

1 United States District Court for the District of Arizona, in a case titled: *Universal Avionics*
2 *Systems Corporation v. Optima Technology Group, Inc.*, No. CV 07-588-TUC-RCC (the
3 "Arizona Action"). In the Arizona Action, Mr. Margolin and OTG filed a cross-claim for
4 declaratory relief against Optima Technology Corporation (Zandian) in order to obtain legal
5 title to their respective patents.

6 18. On August 18, 2008, the United States District Court for the District of Arizona
7 entered a final judgment in favor of Mr. Margolin and OTG on their declaratory relief action,
8 and ordered that OTC—California and OTC—Nevada had no interest in the '073 or '724
9 Patents, that the assignment documents filed by Zandian with the USPTO were "forged, invalid,
10 void, of no force and effect," that the USPTO was to correct its records with respect to any
11 claim by OTC to the Patents and/or the Power of Attorney, and that OTC was enjoined from
12 asserting further rights or interests in the Patents and/or Power of Attorney. Attached as Exhibit
13 A is a copy of the Order from the United States District Court in the Arizona Action.

14 19. Due to Defendants' fraudulent acts, title to the Patents was clouded and
15 interfered with Plaintiff's and OTG's ability to license the Patents.

16 20. During the period of time Mr. Margolin worked to correct record title of the
17 Patents in the Arizona Action and with the USPTO, he incurred significant litigation and other
18 costs associated with those efforts.

19 **Claim 1--Conversion**
20 **(Against All Defendants)**

21 21. Paragraphs 1-20 of the Complaint set forth above are incorporated herein by
22 reference.

23 22. Through the fraudulent acts described above, Defendants wrongfully exerted
24 dominion over the Patents, thereby depriving Mr. Margolin of the use of such property.

25 23. The Patents and the royalties due Mr. Margolin under the Patents were the
26 personal property of Mr. Margolin.

27 24. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' conversion, Mr. Margolin
28 has suffered damages in excess of ten thousand dollars (\$10,000), entitling him to the relief set

1 forth below.

2 **Claim 2--Tortious Interference With Contract**
3 **(Against All Defendants)**

4 25. Paragraphs 1-24 of the Complaint set forth above are incorporated herein by
5 reference.

6 26. Mr. Margolin was a party to a valid contract with OTG for the payment of
7 royalties based on the license of the '073 and '724 Patents.

8 27. Defendants were aware of Mr. Margolin's contract with OTG.

9 28. Defendants committed intentional acts intended and designed to disrupt and
10 interfere with the contractual relationship between Mr. Margolin and OTG.

11 29. As a result of the acts of Defendants, Mr. Margolin's contract with OTG was
12 actually interfered with and disrupted.

13 30. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' tortious interference with
14 contract, Mr. Margolin has suffered damages in excess of ten thousand dollars (\$10,000),
15 entitling him to the relief set forth below.

16 **Claim 3--Intentional Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage**
17 **(Against All Defendants)**

18 31. Paragraphs 1-30 of the Complaint set forth above are incorporated herein by
19 reference.

20 32. Defendants were aware of Mr. Margolin's prospective business relations with
21 licensees of the Patents.

22 33. Defendants purposely, willfully and improperly attempted to induce Mr.
23 Margolin's prospective licensees to refrain from engaging in business with Mr. Margolin.

24 34. The foregoing actions by Defendants interfered with the business relationships of
25 Mr. Margolin, and were done intentionally and occurred without consent or authority of Mr.
26 Margolin.

27 35. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' tortious interference, Mr.
28 Margolin has suffered damages in excess of ten thousand dollars (\$10,000), entitling him to the
relief set forth below.