

CONCERNS NOTICE

This is a Concerns Notice within the meaning of Section 14(2) of the *Defamation Act 2005* (QLD) ("the Act").

The Concerns Notice is issued on behalf of Dany Tjan of c/- Goldsmiths Lawyers, Level 8, 25 Bligh Street, Sydney NSW 2000 ("the complainant") and is addressed to [REDACTED], Auckland, New Zealand ("the publisher").

Publication of the matters complained of

This Concerns Notice arises out of the publication of material on the internet, on the following dates, at the following locations:

- A. On 4 March 2012, at <http://pro-ma-dany-tjan.com/2012/03/04/pro-ma-systems-australia-dany-tjan/> ("the first matter complained of");
- B. On 16 March 2012, at <http://pro-ma-dany-tjan.com/2012/03/04/pro-ma-systems-australia-dany-tjan/#comment-3> ("the second matter complained of"); and
- C. On 13 September 2012, at <http://pro-ma-dany-tjan.com/2012/03/04/pro-ma-systems-australia-dany-tjan/#comment-9> ("the third matter complained of").

The complainant alleges that each of the matters complained of was published to, was capable of being, and was read by all readers of the publisher's blog, being <http://promadanytjan.files.wordpress.com>

Twelve month limitation period

Notwithstanding that the matters complained of were published more than 12 months prior to the date of this notice, they have been read by readers, including by at least one resident in the State of Queensland, within 12 months prior to the date hereof.

Imputations carried by the publication of the first matter complained of

The complainant alleges that the first matter complained of is defamatory of him and alleges that it carries some or all of the following imputations, or imputations to similar effect:

1. The complainant fled New Zealand in order to avoid his obligations.
2. The complainant managed a company that had a large number of creditors who were owed substantial amounts.
3. The complainant left New Zealand for the purpose of avoiding his legal obligations.
4. The complainant consistently has not honoured his obligations.
5. The complainant is untrustworthy.
6. The complainant is not fit to do business with.