

Exhibit 6

I am concerned about your statement that you should not have spoken to me. What should be coming forth is the truth. It appears from your statement that you feel you should have prevented some relevant fact from being discovered. It would have been revealed anyway. From viewing the truck there is no doubt the truck was the property of your son and your only involvement is to maintain your name on the title for your son's benefit, for insurance purposes, etc. That's not unusual for parents to do. You were nothing more than a straw owner.

A forfeiture case has two sides. One side the State's burden to show the property was being used in a racketeering offence, like theft. The documentation provided and evidence suggested in the request for admissions, illustrates the truck was used to go to the utility yard to steal parts for the truck and then have the parts installed onto the truck. You chose to dispute those facts. Maybe you should have asked your son first.

The second side is the exception to forfeiture for which you have the burden of proof. As stated above you're merely a straw owner, holding title for the benefit of your son. As such a straw owner does not have standing to bring a claim. Even if you did have standing you must show you could not have known of any illegal activity by your son. Your son has a history of shoplifting and other crimes which put you on notice of his character. The family purpose doctrine which has been raised, imposes a duty on your part to ensure the truck would not be used to facilitate a crime. That is more than simply being unaware of what your son is doing.

Your statement of regret, implying that you would like to have prevented relevant facts from being disclosed reveal your disingenuous purpose of opposing the forfeiture case. Under A.R.S. 13-4314(G) the State is due attorney fees from a party who does not prove they are entitled an exception to forfeiture.

The proper venue to seek return of the tools is in this forfeiture case. You may wish to file a motion of withdrawal of the claim to drop the case.

Sincerely,

Craig Cameron

From: Rhonda Cox [mailto:rhonda_cox1970@msn.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 02, 2014 10:45 AM
To: Craig Cameron
Subject: RE: CV 201302162

Mr. Cameron,

After reading the admissions, I am not going to proceed but, then you knew that. Attorney's charge too much to help you defend yourself and your property in a case such as this and the lay person does not stand a chance over someone who does this everyday. I should not have spoke with you and now understand fully why attorneys tell you not to speak to the police. What do I

need to do to drop the case? Also, is there anything I file in an attempt to get my tools and other personal items out of the vehicle.

Thank you for your help,

Rhonda Cox

From: Craig.Cameron@pinalcountyz.gov
To: rhonda_cox1970@msn.com
Subject: RE: CV 201302162
Date: Mon, 31 Mar 2014 19:58:30 +0000

Ms. Cox,

The Request for admission should be sent separately, but attached are the requests.

Thank you,

Craig Cameron

From: Rhonda Cox [mailto:rhonda_cox1970@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2014 11:57 AM
To: Craig Cameron
Subject: CV 201302162

Hello Mr. Cameron,

I am in receipt of your letter dated March 19,2014. In the letter you state you are also enclosing a request for admissions. The only documents enclosed in the envelope are your letter and the Stipulated Pretrial Schedule. Can you please e-mail me a copy of the request for admissions?
Thank you,

Rhonda Cox