

Exhibit C

Carotank Road Ventures

CONFIDENTIAL

Washington, D.C. · carotankroad.com

5 May 2026

CRV-LETTER-RACKETEER-LOGO-0526-v1

The Directors

Gin and Ignorance Limited

trading as The Racketeer

105 King's Cross Road

London, WC1X 9LR

England

Re: Formal Notice: Unauthorised Use of Your Mark by @RacketeerX – Defamation, Harassment, and Active United States Federal Litigation

Dear Directors,

I am the Managing Director of Carotank Road Holdings, Inc., a defence industry advisory with offices in Washington, D.C., and the plaintiff in *Curtin v. Watts et al.*, No. 1:25-cv-00782, before the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina. I also write and investigate under the pen name Jackson Holt. On 23 April and 1 May 2026, I wrote to this address by email, in terms I considered measured, offering you the opportunity to engage with a matter that directly implicates your brand. Both communications are attached. You did not respond. This letter is the consequence of that decision.

The full background is set out in the attached correspondence and I do not intend to repeat it here. The short version is this: an X (formerly Twitter) account, @RacketeerX, conducted a sustained and coordinated campaign of defamation, doxxing, and harassment directed at me personally and at one of my professional clients, a NATO-allied defence company. That campaign published allegations of criminal conduct – espionage, market manipulation, deliberate destruction of a United States company on behalf of a foreign state-linked entity – presented as statements of fact, amplified through a network of associated accounts, and directed at named individuals and named organisations. Details of my family, including my children, were published without consent. The account that originated and coordinated that campaign used your mark – the inked eight-point star with radiating dots that appears on your premises and branded materials – as its profile image. That mark is bespoke. It is not in general circulation. The same screenshots are now part of the evidentiary record before the United States District Court. Your brand is in those proceedings.

Under the Defamation Act 2013, the statements published by @RacketeerX are defamatory on their face. The serious harm threshold – that a statement has caused or is likely to cause serious harm to reputation – is not a difficult one to meet when the allegations in question include espionage, foreign state agency, and the deliberate manipulation of a regulated public market. Those allegations were published to a public audience, amplified, and directed at me by name. They were also published to and specifically targeted at my professional client with the express purpose of damaging that relationship. Under section 2 of the Defamation Act 2013, the burden of proving those allegations substantially true falls

upon the defendant. It does not fall upon me. There is no First Amendment analogue in English law and no equivalent public interest shield. The account that published those statements did so under your mark.

The co-ordinated deployment of hostility toward a protected characteristic – gender identity – as a tool of that campaign engages the Criminal Justice Act 2003. The multi-account architecture and sustained conduct raise questions under the Online Safety Act 2023. I have taken advice on the full range of civil and criminal remedies available under English law. I am prepared to use them. I am also a plaintiff in active United States federal litigation in which @RacketeerX is already named as an anonymous actor. Discovery is coming. If the identity of the operator, and any connection to the defendants in that case, is established through that process, the picture becomes considerably more complicated for everyone involved.

I require a written response to this letter within fourteen (14) days of the date above. That response must address: (i) whether the @RacketeerX account is operated, authorised, or controlled by Gin and Ignorance Limited or any current or former officer, director, or employee; and (ii) if not, whether you have any information about who within your organisation or customer network had access to the digital files for your mark. If the account is yours, I expect direct contact from the responsible person. If it is not, you have your own interest in identifying who took your brand into a federal courthouse and a co-ordinated harassment campaign. Either way, the silence ends here.

Yours faithfully,



Jim Curtin

Managing Director

Carotank Road Holdings, Inc.

1500 K Street NW, Second Floor

Washington, D.C. 20005

jim@carotankroad.com · +1 (202) 878 2949

Enc. Email correspondence to hello@theracketeer.co.uk dated 23 April 2026 and 1 May 2026 (two documents)

From: Jim Curtin jim@carotankroad.com
Subject: Re: Unauthorised use of The Racketeer logo on account named in active US federal litigation
Date: May 1, 2026 at 12:48 pm
To: hello@theracketeer.co.uk
Cc: Jim Curtin jim@carotankroad.com



Hello,

As I have not heard back from you regarding this issue, I will proceed at my discretion.

Thank You.

Jim Curtin

From: Jim Curtin <jim@carotankroad.com>
Date: Thursday, April 23, 2026 at 7:53 pm
To: hello@theracketeer.co.uk <hello@theracketeer.co.uk>
Cc: Jim Curtin <jim@carotankroad.com>
Subject: Unauthorised use of The Racketeer logo on account named in active US federal litigation

Hello,

I'm the Managing Director of Carotank Road Holdings, Inc., a defence industry advisory based in Washington, D.C., and the plaintiff in active United States federal litigation concerning a US Department of Defence contract — Curtin v. Watts et al., No. 1:25-cv-00782, United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina. I also write under the pen name Jackson Holt.

On 27 May 2025, beginning at approximately 7:20 PM GMT, an X (Twitter) account operating under the handle @RacketeerX published a coordinated series of posts directed at me. The posts revealed my real identity behind the Jackson Holt byline, disclosed my personal (and my children's) identifying information (doxing), and directed other accounts to amplify the material. Those same posts named and tagged one of my professional clients — WB Group, Poland's largest privately held defence company and a major Ukraine supplier — in false allegations of corporate espionage and deliberate efforts to destroy a US defence company. WB Group representatives confirmed in writing that they received multiple messages making the same false accusations. The posts ran until approximately 10:22 PM GMT that evening.

The campaign that @RacketeerX initiated did not remain confined to professional defamation. The coordinated network of accounts it fed and directed also deployed imagery of men in drag and explicit insinuations about transgender identity as instruments of mockery and personal humiliation, directed at me by name. Screenshots of these posts, which include The Racketeer logo, are part of the evidentiary record now before the United States District Court. Under the Criminal Justice Act 2003 and the Online Safety Act 2023, a coordinated online campaign in which hostility toward a protected characteristic — here, gender identity — is demonstrated through a pattern of conduct carries specific legal exposure in England and Wales. The account that initiated and coordinated this campaign used your logo.

The campaign continued through further posts into July 2025 and has continued through related and successor accounts to the present day. @RacketeerX is the origin.

@RacketeerX is named in the pleadings of the above-referenced case as an anonymous actor in the retaliation campaign underlying my claims. The Court has been advised that discovery will be sought to determine the identity of the operator and whether the conduct was directed or facilitated by persons affiliated with the defendants.

The account's profile image is the exact custom logo used by The Racketeer — the inked eight-point star with radiating dots, as it appears on your menu and branded materials. The mark is custom. It is not in wide circulation. The correspondence is not approximate; it is the same design.

I'm writing on the working assumption that you're not aware of this, and that the use is unauthorised. If that is right, you have a direct interest in knowing. Someone is passing off your brand while engaged in conduct that spans active US federal proceedings, harassment of a NATO-allied defence company, and a coordinated campaign now touching UK hate crime law. That is not a position any business would choose to be associated with.

I'd like to have a conversation. Either the account is authorised by your business, and we should talk directly before anything escalates. Or it isn't, and you'd like to address the misuse of your brand. Or — and this is often how these things surface — the account isn't run by your business, but someone on your side has a suspicion, a name, a former employee or regular, or a sense of who had access to the custom

logo file. Any of those is worth hearing.

English defamation law places the burden of proving truth on the defendant, not the plaintiff. There is no First Amendment equivalent. If the evidence requires me to pursue remedies through the courts of England and Wales, I am prepared to do so.

I would appreciate a response, or an opportunity to discuss and remedy this situation. If needed, I can provide additional documentation of the retaliation initiated by the person controlling @racketeerx.

Kind regards,

Jim Curtin
Managing Director
Carotank Road Holdings, Inc.
1500 K Street NW, Second Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
jim@carotankroad.com | +1 (202) 878 2949 GMT-5

From: Jim Curtin jim@carotankroad.com
Subject: Unauthorised use of The Racketeer logo on account named in active US federal litigation
Date: April 23, 2026 at 7:53 pm
To: hello@theracketeer.co.uk
Cc: Jim Curtin jim@carotankroad.com



Hello,

I'm the Managing Director of Carotank Road Holdings, Inc., a defence industry advisory based in Washington, D.C., and the plaintiff in active United States federal litigation concerning a US Department of Defence contract — Curtin v. Watts et al., No. 1:25-cv-00782, United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina. I also write under the pen name Jackson Holt.

On 27 May 2025, beginning at approximately 7:20 PM GMT, an X (Twitter) account operating under the handle @RacketeerX published a coordinated series of posts directed at me. The posts revealed my real identity behind the Jackson Holt byline, disclosed my personal (and my children's) identifying information (doxxing), and directed other accounts to amplify the material. Those same posts named and tagged one of my professional clients — WB Group, Poland's largest privately held defence company and a major Ukraine supplier — in false allegations of corporate espionage and deliberate efforts to destroy a US defence company. WB Group representatives confirmed in writing that they received multiple messages making the same false accusations. The posts ran until approximately 10:22 PM GMT that evening.

The campaign that @RacketeerX initiated did not remain confined to professional defamation. The coordinated network of accounts it fed and directed also deployed imagery of men in drag and explicit insinuations about transgender identity as instruments of mockery and personal humiliation, directed at me by name. Screenshots of these posts, which include The Racketeer logo, are part of the evidentiary record now before the United States District Court. Under the Criminal Justice Act 2003 and the Online Safety Act 2023, a coordinated online campaign in which hostility toward a protected characteristic — here, gender identity — is demonstrated through a pattern of conduct carries specific legal exposure in England and Wales. The account that initiated and coordinated this campaign used your logo.

The campaign continued through further posts into July 2025 and has continued through related and successor accounts to the present day. @RacketeerX is the origin.

@RacketeerX is named in the pleadings of the above-referenced case as an anonymous actor in the retaliation campaign underlying my claims. The Court has been advised that discovery will be sought to determine the identity of the operator and whether the conduct was directed or facilitated by persons affiliated with the defendants.

The account's profile image is the exact custom logo used by The Racketeer — the inked eight-point star with radiating dots, as it appears on your menu and branded materials. The mark is custom. It is not in wide circulation. The correspondence is not approximate; it is the same design.

I'm writing on the working assumption that you're not aware of this, and that the use is unauthorised. If that is right, you have a direct interest in knowing. Someone is passing off your brand while engaged in conduct that spans active US federal proceedings, harassment of a NATO-allied defence company, and a coordinated campaign now touching UK hate crime law. That is not a position any business would choose to be associated with.

I'd like to have a conversation. Either the account is authorised by your business, and we should talk directly before anything escalates. Or it isn't, and you'd like to address the misuse of your brand. Or — and this is often how these things surface — the account isn't run by your business, but someone on your side has a suspicion, a name, a former employee or regular, or a sense of who had access to the custom logo file. Any of those is worth hearing.

English defamation law places the burden of proving truth on the defendant, not the plaintiff. There is no First Amendment equivalent. If the evidence requires me to pursue remedies through the courts of England and Wales, I am prepared to do so.

I would appreciate a response, or an opportunity to discuss and remedy this situation. If needed, I can provide additional documentation of the retaliation initiated by the person controlling @racketeerx.

Kind regards,

Jim Curtin
Managing Director
Carotank Road Holdings, Inc.

1500 K Street NW, Second Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
jim@carotankroad.com | +1 (202) 878 2949 GMT-5