Law Offices of Scott J. Bloch*, P.A.
Attorney at Law
1050 17th St., NW Ste 600
Washington, DC 20036
PH: (202) 496-1290
FAX: (202) 478-0479

"Justice delayed is Justice denied."

-William Gladstone

* Admitted to practice only in the District of Columbia, California, and Kansas

March 19, 2013



CONFIDENTIAL - NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Re: Defamatory Blog and Articles concerning Scott J. Bloch



website and blog site. The content and intent of these blogs/articles is to defame me by casting aspersions on my professional standing, and ability to represent contractors. As someone who has also published positive reports on cases I am pursuing, I am puzzled by why you recently started posting content that is defamatory.

I direct your attention to the attached which contain falsehoods, cast me in a defamatory light. They contain numerous falsehoods, intentional and gratuitous swipes at me and my tenure as Special Counsel that are false and defamatory, demonstrating actual malice. It continues to stand on the internet with its falsehoods.

I write to demand that you remove these articles and blogs about me and my time as Special Counsel immediately. This is harmful to my professional reputation as a lawyer and you are not commenting on any public matters that are current. The prior legal defense fund is defunct and has not been active for over two years. Your demeaning personal attacks impute to me qualities that tend to injure me in my business of representing contractors. Your website is dedicate to them and therefore you are targeting my business in Washington, D.C. intentionally, and my residence in Virginia, from where I draw some of my clients.

If you choose to ignore this and not remove the materials from your internet site and blogs and all caches, I will be forced to sue for an injunction and to seek damages. As long as the article remains on your website, you are publishing it. In addition, you are publishing it in various fora, including in Virginia and Washington, D.C. where I represent employees and federal employees Continuing publication also subjects you to Virginia jurisdiction as long as the article remains on the web. I will institute an action in Virginia and in Washington, D.C. against you for defamation and actual malice, together with damages and punitive damages. I will also seek damages for civil conspiracy to harm my business, and Virginia courts and juries have proved to be very protective of one's business reputation when gratuitously harmed by publications. If I determine through discovery that you have worked with others to do this, I will join them as well.

I look forward to hearing from you in order to resolve this. I will give you 10 days to indicate that you have removed all of the offending materials.

Sincerely,

LAW OFFICES OF SCOTT J. BLOCH, P.A.

Scott J. Bloch

^{1 &}quot;Every false and unauthorized imputation, spoken, written or printed which imputes to a business or professional man conduct which tends to injure him in his business or profession is libelous and actionable without allegation or proof of special damages." James v. Haymes, 160 Va. 253, 168 S.E. 333; Hancock v. Mitchell, 83 W.Va. 156, 98 S.E. 65; Michie's Jurisprudence, Libel and Slander, § 8, p. 45." Carwile v. Richmond Newspapers, 196 Va. 1, 7, 82 S.E. 2d 588, 591 (1954). Recently the Virginia Supreme Court held that a statement that merely implied an officer of a company was not competent in handling business affairs could be defamation because if proven false it could be an assault on business competence even though it was only implied. See Hyland v. Raytheon Technical Services Co., 277 Va. 40, 670 S.E.2d 746 (2009) (jury awarded in excess of \$1 million). See also Great Coastal Express, Inc. v. Ellington, 230 Va. 142, 334 S.E.2d 846 (1985) (allegations of attempted bribery against former employee when not proven was sufficient for defamation).

See Carwile v. Richmond Newspapers, 82 S.E. 2d 588 (Va. Sup. Ct. 1954) (reversing grant of summary judgment when newspaper printed that an attorney who reported wrongdoing should be subject to proceedings by the Virginia bar for false reporting, holding it could constitute defamation per se). In this case, the malicious accusation against me was clear and unmistakable and is defamatory per se, requiring no proof of losses to his reputation. Additionally, Virginia statutes provide a remedy of treble damages and attorneys fees for conspiracies to damage reputation and business. See VA, Code §§ 18.2-499 through -501. You are subject to Virginia or Washington, D.C. jurisdiction because you targeted a resident of those jurisdictions, and your website has an interactive blog. See Bochan v. La Fontaine, 68 F. Supp. 2d 692, 694-95, 701-02 (E.D. Va. 1999); Blumenthal v. Drudge, 992 F. Supp. 44, 57 (D.D.C. 1998) (finding jurisdiction was fo87 F. Supp. 2d 1068, 1072-73 (D. Ariz. 2010) ((1) the defendant committed an intentional act, which was (2) expressly aimed at the forum state, and (3) caused harm, the brunt of which is suffered and which the defendant knows is likely to be suffered in the forum).