

Donohoo, Lisa

From: Dr. Michael A. Aquino [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 14, 2008 9:45 AM
To: Donohoo, Lisa
Cc: Loftus Elizabeth F.
Subject: Diana Napolis Internet Sites

Dear Ms. Donohoo,

Napolis has published this "press release" on the Internet:

<http://newsgroups.derkeiler.com/Archive/Sci/sci.psychology.psychotherapy/2008-05/msg00012.html>

She has also created this threatening and defamatory web page:

<http://www.diananapolis.wordpress.com>

Upon discovering this webpage yesterday I sent an enote to the ISP requesting that it be taken down. As of this morning it is still there. Among its contents [referring to this new lawsuit of hers]:

"In pages 167-177 I allege that Dr. Elizabeth Loftus attempted to have me reincarcerated based on false allegations after I requested that the Institutional Review Board of UC Irvine investigate Loftus, for which I am demanding monetary damages and an explanation. Dr. Loftus claimed I had sent her material after which she felt "fear." For the record, the forensic evidence – a fingerprint on the envelope – which was sent to the DOJ did not match mine. In addition, I took a lie detector about this issue which I passed. In these pages I also expose what I believe to be malfeasance by San Diego Probation which was perhaps due to one or more defendants interaction with that department."

For the record, in view of Napolis' clear fixations, history of violence, and possession & discharge of a weapon [as stated in her lawsuit], I consider her a very real danger to the safety of my wife and myself. Furthermore, as is clear by this renewed and intensive Internet campaign of defamation, threats, and solicitation of others to defame and/or harm us, she has not been mentally healed or reformed in the slightest; indeed her mania and venom are if anything substantially more fanatic.

My wife and I respectfully request anything your Department can do to remove her Internet access and prevent her from pursuing her hate-campaign by other means. If you do not feel that she can be adequately restrained by your Department's supervision, we would support and request her return to mental confinement.

I am copying this eletter to Dr. Loftus to alert her to the Napolis webpage extract above.

Sincerely,
Michael A. Aquino

Donohoo, Lisa

From: Dr. Michael A. Aquino [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 14, 2008 7:39 PM
To: Donohoo, Lisa
Cc: Loftus Elizabeth F.
Subject: Napolis Webpage Comments

Dear Ms. Donohoo,

While an exhaustively detailed rebuttal to all of Napolis' statements is presumably both unnecessary and self-inflicted MEGO (My Eyes Glaze Over) for both of us, I thought I might send you a few brief comments concerning her contentions about me on her new webpage. All of my comments are "on the record" and "swear to under penalty of perjury", in brief or detailed/documented.

1. The Temple of Set is not "satanic", and my wife and I since its 1975 founding have been Setians, not "Satanists". The philosophy and mythology of the Temple of Set come from ancient Egypt and derivative Mediterranean metaphysical systems such as those of Plato and Pythagoras. We have no religious interest in Judæo-Christianity, and we do not advocate or worship evil in any sense. The Temple of Set's website is at:

[REDACTED]
 and my personal memoir of it, The Temple of Set, is downloadable in its "work-in-progress" state on my personal webpage:

[REDACTED]
 During 1969-1975 I was indeed a member of Anton LaVey's Church of Satan, which was a completely law-abiding organization. My extensive ebook history of it, The Church of Satan, can be downloaded from my personal webpage.

2. The "Presidio of San Francisco daycare episode" of 1986-87 was an \$84 million parental get-rich-quick scam, with no physical evidence that I have been able to discover that any child was actually abused, kidnapped, or otherwise harmed [except by the "therapist"]. There is a summary of it as a link from my webpage, and I can go into any degree of detail desired to substantiate and document all statements there.

3. The letter and assignment record that Napolis FOIA'd from the Army about me are simply incorrect - the result, I presume, of an indifferent clerk in an office full of old "dead" personnel files. I continued my Army Reserve career until 1994, when I decided to transfer to the Retired Reserve, and in 2006 I retired completely from the Army (continuing to draw retirement pay & benefits today). I have sent a corrective letter to the office that corresponded with Napolis, with supporting documentation to get its file corrected. [I have emailed you a copy of my letter and correct Officer Record Brief.] Copies of my Army retirement certificates and my 1994 Meritorious Service Medal are also clickable from my subwebpage about the Presidio affair.

4. My sole interest 1995-2000 in identifying the anonymous cyberstalker and Internet hate-campaigner "Curio" was protection of my and my family's safety and good name. When this entity was identified as Napolis in 2000, my reaction was just as quoted in the San Diego Union-Tribune 'expose' story: that she was just a woman with "Satanic" sexual fantasies who, now that she was exposed and accountable, could be ignored - which is exactly what we have done until this moment.

5. Napolis' claim that I or anyone associated with me has been attacking her with mind-control rays is utterly absurd. I don't believe that any such technology exists, and indeed in the 1980s I wrote a paper for the Association of Former Intelligence Officers arguing that ESP, "remote viewing", and similar notions are scientifically and physically impossible. This paper was published in AFIO's national journal, to the considerable annoyance of the Stanford Research Institute, which had been making lots of money trying to sell the government this silly snake-oil. You can download the paper - "Project Star Gate: \$20 Million Up in Smoke and Mirrors" - on my webpage.

6. During my entire 1966-1994 military career, U.S. Army PSYOP was very strictly controlled and regulated, with any targeting of American citizens absolutely forbidden. This has its basis in stringent federal law, specifically the post-WW2 Smith-Mundt Act, which is summarized here:

http://publicdiplomacy.wikia.com/wiki/Smith_Mundt_Act

7. I have never had any contact with, nor met, Steven Spielberg [though I would love to someday, as I am a longtime Indiana Jones fan].

I think that's about it. If you have any questions about any of the above [or anything else], please feel welcome to ask them

Sincerely,
Michael Aquino

vas

Donohoo, Lisa

From: Dr. Michael A. Aquino [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2008 11:15 PM
To: Donohoo, Lisa
Cc: Loftus Elizabeth F.
Subject: Napolis Situation

Dear Ms. Donohoo,

I did contact the DA and at this point we are monitoring the sites.

According to the 11/6/03 San Diego Union-Tribune article,

"Napolis has been diagnosed with delusional disorder and paranoid schizophrenia and must take part in a program for mentally ill criminals, according to court records. The judge also ordered Napolis, 47, to stay away from Love Hewitt and director Steven Spielberg for at least 10 years ... Shortly after her arrest Nov. 26, 2002, Napolis was declared too mentally ill to stand trial and was committed to Patton State Hospital near San Bernardino. After months of psychiatric treatment, she began saying it was possible she was wrong about being persecuted by the Hollywood starlet and the famous director, said psychologist Thomas MacSpeiden."

If the court indeed found that Napolis was mentally-ill to a criminal degree sufficient to have her committed for two years and then paroled for five, I submit that her current lawsuit and massive "press releases" make it quite clear that she was just telling more lies to MacSpeiden in order to be paroled, and then again to the judge to be allowed back on computers and the Internet, where she has instantly and viciously resumed her cyberstalking and defamation campaign.

At the very least I should think that this is grounds to have the computer access/Internet permission of her parole rescinded, and the court to order her to remove the material she has rushed to post [and is presumably continuing to increase, publicize, and promote right now].

I also think that the judge should expand his "stay away for at least ten years" order to include myself and my wife, Professor Loftus, and for that matter the other named Napolis targets in her crank lawsuit. Napolis has an established record of personal violence, possession of a handgun, and discharge of it. Given her hate-agenda towards all of us, and particularly when her lawsuit deflates, I think that her potential for more confrontational and violent action is very real. Mr. Sauer and Mr. Copley are easily findable in San Diego, Professor Loftus at UC Irvine, and ourselves in San Francisco. I'm sure none of us [or the other targets] have any desire to be assaulted or shot by Napolis. If the Parole Department feels that it can adequately monitor and restrain Napolis, I think we would trust your judgment. If you do not, I think we would all hope that you would recommend her return to a controlled facility where she cannot possess or use weapons.

Pls continue to send me docs. ?

To date the "lawsuit" and "press release" documents are the only ones from Napolis that I have come across. As noted, she has apparently duplicated these widely across various Internet sites, and on some forums called attention to them and asked for help in furthering their agenda.

The only other Napolis-related material that I have would date back to her 1995-2000 anonymous "Curio" hate-campaign against us. If you're looking for something specific, please let me know, and if I have it, I'll be glad to send it. Again, I instantly ceased any Internet responses to/about the "Curio" material the moment the SDSU Police identified her. Until she suddenly initiated this new

campaign, I thought she was relegated to history, at least where we were concerned. Obviously we are more her targets than ever.

I would also ask what your civil attorney has recommended on this issue.

My attorneys have only advised me concerning the lawsuit: that there is nothing to be done until/unless it is served [which to date it has not been]. Then they would review it and presumably seek its dismissal on the most obvious grounds such as statute of limitations and failure to state a cause of action. [I am assuming that mind raygun attacks don't qualify!]

I have not asked my attorneys about what you or the court could do from the standpoint of Napolis' sentence/parole situation, because I assume you and the court are the only ones who know that. And you did comment on the phone to me that you were not at professional liberty to discuss any such specifics about any parolee with me. So here I am trusting your and the court's initiative and responsibility. If I can do anything to be of assistance to you or the court, of course, you need only ask.

I will definitely call you on friday. I'm sorry it won't be sooner.

Thank you. If you can email me in advance the approximate time of your call, I'll be sure to be at my home to receive it.

Sincerely,
Michael A. Aquino

4

Donohoo, Lisa

From: Dr. Michael A. Aquino [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 11, 2008 12:50 PM
To: Donohoo, Lisa
Cc: Loftus Elizabeth F.; Hopkins Carol
Subject: Napolis Campaign Extending Internationally

Dear Ms. Donohoo,

You asked me to keep you updated ...

Napolis has extended her defamation campaign to specifically foreign countries and websites - three examples from Britain, Russia, and Germany:

http://groups.google.co.uk/group/alt.politics.uk/browse_thread/thread/61d40cf7da9911a7

http://groups.google.ru/group/alt.abuse.recovery/browse_thread/thread/50df12ae28165ba5

<http://alt.nntp2http.com/showbiz/gossip/2008/05/05becbd14e05017c0271fa6e73545ba7.html>

Notice that the British posting specifically attacks Professor Loftus and your Department. This may be a deliberate effort by Napolis to revive the international difficulties she originally caused for Loftus, who presumably continues to participate in symposia and speaking engagements abroad.

Sincerely,
Michael Aquino

From: Lisa Donohoo, San Diego Probation Department
To: Dr. Michael A. Aquino
Sent: May 21, 2008

I will be in the office in the late afternoon. I will definately email you with a specific time. Please know that we are taking this very seriously and will be addressing this with the courts. My question re the civil issues were about her lawsuit to you. Thank you for the information. When I asked for you to keep sending me the documents, it is because I am out of the office so often in these recent weeks that I don't want to miss anything. Thanks again! Talk to you Friday!

* * * * *

From: Lisa Donohoo, San Diego Probation Department
To: Dr. Michael A. Aquino
Sent: Wed May 23, 2008
Subject: Re: Napolis Situation

I have been in court all morning, and the judge just determined we would be here all day (not on Ms. Napolis). I want you to know that I have contacted the court and the DA and am actively working on this. The holiday is Monday. I am to be off next week, but it looks like my plans will change. I will call you next week.

* * * * *

From: Lisa Donohoo, San Diego Probation Department
To: Dr. Michael A. Aquino
Sent: June 20, 2008

As I spoke to you on the phone yesterday, I will inform the others as to what occurred in court.

The outcome of the hearing was that the court determined that the information provided to the court had no bearing on the current criminal matter. The information you all sent to me was presented and provided to the court and the court determined that the appropriate venue for this information would be in the civil courts or for you all to take action on restraining orders as you saw fit. I notified the court of the information you provided to me taking as much precaution to protect you as possible. I did not provide Ms. Napolis with any information you or the others provided to me. As I told you from the beginning, she was not in violation of her conditions as you all are not the victims in the current case and it would be up to the court as whether the court would act on this information and restrain her from utilizing the internet as the court authorized her to use the internet. This was the purpose of the letters to inform the court of your feelings on this matter.

I received information regarding your questions yesterday as to filing a restraining order and if all of you can file collectively or if it must be individually. The DA indicated that she believes you can file the RO either in your own jurisdiction or here in SD. As an aside, if

you file for a restraining order, she will likely learn your address and you may wish to request for the court to keep that information sealed if possible. It is unknown if you can file a collective restraining order for all of you. You will have to ask that of the court.