

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
NATIONAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION / NATIONAL PROSECUTION SERVICE

SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT-AFFIDAVIT

*Martin Attribution Correction; Family/Email Communications; Jerry Identification Lead;
Mactan Three-Man Encounter; Gray-SUV / “Ruby” Clarification; Cebu Hotel Window Sequence; Gecko Bar Identification /
Threat Lead;
Consular / Lapu-Lapu Record Locators; Loan-Service/Trust Clarification; Protected Investigative Information*

RELATED MATTER	Original multi-jurisdiction Complaint-Affidavit (Manila / Cebu / Baguio / Bohol)
ORIGINAL JURAT	Subscribed and sworn at the Philippine Consulate General in Guangzhou on 25 August 2026
NOTARIAL REFERENCE	Doc. No. 0699; Page No. 215; Book No. 17; Series of 2026
COMPLAINANT-AFFIANT	Larry Margulies
CONTACT	larry@diydetective.org
DOCKET / I.S. / NBI REFERENCE	_____

I, LARRY MARGULIES, of legal age, American citizen, presently residing overseas, after being duly sworn in accordance with law, depose and state as follows:

I. LIMITED PURPOSE AND RELATIONSHIP TO ORIGINAL COMPLAINT-AFFIDAVIT

1. This Supplemental Complaint-Affidavit concerns the same Philippine investigative matter as my original Complaint-Affidavit notarized on 25 August 2026. It does not replace, withdraw, restart, or renumber the original Complaint-Affidavit or its exhibits. It is limited to: (a) correcting an overstatement concerning Martin Yudowitz’s participation in one family call; (b) identifying Bernard S. Yudowitz as a participant in that corrected call and as a communications subject whose surviving 2014–2016 records should be sought, without converting him into a newly charged respondent for every offense already pleaded; (c) adding more specific information concerning separate family/email communications during the Philippines period; (d) adding a narrow Davao identification lead concerning the American known to me as “Jerry”; (e) adding a Cebu/Mactan identification lead concerning a three-man encounter at or near the Deca apartments; (f) adding a Cebu identification lead concerning the name “Ruby” and the associated telephone-number identification lead from the gray SUV already described in the original Complaint-Affidavit, including the paper I received from Lesyl Medalla; clarifying the Cebu hotel window / gray-SUV sequence by distinguishing an earlier preserved account describing persons “discussing plans to shoot two people” from my more specific present recollection of the question, in substance, “Are we going to shoot them both?”; identifying my contemporaneous report of that SUV to a United States consular or State Department duty officer, with the resulting Lapu-Lapu police-station referral and later Perpetual Succour Hospital record locator; and submitting two contemporaneous hotel documents as Supplemental Exhibits PH-S1 and PH-S2 for property/date authentication; (g) adding a separate Cebu / Gecko Bar

identification and threat lead concerning the Australian man known to me as “Bill,” whom I personally spoke with and understood, and recall was publicly regarded locally, as the acting owner, owner, or “silent owner” of Gecko Bar, while leaving his formal legal or beneficial ownership status for verification; another male present; a waitress witness; the threat-related statements; and the court-document/testifying question; (h) clarifying that different clusters of people appeared as we moved from place to place; (i) clarifying the interruption of private financing and the first trust-related information communicated to the lender; and (j) establishing protected handling for sensitive witness, source, and operational information; and (k) clarifying source attribution concerning Lesyl Medalla’s handwritten statement, the separate paper bearing the name “Ruby” and a telephone number, and earlier descriptions in Philippine, Aventura, or other cross-jurisdiction materials. Matters already adequately stated in the original Complaint-Affidavit are not repeated as new allegations except where limited repetition is necessary to explain a new identification or record-location lead.

2. I adopt the original Complaint-Affidavit’s jurisdictional limitations. The alleged offenses committed within Philippine territory remain the basis for Philippine investigation and any appropriate prosecution. Events, persons, or records outside the Philippines are referenced only to the extent they may supply evidence, context, identification, communications, motive, or other lawful investigative leads concerning the Philippine offenses. I do not ask a Philippine office to exercise territorial jurisdiction it does not possess.

3. I request that this supplement be permanently associated with the original Complaint-Affidavit and handled under the same docket, I.S., NBI, or other official reference. Where preliminary investigation is conducted by the National Prosecution Service, I request that the matter continue under Department Circular No. 015, series of 2024, and other applicable current rules, as already requested in the original Complaint-Affidavit.

3A. Unofficial merged writings, literary titles, marketplace uploads, and similar extra-record materials are investigative aids only. Their internal dates and narrative compressions do not control. This sworn supplement and the original notarized Complaint-Affidavit control over unofficial writings. Where contemporaneous official records establish a more precise date, location, station number, identity, or sequence than my present recollection, I request that those objective records control. Where earlier unofficial or preserved writings contain materially different wording for the same remembered statement, I do not silently choose one variant and present it as certain. I identify the discrepancy where relevant, distinguish my present recollection from the wording preserved in those writings, and ask investigators to evaluate the underlying event from objective records and independent witness accounts.

II. MATERIAL CORRECTION AND ADDITIONAL CLARIFICATION CONCERNING MARTIN YUDOWITZ AND BERNARD S. YUDOWITZ

A. Correction of definite participation in the “That’s what you get for writing the letter” call

4. The first page of my original Complaint-Affidavit identifies Martin Yudowitz as an additional person requiring investigation and states, among other things, that he participated in the 2014 joint telephone communication in which the statement “That’s what you get for writing the letter” was made. The original Complaint-Affidavit also contains later passages and an investigative request describing Martin as

definitely participating in that particular call. After further reconstruction of my recollection, that level of certainty as to Martin is too strong and should be corrected wherever it appears.

5. My present recollection is that Evelyn Yudowitz and Bernard S. Yudowitz participated in the relevant call. Bernard was physically with Evelyn at their Massachusetts residence, and both participated in the conversation with me. I distinctly remember the statement “That’s what you get for writing the letter” being made during the relevant family communication, but I do not presently assign the exact quoted words to one particular speaker with greater certainty than my recollection supports.

6. I do not presently recall with sufficient certainty whether Martin Yudowitz also participated in that same “That’s what you get for writing the letter” call. I separately and distinctly recall another three-way family telephone communication involving Bernard S. Yudowitz and Martin Yudowitz concerning my emails, described below. My recollection of that separate email-related call should not be treated as establishing that Martin was present for, or absent from, the particular “That’s what you get for writing the letter” call. Any prior description stating his participation in that particular call with certainty should therefore be qualified by this supplement.

7. This correction is also informed by earlier preserved accounts prepared closer in time to the events, which describe me calling my father after the police-escorted appearance of the gray-haired American man connected with my United States repatriation-loan process. I rely on those earlier accounts only as memory and chronology aids. They do not authorize investigators to treat any unofficial publication date, literary title, or marketplace dating as controlling.

8. This correction applies to the top-page description of Martin, the Martin-related description in the section identifying respondents and persons requiring investigation, the request to verify the relevant family communications, and any other sentence that treats Martin’s participation in that particular quoted call as established. It does not change the allegation that the quoted statement was made during the relevant family communication. It does not withdraw the separate Martin-related communications described below. Because Bernard S. Yudowitz is now identified as a participant in the corrected call, I request that investigators treat him as a person whose 2014–2016 telephone, email, and related communications should be obtained and compared, without treating this supplement as a new charging instrument against him for every offense already pleaded. Bernard S. Yudowitz died in 2018. A public death notice and obituary so state. This supplement therefore seeks only surviving records and does not request an interview or personal examination of him.

B. Massachusetts residence telephone as a record locator

9. During the relevant period, Evelyn Yudowitz and Bernard S. Yudowitz lived together at Evelyn’s Massachusetts residence. The family calls at issue were generally placed by me to the telephone serving that residence. If any historical subscriber, billing, toll, or archival records remain lawfully obtainable through appropriate international-assistance channels, that residence and telephone account may provide a more precise locator for the corrected call and for the separate Bernard/Martin email-related call. The identity of a subscriber or account holder, by itself, does not establish who participated in any individual conversation. I do not claim that 2014–2016 United States telephone records will still exist. If they do not, that fact should be noted. It does not withdraw the correction or the other communications already sworn.

C. Separate Martin-related communications and Bernard/Martin email call

10. This correction does not withdraw my separate recollection that, during the Philippines period and while I was reporting active threats against my life, Martin Yudowitz instructed me to ignore those threats and not report or complain about them. It also does not withdraw my separate recollection that, in or about 2015 while I was in the Cebu region, Martin told me that Evelyn Yudowitz and her husband had ordered him to help “take care of” me. Those distinct communications remain submitted for investigation subject to the qualifications already stated in the original Complaint-Affidavit.

11. I additionally and distinctly recall a separate three-way telephone call involving me, my father Bernard S. Yudowitz, and my brother Martin Yudowitz while I was in the Philippines, approximately during the 2014 period. Before I had entered the substantive part of the conversation, I heard Bernard ask Martin whether he had finished doing something concerning my emails. I recall Martin responding, in substance, that I had “too many.” I do not know from that exchange what task Bernard was asking Martin to perform, and I do not claim that the conversation by itself proves unauthorized access, deletion, interception, alteration, or any other particular electronic act.

12. This separate call is nevertheless an objectively testable investigative lead. It may be compared with available family telephone records, email headers, forwarding history, recipient information, account-recovery or password-reset records, account-security alerts, login records, provider records, devices, backups, and related family communications. The purpose is to determine what Bernard was asking Martin to finish, which email accounts or communications were involved, and whether any electronic activity can be independently corroborated. This Bernard/Martin email-related call should not be treated as the same event as the “That’s what you get for writing the letter” call unless objective records establish otherwise.

D. Related Evelyn email communication during an acute Philippines incident

13. I clarify an additional family/email fact from the Philippines period because it gives context to the Bernard/Martin email call and to the motive and communication issues already raised in the original Complaint-Affidavit. I am certain that, during an acute incident that I had reported as an attempt to kill me by poisoning or drugging, while I was severely impaired, frightened, and believed my life was in immediate danger, I telephoned Evelyn Yudowitz seeking help. I believed from the family communications and surrounding events already described in my complaint that she had information about, communications with, influence over, or access through intermediaries to persons connected with the threats and might therefore be in a position to cause the threatening conduct to stop. I submit the actual identity of the persons responsible and the nature of any connection to Evelyn for independent investigation.

14. During that same telephone communication, Evelyn was angry concerning the childhood-abuse allegations and the 1979 psychological records I had previously sent her by email. She told me that she was physically holding printed copies of those emails in her hands while speaking with me and accused me, in substance, of lying about the allegations. Because this was a telephone communication, I did not visually see the papers; my recollection that they were physically in her hands is based on what Evelyn herself told me. I asked her for immediate help obtaining private security to protect me and legal counsel

so that I could report, document, and take lawful action concerning the threats. She told me that she would “think about it.”

15. I did not believe the concurrence of those circumstances was coincidental: while I believed an active attempt was being made on my life and was asking Evelyn to help stop the persons threatening me, she was angrily focused upon printed communications in which I had confronted her concerning matters I believed supplied motive for hostility toward me. I state that as my contemporaneous interpretation, not as proof that Evelyn caused the poisoning or that the family email communications establish the identity of any assailant. I request that investigators compare telephone, email, financial, trust, and intermediary records to determine whether an objective connection exists. The separate Bernard/Martin email call described above, Evelyn’s possession of printed emails described here, and Martin’s separate references to emails while telling me not to report active threats should be investigated as distinct communications that may or may not have involved the same underlying email material.

III. ADDITIONAL DAVAO LEAD CONCERNING “JERRY” AND BERNARD S. YUDOWITZ

16. The original Complaint-Affidavit already records that, during the pre-2014 Davao period, I personally observed an American national known to me as “Jerry” display a Quezon City Drug Task Force identification card to a Philippine police desk officer, and it records other statements and conduct attributed to Jerry. I do not repeat those existing allegations here as new charges. I add one narrower fact that may assist investigators in identifying the source of Jerry’s information about me and my family.

17. During an encounter in my Davao apartment, I recall Jerry pointing toward or recognizing a photograph of my father, Bernard S. Yudowitz, and warning me, in substance, against crossing Bernard. Because this occurred many years ago, I do not present a particular wording as a verbatim quotation beyond the substance stated here. I do not contend that this statement alone proves Jerry worked for Bernard, Evelyn Yudowitz, or any family member.

18. The investigative significance is that Jerry appeared to know or recognize Bernard and made a warning about him, while the original Complaint-Affidavit already provides a potentially independent identification route through Jerry’s Davao presence and the Quezon City Drug Task Force credential I personally observed. I respectfully request that investigators determine Jerry’s true identity—including through any lawfully available Davao arrest, fingerprint, booking, task-force credentialing, immigration, or travel records—and determine how he knew or recognized Bernard; who supplied him with information concerning me or my family; and whether any Philippine police, task-force, immigration, communications, travel, or other records objectively connect him with Bernard, Evelyn, another family member, a government contact, or another intermediary. No such connection should be presumed merely from Jerry’s statement.

IV. ADDITIONAL CEBU / MACTAN LEAD: THREE-MAN ENCOUNTER AT OR NEAR DECA APARTMENTS

19. The original Complaint-Affidavit already describes threats, surveillance, a later apartment break-in, the interruption of private financing, and the pregnancy-period events in the Cebu / Mactan / Lapu-Lapu area. I do not repeat those events as new charges. I add one personally observed encounter that may assist

identification of persons present in that area shortly before the move to the apartment that later had the break-in, and before the fetal death already described in the original filing.

20. During the Cebu / Mactan period, approximately a week or so before Lesyl Medalla and I moved to the apartment that later had the break-in, three men were sitting at a table outside our then-room, in or at the entranceway or small store area of the apartment complex I presently recall as Deca apartments (sometimes written Decca) on Mactan. Earlier preserved writing identified the place as Decca 5 and identified a local man named Jun as being from Decca 3. After the passage of time, I presently recall the building or phase as Deca 5 or Deca 6. I ask that any surviving apartment, tenant, barangay, police, utility, or other objective location records control the precise building and timing.

21. I greeted them and shook the hand of the man to my left. I presently recall the three men as follows. First, the man whose hand I shook, known to me as Jun and associated in my recollection with Deca 3, said aloud to the other two, in substance, “I’m not going to shoot him” or “I’m not going to shoot this man.” I remember the statement because the subject of shooting was introduced immediately after I approached the group. Second, the man in the middle was Filipino and had a large birthmark surrounding one eye. I estimate the mark at approximately four inches in diameter, but I do not claim a precise measurement after this passage of time. He said, in substance, that he was in, or they were, the Philippine Army. I did not inspect any military credential and I do not swear that he was in fact a member of the Armed Forces of the Philippines. Third, the remaining man was a short, bald Caucasian who sounded American. I asked him whether they had been sent by the United States Department of State. He replied, in substance, “Why, do you want to die?” I understood that response as threatening in the circumstances. I do not treat my question as proof of his affiliation.

22. I do not contend that this encounter, standing alone, proves that the three men were sent by any particular family member, government office, or organized group, or that they were the same persons later involved in the gray-SUV events, the break-in, or any later offense. I submit the encounter as a Philippine-territory identification and threat lead because: (a) it occurred in Mactan / Lapu-Lapu; (b) one participant is associated in my recollection with the name Jun and Deca 3; (c) one participant has a distinctive facial birthmark; and (d) two of the statements I heard—“I’m not going to shoot him” and “Why, do you want to die?”—may be relevant to investigation of threats, intimidation, and whether any agreement or coordination existed, issues already raised in the original Complaint-Affidavit.

23. I request that investigators attempt to identify the three men through Deca / Decca apartment, landlord, barangay, CCTV if still obtainable, PNP Lapu-Lapu or Mactan blotter, immigration or alien-registration records for a bald short Caucasian American then present in Mactan, and any surviving witness account. If a candidate is identified through those sources or through AFP assignment or personnel records connected to Mactan at the relevant time, I request that any available description or photograph then be compared with my recollection of a large periocular birthmark. I do not ask that AFP records be searched by birthmark alone. If Jun can be identified and located, I request that investigators, if practicable, obtain his initial independent account before providing him detailed later allegations or filings, and that any sensitive contact information be handled under the protected-handling request below and, if the facts warrant, confidential evaluation under Republic Act No. 6981. I do not place Jun’s current address, workplace, or contact details in this written supplement.

23A. Lesyl Medalla's NBI Complaint Sheet dated 21 July 2015, identified in the original Complaint-Affidavit as Exhibit 7-C, separately refers in its narrative to categories including Philippine army personnel and various white Caucasian persons. I do not contend that those general descriptions identify these three men. I submit the overlap only as a reason to compare her independent account with my identification details and any available official records.

V. CEBU GRAY-SUV / “RUBY” LEAD, HOTEL WINDOW SEQUENCE, AND CONSULAR / HOSPITAL / LAPU-LAPU RECORD LOCATORS

24. The original Complaint-Affidavit already describes a gray SUV in the Cebu period, Lesyl Medalla's written account of a woman who left that vehicle and spoke with her, and surrounding threats. I do not repeat those facts as new charges. I add the name “Ruby” that appeared on the paper Lesyl later gave me, the fact that I received that paper, what I personally heard and saw at the Cebu hotel, and my own contemporaneous report of that SUV to a United States consular or State Department duty officer. Those additions are identification, threat, and record-locator facts. They are not a new extra-territorial case against any foreign office.

25. I also note, as a limited pattern observation and not as proof of one formal organization, that the particular persons who appeared changed as Lesyl and I moved from one Philippine city or lodging to another. I ask investigators to treat the gray-SUV-associated Cebu sequence as one location-linked comparison cluster; the three men at the Mactan / Deca apartment as another specifically identifiable encounter; the Gecko Bar incident described below as a separate business-location and witness-identification lead; and the other persons described in the original Complaint-Affidavit according to their own dates, locations, witnesses, vehicles, numbers, and official-record locators. Any conclusion that two groups overlapped, coordinated, or were unrelated should be based on objective evidence rather than assumption.

A. What Lesyl's written statement actually says, and what the paper added

26. Lesyl Medalla's surviving written statement, identified in the original Complaint-Affidavit as Exhibit 7-B, does not print the name “Ruby.” What that statement does describe, in substance, is this: after we lost the baby, suspicious people talked to her when I was not around; they offered help for her to leave me and said bad things about me; they offered everything she wanted or needed; while we were at the place Lesyl's statement calls the “HOLIDAY HOTEL” and I was gone, she was waiting in the lobby and saw a gray SUV with people inside; a lady came out and spoke with her; another girl told a man to wait down the road and watch whether I was coming so they could “act nothing”; the lady forced Lesyl to accept a telephone number and to hide it from me; the lady asked Lesyl to contact her without telling me; the lady said they cared about Lesyl because she is Filipina; Lesyl asked them to leave her alone; Lesyl and I later moved to Crowne Regency Hotel, then Palladium, then Escario Hotel, where Lesyl saw the gray SUV again while I was gone; a taxi driver later asked whether she had changed her mind or when she would call or text the number she had; and Lesyl wrote that those people wanted to do bad things to me. I do not claim that Lesyl's written statement uses the phrase “take care of him.” That phrase appears in my separate recollection of Martin Yudowitz, already stated above, not as a word I am attributing to Lesyl's exhibit pages.

27. Lesyl later gave me a piece of paper. That paper bore the name “Ruby” and a telephone number. As I understood from Lesyl, that was the number and the name from the SUV approach described in her statement. I personally received the paper from Lesyl. I did not personally witness the woman hand the paper or number to Lesyl. I cannot independently establish whether “Ruby” was the woman’s true name, an alias, the name of the woman who handed over the number, or another person acting with the same group. My knowledge that the name on the paper was Ruby is based on the paper I physically received and on Lesyl’s explanation to me. Investigators should therefore treat Lesyl’s writing as evidence that a woman from the gray SUV forced a concealed number on her, and treat the name “Ruby” as the identifier that appeared on the paper Lesyl then gave me.

28. The paper later was no longer in my possession after our moves. I was unable to recover it and do not know whether it was lost, misplaced, or removed. I do not accuse any particular person of taking it. I request that investigators attempt to recover the number from Lesyl, from any preserved image or prior NBI material, or from old devices or messages if any still exist, and if recovered use lawful process to identify the historical subscriber.

B. Cebu hotel window sequence that I personally observed

29. Separately from Lesyl’s lobby encounter, I personally observed this Cebu hotel sequence. The exact hotel property is not presently fixed with certainty. My present recollection is that this was a Holiday Inn, or a hotel I remember as Holiday Inn. Lesyl Medalla’s preserved statement refers to the location as the “HOLIDAY HOTEL.” An earlier exhibit description in my original filing identified the location as Days Inn. Supplemental Exhibit PH-S1 is a Days Hotel-branded Cebu meal voucher bearing my name, Room 101, and a handwritten date of 12/17/14. I do not treat any one of those labels or PH-S1 alone as conclusive of the exact property. I request that hotel, guest-registration, booking/payment, consular, police, or other contemporaneous records establish the exact property, and those objective records should control.

29A. As to the physical sequence, an earlier preserved account states that shortly after Lesyl and I checked into a ground-floor room, I observed a person outside our room near the window; after we moved to an upstairs room, I heard persons speaking about Lesyl and me and saw a man wearing a yellow shirt walking away from the area where I had heard the conversation; and I could not see the SUV from the upstairs-room window. That earlier account further states that I later went to the lobby and spoke with the hotel security manager and, from the road leading from the lobby toward the highway, saw the man in the yellow shirt approach an SUV parked across the road from the hotel gate, directly down the access road. My present recollection adds that we arrived at about 5:00 a.m. as the sun was coming up and that, before we slept, I went to adjust the curtains and saw a man outside the first-room window. My present recollection of the shooting-related words is also more specific: I presently recall one person asking the other, in substance, “Are we going to shoot them both?” I do not represent that exact question as a verbatim quotation preserved in the earlier account; the earlier preserved wording describes persons “discussing plans to shoot two people.” After the lobby/access-road observation, I immediately telephoned a United States consular or State Department duty officer and reported the SUV and what I had heard and seen.

30. I do not presently assign the shooting-related question or discussion to one named speaker. I do not claim that the man at the first-room window, the yellow-shirted man, any person at or near the SUV, or the person associated with the name “Ruby” was necessarily the same individual. I do claim that, as

presently reconstructed, the first-room window observation, the hotel-authorized room change, the upstairs-room conversation, the yellow-shirted man walking away, the later lobby/security-manager interaction, the access-road observation of that man approaching the SUV, and my consular report belong to the same Cebu hotel incident already raised in the original Complaint-Affidavit. I request that contemporaneous records control if they establish a more precise physical sequence or identity.

31. I had not first told Lesyl what I had overheard or reported. Her later account of the lady from the gray SUV, the concealed number, and “bad things” is therefore an independent comparison, not a repetition of something I had already described to her. I do not present her account as wholly independent evidence of everything I heard. She had her own experiences and her own source of knowledge. I understood the persons associated with that gray SUV, in that setting, as acting together to target, harm, or kill me. I have sometimes used the words “hit team” in unofficial writing. I use that expression here only as my contemporaneous characterization of apparent purpose. It is not a formal legal finding that a named organization, roster, or completed homicide has already been proven, and it is not a statement that Ruby personally uttered the shooting question or personally made a direct death threat to me.

C. Consular referral, Lapu-Lapu station, Escario, and Perpetual Succour Hospital

32. The duty officer confidentially directed me to report the matter to a particular Lapu-Lapu police station. I did so. My present recollection is that the station may have been Police Station No. 6, but I am not sufficiently certain of the station number after the passage of time. I request that contemporaneous consular and Philippine police records control. I do not ask a Philippine office to exercise jurisdiction over a United States agency, and I do not convert the fact of a consular report into proof that any particular foreign official caused the Philippine offenses. Because my present recollection does not fix the exact hotel property or Lapu-Lapu police-station number with certainty, I request that investigators first establish those two identifiers from any available hotel or booking/payment records, consular duty-call/referral records, and Philippine police blotter or desk records. Using the confirmed identifiers, I request comparison of any surviving guest-registration and room-assignment records, the authorized room-change record, security or CCTV records concerning the ground-floor window area, upstairs room or hallway, lobby, hotel gate and access road, any record capable of identifying the yellow-shirted man or the gray SUV, and related dispatch, telephone, vehicle, witness, consular, and police records.

33. At a later time, while we were staying in the Escario area of Cebu during the same general period in which I experienced the suspected poisoning or drugging described in the original Complaint-Affidavit, a taxi driver asked Lesyl whether she had changed her mind or when she would call or text the number she had. Lesyl’s written statement records that question. I understood this to refer to the same number associated with the paper bearing the name “Ruby”; that is my interpretation of the sequence, and I do not claim the taxi driver himself used the name “Ruby.” The significance, if that interpretation is correct, is that someone outside Lesyl’s first conversation with the SUV woman later pressed her about calling that number.

34. As already described in the original Complaint-Affidavit, during the Escario incident I experienced severe symptoms after food was delivered to my room and I sought urgent medical assistance. I ultimately took a taxi to Perpetual Succour Hospital in Cebu (also written Socceur, Soccuier, Socorro, or Soccer in earlier unofficial writings). When I left or hurried away from the hospital, I observed an American man

seated in a vehicle with the window lowered. While he was speaking by telephone, I heard him ask the person on the other end to do him a favor and call a particular Lapu-Lapu police station. I immediately recognized the station, at the time, as the same station the duty officer had given me after the gray-SUV report. I was certain of that recognition then, although I cannot now state the exact station number with complete certainty. I submit this as an objectively testable record-location and communications lead. I do not contend that the American man's knowledge of the station number, standing alone, proves that he was a State Department employee, a police officer, a member of the gray-SUV group, or connected to the suspected poisoning.

35. The principal existing source documents relevant to this clarification include Lesyl Medalla's preserved written statement concerning third-party approaches in Cebu, identified in the original Complaint-Affidavit as Exhibit 7-B, and her NBI Complaint Sheet dated 21 July 2015, identified as Exhibit 7-C. The NBI Complaint Sheet separately refers to broad categories including special agents, barangay officials, taxi officials, NGO personnel, possible U.S. State Department personnel, policemen, Philippine army personnel, and various white Caucasians. I do not treat those broad categories as identification of the particular Mactan men, the gray-SUV occupants, Ruby, the taxi driver, or the American outside Perpetual Succour Hospital. I request that the categories be used only as comparison leads together with the more specific facts and record locators stated above.

35A. Additional contemporaneous hotel documents. I am submitting two photographic reproductions of hotel documents presently in my possession as a separate PH-S supplemental exhibit series, without altering the numbering of the original Complaint-Affidavit exhibits. Supplemental Exhibit PH-S1 is a Days Hotel-branded MEAL VOUCHER bearing a "CEBU" identifier, the guest name "Mr. Margulies," Room No. 101, a handwritten date of 12/17/14, and Breakfast marked. I submit PH-S1 as a property/location and chronology lead relevant to identifying the Cebu hotel described above; I do not characterize the voucher by itself as a complete guest folio or as conclusive proof of the exact property, length of stay, or sequence of movements. Supplemental Exhibit PH-S2 is an Escario Central Hotel guest folio bearing the name "MARGULIES, LARRY," Room 103, an arrival date/time of 12/15/2014 at 5:41 PM, a departure date of 12/21/2014, six nights, and a print date of 12/21/2014. I submit PH-S2 as a contemporaneous location/date record relevant to the later Escario sequence. Because the dates displayed on PH-S1 and PH-S2 overlap, I do not use the documents alone to resolve the precise sequence of hotel movements; I request authentication and comparison with surviving hotel, guest-registration, booking, payment, merchant, security, police, consular, and other business records. Neither exhibit, standing alone, establishes the identity or criminal responsibility of any person described in this affidavit.

D. Separate Gecko Bar identification and threat lead

35B. During the Cebu period, while I was walking back toward Lesyl Medalla's residence one night, an Australian man known to me as "Bill" called me over to Gecko Bar for a private conversation. Bill was the man with whom I personally spoke during the encounter described below. I understood him at the time, and presently recall that he was publicly regarded locally, as the acting owner, owner, or "silent owner" of Gecko Bar. I do not presently know whether any of those descriptions reflected the formal registered owner, beneficial owner, investor, lessor, lessee, operator, manager, or another legally recognized status, and I request that business and licensing records establish his exact role. My earlier preserved Gecko Bar writings do not themselves supply the given name "Bill"; that name is my present

recollection of what he was called. Those writings describe another male present, referred to in one version as an unusual “sidekick” and in another as another Caucasian man, and a waitress who served beer. One preserved version describes the encounter as occurring after closing. I submit those details as location, identity, and witness leads and do not rely on the exact after-hours headcount as an independently established fact.

35C. Bill sat close to me and told me, in substance, that there was “a contract on my life” or that someone wanted me shot. The earlier preserved writings are not internally consistent concerning an additional exclusion phrase attributed to him. Variants in those writings include “It isn’t a white man,” “It isn’t a black man,” and “It isn’t an American.” I do not now swear that any one of those three variants is the exact wording and I do not use them as a reliable racial or national identification of the person Bill was referring to. The stable point I submit is that Bill spoke as though he possessed information concerning a serious threat against my life but did not identify the person or source to me. The other male present then said, “Just shoot him!” One preserved account further records Bill moving to another chair after that statement and me sitting back next to him. I understood the conversation as threat-related. I do not contend from these statements alone that Bill or the other man commissioned, joined, or knew the true source of any planned attack; I submit the meaning of the statements, the source of their information, and their respective roles for independent investigation.

35D. During the same conversation, the preserved writings describe Bill asking about court documents and, in another version, asking whether I was testifying in court. I told him, in substance, that I was not involved in any court case or proceeding and had not testified against anyone. The only potentially related legal material that came to mind at the time was a questionnaire or communication sent to me in the Philippines from Boston by attorney Mitchell Garabedian concerning earlier family-abuse matters and the 1979 “Park” report. I state that only as my contemporaneous association. I do not state that Bill, the other man, the waitress, or anyone connected with Gecko Bar knew Mr. Garabedian, had seen that correspondence, knew of the questionnaire, or that the Garabedian material caused or explained the threat-related statements. Any connection should be established, if at all, from independent evidence.

35E. For avoidance of ambiguity, the “Bill” identified in paragraphs 35B–35D is the Australian man who called me over and personally spoke with me during the Gecko Bar conversation. The uncertainty concerns his formal ownership, beneficial-ownership, management, or operating status at Gecko Bar—not his presence in the conversation. I request that investigators establish his full legal identity and exact relationship to Gecko Bar from business registration, licensing, permit, lease, ownership, tax, employment, immigration, photograph, and other lawfully available records.

35F. I keep this Gecko Bar event separate from other incidents unless objective evidence establishes a connection. In particular, I do not merge this conversation with any separate duty-officer statement elsewhere in my materials concerning a “warrant on my life” or a person described as “Whitey,” and I do not merge Bill with a different Australian couple described elsewhere in connection with the Mactan loan. Similar nationality, threat language, timing, or geography is not by itself proof that different persons or events were connected.

35G. I request that investigators identify and independently interview Bill, the other male, and the waitress if they can be located; determine the exact Gecko Bar business entity, address, ownership and

operating structure during the relevant period; obtain, where lawfully available, business-registration, permit, licensing, lease, ownership, management, employment, tax, barangay, police, immigration, travel, photograph, and related records; and compare those records and first-hand witness accounts with the preserved writings before exposing witnesses to detailed later theories or filings, if practicable. The purpose is to determine what Bill and the other man actually knew, the source of any information concerning a threat against my life, the meaning of the “Just shoot him!” statement, and whether the court-document/testifying question had any objectively verifiable connection to other Philippine events. I do not ask investigators to presume the existence of a contract, the identity of any person behind one, or any broader conspiracy from this encounter alone.

VI. LOAN-SERVICE / TRUST CLARIFICATION AND MATERIAL EFFECT DURING THE PREGNANCY

36. The original Complaint-Affidavit already describes that a private loan-service source I had used and repaid successfully was unexpectedly stopped during the Cebu period after, as I was informed, an unidentified person told the lender that I was mentally ill and possessed information concerning a trust account or trust-related financial circumstances. It also already records the pregnancy-period use of available funds, my report to a United States Consulate duty officer that I feared the unborn baby could die if we could not obtain adequate nutrition, and that the separately reported dating-profile/KFC lead is not used to fix a precise sequence relative to the fetal death. I do not repeat those underlying events as new allegations.

37. I add only this clarification. This was the first occasion I presently recall on which an outside source referred to a trust account said to be associated with me. At that time I did not know that the Bernard S. Yudowitz Irrevocable Trust existed, who controlled it, or how an unidentified outsider could possess such information. I later learned of the trust through other events and records. Hearing an outsider refer to a trust is not the same as then knowing the legal existence, terms, ownership, or administration of that trust.

38. Based on the timing, the private trust-related and mental-health information supplied to the lender, and the other events I was experiencing during the same broader Cebu period, I came to suspect that the person who interfered with the loan may have been connected to Evelyn Yudowitz, an intermediary, or the same broader group of persons I believed was threatening or monitoring me. I do not present temporal or geographic proximity alone as proof of such coordination. I request investigation of who supplied the lender with both the mental-health characterization and the trust-related information, how that person obtained the information, and whether the source had communications with any respondent, family member, intermediary, government employee, or person involved in the Philippine events.

39. The financing was materially important because I was using and seeking available funds for food, prenatal care, transportation, safer lodging, and protection while Lesyl Medalla was pregnant. I personally believe that continuation of the private financing would have materially increased my ability to obtain those things and might have changed what followed. I do not state that the baby necessarily would have survived as an established medical or legal fact. The cause of fetal death, and whether interruption of the financing was intentionally used to isolate or financially constrain me or had any legally material causal relationship to later events, should be determined from lender records, medical evidence, witness evidence, communications, and criminal investigation.

VII. PROTECTED HANDLING OF SENSITIVE WITNESS, SOURCE, AND INVESTIGATIVE INFORMATION

40. The original Complaint-Affidavit already requests witness-protection and confidentiality measures. Consistent with that request, I have intentionally not placed every sensitive witness or source identifier, current contact detail, precise location, or other operationally sensitive lead into this written supplement. This is not intended to withhold relevant information from Philippine law enforcement or prosecutors. This request specifically includes any later-recovered identifying information concerning Jun, the birthmark-bearing man, the bald Caucasian, the person or identity associated with the name “Ruby,” the taxi driver described above, and any Gecko Bar witness whose non-public identifying or contact information is later obtained.

41. Where I possess additional identifying information or later recover source communications, I am prepared to provide that material promptly and directly to the assigned NBI investigator, handling prosecutor, or other competent Philippine law-enforcement authority through a confidential or otherwise appropriate channel. My purpose is to allow investigators to preserve and evaluate potentially useful evidence before unnecessary circulation creates a risk of intimidation, bribery, retaliation, coordination among interested persons, or contamination of witness recollection.

42. For the same protective reasons, I do not include in this written supplement any future travel itinerary, lodging information, non-public witness locations, or protective-security and private-investigative operational details. Any such information that becomes relevant to the investigation will be supplied directly to the responsible investigator, prosecutor, or other competent authority on a need-to-know basis and subject to applicable law and lawful investigative or prosecutorial requirements.

43. I am not asking investigators or prosecutors to conceal from a respondent any material that applicable law, due process, or a lawful prosecutorial or judicial directive requires to be disclosed. I instead request protective handling, limited circulation where legally permissible, and advance consideration of witness-protection measures before sensitive identifying information is disclosed more broadly. The undisclosed identifiers or contact details are not offered as the sole factual basis for any allegation or correction in this supplement.

44. This protected-handling request supplements, and does not replace, my original request for confidential evaluation under the DOJ Witness Protection, Security and Benefit Program under Republic Act No. 6981. I remain willing to cooperate with lawful investigative and prosecutorial procedures and to provide sensitive source information to the competent authority when a secure method is identified.

VIII. LIMITED ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATIVE REQUESTS

45. Arising only from the correction and additional clarifications above, I respectfully request that the receiving authority:

- correct or annotate the investigative record so that Martin Yudowitz is not described with greater certainty than my present recollection supports as a participant in the “That’s what you get for writing the letter” call;

- treat Bernard S. Yudowitz as a communications subject only, not as a person available for interview. He died in 2018. Seek surviving telephone, email, subscriber, billing, or archival records concerning the corrected family call and the separate Bernard/Martin email-related call, using the Massachusetts residence telephone as a locator if records remain lawfully obtainable;
- preserve the separate Martin-related allegations concerning his instruction not to report active death threats and his later “take care of” statement, and separately investigate the Bernard/Martin email-related three-way call;
- where records remain lawfully obtainable, compare 2014–2016 family telephone records with email transmission, forwarding, recipient, account-security, recovery, provider, device, or backup records to determine what Bernard was asking Martin to finish;
- preserve or obtain family email and telephone records sufficient to test Evelyn Yudowitz’s statement that she was physically holding printed copies of my emails during the acute Philippines incident;
- identify the American known as “Jerry” through available Davao police, fingerprint/booking, Quezon City Drug Task Force, immigration, travel, or credentialing records, and determine how he knew or recognized Bernard S. Yudowitz;
- identify and, if located, independently interview Jun concerning the Mactan three-man encounter and, if practicable, obtain his initial independent account before providing him detailed later allegations or filings; attempt to identify candidate persons through Deca, barangay, police, witness, or AFP assignment or personnel records, then compare any available description or photograph with my recollection of the periocular birthmark, without searching AFP records by birthmark alone; and attempt to identify the short bald Caucasian/American-sounding man;
- treat “Ruby” and the associated telephone number as an identification lead tied to the gray-SUV group; compare that name with Lesyl Medalla’s Exhibit 7-B statement of the lady who forced a concealed number on her, and with the lost paper that bore the name Ruby; attempt to recover the number from Lesyl, prior NBI materials, images, or old devices; and do not presume Ruby’s true identity or criminal role;
- annotate the Philippine investigative record so that Exhibit 7-B is not described as itself containing the phrase “take care of him” or the name “Ruby”; treat “take care of him” as my separate recollection of Martin Yudowitz and treat “Ruby” as the identifier on the separate paper containing a telephone number that Lesyl Medalla later gave me, while preserving Exhibit 7-B for what it actually records concerning the gray-SUV woman, the concealed telephone number, the later taxi-driver reference to “the number,” and Lesyl’s statement that the persons wanted to do bad things to me;
- identify the Gecko Bar operating in Cebu during the relevant period; obtain, where lawfully available, business-registration, permit, licensing, lease, ownership, beneficial-ownership, management, employment, barangay, police, immigration, travel, photograph, tax, and related records capable of establishing the full legal identity and formal or informal business role of the Australian man known to me as “Bill,” whom I personally spoke with and understood, and recall was publicly regarded locally, as the acting owner, owner, or “silent owner”; separately identify

and, if practicable, independently interview the other male who made the “Just shoot him!” statement and the waitress present during the conversation; compare their independent accounts with the preserved variants concerning a “contract on my life” or someone wanting me shot, the inconsistent exclusion phrases (“It isn’t a white man,” “It isn’t a black man,” and “It isn’t an American”), and the court-document/testifying question; do not treat any one exclusion phrase as established merely because it appears in an unofficial preserved version; determine the source and meaning of the threat-related information; and do not presume that the Gecko Bar witnesses were connected to the gray-SUV sequence, the Mactan / Deca three-man encounter, any separate duty-officer reference to a “warrant on my life” or “Whitey,” or the different Australian couple connected with the Mactan loan unless objective evidence establishes such a connection;

- because my present recollection does not fix the exact hotel property or Lapu-Lapu police-station number with certainty, and because the property is identified differently in the available accounts—as Holiday Inn in my present recollection, “HOLIDAY HOTEL” in Lesyl Medalla’s statement, and Days Inn in an earlier exhibit description—first establish those two identifiers from any available hotel or booking/payment records, consular duty-call/referral records, and Philippine police blotter or desk records; then locate and preserve, if still available, hotel guest-registration, room-assignment, room-change, and security/CCTV records concerning the ground-floor room/window, the upstairs room or hallway, the lobby/security-manager interaction, the hotel gate and access road, the yellow-shirted man, and the gray SUV; preserve United States consular or State Department duty-call/referral records of my report, while keeping distinct the earlier preserved wording that persons were “discussing plans to shoot two people” and my more specific present recollection, in substance, “Are we going to shoot them both?”; and locate Lapu-Lapu police-station blotter, desk, station-diary, telephone, or officer records of the referral, including whether the station was Station No. 6;
- authenticate Supplemental Exhibits PH-S1 and PH-S2 through available hotel, guest-registration, booking, payment, merchant, and related business records; use the authenticated records to determine the precise properties, dates, rooms, and sequence of stays before comparing associated security, police, consular, vehicle, taxi, hospital, and witness evidence; and because PH-S1 is a meal voucher and its displayed date overlaps the stay period shown on PH-S2, do not infer the exact movement sequence from the exhibit images alone;
- compare the earlier Lapu-Lapu station identifier with any surviving records from the later Escario / Perpetual Succour Hospital sequence, including hotel, taxi, hospital, police, telephone, vehicle, and consular records, without assuming that the American outside the hospital was a State Department employee or a member of the gray-SUV group;
- investigate the location-specific groups separately before drawing any overarching conclusion: distinguish the gray-SUV group, the Mactan/Deca three-man encounter, the separate Gecko Bar business-location encounter, and other persons in the original Complaint-Affidavit; then compare only objective identifiers such as names, photographs, distinctive physical features, vehicles, telephone numbers, police or military records, hotel or apartment records, travel records, and independently obtained witness accounts;

- preserve or obtain records from the private loan-service company sufficient to identify who communicated with the lender concerning my alleged mental illness and a trust account, and compare that communicator with persons who already knew of the Bernard S. Yudowitz Irrevocable Trust;
- permit sensitive witness/source identifiers to be supplied directly to the assigned investigator or prosecutor through a confidential channel;
- associate this Supplemental Complaint-Affidavit with the original notarized Complaint-Affidavit and all existing exhibits under the same docket, I.S., NBI, or other official reference, without renumbering or replacing the original filing; and
- provide written acknowledgment that this supplement has been received and associated with the original matter, and identify the handling office, investigator, prosecutor, or official reference number if available.

46. Except for the express correction and limited clarifications stated in this supplement, I do not withdraw the factual allegations, evidence, or investigative requests in the original Complaint-Affidavit. Where this supplement expressly qualifies an earlier statement concerning Martin’s participation in the quoted call, or clarifies source attribution concerning Lesyl Medalla’s handwritten statement and the separate paper bearing the name “Ruby,” this supplement states my present recollection and source attribution and should control for those specific issues. The additional Jerry, Mactan three-man, Ruby / gray-SUV, Cebu hotel window sequence, Gecko Bar identification/threat, consular / Lapu-Lapu / Perpetual Succour, email, Bernard-communication, and loan-service clarifications are submitted as investigative leads. References to a “hit team” or targeting group state my understanding of the apparent purpose of the particular gray-SUV group and are not a substitute for proof of identity, agreement, intent, or legal liability of any individual.

46A. Source-attribution clarification concerning Lesyl Medalla’s statement and the separate “Ruby” paper. For purposes of this Philippine supplemental record, to the extent any earlier Philippine filing, Aventura filing, cross-jurisdiction exhibit, or other prior submission states or implies that Lesyl Medalla’s handwritten statement itself contains the phrase “take care of him,” or that the name “Ruby” is printed in that handwritten statement, I clarify that those descriptions are too broad. Lesyl’s handwritten statement records, in substance, that persons wanted to do bad things to me, that a woman associated with the gray SUV forced Lesyl to accept a telephone number and instructed her to conceal the contact from me, and that a taxi driver later asked whether she had changed her mind or when she would call or text “the number.” The phrase “take care of him” is from my separate recollection of Martin Yudowitz, not from Lesyl’s handwritten statement. The name “Ruby” was on the separate paper containing the telephone number that Lesyl later gave me; it is not printed in her handwritten statement. This paragraph states the source attribution I presently swear to for this Philippine record. It does not purport to amend a filing in another jurisdiction, but it should control my source attribution wherever an earlier description is inconsistent with it.

VIII-A. SUPPLEMENTAL EXHIBIT INDEX — PH-S SERIES

The following exhibits are supplemental to this filing only. They do not replace, restart, or renumber any exhibit attached to the original Complaint-Affidavit:

- PH-S1 — Days Hotel–Branded Cebu Meal Voucher (guest “Mr. Margulies”; Room 101; handwritten date 12/17/14). Purpose: property/location and chronology lead; submitted for authentication. Limitation: the document is a meal voucher, not a complete guest folio, and does not by itself establish the exact property, duration of stay, or movement sequence.
- PH-S2 — Escario Central Hotel Guest Folio (name “MARGULIES, LARRY”; Room 103; arrival 12/15/2014 5:41 PM; departure 12/21/2014; six nights; printed 12/21/2014). Purpose: contemporaneous location/date record for the Escario sequence; submitted for authentication and comparison with hotel and related records.

IX. MATTERS INTENTIONALLY OMITTED FROM THIS SUPPLEMENT

47. To keep this filing limited, I do not use this supplement to restate the original narrative of Philippine events, to add unofficial literary or self-published accounts as sworn exhibits, or to import extra-territorial matters that belong, if anywhere, in another jurisdiction’s investigative file. In particular, I do not add through this supplement: (a) United States attorney-contact or later commercial-platform communications occurring outside Philippine territory; (b) later Hong Kong medical-assessment issues; or (c) unofficial writings whose internal dates I do not adopt. Those materials may be supplied later, if relevant, only as investigative aids and only through the protected channel described above.

X. VERIFICATION

48. I have read this Supplemental Complaint-Affidavit. The statements concerning matters personally known to me are true and correct to the best of my present knowledge and recollection. Where I describe an inference, contemporaneous interpretation, belief, report from Lesyl Medalla or another person, earlier preserved writing used as a memory aid, or a matter requiring independent verification, I intend it to be evaluated according to that evidentiary status and not treated as an established fact merely because it appears in this sworn supplement. Where contemporaneous official records establish a more precise date, location, station number, identity, or sequence than my present recollection, I request that those objective records control.

48A. The photographic reproductions attached as Supplemental Exhibits PH-S1 and PH-S2 are reproductions of hotel documents presently in my possession. I submit them as documentary exhibits subject to independent authentication. I do not contend that the images alone establish every date, hotel movement, event, identity, or connection described in this Supplemental Complaint-Affidavit.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto affixed my signature this _____ day of _____ 2026, in _____.

LARRY MARGULIES
Complainant-Affiant
Email: larry@diydetective.org

JURAT

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this _____ day of _____ 2026, at _____, by Larry Margulies, who personally appeared before me and exhibited _____ as competent proof of identity.

Signature of Consular Officer / Notary / Authorized Officer: _____

Printed Name and Official Title: _____

Commission / Authority / Notarial Reference (if applicable): _____

Official Seal: _____

SUPPLEMENTAL EXHIBIT PH-S1

Days Hotel–Branded Cebu Meal Voucher — 17 December 2014

Document type: Photographic reproduction of a Days Hotel–branded “MEAL VOUCHER.”

Visible identifiers: The image shows “CEBU,” guest name “Mr. Margulies,” Room No. 101, handwritten date 12/17/14, Breakfast marked, and Days Hotel branding.

Evidentiary purpose: To assist investigators in identifying/authenticating the Cebu hotel property and comparing the hotel/window/gray-SUV sequence with contemporaneous business, security, police, and consular records.

Limitation / authentication note: This document is a meal voucher rather than a complete hotel guest folio. It is not treated by itself as conclusive proof of the exact property, length of stay, or sequence of hotel movements. Its displayed date should be compared with PH-S2 and authenticated hotel records.

Exhibit handling note: This PH-S exhibit designation is supplemental only and does not alter the numbering of the original Complaint-Affidavit exhibits.

PH-S1 — Photographic Reproduction

Image supplied by affiant; reproduced without substantive alteration.

Days Hotel
MEAL VOUCHER

☒ Breakfast
☐ Lunch
☐ Dinner
☐ Snack

Name of guest: Mr. Margales
Room No.: 101 Date: 12/17/14
Coupon Type: ☐ Individual ☒ Corporate
Name of Function, if any: 21st
(Please present this coupon to any Food Attendant when availing of meal)

Mr. ☐ Ms. ☐ DAYS: 1-23
PASSWORD: hotel123
Name: 506
Room Number
Arrival
Departure
No. of persons
Tel# 09434007561
Tel# 495-5381

Days Hotel
HEAD OFFICE
Penthouse Viro Bldg.
500 P. Burgos Street
Makati City, Philippines
Tel. No.: (043) 413-2400
TAGAYTAY
Aurora Highway, Strong Crossing
Tagaytay City, Philippines
Tel. No.: (046) 413-2400
BATANGAS
Palara Village, Palacanan West
Batangas City, Philippines
Tel. No.: (043) 980-7221

ENTER

Days Hotel
The Best Value Under The Sun...
The World's Largest
and Fast Growing Hotel Chain

Mr. ☐ Ms. ☐ DAYS: 1-23
PASSWORD: hotel123
Name: 101
Room Number
Arrival
Departure
No. of persons
Tel# 495-5381
Tel# 09434007561

Days Hotel
HEAD OFFICE
Penthouse Viro Bldg.
500 P. Burgos Street
Makati City, Philippines
Tel. No.: (043) 413-2400
TAGAYTAY
Aurora Highway, Strong Crossing
Tagaytay City, Philippines
Tel. No.: (046) 413-2400
BATANGAS
Palara Village, Palacanan West
Batangas City, Philippines
Tel. No.: (043) 980-7221

ENTER

Days Hotel
The Best Value Under The Sun...
The World's Largest
and Fast Growing Hotel Chain

SUPPLEMENTAL EXHIBIT PH-S2

Escario Central Hotel Guest Folio — 15–21 December 2014

Document type: Photographic reproduction of a hotel guest folio/account.

Visible identifiers: The image shows “MARGULIES, LARRY,” Room 103, Folio No. 0000003454, Reservation No. 14-0005239, arrival 12/15/2014 at 5:41 PM, departure 12/21/2014, six nights, and print date 12/21/2014.

Evidentiary purpose: To provide a contemporaneous location/date record for the Escario-period sequence and permit comparison with hotel, hospital, taxi, police, telephone, consular, and other records.

Limitation / authentication note: The folio is submitted subject to authentication. It does not, standing alone, establish the cause of any medical event, the identity of any person, or any criminal connection. Its displayed stay period overlaps the date shown on PH-S1, so the precise movement sequence should be established from authenticated records rather than inferred from the two images alone.

Exhibit handling note: This PH-S exhibit designation is supplemental only and does not alter the numbering of the original Complaint-Affidavit exhibits.

PH-S2 — Photographic Reproduction*Image supplied by affiant; reproduced without substantive alteration.*

N. Escario Street, Kampo Pulaw
 Cebu City
 Philippines
 rsun@escariocentral.com

Print Date: 12/21/2014
 Print Time: 3:17PM
 Page: 1

CHECKED IN

Folio No.: 0000003454
 Res. No.: 14-0005239 Room: 103
 Rate Code: RED15
 Arrival: 12/15/2014 5:41PM
 Departure: 12/21/2014
 Nights: 6 Pax: 2 / 0

Date	Reference No.	Code	Memo	Debit	Credit	Balance
12/15/14	NO OR	2000	CASH/ROOM		1,275.00	(1,275.00) haze
12/15/14	C	1000	ROOM CHARGES	1,275.00		0.00 john
12/16/14	C	1000	ROOM CHARGES	1,275.00		1,275.00 john
12/17/14	NO OR	2000	CASH/ROOM		1,275.00	0.00 haze
12/17/14	C	1000	ROOM CHARGES	1,275.00		1,275.00 john
12/18/14	NO OR	2000	CASH/ROOM		2,000.00	(725.00) haze
12/18/14	C	1000	ROOM CHARGES	1,275.00		550.00 john
12/19/14	NO OR	2000	CASH/ROOM		550.00	0.00 haze
12/19/14	C	1000	ROOM CHARGES	1,275.00		1,275.00 john
12/20/14	78154	1100	116 (0:00:03)			1,275.00 super
12/20/14	78154	1100	117 (0:02:14)			1,275.00 super
12/20/14	78154	1100	111 (0:03:55)			1,275.00 super
12/20/14	C	1000	ROOM CHARGES	1,275.00		2,550.00 colle
12/21/14	C	1001	LATE CHECK OUT	750.00		3,300.00 john
TOTAL DEBIT				5,400.00		
TOTAL CREDIT				5,100.00		
NET BALANCE				3,300.00		

PLEASE PAY (REFUND) THIS AMOUNT >>> PHP 3,300.00

PREPARED BY: Eric John Codilla
 SIGNATURE OF GUEST:

BILLING REMARKS:
 with no extra deposit amount 225

www.chapowesthotels.com Email: info@chapowesthotels.com