

Dear Ms. Ward,

Thank you for your letter of December 19th further documenting your negligent, irresponsible, vague reporting style. First with respect to my house. If you recall you asked me on numerous occasions, whether I had purchased #9 outright. You followed up with a similar question to Mr. Wexner on at least 2 occasions, I have told you repeatedly that yes in fact I did purchase it out right and you tirelessly repeated “then why were there no transfer taxes paid?” I explained in writing that transfer taxes are in most instances not made public. After sending you documentation on #9’s transfer taxes, you then continued on #11. Also in writing, I told Graydon that I never owned #11. Add that to the fact that Graydon has told me that #11 is not part of the story and once again, like a Gospel choir, you chant: “but what about the transfer taxes?” Enclosed please find a copy of the transfer taxes paid confirming me only as a trustee and once again requiring me to spend more time on questions whose relevance you have yet to describe. In that regard your question in your latest letter regarding refuting the claims of [REDACTED], I hope the copy of this letter when give to Vanity Fair’s lawyers, will at last give them cause for concern. I think you will agree that the only quote claim that you describe to me was that [REDACTED]

██████ had felt uncomfortable and asked her father to immediately come and get her. Are you asking me to refute how █████ █████ felt? A typical tabloid-like question. The facts and circumstances surrounding █████ behavior, attitude and actions which include hundreds of dollars of unauthorized country club charges, misrepresentations and erratic outbursts are easily verified by the former State Trooper, a highly reputable source, who lived on the property the entire time █████ was in residence. You have yet to make any attempt to contact this person that I made known to Graydon in writing, who will attest to these incidents and more. I can only believe that knowing his story would contradict your article. You have refused to contact him. You have already seen the letter from █████ after she left Ohio that suggests her idea of repaying her theft with paintings. Enclosed you will find one more such letter. With respect to █████ █████, you will recall that you specifically told me that there had been no allegations with respect █████. I would like to say that when the fact checker then faxed Ghislaine with the allegations regarding █████, in a fax dated last Friday, that your less than precise questions had made no mention of this? I have already sent documentation from █████ █████ comprising a postcard written from Thailand after her ranch visit confirming her hardly disturbed attitude. Enclosed please find additional correspondence from █████ and

her mother who helped her research student programs after her ranch visit. I would caution you that the quotes you say were read to me in context, could be best exemplified by your question, “have you ever upgraded your friends to first class and why?” The context as you put it only made clear when Erin Gladney faxed me the question: “we are also wondering if at any time you put upgrade stickers on airline tickets for any employees or friends of yours, if so can you explain how they work”. Not exactly a quote read to me in context is it? Please pay me the minimum courtesy and deny to me in writing the fact, or as you wrote it, the allegation contained in my letter to Graydon, the fact that on numerous occasions you repeated the sentence: “I am only a journalist hired by my editor to do a story and then required to publish what I hear”. I am sure you believe that this sentence denigrates both you, your magazine and your profession. So if you did not often repeat this sentence to me I will accept your denial in writing. Last, but not only not least, is the sentence in your letter that illustrates the care, professionalism, and attention to ethics that you have so brazenly portrayed. You state that you are “only investigating with people with knowledgeable sources”. I am unqualified to comment on the sentence’s grammar, but can only assume this will in future allow you to fall back on the idea that the inaccuracies and negligence weren’t yours, they weren’t even your sources, they could only

be attributable to the lack of care of the people whose sources had misled them.

P.S. In one of your last calls you referred to Michael Stroll as one of my clients. I am sure you will find no evidence of him ever paying me a fee or commission on any transaction. A disgruntled, one time friend, loser in a lawsuit, after the loss of his investment, looking to me for reimbursement; in fact after deducting his losses concurrently on his tax returns.