



Alexander Falconi &lt;admin@ournevadajudges.com&gt;

## NOTICE of DEMAND for RETRACTION/ CORRECTION

**TMatthewPhillips** <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>

Fri, Mar 19, 2021 at 6:59 PM

Reply-To: TMatthewPhillips <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>

To: "admin@ournevadajudges.com" <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

Cc: "JVAGroup@tamlf.com" <JVAGroup@tamlf.com>, "Marc.Cwik@lewisbrisbois.com" <Marc.Cwik@lewisbrisbois.com>, "Adam.Pernsteiner@lewisbrisbois.com" <Adam.Pernsteiner@lewisbrisbois.com>, "mark.diciero@gmail.com" <mark.diciero@gmail.com>, "schoeniv@mac.com" <schoeniv@mac.com>, "melg@grimes-law.com" <melg@grimes-law.com>, "jgarin@lipsonneilson.com" <jgarin@lipsonneilson.com>

### MY RESPONSE IS UNDERLINED BELOW:

Mr. Phillips: by default I treat ordinary communication as confidential source information but because this is in response to a legal instrument and involves our coverage policy [coverage policy? You have defamation insurance?] I've included parties and attorneys involved in the case [because you are all on the same team...].

I understand the intent of your demand for retraction. [I don't think you do. The intent is to get you to correct your falsehoods, but you refuse.]

Sometimes the purpose of the Event video is misunderstood and it usually comes from the perspective that Event videos are themselves a report of the news. [But your video \*IS\* a report of the news! Regardless of what you call it, you make public statements concerning litigation and your statements are actionable!] We don't actually do original reporting to summarize your case [okay, your statement shows insanity! Deny it all you want—your video contains original reporting!]; what we do instead is publish comprehensively the proceedings [along with your personal narratives!] that are to come.

If you review other Event videos and other hearing videos, you'll see that Event videos discuss very briefly the background of the case [hey, when you discuss the "background of the case," your statements, if false, are subject to defamation lawsuits] and the hearings themselves are the actual "news" [It's all news!] You'll be able to go into the details of your case yourself at the actual hearings that arise, [yeah, and you'll be able to go into the details of your case when I sue you, pal! Can't wait to see you assert the Non-Original Reporting Defense ... whatever that is ....].

This includes your ability to discuss the police report and the court orders that you disagree with. I realize that litigants sometimes prefer Event videos discuss every detail of their case [every detail? Just one adverb, and just the police report—which you omit because it exonerates me and shows the liability of your buddies!] but this stretches the video beyond its intended purpose and forgets that ultimately, the litigants themselves present the case. I urge you to take this opportunity to address the details you want addressed, yourself, through the legal process [Yes, I will go through the legal process—when I sue Alexander M. Falconi for defamation and false light!]. Rest assured the entire hearing video(s) will be published. [Rest assured, you will be sued for defamation and false light!]

I understand you may be frustrated with the claims being made against you by Defendants, [what claims? Defendants have filed NO claims or counter claims against me; instead of "claims" you meant to say false allegations], but it is the role of the court to ultimately decide what is true and make a ruling on the facts and the law. Sometimes litigants have an urge to pull us into the conflict [I'm sure they do because you're a liar!] and have us display their details, counter-arguments, etc., but this also frustrates the purpose of our comprehensive coverage policy [Srsly? Comprehensive? Hey, if you coverage was "comprehensive," you would include the police report...]

////

Your video proves only that you are part of Abrams defamation machine. YOU are the problem. All you had to do is: (1) add the word ALLEGEDLY, and (2) mention the existence of the police report. But you'd rather portray me in a false light. You want me to sue you! Well, sweetheart, guess what? Your wish has come true!

T. Matthew Phillips  
Attorney-at-Law  
323-XXXX-XXXX

[Quoted text hidden]



Alexander Falconi &lt;admin@ournevadajudges.com&gt;

---

## NOTICE of DEMAND for RETRACTION/ CORRECTION

---

**TMatthewPhillips** <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>  
 Reply-To: TMatthewPhillips <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>  
 To: "admin@ournevadajudges.com" <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

Fri, Mar 19, 2021 at 3:11 PM

NOTICE of DEMAND for RETRACTION/ CORRECTION (March 19, 2021)

To: Our Nevada Judges, Alexander Falconi, (aka "Matthew Butcher")

This letter demands retraction and/ or correction of your ONJ video: "T. Matthew Phillips v. Mark DiCiero" – which you published on YouTube today, March 19, 2021.

Point of clarification, the proper case title is: T. Matthew Phillips vs. Abrams, et.al.

### FIRST

In your video, (at 1:50), you state that Plaintiff's lawsuit alleges multiple acts of defamation, citing public posts on Nevada Court Watchers: "*that criticize him for threatening to shoot-up his son's school ...*"

My good man, I do believe you meant to say: "... that criticize him for ALLEGEDLY threatening to shoot-up a school."

And, by the way, Plaintiff is not suing for "criticisms." Rather, Plaintiff sues for "falsehoods." Know the difference.

But, in any case, without the adverb ALLEGEDLY, your statement is false and defamatory per se.

If you pay attention to major networks, they are careful to report, for example, that: "Bill Cosby was arrested for ALLEGEDLY committing rape." Networks never report: "Bill Cosby was arrested for committing rape" – because it exposes them to liability for defamation and false light. And that's why they always, always, always, include the adverb, ALLEGEDLY. (Get it?)

Your inclusion of the adverb ALLEGEDLY makes all the difference in the world and, frankly, saves you from certain defeat in a defamation lawsuit.

### SECOND

In your video, (at 3:00), you state that: "Vincent Ochoa ... made findings that Mr. Phillips' threats to shoot up a school were what triggered a campus lockdown." No! Ochoa never made any such findings! Your words are false and defamatory per se. (And Fair Report Privilege is here no defense because your statement is inaccurate.)

What triggered the campus lockdown? If you carefully read the decision, Ochoa writes: "The school 'campus initiated a lockdown to ensure safety for students and staff.'" Okay. All we know is that the lockdown was done for safety reasons.

Ochoa's decision continues: "This [lockdown] was taken in response to an allegation that [Phillips] may 'shoot-up' the school." Note: re-read Ochoa's words, which contain no language indicating that Phillips threatened anybody with anything.

Okay, so, what made the school believe that Phillips "MAY" shoot-up the school? Get this—according to the school's lawyer: "With the anniversary of October 1st looming, we had (and continue to have) reasonable, credible fears of Mr. Phillips." [First Amended Complaint, page. 26, line 25] But you omitted this passage this from your video! Read the lawsuit!!

Remarkably, the school feared Plaintiff because, (get this), October 1st would mark the one-year anniversary of the Mandalay Bay conspiracy.

The fact remains: there is no evidence that Phillips ever threatened anybody AND nobody alleges that Phillips threatened anybody.

## THE POLICE REPORT

Most significantly, the police report, (FAC, Exhibit No. "1"), clearly proves Plaintiff's claims!

Exhibit No. "1" is the centerpiece of Plaintiff's case. Exhibit No. "1" totally proves that DiCiero and Schoen are liars. And yet, curiously, your video presentation conspicuously omits this public record (from LVMPD).

It would appear that, by omitting the police report, YOU are holding Phillips in a false light.

So, why does your ONJ video omit reference to the police report? Whatever happened to the "whole" truth and nothin' but? Tell me more about your "reckless disregard for the truth!" [See N.Y. Times vs. Sullivan (1964)]

Here, because you intentionally omit the police report, you hold Plaintiff in a false light. You expose yourself to a civil suit.

My good man, I must presume that you inadvertently forget to mention the police report. A reasonable reporter would have mentioned that LVMPD issued a written report that concludes: NEGATIVE THREATS MADE TO THE SCHOOL. Read the police report—which is attached to the FAC.

## SPECIFIC DEMANDS

First, you must re-do your video to include the adverb, "ALLEGEDLY" (at 1:30).

Second, you must reference the police report in your video—in the same manner that you reference all the other public documents in your video.

Be advised, you and ONJ now accrue liability. You are wise to contact an experienced First Amendment attorney (this, of course, excludes Mel Grimes).

You know TMP's track record—I will not hesitate to sue you and ONJ.

Note: your good faith retraction will *not* be viewed as an admission of wrongdoing; (public policy rewards mitigation). You may rely on this writing.

Based on my experience, if you were to immediately make the above listed corrections, and I were to stubbornly file suit on Monday (even after retraction), you would likely prevail on a 12(b)(5) motion because you quickly satisfied the retraction demands.

And, as a practical matter, if you make the above listed corrections today, I would likely be disinclined to sue (even though I contend you now stand liable).

On the other hand, if I wake up tomorrow, and the video remains unchanged, then you will deffo be appearing in your own video broadcast as a named Defendant.

This is your opportunity to mitigate. This is your opportunity to "do the right thing."

Don't say I didn't warn ya. ~~TMP.

T. Matthew Phillips  
Attorney-at-Law  
323-XXX-XXXX



Alexander Falconi <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

---

## Counsel

---

**TMatthewPhillips** <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>  
Reply-To: TMatthewPhillips <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>  
To: "admin@ournevadajudges.com" <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

Tue, Mar 23, 2021 at 7:55 PM

To: Alexander Falconi

Do you have a lawyer? Have you retained counsel for the alleged defamation matter?

Please advise.

T. Matthew Phillips  
Attorney-at-Law  
323-XXX-XXXX



Alexander Falconi &lt;admin@ournevadajudges.com&gt;

---

## Service of Process

2 messages

---

**TMatthewPhillips** <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>  
Reply-To: TMatthewPhillips <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>  
To: "admin@ournevadajudges.com" <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

Wed, Mar 24, 2021 at 9:09 AM

Will you accept service of process via email?

T. Matthew Phillips  
Attorney-at-Law  
323-XXX-XXXX

---

**Alexander Falconi** <admin@ournevadajudges.com>  
To: TMatthewPhillips <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>

Wed, Mar 24, 2021 at 9:33 AM

I will accept service of process of an initial pleading to this email address only from a third-party process server that is licensed in Nevada. The pleading would have to be file-stamped and included as an attachment, with the subject line stating "Service of Process by Email, re Todd Matthew Phillips".

If your licensed process server insists on personal service, they can contact me directly to arrange service so they are not wasting time with failed service attempts.

This applies only if service is effectuated within the next 30 calendar days. If you would like an extension you can renew this request.

This conditional waiver applies only for service of the initial pleading. All subsequent service will continue under NRCP 5.

[Quoted text hidden]

--

**Alexander Falconi**

**Administrator**

| *Scrutiny, Competence, Truth.*

<https://www.ournevadajudges.com>





Alexander Falconi <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

---

## Media Request

---

**TMatthewPhillips** <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>  
Reply-To: TMatthewPhillips <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>  
To: "admin@ournevadajudges.com" <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

Mon, Mar 29, 2021 at 7:59 AM

[Phillips vs. Abrams, et.al.](#)

On which date did you present to the court your proposed MEDIA REQUEST?

T. Matthew Phillips  
Attorney-at-Law  
323-XXX-XXXX



Alexander Falconi <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

---

**A-21-829038-C [PHILLIPS vs. ABRAMS]**

---

**TMatthewPhillips** <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>

Wed, Mar 31, 2021 at 7:24 PM

Reply-To: TMatthewPhillips <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>

To: "admin@ournevadajudges.com" <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

Cc: "marc.cwik@lewisbrisbois.com" <marc.cwik@lewisbrisbois.com>, "adam.pernsteiner@lewisbrisbois.com" <adam.pernsteiner@lewisbrisbois.com>, "jgarin@lipsonneilson.com" <jgarin@lipsonneilson.com>

A-21-829038-C [[PHILLIPS vs. ABRAMS](#)]

TO: FALCONI

Today, YOU filed an opposition to Plaintiff's *Motion for Reconsideration*. Curiously, the opposition YOU filed provides NO statutory basis that authorizes YOUR "appearance."

--->> What is the legal basis that allows YOU, a non-party, to file an opposition in the above captioned lawsuit?

T. Matthew Phillips  
Attorney-at-Law  
323-XXX-XXXX





Alexander Falconi &lt;admin@ournevadajudges.com&gt;

---

**DEMAND to WITHDRAW OPPOSITION**

---

**TMatthewPhillips** <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>

Fri, Apr 2, 2021 at 5:41 PM

Reply-To: TMatthewPhillips &lt;tmatthewphillips@aol.com&gt;

To: "admin@ournevadajudges.com" &lt;admin@ournevadajudges.com&gt;

Cc: "adam.pernsteiner@lewisbrisbois.com" &lt;adam.pernsteiner@lewisbrisbois.com&gt;, "marc.cwik@lewisbrisbois.com" &lt;marc.cwik@lewisbrisbois.com&gt;, "jgarin@lipsonneilson.com" &lt;jgarin@lipsonneilson.com&gt;

A-21-829038-C [*PHILLIPS vs. ABRAMS*]

TO: FALCONI

On March 31, 2021, my office contacted YOU to learn the supposed legal basis that allows YOU, a non-party, to file an opposition in these proceedings. Naturally, YOU failed to respond, which demonstrates bad faith.

Obviously, there is no legal basis that allows YOU -- an interloper -- to randomly file pleadings in connection with cases where YOU are neither a party, nor counsel-of-record.

RULE 11: "Every pleading, written motion, and other paper must be signed by at least one attorney of record in the attorney's name — or by a party personally if the party is unrepresented." [Rule 11(a); underscores added]

Obviously, YOU are *not* a "party" and YOU are *not* an "attorney of record"; therefore, YOUR so-called opposition "shall" be stricken as non-conforming. Rule 11 provides--

"The court must strike an unsigned paper." [Rule 11(a); underscores added]

Note: YOUR so-called opposition is not merely subject to a motion to strike, rather, it "shall be stricken." YOUR so-called opposition, as a matter of law, is fatally defective and cannot stand.

Plaintiff hereby DEMANDS that YOU immediately withdraw YOUR so-called opposition. If not, I will ask the court for sanctions at the hearing — for willful abuse of process. I know where to garnish your wages. You are wise to hire a lawyer.

Have a nice day.

T. Matthew Phillips  
Attorney-at-Law  
323-XXX-XXXX



Alexander Falconi &lt;admin@ournevadajudges.com&gt;

---

**Notice of Liability**

9 messages

---

**TMatthewPhillips** <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>  
Reply-To: TMatthewPhillips <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>  
To: "admin@ournevadajudges.com" <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

Mon, Oct 4, 2021 at 11:56 AM

On or about Sept. 26, 2021, you published a video of TMP repeating the phrase, "*Phillips threatened to shoot up the school*" and "*Phillips threatened to bomb the school.*"

Be advised, this video is false, defamatory, and actionable. Plaintiff will be seeking leave to amend the complaint to include causes of action against YOU and ONJ. This is your opportunity to mitigate damages. So please squander it accordingly.

Feel free to ignore this email. It will be an exhibit in the lawsuit against YOU and ONJ.

Oh, and have a nice day.

T. Matthew Phillips  
Attorney-at-Law  
(323) [REDACTED]

---

**Alexander Falconi** <admin@ournevadajudges.com>  
To: TMatthewPhillips <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>

Mon, Oct 4, 2021 at 12:02 PM

You appear to be mistaken.

A hearing video published on September 21 at 8:30 a.m. A second hearing video published on October 5 at 8:30 a.m. These are publications of courtroom hearings.

Your email references a September 26 video but no such video has published. If you provide a link to the video I may be able to provide further assistance.

[Quoted text hidden]

--

**Alexander Falconi**

**Administrator**

| *Those who fear the darkness have never seen what the light can do.*

<https://www.ournevadajudges.com>



---

**TMatthewPhillips** <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>  
Reply-To: TMatthewPhillips <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>  
To: "admin@ournevadajudges.com" <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

Mon, Oct 4, 2021 at 12:06 PM

Don't play dumb.

The video is posted at the hater page. Your co-defendant posted it there.

T. Matthew Phillips  
Attorney-at-Law  
(323) [REDACTED]

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Alexander Falconi** <admin@ournevadajudges.com>  
To: TMatthewPhillips <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>

Mon, Oct 4, 2021 at 12:12 PM

Mr. Phillips, if you're going to send legal communications threatening to sue, and you expect me to respond to you consistent with your request, I need you to be clear about what you are talking about. I have a feeling most of the people you send these types of emails to don't even respond to you because of how insincere you come off. I'm covering around 40 different cases at the same time and I work a full-time job, I don't monitor your case all the time and I think it is a very simple request to ask for a YouTube link when you send a complaint about a particular video with dates that do not match up.

I published two videos to YouTube and FaceBook, one on September 21, and one on October 5. You are referencing a September 26 video. That doesn't match up. It can't possibly be that difficult for you to send me a precise link to the video that you are talking about.

When you send responses like that, I don't get the impression that you are actually trying to resolve issues at all. I just get the impression that you want to sue for the sake of suing. If this is what you are doing, then I suppose there isn't even a point to emailing back and forth. If you're actually trying to get me to look at what it is you are talking about, simply send the link.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**TMatthewPhillips** <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>  
Reply-To: TMatthewPhillips <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>  
To: "admin@ournevadajudges.com" <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

Mon, Oct 4, 2021 at 12:16 PM

**Did you eat a brain tumor for breakfast?**

**IT'S THE PINNED POST AT NEVADA COURT WATCHERS!!**

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Alexander Falconi** <admin@ournevadajudges.com>  
To: TMatthewPhillips <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>

Mon, Oct 4, 2021 at 12:29 PM

Mr. Phillips, there is a post by Mark DiCiero that looks like clips from the Our Nevada Judges videos were chopped up and edited together into a shorter video.

If this is what you are referring to, there is nothing I can do, because this is not a video that I published nor do I have any control over it. It is actually very common for YouTubers to download or screen-record clips from news channels and edit them into a new video that they then provide commentary on. There is a "Fair Use Exception" to copyright law that allows content creators to do this. There are at least 2 other content creators on YouTube that have done this to Our Nevada Judges hearing videos.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**TMatthewPhillips** <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>  
Reply-To: TMatthewPhillips <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>  
To: "admin@ournevadajudges.com" <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

Mon, Oct 4, 2021 at 12:37 PM

**The video bears the name OUR NEVADA JUDGES -- which creates liability for YOU and ONJ.**

**And, YOU are further connected because the video bears Falconi's DECEITFUL caption: [Phillips vs. DiCiero](#)**

**You've been given notice. You will be sued. Go ahead and squander your opportunity to mitigate. The jury will see these emails.**

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Alexander Falconi** <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

Mon, Oct 4, 2021 at 12:46 PM

To: TMatthewPhillips <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>

Mr. Phillips, this is the last time I'm going to explain this to you. I cannot "mitigate" "liability" any more than NBC or FOX could if someone edited one of their videos and posted it. There is nothing that I can click on, mouseover, edit, or delete that will make that video disappear.

To be as clear as possible: another individual took an Our Nevada Judges video, edited it, and posted the video to another Facebook page. I cannot go into that video and magically erase the logos and the captions because I have no control over it. I only have control over the videos on my channels.

If you have a problem with the video posted to Nevada Court Watchers, you need to communicate with Nevada Court Watchers about it.

If you sue Our Nevada Judges over it, I'm just going to end up explaining to the Court what I've already explained to you, ad nauseum. You are a licensed California attorney, so try to think of it this way. If a person downloaded a Fox News video, edited it, and reposted it to their channel, it doesn't make Fox News liable just because their logos and captions are in the video.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**TMatthewPhillips** <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>  
Reply-To: TMatthewPhillips <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>  
To: "admin@ournevadajudges.com" <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

Mon, Oct 4, 2021 at 12:53 PM

You are woefully ignorant. I can't wait to sue you.

I'm gonna take your money.

[Quoted text hidden]



Alexander Falconi <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

---

## GET OUT of MY CASE NOW!

---

**TMatthewPhillips** <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>

Sat, Jul 2, 2022 at 7:22 AM

Reply-To: TMatthewPhillips <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>

To: "admin@ournevadajudges.com" <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

Cc: "haseebullah@aclunv.org" <haseebullah@aclunv.org>, "peterson@aclunv.org" <peterson@aclunv.org>

T. Matthew Phillips  
Attorney-at-Law  
(323) [REDACTED]



Alexander Falconi <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

---

## 2nd Warning: GET OUT of MY CASE!!

---

**TMatthewPhillips** <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>

Mon, Jul 4, 2022 at 8:08 AM

Reply-To: TMatthewPhillips <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>

To: "admin@ournevadajudges.com" <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

Cc: "haseebullah@aclunv.org" <haseebullah@aclunv.org>, "peterson@aclunv.org" <peterson@aclunv.org>, "romero@aclunv.org" <romero@aclunv.org>

When I file suit against you, don't say I didn't warn you -- TWICE!!

T. Matthew Phillips

Attorney-at-Law

(323) [REDACTED]



Alexander Falconi <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

---

**GET OUT OF MY CASE!!! NOW!!!**

---

**TMatthewPhillips** <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>  
Reply-To: TMatthewPhillips <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>  
To: "admin@ournevadajudges.com" <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

Mon, Oct 3, 2022 at 5:51 PM

T. Matthew Phillips  
Attorney-at-Law  
(323) [REDACTED]



Alexander Falconi <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

---

**REMOVE YOUR NAME FROM THE SERVICE LIST!! DO IT NOW!!**

---

**TMatthewPhillips** <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>  
Reply-To: TMatthewPhillips <tmatthewphillips@aol.com>  
To: "admin@ournevadajudges.com" <admin@ournevadajudges.com>

Mon, Oct 3, 2022 at 7:06 PM

T. Matthew Phillips  
Attorney-at-Law  
(323) [REDACTED]