

Wayne P. Vaughn  
6473 Gillia Cir S  
Bartlett, TN 38135-9499

April 4, 2007

Dear Lee,

If you prefer to not receive documents in which I publish, it will be necessary for you to follow the procedure that I established in my December 18, 2006 letter. Not only do I require this procedure, this would be your best recourse in accordance with the law. Marking mail "return to sender" is merely a request of the post office to return that specific article. For me to remove you from the mailing list, you must indicate so directly within a signed and verifiable statement containing a directive that I not contact you. Including proof of identity would not be necessary. The signature on your false claim is available for comparison.

The mailing list included you and Mabel to make you aware of my statements. Unlike Mabel's exploitation of private conversation, my statements are published and provided to everyone who has not formally declined my correspondence. I would not deny you the opportunity to challenge my statements. A formal directive she initiated through Mr. Brown within his July 27, 2006 letter has removed Mabel from the mailing list. Contrary to that in which his letter falsely implies, you only have the legal authority to issue a directive not to be contacted on your own behalf unless additional documentation such as Power of Attorney is provided clearly confirming your lawful ability to make decisions for any individuals cited other than yourself.

As you may recall, you previously stated that you agreed with Mabel and thought yourself to be an appropriate person to make decisions related to items that she verbally demanded to receive. Mabel had already met with Mr. Brown and was fully aware that she had no legal claim to the items. Instead of responding in an ethical manner to my first letter and providing the written list that I requested, she resorted to the same abusive nature in which she tormented Kay. Prior to her threats and harassments, I would have gladly reviewed all legitimate requests formalized in writing with an explanation. Refusing to comply yet persistent to receive items in which she had no entitlement, Mabel initiated her campaign of threats and harassments. She manipulated several individuals including you to assist.

During our very last conversation, you interjected topics related to religion. When Mabel conveyed her foremost threat, the consequence for not meeting her demands was her ability to tell family members anything with all believing her. Your false claim was an obvious lie. Initially, it seemed possible that you truly believed Mabel had confused Edgar's gun with one belonging to you. To firmly establish which guns you claimed and a logical explanation as to why Mabel would have been safeguarding any gun for you, I requested written descriptions and a formal explanation within my September 15, 2005

letter to you. If not false, you would have been able to substantiate the claim. Mabel's obsession about the gun was due to a threat that she swore to Kay. There were several inconsistencies. Not being present long ago when the gun was gifted to me, you had no way of knowing which gun I had received. Mabel mistakenly stated two guns and oddly enough, your false claim also stated "2 guns." After receiving my letter requesting documentation, you never again raised the topic. To lie in this manner is also to bear false witness. You were attesting to yourself being the owner. Doing so to obtain something not belonging to you is equivalent to stealing. Both being Christian Commandments, Mabel's influence over you must be strong for you to have compromised your faith.

I had hoped that your participation was merely extremely poor judgment. Mabel is a skilled liar. Evident by your fascination with junk mail, you are easily deceived. Every fact is indicative of you having intentionally lied to actively assist Mabel. When you offered to make decisions as a referee, I suggested that you assist Mabel with a written list. You responded, "You know how Mabel is." Obviously, you already knew that she wouldn't and had at least a general understanding of the reasons why. Although you may have thought of your actions as harmless gestures supportive of Mabel, both the false scenario of you being a decision maker and your false claim were acts of fraud.

Mr. Brown's October 31, 2005 letter further confirms your false claim. If Mabel had mistakenly gifted to me a gun belonging to you, she had Mr. Brown's assistance to substantiate the claim. Her obligation to you would have been to correct the mistake by providing at the very least, a formal request and explanation. Neither this letter nor any other subsequent letter includes a reference to guns, singular or plural. Any form of documentation was impossible because the claim was a fabrication collaborated by Mabel and you. Another important point to note about Mr. Brown's letter is that no items mentioned are ones substantiated as belonging to Mabel. This contradicts your statements about Mabel's demands. Mr. Brown is an attorney and he was unable to identify even one item in which Mabel had legal entitlement. Regardless of how "deserving" you thought Mabel to be, she manipulated you.

In addition to incorrectly stated items, the descriptions within Mr. Brown's October 31, 2005 letter were vague. Mabel's verbal demands were highly descriptive. She met with Mr. Brown to execute her recorded threat forewarning of someone that would force me to comply with her demands. Mabel having no legal entitlement to anything that she desired to forcibly acquire, Mr. Brown could only offer to compose a letter requesting items that were seemingly sentimental. Apparent from the content, Mabel was unprepared. If the purpose of their meeting was to compose a list, Mabel had ample time to prepare for Mr. Brown her own draft with accurate items and descriptions. During the three months prior to Mr. Brown's first letter, Mabel was aggressively executing her threats and harassments. Perpetuating her harassments, Mr. Brown's letter failed to comply with my prior formal directive and statements.

Mr. Brown's participation is inexcusable. As a legal professional, he has an obligation to ensure that his actions are lawfully accurate and ethical. Each of the three letters that I received from him defied my prior directive and formal statements. Mr.

Brown's July 27, 2006 letter contains legal inaccuracies and opinion that omitted identifying any statement in which he inferred. Aligning with Mabel's threats, the only viable explanation for his inclusion of the statements was intimidation. In his letter, he confirmed receiving "all the correspondence" yet emphasized only a discussion between he and Mabel. In context, Mr. Brown neither read the correspondence nor did he exert any effort beyond the discussion before so capriciously including his statements. Evident to everyone who has commented, Mabel is incapable of challenging my truthful statements. His reference to legal action was fictitious as well. Mabel is not as financially sound as she leads everyone to believe. Not only are there documented instances where she has leveraged you financially, this was also one of her underlying motivations.

Mabel toggled between saying that she "could not" and "would not" provide a written list. Most plausible, "could not" was more accurate and because Mr. Brown had advised her not to during their June 14, 2005 meeting. Supportive of this presumption, Mabel stated that anything she put in writing would be held over her head. This aligns with the strategy of asking for items regardless of entitlement in hopes that all would be blindly provided. Defeating this objective, documentation could be challenged. If so, Mr. Brown fueled Mabel's behavior. Empowered to say and do anything provided nothing was in writing, Mabel resorted to the extremes in which she utilized to torment Kay.

Most heinous was the abuse Kay endured. Elder family members emotionally, physically and sexually abused other family members as well. It was ironic that Mabel included the phrase "evils that existed" in her January 25, 2006 letter. Child abuse, lies, manipulations, deceptions, threats, harassments, theft, tax evasion, fraud and murder are all evils. Mabel omitted citing even one example of that in which she inferred. This directly aligns with her foremost threat. Mabel boasted about having the ability to tell family members anything with all believing her. She was incapable of citing examples because in writing, her lies could be challenged. Over the years, Mabel has conveyed numerous fabrications to family members. It was common for Mabel to tell Kay what she had said, expecting Kay to maintain alternate versions of the truth. When discussing the topics with others and myself, Kay would make a distinction between the truth and what her mother desired for everyone to believe.

For many years, Kay was aware of her father's infidelities. Rather than approval, Kay sympathized with his desire for companionship. Neither Kay nor I believed that his motivations were directly sexual. Although seldom discussed with him, Kay was critical of any motivation beyond basic companionship. During Edgar's depression, he would leave for periods of time and spend unaccounted sums of money. It became necessary for Kay to disclose to her mother some details about his activities. Several years later, Kay revealed more. Bob Clark enjoyed his friendship with Mabel. Pulling Kay aside during a gathering, he told Kay that he appreciated her companionship and defined their relationship as good friends. This was insightful. Bob honorably conveyed his intentions to Kay. Possibly also, he desired for Kay to intervene should Mabel have objectives that exceeded their friendship. Soon to follow was an absurd phone conversation Mabel had with Kay. Just a few weeks later, Mabel asked Kay her opinion of Bob and stated the

possibility of him becoming her stepfather. Insulting to Kay, Mabel elaborated as one would to a juvenile child with comments about Bob not replacing her father.

Many years ago, one maternal family member conveyed to me his interest in pornographic pictures. Wishing to share his interest, he gave me a computer diskette with graphic images. The set of pictures do have a theme, one woman and multiple men. Should anyone wish to challenge whether or not this is true, the diskette is available for fingerprint analysis. I placed the diskette in a stack to be recycled. Diskettes became obsolete and it was never reused. Kay was aware of the incident. Mabel expressed to Kay gossip type comments about this family member. When Kay and I discussed her mother's comments, we derived that the validity of topic was not logically possible. We further discussed truthful topics, including the diskette.

An individual describing a recent conversation with Mabel contacted me early January. In violation of the directive to terminate communication formalized within Mr. Brown's July 27, 2006 letter, Mabel attempted to persuade this individual to have a confrontational phone conversation with me. To disguise her involvement, she desired the appearance of enraged statements originating from this individual. I was also informed of a highly derogatory comment Mabel interjected about a family member during the same conversation. This is another example demonstrating Mabel's exploitation of private conversation and continued harassments. It is reasonable to presume that Mabel placed similar calls to other individuals hesitant to expand the gravity of her behavior. Apparently, Mr. Brown did not properly advise his client or Mabel ignored his advisements pursuing further harassment.

So far, I've had conversations with two prominent authors. One would be perfect. A well-known author of non-fiction, she is a former journalist renowned for intricate details. Although the website's monthly traffic has grown to exceed 300 visitors, the first press release resulted minimal media attention. I have been advised that legal action would be the best method of generating the publicity necessary to promote awareness of the topics and interest in Kay's biography. Initiating litigation has not been my objective, however, I have been open to defending any legal action that Mabel may be compelled to pursue as stated by Mr. Brown. According to the statistical data collected, several law firms have visited the site and downloaded documents. Another advisement that I received related to media attention shifts the next focal point to Mr. Brown's harassments and the fallacious content of his July 27, 2006 letter.

Due to the developments in January, Mabel's violation of her own directive and the advisements that I received regarding Kay's biography, I have delayed the interviews pending a decision on how best to proceed. With the increased potential for litigation, the prior objective of acquiring testimony to circumvent legal action is no longer valid. Testimony acquired during litigation would be far more significant and have the additional benefit of including reluctant family members. My decision is to publish the final review, allowing every recipient the opportunity to challenge any statements within the comprehensive document. Specifying time frames, I have experienced unexpected delays and effort exceeding that in which I anticipated. My best estimation is June. The final

review will include topics not previously published that are related to your involvement. It is imperative that I receive your directive not to be contacted prior to publication should you wish to be excluded.

Kay was appreciative that you were thoughtful to recommend and give her herbal supplements. As advised by her doctor, the consequences would have likely been more harmful than beneficial. Chemicals derived from plants and other food products can impact prescription medications. Supplements can neutralize prescription medications and in extreme cases, dangerous interactions can result. Regardless of how exhilarating it may be for you to think that you are more knowledgeable than doctors, anyone following your advice without first consulting a physician may be devastated by the consequences. Similar to the contest scams, the literature that you receive in the mail is marketing. Even if a manufacturer advertises having high standards, the products vary by lot due to inconsistencies in raw ingredients. The FDA does not regulate supplements. Medical benefits are rarely substantiated by conclusive scientific research.

This is my very last personal letter to you unless I receive correspondence from you or your attorney prompting a response.

Respectfully,

[Signature on original]

---

Wayne P. Vaughn