Blake R. Mathesie | Blake.Mathesie@gray-robinson.com | **D** 904.632.8471
50 North Laura Street, Suite 1100, Jacksonville, Florida 32202 | **T** 904.598.9929 | **F** 904.598.9109

July 14, 2026

VIA E-MAIL: JDSKYLES@SKYLESLAW.COM

James D. Skyles, Esq.
Skyles Law Group, LLC
875 North Michigan Avenue, 31st Floor
Chicago, IL 60611
jdskyles@skyleslaw.com

Re: Response to Meritless July 1, 2026 "Cease and Desist; Demand for Retraction" addressed to Kyle Reyes and SPM Performance LLC —
REYES & SPM DEMAND FOR IMMEDIATE WITHDRAWAL AND RETRACTION

Mr. Skyles:

This firm represents Kyle Reyes, The Silent Partner Marketing, LLC, The 1776 Project, Law Enforcement Today, and Blue Lives Matter (collectively, our "Clients") in connection with your letter dated July 1, 2026 (the "Letter"). We write to reject your demands in their entirety and to demand that you withdraw the Letter and retract its accusations.

As an initial matter, your Letter is directed to "SPM Performance LLC". Neither I nor my Clients have any knowledge of, or affiliation with, any entity by the name of "SPM Performance LLC." Your inability to correctly identify the target of your legal threats is merely the first in a series of glaring factual and legal failures that render your correspondence a complete nullity.

Overall, your Letter is legally deficient, ethically improper, and relies on a fundamental fabrication and misrepresentation of the ongoing litigation. The Letter is wholly defective in substance and in form. It fails to identify a single statement it claims is false. It rests on a representation about a pending lawsuit that is demonstrably untrue and that a two-minute review of the public docket would have corrected. It improperly threatens criminal prosecution to extract a civil concession. And it was transmitted by an out-of-state attorney who is not licensed to practice law in the state of Florida, to which he directed it, and who cannot lawfully prosecute the litigation he threatens.

Our Clients will not be retracting anything; you will. We address the fatal defects of your correspondence below.

I. The Letter Does Not Identify a Single Allegedly Defamatory Statement.

A demand for retraction that identifies nothing to retract is a nullity and legally meaningless. Your Letter broadly accuses our Clients of publishing "false accusations of fraud, theft, financial misappropriation, dishonesty in business dealings, and other criminal or quasi-criminal misconduct," yet it does not quote, date, attribute, or otherwise identify one single statement our Clients are alleged to have made. Our Clients cannot "retract" — and no publisher could be expected to retract — statements you have declined to specify.

This is not a mere drafting oversight. Under Florida law, defamation requires a false statement of fact that is "of and concerning" the plaintiff, published with the requisite fault and causing actual damage. *Carroll v. TheStreet.com, Inc.*, No. 11-CV-81173, 2014 WL 5474061 (S.D. Fla. July 10, 2014); *Turner v. Wells*, 879 F.3d 1254 (11th Cir. 2018). Falsity is measured statement by statement; a plaintiff cannot establish falsity in the abstract.

Moreover, because Law Enforcement Today and our Clients' publications operate as media outlets engaged in the dissemination of news and commentary, Florida's pre-suit notice statute requires any prospective libel plaintiff to serve written notice specifying the article or broadcast and the exact statements therein which he or she alleges to be false and defamatory at least five days before filing suit. *Doe v. Finkelman*, 429 So. 3d 456 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 2025). Your Letter satisfies none of these mandatory requirements. Until your clients identify the specific statements they contend are false, there is nothing to which our Clients can meaningfully respond.

II. To the Extent We Can Discern the Subject Matter, the Challenged Publications are True, Constitutionally Protected, and Grounded in Public Records.

Although your letter identifies nothing, we will not hide from the subject matter. Our Clients' publications concern the solicitation and use of charitable donations by Michael Letts, Karen Letts, and InVest USA — an organization that solicits public contributions on the representation that it provides bulletproof vests to law enforcement officers. Statements on that subject are both true and protected.

Truth is an absolute defense to a defamation claim in Florida, and the "gist" or "sting" of a statement need only be substantially true. *Carroll v. TheStreet.com, Inc.*, 2014 WL 5474061. The "sting" of our Clients' publications is entirely accurate, as established by public regulatory records, court dockets, and your own clients' public admissions.

- **Factual Evidence.** Our Clients' statements regarding the handling of donor funds are supported by documentary evidence, including InVest USA's own public Forms 990 and the parties' own business records and correspondence. Our Clients are prepared to substantiate each challenged statement, item by item, with primary source documentation. A party who has spoken the truth owes no retraction.

- **The statements are also protected opinion and commentary.** True statements, statements not readily capable of being proven true or false, and statements of pure opinion are all protected from defamation liability by the First Amendment. *Turner v. Wells*, 879 F.3d 1254 (11th Cir. 2018). A commentator's subjective characterization of another's conduct, based on disclosed or publicly available facts, is nonactionable opinion even if a reader might draw a different conclusion from the same facts. *Id*. To the extent our Clients' publications express views about your clients' stewardship of charitable donations, those views rest on disclosed and verifiable facts and are fully protected.

- **Your clients are public figures who must prove actual malice.** Michael Letts, Karen Letts, and InVest USA have thrust themselves into a matter of public concern — the solicitation of public donations in the name of officer safety — through extensive media appearances, national fundraising campaigns, and public advocacy. In fact, Michael Letts: (i) was a political candidate for a South Carolina State Senate District 22 seat in 2020[1]; (ii) was a political candidate for Richland County Council District 8 in 2012[2]; (iii) hosts the "Michael Letts Show", which has run twenty-five (25) weekly episodes from January 24, 2026, through July 11, 2026[3]; (iv) hosts a personal, public-facing website (MichaelLetts.us); (v) claims he has "earned [] a Congressional Gold Medal Award for Community Service and the SC Order of the Palmetto, South Carolina's highest civilian honor for extraordinary lifetime achievement and service to the state and nation. His efforts have been recognized globally with the bestowing of the title." and portrays that "he is also the Chaplain at Columbia Police Department, the State Constable for the State of South Carolina, the Chaplain at South Carolina Law Enforcement Division, was the Executive Pastor at Hope Baptist Church, Councilman at Central Midlands Council of Governments, Airport Commission, SC State Counter Terrorism Council, Founder, President, and CEO of Salty Fin Realty and Holdings, LLC, Board Member, and Partner, Talaus Technology, LLC, and a member of the First Palmer Trust. He also holds numerous leadership positions in the Chamber of Commerce, Boy Scouts of America, and Kiwanis." [4]; (vi) is a prolific contributing author, writing fifty-two (52) articles for NewsMax[5] and forty-four (44) articles for BizPac Review[6] alone, not including the numerous other outlets he appears on; (vii) craves the public spotlight, appearing at least three-hundred (300) times on various newscasts, YouTube interviews, podcasts, etc.[7]

Suffice to say, they are, at minimum, limited-purpose public figures who must prove that any challenged statement was made with actual malice, i.e., knowledge of falsity or reckless disregard for the truth. *Miami Herald Pub. Co. v. Ane*, 423 So. 2d 376 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1982); *Turner v. Wells*, 879 F.3d 1254 (11th Cir. 2018). They cannot do so, because the statements are true. Your Letter's suggestion that our Clients acted with "actual malice" is not only unsupported — as shown in Section III, the sole basis you offer for it is itself false.

A. The Mathematical Impossibility of InVest USA's Donation Claims.

Your clients publicly claim on homepage of their organization's website that they have donated **"17,100+ Vests."**[8] Because your client has publicly stated that these active-shooter vests cost approximately

---

[1] https://ballotpedia.org/Michael_Letts.
[2] https://www.wistv.com/story/19854193/michael-letts/.
[3] https://crntalk.com/the-michael-letts-show/; https://podcasts.apple.com/us/podcast/the-michael-letts-show/id1803847986.
[4] https://michaelletts.us/about; https://investusa.org/team-member/michael-letts.
[5] https://www.newsmax.com/insiders/michaelletts/bio-820/; https://www.newsmax.com/insiders/MichaelLetts/id-820/.
[6] https://www.bizpacreview.com/author/michael-letts/.
[7] https://music.amazon.com/search/michael+letts/episodes?filter=IsLibrary%7Cfalse&sc=none; https://podcasts.apple.com/us/search?term=michael%20letts%20invest; https://rumble.com/c/InVestUSA?page=6&e9s=src_v1_cbl; https://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=michael+letts+invest.
[8] https://investusa.org/.

$700 each[9], simple mathematics dictates that donating 17,100 vests requires an expenditure of nearly **$11,970,000** on vests alone.

However, mapping your clients' own public donation claims to a timeline exposes a staggering, mathematical impossibility:

- **December 2021:** According to an article published on December 22, 2021[10], your clients claimed that *"6,500 active concealable shooting vests have been distributed"* up to that point. At $700 per vest, this would have required **$4,550,000** in direct vest expenditures by the end of 2021.

- **June 2023:** On your client's personal website (MichaelLetts.us), he specifically claims that as of June 2023, more than **13,520 vests** had been distributed[11]. This means your clients claim to have distributed over **7,000 additional vests** in a mere 18-month window. At $700 each, this would have required another **$4,900,000** in direct vest expenditures across 2022 and 2023 alone.

InVest USA's own public IRS Form 990 tax returns expose these timelines and figures as complete fabrications; of note, InVest USA's tax returns only appear for the years 2015-2023[12]. According to the sworn disclosures filed by your clients with the Internal Revenue Service, their actual itemized expenditures on vest purchases leading up to that December 2021 claim are as follows:

Tax Year	Total Reported Revenue	Actual Expenditure on Vest Purchases / Distribution
2015	$5,594	**$2,187** (Approx. 3 vests at $700/ea)
2016	$814,595	**$5,434** (Approx. 7 vests at $700/ea)
2017	$744,482	**$3,584** (Approx. 5 vests at $700/ea)
2018	$451,921	**$5,771** (Approx. 8 vests at $700/ea)
2019	$706,446	**$2,297** (Approx. 3 vests at $700/ea)

Over this entire five-year period, your clients raised over **$2.7 million** from the public, yet spent a combined total of only **$19,273 on actual vests**. That equates to roughly **27 vests total** while hundreds of thousands of dollars were systematically poured into "Printing," "Postage / Mailing," and "Professional Fundraising Services" to solicit more money. In other words, **InVest USA spent less than one-percent (1%), seven-tenths-percent (0.7%) to be exact, on bulletproof vests for law enforcement officers**—the very mission and people they allege to protect—over the five-year period from 2015-2019. This is a hard pill to swallow when according to InVest USA's own website: "Mission Statement: INVESTUSA is dedicated to "protecting those who protect us.""[13]

---

[9] This is a believable number, according two reputable sources knowledgeable on the topic: https://bodyarmornews.com/how-much-does-body-armor-cost/ ("Ballistic vests usually come at around $600 on average, with prices ranging from $300 to $1800. May 4, 2023); https://bulletsafe.com/blogs/news/how-much-do-bulletproof-vests-usually-cost?srsltid=AfmBOopkNW9xcI1s5ey4z6ebnRNubtb47xW4N3-hn3jeqQH1tcjk4FNZ ("Traditional bulletproof vests on the market range from around $600 to well over $1,000 for NIJ-certified protection." February 23, 2026).
[10] https://medium.com/@imsaraakram/michael-a-letts-founder-president-ceo-in-vest-usa-2fb7049729cd.
[11] https://michaelletts.us/about.
[12] https://apps.irs.gov/app/eos/details/ (Invest to Protect Our Law Enforcement Officers Inc., EIN: 57-0985129).
[13] https://investusa.org/about.

Interestingly enough, when InVest's public fundraising skyrocketed to over $2 million per year, they altogether *stopped* itemizing vest purchases on their tax returns—making the subsequent claims of 6,500 and 13,520 vests even more absurd:

- **2020 Form 990:** Raised **$2,085,623**. Vest purchases are completely un-itemized, while **$1,110,379** was spent solely on Postage and Printing, with an additional $253,579 spent on Professional Services, Advertising, Travel, and Bank Charges.

- **2021 Form 990:** Raised **$2,334,501**. Vest purchases are completely un-itemized, while **$1,311,785** was spent solely on Postage and Printing, with an additional $441,129 spent on Professional Services, Advertising, and Travel.

- **2022 Form 990:** Raised **$1,827,721**. Vest purchases are un-itemized, while **$1,053,885** went to Postage and Printing alone.

- **2023 Form 990:** Raised **$1,322,770**. Itemized expenditures show **$500,783** in general "Office Expenses," **$409,610** in "General Administrative" costs, and exactly **$0** itemized for vests (with a single entry of $161,461 for "Emergency Supplies").

- It should be noted that your clients' total combined revenue for 2022 and 2023 was only $3.15 million, rendering the claim of purchasing $4.9 million worth of new vests during that same exact period mathematically impossible.

Subtracting direct mail, fundraising, marketing, and administrative overhead from InVest USA's reported expenses leaves no financial room for the thousands of vests your clients claim to have distributed. **Reporting these cold, hard, financial realities is a matter of clear public interest and is completely shielded by the absolute defense of truth**.

B. The Veracity of Public Criminal Records.

Your Letter implies that references to Michael Letts' criminal history constitute defamation. It is a matter of indisputable public record that your client is the subject of multiple severe criminal arrests, the publication of which is protected by the fair-report privilege.

1. **Arrest for Sexual Assault of a Minor[14]:** On April 1, 2020, **Michael Letts was arrested for Incest and Rape of his female, underage relative, over a span of seven (7) years, from the time she was**

---

[14] https://apnews.com/general-news-ade15a33b9beaae4d0f9c16f94a6e46f; https://www.abccolumbia.com/2020/04/02/sc-candidate-charged-with-criminal-sexual-conduct-with-a-minor/; https://abcnews4.com/news/crime-news/deputies-bulletproof-vest-charity-ceo-charged-with-rape; https://www.cbs17.com/news/south/sc-senate-candidate-bulletproof-vest-charity-ceo-charged-with-incest-rape/?fbclid=IwY2xjawTD1QJleHRuA2FlbQIxMQBicmlkETFOaHA0SjhzRk9NYllKQ0t3c3J0YwZhcHBfaWQQMjIyMDM5MTc4ODIwMDg5MgABHnO_ZNrci3edb8Xx32uYhHdEwip7-iFZDX7UDXnqy-kFxLdCyCsB_CZf9u7E_aem_aQ8FaapVvXpO8R3xvx_FkA; https://www.wistv.com/2020/04/02/candidate-state-senate-arrested-accused-sexually-abusing-relative/; https://www.thestate.com/news/politics-government/article241691646.html; https://wach.com/news/local/deputies-man-charged-with-sexually-abusing-minor; https://conwebwatch.org/2024/06/19/despite-his-pending-criminal-charges-wnd-and-newsmax-still-publish-columns-by-michael-letts/.

ten-years-old, until she turned seventeen, by the Richland County Sheriff's Department. Michael Letts was charged with (i) Incest, (ii) Second-Degree Criminal Sexual Conduct with a Minor Between 11 and 14 Years of Age, (iii) Second-Degree Criminal Sexual Conduct with a Minor Under 16 Years of Age, and (iv) Third-Degree Criminal Sexual Conduct for the continuous sexual abuse of a relative throughout a period of seven years. While the State of South Carolina ultimately entered a *nolle prosequi* to avoid forcing the young victim to suffer through trial testimony, a *nolle prosequi* dismissal is **not** an acquittal under South Carolina law. Reporting on the fact of this arrest and the nature of the charges is entirely lawful.

2. **Arrest for Shoplifting[15]:** In 2022, Michael Allan Letts was subsequently arrested and criminally charged with Shoplifting in Richland County, South Carolina (*State of South Carolina vs. Michael Allan Letts*, Case No. 2022A4010200395).

Accurately publishing public mugshots, arrest data, criminal charges, and docket information cannot form the basis of a defamation claim.

C. The Challenged Publications Are Protected Speech – Not "Incitement."

Your Letter asserts that our Clients' publications are "not entitled to constitutional protection" because they allegedly "provoked" death threats against your clients. That assertion is both offensive and legally baseless. As a threshold matter, our Clients unequivocally condemn any threat or act of violence against any person, including Michael and Karen Letts, and had no part in making, encouraging, or endorsing any such threat. But the reaction of anonymous third parties does not strip protected speech of its protection. Truthful reporting and good-faith commentary on a public figure's charitable finances and public criminal record do not become actionable — much less lose their First Amendment protection — because some reader responds to the disclosed facts in a manner no one condoned. Speech forfeits constitutional protection as "incitement" only where it is directed to inciting or producing imminent lawless action and is likely to produce it. *Brandenburg v. Ohio*, 395 U.S. 444. Nothing our Clients have published approaches that standard, and your effort to recast protected, public-interest reporting as "incitement" only confirms the retaliatory, speech-chilling purpose of your Letter.

III. Your Central Factual Premise — That "Every Prior Claim …Was Dismissed for Failure to State a Claim" — Is False.

Section II of your Letter asserts that "[e]very claim previously asserted against Michael Letts, Karen Letts, InVest USA, and Broken Arrow Children's Ranch was DISMISSED for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted", and that "[a] court of competent jurisdiction has already adjudicated the underlying allegations to be legally insufficient." You then build your entire "actual malice" liability theory on that assertion.

[15] State of South Carolina vs. Michael Allan Letts, Richland County, 2022A4010200395, https://publicindex.sccourts.org/Richland/PublicIndex/CaseDetails.aspx?County=40&CourtAgency=40101&Casenum=2022A4010200395&CaseType=C&HKey=98120117698966678876758610311250748178737852104707110110812143437511350117116817411682658310175116111.

The assertion is false and a total fabrication. There has been no such dismissal — not of "every claim," nor of any single claim at all for a matter of fact.

The litigation you reference is *The Silent Partner Marketing, LLC v. Invest to Protect Our Law Enforcement Officers, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 562025CA001960AXXXHC, pending in the Circuit Court of the Nineteenth Judicial Circuit in and for St. Lucie County, Florida. You have the procedural posture exactly backward:

- Our Client, The Silent Partner Marketing, LLC, is the Plaintiff. Your clients are the Defendants.
- Your clients filed a Motion to Dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and, as to certain counts only, for failure to state a claim.
- **That motion remains pending. No hearing has been held. No order has been entered. Nothing has been dismissed.**
- On July 1, 2026 — the very date of your Letter — our Client filed its Response in Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss.

A defendant's unheard motion to dismiss is not an adjudication; it is the opposite of one. Your representation that "[a] court of competent jurisdiction has already adjudicated the underlying allegations to be legally insufficient" is flatly untrue.

You—a licensed attorney—allege in your Letter that my Clients' "persistence in republishing allegations a court has already rejected is itself powerful evidence of actual malice and reckless disregard for the truth, and will support a substantial award of punitive as well as compensatory damages in any defamation action our [c]lients elect to bring."…This is alarming as we are compelled to observe that any member of the public — let alone an attorney threatening litigation over these very matters — can confirm the status of this case by searching the St. Lucie County docket in a matter of minutes.

Giving you the benefit of the doubt, you presumably were yet another victim of your clients' perpetual misrepresentations. However, had you done some simple due diligence before signing the Letter, you would have seen that nothing has been dismissed. The result is that the one fact you offer as "powerful evidence of actual malice" is a fabrication — and it is your Letter, not our Clients' publications, that traffics in demonstrably false statements about the status of a court proceeding. The fact that your central argument is an outright falsehood speaks volumes to the bad-faith nature of your demand Letter.

IV. The Threat of Criminal Prosecution Is Improper and, As Framed, Potentially Unlawful.

Your Letter explicitly threatens "referral for criminal investigation," and the materials circulated under cover of your Letter (addressed below) expressly threatened immediate "criminal charges" against our Clients and their associates. Those threats are improper and constitute potential extortion.

Rule 4-3.4(g) of the Rules Regulating The Florida Bar strictly prohibits a lawyer from "present[ing], participat[ing] in presenting, or threaten[ing] to present criminal charges solely to obtain an advantage in a civil matter." *FL ST BAR* Rule 4-3.4. Your Letter is, on its face, an effort to leverage the threat of the criminal justice system to coerce a civil retraction and the deletion of protected speech. Injecting threats of criminal prosecution into that effort is precisely what the rule forbids. **This is a severe ethical violation.**

The threat is also baseless. The claims your Letter asserts — defamation, defamation per se, false light, intentional infliction of emotional distress, tortious interference, and civil conspiracy — are civil claims. While Florida nominally retains a criminal libel statute, it is an all-but-unenforced provision of doubtful constitutionality, (*Fla. Stat. Ann.* § 836.01) and nothing in your Letter comes close to describing conduct that any prosecutor would treat as a crime. There is no cognizable criminal exposure here to "refer."

Most significantly, a written threat to accuse another of a crime in order to extract a concession, compel an act against their will, or with intent to extort any pecuniary advantage, is a serious criminal offense in Florida. Under *Fla. Stat.* § 836.05, any person who maliciously threatens via written communication to accuse another of any crime with the intent to compel the threatened person to do any act against his or her will **commits a felony of the second degree**. A demand that our Clients delete protected speech and publish a coerced "apology" — under threat of "criminal charges" and "criminal investigation" — implicates that statute directly. We do not raise this lightly, and we expect these threats to be withdrawn immediately and without qualification.

V. Your Correspondence Appears to Constitute the Unauthorized Practice of Law.

You are a member of the Illinois bar. You are not admitted to practice law in Florida or South Carolina. Yet, you directed a litigation-threatening demand to a Florida resident and Florida business entities, on behalf of South Carolina clients, concerning a dispute with zero connection to Illinois.

In Florida, providing legal representation or practicing law without a license constitutes a **felony of the third degree** under Fla. Stat. § 454.23. Florida maintains a unified bar, and a non-member who provides legal representation in Florida engages in the unauthorized practice of law unless a narrow exception applies. *Chandris, S.A. v. Yanakakis*, 668 So. 2d 180 (Fla. 1995). The provision of legal services in Florida by a non-member is itself unlawful. *Morrison v. West*, 30 So. 3d 561 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 2010). Rule 4-5.5 of the Rules Regulating The Florida Bar permits an out-of-state lawyer to provide temporary legal services in Florida *only* if they are acting in association with an actively participating Florida lawyer, or in connection with an active proceeding in which they reasonably expect to appear *pro hac vice*. *Morrison*, 30 So. 3d 561. You satisfy neither condition.

Sending a demand letter threatening litigation does not qualify as preliminary work incident to a proceeding you reasonably expect to enter. The very stated purpose of your Letter is to resolve the matter out of court so that no litigation ensues; if it succeeds, there is no lawsuit for which you would seek admission. And you cannot lawfully initiate the threatened litigation yourself, as it could only be brought in Florida or South Carolina, in neither of which you are admitted. In fact, this matches the exact reasoning of the Illinois State Bar Association—coincidentally the state you *are* licensed to practice in—in Professional Conduct Advisory Opinion 23-01, which concluded that a lawyer admitted only in one state engages in the unauthorized practice of law by sending a demand letter into another state where the client, the recipient, and the dispute are located. The analysis applies with full force to your conduct here. We reserve all rights arising from it.

VI. Coordinated Witness Tampering and Intimidation via Third Parties.

As we established on July 8, 2026, within hours of your transmission of the Letter, an individual identifying herself as "Phoebe Trull" (using a domain registered just 24 hours prior) blasted your Letter to numerous professional contacts of our Clients. Those emails explicitly stated that the letter enclosed a cease-and-desist "along with criminal charges for all partners, board members, employees, agents, officers, members, and any persons acting in concert with" our Clients.

You have represented in writing that you have no knowledge of "Phoebe Trull" and that she is not associated with your firm. We take you at your word for present purposes. However, we note that these fraudulent emails and coordinated distribution specifically targeted and threatened at least four (4) active witnesses in the pending Florida lawsuit. Weaponizing your legal work product to explicitly threaten these witnesses with "criminal charges" crosses the line into a highly coordinated campaign of criminal witness tampering and intimidation under *Fla. Stat.* § 914.22, as well as actionable tortious interference with business relationships.

It is hard to ignore the obvious chain of custody of your Letter. It is safe to assume that only you and your client, Michael Letts, had possession of this letter until it was sent to my Client on July 7, 2026 at 3:25pm; my Clients certainly did not forward the Letter to any third parties. Despite only you and your client, Michael Letts, having possession of the Letter, somehow beginning on July 7th at 8:36pm, through 10:38pm, "Phoebe Trull" sent your Letter to eight (8) different individuals, all related to my Clients. Then again, beginning on July 8th at 7:47am, continuing through 11:05am, "Phoebe Trull" sent your Letter to another two (2) individuals. In sum, in just 20-hours since you sent the Letter to my Client, a total of twelve (12) e-mails were sent to ten (10) different individuals, by Phoebe@TrullLegal.com attaching your Letter. It just so happens that coincidentally each and every single one of those ten recipients were introduced to your client, Michael Letts, by my Client during their business relationship. The implication is obvious and the conclusion is inescapable.

Our Clients reserve all rights and remedies on this subject against all responsible parties. We renew our demand that you confer with your clients and confirm, in writing, whether they, or anyone acting on their behalf, caused, facilitated, or authorized the "Phoebe Trull" communications.

VII. This Demand Letter Is a Frivolous Threat Designed to Chill Protected Speech.

Your demand is a heavy-handed and clear vindictive effort to muzzle legitimate, public-interest journalism and truthful criticism through the threat of litigation and baseless criminal referrals. Michael Letts is an active public figure who routinely courts national media attention, aggressively solicits millions of dollars in public charitable donations, and touts himself as "America's Top Cop." Yet, while he eagerly exploits the spotlight for financial gain, he completely buckles under any meaningful accountability regarding his actual financial management, nor can he withstand factual reporting on his public criminal record. This retaliatory, speech-chilling posture is the exact type of abuse that anti-SLAPP (Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation) legislation was enacted to dismantle.

Should your clients make the ill-advised decision to initiate a lawsuit over these protected publications, or attempt to assert these meritless claims in our active Florida action, we will immediately move for dismissal under Florida's Anti-SLAPP statute, Fla. Stat. § 768.295. We will vigorously pursue the mandatory recovery of our Clients' attorneys' fees, legal costs, and actual damages resulting from your clients' bad-faith conduct.

Furthermore, we will not hesitate to seek statutory sanctions against both you and your clients under Fla. Stat. § 57.105 for bringing a frivolous action completely devoid of any factual or legal basis.

VIII. Preservation Obligations Run Both Ways.

In Section V of your Letter, you assert that my Clients are under an obligation to preserve documents in anticipation of litigation. Please be advised that these evidentiary duties apply equally to your clients. Effective immediately, Michael Letts, Karen Letts, and InVest USA are on notice to halt all routine document destruction policies and ensure the absolute preservation of all documents, electronically stored information (ESI), communications, and materials concerning:

- The non-privileged, if any, decision-making, drafting, and transmission of the July 1, 2026, demand letter;
- The registration of the "trulllegal.com" domain, the creation of the "Phoebe Trull" persona, the subsequent dissemination of your Letter to third parties, and any and all communications regarding same;
- Any communications regarding Kyle Reyes, The Silent Partner Marketing, Law Enforcement Today, or any associated individuals;
- All financial records, ledgers, receipts, and bank statements relating to InVest USA's revenue, general expenditures, and specifically, the actual purchase and distribution of bulletproof vests from 2015 to the present;
- All documents, records, or communications relating to Michael Letts' claims of military service, his law enforcement employment history, and his past or pending criminal charges in the State of South Carolina.

If your clients are reckless enough to initiate the litigation you threaten, that would be an act of profound self-sabotage, as it will give us the immediate right to compel the disclosure of the very financial and personal records your clients are desperately trying to hide.

In fact, we invite your clients to proceed with their threatened lawsuit, as doing so will immediately unlock our ability to expose these exact operational and financial realities through court-mandated discovery, all while recovering our attorneys' fees and costs.

IX. Demand.

For the reasons above, our Clients reject each and every demand contained in your July 1st Letter. That said, demand is hereby made that, no later than seven (7) calendar days from the date of this correspondence, you and your clients:

1. Withdraw the Letter in its entirety and confirm in writing that no defamation or related action will be pursued on the basis of the unspecified statements it references;

2. Formally retract the false statement in Section II of your Letter asserting that "every claim" against your clients "was DISMISSED for failure to state a claim" and that a court "has already adjudicated the underlying allegations to be legally insufficient";

3. Withdraw all threats of criminal prosecution and criminal referral, whether contained in your Letter or in the materials circulated under cover of it; and

4. Confirm in writing whether your clients caused, authorized, or have direct knowledge of the "Phoebe Trull" communications described herein in Section VI.

Nothing in this letter is a complete recitation of the facts or law, and it is written without waiver of any of our Clients' rights, claims, remedies, or defenses, all of which are expressly reserved — including their rights with respect to the pending St. Lucie County litigation, the improper threats described above, and the third-party circulation of your Letter. Our Clients will continue to exercise their First Amendment rights and will not delete, alter, or "retract" truthful, protected, public-interest speech.

Govern yourself accordingly.

Very truly yours,

Blake R. Mathesie, Esq.
GrayRobinson, PA
Counsel for Kyle Reyes, The Silent Partner Marketing, LLC, Law Enforcement Today, The 1776 Project, and Blue Lives Matter

BRM

cc:
Jason B. Burnett, Esq., GrayRobinson PA, *Counsel for Kyle Reyes, The Silent Partner Marketing, LLC, Law Enforcement Today, The 1776 Project, and Blue Lives Matter; Counsel for Plaintiff, The Silent Partner Marketing, LLC, St. Lucie County Circuit Court Case No. 56-2025-CA-001960*

Jonathan P. Hart, Esq. and **Benjamin J. Gibson, Esq.**, Shutts & Bowen LLP, *Counsel for Defendants, InVest, Michael Letts, and Karen Letts, St. Lucie County Circuit Court Case No. 56-2025-CA-001960*