVERAGE.

HIDE BEHIND THE FIRST AMENDMENT WITH NO MORAL JUDGEMENT ALL YOU WANT.

YOU CAN RECITE OLD STATUTES ..

BUT IT IS A NEW WORLD EVERYDAY AND WE ARE IN A NEW TYPE OF TIME AND AN INNOCENT MAN HAVING HIS LIFE DESTROYED FOR NOT BREAKING THE LAW WILL BE PUT BEFORE A JURY.

REAL PEOPLE WILL DECIDE AND NOT SENSATIONALIST MONEY GRUBBING BEASTS LIKE HEARST ... you did invent yellow journalism after all.

lol

SEE YOU IN COURT.

I fear nothing about you cowardly cucks.

Not one thing.

I look forward to making this national news and look forward to sharing every detail in a documentary and with every allied news organization around the globe.

JAMES LAWRENCE

On Fri, Jun 15, 2018 at 5:38 PM, Yuhan, Stephen <SYuhan@hearst.com> wrote:

Please see the attached.

Best,

Stephen H. Yuhan
Counsel

HEARST

Office of General Counsel
300 West 57th Street, 40th Floor
New York, NY 10019-3792
212.649.2021 (tel)
646.280.2021 (fax)
syuhan@hearst.com

EXHIBIT F cont.

MY FEBRUARY 1, 2021

MIDDLE COURSE IN BETWEEN OFFER

HEARST TURNED IT DOWN



James Larenaissance <sancorgoman@gmail.com>

Prior to 11:00 A.M. conversation Feb. 1, 2021 with Stephen Yuhan

James Larenaissance <sancorgoman@gmail.com>

Mon, Feb 1, 2021 at 8:04 AM

To: "Yuhan, Stephen" <SYuhan@hearst.com>

To Stephen Yuhan and Hearst Legal and Hearst Communications:

The following letter to you will be submitted as an Exhibit to Judge Shea if I am to file the next documents to argue against the Motion to Dismiss/Summary Judgement.

As you all cannot deny now you certainly know more of me than when I reached out to you in April of 2018 to remove Article #2 contested in James Lawrence v. Hearst. I stand by the facts that this Article #2 and Article #3 are unfair and yes libelous articles that are forever unproven and unprovable worthy of a jury of our peers.

You now have the additional knowledge:

- The fact that I was not criminally convicted of the false arrest.
- The facts of my Criminal Background Check that were presented by your novice reporter without distinguishing any actual conviction.
- Numerous Documents filed showing the numerous grey areas of this case that a 3-4 broken paragraph article never showed.
- Perspective from Judges that past Incident Reports devoid of arrest are not admissible to prove any past harassment.
- Beginning knowledge of misconduct by other antagonists.

Keep in mind this is more information than Altice USA ever had and they still removed their coverage after 1 day. Your coverage is living for 3 years and counting.

I am 3 years into this utter nightmare. If I was to get screwed at Summary Judgement I would be facing another year of Appeal and even longer for I have a Writ of Certiorari lined up for the U.S. Supreme Court in my case against Altice. I would be pursuing the same course with you Hearst if need be and that keeps me in this legal fight for over 4 years. **And over what?** I caused no harms or damages whatsoever in relation to the accusations in your articles. The alleged past "cases"/past calls of concern reported on (within this small town of Westport and only Westport) resulting in no police action after thorough investigations are decades old to which Judges will not even entertain as evidence. This Warrant like any Warrant (if ascertained for most of the time the Official Police Press Release is the source) demands respect for Presumption of Innocence, Due Process of Law, past Due Processes of Law, and should attempt to include the kind of material I have submitted in this lawsuit for which a simple interview with either me or even the police could have provided - more socially scientific perspectives.

I am 55 and would like to live out my life EMPLOYABLE without being profiled and thus having to change my name and spend additional years locked in this legal world of the unscientific issues of "substantial truth" to which 99% of the public know nothing about. I would be the first to give you all the green light to report on me with any kind of past conviction let alone arrest. But these do not exist and I come to you now with even more details so you can make fair decisions. If a trial were to commence, you would be forced to find actual Westport women from distant pasts for I lived in San Francisco from 2007-2017. Women who themselves never claimed harassment in any Incident Report.

Should a man never convicted of anything harassing with ample opportunity to do so be reported upon for harassing women in the distant past? No. And I believe a proper court would agree. There is no doubt that logic dictates that all involved can have their own type of guilt - media, police, myself. But I am the only one going through the system. Any persistence to believe this harassment described by only your reporter (not police nor any woman for your only witness herself - Wendy Chambers - never used this term) devoid of proper evidence is not fair. I am not a person who is fodder for ratings that could tempt Hearst to flirt with playing with legal loopholes within the system. Am I that interesting? Have I been known in ways before?

I hereby offer to Remove this case free of any Compensation if the contested Article #2 and Article #3 are permanently removed before Feb. 17, 2021 from your websites so it does not show up on Internet search. A decision within this week would be expected.

I find in this often too black and white legal world that there is no seeking a **middle course in between**. It seems ¹³ as if I am either some "substantial" game to be portrayed as a "harasser of women" or you are guilty of extreme treatment aka libel and need to pay me some large amount of money. I really do not care about the money now. I care about my health and quality of life and your articles have me now forever profiled of unproven and unprovable material in this age of Internet search. Courts are infamously behind the times with proper precedents and perspective on a host of issues. For example, New York Times v. Sullivan was in 1964 while Xerox came onto the market around the same time in 1960 and saturated offices and libraries in the 1970s. Today everyone not only has a Xerox machine on their phone, but are also able to publish in nanoseconds themselves. I think you would agree as others have agreed that distancing yourself from such type of unprovable reporting is a middle course in between.

I believe that the type of articles claiming "harassment" demand actual names and actual descriptions of the type of harassment from actual women - women actually saying that I "harassed" them - typical MeToo reporting (let alone any prior arrest) let alone police deploying this term. A subjective interpretation of the Arrest Warrant is not proper evidence especially when the officer never deployed the harassment language. You all have had 3 years of depicting me in these unproven and unprovable ways and I ask that you cease now and let any future hard cold truthful evidence dictate the need for such type of articles. **Once again, my offer is IF you remove these contested articles I will withdraw my lawsuit and seek no compensation.** I am tired of elaborating common sense and having to digest more potential mental abuse from the system. I did nothing wrong and **I deserve exactly what Altice did with their "unfair" and "outright false" reporting - removal of controversial unprovable material.** I do believe I deserve a trial especially with my new Exhibits (Exhibits never submitted in my Altice case) with you all to iron out all the hype with proper details but I first will offer you this settlement as a means to achieve what is chiefly important to me. With this settlement we both win free of future hassles.

Feel free to contact me asap to hammer out any legal documents asap that can be formulated to settle this dispute.

If I do not hear from you I will press on with my case filing on Feb. 17 as ordered by the court, yet still trying to understand why Hearst even persistently cares about me while I have caused no harms or damages and am never convicted of anything. I appeal to rational thinkers with an empathetic understanding of the Internet search zeitgeist. **I truly believe this is fair for all involved without engaging in future expenditures given the challenges we all have in this unique time. I am asking that my reasonableness is reciprocated with equal reasonableness.**

James Lawrence

Sancorgoman@gmail.com

203 233-4335

January 31, 2021



James Larenaissance <sancorgoman@gmail.com>

Prior to 11:00 A.M. conversaaion Feb. 1. 2021 with Stephen Yuhan

Yuhan, Stephen <SYuhan@hearst.com>

Thu, Feb 11, 2021 at 11:14 AM

To: James Larenaissance <sancorgoman@gmail.com>

I've had a chance to discuss this matter with my client and we cannot agree to these terms.

[Quoted text hidden]

EXHIBIT F cont.

**POST FEB. 22, 2021 DEPOSITION
REAFFIRMING MY PRE-DEPOSITION
OFFER TO WITHDRAW LAWSUIT IF
HEARST DID THE RIGHT THING AND
REMOVED ITS ARTICLES FROM THE
INTERNET**

POST FEB. 22, 2021 DEPOSITION REAFFIRMING MY PRE-DEPOSITION OFFER TO WITHDRAW LAWSUIT IF HEARST DID THE RIGHT THING AND REMOVED ITS ARTICLES FROM THE INTERNET

Gmail Search mail 166 of 2,161

Yuhan, Stephen Feb 22, 2021, 9:44 AM ☆
It's typical to share them with all counsel in advance to make the process go more smoothly.

James Larenaissance Feb 22, 2021, 9:51 AM ☆
easy one page reads highlighting an area.

James Larenaissance <sancorgoman@gmail.com> Feb 22, 2021, 3:39 PM ☆ ↶ ⋮
to Stephen ▾

Thanks for smooth process Stephen Yuhan

I extend my previous offer to you all in the spirit with what is fair.
Knowing of now firmly established police misconduct and reporting on it is not right.
An entire portion of the wrarant was fabricated from gossip tied to complete phantoms and not any kind of proper documents or evidence.
I still frimly stand by my positions on your misconduct as well but feel a middle course in between would be beneficial to all including the police.
Persistence on your end is not in your interests.

James Lawrence

Reply Forward

James Larenaissance <sancorgoman@gmail.com> Feb 22, 2021, 3:39 PM ☆ ↶ ⋮
to Stephen ▾

Thanks for smooth process Stephen Yuhan

I extend my previous offer to you all in the spirit with what is fair.
Knowing of now firmly established police misconduct and reporting on it is not right.
An entire portion of the wrarant was fabricated from gossip tied to complete phantoms and not any kind of proper documents or evidence.
I still frimly stand by my positions on your misconduct as well but feel a middle course in between would be beneficial to all including the police.
Persistence on your end is not in your interests.

James Lawrence
