



February 7, 2026

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Dennis Yu
BlitzMetricxs
1480 Paseo Verde Parkway, Apt 1303
Henderson, NV 89012

RE: State of The Union

Dear Dennis,

I am sure you know the District Court Montgomery County Maryland misdemeanor case against you will be dismissed (**without prejudice**) to make way for a felony case that will likely be filed against you in the Circuit Court of Montgomery County Maryland.

Richard Schimel and I have had several meetings with the States Attorney Director who oversees all Montgomery County's felony cases in Montgomery County Maryland. I have also met with criminal law attorneys, and I have been provided with an overview of what a felony case against you may entail (below).

You should know that attacking me is one thing, but **attacking Richard Schimel, an officer of the Court, takes this matter to an entirely different level.** You have a pattern of behavior attacking attorneys by purchasing their names URL; Richard Schimel (**richardschimel.com**) Dave Aronberg (**dave-aronberb.com**) L.A.Perkins (**laperkinslawyer.com**) and others.

Nevertheless, I have made several unsuccessful attempts to resolve this matter with you. You have written 19+/- online post about me and Richard Schimel filled with bold-face slanderous lies, ½-truths, and your twisted opinions. Your First Amendment defense will not protect you, because you have simply gone too far. You used the internet to send written threats to me and to Richard Schimel. You filed a Bar Complaints against Richard Schimel making assertions that are dead wrong. You filed a Criminal Application against me filled with fraudulent statements and you obtained a Court Appointed Attorney is also based on fraud, and that is just the tip of the iceberg.

In the beginning, you demanded that I withdraw from representing my clients against Nautical Bowls. When I refused, you "turned up the heat" as you stated in writing several times. I refused to abandon my clients and was able to settle **EVERY** case. Nautical Bowls and my clients were satisfied with every settlement. Why was that not enough to end your attacks on me and Richard Schimel.

I filed 4 Peace orders against you **myself**, Richard Schimel had **ABSOLUTELY NOTHING** to do with any Peace Order filing. You attached Richard Schimel over the Peace Orders with no proof of his involvement whatsoever. Clearly you did **NO** research. But that did not stop you from filing a fraudulent complaint against him with the Marland Bar.

I have sued you in US District Court, and you demanded that I pay you money before you take the post down, why? You have no counter claim against me, or a valid reason why I would need to pay you for anything. You claim you want reimbursement for your expenses, but in reality, your game is simply extortion. If I do not capitulate to your demands, you will post more online posts filled with lies about me and Richard Schimel.

I have already filed 2 Applications for Criminal Charges against you in Montgomery County. If Montgomery County elects not to go forward with the felony charges, I have several other options, including but not limited to, the Maryland Attorney General, the Maryland US Attorney, the Department of Justice, and the FBI. In short, I am not going away any time soon. I have also been contacted by many other Dennis Yu "victims," and they want to form a group to sue you and/or put you in jail.

You also have a history of attacking your victims' attorneys, and that is a huge mistake. Some attorneys I have spoken to believe your behavior could be considered a RICO matter, since your behavior is ongoing, consistent and crosses state lines. You have other civil cases pending against you (other than my case) and another case that I know of on the way.

My question is how this can be worth your time to get caught up in any criminal or civil matter. You are spending time and money with **NO** upside. Needing a Court Appointed Attorney does not help your so called pristine reputation and any criminal conviction or civil case loss will make you radioactive with DigiMarCon, NAMM, Yahoo, and all the other speaking event platforms you have a relationship with. Attracting new clients will be **Mission Impossible!** I am not writing to you to make you angry or to threaten you, only to enlighten you to what is going on and what may come your way.

I told you a month ago that I thought you have a lot of talent getting your posts to the top of the Google page. You could use that talent to make a lot of money helping people with their online reputations. It will make you a lot more money than sitting in a Court room or in a jail cell. Believe it or not, I would be the first to hire you for some of my ZivZo clients that have some online reputation issues.

So, before a criminal felony case is filed against you, consider ending this. You already won; you have successfully made my life miserable. Take the win before the pendulum swings in the other direction.

Look at the information below. Will it all happen...neither of us is smart enough to know where this will end up.... but is it worth the time, effort, money, and risk?

Think about it.

Truly yours,

Benson Fischer

Under the Maryland Criminal Code, the following statutes would apply to Dennis Yu's conduct perpetrated on Benson Fischer and ZivZo, LLC.

1. Extortion by Written Threat (§ 3-706)

This is the most direct statute for a "written threat" to post negative articles unless a demand is met.

- **The Law:** A person may not knowingly send or deliver a writing threatening to accuse any person of "anything that, if true, would bring the person into contempt or disrepute" with the **intent to unlawfully extort** money, property, or **anything of value**.
- **"Anything of Value":** In Maryland, forcing a person to give up their business, contracts, or right to work (forbearance) is considered a "thing of value."
- **Penalty:** This is a **Felony** in Maryland, punishable by up to **10 years** in prison and/or a \$10,000 fine.
- **"Written Threats"** were made by Dennis Yu directly to Benson Fischer and to Richard Schimmel by email and by LinkedIn messaging service in 2025.

2. Extortion Generally (§ 3-701)

This statute covers the broader scheme of using "economic injury" to coerce a victim.

- **The Law:** Prohibits obtaining or attempting to obtain "anything of value" from another with their consent if that consent is induced by the **wrongful use of actual or threatened economic injury**.
- **Application:** If Yu threatened to destroy Fischer's business reputation (economic injury) to force Fischer to "consent" to leaving his clients, it fits this statute.
- **Penalty:** If the value of the business/contracts is over \$1,000, it is a **Felony**. The prison sentence ranges from 10 to 25 years depending on the monetary value of the loss.

3. Misuse of Electronic Communication (§ 3-805)

Often called "Cyber-harassment," this covers the "course of conduct" involving the 16 posts.

- **The Law:** Prohibits maliciously engaging in a course of conduct through electronic communication (websites, social media) that alarms or seriously annoys another person:
 1. With the intent to **harass, alarm, or annoy**.
 2. After receiving a **reasonable warning** or request to stop.
 3. **Without a legal purpose**.
- **Penalty:** A misdemeanor punishable by up to **3 years** in prison and/or a \$10,000 fine.

4. Extortion by False Accusation (§ 3-704)

If the information posted is demonstrably false (as you noted "false information" and "slander"), this specific statute applies.

- **The Law:** A person, with intent to extort, may not **falsely accuse** or **threaten to falsely accuse** another of anything that would bring them into disrepute.
- **Penalty:** A misdemeanor punishable by up to **10 years** in prison.

Summary Table of Potential Charges

Statute	Classification	Key Element Met	Max Prison
CR § 3-706	Felony	The written threat to post more articles unless he quits.	10 Years
CR § 3-701	Felony	Using the domain to cause "economic injury" to the business.	10–25 Years
CR § 3-805	Misdemeanor	The 19+/- online -post "course of conduct" after being told to stop.	3 Years
CR § 3-704	Misdemeanor	Posting information known to be false to extort a withdrawal.	10 Years

Intimidation of Richard Schimel

The inclusion of an attorney (**Richard Schimel**) as a target of several articles published by Dennis Yu **significantly escalates** the legal stakes for him. In Maryland, attorneys are considered "**officers of the court**," and target Richard Schimel to influence, inhibit, or stop a legal proceeding moves the case out of the realm of "public criticism" and into the realm of **Crimes Against Public Administration**.

If the online articles were posted with the intent to intimidate and/or harass attorney Schimel into dropping the lawsuit or changing his legal strategy, it directly impacts the pending criminal case *State of Maryland v. Dennis Yu* in four primary ways:

1. Potential for New Felony/Misdemeanor Charges

Under Maryland law, targeting an attorney involved in a case is a specific criminal offense distinct from general harassment:

- **Intimidating an Officer of the Court (CR § 9-305):** This statute prohibits using threats or "corrupt means" to try to influence, intimidate, or impede an officer of the court (including attorneys) in the performance of their official duties.
 - **Penalty:** Up to 10 years in prison.
- **Retaliation for Official Duties (CR § 9-303):** It is a crime to threaten an officer of the court "for any reason relating to the performance of the officer's official duties."
 - **Penalty:** Up to 10 years in prison.
- **Obstruction of Justice (CR § 9-306):** Broadly prohibits any act that "impedes the administration of justice." Using 16 articles to pressure an attorney to stop representing a client is a textbook example of obstruction.

2. Evidence of "Course of Conduct" and "Malice"

In a criminal harassment case (CR § 3-805), the prosecution must prove a "course of conduct" intended to alarm or annoy with **no legal purpose**.

- **The Impact:** By expanding the attacks to the *attorney*, the prosecution can argue that Yu's online articles are not about protecting the public but are part of a malicious campaign to interfere with the judicial system.
- **Pattern Of Behavior:** Dennis Yu has a patter of purchasing domain URL names of attorney's representing Parties that Yu has a history of attacking. Richard Schimel (**richardschimel.com**) Dave Aronberg (**dave-aronberb.com**) L.A.Perkins (**laperkinslawyer.com**).

3. Impact on Bail and Pretrial Release

- **Bail Revocation:** If the court determines that the 19 new posts about Schimel constitute "witness or officer intimidation," the State's Attorney can move to **revoke Yu's bail**.
- **Public Safety:** Maryland judges view interference with the legal process (targeting lawyers/witnesses) as a threat to the "integrity of the judicial process," which is a ground for holding a defendant without bond until trial.

Copyright Infringement

Yu posted copyrighted photos of Benson Fischer & Richard Schimel without their expressed consent.

Unauthorized use of a photo in a article fits into the context of criminal behavior, it is necessary to distinguish between copyright law (civil) and harassment law (criminal).

1. "Criminal Behavior" (Harassment)

The "criminal behavior" refers to is the **criminal harassment charge** (Electronic Communication Harassment) filed against Dennis Yu in Maryland in June 2025. In this context, the photos are used as **evidence of intent** rather than a crime.

- In a criminal harassment case, the prosecution will prove a **"course of conduct"** intended to annoy, alarm, or harassment. Based on Yu's pattern of behavior with Benson Fischer, Richard Schimel, Dave Aronberg L.A. Perkins, and others **"course of conduct"** is easily established.

Yu has published several online articles about Richard Schimel and Yu also writes extensively about Richard Schimel in nearly all the 19+/- online articles published about Benson Fischer. In addition, Yu has published online articles that have titles that contain both Benson Fischer and Richard Schimel

- **Intent to Humiliate:** By using a personal or copyrighted image without consent in a series of "attack" articles, Yu was attempting to exert control or cause emotional distress to Fischer and Schimel.
- **Persistence:** The repetition of using Fischer and Schimel's name in the titles of all the online articles and his photos of Fischer and Schimel demonstrate that the behavior was a persistent campaign of "cyberbullying."
- **Stalking/Surveillance:** Yu's deep dives into Benson Fischer and Richard Schimels personal history and use of their images constituted a form of digital stalking.

Digital Stalking Summary Table

Action	Civil Context	Criminal Context (Alleged)
Using a photo without permission	Copyright Infringement (requires paying damages).	Evidence of a "course of conduct" in a harassment/stalking charge.
Publishing several online articles	Defamation / Libel (if the facts are proven false).	Electronic Communication Harassment (intent is to alarm/annoy).

4. Aggravating Factors at Sentencing

Judges typically impose much harsher sentences (including jail time rather than probation) on defendants who "double down" on the behavior they are currently being prosecuted for. Yu continues to write online articles about Fischer and Schimel long after criminal charges have been filed. Over a 4-month period from August 2025 through November, Fischer filed 4 Peace orders against Yu. Yu continued to write numerous online articles about Fischer and Schimel during this period.

Summary of the Conflict

Action	Maryland Statute	Classification
Targeting Fischer (Business)	Harassment / Extortion	Misdemeanor/Felony
Targeting Schimel (Attorney)	Intimidating Officer of Court	Felony/Misdemeanor
Threatening to post more	Extortion / Obstruction	Felony

The "Bar Complaint" Countermove

Dennis Yu recently filed a **formal Bar Complaint** against Richard Schimel (late 2025). Yu's legal strategy is framing his articles as "public disclosures of attorney misconduct."

- **Yu's Goal:** To establish a "legal purpose" for the articles to avoid the criminal harassment threshold.
- The sheer volume (19+/- online posts) and the written threats to "capitulate" prove the bar complaint was merely a tool for **extortion**, not a legitimate ethical concern.