

1 books and records, or any accounting with respect to Blue Mist Touring Company, Inc., the entity that
2 owned the assets for which Leonard Cohen, LC Investments, LLC, and possibly other entities collected
3 the royalty income. Lynch's representatives explained the scheme in this manner: Blue Mist Touring
4 Company, Inc. owns all intellectual property; Leonard Cohen and LC Investments, LLC (possibly others)
5 collect the income generated by the Blue Mist Touring assets; and Traditional Holdings, LLC sold certain
6 intellectual property and other rights that it did not own. Those properties and rights were owned by
7 Blue Mist Touring Company, Inc. Lynch is unaware of any financial account assigned to the revocable
8 Leonard Cohen Family Trust established for probate purposes. Old Ideas, LLC, and the intellectual
9 property that was to be assigned to that entity, is also missing from this analysis. The analysis is evidence
10 of financial and accounting fraud.
11

12 160. The analysis prepared by Kevin Prins evidently relied on Leonard Cohen's declaration
13 dated January 24, 2006, used to support the default judgment. Kevin Prins' declaration was signed
14 January 24, 2006. According to Paragraph 6 of Prins' declaration, "pursuant to paragraph 11 in Cohen's
15 declaration" he understood that "Cohen had an oral agreement with Lynch and her d/b/a Stranger
16 Management pursuant to which Lynch was entitled to receive 15% of the income received by LCILLC
17 and Traditional Holdings from third party sources (i.e., royalty payments from recording companies) for
18 certain professional services performed by Lynch in her capacity as business manager to Cohen,
19 LCILLC, and Traditional Holdings, LLC. For approximately 17 years, Lynch worked as Leonard
20 Cohen's personal manager. At no time was Lynch Cohen's business manager and she was most certainly
21 not business manager to LC Investments, LLC and/or Traditional Holdings, LLC. Lynch was entitled to
22 a 15% commission on all gross income received by Leonard Cohen from all sources. There were no
23 cavaets whatsoever. Kevin Prins' analysis willfully disregards Lynch's ownership interests in numerous
24 corporate entities. The declaration goes onto state that Prins understood, pursuant to Cohen's
25 declaration, that "Lynch was to receive a \$20,000 annual management fee payment from Traditional
26
27
28

1 Holdings.” Lynch was to receive, per the corporate books and records, three designated payments and a
2 share of profit/loss commensurate with her and Cohen’s ownership interest in Traditional Holdings,
3 LLC the designated payments Lynch was to receive were \$20,000/year, \$24,000/year, and \$240,000/year.
4 These three designated payments were distributed to Lynch with respect to promissory note payments
5 and monies reserved for designated tax payments. Clause 6 of Prins’ declaration states that he
6 understands that at “no time was Lynch ever entitled to any money from the LC Family Trust or from
7 Cohen’s personal account.” As stated above, Lynch has no idea what the LC Family Trust account is.
8 Lynch was most certainly entitled to commissions related to royalty and other income Cohen elected to
9 deposit into his personal bank account. That would include, but is not limited to, artist record royalty
10 income and book publishing income. Lynch has submitted to this court, at least one email confirmation
11 from Leonard Cohen, confirming that she was indeed entitled to commissions against royalties deposited
12 into his personal account. Nevertheless, this fraudulent Expense Ledger has taken the position that
13 Lynch misappropriated designated corporate distributions as well as commissions she was paid for
14 services rendered. Lynch has approached Internal Revenue Service about this situation due to the fact
15 that these fraudulent misrepresentations would mean that, for the entire period of time Lynch worked as
16 Cohen’s personal manager, she was provided or relied on entirely fraudulent W-2s and 1099s.
17
18

19
20 161. Clause 7 of Prins declaration states that he has “been informed that Cohen has complete
21 ownership interests in LCILLC, the LC Family Trust, and Cohen’s personal checking account.” Prins
22 further “assumed” that, as alleged in Paragraph 5 of Cohen’s Declaration, that he has a beneficial interest
23 in Traditional Holdings. Once again, Lynch has no idea what the LC Family Trust account is. Leonard
24 Cohen does indeed have complete ownership interest in LC Investments, LLC, has repeatedly confirmed
25 this for numerous courts, but nevertheless refuses to rescind K-1 partnership documents this entity
26 transmitted to Internal Revenue Service for the years 2004 and 2005 indicating that Lynch has an
27 ownership interest in LC Investments, LLC. The manner in which Kevin Prins addressed Traditional
28

1 Holdings, LLC and Cohen's beneficial interest therein strongly suggests that the willfully and knowingly
2 elected to disregard corporate books and records as well as federal tax returns where Lynch was included
3 as a partner for the years 2001, 2002, and 2003.

4 162. Clause 8 of Prins' declaration states that "between December 1998 and May 1999" Lynch
5 alleged deposited certain checks made payable to Cohen or FBO Leonard Cohen. This statement
6 willfully misrepresents the fact that checks made payable to Kelley Lynch also contained language
7 alleging that they were "for the benefit of Leonard Cohen." Lynch has no idea why checks would be
8 issued to her, contain a reference to Leonard Cohen, and has asked Internal Revenue Service to
9 investigate this matter as it appears to involve some form of shenanigans. There would be no reason
10 whatsoever not to simply prepare the checks in the name of Leonard Cohen. The remainder of this
11 clause is confused, nebulous, and misleading as these checks evidently relate to corporate entities and
12 assets that Lynch has an ownership interest in.
13
14

15 163. Clause 13 of the Prins' declaration states that "Lynch's agreement with Cohen provided
16 that she was to receive 15% of the income received by LCILLC from third party sources." This is a
17 blatantly false and fraudulent misrepresentation. Lynch was entitled to a commission for services
18 rendered as Cohen's personal manager AND had a 15% ownership interest in the assets owned by Blue
19 Mist Touring Company, Inc. WHICH generated royalty income collected by Leonard Cohen personally,
20 LC Investments, LLC, and possibly others. Once again, Leonard Cohen is not the party who would
21 decide what entity or individual he should pay on Lynch's behalf. That is a decision she personally would
22 make. In summary, Lynch was entitled to a 15% commission on all gross income, from all sources, with
23 respect to her services rendered as Cohen's personal manager. IN ADDITION, Lynch had a legal
24 ownership interest in numerous corporate entities. That would include, but is not limited to Blue Mist
25 Touring Company, Inc. and Old Ideas, LLC, the entities which own or should own all intellectual
26 property through the release of "Dear Heather." Lynch is also entitled to commissions in perpetuity,
27
28

1 which is a standard industry agreement, with respect to all materials (literary, musical, and artwork) that
2 Cohen created and/or delivered during the 17 year period (1988 through 2004) that Lynch worked as his
3 personal manager. There are other corporate distributions that were made in accordance with the
4 corporate books and records. Furthermore, Lynch received K-1 partnership documents with respect to
5 corporate distributions, relied on those documents, and paid taxes on the alleged income. All of this has
6 been concealed. The Expense Ledger is, as stated above, evidence of financial and accounting fraud. It
7 is also entirely unreliable, provides no information with respect to actual income to the respective
8 entities, provides no back-up documentation, and apparently relies on Natural Wealth's entirely
9 incoherent financial summaries.
10

11 164. Clause 15 of the Prins' declaration related to the LC Family Trust. Lynch has no idea
12 what this trust is. Furthermore, this portion of the Expense Ledger relies on Natural Wealth's entirely
13 incoherent and unaudited "summary statement" that provides no back-up documentation.
14

15 165. Clause 21 of the Prins' declaration repeated the fraudulent misrepresentation that "no
16 agreement existed between Cohen and Lynch pursuant to which Lynch was to receive any income or
17 payments from Cohen's personal check account." Lynch is in disbelief that the RICO Defendants would
18 even attempt to argue that her commissions for services rendered were actually misappropriated –
19 particularly given the approximately 17 years of tax information Lynch relied on with respect to these
20 payments. Lynch has asked IRS to investigate this situation and the entire fraudulent financial ledger. It
21 is part of the related Tax Fraud Scheme.
22

23 166. Clauses 24 and 25 of the Prins declaration regurgitate fraudulent misrepresentations with
24 respect to Lynch's agreements with Cohen and Traditional Holdings, LLC.

25 167. Prins calculated illegal financial interest totaling over \$2.5 million. Exhibit II:
26 Declaration of Kevin Prins, attached hereto and made a part here.
27
28

1 **The Fraudulent Default Judgments**

2 168. The Default Judgment (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC338322) was supported
3 by perjured declarations, a fraudulent Expense Ledger, and a Complaint that is replete with fraudulent
4 misrepresentations and false statements. This Default Judgment has permitted the RICO Defendants to
5 engage in their scheme to defraud and extort Kelley Lynch. This evidence was then submitted to the
6 U.S. District Court in Colorado and used to corruptly persuade the Court to find in favor of Leonard
7 Cohen with respect to the interpleaded corporate funds. The fraudulent Default Judgment put Leonard
8 Cohen and his wholly owned entity, LC Investments, LLC in complete control of the assets owned by
9 Blue Mist Touring Company, Inc. and Old Ideas, LLC. The RICO Defendants evidently view the
10 fraudulent Default Judgment (Case No. BC338322) as a jury verdict that Lynch and third parties are
11 obliged to rely upon.
12

13
14 **Kelley Lynch’s Motion to Vacate**

15 169. On August 9, 2013, shortly after relocating to Los Angeles, Lynch filed a motion to
16 vacate the fraudulently obtained Default Judgment. The RICO Defendants continued to submit
17 fraudulent legal pleadings and declarations to Los Angeles Superior Court. They argued that Lynch was
18 the “Jane Doe” subserved Cohen’s lawsuit on August 24, 2005 when she was most certainly not.
19 Leonard Cohen’s declaration personally submitted two photographs of Lynch from much earlier and a
20 year or two after their failure to serve Lynch. The RICO Defendants evidently had contacts with people
21 who were with or in touch with Lynch in 2006 or 2007. That individual evidently provided them with a
22 photograph of Lynch and His Holiness Kusum Lingpa although the RICO Defendants were not at lunch
23 with them when the photograph was taken. Although ordered to do so, the RICO Defendants, and their
24 co-counsel, failed to file a court order with respect to the January 14, 2017 decision. Therefore, Lynch
25 had nothing to appeal.
26
27
28

1 Exhibit JJ: Kelley Lynch's Motion to Vacate dated August 9, 2013; RICO Defendants' Response
2 documents (including declarations of Leonard Cohen, Michelle Rice, and Robert Kory dated January 4,
3 2014); Transcript of January 17, 2014 hearing. Please refer to racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an
4 evidence blog created for this Complaint, incorporated herein and made a part here. The documents
may be located through the blog index and the first exhibit, in alphabetical order, would be the first
posted document.

5 170. On March 15, 2015, Lynch filed a motion for terminating sanctions with Los Angeles
6 Superior Court. This was due to the fact that the RICO Defendants' legal pleadings, and declarations,
7 filed in response to her motion to vacate were replete with perjured statements and fraudulent
8 misrepresentations. Lynch's motion to vacate addressed the extrinsic fraud with respect to the proof of
9 service filed in connection with the summons and complaint (Case No. BC338322). Her motion for
10 terminating sanctions addressed the fraud and perjury used to argue that the fraudulently obtained
11 Default Judgment should not be vacated. A tactic the RICO Defendants have used against Lynch
12 involves using arguments related to the merits of the case, intrinsic fraud, in their legal pleadings. The
13 RICO Defendants are convinced that they have a legal right to submit fraudulent misrepresentations and
14 perjured statements to courts with respect to "intrinsic fraud" due to the fact that courts do not vacate
15 judgments based on factors related to "intrinsic fraud." The RICO Defendants then argue that Lynch
16 had no legal right to confront or object to the elements of intrinsic fraud. Lynch maintains that the
17 RICO Defendants have no legal right or privilege to submit fraudulent grievances to the government in
18 the form of fraudulent legal pleadings, perjured declarations, and/or baseless lawsuits. Exhibit KK :
19 Kelley Lynch's Motion for Terminating Sanctions (fraud upon the court); RICO Defendants' Response
20 Documents; Transcript of June 23, 2015 Motion for Terminating Sanctions hearing. Please refer to
21 racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created for this Complaint, incorporated herein and
22 made a part here. The documents may be located through the blog index and the first exhibit, in
23 alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.
24
25
26
27
28

1 171. On June 23, 2015, Los Angeles Superior Court wrongfully characterized Lynch’s motion
2 for terminating sanctions (fraud upon the court) as a motion to reconsider once against depriving Lynch
3 of a legal remedy.

4 172. Two additional issues arose in response to Lynch’s motion for terminating sanctions. On
5 May 29, 2015, the RICO Defendants filed an Ex Parte Application which the Court ultimately granted.
6 That decision granted the RICO Defendants’ request to seal evidence submitted to both IRS and Los
7 Angeles Superior Court. That evidence has been concealed from numerous courts with respect to the
8 issues raised in this case. Exhibit LL: RICO Defendants’ Ex Parte Application to Seal Evidence;
9 Lynch’s Objection; Court Order. Please refer to racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog
10 created for this Complaint, incorporated herein and made a part here. The documents may be located
11 through the blog index and the first exhibit, in alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.
12

13 173. Another issue that arose due to Lynch’s motion for terminating sanctions was the RICO
14 Defendants decision to retaliate against her by filing an entirely baseless and frivolous Sanctions motion.
15 The RICO Defendants attempted to terminate Lynch’s fee waiver and prevent her from filing further
16 legal pleadings with respect to Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC338322. At the motion for
17 terminating sanctions hearing, Leonard Cohen was represented by two law firms, at least five or six
18 lawyers were present in the courtroom, and their arguments that anything involved with respect to the
19 issues raised in this case are “frivolous” is preposterous. One of the law firms involved was the Bergman
20 Law Group. Daniel J. Bergman, who was present for the hearing, is the lawyer who represented Steven
21 Clark Lindsey in the coordinated custody matter that is also entirely fraudulent, baseless, and led to the
22 destruction of Lynch’s sons’ lives based on yet another Los Angeles Superior Court default judgment.
23 On October 6, 2015, Los Angeles Superior Court denied the RICO Defendants’ Sanctions Motion.
24 Leonard Cohen has an endless array of lawyers and other professionals willing to represent him, submit
25 fraudulent legal pleadings, submit perjured declarations, and two of whom – Kory & Rice – now serve as
26
27
28

1 paid witnesses in addition to the services they render as Cohen’s attorneys of record, general counsel,
2 personal managers, and business managers. In other words, they benefit from this unconscionable
3 conduct. Exhibit MM: RICO Defendants’ Sanctions Motion; Lynch’s Opposition; Hearing Transcript –
4 October 6, 2015. Please refer to racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created for this
5 Complaint, incorporated herein and made a part here. The documents may be located through the blog
6 index and the first exhibit, in alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.
7

8 **Lynch’s Motion for Terminating Sanctions Asked Los Angeles Superior Court to Clarify**
9 **Elements of the Fraudulently Obtained Default Judgment**

10 174. Lynch asked Los Angeles Superior Court to clarify the May 12, 2006 fraudulent Default
11 Judgment with respect to federal tax matters, the IRS required tax and corporate information the RICO
12 Defendants willfully and knowingly refuse to provide Lynch, the corporations themselves, and how the
13 Court determined that Lynch had no ownership interest in the corporations and was not entitled to
14 commissions due for services she rendered as Cohen’s personal manager. As the Court refused to
15 entertain Lynch’s Motion for Terminating Sanctions, wrongfully mischaracterizing it as a motion to
16 reconsider, Lynch still has no clarification with respect to these elements of the fraudulent Default
17 Judgment. The RICO Defendants argued that the fraudulently obtained Default Judgment was not
18 vague and/or in need of clarification. The fraud used to obtain the Default Judgment has indeed harmed
19 Lynch and Los Angeles Superior Court has provided no corrective remedy with respect to this situation.
20 The Court refused to sanction the RICO Defendants with respect to their litigation misconduct.
21

22 **The Fraudulent, Baseless Los Angeles Superior Court Lawsuit & Related Case (BC338322 &**
23 **BC341120) That Resulted in Fraudulent Default Judgments**

24 175. On August 15, 2005, Leonard Cohen and his wholly owned entity, LC Investments, LLC,
25 an entity with no legal claims to the property included in the default judgment, filed a lawsuit against
26 Kelley Lynch, Richard Westin, and John Does 1-50, inclusive. The lawsuit fraudulently alleged breaches
27 of fiduciary duty, common law fraud, breach of contract; accounting; conversion, imposition of
28

1 constructive trust, and injunctive relief. The entire Complaint is a fabricated narrative, unsupported by
2 the facts and evidence (including all corporate books, records, and federal tax returns), which led to the
3 filing of default judgment. Lynch was not served the summons and complaint; the RICO Defendants
4 and their co-counsel steadfastly refused to communicate with Lynch about this or any litigation matter
5 through the entire proceeding, willfully and knowingly refused to serve her, and responded to Lynch's
6 motion to vacate (filed August 9, 2013) with a body of legal pleadings replete with fraudulent
7 misrepresentations, perjured declarations, and arguments that Lynch – not the alleged Jane Doe – was in
8 fact served. Leonard Cohen submitted photographs to the Court proving, in his mind, that Lynch was in
9 fact the individual who was served. The proof of service alleged, under oath of perjury, that the
10 individual served was a female co-occupant, weighing approximately 130 pounds, and an individual with
11 blonde hair and black eyes. Lynch submitted approximately five or more declarations to Los Angeles
12 Superior Court confirming that she did not have a female co-occupant, at least four individuals were at
13 her residence on August 24, 2005 (when the Complaint was allegedly served upon the Jane Doe co-
14 occupant), and she did not resemble the individual at all. Over the years, Lynch has worn her hair
15 platinum blonde, auburn, black, brown, red, and other colors. Lynch's hair is naturally blonde, has
16 grown darker over the years, and was nearly pitch black on August 24, 2005. Lynch's eyes are blue.
17 Lynch weighed approximately 102 pounds and no one would allege that Lynch, at that time, was of
18 medium build. She was extraordinarily thin. Lynch is approximately 5'6" and the Jane Doe was
19 approximately 5'7" Lynch was not served the summons and complaint. Lynch did not have a female co-
20 occupant. No one in Lynch's home attempted to evade service. Lynch does have a legal background,
21 although she worked as personal manager – not lawyer or paralegal or legal assistant or business manager
22 – for Leonard Cohen for approximately 17 years. Lynch absolutely could draft an answer to a complaint
23 that stated, at the very least, DENIED. Lynch has endlessly attempted to address the fact that she was not
24 served and the RICO Defendants responses have grown exceedingly deranged. Leonard Cohen is an
25
26
27
28

1 extremely wealthy with a team of lawyers whose sole purpose evidently is to respond to Kelley Lynch's
2 pleadings or find ways to entrap, terrorize, silence, and blame her. In the recent past, Leonard Cohen's
3 lawyers are extremely comfortable fedexing overnight documents to Lynch. However, when Lynch
4 informed the RICO Defendants that she was not served the lawsuit, she heard nothing but deafening
5 silence. Lynch remains convinced that any intelligent human being, and their lawyers, would do what is
6 necessary to ensure that an adverse party is served even if that meant spend \$25 to fedex a package to
7 Lynch; an additional \$4 to mail the documents certified mail; and possibly find other ways to ensure
8 delivery of the documents. The RICO Defendants did none of the above. Lynch has worked in law
9 firms, for lawyers, and with teams of lawyers for over 25 years or so. Never in her entire life has she seen
10 what a former employer of hers referred to, when speaking of the RICO Defendants and their co-
11 conspirator lawyers, as "filthy lawyering." It is self-evident that rather than serve Lynch, provide her
12 with an opportunity to respond (as difficult as that may have been at the time, Lynch feels certain she
13 could have found a way to at least write a letter to the judge explaining her circumstances), the RICO
14 Defendants elected to pursue a fraudulent restraining order, sham allegations related to "stalking," and
15 evidently met with Detective Albanese of Beverly Hills who in turn met or spoke with Los Angeles
16 Deputy District Attorney William Hodgman and Deputy District Attorney Wendy Seagal. Evidently the
17 District Attorney's office did not see the elements of "stalking" alleged at that time and advised the
18 RICO Defendants to pursue "intent to annoy" charges which they ultimately did. This was
19 accomplished, in great part, due to the refusal to communicate with Lynch about legitimate tax, business,
20 corporate and financial matters outstanding between Cohen and Lynch. That would include, but is not
21 limited to, the IRS required tax and corporate information Leonard Cohen and his co-defendants
22 steadfastly refuse to provide Lynch although that information was due her well in advance of the filing of
23 the Complaint or entry of default in this case. Additionally, the RICO Defendants – six months in
24
25
26
27
28

1 advance of entry of the default judgment in Cohen’s favor – filed Cohen’s tax returns, amended others,
2 applied for and received fraudulent tax refunds using the fabricated Complaint narrative and possibly
3 some version of the fraudulent “Expense Ledger.” Lynch discovered this entire situation, including with
4 respect to BHPD and the Los Angeles District Attorney, in or around April 9, 2012 and mid-September
5 2012 due to the 2012 Trial and documents provided piece-meal, if at all, by her public defenders. The
6 RICO Defendants have used these tactics, including the willful and knowing failure to serve Lynch the
7 summons and Complaint, or notify her of the entry of default. Lynch was homeless when the default
8 judgment was entered and had no ability whatsoever to open, read, download, print, or review
9 documents regardless of the fact that RICO Defendants have argued elsewhere that “busyness” is not an
10 excuse. Willfully failing to serve Lynch is a blatant violation of her constitutional right to due process.
11
12 **Exhibit NN: Declarations of Joan Marie Lynch, John Rutger Penick, Paulette Brandt, Clea**
13 **Surkhang, Palden Ronge, Daniel J. Meade, and Ray Charles Lindsey. Signature Pages &**
14 **Limited Powers of Attorney. Please refer to racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog**
15 **created for this Complaint, incorporated herein and made a part here. The documents may be**
16 **located through the blog index and the first exhibit, in alphabetical order, would be the first**
17 **posted document. Note: Signature pages are attached hereto and made a part hereof.**

18
19 176. On August 9, 2015, Lynch filed a motion to vacate. She provided all documents,
20 including her declaration, Rutger’s declaration, a case history, answer to the complaint, and fee waiver
21 application to her appellate attorney. Francisco Suarez, who was harassed for over a year by the co-
22 conspirators (and specifically Stephen Gianelli and Susanne Walsh), generously assisted Lynch with the
23 filing of the motion and attached documents. Mr. Suarez transformed Lynch’s declaration and case
24 history into one exhibit. That was marked Exhibit A. He crossed off the original exhibit letter on
25 Rutger’s declaration and his declaration became Exhibit B. This became problematic during the hearing
26 on the motion to vacate. Lynch’s witnesses, some of whom were available and others who were willing to
27
28

1 testify telephonically as they were unavailable, were not permitted to testify. These individuals have
2 personal knowledge that Lynch was not served the summons and complaint, a number of them were at
3 the house the morning the process server declared that he served a Jane Doe co-occupant, and others
4 understood that Lynch wore her hair extremely dark brown – nearly black – at that time. It is irrelevant
5 that Lynch, a year or two previously, wore her hair blonde. She also had the funds to hire a hair dresser.
6 It is irrelevant if, when Lynch met Michelle Rice approximately three months later, she had blonde hair
7 with “brown roots.” This is not evidence of effecting service upon someone and is worthy of a scene in
8 “*My Cousin Vinnie*.” Exhibit OO Renewal of Default Judgment; Exhibit PP Accrued Statutory Interest
9 Form; and, Exhibit QQ: Los Angeles Superior Court Dockets (Case No. BC338322 and Related Case
10 No. BC341120). Please refer to racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created for this
11 Complaint, incorporated herein and made a part here. The documents may be located through the blog
12 index and the first exhibit, in alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.
13
14

15 **Motion for Terminating Sanctions (fraud upon the court) & Ex Parte Application to Seal**
16 **Evidence**

17 177. On May 28, 2015, in response to Lynch’s motion for terminating sanctions (fraud upon
18 the court), Leonard Cohen filed a motion to seal portions of the court record. The motion was based on
19 the grounds that, “pursuant to the default judgment,” Lynch “was found to have no interest in any of”
20 Cohen’s “business entities and has otherwise been ordered to return” all of Cohen’s “personal property
21 that she wrongfully retained after being terminated for cause as” Cohen’s “personal manager in or about
22 October 2004. Despite such court orders,” Lynch “has retained privileged and confidential documents
23 of” Cohen’s “including attorney client privileged communications and tax documents and” Lynch “has
24 now disclosed such privileged and confidential information in her motion for terminating sanctions and
25 disclosed same on the internet and her blog.” The motion was brought to seal those portions of the
26 Court record to prevent further public dissemination of the evidence. The document was replete with
27
28

1 fraudulent representations, blatant lies, and false accusations. The document takes the position that
2 Lynch was Cohen’s fiduciary and both his personal and business manager. Lynch never served as
3 Cohen’s business manager and was not his fiduciary. Lynch was unaware of this related case (Los
4 Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC341120) until sometime in or around April 2010. Furthermore, the
5 writ of possession does not name the corporations, Kelley Lynch, Phil Spector, or Machat & Machat
6 although their property was wrongfully seized. The documents related to the Ex Parte Application to
7 seal evidence have been incorporated into this Complaint and are attached as exhibits hereto. The
8 motion opens with the following blatant fraudulent and false statements:
9

10 “In or about October 2004, Plaintiff [Leonard Cohen] terminated Defendant [Kelley Lynch] for cause
11 after she embezzled millions of dollars. See Declaration of Leonard Norman Cohen . On May 15, 2006,
12 the Court entered a judgment that Defendant was not a rightful owner of the assets nor had any interest
13 in any of Plaintiffs’ [Leonard Cohen’s] business entities and was ordered to return all money (judgment
14 was for \$7,341,345.00) and property of Plaintiff’s [Leonard Cohen’s] that she wrongfully retained or
15 transferred after her termination as Plaintiff’s [Leonard Cohen’s] business manager. Exhibit A.”

16 “On May 9, 2006, in a related case, Case No. BC341120, the Court ordered that all property of Plaintiff
17 [Leonard Cohen] that was then located at Defendant’s former residence at 2648 Mandeville Canyon
18 Road, Los Angeles, California, was rightfully owned by Plaintiff [Cohen] and returned by him.”

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT
WRIT OF POSSESSION
Case No. BC341120

19 178. It is important to review the court dockets with respect to what documents are being filed
20 in Colorado vs. what the RICO Defendants are filing with Los Angeles Superior Court. On October 11,
21 2005, Leonard Cohen filed a second Complaint with Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC341120.
22 In or around April 2010, this case was brought to Lynch’s attention by Los Angeles Superior Court Judge
23 Ken Freeman’s Court Reporter. Until that time, Lynch was entirely unaware that there was a separate
24 and related case. She was not served this lawsuit and did not receive copies of many of the documents
25 until Jeffrey Korn, one of Cohen’s legal representatives, agreed to provide them to her in December
26 2013. Documents from this case were submitted to Los Angeles Superior Court when the RICO
27
28

1 Defendants filed a Supplemental Request for Judicial Notice dated September 28, 2015 with respect to
2 Lynch's motion to vacate the RICO Defendant's entirely retaliatory Sanctions Motion filed in response
3 to Lynch's motion for terminating sanctions (fraud upon the court). The RICO Defendants attempt to
4 insert extraneous evidence into various matters through their Requests for Judicial Notice. This
5 document was submitted to Los Angeles Superior Court due to the fact that the RICO Defendants
6 continue with their attempts to conceal, alter, tamper with, and destroy evidence. Exhibit RR:
7 Supplement Request for Judicial Notice dated September 28, 2015. This document contains the writ of
8 possession pleadings Lynch has received to date. The documents included in this Supplemental Request
9 are replete with fraudulent misrepresentations and perjured statements in declarations. Please refer to
10 racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created for this Complaint, incorporated herein and
11 made a part here. The documents may be located through the blog index and the first exhibit, in
12 alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.
13
14

15 179. Lynch was aware of a letter Scott Edelman, Cohen's lawyer at the time, sent her dated
16 October 7, 2005, attached as Exhibit A to Edelman's Declaration incorporated into the Supplemental
17 Request for Judicial Notice dated September 27, 2005. Lynch responded to that letter by phoning Scott
18 Edelman who refused to communicate with her and advised that he looked forward to speaking to her
19 attorney. Lynch was and remains self-represented. While Lynch had stored boxes of extremely old
20 business documents for Cohen since approximately 1996, she attempted to inform Edelman that Cohen
21 never contacted her to discuss the fact that such valuable items were allegedly in her home. The writ of
22 possession contains an inordinate amount of fraudulent misrepresentations about what was stored in
23 Lynch's garage as a courtesy to Cohen and ultimately abandoned. While Lynch has been unable to
24 obtain certain documents from the RICO Defendants (such as the proof of service and Steven Clark
25 Lindsey's declaration), documents submitted to Los Angeles Superior Court confirm that Steve Lindsey
26 alleged informed the RICO Defendants that Lynch planned to sell Cohen's documents. Lynch had
27
28

1 extremely valuable artwork and other gifts from Cohen to her – all signed. She has never sold those
2 items, planned to donate to charity, and they were all eventually destroyed, sold with items in her storage,
3 or lost. More important, Scott Edelman was copied on emails Lynch sent IRS Commissioner’s Staff
4 confirming her decision to send the boxes of evidence, including everything Cohen abandoned, to IRS in
5 Washington, DC. She had no plans whatsoever to sell anything and tends to doubt she would have
6 raised a tremendous amount of money selling corporate records that are not Leonard Cohen’s personal
7 property and which were not named in the writ of possession but nevertheless seized by the Los Angeles
8 Sheriff’s Department. Other property that didn’t belong to Cohen was wrongfully seized. That would
9 include, but is not limited to, Lynch’s property (including books written by Leonard Cohen that she
10 purchased over the years), Phil Spector’s master tape for “Heart On” (or “Don’t Go Home With Your
11 Hard On”), tapes of Adam Cohen’s recording sessions, at least one tape of an Elton John track he
12 provided for a tribute album which Lynch executive produced, documents belong to Machat & Machat,
13 and other items that did not and do not belong to Leonard Cohen. See Los Angeles Sheriff’s
14 Department Inventory (contained in the September 28, 2015 Request for Judicial Notice, Exhibit SS).
15
16

17 180. On November 14, 2005, Tactical Allocation Services, LLC (a Neal Greenberg company)
18 filed an Ex Parte Application in Intervention for Order Protecting & Preserving Documentary Evidence,
19 Etc. On November 14, 2004 Judge Kenneth Freeman denied the Application. This Application
20 contains very serious evidence and facts.
21

22 181. Tactical Allocations Services, LLC advised LA Superior Court that the seized documents
23 should be “preserved and maintained because such an order is necessary to prevent the potential loss or
24 destruction of relevant evidence pending discovery” in the Colorado matter between Cohen and Agile.
25 It was also necessary to preserve for other litigation matters. As Tactical Allocations advised LA
26 Superior Court, there would be no harm in preserving that evidence and, in fact, “an order of the kind
27 requested is likely to protect the rights and interests of all parties here.” Tactical Allocations’ Ex Parte
28

1 order confirmed that Leonard Cohen “conspired with others to defraud and extort money from Agile ...
2 Central to Cohen’s extortionate scheme was the continued concealment of critical documents in the
3 possession of defendant here, Kelley Lynch – documents proving that Cohen and others effected their
4 conspiracy and that the conspirators should have been and were aware that their threats of legal action
5 against Agile and others were entirely pretextual.” The document goes onto state that “Cohen recently
6 commenced the present action without breathing a word of it to Agile or its attorneys – a calculated
7 attempt at concealment that served his purposes. The lawsuit’s aim, as reflected on the face of the
8 complaint, was to recover possession of certain business, financial and other documents and items from
9 Lynch, his former personal manager, whom he accuses of misappropriating several million dollars.
10 (Lynch is also a defendant in the Colorado action, although she is not accused of being a co-conspirator
11 with Cohen.) When Lynch refused to cooperate in Cohen’s extortionate scheme against Agile [and
12 others] by declining to cover up and lie for him, Cohen’s gambit became to seize documents in Lynch’s
13 possession (some of which she had previously revealed to Agile [Boies Schiller].” According to the Ex
14 Parte Application, Cohen “filed this second lawsuit here against Lynch without the required Notice of
15 Related Case (Counsel is required to file and serve a Notice of Related Case ‘promptly’ upon learning
16 that the action is related to another pending action CRC 804(a)) which Cohen and his counsel knew from
17 the start).” Leonard Cohen and his legal team engage in these types of deceptive practices, including as
18 they relate to service issues, because it furthers their goal of winning at all costs. “As Cohen is aware,
19 Lynch has made no appearance in either of the other cases – and, as he no doubt anticipated, she made
20 no appearance here.” The Ex Parte Application confirmed that Lynch owned 99.5% of Traditional
21 Holdings, LLC and Cohen owned .5%.

22
23
24
25 182. At a hearing on October 6, 2015, defendant Michelle Rice addressed this case and
26 confirmed that the RICO Defendants submitted Scott Edelman’s declaration that shows Lynch was
27 personally served. Scott Edelman’s declaration is not a proof of service. Evidently Edelman’s
28

1 "declaration" shows that Lynch was personally served the documents on October 11, 2005 at 6:15 PM.
2 Lynch would like to review the proof of service and all documents in this particular case however the
3 RICO Defendants repeatedly prove that service of process, or even the courtesy of a reply (unless they
4 want something such as a continuance) - is irrelevant. An excerpt of the October 6, 2015 hearing
5 transcript, which is attached to this complaint, reads as follows:
6

7 MS. RICE: Can I just make one follow up along with that, Your Honor? She does claim she was never
8 served with the writ of possession documents, but we had submitted Edelman's declaration in our first
9 opposition to her motion to vacate in Exhibit E; actually shows Ms. Lynch was personally served the
documents on October 11, 2005 at 6:15 p.m. There was no sub service involved. It was personal
service, and that's Exhibit E of the Edelman declaration. RT 40.

10 **DEFAULT JUDGMENTS PROCURED BY FRAUD**

11 **Non Statutory Claims for Equitable Relief With Respect to the Fraudulent Judgments**

12 183. Lynch asserts herein that the Los Angeles Superior Court Default Judgments (Case No.
13 BC338322 and BC341120) were procured through fraud and then used to tamper with the administration
14 of justice with respect to the Natural Wealth Lawsuit before the U.S. District Court in Colorado. Lynch
15 seeks to set aside the fraudulently obtained Los Angeles Superior Court Default Judgments as well as the
16 decision rendered by Judge Lewis Babcock with respect to the Natural Wealth Case on September 5,
17 2008. Alternatively, she asks this Court to provide whatever alternative relief the Court deems
18 appropriate. That would include, but is not limited to, asking this Court to prohibit the RICO
19 Defendants, and any and all third parties, from profiting from the judgments they have procured as a
20 result of their corrupt judgments and decisions and to enjoin enforcement of the judgment in the United
21 States including by Internal Revenue Service in connection with Leonard Cohen, fraudulent tax refunds,
22 his personal tax returns, and any defense of Leonard Cohen with respect to the allegations Lynch
23 brought to the attention of IRS that Cohen committed criminal tax fraud.
24
25

26 **Equitable Relief With Respect to Fraudulent Judgments Generally**

27 184. Three basic principles underlie Lynch's non-statutory claim for relief from the
28

1 Judgment: equitable actions with respect to relief from judgments obtained by fraud; the failure of Los
2 Angeles Superior Court to obtain jurisdiction over Lynch; and, the use of fraud in the procurement of
3 the judgments where other requisites of the exercise of equitable power are present.

4 185. First, independent equitable actions long have afforded relief from judgments
5 obtained by fraud, whether by enjoining their enforcement, preventing those responsible from
6 benefitting from their fraudulent actions, or otherwise. See *E.g.*, 4 John Norton Pomeroy, *A Treatise on*
7 *Equity Jurisprudence* § 1364, at 984 (Symons 5th ed. 1941) (“Pomeroy”) (“where the legal judgment was
8 obtained or entered through fraud, . . . then a court of equity will interfere . . . and restrain proceedings
9 on the judgment which cannot be conscientiously enforced”).

10
11 186. The willingness of equity to “enjoin a judgment obtained by fraud” has existed at least
12 since the seventeenth century. See, e.g., Henry L. McClintock, *McClintock on Equity* (“McClintock”) § 4,
13 at 11, 459 (1948); see also *id.* § 171, at 459 (“Since [the seventeenth century] . . . there has been no serious
14 question as to the power [of equity] to enjoin the enforcement of a judgment
15 obtained by fraud . . .”).

16
17 187. While the merger of law and equity altered the procedural context in which such actions
18 are pursued and other changes in the legal environment have reduced the frequency with they are
19 brought, all relief traditionally granted in equity remains available. See *Stainback v. Mo Hock Ke Lok Po*,
20 336 U.S. 368, 382 n.26 (1949) (“Notwithstanding the fusion of law and equity by the Rules of Civil
21 Procedure, the substantive principles of Courts of Chancery remain unaffected.”); 4 Charles Alan Wright
22 et al., *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 1043, at 177 (3d ed. 2002) (“[T]he merger of law and equity and .
23 . . . abolition of . . . forms of action furnish a single uniform procedure by which a litigant may present his
24 claim in an orderly manner to a court empowered to award whatever relief is appropriate and just; the
25
26
27
28

1 substantive and remedial principles that applied prior to the advent of the federal rules are not
2 changed.”); see also, e.g., Grupo Mexicano de Desarrollo, S.A. v. Alliance Bond Fund, Inc., 527 U.S. 308,
3 318-19 (1999) (“[T]he substantive prerequisites for obtaining an equitable remedy as well as the general
4 availability of injunctive relief are not altered by [Rule 65] and depend on traditional principles of equity
5 jurisdiction.”).

6
7 188. Second, equity acts in personam - it acts on the person subject to its jurisdiction and,
8 in this context, not on the challenged judgment, whether foreign or domestic. See E.g., 2 Pomeroy §
9 428; McClintock § 34, at 85; see also, e.g., Hart v. Sansom, 110 U.S. 151, 155 (1884) (“A court of equity
10 acts in personam, by compelling a deed to be executed or canceled by or on behalf of the party. It has no
11 inherent power, by the mere force of its decree, to annul a deed or to establish a title.”); Massie v. Watts,
12 10 U.S. (6 Cranch) 148, 158 (1810) (Marshall, C.J.) (“The principles of equity give a court jurisdiction
13 wherever the person may be found, and the circumstance, that a question of title may be involved in the
14 inquiry, and may even constitute the essential point on which the case depends, does not
15 seem sufficient to arrest that jurisdiction.”).

16
17 189. It therefore “may command persons properly before it to cease or perform acts outside
18 its territorial jurisdiction.” See Steele v. Bulova Watch Co., 344 U.S. 280, 289 (1952) (affirming
19 injunction prohibiting use of trademark in Mexico); accord, e.g., Cole v. Cunningham, 133 U.S. 107, 111
20 (1890) (affirming Massachusetts decree restraining Massachusetts citizens from prosecuting attachment
21 actions in New York); Storm LLC v. Telenor Mobile Commc’ns AS, No. 06 Civ. 13157 (GEL), 2006 WL
22 3735657, at *14 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 15, 2006) (Lynch, J.) (enjoining initiation of lawsuits in Ukraine that
23 would disrupt or delay New York arbitration proceedings); Penn v. Lord Baltimore, 1 Ves. Sen. 444, 447-
24 48, 27 Eng. Rep. 1132, 1134-35 (Ch.) (1750) (Lord Chancellor entertained in England bill seeking specific
25 performance of contract to determine boundary between provinces of Maryland and Pennsylvania).
26
27
28

1 190. Since the time of Lord Coke, this principle has resulted, in proper cases, in equitable
2 decrees “enjoining parties from enforcing judgments obtained by them at law when it was
3 unconscionable for them to do so. See McClintock § 34, at 85.

4 191. Moreover, the principle that equity acts *in personam* means that a court of equity having
5 jurisdiction over individual parties may enjoin those parties from enforcing, or afford other equitable
6 relief with respect to, a judgment of another state or another nation. Gray v. Richmond Bicycle Co., 167
7 N.Y. 348, 358-59 (1901) (“a court of one state may, where it has jurisdiction of the parties, determine the
8 question whether a judgment between them, rendered in another state, was obtained by fraud, and, if so,
9 may enjoin the enforcement of it, although its subject-matter is situated in such other state”); Title Ins. &
10 Trust Co. v. Cal. Dev. Co., 152 P. 542, 550-51, 553, 557-58 (Cal. 1915) (affirming injunction barring
11 enforcement in Mexico of Mexican judgment obtained by fraud; *Injunction Against Enforcement of Judgment*
12 *Rendered in Foreign Country or Other State*, 64 A.L.R. 1136 (1930).

13 192. Thus, the fact that equity acts *in personam* affords ample scope for equitable relief.
14
15 Furthermore, Los Angeles Superior failed to obtain jurisdiction over Lynch (Case No. BC338322 and
16 BC341120) and the judgments entered against Lynch are void and this provides additional support for
17 Lynch’s arguments that these judgment should be set aside.
18

19 193. Third, fraud in its procurement is an ancient basis for enjoining enforcement of or
20 granting other equitable relief with respect to a judgment where other requisites of the exercise of
21 equitable power are present. See *E.g., supra* note 1263; 12 Moore’s Federal Practice § 60.81. Lynch will
22 now address the fact that these judgments, as well as the decision in the Natural Wealth Case, were
23 procured by fraud upon the court.
24

25 **Fraud on the Court**

26 194. There is considerable agreement amongst courts and scholars concerning the kinds of
27 fraud that support an independent action for relief from a judgment. Fraud in the context of
28

1 independent actions or other applications for relief from a judgment generally falls into two or three
2 categories. “Relief is always possible for ‘extrinsic’ fraud” and for “fraud on the court,” which often is
3 confused with or treated as a subset of extrinsic fraud. 12 Moore’s Federal Practice § 60.81[1][b]. Relief
4 for so-called “intrinsic fraud” often has been available less frequently. *Id.* § 60.81[1][b][ii]. There is more
5 recent discussion as to whether the supposed distinction between extrinsic and intrinsic fraud is or
6 should be meaningful. *Id.* § 60.81[1][b][iv]; see Gleason v. Jandrucko, 860 F.2d 556, 560 (2d Cir. 1988)
7 (“Relief from a judgment by way of an independent action need not be premised on a showing of
8 extrinsic as opposed to intrinsic fraud.”).

10 194. The RICO Defendants committed fraud upon the U.S. District Court in Colorado, Los
11 Angeles Superior Court, the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California and with the other
12 courts. The fraud upon Los Angeles Superior (Case No. BC338322 and BC34112) relates to extrinsic
13 fraud with respect to the willful and knowing failure to effect service of process upon Lynch. However,
14 the legal pleadings to the court in those cases are replete with fraudulent misrepresentations. That would
15 include, but is not limited to, submitting the fraudulent Expense Ledger to the Court and
16 misrepresenting that as and valid, independent and impartial accounting.

18 **Hazel Atlas**

19 195. Particularly relevant here is the Supreme Court’s decision in Hazel-Atlas Glass Co.
20 v. Hartford-Empire Co., 322 U.S. 238 (1944), in which the Court reversed a ruling that had denied
21 equitable relief against a previous judgment and, indeed, in which the Court directed that the prior
22 judgment be vacated. The facts in this case parallel the facts in the Hazel Atlas case in important respects.

24 196. *Hazel Atlas* involved a patent infringement and a fraudulent article written by an allegedly
25 disinterested expert was used to procure the issuance of the patent. Hartford sued Hazel-Atlas for
26 infringement. The ghostwritten article played no role in the trial and the district court dismissed the case
27 on the ground that there was no infringement. Hartford appealed and directed the appellate court to the
28

1 ghostwritten article. The court of appeal, relying on the fraudulent article, reversed and reinstated the
2 infringement suit which was settled on terms favorable to Hartford. After the court of appeals' ruling,
3 facts concerning the fraudulent article emerged. Hazel Atlas commenced a new action in the court of
4 appeals seeking relief, that court ruled against it, and the Supreme Court ultimately reversed and directed
5 that the prior judgment be vacated. The basis for the Supreme Court's ruling was that Hartford's actions
6 constituted fraud on the court. As the Court put it:

7
8 "Every element of the fraud here disclosed demands the exercise of the historic power of equity to set
9 aside fraudulently begotten judgments. This is not simply a case of a judgment obtained with the aid of a
10 witness who, on the basis of after discovered evidence, is believed possibly to have been guilty of perjury.
11 Here, even if we consider nothing but Hartford's sworn admissions, we find a deliberately planned and
12 carefully executed scheme to defraud not only the Patent Office but the Circuit Court of Appeals. *Cf.*
13 *Marshall v. Holmes, supra.* Proof of the scheme, and of its complete success up to date, is conclusive. *Cf.*
14 *United States v. Throckmorton, supra.*

15 We have, then, a case in which undisputed evidence filed with the Circuit Court of Appeals in a bill of
16 review proceeding reveals such fraud on that Court as demands, under settled equitable principles, the
17 interposition of equity to devitalize the 1932 judgment despite the expiration of the term at which that
18 judgment was finally entered.

19 Hartford's fraud, hidden for years but now admitted, had its genesis in the plan to publish an article for
20 the deliberate purpose of deceiving the Patent Office. The plan was executed, and the article was put to
21 fraudulent use in the Patent Office, contrary to law. [citations omitted] From there the trail of fraud
22 continued without break through the District Court and up to the Circuit Court of Appeals. Had the
23 District Court learned of the fraud on the Patent Office at the original infringement trial, it would have
24 been warranted in dismissing Hartford's case. * * * So, also, could the Circuit Court of Appeals have
25 dismissed the appeal had it been aware of Hartford's corrupt activities in suppressing the truth
26 concerning the authorship of the article. The total effect of all this fraud, practiced both on the Patent
27 Office and the courts, calls for nothing less than a complete denial of relief to Hartford for the
28 claimed infringement of the patent thereby procured and enforced.

197. The U.S. Supreme Court went on to direct that the earlier judgment of the court of
appeals be set aside, that the mandate be recalled, that Hartford's original appeal be dismissed, and that
the district court be directed to dismiss the infringement suit in addition to "taking such additional action
as may be necessary and appropriate." The situation here is at least, if not more, as egregious, and
involves a series of fraudulently obtained default judgments and egregious fraud upon numerous U.S.
District and state courts throughout this country.

1 **The Other Requirements for Relief Have Been Satisfied**

2 198. In considering whether a litigant is entitled to relief from a prior judgment on the
3 ground of fraud, courts frequently consider whether (1) the fraud (whether intrinsic or extrinsic)
4 prevented a full and fair presentation or determination of the litigant's claim or defense in the prior
5 action or otherwise would render it unconscionable to give effect to the prior judgment, (2) the party
6 seeking relief was diligent in discovering the fraud and attacking the judgment, and (3) evidence of
7 the fraud is clear and convincing. Hazel-Atlas concluded that diligence on the part of the defrauded
8 party was not a requirement for vacating the decision. Lynch nevertheless has acted with diligence with
9 respect to these judgments and decisions. The fraud involved in this case prevented Lynch from making
10 a full and fair defense. She did not receive any opportunity, let a full and fair one, to present her case.
11 See Restatement (Second) of Judgments § 70 cmt. d (1982); see also Toledo Scale Co.v. Computing Scale
12 Co., 261 U.S. 399, 421 (1923) ("It must appear that the fraud charged really prevented the party
13 complaining from making a full and fair defense"); Marshall, 141 U.S. at 596; Lundborg v. Phoenix
14 Leasing, Inc., 91 F.3d 265, 271 (1st Cir. 1996) (due diligence; clear and convincing evidence); Diaz v.
15 Methodist Hosp., 46 F.3d 492, 497 (5th Cir. 1995) (full and fair opportunity to present case); Cresswell v.
16 Sullivan & Cromwell, 922 F.2d 60, 71 (2d Cir. 1990) (due diligence and lack of fault on part of party
17 attacking judgment); Green v. Foley, 856 F.2d 660, 665 (4th Cir. 1988) (fully and fairly presenting case),
18 cert. denied, 490 U.S. 1031 (1989).

19
20
21
22 199. Lynch has been diligent in both discovering the fraud and attacking the judgment. When
23 courts are asked to grant relief from or to decline to recognize a prior judgment on the ground of fraud, a
24 central question is whether such an outcome is appropriate to "protect the fairness and integrity of
25 litigation." See 12 Moore's Federal Practice § 60.43[1][d] (3d ed. 2012) (quoting Lonsdorf v. Seefeldt, 47
26 F.3d 893, 898 (7th Cir. 1995)).
27
28

1 filed the declaration on September 6, 2005. One of the documents Lynch discovered in 2013 (attached to
2 the declaration of Joel Feuer) was a Statement of Claim for Damages. The Statement of Claims is replete
3 with fraudulent misrepresentations and regurgitates the fabricated narrative used in Cohen's Los Angeles
4 Litigation Complaint, responses to the Natural Wealth Lawsuit, and in documents transmitted to the
5 Internal Revenue Service. Exhibit SS: Declaration of Joel Feuer and attached Statement for Claims and
6 Damages. Please refer to racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created for this Complaint,
7 incorporated herein and made a part here. The documents may be located through the blog index and
8 the first exhibit, in alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.

10 204. The Statement of Claims fraudulently misrepresents that the Agile Group "permitted
11 Cohen's accounts to be looted by Kelly [sic] Lynch. Lynch will once again point out to this Court that
12 corporate accounts are not Leonard Cohen's personal accounts and Lynch misappropriated nothing
13 whatsoever. On the contrary, Leonard Cohen has engaged in embezzlement, money laundering, and
14 outright theft with respect to the assets and property of numerous corporate entities.

16 **THE FRAUDULENT USE OF**
17 **RESTRAINING ORDERS AS A TACTIC TO**
18 **DISCREDIT, HARASS & INTIMIDATE LYNCH**

19 **Los Angeles Superior Court Civil Harassment Order (Case No. BS099650) granted Leonard Cohen on November 3, 2005**

20 205. The Natural Wealth Lawsuit, filed in June 2005, confirmed that Leonard Cohen and
21 Robert Kory planned to use certain tactics to prevent Lynch from "serving as a credit witness." The
22 precise language used in the Natural Wealth Complaint, filed six months prior to the RICO Defendants
23 obtaining their first fraudulent restraining order against Lynch, is as follows:

25 "When these tactics to draw Lynch into his extortion scheme proved futile, Cohen and Kory – according
26 to Lynch – turned to far more aggressive means to obtain her cooperation. Indeed, as heard by other
27 witnesses, Cohen and Kory vowed to "crush her," and planned to use one of LA Superior Court's
28 fraudulent domestic violence restraining orders and other means to prevent her from serving as a
credible witness regarding both Cohen's affairs and in regard to the scheme into which they had tried
without success to draw her."

1 205. On October 14, 2005, according to Los Angeles Superior Court’s website, filed a
2 Complaint against Lynch related to “civil harassment.” That complaint, according to this site, evidently
3 was granted on November 3, 2005 to “prohibit harassment.” This was the RICO Defendants response
4 to their willful and knowing failure to serve and/or communicate with Lynch. Lynch has no actual
5 details about the evidence submitted to Los Angeles Superior Court to support this “complaint.”
6 Exhibit TT: Los Angeles Superior Court Docket, Case No. BS099650. Please refer to
7 racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created for this Complaint, incorporated herein and
8 made a part here. The documents may be located through the blog index and the first exhibit, in
9 alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.
10

11 206. In or around September 2012, in documents her lawyer transmitted to her, Lynch
12 discovered an LAPD report dated June 14, 2011, that would ultimately form the basis of an April 6
13 through 12, 2012 trial. The LAPD report confirmed that Lynch’s emails to Leonard Cohen were
14 “generally requests” for tax information. Detective Viramontes, LAPD’s Threat Management Unit,
15 would later inform Lynch that Leonard Cohen did not feel “comfortable” with Lynch’s requests for IRS
16 required tax and corporate information. Evidently these requests violated one of the tactical restraining
17 orders the RICO Defendants have obtained against Lynch since 2005.
18

19 207. The LAPD contained information with respect to a November 3, 2005, the date the
20 RICO Defendants obtained their first fraudulent, tactical restraining order against Lynch. Evidently,
21 after obtaining the order in this case, the RICO Defendants contacted Beverly Hills Police Department
22 and filed a violation of a court order with the police department. This would have occurred, according to
23 LAPD’s report, on the date Los Angeles Superior Court issued the order. According to LAPD’s report,
24 Detective Albanese (Beverly Hills Police Department) handled the “investigation.” Albanese evidently
25 made an appointment to meet with Wendy Segall and Bill Hodgman of the Los Angeles District
26
27
28

1 Attorney's Office to request "felony" charges. According to LAPD's report, they discussed certain
2 criminal elements and were advised that the elements of stalking had not been met and the RICO
3 Defendants were advised to file the case as 653(m) PC, an intent to annoy statute. This case would
4 ultimately be filed at some point in January 2012, as more fully detailed hereinbelow. Detective Albanese
5 refuses to return Lynch's calls for information about this incident. Lynch did contact DDA Bill
6 Hodgman who does not have any recollection of this conversation, an incident with Leonard Cohen, and
7 felt that he would due to the fact that he has an interest in music. The report, dated noted that the
8 original report was taken on May 1, 2011. Exhibit UU: LAPD Report #1107-10476 dated June 14,
9 2011. Please refer to racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created for this Complaint,
10 incorporated herein and made a part here. The documents may be located through the blog index and
11 the first exhibit, in alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.
12
13

14 **Boulder Combined Court Civil Harassment order entered September 2, 2008 (Case No. 2008 C
000776)**

15 208. On August 19, 2008, one day after legally threatening Ann Diamond, Leonard Cohen and
16 Michelle Rice (Lynch is unclear if Kory was present) flew into Boulder, Colorado in the midst of Leonard
17 Cohen's European tour. They evidently traveled by private jet. The reason for this extraordinary flight
18 was the RICO Defendants understanding that the California order was about to expire, Lynch was
19 posting online in defense of herself, and Lynch was communicating with third parties such as IRS, FBI,
20 DOJ, Treasury, Phil Spector's attorneys, and the news media. Leonard Cohen, who was in the midst of
21 his 2008 European tour, did not meet the statutory requirements for an emergency order. Colorado
22 requires an element of imminent danger. The RICO Defendants merely wanted to silence Lynch,
23 threaten Ann Diamond, and were obviously concerned that the fraudulently obtained 2005 default
24 judgment restraining order was about to expire.
25
26
27
28

1 209. Lynch was not served this documents in the manner in which the process server declared
2 under the oath of perjury. She ultimately addressed this fact with the Court. Nevertheless, she attended
3 the hearing. The process server ran around Boulder, Colorado advising Lynch's friends and
4 acquaintances that they were attempting to locate Lynch because they were in possession of a check in
5 connection with her son's horrific Whole Foods incident. This individual visited Marpa House, a
6 Buddhist residence where Lynch has never resided, the Boulder Hostel, where Lynch had not stayed for
7 a considerable period of time, possibly the Trident Bookstore (where someone alleging to be a private
8 investigator spoke to one of Trungpa Rinpoche's former kusing or guard and left his card for Lynch),
9 and elsewhere. The individual scares and upset people. Lynch's friend obtained the process server's
10 phone number. Due to the fact that he upset so many people with his statements, Lynch phoned him
11 and confirmed her address for him. The RICO Defendants must have provided this individual with
12 information about her son's accident which has repeatedly been used against Lynch – including when
13 Leonard Cohen had the audacity to testify that Lynch blamed him for that accident where Rutger's
14 fingers, and part of his hand, were ripped off. At no time has Lynch alleged that Leonard Cohen caused
15 that accident. In fact, Lynch has received a horrifying email accusing her of causing that accident,
16 horrendously slandering her and Oliver Stone, and advising her that she should be murdered, raped, or
17 commit suicide. That email was, addressed more fully in this Complaint, was most likely written by co-
18 conspirator Stephen Gianelli who creates monikers such as the 14th Sheepdog, 17th Shitzu, and so forth.
19 This is the type of activity, the RICO Defendants have exposed Lynch, her sons and family, friends, and
20 witnesses to.

21
22 210. Lynch attended the September 2, 2008 hearing, discovered that Leonard Cohen had made
23 an extraordinary secret flight into Boulder, his lawyers (Kory & Rice) were now serving as witnesses, and
24 the individual who represented him at the hearing could not define "directly or indirectly," appeared to
25 have no idea what he was talking about, confused Lynch, and ended up complaining to the judge about
26
27
28

1 Lynch's emails to IRS Commissioner's Staff and Bruce Cutler, Phil Spector's trial counsel. At some
2 point, Lynch informed the Court that she felt the parties involved in the matter were "insane," had
3 destroyed her life, targeted her children, and asked if the order could be made permanent. This was after
4 Lynch raised serious concerns about possible fraud and perjury in connection with the ex parte
5 proceedings. The judge advised Lynch that she could not provide her with legal advice. Following the
6 hearing, Lynch returned to the Court, discovered Cohen's entirely perjured declaration (which Rice has
7 confirmed drafting), and submitted an Motion to Quash with the Court. The Court denied that motion
8 and reminded Lynch that she requested that the order be made permanent. At no time whatsoever did
9 Lynch agree to the entry of any order based on the use of fraud and perjury.
10

11 211. From approximately January 2010 through the spring of 2014, Lynch and others were
12 consistently informed by the Boulder Combined Court that the permanent order expired on February 15,
13 2009. Exhibit VV: The Boulder Colorado Verified Motion; Exhibit WW: April 10, 2014 Email from
14 the Boulder Combined Court; and Exhibit XX: Transcript of the September 2, 2008 hearing. Please
15 refer to racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created for this Complaint, incorporated herein
16 and made a part here. The documents may be located through the blog index and the first exhibit, in
17 alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.
18

19 **Los Angeles Superior Court Fraudulent Domestic Violence Order (Case No. BQ033717) granted**
20 **May 25, 2011**

21 212. On May 25, 2011, after lying to Lynch about registering the out-of-state order, the RICO
22 Defendants (Michelle Rice signed the registration and testified that she did extensive research, months
23 worth, into the registration of a foreign protection order). The Colorado foreign order was not a
24 "domestic violence order" but LA Superior Court registered it as such on May 25, 2011. This
25 registration caused the creation of a new order which Lynch was neither notified of nor served. Exhibit
26 YY: Registration of Colorado Sister State Order (DV-600); Exhibit ZZ: LA Superior Court, Case No.
27
28

1 BQ033717, Docket.’ Exhibit: AAA: The Boulder Colorado Verified Motion; Exhibit BBB: April 10,
2 2014 Email from the Boulder Combined Court; and Exhibit CCC: Transcript of the September 2, 2008
3 hearing. Please refer to racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created for this Complaint,
4 incorporated herein and made a part here. The documents may be located through the blog index and
5 the first exhibit, in alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.
6

7 213. On July 28, 2015, Lynch filed a Motion to Vacate the fraudulently obtained domestic
8 violence order. It is important for this Court to note that the 2005 restraining order was a civil
9 harassment order. The two orders require different statutory relationships. Evidently, from
10 approximately November 3, 2005 until May 25, 2011 (although Lynch had not seen Cohen since
11 November 2004), the nature of their relationship changed. That matter is under appeal. Exhibit DDD:
12 September 1, 2015 Hearing Transcript; Exhibit EEE: RICO Defendants’ Request for Judicial Notice
13 dated July 17, 2015. Please refer to racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created for this
14 Complaint, incorporated herein and made a part here. The documents may be located through the blog
15 index and the first exhibit, in alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.
16

17 **THE RICO DEFENDANTS COLLUDE**
18 **WITH ELEMENTS OF THE LOS ANGELES GOVERNMENT**
19 **OFFICIALS TO BRING SHAM CHARGES AGAINST LYNCH**

20 214. On March 1, 2012, Lynch was falsely arrested in Berkeley, California, transported to Los
21 Angeles (without being appointed a lawyer), and ultimately charged with willfully and knowingly violating
22 the domestic violence order (Case No. BQ033717). Lynch was also charged with intending to “annoy”
23 Leonard Cohen over a number of issues. Those issues include, but were not limited, the Tax Fraud
24 Scheme, RICO Defendants willful and knowing refusal to provide Lynch with IRS required tax and
25 corporate information, her alleged emails (that LAPD’s TMU concluded were generally requests for tax
26 information), the coordinated custody matter, Rutger’s horrifying Whole Foods incident, calls she placed
27
28

1 to Paul Shaffer and Bob Dylan, Cohen’s sexual harassment and indecent exposure with respect to Lynch,
2 Phil Spector’s case, and the RICO Defendants’ failure to serve Lynch notice of entry of the default
3 judgment. The Trial was replete with fraudulent misrepresentations on the part of the prosecutor,
4 perjured testimony on the part of the RICO Defendants. The prosecutor’s opening arguments included
5 the following statements:
6

7 Streeter: Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen of the jury. Now, as the Court has informed you, this
8 is the stage of the trial that is referred to as the Opening Statements. It’s kind of like – for those of you
9 still old fashioned, are still in love with the written word and like to buy books at a bookstore instead of
10 having an e-reader and you want to find out what the book is about and you look at the dust cover of the
11 book, just to get an idea what that book is going to be about, that’s kind of what my job here is in an
12 opening statement; to give you an idea, a road map of what the People believe the evidence in this case is
going to show. Exhibit FFF: Trial Transcript RT 37. Please refer to racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an
evidence blog created for this Complaint, incorporated herein and made a part here. The documents
may be located through the blog index and the first exhibit, in alphabetical order, would be the first
posted document.

13 So the People believe that the evidence will show in the case of People of the State of California vs.
14 Kelley Lynch that during the 80s, Mr. Leonard Cohen, who was a singer – was and is a
15 singer/songwriter, but also a poet, struck up a relationship with Ms. Lynch. They had a brief intimate
16 relationship, and then at some point after that the relationship ended in the late 80s when Mr. Cohen’s
17 business manager died, Mr. Cohen hired Ms. Lynch, first as his personal assistant, and then ultimately as
18 his business manager. But unfortunately around 2004 or so, things started to go not very well between
19 Mr. Cohen and Ms. Lynch. And Mr. Cohen ended the business relationship that he had with Ms. Lynch.
20 Unfortunately, that was not the end of it for Ms. Lynch, the evidence will show. The evidence will show
21 that shortly after the termination of the business relationship by Mr. Cohen that Ms. Lynch began an
22 onslaught, a campaign of harassment on Mr. Cohen, and that harassment – PD: Objection;
23 argumentative. Court: Overruled. Streeter: That harassment has continued or did continue up until
24 February 29, 2012. Now, let’s talk a little bit how we got from 2005 to where we are right now. Exhibit
25 GGG: Trial Transcript RT 37 – 38. Please refer to racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog
26 created for this Complaint, incorporated herein and made a part here. The documents may be located
27 through the blog index and the first exhibit, in alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.
28

Streeter: Now, in some of the emails there are mention by Ms. Lynch of failed business agreements and
failure by Mr. Cohen to live up to his agreement of what she believed their business relationship was.
And indeed one of the things, the evidence will show, that she talks a lot about is tax fraud and the need
to have the tax return. But the People will submit to you or show to you that this so-called business
relationship, or not honoring their business relationship, indeed the most important thing that she
mentions every so often the tax statement is merely a ruse. For example, the evidence will show, that in
a three-day period from January 19 to January 231 where again, like, the evidence you will see from
December 18, where there were numerous emails by Ms. Lynch to Mr. Cohen, exactly one of all those
emails that Ms. Lynch specifically asked for her K-1s form it is. Exhibit HHH: Trial Transcript RT 42.
Please refer to racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created for this Complaint, incorporated

1 herein and made a part here. The documents may be located through the blog index and the first exhibit,
2 in alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.

3 Streeter: Let's talk a little bit about Ms. Lynch's need for the tax form or tax return – PD: Objection;
4 Argumentative. Court: Sustained. Streeter: The evidence will show that Ms. Lynch was Mr. Cohen's
5 business manager. The evidence will show that Ms. Lynch – Mr. Cohen has no clue as to what a W-2
6 form is, a 1099 is, a K-1 form, the evidence will show that Ms. Lynch is the one that had all of that
7 information, knew all that information. Mr. Cohen did not have it, does not have it and does not
8 understand what it means. Okay. Exhibit III: Trial Transcript RT 42 – 43. Please refer to
9 racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created for this Complaint, incorporated herein and
10 made a part here. The documents may be located through the blog index and the first exhibit, in
11 alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.

12 Remember what the People said the purpose of the opening statement is to give you an outline, overview
13 of what the People believe the evidence will show. Thank you very much. Court: Thank you, Ms.

14 Streeter. Exhibit JJJ: Trial Transcript RT 43 – 44. Please refer to racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an
15 evidence blog created for this Complaint, incorporated herein and made a part here. The documents
16 may be located through the blog index and the first exhibit, in alphabetical order, would be the first
17 posted document.

18 215. On April 9, 2012, the prosecutor provided Lynch's public defenders with an "IRS
19 Binder" that evidently related to the testimony of Robert Kory. Lynch immediately instructed her
20 lawyers to issue a subpoena to Agent Luis Tejada, head of an IRS fraud group in Los Angeles, California.
21 Pursuant to federal regulations, Agent Tejada had to clear the subpoena request with the appropriate
22 authorities prior to testifying. Lynch's lawyer, Nikhil Ramnaney, spoke to Agent Tejada and was advised
23 that the subpoena request was being considered and evaluated by their attorneys. Among other issues
24 Lynch's attorneys raised with the court was the fact that they felt Agent Tejada's testimony would go to
25 the motivation of the People's witnesses, all three RICO Defendants.

26 I spoke with the agent this morning. That request is being considered and evaluated by their attorneys.
27 And as I said, they'll give me an answer by this afternoon regarding whether or not he will be able to
28 testify and as to what he will testify to. Based on the fact that we received the binder on Monday, I think
me and Mr. Kelly -- Court: What does his testimony go to? PD: We believe it goes directly to the level
of specific intent elements, Your Honor, that Ms. Lynch's communications were not made with any
intent to harass or annoy, and they were made in good faith, based on the actions taken by this agent,
they fully corroborate Ms. Lynch's intent. We also think that on the secondary corollary matter, they go
the vice motivation of the People's witnesses. Court: Okay. Well, I will consider that after I hear your
information this afternoon. Exhibit KKK: Trial Transcript RT 384-385. Please refer to
racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created for this Complaint, incorporated herein and

1 made a part here. The documents may be located through the blog index and the first exhibit, in
2 alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.

3 216. The IRS Binder contained letters from defendant Robert Kory to Internal Revenue
4 Service with respect to fraudulent refunds defendant Leonard Cohen applied for and received and letters
5 to Agent Tejada with respect to Agent Sopko's March 6, 2007 email to Kelley Lynch. In March 2007,
6 Lynch met with Agent Sopko, U.S. Treasury, and her partner. Following that meeting, Lynch received an
7 email from Agent Sopko that advised Lynch that she had found a "solid IRS contact" whose name was
8 Agent Luis Tejada. Agent Sopko had evidently spoken with Agent Tejada and advised him that she
9 would be passing his conduct information onto Lynch. Agent Sopko also advised Lynch that Agent
10 Tejada "emphasized that you will need to put something in writing - a summary of all important details,
11 with as much specificity as you have. (For example if you have copies of any paperwork involved, or
12 social security numbers of people involved ...) Once you pass the information on to him, he will review
13 it and proceed accordingly. As standard practice, you will not get confirmation that your information was
14 received. However, you may contact Tejada to follow-up. The IRS Binder will be discussed in greater
15 detail in this Complaint.
16

17
18 217. In his March 11, 2007 letter to Agent Tejada, Robert Kory confirmed that, while he
19 understood that Agent Tejada "must be open to Ms. Lynch's allegations" Kory asked that he take
20 "whatever steps might be in" Agent Tejada's power to "limit communications that she can then use to
21 further 'defame' Leonard Cohen." At no time has Lynch defamed Leonard Cohen. The state claims
22 section of this complaint will address the extensive campaign of defamation with respect to Lynch.
23 Another letter from Kory to Agent Tejada, dated March 23, 2007, provided evidence that the RICO
24 Defendants were using the fabricated Los Angeles Litigation Complaint, other documents filed in that
25 matter, and the fraudulent Default Judgment to Leonard Cohen with respect to the Tax Fraud Scheme
26 allegations.
27

1 218. Los Angeles Superior Court refused to permit Agent Tejada, and other witnesses, to
2 testify. The Court determined that Lynch had previously been aware of the federal tax matters, Agent
3 Tejada, and possibly the content of the IRS binder. This is blatantly false. Lynch was aware that on or
4 around April 15, 2005, and thereafter, she reported the allegations that Leonard Cohen committed
5 criminal tax fraud to Internal Revenue Service and other tax authorities. Lynch was completely unaware
6 of the fraudulent tax refunds. During the 2012, Leonard Cohen testified that he and his personal
7 corporate and tax lawyer, Richard Westin, “rectified” a “mistake” in Lynch’s ownership interest in
8 Traditional Holdings, LLC. The RICO Defendants, although Lynch was included on the 2001 through
9 2003 federal tax returns, refuse to provide Lynch with any additional information or evidence. Exhibit
10 LLL: IRS Binder. Please refer to racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created for this
11 Complaint, incorporated herein and made a part here. The documents may be located through the blog
12 index and the first exhibit, in alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.
13
14

15 219. On April 17, 2012, Lynch was convicting of violating what she would ultimately discover
16 was a fraudulent “domestic violence order” which she was neither served nor notified of. Lynch would
17 also discover that prosecutor Sandra Jo Streeter, who engaged in egregious misconduct through her trial
18 (including blatantly lying about federal tax matters), was a member of the City Attorney’s Family
19 Violence Unit. Leonard Cohen was permitted to provide a Victim Impact Statement at this hearing
20 which was widely recounted in the news media. An example of the type of press coverage Cohen
21 received for his performance, during and after the trial, is an article that appeared in the Guardian on
22 April 19, 2012 entitled “Leonard Cohen’s poetic thanks as former manager and lover is jailed for
23 harassment.” Exhibit MMM: Leonard Cohen’s Victim Impact Statement. Please refer to
24 racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created for this Complaint, incorporated herein and
25 made a part here. The documents may be located through the blog index and the first exhibit, in
26 alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.
27
28

1 220. Kelley Lynch is not Leonard Cohen’s former manager and at no time did she harass him
2 or his RICO co-defendants. The Guardian’s article detailed Leonard Cohen’s tale of a “relentless
3 strategy of a woman fired over lost earnings.” Of course, Leonard Cohen has been unopposed in all
4 legal matters that involve him and Kelley Lynch. He has a team of lawyers throughout the United States
5 willing to do and say anything. The RICO co-defendant lawyers, Kory & Rice, serve as paid witnesses
6 and their rhetoric has become increasing aggressive, vile, and outrageous. The author of the article
7 commented on Cohen’s poetic and lyrical voice in his carefully crafted “phrasing.” Cohen first thanked
8 the court, “in the person of your honour for the cordial, even-handed and elegant manner in which these
9 proceedings have unfolded. It was a privilege and an education to testify in this courtroom.” Of course,
10 the Court permitted Leonard Cohen to literally confess to committing perjury on the witness stand. The
11 author noted that the proceedings, “however dignified his prose,” marked the end of an ugly episode
12 between Cohen and his former manager and quoted Judge Robert Vanderet who had the audacity to
13 comment on a “long, unrelenting barrage of harassing behavior” towards Cohen when, in fact, Lynch,
14 her sons, other family members, friends, and others have been the victims of a relentless campaign of
15 harassment and slander. This campaign of harassment and slander is more fully addressed hereinbelow.
16 Of course, due to the fact that Leonard Cohen is a fabulist with no regard whatsoever for the truth, the
17 situation caused him to “fear for his life.” Lynch confirmed for the court that she had engaged in
18 “unauthorized rambling” in connection with her emails documenting the destruction of her life for IRS,
19 FBI, DOJ, Treasury, and others, requesting IRS required tax and corporate information, refuting highly
20 slanderous, false and inflammatory information being transmitted to third parties – including federal
21 government agencies – about Lynch by certain of the co-conspirators, advising Cohen to cease and
22 desist slandering her, requesting corporate accountings and other financial information, and attempting
23 to address the fact that she was not served the summons and complaint in Los Angeles Superior Court
24 Case No. BC338322.
25
26
27
28

1 221. Due to the incoherent transcripts the prosecutor submitted to the jurors, entirely filled
2 with inaccuracies and misrepresentations, Lynch was accused of making statements such as “Cohen is
3 going to be hung” although she never made any such statement. The author of this particular article felt
4 the “case was given added piquancy through the long and, recently, dramatic history between the
5 Canadian singer and his harasser. Cohen sued Lynch in 2005, a year after he dismissed her as his
6 manager, claiming she had stolen \$5 million from his personal accounts and investments and left him
7 virtually penniless. The court found in his favour and ordered Lynch to pay him \$9.5 million but her
8 lawyers claimed she was unreachable” and she has “never repaid the money or faced criminal charges.”
9 The RICO Defendants obtained a default judgment against Lynch after failing to serve her. They and
10 their co-counsel refused to communicate with Lynch throughout all litigation matters and continue to
11 employ that tactic. The author was off with respect to the amount of the original judgment by over \$2
12 million. Lynch has not been represented by an attorney since approximately March 2005 and at no time
13 did her lawyers claim she was “unreachable.” At all times, Cohen (who hired private investigators to
14 monitor Lynch, harass her colleagues, visit her landlord, and so forth) understood precisely where she
15 was. Most articles, including the Guardian’s, note that the “theft” prompted the “hard-up Cohen to
16 begin touring again after years in a Zen Buddhist monastery in California. The Natural Wealth Lawsuit
17 repeatedly confirmed the fact that as of 2005, Leonard Cohen planned to tour. In or around December
18 1998, Leonard Cohen permanently left Mt. Baldy Zen Center where he stayed at times in a deluxe cabin
19 provided to him. Cohen was on Mt. Baldy due to his dependence on various substances and tendency to
20 drink heavily. Cohen, who testified during a March 23, 2012 hearing related to the trial, acknowledged,
21 as the article noted, that he and Lynch had a statutory required “brief intimate relationship” although
22 they never did. This issue was the testimony Cohen acknowledged perjuring himself over. Cohen
23 specifically informed the Court that he changed his testimony from the March 2012 hearing during the
24 April 2012 trial. Of course, no story is complete without one of Cohen’s inane, self-serving absurd
25
26
27
28

1 comments. In this particular instance, Cohen was quoted as feeling conscious about his surrounded
2 because every time he sees a car slow down he gets worried. Of course, Cohen had not seen Lynch in
3 approximately seven years at that time; she lived in the Bay Area; and is not known for her participation
4 in “gang” drive-bys. Nevertheless, Leonard Cohen knows precisely what the news media will mindlessly
5 regurgitate. This habit of Leonard Cohen’s is addressed more fully hereinbelow. The prosecutor, being a
6 match for Leonard Cohen in terms of the extent of her dishonesty, informed the jurors that “this is
7 nothing than the unraveling of a con.” Cohen went on to comment, as regurgitated in this article, that he
8 wanted to thank Ms. Kelley Lynch “for insisting on a jury trial, thus . . . allowing the court to observe her
9 profoundly unwholesome” conduct and “relentless strategies to escape the consequences of her wrong-
10 doing.” It was Cohen’s prayer that “Ms. Lynch will take refuge in the wisdom of her religion.” Lynch
11 believes that this is an appropriate moment to quote His Holiness Kusum Lingpa, an enlightened teacher
12 from Tibet, who knew Leonard Cohen intimately: “He is an asshole who is going to hell.” The
13 prosecutor attempted to mislead the jurors into believing that Ms. Lynch made this remark to annoy
14 Leonard Cohen.
15
16

17 222. Cohen, who was clearly emboldened by his temporary victory, proceeded to make a
18 Victim Impact Statement that contained extremely outrageous, blatantly false, fraudulent, and
19 inflammatory statements about Lynch with respect to federal tax matters and Internal Revenue Service.
20

21 **Excerpt of Victim Impact Statement**

22 This eight year ordeal of harassment . . . was designed specifically to avoid or postpone the inevitable day
23 of reckoning with the IRS, the day when she will be bound to account for the taxes she has neglected to
24 pay on the stolen monies she received and failed to report.

25 Immediately upon a forensic analysis of the theft by Moss Adams, a highly respected accounting firm, we
26 submitted a theft loss amendment to the IRS, and this was the considered basis for their refund to me, a
27 refund for the taxes that I had paid on the stolen monies that I did not receive.

28 Ms. Lynch herself, her former tax attorneys (whom she fired), her accountant (who resigned), the IRS,
and two courts of law, one in California, the other in Colorado, have long been in possession of these
very same and very public reports which the Public Defenders dare to assert we withheld and offer this

1 fictional withholding as justification ... Ms. Lynch is in full possession of the forensic analysis. She just
2 doesn't like it.

3 223. The prosecutor drove her points points home – all false statements submitted to the
4 jurors (who would inform Lynch's lawyers in debriefing that they wanted to hear from IRS) - about the
5 federal and state tax matters as follows:

6 This is the other thing the people found a little interesting. She knows what a 1099 is a K-1 -- a K-1.
7 Whoever heard of a K-1 before this case? The FTB and the IRS. Did anyone know there was a
8 difference between the FTB and the IRS? Or what the FTB is? ... This is a woman who knows what a
9 K-1 is ... RT 566 So this isn't about Ms. Lynch being angry that she didn't get her tax documents. RT
10 577 So what you have here, what this is proof of is not a woman who legitimately wants her IRS records
11 or documents. It's the unraveling of a con. Exhibit NNN: RT 578 Trial Transcript. Please refer to
12 racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created for this Complaint, incorporated herein and
13 made a part here. The documents may be located through the blog index and the first exhibit, in
14 alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.

12 **IRS DECLARATION & EXHIBITS**
13 **MARCH 1, 2015**

14 224. On March 1, 2015, Kelley Lynch submitted a declaration, with exhibits, to Internal
15 Revenue. On or about March 17, 2015, Lynch filed a Motion for Terminating Sanctions with LA
16 Superior Court. She attached the declaration and exhibits. Her motion addressed fraud upon the court
17 but was wrongfully characterized as a motion for reconsideration. That matter is under appeal with the
18 Second Appellate Division. On or about May 29, 2015, the RICO Defendants filed an ex parte
19 application asking the court to seal many of the documents. The RICO Defendants have continuously
20 taken the position that corporations are Leonard Cohen's personal property and the corporate
21 documents are his personal property as well. Kelley Lynch was an independent contractor and did not
22 have attorney/client privilege with Leonard Cohen or his representatives. Michelle Rice has now
23 confirmed this for LA Superior Court. In fact, Lynch was intentionally excluded from attorney/client
24 privilege. At one point, Cohen wrapped Richard Westin and Neal Greenberg into attorney/client
25 privilege. All parties understood that Lynch did not share this privilege. The order sealing these
26 documents is also presently under appeal. The IRS declaration, together with a document index and all
27
28

1 exhibits, can be found at the evidence blog created for this RICO Complaint. Exhibit 000:
2 Declaration of Kelley Lynch (submitted to IRS on March 1, 2015), and all exhibits attached thereto. This
3 identical declaration, and all exhibits attached thereto, was submitted to Los Angeles Superior Court with
4 Lynch's Motion for Terminating Sanctions (fraud upon the court) and many of the documents in that
5 matter were sealed. Please refer to racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created for this
6 Complaint, incorporated herein and made a part here. The documents may be located through the blog
7 index and the first exhibit, in alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.
8

9
10 **NON-REVOCABLE CORPORATE**
11 **ASSIGNMENTS – BLUE MIST TOURING COMPANY, INC.**
12 **LYNCH'S OWNERSHIP INTEREST IN**
13 **THE CORPORATE ENTITIES AT ISSUE**

14 225. Blue Mist Touring Company, Inc., a Delaware corporation, was formed on June 23, 1988.
15 It was originally named Leonard Cohen Productions, Inc. ("LCPI"). However, when it registered to do
16 business in California, on March 18, 1993, LCPI changed its name to Blue Mist Touring Company, Inc.

17 226. According to the Complaint in the Los Angeles Litigation, Clause 40, the transfer of the
18 entirety of Cohen's intellectual properties into Blue Mist began in earnest in January 1998. This was
19 done well before Lynch was compensated with her ownership interest in this entity and the assignments
20 were done solely based on Leonard Cohen's directions and instructions.

21 227. At Cohen's direction, Westin drafted corporate minutes of a special meeting of the
22 directors of Blue Mist "to accept a transfer of intellectual property from shareholder Leonard Cohen
23 under "IRS Section 1998."

24 228. In May 1998, Westin prepared the transfer documents (assignments) and three separate
25 set of minutes.

26 229. On June 1, 1998, Westin provided Leonard Cohen with a Waiver of Notice for a Special
27 Meeting, the minutes of a Special Meeting, and the proposed assignments for 1) the Writer's Share, 2) the
28

1 Performer's share; and 3) copyrights to Cohen's eleven published books (in all translations).

2 230. Due to oral agreements Cohen and Lynch had previously entered into, whereby Cohen
3 agreed to compensate Lynch for services rendered in addition to her work as his personal manager,
4 Lynch was issued a 15% interest in Blue Mist stock. In March of 1999, to facilitate this understanding,
5 Richard Westin cancelled Cohen's sole ownership of the total outstanding shares (500 shares) in Blue
6 Mist and issued Lynch 75 shares of Blue Mist which represented a 15% equity interest. The language in
7 the corporate minutes, dictated by Leonard Cohen personally, with respect to the stock issuance indicate
8 that Lynch's 75 shares were issued "as compensation for her services to the Corporation, with great
9 gratitude for her efforts.
10

11 231. On December 28, 1998, an "Assignment, Assumption and Consent" Agreement was
12 executed by Leonard Cohen (as Assignor and President of Blue Mist) irrevocably transferring the
13 Writer's Royalties into Blue Mist.
14

15 232. On December 29, 1999, an "Assignment, Assumption and Consent" Agreement was
16 executed by Leonard Cohen (as Assignor and President of Blue Mist) irrevocably transferring the Artist's
17 Record Royalties into Blue Mist.

18 233. On December 29, 1999, an "Assignment, Assumption and Consent" Agreement was
19 executed by Leonard Cohen (as Assignor and President of Blue Mist) irrevocably transferring the
20 SOCAN Agreement (Writer's Share of Performance Income) into Blue Mist.
21

22 234. On August 4, 2000, an "Assignment, Assumption and Consent" Agreement was executed
23 by Leonard Cohen (as Assignor and President of Blue Mist) irrevocably transferring the Master
24 Recordings of 1979, 1988, and 1993 Live Performances into Blue Mist.

25 235. In September 2000, Westin prepared "Special Meeting Minutes of the Board of Directors
26 of Blue Mist Touring Company, Inc." approving the assignments into Blue Mist. Westin instructed
27 Lynch to sign them and "insert in minutes in chronological order [in the Blue Mist corporate binder.] All
28

1 assignments to Blue Mist Touring Company, Inc. were valid and transferred into the corporation at the
2 express and implicit instructions of Leonard Cohen. The Assignments were never rescinded and, while
3 Michelle Rice informed LA Superior Court that the assignments are “out there,” the assignments and
4 intellectual property belong to Blue Mist Touring Company, Inc. Lynch has a 15% ownership interest in
5 Blue Mist Touring Company, Inc. and a 15% ownership interest in Blue Mist Touring Company, Inc.
6 Exhibit PPP: Non-revocable assignments to Blue Mist Touring Company, Inc., attached hereto and
7 made a part hereof.

8 236. Similarly, Lynch has a 15% ownership interest Old Ideas, LLC. Leonard Cohen has
9 merely used his wrongdoing to benefit while bringing grave harm to Lynch and her family. The
10 copyrights to be assigned to this entity, formed in June 2004, relate to all intellectual property in
11 connection with the studio album “Dear Heather.”

12 237. Any attempts on the part of Leonard Cohen, personally or individually, to transfer the
13 assets of Blue Mist Touring Company, Inc. into his wholly owned LC Investments, LLC, Traditional
14 Holdings, LLC, would be invalid, unlawful, and evidence of fraud. Lynch relied on the representations
15 made to her with respect to Blue Mist Touring Company, Inc., Traditional Holdings, LLC, and Old
16 Ideas, LLC. She was fraudulently induced into entering into all agreements, fraudulently included on tax
17 returns, and used horrendously to promote the sham transactions Leonard Cohen pursued.

18 238. During Lynch’s representation of Cohen as his personal manager, and in other capacities,
19 Cohen and his representatives misrepresented her ownership interest in Blue Mist Touring Company,
20 Inc., Traditional Holdings, LLC, and Old Ideas, LLC. Due to these misrepresentations, Lynch was led to
21 believe that she had a 15% ownership interest in Blue Mist Touring Company, Inc., 99.5% ownership
22 interest in Traditional Holdings, LLC, 15% ownership interest in Old Ideas, LLC, and was clearly
23 fraudulently induced into executing many agreements including a valid and legal Annuity Agreement.

24 239. Cohen’s misrepresentations and omissions were made with the intent that Lynch rely
25 upon them.
26
27
28

1 240. Each statement or representation was known to Cohen to be false or untrue when they
2 were made to Lynch.

3 241. Lynch reasonably relied upon these misrepresentations, with respect to all entities she was
4 led to believe she had an ownership interest in, made by Cohen.

5 242. Lynch has suffered losses in an amount to be proven at trial, which require accountings
6 related to Leonard Cohen personally and each corporation, as a direct and proximate result of the
7 misrepresentations and omissions of Cohen.

8 243. The actions of Cohen were made with malice, fraud or oppression.

9 244. As of the date of this Complaint, Lynch has been unable to determine any information
10 whatsoever with respect to her ownership interest in valuable literary and musical intellectual property.
11 The Default Judgment is silent as to the intellectual property and, while she has diligently and
12 consistently attempted to discover facts with respect to this matter, Lynch has been continuously stone-
13 walled and on October 6, 2015 discovered that the assets are “out there” and somehow this relates to
14 Judge Lewis Babcock’s September 5, 2008 Order. The legal positions taken by the RICO Defendants
15 with respect to Blue Mist Touring Company, Inc., Traditional Holdings, LLC, and Old Ideas, LLC have
16 rendered all tax returns filed during certain periods of time, vis a vis Lynch’s legitimate ownership interest
17 in those entities, fraudulent.
18

19 245. Leonard Cohen’s professional representatives, including Richard Westin were engaged by
20 Cohen to perform professional services for him. In April 2010, when Lynch discovered the
21 unauthenticated, unverified Complaint online, she learned that Westin was an active member of the
22 California Bar from May 27, 1997 through December 31, 2002, after which he become inactive and
23 therefore ineligible to actively practice law within this State. This was not disclosed to Lynch.
24
25
26
27
28

**FRAUDULENT RENEWAL OF DEFAULT JUDGMENT
LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT
CASE NO. BC338322**

1
2
3 246. On July 13, 2015, the RICO Defendants renewed the fraudulent default judgment. The
4 renewal of judgment included the following amounts: \$7341,345.00 (original default amount that
5 includes over fraudulent damages of \$5 million and fraudulent financial interest of over \$2 million);
6 additional interest totaling \$6,717,808.80; and a total renewed judgment in the amount of \$14,059,183.80.
7 The application was signed by Michelle Rice. The original language, used in connection with the original
8 fraudulent default judgment, is attached. This document was sent to Lynch by U.S. mail and is addressed
9 on Appendix A: Mail & Wire Fraud Schedule, attached hereto and made a part hereof. At the time of
10 the renewal of judgment, the RICO Defendants, including the two officers of the court (Michelle Rice
11 and Robert Kory), understood that Blue Mist Touring Company, Inc. and Traditional Holdings, LLC
12 were administratively dissolved, suspended, and/or forfeited. Nevertheless, the RICO Defendants
13 submitted the language attached to the original judgment once again fraudulently converting the property
14 of Kelley Lynch to Leonard Cohen. That would include, but is not limited to, the property of the two
15 suspended corporations. At the hearing on Lynch's motion to vacate the renewal of judgment, Michelle
16 Rice informed the Court that the fact that these corporations are suspended is irrelevant and proceeded
17 to blame that issue on Richard Westin, who did not work for Lynch, and Judge Lewis Babcock who
18 relied on Los Angeles Superior Court's May 15, 2006 default judgment when determining ownership of
19 the interpleaded funds in his September 5, 2008 order.
20
21
22

23 247. On July 13, 2015, the RICO Defendants filed a Memorandum of Costs related to the
24 fraudulent renewal of the judgment. The memorandum attached a schedule of accrued interest. This
25 document was sent to Lynch by U.S. mail and is addressed on Appendix A.
26

27 248. The denial of Lynch's motion to vacate the fraudulent renewal of the multi-million
28 default judgment, with additional accrued interest at over \$6 million, is presently under appeal.

1 250. Instead of arguing that Lynch was entitled to a credit, Lynch contacted Lloyd's of
2 London to report this matter as insurance fraud. Michelle Rice is quite clear with Gianelli that Richard
3 Westin settled, in some manner, for the acts of Kelley Lynch. Lynch finds this incredibly disturbing. She
4 has discovered one matter after another, in piece meal form, and time after time, she is blamed for
5 Leonard Cohen's wrongdoing. This also occurred with a case before the U.S. District Court for the
6 Central District of California. Lynch has been able to obtain one document, submitted to the U.S.
7 District Court in Colorado, and it is replete with fraudulent misrepresentations and blatant lies. Exhibit
8 QQQ: Stephen Gianelli's email dated September 24, 2015 at 11.01 PM to Kelley Lynch (enclosing
9 Michelle Rice's email to Gianelli re. Westin, Lloyd's of London, and Kelley Lynch), attached hereto and
10 made a part hereof.
11

12
13 **THE MEDIA CAMPAIGN,**
14 **ONGOING CAMPAIGN OF HARASSMENT,**
15 **SLANDER, DEFAMATION, LIBEL, DISSUASION,**
16 **RETALIATION & WITNESS TAMPERING**

17 251. Once the Natural Wealth Lawsuit was filed, the news media ran with the salacious details
18 of the story as presented to them first by Natural Wealth and then, through interviews, press releases,
19 and statements provided to the media by Leonard Cohen and the RICO Defendants. The June 30, 2005
20 article, "Hellalujah," which appeared in Westword essentially set the tone for the general media accounts.
21 Exhibit RRR: Hellalujah article. Please refer to racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created
22 for this Complaint, incorporated herein and made a part here. The documents may be located through
23 the blog index and the first exhibit, in alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.

24 252. Leonard Cohen, who has strong affiliations with certain journalists and news outlets,
25 evidently began communicating with journalist, Brian Johnson. He understood he had to move
26 offensively in the news media. Therefore, an article (that contained an interview with Cohen) was
27 coordinated to be released at the same time the RICO Defendants filed their entirely baseless, meritless,
28 fraudulent, salacious Complaint that is nothing other than a defense to the allegations that Cohen ———

1 committed criminal tax fraud and an opportunity to benefit further from his wrong-doing by wrongfully
2 converting Lynch's property to himself. While it may be true that a meritless lawsuit is not a predicate
3 act, in and of itself, this situation goes far beyond a mere lawsuit and involves blatant theft,
4 embezzlement, money laundering, self-dealing, and extortion via the Default Judgment itself. The
5 MacLean's piece was published on or around August 17, 2005, two days after Cohen's retaliatory Los
6 Angeles Superior Court Litigation was filed. The article reads like a blatant defense to tax fraud and
7 notes that Cohen's motive for filing this lawsuit was a potential massive tax hit. It is inconceivable to
8 imagine why the RICO Defendants felt it was acceptable to conceal the fact that 1) Cohen's
9 loans/expenditures from Traditional Holdings, LLC alone totaled approximately \$6.7 million; 2) the
10 annuity obligation itself had been extinguished from the 2003 federal tax returns; and, 3) Cohen and his
11 representatives failed to report \$8 million in gross income on the 2001 federal tax returns. Clearly, one
12 answer lies in the fact that the RICO Defendants were convinced they would be unopposed; understood
13 that they had successfully bankrupted Lynch; and realized she would not be able to defend herself. By
14 August 24, 2005, they also understood that Lynch had not been served. At no time did any of the RICO
15 Defendants make an attempt to ensure that Lynch was served. One would assume that any Plaintiff, and
16 their attorneys, who realized someone was not served – or even claimed not to have been served – would
17 have taken steps to ensure that service was effected. Each time Lynch attempts to find a legal remedy,
18 the RICO Defendants claim they are being "harassed." That is now their catchall defense or excuse.
19 Exhibit SSS: MacLean's Article, Devasted. Please refer to racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence
20 blog created for this Complaint, incorporated herein and made a part here. The documents may be
21 located through the blog index and the first exhibit, in alphabetical order, would be the first posted
22 document.

23
24
25
26
27
28
253. On October 6, 2006, the New York Times ran a piece entitled "Leonard Cohen's

1 Troubles May Be A Theme Come True.” Leonard Cohen personally collaborated with the journalist
2 who wrote this article. Exhibit TTT: NY Times Article. Please refer to racketeeringact.wordpress.com,
3 an evidence blog created for this Complaint, incorporated herein and made a part here. The documents
4 may be located through the blog index and the first exhibit, in alphabetical order, would be the first
5 posted document.

6
7 254. On October 7, 2005, the Guardian ran a piece entitled “Cohen Stays Calm While \$5
8 Million Pension Disappears. Exhibit UUU: Guardian Article. Please refer to
9 racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created for this Complaint, incorporated herein and
10 made a part here. The documents may be located through the blog index and the first exhibit, in
11 alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.

12
13 255. On October 11, 2012, Cohen participated in an interview with Uncut. As of this date,
14 Cohen continued to present his fabricated narrative to the news media. Cohen also confirmed that he
15 pursued the deal Lynch had been negotiating with respect to the lithograph deal with Richard Goodall
16 Gallery. Exhibit VVV: Uncut Interview. Please refer to racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence
17 blog created for this Complaint, incorporated herein and made a part here. The documents may be
18 located through the blog index and the first exhibit, in alphabetical order, would be the first posted
19 document.

20
21 256. The Media Campaign recently involved the RICO Defendants participation in an
22 absolutely deranged article written for Issimo, dated February 20, 2014 (with blatant lies about Kelley
23 Lynch and Phil Spector re. two incidents that never occurred) and a Vogue birthday article, dated
24 September 21, 2015, where the journalist admits breaking down in tears over Leonard Cohen’s carefully
25 crafted fabricated narrative. The RICO Defendants all participated in the outrageous Issimo article. The
26 author advised Lynch that the piece had been “legaled.” Lynch has contacted many news outlets with
27 respect to the ongoing slander, defamation, and libel. A few outlets, including Rolling Stone and the
28

1 Guardian, have either removed statements or updated their stories. Exhibit WWW: Issimo Article, The
2 Troubles of a Troubador; Exhibit XXX: Vogue Birthday Article. Please refer to
3 racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created for this Complaint, incorporated herein and
4 made a part here. The documents may be located through the blog index and the first exhibit, in
5 alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.

6
7 257. On December 10, 2015, Stephen Gianelli sent an article he wrote “Former Cohen
8 Manager Kelley Lynch” to Lynch, third parties, and record producer the Scientist who has repeatedly
9 advised Gianelli to cease and desist and questioned his slanderous remarks about Lynch. The Scientist is
10 a member of the entertainment industry. This “article,” which also slandered and defamed Paulette
11 Brandt, was published online but subsequently removed. Exhibit YYY: Steven Gianelli email to the
12 Scientist (article attached thereto and Lynch’s commentary provided on Exhibit YYY-1). Please refer to
13 racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created for this Complaint, incorporated herein and
14 made a part here. The documents may be located through the blog index and the first exhibit, in
15 alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.

16
17 258 Stephen Gianelli, who has targeted Lynch, her family, and friends since hearing from
18 Kory & Rice in or around May 2009, descended to attach Lynch over a response she made to
19 Phawker.com with respect to a piece on Leonard Cohen. Stephen Gianelli, at various times, has worked
20 in tandem targeting Lynch with Michelle Blaine (Phil Spector’s former assistant who misappropriated \$1
21 million from him and went on a rampage slandering him publicly); Susanne Walsh (Leonard Cohen’s fan
22 who would copy Michelle Rice on her emails harassing Lynch, members of her family, and others); Ed
23 Lozzi (the publicist for Lana Clarkson, the woman who shot herself at Phil Spector’s home on February
24 3, 2003); and others. Gianelli also uses monikers to create email accounts with which to harass Lynch
25 with. He engages in dialogues online using various monikers. In fact, Lynch remains convinced that
26 Gianelli created the 17th Shitzu moniker and sent her the “bloody stump” email horribly slandering her
27
28

1 and Oliver Stone. Exhibit ZZZ: Bloody stump email; Stephen Gianelli's email Ed Lozzi, cc. to Lynch,
2 and Lozzi's email to Lynch re. Michelle Rice.

3 259. The Phawker.com attach is a very good example of the activity of the cyber-terrorists
4 with respect to Lynch. Her son Rutger was threatened on this site over evidence and property he stored
5 for Lynch until February 2012. And, her minor son made an appearance on this site. At that time, adult
6 strangers attempted to lure Lynch's minor son into privately communicating with them. Stephen Gianelli
7 succeeded. Lynch's cannot imagine what adult would approve of strangers targeting their sons over
8 Leonard Cohen's legal issues, IRS and criminal tax fraud, or the Phil Spector murder trial. Exhibit
9 AAAA: "Leonard Cohen Is Not A Nice Man" Phawker Excerpt. Please refer to
10 racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created for this Complaint, incorporated herein and
11 made a part here. The documents may be located through the blog index and the first exhibit, in
12 alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.
13
14

15 260. Numerous biographies have been released that regurgitate the RICO Defendants'
16 fraudulent misrepresentations, false statements, blatant lies, and discursive narrative. That would include
17 Sylvie Simmons book, "I'm Your Man," released in September 2012. This biography, which the RICO
18 Defendants participated in, was reviewed in the news media globally. It served to further harm and
19 damage Lynch and her family. Exhibit BBBB: Sylvie Simmons "I'm Your Man" Biography Blurb.
20 Please refer to racketeeringact.wordpress.com, an evidence blog created for this Complaint, incorporated
21 herein and made a part here. The documents may be located through the blog index and the first exhibit,
22 in alphabetical order, would be the first posted document.
23

24 261. On or about April 13, 2016, while accessing Natural Wealth documents through Pacer,
25 Lynch discovered certain documents that address the RICO Defendants role in a planned media
26 campaign with respect to Lynch. Lynch will address those documents at this time.
27
28

1 262. On June 10, 2005, Robert Kory wrote Matthew Traub, DKC News, a public relations
2 firm, with respect to the “Agile Group Pre-Emptive Strike.” Leonard Cohen, Michelle Rice, and others
3 were copied on this email. The email fraudulently asserted that Leonard Cohen lost his life savings and
4 the Agile Group was attempting to avoid liability with respect to that issue. The email addressed a press
5 release apparently issued by one of Natural Wealth’s lawyers on June 9, 2005. Kory confirmed that the
6 Natural Wealth Lawsuit mentioned “misappropriation” related to Lynch. That was in response to the
7 RICO Defendants fraudulent accusations that Lynch misappropriated monies from Leonard Cohen’s
8 “retirement account.” Kory informed Traub that the Natural Wealth Complaint was based largely on
9 “unfounded charges” by Kelley Lynch with respect to the extortion scheme related to Neal Greenberg
10 and his related companies. Kory informed Traub that the “battle has begun” and informed him that they
11 were willing to expedite the \$20,000 retainer for the services of the public relations firm. The Agile
12 Group’s statement was transmitted to the news media and remains available online. Exhibit CCCC: On
13 June 10, 2005, Robert Kory wrote Matthew Traub, DKC News, attached hereto and made a part hereof.

14
15
16 263. On April 23, 2008, Matthew Traub executed an Affidavit that was submitted to the Court
17 in the Natural Wealth case. It set forth the fact that Traub was the managing director of Dan Klores
18 Communications (“DNC”), a public relations and marketing firm that handles public relations for high
19 profile individuals. In approximately May 2005, Traub was introduced to Robert Kory, Cohen’s lawyer,
20 who was on a conference call with Traub and Sam Feldman, Cohen’s former personal manager. During
21 the call, the parties discussed DNC providing public relations assistance regarding “Mr. Cohen’s former
22 manager, Kelley Lynch.” The discussion focused on “Ms. Lynch’s business relationship to Mr. Cohen,
23 and issues resulting from that relationship, there was mention of Mr. Cohen’s investments with the Agile
24 Group and Neal Greenberg.” Exhibit DDDD: Matthew Traub Affidavit dated April 23, 2008, attached
25 hereto and made a part hereof.
26
27
28