

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



A Commissioner, etc.

265

Kenneth William McKenzie

[REDACTED]

Ph: [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

Monday, March 29, 2010

Mr. Andrew Roman
Miller Thomson LLP
Barristers & Solicitors
Scotia Plaza, 40 King Street West, Suite 5800
P.O. Box 1011
Toronto, ON M5H 3S1

by fax

Dear Mr. Roman

Re: Nelson Barbados v. Cox et. al.

I have recently come across some information which, because of the nature of the allegations you have made against me, requires an immediate explanation as it is relevant to the ongoing motions.

I require that you confirm or deny that your law firm's IP address was, for each year from 2004 onward, 206.47.255.108. I have recently done a 'whois' search and find that the present IP address of Miller Thomson is 206.47.255.108 and presume that it has been so since 2004 however if that is not the case please clarify by providing the IP address for each year.

It appears that your law firm made regular postings to the Keltruth web site which started in 2004. I am not one to jump to conclusions but it appears that you have withheld crucial information that would help explain the postings about which you have complained. Accordingly I am writing to you to provide you and your firm an opportunity to investigate and explain. For ease of reference I have attached evidence of the first posting in time that has been located.

As well there is further evidence of involvement of Miller Thomson in internet exchange regarding the Kingsland matter by Sandra Lyons at Miller Thomson whose email address is shown as slyons@millerthomson.ca.

I look forward to an early response.

Yours Truly

[REDACTED]

Kenneth William McKenzie

Cc counsel by fax

Schedule to March 29th 2010 letter to Andrew Roman

Sample of postings to Keltruth web site from IP address 206.47.255.108 which is presently shown to be the IP address of Miller Thomson law firm.

Posting - April 1, 2004

•

"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 Erie 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 good idea, so we refrain." "Kingsland Estates Ltd." "" "" "01 Apr 2004"

"07:49: 14" "206.47.255.108"