

1 DONGXIAO YUE
111 Deerwood Rd
2 Suite 200
San Ramon, CA 94583
3 Telephone: (510) 396-0012
4 Facsimile: (510) 291-2237
E-Mail: ydx@yuedongxiao.com

5 SELF-REPRESENTED
6 (CA SBN# 319955)
7
8

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 DONGXIAO YUE,
12 Plaintiff,
13 v.
14 CHUN-HUI MIAO, et al.,
15 Defendants.
16
17
18
19
20
21

Case No. C18-1074-DMR

**PLAINTIFF’S DECLARATION IN
OPPOSITION TO AMENDED MOTION
TO DISMISS, PURSUANT TO FED. R.
CIV. P. 12(b)(2), OR IN THE
ALTERNATIVE, TO TRANSFER VENUE
PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a).**

Hearing Date: May 10, 2018
Time: 11:00 AM
Courtroom: 4, 3rd Floor

Judge: The Honorable Donna M. Ryu

22 I, Dongxiao Yue, declare,

23 1. I am the plaintiff of this lawsuit. I have knowledge of the matters stated herein, and if
24 called upon to do so, I could and would competently so testify.

25 2. I submit this supplemental declaration in opposition to some of Defendant Chun-hui Miao
26 (“Miao”) and Bian-Wang.com (“BIAN”)’s motion to dismiss and in the alternative to transfer
27 venue to South Carolina.
28

1 3. In this declaration, I may also refer to myself as "Plaintiff."

2 4. I am proficient in Chinese and English languages. In the following, the English translations
3 of original Chinese text are made by me and are accurate and faithful.

4 5. I have owned a website at www.zhenzhubay.com (hereafter "ZZB") and served as its
5 administrator with the "admin" username since June 2012. ZZB is a social media website that
6 provides friends, blogging, micro-blogging, forum discussion and other interactive features. ZZB's
7 servers are located in data centers in northern California. Many bloggers and readers of ZZB are
8 local to the San Francisco Bay Area. Many knew me personally.

9 6. On ZZB, I often wrote articles about my personal activities in the San Francisco Bay Area.
10 I used my real name online.

11 7. One of my blog articles described how I used the DISCUZ software to quickly create the
12 ZZB website and how I wrote code to improve its functions. After that, several similar websites
13 appeared. There is considerable overlap among the users of the several new sites. One of them is
14 yeyclub.com ("Yeyclub"), owned and operated by a California man named Muye Liu ("Liu").
15 Many of Yeyclub users are local also California residents. Liu is a defendant in the related unfair
16 competition and defamation action pending in the Superior Court of California for the County of
17 Contra Costa. The title of that related case is *Yue v. Trigmax Solutions, et al* (case number C16-
18 01118).

19 8. On January 17, 2013, Miao created the BIAN-WANG (Chinese: 彼岸网) ("BIAN")
20 website at bian-wang.com. The Chinese character "网"(WANG) means network or website. The
21 creation time of the website can be determined from the creation time of the "admin" user of the
22 site, which has the "UID" of 1, at [http://www.bian-](http://www.bian-wang.com/discuz/home.php?mod=space&uid=1&do=profile)
23 [wang.com/discuz/home.php?mod=space&uid=1&do=profile](http://www.bian-wang.com/discuz/home.php?mod=space&uid=1&do=profile) .

24 9. Sometime after the inception of BIAN site, Liu, the owner of Yeyclub registered on Bian-
25 wang.com. On March 5, 2013, Miao interacted with Liu on his guestbook. Liu replied that he
26 created a friend link to Bian-Wang.com on his Yeyclub website and sought Miao's cooperation.
27

1 At that time, Miao and Liu seemed to have a good relationship. Plaintiff is able to identify the two
2 users as Liu and Miao, because only they had the administrative authorities to create friend links
3 on their own websites. Attached **Exhibit 1** is a true copy of the exchange between Miao and Liu.

4 10. On May 30, 2013, Miao registered as under the username BIAN-WANG (Chinese: 彼岸网)
5 on ZZB, using the email address of bian-wang@bian-wang.com.

6 11. In early 2014, there was a California Senate bill to amend the California Constitution
7 known as SCA5, which generated substantial public debate. Upon searching on the internet, I
8 noticed an article posted by Miao on bian-wang.com about SCA5.

9 12. On March 2, 2014, Miao sent me an email to my YAHOO email account, with his
10 comments about California SCA5 and a link to a blog article he wrote. Attached **Exhibit 2** is a
11 true copy of Miao's blog article that he linked to in that email. Miao later published his email
12 exchange with me on bian-wang.com, without my permission.

13 13. The rules of BIAN stated that, in light of the disputes and troubles on other websites,
14 BIAN established the rules as follows (translated):

- 15 i. "No commercial advertisement and pure external links (without content)".
16
17 ii. "Blog articles shall not be censored, filtered or blocked, but any blog article that
18 contains a Netizen's user ID in its subject shall be immediately deleted once
19 being reported (same applies to comments)."
20
21 iii. "IDs will not be banned, but [bian-wang.com] will deprive a user who posts
22 filthy language the right to post microblogs for 1 day for the first offense, 7
23 days for the second offense, and permanently for repeated violations."

24 14. Attached **Exhibit 3** is a true copy of BIAN's rules dated October 2, 2013, titled "Website
25 Rules", in Chinese.

26 15. On March 2, 2014, after reading the rules of the BIAN site that was posted by Miao, I
27 registered as a user with my real name in Chinese and later had discussions with the users there on
28 a range of topics.

1 16. Based on my count on March 11, 2018, Miao wrote or posted at least five articles about
2 California SCA5. Attached **Exhibit 4** was an article Miao wrote on February 16, 2014, which was
3 partially in English. In this article, Miao stated that he engaged in discussion with a member of the
4 Yeyclub regarding SCA5.

5 17. Based on my count on March 11, 2018, Miao wrote at least 9 blog articles about Yeyclub,
6 several of them were about Miao's interaction with Muye Liu, the owner of Yeyclub.

7 18. A blog article of Miao dating January 11, 2014 was titled "To the comrades at Yeyclub"

8 19. On May 23, 2014, Miao sent me an email to my YAHOO account. In the email, Miao
9 included a link to a lengthy blog article that he wrote about Yeyclub and its owner Muye Liu.
10 Miao purportedly asked for my permission because the article would involve ZZB. While amazed
11 at Miao's energy and dedication to Bian-wang.com, I declined to be involved in any way.

12 20. There is no easy translation of Miao's blog article he sent me, as it involved never ending
13 online disputes. The main dispute between Miao and Liu seemed to be that Liu accused Miao of
14 enticing Yeyclub bloggers to leave Yeyclub for Bian-wang.com (the word they both used was
15 "stealing people" (Chinese: 偷人), which has some other connotation), and Miao attempted to
16 justify his actions or refute Liu. In a later blog article dating May 25, 2014, Miao acknowledged
17 the following: "Most of bloggers of Yeyclub came from other websites such as Backchina.com
18 and ZZB", "[Miao] published three blog articles about Yeyclub, people may think that Bian-
19 Wang was struggling for readership with Yeyclub".

20 21. Besides me, at least three other California bloggers registered on Miao's bian-wang.com
21 site in 2014, and interacted with Miao there. 1) I knew that the BIAN user with UID 10359 is from
22 the San Francisco Bay Area, because I had telephone conversations with this person before. 2)
23 The BIAN user with UID 10004 is Mr. Muye Liu, the owner of Yeyclub, and a resident in the
24 Sacramento area. 3) According to a comment posted by Miao, the BIAN user with UID 10010 is
25 from California. This user is also a member on ZZB, and I can confirm that the IP address of this
26 user originates from California.
27
28

1 22. In June 2015, Plaintiff filed a defamation lawsuit against Wenbin Yang and several DOE
2 defendants in the Superior Court of California for the County of Alameda. Yang and the DOEs
3 conduct their defamation campaign against Plaintiff on many websites, including Bian-Wang.com,
4 with filthy and indecent language.

5 23. Instead of upholding the rules of his own website, and stop the attacks against Plaintiff,
6 Miao and his associate under the ID “lawandorder”, allegedly a lawyer from New York, actively
7 participated in the attacks and encouraged the attacks against Plaintiff. The verbal attacks against
8 Plaintiff were prominently displayed on the front page of BIAN.

9 24. I was greatly disturbed by these attacks, and attempted to dissuade Miao from participating
10 in the attacks, stating Miao’s indecent language was unbecoming for a person at his education
11 level. Miao and the few others reacted with more attacks on Plaintiff.

12 25. Still, I tried to avoid a conflict with Miao and sought Miao’s cooperation. One of my
13 reasons was that Miao studied at my *Alma mater* Peking University as a graduate student and was
14 several years younger. I announced that I would not pursue Miao for his actions prior to
15 September 19, 2015, but would seek Miao and BIAN’s cooperation in discovery.

16 26. On September 20, 2015, I sent an email to Miao, requesting him to accept service of a
17 California subpoena. In the same email, I also requested Miao to delete certain postings and
18 comments under BIAN’s Rule #2.

19 27. In one email response, Miao thanked me for reporting the posts and stated that he had
20 promptly deleted them. Attached **Exhibit 5** is this email response.

21 28. Regarding the subpoena, Miao replied in a separate email that “Bi’An will accept service of
22 the subpoena by email without prejudice.” (English original). Attached **Exhibit 6** contains this
23 email response.

24 29. The next day, September 21, 2015, I emailed the California subpoena to Miao.
25
26
27
28

1 30. Unbeknownst to me at the time, defendant Miao posted the subpoena on his website on
2 November 3, 2015, but failed to respond to me. Attached **Exhibit 7** is Miao's post with the
3 California subpoena.

4 31. After several email exchanges, Miao responded on November 16, 2015, stating that "The
5 subpoena you sent is invalid because it is issued by a California Court, but I am not a resident of
6 CA." Attached **Exhibit 8** is this email exchange.

7 32. On information and belief, the user "lawandorder", allegedly a lawyer from New York,
8 and a close associate of Miao, advised Miao not to obey the California subpoena.

9 33. The defamatory blog postings against Plaintiff continued on Bian-Wang.com in 2016, and
10 Miao actively participated in and encouraged such activities by **posting comments echoing the**
11 **indecent language under those blogs. Many of the offending posts have been viewed over a**
12 **thousand times.**

13 34. On January 18, 2016, a local California resident posted a blog article on ZZB with a link to
14 an article on bian-wang.com. The author of this blog post is a personal acquaintance of Plaintiff.
15 He wrote (translated from Chinese):

16 Searched on the internet and found this article stating that "ZZB not only falsified
17 its click count but also falsified its ALEXA ranking" at

18 [http://www.bian-](http://www.bian-wang.com/discuz/home.php?mod=space&uid=10704&do=blog&id=1168)
19 [wang.com/discuz/home.php?mod=space&uid=10704&do=blog&id=1168](http://www.bian-wang.com/discuz/home.php?mod=space&uid=10704&do=blog&id=1168)

20 If they defamed ZZB, can they be sued in court?

21 Several members of ZZB, including Plaintiff, made comments below. Attached **Exhibit 9** is a true
22 copy of the blog article posted by the California resident. As the administrator of ZZB, Plaintiff is
23 able to view the IP address from which this ZZB post was made, and confirms that IP address
24 indicated that the person posted from the San Francisco Bay Area. If required, Plaintiff can
25 provide the Court this ZZB blogger's last name, telephone number and city of residence in
26 California.

1 35. On June 13, 2016, I commenced the action against Trigmax Solutions, LLC, a California
2 Limited Liability Company, and Muye Liu, et al. in the Superior Court of California for the
3 County of Contra Costa, alleging unfair competition and defamation. The case number is C16-
4 01118.

5 36. On October 14, 2016, the California Superior Court issued a subpoena to Miao for the
6 information of several users who posted libel against Plaintiff on Bian-wang.com.

7 37. On October 25, 2016, Plaintiff's process server served the subpoena re-issued by the court
8 of Common Pleas of Richland County, South Carolina, on Miao at his office. Attached **Exhibit 10**
9 is true copy of the Affidavit of Service.

10 38. Still, Miao refused to comply with the subpoena and ignored Plaintiff's subsequent request
11 for a telephone conference about the subpoena.

12 39. On December 15, 2016, while he was in California, Plaintiff posted a notice to Miao on
13 bian-wang.com, requesting Miao to delete all posts that contain Plaintiff's name in the subject or
14 comments, in accordance of the aforementioned Rule No. 2.

15 40. Miao refused to delete the posts. Instead, Miao launched a round of verbal insults on
16 Plaintiff. Plaintiff informed Miao that the BIAN's rule is a contract between the Miao and
17 Plaintiff, and that Miao should perform under that contract as an honorable man. Plaintiff
18 repeatedly requested Miao perform his duty under the contract and delete the offending posts.

19 41. Miao did not deny the contract. After I pointed out that he must perform the contract, Miao
20 changed the rule, by adding a clause titled "Statute of limitations" (English original), stating one
21 must report under Rule No.2 within one year, after the one year period, nothing will be penalized.

22 42. Other than my communications with Miao, attempts to serve Miao discovery requests and
23 this lawsuit, I have had no other contact with South Carolina.

24 43. Most of the witnesses in this case reside in California, including the person who asked
25 whether Bian-Wang.com should be sued. The defamatory postings were mostly likely posted by
26

1 the Defendants in the related *Yue v. Trigmax Solutions, LLC* case, pending in the Superior Court of
2 California.

3 I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of California and the federal laws
4 that the forgoing declaration is true and correct to my best knowledge.

5
6 March 16, 2018

7
8
9 By: /S/
Dongxiao Yue

EXHIBIT 1

Ludi的个人空间

http://www.bian-wang.com/discuz/?10004 [收藏] [复制] [分享] [RSS]

空间首页

动态

记录

日志

评论

相册

主题

分享

留言板

个人资料

头像



Ludi

收听TA

加为好友

给我留言

打个招呼

发送消息

个人资料

性别 保密

生日

查看全部个人资料

动态

现在还没有动态

分享

现在还没有分享

日志

现在还没有日志

留言板

全部

你需要登录后才可以留言 登录 | 立即注册

留言



Ludi 2013-5-10 06:59 PM

老大，您好！
我刚把彼岸网加到页页城的友情链接中。盼互通有无。顺致夏安！



忆江南 2013-3-5 12:03 AM

过来试一试看能否留言。。。

查看全部

好友



忆江南

最近访客

现在还没有访客

群组

现在还没有群组

统计信息

已有 1172 人来访过

积分: 16

威望: --

金钱: 16

贡献: --

好友: 1

日志: --

相册: --

分享: --

相册

现在还没有相册

记录

现在还没有记录

EXHIBIT 2

忆江南的个人空间

<http://www.bian-wang.com/discuz/?10003> [收藏] [复制] [分享] [RSS]

"To reach a port we must sail, sometimes with the wind, and sometimes against it."

[空间首页](#)[动态](#)[记录](#)[博文](#)[评论](#)[相册](#)[主题](#)[分享](#)[留言板](#)[个人资料](#)

日志

The myth of shrinking minority student body at UC campuses

已有 1378 次阅读 2014-2-28 11:27 PM

Let N denote the total number of California high school graduates, M the number of minority students, W the number of all entering UC freshmen, and U the number of entering minority UC freshmen. Also let subscript 0 (respectively, 1) denote the values before (respectively, after) the passage of Proposition 209. The data cited by the author's own analysis shows that

$$\frac{M_0}{N_0} = 38\% \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{U_0}{W_0} = 21\% \quad (2)$$

and

$$\frac{M_1}{N_1} = 52\% \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{U_1}{W_1} = 28\%. \quad (4)$$

Dividing (1) by (2), we get

$$\frac{M_0}{N_0} / \frac{U_0}{W_0} = 1.8095;$$

dividing (3) by (4), we get

$$\frac{M_1}{N_1} / \frac{U_1}{W_1} = 1.8571.$$

It appears reasonable to assume that the passage of Proposition 209 does not change the proportion of California high school graduates that enter the UC system, i.e.,

$$\frac{W_0}{N_0} = \frac{W_1}{N_1}, \quad (5)$$

then we must have

$$\frac{U_1}{U_0} / \frac{M_1}{M_0} = \frac{1.8095}{1.8571} = 0.97437. \quad (6)$$

If anything, $\frac{M_1}{M_0}$ reflects the growth rate of California minority students while $\frac{U_1}{U_0}$ represents the growth rate of entering minority UC freshmen. Equation (6) tells us that before and after Proposition 209 the growth rate of the minority students and the growth rate of entering minority UC freshmen are roughly the same, subject to perhaps some rounding error. So we can conclude from the very data provided by the author himself that there is no basis at all for the claim that "there was a significant drop in the percentage of enrolled minority students at UC campuses" following the passage of Proposition 209.



评论 (0 个评论)

涂鸦板

您需要登录后才可以评论 登录 | 立即注册

评论

作者的其他最新日志

全部

The greatest comeback in football history

绕口令：规则的公平与合理

历史上的今天

我看6/4

儿童节看电影

我参加过的两次游行

小黑屋 | Archiver | 彼岸网

Powered by Discuz! X3.1 © 2001-2014 Comsenz Inc.

GMT-4, 2018-3-12 01:21 AM , Processed in 0.048769 second(s), 9 queries. ,ApcOn

http://www.bian-wang.com/discuz/home.php?mod=space&uid=10003&do=blog&id=447

2/2

EXHIBIT 3

admin的个人空间

http://www.bian-wang.com/discuz/?1 [收藏] [复制] [分享] [RSS]

空间首页 动态 记录 日志 评论 相册 主题 分享 留言板 个人资料

日志

网站规则

热度 8 已有 3158 次阅读2013-10-2 06:22 PM | 系统分类:社交网理论与实践

虽然目前毫无必要，但有鉴于兄弟网站的一些是非纷扰，本着防患于未然的宗旨，特制订以下网规（如果出现冲突，以排名靠前的规则为准）：

1. 不允许商业广告和纯粹的外部链接（无内容）；

2. 对博文内容不作审查，过滤和屏蔽，但标题中带网友ID的一经举报将被立即删除（同样适用于评论）；

3. ID一律不封杀，但对污言秽语*者将剥夺发表“记录”即“微博”的权限1天（初犯）、7天（再犯）、永久（累犯）。

注：关于污言秽语的定义，将采用 United States Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart's threshold test for obscenity in Jacobellis v. Ohio (1964): I shall not today attempt further to define the kinds of material I understand to be embraced within that shorthand description; and perhaps I could never succeed in intelligibly doing so. But **I know it when I see it...** [Emphasis added.]

举报 邀请 分享 收藏

评论 (31 个评论) 发表评论 作者的其他最新日志 全部

 彼岸网 2013-12-27 12:51 AM

“天香公主：找到一个按用户组决定是否编辑代码的地方：管理中心，用户 » 用户组 编辑用户组 允许使用HTML代码：是/否 烦你帮我查一下对中级会员这个选项的值。 ... ”

没错，就是这个了。

回复

 天香公主 2013-12-26 05:19 PM

“彼岸网：也许是因为用户级别？得去查一下。”

找到一个按用户组决定是否编辑代码的地方：管理中心，用户 » 用户组 编辑用户组 允许使用HTML代码：是/否 烦你帮我查一下对中级会员这个选项的值。

回复

 彼岸网 2013-11-20 11:40 AM

“天香公主：奇怪。你这里编辑器工具条的最后一个按钮是编辑源码，而美中和夜夜都没有。我自己机器上原来也没有，昨天将常见改为高级后就有这个按钮了。 ... ”

也许是因为用户级别？得去查一下。

回复

 天香公主 2013-11-20 11:35 AM

“彼岸网：好像不是这个原因，这里用的也是缺省设置即“常用”。”

奇怪。你这里编辑器工具条的最后一个按钮是编辑源码，而美中和夜夜都没有。我自己机器上原来也没有，昨天将常见改为高级后就有这个按钮了。

回复

 彼岸网 2013-11-20 11:28 AM

“天香公主：估计和编辑器的设置有关。在管理中心，界面->编辑器设置->全局里，编辑栏样式有高级和常用两种。你和珍珠湾用的应该是高级样式，而美中和夜夜城用的是常用样 ... ”

好像不是这个原因，这里用的也是缺省设置即“常用”。

回复

 天香公主 2013-11-20 12:15 AM

回复

http://www.bian-wang.com/discuz/home.php?mod=space&uid=1&do=blog&id=110

1/3



“彼岸网: 敢情吃素斋还是有好处的, 虽然不知道科学原理是什么 🤔”

估计和编辑器的设置有关。在管理中心, 界面-> 编辑器设置-> 全局里, 编辑栏样式有高级和常用两种。你和珍珠湾用的应该是高级样式, 而美中网和夜夜城用的是常用样式。



彼岸网 2013-11-18 09:16 PM

回复

“天香公主: 发觉你这个网站有个好处。我将美中网博文后的评论拷贝后可以直接放在这里的博文正文里。美中网和夜夜城都不行, 那里储存后格式没保存都没法看。 ... ”

敢情吃素斋还是有好处的, 虽然不知道科学原理是什么 🤔



天香公主 2013-11-18 09:05 PM

回复

“彼岸网: 乌龟奋斗, 蜗牛狂奔, 小庙经不起折腾。”

发觉你这个网站有个好处。我将美中网博文后的评论拷贝后可以直接放在这里的博文正文里。美中网和夜夜城都不行, 那里储存后格式没保存都没法看。



彼岸网 2013-10-18 07:39 PM

回复

“天香公主: 说得好象你那服务器有多忙似的 🤔”

乌龟奋斗, 蜗牛狂奔, 小庙经不起折腾。



天香公主 2013-10-18 04:57 PM

回复

“彼岸网: 这篇没有问题啊。它在热门日志里, 不是最新日志, 没说热门日志不可以炒冷饭。或者说, 新饭无人问津那就挤不走过去的热饭。

缓存更新频率可以增加, 但会增加服务 ... ”

说得好象你那服务器有多忙似的 🤔



彼岸网 2013-10-18 10:05 AM

回复

“天香公主: 不想吃隔夜饭? 下面这碗我都吃了大半年了
这里真静啊? !.

缓存不是随时更新的? 你可以选择更新频率的啊 ”

这篇没有问题啊。它在热门日志里, 不是最新日志, 没说热门日志不可以炒冷饭。或者说, 新饭无人问津那就挤不走过去的热饭。

缓存更新频率可以增加, 但会增加服务器负担。即时更新似乎不可能, 美中网夜夜城首页同样是有延迟的。

还有一个出发点是允许但不鼓励标题党。



天香公主 2013-10-18 08:37 AM

回复

“彼岸网: 你真是火眼金睛, 能看出隐藏的设置。这是个可以讨论的话题。反方: 彼岸网。
之所以选择6, 是因为这里写博吃饭的人少。如果列10篇, 其中就会有隔夜饭。此外, “家 ... ”

不想吃隔夜饭? 下面这碗我都吃了大半年了

这里真静啊? !.

缓存不是随时更新的? 你可以选择更新频率的啊



彼岸网 2013-10-16 08:56 AM

回复

“天香公主: 最新日志只有六篇? 能不能在那里多列几篇? ”

你真是火眼金睛, 能看出隐藏的设置。这是个可以讨论的话题。反方: 彼岸网。

之所以选择6, 是因为这里写博吃饭的人少。如果列10篇, 其中就会有隔夜饭。此外, “家园”里有“最新发表的日志”一栏, 缺省一页列10篇, 所以似乎没有必要重复构造, 况且主页由于缓存的缘故, 不是随时更新的。



天香公主 2013-10-16 01:44 AM

回复

最新日志只有六篇? 能不能在那里多列几篇?



彼岸网 2013-10-12 09:37 PM

回复

“天香公主: 专家这帽子得奉还。我猜你用的是shared server吧, 至少另一个域名<http://utau.me/>和你的指向同一个IP。我是因为随笔说没法上你的网站, 就想问你一下能否通过IP来 ... ”

网站是挂靠运营商的, 可能运营商的服务器是客户共享的吧。后来和运营商联系过, 他们说DNS Cache的问题已经消除了。



天香公主 2013-10-10 01:05 AM

回复

“彼岸网: 噢, 好像不行。请教你这位专家, 怎么回事? 给普及一下。 ”

专家这帽子得奉还。我猜你用的是shared server吧，至少另一个域名<http://utau.me>和你的指向同一个IP。我
是因为随笔说没法上你的网站，就想问你一下能否通过IP来连。不过她现在又能上了。



彼岸网 2013-10-9 10:25 PM

回复

“奋斗的乌龟: 好吧，那就有病呻吟吧。🙄”

阿弥陀佛。那别忘了吃药打针，当然也可以念金刚经（和另几个金刚一起念，意念倍乘）。



奋斗的乌龟 2013-10-9 10:00 PM

回复

“彼岸网: 不把微博置于首页不是出于技术原因，而是基于网站定位。本网的侧重点是博文及其评论，供网友
各抒己见，而不是用微博晾晒心情或者无病呻吟。对网友此刻在哪里，吃 ... ”

好吧，那就有病呻吟吧。🙄



彼岸网 2013-10-9 07:50 PM

回复

“天香公主: 请问你这个网站能用IP连上吗？类似于 <http://192.95.32.41/~hq> ”

噢，好像不行。请教你这位专家，怎么回事？给普及一下。



彼岸网 2013-10-9 07:46 PM

回复

“奋斗的乌龟: 微博弄个滚动或不滚动的到首页不困难吧。你看，狂奔的牛牛，发了一条微博大伙都不知道。”

不把微博置于首页不是出于技术原因，而是基于网站定位。本网的侧重点是博文及其评论，供网友各抒己见，
而不是用微博晾晒心情或者无病呻吟。对网友此刻在哪里，吃甚么，做什么，心情怎样，我们毫无兴趣。

🗨️ 涂鸦板

评论



EXHIBIT 4

忆江南的个人空间

<http://www.bian-wang.com/discuz/?10003> [收藏] [复制] [分享] [RSS]

"To reach a port we must sail, sometimes with the wind, and sometimes against it."

空间首页

动态

记录

博文

评论

相册

主题

分享

留言板

个人资料

日志

加州209法案的实施后果

热度 1 已有 2546 次阅读2014-2-16 06:30 PM | 系统分类:时事政治

加州於1996年通过209提案，成为全美第一个州禁止公立大学以种族决定入学，政府也不可以种族为聘用标准。但据夜夜城Jaguar网友介绍，最近州参议院通过SCA5修宪提案将取消209法案部分规定，要求限制亚裔入学，提高西裔和非裔在加州大学系统中的入学比率。

对此我们亚裔必须抗争。在这里介绍两篇最新的关于209法案实施后果的研究论文。放在一起看，他们证明了209提案的正面积极作用，也证明了西裔和非裔即使在209法案实施后仍然受到优惠，要求进一步提高其入学比率是得寸进尺的无理要求。

杜克大学Arcidiacono, Aucejo, Coate and Hotz (2013) 的研究表明，209法案实施后，加大毕业率上升了4.4%，而导致这个上升的两个主要原因是：1。209法案使学生和学校间的双向选择更为合理有效；2。209法案实施后学校增加了对学生的投入。

加州大学圣地亚哥分校Antonovics and Backes (2013) 则发现在209法案实施后，学校通过改变录取标准比重的办法，弱化学术标准，转而强调家庭背景，所以在录取过程中实质上仍然优惠了部分少数民族。而这些改变的负面影响则落到了学术能力较强，父母相对富有教育程度较高的学生身上。

Jaguar网友建议大家写信给各自选区的加州众议员，在其原稿基础上我加入了叙述209法案实施后果的语句，可选择使用。

Please vote NO on SCA 5, the constitutional amendment to repeal provisions implemented through the enactment of Proposition 209. I believe preferential treatment based on race in college admission is not the right practice and violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Children who study and work hard deserve equal opportunity in college admission regardless of their race.

In fact, recent empirical evidence has shown that Prop 209 has a favorable effect on graduation rates of the University of California (UC) system. Duke University economists Arcidiacono, Aucejo, Coate and Hotz (2013) find that Prop 209 led to a more efficient sorting of minority students and that universities appear to have responded to Prop 209 by investing more in their students, together contributing to an increase of 4.4% in the graduate rates.

At the same time, UCSD economists Antonovics and Backes (2013) find that UC campuses changed the weight given to SAT scores, high school GPA and family background in response to Prop 209, and that these changes were able to substantially offset the fall in minority admissions rates and especially benefited students from socioeconomically disadvantaged households.

Taken together, the above evidence strongly suggests that SCA 5 will do more harm than good and therefore you should reject the amendment. I strongly urge you to vote "No" on SCA 5. Thank you for listening to the voice of your constituents.

附以上文章的英文摘要：

Arcidiacono, Aucejo, Coate and Hotz (2013) **Affirmative action and university fit: evidence from proposition 209**

Proposition 209 banned the use of racial preferences in admissions at public colleges in California. We analyze unique data for all applicants and enrollees within the University of California (UC) system before and after Prop 209. After Prop 209, graduation rates increased by 4.4%. We present evidence that certain institutions are better at graduating more-prepared students while other institutions are better at graduating less-prepared students and that these matching effects are particularly important for the bottom tail of the qualification distribution. We find that Prop 209 led to a more efficient sorting of minority students, explaining 18% of the graduation rate increase in our preferred specification. Further, universities appear to have responded to Prop 209 by investing more in their students, explaining between 23-64% of the graduation rate increase.

Antonovics and Backes (2013) **The Effect of Banning Affirmative Action on College Admissions Rules and Student Quality**

UC campuses changed the weight given to SAT scores, high school GPA and family background in response to California's ban on race-based affirmative action, and that these changes were able to substantially (though far from completely) offset the fall in minority admissions rates. For both minorities and non-minorities, these changes to the admissions rule hurt students with relatively strong academic credentials and whose parents were relatively affluent and educated.



举报 邀请 分享 收藏

评论 (8 个评论)

发表评论

作者的其他最新日志

全部



忆江南 2014-2-26 11:46 PM

回复

“lawandorder: 注意这句话: “Campuses have become less diverse” since Prop. 209 passed, Chin said. “Qualified individuals have been looked over.” Since Prop. 209, ... ”

对这个法案一些兄弟网站好比夜夜城关注的比较多, 我因为忙所以后来也没有持续跟踪。修宪假如通过, 校方将会如何具体执行是个很好的问题, 等周末我再仔细看一下相关资料。



lawandorder 2014-2-26 11:35 PM

回复

“忆江南: 关于前两个问题, LAO兄可以读一下这个: <http://calwatchdog.com/2013/07/12/sca-5-would-repeal-much-of-prop-209-anti-discrimination-initiative/> 关于后一点 ... ”

注意这句话: “Campuses have become less diverse” since Prop. 209 passed, Chin said. “Qualified individuals have been looked over.” Since Prop. 209, she said, minorities have been “underrepresented” in universities, and SCA 5 seeks to correct this error by securing the best and brightest students.” 这位华裔是个白痴。 “the best and brightest students” 和 “underrepresented” 没有任何联系, 如果这就是她老板的立法意图, 那么这就不连贯, 也缺少正当的目的(legitimate purpose), 很有可能通不过宪法的约束 (cannot pass constitutional muster).

但是从修改的语言上看, 我还是认为不应该是亚裔或任何族裔的问题, 而是对公共教育这个公共资源进行统一的宏观控制利用。很有可能, 加州大学在录取学生时利用这个修宪对西裔或黑裔不予录取, 因为这个修宪文中并没有明确要求在录取是要进行人口比例分配录取名额。



忆江南 2014-2-23 10:23 AM

回复

“lawandorder: 你这个说法带有几个假设, 假设是否有公认的统计数据支持并可靠? 有任何事实说明这就是修宪的立法动机? 你举的类比假设正好说明这个修宪提案的目的(end) 是有正 ... ”

关于前两个问题, LAO兄可以读一下这个: <http://calwatchdog.com/2013/07/12/sca-5-would-repeal-much-of-prop-209-anti-discrimination-initiative/>

关于后一点, 我觉得要分两个角度来看。

1. 从全社会角度来看, 资源分配的公平性没有一个公认的标准。能者多得或劳者多得 (都属merit-based) 还是人人有份, 政府是否应当干预, redistribution的程度应该多大, 不同的人不同的阶层不同的种族对这些问题都有各自不同的答案。上述修宪提案将是对教育资源的重新分配, 但从超越种族个人的角度来看难说好坏。所以LAO兄的质疑是成立的。

2. 但是, 从个人利益的角度来看, 答案却是毋庸置疑的, merit-based admission对亚裔更有利。而在我投票参与选举政治时, 究竟是要考虑哪个角度? 我不排除将我的政治理念置于个人利益之上, 从而推选不符合我个人利益的政策或候选人。好比Warren Buffett支持增税, George Soros支持民主党, 都是损害他们个人经济利益的。但这并不代表选民不应该从个人利益出发来做选择。应该说, 正是由于选票基于个人利益的考虑, 所以选举结果才反映了社会方方面面的诉求, 整合了全民利益。上文的出发点就是亚裔必须维护自己的利益, 用选票来争取对自己有利的政策。

还有一点是我比较认可的作为一个Libertarian所持的观点。很多政策好比Affirmative Action对社会效率或者公平的影响难以评价或预估。那么与其用充满争议的he said she said来进行取舍, 不如就从个人利益出发来做选择。而对政策制定来讲, 与其进行后果难以预料的干预, 不如无为而治。回到入学的问题, 加入种族因素就是不必要的干预, 无论是在录取标准还是奖学金发放上。



lawandorder 2014-2-23 02:38 AM

回复

“忆江南: 打个常用的比方, 这个提案就像是个Trojan Horse, 表面上看innocuous, 其实暗藏玄机。首先, 它允许在public education里以肤色决定录取, 这本身就是不合理的。其 ... ”

你这个说法带有几个假设, 假设是否有公认的统计数据支持并可靠? 有任何事实说明这就是修宪的立法动机? 你举的类比假设正好说明这个修宪提案的目的(end) 是有正当目的的(legitimate purpose), 手段 (means) 和目的是理性的联系 (rationally related). 如果按照人口来分配运动员奖学金, 亚洲学生也会得到比修宪之前更多的奖学金, 从而达到宏观上的进一步平等分配。

忆江南 2014-2-21 09:50 PM

回复



“lawandorder: 这个案件不熟悉，等有时间读一下再评论。但是这个加州参议院的提案是把 public education 从现有的宪法条款中删除，我不明白为什么就成为一个亚裔的问题了？从 ...”

打个常用的比方，这个提案就像是个Trojan Horse，表面上看innocuous，其实暗藏玄机。首先，它允许在 public education里以肤色决定录取，这本身就是不合理的。

其次，看这个条款的意义必须结合加州的现状来看。目前来讲，仅凭考分亚裔是不吃亏的，大量亚裔凭借自己的学力进入加州大学系统。而这个条款就是要修改规则，考不过你，那我就用学业以外的录取标准来限制你。

最后举个类比假设：许多大学给运动员奖学金，而大多数运动员是黑人。如果法律规定必须按照人口比例来给奖学金，那么哪个人种会因此吃亏呢？



lawandorder 2014-2-21 09:06 PM

回复

这个案件不熟悉，等有时间读一下再评论。但是这个加州参议院的提案是把 public education 从现有的宪法条款中删除，我不明白为什么就成为一个亚裔的问题了？从现在的提案上看，加州大学可以因为任何人的肤色而拒绝录取。

That Section 31 of Article I thereof is amended to read:

Sec. 31 (a) The State shall not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, or public contracting.

现行条款：

Sec. 31 (a) The State shall not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting.



忆江南 2014-2-19 12:31 AM

回复

“lawandorder: 加州最高法官7个法官有三个亚裔，包括被参议院排除上任第九中级法院法官但在2011年被加州州长任命上任的刘。再找一票并不难。及时提案通过，最高法院也可以宣布 ...”

如果通过选票政治没法阻止的话，也就只能用这个退而求其次的法律途径了。最高法院可能会借Fisher v. University of Texas这个案子对平权法案再来审视一番，LAO兄对该案的前景怎么看？



lawandorder 2014-2-18 01:00 AM

回复

加州最高法官7个法官有三个亚裔，包括被参议院排除上任第九中级法院法官但在2011年被加州州长任命上任的刘。再找一票并不难。及时提案通过，最高法院也可以宣布违宪，像2009年的 4-3 决定宣布Proposition 8 违宪。

涂鸦板

您需要登录后才可以评论 [登录](#) | [立即注册](#)

评论

EXHIBIT 5

Subject: Re: Subpoena for user records
From: HQ <bluewaterunderthesky@gmail.com>
Date: 9/20/2015 6:42 PM
To: "D.X. Yue" <dxyue@yahoo.com>

谢谢举报。The two comments titled "方枪枪其人其事" have been deleted.

On Sun, Sep 20, 2015 at 1:11 PM, D.X. Yue <dxyue@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Chun-hui,

The Superior Court of California has issued a subpoena for the records (email and IP addresses) of several users who posted libelous statements against me on bian-wang.com .

I am writing to see if you are willing to accept service of the subpoena by email. In the meantime, I request that you make a backup of all user and user posting records.

In addition, as you have seen, many of the posts are clearly defamatory and indecent. You have previously deleted messages posted by Tianxiang Gongzhu, and possibly others. This shows that you have editorial control of the site's content. Your responses to those messages demonstrated a clear intent to encourage and abet such libelous postings. Although I have waived the claims against you for your conduct prior to September 19, the waiver does not include claims after that date. Your past postings can also be used as evidence of your intent.

In accordance of the rule "但标题中带网友ID的一经举报将被立即删除(同样适用于评论)", I report to you

about the libelous postings and comments which named "方枪枪" (or FQQ) at <http://www.bian-wang.com/discuz/home.php?mod=space&uid=10690&do=comment&view=me&from=space>

Sincerely,

Dongxiao Yue, Ph.D.

EXHIBIT 6

Subject: Re: Subpoena for user records
From: HQ <bluewaterunderthesky@gmail.com>
Date: 11/3/2015 9:25 AM
To: "D.X. Yue" <dxyue@yahoo.com>

Sorry for the late reply. I don't check this email account everyday. I have no idea what you are talking about. What subpoena? I have not received any.

On Wed, Oct 28, 2015 at 4:00 PM, D.X. Yue <dxyue@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Dr. Miao,

You have not responded to the Subpoena which you accepted service. Please advise me of your intentions.

Dongxiao Yue, Ph.D.

From: HQ <bluewaterunderthesky@gmail.com>
To: D.X. Yue <dxyue@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2015 9:11 PM
Subject: Re: Subpoena for user records

Bi'An will accept service of the subpoena by email without prejudice.

On Sun, Sep 20, 2015 at 1:11 PM, D.X. Yue <dxyue@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Chun-hui,

The Superior Court of California has issued a subpoena for the records (email and IP addresses) of several users who posted libelous statements against me on bian-wang.com .

I am writing to see if you are willing to accept service of the subpoena by email. In the meantime, I request that you make a backup of all user and user posting records.

In addition, as you have seen, many of the posts are clearly defamatory and indecent. You have previously deleted messages posted by Tianxiang Gongzhu, and possibly others. This shows that you have editorial control of the site's content. Your responses to those messages demonstrated a clear intent to encourage and abet such libelous postings. Although I have waived the claims against you for your conduct prior to September 19, the waiver does not include claims after that date. Your past postings can also be used as evidence of your intent.

In accordance of the rule "但标题中带网友ID的一经举报将被立即删除(同样适用于评论)", I report to you about the libelous postings and comments which named "方枪枪" (or FQQ) at

<http://www.bian-wang.com/discuz/home.php?mod=space&uid=10690&do=comment&view=me&from=space>

Sincerely,

Dongxiao Yue, Ph.D.

EXHIBIT 7

彼岸网的个人空间

<http://www.bian-wang.com/discuz/?9999> [收藏] [复制] [分享] [RSS]

空间首页

动态

记录

日志

评论

相册

主题

分享

留言板

个人资料

日志

岳东晓发来的“船票”

热度 3 已有 1492 次阅读2015-11-3 07:59 PM | 系统分类:法律制度

SUBP-010

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address): DONGXIAO YUE 2777 ALVARADO STR, STE C SAN LEANDRO, CA 94577 TELEPHONE NO.: 510-396-0012 FAX NO. (Optional): 510-291-2237 E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): YDX@NETBULA.COM ATTORNEY FOR (Name): PRO PER	FOR COURT USE ONLY
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA STREET ADDRESS: 24405 Amador Street MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: Hayward, California 94544 BRANCH NAME:	
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: DONGXIAO YUE DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: Wenbin William Yang and DOES 1-5	
DEPOSITION SUBPOENA FOR PRODUCTION OF BUSINESS RECORDS	CASE NUMBER: HG15773556

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, TO (name, address, and telephone number of deponent, if known):

BIAN-WANG.COM

1. YOU ARE ORDERED TO PRODUCE THE BUSINESS RECORDS described in item 3, as follows:

To (name of deposition officer): D. Yue	At (time): 10:00 AM
On (date): October 9, 2015	
Location (address): 2777 Alvarado Str, Ste C, San Leandro, CA 94577	

Do not release the requested records to the deposition officer prior to the date and time stated above.

a. ☒ by delivering a true, legible, and durable copy of the business records described in item 3, enclosed in a sealed inner wrapper with the title and number of the action, name of witness, and date of subpoena clearly written on it. The inner wrapper shall then be enclosed in an outer envelope or wrapper, sealed, and mailed to the deposition officer at the address in item 1.

b. ☐ by delivering a true, legible, and durable copy of the business records described in item 3 to the deposition officer at the witness's address, on receipt of payment in cash or by check of the reasonable costs of preparing the copy, as determined under Evidence Code section 1563(b).

c. ☐ by making the original business records described in item 3 available for inspection at your business address by the attorney's representative and permitting copying at your business address under reasonable conditions during normal business hours.

2. The records are to be produced by the date and time shown in item 1 (but not sooner than 20 days after the issuance of the deposition subpoena, or 15 days after service, whichever date is later). Reasonable costs of locating records, making them available or copying them, and postage, if any, are recoverable as set forth in Evidence Code section 1563(b). The records shall be accompanied by an affidavit of the custodian or other qualified witness pursuant to Evidence Code section 1561.

3. The records to be produced are described as follows:
The names, IP addresses, email addresses of the users who posted the attacks on Yue

☒ Continued on Attachment 3.

4. IF YOU HAVE BEEN SERVED WITH THIS SUBPOENA AS A CUSTODIAN OF CONSUMER OR EMPLOYEE RECORDS UNDER CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE SECTION 1985.3 OR 1985.6 AND A MOTION TO QUASH OR AN OBJECTION HAS BEEN SERVED ON YOU, A COURT ORDER OR AGREEMENT OF THE PARTIES, WITNESSES, AND CONSUMER OR EMPLOYEE AFFECTED MUST BE OBTAINED BEFORE YOU ARE REQUIRED TO PRODUCE CONSUMER OR EMPLOYEE RECORDS.

DISOBEDIENCE OF THIS SUBPOENA MAY BE PUNISHED AS CONTEMPT BY THIS COURT. YOU WILL ALSO BE LIABLE FOR THE SUM OF FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS AND ALL DAMAGES RESULTING FROM YOUR FAILURE TO OBEY.

Date issued: **SEP 11 2015**
MARISOL DIAZ
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)


(Proof of service on reverse)

Marisol Diaz
(SIGNATURE OF PERSON ISSUING SUBPOENA)

LPA
(TITLE)

1 DONGXIAO YUE
2 2777 ALVARADO ST
3 SUITE C
4 SAN LEANDRO, CA 94577
5 Telephone: (510) 396-0012
6 Facsimile: (510) 291-2237
7 E-Mail: ydx@netbula.com

8 *Pro Per*

9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10 FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

11 DONGXIAO YUE,
12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 Wenbin William Yang and DOES 1-5.

15 Defendants.

CASE NO. HG15773556

ATTACHMENT TO DEPOSITION
SUBPOENA FOR PRODUCTION OF
BUSINESS RECORDS

DEPONENT: BIAN-WANG.COM

(Supplemented Sept. 21, 2015)

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TO BIAN-WANG.COM:

YOU ARE BEING SERVED A DEPOSITION SUBPOENA FROM THE SUPERIOR
COURT OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA FOR THE
PRODUCTION OF BUSINESS RECORDS DESCRIBED BELOW:

-1-

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

1. The names, emails and IP addresses the user "TING" (uid 10674 profile page at <http://www.bian-wang.com/discuz/home.php?mod=space&uid=10674&do=profile>) used to register and access BIAN-WANG.COM, and TING's IP address when posting the message at <http://www.bian-wang.com/discuz/home.php?mod=space&uid=10674&do=blog&id=1064> .
2. All user IDs originating from the IP address "99.225.167.112", which belonged to iMan (defendant), and their email addresses.
3. The names, emails and all IP addresses of the user "东晓鼠太郎" (uid 10690) used to register and access BIAN-WANG.COM.
4. The IP address from which "东晓鼠太郎" posted the following message on <http://www.bian-wang.com/discuz/home.php?mod=space&uid=10683&do=blog&id=1102> :
"无赖到控告一家公司侵权他一个没人用了的程序，结果被人反诉，差点倾家荡产，幸亏领馆和许多华人好心帮忙，那家公司可怜他的孩子无家可归，才最后和解给他些钱，饶了这个无赖，打发了这个无赖。"
5. The names, emails and all IP addresses of the user "speaker" (uid 10692) used to register and access BIAN-WANG.COM.
6. The IP address from which "speaker" posted the following message at <http://www.bian-wang.com/discuz/home.php?mod=space&uid=10006&do=blog&id=1108>:
"据可靠消息，有自愿人士将独家揭露岳东晓，方枪枪及其他珍珠湾装逼犯，最后会揭露隐

20 藏在这些 ID 后面他（她）们的真面目。还有自愿的律师会免费代理所有被珍珠湾这些人诽
21 谤的网友提起集体诉讼，到时只需你们签字即可。现在已经在收集这些人的诽谤言论，这
22 些诽谤证据的收集不限于珍珠湾，他（她）们在任何网站的言论都在收集之中，包括他
23 （她）们在各地的马甲。希望网友提供线索。这些揭露将费时费力，这些自愿人士誓言不
24 会放弃，也许会长期的。但会随时发布所发掘的结果。对岳和方的其人其事只是开始，
25 以后还会有之二之三，将会不断进行下去。"
26
27
28

-2-



举报 邀请 分享 收藏

评论 (1 个评论)

发表评论 作者的其他最新日志 全部



lawandorder 2015-11-26 10:25 PM [回复](#)

这个传票，按照纽约的《统一跨州取证和口供法律》(UIDDA) 的规定，将是无效而且法院不会执行的废传票，因为[绝对没有争议的原因，白纸黑字] _____ [留给某人Google 研究学习]。我不知道彼岸网的server的所在地和管辖州，如果该州和纽约州一样也有同样的白纸黑字的要求，那么这个传票在那个州也不会得到执行也是个废传票。还有，按照纽约州最高法院 (Court of Appeals) 2014年案例要求，这个传票还应该_____ [留给某人Google 研究学习]，否则就不会得到执行 (注意：任何外州都可以按自己的州的程序法发出传票，但是否能够得以执行是按照纽约州的法律为准 [这也是白纸黑字毫无争议的问题]。还有，这是个加州法院发出的口供传票，口供地址却设在加州，这点又把这个传票变的不能执行，因为 _____ [留给某人Google 研究学习]。这是从该传票表面看出来的问题，其他具体的比如送状程序等在不知道具体事实前无法评论。

涂鸦板

评论

您需要登录后才可以评论 [登录](#) | [立即注册](#)



小黑屋 | [Archiver](#) | [彼岸网](#)

Powered by [Discuz!](#) X3.1 © 2001-2014 [Comsenz Inc.](#)
GMT-4, 2018-3-12 03:14 AM , Processed in 0.048240 second(s), 11 queries. ,ApcOn

EXHIBIT 8

Subject: Re: Fw: Subpoena attached
From: HQ <bluewaterunderthesky@gmail.com>
Date: 11/16/2015 5:30 PM
To: "D.X. Yue" <dxyue@yahoo.com>

Dear Dr. Yue,

The subpoena you sent is invalid because it is issued by a California Court, but I am not a resident of CA.

regards,
HQ

On Tue, Nov 3, 2015 at 3:12 PM, D.X. Yue <dxyue@yahoo.com> wrote:

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: D.X. Yue <dxyue@yahoo.com>
To: HQ <bluewaterunderthesky@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2015 4:23 PM
Subject: Subpoena attached

Dear Bian-Wang.com,

I am attaching a subpoena issued for certain user records. I would appreciate it if you could respond to the subpoena by September 23, 2015. You may email the information back to me. I will make every effort to keep your information confidential.

Dongxiao Yue, Ph.D.

EXHIBIT 9

天涯过客的个人空间

<http://zzwave.com/upload/upload/?5631> [收藏] [复制] [分享] [RSS]

空间首页

动态

记录

日志

相册

广播

主题

分享

留言板

个人资料

日志

如果他们污蔑珍珠湾点击率可能作假和ALEXA排名涉嫌作假，能不能告他们上法庭？ ...

热度 5 已有 2798 次阅读 2016-1-18 02:02 | 系统分类:转帖-知识 | 点击率, 而且, 网上

在网上搜到“其实珍珠湾不光点击率可能作假，而且ALEXA排名也涉嫌作假”：

<http://www.bian-wang.com/discuz/home.php?mod=space&uid=10704&do=blog&id=1168>

如果他们污蔑珍珠湾，能不能告他们上法庭？

路过 鸡蛋 鲜花 支持 雷人 难过 搞笑



0

[举报](#) [邀请](#) [分享](#) [收藏](#)

评论 (18 个评论)

发表评论

作者的其他最新日志

全部

**方枪枪** 2016-1-18 03:06

呵呵，岳东晓把彼岸网当像江南七怪看待，就当没听见似的，可能段位低了。 😊

回复

• 纪念李孟贤 为旧金山倾心付出28载

• 李孟贤政治遗产：为民权而斗争

• 李孟贤去世 华人痛失典范

• 告别李孟贤——美国老一代华人政治的

• 请您为三藩市首位华人市长永留千古，

• 李孟贤打开了华人加入旧金山警界的大

**岳东晓** 2016-1-18 03:31

这些所谓作假当然是虚假、诽谤之词。

回复

**岳东晓** 2016-1-18 03:59

“ crossingthesea: 😊 这种事儿就像打鸟儿，打着一个，其他的全散~ ”

回复

有人已经削尖脑袋搭上 iMan 的 顺风车，有人想搭，又很纠结。

美中国网来的 2016-1-18 04:42

回复



“岳东晓: 有人已经削尖脑袋搭上 iMan 的 顺风车, 有人想搭, 又很纠结。”

夜夜城的一些人不是好东西。

整天在网上幻想或者以征服IMAN为幸。😄 哪个正派人会跟这网络流氓有说不完的话。可选择对话的那么多, 男男女女们却爱跟一个喜欢说扒裤子, 网上欺凌女人的对话, 这让人想起新闻里说的罪犯收到很多情书的事。



crossingthesea 2016-1-18 04:47

[回复](#)

啊哈, 吃块鱼的功夫就有个回复不见了? 下次拍照留念~~



crossingthesea 2016-1-18 04:50

[回复](#)

“美中网来的: 夜夜城的一些人不是好东西。

整天在网上幻想或者以征服IMAN为幸。😄 哪个正派人会跟这网络流氓有说不完的话。可选择对话的那么多, 男男女女们却爱跟一个喜欢 ... ”

拍照~

你是好东西? 😊



美中网来的 2016-1-18 04:51

[回复](#)

“crossingthesea: 拍照~

你是好东西? 😊”

IMAN好吗? 你喜欢不?

是否如此: IMAN骂所有人, 如果不骂其中一个, 这个人便相当觉得被欣赏。



美中网来的 2016-1-18 05:04

[回复](#)

“crossingthesea: 你不就是想搭顺风车吗? 你配吗? 去给IMAN 擦屎吧, 😏”

唉, 黎明的粉丝知道黎明穿四十二码的鞋, 乐基儿和黎明结婚, 黎粉说她只配擦屎。

理解理解。

他当方州子的粉, 被封无数次, IP也被交给小岳了, 但还是仆服在脚下呜呜。

也许他也算个另类偶像吧, 也有被他骂还粉他的。

👏 IMAN应该感到幸福啊, 我真羡慕他, 如果我六十来岁还能这样在网上混成这样的话。



岳东晓 2016-1-18 05:05

[回复](#)

“方枪枪: 呵呵, 岳东晓把彼岸网当像江南七怪看待, 就当没听见似的, 可能段位低了。

😄”

学院派嘛, 不甘寂寞又纠结。😄



岳东晓 2016-1-18 05:18

[回复](#)

“美中网来的: 唉, 黎明的粉丝知道黎明穿四十二码的鞋, 乐基儿和黎明结婚, 黎粉说她只配擦屎。

理解理解。

他当方州子的粉, 被封无数次, IP也被交给小岳了, 但还是仆服在脚 ... ”

您别说, 方博是有两下子。他对 JFF/iMan aka 杨文彬真是像踢癞皮狗似的。咋擦把鸡飞飞砍了, 毫无鸡权可言; 后来又把iMan@新语丝砍了, 再次剥夺鸡权; 我一个EMAIL过去, 方博第二天就把 iMan 的信息给我了。而竟JFF/iMan 仍然像哈巴狗似的, 舔着方博的脚趾头。



crossingthesea 2016-1-18 05:28

[回复](#)



天涯过客

[加为好友](#) [给我留言](#)

[打个招呼](#) [发送消息](#)

“岳东晓: 您别说, 方博是有两下子。他对 JFF/iMan aka 杨文彬真是像踢癞皮狗似的。咔嚓把鸡飞飞砍了, 毫无鸡权可言; 后来又把iMan@新语丝砍了, 再次剥夺鸡权; 我一个EMAIL ...”

你不也有只美中网来的 😊



美中网来的 2016-1-18 05:28

回复

“岳东晓: 您别说, 方博是有两下子。他对 JFF/iMan aka 杨文彬真是像踢癞皮狗似的。咔嚓把鸡飞飞砍了, 毫无鸡权可言; 后来又把iMan@新语丝砍了, 再次剥夺鸡权; 我一个EMAIL ...”

方对方黑态度很坚决。但他不是方黑。

新语丝都是人精, 有点教育水平的, 都不可能把他当回事, 不像小碗那地方, 所以尽管他在一定程度上粉方, 方也对他可有可无。不过他到底是新语丝出来的, 也许其他方粉还是对他有些同情之心的。这么说来又是个可怜之人。



岳东晓 2016-1-18 05:33

回复

“美中网来的: 方对方黑态度很坚决。但他不是方黑。

新语丝都是人精, 有点教育水平的, 都不可能把他当回事, 不像小碗那地方, 所以尽管他在一定程度上粉方, 方也对他可有可无。 ...”

鸡飞飞当然不是方黑, 而是最效忠方的。方博的厉害在于, 对这癞皮狗任意踢打, 癞皮狗却依然不离不弃, 千方百计想再次获得方博的垂爱。这种行为在新语丝被人识破, 百般取笑, 鸡师傅却一点都不觉得羞耻, 反而光荣。

服了方博。 😊



美中网来的 2016-1-18 05:34

回复

“方枪枪: 呵呵, 岳东晓把彼岸网当像江南七怪看待, 就当没听见似的, 可能段位低了。

😊”

看到彼岸网, 就想起了麻将牌里的“八万”。

两次不算不客气的讨论, 就搞得像小寡妇上坟似的, 一年半载都哭哭啼啼的。



岳东晓 2016-1-18 05:37

回复

“美中网来的: 看到彼岸网, 就想起了麻将牌里的“八万”。

两次不算不客气的讨论, 就搞得像小寡妇上坟似的, 一年半载都哭哭啼啼的。 ...”

😊 唉, 学院派面子薄嘛。



美中网来的 2016-1-18 05:44

回复

“crossingthesea: 小可怜, 想做粉丝被人欣赏是吗? 别扭扭捏捏的, 爬过来我欣赏欣赏, 杂毛儿也得给点运气是不是? 😊”

😊 你运气看来不错。



方枪枪 2016-1-18 06:15

回复

“crossingthesea: 啊哈, 吃块鱼的功夫就有个回复不见了? 下次拍照留念~~”

呵呵, 不会是我的回复吧。我删了自己的, 省得说起来没完。 🍷



ojx111 2016-1-18 13:49

回复

“方枪枪: 呵呵, 岳东晓把彼岸网当像江南七怪看待, 就当没听见似的, 可能段位低了。

😊”

老牛是黄老邪啊,看不起江南7怪的



您需要登录后才可以评论 [登录](#) | [用户注册](#)

评论

EXHIBIT 10

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)

IN THE COMMON PLEAS COURT

COUNTY OF RICHLAND)

CASE NO.:C16-01118

DONGXIAO YUE)

Plaintiffs,)

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

-versus-

TRIGMAX SOLUTIONS, LLC, et al.)

Defendant,)

PERSONALLY APPEARED BEFORE ME, THE UNDERSIGNED, WHO BEING
DULY SWORN, SAYS THAT HE/SHE SERVED:

(X) Summons

(X) Deposition Subpoena for Production of Business Record

IN THIS ACTION ON, TRIGMAX SOLUTIONS, LLC, et al

(X) By personal delivery to him/her; CHUN-HUI MIAO

() Registered Agent for:

() By delivery to:

A person of discretion residing in the same resident and present in such
residence at the time of service;

AND LEAVING WITH HIM/HER COPIES OF THE SAME AT **Dept of Economics,
University of South Carolina, Columbia SC 29208** ON THE **25** DAY OF **October,**
2016 AND THAT DEPONENT IS A PARTY TO THIS ACTION.

 , Process Server

SWORN TO before me this

25th Day of October, 2016


Notary Public for South Carolina

My Commission Expires: 7/14/2018

Served for : Dongxiao Yue
Time of Service: 11:26 a.m.

KEONYE RENEE JOHNSON
Notary Public - State of South Carolina
My Commission Expires July 14, 2018