

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT-AFFIDAVIT

Martin Attribution Correction; Family/Email Communications; Jerry Identification Lead; 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) adding more specific information concerning separate family/email communications during the Philippines period; (c) adding a narrow Davao identification lead concerning the American known to me as "Jerry"; (d) clarifying the evidentiary significance of the interruption of private financing and the first trust-related information communicated to the lender; and (e) establishing protected handling for sensitive witness, source, and operational information. Matters already adequately stated in the original Complaint-Affidavit are not repeated as new allegations.

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.

II. MATERIAL CORRECTION AND ADDITIONAL CLARIFICATION CONCERNING MARTIN 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 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.

6A. My decision to qualify Martin Yudowitz’s participation in this particular call is also informed by earlier preserved accounts prepared closer in time to the events, which describe me calling my father, Bernard S. Yudowitz, after the gray-haired American man appeared with a Philippine police escort. I rely on those earlier accounts as relevant memory and chronology aids, not as infallible proof of the precise participants or date of the call. Any publication, upload, marketplace, or other unofficial date associated with those writings is not intended to control the actual date of the underlying event; objective telephone, repatriation-loan, police, immigration, email, and other contemporaneous records should control where available.

7. 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, and it does not withdraw the separate Martin-related communications described below. 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. Separate Martin-related communications and Bernard/Martin email call

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. 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.

C. Related Evelyn email communication during an acute Philippines incident

11. 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.

12. 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.”

13. 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 in paragraphs 9–10, 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

14. 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. I add one narrower fact that may assist investigators in identifying the source of Jerry’s information about me and my family.

15. 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.

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

17. The original Complaint-Affidavit already describes the private loan-service interruption, the mental-health information supplied to the lender, the pregnancy-period financial hardship, the use of available funds for prenatal and living needs, and the surrounding Cebu events. I do not repeat those matters as new allegations in this supplement. I add only the two trust-related points stated below and rely on the original notarized Complaint-Affidavit for the underlying incident and its previously sworn consequences.

18. First, this was the first occasion I presently recall on which a person or business outside my family referred to a trust or trust account said to be associated with me. Second, at that time I did not know that the Bernard S. Yudowitz Irrevocable Trust existed. I therefore did not know how the person who communicated with the lender had obtained trust-related information concerning me. I later learned of the trust through other events and records. These two points are submitted so investigators can determine who supplied the lender with the trust-related information and how that person obtained it.

19. I do not ask investigators to infer from those two points alone that a particular family member, trustee, intermediary, or other person contacted the lender. Their evidentiary significance is that the source of the lender's trust information can be tested against persons who, according to the trust instruments, trustee records, financial records, correspondence, or other independently verifiable evidence, already knew of or had access to information concerning the Bernard S. Yudowitz Irrevocable Trust.

20. For the remaining facts concerning the loan interruption, pregnancy-period hardship, prenatal needs, fetal death, the KFC/dating-profile lead, and the surrounding Cebu events, I rely upon the original notarized Complaint-Affidavit. Nothing in this limited clarification changes the qualifications or evidentiary limitations already stated there.

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

21. 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.

22. 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.

22A. 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.

23. 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.

24. 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.

VI. LIMITED ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATIVE REQUESTS

25. 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. I therefore do not request that any Philippine office attempt to examine him. I request only that, if any records remain lawfully obtainable, investigators seek surviving telephone, email, subscriber, billing, or archival records concerning the corrected "That's what you get for writing the letter" call and the separate Bernard/Martin email-related call. Those family calls were generally placed by me to the telephone serving Evelyn Yudowitz's Massachusetts residence, where Bernard was then physically present. 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;
- 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 without treating the corrected call attribution as a withdrawal of those distinct matters;

- where any such records still remain lawfully obtainable through appropriate channels, compare surviving family telephone or subscriber records with any surviving email transmission, forwarding, recipient, account-security, recovery, provider, device, or backup records to determine what Bernard was asking Martin to finish and whether any related electronic activity can be independently corroborated;
- preserve or obtain, where legally available, the relevant 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 and to determine whether those emails were shared, printed, forwarded, or discussed with other family members or intermediaries;
- identify the American known as "Jerry" through available Davao police, Quezon City Drug Task Force, immigration, travel, credentialing, or other lawful records, including any arrest, detention, booking, fingerprint, or photograph records if such records exist; compare any such records with the identity reflected on the Drug Task Force credential I personally observed; and, if Jerry is independently identified, determine how he knew or recognized Bernard S. Yudowitz and whether any objective record connects that knowledge to a family member, intermediary, or government contact;
- 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, when and how the communication occurred, what information was supplied, why the previously recurring loan process was stopped, and whether the communicator can be connected through telephone, email, payment, financial, government, or other records to any person identified in the original Complaint-Affidavit;
- determine who communicated the trust-account information to the loan-service company and compare that person, telephone number, email account, or other identifier with persons who, according to the underlying trust instruments, trustee records, financial records, correspondence, or other independently verifiable evidence, already knew of or had access to information concerning the Bernard S. Yudowitz Irrevocable Trust; determine whether the lender was supplied information that was non-public or otherwise unlikely to have been known without access to family, trustee, financial, legal, or intermediary communications;
- permit sensitive witness/source identifiers, contact details, precise locations, and operational leads to be supplied directly to the assigned investigator or prosecutor through a confidential channel, subject to applicable disclosure obligations and protective procedures;
- 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.

26. 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, this supplement states my present recollection and should control for that specific issue. The additional Bernard/Martin email, Evelyn printed-email, Jerry/Bernard-photo, and loan/trust-source clarifications are submitted as investigative leads with the evidentiary limitations stated above and do not convert inference, timing, or association into established fact.

VII. VERIFICATION

27. 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, belief, report from another person, or 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.

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: