

Date: Thu, 3 Apr 2008 04:24:20 -0700 (PDT)
From: Irvin Muchnick
Subject: Questions about Scott James and Chavo Guerrero
To: Ethon Harper

Ethon,

I will be writing further on my blog about the roles of Scott James and Chavo Guerrero. Again, I want to be fair and accurate in my portrayal of the Sheriff's Office investigation, so please get back to me on the following:

JAMES

[snip]

3. Your report doesn't probe the 9:26 a.m. Sunday text from James to Benoit, "When do u land?" In your phone conversation with me the other day, you said, "That is very interesting." I don't want to hype -- is it fair to call this something that you're conceding you missed at the time?

[snip]

Date: Sat, 5 Apr 2008 12:57:42 -0700 (PDT)
From: Irvin Muchnick
Subject: Resetting Muchnick's questions for you
To: Ethon Harper

Ethon,

One dangling question, two new ones:

1. SCOTT JAMES

I want to blog further about his 9:26 a.m. text on 6/24/07, "When do u land?" You said it's "interesting" and I want to know if you had a theory for it in your report or if you are pondering it now for the first time as a result of my report.

[SNIP]

Subject:Answers

Date: Tue, 8 Apr 2008 13:03:44 -0400

From: Ethon Harper

To: Irvin Muchnick

Irv,

[snip]

1. SCOTT JAMES

I want to blog further about his 9:26 a.m. text on 6/24/07, "When do u land?" You said it's "interesting" and I want to know if you had a theory for it in your report or if you are pondering it now for the first time as a result of my report.

The biggest point we took from the message is that it was unanswered. That helped with the timeline of when Chris died. There may have been a flight scheduled for Sunday, but that never came up in the homicide investigation. If the WWE scheduled the flight for him then they would be the best source for proof of the flight.

[snip]

Subject: "Interesting"
Date: Wed, 9 Apr 2008 08:22:53 -0400
From: Ethon Harper
To: Irvin Muchnick

Irv,

I thought in one of your previous emails, you said you did not want to "hype."

Here is what you sent to me and my response sent in a previous email.

3. Your report doesn't probe the 9:26 a.m. Sunday text from James to Benoit, "When do u land?" In your phone conversation with me the other day, you said, "That is very interesting." I don't want to hype -- is it fair to call this something that you're conceding you missed at the time?

I was referring to the way you were interpreting the text. During our conversation, I felt you were trying to say the text was planned or planted by Scott under some type of direction from the WWE.

Take Care,

Ethon

Date: Wed, 9 Apr 2008 05:28:22 -0700 (PDT)
From: Irvin Muchnick
Subject: Re: "Interesting"
To: Ethon Harper

Ethon,

Categorically, I did not previously receive a message from you with your verbiage below about the Scott James text.

My question to you about this was posed last Thursday. Please note that in my message on Saturday, I'm following up, which wouldn't make sense if the question had been answered.

I will clarify in a new blog entry. However, I first request that you send me the complete previous email, with time and date stamp, in which you gave your perspective on the James message.

You are correct, I said I did not want to hype.

Best,
Irv

Date: Wed, 9 Apr 2008 08:41:02 -0700 (PDT)
From: Irvin Muchnick
Subject: Further on "Interesting"
To: Ethon Harper

Ethon,

Tonight I will put up a new blog post noting that you clarified your "interesting" comment in an email in which you wrote: "I was referring to the way you were interpreting the text.... [etc.]"

Absent the backup I requested from you, I am not going to get into your claim that I'd previously gotten this statement from you. It's possible that cyberspace played a trick on us, which would become clear if you forward to me the referenced previous message. However, I did not deliberately quote you out of context. And I would not.

I'll now call you to reinforce this message. Feel free to call me [snip]

Thanks and best,
Irv

Subject:RE: Further on "Interesting"
Date: Wed, 9 Apr 2008 12:39:48 -0400
From: Ethon Harper
To: Irvin Muchnick

Irv,

I really don't want you to clarify the post. I was really just poking a little bit of fun at you. No reason to point out a misunderstanding and make it a bigger issue than it is.

As for proof, I clear out my sent box pretty frequently to keep from getting the "over size limits" message from our server. I don't have any messages past a week ago. The only thing I have is a word document I have been pasting all of your questions into.

I just didn't want you to think I was upset. I wasn't trying to say you were misquoting me.

Take Care

Ethon

Date: Wed, 9 Apr 2008 09:41:40 -0700 (PDT)
From: Irvin Muchnick
Subject: RE: Further on "Interesting"
To: Ethon Harper

Ethon,

Cool. I will not run a clarification. However, I do now have this more elaborate explanation of what you think about the Scott James text, and I'll no doubt return to it at some point -- though not now, and not to make it look like you and I are quibbling about something, which, it seems, we're not.

Best,
Irv