

How Google Maliciously and Covertly Uses It's Technology To Attack It's Political Enemies and Business Competitors

By Brian Kosker and Aileen Solen

We have been shown absolute proof that Google executives and venture capitalists manipulate Google's technology to intentionally destroy lives, reputations, companies, political careers and brands. Google uses this same process to manipulate stock market results, at the same time, for the private benefit of those same Google executives and venture capitalists in violation of the intended community benefit of the public operation of the stock market.

As the Presidential elections approach, Google, Twitter, LinkedIn and Facebook have come under scrutiny because they are run by the same campaign financiers supporting the same candidates who have promised them billions of dollars of government contracts and hand-outs. While the "Silicon Four" are, now, forced to daily proclaim that they are not rigging the elections and the markets, the evidence proves otherwise. Google has now made a ludicrous number of statements charging that naive young millennial staffers went "rogue" and "leaned" the global Google system towards Obama and Hillary but few are buying that claim. Much of the staffing for Obama and Hillary came from Google, most of the money for their campaigns came from Google and a record number of government perks came FROM the Obama White House and the Hillary State Department TO Google. The Quid-Pro-Quo is audaciously overt.

Google, owns billions of dollars of lithium ion battery technology. The existence of Elon Musk is staked on lithium ion battery technology. Elon Musk sleeps at the house of Larry Page, and is best friends with Larry Page. Both Larry Page and Elon Musk spend tens of millions of dollars co-promoting each others glory. Larry Page and his staff overtly, and

covertly, own a large portion of both Larry Page's Google and Elon Musk's Tesla. When lithium ion batteries blow up, as they do every day in Tesla cars, Cell phones, passenger jets, etc. Google hides these news stories on the world's internet in order to protect the stock market positions of Google and Tesla. Google's driverless cars use lithium ion. Musk and Google hate fuel cells, ultra capacitors, and all of the technologies that are safer, cleaner, better solutions than lithium ion. Over a ten year study, it has been proven, with internet archival statistics, that Google hides news stories about technologies that compete with Musk's and Google's lithium ion. Musk and Google arranged for a vast set of news articles and "white papers" to be delivered to Washington DC, and major cities, proclaiming that "*Afghanistan is the Saudi Arabia of Lithium*" and that "*Trillions of dollars of lithium*" can be taken out of Afghanistan for Tesla Motors. You can still find many of these news stories on-line on non-Google search engines. These stories were a marketing pitch by Google and Musk venture capitalists to "sell" Congress on underwriting a deeper invasion of Afghanistan in order to seize control of mining fields (Think: "*Frank Guistra*") that those Silicon Valley VC's had already monopolized the profiteering routes for. Essentially, the green crunchy-granola VC's sold the "green-washing" of a war in which people were killed and another nation was razed so that they could monopolize some batteries. Google went to great lengths to make certain that news coverage of this fact never saw the light of day on the internet.

They did this news and investigation cover-up by rigging the internet.

Google made settings, by hand, on purpose, to hide things it did not want people to see and to puff up the marketing hype of Elon Musk and the Google/Musk battery deal.

Google and the Musk Cartel paid money and billions of dollars of search engine rigging (never reported in campaign disclosure reports making that oversight a "Felony") to a President and a State Department head and then received a war, a commodity monopoly and a vast number of government contracts, tax evasions, stock market perks and other quid-pro-quo.

In 2007 the Google/Musk Cartel were working to put their friend: Steven Chu, in charge of the U.S. Department of Energy, get Obama elected and accelerate the Afghan war in order to control the Afghan lithium mining deals for Musk and the Afghan indium mining deals for Solyndra, Musk's next door neighbor, later raided by the FBI. Indeed, that is what eventually happened.

Their planted insider: Steven Chu, handed out the taxpayer cash exclusively to the Google/Musk Cartel while jacking up and sabotaging their competitors. He even gave cash to the Russian oligarchs who had the mining company ownerships for the Afghan mining deals (ie: Ener1, Severstal, etc. connections). A ten year+ study using the Internet Archive along with a huge number of server nodes around the world shows, for a fact, that 1.) when a Tesla car blew up, or killed someone, 2.) only Google would hide the story while, at the same time 3.) replacing the post about the incident with a Motley Fool, Value Walk, or other stock market hype, article designed to pump Tesla's stock, while, 4.) at the same moment Google investors would engage in buybacks of Tesla stock to 5.) falsify a valuation jump on the stock market tickers.

A recently filed lawsuit against Google, adds more details.

One part of the publicly filed lawsuit reveals:

"...These funds, were ear-marked to be used by Defendants (ed. Note: Google is the "Defendant" in this case) in a scheme designed for mining and exploiting non-domestic energy resources, (which eventually created a threat to U.S. domestic security by destabilizing other nations) via investment bank stock market mining commodities manipulations Defendants had arranged with their investment bankers, including Goldman Sachs. Until 2016, Plaintiffs were not aware that Defendants had placed their friends, employees and business associates in charge of the public agencies responsible for distributing these taxpayer funds. Indeed, the facts on public record and in breaking investigations and investigative journalism reports now prove that Defendants bought public policy influence with cash and internet services, much of that influence buying now found to have not been legally reported. The Defendants had their agents in California State and U.S. Federal offices distribute those funds to themselves while cutting out and sabotaging most all competing applicants. The Defendants, own a managing interest and control the source of these foreign mining resources and the supply chain for them.^{1 2}

18. In or about September 20, 2009, the Plaintiffs, were contacted by the Government Accountability Office of the United States with a request that they

¹ This control has been established by the Defendants, Google and Alphabet, through a series of series of sophisticated and complex relationships with electric vehicle companies including VVC, Tesla Motors, Driverless Car Project and other of the Plaintiffs's competitors as well as the numerous main-stream investigative journalism articles attached as Exhibits which provide proof that Defendants paid public officials billions of dollars of unreported cash and search services in exchange for market monopolies which harmed Plaintiff, among others.

participate in an investigation being conducted by that entity into the business practices of the Defendants, and their associates, pursuant to anti-trust allegations and allegations of corruption.

19. *In or about January 15, 2010, the Plaintiffs, did, in fact, provide live testimony to, and receive information from, the Government Accountability Office of the United States, the Department of Justice, Robert Gibbs (who immediately thereafter quit his job at The White House) and their staff at the White House Press Office, the Washington Post White House Correspondent and other investigators.*³

20.. *The testimony provided by the Plaintiffs, was, in fact, truthful and did, in fact, tend to support the veracity of the anti-trust allegations under investigation by the Government Accountability Office and other federal and EU agencies.*

21. *In or about June, 2010 and January, 2015 the Defendants, Alphabet and Google, exchanged funds with tabloid publications. As a result, those tabloid publications coincidentally published the only two articles and the only custom animated attack film including false, defamatory, misleading and manufactured information belittling the Plaintiffs, attacking them and discrediting their reputation as an inventor, project developer and project director.*⁴

22. *In or about January 20, 2011, the Plaintiffs, contacted Defendants, with written requests that it delete the false, defamatory, misleading and manufactured information belittling the Plaintiffs, attacking them and discrediting their reputation as an inventor, project developer and project director from its search engine servers.*

23. *The Plaintiffs had numerous lawyers, specialists and others contacted Google requesting a cessation of Google's harassment and internet*

² These are two of the numerous interceptions of public funding by the Defendants, Google and Alphabet, of funds originally allocated to the Plaintiffs. As with the other interceptions, the Plaintiffs subsequently suffered media and revenue attacks authored by and originating with the Defendants, Google and Alphabet, Inc. in a manner intended to ensure that the Plaintiffs enjoyed no public or governmental sympathy or remaining alternative for relief.

³ The Plaintiffs has also provided multiple written and verbal reports to the FBI, via Mr. James Comey and his staff at the Washington office, and Mr. David Johnson of the San Francisco office. The FBI investigation of the related matters is described as "on-going."

⁴ Defendants is known to have provided tens of millions of dollars to this tabloid chain per Defendants financial staff, SEC filings and disclosures in other legal cases.

manipulation and removal of the rigged attack links and hidden internet codes within the links on Google's server architecture.

24. *At all times pertinent, the Plaintiffs, including Google staff members, Matt Cutts, Forest Timothy Hayes, Google legal staff and others refused to assist and commonly replied: "...just sue us..", "...get a subpoena...", etc., even though the Plaintiffs, and the Plaintiff's representatives, provided the Defendants with extensive volumes of third-party proof clearly demonstrating that not a single statement in the attack links promoted by google was accurate or even remotely true.*

25. *In, or about, February 20, 2011, YouTube, published a custom produced and targeted attack video that also included false, defamatory, misleading and manufactured information belittling the Plaintiffs, and discrediting their reputation as an inventor, project developer and project director. The video is believed to have been produced by Defendants as part of their anti-trust attack program against Plaintiffs.*

26. *In or about February 25, 2011 the Plaintiffs contacted the Defendants, YouTube and Google, with many written requests that they delete the false, defamatory, misleading and manufactured information belittling the Plaintiffs, attacking them and discrediting their reputation as an inventor, project developer and project director from its website. [See, Sample responses of the Defendants Google and YouTube, attached as Exhibits and incorporated herein by reference.]*

27. *All of the written demands of the Plaintiffs were to no avail and none of the Defendants, agreed to edit, delete, retract or modify any of the false, defamatory, misleading and manufactured information belittling the Plaintiffs, attacking them and discrediting their reputation as an inventor, product developer and project director from their websites and digital internet and media platforms and architecture.*

28. *The Plaintiffs, whose multiple businesses ventures had already suffered significant damage as the result of the online attacks of the Defendants, contacted renowned experts, and especially Search Engine Optimization and forensic internet technology (IT) experts, to clear and clean the internet of the false, defamatory, misleading and manufactured information belittling the Plaintiffs, attacking them and discrediting their reputation as an inventor, product developer and project director from their websites.*

39. *None of the technology experts hired by the Plaintiffs, at substantial expense, were successful in their attempts to clear, manage or even modify the false, defamatory, misleading and manufactured information belittling the Plaintiffs, attacking him and discrediting their reputation as an inventor, product developer and project director which only Google, the controlling entity of the internet, refused to remove. In fact, those experts were able to even more deeply confirm, via technical forensic internet*

analysis and criminology technology examination techniques that Google was rigging internet search results for its own purposes and anti-trust goals.

30. All efforts, including efforts to suppress or de-rank the results of a name search for “Plaintiffs” failed, and even though tests on other brands and names, for other unrelated parties did achieve balance, the SEO and IT tests clearly proved that Google was consciously, manually, maliciously and intentionally rigging its search engine and adjacent results in order to “mood manipulate” an attack on Plaintiffs.

31. In fact, the experts and all of them, instead, informed the Plaintiffs, that, not only had Google locked the false, defamatory, misleading and manufactured information belittling the Plaintiffs, attacking them and discrediting their reputation as an inventor, project developer and project director into its search engine so that the information could never be cleared, managed or even modified, Google had assigned the false, defamatory, misleading and manufactured information belittling the Plaintiffs, attacking them and discrediting their reputation as an inventor, project developer and project director “PR8” algorithmic internet search engine coding embedded in the internet information-set programmed into Google's internet architecture. [See, Information received from one of over 30 IT, forensic network investigators and forensic SEO test analysts, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto in the Exhibits.] Plaintiffs even went to the effort of placing nearly a thousand forensic test servers around the globe in order to monitor and metricize the manipulations of search results of examples of the Plaintiffs name in comparison to the manipulations for PR hype for Defendants financial partners, for example: the occurrence of the phrase ”Elon Musk”, Defendants business partner and beneficiary, over a five year period. The EU, China, Russia, and numerous research groups (ie: <http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2015/08/how-google-could-rig-the-2016-election-121548> By Robert Epstein) have validated these forensic studies of Google’s architect-ed character assassination and partner hype system .

32. The “PR8” codes are hidden codes within the Google software and internet architecture which profess to state that a link is a “fact” or is an authoritative factual document in Google's opinion. By placing “PR8” codes in the defamatory links that Google was manipulating about plaintiffs, Google was seeking to tell the world that the links pointed to “Facts” and not “Opinions”. Google embedded many covert codes in their architecture which marketing the material in the attack links and video as “facts” according to Google.

33. The “PR8” codes are a set of codes assigned and programmed into the internet, by the Google to matters it designates as dependable and true, thereby

attributing primary status as the most significant and important link to be viewed by online researchers regarding the subject of their search.⁵ Google was fully aware that all of the information in the attack articles against Plaintiffs was false, Google promoted these attacks as vindictive vendetta-like retribution against Plaintiffs.

34. *At all times pertinent from January 1, 2006, to in or about November 20, 2015, Google maintained it had no subjective control or input into the rankings of links obtained by online researchers as the result of a search on its search engines and that its search engine algorithms and the functions of its media assets were entirely “arbitrary” according to the owners and founders of Google.*

35. *In or about April 15, 2015, The European Union Commission took direct aim at Google Inc., charging the Internet-search giant with skewing and rigging search engine results in order to damage those who competed with Google's business and ideological interests.*

36. *In those proceedings, although Google continued to maintain that it has no subjective control or input into the rankings of links obtained by online researchers as the result of a search on its search engines and that its staff had no ability to reset, target, mood manipulate, arrange adjacent text or links, up-rank, down-rank or otherwise engage in human input which would change algorithm, search results, perceptions or subliminal perspectives of consumers, voters, or any other class of users of the world wide web, also known as The Internet, the court, in accord with evidence submitted, determined that Google, does in fact have and does in fact exercise, subjective control over the results of information revealed by searches on its search engine.⁶*

⁵ Google has a variety of such hidden codes and has various internal names for such codes besides, and in addition to, “PR8”. Google has been proven to use these fact vs. fiction rankings to affect elections, competitors rankings, ie: removing the company: NEXTAG from competing with Google on-line; or removing political candidates from superior internet exposure and it is believed by investigators and journalists, that Defendants are being protected from criminal prosecution by public officials who Defendants have compensated with un-reported campaign funding.

⁶ The EU case, and subsequent other cases, have demonstrated that Google sells such manipulations to large clients in order to target their enemies or competitors or raise those clients subliminal public impressions against competitors or competing political candidates. In fact, scientific study has shown that although Google claims to “update its search engine results and rankings, sometimes many times a day”, the attack links and codes against Plaintiffs have not moved from the top lines of the front page of Google for over FIVE YEARS. If Google were telling the truth, the links would have, at least, moved around a bit or disappeared entirely since hundreds of positive news about Plaintiffs was on every other search engine EXCEPT Google. Many other lawsuits have now shown that Google locks attacks against its enemies

37. As a result of receiving this information, the Plaintiffs became convinced of the strength and veracity of their original opinion that the Defendants, had, in fact posted the false, defamatory, misleading and manufactured information belittling the Plaintiffs, attacking them and discrediting Plaintiffs reputation as inventor, project developer and project designer had been intentionally designed, published, orchestrated and posted by them in retaliation to the true testimony provided by the Plaintiffs, to the Government Office of Accountability of the United States in May of 2005, and to the Securities and Exchange Commission, The Federal Bureau of Investigation, The United States Senate Ethics Committee and other investigating parties, and had been disseminated maliciously and intentionally by them in an effort to do damage to their reputation and to their business prospects and to cause him severe and irremediable emotional distress.

38. In fact, the Plaintiffs, has suffered significant and irremediable damage to their reputation and to their financial and business interests. As a natural result of this damage, as intended by the Defendants, Gawker, Google and Youtube, the Plaintiffs has also suffered severe and irremediable emotional distress.

⁷ 39. To this day, despite the age of the false, defamatory, misleading and manufactured information belittling the Plaintiffs, attacking him and discrediting their reputation as an inventor, project developer and project director, in the event any online researcher searches for information regarding the Plaintiffs, the same information appears at the top of any list of resulting links.

40. In addition, due to their control of all major internet database interfaces, Defendants have helped to load negative information about Plaintiffs on every major HR and employment database that Plaintiffs might be searched on, thus denying Plaintiffs all reasonable rights to income around the globe by linking every internal job, hiring, recruiter, employment, consulting, contracting or other revenue engagement opportunity for Plaintiffs back to false “red flag” or negative false background data which is designed

and competitors in devastating locations on the Internet. The entire nations of China, Russia, Spain and many more, along with the European Union have confirmed the existence and operation of Google's “attack machine”.

⁷ As a party, attacked in a similar “hit job” media attack describes it: “Gawker sets up the ball and Google kicks it down the field...over and over, until the end of time”. The recent Hulk Hogan, and other lawsuits, against Gawker Media has clearly demonstrated that Google and Gawker run “hit jobs” against adversaries of themselves and their clients.

to prevent Plaintiffs from future income in retribution for Plaintiffs assistance to federal investigators.⁸

41. It should be noted here that, in 2016, one of the companies Plaintiffs was associated with, in cooperation with federal investigations, won a federal anti-corruption lawsuit against the U.S. Department of Energy in which a number of major public officials were forced to resign under corruption charges, federal laws and new legal precedents benefiting the public were created, and Google and its associates and related entities found culpable of corruption....”

The filing goes on to say:

“... favor of the Plaintiffs and COMPANY B and applying the information they pirated from the Plaintiffs, for their own benefit as well as terminating the Plaintiff's competing efforts, which third party industry analysts felt could obsolete Defendants products via superior technology.

46. Individuals approached Plaintiffs offering to “help” the Plaintiffs get their ventures funded or managed. Those individuals were later found to have been working for Kleiner Perkin's, the founding investor and current share-holder of Google. The Plaintiffs discovered that those “helpful” individuals were helping to sabotage development efforts and pass intelligence to Google for its own use and applications.

47. Accordingly, Google was successful in its efforts and, in or about August of 2009, the grant and other funding programs in favor of the Plaintiffs, was summarily canceled and re-directed to Defendants and their holdings.

48. Commencing in or about 2008, Google commenced to take credit for advancement in its own energy storage and internet media technology, as based on the information it had pirated from the Plaintiffs.

⁸ Major public figures and organizations, including the entire European Union, have also accused Defendants of similar internet manipulation by Defendants. The attacks, by Defendants, continue to this day. In 2016, the renowned Netflix series: “House of Cards” opened its sixth season with a carefully held script-surprise researched by the script factuality investigators for the production company of “House of Cards.” The surprise featured Google, fictionally named “PollyHop,” and described, in detail, each of the tactics that Google uses to attack individuals that Google's owners have competitive issues with. The Plaintiffs maintains that each and every tactic included in the televised example were tactics actually used to attack the Plaintiffs, his intellectual properties, his peers and his associates as threatening competitors.

49. *The interference of Google, with the relationship of the Plaintiffs, was intentional, continues to today, and constitutes an unfair business practice in violation of Business and Professions code section 17200.*

50. *As a proximate result of the conduct of the Defendants, GOOGLE and severance and termination of the grant to the Plaintiffs, the Plaintiffs have suffered damages including financial damage, damage to their reputation and loss of critical intellectual property.*

51. *The aforementioned acts of the Defendants, were willful, fraudulent, oppressive and malicious. The Plaintiffs is therefore entitled to punitive damages.*

Google attacks. These postings were intended by Google to prevent the Plaintiffs, not only from working for himself, but also from working for other, noteworthy individuals of good repute.

61. *Additionally, Google representatives sent a copy of the Gawker attack article to an employer of the Plaintiffs via their human resources office and asked this employer, “You don't want him working for you with this kind of article out there, do you?” This resulted in the Plaintiff's immediate termination because of that article. Plaintiff has recovered documents between Defendants showing the preplanned and premeditated deployment of this attack. As documented in one of the Hulk Hogan cases against Defendants associates: “As evidence, the lawsuit points to a Gawker article by its founder, Nick Denton, that predicted Mr. Bollea’s “real secret” would be revealed — it was posted soon before The Enquirer report — and a 14-minute gap between the publication of the article and a Gawker editor, Albert J. Daulerio, tweeting about it. “Based upon the timing and content of Daulerio’s tweet, Daulerio was aware, in advance, of The Enquirer’s plans to publish the court-protected confidential transcript,” the lawsuit argues...” Plaintiffs in this case also have the same form of evidence from the same parties.*

62. *As a proximate result of the conduct of the Defendants, the Plaintiffs and COMPANY B have suffered severe financial damage and, accordingly, loss of their good will and reputation.*

63. *Plaintiffs are informed by investigators and Defendants' own former staff that Google planned an effort to “take him down” in retribution for effectively competing with Google and for co-operating with law enforcement and regulatory investigations of Defendants.*

64. *The aforementioned acts of the Defendants were willful, fraudulent, oppressive and malicious. The Plaintiffs is therefore entitled to punitive damages...”*

Google's attacks are shown to be harsh and aggressive:

"... in the guise of publishing opinion, the Defendants Google intended to harass the Plaintiffs and did in fact harass the Plaintiffs.

67. *By refusing to remove the offending publication and, in fact, assigning it a value associated with "truth", "factuality" and a position in its web browser that came up and still comes up the first and most prominent link pursuant to any search for the Plaintiffs and maintaining this link for the past 5 years as globally marketed, public, published, permanent, un-editable and unmovable, Google intended, and continues to intend to harass the Plaintiffs.*

68. *By doing the things described in paragraphs 67 and 68 above, Google, did and does continue to intend to cause the Plaintiffs substantial emotional distress.*

69. *The Plaintiffs, commencing in or about their discovery of the post and the link, has experienced and continues to experience substantial emotional distress.*

70. *Google engaged in the pattern of conduct described above with the intent to place the Plaintiffs in reasonable fear for their safety or in reckless disregard for the safety of the Plaintiffs.*

71. *The Plaintiffs admit here that Plaintiffs knew of a number of Bay Area technologists including Gary D. Conley, Rajeev Motwani who also had strange run-ins with Defendants and who subsequently suffered strange terminations per investigators and media who continue, at the request of the families and friends of those individuals, and others, to examine those cases. This has caused concern and stress for Plaintiffs. While Defendants did not necessarily have the intent to do physical harm to the Plaintiffs, by arranging for publication of the subject article, ensuring the subject article could not be moved or altered and would be certain to appear first and permanently as the result of any search for the Plaintiffs, intended to do significant damage to Plaintiff's financial interests in retaliation for their testimony at the proceedings described above and also intended to ensure the Plaintiffs would have no future as a competitor in the industry of technology populated by the Plaintiffs and by the Defendants.*

72. *Defendants chose to cheat rather than compete and decided, as a whole to plan, operate and deploy "hit jobs", defamation attacks, media hatchet jobs, character assassinations, venture capitol black-lists, technology hiring no-poaching*

blacklists, public officials influence buying and other illicit tactics against Plaintiffs, public officials, journalists, ex-employees, political candidates and others, as retribution, vengeance and vendetta tactics.

73. *The results of any search for the Plaintiffs on Google's search engine are attached hereto in the Exhibits and incorporated herein by reference. These same results have remained consistently in place and unmovable and un-editable since April 3, 2011.*

74. *In 2011, and through 2015, the Plaintiffs did contact Google with written requests to remove the offending content. [See, Correspondence, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibits and incorporated herein by reference.] In response, Google consistently stated it has no control over the results of any search on its search engine or the operation of its technology or its algorithm and, accordingly, refused to remove the results or cease the harassment.*

75. *Google continues to refuse to allow any member of the public to search for the Plaintiffs, without locating results that falsely identify the Plaintiffs in a negative and damaging narrative contrived for the sole intended purpose of Plaintiff's financial and social destruction.*

76. *As so aptly stated by Hulk Hogan's lawyers in their own suit against associates of the Defendants: The Defendants "chose to play God."*

Google is found to have lied about their ability to control search results:

".....the Defendant GOOGLE stated that has no control over the results of any search on its search engine and no control over the results of its algorithms, refused to and continues to refuse to allow any member of the public to search for the Plaintiffs, without publishing results that falsely identify the Plaintiffs as a scam artist.

79. *The Defendant made this statement with the intent to induce the Plaintiffs INDIVIDUAL A to rely on it.*

80. *The Plaintiffs continued to rely on the statement and to believe that the Defendant GOOGLE has not power or authority to manipulate the results of searches conducted on its search engine until in or about mid 2015 when it became clear as the result of the litigation commenced in Europe by The European Commission, that GOOGLE does in fact have such ability and does, in fact, exercise this ability regularly to manipulate and manage any of the results of any search on its engine.*

81. On or about early 2011, defendants made the following representation(s) to the Plaintiffs: They stated that Google had no control over the public experience of its products, page ranking and link presentation and that all results were arbitrary and a matter of luck.

82. The representations made by the defendant were in fact false. The true facts are that Google owners and executives can freely, consciously and manually rig, manipulate, modify, mood emphasize, re-rank, hide, adjust psychological adjacency perceptions of above-and-below text, delete or otherwise affect the local, regional, national and global perceptions of the public overall, or any market segment, or demographic, at will, in precise, controlled and monitored manipulations and that Google has even sold these manipulations-as-a-service to private clients.

83. When the defendant made these representations, he/she/it knew them to be false and made these representations with the intention to deceive and defraud the Plaintiffs and to induce the Plaintiffs to act in reliance on these representations in the manner hereafter alleged, or with the expectation that the Plaintiffs would so act.

84. The Plaintiffs, at the time these representations were made by the defendant and at the time the Plaintiffs took the actions herein alleged, was ignorant of the falsity of the defendant's representations and believed them to be true. In reliance on these representations, the Plaintiffs was induced to and did delay their attempts to have Google cease their abuse of Plaintiffs by technical means. Had the Plaintiffs known the actual facts, he/she would not have taken such action. The Plaintiff's reliance on the defendant's representations was justified because Defendants stated that they represented government interests and because FTC and SEC investigation manipulations, by Defendants, had not yet been fully exposed in the news media.

85. As a proximate result of the fraudulent conduct of the defendant(s) as herein alleged, the Plaintiffs was induced to expend hundreds of hours of their/her time and energy in an attempt to derive a profit from their ventures which were covertly under attack by defendant(s) but has received no profit or other compensation for their/her time and energy], by reason of which the Plaintiffs has been damaged in the sum of at least two billion dollars based on the minimum reported amounts by which Defendants profited at Plaintiffs expense and the paths of direction which Plaintiffs were steered to by Defendants fraudulent misrepresentations.

86. *The aforementioned conduct of the defendant(s) was an intentional misrepresentation, deceit, or concealment of a material fact known to the defendant(s) with the intention on the part of the defendant(s) of thereby depriving the Plaintiffs of property or legal rights or otherwise causing injury, and was despicable conduct that subjected the Plaintiffs to a cruel and unjust hardship in conscious disregard of the Plaintiff's rights, so as to justify an award of exemplary and punitive damages...*"

As an aside, the lawsuit also details Google's outright theft of intellectual property, which Google has little fear from since Google's lawyer: Michelle Lee, controls the U.S. Patent Office.

"...Defendants did have their agents, investors, executives and staff contact Plaintiff under the guise of "considering an investment" in order to induce Plaintiff to disclose trade secrets under false promises of confidentiality

137. *The New York Times newspaper and digital publications group published an investigative article entitled: "**How Larry Page's Obsession Became Google's Business**" on January 22, 2016 by [CONOR DOUGHERTY](#). This article describes the manner in which Google founder, Larry Page, seeks to steal ideas, for Google, from young entrepreneurs and inventors, much as he appears to have done to Plaintiff. The article discloses the covert manners in which Defendants harvest intellectual property without revealing their true identities or actual intentions.*

138. *Hundreds of reporters, clients and members of the public have commented that: "Google seems to copy everything you come up with" to Plaintiff. In one specific instance, a television show entitled the Silicon Valley Business Report did a broadcast report demonstrating how Plaintiff company appeared to have been nearly 100% copied by Google's YouTube...."*

The following report from investigator [Johnny Kampis](#) elaborates on the details about how Google had the power to order federal agencies to sabotage Google's competitors!

FCC, Dept. of Energy, EPA, DOT cooperated with running hit-jobs, black-lists, stonewalling, slow-walking and application rejections against the competitors of Google's VC's

and investors in almost every case. XP Vehicles, Limnia, Apterra, Elio, VVC, Eco-Motors and Bright Automotive were cut-off on orders from Google and Google investors.

Visitor logs show Google's unrivaled White House access

By [Johnny Kampis](#) /



Creative Commons/Tom Lohdan

OUR DOOR IS OPEN: Google officials have visited the White House more than once a week on average since President Barack Obama took office.

A project examining [White House visitor logs](#) shows the Obama administration has extended an open door to Google.

[Johanna Shelton](#), Google's director of public policy — in effect, the company's top lobbyist — has visited White House officials 128 times since President Barack Obama took office in 2009.

To put that in perspective, senior lobbyists for other companies in the telecommunications and cable industry — including Comcast, Facebook, Amazon, Oracle and Verizon — have visited the White House a combined 124 times in the same span. (That data goes through October 2015.)

The Google Transparency Project, the work of Campaign for Accountability, a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that works to expose corporate influence on government, identified policy pushers for the 50 biggest lobbying spenders and [counted how many times they appeared in the White House visitor logs.](#)

Alphabet Inc., the parent company of Google, [spent \\$16.6 million on lobbying in 2015.](#) That was the twelfth most of any company, and the [most by a technology firm,](#) just above AT&T's \$16.4 million and Comcast's \$15.7 million.

Anne Weismann, executive director of the Campaign for Accountability, told Watchdog.org those logs don't reveal the discussion of the meetings, just who attended them.

"You don't know what the meetings are about, but the fact that someone has that level of access at the White House is revealing," she said. "It certainly suggests a level of influence."

[RELATED: Google could face record antitrust fine in Europe after skating by in U.S.](#)

Shelton far outpaced her peers. The second most frequent White House visitor, with 75 visits, was [Alissa Fox](#), senior vice president of the Office of Policy and Representation for Blue Cross/Blue Shield (again, essentially a mouthful of a title for head lobbyist.)

Oil companies in the top 50 visited 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue a combined 101 times, and defense contractors in the top 50 came 89 times since 2009. Shelton visited the White House more than 18 of the top 50 lobbying spenders combined.



AP file photo

SHHHH: President Barack Obama and his top advisers meet frequently with representatives of tech industry giant Google.

Shelton didn't return a call from Watchdog.org seeking comment about the White House visits. Google media relations didn't respond to an email seeking comment.

"It suggests, given the intrusion of the Obama administration into the internet and health care, the idea these companies are independent of the government is quaint," said Tom Fitton, president of [Judicial Watch](#), a conservative foundation promoting transparency and accountability in government.

Fitton said the Obama administration wants to regulate the internet like a public utility, so he can't blame Google for beating a trail to the White House.

"The government wants to turn these companies into socialized entities," he said. "I'm surprised Google isn't there twice as much."

"With Obama's destruction of the health care industry, evidently Blue Cross didn't go there enough," Fitton joked.

He pointed out, however, that because the White House isn't subject to the Freedom of Information Act, the public can't be sure the logs reflect all the visits that are made.

Google's open door

In all, employees of Google and related companies [visited the White House 427 times](#), or more than once a week over a period of nearly seven years. Those trips included 363 meetings in total, attended by 169 Google employees — from executives to software engineers — and 182 officials from the White House.

Weismann said the transparency project hasn't crunched the numbers for total visits by other companies among the top 50 lobbying spenders.

The Google Transparency Project examination includes large events such as parties, state dinners and industry conferences. The majority of these meetings were likely between small groups of company officials and key White House officials, "meetings at which public policies are likely to have been discussed," the Campaign for Accountability wrote.



LinkedIn photo

SHELTON: Google's top liaison to the Obama administration has visited the White House more than 18 of the top 50 lobbying spenders combined.

At least 21 of those meetings included Obama, and a similar number included such high-ranking political and economic advisers as current White House chief of staff Denis McDonough, former chiefs of staff Jack Lew (now Treasury secretary), Bill Daley, Pete Rouse and Rahm Emanuel, senior adviser Valerie Jarrett and economic adviser Jeffrey Zients.

Of Shelton's 128 visits, 94 included meetings with White House officials (she has also, for example, ferried Google Science Fair winners there), and four of those meetings involved Obama.

"That's a lot of meetings for one individual to have," Weismann said.

White House logs are not available for previous administrations; Obama was the first president to make that information available for public inspection.

A document showed that the George W. Bush administration's Energy Task Force met with energy industry officials at least 40 times in 2001 in preparation for creating a new national energy policy, [reported the Washington Post in 2007](#).

The administration went to court to try to keep the task force records private.

A little help from their friends?

Before working at Google, Shelton was senior counsel for telecommunications and internet issues for the House Energy and Commerce Committee and served as counsel on similar

issues for Rep. Rick Boucher, D-Virginia. She also held multiple senior positions at the Federal Communications Commission.

A host of other former Google executives [have ended up working in the administration](#), including U.S. Chief Technology Officer [Megan Smith](#).

[Shelton has most commonly met](#) with David Edelman, senior adviser for technology and economic policy, (13 meetings) and Victoria Espinel, intellectual property enforcement coordinator (12 meetings.) Shelton has met with 48 White House officials in all.

Of particular note for government watchdogs are the flurry of meetings by Shelton and other important Google representatives around the time the Federal Trade Commission was considering an antitrust case against the company in 2011. The FTC looked into whether Google's business practices in searches and advertising was shutting out competitors and harming consumers. Namely, regulators investigated to see if Google favored its own companies in search results.

[Google Transparency Project lists a number of meetings](#) that took place in 2011 and 2012 during that investigation. Of particular note is this one: Shelton, Google director of product management Hunter Walk and Raben Group lobbyist Courtney Snowden met with White House domestic policy counsel Steve Robinson on April 17, 2012. Raben Group was one of the lobbying firms Google retained to help with the FTC antitrust case.

In January 2013, Google reached a settlement with the FTC, agreeing to allow competitor access to patents "on critical standardized technologies needed to make popular devices such as smart phones, laptop and tablet computers, and gaming consoles," [the FTC said in a press release](#).

The FTC did not, however, find that Google gamed the search-engine system.

"The evidence the FTC uncovered through this intensive investigation prompted us to require significant changes in Google's business practices. However, regarding the specific allegations that the company biased its search results to hurt competition, the evidence collected to date did not justify legal action by the Commission," said Beth Wilkinson, outside counsel to the FTC. "Undoubtedly, Google took aggressive actions to gain advantage over rival search providers. However, the FTC's mission is to protect competition, and not individual competitors. The evidence did not demonstrate that Google's actions in this area stifled competition in violation of U.S. law."

Google could face record antitrust fine in Europe after skating by in U.S.

By [Johnny Kampis](#) / May 18, 2016 / News / [No Comments](#)



Part 2 of 3 in the series [The Google Administration](#)

Google could be slapped with a record 3 billion euro fine (about \$3.4 billion) from the [European Commission](#) in an antitrust case that has dragged on since 2010.

The company is accused of promoting its shopping service over rival services in internet searches on its website .

Google faced a similar case in the United States, when the Federal Trade Commission began looking into the company's search-engine practices in 2011. The company reached a settlement with the FTC in 2013 that allowed competitors access to patents on critical standardized technologies needed for a variety of devices such as phones and laptops, but the FTC didn't find that Google gamed the search-engine system.



Creative Commons/Jon Russell

GOOGLE: The tech giant could face a record fine from the European Commission for allegedly gaming search-engine results.

Watchdog.org reported Monday that the Obama administration has extended an open door to Google, with company officials visiting the White House at least 427 times since Obama took office in January 2009. The data comes from [Google Transparency Project](#), the work of Campaign for Accountability.

[RELATED: Visitor logs show Google's unrivaled White House access](#)

Email Address

As part of its regular visits to the White House, Google held several meetings that could have been related to the FTC case.

For example, on April 17, 2012, Google's top lobbyist Johanna Shelton, product management director Hunter Walk and Raben Group lobbyist Courtney Snowden met with White House domestic policy counsel Steve Robinson. Google retained Raben Group in July 2011 to assist with the FTC case.

On Oct. 31 and Nov. 13, 2012, Shelton and Google competition counsel Matthew Bye met with Office of Science and Technology Policy senior internet adviser David Edelman. Prior to joining Google, Bye advised on antitrust matters at the FTC general counsel's office.

Google evidently has less pull with the European Union watchdog. [Reuters reports](#) that Google has tried and failed several times to reach a compromise with the European Commission in the past six years and now has no plans to try again to settle.

The commission can fine companies up to 10 percent of their annual sales, equating to Google having to cough up as much as 6.6 billion euros, but [the Sunday Telegraph reported](#) the fine would likely be half that and be imposed in June.

Still, that would be nearly three times the amount of the previous largest antitrust fine, the 1.1 billion euros slapped on chip-maker Intel by the commission in 2009.

Google's Android operating system has also drawn regulatory scrutiny by the commission for the way its own apps come pre-installed on devices.

Berin Szoka, president of [TechFreedom](#), said the possible fine smacks of a European money grab.

"This is just, frankly, tax revenue," he said. "It's a way of taking money out of an American company's pockets and putting it into the pockets of the great bureaucratic behemoth in Brussels. And by the way, the formula that the Commission uses to calculate revenues is inherently protectionist, because it's not based on European revenues, it's based on a total. The fine can be up to 10 percent of global revenue. And they always look at global revenue basically to say 'the bigger you are around the planet, the more money we're going to take out of your pocket.'"

Google employees have enjoyed revolving door during Obama administration

By [Johnny Kampis](#) /



Part 3 of 3 in the series [The Google Administration](#)



Photo illustration from LinkedIn photos

ALL IN THE FAMILY: These are among the more than 250 people who have transitioned from Google to government or vice versa during the Obama administration. At least two dozen among the group have taken jobs in key posts in government or Google in that span. (Pictured, from top left to bottom right, Mikey Dickerson, Robert Manhini, Nicole Wong, Jannine Versi, Michele Weslander, Sameer Bhalotra, Julie Brill, Will Hudson, Michelle Lee, Matthew Bye, Joshua Wright and Renata Hesse.)

More than 250 people have moved from Google and related firms to the federal government or vice versa since President Barack Obama took office.

The Google Transparency Project, the work of Campaign for Accountability, poured over reams of data to find [258 instances of “revolving door activity”](#) between Google or its associated companies and the federal government, national political campaigns and Congress since 2009.

Much of that revolving door activity took place at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, where 22 former White House officials went to work for Google and 31 executives from Google and related firms went to work at the White House or were appointed to federal advisory boards by Obama. Those boards include the President’s Council on Science and Technology and the President’s Council on Jobs and Competitiveness.

Regulation watchdogs may be just as keen about the moves between Google and the Federal Communications Commission and Federal Trade Commission. Those government

bodies regulate many of the programs that are at the heart of Google's business, and there have been at least 15 moves between Google and its lobbying firms and those commissions.

Email Address

The research also shows that 25 officials in national security, intelligence or the Department of Defense joined Google, and three Google executives went to work for the DOD.

Eighteen former State Department officials became Google employees, and five Google staffers became employed at the State Department.

[The complete list can be downloaded via Excel file here.](#)

Friends in high places

Former Google employees occupy several key slots in the federal government. These include:

- [Megan Smith](#), vice president new business development at Google 2003-12, vice president of Google 2012-14, chief technology officer at the [Office of Science and Technology Policy](#) 2014-present.
- [Alexander Macgillivray](#), deputy general counsel at Google 2003-09, general counsel at Twitter 2009-13, deputy chief technology officer at OSTP 2014-present.
- [Nicole Wong](#), vice president and deputy general counsel at Google from 2004-11 and deputy chief technology officer at OSTP 2013-14.
- [Jannine Versi](#), product marketing manager in Middle East and North Africa for Google 2010-2012, White House National Economic Council 2013-14, chief of staff International Trade Administration at U.S. Department of Commerce 2014-present.
- [Michelle Lee](#), deputy general counsel at Google 2003-12, under secretary of commerce for intellectual property and director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office 2012-present.
- [Mikey Dickerson](#), site reliability manager at Google 2006-13, administrator U.S. Digital Service 2014-present. Dickerson also assisted with election day monitoring and modeling with Obama's 2012 re-election campaign and helped repair the broken HealthCare.gov website.

At least 18 former Google employees work or have worked for the [U.S. Digital Service](#) and its General Services Administration sidekick, 18F. USDS operates under the Executive Office of the President, consulting on big federal information technology projects.

The door revolves

Scott Amey, general counsel for the [Project on Government Oversight](#), a nonpartisan group that exposes abuses of power in government, said it's hard to know for sure how more than 250 people moving between Google and the federal government since 2009 compares to other corporations, but "it sounds like it's a very significant number."

"It's very hard to get information about the quantity of people who go in and out of government service," Amey told Watchdog.org.

Google didn't return an email seeking comment for this story.

Analysts at Google Transparency Project compiled the revolving-door data by using public information that includes lobby disclosure records, news stories, LinkedIn profiles and reports from Open Secrets. [Campaign for Accountability notes the analysis](#) is "an evolving representation of the scale of the revolving-door relationship between Google and government" rather than a comprehensive tally.

In other words, the total could be higher.



SCHMIDT: The Google chief executiv

SCHMIDT: The Google executive chairman's company Cavis Analytics was a key ally of Obama during his re-election campaign.

The project's analysis included affiliates of Google, such as YouTube, as well as key law firms and lobbyists.

It also includes [Civis Analytics](#), whose sole investor is Eric Schmidt, executive chairman of Google parent company Alphabet Inc.

At least 27 people who worked on Obama's 2012 presidential re-election campaign went to work for Civis Analytics after the election. [Google Transparency Project said](#) "those employees are then deployed by the White House to work on President Obama's top policy priorities."

Those policies include federal technology acquisition reform, national security matters and health care reform – Civis Analytics employees worked with Google engineers to [fix the broken HealthCare.gov website](#) in 2013, Campaign for Accountability reports.

White House visitor logs showed that Civis Analytics executives met with White House officials at least 51 times since Obama took office.

[RELATED: Visitor logs show Google's unrivaled White House access](#)

The company received more than \$3.5 million in payments from Democratic campaigns in the last two presidential election cycles, Campaign for Accountability found.

Going from government to Google

The door has swung open the other way, as well, with prominent federal employees taking high-ranking positions at Google. These include:

- [Caroline Atkinson](#), head of global public policy for Google beginning this year, previously White House economic affairs adviser.
- [Sameer Bhalotra](#), cybersecurity at Google in 2014, senior director for cybersecurity at White House, 2010-2012.
- [Will Hudson](#), senior advisor for international policy at Google 2015-present, director for international cyber policy at National Economic Council, 2014-15. Hudson previously served as a counsel advising government clients on cyber law.
- [Regina Duncan](#), head of Google's advanced technology and products division 2012-present, director of Defense Advance Research Projects Agency, 2009-12.
- [Michele Weslander Quaid](#), chief technology office for public sector at Google 2011-15, chief technology officer at National Reconnaissance Office, 2009-11.

Then there is the curious case of the FTC. [Joshua Wright](#), senior counsel at Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati (Google's most trusted antitrust law firm) since January, served as FTC commissioner from 2013-15 after being appointed by Obama.

But Wright had to recuse himself from deciding on issues related to Google while on the FTC because he had co-authored papers urging the commission to not file suit against the company. Those papers were indirectly funded by Google.



Twitter photo

WRIGHT: Appointed to the FTC by President Obama, he had to recuse himself from matters involving Google because he'd written company-friendly papers to the FTC in the past. Wright now works for a favored Google law firm.

The FTC previously investigated allegations that Google manipulated search results to benefit its own companies, but the FTC ruled in 2013 that wasn't the case. [This, despite FTC staff saying Google's practices cause "real harm to consumers and to innovation."](#)

Meanwhile, the European Commission is expected to slap a record fine on Google for the same allegations the FTC dismissed.

[RELATED: Google could face record fine in Europe after skating by in U.S.](#)

"Google loses its friend at the FTC," [Fortune wrote](#) when Wright decided to take a job as professor of law at George Mason University, a position he still holds.

Wright is just one of several former high-ranking FTC officials who have since been employed at Google or its law firms. Others include former commissioner [Julie Brill](#), who went to work for Hogan Lovells as partner and co-director of privacy and cybersecurity in March. That law firm has represented Google on a variety of issues.

[Matthew Bye](#), who advised the FTC on antitrust issues, went to work for Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati before moving to Google. He has been the company's director of legal competition since November 2015.

jkampis@watchdog.org

In late 2012, months before the FTC settled with Google in its antitrust investigation, FTC Office of General Counsel attorney [Robert Mahini](#) took a job as Google's senior policy counsel.

Some key FCC officials have moved from the commission to Google or its associate law firms, or vice versa. [Johanna Shelton](#), who has visited the White House 128 times since Obama took office, was an FCC attorney from 1998 to 2001.

[Renata Hesse](#), a member at Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosata from 2006-11, became senior counsel to the chairman for transactions at the FCC later in 2011. She is now a deputy assistant attorney general in the Department of Justice's antitrust division.

[Austin Schlick](#) has been Google's director of communications law since 2012. Before that, he was general counsel at the FCC from 2009-12.

The 18 people involved in the revolving door listed in this story are just the tip of the 251-plus name iceberg, though in some cases people among that 251 are low-level employees.

Amey said he's not as concerned about programmers moving over – and quite a few data engineers who worked on Obama's re-election campaign have ended up in White House jobs – but top level executives changing jobs can raise “red flags.”

“If they have access to information on competitors and they go to Google ... then you have to wonder if Google is getting an unfair advantage over others in their market,” he said.

Campaign for Transparency notes Google hiring former bureaucrats “gives it valuable insights into the inner workings of government and politics,” while having its former employees ensconced in federal offices “gives it a formidable conduit to influence policy making on a variety of issues affecting its interests.”

Prepared for Mr. James Comey at the Washington, DC office- FBI and Mr. David Johnson at the San Francisco Office – FBI and the FTC Whistle-Blower Program. Copies submitted to the U.S. Senate Ethics Committee and the Office of Special Counsel.