



By Hand
Coin Rivet Limited
Kemp House
160 City Road
London
United Kingdom
EC1V 2NX

5 April 2019
Our Ref: AYR1.4

By Email
darren@coinrivet.com
hello@coinrivet.com

Attn: Darren Parkin, Sheba Karamat

Dear Sirs

Our client: Calvin Ayre

We refer to your email of 2 April 2019 in response to our letter of 1 April 2019.

Our client is very disappointed by your thoroughly inadequate response.

Whilst your removal of certain articles has gone some way towards addressing our client's concerns, you have completely failed to address our client's demand for an undertaking not to republish the allegations of which our client has made complaint.

Nor, crucially, have you said you will publish the apology which our client requires, nor that you will join in a statement in open court making clear that there is no truth in the allegation of paedophilia. As is obvious, these are critically important requirements, since without them there is no chance our client can achieve the vindication he needs in respect of these devastating allegations.

The matter is therefore far from being 'closed' as you suggest. Your dismissive response has made it apparent that you are not taking his complaint seriously. Given the gravity of the matter this is most regrettable.

In the light of your response our client now requires you, in addition to the demands made in the letter of 1 April, to pay him substantial damages as well as the legal costs he has incurred in relation to this complaint. Moreover he requires you to add to the apology the fact you have taken these steps. A revised apology is set out at the end of this letter.

Please therefore confirm that:

- (a) You will comply with the demands numbered 2, 3, 4 and 5 in our letter of 1 April, with reference to the revised apology below.
- (b) You will pay our client substantial damages in order to vindicate his reputation.
- (c) You will pay the legal costs our client has had to incur in relation to this matter.

If no such confirmation is received by 4pm this coming Monday, 8 April, our client will issue proceedings against your publisher for libel without further notice. That claim will be for an injunction, damages and costs. Proceedings have already been drafted by specialist leading counsel.

Provision of documents

You refer to an opinion article which was posted prior to the article of 16 March which was removed after 15 minutes. Please provide us with a copy of that article, so we can understand which article you are referring to. Please confirm whether the article was written by your journalist Ms Helen Bennicke, and whether it is Ms Bennicke who is the person you say has since left your employment. Please also confirm whether Ms Bennicke had any hand in writing, contributing to, editing or authorising publication of the article of 16 March. In addition, please confirm whether you have published any article(s) and social media post(s) in the Spanish language in relation to the subject matter under discussion and if so provide us immediately with copies of all such items.

We have noted that Ms Helen Bennicke in a separate article described how she had personally referred our client to the authorities for investigation. It is extraordinary that the 16 March article stated that our client had been referred for investigation without mentioning that it was your own staff that had done this. In the event that our client brings proceedings this is a matter which will be relied upon in aggravation of damages.

We will require disclosure of all documents that Ms Bennicke wrote, whether notes, articles, draft articles, messages or otherwise, concerning our client. If Ms Bennicke has left your employment please inform us of her contact details and pass a copy of this letter to her. We will be seeking disclosure of such documents from her directly in due course.

Malice

We believe that the 16 March article was maliciously motivated. We suspect that the article was written in pursuance of an agenda driven by commercial rivals of our client to damage his commercial interests and in particular his interest in Bitcoin SV. Given Ms Bennicke's conduct we suspect that she was personally involved in this malicious campaign, but will also be exploring whether others at Coin Rivet were driven by a dishonest agenda of this nature.

Please therefore confirm:

- (a) Whether Coin Rivet was approached or asked by any third party to write the 16 March article or any of the other articles concerning our client;
- (b) Whether any person working for Coin Rivet, including but not limited to Ms Bennicke, received or was offered any payment or other inducement for writing and publishing any article about our client, and if so who that third party was, who the relevant person at Coin Rivet was and how much was paid or offered.

Please also provide us with a copy of all references made by your staff (or others carrying out work for Coin Rivet) to police or other investigating authorities about our client.

Finally, please confirm:

- (a) That you have preserved all documents potentially relevant to this claim, including copies of all articles that you have published about our client, and all communications, both internal and external, in relation to our client;
- (b) That Coin Rivet Ltd is the publisher of the Coin Rivet website and therefore the correct defendant for the purpose of legal proceedings; and
- (c) Whether you have instructed solicitors to accept service of proceedings, and if so provide us with the details of those solicitors.

Our client will take all necessary steps to achieve vindication and to ascertain who was behind this apparently maliciously motivated campaign against him. He requires your immediate response to the above questions. Please do not doubt his resolve to see this matter through to a successful conclusion, at trial if necessary.

Yours faithfully

SCA Ontier LLP.
SCA Ontier LLP

Calvin Ayre: An Apology

On 16 March 2019 we published an article entitled 'You're heading down a dark alley, John McAfee warns Calvin Ayre'.

The article reported claims that Calvin Ayre had been referred to Interpol, to the police and to child abuse charities after tweeting images of 'pre-teen' girls. It alleged that, by filing and tweeting images of these 'girls', he was guilty of child abuse offences.

This is completely untrue. The women that Mr Ayre featured in his tweets were all at least 18 years old. Mr Ayre has not been referred to any authorities or child abuse charities over his tweets. There are no grounds to suspect him of child abuse.

We apologise to Mr Ayre for publishing these untrue claims.

We have removed all articles on this topic from our website and all links to those articles on social media. We have agreed to pay substantial damages to Mr Ayre for libel as well as his legal costs, We have also agreed to join in a statement to the English High Court in settlement of Mr Ayre's complaint.