UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

JOHN A. BLAZI and GREEENWICH COFFEE, LLC

CIVIL ACTION

Plaintiffs

VS.

: No: 308CV01441 CFD

JASON WAGONER, Pro Se and NICHOLAS DEGRAZIA, Pro Se

October 20, 2008

:

ANSWER PRESENTING DEFENSES UNDER RULE 12(B)

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The complaint fails to state a claim against defendants upon which relief can be granted.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Defendants ADMIT the allegation contained in paragraph 3 of the complaint; Admits first part of allegation in paragraph 4 pertaining to residency and denies remainder; DENIES KNOWLEDGE OR INFORMATION sufficient enough to form a belief in paragraphs 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 16, 17, 20 and 22; and DENIES paragraphs 6, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25 and 27 through 40.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs have willfully and maliciously failed to notice the honorable Court that the plaintiffs prior to the onset of this action has an identical prior action pending against defendants Wagoner and DeGrazia in SUPERIOR COURT, J D OF WATERBURY at WATERBURY, CT seeking the same relief. (See Exhibit A.)

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs John Blazi and Greenwich Coffee, LLC has willfully and intentionally misled the honorable court by acting in bad faith, leading this court into believing that this action is over trademark infringement, when in fact it is about nothing more than a partnership dispute between the parties and has nothing to do with the allegations set forth herein. (see exhibit b annexed herein)

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff John Blazi has repeatedly used his law firm, associates of his firm and his authority as an officer of the court to systematically cause irreparable harm both financially and in character to both defendants Wagoner and DeGrazia full well knowing that multiple litigation costs could financially devastate both defendants. Once again Blazi has acted in a tortious manner towards defendants and has caused severe economic interference and hardship due to his malicious conduct of using the court system to file numerous frivolous and baseless actions causing further harm to defendants. (see exhibits a & d annexed herein)

October 20, 2008 at Woodbury, CT

Exhibit A

RETURN DATE: MARCH 18, 2008 SUPERIOR COURT

GREENWICH COFFEE, LLC J.D. OF WATERBURY

VS. AT WATERBURY

NICHOLAS DeGRAZIA, JASON **FEBRUARY 21, 2008** WAGONER and NANCY DeGRAZIA

APPLICATION FOR ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AND FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

TO THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF WATERBURY:

The undersigned represents that:

- 1. Greenwich Coffee, LLC is about to commence an action against NICHOLAS DeGRAZIA, JASON WAGONER and NANCY DeGRAZIA, all of 50 Pilgrim Trail, Woodbury, Connecticut, pursuant to the attached Writ, Summons, Complaint, Order to Show Cause and Temporary Restraining Order, Order for Temporary Injunction and Verification.
- 2. The defendants, individually and in concert, are deliberately obstructing, hindering or otherwise interfering with the plaintiff's computer point-of-sale and credit card and gift card systems for the plaintiff's coffee shop business, all as more particularly enumerated in the Verified Complaint, attached hereto and filed of even date herewith.
- The defendants' actions pose the threat of irreparable injury to the plaintiff, 3. namely by permanently damaging its relationship with its customer base for the plaintiff's coffee

(N0783432)

CVOX 4015494

shop business in Cheshire, specifically by denying access to the computer system that enables the plaintiff's patrons to utilize their prepaid gift cards to purchase food and beverages at the coffee shop.

- The plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law. 4
- There is a strong likelihood that the plaintiff will ultimately prevail against the 5. defendants in this action.
- The plaintiff seeks an Order from this Court for an Order for Temporary 6. Injunction as stated in the Complaint.
- 7. The plaintiff also seeks an Ex Parte Temporary Restraining Order from this Court prohibiting the defendants, either individually or in concert, from denying it access to its computer point-of-sale and credit card and gift card systems.
- Pursuant to Section 4-5 of the Rules of Practice, subsection (a) (2), the plaintiff 8. contacted the defendants' counsel, Timothy J. Lee of the law firm of Fasano, Ippolito and Lee, LLC to inform him of the date, time and place of the presentation of this Application. Specifically, the undersigned spoke with Mr. Lee by telephone on Wednesday, February 20th and apprised him of the undersigned's intention to seek ex parte relief in this matter, and again, on Thursday, February 21st, to inform him that the Application for such ex parte relief would be

presented at the Office of the Chief Clerk of the Waterbury Superior Court at 3:00pm that day, and provided a copy of such Application and all ancillary pleadings thereto, to him.

> THE APPLICANT, GREENWICH COFFEE, LLC

Thomas J. Sansone Commissioner of the Superior Court

A True Copy Attest:

Julianne Ingham Connecticut State Marshal RETURN DATE: MARCH 18, 2008 SUPERIOR COURT

GREENWICH COFFEE, LLC J.D. OF WATERBURY

VS. AT WATERBURY

NICHOLAS DeGRAZIA, JASON FEBRUARY 21, 2008 WAGONER and NANCY DeGRAZIA

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AND TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

The plaintiff in the above-entitled action having prayed that a temporary injunction issue forthwith, it is hereby

ORDERED that NICHOLAS DeGRAZIA, JASON WAGONER and NANCY DeGRAZIA, named as defendants herein, appear before the undersigned or another Judge of the Superior Court, at the Courthouse for the Judicial District of Waterbury at Waterbury, on MARCH 3 _____, 2008, at 11 o'clock in the forenoon, in Room 5 , then and there to show cause, if any, why a temporary injunction should not issue as prayed for,

AND IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that notice of said Writ, Complaint and of this Order, be given to the defendants by a proper officer, by leaving with said defendants a true and attested copy of said Writ, Complaint and of this Order on or before FEBRUARY 26, 2008.

AND, IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the defendants, either individually or in concert, are temporarily restrained from denying the plaintiff immediate access to its computer point-of-

{N0783432}

sale and credit card and gift card systems for the operation of its coffee shop business at 209 West Main Street in Cheshire, Connecticut.

Dated at Waterbury, Connecticut, this 21st day of February 2008.

True Copy Attest:

Julianne Ingham Connecticut State Marshal

TO ANY PROPER OFFICER WITHIN SAID COUNTY, GREETING:

BY THE AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT, You are hereby commanded to summon the defendants, NICHOLAS DeGRAZIA, JASON WAGONER and NANCY DeGRAZIA, all of 50 Pilgrim Trail, Woodbury, Connecticut, in the foregoing action to appear before the SUPERIOR COURT in and for the JUDICIAL DISTRICT of WATERBURY, now in session at 300 Grand Street, Waterbury, Connecticut, at the place and time specified in the Order to Show Cause appended hereto, by serving in the manner provided by statute for service of process true and attested copies of the foregoing Application for Order To Show Cause, Order To Show Cause and Temporary Restraining Order, Proposed Order For Temporary Injunction, Proposed Order Of Service, Verification, Affidavit, and Writ, Summons and Complaint upon the defendants on or before February 26, 2008.

AND, YOU ARE FURTHER commanded to summon NICHOLAS DeGRAZIA, JASON WAGONER and NANCY DeGRAZIA, all of 50 Pilgrim Trail, Woodbury, Connecticut, to appear before the Superior Court for the Judicial District of Waterbury at Waterbury on March 18, 2008, said appearance to be made by said NICHOLAS DeGRAZIA, JASON WAGONER and NANCY DeGRAZIA or their attorneys by filing a written statement of appearance with the Clerk of said Court, on or before the second day following said return date, then and there to answer unto Greenwich Coffee, LLC, a Connecticut limited liability company having an office

{N0783432}

and place of business at 209 West Main Street, Cheshire, Connecticut, in which the plaintiff complains and alleges as set forth in the accompanying Complaint.

HEREOF, FAIL NOT, but due service and return make.

Dated at New Haven, Connecticut, this 21st day of February 2008.

Thomas J. Sansone

Commissioner of the Superior Court

A True Copy Attest:

Julianne Ingham Connecticut State Marshal RETURN DATE: MARCH 18, 2008

SUPERIOR COURT

GREENWICH COFFEE, LLC

J.D. OF WATERBURY

VS.

AT WATERBURY

NICHOLAS DeGRAZIA, JASON WAGONER and NANCY DeGRAZIA

FEBRUARY 21, 2008

COMPLAINT

FIRST COUNT: TORTIOUS INTERFERENCE WITH A BUSINESS EXPECTANCY (AS TO ALL DEFENDANTS):

- At all times mentioned herein, the plaintiff, Greenwich Coffee, LLC 1. ("Greenwich"), was a limited liability company organized under the laws of the State of Connecticut with a principal place of business at 209 West Main Street in Cheshire, Connecticut at which it operated a specialty coffee retail business which enjoyed a strong and loyal customer base.
- At all times mentioned herein, John A. Blazi ("Blazi"), a Connecticut resident, 2. was the sole member of Greenwich. Blazi was also the sole investor of the business, funding both the start-up costs and operating expenses from his personal assets. Blazi is also the sole holder of all trademark rights to the "Greenwich Coffee" name and logo.
- At all times mentioned herein, the defendant, Nick DeGrazia ("Mr. DeGrazia"), 3. resided at 50 Pilgrim Trail in Woodbury, Connecticut.

- 4. Mr. DeGrazia, at all times relevant hereto, was engaged by Greenwich as the store manager at an agreed upon salary not to exceed \$55,000 per year, and in this role, was responsible for the operation, staffing and management of the business so as to maximize the store's profit margin such that Blazi would recoup his investment and begin seeing a return of profits as quickly as possible.
- Upon information and belief, Mr. DeGrazia compensated himself far in excess of 5. the agreed upon amount of \$55,000 annually without the permission or consent of Greenwich.
- At all times mentioned herein, the defendant, Jason Wagoner ("Wagoner"), who is 6. Mr. DeGrazia's stepson, resided at 50 Pilgrim Trail in Woodbury, Connecticut.
- 7. At all times relevant hereto, Wagoner worked as the "barista" of the business, the person who staffs the counter, accepting and filling customer orders for food and beverages.
- 8. At Mr. DeGrazia's request, Wagoner also functioned as Greenwich's information technology specialist, serving as the sole administrator of the store's computer system.
- This computer system controlled Greenwich's point-of-sale, credit and gift card 9. sales, inventory control, time clock, and financial data collection systems, as well as storing data critical to the operation of these systems.

- Without Greenwich's approval or consent, Wagoner created a web site, 10. GreenwichCoffee.com, registering it personally, allowing him to maintain personal control over the domain and web site.
- The web site was designed to provide an on-line retail presence for Greenwich's 11. store, and allowed its customers to purchase products and to track the balances of gift cards they had purchased at the store.
- Upon information and belief, this web site was customized by Wagoner in such a 12. way that he alone as webmaster of the site has the ability to process certain gift card transactions and allow for debits to be registered to the individual gift card accounts.
- Upon information and belief, an unauthorized e-mail address, 13. "GreenwichCoffee@sbcglobal.net", was created by Wagoner which allowed him, by use of a password, to control the processing of credit card transactions made at the store's point-of-sale registers.
- At all times mentioned herein, the defendant, Nancy DeGrazia ("Mrs. DeGrazia"), 14. the wife of Mr. DeGrazia, resided at 50 Pilgrim Trail in Woodbury, Connecticut.
- At all times relevant hereto, Mrs. DeGrazia worked at the business at Mr. 15. DeGrazia's behest to prepare certain baked goods, because Mr. DeGrazia was of the opinion that Greenwich could operate more profitably if she prepared baked goods from their home.

- 16. Without prior authorization or consent of Greenwich, Mr. DeGrazia paid Mrs. DeGrazia as much as \$800/month for her baking activities.
- 17. Mrs. DeGrazia's baking activities did not increase Greenwich's profitability, but rather provided a personal financial gain to Mr. and Mrs. DeGrazia.
- 18. At all times mentioned herein, the defendants made unauthorized charges and debits to accounts on which Greenwich was the obligor, for gasoline for the defendants' vehicles, food, liquor and entertainment for their personal consumption, personal cell phone services, and propane fuel for their personal residence.
- 19. On January 8, 2008, Blazi sent Mr. DeGrazia a letter by fax advising him that he had reason to believe that Mr. DeGrazia was compensating himself for his service as store manager far in excess of the agreed-upon salary of \$55,000, and further advising him that, effective immediately, Blazi and his wife, Tricia Blazi ("Mrs. Blazi"), would be assuming complete financial control of the business.
- 20. On January 9, 2008, at approximately 11am, Mrs. Blazi went to the store, accompanied by a financial consultant, to review the store's financial records on the store computer's Quick Books program.
- 21. Upon discovering the program missing from the store's computer system where it had been maintained historically, they asked Mr. DeGrazia about its whereabouts.

{N0783274}

- Mr. DeGrazia claimed that he did not know anything about the program's 22. whereabouts, and told them that they should make inquiry of Wagoner about the program.
- 23, On January 9, 2008, at approximately 9pm, Mrs. Blazi, while at the store, answered a telephone phone call from Wagoner who, unaware that he was speaking to Mrs. Blazi and believing instead that he was speaking to a fellow employee, directed the employee to remove an external flash drive from the store's computer and put it in the store's safe so he could pick it up the next day, specifying that he did " ... not want Trish [Mrs. Blazi] to have access to Quick Books because, every time she touches Quick Books, she f---s everything up because she is f---in' retarded."
- In point of fact, Mrs. Blazi had never used the Quick Books system at the store at 24. any time prior to January 9, 2008.
- Mrs. Blazi retrieved the flash drive from the computer, and presented it to Blazi, 25. who examined its contents.
- 26. Blazi discovered that the flash drive contained the Quick Books program that Mrs. Blazi and the consultant had inquired about earlier that day, along with a list of inventory.
 - On January 10, 2008 Blazi called Mr. DeGrazia to schedule a meeting that day. 27.

- At that meeting, Blazi advised Mr. DeGrazia what had transpired the previous 28. evening during the telephone call placed by Wagoner to the store, which Mrs. Blazi had answered.
- Mr. DeGrazia requested that Wagoner be provided an opportunity to apologize to 29. Mrs. Blazi, but Blazi refused, indicating that the financial integrity issues were too significant to ignore, and that Wagoner would instead be terminated immediately.
- 30. Mr. DeGrazia agreed with the decision to terminate Wagoner, and the meeting was concluded.
- Thereafter, on January 10, 2008, Mr. DeGrazia asked Mrs. Blazi if she would 31. return the flash drive, stating that there had been a misunderstanding because all the flash drive contained was "Jason's personal data," a statement known by Mr. DeGrazia to be false.
- 32. On January 11, 2008, Mr. DeGrazia allowed Wagoner to work his regular shift, despite the fact that he had been terminated on January 10th.
- On the morning of January 12, 2008, Blazi discovered that Wagoner had worked 33. the night before because Wagoner's till report for that evening's receipts had been placed in the store's safe.
- Blazi telephoned Mr. DeGrazia and advised him that Wagoner should not have 34. been allowed back into the store with access to the store's computer because he had been

terminated as a consequence of his concealment of the store's financial records and could no longer be trusted.

- Mr. DeGrazia said that he understood Blazi's position, but that he could not run 35. the store without Wagoner, and he was not sure if he could fill Wagoner's shifts at the store.
- Subsequently on the 12th, Wagoner left a message on Blazi's cell phone advising 36. that he had "quit" and then said "good luck trying to fill my shifts this week."
- At the close of business on January 12, 2008, Blazi and his wife went to the store 37. to collect the day's receipts.
- Upon arriving at the store, they discovered that the list of employee names and 38. contact numbers had been ripped off the wall and that surveillance cameras with remote access had been repositioned to a location within the office at the premises, so as to render them useless.
- 39. Blazi and his wife also observed that the employees who were working the evening shift were openly hostile to them, and one employee, Brenda, announced she was quitting at the end of her shift.
- Upon information and belief, Mr. DeGrazia informed the employees that 40. Wagoner had been terminated for calling Mrs. Blazi an uncomplimentary name, and concealed the real reason for Wagoner's termination, i.e. his lack of trustworthiness, knowing that such

communications would drive a wedge between employees who were loyal to him and his stepson and Blazi and his wife.

- On the morning of January 13, 2008, Blazi tried unsuccessfully to contact Mr. 41. DeGrazia on his cell phone to discuss the list of names having been destroyed, the re-positioning of the surveillance camera and the need to hire Wagoner's replacement.
- Blazi then called Mr. DeGrazia's residence and advised him of the problems that 42. had been experienced the evening before at the store.
- 43. Mr. DeGrazia responded by saying that Wagoner had nothing to do with those problems, and that the employee, Brenda, who was angry over Wagoner's firing, had been responsible.
- 44. Mr. DeGrazia also told Blazi that he did not know if he could fill Wagoner's shifts.
- During the evening hours of January 13, 2008, Blazi was at the store at the 45. beginning of what had formerly been Wagoner's shift.
- 46. The employees told Blazi that they did not know if anyone had been hired to replace Wagoner.
 - 47. Ultimately an employee from the afternoon shift agreed to work that evening.

- At the close of business that evening, several employees, including Brenda, two 48. scheduled employees and two that were not scheduled for work that night convened a meeting as Blazi left for the night.
- 49. At the time of his departure, Blazi observed the store-closing procedures being carried out and noted that the espresso machine appeared to be fully functional.
- On January 14, 2008, approximately three hours after the store's normal opening 50. time of 6am, Mr. DeGrazia telephoned Blazi to inform him that he could not open the store because everyone was "quitting" over Wagoner's termination, adding that the espresso machine had "broke down."
- The statement about the espresso machine was known to be false by Mr. 51. DeGrazia at the time that he made it.
- During that telephone call, Mr. DeGrazia further informed Blazi that he could not 52. run the store without Wagoner because it was "too complicated" and that, unless Greenwich agreed to rehire him, Mr. DeGrazia would close the business, indicating that his family was more important to him than the business was, and that he would rather go bankrupt than continue working at the store without Wagoner.

- Blazi directed Mr. DeGrazia to get an employee to the store to get it opened, but 53. Mr. DeGrazia refused, insisting that a meeting had to take place first, to clear up the situation concerning Wagoner.
- Blazi and Mr. DeGrazia initially agreed to meet that day at Bally's gym to discuss 54. the situation, but Blazi thereafter decided that it was preferable to meet at the store.
- Blazi went to the store and discovered that the espresso machine had been 55. removed, and the computer system had been sabotaged, rendering the store's point-of-sale, inventory control and credit and gift card systems useless.
- That same day, Blazi called several employees, who informed him that they were 56. not going to return to work unless Wagoner were rehired.
- Blazi contacted the police, who advised Mr. DeGrazia and Wagoner that they 57. were no longer welcome at the store and would be subject to arrest if they came there.
- According to the police, both individuals acknowledged that they would not 58. return to the store.
 - 59. At that point, Blazi assumed full management responsibility for the store.
- Later that day, a computer data recovery specialist was retained who examined 60. the store's computer and determined that Wagoner had intentionally caused operational data

systems and financial data files to be deleted, so that the store's point-of-sale, credit and gift card, inventory control and other systems were no longer functional.

- 61. As a result of the deletion of the files, the store could no longer process or record sales transactions and had to cease operation.
- 62. As a further result of the deletion of the files, all of the store's electronically-stored financial data had been destroyed.
- 63. On January 15, 2008 Blazi learned that Wagoner was illegally using the trademarked name and logo belonging to Greenwich on the web site he created, and was also using that same web site to host a "blog page" to which he posted only negative comments about the store, while removing all positive ones, in an attempt to turn local residents' opinion against the store and its new management.
- 64. That same day, Blazi learned that Mr. DeGrazia had run up extensive overdue balances with many vendors, causing them to demand immediate payment to continue to provide products and services.
- 65. On January 18, 2008, when employees were given notices indicating that they had been terminated as a result of their refusal to report to work, which constituted a voluntary separation from employment, one employee advised that she had been instructed not to return to work until she heard from Wagoner or Mr. DeGrazia indicating that Wagner had been rehired.

- When this same employee agreed to continue working at the store and to train 66. new employees, she was subjected to harassment by Wagoner.
- When police ordered Wagoner to stop harassing that employee, another 67. employee, loyal to Mr. DeGrazia and Wagoner continued to pressure the employee until she quit, thereby thwarting the efforts of Blazi to train a new staff and get the store reopened as quickly as possible.
- After the store reopened on January 28, 2008, Mr. DeGrazia contacted its 68. vendors, posing as an attorney, directing the vendors not to ship product to the store until he directed otherwise.
- Also, after the store reopened on January 28, 2008, Blazi learned that Wagoner, 69. acting alone or in concert with Mr. DeGrazia, caused the store's password to be changed on its email address, preventing the store from processing credit card sales.
- Also after the store reopened on January 28, 2008, upon information and belief, 70. former employees, loyal to Mr. DeGrazia and Wagoner, interfered with Greenwich's business by stopping customers in the parking lot and disseminating false information that would be harmful to Greenwich's reputation in the community.
- 71. Also after the store reopened on January 28, 2008, Wagoner falsely claimed on his blog site that the technical difficulties being experienced with the store's computer, resulting

in the inability to process credit and gift card transactions, was attributable to the incompetence of the store's new management, a statement deliberately made to undermine the community's confidence in the store's management team.

- Upon information and belief, Wagoner is the only person who can restore the 72. store's ability to process gift cards, given that he had custom-created the processing site, meaning that the information needed to process the gift card transactions is known only to him.
- Upon information and belief, Wagoner, acting alone or in concert with Mr. and 73. Mrs. DeGrazia, has knowingly refused to provide Greenwich the technical assistance and/or the information that would allow gift card users to use their cards, all in an attempt to further disrupt Greenwich's business and injure its reputation in the community.
- 74. The defendants' actions have caused a direct loss to the gift card holders whose cards can no longer be processed, which actions have a chilling effect on such customers' willingness to patronize Greenwich further and to buy gift cards in the future.
- As a result of the foregoing actions of the defendants, Greenwich has suffered 75. economic losses, including loss of profits, cost of repairs, cost of re-staffing and retraining, advertising costs, legal, accounting and consulting fees, business interruption expenses, loss of good will, as well as damages attributable to the defendants' trademark infringement.

SECOND COUNT: UNJUST ENRICHMENT (AS TO ALL DEFENDANTS):

- 1. 18. Paragraphs 1 through 18 of the First Count are hereby reincorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.
- The defendants have knowingly received a benefit as a result of the foregoing 19. actions.
- The defendants have not compensated Greenwich for the fair and reasonable 20. value of the benefit that they have knowingly received.
- The defendants have been unjustly enriched and are, accordingly, liable to 21. Greenwich for the fair and reasonable value of the moneys, products and services that they have received.

THIRD COUNT: STATUTORY THEFT (G.G.S. SECTION 52-564) (AS TO ALL **DEFENDANTS):**

- 1. 74. Paragraph 1 through 74 of the First Count are hereby reincorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.
- The foregoing actions of the defendants constitute civil theft within the meaning 75. of C.G.S. Section 52-564, insofar as the property and assets at issue belong to Greenwich.
- The defendants intentionally deprived Greenwich of its property and use of its 76. assets without its permission or authorization.

As a result of the defendants' actions, Greenwich was deprived of the full use and 77. possession of its assets, and sustained damages including, but not limited to, the loss of use of its equipment, spoliation of inventory, loss of future profits, damage to its business reputation, attorneys' fees and costs.

FOURTH COUNT: CIVIL CONSPIRACY (AS TO ALL DEFENDANTS):

- 1. 74. Paragraphs 1 through 74 of the First Count are hereby reincorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.
- The foregoing actions of the defendants were undertaken in furtherance of a civil 75. conspiracy in that the defendants acted jointly and in concert for their own financial gain.
- Accordingly, the defendants are jointly and severally liable for the actions taken 76. by each other.
- As a result of the foregoing actions of the defendants, Greenwich has suffered 77. economic losses, including loss of profits, cost of repairs, cost of re-staffing and retraining, advertising costs, legal, accounting and consulting fees, business interruption expenses, loss of good will, as well as damages attributable to the defendants' trademark infringement.

FIFTH COUNT: CONNECTICUT UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES ACT (C.G.S. SECTION 42-110b, ET SEQ.) (AS TO ALL DEFENDANTS):

- 1. 77. Paragraphs 1 through 77 of the Fourth Count are hereby reincorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.
- 78. Upon information and belief, at all times mentioned relevant hereto, the defendants planned to open another specialty coffee store in the same geographic area where Greenwich operated its store.
- 79. The foregoing actions were taken in furtherance of the plan to gain control of the management of Greenwich's store in Cheshire and, if that attempt failed, to undermine its business so as to gain an unfair advantage in opening a competing store.
- 80. The threat to close Greenwich's store unless Wagoner were rehired was part of an overall practice or pattern of deceptive and unfair trade practices undertaken by the defendants to further their improper motives.
- 81. The actions taken by the defendants after such attempt failed constituted a pattern or practice of unfair trade or business practices within the definition of the Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act, and were taken with the intent of undermining Greenwich's ability to conduct business and to undermine the loyalty of its customer base, to give the defendants an unfair business advantage in opening a competing specialty coffee store in the same geographical area.

- 82. The defendants are persons within the meaning of C.G.S. Section 42-110b, et seq.
- 83. The foregoing actions of the defendants are immoral, unscrupulous, oppressive, and pose a genuine threat to consumers.
- 84. As a result of the actions of the defendants, Greenwich has suffered an ascertainable loss, namely economic losses, including loss of profits, costs of repairs, costs of restaffing and retraining, advertising costs, legal, accounting and consulting fees, business interruption expenses, loss of good will, as well as damages attributable to the defendants' trademark infringement.

Wherefore, the plaintiff claims:

AS TO ALL COUNTS:

- Money damages; 1.
- 2. Costs,
- Interest, pursuant to C.G.S. Section 37-3a; and 3.
- Any other relief, legal or equitable that the Court deems proper. 4

AND, IN ADDITION, AS TO THE FIRST COUNT:

A temporary and permanent injunction, enjoining the defendants or any one or more of them from obstructing, hindering or otherwise interfering with the plaintiff's computer point-ofsale and credit card and gift card systems, including any and all actions to deny access of the plaintiff to such systems.

AND, IN ADDITION, AS TO THE THIRD COUNT:

Treble damages, pursuant to C.G.S. Section 52-564.

AND, IN ADDITION, AS TO THE FIFTH COUNT:

- Punitive damages, pursuant to C.G.S. Section 42-110b, et seq. and l.
- 2. Attorneys' fees, pursuant to C.G.S. Section 42-110b, et seq.

THE PLAINTIFF, GREENWICH COFFEE, LLC

James K. Robertson, Jr. Thomas J. Sansone

Carmody & Torrance LLP For:

Its Attorneys

A True Copy Attest:

Julianne Ingham Connecticut State Marshal

RETURN DATE: MARCH 18, 2008

SUPERIOR COURT

GREENWICH COFFEE, LLC

J.D. OF WATERBURY

VS.

AT WATERBURY

NICHOLAS DeGRAZIA, JASON WAGONER and NANCY DeGRAZIA

FEBRUARY 21, 2008

STATEMENT OF AMOUNT IN DEMAND

Other relief, in lieu of or in addition to, monetary damages greater than \$15,000.00, exclusive of interest and costs, pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §52-91 and P.B. §10-20, is sought herein.

> THE PLAINTIFF, GREENWICH COFFEE, LLC

James K. Robertson, Jr.

Thomas J. Sansone

For:

Carmody & Torrance LLP

Its Attorneys

{N0783432}

Tryé Copy Attest;

Julianne Ingham Connecticut State Marshal

RETURN DATE: MARCH 18, 2008 : SUPERIOR COURT

GREENWICH COFFEE, LLC : J.D. OF WATERBURY

VS. : AT WATERBURY

NICHOLAS DeGRAZIA, JASON : FEBRUARY 21, 2008 WAGONER and NANCY DeGRAZIA

VERIFICATION

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
) ss: Waterbury
COUNTY OF NEW HAVEN

I, John A. Blazi, being duly sworn, do hereby depose and say that I am the sole Member of Greenwich Coffee, LLC, a Connecticut limited liability company; that I have read the foregoing Complaint and know the contents thereof; that the same is true to my knowledge or is based upon information obtained from records and files of the plaintiff.

John A. Blazi

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 21st day of February 2008.

Thomas J. Sansone

Commissioner of the Superior Court

{N0783432}

A True/Copy Attest:

Kulianne Ingham
Connecticut State Marshal

RETURN DATE: MARCH 18, 2008 SUPERIOR COURT

GREENWICH COFFEE, LLC J.D. OF WATERBURY

VS. AT WATERBURY

NICHOLAS DeGRAZIA, JASON 2008 WAGONER and NANCY DeGRAZIA

ORDER FOR TEMPORARY INJUNCTION

WHEREAS, the plaintiff has applied in the captioned action for a temporary injunction; and

WHEREAS, it is found that a Verified Complaint, Application for Temporary Injunction, and Order to Show Cause why a temporary injunction should not issue as prayed for were duly served upon the defendants; and

WHEREAS, after due hearing at which the parties appeared and were fully heard, or [at which the defendants did not appear, it is found that a copy of the Order for the hearing as duly served on the defendants as appears from the officer's return on file;] it is also found that good cause has been shown to sustain the validity of plaintiff's claim that the temporary injunction should issue without bond;

NOW, THEREFORE, under penalty of \$500 for each violation hereof, the following is hereby ORDERED:

- 1. The defendants, individually and in concert, are enjoined from any and all acts that result in the obstructing, hindering or interfering with the plaintiff's computer point-of-sale and credit card and gift card systems, for the operation of its coffee shop business at 209 West Main Street in Cheshire, Connecticut, including any and all actions to deny access of the plaintiff to such systems; and
- The defendants are directed to provide promptly all reasonably necessary 2. cooperation to remove whatever obstructions, hindrances or interference exist which have resulted in the denial of access to the plaintiff's point-of-sale and credit card gift operations on its computer system.

Dated at Waterbury, Connecticut, this day of	, 2008.
BY THE COURT	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	Judge/Clerk

st Office Box 1950 rw Haven, CT 06509-1950 lephone: 203 777-5501 RETURN DATE: MARCH 18, 2008 : SUPERIOR COURT

GREENWICH COFFEE, LLC : J.D. OF WATERBURY

VS. : AT WATERBURY

NICHOLAS DeGRAZIA, JASON : 2008 WAGONER and NANCY DeGRAZIA

SUMMONS

TO ANY PROPER OFFICER:

BY ORDER OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT, You are hereby commanded to give notice of the foregoing Order of Temporary Injunction to the defendants, by serving upon them, in the manner provided by the statute for the service of process, a true and attested copy of the Order, and return make to this Court.

Hereof fail not, but due service and return make.	
Dated at New Haven, Connecticut, this day of 2008.	
Thomas J. Sansone	

Commissioner of the Superior Court

{N0783432}

ost Office Box 1950 ew Haven, CT 06509-195 elephone: 203 777-5501 RETURN DATE: MARCH 18, 2008 : SUPERIOR COURT

GREENWICH COFFEE, LLC : J.D. OF WATERBURY

VS. : AT WATERBURY

NICHOLAS DeGRAZIA, JASON : FEBRUARY 21, 2008 WAGONER and NANCY DeGRAZIA

CERTIFICATION INTO COURT

The accompanying Verified Complaint, Order to Show Cause, Application for Temporary Injunction and Temporary Restraining Order, having been brought before me, a judge of the Superior Court, in the above-captioned actions and proceedings thereon had before me are hereby certified to the Court.

BY THE COURT

Dated at Waterbury, Connecticut, this 21st day of February 2008.

 Judge/Clerk

Case 3:08-cv-01441-CFD Document 13-4 Filed 10/21/2008 Page 1 of 9

Exhibit B

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

REGARDING: NIJO ENTERPRISES PROJECT "GREENWICH COFFEE"

OCTOBER 22, 2003

This is an overview of NIJO ENTERPRISES' plan and action taken to date in furtherance of the plan to establish a chain of ten or more coffee/espresso bars in the greater New York/Connecticut area.

This overview includes a break out of action to date and costs incurred to date in furtherance of NIJO ENTERPRISES' project, "Greenwich Coffee" and of punch list of tasks necessary for completion before the "Grand Opening".

ACTION TO DATE

The principals of NIJO ENTERPRISES; Nick DeGrazia and John Blazi formed a partnership known as "NIJO ENTERPRISES" to advance the economic best interests of the principals. NIJO ENTERPRISES previously formed a corporation BioNuetricueticals to facilitate it in the transaction of business.

The principals of NIJO agreed to lease certain property known as 209 West Main Street, Cheshire, Connecticut for an initial term of five years with an option for an additional ten years and leased it in the name of BioNuetricueticals. John A. Blazi acting as a duly authorized agent of NIJO ENTERPRISES and officer in BioNuetricueticals, Inc. executed the lease on behalf of NIJO ENTERPRISES. Both principals of NIJO ENTERPRISES intend to be mutually bound by the terms and conditions of the lease notwithstanding that the personal guarantee provision of the lease was executed by John a. Blazi, acting on behalf of NIJO ENTERPRISES.

NIJO ENTERPRISES took possession of 209 West Main Street Cheshire, Connecticut on or about September 1, 2003 in reliance upon a verbal approval obtain from Cheshire Planning and Zoning Commission that the location was approved for use as a coffee shop and espresso bar.

All advances of expenses to date have come from the general account of the Law Offices of John A. Blazi to be repaid to the general account by the partners upon receipt of suitable financing for the project, i.e. a commercial loan. If necessary any sums advanced to NIJO ENTERPRISES by Law Offices of John Blazi to finance "Greenwich Coffee" will be repaid in equal shares from the partners personal assets. The partners of "NIJO ENTERPRISES" intend to be bound jointly for a commercial loan for financing the project. To the extent non-conventional financing (for example, a home equity loan) is required to finance any aspect of the project the partners intend to be bound equally to repay said loan from their personal assets.

NIJO ENTERPRISES immediately began work at the site to include restoration of utilities and interior modifications. Upon application for a building permit, NIJO ENTERPRISES was informed that a site plan modification approval was required because the intended use was a change in use. While not conceding that "additional approval" was required, NIJO has submitted a site plan modification application and suspended all further work pending approval of its zoning application.

NIJO ENTERPRISES has tentatively agreed on calling the chain of coffee shops "Greenwich Coffee".

NIJO ENTERPRISES has tentatively agreed on the product line it will offer, to include; coffee and espresso products, pastries, chocolates and "gellatto" ice cream.

NIJO ENTERPRISES has selected the necessary fixtures, equipment, furniture and cabinetry for the interior of the shop and placed a deposit on same with Waterbury Warehouse. NIJO ENTERPRISES has selected the interior lay-out and color scheme for the Greenwich Coffee chain.

NIJO ENTERPRISES has contacted the necessary vendors to supply the products it intends to offer for sale.

EXPENSES TO DATE

Deposit on equipment Waterbury Warehouse	\$1500.00
September Rent 209 W. Main	\$2000.00
October Rent 209 W. Main	\$3116.90
Second Deposit Waterbury Warehouse	\$5000.00
Filing Fee Site Plan Modification	\$ 160.00
Copy Costs Site Plans	\$ 21.10

TASKS NECESSARY FOR COMPLETION BEFORE OPENING

BUILDING EXTERIOR:

RE-PAVE PARKING LOT (To be performed by BSL Associates)

PAINT EXTERIOR OF BUILDING

INSTALL SIGNS

INSTALL EXTERIOR LIGHTING

LANDSCAPE PARKING AREAS

BUILDING INTERIOR:

INSTALL ROUGH PLUMBING

REMODEL INTERIOR TO PLAN SPECIFICATIONS

INSTALL CABINETRY AND FIXTURES

INSTALL FINISH PLUMBING

INSTALL ELECTRICAL FIXTURES

INSTALL HEATING/AIR-CONDITIONING

INSTALL FLOORING

PAINT AND/OR WALL PAPER WALLS

INSTALL NEW DOORS AND WINDOWS

NON-STRUCTURAL RELATED TASKS:

OBTAIN SITE PLAN APPROVAL (OCTOBER 27, 2003)

DESIGN LOGO AND SIGNS

MARKETING AND ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN

HIRE AND TRAIN EMPLOYEES

This Memorandum of Understanding reflects the agreement of the principals as of October 23, 2003 and does not in anyway effect the original agreement of the principals in forming NIJO ENTERPRISES (copy attached as Exhibit "A") and is subject to modification only by formal recission of this agreement of substitution of another agreement.

ACCEPTED BY:

NICHOLAS DECRAZIA

10/22/03 10/22/03

ACCEPTED BY

JOHN A. BLAZI

PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT NIJO ENTERPRISES (D/B/A "BIO/LAB NUTRICEUTICALS, INC")

Whereas the undersigned wish to enter into a partnership arrangement for the furtherance of conducting a business involved in retail sales, they have agreed this date to enter in this agreement for the formation of the partnership. It is understood and agreed that both partners Nicholas DeGrazia 50 Pilgrim Trail, Woodbury, CT 06798 and John Blazi of 43 Falconcrest Road, Middlebury, CT 06798 will be jointly and equally responsible for all debts and obligations of the business which will be known as NIJO ENTERPRISES. Moreover, the partners will share equally in bearing the operational cost of running the business and will share equally in the profits of such enterprises after all necessary expenses of business are deducted, including salaries, as agreed upon, and operational costs and product-related expenses.

The start up capital for the partnership will be advanced by John A. Blazi and will be repaid from the proceeds of the business. In the event that there are no proceeds from the enterprise, Nicholas DeGrazia will repay John Blazi whatever amount is advanced toward the start-up or operation of the enterprise.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

REGARDING: NIJO ENTERPRISES PROJECT "GREENWICH COFFEE"

OCTOBER 22, 2003

This is an overview of NIJO ENTERPRISES' plan and action taken to date in furtherance of the plan to establish a chain of ten or more coffee/espresso bars in the greater New York/Connecticut area.

This overview includes a break out of action to date and costs incurred to date in furtherance of NIJO ENTERPRISES' project, "Greenwich Coffee" and of punch list of tasks necessary for completion before the "Grand Opening".

ACTION TO DATE

The principals of NIJO ENTERPRISES; Nick DeGrazia and John Blazi formed a partnership known as "NIJO ENTERPRISES" to advance the economic best interests of the principals. NIJO ENTERPRISES previously formed a corporation BioNuetricueticals to facilitate it in the transaction of business.

The principals of NIJO agreed to lease certain property known as 209 West Main Street. Cheshire, Connecticut for an initial term of five years with an option for an additional ten years and leased it in the name of BioNuetricueticals. John A. Blazi acting as a duly authorized agent of NIJO ENTERPRISES and officer in BioNuetricueticals, Inc. executed the lease on behalf of NIJO ENTERPRISES. Both principals of NIJO ENTERPRISES intend to be mutually bound by the terms and conditions of the lease notwithstanding that the personal guarantee provision of the lease was executed by John a. Blazi, acting on behalf of NIJO ENTERPRISES.

NIJO ENTERPRISES took possession of 209 West Main Street Cheshire, Connecticut on or about September 1, 2003 in reliance upon a verbal approval obtain from Cheshire Planning and Zoning Commission that the location was approved for use as a coffee shop and espresso bar.

All advances of expenses to date have come from the general account of the Law Offices of John A. Blazi to be repaid to the general account by the partners upon receipt of suitable financing for the project, i.e. a commercial loan. If necessary any sums advanced to NIJO ENTERPRISES by Law Offices of John Blazi to finance "Greenwich Coffee" will be repaid in equal shares from the partners personal assets. The partners of "NIJO ENTERPRISES" intend to be bound jointly for a commercial loan for financing the project. To the extent non-conventional financing (for example, a home equity loan) is required to finance any aspect of the project the partners intend to be bound equally to repay said loan from their personal assets.

PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT NIJO ENTERPRISES (D/B/A "BIO/LAB NUTRICEUTICALS, INC")

Whereas the undersigned wish to enter into a partnership arrangement for the furtherance of conducting a business involved in retail sales, they have agreed this date to enter in this agreement for the formation of the partnership. It is understood and agreed that both partners Nicholas DeGrazia 50 Pilgrim Trail, Woodbury, CT 06798 and John Blazi of 43 Falconcrest Road, Middlebury, CT 06798 will be jointly and equally responsible for all debts and obligations of the business which will be known as NIJO ENTERPRISES. Moreover, the partners will share equally in bearing the operational cost of running the business and will share equally in the profits of such enterprises after all necessary expenses of business are deducted, including salaries, as agreed upon, and operational costs and product-related expenses.

The start up capital for the partnership will be advanced by John A. Blazi and will be repaid from the proceeds of the business. In the event that there are no proceeds from the enterprise, Nicholas DeGrazia will repay John Blazi whatever amount is advanced toward the start-up or operation of the enterprise.

Witness

ousiness inquiry

BUSINESS DETAILS

Business Name:

Business ID:

Business Address:

GREENWICH COFFEE, LLC

0770378

209 WEST MAIN STREET, CHESHIRE,

CT

Mailing Address:

Citizenship/State Inc:

Last Report Year:

209 WEST MAIN STREET, CHESHIRE,

CT

Domestic/CT

2007

Business Type:

Business Status:

Date Inc./Register:

Domestic Limited Liability Company

Active

Jan 08, 2004

PRINCIPALS:

Name/Title:

Business Address:

Residence Address:

JOHN A BLAZI MEMBER 786 CHASE PARKWAY, WATERBURY, CT, 06708 43 FALCONCREST ROAD, MIDDLEBURY, CT, 06762

BUSINESS SUMMARY:

Agent Name:

Agent Business Address:

Agent Residence Address:

JOHN A. BLAZI, ESQ.

1138 WEST MAIN STREET, WATERBURY, CT, 06708 43 FALCONCREST ROAD, MIDDLEBURY, CT, 06762

>> View Name History

>> View Filing History

>> View Shares

Cancel

obsiness inquiry

BUSINESS DETAILS:

Business Name:

Business ID:

Business Address:

BIOLAB NUTRICUETICALS, INC.

0681400

1138 WEST MAIN STREET,

WATERBURY, CT, 06708

Mailing Address:

Citizenship/State Inc:

Last Report Year:

1138 WEST MAIN ST., WATERBURY,

CT, 06708

Domestic/CT

2002

Business Type:

Business Status:

Date Inc./Register:

Stock

Active

May 14, 2001

PRINCIPALS:

Name/Title:

Business Address:

Residence Address:

NICHOLAS DEGRAZIA

PRESIDENT

NONE

74 WASHINGTON ROAD, #39,

WOODBURY, CT, 06798

NANCY DEGRAZIA

SECRETARY

NONE

74 WASHINGTON ROAD, #39,

WOODBURY, CT, 06798

JOHN BLAZI

VICE PRESIDENT

NONE

43 FALCONCREST ROAD, MIDDLEBURY, CT, 06762

IMPORTANT: There are more principals for this business that are not shown here.

BUSINESS SUMMARY:

Agent Name:

Agent Business Address:

Agent Residence Address:

JOHN A. BLAZI, ESQ.

1138 WEST MAIN ST,

43 FALCONCREST RD, MIDDLEBURY, CT, 06762

WATERBURY, CT, 06708

>> View Shares

>> View Name History

>> View Filing History

Cancel

Exhibit C

NAUGATUCK SAVINGS BANK

7	#FFADA An -	COM	IMERCIA:	L INSTALLM	ENT NOTE	
	#77001686 mwich Coffee, LL				Date: March	70 T
Name	Curec till	<u> </u>	- i			-0, 2
	Vest Main Street,	Charta				
No.	Street	Cheshire,	<u>C1</u>	06410	_	
Į,	TERMS OF PA	City	State	2m		
	For value received	the neutron.				
SDCTUD	() Payable ininite box). These installer, each of such installer,	ALONG TO BE ACCUMENTS TO BE ACCUMENTS TO BE ACCUMENTS TO BE ACCUMENTS TO BE ACCUMENTS.	Dank at any of a neight, of 5, message on the observed by a p	ts banking offices. The each, which installs day of and symmet of interest on	called the "Berrower") promise to pay to the purchaser or assignee of the Nove (nervisative): Principal to be (applicable box is checked); ment shall be payable () monthly/() quarter shall continue on theday of each () nenth/ the majude balance of the principal at the later	dy (c
	x. to the Principal	the embracia man	to are balances of	interest on the unpeto	ments of \$ 1.419.66 each, which installment 06, and shall continue on the 22 day of ea baisance of the Principal at the rate set forth be	s sibal ch m olow,
	interest on the temperal (X) of \$,25% per	r year; or	MITT DE DORM SE IL	e rate ("Rate") (applie	able box is checked):	
	() oqual to the B	aso Rate (as here	insfer defined)	àn-	•	
	(etiseile	- % (\ above / i	1-1		•	
Note to a					as as it may exist from thine to time. If the Rat	
payable a	Title Pero suntil also see		AT 9 DOO DEAL AND	u, with cech luterest r	enyment based upon a 30 day month. Interact	السلاء
l schadujad	way paymout is not p	nner faut m no è	vent will the Ban b addition to inte	k charge leer thin \$25. rest, Borrower shall p	Of for this transaction)	ASC, :
tha Dala.	orrower shell also pay	all costs of colle	ction of this Nais	(Which term shall it	p include any renewal or extension hereoft men	⊕ ¥₹XI
"hodebte A	a, anchiolog lengober Boss")	ile attenney's E	ca, plus court	costs (all of the abo	o include any renewal or extension hereof) men we Section I is herminater collectively cal	hers
	ECURITY INTE			4	a necessities collectively cal	llođ
1	The Rolder shall be	Maria I.				
loposita o	the Borrower and of	MY STATEMENT OF \$ 5	or endormers :	is and charing the excis	touce of an Event of Default an option to set	aff.
2.	ral securing all or part	of the Indebtoday	st, and without a	unimatured, without	rior defined or solida regarded of the stock	MELY MILY
						Dime
3.	oring and (if applicable () (Check box if applicable VENTS OF DEYA	C) is more fally d discaple) I amelois	cacalbed in a Sec		tolder a security interest pledge/mortgage/and UCC-1 blanket (filing dated 12/6/04 and the 12/2/04 and dated date of closing.	date
					•	
voot of an	proceedings metiture	by or against th	e, or apon muni-	e to perform any other	r abligation of the Borrower to the Holder, or anicruptcy, insolvency, receivership or arrange a no "Event of Definite", the control of	to do
um caccalle	or is the Holder de	oms itself bisec	To (each of which	the is hereinoffer and	endruptcy, insolvency, receivership or arrange	Web.
unediately	r due and payable.	og previously be	en cured), the I	Tolder may, without	assistant of the holder, or assistantly, receivership or arrange an "Event of Default"), thereupon, or at any notice of demand, declare the indebteriness	מולו ק
. NO	IN-WATUED BY	MAI NEEL			the motories	to b
No	modification or smean	inent hereof else	t vera <u>rii [</u>]	ΓY.		
tver there	of or preclude the entire	CONTRACTOR AND	t to chilorce any	of its rights hereunde	extension of time for payment, dalay in enforce siver of any rights horounder or release or also or or partial enforcement thereof, shall consti- circumstances	a th
in ti An no bila	ne event that any prov	ision bereaf the	U be found to be	in the same or similar	circumstances, ship under applicable law, such provision she	
This	Man and the late of	AL OBLIGA	TIONS.	•	was the commental broaterout of this Note:	
				and several obligation and all jointly and several IY BORROWED	as of all makers, guaranters, endersons, and emaily.	other
2.	HATTER STATE OF THE REAL PROPERTY.	1				
proceeds 3. 1	shall be used for perace Borrower expressly wa	ives all nights uns	chold, or agricult der Section 52, 22	occeds of this losn and ural purposes. Rethrough \$2,270c —	to be used for commercial purposes, and non- f the Connecticut Owneral Stamme to any notic Note including without the tree to any notic	w of
. WA	IVED	-Rismar with Inch	serry or need or no	изсина в Воггочех.	with a second figurestrop' faragapill	e ar ent
The E L. COL	ORTOWER WEIVES present Y RECEIVED.	oment, demand, 1	notice of disbono	and protest of this No	pte,	
,	/	idersigned ack C	nowledges rec	cipt of a complete.	ly filled in copy of this note.	
A Bi	d, its Mobiler		-			
	/					
1 /						

GUARAN	TY (SF I	Λ.	

Each of the undersigned, jointly and severally, absolutely and unconditionally guarantees payment of the "Indebtedness" (as defined in the Note).

Purther, each of the undersigned consents without notice or further assent (a) to the terms and conditions of the Note or any renewal or renewals thereof or extension or extensions of time for payment thereof for any period or periods of time, (b) to the change, exchange or surrender of, or the failure to perfect or maintain perfected, may security interest, mortgage, pledge or lich on, any collateral given by any party to secure all or part of Indebtedness, (c) to the addition of or to the release of any guarantors, endorsers or sureties for all or any part of the Indebtedness. (d) to any change or changes of interest rate of the Note, and (e) to any incluigence(s) granted to "Borrower" (as defined in the

In addition, each of the underzigned further agrees that Naugatuck Savings Bank (the "Bank") if it is the Holder of the Note, shall have a lien on, security interest in, and during the existence of an "Event of Default" (as defined in the Note) an option to set off against the Indebtedness, whether or not manned, in any order, all deposits and other property of said Bottower and of each of the undersigned in the possession or control of the Bank in any capacity, without prior demand or notice, regardless of the adequacy of any collateral securing all or part of the hidebiedness, and without resort to legal process or judicial proceeding, order or authorization. Demand for payment, presentment for payment, notice of nonpayment, protest, and notice of protest are hereby waived by each of the understaned.

Date March 28, 2006 Address	Signature, Joho Blazi, Personally
Date March 28, 2006 Address	Signature, Nick DeGrazia, Personally
Date Address	Signature,
Date	Signature,
	COLLATERAL

Exhibit D

Case 3:08-cv-01441-CFD Document 13-6 Filed 10/21/2008

Page 2 of 6

Fasano, Ippolito & Lee, LLC

Attorneys at Law

388 Orange Street New Haven, Connecticut 06511

Leonard A. Fasano Alphonse Ippolito Timothy J. Lee

Telephone:

(203)787-6555

Telefax:

(203)776-2119

Real Estate Fax: (203)776-1088

Nicholas N. Mingione

March 10, 2008

Nick DeGrazia 50 Pilgrim Trail Woodbury, CT 06798

Re: Greenwich Coffee, NIJO Enterprises and Bio/Lab Nutriceuticals, Inc.

Dear Mr. DeGrazia:

I received a telephone call from Attorney Tom Sansone last week. Attorney Sansone is the attorney representing John Blazi. Attorney Sansone stated that John Blazi would be interested in purchasing the website for Greenwich Coffee and compensating Jason for a reasonable amount of time spent in creating the website. As a condition of purchasing the website, they would also require Jason's assistance with the gift cards. Please contact me upon receipt of this letter so that we may discuss this matter in further detail. As you are aware, the Court has scheduled this matter for a hearing on March 19th. If we reach an agreement on this issue, we will not need to have the hearing on the 19th.

look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely you

Timothy J. Lee, Esq.

Case 3:08-cv-01441-CFD Document 13-6 Filed 10/21/2008 Page 3 of 6



State of Connecticut - Superior Court Centralized Small Claims 80 Washington Street Hartford, CT 06106-

Toll Free in Connecticut (866) 383-5927

Local Hartford Area (860) 756-7800

Fax: (860) 756-7805

www.jud.ct.gov

151210

Signed

Address (No., Street, Town, Zip Code)

JASON WAGONER 50 PILGRIM TRAIL WOODBURY, CT 06798-

Docket No.: SCC-151210

GREENWICH COFFEE, LLC VS. DEGRAZIA ET AL

Answer

Venue: SCAW

YOU MUST ANSWER THIS CLAIM BY: July 16, 2008

YOUR ANSWER MAY BE MAILED, FAXED OR HAND DELIVERED AND MUST BE RECEIVED ON OR BEFORE THE ANSWER DATE.

plus court costs, if any

NOTICE OF SUIT.

READ THE INSTRUCTIONS ON

THE BACK OF THE WRIT AND

IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS, CALL THE

TELEPHONE NUMBER LISTED ABOVE.

\$5,000.00

Date Signed

Juris No.

IN RESPONSE TO THE ENCLOSED CLAIM FOR THIS AMOUNT THIS IS MY ANSWER: (Check one box)

	I disagree with the claim because: (State below why you disagree. Be brief but specific. At trial you will be able to explain your defense and submit documentation.
	I admit I owe the claim but desire more time to pay for the following reasons: (You may suggest a method of payment or a timetable for and amount of deferred payments.) DO NOT SEND PAYMENT(S) TO THE COURT. ALL PAYMENTS ARE TO BE MADE DIRECTLY TO THE FOLLOWING:
BLA	AZI JOHN LAW OFFICES OF , 786 CHASE PARKWAY WATERBURY, CT 06708- , (203)596-0600
 M	y counterclaim is: (Check box and see instructions if you claim the plaintiff owes you money.)

Print Name and Title of Person Signing

Telephone No.

YOU DO NOT HAVE TO COME TO COURT ON THE ABOVE DATE EXCEPT TO SUBMIT A WRITTEN ANSWER IF YOUR DONE SO BY THAT DATE. It is not the date of trial. If you have filed an answer contesting the claim the clerk will schedule.
trial and will send you a written notice of the date and time to come to court.

^{2.} Failure to file an answer by the answer date may result in a default judgment against you. If the plaintiff(s) win the case and pay the judgment, the plaintiff(s) may try to collect the money owed by getting permission from the court to have money taken out of wages, financial accounts or other property.

SMALL CLAIMS WRIT AND NOTICE OF SUIT

JD-CV-40 Rev. 12-07 C.G.S. §§ 51-15, 51-345(g) Pr. Bk. § 24-1 et seq.

CONNECTICUT SUPERIOR COURT SMALL CLAIMS SESSION

Type or print legibly. Complete original and provide a copy for each defendant. If downloading the form from the Internet, include "Instructions to Defendant" for each defendant. File the original and copy(ies) for defendant(s) with the court, along with the appropriate entry fee. Retain a copy for your records. See "Instructions to Plaintiff" on back/page 2 for assistance.

FOR COURT USE ONLY DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE BARCODE LABEL ONLY

(1.)	INFORMATION THAT WILL DETER	RMINE HEARING LOCA	TION			ANSWER DATE	=				
Wa	erbury										
_	(2.) NAME ADDRESS AND ZIP CO	ODE OF PLAINTIFF #1			_	NAME ADDRESS AND	ZIP CODE	OF PLAINT	IFF #2		1
P	Greenwich Coffee, LLC				P						[
Ŧ	209 West Main Street				۲I						
F	Cheshire, CT 06410				F						·
#		T	<u></u>		#				Files	DADTHERS	-
1	TELEPHONE NO. (w/area code)	=	PARTNER		2	TELEPHONE NO. (w/a	area code)	("X" ONE)		PARTNERS	- 1
<u> </u>	203-271-1862	INDIVIDUAL	CORPOR	1			**1010.110	INDIVI		CORPORAT	
Ι`'	NAME, ADDRESS AND ZIP CODE		PLAINTIFF(5)			JURIS NO. 419424		203-596	•	a cooe)
نيا	w Offices of John A. Blazi					L	413424		203-330		
78	6 Chase Parkway, Waterb	ury, CT 06708									
 	(4.) NAME ADDRESS AND ZIP CO	ODE OF DEFENDANT	#1			NAME ADDRESS AND	ZIP CODE	OF DEFEN	DANT #2		
Ь	Nicholas DeGrazia				а	Jason Wagoner					
Ĕ	50 Pilgrim Trail				E	50 Pilgrim Trail					
F	Woodbury, CT 06798				F	Woodbury, CT 0	6798				
#					#						
1	TELEPHONE NO. (w/area code)	("X" ONE) LLC	PARTNER	RSHIP	2	TELEPHONE NO. (w/a	area code)	("X" ONE)	LLC [PARTNERS	HIP
	203-263-7515	INDIVIDUAL [CORPOR	ATION	- 1	203-263-7515		INDIVI	DUAL [CORPORAT	ION
(5.)	NAME OF TOWN WHERE TRANS IN HOUSING MATTERS, WHERE								NT FOR SE Corporate L		
(6.)	IS THIS CLAIM BETWEEN A LANG	DLORD AND A TENANT	T? "X" box if	yes:							
V	OU ARE BEING SUE	D THE DI AII	NITIEE/	S) CL AIR	AC	VOLLOWE		(7.) AMOU	NT CLAIM	ED PLU	-
				o, CLAII	TIO	100 OWL		\$	5,000.	COL	
(8.)	FOR THE FOLLOWING	REASONS:						<u> </u>			10,
Th	e plaintiff, Greenwich Coff	fee, LLC, owns Gi	reenwich	Coffee wh	ich	does business as	s a specia	ality coffe	ee store	located in	
CI	neshire, CT. The Defendan	its, Nicholas DeG	razia and	Jason Wa	gno	rer, were employ	ed by Gr	eenwich	Coffee.	On or abou	it
	nuary 13, 2008, the defend						f sale op	erating s	ystem, c	causing dan	nage
to	the store's computer systematical	em. The defenda	nts owe t	he plaintiff	\$5,	000.00.					
	e undersigned, being duly sv			the signer l	has	read the claim and	d, to the b	est of the	signer's	knowledge,	
	ormation and belief, there is g	good ground to sup	oport it.	=							
	SIGNED			TYPE IN NAI	ME A	ND TITLE OF PERSON	SIGNING	AT LEFT			
<u>X</u>				John A. B		•					
(10) SUBSORIBED AND SWORN TO	BEFORE ME ON (Date))	1 7.	<u>*</u> ^	lotang Comm. of Sup. C	Z()				
04	2212008			X G	2	XYV					
(11.	The undersigned deposes	and says:	MILITA	RY SERV	ic É	AFFIDAVIT	ļ	FO	R COURT	USE ONLY	
	that the defendant is in the	military or naval se		<u> </u>	_						
_	that the undersigned is unat	•									
	are in the military or naval se										
X	that no defendant in this act	tion is in the militar	v or naval	service of	the	United States, and	I that.				
	to the personal knowledge of such service)	of the undersigned	(state fac	ts showin	g d	efendant is not in					
T	ne plaintiff knows the defe	ndants and has n	ersonal k	nowledge	tha	t they are not					
	irrently in the military or n		7								
	- *										
		11/									:
SIC	SNATURE AND TITLE X				Αi	trney					
ŞU	BSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEF	REME ON (Date)	SIGNED (GH	erk, Majary, Cy	mg».	of Sup. Ct.)					!
	22/2008		X/S	The V		_	-				
											

Case 3:08-cv-01441-CFD Document 13-6 Filed 1

Filed 10/21/2008 Page 5 of 6

JD-CV 40A1 Rev 3/2006

SONAL MRANTE

State of Connecticut - Superior Court Centralized Small Claims 80 Washington Street Hartford, CT 06106-

Toll Free in Connecticut (866) 383-5927

Local Hartford Area (860) 756-7800

Fax: (860) 756-7805

www.jud.ct.gov

151209

NICHOLAS DEGRAZIA 50 PILGRIM TRAIL WOODBURY, CT 06798-

Docket No. : SCC-151209

BLAZI VS. DEGRAZIA

Venue: SCAW

Answer

YOU MUST ANSWER THIS CLAIM BY: July 16, 2008

YOUR ANSWER MAY BE MAILED, FAXED OR HAND DELIVERED AND MUST BE RECEIVED ON OR BEFORE THE ANSWER DATE.

READ THE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE BACK OF THE WRIT AND NOTICE OF SUIT. IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS, CALL THE TELEPHONE NUMBER LISTED ABOVE.

IN RESPONSE TO THE ENCLOSED CLAIM FOR THIS AMOUNT plus court costs, if any THIS IS MY ANSWER: (Check one box)

\$5,000.00

(Sta	sagree with the ate below why y umentation.			ecific. At tria	you will be al	ole to explai	n your defer	nse and sub	mit
(You DO	Imit I owe the I may suggest a NOT SEND PA IOHN LAW OI	a method of pa NYMENT(S) TO	ayment or a tin OTHE COURT	netable for an . ALL PAYM	d amount of d ENTS ARE TO	eferred pay D BE MADE	DIRECTLY	TO THE FC	
	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·								
••					•				· · · · · ·
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·								
My co	unterclaim is:	(Check box	and see instr	uctions if yo	u claim the p	laintiff owe	es you mon	ey.)	
							· - · · -	. —	
•									
	·····								
Signed		····	Print Na	me and Title of	Person Signing	7		Date Signed	
Address (No.,	Street,Town,Zip	Code)		Telej (phone No.			Juris No.	

- 1. YOU DO NOT HAVE TO COME TO COURT ON THE ABOVE DATE EXCEPT TO SUBMIT A WRITTEN ANSWER IF DONE SO BY THAT DATE. It is not the date of trial. If you have filed an answer contesting the claim the clerk will schotrial and will send you a written notice of the date and time to come to court.
- 2. Failure to file an answer by the answer date may result in a default judgment against you. If the plaintiff(s) win the case appay the judgment, the plaintiff(s) may try to collect the money owed by getting permission from the court to have money wages, financial accounts or other property.

Case 3:08-cv-01441-CFD Document 13-6 SMALL CLAIMS WRIT CONNECTICUT SUPERIOR COURT

Filed 10/21/2008

Page 6 of 6

AND NOTICE OF SUIT

JD-CV-40 Rev. 12-07 C.G.S. §§ 51-15, 51-345(g) Pr. Bk. § 24-1 et seq.

CONNECTICUT SUPERIOR COURT

SMALL CLAIMS SESSION
Type or print legibly Complete original and provide a copy for each defendant. If downloading the form from the Internet, include "Instructions to Defendant" for each defendant, File the original and copy(ies) for defendant(s) with the court, along with the appropriate entry fee. Retain a copy for your records. See "Instructions to Plaintiff" on back/page 2 for

FOR COURT USE ONLY DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE BARCODE LABEL ONLY

	a	sistance								
(1.)	INFORMATION THAT WILL DET	RMINE HEARING I	OCATION			ANSWER DAT	г			
	aterbury					MINSWERUAT	E			
1_	(2.) NAME ADDRESS AND ZIP	CODE OF PLAINTIFF	F#1		1 1	NAME ADDRESS AND	D ZIP CODE	OF PLAIN	TIFF #2	
P	John A. Blazi				P					
ΙĻ	43 Falcon Crest				L					
F	Middlebury, CT 06762				T				~	
[middlebdiy, CT 00702				F					
#		_		j	f I					
4	TELEPHONE NO. (w/area code)	("X" ONE)	CEPARIN	ERSHIP	#	TELEPHONE NO. (w/a	area codel	("X" ONE)	Пцс	DADTHEDGUID
Ι'	203-596-0600	INDIVIDUAL	⊢	RATION	2	TEEL HOME 140. (402	# ca (co)e)	f` ′		PARTNERSHIP
/3	NAME, ADDRESS AND ZIP COD			PRATION					DUAL	CORPORATION
			OR PLAINTIFF	F(S)		i	JURIS NO.		TELEPH	ONE NO. (w/area code)
L	w Offices of John A. Blaz	<u>zi</u>					419424		203-59	6-0600
						L				
78	6 Chase Parkway, Watert	oury. CT 06708								
 	(4.) NAME ADDRESS AND ZIP (·							
1		ODE OF DEFENDA!	NT #1	1		NAME ADDRESS AND	ZIP CODE	OF DEFEN	DANT #2	
D	Nicholas DeGrazia									
E	50 Pilgrim Trail			·						
F	Woodbury, CT 06798	-··—	·		Ē					
1 1	1100000u1y, C1 00/38			[11					
#				1	#		-			
1	TELEPHONE NO. (w/area code)	("X" ONE) LLC	PARTNE			TELEPHONE NO. (w/a	rea codel	("X" ONE)	Пцс	PARTNERSHIP
! [203-263-7515	INDIVIDUAL	CORPO		-	· LLEI HORLE NO. (M/L	· CLICOLC)	` '	└	
15.	NA LAT OF TOWN							INDIVII	DUAL [CORPORATION
(3.)	NAME OF TOWN WHERE TRANS	ACTION/INJURY OF	CCURRED OR	Ļ					IT FOR SE	
	IN HOUSING MATTERS, WHERE						1	(For C	orporate L	Defendant)
(6.)	IS THIS CLAIM BETWEEN A LAN	OLORD AND A TEN	ANT? "X" box it	f yes:						
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			<u> </u>		•				PLUS
	OU ARE BEING SUE	:D. THE PL/	\INITIEE/	SICLAIN	AS:	VOU OME		(7.) AMOU	NT CLAIM	F()
T			3113 I EFF							
T (FOR THE FOLLOWING	DC 1 0 0 1 1 0	zuv i i i i i	O) OLKIN		TOO OWE	-	¢	5 000	nn COURT
(8.)	FOR THE FOLLOWING	REASONS:	ana i ii r (100 OWE	7	\$	5,000.	nn =
(8.)	FOR THE FOLLOWING	REASONS:								COSTS,
(8.) Th e	FOR THE FOLLOWING plaintiff and defendant e	REASONS:	ontract who	arain tha nia		ff and data advant				COSTS,
(8.) The	FOR THE FOLLOWING Plaintiff and defendant enterprise food	REASONS: entered into a co	ontract who	erein the pla	inti	ff and defendant	agreed ti	nat the p	laintiff v	COSTS,
(8.) The sta	FOR THE FOLLOWING plaintiff and defendant e rt-up costs for a pet food rting the company if the c	REASONS: entered into a co supplement co company never	ontract who mpany. Th	erein the pla ne defendant	inti	ff and defendant	agreed ti e the plai	nat the p	laintiff v	COSTS, would advance ssociated with
(8.) The star star De:	FOR THE FOLLOWING plaintiff and defendant e rt-up costs for a pet food rting the company if the c spite demand for repayme	REASONS: entered into a co supplement co company never in ent, the defenda	ontract who mpany. Th realized a point has refu	erein the pla ne defendant profit. The c	inti t ag	ff and defendant reed to reimburs pany seized oper	agreed ti e the plai	nat the p	laintiff v	COSTS, would advance ssociated with
(8.) The star star De:	FOR THE FOLLOWING plaintiff and defendant e rt-up costs for a pet food rting the company if the c spite demand for repayme	REASONS: entered into a co supplement co company never in ent, the defenda	ontract who mpany. Th realized a point has refu	erein the pla ne defendant profit. The c	inti t ag	ff and defendant reed to reimburs pany seized oper	agreed ti e the plai	nat the p	laintiff v	COSTS, would advance ssociated with
(8.) The star star De:	FOR THE FOLLOWING plaintiff and defendant e rt-up costs for a pet food rting the company if the c	REASONS: entered into a co supplement co company never in ent, the defenda	ontract who mpany. Th realized a point has refu	erein the pla ne defendant profit. The c	inti t ag	ff and defendant reed to reimburs pany seized oper	agreed ti e the plai	nat the p	laintiff v	COSTS, would advance ssociated with
(8.) The star star De:	FOR THE FOLLOWING plaintiff and defendant e rt-up costs for a pet food rting the company if the c spite demand for repayme	REASONS: entered into a co supplement co company never in ent, the defenda	ontract who mpany. Th realized a point has refu	erein the pla ne defendant profit. The c	inti t ag	ff and defendant reed to reimburs pany seized oper	agreed ti e the plai	nat the p	laintiff v	COSTS, would advance ssociated with
(8.) The star star De:	FOR THE FOLLOWING plaintiff and defendant e rt-up costs for a pet food rting the company if the c spite demand for repayme	REASONS: entered into a co supplement co company never in ent, the defenda	ontract who mpany. Th realized a point has refu	erein the pla ne defendant profit. The c	inti t ag	ff and defendant reed to reimburs pany seized oper	agreed ti e the plai	nat the p	laintiff v	COSTS, would advance ssociated with
(8.) The star star De:	FOR THE FOLLOWING plaintiff and defendant e rt-up costs for a pet food rting the company if the c spite demand for repayme	REASONS: entered into a co supplement co company never in ent, the defenda	ontract who mpany. Th realized a point has refu	erein the pla ne defendant profit. The c	inti t ag	ff and defendant reed to reimburs pany seized oper	agreed ti e the plai	nat the p	laintiff v	COSTS, would advance ssociated with
(8.) The sta sta De:	FOR THE FOLLOWING plaintiff and defendant ert-up costs for a pet food rting the company if the copite demand for repayment is in breach of the contribution.	REASONS: entered into a co- supplement co- supplemy never a ent, the defenda act. The defend	ontract who mpany. Th realized a p int has refu lant owes t	erein the pla ne defendant profit. The c used to repa the plaintiff S	ainti t ag com y th \$5,0	ff and defendant reed to reimburso pany seized oper e plaintiff the fun 900.00	agreed ti e the plai ration wit ids advar	nat the p intiff the hout eve iced for	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
(8.) The	FOR THE FOLLOWING plaintiff and defendant entrup costs for a pet food rung the company if the copies demand for repayment is in breach of the contractions and the contractions are supplied to the contractions of the contraction	REASONS: entered into a co- supplement co- supplement re- company never a ent, the defenda act. The defenda	ontract who mpany. Th realized a p int has refu lant owes t	erein the pla ne defendant profit. The c used to repa the plaintiff S	ainti t ag com y th \$5,0	ff and defendant reed to reimburso pany seized oper e plaintiff the fun 900.00	agreed ti e the plai ration wit ids advar	nat the p intiff the hout eve iced for	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
(8.) The sta sta Des	FOR THE FOLLOWING plaintiff and defendant ert-up costs for a pet food rting the company if the copite demand for repayment is in breach of the contribution and period being duly sw matter application, there is g	REASONS: entered into a co- supplement co- supplement re- company never a ent, the defenda act. The defenda	ontract who mpany. Th realized a p int has refu lant owes t	erein the pla ne defendant profit. The c used to repa the plaintiff S	ainti t ag com y th \$5,0	ff and defendant reed to reimburso pany seized oper e plaintiff the fun 900.00	agreed ti e the plai ration wit ids advar	nat the p intiff the hout eve iced for	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
(8.) The sta sta Des	FOR THE FOLLOWING plaintiff and defendant entrup costs for a pet food rung the company if the copies demand for repayment is in breach of the contractions and the contractions are supplied to the contractions of the contraction	REASONS: entered into a co- supplement co- supplement re- company never a ent, the defenda act. The defenda	ontract who mpany. Th realized a p int has refu lant owes t	erein the pia ne defendant profit. The c used to repay the plaintiff t the signer he	ainti t ag com y th \$5,0	ff and defendant reed to reimburse pany seized oper e plaintiff the fun 100.00	agreed ti e the plai ration wit ids advar	nat the p intiff the chout evenced for	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
(8.) The sta sta Des	FOR THE FOLLOWING plaintiff and defendant ert-up costs for a pet food rting the company if the copite demand for repayment is in breach of the contribution and period being duly sw matter application, there is g	REASONS: entered into a co- supplement co- supplement re- company never a ent, the defenda act. The defenda	ontract who mpany. Th realized a p int has refu lant owes t	erein the pia ne defendant profit. The c used to repay the plaintiff of the signer ha	ainti t ag com y th \$5,0	ff and defendant reed to reimburse pany seized oper to plaintiff the fundo.00	agreed ti e the plai ration wit ids advar	nat the p intiff the chout evenced for	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
(8.) The star star Des	FOR THE FOLLOWING plaintiff and defendant ert-up costs for a pet food rting the company if the copite demand for repayment is in breach of the contribution and pelief, there is greaten	REASONS: entered into a co- supplement co- company never ent, the defenda act. The defenda from, deposes an	ontract who mpany. The realized a point has refulant owes to ant owes to d says that support it.	erein the pia ne defendant profit. The c used to repay the plaintiff t the signer ha TYPE IN NAME John A. Bla	ainti t ag com y th \$5,0 as re	ff and defendant reed to reimburso pany seized oper le plaintiff the fun 100.00 ead the claim and,	agreed ti e the plai ration wit ids advar to the be	nat the p intiff the chout evenced for	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
(8.) The sta sta Des and	FOR THE FOLLOWING plaintiff and defendant ert-up costs for a pet food rting the company if the copite demand for repayment is in breach of the contribution and pelief, there is good to be supplied by the contribution and pelief, there is good to be supplied by the contribution and pelief, there is good to be supplied by the contribution and pelief, there is good to be supplied by the contribution and pelief, there is good to be supplied by the contribution and the contribution are contributed by the contribution and the contribution and the contribution and the contribution are contributed by the contribution and the contribution are contributed by the contribution and the contribution and the contribution are contributed by the contribution are contributed by the contribution and the contribution are contributed by the contribution are contributed by the contribution are contributed by the contributed b	REASONS: entered into a co- supplement co- company never ent, the defenda act. The defenda from, deposes an good ground to se	ontract who mpany. The realized a point has refulant owes to ant owes to d says that support it.	erein the pia ne defendant profit. The c used to repay the plaintiff t the signer ha TYPE IN NAME John A. Bla	ainti t ag com y th \$5,0 as re	ff and defendant reed to reimburso pany seized oper le plaintiff the fun 100.00 ead the claim and,	agreed ti e the plai ration wit ids advar to the be	nat the p intiff the chout evenced for	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
(8.) The sta sta Des and	FOR THE FOLLOWING plaintiff and defendant ert-up costs for a pet food rting the company if the copite demand for repayment is in breach of the contribution and pelief, there is good to be supplied by the contribution and pelief, there is good to be supplied by the contribution and pelief, there is good to be supplied by the contribution and pelief, there is good to be supplied by the contribution and pelief, there is good to be supplied by the contribution and the contribution are contributed by the contribution and the contribution and the contribution and the contribution are contributed by the contribution and the contribution are contributed by the contribution and the contribution and the contribution are contributed by the contribution are contributed by the contribution and the contribution are contributed by the contribution are contributed by the contribution are contributed by the contributed b	REASONS: entered into a co- supplement co- company never ent, the defenda act. The defenda from, deposes an good ground to se	ontract who mpany. The realized a point has refulant owes to ant owes to d says that support it.	erein the plane defendant profit. The cused to repain the plaintiff of the signer has been a signer has signer has signer of the signer has signer (signer).	ainti t ag com y th \$5,0 as re	ff and defendant reed to reimburse pany seized oper to plaintiff the fundo.00	agreed ti e the plai ration wit ids advar to the be	nat the p intiff the chout evenced for	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
(8.) The sta sta De: and	FOR THE FOLLOWING plaintiff and defendant ert-up costs for a pet food rting the company if the conting the company if the control spite demand for repayment is in breach of the control undersigned being duly swimation and pelief, there is control subscribed and sworn to e	REASONS: entered into a consupplement consupplement consumption of the defendance of the defendance. The defendance of t	ontract who mpany. The realized a point has refulant owes to ant owes to d says that support it.	erein the pia ne defendant profit. The c used to repay the plaintiff t the signer ha TYPE IN NAME John A. Bla	ainti t ag com y th \$5,0 as re	ff and defendant reed to reimburso pany seized oper le plaintiff the fun 100.00 ead the claim and,	agreed ti e the plai ration wit ids advar to the be	nat the p intiff the thout evenced for st of the	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
(8.) The sta sta De: and	FOR THE FOLLOWING plaintiff and defendant ert-up costs for a pet food rting the company if the copite demand for repayment is in breach of the contribution and pelief, there is good to be supplied by the contribution and pelief, there is good to be supplied by the contribution and pelief, there is good to be supplied by the contribution and pelief, there is good to be supplied by the contribution and pelief, there is good to be supplied by the contribution and the contribution are contributed by the contribution and the contribution and the contribution and the contribution are contributed by the contribution and the contribution are contributed by the contribution and the contribution and the contribution are contributed by the contribution are contributed by the contribution and the contribution are contributed by the contribution are contributed by the contribution are contributed by the contributed b	REASONS: entered into a consupplement consupplement consumption of the defendance of the defendance. The defendance of t	ontract who mpany. The realized a point has refulant owes to dant owes to d says that upport it.	erein the plane defendant profit. The cused to repart the plaintiff the signer has signer has signed (Clarke)	aintiit agcom t agcom y th \$5,0 as re	off and defendant reed to reimburson pany seized oper the plaintiff the fundant from the fundant from the claim and, attorney the common of Sup. Ct.	agreed ti e the plai ration wit ids advar to the be	nat the p intiff the thout evenced for st of the	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
(8.) The sta sta De: and (9.) \$ X (10) 04/2	FOR THE FOLLOWING plaintiff and defendant entrup costs for a pet food rung the company if the copite demand for repayment is in breach of the control of the	REASONS: entered into a consupplement consumpany never ent, the defendanct. The defendanct. The defendanct. The defendanct ent, deposes an approximate of the conference of th	ontract who mpany. The realized a point has refulant owes to design that the contract of the c	erein the plane defendant profit. The cused to repart the plaintiff of the signer has signed A. Blassigned (Clark)	aintirtirt agcom y the \$5,0 as real E ANI	off and defendant reed to reimburson pany seized oper the plaintiff the fundant from the fundant from the claim and, attorney the common of Sup. Ct.	agreed ti e the plai ration wit ids advar to the be	nat the p intiff the thout evenced for st of the	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
(8.) The sta sta De: and (9.) \$ X (10) 04/2	POR THE FOLLOWING Plaintiff and defendant of the plaintiff and defendant of the costs for a pet food rung the company if the costs for a pet food rung the company if the costs in breach of the contribution and pelief, there is good to be company to be contributed by the costs of the contributed by the costs of the	REASONS: entered into a consupplement consumpany never ent, the defendanct. The defendanct. The defendanct. The defendanct ent, deposes an end of ground to supplement ent entered ent	ontract who mpany. The realized a point has refulant owes to design that the many that	erein the plane defendant profit. The plantiff state plaintiff	aintitit ag com y the \$5,0 as re	off and defendant reed to reimbursi pany seized oper plaintiff the fundou.00.00 ead the claim end, D TITLE OF PERSONS attorney	agreed ti e the plai ration wit ids advar to the be	nat the p intiff the thout evenced for st of the	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
(8.) The sta sta De: and (9.) \$ X (10) tt tt	e plaintiff and defendant of the plaintiff and defendant of the costs for a pet food ring the company if the costing the company if the cost is in breach of the contribution and pelief, there is company to the contribution of	REASONS: entered into a consupplement consupplement consumption in the defendance. The defendance. The defendance. The defendance in the d	ontract who mpany. The realized a point has refulant owes to a says that support it. MILITA ervice of the other or not a says that support it.	erein the plane defendant profit. The plantiff state plaintiff	aintitit ag com y the \$5,0 as re	off and defendant reed to reimbursi pany seized oper plaintiff the fundou.00.00 ead the claim end, D TITLE OF PERSONS attorney	agreed ti e the plai ration wit ids advar to the be	nat the p intiff the thout evenced for st of the	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
(8.) The sta sta De: and (9.) \$ X (10) tt tt	e plaintiff and defendant of the plaintiff and defendant of the costs for a pet food ring the company if the costing the company if the cost is in breach of the contribution and pelief, there is company to the contribution of	REASONS: entered into a consupplement consupplement consumpany never and the defendance. The defendance. The defendance. The defendance are applied to select the consumpant of the consumpant o	ontract who mpany. The realized a point has refulant owes to a says that support it. MILITA ervice of the other or not a says that support it.	erein the plane defendant profit. The plantiff state plaintiff	aintitit ag com y the \$5,0 as re	off and defendant reed to reimbursi pany seized oper plaintiff the fundou.00.00 ead the claim end, D TITLE OF PERSONS attorney	agreed ti e the plai ration wit ids advar to the be	nat the p intiff the thout evenced for st of the	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
(8.) The sta sta De: and (9.) \$ X (10) tt tt a	POR THE FOLLOWING plaintiff and defendant entrup costs for a pet food ring the company if the copite demand for repayment is in breach of the control with the part of the control with the part of the control with the part of the winds and pelief, there is good to be undersigned deposes a mat the defendant is in the mat the undersigned is unable in the military or naval see in the military or naval see.	REASONS: entered into a consupplement consumpany never that, the defendence. The defendence in the de	mpany. The realized a point has refulant owes to design and the second s	erein the plane defendant profit. The cised to repair the plaintiff the signer has signed as Signed (Cised X) RY SERVICE United State to the defendant are defended.	aintitit tag com y th \$5,0 as re E ANII CE tes. dant	off and defendant reed to reimburson pany seized oper the plaintiff the fundant follows at the claim and, attorney the common of Sup. Ct.	agreed the plain ration with ids advantage of the best Signing A	nat the p intiff the thout evenced for st of the	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
(8.) The star star De: and (9.) \$ X (10) 04/2 tt date and (11.) tt date and (12.) \$ tt date and (13.) \$ tt	POR THE FOLLOWING Plaintiff and defendant of the plaintiff and defendant of the costs for a pet food rung the company if the costs for a pet food rung the company if the costs is in breach of the contribution and pelief, there is company to the personal knowledge of the persona	REASONS: entered into a consupplement consupplement consumpany never and the defendance. The defendance. The defendance. The defendance. The defendance are applied to determine which is in the military or is in the military on its interest on its interes	ontract who mpany. The realized a point has refulant owes to a says that a say	erein the plane defendant profit. The cised to repain the plaintiff of the signer has signed to the defendant the	aintitit tag community tag the stage of the	off and defendant reed to reimbursi pany seized oper plaintiff the fundance of the claim end, attorney by Comm. of Sup. Ct.	agreed the plain ration with ids advantage of the best Signing A	nat the p intiff the thout evenced for st of the	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
(8.) The star star De: and (9.) \$ X (10) 04/2 tt date and (11.) tt date and (12.) \$ tt date and (13.) \$ tt	POR THE FOLLOWING Plaintiff and defendant of the plaintiff and defendant of the costs for a pet food rung the company if the costs for a pet food rung the company if the costs is in breach of the contribution and pelief, there is company to the personal knowledge of the persona	REASONS: entered into a consupplement consupplement consumpany never and the defendance. The defendance. The defendance. The defendance. The defendance are applied to determine which is in the military or is in the military on its interest on its interes	ontract who mpany. The realized a point has refulant owes to a says that a say	erein the plane defendant profit. The cised to repain the plaintiff of the signer has signed to the defendant the	aintitit tag community tag the stage of the	off and defendant reed to reimbursi pany seized oper plaintiff the fundance plaintiff the fundance plaintiff the fundance plaintiff the fundance plaintiff the claim end, attorney the Comm. of Sup. Ct.	agreed the plain ration with ids advantage of the best Signing A	nat the p intiff the thout evenced for st of the	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
The standard The and T	plaintiff and defendant or t-up costs for a pet food ring the company if the copite demand for repayment is in breach of the control with the period being duly switch and period deposes a fact the defendant is in the mat the undersigned is unable in the military or naval senat no defendant in this action the personal knowledge ouch service)	REASONS: entered into a co- supplement co- company never ent, the defenda act. The defenda	mpany. The realized a point has refulant owes to a says that apport it. MILITA ervice of the whether or med States. Bury or navalled (state face)	erein the plane defendant profit. The cised to repaint the plaintiff the signer has signer has signed (Cised X) RY SERVICE United State to the defenders showing the defenders of the defenders showing the defenders showing the defenders showing the defenders showing the defendance of the defenders showing the defenders are defendered to the defenders are defendered to the defender of the defendered to	aintitit aggregation to the second se	off and defendant reed to reimbursi pany seized oper plaintiff the fundant of the fundant of the claim and, attorney become of Sup. Ct.	agreed the plain ration with ids advantage of the best	nat the p intiff the thout evenced for st of the	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
The standard The and The line (9.) S X (10) the line (1.) It to standard T	plaintiff and defendant ent-up costs for a pet food ring the company if the copite demand for repayment is in breach of the control is in breach of the undersigned deposes a mat the defendant is in the mat the undersigned is unable in the military or naval senat no defendant in this action the personal knowledge ouch service)	REASONS: entered into a co- supplement co- company never ent, the defenda act. The defenda	mpany. The realized a point has refulant owes to a says that apport it. MILITA ervice of the whether or med States. Bury or navalled (state face)	erein the plane defendant profit. The cised to repaint the plaintiff the signer has signer has signed (Cised X) RY SERVICE United State to the defenders showing the defenders of the defenders showing the defenders showing the defenders showing the defenders showing the defendance of the defenders showing the defenders are defendered to the defenders are defendered to the defender of the defendered to	aintitit aggregation to the second se	off and defendant reed to reimbursi pany seized oper plaintiff the fundant of the fundant of the claim and, attorney become of Sup. Ct.	agreed the plain ration with ids advantage of the best	nat the p intiff the thout evenced for st of the	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
The standard The and The line (9.) S X (10) the line (1.) It to standard T	POR THE FOLLOWING Plaintiff and defendant of the plaintiff and defendant of the costs for a pet food rung the company if the costs for a pet food rung the company if the costs is in breach of the contribution and pelief, there is company to the personal knowledge of the persona	REASONS: entered into a co- supplement co- company never ent, the defenda act. The defenda	mpany. The realized a point has refulant owes to a says that apport it. MILITA ervice of the whether or med States. Bury or navalled (state face)	erein the plane defendant profit. The cised to repaint the plaintiff the signer has signer has signed (Cised X) RY SERVICE United State to the defenders showing the defenders of the defenders showing the defenders showing the defenders showing the defenders showing the defendance of the defenders showing the defenders are defendered to the defenders are defendered to the defender of the defendered to	aintitit aggregation to the second se	off and defendant reed to reimbursi pany seized oper plaintiff the fundant of the fundant of the claim and, attorney become of Sup. Ct.	agreed the plain ration with ids advantage of the best	nat the p intiff the thout evenced for st of the	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
The standard The and The line (9.) S X (10) the line (11.) It to standard the line (11.) It to s	plaintiff and defendant ent-up costs for a pet food ring the company if the copite demand for repayment is in breach of the control is in breach of the undersigned deposes a mat the defendant is in the mat the undersigned is unable in the military or naval senat no defendant in this action the personal knowledge ouch service)	REASONS: entered into a co- supplement co- company never ent, the defenda act. The defenda	mpany. The realized a point has refulant owes to a says that apport it. MILITA ervice of the whether or med States. Bury or navalled (state face)	erein the plane defendant profit. The cised to repaint the plaintiff the signer has signer has signed (Cised X) RY SERVICE United State to the defenders showing the defenders of the defenders showing the defenders showing the defenders showing the defenders showing the defendance of the defenders showing the defenders are defendered to the defenders are defendered to the defender of the defendered to	aintitit aggregation to the second se	off and defendant reed to reimbursi pany seized oper plaintiff the fundant of the fundant of the claim and, attorney become of Sup. Ct.	agreed the plain ration with ids advantage of the best	nat the p intiff the thout evenced for st of the	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
The standard The and The line (9.) S X (10) the line (11.) It to standard the line (11.) It to s	plaintiff and defendant ent-up costs for a pet food ring the company if the copite demand for repayment is in breach of the control is in breach of the undersigned deposes a mat the defendant is in the mat the undersigned is unable in the military or naval senat no defendant in this action the personal knowledge ouch service)	REASONS: entered into a co- supplement co- company never ent, the defenda act. The defenda	mpany. The realized a point has refulant owes to a says that apport it. MILITA ervice of the whether or med States. Bury or navalled (state face)	erein the plane defendant profit. The cised to repaint the plaintiff the signer has signer has signed (Cised X) RY SERVICE United State to the defenders showing the defenders of the defenders showing the defenders showing the defenders showing the defenders showing the defendance of the defenders showing the defenders are defendered to the defenders are defendered to the defender of the defendered to	aintitit aggregation to the second se	off and defendant reed to reimbursi pany seized oper plaintiff the fundant of the fundant of the claim and, attorney become of Sup. Ct.	agreed the plain ration with ids advantage of the best	nat the p intiff the thout evenced for st of the	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
The standard The and T	plaintiff and defendant or t-up costs for a pet food rting the company if the company if the company if the company if the control is in breach of the personal throwledge of the personal knowledge of the personal	REASONS: entered into a co- supplement co- company never ent, the defenda act. The defenda	mpany. The realized a point has refulant owes to a says that apport it. MILITA ervice of the whether or med States. Bury or navalled (state face)	erein the plane defendant profit. The cused to repay the plaintiff of the signer has signer has signer has signer has signer cused by the defendant the defendant service of the showing owledge that	aintitit aggression ag	ff and defendant reed to reimbursing pany seized oper the plaintiff the fundation and the claim and, attorney to Comm. of Sup. Ct. AFFIDAVIT Ets) in this action and the claim is not in the currently the contract of the currently in the c	agreed the plain ration with ids advantage of the best	nat the p intiff the thout evenced for st of the	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
The standard The information (9.) S X (10) the analysis of the sign The sig	plaintiff and defendant ent-up costs for a pet food ring the company if the copite demand for repayment is in breach of the control is in breach of the undersigned deposes a mat the defendant is in the mat the undersigned is unable in the military or naval senat no defendant in this action the personal knowledge of uch service) plaintiff knows the defendant in this action the personal knowledge of uch service)	REASONS: entered into a consupplement consumpany never that, the defendanct. The defendanct. The defendanct. The defendanct. The defendanct. The defendanct are the consumption of the United on its in the military or in the undersigned dant and has possible to determine where the undersigned dant and has possible to determine where the undersigned dant and has possible to determine where the undersigned dant and has possible to determine where the undersigned dant and has possible to determine where the undersigned dant and has possible to determine the undersig	mpany. The realized a point has refulant owes to a says that apport it. MILITA ervice of the whether or med States. Bury or navalled (state face)	erein the plane defendant profit. The cused to repay the plaintiff of the signer has signer has signer has signer has signer cused by the defendant the defendant service of the showing owledge that	aintitit aggression ag	ff and defendant reed to reimbursing pany seized oper the plaintiff the fundation and the claim and, attorney to Comm. of Sup. Ct. AFFIDAVIT Ets) in this action and the claim is not in the currently the contract of the currently in the c	agreed the plain ration with ids advantage of the best	nat the p intiff the thout evenced for st of the	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
The standard The information (9.) S X (10) the analysis of the sign The sig	plaintiff and defendant ent-up costs for a pet food ring the company if the copite demand for repayment is in breach of the control is in breach of the undersigned deposes a mat the defendant is in the mat the undersigned is unable in the military or naval senat no defendant in this action the personal knowledge of uch service) plaintiff knows the defendant in this action the personal knowledge of uch service)	REASONS: entered into a consupplement consupplement consumption in the defendance. The defendance. The defendance. The defendance in the defendance in the consumption in the military or naval so the undersigned dant and has proposed in the second in the second in the in the military or naval so the undersigned dant and has proposed in the second in t	mpany. The realized a point has refulant owes for the proof of the pro	erein the plane defendant profit. The cised to repaint the plaintiff of the signer has signer has signed (Company). The signer has signed (Company) and the defendance of the defendance of the defendance of the company owledge that the defendance of the company of the defendance of	aintitit aggregation to the second se	ead the claim and, attorney common of Sup. Common of Sup. Ct. The plaintiff the fundament, attorney common of Sup. Ct. The plaintiff the fundament, attorney common of Sup. Ct. The plaintiff the fundament is not in the common of sup. Ct.	agreed the plain ration with ids advantage of the best	nat the p intiff the thout evenced for st of the	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
(8.) The star star De: and (9.) S X (10) O 4/2 Ith a the sign. The the Sign.	plaintiff and defendant or t-up costs for a pet food rting the company if the company if the company if the company if the control is in breach of the personal throwledge of the personal knowledge of the personal	REASONS: entered into a consupplement consupplement consumption in the defendance. The defendance. The defendance. The defendance in the defendance in the consumption in the military or naval so the undersigned dant and has proposed in the second in the second in the in the military or naval so the undersigned dant and has proposed in the second in t	mpany. The realized a point has refulant owes to disays that apport it. MILITA ervice of the whether or need States. But or naval distate factors of the control of the co	erein the plane defendant profit. The cised to repaint the plaintiff of the signer has signer has signed (Company). The signer has signed (Company) and the defendance of the defendance of the defendance of the company owledge that the defendance of the company of the defendance of	aintitit aggregation to the second se	ff and defendant reed to reimbursing pany seized oper the plaintiff the fundation and the claim and, attorney to Comm. of Sup. Ct. AFFIDAVIT Ets) in this action and the claim is not in the currently the contract of the currently in the c	agreed the plain ration with ids advantage of the best	nat the p intiff the thout evenced for st of the	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company
(8.) The star and The and (9.) S X (10) the star and the	plaintiff and defendant or t-up costs for a pet food rting the company if the company if the cospite demand for repayment is in breach of the control is in breach of the undersigned deposes a mat the defendant is in the mat the undersigned is unable in the military or naval senat no defendant in this action the personal knowledge of uch service) plaintiff knows the defendant in the control is in the military ATURE AND TITLE X CRIBED AND SWORN TO BE FOR	REASONS: entered into a consupplement consupplement consumpany never and the defendance. The defendance. The defendance. The defendance. The defendance are also of ground to supplement and says: military or naval sale to determine where of the United on is in the military or in the undersigned dant and has possible to the undersigned dant and the undersigned dant and the undersigned dant and the undersigned dant dant dant dant dant dant dant dan	mpany. The realized a point has refulant owes for the proof of the pro	erein the plane defendant profit. The cised to repaint the plaintiff of the signer has signer has signed (Company). The signer has signed (Company) and the defendance of the defendance of the defendance of the company owledge that the defendance of the company of the defendance of	aintitit aggregation to the second se	ead the claim and, attorney common of Sup. Common of Sup. Ct. The plaintiff the fundament, attorney common of Sup. Ct. The plaintiff the fundament, attorney common of Sup. Ct. The plaintiff the fundament is not in the common of sup. Ct.	agreed the plain ration with ids advantage of the best	nat the p intiff the thout evenced for st of the	laintiff v costs a r realizi starting	COSTS, would advance ssociated with ing profit. the company