

CAROLYN CHAN
ATTORNEY AT LAW
2701 DEL PASO ROAD STE. 130-373
SACRAMENTO CA 95835
916/484-4020/24 HR.

**"Anybody who shoots a pit bull running loose is justified," said Kory Nelson,
the Denver city attorney.**

San Francisco Chronicle, Monday, June 27, 2005

Kory Nelson, City Attorney
1437 Bannock St.
201 West Colfax Avenue
Denver CO 80202

Interested Parties:

I represent the American Canine Foundation in California litigation, currently against San Francisco and Los Angeles counties. Each of these counties has either enacted laws which are premised off of "Breed specific Legislation" (BSL) or are based upon BSL.

It has recently come to our attention that you have a **personal or quasi-governmental website** posted universally on the world wide web, whereby you clearly state that....

....."politically correct" arguments and lawsuits from dog owners,
organizations of dog owners seeking to expand their political base and justify
collections of dues and donations,
**and strawmen for dog fighters, including but not limited to such anti-BSL
groups as the American Canine Foundation."**

Inasmuch as you are a governmental employee, and one that has sought to influence, of your own accord, such cities as San Francisco, attempting to convince the city that they should adopt your stance which involves rounding up and killing dogs which have done absolutely nothing against anyone or any specific person, it strikes me as horrendously unethical, unprofessional, and egregious that you should publish a public statement, wherein you outright accuse a nationally known group (ACF) for its advocacy work on behalf of canines, and blatantly accuse the group of being "strawmen for dogfighters", when it is a known fact that dog fighting is illegal in the United States.

Making this statement public, and sending it out on the world wide web, combined with your position as a governmental employee, indicates not only have you purposely availed to use your governmental position and authority, but in fact have attempted to utilize your position to gain an advantage in the civil arena by attempting to influence those who may have, will, or intend to seek out facts regarding the legislative canine law regarding BSL.

In this regard, we consider your attempt to influence others who are similarly positioned in other government jobs as both illegal, as well as seriously unethical; furthermore, it is an obvious ploy on your part to do damage to the credibility of American Canine Foundation because American Canine Foundation has managed to obtain a ruling in Colorado which proves at least one of your breed specific laws is not constitutional.

You have absolutely no evidence that would prove your allegation, and on its face this might well be purposeful defamation published for the sole purpose of creating a false light, misrepresentation, and fraud.

Furthermore, as a governmental employee, your statement is made in conjunction with your position as a city employee, and you have therefore involved your employer as you claim this **group will “act as a clearinghouse” for local and state government officials** to obtain information” as to BSL. You have, therefore, chosen to use your position as a city employee to gain an advantage in spreading false information, misrepresentation, and fraud.

You also claim that “anti BSL” groups are “misleading” ignorant lawmakers into making quick decisions. Surely you are aware that any advocacy group may lobby appropriately without running afoul of any first amendment violations, and that your characterizations of “misleading”, without more, are without merit.

Your statement that government attorneys, and officials can “network, share experiences, possible solutions” indicates that you specifically intend to disseminate your false information to these particular individuals involved in specific issues, thereby it is overtly stated that your information will travel to those in positions of authority involving these issues. As an example, the Missouri Municipal League: Attorneys Newsletters states that your Yahoo group site on the world wide web is available to “share both factual information on pit bulls and legal research”.....

As such, this is an attempt to mislead and influence those who will, may hear, or may intend to consider BSL law, and therefore, your intent can only be to intentionally poison and corrupt the minds of these lawmakers with misrepresentations, including those misrepresentations as to American Canine Foundation specifically.

It is no secret that you only specifically NAMED the American Canine Foundation.

It is the American Canine Foundation’s formal demand that you immediately remove all statements alluding to “strawmen for dogfighters”, or any implication that such advocacy groups are in violation of legally expanding their political base or expanding their base by obtaining donations *which are implicated to further illegal interests.*

Second, we demand that you issue a public retraction which includes the factual statement that you have absolutely no knowledge or evidence of this allegation, and that you are retracting such statement. Such retraction shall be done by the close of business day (5pm) August 22, 2006, in writing, and sent directly to my address on this letterhead. In addition, a duplicate of this retraction shall be sent via email by the same date, directly to my email used for our federal case (doglitigation@yahoo.com)

Further, if you do not make such changes, or if you insist on promoting your agenda regarding BSL in this method, we will be forced to take further action against you and see to it that such antics are stopped once and for all.

Very truly yours,

Carolyn Chan, Esq.
Representing the American Canine Foundation