

March 20, 2025

Dear Ms. Demmon and Ms. Curtis,

I am writing to formally address the recent claim by Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani LLP (GRSM) that your firm only represents DRVM LLC, despite previously appearing as counsel for AMJ Services and Maged “Mike” Boutros in the original demand for arbitration.

As you are aware, service was properly completed for all three respondents through your firm on **February 24, 2025**, as you were listed as the representing counsel for each entity on the JAMS dashboard. **You never raised any objection to service or representation at that time.**

On **February 27, 2025**, I served my **Amended Demand** through your firm, consistent with the representation reflected in JAMS records. Now, after receiving my Amended Demand, which increases financial exposure for the respondents, your firm is attempting to retroactively limit representation—despite accepting service on their behalf **without issue** in the original demand. This is an **intentional bad-faith procedural delay tactic** that will only escalate financial exposure and pressure in this case.

My Position Moving Forward

- If your firm is no longer representing AMJ Services and Maged “Mike” Boutros, you must **immediately** provide the names and contact information of their new legal representatives.
- JAMS will be notified that service was already properly completed through your firm and that no previous objection was made.
- **Every delay** caused by these bad-faith tactics will directly result in an **increase** in the financial amount I will be seeking in this case.

I will not engage in procedural games. If this continues, I will raise this as a pattern of obstruction and request procedural sanctions once the arbitrator is assigned.

Please respond **immediately** with clarification regarding representation. **Further delays will only escalate the financial demand in this arbitration.**

Sincerely,

Jorden Hollingsworth

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

March 20, 2025