

1 M. Cris Armenta (SBN 177403)  
THE ARMENTA LAW FIRM APC  
2 11900 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 730  
Los Angeles, CA 90064  
3 Tel: (310) 826-2826 x 108  
Facsimile: (310) 826-5456  
4 Email: [cris@crisarmenta.com](mailto:cris@crisarmenta.com)

5 Credence E. Sol (SBN 219784)  
La Garenne  
6 86300 Chauvigny  
France  
7 Tel: 06 74 90 22 08  
8 Email: [credence.sol@sol-law.com](mailto:credence.sol@sol-law.com)

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
Cindy Lee Garcia

10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
11 **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

12 CINDY LEE GARCIA, an  
13 individual,  
14  
15 Plaintiff,

16 vs.

17 NAKOULA BASSELEY  
18 NAKOULA, an individual also  
19 known as SAM BACILE, MARK  
20 BASSELEY YOUSSEF,  
21 ABANOB BASSELEY  
22 NAKOULA, MATTHEW  
23 NEKOLA, AHMED HAMDY,  
24 AMAL NADA, DANIEL K.  
25 CARESMAN, KRITBAG  
26 DIFRAT, SOBHI BUSHRA,  
27 ROBERT BACILY, NICOLA  
28 BACILY, THOMAS J. TANAS,  
ERWIN SALAMEH, YOUSSEFF  
M. BASSELEY, and/or MALID  
AHLAWI; GOOGLE, INC., a  
Delaware Corporation;  
YOUTUBE, LLC, a California  
limited liability company, and  
DOES 1 through 10, inclusive.

Defendants.

Case No. CV12-8315-MWF(VBKx)

**DECLARATION OF JAMES A.  
BLANCO IN SUPPORT OF  
OBJECTION AND REQUEST TO  
STRIKE DECLARATIONS OF  
TIM ALGER AND MARK  
BASSELEY YOUSSEF**

**DECLARATION OF JAMES A. BLANCO**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

I, James A. Blanco declare as follows:

1. I am James A. Blanco, all of the facts set forth in this declaration are of my own personal knowledge and if called as a witness I could and would competently testify as to the following:

**EXAMINER’S PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND AND WORK HISTORY:**

2. I am a Forensic Document Examiner and I maintain a full time practice in Forensic Document Examinations. My business addresses are 55 New Montgomery Street, Suite 712 San Francisco California 94105 and 655 North Central Avenue 17<sup>th</sup> Floor, Glendale California 91203 and 1629 K Street N.W. Suite 300 Washington, DC 20006. I have been in the field of Forensic Document Examinations for over twenty five years. My training, experience and qualifications as a Forensic Document Examiner are set forth in my three page curriculum vitae which is attached and incorporated hereto as EXHIBIT 1. My training included review of such notable cases as the Zodiac Killer and the Howard Hughes Will.

3. I formally subscribe to the Collaborative Testing Services tests which are controlled tests with known results. These are the same tests given to forensic document experts in government laboratories that are accredited by ASCLAD (American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors). I continue to pass these ongoing tests maintaining a zero personal examiner error rate. In my government positions I

1 also accurately passed all of the “CTS” tests.

2 4. I was formerly commissioned with the Federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco  
3 and Firearms working as a full time Forensic Document Examiner employee in their  
4 Western Regional Forensic Science Crime laboratory. In this position I worked cases  
5 for the numerous field offices (“Posts of Duty”) in the United States and in the U.S.  
6 Protectorates and Territories of the Special Agents of ATF which also occasionally  
7 involved joint investigation cases involving DEA and FBI questioned documents  
8 cases. I left this position on good terms for a full time Forensic Document Examiner  
9 employee position with the California Department of Justice where I examined cases  
10 for hundreds of government and law enforcement agencies throughout the State of  
11 California. I left this position on good terms to enter private practice as a Forensic  
12 Document Examiner and have been in full time private practice now for fifteen years.

13 5. In addition to civil casework, I also maintain the exclusive contract with the  
14 California Secretary of State’s Office for Forensic Document services wherein I  
15 service their Forensic Document casework regarding voting fraud cases, and I also  
16 work cases for numerous other government agencies both inside and outside of  
17 California including the Montana Division of Criminal Investigation, the Federal  
18 Defenders offices in Anchorage, Florida, Puerto Rico, and other agencies.

19 6. I have rendered expert opinions regarding questioned documents on over  
20

1 7,000 occasions. I have qualified and testified as an expert witness concerning  
2 questioned documents in excess of two hundred times in both Federal and Superior  
3 Courts in numerous States and also abroad in Mexico, Singapore and the High Court  
4 of South Africa. I have never been prevented from testifying in any venue. Attached  
5 hereto as EXHIBIT 2 is a list of my testimony over the past four years.

6 7. My services are charged at \$250.00 per hour with the exception of court or  
7 deposition appearances/testimony which are charged at \$300.00 per hour.

8 8. I received from the law offices of Cris Armenta the following documents for  
9 examination which are described as follows:

10 **DESIGNATION OF DOCUMENTS BEARING QUESTIONED WRITINGS:**

11 EXHIBIT 3 Personal Release dated 8/9/11 (Doc. 33 Page ID#:871)

12 **A copy of this questioned document is attached hereto as EXHIBIT 3**

13 EXHIBIT 4 Two-page Cast Deal Memo dated 8/9/11 (Doc. 33 Page ID#872 & 873)

14 **A copy of this questioned document is attached hereto as EXHIBIT 4.**

15 **DESIGNATION OF KNOWN SPECIMEN DOCUMENTS:**

16 EXHIBIT 5 Numerous documents bearing signatures and, or handwritings

17 attributed to Cindy Garcia are attached collectively hereto as **EXHIBIT 5.**

18 **ASSIGNMENTS:**

19 9. I was asked to examine and compare the “Cindy Garcia” signatures and other  
20

1 handwritings on the EXHIBIT 3 and EXHIBIT 4 documents to the EXHIBIT 5  
2 handwritings to determine whether or not Cindy Garcia was the author of the  
3 handwritings on EXHIBIT 3 and, or on EXHIBIT 4. I was advised that the  
4 “Matthew mta” handwritings were not a matter of investigation so my analysis did  
5 not include these handwritings on EXHIBIT 3 or on EXHIBIT 4.

6 **EXAMINATIONS CONDUCTED:**

7 10. The questioned and known handwritings were examined in detail.  
8 Comparisons were made of line quality, letter forms and of letter proportions to  
9 determine similarities and/or differences between the questioned and known  
10 handwritings. Copies of these documents were made and notes were taken during  
11 the examination processes. ASTM Standard E-2290 was used as a guide in the  
12 examination processes. This guide is titled, “Standard Guide for Examination of  
13 Handwritten Items” and was developed by one of the scientific working group  
14 committees of the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) which has  
15 established standard protocols for most of the forensic sciences including pathology,  
16 fingerprints, DNA, firearms and tool marks, just to cite a few examples.

17 **ANALYSIS:**

18 11. About twenty-five pages containing known specimen writings of Cindy Garcia  
19 were presented for examination. This provided for a meaningful specimen group  
20

1 which sufficiently revealed the writing variations of Cindy Garcia, the writer of the  
2 EXHIBIT 5 materials. Detailed handwriting comparisons revealed numerous  
3 persistent difference in handwriting features in the comparison of the handwritings  
4 on EXHIBIT 3 and EXHIBIT 4 to the known handwritings of Cindy Garcia, the  
5 author of the EXHIBIT 5 handwriting samples. For example,

6 -The signatures by Cindy Garcia are more cursive and stylized in nature than  
7 the questioned signatures on EXHIBIT 3 and on EXHIBIT 4.

8 -The letters "r" of the questioned writings are more hand printed than cursive  
9 in nature. Further, the "r"s of the known writings are more  
10 elongated and vertical than the "r"s on the questioned documents.

11 -The letters "C" are different in form.

12 -The axis of the "d" in "Cindy" is oriented differently in the comparisons  
13 between the questioned and known writings.

14 -The letters "a" by Cindy Garcia are more stylized than those observed on  
15 EXHIBIT 3 and EXHIBIT 4.

16 -The "rc" connections of the questioned "Garcia" names are different in their  
17 connection strokes.

18 Numerous additional differences were noted in the comparisons between the  
19 questioned and known writings by Cindy Garcia.

20

DECLARATION OF JAMES A. BLANCO - 5

1 **RESULTS OF EXAMINATIONS—OPINIONS:**

2 12. Given all of the observed handwriting differences, it was determined that the  
3 handwriting features observed on the questioned documents did not represent the  
4 natural, normal, nor genuine handwriting characteristics of Cindy Garcia as  
5 demonstrated by her EXHIBIT 5 handwriting samples. Consequently, Cindy Garcia  
6 *is eliminated* as the writer of the handwritings on EXHIBIT 3 and on EXHIBIT 4.  
7 An "*elimination*" is a term of art in Forensic Document Examination opinion  
8 rendering and represents the highest degree of confidence expressed by document  
9 examiners in handwriting comparisons. That is, the examiner has no reservations  
10 whatever, and the examiner is certain, based on evidence contained in the  
11 handwriting, that the writer of the known material did not write the materials in  
12 question (ASTM—*American Society for Testing and Materials* Designation: E  
13 1658 – 08 Standard Terminology for Expressing Conclusions of Forensic Document  
14 Examiners).

15 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that  
16 the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

17 Executed this 30<sup>th</sup> day of November 2012, at San Francisco, California.

18   
19 JAMES A. BLANCO

20  
DECLARATION OF JAMES A. BLANCO - 6