

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE  
DISTRICT OF VERMONT

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF VERMONT  
FILED

2012 JUL 24 PM 1:44

CLERK

BY

DEPUTY CLERK

*ABC*

John D. Haywood, Plaintiff

v.

Case No. 2:12-CV-164

St. Michael's College,  
Logan R. Spillane, and  
Christopher Hardy, Defendants

**SWORN COMPLAINT**  
**Trial By Jury Demanded On All Issues Presented**

Now Comes the Plaintiff, John D. Haywood, and being first duly sworn, says the following statements of Parties, Jurisdiction, Venue, Claims and Relief are true and accurate except where he has indicated that they are made upon information and belief rather than personal knowledge. And the Plaintiff says further that Exhibit A is a true and accurate representation of Plaintiff's political website from the time of its publication on the web on November 4, 2011 and throughout his political campaign of 2012. And Plaintiff says further that Exhibit B is a true and accurate representation of Plaintiff's print advertising during his campaign. And Plaintiff says further that Exhibit C was signed by the individual Defendants and published on the St. Michaels College website on January 4, 2012 and that the attached Exhibit C is a true and accurate representation of that Profile, and that the Profile contains all libels herein complained of below.

Parties

1. The Plaintiff, John D. Haywood, resides at 3116 Cornwall Road, Durham, North Carolina, 27707-5102.
2. Defendant Logan R. Spillane is a student at St. Michael's College in Colchester Vermont.
3. Defendant Christopher Hardy is, upon information and belief, a student at St. Michael's College in Colchester, Vermont.
4. Defendant St. Michael's College is a long-established institution of higher learning located in Colchester, Vermont.

#### JURISDICTION

5. This is a controversy between citizens of different states, and this court has jurisdiction under Article II, Section 2, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution by reason of that diversity of citizenship.

6. The amount in controversy exceeds the \$75,000 threshold since the defendants' libels as set for below:

(a) have greatly damaged plaintiff's reputation— established over a lifetime—in his community of Durham and in his home state of North Carolina. As stated in the second paragraph of the "Profile" written by the individual defendants and published by the institutional Defendant and attached as Exhibit C to this Complaint, Defendants and/or their agents "contacted Plaintiff's friends." Almost all of Plaintiff's friends are North Carolina Republicans. *Virtually no one in North Carolina knew of Plaintiff's candidacy prior to those contacts being made.* That is because Plaintiff's brother-in-law, a Republican, is an elected and re-elected Associate Justice on the North Carolina Supreme Court and was, previous to that, an elected Republican judge on the N. C. Court of Appeals. Plaintiff and Plaintiff's wife have over the years supported said brother-in-law as well as other Republican candidates with parties at home, by attending numerous Republican gatherings, by working the polls, contributing money, and annually manning the Republican booth at Durham Festival on the Eno. Plaintiff's agreement with his wife made prior to entering the Democratic Presidential Primary in New Hampshire was that Plaintiff's candidacy in the New Hampshire Democratic Presidential Primary would be revealed to as few people as possible in North Carolina and would *never* be revealed to Republican or

Republican operatives in our state and community until such time as Plaintiff became a national figure by attaining a substantial vote count in the January 10, 2012 Democratic New Hampshire primary. The defendants say in the introductory section of their Profile that they contacted several of the Plaintiff's friends. All of Plaintiff's friends are North Carolina Republicans who are either active in, semi-active in, or voting with the Republican Party. Absent some outside circumstance or stimulus, *no* North Carolina Republican had any interest whatsoever in the candidacy of anyone running in the 2012 *Democratic* Presidential Primary in New Hampshire against an incumbent widely presumed to be a shoo-in for renomination. Plaintiff alleges and says that these calls to Plaintiff's friends in North Carolina Defendants had no legitimate journalistic purpose when it came to preparing a "Profile" as to what Plaintiff stood for in his issues-oriented campaign. Plaintiff says and alleges that these contacts were made for one purpose only: pressuring the Plaintiff from continuing his campaign. For during the final two weeks of the campaign Plaintiff: received out of the blue an email from his mother stating how wonderful the Israelis were; Plaintiff wife's very good friend called to say that it couldn't *possibly be true* that what her brother-in-law (a Durham organizer of Republican fund raising events) just told her that Plaintiff was running in New Hampshire as a *Democrat*; and the email from Plaintiff's aforesaid brother-in-law that came in on January 4, 2012 that started out "What in the world..." and reported that a Republican leader had just told him that Plaintiff was in the Democratic primary in New Hampshire. Plaintiff doesn't contend that the Defendants' attempted pressure is actionable, but does contend that it is evidence of the malice behind their libels as alleged below. *But most importantly, these contacts to Plaintiff's friends created an interested North Carolina audience among Plaintiff's friends and associates—an audience that otherwise would not have existed—for the libels they wrote and published against the Plaintiff.* And it would be the Defendant's Profile that they would read long before they would tackle Plaintiff's 25-page website—the website of a *Democratic* candidate. These friends and associates were a particularly interested and ripe audience, not only for the anti-Semitism attributed to Plaintiff by the Defendants, but for Defendants' allegations that Plaintiff accused Republican leaders of taking bribes (See the Foreign Policy section of Defendants' Profile and Plaintiff's Fourteenth Claim below.)

(b) essentially nullified the expenditures by plaintiff in running an issues oriented campaign—expenditures considerably in excess of \$75,000 and in advertising his website (See Relief below) in New Hampshire and California newspapers and on a New England television station reaching over 5 million persons. It is common knowledge that voters and persons considering a political contribution will first "Google" a candidate and thereby read a 1.5 page, supposedly independent, academic review of that candidate's politics before tackling that candidate's website—a website that in the instant case exceeded 25 pages.

(c) For all intents and purposes the publication of Defendants' libels as alleged below terminated Plaintiff's issues oriented campaign because no one who read that Profile or talked anyone who had read the Profile would even consider visiting Plaintiff's website, much less contributing to his campaign, or casting a precious vote for the bumbling, inept monster depicted by that Profile. Plaintiff received a scant 432 votes in the New Hampshire Primary and lost to the incumbent by a ratio of 115 to 1.

### VENUE

7. As the defendants are residents of this jurisdiction and the alleged libels were first published in Vermont, this court is the proper venue for the hearing of this controversy.

### CLAIMS

8. The information contained in this and the three following paragraphs pertains to all claims of libel hereinafter set forth. On October 27, 2011 Plaintiff filed with the Durham County, NC Register of Deeds a Certificate of Assumed Name as "John D. Haywood Doing Business as Haywood for President." That entity then opened an account at Wells Fargo Bank in the name of "John D. Haywood DBA Haywood for President" and thereafter received from that bank a Visa credit card in the name of "John Haywood, Haywood 4 President."

9. Also in late October 2011 the Plaintiff paid a filing fee with the New Hampshire Secretary of State to run as a candidate in the New Hampshire Democratic Presidential Primary. In early November 2011 Haywood for President filed with the Federal Elections Commission a Statements of Organization (FEC form 1) and Candidacy (FEC form 2) which listed Plaintiff not only as the Candidate but as the sole member and treasurer of the Campaign Committee known as Haywood for President.

10. On November 4, 2011 Plaintiff caused to be published on the internet haywoodforpresident.com. A copy of that website is attached to this complaint as Exhibit A. Exhibit A was copied off the internet in June/July 2012 for the purpose of attaching it to this complaint. Other than the January 2012 inclusion of links to Plaintiff's ads run in the New Hampshire newspapers, the website has not been altered since its publication on November 4, 2011. Beginning on Sunday, November 6 and every Sunday thereafter through January 8, 2012, Plaintiff caused to be published by the Union Leader newspaper

based in Manchester, NH in its "New Hampshire Sunday News," ten advertisements that touted the just named website and Plaintiff's positions on health care, job creation, abortion, Zionism, war, and peace. Most of these advertisements were also published in The Concord, NH *Monitor* and the Nashua, NH *Telegraph* . An Eleventh advertisement was run in the *Los Angeles Times* on March 3, 2012. All eleven print advertisements are attached to this complaint as Exhibit B, pages 1-11.

11. On or about January 4, 2012 Defendants published on the internet a "Profile" of the Plaintiff's candidacy, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit C to this Complaint. The following claims of libel arise from the publication in said Profile of false statements about the positions of Plaintiff, statements that the Defendants knew or should have known were false and untrue or were made with reckless disregard of whether they were false, and which were destructive, not only of Plaintiff's candidacy, but of his reputation as well. Plaintiff's campaign was terminated in late March 2012 with the filing of a termination report with the Federal Election Commission. The Claims of Libel are presented below in the order in which they appear in the Exhibit C Profile published by the Defendants.

#### First Claim

12. Defendants wrote and published under **Estate Tax**; "One of Haywood's policies is the proposal of a raised estate tax." In truth and in fact Plaintiff advocated raising the *income* taxes to revitalize the economy as set forth in the Restoring Full Employment section of his website at Schedule A pages 8 to 10 and in his advertising Schedule B, pages 2,5,7, 9,10, and 11. Plaintiff specifically stated in the Estate Tax section of his website (Schedule A, page 11) : "...the primary purpose of the estate tax is to prevent income/property hoarding, not the collection of revenue...The relatively low 'take' from the estate tax is a testament to its success, not its failure." Moreover, the estate tax reforms proposed by Plaintiff would have *reduced* revenues from the estate tax revenues by drastically lowering tax rates on estates under \$80 million— where the great majority of taxable estates fall. The proposed reforms would also increase *income* tax revenue from capital gains taxes as taxpayers with appreciated assets would be encouraged to raise their basis during their lifetimes. The estate tax is a thoroughly hated tax. Defendants' false allegation that Plaintiff proposed raising that tax makes it one inherently injurious to Plaintiff's reputation is therefore alleged to be a libel *per se*.

#### Second Claim

13. Defendants wrote and published under **Estate Tax**: "Haywood is in favor of using

these taxes to fund social programs that he believes will revitalize the country.” Clearly the words “these taxes” refers to revenue collected from estate taxes. In truth and in fact, Plaintiff proposed spending *income tax revenue on infrastructure renewal, and spending through government contracts*. Reference is made to website Exhibit A, page 9, where the Plaintiff wrote: “...the revenue from these taxes are spent rather than being hoarded. And that means lots of hiring by government contractors. From the beginning of 1940 (when sharp tax increases were imposed) through the end of 1942 the unemployment rate dropped from 14% to 2%. Much of the proposed revenue will be spent on much needed infrastructure improvement (water, sewer, roads, bridge, rail transport) which is something President Obama has talked about doing but is powerless to accomplish without the cash to pay for it.” See also the last paragraph of advertising Exhibit B, page 9 where Plaintiff called for massive infrastructure investment to put America back to work. Plaintiff was in actuality proposing a considerable *reduction* of government spending on our largest and fastest growing social program— health care. Reference is made to the Health Care section of the website at (Exhibit A, pages 1-5) and to print advertising (Exhibit B, pages 1,4,7,8, and 11.)

#### Third Claim

15. Defendants falsely wrote and published under **ABORTION** that Plaintiff ... “feels pro-life supporters ‘punish the pregnant woman’ due to the fact that they oppose abortion.” In truth and in fact the Plaintiff clearly stated at website Exhibit A, page 14, 3rd paragraph: “I submit that it is first and foremost motivation of pro-lifers is to punish the pregnant woman for having sex in the first place, with additional condemnation for those who had sex with the intention or expectation of not getting pregnant.” Defendants’ allegation that Plaintiff claims *spite* as the primary motivation behind the abortion prohibition movement is an allegation inherently injurious to Plaintiff’s reputation and is alleged as a libel *per se*.

#### Fourth Claim

16. Defendants falsely wrote and published in the first sentence under **Health Care** that the cartoon on Plaintiff’s web page “comments on Europe’s systems of state run healthcare.” In truth and in fact the cartoon, appearing repeatedly on Plaintiff’s website, makes a clear statement that comments, not on *Europe’s* system of health care, but on the *United Kingdom’s* system of health care and compares it to our own burdensome for-profit system. The false characterization—despite the cartoon characters clearly marked with British and American flags—conveys to its readers that the Plaintiff hasn’t decided what path he wants us to follow on health care. Defendants thereby portray Plaintiff as a

bumbling buffoon on his number one issue. In truth and in fact the Plaintiff clearly advocated at his website (Schedule A, pages 1 through 5 and page 7) and in his advertising (Schedule B, pages 1, 4,7,8,10, and 11) the adoption of the British system in its totality—a system that has delivered quality health care for over 63 years at 40% our cost.

#### Fifth Claim

17. Defendants falsely wrote under **Health Care** in the second line thereof that Plaintiff proposed “switching to a single-payer system that is similar to the one in Britain.” In truth and in fact Plaintiff advocated a system *exactly* like the one in Britain. Plaintiff stated in the first paragraph at his website: “The solution: replace our existing for-profit system (before it takes ALL our money) with one identical to Britain’s National Health Service.” (Schedule A, page 1) Defendants’ use of the word “similar” again depicts Plaintiff as bumbling around by not offering a specific solution to a major problem when the Plaintiff, in truth and in fact, had done so.

#### Sixth Claim

18. Defendants falsely wrote and published under **Health Care** in the seventh line thereof that Plaintiff “...still believes that the best and most efficient health care systems are domestic...” In truth and in fact Plaintiff advocated just the opposite throughout the Health Care section of his website (Exhibit A, pages 1-5.) Plaintiff made his position clear as a bell when he stated at the bottom of page 4 of Exit A: and in his advertising (Schedule B, page 1, all paragraphs; page 7—1st four paragraphs; page 8—4th and 5th paragraphs; page 11— under Myth number two.) In fact at the bottom of page 4 of Schedule A plaintiff stated the following:

“But here is the comparison that’s sickening. Great Britain provides universal health care at no charge to the patient, while we don’t even come close to providing that service. Would you believe the UK spends 15.8% of its government’s revenue on health care while we spend 18.5% (and rising) of our government’s revenue? That’s just how inefficient our system is and why I assert that **OUR FOR-PROFIT HEALTH CARE SYSTEM IS RIPPING US OFF, AND THAT THE MOST INEFFICIENT HEALTH CARE SYSTEM IN THE WORLD (OURS) MUST BE REPLACED WITH THE WORLD’S MOST EFFICIENT (BRITAIN’S).**”

#### Seventh Claim

19. The Defendants falsely wrote and caused to be published, again in the **Health Care** section, the following language found in the last three lines of that section: "Haywood also claims that if his health care proposal were put into place, the country would save over a trillion dollars per year as compared to the ten year projection of the current health care bill. This claim was unable to be substantiated due to the fact that Haywood leaves out key elements of specifics in his health care pitch." In truth and in fact Plaintiff repeatedly asserted in the health care section of his website and in his advertising (Exhibits A, pages 4 and 5) and in his initial full page print ad (Exhibit B, page 1) that the British, even with 10% of their health care remaining for-profit, spend \$2,992 per person for health care vs. \$7,290 per person in America. All one has to do is multiply the \$4,298 difference by 330 million Americans to get over \$1.4 trillion. So no "key element" was left out to support Plaintiff's claim of over \$1 trillion in annual savings. They were not missing, but present and available to be seen just as plain as day. They were also repeated in Plaintiff's advertising at Exhibit B at the following pages: page 1, first four paragraphs of page 7, fifth paragraph of page 8, and under Myth 2 of page 11.

#### Eighth Claim

20. In the **Economic Policy** section of the Profile, the Defendants wrote and caused to be published the following: "He wants to return to the tax code of 1965 and have a steep, yet progressive income tax so that the super-rich cannot be 'income-hoarders' anymore." The quoted language insinuates falsely that the Plaintiff wants to single out the very richest citizens for especially harsh treatment. To the contrary, Plaintiff proposed a return to a steep, multi-bracketed tax code that increases taxes on—and denies income hoarding to—all Americans with the middle class excepted prior to the implementation of a national health service. Without such a tax raise, the federal treasury will not gain the resources required to return the country to full employment. Reference is made to Exhibit A, pages 8 through 10, and to the print advertisements shown in Exhibit B, pages 2, 5,7,9, 10, and 11.

#### Ninth Claim

21. Under the **Economic Policy** section of the profile, the Defendants fail to acknowledge any connection between Plaintiff's health care proposals to save the country over \$1.4 trillion yearly and his proposals to raise income taxes across the board. As stated in Plaintiff's advertisement on December 18, 2011 (Exhibit B, page 7) and published in all three of New Hampshire's major newspapers weeks before the Defendants published their Profile of the Plaintiff:

"Replacing insurance with a National Health Service will eliminate a heavy tax



burden. "Premiums" may be a private tax, **BUT THEY'RE STILL A TAX!** An end to these premiums will indeed put \$68,000 into the pockets of that family of four over that four year period. But there's bad news to temper the good: Uncle Sam must have a piece of that action. ...Like love and marriage, **THE TAX INCREASE AND THE TAX CUT GO TOGETHER.** There can't be one without the other. Thanks to insurance premiums, the middle class is grossly overtaxed. Thanks to current tax structure, the upper end is grossly undertaxed."

#### Tenth Claim

22. In the **Foreign Policy** section of the Profile the Defendants wrote and published the following language knowing it was false or with reckless disregard of whether it was false. "Haywood is also vehemently opposed to Israel..." In truth and in fact Plaintiff at his website, in his advertising, and in all private or public statements has expressed vehement opposition, not to Israel, but to *Israel's treatment of the Palestinian people*. That treatment has been condemned time and time again in the United Nations General Assembly by votes of over 150 to 7. Reference is made to Plaintiff's website at Exhibit A, pages 21 through 27 as well as to Plaintiff's print advertising, Exhibit B, pages 3, 6, 10, and 11.

#### Eleventh Claim

23. In the **Foreign Policy** section of the Profile the Defendants wrote and published the following language knowing that it was false or with reckless disregard of whether it was false: "Haywood is also vehemently opposed to...what he calls the 'Jewish Lobby.'" Plaintiff says that this is a libel *per se* the Defendants' statement is inherently injurious to reputation. In truth and in fact the quoted words "Jewish Lobby" have never issued forth from Plaintiff's mouth or pen. What's more, Defendants ignore the perfectly obvious fact that Plaintiff at his website (Exhibit A, p. 22) not only identified a lobby for Jewish people, but quoted the following from that lobby's website:

"Zionism was supported by the German SS and Gestapo. Hitler himself personally supported Zionism. During the 1930's, in cooperation with the German authorities, Zionist groups organized a network of some 40 camps throughout Germany where prospective settlers were trained for their new lives in Palestine. As late as 1942 Zionists operated at least one of these officially authorized 'Kibbutz' training camps over which flew the blue and white banner which would one day be adopted as the national flag of 'Israel'."

(TrueTorahJews.org)

#### Twelfth Claim

24. In the **Foreign Policy** section of the Profile the Defendants wrote and published the following language knowing it was false or with reckless disregard of whether it was false: "During an interview Haywood explained that he believed that Israel is forcing our involvement in the Middle East." The libel alleged is a libel *per se* as it paints Plaintiff as anti-Semitic and therefore is inherently injurious to his reputation. However, no person, lobby or country ever "forced" American involvement in Iraq or anywhere. Plaintiff denies ever saying that Israel "forced" us into anything. Reference is made to Exhibit A, pages 21-27.

#### Thirteenth Claim

25. In the **Foreign Policy** section of the Profile the Defendants wrote and published the following language knowing it was false or with reckless disregard of whether it was false: "He also says several times during the interview, that Israel was a primary factor in the American economic downturn and blamed the 'Jewish Lobby' for distracting us from our domestic problems." But no such words were ever said by Plaintiff. This is a libel *per se* as it ascribes anti-Semitism to the Plaintiff and is therefore inherently injurious to Plaintiff's reputation. In truth and in fact the Plaintiff blamed *income tax structure* for our economic problems in the "Restoring Full Employment" section of my website (Exhibit A, p. 8-10) and quoted quite a bit in that section from *Aftershock*, a 2010 book authored by President Clinton's Secretary of Labor and former Brandeis University Professor, Robert Reich.

#### Fourteenth Claim

26. In the **Foreign Policy** section of the Profile the Defendants wrote and published the following language knowing it was false or with reckless disregard of whether it was false: "He also accused key Republican members of Congress of taking bribes from this 'Jewish Lobby' in return for favorable treatment." But no such words were ever said by the Plaintiff. Ever. They are another clear and deliberate attempt to smear the Plaintiff as anti-Semitic, reckless, extremist, ruthless, and irresponsible and as such constitute a libel *per se*. The just quoted words, however, were contained in the next to last question of a videotaped interview of the Plaintiff just before the Lesser Known Candidates Debate at St. Anselm College on December 19, 2011. The interviewer, *not* a college student (he had gray in his beard), whose name is unknown to Plaintiff, was posing as a *bona fide* journalist until near the end of what seemed like an ordinary interview. That's when he suddenly threw out a question which was to the effect; "Are you saying that key Republicans in Congress are

taking bribes from the Jewish Lobby?" My reply was to laughingly say that I didn't know what was going on down there in Washington, DC. He then asked if I wanted to make a closing statement, I said I didn't, and that ended it. I mention this episode because I fully expect—based on the untruths and distortions that have appeared in the Profile—that Defendants will produce at trial a videotape of Plaintiff making an affirmative reply (made to an earlier question) to the "loaded" question posed near the end of the interview.

#### Fifteenth Claim

27. In the **Global Warming** section of the Profile the Defendants wrote and published the following language knowing it was false or with reckless disregard of whether it was false: "Haywood fully accepts the theory of global warming and believes the issue needs to be addressed aggressively and immediately. He proposes more lab and in-field research as a way to gain more knowledge about the issue. He also offers a solution to global warming which is to spray particles into the atmosphere as a way to reflect the sun's heat back into space, which, in his opinion, would cool the earth." But Plaintiff did *not* propose lab and in-field research into the issue of whether greenhouse gases are causing global warming. Instead, at Exhibit A, p. 16-17, Plaintiff referred to *Howto Cool the Earth*, a 2010 book by Jeff Goodell whose thesis is that there's already so much CO<sub>2</sub> affixed to the upper levels of the atmosphere as to cause extensive global warming for centuries to come. Plaintiff, like Goodell, called for government funded lab and in-field research *into ways to geoengineer the cooling of the earth*. Plaintiff has *never* said or claimed that he has a solution to global warming. Plaintiff *has* indicated that one of the most promising areas for *research* into how to cool the earth is particle insertion that would replicate the global cooling that followed the 1991 eruption of Mt. Pinatubo. Plaintiff has no *idea* how such research would turn out and *has never* advocated spraying particles into the atmosphere prior to a determination that such activity is safe for humans, animals, and the environment. Defendants' false allegations that Plaintiff has a solution to global warming and that Plaintiff advocates spraying particles into the atmosphere are allegations inherently injurious to reputation and are claimed as a libel *per se*.

#### Sixteenth Claim

28. In the **Education** section of the Profile the Defendant wrote and published the following words knowing them to be false or with reckless disregard of whether they were false: "He believes that children need to learn to read and write at young age, but are not afforded the opportunity to do so." But that was not what Plaintiff was talking about. The problem Plaintiff was addressing is one that arises *years before* a child is old enough to

read. Plaintiff's clearly stated (Exhibit A, page 19-20): "In many cases—at the preschool ages when a child should be greatly increasing his or her vocabulary and learning language skills at home—no one is speaking to that child or speaking very little. No one is reading to that child, or reading very little. And because of this these children have 'bounds' placed on their minds at an enormously important time in their lives. By the time they're school age, they're handicapped for life." *That* was the problem addressed by the 1971 bill known as the Comprehensive Child Development Act that passed both houses of Congress with large bipartisan majorities and was vetoed by President Nixon for political reasons. And that's why Plaintiff sought that bill's reconsideration. Defendants' false statement that Plaintiff believes that children need to learn to read and write at a young age but are not afforded the opportunity to do so is inherently damaging to Plaintiff's reputation and is alleged as a libel *per se*.

### RELIEF

Plaintiff prays for a judgment that would reimburse him for his print and television advertising as follows: thirteen payments to the Union Leader totalling \$49,813.50; nine payments to the Nashua Telegraph totalling \$26,991.65; eight payments to the Concord Monitor totalling \$25,127.00; one payment to WBIN TV dated January 5, 2012 of \$7,500; one payment to LA Times Media Group of \$10,770 dated March 1, 2012. These advertising expenses total \$120,202.15.

Plaintiff prays further for a judgment of money damages in an amount not less than \$1 million to compensate him for the permanent damage to his reputation in his community of Durham and in his state of North Carolina.

Plaintiff prays further for a judgment of not less than \$50 million dollars in punitive damages by reason of the said permanent damage to his reputation in his community of Durham and in his state of North Carolina—an amount that represents a scant 13 days worth of savings to the American people when British health care is substituted for existing American care. These are savings the American people will never see because the presidential candidacy of the Plaintiff was cruelly, maliciously and purposely destroyed by the libels of the Defendants as alleged above even before the initial primary. It is also an amount that will, after tax, enable Plaintiff to run in 2016 with a cleared name and the ability to do the advertising that can perhaps overcome his low 2012 vote count.

Plaintiff prays lastly for a speedy trial before a jury of twelve.

The Plaintiff having been as aforesaid duly sworn, signs this sworn complaint before a notary public of the state of North Carolina.

signed this 17 day of July 2012.

John D. Haywood  
John D. Haywood

Plaintiff  
3116 Cornwall Road  
Durham, NC 27707-5102  
land line: (919) 489-5202  
cell: (919) 972-1835

North Carolina  
Durham County

Now comes Emilee J. Collins, a notary public in the county and state as aforesaid, and certifies that John D. Haywood of the address of 3116 Cornwall Road, Durham, NC came before me, and being first duly sworn, did certify that the allegations set forth in the above Complaint are true and accurate except wherein he stated that they were upon information and belief; and said John D. Haywood did further swear and say that he has attached to this Complaint as Exhibit A thereto documents numbering 27 pages as a true and accurate copy of his website known as haywoodforpresident.com published to the internet on November 4, 2011 and swore further that no material change has been made therein since the date of publication; and said John D Haywood did further swear and say that he has attached to this Complaint as Exhibit B thereto eleven pages as a true and accurate copy of his print advertising published in newspapers during his candidacy for president; and lastly he has attached to this Complaint as Exhibit C thereto a true and accurate copy of the Defendants' Profile of the Plaintiff published to the internet on January 4, 2012.

Sworn and Subscribed before me on this the 17<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2012.

Emilee J. Collins  
Notary Public

My Commission expires: 3/28/17

EMILEE J COLLINS  
Notary Public, North Carolina  
Orange County  
My Commission Expires  
March 28, 2017