

This is Exhibit "Z" referred to in the affidavit of **Donald BEST** sworn before me, this 24th day of March, 2014.

A Commissioner, etc.



243
ONE BISCAYNE TOWER
2 SOUTH BISCAYNE BOULEVARD
21ST FLOOR
MIAMI, FLORIDA 33131
TELEPHONE: 305.373.9400
FACSIMILE: 305.373.9443
www.broadandcassel.com

MARK F. RAYMOND, P.A.
MANAGING PARTNER
DIRECT LINE: 305.373.9425
DIRECT FACSIMILE: 305.995.6385
EMAIL: MRaymond@BroadandCassel.com

April 22, 2010

VIA FEDEX
AND EMAIL (aroman@millerthomson.com)

Andrew J. Roman, Esq.
Miller Thomson LLP
Scotia Plaza
40 King Street West
Suite 5800, P.O. Box 1011
Toronto, ON M5H3S1

RE: Kathleen Davis

Dear Mr. Roman:

Our client, Kathleen Davis, has asked us to respond to your email with a letter attached, dated April 13, 2010.

Be advised that your communication is in violation of several Florida laws. First, due to the fact that it is threatening, and another example of the harassment she has had to endure, commencing in 2004, originating from your law firm. Secondly, knowing she is represented by counsel, you are prohibited from directly communicating with her.

Be advised that our research demonstrates that the IP address of 206.47.255.109, from which your April 13th email originates, is one of eight (8) IP addresses assigned to Miltom Management (Miller Thomson LLP) by Bell Canada. These IP addresses are reflected below with two IP addresses being highlighted.

206.47.255.104
206.47.255.105
206.47.255.106
206.47.255.107
206.47.255.108
206.47.255.109
206.47.255.110
206.47.255.111

244

Andrew J. Roman, Esq.
Miller Thomson LLP
April 22, 2010
Page 2

My client has received harassing feedback on her website from the IP address of 206.47.255.108. As you should know, this IP address, which is listed above, has been assigned to your firm.

Please see the attached feedback received from your firm in 2004. You will note that they are not dissimilar in content, style, and verbosity from some of what the latter day "Black Woman Who Reads/BWWR" has written.

Please note that all of the feedback attached occurred long before any of the proceedings you refer to were even contemplated. In fact, as far as I can determine, neither Barbados Underground, nor Barbados Free Press, were in existence. Your letter is unlike most legal letters I have seen in that it attempts to foretell the future. This attempt to foretell the future was also a characteristic of "Black Woman Who Reads".

Finally, your omission in copying your correspondence to the people mentioned in your letter is noted.

Mr. Ranking recently wrote Mr. Dribin, my co-counsel here in Miami for Marjorie Knox, and I am certain you received a copy of both his letter and the response from Mr. Dribin, as did the other lawyers in the litigation to whom Mr. Ranking copied his request.

You and your firm need to cease and desist from harassing or contacting our client. All future communication is to be addressed to me.

Please see that Mr. Iain Deane gets a copy of this letter as I have no current contact details for him. Thank you.

(Sincerely,

Mark F. Raymond, P.A.

MFR/ss

Enclosures

cc: Nora F. Osbaldeston, Managing Partner
Bill McKenzie, Esq.
Kathleen Davis
Michael Dribin, Esq.
Gerald Ranking, Esq.
Lorne S. Silver, Esq.
(all w/encls.)

1st April 2004

Feedback to keltruth.com website

From IP 206.47.255.108

WHOIS :

Bell Canada WORLDLINX03 (NET-206-47-0-0-1)

206.47.0.0 - 206.47.255.255

Milton Management (MIL-0712-CA) (NET-206-47-255-104-1)

206.47.255.104 - 206.47.255.111

"It has been some time since I bothered to look at your website, as it has always been a most one-sided source of information with a great many omissions. If one is to form an objective opinion, it needs to be with knowledge of all the facts. This principal of forcing parties to a litigation to reveal all the facts, not only in ex parte proceedings, has now become a standard practice direction in England and Wales where counsel are required to produce even precedents which will harm their case, provided they are deemed to have the professional competence to know of them. Thus, the English courts have eliminated to a large degree the bringing of frivolous actions. Anyway, that is apart from the point. Here are a few matters upon which I am sure your readers would like to be informed. 1. Is it true that, following leave to appeal to the Privy Council being granted on consent of all parties, you wrote to all parties stating that you were advised by your English solicitors that your action would succeed and seeking to negotiate a settlement upon terms set out in your counsel's letter - if so, enlighten us as to those terms? 2. Is it true that your counsel subsequently wrote withdrawing your offer? 3. Was your counsel's letter of offer and its letter of retraction both copied to the Privy Council? 4. Is it true that you have tried to transfer your shares in the Ninth Respondent into a trust and to place liens on this trust? 5. Is it true that your youngest daughter has mortgaged her house to a Canadian lawyer for \$1.5 million, of which \$1.4 million has already been spent on your prosecution of your action? 6. I have read the various press reports which you have publicized and I ask in connection with these if, (a) you propose to attempt to have your valuations entered before the Privy Council, despite the overwhelming number of precedents disallowing this, including one right on point from the Privy Council itself; (b) what difference do you think that such evidence will make to what is not a sale of the assets of the Ninth Respondent; but the shares (personal property) of the shareholders in the Ninth Respondent; (c) why have the various press reports tried to focus on your age and chickens, and omitted to state that Eric Deane is 84, Keith Deane is 80 and his wife 86, Vere Deane is 86 and Muriel Deane has died, aged 87? Most important of all, why is this case, a civil action, being prosecuted as if it were a death penalty case where operation of Pratt and Morgan would kick in after a certain period of time? Is it somehow imagined that there will be a commutation of some sort? Pray enlighten us, your utterly perplexed readers, as to what all this manoeuvring is designed to achieve? We don't see it from the Respondents, so why do we see it from you? We await with anticipation your response, but the holding of the collective breath is really not a

ARIN WHOIS Database Search

Search ARIN WHOIS for: 206.47.255.108

Bell Canada WORLDLINX03 (NET-206-47-0-0-1)

206.47.0.0 - 206.47.255.255

Miltom Management (Miller Thomson LLP) MIL0712-CA (NET-206-47-255-104-1)

206.47.255.104 - 206.47.255.111

ARIN WHOIS database, last updated 2010-03-25 20:00

Enter ? for additional hints on searching ARIN's WHOIS database.

#

ARIN WHOIS data and services are subject to the Terms of Use

available at https://www.arin.net/whois_tou.html

21st April 2004

Feedback to keltruth.com website

From IP 206.47.255.108

WHOIS:

Bell Canada WORLDLINX03 (NET-206-47-0-0-1)


206.47.0.0 - 206.47.255.255

Milton Management (Milton Management, LLC) MIL0712-CA (NET-206-47-255-104-1)

206.47.255.104 - 206.47.255.111

"I have been following this case and your website and now feel impelled and, indeed, compelled, to put in my two cents worth, finally. I am frankly appalled by what has happened. I am surprised that you have not updated your site since March 30th. So much has happened since then. For instance, the Broad Street Journal has produced another two articles, which you have not publicized; in the matter of the hearing of the writ to have the transfer of your shares in Kingsland set aside on the basis of fraud so that a Charging Order can be obtained against them, an Order for Discovery of Documents has been issued by the Deputy Registrar, pursuant to the application of Plaintiff counsel in that application; in addition, it has been discovered that, although Leave to Appeal to the Judicial Committee was granted on consent on October 3, 2003, you did not register the appeal until 4 months later, on January 30, 2004; further, the Record has been sent by you to and duplicated by the Judicial Committee, without it having been seen or agreed to by Respondent counsel, as is the practice, as to form and content. In other words, more ultra vires acts and acts of mala fides on your part. Therefore, your silence makes one wonder several things. (1) Have you finally come to realise the inadequacy and sharp practices of your legal counsel and how it impacts on you and your family? (2) Have you finally come to see how you have been used by your Canadian backer, whose desire to own something and to revenge himself on someone, you have promoted at the risk to yourself and your children of forfeiting all that you own? The last time you lauded and advertised an article written by the Broad Street Journal, it was dedicated to an action which you had recently filed against the Kingsland directors, all supported by an affidavit from Mr. Peter Allard, your Canadian backer. I am utterly perplexed as to what you and your counsel hope to achieve by that action, since, almost certainly it is statute-barred by reason of the operation of the Statute of Limitations and, as you were yourself a director of Kingsland for a number of years, you are almost certainly estopped in law from bringing it in the first place. And even if you were not statute-barred or estopped, all the other side needs to do is to plead res judicata, and your action will be dismissed, with costs awarded against you. It amazes me that, since the Respondents in your first action relied heavily on the 1943 case of Greenhalgh v. Mallard et al (and rightly so, in my opinion, as it is almost completely on point), that, prior to filing what amounts to a second action representative of an attempt to have a second bite at the apple, your counsel would not have checked the 1947 case of Greenhalgh v. Mallard et al (3 All ER at page 255) and discovered that, exactly like you are attempting, Mr. Greenhalgh tried to have another bite at the apple and, exactly as shall likely happen to you, the action was thrown out on the plea of res judicata and at substantial financial prejudice to the Plaintiff. Surely these are things which your counsel will be held by the reasonable man-in-the-street or, indeed, the courts, to be deemed to have the professional competence to know. I, of course, cannot and will not predict the outcome of the Judicial Committee's deliberations in your appeal, except, having examined the matter from all sides, I do not know how you expected to win in the first instance, I do not know why you did not cut a deal when you might have been able to do so - as, if the Respondents were MY clients, I certainly would not allow them to entertain any deal with you now - I cannot in any wise see how you can possibly prevail before the Judicial Committee - but maybe I am missing something somewhere and your website surely is not enlightening me as to what that may be. What I DO know, however, is that, if you lose, your conduct of the entire action has been so filled with false and misleading information given to the courts by you and has been prosecuted with such mala fides, indeed, to a degree that I have never seen before (at least in a society with a proper judicial system and rule of law) and with legal misconduct so enormous, that it constitutes gross abuse of judicial process, that, without doubt, Their Lordships will have much to say on these subjects and you and your counsel will be the recipients of their outrage. This outrage, once expressed, will be reported, first in the Law Reports of the Times and the Telegraph, and subsequently on the Judicial Committee's own website. Effectively, that means that every major, English-speaking law library, law school and court worldwide will know of the abuse and the forms which it has taken - and not from your, forgive me, one-sided reporting. Thus, in addition to the potential and probable financial ruin brought to yourself and your children, you (and they) will be branded, at worst, as vindictive liars and cheats and, at best, as credulous cretins. As for your counsel, well, the intimation of abuse of process from the Judicial Committee will almost certainly cause the local law society to launch an investigation into the conduct and professional competence of your counsel and to take disciplinary action. NOW, what happens if you die before the matter is resolved (as, at your age, you may) and before any of these actions commenced by you have been adjudicated? The decision as to whether to continue them or not will lie with your heirs (presumably your children), against whom personally orders as to costs and damages may be given, should the actions fail - and it will be immaterial in what country they reside (unless it is somewhere like Cambodia) as these orders will be enforceable in places like the United Kingdom and the USA and Canada and Australia and New Zealand and South Africa, so your heirs and their assets and future earnings will not be able to escape them. Nonetheless, be of good cheer. There is a possible ray of sunshine in the murk and mire of your own creation. Should you lose before the Judicial Committee, I refer you to the conjoined appeal to the Judicial Committee of the House of Lords of July 20, 2000 entitled Hall & Co. v. Simons et al, Barratt v. Ansell et al and Harris v. Scholfield Roberts & Hill, which you can pull up on the Internet, always provided you have the Internet - which I doubt, as the merits of your case could easily

have been researched by you using the Internet - but, if you do not have the Internet, get a friend who does to help you. You will find that, no longer is your counsel likely to be able to avail himself of the public policy of claiming immunity from an action by you against him for negligence, but that in all likelihood the Barbados courts will accept the referenced authority for a change in public policy of immunity and allow your action to proceed. Of course, it will take you about 5 years to recoup from your counsel a part of what you have given away, but you should manage to salvage a little something. You see, Mrs. Knox, unlike the Bajan press and the less well-informed Bajan public which sees you as a chicken-raising, egg-gathering, octogenarian Boudicea, fighting for her "paternal" rights and in order to promote family unity (a claim on your part which is so patently false and motivated solely, I believe, by the principal, "having fucked up, let me see if they will let me off the hook"). I see you as an embittered, vengeful, 82 year-old liar, stupid enough to espouse the desires of a venal Canadian backer, the pawn of totally incompetent counsel and of stupid and revenge-driven children. And very soon, I honestly believe, that that is precisely the same image of you and yours which the entire world will have - and the blame will be yours and yours alone. There is no nobility in your actions or the conduct of them - on the contrary, they are completely lacking in integrity and totally self-serving. What a wonderful legacy you leave when you shuffle off this mortal coil. Oh, by the way, if you did win before the Judicial Committee, which, as I say, I doubt, are you under the impression that you will obtain an order whereby the sale of the shares of Kingsland must be made to you? You won't get such an order, you know (look up the legal precedents), and, having published two valuations, it does rather set out clearly what YOU consider to be fair value, doesn't it. The Judicial Committee would only have the power to set aside the agreement for sale to Classic - NOTHING MORE. But, as I said, I do not think there is the slightest chance of you prevailing. "Kingsland Estates Ltd." ""



ARIN WHOIS Database Search

Search ARIN WHOIS for: 206.47.255.108

Bell Canada WORLDLINX03 (NET-206-47-0-0-1)

206.47.0.0 - 206.47.255.255

Milton Management (Miller Thomson LLP) MIL0712-CA (NET-206-47-255-104-1)

206.47.255.104 - 206.47.255.111

ARIN WHOIS database, last updated 2010-03-25 20:00

Enter ? for additional hints on searching ARIN's WHOIS database.

#

ARIN WHOIS data and services are subject to the Terms of Use

available at https://www.arin.net/whois_tou.html

27 August 2004

Feedback to keltruth.com website

From IP 206.47.255.108

WHOIS :

Bell Canada WORLDLINX03 (NET-206-47-0-0-1)

206.47.0.0 - 206.47.255.255

Milcom Management (Viller, Thompson LLP) MIL0712-CA (NET-206-47-255-104-1)

206.47.255.104 - 206.47.255.111

Dear Kathleen Davis et al: Are you aware that the Barbados Government has tabled a new white paper aimed at Internet libel? As you will, of course, know, the last time defamation legislation was passed in Barbados, it operated retroactively, as may well be the case here. If so, any libels which you may have uttered against any parties, dead or alive, will be actionable against yourselves and, if successful, damages and costs will be collected against your assets, since your website clearly identifies yourselves as its authors. May I respectfully suggest, therefore, that you sift through the data which you have published to date and publish retractions for any items for which you do not have solid, document-backed proof that will stand up in court. You can, of course, get away with minor infractions to the libel laws, as no one is going to sue you if they will not be awarded a sufficiently large amount of damages to compensate them for their trouble. However, you have published things which, while fact, are slanted in such a way as to infer professional wrongdoing and this may well lead to someone suing you, regardless of the small amount of damages they stand to be awarded, merely to clear their names and reputations. If this happens, you are facing a small amount of damages, but probably a very substantial amount of legal costs. This is to be avoided. In addition, commencing an action as a Plaintiff is one thing. Your lawyer will, presumably (but not always), have filed the suit on the basis of a legal opinion which he/she has given you which is that your action will succeed, although there are times when lawyers will file suit because you so instruct them and because you have the money and/or assets to pay their costs, but then they usually ask for money up front. When you are sued, however, it is more difficult to find a lawyer to represent you, unless you have an airtight defence or a lot of cash or assets as, if you lose, you may not be able to pay his/her bill, since the opposing counsel, should he/she win, has first crack. So, with respect, were I you I would examine my Internet publications most carefully and ensure that everything is in order and, if not, apologise where necessary and publish retractions with the same prominence as the libel or probable libel itself. The old proverbs, "A stitch in time saves nine" and "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" are to be recommended here. "Kingsland Estates Ltd." "" "" "27 Aug 2004" "09:22:22" "206.47.253.106"

254

ARIN WHOIS Database Search

Search ARIN WHOIS for: 206.47.255.108

Bell Canada WORLDLINX03 (NET-206-47-0-0-1)

206.47.0.0 - 206.47.255.255

Milton Management (Miller Thomson LLP) MIL0712-CA (NET-206-47-255-104-1)

206.47.255.104 - 206.47.255.111

ARIN WHOIS database, last updated 2010-03-25 20:00

Enter ? for additional hints on searching ARIN's WHOIS database.

#

ARIN WHOIS data and services are subject to the Terms of Use

available at https://www.arin.net/whois_tou.html

30th October 2004

Feedback to keltruth.com website

From IP 206.47.255.108

WHOIS :

Bell Canada WORLDLINX03 (NET-206-47-0-0-1)

206.47.0.0 - 206.47.255.255

Milton Management (Milton-Thomson LLP) MIL0712-CA (NET-206-47-255-104-1)

206.47.255.104 - 206.47.255.111

"Will you also be publishing the factors surrounding the Chief Justice's comments about the practice of law and the moves he intends to make to ensure that frivolous cases, such as Knox v. Deane et al and your other equally flimsy actions (some of which are statute barred and others res judicata) do not make it to the courts and clog up the system, or are you "publishing" efforts to be restricted only to the judicial delays in handing down decisions? In other words, do you intend to publish the whole story, or merely, as is your wont, a part of it? Gunning for Greenidge (or assisting Alair) are we? No one is going to hold their breaths to see where the answer to those questions lie. One notices another article in the Nation dated September 15, 2004 in its Courts section. An article clearly written simply to fill up space and which, for once, did not attempt to take sides. Obviously the failure to portray the Martyred Madge as a reincarnation of every saint did not strike a chord with you and accordingly you deemed it unworthy of any publicity from you. Your site really is compulsive reading, but not, I fear, for the reasons you would wish. It affords me great amusement and I look forward to every fallacious, one sided, desperate little update with keen anticipation. When will the next one be? I can't wait." "Kingsland Estates Ltd." "" "" ""

ARIN WHOIS Database Search

Search ARIN WHOIS for: 206.47.255.108

Bell Canada WORLDLINX03 (NET-206-47-0-0-1)

206.47.0.0 - 206.47.255.255

Miltom Management (Miller Thomson LLP) MIL0712-CA (NET-206-47-255-104-1)

206.47.255.104 - 206.47.255.111

ARIN WHOIS database, last updated 2010-03-25 20:00

Enter ? for additional hints on searching ARIN's WHOIS database.

#

ARIN WHOIS data and services are subject to the Terms of Use

available at https://www.arin.net/whois_tou.html

25 November 2004

Feedback to keltruth.com website

From IP 206.47.255.108

WHOIS:

Bell Canada WORLDLINX03 (NET-206-47-0-0-1)

206.47.0.0 - 206.47.255.255

Yilton Management Miller-Thompson LLP MIL0712-CA (NET-206-47-255-104-1)

206.47.255.104 - 206.47.255.111

"I have a story for you. The Privy Council has made available the dates of April 6th and 7th for the hearing of your appeal. Previously, responding counsel had written to your counsel saying that they were all available April 5, 6, 7 and 8. Everyone in Barbados knows this and is a little surprised that you, apparently, do not. "Kingsland Estates Ltd." "" "" [REDACTED]

260

ARIN WHOIS Database Search

Search ARIN WHOIS for: 206.47.255.108

Bell Canada WORLDLINX03 (NET-206-47-0-0-1)

206.47.0.0 - 206.47.255.255

Miltom Management (Miller Thomson LLP) MIL0712-CA (NET-206-47-255-104-1)

206.47.255.104 - 206.47.255.111

ARIN WHOIS database, last updated 2010-03-25 20:00

Enter ? for additional hints on searching ARIN's WHOIS database.

#

ARIN WHOIS data and services are subject to the Terms of Use

available at https://www.arin.net/whois_tou.html

15 December 2004

Feedback to keltruth.com website

From IP 206.47.255.108

WHOIS:

Bell Canada WORLDLINX03 (NET-206-47-0-0-1)

206.47.0.0 - 206.47.255.255

Milcom Management Inc. (NET-206-47-255-104-1)

206.47.255.104 - 206.47.255.111

"FINALLY, you announce the Privy Council dates. I suggest that you have possibly received MANY anonymous responses from persons purporting to be parties to the action and appeals or APPEARING TO YOU to be parties, usually due to their knowledge of some misinformation or omission on your part in your "reporting"; for want of a better word. Thus I think there may well be some confusion as to which article you seek permission to publish. I do suggest to you, also, that, far from your hit counter providing an accurate head count of people who have read your journalistic efforts, you should take into account that the ONLY people, other than myself, to read your site ARE the parties to the action. Thus, you need to question if your message is getting across at all. There is ONE point I wish to raise with you. You have a mirror site named privydraft (or something like that) on which you have published the first pages only of the affidavits filed in another action which is almost certainly going to take a nose dive due to the operation of both the plea of res judicata and also the statute of limitations - with costs, of course, against you. I would be fascinated to read those affidavits in their entirety and suggest that PDF format would be the best way to scan them, rather than the TIFF or JPG which you appear to have attempted. If you see the number of hits at that site rising much above 30, it will be me checking to see if you have been able to accomodate me." "Kingsland Estates Ltd." "" ""

15 Dec 2003 10:03:00 AM

263

ARIN WHOIS Database Search

Search ARIN WHOIS for: 206.47.255.108

Bell Canada WORLDLINX03 (NET-206-47-0-0-1)

206.47.0.0 - 206.47.255.255

Miltom Management (Miller Thomson LLP) MIL0712-CA (NET-206-47-255-104-1)

206.47.255.104 - 206.47.255.111

ARIN WHOIS database, last updated 2010-03-25 20:00

Enter ? for additional hints on searching ARIN's WHOIS database.

#

ARIN WHOIS data and services are subject to the Terms of Use

available at https://www.arin.net/whois_tou.html