

Defendant Pro Se's Supplement to Notice of Violation of Stipulation on Injunction by PARIS (Oxebridge)
Case 8:15-cv-00011-EAK-TBM

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
TAMPA DIVISION

FILED
2017 JUN 22 PM 12:03
CLERK US DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
TAMPA FLORIDA

Case number: 8:15-cv-00011-EAK-TBM

OXEBRIDGE QUALITY RESOURCES
INTERNATIONAL, LLC, and
CHRISTOPHER MARK PARIS, individually.

Plaintiffs,

Vs.

MARC TIMOTHY SMITH, individually,
and d/b/a/ CAYMAN BUSINESS SYSTEMS

Defendant.

Presiding Judge: Elizabeth A. Kovachevich
Referring Judge: Thomas B. McCoun III
Court: Florida Middle District Court
Office: Tampa Office
County: Hillsborough

DEFENDANT'S SUPPLEMENT TO NOTICE TO PLAINTIFF OF PLAINTIFF'S VIOLATION OF THE STIPULATION ON INJUNCTION AND MOTION TO COMPEL COMPLIANCE MAILED 15 JUNE 2017

Comes now the Defendant, MARC SMITH, filing Pro Se, to file a *Supplement* to the Notice of the Plaintiff's Breach of the Joint Stipulation on Injunction and Violation of Court Order and Motion to Compel Compliance with the Joint Stipulation on Injunction, against, CHRISTOPHER MARK PARIS (PARIS), individually, and OXEBRIDGE QUALITY RESOURCES INTERNATIONAL LLC, cumulatively ("plaintiffs"), as follows:

BACKGROUND

1. On 15 June 2017 at approximately 10:30 AM EDT SMITH mailed a Notice of the Plaintiff's Breach of the Joint Stipulation on Injunction and Violation of Court Order to be filed by the Court. Copies were mailed to PARIS and his attorney of record, William Wohlsifer via Certified Mail (USPS). [Receipts – Exhibit A]
2. On 16 June 2017 at approximately 2:20 PM EDT, PARIS sent SMITH by email a "Notice" (threat?) titled "Next stop". [Exhibit B]

PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

3. PARIS did not advise SMITH of who his "new counsel" is, so SMITH will be mailing this to PARIS' attorney of record in this case as of this date.
4. SMITH is not involved with any of the cited "recent publications" on any of the venues cited by PARIS, or on any other venue. SMITH is aware of "oxebridge.co" and "osteinfo.com" as they have been cited on GUBERMAN's

Defendant Pro Se's Supplement to Notice of Violation of Stipulation on Injunction by PARIS (Oxebridge)
Case 8:15-cv-00011-EAK-TBM

various web sites. For all SMITH knows, PARIS himself may be responsible for "oxebridge.co" and "osteinfo.com" to cast SMITH in a bad light, the same reason SMITH believes is the reason for PARIS having "hacked" his own web site during July 2015, which he blamed on SMITH.

5. A hearing was held on 16 March 2016 in Tampa, FL. With Federal Magistrate Judge Honorable Thomas B. McCoun III presiding re: the "Second Notice of Breach of the Stipulation of Injunction".
6. SMITH disputes Docket Document 82 of 22 March 2016 and is still, almost 2 years after the Mediation Settlement Agreement, waiting for the "letter" PARIS' attorney said he was going to send SMITH to sign to get information removed from Google. Exhibit B of Docket Document is one example showing neither SMITH nor PARIS can get the cited URLs removed. SMITH has not objected to such a Court Order and does not now have any objection to such an order.

On July 14th, a list of URLs was entered into the form as directed by Google. On August 18th, Google responded with a request that made it clear only a court order listing the URLs would be acceptable.

Hello,

Thanks for reaching out to us.

We confirm receipt of your removal request and the attached document that you provided us. It remains unclear to us how the material specified in your removal request relates to the legal document that you attached to your previous correspondence. While we attempt to comply with all valid legal process, we are unable to take any further action on your complaint unless you can demonstrate to us exactly where the removal of the content in question is specified in the document you attached, or you can provide additional documentation from the court confirming that the URLs mentioned in your complaint are the ones the court has found to be unlawful.

Regards,
The Google Team

This response came after the mediated settlement on June 5th, making the need for a "letter" signed by Smith moot.

7. In response to Docket Document 79 of 16 March 2016, SMITH submitted Docket Document 81 of 21 March 2016 which includes evidence that SMITH tried to remove what he had the power to remove and that SMITH was in

Defendant Pro Se: Marc Timothy Smith, 8466 Lesourdsville-West Chester Road
West Chester, Ohio 45069 Tel: 513 341-6272

Defendant Pro Se's Supplement to Notice of Violation of Stipulation on Injunction by PARIS (Oxebridge)
Case 8:15-cv-00011-EAK-TBM

compliance with the Stipulation on Injunction. SMITH also provided additional evidence in Docket Document 83 of 22 March 2016.

8. On 28 July Federal Magistrate Judge Honorable Thomas B. McCoun III, having considered all the evidence presented, issued his REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION [Docket Document 99]
9. SMITH filed further evidence, and objections to Docket Document 99, in Docket Document 102 of 8/5/2016.
10. On 18 January 2017, having considered all the evidence presented and Federal Magistrate Judge Honorable Thomas B. McCoun III' RECOMMENDATION AND REPORT [Docket Document 99], Federal Judge Honorable Elizabeth A. Kovachevich issued her Judgment. [Docket Documents 120 and 121] It is SMITH's understanding that all matters before the court have been settled, and that PARIS' words "...cite you for continuing to refuse to remove the posts under the original court order..." is ridiculous. SMITH believes the email from PARIS constitutes a direct personal threat and an attempt to intimidate SMITH.
11. PARIS, in his email, states: "...I urge you to obtain counsel and let the adults begin talking...". PARIS knows full well SMITH has no money to pay for a lawyer. It is interesting that after filing for bankruptcy with liabilities of approximately US\$650,000 in 2016 PARIS is doing well enough financially so soon to be able to afford a new lawyer to further pursue claims of Violation of the Stipulation on Injunction. This is especially true considering his statement during the 16 March 2016 hearing where declared that he could not now "...even start a gasoline station" because his name would "...be

Defendant Pro Se's Supplement to Notice of Violation of Stipulation on Injunction by PARIS (Oxebridge)
Case 8:15-cv-00011-EAK-TBM

following him..." and "...then the gas station would be gone..." (blaming this on SMITH).

12. SMITH has no response to the accusation of perjury. SMITH has already written the court of SMITH's accusations of perjury by PARIS. [Docket Document 102]
13. PARIS states "...The other false charges you made, such as recording court proceedings, will also be used against you..." SMITH has made no such "charges".
14. PARIS states "...It's abundantly clear that whatever mental illness you suffer from prevents you from stopping this behavior, so we will be using the court to force you to stop..." This is typical of statements PARIS makes. SMITH understands that it is not uncommon for someone to project themselves onto others.
15. PARIS continues his false accusations, which illustrate the extent of his belief in some type of vast conspiracy against him, as well as his intensifying "war" with GUBERMAN. [Exhibits F and F1]
16. PARIS states on his Oxebridge.com website on 25 May 2017 that he believes SMITH, in a vast reaching conspiracy, recently "hacked" his web site [Exhibit E] and. SMITH doubts his Oxebridge.com web site actually did undergo a "DDoS" (distributed denial of service) attack as PARIS claims. SMITH invites PARIS to submit to the Court a *report and supporting evidence* from his Oxebridge.com web site host that such a DDoS actually *did* occur. SMITH herein states that neither he, nor anyone SMITH knows, or is in any way associated with, or is in any way in contact with, has any knowledge or, much

less in any way participated in, any such "hack". SMITH believes this is a PARIS "false flag" act.

17. PARIS is spreading his false "charges" far and wide, as indicated by his Twitter posts. [Exhibit G]
18. PARIS is, and has been, promoting his "Fundrazr" in most, if not all, of his various posts for quite some time. [Exhibit H]
19. PARIS is himself in Violation of the Stipulation on Injunction, as SMITH has stated in his Notification to the Court in his filing mailed on 15 June 2017, which should soon be in the Court Docket. USPS has it scheduled for delivery by certified mail to PARIS, his attorney of record William Wohlsifer, and the Court on 19 June 2017.

SUMMARY

- A. PARIS has been violating the Joint Stipulation on Injunction both directly and indirectly by reference *continuously* on his Oxebridge website as well as other internet venues as noted herein since the Stipulation on Injunction [Docket Document 35] was approved on 23 March 2015 and is continuing to do so to this day, as SMITH writes this on 17 June 2017.
- B. PARIS clearly sent the email to SMITH, presented here in evidence, in an attempt to directly, personally intimidate and harass SMITH.
- C. PARIS is clearly trying to "stir the pot" as evidenced in Exhibit C herein, and believes there is some sort of vast conspiracy against him. SMITH believes it is quite obvious that PARIS has made many enemies, especially GUBERMAN.

Defendant Pro Se's Supplement to Notice of Violation of Stipulation on Injunction by PARIS (Oxebridge)
Case 8:15-cv-00011-EAK-TBM

SMITH has no connection of any kind with, much less control over, the actions of GUBERMAN and the many enemies PARIS has made.

- D. SMITH does believe that Federal Judge Elizabeth A. Kovachevich, in Docket Document 105, was incorrect in the introduction where she stated "...(1) someone, probably Smith, makes a nasty online post about Paris, (2) Paris defends himself and in so doing further antagonizes Smith, and (3) Smith responds in kind..." SMITH has presented quite a lot of evidence in this case which, other than a discussion consisting of 33 posts over 3 months in 2001, *all* future "instigations" were started by PARIS. PARIS is such an internet "troll" as evidenced by his recent increasingly frequent "posts". SMITH believes it is PARIS' attempts to get a response from SMITH. SMITH learned his "lesson" and refuses to "take the bait", and is why SMITH is letting the Court know of the email PARIS sent to SMITH.
- E. Statements PARIS is making, such as "...The recent hack of Oxebridge's website isn't the Elsmar operators' first run-in with the law; previously, they advocated for the murder of undercover police officers..." is pure fabrication, a knowingly false statement, as is/are most of his claims, by PARIS to inflame and "troll" SMITH and others on one of PARIS' new "war" web sites. [Exhibit C]
- F. SMITH believes PARIS started this entire lawsuit in an attempt to "clean up" search engine results related to himself, personally, and especially to searches with "oxebridge" in them. In prosecuting this lawsuit it appears he has, in fact, made things much, much worse for himself, not only by forcing the closure of Elsmar on 30 June 2015, which lasted for 10 months (at which time SMITH gave Elsmar.com and its contents to someone as allowed by the Mediation Settlement Agreement, a contract), but especially, PARIS' "war"

Defendant Pro Se's Supplement to Notice of Violation of Stipulation on Injunction by PARIS (Oxebridge)

Case 8:15-cv-00011-EAK-TBM

with GUBERMAN which has significantly hurt his internet search presence in every search engine. SMITH has done nothing to do so which any internet search for "Oxebridge" shows.

G. SMITH only seeks to be taken out of PARIS' "war" with how ever many people, organizations and companies it is now, and that the Court hold PARIS to the Stipulation of Injunction. SMITH asks that the Court act to stop PARIS' trolling SMITH by enforcing PARIS' compliance with the Stipulation of Injunction.

H. SMITH apologizes to the Court for any protocol violations a Pro Se defendant makes in a pleading. As SMITH has repeatedly made clear that he has no means to afford an attorney, and while SMITH is a "fool" to defend himself, when one has no money and is living on Social Security income one has no choice but to do so.

I. NOTE: There is no Exhibit D - It was a mistake, a duplicate of Exhibit C.

WHEREFORE, defendant, SMITH, requests that the Court ensure that PARIS deletes all postings about SMITH, directly and indirectly, made *since* the date of the Stipulation on Injunction, and that PARIS refrains from future posting about SMITH, directly and indirectly, on all internet venues on which he is posting them, and on his oxebridge.com website, (In paragraph 6 of the Joint Stipulation, CHRISTOPHER MARK PARIS agreed to not publish any new content about SMITH "...on any website, social network, or any other manner of technology or communication now known or later to become known) that this Honorable Court compel PARIS to do so by issuing a Court Order to force PARIS' compliance with the Stipulation on Injunction/Court Order of 23 March 2015.

Defendant Pro Se: Marc Timothy Smith, 8466 Lesourdsville-West Chester Road

West Chester, Ohio 45069 Tel: 513 341-6272

Page 8 of 9 - Printed June 19, 2017

Defendant Pro Se's Supplement to Notice of Violation of Stipulation on Injunction by PARIS (Oxebridge)
Case 8:15-cv-00011-EAK-TBM

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been served via Certified Mail with Return Receipt to:

William R Wohlsifer – Attorney of Record for PARIS at:
1100 E. Park Ave Ste B
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

And

Christopher Mark Paris – At his address of record in this case:
1025 West Lake Hamilton Drive
Winterhaven, FL 33881-8225

Respectfully submitted to the Court using UPS on
this 19th day of June 2017.



Marc Timothy Smith (Defendant Pro Se)

Marc Timothy Smith
c/o Property Caretaker
8466 Lesourdsville-West Chester Road
Olde West Chester, Ohio 45069-1929
Tel: 513 341-6272