Plaintiff MARY CUMMINS submits her response to Defendants' objections to Declaration of Mary Cummins and Exhibits submitted as follows:

Objection No. 1.

Plaintiff authenticated this exhibit. It is a still of a video taken from Defendant's YouTube channel BWSvMC. Plaintiff downloaded this still July 25 2012.

Objection No. 2.

This is an email written by Plaintiff sent to Randy Turner. It is not hearsay as it was written only by Plaintiff Mary Cummins.

Objection No. 3.

Plaintiff witnessed Defendant Lollar cutting a bat's vagina with scissors.

Plaintiff witnessed Defendant Lollar pulling the umbilicus out of a then pregnant bat causing the uterus and vagina to be pulled down. The pup was born dead. The mother later died. Plaintiff found a dead bat under Defendant Lollar's desk. It had been dead for days as evidenced by its condition. Defendant Lollar allows her bats to breed. It is against Texas Parks & Wildlife Department regulations to allow rehab and unreleasable animals to breed. Defendant Lollar did not provide proper veterinary care to the bats in her care. She did not seek the help of a veterinarian when a bat was having difficult giving birth. She did not seek the help of a veterinarian when a bat needed to be sutured.

Objection No. 4.

Plaintiff injured her head and back at Bat World Sanctuary. Doctors verified this injury.

Objection No. 5.

Plaintiff did receive treatment for her injuries in California. Plaintiff was prescribed physical therapy and medication for her injuries by her doctors. Plaintiff's doctors have told her that she needs surgery.

///

PL<u>AINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT/PARTIAL</u> SUMMARY JUDGMENT; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

PL<u>AINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT/PARTIAL</u> SUMMARY JUDGMENT; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

SUMMARY JUDGMENT; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

1

2

3

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

Objection No. 22.

Defendant Lollar stated in the Texas trial that she has been communicating with the Does.

Objection No. 23.

Plaintiff sent her second set of discovery requests to Defendants. This is relevant because the responses will provide proof that Defendant posted the defamatory items.

Objection No. 24.

The Judge in the Texas trial never signed an order that said Plaintiff was in "criminal contempt of court."

Objection No. 25.

Plaintiff's Texas deposition was not court ordered. It was by "notice." Copy of the deposition agreement was provided in the exhibits.

Objection No. 26.

The dates on Google blog posts can be changed. Plaintiff proved this in the hearing for temporary injunction. The dates had been changed on the blogs. Plaintiff provided further example by changing a blog post date to the year 1976. Google, Blogger, the Internet as we know it today did not exist at this time.

Objection No. 27.

Plaintiff proved in her temporary injunction hearing that the dates had been changed. Two printouts of the same blog on different dates showed different blog posts. The blog posts were posted within the last year but Does changed the dates to make them appear to be posted over a year ago, i.e. outside of the statute of limitations for defamation.

Objection No. 28.

The Texas injunction was void. Plaintiff's Texas attorney stated this to the Judge. Defendants tried to cure the issue by filing a bond soon after. The injunction

DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT/PARTIAL JUDGMENT; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES