

November 17, 2020

Darryl Cotton  
6176 Federal Boulevard  
San Diego, CA 92114

The State Bar of California  
Complaint Review Unit  
Office of General Counsel  
180 Howard Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105-1617

RE: Attorney Natalie Nguyen, State Bar Case No. 20-O-02531

To Whom it May Concern;

I am hereby requesting that your office reopen and continue your investigation based on the complaint I filed against CA Attorney Natalie Nguyen as new evidence was recently presented that proves she, in violation of California Rules of Professional Conduct 3.4 which states; "A lawyer... shall not suppress any evidence that the lawyer or the lawyer's client has a legal obligation to reveal or to produce." CRPC 3.4(b) breached her ethical duties as a licensed attorney.

The attachments for your review are as follows:

- A1) 11/16/20 Letter from Michelle King advising me to send you this information.
- A2) 11/16/20 Cotton and King New Evidence Emails. Of note King responds as it pertains to numerous CA-BAR complaints I had filed in relation to this conspiracy. For the record the New Evidence emails ONLY pertained to the Nguyen/Young complaint as it is supported evidence. I did not ask to reopen or continue investigating the other parties she references in her denial.
- A3) 11/13//20 Cotton and King New Evidence Emails cc to Cotton's litigation investor, Hurtado
- A4) 11/13/20 Hurtado's email response

- B1) 02/06/20 Original Nguyen BAR compliant
- B2) 05/22/20 King closes complaint stating; "that it is not illegal for an attorney to prevent from being heard by the court through the legal process, as it is their duty to protect their client's interests". I contend that based on the evidence I've provided herein that is exactly what Nguyen did.

- 1) 10/27/20 My original email in which Young was a recipient, served to put her on notice that a recent FOIA request with the City of Lemon Grove would prove that both she and her attorney Nguyen would be held liable for their having engaged in ignoring the subpoena that would have

provided the evidence I needed at state court trial that the defendants were involved in a wide ranging conspiracy to deprive me of my rights.

2.0) 11/28/20 Young's email to me stating "I am not involved" and sharing confidential emails between her and her attorney Nguyen.

2.1) 01/15/19 thru 07/22/19 Nguyen and Young emails In which Nguyen tells Young my attorney Jacob Austin was among other things, "bluffing". These emails will also show numerous attempts by attorney Jacob Austin to have Young provide her testimony.

2.2) 07/22/19 Just days after the jury verdict Nguyen informs Young that I lost the state court case, Young has nothing to "worry about providing any declaration of testimony in the case" and with the file closed, Young owes her nothing for her services.

3) 10/29/20 My ex parte motion in federal court for leave to file my OMNIBUS SUR-REPLY.

4) 10/29/20 My declaration and exhibits in support of my OMNIBUS SUR-REPLY.

5) 11/02/20 My court requested proof of service with exhibits showing defendants blocking my emails to avoid service.

I appreciate your taking another look into this matter and appreciate a timely response. If you decide to not reopen the Nguyen case and it has anything to do with this evidence coming forward after the 90 day expiration date had elapsed, I will refile. If on the other hand you believe that Nguyen's actions in having her client avoid the subpoena have not been proven to your satisfaction, I would appreciate knowing that your decision to not reopen and continue your investigation was based on that.

I prefer email correspondence @ [indagrodarryl@gmail.com](mailto:indagrodarryl@gmail.com). Should you wish to speak with me I can be reached @ 619.954.4447.

Thank you for your consideration and in anticipation of your reply I remain.



Darryl Cotton

Sent via Certified Mail Return Receipt Requested No EJ 414665922US