

False Allegations made by Suzanne Martin against Paul Andrews on March 30th 2016

Right I need to explain this one, and you need to read this bit well first, or the rest of the post will make no sense to you! There will be a second post to explain what happened after this initial issue, but I will spilt it into two to keep it as simple as possible).

As you may or may not know once upon a time I founded and ran a games company, that's a whole book in itself I need to get onto another time! But back then, we did a load of phone games, we did PC games, we did the C64 game conversions which ended up on the Nintendo Wii, we did iPhone apps on Apple, and so on, plus DVDs and documentaries and so. We even had some retro games like Ant Attack signed to us at one point and even some Scott Adams C64 games!

Like most game companies you put a lot of money in, if you have a hit you make a lot of money, if you don't have a hit you lose a lot of money. Sadly in this case we lost a lot of money, mostly mine but there you go. You pick yourself up, you move on and start again. That's the way it works. For the record when eventually the company shut it had no real debts (i.e. the money lost overall was mostly mine and a few other smaller investors, as happens in these cases, but mostly mine) plus we managed to move some of the employees over to my publishing company, many of which still work for me. The only other tiny debt the company had was a small ccj for a few hundred pounds which it actually did not owe, a marketing company which had not done the work it was paid for (i.e. we paid them about £4500 odd of a £5000 bill, they didn't do the work as agreed, we would not pay them the final bit, they did a small online claim, we answered it, but the court got it a day after the deadline, and just did an automatic judgement, but the company had shut by that point, hence why late posting it as we were a little busy funny enough, but anyway... it is relevant later in this story..

We had a few interesting things happen along the way of that company, one of which occurred over a two day or so period, which was a massive news thing for those two days, then when everyone realised they had been sold a duff story by a reporter, they all moved on, and it became nothing more than a news blip, and yesterday's chip paper as they say... until Martin found a use for it.... More on that in a moment...

So here is the 100% true thing that happened.

We had published a phone game by a young artist (from France – his name being Luc Bernard) the game was called Eternity's Child. It was quirky, different and I thought it might do well. Sadly back then doing phone games, you had to go through a chain of sellers, so even if a game sold you got pennies if you were lucky, but often the money went astray before you saw it. That aside, on that basis we also signed an option on the next few game ideas from him should he ever do them. We had no idea what they might be, or if they would ever happen, but he wanted to sign and so why not.

He then moved from France to New York, and I think he might have ended up living with an up and coming female rock singer, and due to that, he managed to get an interview with the New York Times. He talked about his original phone game and showed this reporter some concept ideas/drawings he had done. The interview was over and he awaited the article in due course.

This is where it went wrong for the artist. Not forgetting he had done nothing more than a handful of concept art images. There were no games, no plans, nothing we even knew of at that point in time, he had said or shown us nothing...

To jump ahead, this artist was of Jewish descent, and he also wanted to do creative and positive things with his art and games, he wanted to make a difference. He had come up with a concept (nothing more) for a game in which a child was trapped in the Holocaust and the only thing he could do was escape the horror of that through his imagination, hence the title of the game 'Imagination is the only escape'. It was nothing more than a concept for an teaching and educational game along the lines of Pans Labyrinth the film and other similar type of things which have been created by some very high profile people over the years. And we had no idea about its existence remember!

This reporter obviously thought he was onto a good thing and rung Nintendo and said 'are you publishing a Nazi game about the holocaust?' or something along those lines. Nintendo said something along the lines of 'we have no idea what you are going on about we have no plans to publish such a game' obviously they had no idea more than we did. The next minute the New York Times publishes an article along the lines of 'UK games publisher Holocaust game blocked by Nintendo!. The press went crazy, articles all over the world that day, just repeating the same silly untrue statement. By the time we caught up with what was really going on, spoke to Luc (via emails and so on) we had to make a statement of course, which we did as well as speaking to Nintendo.

The short version was – time we found out the real truth from Luc, spoke to Nintendo to ask them what had happened, and them actually day (Nintendo of Europe – and the platform in question would have ultimately been Wii Ware) that if a game of that was to be submitted subject to the obvious normal rules, they had no problem with it. I have to say Nintendo are very open and positive to things, and open to new ideas by third parties in general more than many large corporations. We then made a statement to the press, along the lines of while we had no prior knowledge of the game CONCEPT, once we understood it was an ANTI holocaust educational game concept, explained Nintendo like us had no known of it, and basically the press had twisted the whole story into something it just really wasn't, that a as company we supported free speech, we supported racial diversity, (in fact the company was just that), we supported new ideas, and so on, that while we had no plans to do so, we did not rule out at some point publishing this ANTI holocaust learning game. A spokesperson for the Anti-Defamation League Myrna Shinbaum, actually made an official release that they encouraged such things for children to learn about this terrible period in history.

The Wikipedia article on this is here (cut and paste) its not something we tried to hide, why would we?

"In 2008 Alten8 came under fire inadvertently, after an independent contract designer Luc Bernard who had done a single phone game for Alten8 did an independent interview, Bernard's anti-holocaust-themed DS game 'concept' was discussed, and then sub sequentially misquoted by the press in an interview with the NY Times, Imagination Is The Only Escape, which was then

immediately met with a media 'controversy' storm, with everyone from Destructoid who stated the concept was "the evolution of gaming, and the chance for videogames to tackle sensitive issues"[11] to the New York Times itself having an distorted view on the interview they themselves carried out.[12] But despite the initial press fuelled public confusion over the concept, an official quote from the Anti-Defamation League spokeswoman Myrna Shinbaum in which she appeared to actually endorse the game concept being made stating "We certainly believe that we have to find new ways of teaching lessons of the Holocaust as new technologies are being developed" [13] According to several erroneous internet sources, Nintendo themselves claimed that the game would never be released, however this was confirmed to not be the case,[14][15] and the game never went past the developers concept art.[16] Imagination and its well-meant intentions by the developer was strongly backed by Alten8,[17] but Alten8 itself had never known of its concept prior to the media storm, nor had any contract with the developer to produce it. Bernard went on to try to crowd fund and develop the game himself in 2013, but was unsuccessful"

Basically within a few days the whole thing had blown over. Meanwhile 8 years later in Martins mind...

(what now follows is the usual cut and paste of the emails followed by screen grab proof images, mostly from Martin and Levy to me, then a few between them and my lawyer, which I paid for out of my own pocket (a subject we will come back to another time about who paid for what legal action from what pots of money, and shareholders agreements, but that's too complex for this post) I actually never responded to them directly on this topic for obvious reasons you will see below, other than to tell her with immediate effect she had no right to act on behalf of the company, again you will see what happened below)

From: Suzanne Martin <
To: David Levy < Paul Andrews < >; Chris Smith < **Cc:** " **Sent:** Wednesday, March 30, 2016 4:10 PM
Subject: CRISIS - RETRO COMPUTERS -IMMEDIATE ACTION REQUIRED

I tried calling you Paul but you are not answering my calls.

Given the serious nature of a call that I received today, I am emailing all of the directors to inform them of the very serious allegations made to me today by a member of the press. During a call "fronting" me up about Paul and Retro Computers business dealings and in particular your/our involvement with what has been described as a "Nazi Sympathiser Holocaust Fantasy Game".

The following does not make for pretty reading and will if handled incorrectly impact on all of the company directors and their associated commercial interests. In my opinion there is only one way to handle this and I will come back to you on that once you have had time to respond to this.

I received a call from a reporter today at around 2pm they plan to run with this story on Sunday and require an immediate rebuttal or response

In my experience there is a very serious threat that they will go to print given the nature of the allegations. From what I can see - information already in the public domain has already featured in what would be considered to be trusted sources including the New York Times and only serves to substantiate their claims. Coupled with your own public records there is no easy or positive way out of this.

I will do what I can, but I cannot see any excusable explanation for this project, I will however in the short term make some recommendations when you respond to this email.

Given the voracity of the claim I believe that they have some kind of sworn statement this is quite normal when they plan to print.

Notes from call 30.3.16

It has been claimed that Andrews is the producer and distributor of a Holocaust Fantasy Computer Game - Imagination is the Only Escape. This does appear to be true as it is in the public domain we therefore cannot deny this in anyway and there really is no positive answer to this. Andrews own statements are also contradictory regarding this matter and by seeking to justify their commercial interest have confirmed the allegations.

It should also be mentioned here that Andrews has previously described his treatment in connection to the bad press surrounding the game as ³unfair² it is also reported that Andrews denied that distribution in the US was pulled and Andrews own Press Releases appears to further support their very serious claims again compounding the allegation.

On another serious note they asked if we Retro Computers Limited have plans to distribute the game following the recent crowd funding success. I have already denied this but this requires very serious consideration. Paul do you plan to do this through another company you are associated with - now is the time for you to come clean and tell me everything so I can establish the facts.

They confirmed that Andrews retains the distribution rights to the Violent Nazi Themed Game and that he had ³boasted² to a third party that he was going ahead now that ³he had the money.²

Original Company Alten8 Limited 100% owned by Andrews Liquidated now but did in fact plan to produce and distribute the game.

Claimed that Andrews publicly shelved the idea following negative publicity in 2008 but reporter advised that Andrews was still claiming to a third party the game was in development and had only said that to make the media ³go away²

Commented that Andrews previously stated that criticism had been ³unfair² there are no words for this and no apology will be sufficient in my opinion you cannot defend the indefensible.

Andrews Allegedly Blacklisted by Sony/Nintendo/Playstation and other major games co's

Accused Andrews of being a White Supremist/Nazi Sympathiser Mentioned C18 - Combat 18 Luton Connection

Accused Andrews of Holding extremist view

Mentioned Luton Connection

Asked about Andrews publishing company and high profile author Dame Stephanie Shirley I understand there is a rights dispute involving this title please expand. And of course she is a German Jew.

I have found the following reports, which in some way substantiate the allegation as do a number of publicly made statements by Andrews.

I have included a number of negative articles about two games that have been greeted with understandable horror so you can see what has previously been printed.

MARTIN THEN PUT A TON OF LINKS TO THE EARLIER NEGATIVE ARTICLES WHICH CAME OUT PRIOR TO THE REAL TRUTH BEING SEEN AS DESCRIBED ABOVE

On 30/3/16 20:15, "David Levy" < > wrote:

Bloody hell!

What a horrendous PR disaster you've landed us in Paul. If Clive and I had known about all this when we met you, do you honestly think we would have touched you with a barge pole.

Suzanne - do you think you can limit the damage that's coming to us in some way? What ideas do you have? What info/statement do you need from Paul to help you do whatever you can? I think we need to put out a statement before Sunday, but what can we say? How can we deal with the indefensible?

Paul - You absolutely have to co-operate with Suzanne on this. Do whatever she says. Damage limitation is one of the key skills in PR work and none of us directors have any experience in this area (certainly I don't and I doubt that you or Chris does either).

Suzanne - What is our deadline in your opinion for sending out a statement to the media to try to put whatever is going to appear on Sunday into a less horrendous perspective? If you haven't got enough from Paul to help you, in time to meet that deadline, give me an hour and some guidance and I'll compose a statement to try to best limit the damage to the company.

David

Suzanne replied to David copying us in and said -

It is not great - not helped by the lack of response from Paul. I have called, text and emailed.

The reporter has called me back twice this afternoon since my email and I honestly think we need

to act swiftly and I suspect they might send a reporter to the office or your home and doorstep you. You need to warn your staff and family of this and advise them not to engage in any dialogue with press.

Paul I have asked you to come clean – this is so I know what I am truly dealing with and will act accordingly in the best interest of the company – you owe the team that.

With immediate effect no one can speak to any media unless agreed by me and in accordance with very strict direction and a full briefing – Paul, you have been giving “rogue” press briefings and this must stop right now – this cannot be handled, you cannot handle this.

One thing that would help is I need to know if there is any debt with regards to this project – as that might be a motivator for this kind of story. I have taken a quick look at the credit history for your company Alten8 and can see a CCJ for a smallish amount – it remains unsatisfied. If you do not have these details – I can send them to you. I suggest you resolve this.

My further comments are below in red..

I am around 24/7 call me no matter what time.

Suzanne

THESE ARE THE COMMENTS IN RED SHE WROTE (JUST FACEBOOK DOES NOT LET YOU SHOW THEM LIKE THAT)

You cannot defend this – you have to act with precision, as speed and distance yourself. This is being touted around to all the papers for sure.

I need the truth and that is a very good starting point.

I need answer to every question they have raised along with proof.

The problem that we have is – when this story originally came to light instead of apologising and grovelling – Paul has sought to justify something that is indefensible to 99.9% of the population. At times he has acted like the “victim ” and in turn this has only inflamed the situation. Worse still having been publicly black balled by the New York times – and allegedly dumped by more than one big name Nintendo DS he has then issued a statement saying that Nintendo hadn’t canned the idea – again compounding the intention to publish and distribute the game. Another problem is that the designer has since created a crowdfunding campaign and kept the money. This has a massive impact on our business and associated businesses.

You can see how this story has been constructed and I feel certain they would be able to print given the documents in the public domain .

We need to have a prepared statement by 9am at the latest. We can not defend this – there is no defence as you will see from the cuttings. As Chairman you have to do what you feel is in the best interest of the company. Paul can apologise although it is unlikely that it will be believed given no effort has been made to do so in the past – making himself out to be the victim of the press is not a helpful position.

Paul must be publicly distanced from the company.

Retro Computers has to deny any connection to this game and In turn that includes Paul.

I can speak to you any time David and support you in anyway you need.

From: Paul Andrews <
To: Suzanne Martin <>; David Levy <davidlevylondon@yahoo.com>; Paul Andrews <>; Chris Smith <
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2016 2:35 AM
Subject: Re: CRISIS - RETRO COMPUTERS -IMMEDIATE ACTION REQUIRED

Suzanne – I am giving you notice that with immediate effect, on behalf of both myself and Retro Computers Ltd, and the shareholders and directors of Retro Computers Ltd, that you do not and shall not act in any way for either party moving forward from this point in time. You do not have the authority to speak on behalf of either the company nor myself. You do not have the authority to issue any statement or notice on behalf of either the company or myself. Any damage caused by your actions from this point forward to ether myself or the company will bring about the full force of the law from the damaged parties.

Paul Andrews

From Suzanne –

Paul

I have read your email sent this morning at 2.45 am. You claim to be acting on behalf of the directors but I believe that this is unlikely to be true. You require three directors to dismiss me if you have grounds and in any event you do not have grounds and essentially you cannot sack me for doing my job.

Also you have not followed the legal protocol for such an action and I put you on notice that I am insured for legal expense. I have also taken legal advice this morning.

You have asked me to work directly for you on a number of projects, I have advised you of the conflict you have created and you have since treated me very badly and not in the best interest of the company.

Your reaction is understandable given what has been revealed – but I fail to see the thought process involved in this judgement call and therefore I plan to continue to act in the best interest of the company, shareholders as directed by them and confirmed by David.

To be clear, I have not done anything that you can sack me for. I have reported the nature of a conversation that has the potential to have a damaging impact on Retro Computers Limited.

It is information that is largely in the public domain and on balance it would appear the reporter has done their homework and is acting in a professional manner. The information I have provided has also been confirmed by you in various public places and on balance appears to be substantiated by you.

I believe that you are not thinking straight and your behaviour over the last few days and weeks has become increasingly erratic. It seems like only a matter of weeks ago you were trying to get rid of Chris – at least you appear to have seen sense on that front, as he is an asset to the company. Then David and now me.

You recently referred to me as the fifth member of the team in an article you penned by you for Micro Mart – you have also praised me for my work until now. I am extremely proud of the work we do at Retro Computers and will continue to act in the best interest of the company.

Given that you are the cause of the scandal I do not see that you can make this decision on an impartial basis

and I appreciate that this is the first time you have been the director of a company with a proper board and shareholders other than yourself or close associates. You have to act in a certain way and it is not this way.

I also add that I cannot be responsible for an ill-conceived commercial project created by you. You are the architect here and you have to own it. If you had handled this professionally when it first blew up you could have consigned it to the pile marked mistakes and apologised.

To be clear if you hadn't sought to create a "Holocaust Fantasy Game" this would not be happening.

Suzanne

From: David Levy < >
To: Paul Andrews < >; Suzanne Martin < >; Paul Andrews < Chris Smith <
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2016 8:26 AM
Subject: Re: CRISIS - RETRO COMPUTERS -IMMEDIATE ACTION REQUIRED

Suzanne,

You are still on the staff of Retro Computers Ltd.

Paul does not have the authority to dismiss you.

As Chairman I would like you to continue the excellent work you have been doing for and on behalf of the company, at the same salary of £300 per week, including protecting the company's interests from any adverse media publicity about the company and/or its directors.

I shall be taking advice later this morning and will be in touch with you this afternoon to confirm or amend any of this as appropriate. In the meantime, since Paul appears to be unwilling to assist you in this, please let me have your suggested strategy and I will draft a statement from the company to be released as and when I tell you later today.

David

David followed this up with –

Suzanne,

I can now confirm that everything I said to you in my email at 8:26am this morning stands.

I have drafted a statement on which I would like you to send me (and only me) your comments and suggestions. I shall send it in a few minutes. Once we have finalized the wording we should agree on when it should be sent out, which in any event must be at least a day before the journo's article appears.

X

David

IT WAS AT THIS POINT I WENT TO SEE MY LAWYER (AND LATER THE POLICE ALSO – MORE ON THAT LATER) LETTERS WERE ISSUED TO MARTIN AND LEVY – THIS CHAIN NOW FOLLOWS

Dear Mr Levy and Ms Martin

Please see the attached letter before action. We look forward to receiving your substantive and full response by no later than 10 am on 1 April 2016.

Kind Regards

Patrick Amith

Re: Retro Computers

Dear Mr Smith

Please provide acknowledgment for the various correspondence that has been forwarded to you since your letter email of 31st March 2015.

Thank you for confirming that it was wrong of you to say that “ Mr Melbourne has not in fact sent his (draft) reply to Mr Levy, whilst he is taking legal advice. ” It is also noted that this is now marked as “draft” and not as per your letter where it was used by way of supporting evidence on behalf of your client(s) to elicit a response from Ms Martin and Dr Levy.

I do not believe that this is a side issue at all, it does in fact highlight the shareholder dispute and conflict issues that are at the core of this dispute.

It is denied that I have sought “the false information sought to be disseminated and published by you and Mr Levy to the detriment of our clients (and in fundamental breach of Mr Levy’s duties as a director of the Company).”

Thank you for also confirming your mistake that “ Mr Andrews was not the sole shareholder of Alten8. His shareholding varied, being only 25 % at the time of liquidation.”

I believe that all of the advice I have given Retro Computers Limited is industry standard. I also agree with you that the information “needs to be fully and properly countered.” as I advised. I also believe that if Mr Andrews were the correct person to deal with the Crisis it would no longer be a crisis after 10 years. It should also be noted that the article has not appeared over the last few days and I invite Mr Andrews to apologise to me over the handling of this matter and to thank me for my efforts in ensuring that it was not.

Furthermore, I again remind you that we will compile and send you a full dossier of all publicly held evidence in relation to Mr Andrews asset “Imagination is the Only Escape” and we put you on notice that we cannot in any way be held responsible for a problem that has been in the public domain since 2006.

Once again, we stand by all our earlier statements made whilst acting in accordance with our individual roles.

When you apply to the High Court for injunctive relief you are required to present this document, in its now sub-edited version, to the Court.

Suzanne Martin

From: Suzanne Martin [
Sent: 01 April 2016 08:06
To: Patrick Smith; David Levy; Chris Smith
Cc: Paul Andrews
Subject: Re: Retro Computers

Mr Smith,

In response to your letter dated 31.3.2016 received at 17.15, copied to Dr Levy, Ms Martin and Mr Andrews but not it should be noted to Mr Smith whom I have copied into this email response.

A full and robust response will be sent to you by 1pm today and in advance of that we ask that you forward a copy of the email you refer to in point 2 of your letter, as Dr Levy has not seen any such reply to his letter from Mr Melbourne.

We thank you for your assistance in advance.

Yours sincerely,

Dr David Levy and Ms Suzanne Martin

From: Patrick Smith <
To: 'Suzanne Martin' < David Levy < Chris Smith
Cc: Paul Andrews <
Sent: Friday, April 1, 2016 10:11 AM
Subject: RE: Retro Computers

Dear Ms Martin

Thank you for your acknowledgement.

We are informed that Mr Melbourne has not in fact sent his (draft) reply to Mr Levy, whilst he is taking legal advice. That is however a side issue and one that will no doubt be taken up with you and Mr Levy by Mr Melbourne's legal representatives.

This matter relates to the false information sought to be disseminated and published by you and Mr Levy to the detriment of our clients (and in fundamental breach of Mr Levy's duties as a director of the Company).

Clearly, on your version, the alleged journalist is in possession of very warped and false 'information' which needs to be fully and properly countered. The best placed person to do so is our client, Paul Andrews, who is absolutely prepared and happy to meet/speak with the journalist in question and to provide him/her with the full and correct facts. We therefore demand that you provide us with the contact details of the alleged journalist by no later than 11:00 am today so that Mr Andrews may set the record straight and this matter may be finally and satisfactorily resolved without the need to have recourse to the courts. You can have no justifiable reason to refuse to divulge this information.

If, despite knowledge of the true facts as set out in our letter of 31 March 2016, you nevertheless disseminate false information in the public domain to the detriment of our clients then our clients will pursue you for damages to the full extent of the law.

A final correction to our letter – Mr Andrews was not the sole shareholder of Alten8. His shareholding varied, being only 25 % at the time of liquidation.

We look forward to your sensible response. All relevant correspondences will be brought to the attention of the court in relation to the issue of costs and costs on the indemnity basis.

Kind Regards

Patrick

From: David Levy [
Sent: 01 April 2016 13:04
To: Patrick Smith; 'Suzanne Martin'; Chris Smith
Cc: Paul Andrews
Subject: Re: Retro Computers

Dear Mr Smith,

Further to Miss Martin's email to you of earlier today, we are in the final throes of preparing our response which will be with you very shortly, hopefully in the coming minutes.

Yours sincerely,

David Levy

From: Patrick Smith <
To: 'David Levy' < 'Suzanne Martin' < Chris Smith <
Cc: Paul Andrews <
Sent: Friday, April 1, 2016 1:55 PM
Subject: RE: Retro Computers

Dear Mr Levy

Please provide the contact details of the alleged journalist (and the name of his newspaper), together with a copy of your proposed press statement immediately.

The other directors and shareholders of the company (and the company itself) are entitled to know what statements you intend to place in the public domain in relation to the company and its officers. As a director your first duty is to the company, which includes fully informing the directors, shareholders and company of any actions you intend to take which are likely to impact upon the company and/or its officers

Yours faithfully

Patrick

From: David Levy [
Sent: 03 April 2016 08:43
To: Patrick Smith; 'Suzanne Martin'; Chris Smith
Cc: Paul Andrews
Subject: Re: Retro Computers

Dear Mr Smith,

Please find attached a tidied up version of the fax sent to you by Ms Martin last Friday.

As to the contact details of the journalist to whom Ms Martin spoke, she has never previously provided me with the names or contact details of any of her journalistic contacts and she has not

done so on this occasion.

Yours sincerely,

David Levy

On 4/4/16 11:48, "Patrick Smith" < > wrote:

Dear Mr Levy and Ms Martin

Thank you for your several "response" emails and the follow up emails with multiple attachments.

To the crux of the matter – the threatened libel and defamation: it is noted that you have withdrawn your threats of imminent libel and defamation and now concede and confirm that you have no intention of making any kind of press release despite your earlier and ever more frantic threats to do so. It is further noted that you refuse to identify the alleged journalist involved, despite the fact that the Company has every interest in obtaining an injunction against any individual proposing to make such false and unjustifiable libellous and defamatory statements. Clearly therefore, there never was any such journalist and you have merely made false statements, for your own advantage.

We are not instructed in any other matter and will not respond to any correspondences relating to any other matter.

Kind Regards

Patrick

Dear Mr Smith,

Thank you for confirming receipt of our "several" emails with "multiple attachments."

It is denied that Dr Levy and Ms Martin have " threatened libel and defamation". It is also denied that we have ever made " frantic threats to do so". It is also denied that Ms Martin have ever "made false statements" in relation to this matter "for your own advantage." As you now concede, this was a crisis that "needs to be fully and properly countered." as I advised in the normal course of working practice.

In the event that the journalist who contacted me last week makes contact again this week – I will give them Mr Andrew's mobile number or your contact details as you choose.

And again remind you from our letter of 1st April 2016 -

In response to your resolution:

- 1 There is no press statement so we cannot send it to you for consideration.
2. The reporter claimed to be freelance and working for a number of titles. Perhaps you should put them all on notice of your intentions to take out an injunction.
3. We have no current plans to make any press statements.

You also claim "We are not instructed in any other matter and will not respond to any correspondences relating to any other matter. " and yet your letter of 31st March 2016 repeats a number of false allegations communicated by you on behalf of your client(s) , and we invite you to look at points 1-4 of your letter.

Finally we demand that you confirm by return who your actual client is and bring this to your attention again as per our letter of the 1st April 2016:

"But first we must put you on notice of the following, namely that you say you are instructed by Retro Computers Ltd through two of its directors and two of its shareholders. "

Your alleged instructions contravene Clause 5(r) of the company's Shareholders Agreement, which requires the company to have the prior written consent of at least three shareholders to "commence the prosecution or defence of any legal or arbitration proceedings other than routine debt collection". Any action you bring on the basis of your alleged instructions will therefore be fatally flawed, and Mr Andrews personally should expect to be fully liable for any costs."

Once again, we stand by all our earlier statements made whilst acting in accordance with our individual roles.

When you apply to the High Court for injunctive relief you are required present this document, in its now sub-edited version, to the Court.

Yours sincerely

Suzanne Martin & David Levy

AS ABOVE THERE WILL BE A FOLLOW UP POST ON THIS – A WHAT HAPPENED BECAUSE OF AND DURING AND AFTER THIS CHAIN OF REAL WORLD EVENTS – BUT FOR NOW YOU CAN ALL SEE WHAT STARTED THE CHAIN REACTION OF MYSELF AND CHRIS HAVING NO OPTION BUT TO RESIGN