



Al Yonovitz, Ph.D., CCC-A
Herbert Joe, M.A., J.D., LL.M., B.C.F.E.,
D.A.B.F.E., D.A.B.L.E.E., F.A.C.F.E.

P.O. Box 980608
Park City, UT 84098

214 / 505-TAPE
703 / 892-TAPE
www.VideoExpert.Pro

VIA E-MAIL AS PDF FILE

January 28, 2012

Attn.: Board of Directors
Life Bliss Foundation
9720 Central Ave.
Montclair, CA 91763

FORENSIC VIDEO EXPERT'S PRELIMINARY REPORT

Dear Board of Directors,

INTRODUCTION. We were retained to objectively review a particular video recording, two particular forensic video reports and six (6) YouTube videos, all described below. Preliminary results of such analyses follow the explanation of the analyses.

EVIDENCE REVIEWED. The video at issue is a 23m12s video - with no audio content - in the WMA format (221 MB; "created Mar. 12, 2010, 9:59:04A") obtained from the Life Bliss Foundation. A screenshot of the beginning of this video follows:



Screen Shot 1.

A screenshot of the last second of this video follows:



Screen Shot 2.

Note that the date (unverified) stamped on the video is 23 December 2009.

The links and titles to the six (6) YouTube videos reviewed are as follows:

- 1) <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3xm19vU53L4>, entitled "*Swami Nithyananda SEX SCANDAL Video Nithyananda Ranjitha Full Video.flv*". This YouTube video, at 240p resolution, starts with a newswoman talking for the first 18 seconds, then the video at issue starts. A screen shot of the first second of the video follows:



Screen Shot 3.

This YouTube video ends at 4m14s of the news coverage. A screen shot of the last second of this video follows:



Screen Shot 4.

2) <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OtiOInIrg5Ow>, entitled "Swami Nithyananda SEX SCANDAL Video Nithyananda Ranjitha Full Video.flv". Note: this link goes to the exact same video as that above.

3) http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tfQi_l4cUKA&oref=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.youtube.com%2Fresults%3Fsearch_type%3Dvideos%26search_query%3Dnithyananda%2Btv9%26search_sort%3Dvideo_date_uploaded%26suggested_categories%3D25%26page%3D7&has_verified=1, entitled "ranjitha hot nithyananda.wmv." This YouTube video starts 7 seconds into the recording, as follows:



Screen Shot 5.

Starting at 3m24s into this YouTube recording, it professionally transitions from fade out of previous segment to fade in of another segment. A screenshot of the beginning of the 2nd segment follows:



Screen Shot 6.

This YouTube video ends at 5m11s of YouTube recording.

4) <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Gu-CWMxxy34>, entitled "*NITHYANANDA SWAMY rasaleelalu with sexy actress RANJITHA...Upload by (anil devunuri).*" This YouTube video starts 9 seconds into the recording, as follows:



Screen Shot 7.

This YouTube video lasts for 3m07s. A screen shot of the last second of this video follows:



Screen Shot 8.

5) <http://www.zimbio.com/Tamil+Movies/articles/yh7o-OS5DDK/Swami+Nithyananda+Tamil+Actress+Ranjitha+Scandal>, entitled "*Swami Nithyananda with Tamil Actress Ranjitha Scandal Video.*"



Screen Shot 9.

The home page of that site states that the "video is no longer available."

6) <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m5O7pJmTe1c>, entitled "03NIJAM2.wmv."



Screen Shot 10.
The start of the 8m18s video.



Screen Shot 11.
The start of the video at issue (at 2m02s).

ANALYSES OF SELECT YOUTUBE VIDEOS.

1) In the first YouTube video entitled "*Swami Nithyananda SEX SCANDAL Video Nithyananda Ranjitha Full Video.flv*", there is music as well as commentary interjected into the otherwise silent video. Such audio and linguistic insertions of any nature, by definition, materially change the putative original video. The reason why such embellishments would typically not be admissible in any U.S. civil or criminal court of law relative to the putative original is because such changing is necessarily and substantively misleading and mischaracterizes the video evidence received, which has no audio. Clearly, also, the deliberate choosing of the nature of the music inserted dramatizes the video content of the evidence and, of course, changes or adds to what the embellisher wants the viewer to take away from the otherwise silent video. The undersigned does not speak the language of the commentator, but such commentary should be done before or after the viewing of the (silent) video - not during, as that likewise materially misleads or mischaracterizes the original silent video.

In addition to the above, there are nineteen documentable edits within the otherwise continuous video. Specifically, there are five (5) edits at 0m54s, 1m01s, 1m10s, 1m19s, 1m30s into the coverage; then there appears to be the black-and-white (B&W) processing effect at 1m43s into the coverage. Two seconds later there is an apparent splicing back to the previous segments. Then there are ten (10) edits at 1m47s, 2m09s, 2m16s, 2m32s, 2m44s, 2m51s, 2m53s, 3m08s, 3m12s and 3m23s into the coverage. There appears to be the same B&W effect segment starting at 3m37s into the coverage. At 3m40s into the coverage, there is no transition as it goes right into a portrait of the Swami while the inserted music continues. In sum, this video is not a true and accurate copy of the video evidence received, and there are inserted content (dramatic music and commentary) that materially mischaracterizes the original content.

2) As previously stated, the link to this YouTube video goes to the exact same video as the one described above.

3) To view this video, the following directive was at this homepage:

This video may contain content that is inappropriate for some users, as determined by the video uploader ([Learn More](#)). To view this video please verify you are 18 or older by signing in or signing up.

Like the YouTube video above, this video has music but different than the above. The music inserted during the original video includes chanting. In addition to the comments for the first YouTube video analyzed, which all apply here for this YouTube video as well, there are thirty (30) documented edits within the otherwise continuous video. Specifically, there are eleven (11) edits at 0m14s, 0m42s, 0m59s, 1m15s, 1m46s, 2m07s, 2m24s, 2m29s, 2m32s, 3m02s, 3m13s of the recording. There is a blurring effect at 2m07s and 2m28s into the recording. Adding, deleting or changing anything within the original video is misleading at the least and fraudulent at the most. Blurring of a part of a video insinuates impropriety, so, for example, if nothing improper is transpiring in a video, then strategic blurring could mislead otherwise.

At 3m24s into the recording, there is a professional transition from fade out of the previous segment to fade in of another segment. A screen shot of this (#5) is above. After this transition to another segment, there are seventeen (17) edits at 3m32s, 3m39s, 3m44s, 3m50s, 4m03s, 4m08s, 4m16s, 4m21s, 4m23s, 4m25s, 4m28s, 4m32s, 4m41s, 4m47s, 4m50s, 4m52s and 4m57s into the recording. Then there is break into another B&W effect at 5m08s into the recording. The video and inserted music ends at 5m11s. After the end of the video, the following scrolling "credits" of eight seconds are seen:

thanks nankeeran
by
ranjitha fans accosiation from abudhabi

4) The beginning of this YouTube video is seen in Screen Shot 4, above. Note that the inserted music is of different music and singing than the other videos. The time and date information of the putative original video has been blurred. There is one edit at 0m52s into the recording. This video ends at 3m07s and can be seen in ScreenShot 5, above. By definition, this video has also been edited and is therefore not authentic and potentially if not actually misleading, relative to the putative original video.

5) As stated above, this link to the YouTube video (see Screenshot 9) has been removed and is no longer available to the general public.¹

6) The beginning of this YouTube video is seen in Screen Shot 10, above. There is commentary (and music) from the beginning. The video at issue does not start until 2m02s into the commentary, see Screen Shot 11. It is remarkable from the outset that much of the content of this YouTube video is not in the video at issue, e.g., the woman at the beginning of this video (Screen Shot 11) is not in the video at issue. This underscores the obvious conclusion that the video at issue is not an accurate copy of the actual original video. It is remarkable that of the YouTube videos reviewed, this YouTube video is the most professionally produced, especially as it relates to the way the video at issue has been edited. For examples, i) the way the edited segments have been transitioned to fade out as a new segment is faded in appears to be professionally produced; and ii) the edited video at one point is in a split screen with other video. There are many edits, all apparently designed to further the agenda of the producer of this commentary or documentary, as is the choice of music and the way the music is synchronized to the video. The more that this (or any) video is edited or mixed, including the choice of music, the more prejudicial the video is made in light of the fact that the putative original is a silent video. Nonetheless, it is still remarkable that all the people in all the videos reviewed are fully clothed.

¹ It is notable that India's telecommunications minister, Mr. Kapil Sibal, and "other (Indian) government officials are upset about Web pages that are insulting to ... major religious figures." *India cranks up pressure to clean up the Internet*, Salt Lake Tribune, Dec. 07, 2011, p. A9.

ANALYSES OF THE FORENSICS REPORTS.

Two "Examination Reports" were reviewed, both of which were from the Forensic Science Laboratory of the Government of NCT of Delhi. One was dated "02/6/10" and the other dated "12/11/10." A copy of each report is appended to this report.

In re "Examination Report" (2 pages), No. FSL 2010/P-2031/**PHY-93/10** (herein-after referred to as "Report 1"), dated "02/6/10": The analyses by the Forensic Science Laboratory Delhi were per the request by Deputy Inspector General of the Police of C.I.D. Bangalore. What was examined were 2 "Sandisk" memory cards (70 and 213 "video clips"; format of "clips" and capacity of cards not specified in the Report) and 1 Moserbaer DVD with "video recordings" (quantity not specified in the Report).

This Report is substantively lacking, even though it states that there were 34 "deleted files" in one of the memory cards, and 24 "deleted files" in the other memory card. The Report states that ENCASE software was used, but did not detail exactly what analyses were performed, nor did Report 1 compile its findings in order for the reader to understand or replicate its findings. For example, ENCASE software is a product of GuidanceSoftware. In one of their publications (EF PS 8090-50004, entitled "ENCASE Forensic - Transform Your Investigations"), it states that a "completed case is only as good as its final report." The undersigned completely concurs.

The reporting capabilities include the ability to "create compelling, easy to read, professional reports for every case." And yet the Report in this case has no details to support its findings or conclusions. In fact, the ENCASE software is set up to generate complete reports to be "consistent across an examiner's entire caseload." This is consistent with the objectives of the National Accreditation Board for Testing and Calibration Laboratories (NABL) - the Forensic Science Laboratory Delhi is a NABL member and yet did not apparently produce a Report consistent with NABL standards and readily completed with the ENCASE software that they use.

What was reportedly examined were:

- * Memory Card, Exhibit 1A: 70 video clips (or shots) + 24 deleted but retrieved files
- * Memory Card, Exhibit 1B: 213 video clips (or shots) + 34 deleted but retrieved files

The Report states that the above video clips or shots were in "digital video format" and no "alterations" were concluded based on Non-Linear Video Editing & Storage System & Video Analyst System. It is remarkable that the Report 1 does not state the exact "digital video format." The characteristics of various digital video formats, e.g., GVI, AVI, DivX, QuickTime, MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, etc. differ and may affect the forensic authenticity analyses of a given video. As for the Non-Linear Video Editing & Storage System, it is not clear because it was not specified how a video editing method was employed to determine the authenticity of any of the clips.

As for the Video Analyst System, likewise, the report is deficient in providing the essential information about what was performed and how any analysis was performed - information essential for another forensic examiner to understand the analyses and/or to attempt to replicate the procedures and findings.

* DVD, Exhibit 2: 116 video clips

Again, the report is deficiently unclear in that there is no explanation of which of these 116 video clips were also in the 283 clips within Exhs. 1A and 1B. Nor does Report 1 discuss the significance of the duplicated clips, or the clips that were not duplicated. Also, Report 1 states that there are "Retrieved video recordings of deleted files from memory cards along with the video recordings in the memory cards marked Exhibit-1A and Exhibit-1B," which are apparently provided in the DVD marked "Copy of Exhibit-1A & Exhibit 1B." And yet another way that Report 1 is deficient is that it does not expand or explain the forensic or legal significance of such findings. Another remarkable finding is that Report 1 is explicit in stating that it "contains 116 video clips" (Report, p.1), but also states in another paragraph on page 2 of the same report that the (same) DVD has *all* of the video recordings, along with the retrieved files on that DVD. In other words, the DVD either has 116 video clips in it, or 341 video clips (the sum of all the clips and retrieved files from both memory card), but not both, as the report states. Such inconsistency is very substantial.

Furthermore, Report 1 does not explain the content, much less their forensic significance, of the clips or shots? Nor the content of retrieved files? Nor the relationship of the clips to deleted files? Nor the significance of video clips and deleted files? Etc.

In re "Examination Report" (3 pages), No. FSL 2010/P-3243/**PHY-152/10** (herein-after referred to as "Report 2"), dated "12/11/10." The analyses by the Forensic Science Laboratory Delhi were per the request by Deputy Inspector General of the Police of C.I.D. Bangalore. It is not obvious what the purpose or objective of the forensic examination of the same evidence is months later. Nevertheless, what was examined were 5 exhibits:

Exhibit-1 San Disc SDHC 8 GB memory card;
facial image of male = Exh.-QMFI and facial image of female = Exh.-QFFI
* same SN as earlier Report but references "male person in *the* video recording" (emphasis added) and yet there are supposedly 70 video clips or shots + 24 deleted clips - "the" recording vis-a-vis 70-94 clips?

Exhibit-2 San Disc SDHC 8 GB memory card;
facial image of male = Exh.-QMFI and facial image of female = Exh.-QFFI
* same SN as earlier Report but references "male person in *the* video recording" (emphasis added) and yet there are supposedly 213 video clips or shots + 34 deleted clips - "the" recording vis-a-vis 213-247 clips?

One of the many confusing aspects of Report 2 is that there are the same Exhibit designations of people from different discs. This, by definition, means that the person at issue in one file is identical (positive identification) as another person in a different file. Although the serial numbers of the 2 memory discs are the same in both Reports, one report spells the make as "Sandisk", while the other report, by the same author, spells the make as "San Disc."

Exhibit-3 Moserbaer DVD w/2 folders: Photos (w/8 JPEGs) + Video (w/Video.MTS) female in video and stills = Exh.-SFFI

Exhibit-4 Moserbaer DVD w/1 folder: Video (w/Video.MTS) with stills; male in video and stills = Exh.-SMFI

Exhibit-5 Sony spy camera in air purifier w/1 adapter and connecting cable

It is very remarkable that the Examiner in both Reports give the serial numbers to the memory cards, but not the model or serial number of the "Sony spy camera." The only "forensic" conclusion about the "spy camera" was that it was in "working condition." Making controlled test recordings of this working "Sony spy camera" would provide very helpful information as a baseline to compare all the other recordings. Exhibit 5 also claims an "adapter" and a "connecting cable." It is very remarkable that a forensic report does not elaborate on these 2 items. Is the adapter, for example, a microphone, or voltage converter or regulator? What was the adapter used for? What was the connecting cable used for? How did either effect the original recording? Why was the total lack of any audio not addressed?

It is very remarkable that the Examiner in both Reports states that the video recording in the memory chips was that it "can be recorded" by the spy camera. The significance of this opinion was not provided in the Report 2. Likewise, the legal or forensic significance of the "opinion" that the memory cards "can be inserted in the memory slot of spy camera" is unknown.

Arguably the most remarkable "opinion" from the Examiner in Report 2 is that from an "image of person" having an unqualified "resemblance" to another can lead to the conclusion that that person and a particular another person "are of the same person." From "resemblance" to a positive identification based on the information in Report 2 is forensically, scientifically and even logically untenable.

ANALYSES OF THE 23m12s VIDEO AT ISSUE.

It is clear that there are content in the YouTube videos that are not contained in the 23m12s video (see, for examples, ScreenShots 3, 4 and 11, above); and, there is content in the 23m12s video that is not contained in any of the YouTube videos analyzed. Likewise, there is video content before and after the beginning and ending of the 23m12s video at issue. Therefore, by definition, this means that the 23m12s video is not a true and accurate copy of the original, as there is at least video content before and after the beginning and ending of the 23m12s video at issue.

There is no audio in the 23m12s video at issue. The fact that there is no audio in the video analyzed is especially remarkable in light of

i) practically every video recording shot in real-time (vis-à-vis time-lapsed video) with the capability of sound recording has sound in the video recording; and

ii) although Report 2 inventories the "Sony spy camera in air purifier w/1 adapter and connecting cable," it does not elaborate on the nature and purpose of said "adapter" or "connecting cable."

iii) Neither Report 1 or 2 notes any video with or without audio.

The video at issue is described variously as a "sex scandal." The main contention appears to be when a woman allegedly appears to be performing oral sex on the male subject. This is not irrefutable based on the angle of the recording system, *i.e.*, only the back of the woman's head is seen, and nothing about the front of her head, what she is or is not exactly doing and what the male subject is or is not doing, are visually obvious. Then the likelihood of what is or is not happening should be based on the circumstantial visual information available: What is apparent from the visual information available are as follows:

i) the male subject's arm is nonchalantly resting behind his head before *and* after the woman's head is lowered (see Screenshots 12 and 13, below):

ii) the male subject's head and attention are both directed to the television before *and* after the woman's head is lowered (see Screenshots 12 and 13, below);

iii) the male subject's demeanor is unchanged before *and* after the woman's head is lowered, *e.g.*, his breathing rate does not appear to change, his facial expression does not appear to change, no part of his body, *e.g.*, his hands or arms, is apparent of any on-going sexual activity, etc. (see Screenshots 12 and 13, above)



Screen Shot 12, at 19m42s.



Screen Shot 13, at 22m53s. Note that his demeanor, e.g., attention to television, relaxed (not aroused) arm resting nonchalantly behind his head, relaxed body, no remarkable facial expression, remains unchanged before (Screenshot 10) and after (Screenshot 11) the woman's head is lowered.

CONCLUSIONS.

- 1) Based on the information provided in Reports 1 and 2, it is of the expert opinion of the undersigned that such Report may not be admissible in any U.S. court of law, or may not survive a *Daubert* reliability challenge².
- 2) Based on the information provided in Reports 1 and 2, it is of the expert opinion of the undersigned that there is no forensically tenable basis to authenticate the silent video at issue, *i.e.*, there is no forensically tenable basis to make a scientifically valid determination that the video at issue is a true and accurate reproduction of the original recording.
- 3) The YouTube video clips reviewed are very misleading, if not outright fraudulent, from an evidentiary standpoint: There are edits, insertions of music, singing and/or commentary, which are more than mere misrepresentations of the putative original video content.
- 4) The 23m12s video at issue is clearly not a true and accurate reproduction or copy of the putative original video, as there is content before the beginning and after the end of the 23m12s video that exists, and as it is likely that the audio content was removed after the fact. In fact, this 23m12s video at issue is an edited version of the true original. Nevertheless, determination of authenticity of this 23m12s recording can be made with more information and additional forensic analyses of the equipment and evidence analyzed in Reports 1 and 2, described above.

² A *Daubert* challenge is a pre-trial hearing before the judge where the validity and admissibility of expert testimony is challenged by opposing counsel; the expert is required to demonstrate that his/her methodology and reasoning are scientifically valid and reliable and can be properly applied to the facts of the case. The undersigned has been *Daubert* challenged once, and overcame it completely. A copy of that *Daubert* Order, which also explains the elements of scientific validity and reliability, is attached.

In summary, given the visual information available in the 23m12s video, either there is sexual activity at the end of the 23m12s video received, or there is not. If there is sexual activity, it is most remarkable that there are no outward signs of any sexual, physical or emotional gratification of the male during or after the alleged event. To the contrary, it is much more likely that there is no sexual activity at the end of this 23m12s video for the reasons stated above. In addition, there is another compelling reason to substantiate the likelihood that no sexual activity is transpiring at the end of the 23s12s video: if one covers up the female in the video from view, then no viewer of that video can logically determine with any certainty the exact second or moment that the alleged sexual activity at the end of the video starts or ends.

QUALIFICATIONS. Yonovitz & Joe, L.L.P., a registered partnership based in Dallas, Texas, is a team of forensic audio/video analysts, experts and consultants. We have been forensic audio/video experts for over fifty-eight combined years. Our diverse legal, forensic, academic, research and clinical experience includes scientifically objective, verifiable and generally accepted analyses of audio and video evidence including, but not limited to, the forensic authenticity analyses of audio or video evidence, voice/speaker identification or elimination via aural-acoustic-spectrography, digital enhancement of audio or video recordings, transcription development and verification, etc. We have been retained in thousands of cases involving thousands of recordings throughout the U.S., Canada, Mexico, the United Kingdom, Sri Lanka, Australia, Singapore and the United Arab Emirates, and have testified in state and Federal courts in civil, criminal and administrative matters throughout the U.S., as well as overseas. Representative clients include Steptoe & Johnson (Wash., D.C.), Shearman & Sterling (NYC), Simpson Thacher & Bartlett (NYC), Mesereau & Yu (Los Angeles), Armstrong Teasdale (Kansas City), Ford & Harrison (Memphis), Rawle & Henderson (Philadelphia), McAfee & Taft (OKC), Bracewell & Patterson (Houston), Akin Gump (San Antonio), Jones Day (Dallas), Haynes & Boone (Houston), Thompson & Knight (Dallas), Vinson & Elkins (Dallas), Jenkins & Gilchrist (Dallas), Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., Georgia-Pacific, LLC, Coastamare Shipping Comp., Motorola Corp., Vivint, Inc., BankOne, BlueCross BlueShield, Shell Oil Co., United Parcel Service, Inc., Shell Texaco & Saudi Refineries, Inc., Reliant Energy, 7-Eleven, Inc., Evercom Systems, Inc., Abu Dhabi (United Arab Emirates) Judicial Department, U.S. Attorney's Office (NM), Mississippi Attorney General's Office, Harris County (Houston) Attorney's Office, Harris County Sheriff's Office, City of Austin, City of San Angelo, City of Galveston, Plano (TX) and Akron (OH) Police Depts., Dallas, Maricopa (Phoenix), Tulsa (OK), Harris (Hou.), Fulton (GA) and Summit (OH) County DA's Offices, Washington D.C., Houston, Little Rock, South Dakota, DuPage County (IL), Green County (PA), New Mexico, New Hampshire and New Jersey Public Defender's Offices, Kentucky Department of Public Advocacy, Louisiana Crisis Assistance Center, Oklahoma Indigent Defense System, the Associated Press (AP), ABC, BBC, FOX-TV, etc. High profile cases include the *Branch Davidian* case; consultations include TMZ, *CSI: Miami* and *People Magazine* and recent speaking engagements include the 2002, 15th Annual Criminal Litigation Seminar, the 2003 annual convention of the American Speech & Hearing Association, the 2004 26th World Congress of the International Association of Logopedics and Phoniatics, the 2005 annual conference of the Center for International Legal Studies, the 2005 3rd Annual Forensics Seminar, the 2006 4th Annual Forensics Seminar, the 2007 annual meeting of the North Carolina Bar Association, the 2007 5th Annual Forensics Seminar,

the 2008 6th Annual Forensics Seminar, the 2009 Spring Meeting of the Forensic Expert Witness Association, the 2009 7th Annual Forensics Seminar, the 2010 8th Annual Forensics Seminar, the 2010 2nd Pan American/Iberian Meeting on Acoustics (Cancún), the 2011 9th Annual Forensics Seminar and the 2011 annual meeting of the American Speech & Hearing Association.

The undersigned is managing partner of Yonovitz & Joe, L.L.P. I have 4 degrees, including 2 science degrees (B.S., M.A.) and 2 law degrees (J.D., LL.M.). The following are a result of my expertise and experience in the area of forensic audio/video: Board Certified Forensic Audio/Video Examiner; Diplomat, American Board of Forensic Examiners; Diplomat, American Board of Law Enforcement Experts; Licensed Instructor, Texas Board of Private Investigators; Member, Evidence Code Committee of the Oklahoma Bar Association; Former Board Member, Forensic Expert Witness Association; Board of Legal Advisors, American Guild of Court Videographers; Charter Member, Legal Advisory Board, American College of Forensic Examiner Institute; Member, The Commission on Forensic Education; Fellow, American Guild of Court Videographers; and Fellow, American College of Forensic Examiners. I am also a Certified Mediator, licensed to practice law in Texas and Oklahoma, a Registered Patent Attorney with the United States Patent & Trademark Office, a Registered Patent Agent with the Canadian Intellectual Property Office, a Member of the College of the State Bar of Texas, Adjunct Faculty (Grad. Law Classes) at the University of Phoenix and a Member of the Summit County Board of Health. My 24-year involvement in the area of forensic audio/video includes expert testimony in state and Federal courts in civil and criminal cases throughout the U.S., as well as overseas, giving regional, national and international presentations, authoring peer-reviewed publications and being interviewed or consulted with throughout the news and entertainment industries domestically and foreign.

This is a preliminary report and subject to change upon receipt of additional information or evidence.

Respectfully submitted,
YONOVITZ & JOE, L.L.P.
Forensic Audio/Video Analysts, Experts & Consultants

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Herbert Joe', with a stylized, cursive script.

Herbert Joe, M.A., J.D., LL.M., B.C.F.E.,
D.A.B.F.E., D.A.B.L.E.E., F.A.C.F.E.
Managing Partner, Yonovitz & Joe, L.L.P.
Board Certified Forensic Audio/Video Examiner
Registered Patent Attorney, USPTO, CIPO
Adjunct Faculty (Grad. Law), University of Phoenix
Licensed Instructor, Texas Board of Private Investigators

Member, Evidence Code Committee, Oklahoma Bar Assoc.
Member, College of the State Bar of Texas
Member, Legal Advisory Board, American College of
Forensic Examiners International
Member, Board of Legal Advisors,
American Guild of Court of Videographers
Fellow, American Guild of Court of Videographers
Diplomate, American Board of Law Enforcement Experts
Diplomate, American Board of Forensic Examiners
Fellow, American College of Forensic Examiners

- Attachments:
- 1) Two "Examination Reports" (dated "02/6/10 and "12/11/10")
from the Forensic Science Laboratory of the Government of
NCT of Delhi; and
 - 2) Copy of only *Daubert* Order of Herbert Joe.