

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

From: [EMF](#)

Date: 2/11/2014 9:59:40 AM

To: [Chris Baldock](#)

Cc: [Richard Smedley](#)

Subject: RE: Questions about my defense and Legal Aid 2/11/2014

Hi Chris, Richard,

Thank you for taking the time to address some of my concerns.

Much of what you say I agree.

I would like to address several concerns before we meet and I will address each concern in a separate email and as time permits.

Re: Legal Aid

*"Legal Aid have sent us the **attached** letter. We have been advised by your grants officer that approval for funding through to trial will be subject to review by Ministry lawyers.*

These lawyers will consider, amongst other things, the prospects of settlement and success at trial.

There is an expectation that a legally aided person will consider all realistic settlement options. If such options are not considered, aid can be withdrawn.

You will recall that we suggested a settlement proposal to JZK whereby you agree to permanently refrain from posting any of her videos online. Settling on this basis would deal with the Copyright Act issue. In our view this part of the claim is not as clear cut as the balance of JZK's claims. This is because JZK will find it very difficult to prove economic loss in respect of the other causes of action. This settlement option might see you extricate yourself from a prolonged and expensive legal battle, whilst avoiding any costs award (if the plaintiffs were successful).

The Legal Services Agency may insist you make a proposal of this nature if you want funding to continue"

I draw you attention to the NZ Bill of Rights: section 13. Freedom of Expression. [Section 14 — Ministry of Justice, New Zealand](#)

Quote:

" Everyone has the right to freedom of expression, including the freedom to seek, receive, and impart information and opinions of any kind in any form."

What you are suggesting is an impinging of my legal rights in the form of a "chill", a self imposed injunction signed under duress.

This would be unconscionable and irresponsible for me to do so at this point.

NOTHING I have done by releasing these JZK video segments has been ruled illegal.

May 10, 2013 US Judge Gary Tabor dismissed with prejudice this same sorts of unfounded lawsuit against me by JZK.

JZK's actions have resulted in a major chilling impact on former customers of RSE to freely criticize and whistle blow JZ Knight of fraud and abuses at RSE. This fact seems completely irrelevant to you.

I request you inform JZK lawyers it is my intention these issue be addressed in a NZ Court of law as scheduled at the Auckland High Court Monday 26 May 2014.

This is much more than making a 'principled stand' and I hope you make this clear to Legal Aid.

Please support me to win this lawsuit in a court of law but not through what it seems are backroom arrangements that bypass a fair hearing and justice.

Should I be contacting legal aid directly over these issues?

I look forward to our meeting on Thursday,

Regards,

David