

**Jean E. McCall**

**From:** Betsy Foote [efoote@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 06, 2005 3:31 PM  
**To:** Edward B. Detwiler; Ben Zacks; Brad Whiteman; Jerry Rampelt  
**Subject:** Re: Leader News 4/6/2005

Ms. Foote is a talented, young former Leader programmer with no business experience who left on good terms with the company, according to her friends. The negative attitude developed subsequently.

Hi all,

Thanks so much, Ed.

FYI - I received (and I assume that other former employees did as well) a piddly little check from Leader about a month ago. I don't even remember the amount but it was no more than \$250.

Being a shareholder, I received their balance sheet from last year and saw that they had something close to nothing in cash. I also noticed that they hosted a "think-tank" on homeland security in Dec or Jan at the Value City Arena (or Nationwide Arena - one of those). Sounds like a typical Mckibben glorification of what was probably a 1 hour meeting with a few no-names from big companies. [Click here for press release and its attendees.](#)

Ed, I really hope you are successful in your endeavor to have MM caught in his lies. If nothing else we might see the liquidation of the company if that comes to pass.

I am not sure whether Ben, et. al., are still interested in taking over the company and pursue sales of existing products... could someone please comment on that? My personal feeling is that there might be something to salvage in marketing and selling some parts of the L2L platform. For example, LeaderPhone might have some potential for future revenues (anyone know how it's doing today?)- but I am concerned that the Leader2Leader concept has missed its opportunity in the market. And then there's the problem of the technologies backing these apps which are getting very out of date. Major work would be required to get to a point that I'd endorse as production-ready. I am not sure how much stock to put in all these claims on leader.com about these new security solutions they offer. It sounds like the components of L2L with a new marketing gimmick.

The more time that passes the more certain I am that I will never recover my losses. I'm sure you all feel the same. I don't know what to do honestly.

FYI - I've taken a new position with Resource Interactive (<http://www.resource.com>), a fantastic company that designs and builds websites for all kinds of clients. The big client I work with is The Limited. We also do hp.com, wendys.com, reebokrunning.com, restorationhardware.com, and so many more. Oh, I'm also getting hitched this summer to Dave Demarchi, who you may have met at that infamous and final Holiday Party at Leader.

Hope you all are doing well!

All the best,  
Betsy

--- "Edward B. Detwiler" <EBD@columbus.rr.com> wrote:

> Hi all,  
>  
>  
>

> A little over a week ago, I was able to obtain about eighty pages of  
> Leader's application for the 421 Grant of \$250,000 to purchase  
> computer hardware for "network" purposes and copies of the invoices  
> from AnySystem.com (John Butler) to Leader for the purchased hardware.  
> This was  
> the application information that resulted in the 421 legal agreement  
> between the Department of Development and Leader. You each have that  
> document from my previous correspondence.  
>

ORIGINAL MESSAGE caption has been removed before Detwiler and Rampelt provided this document in fact discovery to Leader in 2005. Normally Microsoft Outlook will identify the list of TO recipients, DATE sent, FROM sender, and SUBJECT

>  
>  
> Leader told the State of Ohio everything was either "trade secret" or  
> involved with "Homeland Security" and the Department of Development  
> (DOD)  
> therefore could not disclose any information to the public. The  
> Department of Development sent the application documents to the  
> Attorney General's office and the AG let Leader black out all  
> information that Leader thought sensitive. In my opinion, the AG did  
> not challenge Leader therefore essentially allowing Leader to hide  
> behind the veil of secrecy according to Leader's definition. As you  
> may imagine, the document had many many lines of information blocked  
> out. The old story about the fox guarding the henhouse came to mind.  
> What is an interesting detail is that the actual grant agreement and  
> especially the "Scope of Work" never mentioned Homeland Security.

>  
>  
>  
> The invoices had the equipment description blocked out so all that is  
> available about the specific hardware is the quantity and the price.  
> The  
> application dated April 7, 2003 specifically listed Brad Whiteman, Ed  
> Detwiler, Michael Greulich, Ben Zacks, Steve Hanna, Steve Gonzales,  
> James Chandler, and Len Zawistowsk as part of the active management,  
> director, and advisory team. I was gone by May 15; however, I know  
> Michael Greulich and Ben were gone long before the application was  
> submitted.  
> Nevertheless when  
> the agreement was executed (June 12, 2003) all were considered active  
> as far as the DOD was informed.

>  
>  
>  
> Today I spoke with Marlo Tannous the chief legal council for the DOD.  
> She  
> told me that DOD had sent in a team to look at the payroll and they  
> did find the discrepancies I had pointed out in my earlier  
> communications with her.  
> When I asked about the equipment she responded that DOD has not done  
> any investigation at this time. The invoices showed no shipping  
> charges and no state sales tax for N.J. The invoices did show that  
> all equipment was directed to the attention of Jeff Lamb. I suggested  
> to Marlo that perhaps a quick way to ensure all equipment was  
> installed was to have Jeff sign an affidavit stating such as well as  
> physically viewing the equipment in downtown Columbus. I think each  
> of us have the feeling that it is very doubtful all equipment was ever  
> shipped or installed.

>  
>  
>  
> Marlo stated that DOD will be writing a letter to Leader "in the next  
> two  
> weeks" addressing the headcount discrepancies and the fact that  
> Leader did  
> not fulfill the project requirements or deadline. As of this moment,  
> DOD  
> has not decided what the letter will say as they have not fully  
> developed  
> their response strategy. I asked Marlo if the letter will be  
> considered a  
> "public document" and she stated "yes" and she would send me a copy.  
> One  
> small step for the "good guys".

>  
>  
> The facts, in my opinion, show that Leader is in breach of contract  
> in  
> several areas:  
>

More evidence of  
Detwiler's  
interference in  
business  
relationships. He  
never came to  
the Board of  
Directors with  
these concerns  
who would have  
answered his  
questions and set  
him straight.  
Instead, his  
meddling and  
false accusations  
alarmed ODOD  
and spoiled the  
relationship.

