Selected Page from Document 148 Exhibit I

Precision Locating, LLC and Arvig Enterprises, Inc. v. Martin D. Starkebaum

Minnesota District Court, Seventh Judicial District, Otter Tail County

Court file 56-CV-25-198
Document index 148

Filing date December 4, 2025

Original selected PDF pages 153

One selected original PDF page from Exhibit I to the attorney affidavit filed as Index 148. Original PDF page 153 carries internal response page number 6. It includes the responses to Requests for Admission 17 through 19, with preceding material on that same original page preserved.

This PDF contains this added cover followed by the selected original pages. It is an excerpt, not the complete filing. The selected pages retain their original page contents, dimensions, and printed page numbers.

Citation guide Cite the original printed page and line numbers for a hearing transcript. For an exhibit, give its original PDF page and any internal printed page number. The appended pages have not been renumbered. The first selected source page follows this cover; the full original-to-excerpt page map is provided below.

Page map original 153 = excerpt 2

Source file 148 - 2025_12_04 - Affidavit of Attorney.pdf

Source SHA-256
46bbc5dce433d77b800c7808e637c4a2
a90f1c3094cd63e02e3da4a203b80772

Filed in District Court
State of Minnesota
7/25/2025 12:49 PM

RESPONSE: Defendant Starkebaum admits this Request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16: Admit that you have no information or evidence that Plaintiff Arvig knowingly hired pedophiles.

RESPONSE: Defendant Starkebaum admits this Request.

BLENDED INTERROGATORY NO. 2: If your responses to Requests for Admissions Nos. 15 and 16 are something other than unqualified admissions, state and describe in detail under Minn. R. Civ. P. 33, the facts justifying the response.

RESPONSE: Defendant Starkebaum will respond to this by the end of the agreed upon extension.

BLENDED DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 2: If your responses to Requests for Admissions Nos. 15 and 16 are something other than unqualified admissions, provide each and every document and thing justifying the response.

RESPONSE: Defendant Starkebaum will respond to this by the end of the agreed upon extension.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 17. Admit that if false, the statements in Exhibit A are defamation *per se.*

RESPONSE: Defendant Starkebaum admits this request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18. Admit that if the statements in Exhibit A are false and therefore defamation *per se,* Plaintiffs are presumed to have been damaged by the defamation *per se.*

RESPONSE: Defendant Starkebaum admits this request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19. Admit that Plaintiff Precision is entitled to over $250,000 in damages for being defamed by the post in Exhibit A.

RESPONSE: Defendant Starkebaum denies this request.