

Exhibit A – Documentation of Service & Representation

Claimant: Jorden Hollingsworth

Description of Contents and Significance:

Page 3 – Pre-Arbitration Email to Maged Boutros

Initial service communication sent directly to Maged Boutros at both his **personal and professional email addresses** on February 11, 2025. The message clearly states that if no response is received, arbitration will be filed against him in his capacity as CEO of DRVM LLC and AMJ Services.

Pages 4-7 – Pre-Arbitration Letter

Formal letter addressed **personally** to Maged Boutros and delivered to both of his email accounts. The letter outlines the basis for arbitration and holds him directly responsible for his role as CEO of the relevant entities.

Page 8 – First Response from GRSM (February 14, 2025)

Email from Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani LLP, stating they represent DRVM LLC and instructing that **all future communication regarding these claims be directed to them**. This message was sent in direct response to the pre-arbitration email addressed to Maged.

Pages 9-11 – GRSM Attachment of Claimant's Pre-Arbitration Letter

In the same thread, GRSM attaches a copy of the **exact** same pre-arbitration letter that was sent directly to Maged—demonstrating they were fully aware the communication was directed at him. GRSM made **no objection to the parties being addressed and ignored all requests for clarification** about other Respondents or representation.

Page 12 – Claimant's February 18, 2025 Email Notifying GRSM of Filed Arbitration

Email sent to GRSM with notice that arbitration had been initiated. The email clearly lists DRVM LLC, AMJ Services, and Maged Boutros as Respondents. Claimant once again asks

whether there are separate legal representatives for any of the Respondents. **No clarification or response was provided.**

Page 13 – JAMS Dashboard Screenshot (Post-Filing)

This dashboard snapshot shows that all three original Respondents (DRVM, AMJ Services, Maged Boutros) were listed with GRSM attorneys attached as counsel. Multiple attorneys were added without objection, and the listing remained for over 30 days. GRSM, one of the largest firms in the country, cannot reasonably claim this was an oversight.

Page 14-16 – February 27, 2025 Email to GRSM (Amended Demand)

Claimant provides courtesy notice of the amended demand via email in addition to service on JAMS Access. This was sent in good faith, reiterating the named parties and offering GRSM another opportunity to clarify representation. Instead, GRSM attempted to argue that newly named Respondents were not appropriate, while still failing to disclaim representation of the original three.

Page 17 – GRSM Retreat (March 20, 2025)

More than 30 days after original service, GRSM sends a communication asserting they only represent DRVM LLC. This was the first and only statement narrowing their scope of representation, despite weeks of silence and confirmed dashboard listings showing representation for all three original Respondents.

Page 18 – Updated JAMS Dashboard (April 3, 2025)

This screenshot shows that GRSM is now listed as representing only DRVM LLC. The quiet removal of a MJ services and Maged Boutros reflects a delayed procedural retreat that JAMS accepted without notice, enabling GRSM's ongoing bad faith tactics.