

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF NEW YORK

Complaint
Index No. 103498/05

Verified Complaint

This is a Lawsuit alleging Libel and Slander
Plaintiff, who is filing pro-se

Plaintiff
Edward Manfredonia
8337 St. James Avenue
Apt. 4B
Elmhurst, NY 111373
Filing pro-se

Defendants:
Gary Weiss
5 Patchin Place
New York, NY 10011

Robert Pritchard
Vice President
Global Security
The McGraw Hill Companies
1221 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10020

Harold McGraw III
Chairman
The McGraw Hill Companies
1221 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10020

Stephen Shepard
The McGraw-Hill Companies
Editor in Chief
Business Week
1221 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10020

The McGraw-Hill Companies
1221 Avenue of the Americas

New York, NY 10020

The City of New York
Law Department
100 Church Street
New York, NY 10007

1. Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia does hereby allege as follows:
2. Plaintiff is a resident of New York City, Queens County and New York State. Plaintiff resides at 8337 St. James Avenue, Apt. 4B, Elmhurst, NY 11373. Plaintiff is not a public figure, even though Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia has been proclaimed to be a whistleblower in the 26 April 1999 Business Week cover story, Scandal On Wall Street.
3. Defendant Gary Weiss is a public figure, notable author and former employee of Business Week, who resides in New York City, New York County (Manhattan), and New York State.
4. Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies is a multinational corporation, incorporated in the State of New York, whose headquarters are listed as 1221 Avenue of the Americas, in New York City, New York County (Manhattan), and the State of New York. BusinessWeek (Business Week) a weekly magazine is a subsidiary and published by Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies.
5. Defendant Robert Pritchard is an employee of The McGraw Hill Companies, Vice President of Global Security, and the location of his employer, The McGraw Hill Companies, and of his office is the City of New York, New York County (Manhattan), in the State of New York.
6. Defendant Stephen Shepard is a public figure, editor in chief of Business Week, employee of The McGraw-Hill Companies, which office is located at 1221 Avenue of the Americas. Defendant Stephen Shepard has been named the Dean of the City University School of New York School of Journalism.
7. Defendant Harold McGraw III (Defendant Harold McGraw) is a public figure and Chairman of The McGraw-Hill Companies, which company owns and controls BusinessWeek (Business Week). Defendant Harold McGraw's office is located at Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies at 1221 Avenue of the Americas in the City of New York, New York County (Manhattan) in the State of New York.
8. Defendant The City of New York is a municipality incorporated in the State of New York. The Office of the Law Department of the City of New York is situated at 100 Church Street, New York, NY 10007. The Law Department is responsible for all lawsuits involving the City of New York.

9. Plaintiff, Edward Manfredonia, by himself, filing pro se, and requesting a trial by jury, alleges that:

FOR A FIRST AND SEPARATE CAUSE OF ACTION

Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia repeats and alleges paragraphs “1,” “2,” “3,” “4,” “5,” “6,” “7,” “8” and “9” of this complaint.

10. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss was forced to resign from Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies because of the reasons set forth in this Complaint.

11. That upon information and belief in 1998 Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies and Defendant The City of New York knew that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia was an honest and decent individual because Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had voluntarily agreed to be wired by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to investigate the stock fraud, PNF, and money laundering of drug money at the American Stock Exchange. (Exhibit 1: FBI wire order)

12. That upon information and belief in 1998 it was known to Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies and Defendant The City of New York that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had been wired by the FBI (Exhibit 1), specifically FBI Special Agent Joseph Yastremski, and that the FBI had uncovered a vast money laundering operation via the Cayman Islands and a narcotics smuggling operation based at the American Stock Exchange, which money laundering operation involved two members of the Board of the American Stock Exchange, Louis Miceli and Robert Van Caneghan.

12. That upon information and belief it was known to Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies that other individuals at the American Stock Exchange had informed Defendant Gary Weiss that FBI Special Agent Joseph Yastremski had demanded that these other individuals provide information regarding the narcotics smuggling of Louis Miceli and the money laundering operations of two members of the Board of the American Stock Exchange, Louis Miceli and Robert Van Caneghan.

13. That in 1998 upon information and belief it was known to Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had in 1988 earned the undying hatred of Louis Miceli for standing up to Louis Miceli, when Louis Miceli praised Hitler’s extermination of the Jews on the floor of the American Stock Exchange; that Louis Miceli had termed Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia “a f*ckin’ Jew,” “a Jew b**tard,” and other such hateful terms; and, that Arthur Levitt, at that time

Chairman of the American Stock Exchange, had refused to fine and sanction Louis Miceli for this egregious conduct.

14. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia has appeared in three issues of Business Week and that Defendant Gary Weiss authored these three articles.

15. That in the 26 April 1999 Business Week cover story, Scandal On Wall Street (Exhibit 2), which award-winning story was authored by Defendant Gary Weiss, Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia was portrayed as a whistle-blower and that more than one page of the article, Scandal On Wall Street, was dedicated to Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

16. That in the 3 May 1999 Business Week article, The Amex Is Starting To Feel The Heat (Exhibit 3), a letter Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had written to Frank Zarb, Chairman of NASD, was prominently displayed to publicly refute Frank Zarb.

17. That in the 9 August 1999 Business Week article, A Street Scandal That May Not Die (Exhibit 4), Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia was portrayed in a favorable light as gaining the confidence of individuals, who pleaded guilty to illegal trading at the New York Stock Exchange.

18. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had never violated federal law or even the Rules and Regulations of the American Stock Exchange.

19. That in the 10 August 1992 issue of Business Week Chris Welles had written an article, The System Was Perfect, concerning Heinz Grein and insider trading in Motel 6 and other issues.

20. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies knew that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia was the only individual connected to the firm of Frost & Sullivan, which firm Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia represented on the floor of the American Stock Exchange, who did not trade Motel 6, Square D and other stocks on the basis of inside information, which Heinz Grein, Joseph Greenwald and others had provided to Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

21. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies and Defendant The City of New York knew that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had reported to the FBI that Heinz Grein had laundered in excess of \$20 million for Al Avasso, a front man for the Italian Mafia and stock fraud artist, and approximately \$10 Billion for Ferdinand Marcos, which sum Ferdinand Marcos had looted from the Philippines.

22. That upon information and belief on or about April 12, 2004 and at subsequent times thereafter, that Defendant Gary Weiss, at that time an employee of McGraw-Hill Companies; Defendant Stephen Shepard, editor in chief of Business Week, a publication

of Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies; Defendant Harold McGraw, Chairman of The McGraw-Hill Companies and Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies did willfully, deliberately and maliciously conspire to libel and slander Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia through the widespread dissemination of an article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), which article, although published in the September/October 2000 issue of the IRE Journal (Journal of Investigative Reporters and Editors), was brought to the attention of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia via a Google Search of "Edward Manfredonia" on the Internet on 12 April 2004.

23. That the publication of this article, Offering Credence to the Crank, (Exhibit 5) in the IRE Journal (Journal of Investigative Reporters and Editors) libeled Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia specifically targeting those individuals, investigative reporters and editors, whom Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia must seek for his exposés on criminal misconduct on Wall Street.

24. That Defendant Gary Weiss, by libeling Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia to an audience of investigative reporters, denied Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia the right to expose crime in a book, the topic of which book would be crime on Wall Street for which book, Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia would receive remuneration.

25. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss has deliberately and willfully libeled Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia so that Defendant Gary Weiss would obtain a contract to author a book about crime on Wall Street so that the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss could be printed without fear of exposure by Edward Manfredonia.

26. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia was the only subject of this article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5).

27. That the purpose of this article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), was to libel Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and to disparage the importance of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and to reduce his role in providing exclusive and absolutely essential information for a previous article, the 26 April 1999 Business Week award winning cover story, Scandal On Wall Street (Exhibit 2).

28. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss sought to discredit Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and thereby prevent Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia from exposing the deliberate and willful lies published by Defendant Gary Weiss and Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies concerning the murders of Al Chalem and Maier Lehmann in October 1999.

29. That the title of this article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), was of its very nature willfully false, malicious and libelous and the purpose of this article, as manifested by its very title, Offering Credence to the Crank, was to portray Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia as a mentally unstable individual and as well as a dimwitted and inarticulate individual.

30. That upon information and belief this article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), which article was authored by Defendant Gary Weiss was read and given prior approval for publication by Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant McGraw-Hill Companies.

31. That prior approval of all articles, which articles are authored by employees of Business Week and which articles are published in publications other than those controlled by The McGraw-Hill Companies, must be made by Defendant Stephen Shepard, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies is a mandated requirement of employment of The McGraw-Hill Companies.

32. That upon information and belief the article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), was a knowingly willful and wantonly malicious libel by Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, upon the good name and excellent mental health of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

33. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies were aware that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia is a bright and talented individual, that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia possesses a BA and MBA from Fordham University and an Advanced Professional Certificate in Finance from Baruch College; and that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia is articulate and had studied Latin for four years and German for three years.

34. That the portrayal of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia as a mentally unstable individual in the article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), was a necessary and deliberate effort to cover up the lies and malfeasance of Gary Weiss beginning with the lies published in the article, A Message From The Mob (Exhibit 6), which article appeared in the 20 December 1999 issue of Business Week.

35. That the portrayal of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia as a “Crank,” “unconventional, difficult and maybe give the appearance of being off-balance,” and who “wear baseball caps” and who “hang out in front of stock exchanges” was to reinforce the libel of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia was mentally unstable.

36. That the purpose of the article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), was to make more believable the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia was not the source of information for the price-fixing and specialist parts of Scandal On Wall Street than the true statements of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia was the true source of the information for the price-fixing and illegal trading by specialist part of the story, Scandal On Wall Street.

37. That the whole tenor of the article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5) was to denigrate and libel Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

38. That Defendant Gary Weiss wrote of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia: “the tone of his letters was hardly calculated to promote confidence in his story,” to defame and to libel Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

39. That Defendant Gary Weiss by stating in the article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), libeled and denigrated Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia by stating, “Even more off-putting was his opaque writing and overuse of trading jargon that I found almost impossible to cipher.”

40. That Defendant Gary Weiss knew that the letters of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia were written for professionals, such as FBI Special Agents, the United States Attorney, Securities and Exchange Commission attorneys, lawyers employed by the Compliance Department of the American Stock Exchange, etc. and that the language in Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia’s letters would be understood by them.

41. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss intentionally misled readers of the article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), by not explicitly stating that the terms, which Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia utilized were common usage to regulators.

42. That Defendant Gary Weiss lied when he stated in Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5): “Manfredonia’s inability to generate attention for this charges was to a large extent, a product to the tone and the excessive number of his letters.”

43. That Defendant Gary Weiss had been specifically told by SEC attorneys that Arthur Levitt, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, had ordered the SEC staff not to investigate the American Stock Exchange.

45. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss with the approval of Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies libeled Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia, when Defendant Gary Weiss wrote in a libelous manner that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia “Not every source resembles Russell Crowe. Sometimes they hang out in front of stock exchanges.”

46. That Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies knew that it was essential for Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia to “hang out in front of stock exchanges,” so that employees, members and clerks at the American Stock Exchange could provide Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia with information concerning illegal and criminal activities at the American Stock Exchange.

47. That on one occasion Defendant Gary Weiss witnessed a source of Edward Manfredonia approach Edward Manfredonia outside the American Stock Exchange and that this source then spoke to Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

48. That Defendant Gary Weiss maliciously willfully wantonly and recklessly portrayed Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia as a “crank,” and as an “off balance,” or mentally unstable individual so that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia’s statements that Defendant Gary Weiss lied in the article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), would not be believed.

49. That upon information and belief the section of the article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), which mentioned a 1993 letter which Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia received from a prominent newspaper editor (Max Frankel of The New York Times), was mentioned in a manner to give belief that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia was unusual, off-balance and mentally unstable.

50. That Defendant Gary Weiss stated of this editor (Max Frankel): “But to me, the reaction of this editor points up the instinct we all have to avoid people who are unconventional, difficult, and maybe give the appearance of being off-balance.”

51. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss knew that the reason that Max Frankel had stated in a letter to Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia “there’s no reason to keep sending letters,” was that Arthur Levitt had told Max Frankel and the Sulzbergers, pere and fils, who were friends of Arthur Levitt, that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia was not telling the truth and that Frankel and the Sulzbergers believed Arthur Levitt.

52. That upon information and belief one of the primary reasons for the portrayal of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia as mentally unstable was an economic reason for Defendant McGraw-Hill Companies- that is the fear that a loss of money from both a decrease in circulation and a decrease in advertising revenue would ensue if the lies published in the article, A Message From the Mob (Exhibit 6), which article was written by Defendant Gary Weiss and was published in the December 20, 1999 issue of BusinessWeek (a subsidiary of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies).

53. That upon information and belief Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies knew of the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss in the article, A Message From The Mob, and in the article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), is proved by the telephone call, which Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia made to the office of Defendant Harold McGraw on 30 August 2004, and the letter that confirmed this conversation with Defendant Harold McGraw’s secretary, which letter Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia sent to Defendant Harold McGraw on 30 August 2004 via certified mail 7003 3110 0001 3705 214 (Exhibit 7).

54. That upon information and belief Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies knew of the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss in the article, A Message From The Mob (Exhibit 6), and Defendant Gary Weiss’ libel in the article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), is proved by the telephone call, which Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia made to the office of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, that is to the Chief Counsel for Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, Kenneth Vittor, on 30 August 2004, and the letter that confirmed this conversation with the secretary of Kenneth Vittor, which letter

Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia sent to Ken Vittor on 30 August 2004, via certified mail 7003 3110 0001 3705 2029 (Exhibit 8).

55. That the letter to Kenneth Vittor and the letter to Defendant Harold McGraw stated that Gary Weiss had lied in both Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5) and A Message From The Mob (Exhibit 6).

56. That immediately after the murders of Al Chalem and Maier Lehmann in October 1999, Defendant Gary Weiss had requested that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia not provide his information, which is discussed in these pages, to any other reporters because Defendant Gary Weiss was going to write in BusinessWeek (Business Week) a major story concerning the murders of Al Chalem and Maier Lehmann and the connection between the American Stock Exchange, members of the American Stock Exchange, Harbor Securities and the Russian Mob.

57. That Defendant Gary Weiss lied from the very beginning and sought to advance the lie that the Italian Mafia was responsible for the murders of Al Chalem and Maier Lehmann in order to have a book published about the Italian Mafia and Wall Street became readily apparent after the fable, posed as factual reporting, A Message From The Mob (Exhibit 6), appeared in the 20 December 1999 issue of Business Week.

58. That upon information and belief BusinessWeek, a subsidiary of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies has a circulation of approximately 500,000 and its readership is in excess of 1,000,000 in the United States of America- so in excess of 1,000,000 individuals read the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss, who lied to have a book on the Italian Mafia and Wall Street published.

59. That upon information and belief the IRE Journal (Journal of Investigative Reporters and Editors) has a circulation of approximately 15,000 and a much larger number of readers.

60. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia has the right to expose the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss to the 1,000,000 readers of BusinessWeek and the readers of the IRE Journal.

61. That Defendant Gary Weiss knew that Michael Frayler, a former member of the New York Stock Exchange, was a close friend of Al Chalem and that Chalem had functioned as a presence and bodyguard for Chalem when Chalem was meeting with individuals, including as Frayler stated, "with the Russians."

62. That Defendant Gary Weiss knew that Michael Frayler had accompanied Al Chalem to meetings with individuals involved in stock fraud, including an individual, Joe T. Logan Jr., who was linked to a purchase of Kiwi Airlines and testified before a grand jury in 2000 concerning the murders of Al Chalem and Maier Lehmann to the murders of Al Chalem and Maier Lehmann.

63. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies knew that Michael Frayler had visited the local police in New Jersey immediately upon learning of the murder of Al Chalem because Michael Frayler knew that he would be questioned by the New Jersey police.

64. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, because of a desire to increase the revenues of BusinessWeek, a subsidiary of the McGraw-Hill Companies, falsely willfully, wantonly, and maliciously permitted Defendant Gary Weiss to attribute the murders of Al Chalem and Maier Lehmann to the Italian Mafia even after Michael Frayler had stated to Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia that Frayler's friend, Al Chalem, for whom Michael Frayler maintained the computer and the records of stock transactions, etc., at that time did not have business deals with members of the Italian Mafia, but rather that Chalem was in business with the Russians (émigré Russian Mob).

65. That Defendant Gary Weiss knew that the Russian Mob had taken over Harbor Securities, the day trading firm that went bankrupt due to the stock frauds of Al Chalem and Maier Lehmann.

66. That Defendant Gary Weiss knew that Al Chalem was the representative of the Russian Mob, which had taken over Harbor Securities.

67. That in September 1999 Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had informed Gary Weiss that Michael Frayler, an individual whom Weiss had interviewed concerning illegal trading at the New York Stock Exchange, had been employed by a firm controlled by the Russian Mob.

68. That Defendant Gary Weiss knew that the influence of Al Chalem at Harbor Securities was so great that after Michael Frayler, a member of the New York Stock Exchange, had been arrested on federal charges of trading illegally, Chalem had importuned Warren Sulmasy, Chairman of Harbor Securities, to hire Michael Frayler and that because of this control of Harbor Securities by the Russian Mob, Chalem had obtained a position for Frayler at Harbor Securities as a risk manager, a position about which Frayler had no knowledge and that Warren Sulmasy, Chairman of Harbor Securities, had agreed to provide training for Michael Frayler.

69. That Defendant Gary Weiss knew that Al Chalem lived within walking distance of Michael Frayler and that Michael Frayler frequently visited Al Chalem and maintained the trading records of Al Chalem on Al Chalem's computer and that Michael Frayler and Al Chalem had attended college together.

70. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies know that the article, A Message From The Mob (Exhibit 6), was false and have removed the article, A Message From The Mob, from the on-line archives of BusinessWeek.

71. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies willfully smeared all Italian-Americans by publishing the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss, which lies attributed the murders of Al Chalem and Maier Lehmann to the Italian Mafia, which is composed of Italian-Americans, when Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies knew that the Russian Mob had murdered Al Chalem and Maier Lehmann- just as Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies have attempted to knowingly wantonly willfully wickedly deliberately and maliciously libel the good name of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

72. That Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies have knowingly willfully wantonly wickedly and maliciously libeled the good name of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia in part because he is Italian-American and would expose the ethnic biases of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies.

73. That Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies knew that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had reported Harbor Securities for violations of the net capital rule to the American Stock Exchange, the Philadelphia Stock Exchange, as well as to the Federal Reserve System and other federal entities.

74. That Defendant Gary Weiss possessed a tape-recording, which was made in February/March 1999, of a telephone conversation between Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and Guy Velardi, a former member of the American Stock Exchange and an investor in, and de facto office manager of, Harbor Securities.

75. That in this tape-recorded conversation, which Defendant Gary Weiss has in his possession, Guy Velardi stated that he did not like what was going on at Harbor Securities; that Evan Lovett, a specialist at the American Stock Exchange, was trading for the account of Gene Neale, while serving as a specialist at the American Stock Exchange; that Bill Toll had withdrawn his money from Harbor Securities because Toll did not like what was going on at Harbor Securities; that Joel Lovett, former Vice Chairman of the American Stock Exchange, knew what was going on at Harbor Securities, and had invested in Harbor Securities; that the Italian Mafia was not involved in Harbor Securities that it was something else; etc.

76. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies knew that Feivel Gottlieb, a former member of the American Stock Exchange and a close personal friend of Seymour Zucker, a senior editor at Business Week, a subsidiary of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Corporations, was a friend of Maier Lehmann and that Feivel Gottlieb had invested in the stock frauds of Maier Lehmann.

77. That Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies knew Feivel Gottlieb had provided personal financial advice including advice regarding the trading of options and stocks to his close friend, Seymour Zucker.

78. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss refused to interview Guy Velardi, Al Santamaria; Warren Sulmasy; Joel Lovett; Michael Frayler; Bill Toll; and other investors in Harbor Securities and traders at Harbor Securities; had refused to obtain the broker dealer of Harbor Securities and the list of investors in Harbor Securities because it would prove that the Italian Mafia had nothing to do with the murders of Al Chalem and Maier Lehmann and the bankruptcy of Harbor Securities.

79. That upon information and belief these lies by Defendant Gary Weiss linking the Italian Mafia to the murders of Al Chalem and Maier Lehmann were deliberate and necessary for Defendant Gary Weiss to obtain his dream, a dream often rejected by many publishers, of publishing a book about the Italian Mafia and Wall Street.

80. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss knew that the Italian Mafia could not even launder money and that in one instance of a sum in excess of \$20 million, which sum Al Avasso, a front man for and associate of the Italian Mafia had earned in the name of his wife, Rita, via a stock fraud, Greyhound Electronics, had to request the assistance of Heinz Grein, Vice Chairman of Frost & Sullivan, a business associate of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia, to launder into Luxembourg bank accounts.

81. That Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies knew that Heinz Grein had pleaded guilty to insider trading in Motel 6, because an article about Heinz Grein and his illegal trading ring had been exposed in the 10 August 1992 BusinessWeek article, The System Was Perfect.

82. That upon information and belief Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant McGraw-Hill Corporation knew with certainty that Defendant Gary Weiss was untrustworthy was definitely proved in 2000, when Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia wrote and stated that Defendant Gary Weiss had not notified BusinessWeek (Business Week) and Defendant McGraw-Hill Companies that Defendant Gary Weiss had retained an agent and was contacting publishers to publish a book about the Italian Mafia and Wall Street, while Defendant Gary Weiss was employed by Business Week, a subsidiary of The McGraw-Hill Companies.

83. That upon information and belief Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant McGraw-Hill Corporation knew that Defendant Gary Weiss was not an honest individual was apparent when Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia wrote and stated that Defendant Gary Weiss had cheated on his expense account- as Defendant Gary Weiss had informed Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

84. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies knew that the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss concerning the murders of Al Chalem and Maier Lehmann were heinous lies that could result in a timely delay in the investigation of the identities of the true murderers of Al Chalem and Maier Lehmann.

85. That upon information and belief if it were known that Defendant Gary Weiss had lied and that Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies willfully and knowingly had covered up the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss the advertising revenue and circulation of Business Week, the leading business magazine in the United States in terms of advertising dollars, would suffer drastically.

86. That upon information and belief this fear of a loss of advertising revenue and circulation as well as damage to the reputation of Business Week as a publication, which at the time that these articles were printed, could be trusted to report business conditions on a factual basis, was one of the primary motives for Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard, and Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies in their concerted efforts of lying and portraying Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia as a mentally unstable individual.

87. That upon information and belief in the article, Offering Credence to the Crank, Defendant Gary Weiss with the knowledge and approval of Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies knowingly, willfully and maliciously portrayed Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia as “being off-balance,” and wearing “baseball caps,” when it was known to Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia began to wear a baseball cap in December 1993 after having received a death threat from Italian Mafia front man and American Stock Exchange member, Alan Umbria.

88. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, Alan Umbria told Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia that he would have Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia’s name “placed on a death list.”

89. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies knew that Italian Mafia associate and front man, Alan Umbria, boasted to Plaintiff Manfredonia’s acquaintances and friends, including Gene Weissman, that he (Umbria) would have his Mafia friends kill Manfredonia with a “headshot.”

90. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies knew that in December 1999 FBI Special Agent Joseph Yastremski, acting under the supervision of

Assistant United States Attorney Frances Fragos, picked up and questioned Alan Umbria for threatening Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

91. That upon information and belief it is known to Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant McGraw-Hill Companies and Defendant The City of New York through the New York City Police Department that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had been wired by FBI Special Agent Joseph Yastremski (Exhibit 1) and that Alan Umbria had been picked up by FBI Agent Joseph Yastremski for threatening the life of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

92. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies knew that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had informed Alan Umbria that he (Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia) would wear a baseball cap so that an innocent person would not be murdered by mistake because Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia did not wish innocent individuals to suffer for Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's actions.

93. That Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies knew that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had continued to wear a baseball cap because Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had been treated for basal skin cancer on his face and forehead and that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had been instructed by his dermatologist to wear a baseball cap at all times when outside so that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's forehead and face would not be exposed to the cancer-causing rays of the sun.

94. That upon information and belief in the fall of 2004 Defendant Stephen Shepard knowingly willfully wantonly and maliciously lied to members of the Board of Trustees of the City University of New York concerning Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's mental condition, by referring to Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia as a "crank," a guy "who wears a baseball cap," who "appears to be a little off balance," and worse because exposure of the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss and Defendant Stephen Shepard would prevent Defendant Stephen Shepard from obtaining the position of Dean of the newly founded School of Journalism of the City University of New York.

95. That upon information and belief Defendant Stephen Shepard willfully wantonly and maliciously lied about the mental state of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia, referring to Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia as a "crank," a guy "who wears a baseball cap," and an individual "who appears to be a little off-balance," to the Board of Trustees of the City University of New York because the Board of Trustees of the City University of New York would summarily reject Defendant Stephen as Dean of the School of Journalism of the City University of New York if it were known that Defendant Stephen Shepard had willfully deliberately and maliciously lied about the mental condition of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia to cover up for the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss and the lies of Defendant Stephen Shepard.

96. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies conspired to cause great economic harm to Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia by discrediting Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia as a mentally unstable individual.

97. That upon information and belief one of the most important reasons for this portrayal of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia as a mentally unstable individual is that Defendant McGraw-Hill Companies, Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard and Defendant Harold McGraw knew that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia must be discredited and libeled or Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies would suffer irreparable financial problems, such as a loss of advertising revenue, loss of circulation, loss of economic prestige, etc. if it were to become public that Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies had lied and covered up the lies of Gary Weiss.

98. That upon information and belief exposure of the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss in Business Week and the IRE Journal and exposure of the lies of Defendant Stephen Shepard, editor in chief of Business Week, would result in an economic loss of tens of millions of dollars for Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, a multi-billion dollar, and multi-national corporation.

99. That it must be remembered that reporters have been terminated by The Boston Globe, The New York Times and other newspapers for not properly attributing quotes and work performed by other reporters to understand the tremendous loss of prestige and money, which would effect Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies if the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss and Defendant Stephen Shepard were exposed.

100. By reason of the portrayal of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia in the article Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), as a mentally unstable individual, or “Crank;” the derisory portraiture of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia as giving the appearance of ‘being off-balance;” the ridicule of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia as not resembling Russell Crowe; and the mocking portrayal of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia as “wearing a baseball cap,” when the wearing of a baseball cap is for both medical reasons and for ensuring that an innocent person is not murdered, Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia has been held up to ridicule; has had his good name trashed; and has suffered damage to his good name and reputation; has been ridiculed by reporters at Business Week; has been shunned by reporters at Business Week; etc. and has been shunned by book publishers, reporters, etc. Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia seeks exemplary and punitive damages in the amount of \$5 million from each of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies.

101. By reason of the defamatory portrayal in the article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia as a “Crank;” a mentally unstable individual; derisory portraiture of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia as “wearing a baseball cap;” etc.,

Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia has suffered general and compensatory damages in the amount of \$5 million from each of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies.

FOR A SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

102. Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia repeats and alleges paragraphs “1,” “2,” “3,” “4,” “5,” “6,” “7,” “8,” and “9” of this complaint.

103. That upon information and belief on or about April 12, 2004 and at subsequent times thereafter, that Defendant Gary Weiss, at that time an employee of McGraw-Hill Companies; Defendant Harold McGraw; Defendant Stephen Shepard; and, Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies did willfully, deliberately and maliciously conspire to libel and slander Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia through the widespread dissemination of an article, Offering Credence to the Crank, (Exhibit 5) which article, although published in the September/October 2000 issue of the IRE Journal (Journal of Investigative Reporters and Editors), was brought to the attention on 12 April 2004 of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia via a Goggle Search of “Edward Manfredonia” on the Internet.

104. That upon information and belief Defendant Harold McGraw knew of the lies of Gary Weiss in the article, A Message From The Mob (Exhibit 6), and in the article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), is proved by the telephone call, which Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia made to the office of Defendant Harold McGraw on 30 August 2004, and the letter that confirmed this conversation with Defendant Harold McGraw’s secretary, which letter Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia sent to Defendant Harold McGraw on 30 August 2004 via certified mail 7003 3110 0001 3705 2142 (Exhibit 7).

105. That upon information and belief Defendant McGraw-Hill Companies knew of the lies of Gary Weiss in the article, A Message From The Mob (Exhibit 6), and in the article, Offering Credence to the Crank, is proved by the telephone call, which Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia made to the office of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, that is the Chief Counsel for Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, Kenneth Vittor, on 30 August 2004, and the letter that confirmed this conversation with the secretary of Kenneth Vittor, which letter Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia sent to Ken Vittor on 30 August 2004, via certified mail 7003 3110 0001 3705 2029 (Exhibit 8) .

106. That Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies did deliberately, willfully and maliciously lie and knowingly falsely state in the article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia was not the source of information for the “price-fixing or ***** parts of my story,” which story is the 26 April 1999 Business Week cover story, Scandal On Wall Street, which story was authored by Defendant Gary Weiss.

107. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and his friend, whose affidavit (Exhibit 9) is affixed to this complaint, who does not wish his name to appear in the Complaint and who was a member of the American Stock Exchange during the relevant time period 1998-2002, were the only sources of information for the price fixing section of the 26 April 1999 Business Week cover story, Scandal On Wall Street (Exhibit 2), which article was authored by Gary Weiss.

108. That Defendant Gary Weiss knew that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and his friend, who has signed the affidavit (Exhibit 9) and who does not wish his name to appear in the Complaint but who stands willing and able to testify in court and who was a member of the American Stock Exchange during the relevant time period of 1998-2002, were the only sources of information for the price fixing section.

109. That upon information and belief Defendant Stephen Shepard knew that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and his friend, whose affidavit is affixed (Exhibit 9) to this complaint were the only sources of information for the price fixing section of the article, Scandal On Wall Street, because Defendant Stephen Shepard had to personally approve and verify every source for the price fixing section of the article.

110. That upon information and belief Defendant McGraw-Hill Companies and Defendant Harold McGraw knew, by means of the investigation and the approval of the legal department of The McGraw-Hill Companies and, in this instance according to Defendant Gary Weiss, by means of the required personal approval of Kenneth Vittor, General Counsel of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and his friend, whose affidavit is affixed to this complaint, were the sole sources of information for the price-fixing section of the article, Scandal On Wall Street (Exhibit 2).

111. That Defendant Stephen Shepard and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies had to personally approve all sections of the article, Scandal On Wall Street (Exhibit 2), including the section on price-fixing in options.

112. That Defendant Stephen Shepard and Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies had to personally approve of all informants and all information provided by these informants for the section of the article, which concerned price-fixing in options.

113. That Defendant Gary Weiss met with the only two sources of option-price fixing, Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's friend, in whose affidavit (Exhibit 9) Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's friend states that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and he were the sole sources of information for option price-fixing at the American Stock Exchange section of the article, Scandal On Wall Street (Exhibit 2).

114. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's friend, whose affidavit (Exhibit 9) states that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and he (Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's friend) were the sole sources for option price-fixing in the article,

Scandal On Wall Street, patiently explained on two occasions how price-fixing in options is practiced at the American Stock Exchange and the central role of the Option Specialist in this price-fixing.

115. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies knew that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and his friend, whose affidavit (Exhibit 9) is affixed as an exhibit and which affidavit states that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's friend were the only sources of information for the price fixing section of the article, Scandal On Wall Street.

116. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies conspired to permit Defendant Gary Weiss to lie when he wrote the article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), in a deliberate, knowing and malicious manner with the willful and malicious intent to libel Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and, by libeling Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia preventing the exposure of the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss.

117. That upon information and belief Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies covered up the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss because Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies would suffer severe financial dislocation if it were known that Defendant Gary Weiss had lied.

118. That upon information and belief it was known to Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies and Defendant The City of New York that Defendant Gary Weiss had to lie in the article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), about the source of his information regarding price fixing to prevent Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia from publishing a book about The Scandals on Wall Street (WallStreetScandals.com is the name of Plaintiff's website.), which book would prove that Defendant Gary Weiss had lied in numerous articles, including, but not limited to, A Message From The Mob (Exhibit 6), and Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5).

119. That on 14 April 2004 after Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had viewed the wantonly malicious and libelous article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), on the Internet, Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia wrote two missives to various members of the Board of the IRE Journal (Journal of Investigative Reporters and Editors), most notably to Professor Brant Houston of the University of Missouri School of Journalism, which School of Journalism publishes the IRE Journal (Journal of Investigative Reporters and Editors).

120. That two missives, both dated April 14, 2004, which missives were authored by Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia, and which April 14, 2004 missives were mailed to Professor Brant Houston of the University of Missouri School of Journalism, proved that Defendant Gary Weiss had lied in the article, Offering Credence to the Crank.

121. That upon information and belief, Professor Brant Houston and others forwarded copies of these letters, which exposed the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss in the article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), to Defendant Gary Weiss.

122. That upon information and belief, circa June 2004 Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies reached an agreement whereby Defendant Gary Weiss would resign from the staff of Business Week, a subsidiary company of Defendant the McGraw-Hill Companies because Defendant Gary Weiss had lied in the articles, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5) and A Message From The Mob (Exhibit 6).

123. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies conspired to libel Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia in order to cover up the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss and thereby prevent a loss of advertising revenue and a decrease in the number of paid copies and subscription copies to the flagship publishing venture of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, BusinessWeek (Business Week).

124. That in the fall of 2004 Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia wrote several missives, which were accompanied by the two April 14, 2004 letters to the Board of Trustees of the City University of New York, including but not limited to Professor Benno Schmidt and Chancellor Matthew Goldstein, in which letters Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia described the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss and the lies of Defendant Stephen Shepard.

125. That upon information and belief Defendant Stephen Shepard lied to members of the Board of Trustees of the City University of New York concerning Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and the primacy of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's information regarding option price fixing because exposure of the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss and Defendant Stephen Shepard would prevent Defendant Stephen Shepard from obtaining the position of Dean of the newly founded School of Journalism of the City University of New York.

126. That upon information and belief Defendant Stephen Shepard willfully wantonly and maliciously lied about Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia so that Defendant Stephen Shepard could obtain a position as Dean of the City University of New York School of Journalism, a position for which he would not be considered if the Board of Trustees of the City University of New York knew that Defendant Stephen Shepard had knowingly willfully maliciously and wantonly lied about Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's primary importance in the option price-fixing section of the article, Scandal On Wall Street (Exhibit 2).

127. That Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies conspired to cause great economic harm to Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia by discrediting Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia as a primary source of information for option price-fixing.

128. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies conspired to cover up the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss, which lies refused to acknowledge the importance of the information regarding option price-fixing, which information on option price fixing Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia provided to Defendant Gary Weiss, because of fear of great economic harm to Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies.

129. That upon information and belief this refusal by Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies to acknowledge the primacy and importance of information concerning option price fixing provided by Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia was willfully, deliberately, wantonly, and maliciously done both to libel Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and to cause great economic harm to Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia by means of denying Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia the opportunity to author a book on Wall Street Scandals, which book would of necessity have exposed the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss.

130. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies willfully, wantonly, maliciously, recklessly and deliberately conspired to lie about the responsibility of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia as a source for the material on option price-fixing because in the year 2000 the friend of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia was employed as an options market maker on the floor of the American Stock Exchange.

131. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies knew that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's friend, whose affidavit is Exhibit 9, could not openly testify against Defendant Gary Weiss because Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's friend would be terminated from his position if it were known that he had provided information on price fixing to Defendant Gary Weiss.

132. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies knew that an exposé of the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss, no matter how small, would result in terrible economic damage to Defendant McGraw-Hill Companies.

133. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies would suffer a loss of prestige and an economic loss in advertising revenue and an economic loss in circulation permitting Forbes and Fortune, both business magazines, to overtake Business Week (BusinessWeek) as the premier business magazine in the United States if it were known that Defendant Gary Weiss had lied and that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and his friend were the true sources of information concerning the option price-fixing.

134. That it must be remembered that reporters have been terminated by The Boston Globe, The New York Times and other newspapers for not properly attributing quotes and work performed by other reporters to understand the tremendous loss of prestige and money, which would effect Business Week and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies if the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss and Defendant Stephen Shepard were exposed.

135. That Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies willfully, wantonly recklessly and maliciously lied about the importance of the information provided by Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and the friend of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia, whose affidavit (Exhibit 9) is attached as an exhibit.

136. That Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies thus wantonly, deliberately, maliciously and recklessly conspired to permit the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss to be disseminated so that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia would suffer great mental distress and great economic distress.

137. That said defamatory actions of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies have caused great mental distress to Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and said defamatory actions were pursued with malicious, wanton, reckless, and deliberate disregard of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's rights.

138. That for the defamatory actions of the wanton, deliberate and reckless disregard of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's rights and for the knowing false and deliberate misrepresentations of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia seeks compensatory damages of \$4 million from each of the defendants, Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies.

139. That for the defamatory actions of the wanton, deliberate and reckless disregard of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's rights and for the knowing false and deliberate misrepresentations of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia seeks punitive damages of \$5 million from each of the defendants, Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies.

140. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia must remind the court of the biblical injunction against lying and that many Talmudic scholars consider lying to be a greater sin than murder- a topic that in the past Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and Defendant Gary Weiss have discussed in great detail.

FOR A THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

141. Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia repeats and alleges paragraphs “1,” “2,” “3,” “4,” “5,” “6,” “7,” “8,” and “9” of this complaint.

142. That upon information and belief on or about April 12, 2004 and at subsequent times thereafter, that Defendant Gary Weiss, at that time an employee of Defendant McGraw-Hill Companies; Defendant Harold McGraw; Defendant Stephen Shepard; and, Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies did willfully, deliberately and maliciously conspire to libel and slander plaintiff through the widespread dissemination of an article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), which article, although published in the September/October 2000 issue of the IRE Journal (Journal of Investigative Reporters and Editors), was brought to the attention of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia via a Google Search of “Edward Manfredonia” on the Internet on April 12, 2004.

143. That in the article, “Offering Credence to the Crank” (Exhibit 5), Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies (Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies) did knowingly maliciously wantonly and willfully state that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia was not a source for the “**** and specialist parts of my story,” which specialist part refers to the illegal trading by Joseph Giamanco Sr. of stocks in which Joseph Giamanco Sr. and his specialist firm, GHM, served as the specialist. “My story” referring to the 26 April 1999 Business Week cover story, Scandal On Wall Street (Exhibit 2).

144. That upon information and belief Defendant Harold McGraw knew of the lies of Gary Weiss in the article, A Message From The Mob (Exhibit 6), and in the article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), is proved by the telephone call, which Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia made to the office of Defendant Harold McGraw on 30 August 2004, and the letter that confirmed the telephone conversation with Defendant Harold McGraw’s secretary, which letter Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia sent to Defendant Harold McGraw on 30 August 2004 via certified mail 7003 3110 0001 3705 2142 (Exhibit 7).

145. That upon information and belief Defendant McGraw-Hill Companies knew of the lies of Gary Weiss in the article, A Message From The Mob, and in the article, Offering Credence to the Crank, is proved by the telephone call, which Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia made to the office of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, that is the Chief Counsel for Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, Kenneth Vittor, on 30 August 2004, and the letter that confirmed this conversation with the secretary of Kenneth Vittor, which letter Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia sent to Ken Vittor on 30 August 2004, via certified mail 7003 3110 0001 3705 2029 (Exhibit 8).

146. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies did knowingly maliciously wantonly and willfully lie about the importance of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia’s information regarding the illegal trading by specialists.

147. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies did knowingly maliciously and willfully lie in the article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), about the primary importance of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's information regarding illegal trading by specialists so that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia would not be believed when he would state that Defendant Gary Weiss had lied in other articles.

148. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies had thoroughly investigated the sources of Defendant Gary Weiss and know with absolute certitude that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia was the source for the information concerning "the specialist part of" the article, Scandal On Wall Street (Exhibit 2).

149. That Defendant Gary Weiss was so ignorant and lacking in any form of knowledge of stock trading and specialist activities on the floor of the American Stock Exchange that Defendant Gary Weiss did not know the importance of S-3 form for HEB (Hemispherx Biopharma), dated 19980205, SEC file number 333-45677, when Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia brought it to the attention of Defendant Gary Weiss.

150. That this S-3 form for HEB was a filing for owners of stock at a discount that listed several individuals and one firm as beneficial owners of stock, and that these close business associates and partners of Joseph Giamanco Sr. were listed as participating in the ownership of stock.

151. That Defendant Gary Weiss was so ignorant of the specialist operations of Joseph Giamanco Sr. that he did not know that Ronald Menello, who was listed as owning 10,000 shares of HEB in the aforementioned S-3 form of HEB; and Gary Hermann who was listed as owning 40,000 shares of HEB in the aforementioned S-3 form, were partners in the specialist firm, GHM, and that GHM was an acronym for Giamanco, Herman and Menello, who were the partners in the American Stock Exchange specialist firm, GHM, which specialist firm was the specialist in HEB on the American Stock Exchange.

152. That Defendant Gary Weiss requested that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia arrange a meeting attended by Defendant Gary Weiss, Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and one of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's sources, who would state that Joseph Giamanco Sr. was trading the stock of HEB for his personal account.

153. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia informed Defendant Gary Weiss that none of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's sources, who were employed by GHM, and knew of the illegal trading of HEB by Joseph Giamanco Sr. for the personal account of Joseph Giamanco Sr., would meet with Defendant Gary Weiss because they did not trust Defendant Gary Weiss.

154. That one of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's sources for the illegal trading of specialists, that is a source, who possessed knowledge of the illegal trading by Joseph

Giamanco Sr. of HEB stock for the personal account of Joseph Giamanco Sr., agreed to be taped by Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

155. That on 30 December 2004 Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia mailed a missive (Exhibit 12), which was addressed to Professor Brant Houston of the IRE Journal at the University of Missouri School of Journalism in which letter Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia detailed the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss and in which letter Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia requested that Professor Brant Houston arrange a discussion, which Professor Houston could moderate, and that this discussion would be between Defendant Gary Weiss and Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

156. That the topic of this discussion between Defendant Gary Weiss and Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia would be the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss and that the exposure of the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss could then be printed in the IRE Journal (Investigative Reporters and Editors Journal).

157. That on December 1, 2004 Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had stated in a message, which message Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had left on the answering machine of Defendant Gary Weiss' home telephone number that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's friend, whose affidavit is affixed as Exhibit 9, was ready willing and able to testify in court about the lies Defendant Gary Weiss concerning the identity of the sources for the price-fixing section of the article, Scandal On Wall Street (Exhibit 2).

158. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies rejected this solution to the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss and made a conscious decision to continue to knowingly maliciously, willfully and wantonly libel and slander Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

159. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss knew that his career as an author and writer would be finished if Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia exposed the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss.

160. That upon information and belief Defendant Stephen Shepard knew that if the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss were exposed that the reputation and economic wellbeing and reputation of Defendant Stephen Shepard would suffer irreparable damage.

161. That upon information and belief Defendant Stephen Shepard knew that if Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia exposed the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss that Defendant Stephen Shepard would be forced to resign from his position as Dean of the School of Journalism at the City University of New York.

162. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies faced with exposure of their lies before the public press of New York City, willfully, wantonly, maliciously, and knowingly conspired to libel Plaintiff

Edward Manfredonia and to continue to lie rather than let the truth become known about the conspiracy of lies of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies.

163. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies knew that an exposé of the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss would result in terrible economic damage to Defendant McGraw-Hill Companies.

164. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies knew that Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies would suffer a devastating loss of prestige and a disastrous economic loss in advertising revenue and a loss in circulation permitting Forbes and Fortune, both business magazines, to overtake Business Week (BusinessWeek) as the premier business magazine in the United States and these devastating losses would mean economic disaster for Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies.

165. That upon information and belief exposure of the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss in Business Week and the IRE Journal and exposure of the lies of Defendant Stephen Shepard, editor in chief of Business Week, a subsidiary of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies would result in an economic loss of tens of millions of dollars for Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies.

166. That it must be noted that reporters have been terminated by The Boston Globe, The New York Times and other newspapers for not properly attributing quotes and work performed by other reporters to understand the tremendous loss of prestige and money, which would effect Business Week if the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss and Defendant Stephen Shepard were exposed.

167. That for the defamatory actions and the wanton, deliberate and reckless disregard of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's rights and for the knowing false and deliberate misrepresentations of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia seeks compensatory damages of \$5 million from each of the defendants, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies for lying about the importance of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's information in the illegal trading of specialists.

168. That for the defamatory actions of the wanton, deliberate and reckless disregard of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's rights and for the knowing false and deliberate misrepresentations of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia seeks punitive damages of \$5 million from

each of the defendants, Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies for lying about the importance of the role of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia in exposing the illegal trading of specialists.

FOR A FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

169. Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia repeats and alleges paragraphs “1,” “2,” “3,” “4,” “5,” “6,” “7,” “8,” and “9” of this complaint.

170. That upon information and belief on or about January 27, 2004, and thereafter, that Defendant Gary Weiss, at that time a former employee of The McGraw-Hill Companies; Defendant Harold McGraw; Defendant Stephen Shepard; Defendant Robert Pritchard, Vice President, Global Securities, The McGraw-Hill Companies; Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies; and Defendant The City of New York did willfully, wantonly, knowingly, deliberately and maliciously conspire to libel and slander plaintiff through the widespread dissemination of a missive, dated 27 January 2005 (Exhibit 10), which totally libelous missive was authored by Defendant Robert Pritchard, Vice President, Global Security, The McGraw-Hill Companies.

171. That upon information and belief prior to the authorship of this missive by Defendant Robert Pritchard (Exhibit 10), Defendant Gary Weiss with the full knowledge and consent of Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies willfully, wantonly, knowingly and maliciously libeled Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia, when Defendant Gary Weiss filed a Complaint with the Police Department of the City of New York thereby slandering and libeling Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia, in this Complaint provided by Defendant Gary Weiss to Detective Peter Frisica of the Midtown North Precinct, which Midtown North Precinct is the precinct for the address of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies.

172. That upon information and belief the sole reason for this false and illegal complaint of Defendant Gary Weiss, which complaint could only have been filed with the political and economic pressure of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, was to prevent Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia from exposing the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss, as Plaintiff had stated to Defendant Gary Weiss in the message, which Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had left on December 1, 2004 on the answering machine of Defendant Gary Weiss.

173. That in this message of December 1, 2004 to Defendant Gary Weiss, Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia stated that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia would not grant permission to Defendant Gary Weiss to utilize any information that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had provided for the Business Week articles, including Scandal On Wall Street (Exhibit 2.).

174. That according to Detective Peter Friscia Defendant Gary Weiss stated that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had written letters about Defendant Gary Weiss.

175. That according to Detective Frisca Defendant Gary Weiss had stated that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had harassed Defendant Gary Weiss because Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had telephoned Defendant Gary Weiss at his residence and on his cell phone a total of three times over an eight month period in which telephone calls Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia plaintively inquired of Defendant Gary Weiss, why Defendant Gary Weiss was lying about Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia in the article, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5), and in which telephone calls Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia left a message for Defendant Gary Weiss to please telephone Defendant Edward Manfredonia.

176. That initially Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had telephoned Defendant Gary Weiss at his former place of employment at BusinessWeek, a subsidiary of Defendant McGraw-Hill Companies, which is situated at 1221 Avenue of the Americas.

177. That the answering machine for Defendant Gary Weiss' telephone number at Defendant McGraw Hill Companies did not request one to leave a message but merely provided a pre-recorded message from Defendant Gary Weiss that directed the individual, who made the telephone call, to call Defendant Gary Weiss on his cell phone.

178. That the recorded message on Defendant Gary Weiss' former number at McGraw Hill merely stated that Defendant Gary Weiss was no longer at Business Week and that if the caller wished to speak to Defendant Gary Weiss the caller could reach Defendant Gary Weiss at the cell phone number.

179. That upon information and belief it was known to Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had telephoned Defendant Gary Weiss more than 100 times in the period 1998 to 2000, during which period Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and Defendant Gary Weiss had cooperated in the publishing of three articles (Exhibits 2, 3, 4), which gave a primary position to Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia, and several commentaries in 2000- all of which were authored by Defendant Gary Weiss and published in Business Week, a subsidiary of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies.

180. That upon information and belief the reason for the filing of this false, libelous and fictitious complaint of Defendant Gary Weiss, with the knowledge and approval of Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies was that in a December 1, 2004 telephone call to Defendant Gary Weiss, Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had stated that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's sources would testify in court that Defendant Gary Weiss had lied and that if Defendant Gary Weiss utilized Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's information Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia would sue Defendant Gary Weiss in court.

181. That the December 1, 2004 telephone call was Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's last telephone call to Defendant Gary Weiss.

182. That upon information and belief Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's December 1, 2004 telephone call to Defendant Gary Weiss was not threatening is known to Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies and Defendant The City of New York.

183. That upon information and belief that in June 2004 Defendant Gary Weiss was compelled to resign from Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies for lying in the articles, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5) and A Message From The Mob (Exhibit 6) is known to Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies.

184. That Detective Peter Friscia informed Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had harassed Defendant Gary Weiss by writing missives to individuals, even though the subjects of these missives were the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss concerning the murders of Al Chalem and Maier Lehmann; the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss concerning the responsibility of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia for the price-fixing and specialist sections of the article, Scandal On Wall Street; the numerous unethical business deals of Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, etc.; and the participation of Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies in the cover up of the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss.

185. That over the course of several months Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had left one plaintive message on Defendant Gary Weiss' cell phone and had left two plaintive messages on Defendant Weiss' home telephone and Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had left his telephone number and had requested that Defendant Gary Weiss return Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's telephone call, but it was apparent that Detective Peter Friscia had not listened to the telephone calls made by Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia to Defendant Gary Weiss.

186. That the City of New York, through its agency the Police Department of the City of New York, was totally negligent and acted upon the false complaint of Defendant Gary Weiss without investigating the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss because of the economic prestige and power of Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies.

187. That it became obvious to Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia that a favor was being done to the wealthy and powerful by the City of New York and the Police Department of the City of New York in an effort to protect Defendant McGraw-Hill Companies, a multi-billion dollar and multi-national corporation with headquarters at 1221 Avenue of the Americas in the City of New York, and to protect the financial wealth and reputation of Defendant Harold McGraw, a billionaire.

188. That according to Detective Friscia, Defendant Gary Weiss filed a Complaint alleging Harassment, although Defendant Gary Weiss desired a Complaint of Aggravated Harassment and Stalking, which Complaints of Aggravated Harassment and Stalking were denied by statute.

189. That according to Detective Peter Frisca this denial by statute of a Complaint of Aggravated Harassment and Stalking was denied because the statutory requirements had not been met.

190. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia met with Detective Friscia on the afternoon of Thursday, February 10, 2005, at the offices of the Midtown North Precinct, which is situated at 306 West 54th Street.

191. That Plaintiff wishes to affirm this is not the New York City Police Precinct, which is responsible for the home residence of Gary Weiss, who resides at 5 Patchin Place in the County of New York, City of New York, and State of New York.

192. That the Midtown North Precinct is the New York City Police Precinct responsible for the address of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, which is a multi-billion dollar multinational, the headquarters of which is situated at 1221 Avenue of the Americas, which address is located within the confines of the Midtown North Precinct.

193. That upon information and belief the Midtown North Precinct was chosen to file this maliciously libelous and willfully false complaint because of the political influence of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies and because of its largess in donating money to causes including charities that benefit the New York City Police Department.

194. That the City of New York and its agency the Police Department of the City of New York were totally negligent and acted upon the libelous complaint of Defendant Gary Weiss because of the economic prestige and power of Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies.

195. That it became obvious to Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia that a favor was being done to the wealthy and powerful by the City of New York and the Police Department of the City of New York in an effort to protect Defendant McGraw-Hill Companies, a multi-billion dollar, multi-national corporation with headquarters at 1221 Avenue of the Americas in the City of New York, and to protect the financial wealth and reputation of Defendant Harold McGraw, a billionaire.

196. That Detective Peter Friscia did not perform the minimum acceptable standard of investigatory work required to process this complaint.

197. That Detective Peter Friscia did not listen to the telephone calls nor did Detective Peter Friscia read any of the letters, which Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had authored.

198. That it is here that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia must digress and provide a brief history of the transgressions of the New York City Police Department against Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

199. That upon information and belief it was known to Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies and Defendant New York City Police Department that the New York City Police Department had illegally harassed Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia on numerous occasions, as a result of the political and economic influence of the American Stock Exchange, which utilized the New York City Police Department to cover up crime at the American Stock Exchange.

200. That in 1991 the American Stock Exchange, its Senior Vice President of Compliance, attorney Stephen Lister; Louis Miceli, a former member of the Board of the American Stock Exchange and partner in the specialist firm, Miceli-Van Caneghan; and Robert Van Caneghan, a member of the Board of the American Stock Exchange had conspired with members of the New York City Police Department, specifically Lieutenant Molloy and Detective Montellini of the Special Fraud Squad, to illegally harass Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia through the threatening use of unsigned complaints of which there is no such thing.

201. That Louis Miceli and Robert Van Caneghan approached the Special Fraud Squad and stated that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had made threatening telephone calls to the home of Louis Miceli; that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had threatened Paul Volcker, a member of the Board of the American Stock Exchange; etc. (Sounds familiar does it not?)

202. That the Special Fraud Squad illegally harassed Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia by stating that arrest warrants existed for the arrest of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

203. That the illegal harassment of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia desisted only after Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia filed a complaint with Internal Affairs against Detective Montellini and Lieutenant Molloy.

204. That Detective Montellini and Lieutenant Molloy and other police officers informed Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia that Deputy Mayor Norman Steisel had ordered Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia to be illegally harassed by the New York City Police Department.

205. That at the time, and this is known to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and in particular to FBI Special Agent Joseph Yastremski, that Louis Miceli and Robert Van Caneghan were involved in a stock fraud, PNF, with the Italian Mafia, in the person of Al Avasso, an associate of the Italian Mafia and front man for the Italian Mafia in various stock frauds.

206. That it was known to FBI Special Agent Joseph Yastremski that Louis Miceli was involved in the smuggling of drugs aboard his boat, The Jaded Lady.

207. That it was known to FBI Special Agent Joseph Yastremski that Louis Miceli and Robert Van Caneghan were involved in the laundering of drug money via the Cayman Islands.

208. That it was known to FBI Special Agent Joseph Yastremski that Robert Van Caneghan had admitted to the Board of the American Stock Exchange that he (Robert Van Caneghan) had sexually assaulted/raped his female employees.

209. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies and Defendant The City of New York and its New York City Police Department knew that from 1998 to 2000 Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had been illegally followed by New York City Police Officers, operating out of the Wall Street Substation and under the supervision of a crooked cop, Inspector O'Hare.

210. That Inspector O'Hare was removed only after the Special Investigations Unit of Internal Affairs had investigated Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's charge that he was being followed illegally by New York City Police Officers operating from the Wall Street Substation.

211. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies and Defendant The City of New York knew that the constant illegal surveillance of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia by the New York City Police Department had a chilling and frightening effect upon Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

212. That Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies and Defendant The City of New York knew that the filing of a complaint, no matter how false and malicious, would frighten Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia because Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia has previously been threatened with arrest by New York City Police Officers at the behest of the millionaires of Wall Street and the American Stock Exchange.

213. That upon information and belief Defendant City of New York knew that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia has defended minority Asian and Latino women and elderly Latino-American citizens against the depredations of white thugs in Elmhurst, Queens and that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia was ignored by the New York City Police Department—even when Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia was referred to as a “fuckin’ Jew,” and a “Jew bastard.”

214. That upon information and belief Defendant City of New York knew that in Elmhurst, Queens Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia was repeatedly threatened with physical violence, including the threat of broken legs, being hit with a pipe, having his jaw broken, etc. by thugs and that these incidents were reported to the New York City Police Department and The New York City Police Department took no action.

215. That it was only when Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had a friend, who was an attorney, telephone the New York City Police Department and after Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had written to Mayor Michael Bloomberg that any action was taken.

216. That even when Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia was threatened with death by Alan Umbria, a front man for the Italian Mafia, the New York City Police Department did nothing.

217. That it became very obvious that the reason that the Complaint, which was filed by Defendant Gary Weiss at the Midtown North Precinct, which is not the precinct where Defendant Gary Weiss resides, was due to the enormous economic and political influence of Defendant Harold McGraw, a white billionaire, and Defendant McGraw-Hill Companies, a multi-billion dollar, multi-national corporation.

218. That this sale of justice is a widely accepted form of gratitude shown by Defendant The City of New York to multi-billion dollar, multi-national corporations, such as Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, and white billionaires, such as Defendant Harold McGraw, is heinous.

219. That Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies and Defendant The City of New York attempted to frighten Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia by conspiring to have Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia frightened and harassed by The City of New York Police Department so that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia would not expose the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies.

220. That upon information and belief exposure of these lies of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies by Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia would have a drastic effect upon the advertising revenues, subscription base, and net profit of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, which is a large contributor to various charitable agencies of the City of New York and which Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies pays tens of millions of dollars to the coffers of The City of New York in real estate taxes and income taxes.

221. That to prevent a loss in revenue and net profit, Defendant The City of New York conspired with Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant McGraw-Hill Companies to prevent Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia from exposing the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies by illegally harassing Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia through the use of a harassment complaint, which according to Detective Peter Friscia was signed by Defendant Gary Weiss.

222. That on the afternoon of Thursday, 10 February 2005, Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia related to Detective Friscia that when Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia in December 1993 was threatened with murder by Al Umbria, an associate of the Italian Mafia and a front man for the Italian Mafia in restaurants and on Wall Street, the New York City Police department took no action- even though Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia was referred to both the New York City Police Department and to the Office of the Manhattan District Attorney by Assistant United States Attorney Frances Fragos.

223. That at that time Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia knew that there shall always exist two standards of justice and law- one for millionaires, such as Robert Van Caneghan and Louis Miceli and billionaires, such as Defendant Harold McGraw; for Wall Street Corporations, such as the American Stock Exchange, and for multi-billion dollar corporations headquartered in the City of New York, such as Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies; and another standard of justice and law for decent honest individuals, such as Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia, who has made a career of reporting criminal activities on Wall Street and reporting the propagation and dissemination of lies and falsehoods by such individuals and corporations that shape public opinion as Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw, a billionaire, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, a multi-billion dollar multi-national corporation, which is headquartered in New York City.

224. That upon information and belief this assessment of the harassment complaint signed by Defendant Gary Weiss and approved by Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies with the cooperation and consent of Defendant The City of New York was done as a political favor can be readily recognized by the fact that Detective Peter Friscia did not listen to the recordings of the three telephone calls, which Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia made to Defendant Gary Weiss.

225. That this fact that Detective Peter Friscia did not listen to the telephone calls, which Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had made to Defendant Gary Weiss, was self-evident when Detective Peter Friscia informed Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia that he did not possess Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's telephone number, which telephone number Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia left on the answering machine of the home phone of Defendant Gary Weiss and on the voice mail of the cell phone of Defendant Gary Weiss.

226. That the missives, which Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia wrote about Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies always stressed lies by and unethical conduct of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies.

227. That upon information and belief fear of exposure of the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies would cause great economic dislocations and a net loss in earnings from a decrease in advertising revenue, loss of revenue from a decrease in subscriptions, loss of revenue from newsstand purchases, and an enormous loss of prestige for BusinessWeek, a

subsidiary of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies was the primary motive for the signing of the harassment complaint by Defendant Gary Weiss with the invaluable assistance of Defendant Robert Pritchard.

228. That the example of the loss of prestige by The New York Times as a result of the Jayson Blair debacle always reminded Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies that if Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia were given the opportunity to prove that Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies had covered up the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss and Defendant Stephen Shepard, Business Week (BusinessWeek), a subsidiary of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Corporations would lose its prominence and prestige as the number one Business Magazine in the United States and would be overtaken by its competitors, Forbes and Fortune, and that this would result in severe economic dislocations to Defendant The McGraw-Hill Corporations.

229. That upon information and belief this fear of severe economic loss by Defendant McGraw-Hill Companies was the primary motive and the direct cause for Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant McGraw-Hill Corporation and Defendant The City of New York to conspire to permit Defendant Robert Pritchard to author on January 27, 2005 (Exhibit 10), a missive consisting solely of wantonly false and malicious statements aimed at libeling and discrediting Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

230. That on January 31, 2005 Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia received via federal express, FedEx, tracking number 8504 9520 5255, signature required, a copy of a missive, dated January 27, 2005 (Exhibit 10), which missive bore the logo of the McGraw-Hill Companies; bore the heading Via Certified Mail/Return Receipt Requested; and was on the stationary of Robert A. Pritchard, Vice President, Global Security.

231. That this missive was severely distressing to Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and was knowingly, wantonly, wickedly, false, malicious, and libelous was instantly apparent.

232. That upon information and belief Defendant Robert Pritchard wrote this message with the knowledge and consent of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies and in his capacity as Vice President, Global Security, McGraw-Hill Companies.

234. That upon information and belief this missive was written by Defendant Robert Pritchard with the knowledge and consent of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, a billionaire with influential connections throughout the City of New York, and by Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, a multi-national and multi-billion dollar corporation with enormous influence in the political arena that is the City of New York and the Police Department of the City of New York was readily apparent.

235. That upon information and belief Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies and Defendant The City of New York lied and conspired to illegally harass and libel Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia by the dissemination of false and libelous statements made by Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Gary Weiss and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies in order to prevent the exposure of the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant Robert Pritchard and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies.

236. That Detective Peter Friscia told Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia could not inform anyone about the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies- not even agencies of the federal government, such as the FBI and the SEC, and enforcement agencies of various states concerning the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies under penalty of arrest.

237. That the sole objective of this threat of arrest, especially if Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia were to write to the various enforcement agencies of the federal government to report criminal activity of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Stephen Shepard, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies was to permit Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies to libel and slander Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia at will and without fear of exposure.

238. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies have shown a willingness to lie about murder proves that the Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies would permit knowingly false and wantonly malicious statements and stories to be presented as truth in court- rather than suffer an exposure of the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies.

239. That upon information and belief this letter of January 27, 2005 (Exhibit 10), which letter was authored by Defendant Robert Pritchard was written in a knowingly wanton and malicious manner is proved by the lies, which Defendant Robert Pritchard, with the full cooperation of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies and Defendant The City of New York, has stated in this letter of January 27, 2005 (Exhibit 10).

240. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia is legally constrained not to refute to anyone including those individuals to whom this wantonly malicious and wantonly reckless letter of January 27, 2005 have been directed has provided the Defendant Gary Weiss,

Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies the ability to maliciously slander and libel Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia at will.

241. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia shall now begin an intensive examination of the lies authored by Defendant Robert Pritchard in the aforementioned letter of January 27, 2005 (Exhibit 10) with the full knowledge and consent of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies.

242. That it must first be noted that The City of New York, through the Police Department of the City of New York, has refused to honor any complaint, which I have sought to make against Defendant Gary Weiss for lying in his complaint to the Police Department of the City of New York and has refused to honor any complaint which I have sought to have filed against Defendant Robert Pritchard for disseminating wantonly false and wantonly malicious libel in his letter of January 27, 2005.

243. That upon information and belief Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia wishes to make the initial statement that Defendant Robert Pritchard has willfully and knowingly lied in his letter of January 27, 2005 (Exhibit 10) and has done so at the behest of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies to protect Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies from any economic loss, which would ensue if the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss, the lies of Defendant Stephen Shepard, the lies of Defendant Harold McGraw and the lies of the Defendant The McGraw-Hill Corporation were to become public knowledge.

244. That upon information and belief Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies distributed copies and content, in written and verbal forms, of Defendant Robert Pritchard's knowingly malicious and wickedly false letter of January 27, 2005 (Exhibit 10), to various individuals, including faculty of the University of Missouri as well as staff and employees of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, etc.

245. That by the very knowingly false and wantonly malicious wording of the January 27, 2005 (Exhibit 10) letter of Defendant Robert Pritchard, written and delivered to Plaintiff with the approval of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies in which wording Defendant Robert Pritchard stated that Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies "has incurred significant costs instituting security measures to address your conduct," is a knowingly false and wantonly malicious libel, whose sole purpose was to defame, by libel and slander, the Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

246. That this lie sputtered forth by Defendant Robert Pritchard like magma from a volcano is patently false and wickedly malicious and is an attempt to portray Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia as a deranged individual.

247. That this lie made by Defendant Robert Pritchard concerning increased security costs incurred by Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies is so absurd to be beyond the pale because as Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard and Defendant Harold McGraw know 1221 Avenue of the Americas, the corporate home of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, and the business address of Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard and Defendant Harold McGraw, is a building with excellent security.

248. That upon information and belief Defendant Robert Pritchard, with the knowledge and consent of Defendant Gary Weiss Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, has willfully lied about the danger, which Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia supposedly presents, that neither Defendant Robert Pritchard nor Defendant Gary Weiss presented Detective Peter Friscia of the Midtown North Precinct with Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's home telephone number and a photograph of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia- not even a copy of the photograph, which appeared in the 26 April 1999 Business Week cover story, Scandal On Wall Street (Exhibit 2).

249. That unfortunately Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia has been denied access to the Complaint of Defendant Gary Weiss and, therefore, Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia is unable to make a detailed exposition of the libelous complaint of Defendant Gary Weiss.

250. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia wishes to state that this denial by Defendant The City of New York through its agent, the Police Department of the City of New York, and the refusal of Defendant The City of New York through its agent, The Police Department of the City of New York, smacks of a totalitarian regime where one is denied to know the nature of charges against you- and the fiat of someone, such as Saddam Hussein, is sufficient for prosecution.

251. That upon information and belief Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia has been denied the basic right to file a complaint against Defendant Gary Weiss and Defendant Robert Pritchard is due to the immense political and economic power of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, a multi-billion dollar, multi-national corporation, and the financial power of Defendant Harold McGraw, a billionaire, and that Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendants The McGraw-Hill Companies appear to have purchased the Defendant The City of New York through its agent, The Police Department of the City of New York.

252. That upon information and belief Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies have libeled and slandered the good name of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia by assisting Defendant Gary Weiss in filing his knowingly false and wantonly malicious complaint and by distributing knowingly false and wantonly malicious statements via correspondence (libel), including e-mail, and knowingly false and wantonly malicious statements verbally (slander) to employees of Defendant The

McGraw-Hill Companies, the sole purpose of which libel and slander was to cover up the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies.

253. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia is able to state that on January 4, 2002, Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia received a message on his telephone from Professor Brant Houston regarding Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's insistence that a discussion between Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and Defendant Gary Weiss should be held; that this discussion should be monitored by either Professor Brant Houston or Professor Len Bruzzese; and that the discussion should be printed in the IRE Journal (Journal of Investigative Reporters and Editors.)

254. That the message left by Professor Brant Houston on January 4, 2005 for Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia on Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's answering machine was that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia the attorney for the University of Missouri would be in contact with Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

255. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia shall now expose the lies and libelous statements of Defendant Robert Pritchard made with the knowledge and consent of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies.

256. That the most important fact is that Defendant Robert Pritchard is responsible for Global Security and Defendant Robert Pritchard is not employed as an attorney by either Defendant Gary Weiss or Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies.

257. That Defendant Robert Pritchard is not an attorney representing Defendant Gary Weiss means that Defendant Robert Pritchard has no standing to represent Defendant Gary Weiss.

258. That Defendant Gary Weiss is not an employee of Defendant McGraw-Hill Companies means that Defendant Robert Pritchard and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies have no standing and no legal basis to address Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia regarding Defendant Gary Weiss.

259. That Defendant Robert Pritchard is acting as an agent and employee for the Defendant McGraw-Hill Companies is readily apparent by Defendant Robert Pritchard's use in his January 27, 2005 letter (Exhibit 10) of the letterhead and stationery of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies and Defendant Robert Pritchard's assertion that I have sent "libelous" letters to the Chairman and CEO of McGraw-Hill; who is Defendant Harold McGraw and the General Counsel of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, who is Kenneth Vittor; and members of the Board of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, which refers to Vartan Gregorian and my letters to other members of the Board; and Defendant Gary Weiss' supervisor at Business Week, which refers to Defendant Stephen Shepard.

260. That Defendant Robert Pritchard maliciously libeled Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia is readily apparent in the opening sentence of the January 27, 2005 letter (Exhibit 10): “This letter is to demand that you immediately cease and desist your continued harassment of former BusinessWeek employee Mr. Gary Weiss,” because Defendant Robert Pritchard does not represent Defendant Gary Weiss and, therefore, cannot demand anything from me concerning Gary Weiss- only Defendant Gary Weiss and Defendant Gary Weiss’ attorney can demand any conduct from me, and Defendant Gary Weiss has not retained an attorney- but instead much prefers to illegally harass me by utilizing the influence of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Corporations and Defendant Harold McGraw, Chairman and CEO of The McGraw-Hill Companies.

261. That there is no harassment of Defendant Gary Weiss is readily apparent because Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia only telephoned Defendant Gary Weiss on three occasions over an eight month period, and had not telephoned Defendant Gary Weiss for the prior four years and had written only one letter to Defendant Gary Weiss and that letter was dated January 6, 2005.

262. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia did not harass Defendant Gary Weiss is obvious because Defendant Gary Weiss lied in two publications, Business Week in the article, A Message From The Mob (Exhibit 6) and the IRE Journal Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5) in which article Defendant Gary Weiss libeled Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

263. That BusinessWeek has a circulation of approximately 500,000 and the IRE Journal of approximately 20,000, and these are the investigative reporters and editors upon whom Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia must rely to write about crime on Wall Street, proves that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia’s quest to correct the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss of necessity requires Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia to write the truth about the stories authored by Defendant Gary Weiss.

264. That upon information and belief it is readily apparent from the opening sentence that Defendant Harold McGraw, billionaire and Chairman and CEO of The McGraw-Hill Companies, and the Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, a multi-billion dollar, multi-national corporation have purchased justice and The Defendant The City of New York and the Police Department of the City of New York.

265. That Defendant Robert Pritchard is a liar is proven in the second sentence, when he states that “BusinessWeek and Gary Weiss informed you four years ago that they would not assist you in publishing a book,” which statement is a bald-faced lie.

266. That Defendant Stephen Shepard stated that Defendant Stephen Shepard and BusinessWeek were not interested in a book authored by me is true.

267. That Defendant Gary Weiss said that he would not assist me is false and an outright lie because Defendant Gary Weiss had requested that I wait until after the appearance of his book about the Italian Mafia and Wall Street appeared and then Defendant Gary Weiss and Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia could collaborate on a book.

268. That Defendant Gary Weiss informed Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia of this in April 2000 after Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia spoke to Dave Conti, editor of business books at Harper Collins, and Dave Conti suggested that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and Defendant Gary Weiss cooperate on a book about the Scandals on Wall Street.

269. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia did not trust Defendant Gary Weiss after Defendant Gary Weiss told Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia that Defendant Gary Weiss was planning to publish a book about the Italian Mafia and Wall Street and that Defendant Gary Weiss had not notified Defendant Stephen Shepard and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies of Defendant Gary Weiss' attempts to have a book on the Italian Mafia and Wall Street published.

270. That Defendant Robert Pritchard has limited knowledge of the truth is apparent when Defendant Robert Pritchard stated that in 2000 The McGraw-Hill Companies had stated that Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies would not respond to further letters from Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

271. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia wrote to Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies after 2000 was to inform Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies that Defendant Gary Weiss had lied in articles and that Defendant Stephen Shepard had covered up these lies.

272. That Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies refused Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's entreaties to have outside counsel investigate the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss and Defendant Stephen Shepard is proof that Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies conspired to cover up the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss and Defendant Stephen Shepard.

273. That Defendant Robert Pritchard wishes to prove that he is willfully twisting the facts is evident from his next sentence: "You have called Mr. Weiss and left unsolicited messages at his home and on his personal cell phone"- and Defendant Robert Pritchard neglects several important facts: that I had telephoned Defendant Gary Weiss at his former offices at BusinessWeek and was referred to Defendant Gary Weiss' cell phone number and that I would have left a message on his business answering machine, but there was only the message to call Defendant Gary Weiss' cell phone.

274. That Defendant Robert Pritchard lies is best exemplified by this term, unsolicited telephone calls, because Defendant Gary Weiss would not solicit telephone calls from an individual, who had exposed Defendant Gary Weiss as a liar.

275. That upon information and belief it is known to Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had telephoned Defendant Gary Weiss in excess of 100 times during the period 1998-2000 and that

Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had met with Defendant Gary Weiss in excess of 30 times during this period.

276. That Defendant Robert Pritchard is a liar in the mode of Julius Streicher continues in the statement that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had telephoned Defendant Gary Weiss at his home- yet, how could Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia know the home telephone number of Defendant Gary Weiss unless Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had been provided with that telephone number.

277. That Defendant Gary Weiss and Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had discussed the fact in 1999 that Defendant Gary Weiss' home telephone number and address were listed in the Manhattan phone book and the availability of the Italian Mafia to easily locate Defendant Gary Weiss was of concern to Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia- and we even discussed the incident when Defendant Gary Weiss received an unsolicited and angry telephone call from a reporter one night- so Defendant Robert Pritchard should desist from his knowingly false and willfully malicious statements- which in this context is a matter of libel.

278. That if Defendant Gary Weiss were so concerned about the telephone calls of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia why did not Defendant Gary Weiss telephone Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and request that he not telephone Defendant Gary Weiss or why did Defendant Gary Weiss not file a complaint sooner?

279. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss only acted after Defendant Gary Weiss was apprised that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's friend, who has signed the affidavit (Exhibit 9) affixed to this lawsuit, had declared himself ready willing and able to testify that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia, and his friend, and he were the sole sources of information for the section of the article, Scandal On Wall Street (Exhibit 2), which concerned price-fixing.

280. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies knew that with the testimony of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's friend, the two sources of information for the price-fixing section of the article, Scandal On Wall Street (Exhibit 2), Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies would suffer tremendously for their part in lies of Defendant Gary Weiss and that there would be severe economic dislocation for Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies for lying and covering up the lies.

281. That Defendant Robert Pritchard has knowingly willfully wantonly wickedly and maliciously lied about Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia is readily apparent in the following statement in Defendant Robert Pritchard's letter of January 27, 2005 (Exhibit 10): "You have also sent libelous letters concerning Mr. Weiss to"

282. That Defendant Pritchard has willfully knowingly and maliciously slandered Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia is self-evident in the previous statement because writing the truth is not libelous and that for a statement to be libelous, a lie and not the truth must be involved, so when Defendant Pritchard knowingly willfully and maliciously lies, Defendant Robert Pritchard and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies are guilty of libel- because there is no truth in the statement that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia had "sent libelous letters concerning Mr. Weiss," because Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia only speaks the truth.

283. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies have refused to initiate a civil lawsuit for libel and slander against Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia is self-evident because as Defendant Gary Weiss stated in the article, Scandal On Wall Street, about Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia being sued by Pat Schettino, discovery can prove the truth.

284. That if Defendant Gary Weiss were to institute a civil lawsuit the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies would be exposed.

285. That Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies will stop at nothing and lie, lie lie is proved in the wantonly wicked, knowingly malicious, and willfully false statement that "Mr. Weiss and McGraw-Hill view these repeated contacts. Particularly the recent threatening voice-mail message you left on Mr. Weiss' personal cell phone," a statement, which is so false and malicious that if stated in a court of law, whether civil or criminal, would result in Defendant Gary Weiss and Defendant Robert Pritchard being arrested for perjury.

286. That upon information and belief Defendant Robert Pritchard knows that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's last telephone call to Defendant Gary Weiss was made on December 1, 2004 and, therefore, Defendant Robert Pritchard has not only libeled Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia but has also lied.

287. That Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies and Defendant The City of New York, through the New York City Police Department, know that this statement, "particularly the recent threatening voice-mail message you left on Mr. Weiss' personal cell phone," is a knowingly wicked and wantonly malicious lie because not only did Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia never make any threatening telephone call to Defendant Gary Weiss, but this mythical threatening telephone call was never even reported to Defendant The City of New York and the New York City Police Department.

288. That this lie of an alleged threatening voice-mail message, which Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia never made, is so heinous a lie that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia is compelled to request that all statements uttered by Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant

Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies must be examined under penalty of perjury for lying so blatantly, willfully and knowingly.

289. That it must be noted by Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia that if an attorney for Defendant Gary Weiss or Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies had disseminated this lie in a written letter, as Defendant Robert Pritchard has done, the attorney would be disbarred- because a willful and deliberate lie of this magnitude is grounds for disbarment.

290. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies are so confident of their economic power and personal importance and personal influence that Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies have lied and Defendant City of New York through the New York City Police Department knows that they have lied.

291. That Defendant Robert Pritchard has stated in his January 27, 2005 letter (Exhibit 10): "Please be advised that we take your harassing conduct very seriously and have filed a criminal complaint report for Aggravated Harassment with Detective Gerard Gardner and Detective Peter Friscia of the Midtown North Precinct Detective Squad, New York Police Department," is a lie of the utmost gravity because Detective Peter Friscia informed Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia that he had specifically stated to Defendant Gary Weiss that this was not a criminal complaint for Aggravated Harassment, but was a simple harassment complaint, which of course Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia has stated has no merit- and was a false complaint.

292. That this lie of a filing of a criminal complaint for Aggravated Harassment, and that Defendant Gary Weiss was told that Defendant Gary Weiss' complaint was not a criminal complaint for Aggravated Harassment, is of itself prima facie proof of libel and the dissemination of this letter is further proof of libel and of itself is definitive proof of the validity of the Lawsuit filed by Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

293. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies would lie so blatantly, demonstrates the confidence of Defendant Harold McGraw, a white billionaire, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, a multi-billion dollar, multi-national corporation, that billions of dollars make one above the law.

294. That Defendant Robert Pritchard is an inveterate liar is further evidenced by his lie in his letter of January 27, 2005 (Exhibit 10): "Your increasingly bizarre communications with Mr. Weiss and third-parties with whom he is acquainted have been disruptive to our employees and to the conduct of our business, are potentially damaging to Mr. Weiss' career interests, and have caused us to be genuinely concerned for Mr. Weiss' safety and well-being. In addition, McGraw-Hill has incurred significant costs

instituting security measure to address your conduct,” which lies are so outrageous and obviously false that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia can only state that Defendant Robert Pritchard merits the Pinocchio award for the most outrageous lie.

295. That Defendant Robert Pritchard has termed the letters of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia to be increasingly bizarre is to wickedly wantonly and maliciously libel the good name and character of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

296. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia’s letters are written in Standard American English is readily proved and that there is nothing bizarre in Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia’s letters is so apparent that to state otherwise is a willful and knowingly malicious lie.

297. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia’s letters are potentially damaging to Mr. Weiss’ career interests is definitely true because Defendant Gary Weiss has willfully and maliciously lied about the murders of Al Chalem and Maier Lehmann and has willfully wantonly and maliciously lied about Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia’s responsibility for being the source for the options price-fixing and illegal trading by specialists segments of the April 26, 1999 Business Week cover story, Scandal On Wall Street.

298. That Defendant Gary Weiss’ career is ruined is because Defendant Gary Weiss is a liar and not because Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia has libeled Defendant Gary Weiss because Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia has only spoken the truth about Defendant Gary Weiss.

299. That upon information and belief if not for the willful lies and deceit of Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, who for years have covered up the lies and misstatements of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Gary Weiss would have had no career years ago.

300. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia’s letters “have been disruptive to our employees,” is not because Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia’s letters are disturbing or bizarre, au contraire, Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia’s letters are disturbing and disruptive precisely because these letters are true and because they expose the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss and the conspiracy of Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies and Defendant Robert Pritchard to cover up the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss.

301. That Defendant Robert Pritchard can lie with the likes of Julius Streicher is proved by his statement that “and have caused us to be genuinely concerned for Mr. Weiss’ safety and well being. In addition, McGraw-Hill has incurred significant costs instituting security measures to address your conduct.”

302. That Defendant Robert Pritchard is concerned for Defendant Gary Weiss’ safety because of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia’s truthful letters and not because Defendant

Gary Weiss has done the impossible and libeled Phil Abramo, a member of the Italian Mafia, is a wicked and wantonly malicious lie.

303. That it is unfortunate that Defendant Robert Pritchard and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies were not concerned for the safety of Defendant Gary Weiss before Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's friend declared that he was ready willing and able to testify in court that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's friend were the sole sources of the information on price-fixing in options.

304. That Defendant Robert Pritchard has no right to tell Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia not to write to federal agencies such as the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Department of Justice is a standard of law, furthermore Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies cannot order Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia not to report that Defendant Gary Weiss lied about the murders of Al Chalem and Maier Lehmann.

305. That by extension of the warped and illogical reasoning of Defendant Robert Pritchard if an individual were to write missives, which had stated that Scott Sullivan of WorldCom infamy was filing false financial reports and had sent these letters to the press, brokerage firms, and employees of WorldCom, this individual could be arrested for Criminal Harassment because it would effect the employment of Defendant Robert Pritchard were Vice President of Global Security for WorldCom.

306. That Defendant Robert Pritchard has libeled Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia is proved by the lies in his letter of January 27, 2005 (Exhibit 10).

307. That upon information and belief Defendant Robert Pritchard's letter of January 27, 2005 (Exhibit 10), was motivated to cover up the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss, the lies of Defendant Stephen Shepard, the lies of Defendant Harold McGraw, the lies of Defendant Robert Pritchard and the lies of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies.

308. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies have conspired to libel Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia has been proved by the wantonly malicious and knowingly false statements in the letter of January 27, 2005, which letter was authored by Defendant Robert Pritchard and this has been conclusively proved by the fact that Defendant Robert Pritchard libeled Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia in his letter of January 27, 2005 (Exhibit 10).

309. That upon information and belief the entire financial resources and prestige of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies has been marshaled to cover up the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss has been proved by the filing of a false and malicious complaint, which Defendant The City of New York through the New York City Police Department has refused to grant Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia the right to see and Defendant The

City of New York through the Police Department of the City of New York has refused Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia the right to contest.

310. That Defendant Gary Weiss was primarily motivated to file this false complaint of harassment to cover up his lies has been proved conclusively in this lawsuit.

311. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies thus wantonly, deliberately, maliciously and recklessly conspired to permit the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss to be disseminated so that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia would suffer great mental distress and great economic distress.

312. That the said defamatory, libelous and slanderous actions of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies have caused great mental distress to Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and, furthermore, said defamatory actions were pursued with malicious, wanton, reckless, and deliberate disregard of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's rights.

313. That for the defamatory, libelous and slanderous actions of the wanton, deliberate and reckless disregard by Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, and Defendant The City of New York of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's basic human and constitutional rights and for the knowing false and deliberate misrepresentations of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies and Defendant The City of New York, Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia seeks compensatory damages of \$30 million from each of the defendants, Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies and Defendant The City of New York.

314. That for the defamatory actions of the wanton, deliberate and reckless disregard of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's rights and for the knowing false and deliberate misrepresentations of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, and Defendant The City of New York, Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia seeks punitive damages of \$25 million from each of the defendants, Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies and Defendant The City of New York.

FOR A FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

315. Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia repeats and alleges paragraphs "1," "2," "3," "4," "5," "6," "7," "8, and "9" of this complaint.

316. That on or about January 27, 2005, and thereafter, that Defendant Gary Weiss, at that time a former employee of The McGraw-Hill Companies; Defendant Harold

McGraw; Defendant Stephen Shepard; Defendant Robert Pritchard, Vice President, Global Securities, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies did willfully, wantonly, knowingly, deliberately and maliciously conspire to libel and slander plaintiff through the widespread dissemination of a missive, dated 27 January 2005 (Exhibit 10), which missive was authored by Defendant Robert Pritchard, Vice President, Global Security, The McGraw-Hill Companies and which missive was filled with nothing but lies.

317. That upon information and belief prior to the authorship of this letter by Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Gary Weiss, with the full knowledge and consent of Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies, willfully, wantonly, knowingly and maliciously lied about Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia, when Defendant Gary Weiss filed a Complaint thereby slandering and libeling Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia, in this Complaint filed by Defendant Gary Weiss with Detective Peter Friscia of the Midtown North Precinct.

318. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia seeks injunctive relief, a court order forbidding Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies from disseminating any further slanderous statements and libelous documents concerning Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

319. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia seeks the right to further disseminate letters concerning the lies of Gary Weiss- including but not limited to the proofs that Defendant Gary Weiss has lied about Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and that Defendant Robert Pritchard's letter of January 27, 2005 (Exhibit 10) was a lie.

320. That the Court must issue these injunctive remedies and not be swayed by the financial and political power of Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies is a right guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

FOR A SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

321. Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia repeats and alleges paragraphs "1," "2," "3," "4," "5," "6," "7," "8," and "9" of this complaint.

322. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia seeks a court order, which court order shall require The New York City Police Department an agent of Defendant The City of New York, to provide Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia with a copy of the Complaint filed by Defendant Gary Weiss and a copy of all statements of Defendant Gary Weiss and Defendant Robert Pritchard and documents provided by Defendants Gary Weiss, Defendant Robert Pritchard, and Defendant McGraw-Hill Companies as recorded by the police officers, who took the complaint.

323. Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia seeks a court order requiring the Defendant City of New York to release all files and records of the New York City Police Department to

Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia, including the records of incidents discussed previously in this Complaint.

324. That Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia must state that it is so apparent that justice can be bought by Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies and Defendant Harold McGraw by acting through its agents that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia must remark that when an individual visits a police station to file a complaint of harassment the individual is not greeted by police officers, much less detectives, but rather that the visitor is told to file a complaint with a civilian employee of the New York City Police Department.

325. That Plaintiff wishes to affirm that it is a constitutional right for the accused to be presented with all evidence against him- except when multi-billion dollar, multi-national corporations, such as Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies are involved.

FOR A SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

326. Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia repeats and alleges paragraphs “1,” “2,” “3,” “4,” “5,” “6,” “7,” “8,” and “9” of this complaint.

327. That upon information and belief the NYPD Complaint of Defendant Gary Weiss, which is baseless and false, was filed to cover up the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies.

328. That upon information and belief this complaint of Defendant Gary Weiss, which was filed with the Midtown North Precinct, was filed to illegally harass Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia.

329. That upon information and belief Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies conspired to illegally harass and falsely accuse Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia through means of Defendant Gary Weiss filing a knowingly false and wantonly malicious complaint

330. That Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies and Defendant The City of New York knew that this complaint had no basis and that the complaint of Defendant Gary Weiss was a blatant attempt to harass Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and an attempt to cover up the lies of Gary Weiss, which lies Weiss had written in two articles, Offering Credence to the Crank (Exhibit 5) and A Message From The Mob (Exhibit 6).

331. That upon information and belief on or about January 27, 2004, both before and thereafter, that Defendant Gary Weiss, at that time a former employee of The McGraw-Hill Companies; Defendant Harold McGraw; Defendant Stephen Shepard; Defendant

Robert Pritchard, Vice President, Global Securities, The McGraw-Hill Companies; Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies; and Defendant The City of New York did willfully, wantonly, knowingly, deliberately and maliciously conspire to illegally harass plaintiff through the dissemination of a missive, dated January 27, 2005 (Exhibit 10), which missive was authored by Defendant Robert Pritchard, Vice President, Global Security, The McGraw-Hill Companies.

332. That this January 27, 2005 missive, authored by Defendant Robert Pritchard, was knowingly false and wantonly malicious.

333. That the statement of Defendant Robert Pritchard, which statement was seconded by Detective Peter Friscia, that Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia could not write to federal agencies or even to the law enforcement officials, who are investigating the murders of Al Chalem and Maier Lehmann, because Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies do not wish the lies, concerning the murders of Al Chalem and Maier Lehmann, of Defendant Gary Weiss to be exposed is beyond the reasoning capacity of any sane individual.

334. That Defendant The City of New York, Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies would be willing to see an American of Italian descent convicted of a crime, which the American of Italian descent did not commit and have the guilty Russian émigré go free to murder again, solely to prevent the exposure of the lies of Defendant Gary Weiss is the type of reasoning possessed by war criminals and serial murderers.

335. That for the defamatory, libelous, slanderous wanton deliberate harassment and the filing of a false Complaint by Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Harold McGraw and Defendant The McGraw-Hill Companies have violated Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia's basic human and constitutional rights and for the knowing false and deliberate misrepresentations of Defendant Gary Weiss in filing a false and malicious complaint with the police, Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia seeks compensatory damages of \$30 million from each of the Defendants, Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw, Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies and Defendant The City of New York.

336. That for the wanton, deliberate illegal and reckless harassment of Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia and for the knowing false and deliberate harassment and the filing of a knowingly false and complaint with the police by Defendant Gary Weiss, Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia seeks punitive damages of \$30 million from each of the defendants, Defendant Gary Weiss, Defendant Stephen Shepard, Defendant Robert Pritchard, Defendant Harold McGraw, and Defendant The McGraw Hill Companies and Defendant The City of New York.

337. Plaintiff Edward Manfredonia seeks a trial by jury for this civil action.

VERIFICATION

State of New York)
 : .ss:
County of New York)

EDWARD MANFREDONIA, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

I am the Plaintiff herein. I have read the foregoing complaint, and know the contents thereof and the same is true to the best of my knowledge, except as to those matters herein stated to be alleged upon information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true.

Edward Manfredonia

Sworn to before me this
Day of March 2005
