

**Subject:** Re: Message from Meridian Discovery Website  
**From:** Rik Munson <blowintough@att.net>  
**Date:** 8/19/2020, 8:46 PM  
**To:** Arman Gungor <agungor@meridiandiscovery.com>  
**CC:** Bobbie Bayless <bayless@baylessstokes.com>

Thank you Arman, I understand that.

Adobe PDF's are built of container objects in a tree structure.

The signatures are real but the documents do not appear to be wet signed and I've seen too many version. They do have their own meta data as in strange "creation" vs. "modified" dates due to copying across multiple computers, file systems, external drives etc. I looked at them with pdfanopener but I'm a network engineer not a coder or portable document developer so I don't own the necessary programs and the spec is only a about 1000-1200 pages. I pretty much know what I'm looking at but wanted verification on some of the specifics nuance.

Here's what I will do. I'll dig the original disclosure CD's out of the safe and maybe we can discuss them over zoom.

Is there one program you prefer over another Like Exiftool over mpeepdf for functionality?

On 8/17/2020 10:29 AM, Arman Gungor wrote:

Hi Rik,

Thanks for the additional information. We do not have a conflict of interest based on the information you have provided.

I noticed you mentioned that the documents were “[...] *digitally stamped and then printed and re-scanned to pdf*”.

If this is in fact the case, printing to paper and re-scanning to PDF would cause the resultant PDFs to be lacking the metadata of the original documents. So, while they might have their own metadata that pertains to the scanning operation, the original objects such as the inserted digital images of signatures would have been flattened. In that case, I would recommend working with a forensic document examiner (i.e., someone that specializes in the appearance of documents, handwriting, signatures, etc.) rather than a digital forensic examiner who examines electronic documents and their metadata.

Having said that, if you still believe that we can add value, we would be happy to help.

**Arman Gungor**  
Director of Forensics

**Meridian Discovery**  
Direct 213.908.1007  
[www.meridiandiscovery.com](http://www.meridiandiscovery.com)

---

**From:** Rik Munson <[blowintough@att.net](mailto:blowintough@att.net)>  
**Sent:** Friday, August 14, 2020 6:35 PM  
**To:** Arman Gungor <[agungor@meridiandiscovery.com](mailto:agungor@meridiandiscovery.com)>  
**Cc:** Bobbie Bayless <[bayless@baylessstokes.com](mailto:bayless@baylessstokes.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: Message from Meridian Discovery Website

Absolutely Arman,

We are looking at digital forgery, wiretapping, conversion, extortion... lots of fun stuff. The defendants want to pass off digital images of signatures as if they were photo copies of wet signed originals but I already asked Adobe so I'm know I'm looking at documents digitally stamped and then printed and re-scanned to pdf.

Everyone is in Texas except my partner. We are in Napa, CA.

I know enough to prove I don't know enough and so I am copying two of the attorneys on this communication. They need to understand the nuances in the data types and it would be better to cut out the middle man.

On Aug 10, 2020, at 1:03 PM, Bobbie Bayless <[bayless@baylessstokes.com](mailto:bayless@baylessstokes.com)> wrote:

???

What I have are things we scanned from copies provided either in discovery or otherwise. ??I am going to send these in different emails so we can keep them straight. ??If you are able to analyze these in the same way, please let me know. ??I wasn't able to open the video Rik sent in his email this weekend, but I could open the one you sent last week to everyone. ??I also noticed there was some highlighting on some of the documents he sent that, but most of the document was not highlighted, so I am assuming that the highlighting was from something else and not this exercise of recognizing the text of the original document.

There are other things I have questions about. ??Like, it doesn't make any sense to me that Candace Freed's signature was not an image, but her notary stamp was. ??But first things first. ??Let's see if what I send??you can analyzed. ??In this first email, I am sending the scan of the copy of what appeared to be??original documents reviewed by me and my forensic document expert at Cory Reed's office. ??There were other documents there, but I am sending the 8/25/10 QBD, Nelva's resignation, and Nelva's appointment of Anita.

On 8/14/2020 4:21 PM, Arman Gungor wrote:

Hi Rik,

Thanks for getting in touch. We would be happy to help. If this in connection with a legal action, could you please provide the basic case details, parties' names, etc. so we can check for conflicts?

Arman Gungor  
Director of Forensics  
Meridian Discovery

---

**From:** [info@meridiandiscovery.com](mailto:info@meridiandiscovery.com) <[info@meridiandiscovery.com](mailto:info@meridiandiscovery.com)> on behalf of Meridian Discovery

[<info@meridiandiscovery.com>](mailto:info@meridiandiscovery.com)

**Sent:** Friday, August 14, 2020 4:11:32 PM

**To:** Arman Gungor [<agungor@meridiandiscovery.com>](mailto:agungor@meridiandiscovery.com)

**Subject:** Message from Meridian Discovery Website  
??

From: Rik Munson

Email: [blowintough@att.net](mailto:blowintough@att.net)

Phone Number: +9253498348

Remote IP: 107.215.7.54

User Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 6.1; Win64; x64; rv:79.0) Gecko/20100101  
Firefox/79.0

Message Body:

I have digitally altered documents that need analysis.

--

Sent from meridiandiscovery.com